Open-source JIRA

JQL Query: filter = "TTA CoDR Meeting Topics" ORDER BY Labels
Sorted by: Labels ascending
1–32 of **32** as at: **13/Apr/20 4:31 PM**

Key	Summary	Components	Labels	Description
SRDP-430	Peak server load planning	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Architecture	p. 14, Non-functional requirements; The system shall have the following performance metrics which occur at peak times during the day of the proposal deadline. Here we quote values for the PST during the 20A semesters. e.g. "Server shall be able to handle 140 simultaneous users" —Surely we want to plan for substantial increase of the user base, as we make science-ready data products easily accessible to a larger fraction of astronomers? We may want to incorporate the capacity to show videos of how to do many elements of the proposal process, as Hubble has done, which may also increase the load (though this might be on another server).
SRDP-521	Resources vs capabilities	TTA Conceptual Design	Architecture	In section 2.1.2.2 it is stated that the Allocation Request is requesting the use of observatory "resources" while the solicit section (2.1.2.1) states that the facility offer "Capabilities". While I believe I understand what you mean, this is an example of the lack of clarity that is at the heart of my comment in SRDP-514. It sounds trivial but in my experience it can cause confusion.
SRDP-431	Platforms	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Architecture	Supported platforms: Firefox, Chrome, Safari. —-Does this meet the full needs of the user base? Maybe the answer is yes, we know what users are using–I just want to check we've thought this through.
SRDP-514	Definition of "resource"	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description, TTA Conceptual Design	Architecture	The word "resource" is used a lot in these documents, but I couldn't find a definition of it. Its an important concept - this statement in the System Description (p.17) seems to make that clear: "For each Capability the TTA Group will select the configurable list of resources and their constraint" It might be useful to think about this - my concern is that the definition boundary between "Capability" and "Resource" can be a bit fuzzy to some. The SKA has spent sometime trying to dis-entangle the two and come up with a reasonable definition. That said - the issue might be less important for the TTA Tools, and more important for later phases when the scheduling systems are being considered.
SRDP-516	Quality Attributes	TTA Conceptual Design	Architecture	Quality Attributes: I think "Modifiability" applies too. Its related to what this section says about Sustainability and Maintainability but probably should be explicitly drawn out. From the general statements made in section 1 I think you are thinking about it.

SRDP-483	Server load on submitted proposals	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Architecture	(c) Server shall be able to handle 60 proposals submitted within a two hour period. For 20B there were ~80 proposals submitted in the final hour before the deadline. Therefore this number should be more like the server should be able to handle 200 proposals submitted in 2 hours
SRDP-520	Relationship to project missing	TTA Conceptual Design	Architecture	In 2.1.2.2.1 the primary presentation does not show any linkage to the Observing Project (as is shown in the System Description document Figure 1). Though I understand that the different facilities have different project models I think showing a weak association to an abstract project (possibly facade) would be useful. There presumably will exist a link between project and proposals/allocations in all cases.
SRDP-513	System context slight confusion	TTA Conceptual Design	Architecture	In figure 6 some of the elements on the left hand side seem to be part of the TTA system under consideration, but they are drawn as external. This is explained in the text below, but I wonder if the status of those could be identified a bit more clearly in the diagram. Also some explanation of why the status is unclear would be useful. I it is because they might come from another system (like the notification system) then I can understand the choice. But if it is simply because the system architecture is uncertain then I'm less clear why. I'm thinking largely of the three "Generators", and perhaps Project Creation.
SRDP-522	Reviews - general comment	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description, TTA Conceptual Design	Overview Review	A general comment on the design around handling the reviews. I was (am) having some trouble getting my head around the various reviews that (may) take place, so at least to an outsider it feels a complex area with a number of reports that need to be tied together. It may look more straightforward on the inside. However, given my slight confusion I'd like to recommend this area is drafted in a bit more detail fairly early to aim to ensure that all the relationships can be put together without getting in a design knot. I'm not gainsaying the design I see, which looks ok just I feel its an area where an early mis-step might cause difficulty later.
SRDP-515	Sub-arrays?		Overview	Are sub-arrays under consideration at all?
SRDP-461	UI Look and feel - influence of ALMA	688-TTAT-003-MGMT: Project Management Plan	Overview	It is noted that the "Look and feel of software should be ... as close to the ALMA interface as possible" While I understand (and appreciate) this goal it should be noted that the comparable ALMA user interfaces that span the TTA toolset are somewhat varied, and of course that there is a plan to change the technology behind one of them (as is noted elsewhere). Also, of course, the ALMA too are somewhat dated in terms of what is a rapidly moving technological area. That sa

