SCSC Meeting 4/3/2009

Membership

John Arthur, Sebastien Boutet, Tom Devereaux, Richard Dubois*, Gregory Dubois-Felsman, **Gunther Haller (chair-person)**, Aaron Jensen, Catherine LeCocq, Steffen Luitz, Stuart Marshall, Richard Mount, Cho Ng, Sayed Rokni*, Mike Soltis*, Clemens Wermelskirchen

*-Not in attendance

Italics are action items

Minute Taker: Les Cottrell

Agenda:

- Bless Previous Minutes
- Final security charter (Steffen)
- Service list, feed back from members (Haller)
- Comments (Sandy)
- Organization in other labs (PNNL, etc) (Stuart)
- walk on

Action Items from Previous Meetings

Gunther, Steffen and Steve will meet to nominate someone as Chair of CSC. - Done
Gunther will send the new CSC membership list to Teresa. She will update the CSC mailing list and invite everyone to the meetings. - Done
We need to discuss the LCLS services coming from SCCS.
Gunther will edit the SCCS Service Catalog file to remove Column A and add an extra column. There was no consensus as to how to get this new info into the file. Gunther and Stuart will meet next week to figure out how to get everyone's input. Everyone needs to respond a week before the next meeting so there is at least a draft to work from. Done
Stuart will prompt Richard to set up the PNNL meeting.
Richard must know someone at Argonne... Let's invite someone here or have a SLAC person go there.

Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were blessed and will be made public at https://confluence.slac.stanford.edu/display/scscpub/Past+Meetings?SortBy=date.

Final Security Charter

The CSO (Bob Cowles) is chairing the CSC meeting. Having the technical expertise/competency leading the group enables more streamlined addressing of issues. Conflicts of interest can be addressed by taking complaints to the sub-councils. Computer security and computer security team issues can also directly be brought to the IT or SC sub-councils. They added the responsibility of CSC members to aid in the design of security controls for their area (addressing the

concern that this is currently happening in a vacuum). They have added lab-wide computer-security education to the responsibilities of the CSC.

It was moved & seconded that it be accepted. There was a discussion about quarterly reports. It was decided not to include in the charter. It was blessed as is.

Action item: there will need to be a web site for the CSC which will include the members and email list.
Action item: an email will go out to the invited members explaining the purpose etc.

Service list

Gunther showed the service list with columns added to include comments from 7 members of the committee. To get more responses we went through the list in some detail. The idea is to modify and then bless the list at the next meeting. The big picture (end game) is to: break up into IT vs. scientific, to provide mid-term needs; understand who needs what; provide a base to compare with other labs. Then ID what areas need scientific computing, where more is needed. Clemens stated that he believes much (90%) of the list is IT (infrastructure) and not specifically scientific computing. Input of what is scientific and what is IT will be shared with the IT sub-council. Tom/Clemens raised the issue that there are some areas that are needed but SCCS does not/should not provide. In particular SSRL provides many of the services, such as email mail servers, has local support for networking, Tom has his own print servers. This is a potentially contentious area where we need some clearer guidance from the ALDs, i.e. who supports what and what are the boundaries. Also Kavli provides some things such as a collaboration web server which is provided via campus.

Line 7: Customer relations is based on what SCCS does, i.e. SCCS manages projects or IT for a customer, e.g. installation of a cluster, upgrade the network in an area.

Line 8: are the department administrators.

Line 10: An example is Mac service is needed by some departments, and is provided even if not by SCCS. This could be provided locally, or by individual. If the Mac is on a SLAC network (as opposed by the visitors subnet) then this should be filled in.

Line 15: This is outward based documentation, this is the place to request more.

Line 16: SSRL buys their own stuff, so need to identify that the service has been provided by SSRL, it could be SSRL/SCCS.

Action item: change from add resources to needs improvement (this is more generic and does not attempt to define a solution).

Action item: add information to the spreadsheet of who provides the service.

*Action: every member fill out the spreadsheet (i.e. if already provided information add who provides the service, if not already provided information then please add all the information for the member's area), this is a **requirement** for members of the committee. If a member has a question email Gunther or put in a comment.*

Comments, Sandy

Persis and Sandy agreed to visit the sub-councils to specify needs. The lab needs a form of governance to determine what to do. There needs to be a long term vision (e.g. 10 year). SLAC defined its core competencies. These will change the nature of the Lab. There will be a document coming out soon. Out of this 10 year vision comes a SLAC agenda for what to do in years 1-2, 2-5, 5-10 etc. This will have an operations side. Then a business plan is created. The purpose of the sub-councils is to go from philosophical strategic goals to tactical decisions. The sub-councils were appointed by the ALDs. Line manager makes decisions and they need to align with the strategy. If they do not align then a case has to be made to rationalize and articulate the decision. The sub councils have then to determine if something is out of wack and to decide if the decision is sensible. It is in the spirit of a partnership.

There will be meetings between line managers and sub-councils members. This will help prioritize decisions. The final decision authority is made by the 6 ALDS, and the sub-councils represent the directorates. Any resignation from a sub-council is made to the relevant ALD.

Sandy finished up by thanking all members who agreed to serve and then opened up for questions.

PI's need to look out a number of years for what is needed to make her/his program successful. If something is needed to change in the scientific strategy, it is the PIs responsibility to raise this issue and evangelize it.

Is the scientific computing just about SCCS? E.g. PNNL does not have a centralized computing support group. Does Scientific Computing Sub-Council just cover SCCS related items or be more general. E.g. does each group buy/support its own cluster, is it centralized/fragmented, are there economies/constraints of scale? We cannot let yesterday be the driver of what we do tomorrow, or is this reviewed.

Will the sub-councils be involved in the selection process for the new CIO. It is logistically difficult to have all the members of the sub-councils in the review process. There are 3 major hiring processes going on: CIO, CTO, and Facilities management. Representatives from the appropriate area are present on the search committees. If the sub-council wants to be involved then they need to let Sandy know so the sub-council can be involved in the second stage of the hiring process.

The SLAC Annual Business Plan can be found via*:*

Search at SLAC for "annual business plan". That takes you to:

http://today.slac.stanford.edu/a/2008/04-25.htm

from which this:

https://www-internal.slac.stanford.edu/do/2009SLACPlan/2009%20SLAC%20Plan.pdf
is linked.