















#### Petascale Data Storage Workshop, PDSW08

#### Rewarding the Public Release of Valuable Data and Resources

Garth Gibson

Carnegie Mellon University and Panasas Inc.

SciDAC Petascale Data Storage Institute (PDSI)

www.pdsi-scidac.org

w/ LANL (Gary Grider), LBNL (William Kramer), SNL (Lee Ward), ORNL (Phil Roth), PNNL (Evan Felix), UCSC (Darrell Long), U.Mich (Peter Honeyman)

Carnegie Mellon **Parallel Data Laboratory** 



- Claim1: science is better with data
  - DSN06: asking for fixed MTTI is not == to getting it
  - Google05: 1B words + 1K nodes
    - First qualitative Arabic translation for NIST
  - Hubble, LHC, LSST ... quarks, quasars, dark stuff
  - Science w/ big data "beats" science w/o big data

- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
  - Traces (cpu, mem, IO) often a decade old
  - Competitive advantage/marketing embarrassment
  - Lawyers and lawsuits
  - Never transparent, not easy to document
  - Costly to be bigger, more transparent, approved
  - Huge outputs to be distributed
  - Takes fortitude & character to be a data gatherer

3



- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
  - Not the data release
  - The surprising result extracted from data
  - No reward if getting results not done by gatherer
  - No reward if public download gets to paper first

- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
- Claim4: demotivates continuous collection
  - Finding new results less likely first year after paper
  - Much more likely if systems 100x faster (10 years)
  - Leads to once a decade data collection
    - The current students don't remember the pain
  - Not the best style of data collection
  - Slows down data-led understanding of systems



- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
- Claim4: demotivates continuous collection
- Claim5: no review process for data release
  - Current don't "peer review" a data release
  - A collection paper has novel collection techniques
  - Want "this data collection is best-in-class"

- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
- Claim4: demotivates continuous collection
- Claim5: no review process for data release
- Claim6: confs reluctant to give "paper status"
  - "Bias" paper review for "data release papers" ?
  - Rejects "strong" papers from timely publication
  - Non-competitive selection not good for promotion

- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
- Claim4: demotivates continuous collection
- Claim5: no review process for data release
- Claim6: confs reluctant to give "paper status"
- What makes one release better than another?
  - Bigger? Harder to get? Better documentation?
  - Fidelity = closeness to what really happens?
  - Coverage = contains the info that will be needed?



- Claim1: science is better with data
- Claim2: gathering data is a royal pain
- Claim3: reward is paper on results from data
- Claim4: demotivates continuous collection
- Claim5: no review process for data release
- Claim6: confs reluctant to give "paper status"
- What makes one release better than another?
  - Data size, obstacles, docs, fidelity, coverage ....
- Action: Vet a compelling review process
  - It takes a community to raise a strong discipline

