**Arizona MAP 2015 Annual Report**

**COMPRES Facilities Comments**

Andy Campbell

Carbide project? How much is being spent on this, and how was it decided that this was a good expenditure? Exactly how are the cubes being tested? What is hoped to be achieved? Really poor that the first batch of cubes from Sandvik were not machined correctly.  
  
Other development work sounds good. Nice to see interaction with 6-BM, and also ESRF.   
  
Budget is confusing, as usual. Now the cost of providing standard assemblies has been dumped off to RTS? So shouldn't COMPRES see a drop in budget? Also, Kurt's salary seems low for his seniority, esp. compared to Beavers.  
  
It is surprising to see such a short list of publications. It doesn't match the long list of institutions that the project has been dealing with. The PIs should be more agressive about making sure their contributions are acknowledged, and keeping track of the publications.

Bin Chen

The development of cell assemblies appears to be OK. Particularly, I am happy to see the efforts of providing standardized off-line pressure calibration based on SiO2-GeO2 for pressure at 3-10 GPa.

More information about the “carbide project”.

ASU charges overhead for the cell assemblies, adding 50%+ in prices?

Kanani Lee

Mark Rivers

This continues to be a very useful project to the community. They have got 6-BM using their assemblies.

They reference a Figure for the conical slits, but I did not see one.

There is a reference to Depths Inc., but I have no idea what that is about.

Is there an update on the carbide project? It was supposed to be tested in fall 2015.

The work with Sandvik, particularly on pressure standard is very good.

Budget comparison with last year. Salary for second person decreased from $15.6K to 0. Travel increased from $5K to $10K. Equipment decreased from $15K to $10K. Materials and supplies increased from $25K to $40K. Total budget decreased from $114K to $108K.

Last year Tables 1 and 2 were much more informative, because they said what labs were active in the reporting year, and how many assemblies were provided to each lab in the reporting year. This year’s report is lacking that information, which makes it much less useful.

Dan Shim