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# Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and Surname | Abbr. | Representing | Membership[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| Linda Cornwall | LC | EGI SVG Chair | Member |
| David Kelsey | DK | EGI SPG Chair | Member |
| Steven Newhouse | MM | EGI.eu Director and CTO | Member (Chair) |
| Peter Solagna | PS | EGI.eu Operations Officer | Observer |
| Michel Dreschner | MD | EGI.eu Technical Manager | Observer |
| Sergio Andreozzi | SA | Strategy and Policy Manager | Observer |
| Damir Marinovic | DM | Strategy and Policy Officer | In Attendance |

# Minutes of the Previous Meeting

No minute validation

# Action Review

No action review

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Introduction EGI Excellence Science Policy

SN: The EGI Council is particularly worried on how to find out what has be done on the infrastructure. There is a pressure from funding bodies to present clear scientific return on investment. Most of the researchers don’t tell us what is there scientific output using the infrastructure. OpenAIRE can be used so deposit metadata of scientific papers, if not the very paper. This should be done in order to demonstrate what comes from using EGI, information on particular VO and related information on where it is produced. This obligation has to be embodied in in appropriate VO AUP policy or Grid Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) so as to reinforce requirements to the user acknowledging using of EGI for accomplishing their scientific achievements. The question is than what are the appropriate mechanisms to implement it in terms of policy documents? What are the appropriate mechanisms to be rolled out to VOs?

# Discussion

DK: Paper talks about having resource allocation mechanism, it seems there is absolute requirement to acknowledge the use in this case.

SN: One is to explore established PRACE like model, with centralised peer review allocation.

LC: Possible you need different phases of acknowledging, use of resources can only be partly from the EGI infrastructure, thus, lower and higher level of acknowledgment. Maybe we would need more than one phrase.

SN: We also need to know since use of VO resources is not clear.

SA: Report from the [VT EGI Scientific Publications Repository - Recommendations](https://documents.egi.eu/secure/RetrieveFile?docid=1369&version=5&filename=VT-SciPubRepo-Recommendations-Final.pdf) - recommendation number 4 states to add the acknowledgment article to the AUP. XSEDE also has an acknowledgement as a requirement. We need to find the way to extend AUP to EGI cases.

DK: XSEDE case is clearer.

SA: Still they have it in the AUP.

DK: AUP is forced at point to register or to register to VO. We have many resources used everywhere and I am worrying about imposing this all over the globe. Maybe it shouldn’t be explicit statement? Where is the best place to have it? Sure we can put it in the AUP but what will do this to users registered elsewhere?

SN: We have national VOs and international VOs. Maybe to have slightly different terminology if it is national VO since it is related to NGIs.

DK: Appropriate phrase usually includes acknowledgment of funding agency.

SN: Only one aspect is to capture the scientific output and associate it to organization.

MD: ESA integrated acknowledgment in SLAs.

SN: AUP is the only thing user actually clicks on and user is the one submitting papers.

DK: On some level you can say that EGI doesn’t own any resources. Do we want some hard wired statement or we put policy requirement YOU MUST follow…?

SN: Does anybody read AUP?

DK: Actually, some tend to do and to comment on it.

SN: Problem is that I will start to search what users are from which VOs in OpenAIRE. If I don’t find papers in there I would look to disable these VOs from the infrastructure.

LC: They need to mention OpenAIRE?

SN: Yes, we expect to get prototypes from OpenAIRE of the EGI extensions for the EGI Community Forum in April 2013. So we can to start with discussions about changing words of text before technical implementation of OpenAIRE. VO managers should be more proactive in collecting this information. End user is the one who needs to put it but VO manager need to ensure that users read and understand the AUP. Ultimately it is not VO manager responsibility to submit papers, it is the user responsibility.

DK: We need multiple approaches. I suppose it needs to be if we are hitting users all over the world e.g. Venezuela.

SN: If they are clicking on VOMS servers based in or around Europe I don’t care whether they are in Venezuela, we need to know and our funder needs to know our international cooperation activities.

SA: Main issue is to link publications to EGI, which is the moment very weak.

DK: I fully understand, just struggling how to best achieve it. Throughout communication, not so much through policy provision?

LC: It has to be in the policies.

SA: Sometimes users didn’t even know that they are using EGI. That’s the reason for VT report recommendation 6 - Expose EGI in user interfaces. Marketing campaign make users more aware.

DK: Concrete example - we put EGI in the AUP to acknowledge EGI and then I want to apply this to WCLG and I need to go through WLSG Management Board. They will also say the same thing and ask for acknowledgment.

LC: We could have general description of grid infrastructures WLSG, EGI etc. Then users don’t have to say what specific infrastructure they used but than to make it clear that probably EGI is the largest part of the infrastructure.

SN: Another alternative is acknowledgment to VO; it is much easier from us to derive from that than whether EGI, OSG and whoever was resource contributor behind this organization. It is not necessary to have EGI mentioned. If we have VO we still can have metrics about productivity of VO from resources we provided. Acknowledgment in AUP can change purely by inserting VO name in it. If we have unique name from VO from that unique name we can derive resources, infrastructure that contributed these resources.

