

DESIGN REVIEW DOCUMENTATION - RESULTS

Title: NCSX PROTO. VV FDR

WP#: 1074 <sup>N/A</sup> (IN PROGRESS) (ENG-032)

Type of Review:  Peer  CDR  PDR  FDR

Cog Individual: Mike Vook Date of Review: 7-8-03

Review Board Members:

Chairperson Bob Pazianus  
Bob Kelback  
Brad Nelson  
Paul Goranson  
Mike Cole

Invited attendees:

QA J. Malsbury  
T. Brown  
Mike Vook  
Wayne Karsen

Other Attendees:

P. Weitzenroder  
L. Sutton

Regulatory Compliance \_\_\_\_\_

Items Reviewed:

	Sat.	Unsat.	Comments
Appropriate requirements identified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Development plans and schedules	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Regulatory compliance including USQD and NEPA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Wayne will confirm.</u>
Disposition of CHITS from previous reviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cost objectives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other review objectives addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(attachment 4 of ENG-033)

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Vendor requested root pass not be vacuum side - considered but rejected.

Disposition: [check one]

- Acceptable**
- Acceptable pending resolution of concerns** - CHITS identified above must be resolved prior to installation.
- Incomplete** - Additional design work is required prior to another design review.

Chairperson Signature: [Signature] Date: 7-8-03

Distribution: Review Board Members, Operations Center, Cognizant Design Engineer, System Engineer(s), Attendees, QA, ES&H

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # \_\_\_\_\_ (ENG-032)

CHIT # 1

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM \_\_\_\_\_

- PEER
- CDR
- PDR
- FDR

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

- REQUIREMENTS
- ANALYSIS
- PERFORMANCE
- HARDWARE
- CONFIGURATION
- RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY
- SAFETY
- COST/SCHEDULE
- QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

*Translation of CAD models need to be verified as part of MIT/QA plan*

ORIGINATOR Reuser

NAME/ORGANIZATION

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

*Action - Viola*

- CONCUR
- DISAGREE
- OTHER

CHAIRPERSON

*JF Daniels*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

*concur. - Vendors to be notified via Larry Sutton*

SIGNATURE

*Mike Kida*

DATE: 7/8/03

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

- APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
- DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION

SIGNATURE

*Reuser*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT

Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # \_\_\_\_\_ (ENG-032)

CHIT # 2

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM \_\_\_\_\_

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_

- PEER
- CDR
- PDR
- FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

- REQUIREMENTS
- ANALYSIS
- PERFORMANCE
- HARDWARE
- CONFIGURATION
- RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY
- SAFETY
- COST/SCHEDULE
- QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

Models need to be checked along with drawings. Should develop guidelines for checking models - what do we look for?

ORIGINATOR Reviser  
NAME/ORGANIZATION \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

Action: Cole

- CONCUR
- DISAGREE
- OTHER

CHAIRPERSON

[Signature]

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

Concur. Cole to develop criteria for checking and perform the check per that criteria

SIGNATURE [Signature] DATE: 7/8/03

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

- APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
- DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION

SIGNATURE

[Signature]

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT

Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # \_\_\_\_\_ (ENG-032)

CHIT # 3

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM \_\_\_\_\_

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER \_\_\_\_\_ DATE OF REVIEW \_\_\_\_\_

- PEER
- CDR
- PDR
- FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

- REQUIREMENTS
- ANALYSIS
- PERFORMANCE
- HARDWARE
- CONFIGURATION
- RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY
- SAFETY
- COST/SCHEDULE
- QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

*Reflections due to gravity loads should be calculated to verify that they are acceptable (VSAZ and PVVS) in all orientations.*

ORIGINATOR Reeisen

NAME/ORGANIZATION \_\_\_\_\_

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

*ACTION - Paul Goranson*

- CONCUR
- DISAGREE
- OTHER

CHAIRPERSON

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

*WBS 12 should include this analysis in the October PDR*

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

- APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
- DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT

Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # (ENG-032)

CHIT # 4

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE OF REVIEW

- PEER
- CDR
- PDR
- FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

- REQUIREMENTS
- ANALYSIS
- PERFORMANCE
- HARDWARE
- CONFIGURATION
- RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY
- SAFETY
- COST/SCHEDULE
- QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

*Dimensional checks on the PVVS should be checked at the factory and at PPPL to determine if any dimensional changes occur during shipping.*

ORIGINATOR Reuser  
 NAME/ORGANIZATION (Parsells remark.)

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

*Action. Viola*

- CONCUR
- DISAGREE
- OTHER

CHAIRPERSON

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

*update job 1202 to add PVVS receipt QA*

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

- APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
- DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT

Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE

DATE:

PPPL DESIGN REVIEW CHIT

WP # (ENG-032)

CHIT # 5

COMPONENT/SUBSYSTEM/SYSTEM

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER DATE OF REVIEW

- PEER
- CDR
- PDR
- FDR

SUBJECT: (CHECK AS APPLICABLE)

- REQUIREMENTS
- ANALYSIS
- PERFORMANCE
- HARDWARE
- CONFIGURATION
- RELIABILITY/MAINTAINABILITY
- SAFETY
- COST/SCHEDULE
- QUALITY

COMMENT/CONCERN/RECOMMENDATION

*Internally, the project should develop the measurement capability for surface location and port orientation in time to be used when the PVVS arrives.*

ORIGINATOR *Reeisen*  
 NAME/ORGANIZATION

REVIEW BOARD COMMENT/RECOMMENDATION

(Address technical, cost, and schedule impacts as appropriate. If CHIT is not adopted, provide technical reason - do not simply state "out-of-scope or N/A" without explaining.)

*Action - Paul Goranson*

- CONCUR
- DISAGREE
- OTHER

CHAIRPERSON

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER'S RESPONSE/DISPOSITION:

*add metrology development requirements and equipment procurements to work plans.*

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

RESPONSIBLE RLM REVIEW

- APPROVE COG DISPOSITION
- DISAPPROVE COG DISPOSITION

SIGNATURE

*[Signature]*

DATE: 7/8/03

COGNIZANT DESIGN ENGINEER CLOSE-OUT

Sign when action required by disposition is complete.

SIGNATURE

DATE: