

WLCG Resources Review Process

Ian Bird

MB

CERN, 12th July 2017



Roles of LHCC and C-RSG (MoU)

Concerning all technical matters, the WLCG Collaboration shall be subject to review by the **Large Hadron Collider experiments Committee (LHCC)**, which makes recommendations to the **Research Board (RB)**.

3. Concerning all resource and legal matters, the WLCG Collaboration shall be subject to the **Computing Resource Review Board (C-RRB)**. The C-RRB is chaired by CERN's Chief Scientific Officer. The C-RRB membership comprises a representative of each Funding Agency, with voting rights, and (ex-officio) members of the WLCG Management and CERN Management, without voting rights.

The C-RRB shall approve annually, at its autumn meeting, on the advice of an independent, impartial and expert review body - the Resources Scrutiny Group ("RSG"), which shall operate according to the procedures set out in Annex 9, the overall refereed resource requests of each LHC Experiment for the following year. At the same meeting it shall take note of the Computing Resource Levels pledged for the same year to each Experiment by the Institutions. If it emerges that the pledged Computing Resource Levels are inadequate to satisfy the refereed requests of one or more Experiment, the C-RRB shall seek further contributions of Computing Resource Levels. Should **a shortfall persist, the C-RRB shall refer the matter to the LHCC, which may require a scaling down and/or prioritisation of requests** in order to fit the available Computing Resource Levels.

In doing so [the C-RSG] shall interact **as necessary with the Experiments** and in particular with representatives who are knowledgeable about their Experiment's computing models/needs. It shall also examine the match between the refereed requests and the pledges of Computing Resource Levels from the Institutions, and shall make recommendations concerning any apparent under-funding for the coming years. It is not the task of the RSG to negotiate Computing Resource Levels with the Institutions.



Resource pledging process - current

NB. This is modified (by RRB) wrt the MoU ideas

- In year n:
 - C-RSG review in Spring to confirm requests for year n+1
 - Needed as procurements at this scale take ~1 year
 - C-RSG review in Autumn – 1st look at requests for year n+2
 - Often also "adjustments" requested for year n+1
 - But this is too late to affect (most) procurements
 - Also FA's confirm pledges for year n+1
- Initially had a 3-5 year outlook, but this is impractical:
 - Requests difficult to foresee that far ahead (LHC conditions, schedule, etc. – usually not confirmed until Chamonix of the running year)
 - Budgets mostly not known on that timescale: FA's do not discuss budget outlook
- For Run 2; in 2013 we made an outlook for 2015, 2016, 2017
- NB: Constraint that procurements take ~1 year

Proposal

- Go back to original MoU process – with adjusted timescale:
 - Autumn RRB in year N-2 – first look at requests for year N
 - Over Winter
 - C-RSG review and iterate with experiments on the requests
 - Chance to discuss with LHCC in Dec, Feb/Mar meetings in case of scientific questions – change of program, scope, etc.
 - Finalise together the requests: experiments, RSG, LHCC
 - Present an agreed view to RRB
 - Spring RRB year N-1 – confirm requests for year N
 - Begin procurements for year N (9-12 months)

Proposal

- Formally this change should be agreed by the RRB
 - Some concern in the RSG over the potential amount of work
- MB invited to endorse the proposal
- N.B. Resource level vs requests is the biggest concern and risk to the overall LHC computing programme – and will remain so
 - Needs appropriate level of review and concern