

Worldwide LHC Grid Computing Project

Collaboration Board Meeting

DESY, Hamburg, Germany, 15 May 2024

Minutes

Indico event page: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1415125/>

Welcome

R Jones welcomed the attendees, explaining that the meeting was mostly devoted to the update of the annexes of the WLCG Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). He reminded the attendees that while the collaboration is entitled and even obliged to update the annexes regularly, changing the main body of the MoU requires a potentially long round of collecting signatures, which must be avoided. This has repercussions on how to change some of the annexes, in particular annex 4.

Status of WLCG

The proposed technical organisation was discussed in the context of the discussion on the MoU annex 5.

WLCG Memorandum of Understanding: Update of Annexes

S Campana introduced the topic by explaining that a shared document had been made available to the Collaboration Board (CB) for comments and modifications. Many were received, leading to an updated proposal for the annexes that was distributed shortly before the meeting.

R Jones commented that the meeting is supposed to grant an “outline approval” of the proposed changes; detailed changes of wording could still be applied afterwards once an updated proposal will have been circulated.

S Campana noted that this revision was a very serious amount of work due to about 20 years of backlogs of due changes. In future the annexes must be reviewed annually to avoid such backlogs.

Approval of Annexes 1, 2, 3

S Campana explained that the changes to annexes 1 and 2 are of purely administrative nature and will be applied by the LCG office (see below under annexes 4 and 6 for the information flow). Annex 3 received more attention and scrutiny. The required service levels were not changed, but much obsolete text was removed; for example analysis facilities are now mentioned only in the context of the T0.

The CB **approved** the proposed changes.

Annexes 4 and 6

R Jones explained that annex 4 was supposed to list the funding agencies represented at the WLCG RRB, but has in fact listed all the funding agencies that signed the MoU. The former may evolve over time in case of reorganisations.

Following discussion, the CB decided that annex 4 should contain a single table with funding agencies with two columns, one reflecting the agency on behalf of which the MoU was signed, the other one reflecting the one now represented at the WLCG RRB.

Replying to questions by L Sexton-Kennedy, R Jones and S Campana replied that appearance in annex 4 does not necessarily imply that the organisation in question is a legal entity, and that US-ATLAS and US-CMS are special cases covered by separate agreements involving DoE and NSF.

S Campana explained that funding agencies pledge once per year in CRIC, from which annex 6 will be updated automatically following approval by the WLCG RRB.

S Campana and R Jones requested that changes to annex 4 as well as to annex 1 and annex 2 be communicated to the LCG office as they become effective; rapid action on backlogs would be appreciated in order to ensure that future MoUs are equipped with up-to-date annexes (*action: all CB members*). In addition, the LCG office will poll for change notifications in time to provide an updated version to each year's autumn meeting of the WLCG RRB. The updated annexes should be approved formally by the CB in time for that WLCG RRB meeting, possibly in a pure virtual CB meeting or by circulation.

The CB **approved** the proposed changes.

Annexes 7, 8, 10, 11

S Campana explained that these annexes have become obsolete, but cannot be suppressed because of references to them in the main body of the MoU. They will be marked as “due to be archived / in abeyance”.

The CB **approved** the proposed changes.

Proposals on Annex 5

S Campana explained that the current draft did not enjoy the same level of scrutiny yet as most of the other annexes. It deliberately attempts to clarify the respective responsibilities of the Technical Coordination Board (TCB) and the Operations' Coordination. If more time is needed to discuss the changes, simply postponing the changes by a year would not be a big issue; alternatively the revised annex could be improved at the occasion of the following annual revision.

He further explained that care was taken to distinguish duly between the LCG Project leader, which is a purely internal CERN affair, and the representative of the WLCG collaboration (also referred to as Project Leader). While approval for presentations, publications etc. has been removed from the annexes, higher-level policy documents such as contributions to the European Strategy for Particle Physics or the Snowmass process in the US now require the approval of the CB.

Z Marshall commented that bodies may elect, but cannot appoint.

During a discussion about the nomination of the WLCG representative (“Project Leader”), to which Z Marshall, S Campana, R Jones, P Clarke and D Colling contributed, the following comments were made:

- Many organisations represented at the CB would appreciate a more transparent and balanced procedure leading to the appointment similar to what is set out in the MoUs of most CERN experiments for spokesperson nominations. This would explicitly not apply to the function of the LCG Project Leader.
- The current draft already puts more emphasis on the consultation of the CB during the nomination process. It appears to be a decent compromise.
- CB efforts to prepare for the foreseen consultation, for example forming a search committee, should start about a year before the mandate of the current holder of the function expires. This would allow iteration if needed and for the CERN management to be informed of the CB view in good time.

The CB **decided** that with the understanding that the procedure would be applied as set out above, the wording in the current draft is adequate.

A discussion followed around the proposed TCB, to which P Clarke, S Campana, M Jouvin, R Jones, M Wadenstein, J Chudoba and L Sexton-Kennedy contributed; the following points were made:

- The current draft defines the TCB as a closed body with defined membership and a clear mandate to establish technical roadmaps. Other high-level technical issues should be added to its mandate.
- The current draft does not foresee an open forum-style technical meeting. The Grid Deployment Board (GDB) was very successful as a forum for discussion, consensus-building and formulating input into other WLCG bodies. An open technical forum should be added to annex 5; organising the sessions of such technical forum should be added to the TCB mandate.
- The steering group of the GDB was a closed group; its members, mostly regular GDB attendees, were invited by previous or current GDB (co-)chairs. That model worked well.
- The members of the TCB should be nominated by the Management Board (MB), typically following a call for proposals by the Project Leader to the MB and the ensuing list of proposed nominations drawn up by the Project Leader. (An alternative would be to have the CB nominate the TCB members; in the interest of agility, entrusting the MB with these nominations is preferable.) It is not necessary to set this out in detail in annex 5.

