

June 20, 2011

To the Committee:

I would like to respond to the concerns you raised regarding how the GlueX Collaboration is organized for the management of the offline software. We have had the following structure in place for several years (five years? more perhaps?):

Software Coordinator: oversees all offline software components, including but not limited to simulation, reconstruction, calibration, analysis tools, and the management of these projects. Chosen in a collaboration-wide election for a two year term. David Lawrence of the JLab Hall D Group held the position from its inception until April 2009. I have been the Coordinator since that time.

Offline Software Working Group: meets bi-weekly. Main forum for discussion and decision making for offline issues. Membership drawn from the entire GlueX Collaboration. Chaired by the Software Coordinator. Minutes are available on the web (<http://tinyurl.com/3o6zahg>) going back to 2006.

There is a separate Online Working Group that takes care of data acquisition, online controls, and online event monitoring. It has a similar structure. There is of course a lot of overlap in membership between this group and the Offline Group.

I can think of three reasons that this organizational structure was not clear to the committee:

1. I did not describe it.
2. We generally try to reach decisions by consensus and not fiat.
3. The online decision forum is separate from that for offline.

Brad's question to me, as I recall, was about whether there was one person in charge of everything from data acquisition to final analysis software and the answer remains no, for reasons 2 and 3 above. That having been said, at least for the offline, the chair of the working group, the Software Coordinator, has tremendous influence on the direction of the discussion and the form of decisions, and has a mandate from the collaboration to exercise that influence. It is certainly not the case that we are collection of independent software developers occasionally exchanging emails.

The goal of consensus notwithstanding, sometimes someone has to make a call and everyone else has to live with it in the interest of progress. It is tacitly understood that the Software Coordinator can do this if things come to that.

There are other structural features of the collaboration that enforce cooperation and demand collective decision making. On the technical end of these is a shared code repository containing software that no one individual can work without and which is too vast for any one individual to reproduce on their own. Changes by one affect all. Issues like this immediately rise to the top of the list of agenda items at the meetings.

Although I would say that given where we are, we do need to tighten coordination, I think that we do have an organizational structure that can support that effort.

— Mark Ito