Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Tuesday 6 Nov 2012 – 10:00-16:15
Venue:	Face-to-Face meeting
Agenda:	http://go.egi.eu/TCB-14

1 Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing	Membership	Presence
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu Director/CTO	Member & Chair	Yes
Michel Drescher	MD	EGI Technical Manager	Member	Yes
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI Chief Operations Officer	Member	Yes
Peter Solagna	PS	EGI.eu Operations Manager	Member (COO deputy)	Yes
Steve Brewer*	SB	EGI.eu Chief Community Officer	Member	Yes *
Gergely Sipos	GS	EGI.eu Technical Outreach Manager	Member (CCO deputy)	Yes
Ales Krenek	AK	EGI.eu DMSU	Member	Yes
Zdenek Sustr	ZS	EGI.eu DMSU	Member (Deputy)	No
Matteo Turilli	MT	Chair EGI FedCloud Task Force	Member	Yes*ˣ
Sergio Andreozzi	SH	EGI.eu Strategy and Policy Officer	In attendance (Secr.)	Yes
Alberto Di Meglio	AM	EMI Project Director (MoU/SLA)	Member	Yes
Balazs Konya	BK	EMI Technical Directory (MoU/SLA)	Member (Deputy)	Yes
Andre Merkzy	AY	SAGA (MoU/SLA)	Member	Yes
Charles Loomis	CL	StratusLab (MoU)	Member	Yes ˣ
Helmut Heller	HH	IGE (MoU/SLA)	Member	Yes
Steve Crouch	SC	IGE (MoU/SLA)	Member	Yes*
Andrew Grimshaw	AG	UVACSE (MoU)	Member	No
Tomasz Piontek	TP	PSNC (MoU)	Member	Yes*
Mariusz Mamonski	MM	PSNC (MoU)	Member (deputy)	Yes*
Krzysztof Kurowski	KK	PSNC (MoU)	In Attendance	Yes*
Stephen Burke	BU	EGI.eu Information Service	In attendance	Yes
Michel Jouvin	MJ	WLCG GDB Member	In attendance	Yes *ˣˣ

[*] from remote   ˣ joined only for FedCloud Task Force report   ˣˣ Joined in the afternoon

2 ACTIONS REVIEW

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
11/04	IGE/HH	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. 14/09: HH will check it and provide the info 06/11: closed, all products will be supported; for GridWay and AdHoc, a paid SLA can be provided	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
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. 14/09: To be done on the next update of the process 06/11: closed	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
12/05	IGE/SC	Send to BK and TCB the technical details regarding BES implementation documentation. 14/09: SC in touch with the developer, to provide updates 06/11: closed	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
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. 14/09: TF explained that the action about support calendar from IGE and EMI (cannot run unsupported software, i.e. no update in case of critical problem); wait for IGE for a document about a policy on support products (***see Action 13/02***) 06/11: circulated	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
12/07	SAGA/AZ	Provide an update to the SAGA Technical Roadmap by the end of July. 14/09: no progress 06/11: closed, provided in the TCB agenda	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
13/01	EGI/PS EGI/GS	Check the tickets dashboard to verify why status get not updated automatically 06/11: fixed	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
13/02	IGE/HH	Circulate a document describing the support plan of IGE products 06/11: work in progress	~~NEW~~ OPEN

13/03	EGI.eu	Review the current MoU/SLA framework and support structure and see how this needs to change if there will be the need to move towards a more institution based model while avoiding direct engagement with individual product teams; the MoU framework should also consider the requirements handling process and should work also for collaborations; the MoU framework should be modular (e.g., only requirements handling, requirements handling + SLA) 06/11: work in progress	~~NEW~~ OPEN
13/04	EGI.eu/TF EGI.eu/PS	Structure questions for EMI/IGE related to gather information on how to restructure processes after the end of the project in a better way; these should link to the idea of revising the MoU/SLA framework from project to institution 06/11: info provided	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
13/05	IGE/SC	To assess relative cost of solving "Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows" #3406 through the GridWay tool 06/11: work in progress	~~REASSIGN~~ ~~From~~ ~~11/01~~ OPEN
13/06	EGI/MD	To check if #2699 should be in a different state 06/11: checked	~~NEW~~ CLOSED

3 AGENDA BASHING

Agenda approved.

