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# Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and Surname | Abbr. | Representing | Membership |
| Steven Newhouse | SN | EGI.eu Director/CTO | Member & Chair |
| Steve Brewer | SB | EGI.eu Chief Community Officer | Member |
| Steve Crouch | SC | IGE | Member |
| Michel Drescher\* | MD | EGI Technical Manager | Member |
| Tiziana Ferrari | TF | EGI Chief Operations Officer | Member |
| Helmut Heller | HH | IGE | Member |
| Sy Holsinger | SH | EGI.eu Strategy and Policy Officer | In attendance (Sec.) |
| Balazs Konya | BK | EMI | Member |
| Cal Loomis | CL | StratusLab | Member |
| Alberto Di Meglio | AM | EMI | Member |
| Andre Merkzy | AY | SAGA | Member |
| Gergely Sipos | GS | EGI.eu Senior User Community Support Officer | Member (CCO deputy) |
| Peter Solagna | PS | EGI.eu Operations Manager | Member (COO deputy) |

\*on leave

# ACTIONS REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 10/03 | ~~EMI/BK~~  ~~IGE/HH~~  ~~SAGA/AK~~  ~~StratusLab/CL~~ | To provide the list of components that are reasonably safe to be tested in an IPv6 testbed  24/04:  EMI: as soon as the testbed is ready, they will give priority to services used by WLCG  IGE, StratusLab to provide;  SAGA said that all components are safe to be tested  02/07: All has been provided (closed) | ~~NEW~~  ~~OPEN~~  CLOSED |
| 10/04 | ~~EGI/MR~~  EGI/TF | Mario Reale to propose appropriate GGUS support unit creation for IPv6 testbed in collaboration with GGUS and EGI Operations  24/04: Keep open  02/07: Still no final answer; still in process of being provisioned. Action on TF ***(See Action: 12/01)*** | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 10/05 | ~~EGI/SN~~ | Discuss with DMSU solution to high number of less urgent tickets  02/07: SN confirmed that there is now a procedure in place and is being follow (closed) | ~~NEW~~  ~~OPEN~~  CLOSED |
| 11/01 | EMI/AM | To assess relative cost of solving “Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows” #3406  02/07: AM: No news – keep open | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 11/02 | ~~EGI/GS~~ | UCB to assess with the community what is the possible interest in getting “Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows” done #3406  02/07 GS: Closed based on assessment | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |
| 11/03 | ~~EMI/AM~~ | To send reference to ticket about probes problems in SL6 that are maintained by EGI/GRNET; info to be sent to Tiziana Ferrari  02/07: TF confirmed information sent | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |
| 11/04 | IGE/HH  IGE/SC | To send the list of software components that are IGE specific and that will not be supported by Globus/US after IGE  02/07: SC: No information as it is still a bit too early. Will be a couple more months until this information can be provided. | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 11/05 | EMI/AM | To provide the EMI training agenda to EGI/TF  02/07: TF/PS in contact with both site admins and EMI trainers to understand the topics of interest – progressing - but no official agenda | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 11/06 | EGI/TF | To provide feedback to OGF storage accounting document in public draft  02/07: TF: This is in progress and will continue to be discuss at next to OMB | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 11/07 | EGI/MD | Amend TCB requirement process to reinforce the message that endorsed requirements affecting many products should require involvement of all stakeholders  02/07: To be continued upon MD return. | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |

# AGENDA BASHING

Agenda approved.

# MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the TCB meeting held on 24 Apr 2012 (<http://go.egi.eu/TCB-11>) were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

# ITEMS OF BUSINESS

## TCB Requirements Processing

GS: No new requirements to report.

SN: So only remain those pertaining to GLUE.

GS: This will be taken care of through the new Secondment position.

GS: Clarified the Secondment position and why there are no further requirements for the UCB at the moment.

PS: From the operations side, there are no new requirements for this meeting.

