1. Veto scintillators thickness: we are testing them now but, it will take another week  
        if not more. I will contact Youri to see if this is important for the engineering design  
        part.
2. Veto scintillator attachment tolerance: we are working on this item but, it will need  
    again a week or so. I will contact Youri and Dipangkar to see if a 0.5 mm tolerance  
    is realistic (for both edges of a single scintillator). In all cases we need survey points  
    on this device.  
    **Weizhi,** please make this item a priority before the weekend. If we need one more meeting, I am ready for that.
3. Changing the vacuum windows from X17 to PRad-II experiments (as it was shown by Bob). This is highly undesirable since it will involve not only the vacuum part (that comes from the target change also) but it will require a new survey of the HyCal. If we decide to run PRad-II with the new (smaller) window, then the  
   Pb-glass part of the HyCal no longer in use (if even it is ready).  
   **Weizhi and Chao**, please take one more look on this part to before the weekend.
4. The GEM efficiency high accuracy measurement using the so-called third GEM. As we discussed on Monday, this item is not fully clear to me. My questionwas, and still is, what is the accuracy of these measurements using the GEM1, GEM2 and HyCal (plus the target vertex, we even have 12C foil in the target cell)?  
   **Nilanga, Weizhi, Chao**, and who wants to contribute in this part, please come up with your arguments on this part.  
   My approach is that if we even will end up needing the third GEM then there are  
   several open item on this way: (a) the size of the third GEM; (b) we still will need to attach and survey it better than 1 mm (better than HyCal is providing it); (c) the electronics ...
5. Running the X17 experiment with E = 4.4 GeV. We need to recalculate all resolutions and most importantly the parameter space plot for this new energy before the end of January (well before our ERR meeting in mid-February).

……………………………………………………………………………..

My suggestions for the Veto counters survey and **geometrical calibration**

1. First, **we require +/- 0.5 mm engineering survey accuracies** on all 4 edges of all 4 scintillators. We need to come up with a way to make survey points on these scintillators with this accuracy.
2. Then, with **electron beam on**, target in, all devises (HyCal, …) calibrated we make a so-called **on-line veto counters geometrical calibration**.
3. Position the vito counter(s) well below (close to the beam) to fully cover the

area of the second crystal(s) (counted from the beam hole). That can be done with on-line measurements of the **Moller events**.

1. With the stepper motor(s) slowly moving the scintillators away from the beam, continues measurement of the Moller coverage area(s) by the reconstructed (on-line) Moller events.
2. Fix the veto positions when the count(s) of the Moller pairs with the scintillator(s) and the edge of second scintillator(s) **are just vanishing.**
3. This method needs a step size of 0.1 mm for our stepper motors. This is a question to Youri and Christopher (Bob).