SA: Statement like - This work used Grid services as part of the VONAME Virtual Organisation [and is supported by the EC-funded project PRJ\_NAME Grant number XXXXX].

SN: Right, if we know how many papers are produced by VO we can allocate this across RCs and infrastructures.

DK: What is the time scale for this?

SN: This needs a lot of publicity. The EGI CF would be very good time to start and it would fit in time with the development work from OpenAIRE. There is very good discipline from HEP community to deposit the papers in??? at CERN.

SN: How to mine this information? The more recognizable the phrase the easier and better.

MD: From technical point of view, what needs to change in existing infrastructure? There is one unique VO for centrally allocated resource and VO will be dismantled when it is over?

SN: This will be a topic of the workshop in January. Current model around VOs setup gives VO very autonomous status.

MD: Do we need to change something accounting portal?

SN: I don’t think so.

MD: It looks there is nothing to be changed.

SN: Main point of call is to make sure use case is clear in your mind.

DK I understand this, not sure of the best way to do it. Discuss this within SPG? **(action 07/01)**

SN: Yes.

DK: More people discuss it; there will be more bright ideas.

SN: This is EGI Council Policy, no specific implementation date. It doesn’t need to happen before Christmas but soon enough. Ideally, before time we start submitting project proposals for funding.

DK: So we are aiming for public announcement at the CF.

# AOB

SN: Is there is something pressing to discuss as a more general topic for SCG meeting?

DK: Security to collaborating Infrastructure document is getting closer to the first version. I will send it soon to the SCG mailing list for comments and discussions.

# Actions

Inline emphasised in italics are the assessments of the tickets.

| ID | Resp. | Description | Status[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 02/02 | JW | Circulate to the SCG list EMI faults on common security libraries  *OBSOLETE: EMI does not deal with federated identity (which was the context of this action)* | CLOSED |
| 03/04 | TF | To put in place MoU between EGI and Canadian sites in order to clearly define our relationship  *SUPERSEDED: Formally open, but tracked in the manager’s action list.* | CLOSED |
| 05/01 | DK | Add as agenda point discussion about possibility to translate EGI Security notice to EGI security policy on next SPG face-to-face meeting  *CLOSED: EGI top level security policy in force* | CLOSED |
| 05/02 | MD | Contact the middleware providers and see which one use proxies and need to deal with proxy related issues that require middleware changes  *OPEN: No progress.* | OPEN |
| 05/07 | DG, SN | Have a discussion with Ian Bird and Jaime Sheers about what is their understanding of priority in LHCb  *CLOSED: SHA-2 readiness is dealt with at the TCB* | CLOSED |
| 05/08 | SN | Set up doodle for the next SCG meeting, to be held approximately in the middle of February  *CLOSED* | CLOSED |
| 06/01 | TF | Contact A. Di Meglio/B. Konya to ask extensions for WN and UI until end of 2012  *CLOSED: EMI agreed to support extension until 30 November 2012. UI components used in SAM will be supported until SAM Update 22. WN in UMD-2 includes 32 bit libraries for VOs that still rely on them from gLite 3.2* | CLOSED |
| 06/02 | ML | Contact DPM and LFC developers to clarify which is the actual end of support for those components, if there are extensions foreseen  *CLOSED: No support extensions for LFC and DPM, they are in end of life since 30 November 2012* | CLOSED |
| 06/02 | TCB | Review the components before the end of security update, in order to assess which components need an extension  *CLOSED: EMI-2 is backwards compatible to EMI-1 with respect to the components that reach end of security support in gLite 3.2. Sites in question update to EMI-2, skipping EMI-1.* | CLOSED |
| 06/03 | Operations | Identify where EMI-1 components miss a working replacement in EMI-2 (as an input for Action 06/02) – deadline Dec 2012  *CLOSED – EMI-2 is backwards compatible to EMI-1 (with very few uncritical exceptions, e.g. ARC)* | CLOSED |
| 06/04 | S. Gabriel | To prepare a gLite 3.2 retirement calendar advisory draft and circulate it to SCG  *OPEN: Discussion is ongoing in RT* | OPEN |
| 07/01 | DK | Discuss acknowledgment article in the AUP with the SPG members | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Damir Marinovic 07.02.2012.

Minutes Approved Group Chair Steven Newhouse

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This work by EGI.eu is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported License (see a copy of the license at http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0). This license lets you remix, tweak, and build upon this work, and although your new works must acknowledge EGI.eu, you do not have to license your derivative works on the same terms. Reproductions or derivative works must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: “Based on work by EGI.eu used with permission under a CC-BY 3.0 license (source work URL: specify if known)”.

1. Member, Observer, in Attendance [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. NEW, OPEN, CLOSED, REJECTED [↑](#footnote-ref-2)