I think I understand the intent in the statement. I would aim more at being influenced by the ALMA concepts (which I think will be retained, even as the tools evolve), and I think the project would be wise to track trends in good UX design. I certainly agree with the goal of commonali across the targetted facilities.
*

SRDP-493	Project creation	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Overview	Note that DDT projects are created immediately while those from semester solicitations project create may be months later. Also, one of the two semester solicitations will be for 2 VLA configurations, there must be a way to create projects for a single configuration, rather than a single semeste
SRDP-496	Diagrams could use keys and other improvements	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Overview	The diagrams in this (and some other) documents would benefit from keys, show what each diagram element means. Sometimes this is explained in the text, sometimes it is not. Many are half-way to UML/SysML but if they are meant to be one or the other that is not made clear. The problem is that if a diagram is not clearly using a standard language then the meanir of the symbols becomes doubtful in the mind of the reader. Some would also benefit from the multiplicity in relationships to be clear. Element catalogs would also be helpful, though I might agree that in this level of document that level of adherence to SEI recomendations might be unnecesary. I also saw this in 688-TTAT-0002-MGMT, but did not comment (it is a reference doc. and I understand that things have moved on).
SRDP-532	updates to Users Committee should clarify scope & timescale of project.	688-TTAT-002-MGMT: TTA Tools Concept	Overview	This actually refers to document 688-TTAT 001-MGMT There is a comment about how the Users Committee appears to misunderstand the scope and timescale for this effort. Update to this committee should clarify these.
SRDP-507	Automatic assignment of reviewers?	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Review	Section 3.4.2, functional requirement 3. Please clarify if this is meant to be an automatic asignment by the tools, or is a human involved. I was trying to understand this from the description above too, and it wasn't completely clear to me.
SRDP-505	Resubmitted proposal should automatically conflict if original conflicted	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Review	Under Functional Requirements, 3a should be followed by a 3b: The proposal is a re-submission where the reviewer had a conflict with the original.

				Some mention of this should occur at the top of the same page under "SRP Member: conflicts". It says "Care must be taken of any conflicts of interest...etc.". It seems to me that this process could be made automatic.
SRDP-487	Technical Reviews for each Allocation Request?	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Review	Having to do separate technical reviews for each allocation request is something the scientific staff doing technical reviews will rebel against. The Allocation Requests in a proposal will be related so it is inefficient to have each of them reviewed separately. The technical reviews for a proposal should be tied to the facilities rather than the allocation request.
SRDP-477	DDT may go into future semesters	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Review	Occasionally DDT dispositions go into future semesters, so this should not be disallowed. I.e., the Allocation Disposition can go into future semesters.
SRDP-537	how will switching to dual anonymous reviews affect workflow for conflicts?	688-TTAT-002-MGMT: TTA Tools Concept	Review	Will users (proposers/reviewers) need to identify close collaborators so that those proposals can be flagged as conflicts? Will institutional overlap still be considered a conflict?
SRDP-541	software to identify conflicts in dual anonymous peer review	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Review	How will software to identify conflicts work under dual anonymous review?
SRDP-489	Major problem with DDT use case	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	This starts on page 32 but there are parts throughout the rest of the document. In this document there are three steps to the DDT review that mirror the semester solicitation. 1) OSR give review and a binary score (i.e. yes or no); 2) the OSC meets and assigns priorities; and 3) the site director gives their approval. This does not map at all to how things are actually done (for the VLA and VLBA) and is extremely cumbersome. The site director is on the DDT committee, when the committee reviews a proposal they send comments on the proposal and recommends a number of hours and priority via e-mail. There is more or less discussion over email depending on the dispersion of recommendations. Since the site director is part of this discussion there is no need for separate approval from them. The TTA group member who is facilitating the review then puts together comments and grants number of hours and assigns priority based on the discussion and sends the disposition letter. If we wanted to have a better record of the process the reviews could be done through the TTA Tools but the score must be a suggested priority, not a binary yes/no. There will be no OSC meeting, trying to get people together for a meeting would be a huge bottleneck. An e-mail discussion could be the "meeting", but then why not just do the reviews over email as well. Lastly, the site director should not have to do anything in the tool to give their

approval. We don't make the Director push a button approving every proposal after the Director's review. The Director gives their approval and the TTA group just takes care of it. The same thing should be true for the site director and DDTs.

