

Service Coordination Board

19 March 2012 Meeting Summary

In attendance:

- AES: Patric den Hartog, Geoff Pile, John Maclean
- ASD: Michael Borland, Ali Nassiri
- XSD: Mark Beno, Chris Jacobsen
- Upgrade: Tom Fornek, Dean Haeffner, Mohan Ramanathan
- Secretary: Steve Davey

Action Items:

- Find a larger room to meet and schedule longer time for Board meetings (Davey & Pile)
- Send out definitions of small, medium, and large projects (Jacobsen)
- Distribute MS Project table to Board members (distribution: Davey and Citrix access to MS Project: Maclean)
- Confirm status of AES-ERA (Ramanathan)
- Board members to comment on draft charter (see Attachment 2) (comments to Davey)
- Review effort requests for SPX at next meeting (Nassiri)
- ASD & ASD to review priorities for projects (ASD & XSD Board members)
- ASD & XSD to provide what projects/AIP/capital are approved (Borland & Beno)

Summary of the 1 March Board meeting distributed comments to be provided to Davey.

Review of status of action items from 1 March meeting:

- Board to meet again in two weeks / status = closed.
- Thresholds need to be defined for small/medium/large jobs (Jacobsen) / status = ongoing:
Jacobsen forwarded the following from George Srajer
"If an engineering task required one day a week effort (~ 8 hours or ~4-5 days a month), it was considered a small project. It was only discussed between the initiator (our beamline/optics/detectors staff) and an engineer (typically the liaison engineer). Anything above, was brought to the attention of Patric and based on his further assessment, the task/project was tracked. I do not recall having called projects small, medium or large, but I assume that these tracked projects could be categorized as large projects. So basically I had been aware of only two types of projects, small and large. It makes sense to me to introduce a medium project category for 5 days or less."
- The ERA need to be reviewed (Mohan) / status = ongoing:
The AES ERA was distributed at the 19 March Board meeting, questions remained, and Mohan is to confirm the request.

- Update current, realistic effort allocations & present to the Board (Pile) / status = ongoing: Davey to distribute the AES group effort breakdowns from the MS Project demo.
- Present an example of the level of details sought for a project (Pile) / status = open

Feedback: Jacobsen suggested that for small and medium size projects a simple question to the recipient of the service satisfied: Yes/no, were you satisfied with the service? Comments would be optional. Borland reiterated that a simple scale (e.g., 1 to 5) would be good for rating services.

Better progress reporting for projects will be sought.

AES/Upgrade ERA:

Noted: if a service is planned/budgeted for the Upgrade Project, the staffing is provided, but the service is not used/paid for, the cost hits the Operations budget. Operations budgets are constrained and quite limited in what they can absorb. Pile noted that operations budgets are being squeezed by decreases in funding and increases in effort overheads.

Haeffner noted the ERA doesn't include all personnel being used. Mohan stated that if <10% of a person's time being used by the Upgrade Project, it is not included in the ERA. Overhead costs, such as training, can be shared between the Upgrade Project and Operations. DCS is not included in the ERA.

It was recognized that even when a person is assigned to the Upgrade Project, in an emergency, they will support operations.

MED:

Material provided by Den Hartog showed the historical levels of support the Divisions, beamlines, and the Upgrade and current staffing plans for the MED group. Den Hartog estimated that traditionally MED services were approximately evenly split between ASD, XSD, and Operations. He noted that support will be winding down for a number of beamline projects while growing for beamlines as part of the Upgrade. The level of support needed for IEX was discussed.

Following on Pile's 1 March proposal for support teams, Den Hartog presented the possible formation of three teams to provide for smaller, locally-directed jobs. Beamline teams would be group-based rather than sector-based.

Action item: provide the MS Project information for the MED to the members of the Board and the Board members are look set their priorities/ratings projects/services for discussion at the next Board meeting.

The support needed for SPX (e.g., the assignment of Stillwell) to be discussed at the next Board meeting.

