



Review of the Quarterly Reports – 2005Q4

1 Purpose of the Document

The document provides comments on the quarterly reports for 2005Q4 of all Tier-1 grid sites, areas, projects and LHC experiments. This is the first attempt to use a simpler and more structured format for such reports; therefore not all reports have the same level of detail.

All reports will be submitted to the LCG Overview Board.

In addition to the QR reports, an Executive Summary will be provided to the Overview Board. The proposal is that the Executive Summary includes the “Summary of Progress” and “Outstanding Issues” sections of each report. They will be copied as such into the Executive Summary. Therefore is very important that those sections are self-explanatory and provide a good view of the quarter of each project.

Sections 3 to 5 of this document provide specific comments on each report in order to improve them before submission to the Overview Board.

2 General Comments on the Reports

The quality of the reports is very uneven. Some reports really need to include more details, milestones and textual descriptions, in order to better evaluate activity and real progress of the project.

All fields should be filled and the status of each milestone should be commented more in details. The improvements needed, by several reports, are:

- All completed milestones should have a reference to the deliverables (document, plan, etc) or to information about the achievement of the milestone
- When a milestone is delayed or cancelled there should be: (1) the explanation of the reason, (2) the seriousness of the issue and (3) a new estimated completion date.
- All milestones should have identifiers in order to simplify cross-references.
- Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues should be self-explanatory and ready to be copied in an executive summary for the Overview Board.
- VO Boxes installations have been agreed in the last couple of months, therefore the reports should mention the status/schedule of VO Boxes installation milestones.

Gantt charts or milestones plots are not provided and dependencies are not part of the report. Their need and usefulness will be discussed for future reports.

PS: Spell check the reports please (Select All = Ctrl-A + Spell Check = F7).

3 Review of Sites Reports

3.1 ASGC, Taipei

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- Several milestones checkpoints are mentioned in the “Summary of Progress” and they should be added to the ASGC milestones plan.
- The plan should clarify which versions of the VOBoxes have been installed and their availability.

- The outstanding issues mentioned should be monitored by adding future verification milestones to the plan.

3.2 CC-IN2P3, France

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The milestones about hardware evaluation (CPU and disk servers) are delayed to end of January but this is not a problem.
- The report and the plan have a small number of milestones; it would be good to add more milestones for 2006.

3.3 CERN

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- All milestones delayed (i.e. Castor2 migration) should have a new delivery date.

3.4 FZK, Germany

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The Status of the project information is a good idea and will be an additional field in the QR template.
- The report and the plan have a small number of milestones, would be good to add more milestones for 2006. The installation of the VOBoxes should be specified.

3.5 INFN, Italy

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The Status of the project information is a good idea and will be an additional field in the QR template.
- The delayed milestones are about the network installation and configuration, the new delivery date is for Mid February.
- The report and the plan have a small number of milestones, would be good to add more milestones for 2006. The installation of the VOBoxes should be specified.

3.6 NDGF

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The report needs more details in order to appreciate the activities and the progress of the project.
- Milestones should cover all aspects of the preparation for the LCG Services.
- NDGF should have milestones on the relation of ARC and LCG.

3.7 PIC, Spain

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The milestones are very clear and in good detail, maybe milestones VO Boxes installations should be added to the report and to the plan.

3.8 RAL, UK

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are missing. They should have sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The milestones are very clear and in good detail.
- The concerns are about the problems of transfer performance between dCache and DPM. Add reference to more information if you have it.
- Some VO Boxes upgrade milestones should be added to the report, as it will be probably needed even if the installation is done.

3.9 SARA-NIKHEF, Nederland

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are missing. They should have sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The report needs more details in order to appreciate the activities and the progress of the project.
- Milestones should cover all aspects of the preparation for the LCG Services.

3.10 TRIUMF, Canada

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The report and the plan include very few milestones and cover only procurement and basic hardware set-up. The milestones plan will need to be revised.

3.11 US ATLAS (BNL)

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are missing. They should have sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The milestones are completed on schedule, except the OSG 0.4.0 installation that will be done by End January. But this seems not an issue.

3.12 US CMS (FNAL)

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The milestones plan should include information about all aspects of the service not only procurement.

4 Areas and Projects

4.1 Applications Area

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The report on the milestones is very clear and detailed.
- Some milestones are “delayed” or “in progress” (COOL-1, SIMU-1, SIMU-2 SIMU-4) and have rescheduled for End March.
- The “new proposed milestones” should be added to the milestone plan.

4.2 Deployment Area

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.

- Most of the milestones are still "in progress" and should have a new estimated deadline.
- There are no milestones later than End March, additional milestones should be added at least until End 2006

4.3 ARDA

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- There is no explanation on the reason of the delay for milestones dues in 2005Q4.
- The future milestones should be added once the project activities for 2006/7 are defined.

4.4 Distribute Database Deployment (LCG3D)

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The project just started and the only milestone was met.
- Additional milestones should be added for after March 2006.

4.5 Grid Deployment Board

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
-
- The milestones comments are insufficient. In addition to the reference to the wiki, each milestone should have a summary to explain the major topics and decisions of each GDB meeting and workshop.

5 Experiments

Milestone plans from the experiments would be useful to verify the consistency of their need with what is provided by the grid sites, deployment and development activities.

5.1 ALICE

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.
- The milestones mentioned in the Summary and in the Changes and Actions should be added into a milestone plan for ALICE.
- The milestones concerning PROOF at CAF have not discussed and need to be agreed with the managers of the CAF services.

5.2 ATLAS

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The milestones for SC4 should be added to the plan.
- More milestones would allow a better verification of the plans of the grid sites and development projects

5.3 CMS

- Review the Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues which will be copied into the Executive Summary for the Overview Board.

- The milestones should have some more quantitative content. “Ready” is not a very explanatory milestone descriptions. Probably breaking the milestone in smaller ones would allow easier tracking and help understanding them.

5.4 LHCb

- The Summary of Progress and Outstanding Issues are too concise and do not provide sufficient information for being copied as such into the Executive Summary.
- The links to additional information are useful but some self-contained information is needed in order to understand the report.
- Milestones for SC4 and 2006 would help verification that the plans from the sites and the projects suits the experiments needs.