ISIS Mantid PMC Meeting  
Minutes of Meeting 4  
24th January 2014, 1000-1200

Present: Garrett Granroth, Jon Taylor, Nick Draper, Anders Markvardsen (Secretary), Thomas Proffen (Chair), Sean Langridge, Toby Perring

Apologies: Galen Shipman

# Discussion of requirements gathered at SSC/Development meeting

Requirements gathered from meeting at SNS w/c 13th and w/c 20th January: <https://docs.google.com/spreadsheet/ccc?key=0Aq36k77Hr7BldGtZcnhxOG9NWjBYZTdTRVN6aGh3bGc&usp=sharing> .

The 24 man month estimate of masking redesign was discussed. Masking is affecting many Mantid workflows and a previous attempt at modifying the underlying behaviour of masking caused side effects. A cautious design and review process is therefor expected for this item, and may include a review and development implementation in a separate branch.

It was noted that the Vates CLI item had been merged into the general CLI item.

The total man years estimated to implement the requirements adds up to 21. Mantid consists of 17 developers, not all working full time. All developers time cannot be assigned to these requirements. There is the work that is required for Mantid recurrent and the list does not cover all existing requirements.

These requirements were asked to form the basis for a delivery plan visible to scientists/users. Scientists can be referred to this delivery plan when asking when a given feature is likely to be implemented. Also, the delivery plan may be used by scientists to spot missing important medium and high level requirements. Mantid is an agile project, and the delivery plan will not be carved in stone.

**Action ND to create delivery plan based on requirement list**

Some beamlines are only represented at one facility and to ensure that requirements from such beamlines are well represented it was suggested to, where appropriate, to schedule for local SSC prior to the joint SSC, one example is the ISIS muon group. On the other hand, for groups with strong overlap across facilities it was proposed that pilot SSC workshops could be scheduled before the main event, multiple scattering was mentioned in this context.

# How to join the Mantid collaboration

A request has been made from ESS to join. C-SNS has asked how a request can be made.

It was agreed that to join will involve:

1. Any optional two way discussions
2. Email from facility director to Mantid PMB chair person, which includes a high level roadmap of how the facility plan role out (use) Mantid at their facility

An accepted new member will be requested to select one person to be on the Mantid PMB.

# In anticipation of new facilities joining

Possible PMB structures were discussed in view of new facilities joining. It was commented that the number of seats from each facility, long term, may be setup to reflect how much a given facility has contributed to the project up to a given point in time, and it was noted that a new facility joining is expected to contribute less when they first join. It was decided that a new member will be asked to select one person to be on the PMB.

It was suggested that the Chair of the PMB should rotate among facility members on a yearly basis.

Where the board consists of members from very different time zones, meetings may require some board members to participate out of normal working hours. Although this is not currently an issue, a suggestion was to have the facility who chairs the PMB to choose a meeting time that is within the normal working hours of that facility while at the same time trying to accommodate those from other time zones.

The technical aspects of maintaining the standard of the code where many more facilities will contribute to the code was discussed. The current version control software offer a tool, ‘pool request’, which provides more control of the review process of code submitted to Mantid and this is already being used. In general there need to be a right level of control, for example, too much control could put new (or existing) facilities off using Mantid. To discussed and recommend best standard practice this could be done by a technical standard committee, a committee that is described in more detail in the section below.

# Technical standard committee (TSC)

It was agreed to introduce a technical standard committee an idea that was brought up during this developer workshop. The members of this committee will initially be formed by those who are interested and have a senior level of experience within the Mantid project. The chair of this committee will be selected among its members. If there is a conflict within this committee it will be resolved by the PMB. The committee will give recommendations on technical standards to the PMB.

An example of an item to discuss by the TSC will be to compare the effort/cost involved in maintaining each of the supported platforms used by Mantid. Any platform requires a finite developer effort to maintain. The TSC will put forward which platforms that it recommends together with reasons for this.

# Summary of joint SSC meeting

Good feedback from participants of the SSC was reported.

It was agree that a joint SSC should be held next year at ISIS during a period where both facilities are in shutdown and the developer workshop should be held in connection with this meeting.

**Action ND to email suggestion for dates of next joint SSC meeting**

The idea of a SSC chair was discussed. It was decided to bring this up again at a future PMB meeting.

# Next Meeting

End of March, early April.

# New and Ongoing Actions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4.1 | Action ND to create delivery plan based on requirement list | ND |
| 4.2 | Action ND to email suggestion for dates of next joint SSC meeting | ND |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Completed Actions

Completed actions will remain in this list for one meeting then will be removed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 3.1 | To list which software is used by Mantid | ND |
| 3.2 | To comment on governance document | SL+others |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |