DESY Workshop Live Notes

Use these notes to record the discussions on the HSF evolution at the DESY WLCG-HSF Workshop. You can also ask questions here.

Paul Laycock - HSF (Re)-organization

Slides: HSF-Reorg.pdf
Documents:
- HSF Motivation
- HSF Core Coordination Team
- HSF Advisory Group

Q&A:

Jamie Gooding: size of CCT - should it always be around this scale? Or if people go, people are invited?
A: not yet codified, similar size simply because we want to make a decision-making body, and while it's good to have a diversity of opinion things may become difficult if it's too large.

James Catmore: wrt the different working group, do they meet with the same frequency, or do they vary?
A: depends on the working group, function of WG conveners or topics becoming a discussion point for a few months and then dying down. This is why we want to be flexible in defining working groups.
A [Graeme]: one of the things we want to do is connect WG activities to strategic focus of CCT to make sure that there are useful contributions from the HSF as a whole.

Alexei Klimentov: bureaucracy/provocative question. Are we keeping things the same, but changing cosmetics? Why are you doing this, what is the need?
A: in terms of providing WG coordinations, the "HSF coordination team" didn't change - so day to day won't change. But for the long term view we didn't have a place where people who feel like they're invested in the long term are discussing that, it was more ad-hoc, so this way we can be more strategic about HSF directions. Advisory group is needed to engage the communities and for the HSF to be useful rather than a separate/parallel body, so the communities can give inputs on what is interesting and what is coming software-wise.

Alessandro De Girolamo: 20 activities and WGs, there's a lot of meetings, difficult to have an overview and the right experts within these activities and meetings (so, some things will go slower). Can you prioritise with the new CCT + advisory group? Top-down vs do-ocracy.
A: do-ocracy relies on in-kind help and work, balance because we don't want to be pushing people to do free work.

Alessandro: difficult to ask people to participate and be in-kind above a given threshold, not everyone is free to do whatever they want with their time (e.g. grant, research directions…)
Liz: we recruit WG conveners (5% of time commitment) - it's the intellectual following of the field that we need, if you're detector simulation convenor you pay attention to everyone's needs in simulation not just your own experiment's, and when something interesting comes up call a meeting.

Zach: some WGs are acting as WG, some others are mostly organising meetings and workshops. Maybe some are a seminar series, more than a WG. It would be worth reframing what these really need to be.
A: clarification on what activities are, no need to organize anything - work getting done outside the meetings.

[Doug? - no name provided]: can the core team stagnate? There should be some natural turn-over, not just when people become inactive, you need to get new ideas.
A: we have that with the WGs, we need to think of that for the CCT (although with providing continuity).

Liz - HSF (Affiliated) Projects & Software

Q&A:

[Zach] HSF is 10yo. Endorsements already discussed. Engagement happened.
But why did so few people engage? Why didn't small projects engage?
Possibly it was not clear that people *could* have engaged, and how. Do you plan to make it clearer?

A: Dune asked us to review the requirements for a framework. So we asked people from the framework WG, doing the matchmaking and that was successful.
Shall we go around and asks projects if they want to become affiliated? It is time, nobody has really done it so far.

[Ed Moyse] To give badges you have to review. Projects can die, etc.
A: that's the idea. Then they need to copy the badge on their repository (we don't have access to it). In the past we thought we could offer CI, Github Actions, provide some compute for nightly builds… But then GitHub sorted it out for us/everyone.
A [Graeme]: we thought that projects would be an important thing, didn't develop sufficiently. Should the idea be accepted, then we will go out, because we have a much more tangible idea of what it means.

[, BNL] What about reviewing HSF?
Follow up: by the advisory group?
People are volunteering their time, so getting advice (when unfunded) is better.

[Attila Krasznahorkay] We have an example of a project trying to collaborate with Intel. It's a project that works reasonably well and wants a showcase / take on additional responsibilities and tasks.

A [Eduardo]: we went through the process, it takes a long time and we need to attract people to do this.
[Attila]: good to figure out what the pitch is.

[name not given] in other foundations, the main trigger is (apart from industry) visibility, we could have a page where there is a shopping list. Is this something you've thought about / an end point? Will follow up with Liz.

[name missed, DESY]: software development training. I've seen many courses where software is abstract - what about making a connection between a language and a project, "learn how to use this by doing"?
[Valeriia Lukashenko, training WG]: there has been an open call for this but we haven't tried to ask people proactively. We will renew the call / talk about it tomorrow.

[Alastair, STFC]: we have people and projects that both need to be recognised. Where HSF comes in: offering "this is a project that will work across the community" (eg Rucio) and then having other communities pick it up, this works well. This would be good advertisement.

[Liz] Out of Snowmass - interest in pushing for more recognition on C&SW. There might be "partners for the HSF" coming soon online. This is a good time to make a move.

[Caterina D.] Software catalogue efforts exist, e.g. the ESCAPE Software Catalogue or whatever will come out of EVERSE (including software sustainability recommendations, see Stefan's talk on Friday). It would be good for the HSF to be the catalyst of HEP software, work together with these efforts (and equivalent US ones) to avoid duplication and add feedback that is useful for our community.

[Simone] Comment on Advisory Group. The HSF absolutely needs this, to understand stakeholders agree with what is being done/prioritised.
On affiliated projects/SW - also something worth having. SW is also reviewed by our review bodies such as the LHCC. They do ask about success because they want to know about impact, costs, how things are evolving.
In short, what has been presented makes complete sense.

[notetakers kind of ran out of coffee/steam but there was a comment by Gordon about the importance of recognition]
A: working very hard for the experiments, and making things for a broader audience takes away effort from the experiment
[Gordon] maybe list is short?
A: but with no funding…

[Leif Lonnblad] How does MC generator community fit in this discussion?
A: heard that CERN (LHCC, Michelangelo) has plans for a top down approach to generators but we don't know much more - there was a kick-off workshop, with HSF participation, but how do the two groups interact?

[Eduardo] we have good examples of a catalogue, see the PyHEP-resources repo we curate and maintain, and we want to work on these / take inspiration across the board.