PS: Now that the EGI Technical Roadmap has been circulated, I would propose to crosscheck the two documents – to assess whether the new releases are fulfilling the pending requirements.

BK: Ok, just to close all of the requirements that have been addressed. Regarding a timeline, I am heading on summer vacation in July and will be back in August where I can take care of then. Not enough time to train a new person to take care of this in the meantime. ***(See Action: 12/02)***

SC: jGlobus is promising and could be maintained after the end of IGE.

SC: IGE will look at the requirements processing by the end of July. ***(See Action: 12/03)***

SN: Any further requirements from the technology providers?

ALL: No, everything is fine up to now.

### Technology Provider Roadmap Updates

#### IGE

SN: Any updates on the IGE Technical Roadmap?

SC: This was sent to MD on 30 March; then a revised version was sent to the TCB list. There was a bit of confusion with the release schedule. Updated version will be done by the end of next week. Which could be sent to EGI.eu. ***(See Action: 12/04)***

BK: What updates have already been agreed?

SC: IGE version 3 page 10, there are a couple of new ones.

BK: Could we get some documentation around these?

SC: Yes, I can get with the developer for that. ***(See Action: 12/05)***

HH: IGE has decided to move its strategy, from IIS adoption, to a BDII based information system.

SN: Globus America is still developing IIS, just IGE has decided to go with more of a technical/pragmatic implementation.

BK: There is also the migration to Glue2, plans from EGI operations. Gstat.

TF: Starting this week, there is a Secondment position at EGI.eu. We have 2 actions: 1.) Assess the readiness of IGE and EMI across all products; we have a presentation and report due 2.) Define a decommissioning process of components. This starts in July, so there is not much to report at the moment. Plus we needed to define an EGI profile. Once we have everything, then we will provide a deployment plan - of course in collaboration with EMI and IGE.

TF: I will circulate a link to the set of slides that provides further technical information. ***(See Action: 12/06)***

#### EMI

SN: BK circulated a link to the EMI technical roadmap. Does anyone have any comments?

BK: I can provide some highlights:

* New EMI suite will make it more operations friendly and integrated.
* All software development will be completed by year 3.
* A few technical components, data and authentication libraries.
* Clean up for storage elements and computing elements, which was discussed at the previous TCB meeting.
* In year 3, we will finish how to map over everything.

BK: The main activities have been around integrating the EMI data library and common authentication library with EMI components, release of FTS-3. For example: dCache will implement the authentication library, and the data library. Most of the EMI products will pick up these common libraries, during the third year.

BK: We want to finalise the accounting area; EMI chose to have one accounting database (APEL), one storage element can generate storage records.

TF: We submitted two requirements: accounting of local jobs and accounting of MPI jobs.

BK: There is a plan for MPI jobs/parallel jobs, but not for local jobs, so it would need more discussion. We can then see what can be done. But we plan to extend the current accounting record within the next update. Common service discovery system we would like to roll out sometime during the year. Will be available for EMI for any common deployment.

TF: So this is something that we would like to follow up with EMI, just we do not have a use case at the moment, so we have little leverage to push sites to deploy the currently available prototype.

BK: The last thing is the EMI computing service interface, which will be deployed as an additional interface (CEs will keep their interfaces, but will provide this generic interface as an additional one).

SN: Any other questions?

TF: Yes, any plans around storage accounting? Delivering probes for storage accounting?

BK: Yes, this will be provided. We will do everything on the client side.

TF: Is the timeline specified in the roadmap?

BK: It will be delivered by EMI-3 (end of October) - but maybe 2 months earlier. The Debian porting is not completed for many services, will hardly be completed for EMI3 for all the components.

#### SAGA

SN: AZ, anything from the SAGA side?

