

DRMAA Survey

Quick Statistics



Filter Settings

Results

No of records in this query: 26

Total records in survey: 26

Percentage of total: 100.00%

[Browse](#)

[Export](#)

Field Summary for Q1:

In which sense are you interested in DRMAA ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| As implementer (somebody implementing a DRMAA API for his product) (impl) | 12 | 46.15% |
| As user (somebody using a DRM system through the DRMAA API) (user) | 14 | 53.85% |
| As related standardization group (interested in compatibility / stacking) (stand) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Other Browse | 2 | 7.69% |

Field Summary for Q2:

Has a lack of features prevented you so far from implementing / using DRMAA ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% |
| Yes (Y) | 6 | 23.08% |
| No (N) | 14 | 53.85% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q3:

Has a lack of documentation or tutorials prevented you so far from implementing / using DRMAA ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 7 | 26.92% |
| Yes (Y) | 3 | 11.54% |
| No (N) | 16 | 61.54% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q4:

Which of the DRMAA implementations have you implemented / already used / considered to use ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| Condor (University of Wisconsin) (condo) | 8 | 30.77% |
| EGEE library (Jose R. Valverde) (egee) | 1 | 3.85% |
| GridWay (Universidad Complutense de Madrid) (gridw) | 5 | 19.23% |
| LSF library (FedStage) (lsf) | 7 | 26.92% |
| PBSPro library (FedStage) (pbspr) | 6 | 23.08% |

| | | |
|--|----|--------|
| PBS/Torque library (CASPer Labs) (torqu) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Perl wrapper library (Tim Harsch) (perl) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Python wrapper library (Enrico Sirola) (pytho) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Ruby wrapper library (Andreas Haas) (ruby) | 0 | 0 |
| Sun Grid Engine (Sun Microsystems) (sge) | 17 | 65.38% |
| Other Browse | 3 | 11.54% |

Field Summary for Q5:

What are the really important DRMAA language bindings for you ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-------|------------|
| C (C) | 12 | 46.15% |
| C++ (Cpp) | 7 | 26.92% |
| C# (CShar) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Java (Java) | 13 | 50.00% |
| OGSA-compliant WSDL (Ogsa) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Perl (Perl) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Python (Pytho) | 14 | 53.85% |
| REST (REST) | 0 | 0 |
| Ruby (ruby) | 5 | 19.23% |
| WSDL (WSDL) | 0 | 0 |
| Other Browse | 1 | 3.85% |

Field Summary for Q6:

Some DRMAA job template attributes take string values, and those strings can contain "placeholder" strings that will be replaced when the job is submitted. For example, the output path can include a placeholder that represents the user's home directory. What do you think about an extended set of placeholders in job template attributes, such as execution host name, queue name, job id, or environment variable content (issue 2837) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical, please add the following placeholders: (Crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important, please add the following placeholders: (Impo) | 8 | 30.77% |
| Not important (NotIm) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q7:

What do you think about the usage of placeholders as described in the previous question in additional job template attributes, such as the ability to use the the array job index in the job name attribute (issue 5873) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| No answer | 15 | 57.69% |
| Critical for the following cases: (Crit) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Important for the following cases: (Impo) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Not important (NotIm) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q8:

What do you think about JSDL support for job template formulation ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% |
| Should be mandatory for implementations beside traditional job templates (mand) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Should be optional for implementations beside traditional job templates (opt) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Should be the only job template description format (only) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Should not be demanded by the DRMAA standard (not) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q9:

What do you think about new optional job template attributes, in order to support interoperable resource requirements such as CPU type (issue 5881) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 7 | 26.92% |
| Critical for the following cases: (crit) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Important for the following cases: (imp) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Not important, I want you to support JSDL instead (jsdl) | 6 | 23.08% |
| Not important at all (notim) | 0 | 0 |
| Other: (other) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q10:

What do you think about a separate error code for setting / getting unsupported optional job template attributes (issue 2819) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical (crit) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Important (imp) | 8 | 30.77% |
| Not important (notim) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Other Browse | 0 | 0 |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q11:

What do you think about the partial timestamp support for job start and termination time in the current DRMAA API ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 8 | 30.77% |
| Critical (crit) | 0 | 0 |
| Important (imp) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Not important (notim) | 7 | 26.92% |
| Never used / implemented, because: (never) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Other: (other) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q12:

What do you think about the concept of implementation-specific job attributes in the current DRMAA API ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% |
| Critical (crit) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Important (imp) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Not important (notim) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Never used / implemented, because: (never) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Non completed | 5 | 19.23% |

Field Summary for Q13:

What do you think about finer-grained job states ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical, please add the following states: (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important, please add the following states: (imp) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Not important (notim) | 8 | 30.77% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q14:

What do you think about fewer job states ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical, these states are a problem: (crit) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Important, these states are a problem: (imp) | 0 | 0 |
| Not important (notim) | 8 | 30.77% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q15:

Do you have suggestions regarding the job state transition rules ? For example, issue 2788 suggests to allow QUEUED_ACTIVE after SUSPEND state.

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Answer Browse | 5 | 19.23% |
| No answer | 21 | 80.77% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q16:

What do you think about a job state model that can be extended / specialized by an implementation, similar to OGSA-BES ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 10 | 38.46% |
| Critical, these states are a problem: (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important (imp) | 6 | 23.08% |
| Not important (notim) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q17:

What do you think about extending the monitoring of single jobs, for example to include the queue name or the execution machine name (issue 2827) ? This implies the new possibility to monitor not only running jobs, but also pending and suspended jobs.

