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What should be the US strategy for ITER negotiations and planning?

- Procurement packages
  - Contributions in kind?
  - Contributions in cash to the ITER central team?
  - Hybrid 25-50% in kind, the rest in cash?
  - What should be the relation between construction phase contributions and research phase responsibilities and activities?
What should be the US strategy for ITER negotiations and planning?

- **Procurement packages**
  - Detailed discussion of the trade-offs between in kind and in cash contributions
  - In kind contributions promote national interests and commitment
  - In cash contributions could be used to ensure the machine gets built – a question remains how to control contingency costs?
  - *Just return* may be too restrictive to ensure ITER can be built on time and on budget cost effectively
  - How many levels of management of a given package are ideal? Limit to a small number; keep tech. experts close to the project
  - Voted for hybrid scenario 3 with 16 votes leaning for a majority in kind and 12 votes leaning for a majority in cash
How should we rate our participation in packages/activities (metric)?

1) How does the activity position the US for research on ITER?
2) Is the proposed activity or package “cost-effective” from the perspective of ITER-value/dollar?
3) Is this activity’s area one of US relative strength or leverage?
4) What does the activity contribute to the US fusion program?
5) Does the activity enhance the fusion-relevant capability of US industry?
6) Is the activity an opportunity for US industry?
7) Does the activity contribute to the development of the US fusion workforce?
How should we rate our participation in packages/activities (metric)?

- Is US participation in a given package going to make ITER better?
- Industry is still undervalued in this community and will be needed as secondees to manage and build such a big project.
- Run-time will be awarded “on the basis of merit, taking into account the level of contribution of the parties”.
- The US has a weak negotiating position because of its small contribution equal to that of China.
- Need to discuss the metrics in the context of the overall goals and objectives of US involvement in ITER.
Other topics discussed

- We should include as part of our negotiating strategy American people at high levels in ITER
- Concern that there is still no increase in the base program for the foreseeable future but only optimism that given the President’s initiative the funding will eventually come
- “Majority rule and minority rights” should be part of the negotiations
- We should push for a higher contribution in ITER “Aim high or stay at home!”
- Need a structure where there can be two-way communication between our negotiators and the fusion community
Next Steps . . .

- Such meetings are beneficial. Similar meetings should precede each negotiating meeting.
- Topics for succeeding meetings should be whatever is on the table for the next negotiating meeting.
- Need for more industry involvement – follow on forum for industry being considered; more engineering participation.
- Need more focused, real working meetings.
- Need advanced notice and preparation and written output.