4 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the TCB meeting held on 14 Sep 2012 (http://go.egi.eu/TCB-13) were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

5 ITEMS OF BUSINESS

5.1 Requirements Management

5.1.1 Analyse new and reviewed requirements

MD uploaded a document with updates.

ID	Description	Discussion	Agreed State
3230	6.4 Data lifetime management	BK said that this is a very variable requirement, OK to be endorsed, not sure who will have effort to address it	Endorsed
881	Requirement for VO renaming/migration	BK said that technology providers did not understand what the people posing the requirements want (**see action 14/01**)	In Clarification
1187	Some new features for Data Mgmt and Sharing	MD proposed to move it to GGUS	Returned
2538	Quick identification of users affected in an SE intervention	MD proposed to return to user communities; there are specific functionalities available and other request should go to GGUS; TF said this is also requested by WLCG as when putting downtime disk storage, it is not clear what are the affected VOs; SN proposed to return it to user communities so that they can clarify what is missing	Returned
2563	Mandatory variables in configuration files should be identified	endorsed, EMI will deliver this in EMI 3 release; IGE endorsed this even though they are not currently aware of any problems with their SW in this regard; the consumers of the products should raise issues with badly documented variables	Endorsed

1384	DOS Attacks	PS said that the ticket contained a very clear example; AM suggested to verify if this happened for real or if this is just a risk; MD suggested to send back for clarification; TF noticed that the ticket references DCache therefore it can be assigned to DCache through the normal GGUS channel	
1381	Improving automatic services configuration	AM stated that there are recommendations to move to standard service configuration tools, YAIM core is currently supported by INFN, but it's not clear who will do it in the future; TF stated that this requirement was added at the beginning of EGI-InSPIRE and many parameters need to be configured manually so prone to errors; SN considered that this focused particularly on YAIM; AM said that within gLite, product teams are looking at puppet but no production solutions are available; AM said that the main issue is in YAIM core; SN said that this goes behind the tech providers, is more an infrastructure issue, therefore suggested to assign to TF to assess what could be done (***see action 14/02***); requirement returned and assigned to TF	Returned
1203	Uniform API	BK stated that EMI will provide documents describing the API; MD proposed SAGA as client-side API; BK said that SAGA may cover only job management while no data management is available; the requirement is endorsed and to be checked if SAGA wants to provide a solution; EMI will provide clear and precise documentation on the APIs (***see action 14/19***)	Endorsed
3279	Top-BDII must scale with number of sites	MD proposed to send to GGUS as the ticket is well scoped in one document; top-BDII is known to be limited with the number of site-BDIIs that can be contacted to collect information but figures are needed to understand the current scalability limit of the system; BK stated that the number of lower-level BDII will grow in the future due to the resource information providers publishing directly; (***see action 14/03, 14/04);*** AM said that BDII as it is at the moment is too complex and needs to be simplified in the	Returned

		future; WLCG is revising the approach to information discovery; not clear what EGI wants to do; EGI to analyse future requirements for information service to understand long-term needs (e.g., load, type of info, management autonomy, per site, per NGI); BU said that an architecture document is needed; TF said that documentation on information to be published is available: EGI recently released the EGI GLUE 2 profile (it will be discussed during the TCB meeting), AM asking about the topology (e.g., one central service, distributed by site, country, with p2p replications) (*see action 14/05)*	
3326	Automatic configuration of CE capacity parameters	It should be returned because it is related to human doing the wrong things and is complex to solve	Returned
2652	Support multi-VO services, association to multiple topBDIIs	This is clearly scoped for WMS, therefore should go to GGUS; BK said there is a general question about the role of the top-level BDII in the infrastructure; TF stated that the use case is about the capability of WMS to dispatch jobs to different infrastructures (EGI and others). WLCG is a multi-VO service so the capability to submit jobs for different VOs across multiple infrastructures is a natural extension. Currently, multiple WMS are needed, one per top-BDII. HH suggested to introduce one Meta-BDII to group all top-BDIIs that are open to the respective VO together and have WMS talk to the Meta-BDII. SN rephrased as "should WMS be able to point to multiple top BDII?"; requirement to be returned; *see action 14/06*	Returned