I am not saying there are not things that could be improved with the current process just that what is described in this document is not an improvement.

SRDP-440	Keeping track of semesters, joint time	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	p. 35, Functional Requirements, points 1 and 2; Shouldn't we need to maintain information on which semesters time is approved for? And joint time on other facilities. Some other RIDs I've put in mention these points—in general, these should be tracked carefully throughout the process.
SRDP-494	Project creation: VLA	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	"(a) Initial. The initial goal is to reproduce the current capabilities of the proposal to Project migration" The current capabilities are there are none. This is done by hand and is cumbersome and prone to error, the initial goal should be to create projects automatically.
SRDP-495	Project creation: User changes	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	The non-functioning requirements say that user should not have to enter sources or resources again, however there should be a

mechanism for the user to change the sources or resources. They will need permission if it is something significant like changes of source coordinate or frequency setups, but this should be easy to request and TTA group member to approve or dencline. Cosmetic changes (e.g., changing the name of a source) should be allowed without permission.

SRDP-480	The GBO/NRAO TAC can grant time for some HSA proposals and there is no Super-TAC for HSA proposals	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	For the subset of HSA proposals that just involve GBO and NRAO resources the TAC can grant time and assign priorities. Also there is no Super-TAC for HSA proposals. The proposals go to the other TACs (current practice this is only EB) and rated. Then the schedulers get together and decide which proposals are going to be done.
SRDP-501	Concurrent solicitations	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	Section 2.2, functional requirement 1. Should this be refined to state that it should support multiple concurrent solications *with different capabilities*? In particular above it is stated that DDT solicitations shall use the capabilities of the current observing semester - which may be different to those of the future semester.
SRDP-519	Clarify composition of Allocation Request	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description, TTA Conceptual Design	Workflow	In reading the two documents cited I understand that an Allocation Request may comprise many Request Specifications, and that these specifications may be of different types (in pafrticular Observing and Data Processing). However, I was expecting to see a way to link the Data Processing Specification to an Observing Specification at least as one type of Allocation Request. Perhaps that is to be detailed, but though it clear that both observing and processing may be specified I couldn't find a clear description that one type of Allocation Request would involve specific observing to be followed by its related processing. Am I missing something?
SRDP-540	do allocation requests include computing resources?	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	I thought I had read in another document (either the Project Charter or the SRDP Program Plan) that the definition of an

allocation request was intended to be broader than an observing request (i.e. it could be used to refer to computing resources), but that is not mentioned in this document.

SRDP-538	how will integration between proposing and observing systems be achieved?	688-TTAT-004-MGMT: System Description	Workflow	The System Description notes that the TTA project does not include observing process, but a tight integration between proposing and observing is strongly preferred. How will this be achieved?
SRDP-523	Test plans	688-TTAT-010-MGMT: TTA Tools Execution Plan	testing	The description of test plans is a little weak. Testing is mentioned a lot,and I recognize that the project is at the conceptual stage, but do the descriptions meet the level of the statement in the DMSD Work Management Plan, section 5.3: "As part of conceptual architecture development, the stakeholders, the Validation Lead, and the DMS Architect will define tests to validate the conceptual system model."?
SRDP-524	User Interface testing	688-TTAT-010-MGMT: TTA Tools Execution Plan	testing	Are there plans for any community user testing, particularly of the user interface?
SRDP-469	Validation needs to involve stakeholders	688-TTAT-003-MGMT: Project Management Plan	testing	Document says that the Validation will be done by the Project Scientist. Validation should also include operations stakeholders. The Project Scientist is one person and is not familiar with all the aspects of the TTA Tools.