AZ: Nothing at the moment; will be ready by the end of the month. ***(See Action: 12/07)***

#### StratusLab

CL: There was a new StratusLab release, which is much more stable. We are moving from a project to a collaboration, so we may have 1 or 2 more small releases to clean up some final things. Some things may be dropped such as Claudia, others will continue to be supported such as uniform API implementations, support for OCCI, etc. Some short-term activities consist of cleaning up services, providing a more unified interface, and developing a longer-term roadmap, which will be ready around September when we have a better idea of our long-term plans.

### Sustainability Discussions

SN: As many are moving to the end of projects, with different timelines, the sustainability of the middleware components is becoming an increasing topic of conversation. So thank you for circulating the various documents. There is a lot of information to be absorbed. In short (minutes), could each TP explain what is the main mechanism for the prolonged sustained level of activities?

#### StratusLab

SN: The StratusLab document already provides detail to the paths forward. CL, anything in addition?

CL: For StratusLab, the document more or less details everything that will be supported outside of Claudia, as mentioned. From a user side, work is focused around the API, to have a more unified interface. User support will be continued as well. The document has everything.

#### EMI

SN: EMI has a large document that I suggest reading, specifically I point out Section 3.7 on page 42-43. Is this table the same presented to the OMB?

AM: Same table. Not the final version as discussions continue, but this is the latest version.

AM: To summarise the situation for EMI, the doc is very detailed, but there are 3 main parts:

1. Continued support for EMI and the production infrastructure, with all components having been considered sustainable for 12-18 months after the project. Maybe a few components will not, but the majority will be sustained after that. All partners have declared support for WLCG related activities. The main concern is around the security components; specifically Hydra (Univ. of Helsinki) cannot be supported (maybe Security Token Service, we need to finish the implementation of STS to evaluate the value of this new product). They are trying to set up a commercial company. Some partners have requested some components to be modified (e.g. information systems; BDII; things to be simplified in terms of functionalities). They are discussing which form the EMI collaboration should take at the end of the project, feedback has varied, but most of the partners are interested in some form of collaboration with only a few that do not see the need.
2. Carry forward the global tasks in terms of the EMI collaboration.
3. Commercial support in ScienceSoft – we are progressing on how this interaction will take place under this context. It is getting momentum, other projects are asking for things. So the initial phase is complete, therefore, next week we will start the call for participation. ScienceSoft will be the main place for collaboration, this is not separate from the EMI collaboration, it is just one using the other, not in competition. We spoke to the EC about funding part of ScienceSoft to get it started, but have not heard one way or the other as of yet.

TF: Is the security token service with this commercial company?

AM: Yes, but there are many things being discussed. If you think this is important and what to raise the priority, then we can discuss it further.

PS: BDII will be supported by CERN; is CERN going to deliver a document that will define which features and components will be covered and which will not? Or will EMI?

AM: The 3 main families will be covered (e.g. STS). BDII will be just one flavour of resource management.

SN: Just to pick up on PS point - there are only 5 immediate components that will not be supported between that 12-18 month period, so that high-level statement hides the detail. As some will be supported at reduce effort or narrowed focus, which is understandable, but the detail provided to date are very high level so it is hard to plan.

AM: That is clear, we still have one year to go, so there is time and we have to. But we need to know what services are needed by EGI so we can talk about what can be supported and how.

SN: What is the time scale within EMI to get more information about what is going to be scoped down?

AM: Again, this depends on what is needed.

TF: e.g. LFC is said that it will not be supported.

SN: So that is what AM is saying, that this will not be supported at the end of EMI.

AM: EMI has no interest to support it any longer. I understand some communities may need it, but that will then be up to them. LFC will be phased out at the end of 2013, no CERN stakeholders are using LFC.

SN: Ok, we got the statement, so now we need to get a structured list of what is and is not going to be supported.

AM: Yes, what is needed is a gap analysis of what is needed and what can be provided.

SN: Yes, a discussion we need to have.

SN: The product teams you mention as step 1 that starts now around the global tasks that you provide yourself, you plan around September to have an official statement from EMI?