In your answer, please describe both the desired monitoring attribute and the job state where it would become available.

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical, I need to monitor the following attributes: (crit) | 0 | 0 |
| Important, I need to monitor the following attributes: (imp) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Not important (notim) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q18:

Currently the DRMAA job synchronization routines only allow an application to synchronize with job end events. What do you think about the ability to also synchronize with job's start events (issue 2838) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% |
| Critical (crit) | 0 | 0 |
| Important (imp) | 7 | 26.92% |
| Not important (notim) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Other Browse | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q19:

What do you think about changing the job error status routines in DRMAA, in order to make them more compliant with systems that have no UNIX signal support, such as Windows (issue 2817) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 7 | 26.92% |
| Critical (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important (imp) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Not important (notim) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Other Browse | 1 | 3.85% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q20:

Do you want DRMAA NG to provide functions for monitoring resources controlled by the DRM system (e.g. hosts, machines, nodes, queues, ...) ? One example is to get a list of hosts in the DRMS through the DRMAA API.

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 5 | 19.23% |
| Critical for the following cases: (crit) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Important for the following cases: (imp) | 9 | 34.62% |
| Not important (notim) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q21:

Do you need the ability to get a list of the jobs running in the current DRMAA session?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|-----------------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 3 | 11.54% |
| Critical (crit) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Important (imp) | 11 | 42.31% |
| Not important (notim) | 2 | 7.69% |

| | | | |
|---------------|------------------------|---|--------|
| Other | Browse | 0 | 0 |
| Non completed | | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q22:

Do you need the ability to get a list of the jobs running in the DRM system, even if they were not submitted by DRMAA ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------|
| No answer | 4 | 15.38% | |
| Critical (crit) | 3 | 11.54% | |
| Important (imp) | 5 | 19.23% | |
| Not important (notim) | 5 | 19.23% | |
| Other | Browse | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q23:

DRMAA has a session concept, where each application starts a session with the library and submits jobs to it. Session jobs can be controlled and monitored as a whole. What do you think about explicit support for multiple concurrent sessions with one DRMAA library instance (issue 2821) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------|
| No answer | 5 | 19.23% | |
| Critical (crit) | 1 | 3.85% | |
| Important (imp) | 5 | 19.23% | |
| Not important (notim) | 6 | 23.08% | |
| Other | Browse | 1 | 3.85% |
| Non completed | | 8 | 30.77% |

Field Summary for Q24:

What do you think about persistent sessions, in order to work with job groups over multiple application runs (issue 2820) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% | |
| Critical (crit) | 2 | 7.69% | |
| Important (imp) | 6 | 23.08% | |
| Not important (notim) | 3 | 11.54% | |
| Other | Browse | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q25:

What do you think about the possibility to change attributes of pending jobs (issue 2782) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|------------|--------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% | |
| Critical (crit) | 0 | 0 | |
| Important (imp) | 6 | 23.08% | |
| Not important (notim) | 7 | 26.92% | |
| Other | Browse | 0 | 0 |
| Non completed | | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q26:

Do you need the possibility to target specific resources controlled by the DRM system (e.g. hosts, machines, nodes, queues, ...) ? Currently, DRMAA relies completely on the capability of the underlying DRM system job scheduling after handing over the job.

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 6 | 23.08% |
| Critical for the following cases: (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important for the following cases: (imp) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Not important (notim) | 6 | 23.08% |
| Other: (other) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q27:

Should we add a support for job workflows, where multiple interdependent jobs are submitted at once ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--------------------------------|-------|------------|
| No answer | 5 | 19.23% |
| Critical (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important (imp) | 9 | 34.62% |
| Not important (notim) | 2 | 7.69% |
| Other Browse | 2 | 7.69% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q28:

Should we start to support security settings in the DRMAA NG API, like the user account under which a job shall be executed ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|--|-------|------------|
| No answer | 9 | 34.62% |
| Critical for the following cases: (crit) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Important for the following cases: (imp) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Not important (notim) | 4 | 15.38% |
| Other: (other) | 1 | 3.85% |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q29:

How important is the backward compatibility of a DRMAA NG for you ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---|-------|------------|
| No answer | 3 | 11.54% |
| Critical, old applications must always work on a DRMAA NG implementation (crit) | 3 | 11.54% |
| Important, but it would be ok to change applications a little bit (imp) | 7 | 26.92% |
| Not important, getting a consistent interface is more relevant (notim) | 6 | 23.08% |
| Other Browse | 0 | 0 |
| Non completed | 7 | 26.92% |

Field Summary for Q30:

What other wishes do you have for DRMAA NG ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Answer Browse | 6 | 23.08% |

| | | |
|---------------|----|--------|
| No answer | 20 | 76.92% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q31:

What is your company / institution / university ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Answer Browse | 10 | 38.46% |
| No answer | 16 | 61.54% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q32:

What is your DRMAA-related product or project ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Answer Browse | 6 | 23.08% |
| No answer | 20 | 76.92% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

Field Summary for Q33:

How can we contact you, in case of further questions (eMail, phone, ...) ?

| Answer | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Answer Browse | 8 | 30.77% |
| No answer | 18 | 69.23% |
| Non completed | 0 | 0 |

