

## Oversight Committee Members

(Anna Hasenfratz) [anna@eotvos.colorado.edu](mailto:anna@eotvos.colorado.edu)  
(Greg Kilcup) [kilcup@pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu](mailto:kilcup@pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu)  
(Julius Kuti) [jkuti@ucsd.edu](mailto:jkuti@ucsd.edu)  
(Rob Pennington) [robp@ncsa.uiuc.edu](mailto:robp@ncsa.uiuc.edu)  
(Ralph Roskies) [roskies@psc.edu](mailto:roskies@psc.edu)  
(Terry Schalk) [tas@scipp.ucsc.edu](mailto:tas@scipp.ucsc.edu)  
(Steven Gottlieb) [sg@indiana.edu](mailto:sg@indiana.edu)

(Robert Sugar) [sugar@physics.ucsb.edu](mailto:sugar@physics.ucsb.edu) \*

\* (Bob is on the email list, but says he is not an ex officio committee member.)

To email all the Oversight Committee members, send email to:  
[oversight@denali.physics.indiana.edu](mailto:oversight@denali.physics.indiana.edu)

## Activities

July '03 Tsukuba—update on funding

9/8/03 Phone conference—general review

Fall Renewal proposal review

2/12/04 Phone conference—general review, funding, HEPAP

Don Holmgren presented Fermilab hardware plans: single CPU P4 nodes to replace P3 and small infiniband cluster

Committee expressed its approval of this plan

It is important that committee review **all** purchase plans

3/12/04 Phone conference—software review

Rich Brower detailed efforts and accomplishments of committee members

Much has been accomplished; however, significant concerns about level of effort in some cases. Concern that Rich be able to direct efforts expressed to executive committee.

3/19/04 Phone Conference—Review of milestones; Review of funding recommendation

Since there will be no 1.5 TF QCDOC, modified milestones for go ahead on constructing large machine based on discussion.

Review of Scientific Program Committee recommendation on funding (5/6 QCDOC, 1/6 Clusters)

1. Too soon to make a decision

2. It is very important to keep cluster development going

My personal comments (chair's prerogative)

QCDOC represents a unique opportunity now

Capacity planning effort should be improved

5/6, 1/6, seems good if we get \$6 million, but might not be optimal at lower level of funding

Benchmarking should be further along