

**OpenSFS TWG Telecon
December 16, 2010**

*John Carrier (lead)
Shay Seager (notes)*

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

- Edited white paper with group
 - Added what resources and man-hours are estimated to operate the TWG
 - Removed reference to Oracle, replaced with we will be focusing on the needs of the HPC community
 - How TWG is going to interact with other working groups
 -
- Responsibility of members of the working group was addressed. Expected participation includes but is not limited to:
 - Quarterly in-person meetings
 - Bi-monthly telecons
 - two members will be voted into the working group leader position annually
 - two members will be partnered to work on each RFP submitted
 - Everyone is responsible for gathering requirements from the community and reporting back to the group

DISCUSSION NOTES

- Let's go over white paper and road map (homework). The reason this came up, the cross fertilization meeting on Tuesday, Pam Hamilton was going over the white paper that she has sent out to the reflector, they have not gotten any comments back. It was interesting because they have not decided on what the support mechanism is. They think it is going to be a Kernal.org and it will have all the patches applied and then third party vendors can go, however there is another model; a Red Hat model. Mark Seager is very much in favor of the latter mode. There are arguments for both ways. The white paper is a way to get discussion going in-between the working groups. When I talked about our roadmap, Mark was disappointed that we were working on a roadmap before we finished the white paper. The best way to do that is that you all send me your updates on the white paper.

-Speaking for Oakridge, there is not a lot we can add to it, maybe talk about how we are going to interact with the other groups. But I think that you captured what the group talked about at SC.

- Let's come back to that- interacting with all the groups. Galen suggested that we take out the comment about the direction that oracle is taking. We need to take responsibility for the features that we need even when they are not relevant to oracles product

- Yeah it doesn't make sense for OpenSFS to mention Oracle - we should just mention that we will be focusing on the needs of the HPC community.

- Ok, that's great. Let's go around the table. Any suggestions?

-Not really, I think stating that we would like that we are going to push any changes back into the master tree but that's it. I don't know though. Is there any possibility that things outside of the TWG will be suggested by other working groups?

- Our goal is to gather requirements from everyone, and if that is not clearly stated, I will look at that and put it in there. No the expectation is that we are a brain trust for everything that Lustre needs to do to meet the requirements of the community. Our discussion with Eric (Whamcloud) has been starting that. We have identified where there is possible work and where things should go. Pushing things out and what are the building blocks to get to that scalability.

-Would it make more sense to focus on each point, give some input and continue on that way.

- Yes, we can do that. I am assuming that people have had a chance to look at it. But we can go over it section by section right now.

-(Shay) Should we add the resources we are estimating that we are going to need?

- Yes, let me give some background - Pam brought up the question of who is actually going to do the work. Because as Mark was explaining the Red Hat model there is the conflict of funding the work. So when we look at this going on, we are all members, but eventually we are going to be writing RFPs and the expectations is that we will be writing and managing the RFPs, that is part of the expectation. Resources and interaction with groups is what I will add to these white paper.

-I want to add to the mission statement, in the roadmap we talk about the features of the network, we should talk about how we are going to be more stable and useable for different level of customers

- I agree - the requirement is too specific when we address more general features.

-I worry about word-smithing on the call, let's say that platforms will continue to scale and leave it at that.

-I thought that we are suppose to scale more than Mores (sp?) law

-I mentioned Mores law because that was a point of discussion at SC.

-Is there any value to that?

-Well instead of talking about Mores law we should put it in terms of focusing in terms of storage capacity. You do get performance for free as components get faster, but it is really about re-directing the scale of that

-I don't know if we want stabilization in part of the mission statement but I think it is something that we want.

-We do talk about how it is our goal to have stability since it is critical to us all.

- I'm going to change that to what Dave was just saying, to the stability requirements. I dropped the Mores law reference, so do we need a reference to what we are scaling too?

-We should just talk about the platforms, we want to keep up as much as we can. We would ideally like to out-pace them a bit.

- Ok, the Lustre road-map; I'm removing the phrase in reference to Oracle.

-We should just say - these our our goals, and wherever Oracle goes, they may or may not be aligned.

-We should not put Oracle as the other guy.

- There is no reference to Oracle in the White Paper, except to say that we are going to push all fixes up to the Lustre tree. Ok next paragraph - this is where we will talk about the work with the other groups.

-I think we should mention it explicitly, because the goals of the working groups may not match with any one member.

-If we put it in this section then we will have to detail how we are going to work with other working groups.

-Let's not dilute it

- Then our job is to create that road map, prioritize a list, and then get approval for development - that brings us to the next paragraph which talks about the proposals for resource allocation and RFP's. The resource allocations is a buzz word from TWG website from our mission. I am not sure what that word actually does, except to take up space. Ok that talks about the RFP = we don't talk about how we are going to manage RFP's, should we add a paragraph about that? do we know enough about that to clarify that?

-I think we should talk about managing the interactions and writing about meeting the requirements. We should talk about how the TWG will keep the board informed on progress for on-going development projects. If anyone has a better way to say that.

- So this is where we can say we will work with the other groups to....

-We should talk about what we expect to come down the pipe and when we expect it to land, we need to keep them informed of schedule changes. We need to coordinate with the SWG for developments, we want to sit there and make part of the contract be part of the support piece, where the development team helps the SWG get caught up on the new system.

- So that first paragraph, we talk about that, at the end of the next paragraph when we talk about integrating things into the master tree, we talk about how the RFP's will require the developers to work with the RPWG and the SWG to integrate changes into the Oracle tree.

-I don't think we should go into details for the model yet.

- I think that is a cautionary notice, let's not get any more specific than necessary - every working group is going to be different

-Are we good on the feature development? Ok, good. I think we should be meeting bi-weekly after we publish the white paper, we are doing weekly calls right now because we are still working on the white paper.

- The other thing we need to talk about is what our expected level of participation requirements are going to be. Is that ok if we move into that?

-I think we are good

- Alright, so besides the time that we got, how much of our time are we going to need. We are going to need someone meeting with contractors regularly after the RFPs. We are going to need someone to champion every RFP - the principal contact for that RFP. That way we can divide and conquer.

-I like that someone is in charge of it because we need a point person, and they will relay information back to the group.

- Any other tasks that we can envision? We have a working group chair, we can have a formal denomination of the working group.

-I like the idea of co-chairs, maybe when we mention that one guy should be in charge for the RFP we should have 2 people working on it.

- So we are going to be addressing in the board, who is going to be needed for each project, basically just identifying what work is necessary. We will have quarterly meetings that we will have have to attend, we will have bi-weekly calls, 2 people to lead the group, 2 people for RFPs. So who is going to gather requirements? There is no directed effort to gather requirements, but that could be an activity that we all need to do, extending beyond our own organization. The intent it to use a discussion board to talk to the whole community. I think we could create sub-groups to go off and gather those requirements. I am going to put behind that is not the job of the co-chairs. Gathering the requirements is the responsibility of all of us.

END OF CALL.