Eric Voutier

- Take time a careful reading of the draft document on overleaf, and when necessary indicate your text changes with \textcolor{red}{…}. If your concern is deeper than a text adjustement, distribute your comments to our core group of people (Brian, Eric, Eugene, FX, Latifa, Silvia, Volker).

- Main parts to further develop for PAC submission: impact on CFF extraction, Beam time request, Bhabha polarimeter…
+ any comment raised by the Review Committee.

- Is it appropriate time to distribute the proposal to search for other collaborators (PWG, CLAS Collaboration) ?

Time-line

- Full proposal due to CLAS reviewers: ~~May 26, 2020~~
- First response by review committee: June 2, 2020
- Revised proposal due to reviewers: June 9, 2020
- Final committee recommendation: June 16, 2020
- Proposal submission due to PAC48: **June 22**, 2020.

The impact of positron measurements on CFF extraction is not a quantity strictly defined and depends on the evaluation procedure

- Operation of the local fit for the determination of CFF :

  → the larger the number of observables, the better the extraction of CFF;
  → the smaller the number of CFF to fit, the better is the CFF statistical error;
  the systematical error depends on the contribution of other CFF.

- Observables according to BKM
  - CFF from KM15 model
  - CFF from PARTONS
  - CFF from VGG used in DDVCS simulations
  - CFF from AFKM
- Observables according to VGG
  - via PARTON
  - via VGG original
- CFF extraction
  - via BKM with BKM based observables
  - *via VGG with VGG based observables*

$$\sigma_{UU}^- \; A_{LU}^- \; A_{UL}^- \; A_{LL}^- \; + \; A_{UU}^C \; A_{LU}^C$$

4 versus 7 CFF fitting
=
minimal or maximal impact of positron data

What is the impact on other CFF ?

Quantitative $\dfrac{\delta Cff^+}{\delta Cff^-} \quad \dfrac{Cff_M^- - Cff_{Ex.}^-}{Cff_M^+ - Cff_{Ex.}^-}$