5.1.2   Prioritise requirements

#1674: EMI evaluated the necessary code changes to provide a common default port for SRM and found that the real problem is not the necessary development but the operational consequences: if the default changes, this requires configuration of the infrastructure at a site level; The EMI Storage Element product teams can easily implement the default port IF the EGI operation is willing to coordinate the controlled backward incompatible roll-out. Please note an SoS on the request with similar conclusion was provided earlier.

The TCB agreed to return all mentioned tickets in the document

5.1.3   Monitor requirements

The IGE updates covering #3424 and #2699 are released with IGE 3.0; for EMI, BK to circulate a document about what will be available for CREAM (*see action 14/07*); #1189 will not happen; #1378 in EMI3; #1382 possibly for EMI3; #1186 low UNICORE priority, no resources, will happen post-EMI; #1780 will be provided with the documentation of EMI3

5.2   Task Forces review

5.2.1   Accounting Task Force

TF reported on the accounting workshop held at the technical forum. Adoption of protocol SSM v1 for publishing is progressing and being regularly monitored. SSM v2 is being defined under the coordination of EMI to address UNICORE requirements. An accounting architecture proposal was presented at the workshop to address the need of exchange of accounting records across peer infrastructures to address OSG requirement. The open action of the task force is to discuss with OSG if the proposed architecture is acceptable. (*See action 14/08).*

5.2.2   Federated Cloud Task

MT presenting based on slides.

About the effort of co-funded NGIs, there is the need for better tracking the time spent so to deal with possible deviations at the management level (*see action 14/09*).

AM asked about plans to evaluate EMIR; MT said that the evaluation is ongoing.

SN asked timeline for integration of SAM and accounting, MT said beginning of 2013.

Contrail, proposal is to use their portal for user communities to identify which VMs; MT is in the process of evaluation; SN stated that if the work develops, then we should formalise the relationship with an MoU (Note: the Contrail project will end in Sept 2013, understand sustainability is important).

About commitment, SN clarified that moving from task force to task means that there are people with allocated resources, therefore it should be notified who is not delivering. As for the use cases, it is important to have outcomes by April that can be demonstrated at the community forum.

PS/MD to pass advancement on use cases to communication team for publicising.

AM stated that EMI is working with WeNMR and WNodes. MT commented that integration between activities and synergies is important to avoid duplication.

SN touched on the concern of missing consistent command line.

BK asked if there is a guide for users on what they can do; MT stated that if they achieve what expected, then this will be available; BK said that even 1-page would be OK; MT said that the time line is April 2013 for general adoption, set of capabilities reduced to make things usable, this to avoid disappointment;

BK asked if these use cases are using the test-bed in a federated matter or independently; MT confirmed the federated usage scenario. BK asked if there is a candidate client implementation in mind; MT mentioned that rOCCI is an appealing solution (https://github.com/gwdg/rOCCI). *See action 14/10*

5.3 Technology evolution

5.3.1 EGI Profile for GLUE 2

BU presenting based on slides. BK asked for a clear answer to received comments. Inputs received from ARC, WLCG, system manager in UK and few more. SN asked if it is worth to prepare this document. AM said that it is a useful work even though it cannot be incorporated into EMI3, but will be done later by the EMI collaboration. SN recommended that convergence on the profile document should happen soon. IGE asked if the focus should be GLUE 1.3 or GLUE2, BK said GLUE2: 75% of all EGI sites are already publishing GLUE2 information. BK asked to upload/make available all the received documents/feedback on a public page (Action 14)

5.3.2 Integrating Globus Online into EGI

GS reported based on slides.

The presentation was found useful by the TCB because it revealed a number of issues concerning the registration of storage services in EGI GOCDB and BDII services, and about the unresponsiveness of site operation teams. IGE found the recommendations for Globus Online features reasonable (slide 13). IGE will discuss these with Steve Tuecke soon and will check on the possibility to implement these in forthcoming Globus Online service releases.

