Brief comments on ‘CERN Review’

- H.Hoffmann launched idea of CERN Review of LHC Computing in second half of 1999. Announced at Marseille LCB workshop in September 99.
- Aims:
  - assess state of work and preparations in experiments and IT;
  - provide input for Computing MoUs, which should be put in place in 2001;
  - recommend actions and in particular common actions between experiments and IT Division that will help to achieve desired goals within existing resources;
  - first draft of report around June 2000. (see later…)

Brief comments on ‘CERN Review’

- Review organised as Steering Committee (Chair S.Bethke) and three ‘technical panels’:
  - ‘software’: chair M.Kasemann
  - ‘computing model’: chair D.Linglin
  - ‘resources’: chair M.Calvetti
- Inevitably some overlap between panels.
- All LHC experiments are represented on Steering Committee and panels, though ‘independent membership’ is small.
- Steering Committee meets monthly (since Jan. 00)
- Panels have now all had first and second sessions with the experiments.

Brief comments on 'CERN Review'

- **Software Panel** first session with experiments + IT took place in week March 13-17: one day per experiment (or IT). ATLAS on March 17.
- Sessions turned out to be 'public' (though some initial confusion on this point!).
- Experiments asked to respond to long list of questions covering:
  - Process, planning, training and milestones (N.McCubbin)
  - Architecture, data model, and program infrastructure (D.Quarrie)
  - Simulation and Physics (F.Gianotti, D.Barberis, D.Rousseau)
  - Non-experiment specific software (NMcC)
- In practice, presentations lasted almost all day, due to lots of questions and discussion. (This was true throughout the week.)

Brief comments on 'CERN Review'

- Spirit of discussion was lively, probing, and robust. It is actually the first occasion (apparently) on which there has been enough time and the right people present to have an informed, detailed, at times fairly technical, question/answer session on each experiment's plans.
- Major points in ATLAS session:
  - Physics TDR software-suite is a major and impressive achievement;
  - For 'new software', Architectural approach of 'keeping options open' (e.g. use of Objy) has supporters and critics;
  - Planning of Mock Data Challenges (wrt Computing TDR) questioned: does it validate computing model?
  - Interaction between experiment and IT for questions of support, allocation of resources etc. needs addressing. (What replaces LCB?) **This point came up throughout the week.**

Brief comments on 'CERN Review'

- Feedback from Kasemann panel consisted of list of questions asking for written answers, followed by brief (1 hour) 'closed' discussion of small number of ATLAS people with the panel on May 3. (Questions and answers were e-mailed widely within ATLAS ate end April.) Much of the discussion with ATLAS focussed on Objy/dbase and our planning process.
- I am hopeful that sensible suggestions for interaction between IT and experiments will emerge from Kasemann panel.

Brief comments on 'CERN Review'

- Interaction with Linglin and Calvetti panels has been somewhat less gruelling :
  - Alois Putzer presented present ATLAS thinking on 'distributed-computing' model to Linglin panel on March 23. Second meeting with Linglin (+Calvetti) in 1 hour's time.
  - John Huth presented requirements for handling 'calibration and processing' to Calvetti (March 24); second Calvetti session involved some discussion of possible MoU strategy.
- **Some interesting discussion in Steering Committee of eventual (e.g. 2003) needs of experiments for Mock Data Challenges. Les Robertson stressed importance of going for maximum possible (affordable) number of 'inter-connects'.**

Brief comments on ‘CERN Review’

- Work of Steering Committee has so far been dominated to hearing time-table and plans proposed by Technical Panels, and then summaries of what was said to them.
- In my opinion, the ‘real’ work of the Steering Committee begins once panels have submitted their individual reports (end May). Steering Committee must digest these, think, and produce its overall report (to Research Board and DG).
- It would be surprising if this could be completed by June (2000).