



Meeting of the Technical Steering Committee (TSC) Board

Wednesday, July 31th, 2019
11:00am ET

Meeting Logistics

- <https://zoom.us/j/556149142>
- United States : +1 (646) 558-8656
 - Meeting ID: 556 149 142

Antitrust Policy Notice

- Linux Foundation meetings involve participation by industry competitors, and it is the intention of the Linux Foundation to conduct all of its activities in accordance with applicable antitrust and competition laws. It is therefore extremely important that attendees adhere to meeting agendas, and be aware of, and not participate in, any activities that are prohibited under applicable US state, federal or foreign antitrust and competition laws.
- Examples of types of actions that are prohibited at Linux Foundation meetings and in connection with Linux Foundation activities are described in the Linux Foundation Antitrust Policy available at <http://www.linuxfoundation.org/antitrust-policy>. If you have questions about these matters, please contact your company counsel, or if you are a member of the Linux Foundation, feel free to contact Andrew Updegrave of the firm of Gesmer Updegrave LLP, which provides legal counsel to the Linux Foundation.

Agenda

- Reminders
 - SC BoF submission deadline: July 31, 2019 (today)
- TSC 2019/2020 election all wrapped up (thanks)
- PEARC'19 tutorial post mortem
- OBS Updates
- Component Submission Process

PEARC'19



- Good turn-out for the tutorial on Monday:
 - ~35-40 attendees
- Final tutorial slides posted on our GitHub wiki and available at: <http://bit.ly/OHPC-PEARC19>
- Many thanks to Derek, Eric, David, Nirmala, Reese, and Chris for slide preparation and review
- The good news:
 - we had plenty of material
 - using pre-built clusters on TACC CI systems worked fine
 - excellent questions, savvy attendees
 - exercises pretty much worked as intended (one small gotcha with node reboots)
- The bad news:
 - we didn't come close to getting thru all the material

PEARC'19 (cont)

- Additional comments/thoughts:
 - very much a SLURM-oriented crowd; we anticipated this somewhat and provisioned 3 slurm clusters and 1 pbs pro cluster in advance (and prepped slides for both)
 - in the end, one attendee chose the pbs route and had the cluster to himself
 - minority of the attendees said they were existing users (~25%)
 - so, introductory overview seemed warranted, but does limit time for interactive stuff
 - we surveyed the room during second-half of tutorial to prioritize remaining tutorial modules we would focus on; resulting priority order was as follows:
 1. **containerization** (we assembled a Docker and Singularity image using openhpc components and exercised thru resource manager)
 2. performance analysis tools (new material on TAU and Scalasca)
 3. using openhpc on cloud infrastructure (new material using Packer/EC2)
 4. Spack/EasyBuild (updated material)
- If we were to repeat this for ½ day tutorial, would likely to want to shorten overview drastically (point non-familiar users to other existing material) and get to interactive exercises sooner

OBS Updates

- Prior to 2.0 work, would like to take the opportunity to upgrade our back-end OBS infrastructure to a newer version (we have been at v2.6 since beginning of the project)
 - ohpc-required patches need updating - will post updated variants
- Update on Leap 15.1 integration
 - have been struggling to get full version of 15.1 ingested into our OBS server
 - published ISOs do not include devel packages or other items necessary for rpm builds
 - consequently, we are unable to resolve all necessary dependencies locally
 - so, while it would be nice to have everything locally, it looks like it will be easier to continue down the path we had been doing for SLES
 - use SUSE's public OBS infrastructure (build.opensuse.org) as pathway to access Leap variants

Component Submission Process

- One procedural item I would like to suggest we revisit with the current TSC is our component submission voting process:
 - for our new TSC members, a description of the current process is available [here](#)
 - basic gist is that we require a minimum of 5 reviews/votes from existing TSC members to make recommendations as follows:
 - Accept
 - Accept with changes
 - Reject until changes
 - Reject
- Overall I think this has been working well with a couple of small exceptions based on the 8 review cycles we have completed to date:
 - Presently, we have a shared vote from two TSC roles:
 - component development representatives
 - end-user site representatives
 - This shared voting has caused some confusion in the past; not sure we gain much by it
 - Another very small issue is that we provide a checkbox now to provide private feedback to the submitter in addition to public feedback thru GitHub
 - submitters often check this, but we haven't really had anything to provide to them separately from the feedback response on GitHub
- Proposal to slightly tweak the process:
 - remove shared voting requirement for component development and site reps. Any TSC member can volunteer for the reviews and cast an independent vote
 - note: we could potentially raise the minimum votes required if there are concerns (e.g. require 7 votes minimum)
 - remove private feedback option from submission ticket form
- Thoughts/discussion?