The CB **asked** R Jones and S Campana to add a short description of the open technical forum to the draft and **decided** that with such addition, the draft text of annex 5 is accepted (*action: R Jones, S Campana*).

Annex 9

S Campana explained that in view of changes of the way the C-RSG now works since annex 9 was last released, its wording had to be modified. The current draft, like the one of annex 5, has undergone less intense scrutiny than other annexes; CB members are asked to carefully check the text. The C-RSG will also be invited to comment (*action: R Jones, S Campana*).

Z Marshall noted that the current draft mentions “all LHC experiments”, which could be seen as being inclusive of smaller experiments such as FASER and SND@LHC. S Campana replied that it was not intended to include these experiments and agreed to ensure that this emerges clearly from the text (*action: S Campana*).

Z Marshall suggested to consider adding a description of the information flow from and to the experiments; S Piano agreed and suggested adding such description to annex 6 instead. S Campana agreed to consider this (*action: S Campana*).

Replying to a question by L Sexton-Kennedy, H Meinhard explained the practice of RRB nominations to the C-RSG, which had never been a problem in the past.

The CB **decided** that with the additions mentioned above, the draft text of annex 9 is accepted.

Observer status

S Campana explained that the term ‘observer’ is considered inadequate, as the organisations in question, most notably the Belle-2 experiment, are contributing very actively. Following a discussion, to which M Jouvin, R Jones, S Campana, Z Marshall, P Clarke and D Britton contributed, the CB **decided** to replace the term “Observer” by “associated Partner”, that applications for such status be handled by the MB, who would present its conclusions to the CB for approval, and that associated Partners would not be invited to be represented at the CB (*action: R Jones, S Campana*). In case the pertinent changes to the annexes are disputed, they will be postponed to the subsequent annex revision.

Next steps

R Jones explained that the comments and requests made in this meeting will be incorporated to form a new draft of the annexes, which will be distributed to the CB for approval.

Any other business

R Jones informed the CB that following many years of acting as CB chair, an election was overdue; if required, he would be available to continue, but would appreciate if alternative candidates would be suggested. The CB **agreed** that the secretary would organise such call for candidatures and the subsequent election process (*action: H Meinhard*).

R Jones suggested that the next meeting would take place in hybrid form adjacent to CHEP 2024 (21 – 25 October 2024) if local conditions so permit; otherwise a purely virtual meeting will be held at some other point in time during autumn. The CB **agreed**.

Annex: Attendance

At DESY:

Tommaso Boccali (INFN Pisa; deputy WLCG project leader)
David Britton (U Glasgow; UK T1 and deputy WLCG project leader)
Simone Campana (CERN; WLCG project leader)
Gang Chen (IHEP; IHEP)
Jiri Chudoba (CAS; FZU-AS Prague)
Pete Clarke (U Edinburgh; UK Scotgrid)
David Colling (Imperial College London; UK London T2)
Benjamin Couturier (CERN; LHCb)
Laurent Duflot (IJCLab-IN2P3; CC-IN2P3)
Josep Flix (CIEMAT; PIC)
Jose Hernandez (CIEMAT; Spain CMS federation)
Dirk Hufnagel (FNAL; FNAL)
Roger Jones (U Lancaster; chairperson and UK Northgrid)
Michel Jouvin (IJCLab-IN2P3; GRIF)
Alexei Klimentov (BNL; US ATLAS T1)
James Letts (UCSD; CMS)
Helge Meinhard (CERN; scientific secretary)
Tigran Mkrtchyan (DESY; DESY)
Stefano Piano (INFN Trieste; ALICE)
Horst Severini (Oklahoma U; US Southwest ATLAS T2)
Liz Sexton-Kennedy (FNAL; CMS)
David South (DESY; ATLAS)
Daniele Spiga (INFN Perugia; Italy CMS T2 federation)
Norraphat Srimanobhas (Chulalongkorn U; Thailand, National e-Science Infrastructure Consortium)
Reda Tafirout (TRIUMF; TRIUMF)
Jan van Eldik (CERN; LHCb)
Mattias Wadenstein (Umea U; NDGF)

On Zoom:

Ken Bloom (U Nebraska-Lincoln; Nebraska CMS T2)
David Cohen (Technion; HEP-IL T2 federation)
Mihnea Dulea (IFIN-HH; Romanian T2 federation)
Domenico Elia (INFN Bari; INFN ALICE federation)
David Kelsey (RAL; UK SouthGrid)
Jacek Kitowski (U Cracow; Polish T2 federation)
Dietmar Kuhn (Innsbruck; Austrian T2 federation)
Zach Marshall (LBNL; ATLAS)
Bedangadas Mohanty (NISER; ALICE)
Arnulf Quadt (U Goettingen; ATLAS federation HH/Goettingen)
Jose Salt (IFIC; Spain ATLAS federation)
Kai Schweda (GSI; GSI)
Oxana Smirnova (Lund U; SNIC)
Junichi Tanaka (U Tokyo; ICEPP)
Isabel Trigger (TRIUMF; Canada WestFederation)
Vincenzo Vagnoni (INFN Bologna; LHCb)

Marco van Leeuwen (Nikhef; ALICE)
Stephane Willocq (U Massachusetts Amherst; ATLAS)
Wojciech Wislicki (NCBJ; NCBJ)

Also present

David Bouvet (CC-IN2P3)
Santiago Gonzalez De La Hoz (IFIC)
Oliver Gutsche (FNAL)
Fazhi Qi (IHEP)
Cedric Serfon (BNL)
Tony Wong (BNL)

Apologies

Philipp Neumann (DESY; replaced by T Mkrtchyan)