GAG first meeting

F. Carminati

Geneva, February 28, 2003

Objectives of this meeting

- Introduce the members of GAG & calendar
- Define working mode and objectives of GAG
- Discuss role of GAG with respect to the other GRID projects
- My presentation will be very short… the time should be devoted to discussion

GAG membership

- Chair: F.Carminati
- ALICE: P.Buncic, PG.Cerello
- ATLAS: L.Perini, D.Quarrie
- CMS: R.Cavanaugh, C.Grandi
- LHCb: E.Van Herwijnen, N.Brook
- GDA: F.Donno, A.Sciaba
- GTA: D.Foster
- App Area: J.Beringer, O.Smirnova
- Relations with EU Projects: F.Harris
- Relations with US Projects: R.Pordes
- Experiment Independent expert: J.Templon

Proposal to Establish the GAG

- The LHC experiments propose to establish a technical forum following the recommendation of the HEPCAL RTAG; the Gr Applications Group (GAG).
- Issues:
  - There is a lack in LCG of a body in which to discuss the "common technical position of the Experiments regarding the "use cases".
  - SC2 will need to take decisions about the use of the LCG-1 (and the following ones) by the Experiments, and will need coherent technica advice.
  - The focus of the GAG should be on LCG Project.
- Proposal:
  - Form a standing Group (the GAG) that will technically advise the SC HEPCAL use cases status. ["standing" means that the Group will be reviewed periodically, say every one year, and the necessity for it an makeup will be re-discussed]

GAG Mandate and Composition

- **Proposed mandate:**
  - To follow the HEPCAL use cases implementation in LCG
  - To review, complete and prioritize the HEPCAL use cases
  - To assess the readiness of the deployment of the implemented solut satisfying the use cases.
- **Proposed composition:**
  - Chair
  - 1+1 technical members per Experiment
  - 1+1 technical members from Grid Deployment Area of LCG
  - 1+1 technical members from the Applications area of the LCG
    - (1+1 means that 2 people follow the issues but typically only 1 is required a meeting of the GAG. We expect that the chair, nominated by the SC2, w be chosen from among the members of the GAG)
- **Reporting line:**
  - Report to the SC2

An Appropriate TLA ?

λ Gag

- Ë a piece of cloth put in or over a person's mouth to prevent them from speaking.
- Ë a joke or funny story, especially one forming part of a comedian's ac
  - p joke, jest, witticism, quip, pun, play on words, double entendre; informal crack, wisecrack, one-liner, funny
- Ë an instrument that is placed between a patient's teeth to keep his mc open.
- Ë a powerful bit for use on difficult horses.
- Ë a normal reflex action caused by contraction of pharynx muscles wh the soft palate or posterior pharynx is touched.
- Ë physically censor journalist/press
  - p stop up, block, plug, stifle, smother, muffle

Notes

- This is intentionally a forum primarily for the experiments who found the regular contact and direction towards consensus a valuable feature of the HEPCAL RTAG.
- The MW developers are deliberately not in this group for tw reasons:
  1. As David Foster noted over Christmas we have a plethora of committees that involve everybody, we don't need more of them
  2. If differences of approach or understanding exist it is healthier to sl them up than to have them papered over in broad consensus agreements.
- It is not a standing RTAG, it is a way for the experiments to develop a common understanding and to bring that comm understanding to the SC2 as needs arise.
- It is not a management group of the LCG, it does not tell th project what to do, it does not tell the MW developers what do. Thus it is not proposed to be a subgroup of the GDA.

Working mode

- Monthly meetings
  - A lot of work to do… so full day meetings are not a luxury
- However this will not be enough
  - Particularly if we want HEPCAL II and so on (see later)
- And full day meetings are terrible for the American colleagues
  - 1-3 PM is rather early… or late…
- Possible alternative
  - Meeting from 16:00 onward (but then into the evenings!)
  - But then the bulk of the work should be done by a subgroup of GAG in intensive meetings (à la HEPCAL)

Relations with the GRID projects

- Provide requirements
- (if allowed in) help in preparing workplans
- Through SC2 / LCG or directly??
  - My opinion is that it does not really matter, as long as we can produce credible work
  - The point is that it should not be further “reviewed” but just endorsed, otherwise the feedback loop will increase too much

Possible program of work

- Completion of HEPCAL
  - Quantify some of the requirements
  - Add examples of HOW we want things
  - Pseudo-code, pseudo-command lines
- HEPCAL II on analysis
  - EU/US/LCG would like to see this before summer
  - It is possible but!?
- Preparation of common test case for HEPCAL
  - Not in our original remit, but can be very useful

Other possible topics

- Discuss timescale alignment EGEE / LCG / Trillium
- Provide input to US projects (how do we do that?)