

M DIC file

SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL
RUTHERFORD APPLETON LABORATORY

COMPUTING DIVISION

DISTRIBUTED INTERACTIVE COMPUTING NOTE 878

IKBS
Meeting at ICRF 18 August 1983

W P Sharpe
2 September 1983

DISTRIBUTION:

F R A Hopgood
R W Witty
W P Sharpe
C Balderson
Spares (6)
External Links/ICRF file

SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING RESEARCH COUNCIL
RUTHERFORD APPLETON LABORATORY

COMPUTING DIVISION

INTELLIGENT KNOWLEDGE BASED SYSTEMS

Report of Meeting at ICRF on 18 August 1983

W P Sharpe
2 September 1983

PRESENT: J Fox)
 C Rawlings) ICRF
 R Young)
 G Soundy)

 W P Sharpe) RAL
 C Balderson)

1. **PURPOSE**

The meeting was held to discuss details of how ICRF computing facilities for IKBS on their DEC20 could be made available to external users.

2. **PHYSICAL CONNECTION**

C Balderson reported that DEC software for X25 is unlikely to appear for some time, and there is some doubt about it ever being available since DEC's recent announcement that it is withdrawing support for the 36 bit range. A full X25 connection will be expensive but is the best long term solution and ICRF will continue to pursue the possibility.

ACTION: G SOUNDY

It was agreed that the best short-term solution would be to use a reverse PAD at ICRF, connected into SERCNET, probably at ULCC. In the first instance, 2.4K ports only will be provided. C Balderson will draw up a complete costed proposal.

ACTION: C BALDERSON

It was pointed out that this arrangement would only allow terminal traffic and not FTP.

In the first instance, 4 incoming ports would be provided and two outgoing.

3. MACHINE RESOURCES

3.1 Disk Space

It was agreed there should be a single quest directory which would be cleared frequently and 8 directories of $\frac{1}{2}$ Mbyte each which would be permanent and backed up in the usual way.

3.2 CPU Time

The priority requirement is to maintain the proper level of service to ICRF users. Currently ICRF do not use the individual user priority scheduling mechanism and they do not wish to introduce it at the present time. It was therefore agreed that initially the quest directory should be accessible at all times but the permanent directories would only be available after 6.00 pm and at weekends. If too much use is made of the quest directory, the number of incoming ports could be reduced.

4. RESOURCE ALLOCATION PROCEDURES

It was thought that the SERC 'pump priming' procedure could be used for granting access. Details will be discussed between R Young and RAL resource management at a later date. Access to the quest directory will, in principle, not be restricted, but the password will be changed on a regular basis to ensure that only approved users can access it.

J Fox thought that ICRF would be willing to consider use of the facilities by industrial users, given that their charitable status was in no way compromised. It was suggested that a formal request from the Alvey Directorate would be appropriate. SERC would handle the resource management for industrial as well as academic users.

5. USER SOFTWARE AND SUPPORT

The following packages are available:

- (1) INTERLISP
 - (a) INTERLISP
Fully documented. Public domain. In-house expertise.
 - (b) EMYCIN
Fully documented. Extensive in-house experience. SERC should get permission for use of this, MYCIN and UNITS from Stanford.
 - (c) MYCIN
Demonstration program. Needs one week's work to improve documentation.
 - (d) UNITS
Full reference documentation but a reference quick is needed. Extensive in-house expertise. Would be a good basis for a demo program, which would need about one month's effort.

- (e) UNITS + extras
Up to two months effort needed to properly organise and document what is available.
- (f) AGE
(Package built on UNITS). Subject of an agreement with Stanford. SERC needs to enquire about access. Not installed, no in-house experience. Would need unknown effort to install, up to six weeks. ICRF have no plans to install.
- (g) ROSIE
Supplied by RAND subject to non-disclosure agreement. SERC needs to get an agreement for access. Fully documented. Not yet installed by ICRF but plan to install.

W P Sharpe to enquire about access to packages for SERC and Alvey users.

ACTION: W P SHARPE

(2) PROLOG

- (a) Edinburgh DEC10 version with a few local modifications.
- (b) Various other facilities are available. G Soundy will document briefly.

ACTION: G SOUNDY

(3) SAIL

Unrestricted access. Fully documented. Minimal in-house experience.

(4) FUZZY

Not properly installed or documented. QMC are authorities on it.

In summary, it was noted that some of the software could be made available with very little effort but that at least 6 man months of effort would greatly improve the facilities that could be offered. ICRF have no spare manpower and could only allow a very limited extra burden of user support for a trial period if manpower cannot be found. WPS will look into ways of funding manpower and ICRF will try to identify a suitable person.

ACTION: W P SHARPE

No extra operations effort would be required and ICRF would expect to provide consumables in return for SERC providing the networking costs.

6. PROPOSAL

WPS will write a proposal for consideration by ICRF and SERC when all the costs are known. ICRF will expect to benefit from improved network access to UCL (for ARPA) and access to SERC mailbox facilities.

ACTION: W P SHARPE

7. ADVERTISING THE FACILITY

When the facility has been set up it should be fairly widely advertised through the IKBS mailshot etc.

8. AOB

A formal memo to SNMC requesting permission to connect ICRF is required.

ACTION: W P SHARPE