AM: By the Advisory Board it was asked to make a list of the global tasks and which are needed at the end of the project. I want to conclude this by September, even though the conversation is still ongoing. It is important to understand that we are not interested in the continuation of EMI but of the software.

SN: Ok, so this will carry on being discussed.

SN: From EGI, we started discussing the EGI global tasks regarding sustainability. 2 areas of funding: community funds from participation fees and EC funds focusing on community building and policy. So we are splitting the global tasks into these two areas. From 2 years of collecting costs, we are refining these now that the review is out of the way. So which are the critical ones and which ones do we need to add or subtract. This will continue over the summer and will be reported around the TF’12.

SN: Any other comments or questions around sustainability?

AM: One thing to understand in the future. Regarding business and researcher is mission impossible. Difficult to propose how to sell the software, but we would like to discuss how to provide services around the software.

SN: This is always a topic a conversation, within the EGI Council and their level of enthusiasm to increase the participation fee to pay directly for middleware, is extremely low. It is hard to monetise something that has been free for so long. This would be feasible around new stuff. No matter what it is.

AM: Hard for us to define mechanisms in order to generate revenue.

SN: I understand, so we need to do either ad-hoc in-kind, then see how the need goes. Maybe an initial die down, but then it will show to people what is necessary and where money could be provided.

SN: To be continued Wednesday.

#### IGE

SN: HH circulated a slide set.

HH: Yes. To summarise, no one currently has an answer and it is difficult for everyone. So for IGE:

* European Globus Community Forum – this will survive after IGE.
* Page 6: Every year IGE has been organizing the GlobusEUROPE and the EGCF meetings. Both were sponsored by IGE and free of charge for the participants, but after the end of IGE we will have to charge just like EGI is charging now. There is the IGE Hub (web pages), which will continue to be available, but will not be maintained after the project ends. They will be superseded by the EGCF Web presence, which will be maintained. Already now we are moving all IGE services into the EGCF domain. Request tracker will continue.
* Slide 8: Innovation and software development will depend on public funding (local or EU).
* The Globus Tools Market has no after-project maintainer at the moment, but this may change with still a year to go. We might merge this with the EGI market or ScienceSoft.
* Slide 10: Services in green will be maintained after IGE ends, red services have currently no volunteer supporter. GridSAM is then no longer needed as we will have a tighter integration of BES in GRAM-5. HH: Next action is to find more users and define better business plans.

SN: Could you explain better the Globus Tools Market?

HH: A selection of useful Globus related tools: Supported, Recommended, and Useful.

SN: The EGI AppDB is something that could be integrated, which is more than just application but also includes tools.

SN: Anymore questions or comments?

All: No.

SN: This will continue, but more discussion may be better in a F2F meeting, which will take place in Sept.

## AOB

All: No

# Date for Next Meeting

Next TCB: Attempt to have one before EGI TF’12

Doodle for 2.5 hour phone call around end of August. ***(See Action: 12/08)***

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 11:53.

# NEW ACTIONS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 12/01 | EGI/TF | Follow up with Mario regarding the result of the meeting with Hepix, about the coordinated activities of the two IPv6 testbed tasks. | NEW |
| 12/02 | EMI/BK | Review the open tickets within EMI year 2 release. | NEW |
| 12/03 | IGE/SC | Look at the requirements processing by the end of July. | NEW |
| 12/04 | IGE/SC | Circulate updated IGE Technical Roadmap by 13 July. | NEW |
| 12/05 | IGE/SC | Send to BK and TCB the technical details regarding best implementation documentation. | NEW |
| 12/06 | EGI/TF | Circulate a link to the set of slides that provides further technical information regarding readiness of IGE and EMI across all products. | NEW |
| 12/07 | SAGA/AZ | Provide an update to the SAGA Technical Roadmap by the end of July. | NEW |
| 12/08 | EGI/SN | Set up Doodle page for next call and circulate meeting Indico page. | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Sy Holsinger, 05.07.2012

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse
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