**Client Meeting 9**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals** | * Get feedback about Zed specification and use cases * Get approval that they are the first versions | | |
| **Required Preparation:** | Zed specification, use cases (send them to the client in advance) | | |
| **When:** | 11/6/2009, 10:00 – 11:00 | **Where:** | GHC 7101 |
| **Attendees:** | Client: Dr. Schmerl  FACEO5 Team: Aparup, Hector, Laura, Mai, Nina | **Facilitator:** | Mai |
| **Scribe:** | Laura | **TimeKeeper:** | Mai |

**Agenda and Minutes**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Time | Item | Responsibility | Supposed Result |
| 1 | 1 minutes | Review Agenda | Mai | Agenda is complete. |
| 2 | 19 minutes | Review: Zed Specification | Client, Aparup | * Get feedback about what the team should modify further. * Get approval as first version if we send the spec after reflecting on the feedback. |
| 3 | 35 minutes | Review: Use cases | Client, Nina | * Discuss use cases, focusing on “execute”, “edit”, “analyze”, “deploy”, and “compile” * Get approval as first version if we send the use cases after reflecting on the feedback. |
| 4 | 5 minutes | Wrap-Up | Mai | * Check new action items. |

**Minutes**

* Next week there will be training sessions all day (9:30 – 5:00), every day, for SORASCS. They will not be very polished because they are somewhat last-minute, but some of them would likely be constructive for us to attend.
  + Monday: general SORASCS overview. Installation and administration.
  + Tuesday: ORA.
  + Wednesday: Automap.
  + Thursday: SORASCS. Advance topics of ORA.
  + Friday: Integrating a new tool with SORASCS. Dr. Schmerl will not be available for the normal client next week. We need to reschedule our planned activities for Friday to be offline activities.
* Use Cases
  + In “Deploy,” we need to make clear what “made available” means for a workflow. It is only for the individual analyst and does not involve any sort of publishing or permissions management.
  + In “Edit,” we’re missing:
    - “Drill down” which means to select a composite component which is actually a workflow and going down into the nested workflow.
    - Parameterization: be able to edit the properties of the component. For example: data inputs and parameters to tweak the component’s behavior. Parameterization of a work defines the external inputs and outputs, i.e. parameters or outputs for internal components that haven’t been specified in the workflow or that can be overridden.
    - We should add the graphical framework checklist items.
    - “DynetML” not “DynML.”
    - We need to consider what would happen if the automatic data transformation doesn’t find a component that can be used. There is a graduate level working on the different levels of this feature. Need to be careful about going into detail about this feature.
  + It’s not clear what happens in the analyze vs. validation vs. execution stage. Pre-execution analysis is more syntactic, semantic, or structural checks. For example, is my information being kept secure (kept locally when needed), can I run this component after this other component, what will the performance be. These semantic analyses are not required for deployment.
  + The different checks are a bit confusing (syntactic, structural, semantic, validation, analysis, plugins, …) because there are different types with different names that can be run at different times. It might be helpful to just write out all the possible checks and then try to categorize when they can happen in the creation of a workflow.
  + Privacy and security analyses, if we implement them, would be as plugins. Provide an API for analyses and then provide a couple of useful ones.
  + The plugin use cases are still an open issue. The type of user for these use cases is fundamentally different (developers). For now we can leave it as a high level. We don’t need to provide too much support for this beyond an API and some way of accessing it.
  + In “execute” – the step-by-step execution is a bit confusing. We may also want to set a breakpoint before or after a component. It’s also unclear how much of this functionality SORASCS’s current version of BPEL supports. Going to be hard to implement, but we should specify what we hope to have.
  + In “execute” there’s a repeated semantic check that should probably be taken out.
  + What ways can execution fail? There are lots of possible ways that a specific component can fail, and we don’t want to list all of them, but we will need to report any errors that happened.
  + The execution use case, like the edit use case, is less step-by-step and more a “grab bag” of features.
  + May want to have a quick check to ping SORASCS just before execution to make sure that all components are currently available and working.
  + Does importing happen one-by-one or does the tool automatically import *all* available components in that user’s realm? We also need to be sure to store imported components for the next time the user opens the workflow tool. Dr. Schmerl would prefer that the tool automatically imports all components in the realm – in this case it doesn’t make sense to allow importing because there wouldn’t be any other components for you to find. But you do need the tool to be able to “refresh” the palette to update the realms.
  + If you’ve published a workflow is it automatically added to your “palette”? A workflow is just a type of component.
  + We still have not heard from Prof. Carley about the tool categorizations. This is not a blocking issue because we still have to deal with scalability because there are so many components. Want to provide features like filtering, sorting, searching, etc.
  + After these changes the use cases document will go into maintenance mode.
* How will we involve Prof. Carley in the SRS and paper prototyping activities? Two-phase process: the doctors do the first vetting, and then they present it to Kathleen and Mike and get their opinions.
* Is Prof. Carley’s notion of security similar to ours?
* We don’t have any hard constraints for deadlines for things like the SRS.

**Action Items**

* Dr. Schmerl to send the agenda on next week’s SORASCS training. The team will then reply which session we will join or not.
* The team to check with Dr. Garlan about his availability for next Friday’s meeting.
* The team to update the use cases based on the notes from this meeting, and send out a revised version for approval.

**Time**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Scheduled** | **Actual** |
| Meeting Start | 10:00 | 10:07 |
| Z Specification | 10:01 | N/A |
| Use Cases | 10:20 | 10:08 |
| Wrap-Up | 10:55 | 11:08 |
| Meeting End | 11:00 | 11:14 |