

Remote Operations Center Committee Meeting 6/16/05

Attendees:

FNAL: Sandor Feher, Erik Gottschalk, Elvin Harms, Shuichi Kunori, Michael Lamm, Kaori Maeshima, Patty McBride, Elliott McCrory, Suzanne Panacek, Alvin Tollestrup

CERN: Jean Slaughter

OTHER LOCATIONS: Al Thomas, William Trischuk

This meeting is being recorded. The recordings (video and audio) will be put in the Doc DB.

Committee News and Requirements Document – Erik Gottschalk

(<http://docdb.fnal.gov/CMS-public/DocDB/ShowDocument?docid=208>)

For our next meeting (June 23rd) a few of us (Erik, Elvin, and Shuichi) won't be here. We will have working group meetings for the accelerator and detector subgroups. The accelerator subgroup will meet in the Hornet's Nest, and will have access to video conferencing. The working group meetings will be arranged by Patty and Suzanne.

(Slide 3)

We have a new date (July 21st) for the Requirements Review. The slide shows who has agreed to be a reviewer. We are waiting for replies from a few other people.

Elliott: I will be in South Carolina, but I may be able to participate by video.

Al: You need to make sure that you have an ESnet alias, and that South Carolina has registered with ESnet.

(Slide 4)

The proposed schedule for the review is shown on the slide. Mike Lamont has reserved an ESnet capable room (4-S-013) at CERN from 14:30 – 17:30 (CERN time).

(Slide 5)

We have added several people to the remop_advisory@fnal.gov mailing list, and we have three new members on the Advisory Committee. The new members are Lothar Bauerdick, Dragoslav Lazic, and William Trischuk. The web page will be updated to show the new members.

(Requirements Document)

Alvin: Your requirements are based on CMS and LHC, if ATLAS were to join this effort it would change the requirements. It would be nice to keep this option open as long as possible. How would you include ATLAS in these requirements?

Erik: I don't have an answer. However, in the opening paragraph I explicitly state that the current plan involves CMS, so that this isn't lost on anybody. We will keep ATLAS in mind as we develop the requirements.

Elliott: You shall use the word 'shall' when writing requirements.

Elliott: The actors section needs work. The actors should come from the scenarios. For example, for CMS you have 12 different experts, but if the scenario does not have the actor, it should not be in the list.

Erik: I agree that this section needs work. I was coming to the same conclusion as I was working on the document. Do you think this needs to be done before we send the document to the Advisory Committee?

Elliott: No, we can do this at a later date.

Mike Lamm: Not every actor will be covered by a scenario.

Erik: We will have to look at that section again once we have the requirements.

Elliott: There is a typo in the middle of page 6.

Erik: Could someone look into CMS Collaboration regulations regarding confidentiality within the collaboration. This would help to see what could be done for confidentiality related to the LHC accelerator.

Shuichi: I'll look into it.

Req 2-1: Shuishi will find more information on the CMS confidentiality agreements/rules.

Alvin: I would suggest moving the Actors and Scenarios sections into the appendix. Pier will want to know what hardware and software is needed, how many people, etc. He will not need to see the details on actors and scenarios.

Erik: I was coming to the same conclusion myself. We will make these changes after we have sent the current document to the Advisory Committee.

Scenarios to Requirements – Suzanne Panacek

<http://docdb.fnal.gov/CMS-public/DocDB/ShowDocument?docid=207>

(Slide 3)

Erik: Is there any reason to think that software applications developed for the LHC might not be available to the LHC@FNAL?

Elvin: I don't think this is a problem.

Jean: Mike Lamont is very supportive of collaborating on software development.

Elvin: You should use CERN's nomenclature in the scenario. In this case you should use "CCC" instead of "Control Room."

Suzanne: Ok.

(Slide 4)

Elvin: Maybe we should say “designated console,” and that it’s secondary purpose would be communications with LHC@FNAL.

(Slide 5)

Jean: I don’t know what you mean by “there is no beam yet.”

Elvin: Maybe you should call it “hardware commissioning.”

Elvin: I think it is implied that LHC@FNAL will have real-time data access.

Jean: Does this mean you are reading data from a device or from a database?

Elliott: This is a good scenario, since this refers to data that is not being logged.

Al: An important consideration is the latency that is involved in accessing the data. The networking requirements will need to spell this out.

Erik: Do we care what the latency is for this scenario?

Jean: The assumptions should say something about what we mean by real-time data.

Elvin: As I recall, there are two real-time data paths. We are not talking about access to the really fast stuff, only the data in the database.

Suzanne: It would be good to define what we mean.

(Slide 6)

Elvin: Why would Nicole go back to her office? Doesn’t she have the code development tools at LHC@FNAL?

Suzanne: No, the development tools are not at LHC@FNAL.

Elvin: I think they should be.

Jean: I agree with Elvin.

Elvin & Jean: It’s important that the constants don’t change while there is beam.

Detector Subgroup News – Patty McBride

We have not talked to anybody who is involved with running the Tier 1 Center. I have talked to Lothar to see if LHC@FNAL would make their job easier. He agreed to write a few scenarios to use this facility. This is an extension of data quality monitoring. For the GRID there are also some thoughts on making use of LHC@FNAL. I would like to get their feedback and include it in some way in the requirements document.

Next meeting: June 23, 2005 in the **Hornet's Nest (WH 8X)**
This is a working group meeting for the Accelerator Subgroup.
Ask Patty where the Detector Subgroup will meet.