At the same time the TCB agreed that the method suggested by the Cookbook (slide 11) to access SRM storages is unsafe and may lead to damage of storage systems. EGI therefore should not recommend this method to EGI VOs and the Cookbook should be changed. If an EGI Virtual Organisation would like to use the Globus Online service, then the VO should request its resource providers the setup of GridFTP servers (and not SRM storages).

AK will discuss with the DPM community whether a safe configuration for DPM SRM servers could be found, which would allow the mixed use of DPM storages with SRM clients and with Globus Online (*see action 14/16*). If such configuration is possible, then the Cookbook could also recommend this as an alternative option to access DPM type of SRM sites.

There has been some discussion around the issue of not working GridFTP. SN commented that if services appear in GocDB and then they are not working or site admin not answering, it is to be verified as this

should not happen. TF explaining that, among the identified list, a service appearing in GocDB is production-quality while another is uncertified. To be double-checked that the used GridFTP endpoints are certified.

HH commented that there is a graphical tool to upload proxy, but probably does not provide VOMS proxy support. This tool is GSI-SSHTerm (*see action 14/11).*

AK asked what is the overall purpose of this business: to make Globus Online available into EGI or integrate all storage services in Globus Online. SN said both.

SN started the discussion with Steve Tuecke about SRM support, they had discussion with OSG and from his perspective there seems to be no market.

Discussion around SRM support for Globus Online. How should the GridFTP be discovered? Through BDII or through SRM?

See actions 14/12, 14/13, 14/14

BK said that one of the biggest features of new SRM implementation is that they added HTTP WebDav support and it will become the main supported transfer protocol, Globus Online should consider supporting this (*See action 14/15, 14/16*)

5.3.3 SHA2 readiness

HH reported that DRAAMA interface does not support SHA2 because they do not deal with proxy; this line can be removed; all the rest is OK (email sent during the morning); TF clarified that information needed about readiness towards SHA-2 is in which version of the product SHA-2 support was introduced (*see action 14/17*)

EMI uploaded the information in the agenda; PS said that the document is complete even though some row is still empty (e.g. DPM). (*see action 14/18*)

5.4 Post EMI/IGE support from EGI.eu

AM reporting on post-EMI plans. Sustainability: plan defined in 4 phases, first one completed. SN asking what services will the technical collaboration covers; AM explained that the role will not be command/control, more a collaborative/discussion forum where people agree on actions based on interest and then they go home and do the homework. SN stated that this approach seems not to be useful to EGI. AM stated that if EGI needs are perceived as valuable, then people will buy in. AM claimed that this is the very beginning of the proposal, the scope of the collaboration needs now to be investigated with more concrete services.

SN uploaded the document in the agenda with a proposal from EGI to EMI about ideas for post-EMI coordination. AM said about the document that one typical question is how the categorisation of

services was made. TF asked how the product released in EPEL handle the configuration. AM said that there is a mixture, if the product is in EPEL, the YAIM configuration is in the EMI repository.

BU said that all the tracking at the moment is through Savannah, what after. AM stated that in EMI, the bug tracker was freedom of choice; several gLite product teams plan to move away form Savannah; anyway the idea is when possible, to keep users posting into GGUS as a main front-end.

IGE: SC reported about the post-IGE and questionnaire. Showing the excel sheet with information, work in progress, but there are support pledges for every IGE software. From the initial assessment, there is little commitment for SLA. HH clarified that being there no dedicated effort, there is no willingness to make promise, but the support will be on an "available effort basis". The Globus Alliance is conceived is dead. EGCF is the organisational body for a loose collaboration, also in the future, EGCF events are intended happen together with the EGI community forum.

SN showed a table in Section 2 of the document that EGI sends to EMI. Talking about a document from Markus Schulz that highlights value of some EGI services such as the staged rollout. AM commented that the document is very pragmatic and provides guidelines on how things could be continued.

SN summarised the all discussion stating that the new information is a step forward as the horizon starts to be clearer. Late January, EGI will run a series of workshops that will focus on EGI-InSPIRE global tasks that will be continued after the project and also what will be done new.

