

LCG Project Execution Board Meeting Minutes

Version 3 (October 5, 2005)

Date: 27 September 2005
Present: Alberto Aimar (notes), Dario Barberis, Lothar Bauerdick (phone), Nick Brook, Federico Carminati, Philippe Charpentier, Chris Eck (part of the time), John Harvey, Frédéric Hemmer (chair), Bob Jones, Massimo Lamanna, Pere Mato, Bernd Panzer, Les Robertson (phone), Lucia Silvestris, David Stickland
Apologies: Ian Bird, Kors Bos, Jürgen Knobloch, Jamie Shiers
Next meeting: Tuesday, 4 October 2005

Related material: [Agenda of the meeting](#)

Minutes of previous meeting

Minutes of the previous PEB (approved on the 4th of October)

Announcements

- LHCb decided that their regular software meetings, chaired by Andrei Tsaregorodtsev, will be their "task force meetings". To fulfill this mandate a few new people will start to participate to these software meetings.

Reports from other meetings

- No reports.

Comment on the resource tables for the C-RRB (Chris Eck)

[Detailed tables](#) are linked from the agenda, and only the [summary presentation](#) was discussed during the meeting.

The reason of the presentation at the PEB is to get input and feedback on what should be shown at the C-RRB:

Show the tables without explicit comments leaving the conclusions to the audience (missing resources).

Slide 2: Summary for Tier1 and Tiers 2 for 2008

- Is a summary of T1 and T2 resources announced to be pledged.
- Les Robertson pointed out that the headings (offered, planned, etc) are a bit mixed up on the different lines and he will provide the updated table to Chris Eck after the PEB.
Action: Les Robertson and Chris Eck: Fix the headings of the summary table on slide 2.
- Lothar Bauerdick asked to better highlight that the "Required" refers to the TDRs of the experiments.
- Les Robertson reminded that these values are for 2008, and that the "planned capacity" is not necessarily funded.

Slide 3: Tiers 2 more in detail

- Totem requirements and pledged resources need to be clarified (have these to be added together with the CMS experiment?)
Action: Clarify the situation with Totem. {after the meeting it was decided that the Totem allocation in NDGF will be included as a pledge in the MoU Annex, as requested by Finland, but it will NOT be included in the allocations shown in the C-RRB Resource paper for the 4 LHC experiments}
- The Finnish plan for the CMS Tier1 function does not include tapes. The tapes are clearly needed in order to be able to use the Finnish Tier 1 resources. The proposal came late so a reaction from CMS was not possible in time for the PEB. This should be resolved outside the C-RRB.
Action: CMS – Clarify the situation with the Finnish plan and the need of including funding for tapes in the plan.
- Better to remove the specific bullet for ATLAS, because also for the other experiments there will be some more details by the time of the C-RRB.
- Replace the list with a table
Action: Chris Eck – Remove the ATLAS specific bullet and make a table with all information.

Presentation of Roger Bailey on number of days of proton running (reactions of the PEB)

Les Robertson reported that Roger Bailey presented (to PH Senior Staff and CMS) that the LHC proton run will be 100 days long (instead of 200 days in the TDRs). Les verified with Jos Engelen that we should continue to assume 200 days. It was agreed that we continue to use this common approach for the forthcoming TDR review.

Approval of Applications Area plan for Phase 2

Pere Mato explained that [the Applications Area plan](#) is complete. The preparation, including interaction in the Architects Forum, active feedback from the experiments, took about 4 months.

Pere Mato and John Harvey answered the question of why the ROOT project being inside the LCG activities and at the same time mentioned outside: This is due to the fact that developers and user community that are not involved with the LCG project.

Decision: The Applications Area Plan was approved by the PEB.

Reporting, Monitoring and Reviewing Phase 2

See attachment: Original Proposal for the Definition of a Working Group, from Les Robertson.

The purpose is to agree on the mandate and membership of the working group:

- The mandate was approved

- The membership is kept small but the working group will collect input from many other sources.
- There is for now no name for a regional center and the PEB members will send their input about it.
- The membership of the group proposed is the following:
 - Alberto Aimar (chair)
 - Lothar Bauerdick
 - Dario Barberis
 - An LCG area manager?
 - Representative from a regional centre?
- It was agreed that it was not necessary to include an area manager in the group (Alberto will consult with the Area Managers and others)
- **Action: Les Robertson - Find regional center representative for the working group**
- **Action: PEB members – Send input and suggestions on possible candidates**

AOB and Matters arising

- Les Robertson has contacted the Tier 1 regional centers asking for their representative of the future PMB.
- The first PMB will be during the last week of October. The possible days are only Monday 31 October or Tuesday 1 November.

ATTACHMENT

Proposal for a Working Group on LCG Reporting, Monitoring and Reviewing

Several significant organisational changes will take place with the second Phase of LCG.

- The new executive committee, the Management Board (MB), is larger than the PEB, including representatives of the Tier-1 regional centres. This brings the membership to close to 30 (1 Tier-1 members, ~8 experiment members, ~8 ex-officio members).
- The SC2 no longer exists as a formal body. The regular reporting, monitoring and internal reviewing responsibilities move to the MB.
- The Oversight Board (OB) continues in its current form, the membership being high level management of the experiments and the countries providing Tier-1 centres. The OB meets four times a year.
- A Collaboration Board (CB) is created, with representatives of all of the centres/federations providing computing resources for LHC. At present this would meet annually.
- The MB, like the PEB, is supported by two more technical committees, the Architects Forum and the Grid Deployment Board.

With the end of the SC2 the current reporting and milestone monitoring process must be changed. In addition, the current process has acquired several clear deficiencies that need to be addressed:

- inconsistencies between different sections of the (lengthy) quarterly progress report;
- experiment progress reports sometimes missing;
- difficulties with defining effective milestones that track the progress of the experiments in using LCG tools and services;
- uneven monitoring of milestones in different areas of the project;
- no progress reports from grid services other than those operated as EGEE;
- no formal milestones to track progress of individual regional centres;

It is proposed to create a small working group with the following mandate:

- Taking account of the new management organisation and deficiencies of the current practices, prepare a proposal for the reporting, monitoring and internal reviewing process for LCG Phase 2 to help the MB manage the project.
- Take account of the need to provide quarterly reports to the OB summarising progress, difficulties and risks.
- Include experiments and regional centres in the reporting process.
- Consider the cost-effectiveness of the different aspects of the proposal.
- Prepare the proposal in time for the first meeting of the new MB, scheduled for early November.

I propose the following membership of the group.

- Alberto Aimar (chair)
- Lothar Bauerdick
- Dario Barberis
- an LCG area manager??
- xxx (regional centre)