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