Lattice QCD Computing Project (LQCD)

Response to Recommendations from the 2010 Annual Progress Review of the LQCD Computing Project Extension / ARRA

Compiled by

Paul Mackenzie Chair, LQCD Executive Committee

William Boroski Contractor Project Manager, LQCD Computing Project

May 2, 2011

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

On April 29-30, 2010, the U.S. Department of Energy Office of High Energy Physics and the Office of Nuclear Physics conducted an Annual Progress Review of the ongoing Lattice Quantum Chromodynamics (LQCD) Computing Project. The review was held at the Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility and resulted in a written report that contained one recommendation to help improve the project's effectiveness and impact. This document summarizes the LQCD Computing Project's response to the recommendation and subsequent actions taken.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS

Effectiveness of Management Structure and Responsiveness to Past Recommendations

Recommendation:

The review panel noted that members of the USQCD executive board which governs all the computational efforts of the collaboration do not have fixed terms and that several of its members have served for over a decade. They recommended that the terms of members of the executive board of USQCD be limited so that younger members of the community could join.

Response:

The USOCD Executive Committee recognizes the desirability of having regular rotations of its members, and has examined ways of doing so. Such changes in membership should be made to enhance the committee's effectiveness in carrying out its functions. The role of the Executive Committee is to provide leadership for the development of the scientific program and computational infrastructure of the USQCD Collaboration, which consists of nearly all members of the US lattice gauge theory community. In particular, the Executive Committee crafts and submits proposals to the DOE for funds to develop the hardware and software resources needed for research in lattice gauge theory. It also appoints the Scientific Program Committee. The SPC recommends allocations of time on USOCD's hardware facilities and on its resources at leadership class centers, and advises the Executive Committee on the scientific priorities on which it bases its proposals. The Executive Committee is constituted to have a balance between nuclear and particle physics, and the various active research directions pursued by members of USQCD. The laboratories that house USQCD's hardware, and most of the major physics collaborations within USQCD, are represented on the Executive Committee. New members of the Executive Committee are chosen by the Executive Committee after appropriate consultation. We believe that this approach is the most straightforward way of ensuring that the balance and representative character of the committee play a central role in the selection process.

For the USQCD Collaboration to remain healthy, one should expect continual turnover in the Executive Committee as the interests and roles of its individual members change, and as

the scientific directions within USQCD and its partner laboratories change. The lifetime of a typical project, from proposal to close-out, is five to six years, and it is important to have a significant fraction of the committee involved during the full course of a project in order to maintain continuity and institutional memory. We therefore foresee a turnover of approximately one member per year as typical. We believe that it is important to maintain flexibility in the length of service of Executive Committee members, rather than to have precisely fixed terms, in order to enable us to maintain the desired balance.

Response to LQCD 2010 Review Recommendations