AMB F2F, 2 March 2011, Amsterdam

Action list:

1. **User Forum**
	1. ROD team training on the Monday - set up a camera in the corner on a tripod to be post processed.
	2. Keynotes - Steve Rawlings (SKA), Ruth Pordes (OSG) + ELIXIR + RedHat + Data
	3. Audio recording in Gamma 1,2,3 on Monday
	4. Also audio for Skype
	5. add session chairs to TF programme
2. to CESNET: Is it possible to integrate RT with Pivotal Tracker (SA+MD)
3. **Project Review**
	1. Prepare a document outlining a response to the EGEE-III recommendations.
	2. Review slide template will include slides on resources, tasks (DoW), issues, summary
	3. EAC and PMB will be invited to dress rehearsal on 15th
	4. make sure we know what the reviewers want to hear.
	5. If there are issues that are important for the review, make sure that Steven Newhouse knows about it and if necessary identify the person to address the issue at the meeting (if the issue is brought up
	6. SA3 task leaders need to be present, or make sure that Jamie Sheers is suitably briefed to answer all questions during the hearing.
4. **Document review process**
look into merging AMB M&D list with task leaders list.

If it seems impossible to get content from other groups, do not delay the document, but specify what information is missing when submitting to the reviewer. Delaying the document is not helping the project, nor the group that is late.

Look at the reviewers guidelines. What should be their focus?

We could collapse the AMB review into the external review process, and keep an AMB member as moderator
Assign external reviewers as early as possible - when the ToC is uploaded
Who actually adds the moderator and reviewer names to the ticket? the QA team?
Could use the owner of the ticket better - should be the moderator or a different person at different stages? Add this extra process to the review process document.
Reviewers guidelines - adjust these to tell them to avoid commenting on US vs UK English etc - put these comments in the templates as well
File names of the review documents should be more logical.
Ask the reviewers to state their knowledge of the area in the review form.
Add the previous and next versions of the documents to the RT queue and also depreciate things in DocDB and add related documents
Come up with some flow diagrams - outline the stages and the actions triggered at each stage
Need a "shepherd" who owns the ticket who is an AMB member - they can chivvy the moderator if this is a non AMB person (who cannot see the RT queue).
The external review comments can be rejected - part of the role of the AMB review is to resolve disputes with clashing comments.
An AMB member who is closely interested in the technical aspects can also participate in the external review, to shorten the AMB review.

1. **Technical Forum**

plan for the TF 2011 in Lyon, as to what meetings you (task leaders) need, group size and possible clashes with other meetings.

Prize for first abstracts submitted by the end of the week at the UF?
OGF (they will call for sessions in July) and Grid2011 (call for papers) will do their own calls independent of our CfP.
Close the EGI CfP at the beginning or end of June?
Registration options are: all week, 3 days or 1 day - registration is not separated between the events, you register for everything to encourage cross-over between events.

1. **QR/Metrics**Alternative editing plug in for the wiki
Metrics portal - include text based entries as well as numbers for manual NGI metrics