BK commented about what EGI could provide to the post-EMI technical collaboration, e.g., the UMD repository could be a very interesting service that would also solve the duplication with the EMI.

5.5 AOB
Germany and limitation of services by nationality

Question by HH; SN said this should be fed to the EGI Council through the German member

5.5.1 Approving minutes via Mailing list

Minutes to be approved by email, new agreements

- After 5 working days from the TCB meeting, the minutes will be circulated to the list
- TCB members have 5 working days to review and propose changes (no answers within 5 working days is taken as acceptance)
- After that, changes will be incorporated and the final version will be published an approved as correct record of the meeting

5.5.2 Update to TCB Requirements management process

No objections to the new changes; approved

6   Date of next meeting
http://www.doodle.com/ceysx7fs94vw6gdb

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 16:10.

7 NEW ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
13/02	IGE/HH	Circulate a document describing the support plan of IGE products 06/11: work in progress	OPEN
13/03	EGI.eu	Review the current MoU/SLA framework and support structure and see how this needs to change if there will be the need to move towards a more institution based model while avoiding direct engagement with individual product teams; the MoU framework should also consider the requirements handling process and should work also for collaborations; the MoU framework should be modular (e.g., only requirements handling, requirements handling + SLA) 06/11: work in progress	OPEN
13/05	IGE/SC	To assess relative cost of solving "Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows" #3406 through the GridWay tool 06/11: work in progress	OPEN
14/01	EMI/BK	To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about	NEW
14/02	EGI/TF	Evaluate options for a standard service configuration tool that could be adopted for UMD	NEW
14/03	EMI/AM	Talk with Laurence Field to verify the scalability limits of top-level BDII (e.g., how many site level BDII can it support?)	NEW
14/04	EMI/BK	Provide EMI's roadmap of information service evolution and usage options (e.g., issues, evolution of information service; EMIR option is an option for service endpoint, while Resource BDII is could be for resource information) by next TCB	NEW
14/05	EGI/TF	Define EGI's requirements for information service focused on long-term evolution (e.g., load, type of info, management autonomy, per site, per NGI)	NEW
14/06	EGI/TF	To circulate a document with policies about deployment of BDII in NGIs	NEW
14/07	EMI/BK	Report on progress of the High Availability CREAM (Load balancing) requests #2279	NEW
14/08	EGI/TF	Circulate slides from Prague about the accounting workshop held in Prague 6/11: link added to the TCB agenda	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
14/09	EGI/MT	Report to Steven Newhouse about effort spent by co-funded NGIs in the EGI FedCloud task force to identify deviations	~~NEW~~ CLOSED

14/10	EGI/SA EGI/SN	Evaluate the use cases passed from Helix Nebula for FedCloud engagement	NEW
14/11	IGE/HH	Check if GSI-SSHTerm supports VOMS proxy	NEW
14/12	EGI/GS EGI/TF	Identify which EGI communities are using only GridFTP (no SRM) for the Globus Online test	NEW
14/13	EGI/GS EGI/TF	Identify which EGI communities are using simple FTP for the Globus Online test	NEW
14/14	EGI/TF	Analyse which versions of GridFTP servers are deployed in EGI that are out of support. This action depends on action 13/02 to be completed	NEW
14/15	EMI/BK	Investigate if WebDAV can support third-party transfer; the goal is to find out if EMI storage elements with no GridFTP can be used in Globus Online	NEW
14/16	EGI/AK	Contact DPM developers and investigate integration option with Globus Online	NEW
14/17	IGE/HH	Resend information among the supported Globus components stating which versions are SHA2-ready and which are not	NEW
14/18	EMI/BK	Complete the EMI document on SHA2 readiness	NEW
14/19	SAGA/AY	Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #1203	NEW
14/20	EGI/BU	Make publicly available all the received documents/feedback for the GLUE 2.0 EGI profile	NEW

Minutes prepared by   Sergio Andreozzi, 16.11.2012

Minutes Approved   TCB Chair Steven Newhouse

_____