Attachment 1 – Agenda

SCB 19 March 2012 Agenda

- Approval/corrections of 1 March meeting summary.
- Action items from last meeting:
 - Board to meet again in two weeks (Pile to schedule)
 - Thresholds need to be defined for small/medium/large jobs (Jacobsen)
 - The ERAs need to be reviewed (Mohan)
 - Update current, realistic effort allocations to be presented to the Board (Pile)
 - Present an example of the level of details sought for a project (Pile)
- Confirm standing meeting time (bi-weekly Wednesdays at 11:15, B4300).
- Report on definitions of project thresholds.
- Review of AES ERA
- Report of group-level breakdown of services provided by AES (MED example).
- What reports are needed by the Board?
- SCB charter and membership.
- New business

Next meeting: (April 4 @11:30)

Attachment 2 - Draft SCB Charter

APS Service Coordination Board Charter
(3 Feb 2012 Draft)

Mission: The APS Service Coordination Board (SCB) will guide the allocation of services at the APS to ensure that the services are delivered efficiently to accomplish the mission of the APS. The SCB is also available to provide timely feedback on provided services.

Board Members:

Members are appointed by the APS Director. The Chair is a member of the SCB and is selected by members of the board on an annual basis.

Members:

1. XSD ADD (2)
2. XSD Deputy Division Director
3. ASD ADD
4. AES ADD (2)
5. APS-U Project Manager

Secretary: Will aid the Board in preparation of materials and documenting proceedings. (Incumbent: TBD by the Board)

Meetings: 1st and 3rd Tuesday of each month at 10:00.

Quorum: at least one representative from each Division

Background:

A requestor of services will use the on-line proposal system to make a request for support. Requests can be made for:

- a. Assignment of a percentage of a group's efforts to a project or task, including set-asides for internal responsibilities (e.g., the IT Group may seek to set aside a portion of the groups effort for responding to help desk requests and a portion for maintaining the facility networking infrastructure);
- b. Matrixing of personnel (i.e., assignment of particular individual[s] effort[s] for a fixed time]; or
- c. Delivery of effort for a specific project of task (commonly, the effort time estimate should be made in consultation with service providers).

The SCB will use the on-line system to track these effort requests.

Method:

1. Requestors of services submit effort proposals using the APS Proposal System.
2. The SCB members familiarize themselves with submitted proposals to represent their Division's interests. (For purposes of this process, the APS-U Director acts as the Division Director (DD) for upgrade activities and references to the DDs include the Division Directors and the APS-U Director.)
3. The SCB Chair convenes the Board.
4. The Board reviews status of ongoing services (e.g., progress reports and feedback on services).
5. Board reviews new/pending requests.
 - a. If additional information is needed for a particular request, a Board member from the requesting Division/Upgrade Project goes back to the requestor and/or potential services provider and requests the clarification.
 - b. If a Board wants the service provider Group Leader input to confirm the availability of the support service, the proposal is given "provisional approval". Group Leaders review for conflicts with existing commitments, matching technical competence with requirements, balancing personnel issues (e.g., career development, training, mentoring and being mentored, etc.), and impacts of commitments As needed, the Board can work with requestors to clarify scope of commitment (i.e., deliverables and schedule). If approved by the Group Leader, the request will be added to the list of approved commitment. If not approved by the Group Leader, the Board will re-review the request.
 - c. If the Board needs no additional input, the Board approves or rejects the proposal or leaves it for later reconsideration.
6. A summary of the meeting is prepared and posted by the Board's secretary.
7. If there is a consensus of the Board of on which tasks/projects/assignments should be supported /approved or rejected, the Board requests endorsement by the Division Directors (DD) and APS-U Director.

If there is not a consensus of the Board on which tasks/projects/assignments should be supported, the Board requests the DDs/APS-U Director to arbitrate.
8. The DDs and APS-U Director review the request from the Board:
 - a. If a consensus of the DDs and APS-U Director is reached, the ALD is advised of the plan.
 - b. If a consensus of the Directors is not reached, either: 1) the ALD may asked to arbitrate or 2) the Board can be asked to revisit the requests and attempt to reach a consensus

(go back to step 5).

9. The ALD can either: 1) let the commitment plan go forward or 2) reject the plan and send it back to the DDs and APS-U with additional guidance (go back to step 7).
10. A notice of approved services/commitments will be posted being available to all stake holders (requestors, service providers, APS managers).