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# 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 |
| Gergely Sipos | GS | EGI.eu Technical Outreach Manager | Member (CCO deputy) | Yes |
| Ales Krenek | AK | EGI.eu DMSU | Member | Yes |
| Matteo Turilli | MT | Chair EGI FedCloud Task Force | Member | No |
| Sergio Andreozzi | SH | EGI.eu Strategy and Policy Officer | In attendance (Secr.) | Yes |
| Alberto Di Meglio | AM | EMI Project Director (MoU/SLA) | Member  | No |
| Balazs Konya | BK | EMI Technical Directory (MoU/SLA) | Member (Deputy) | Yes |
| Andre Merkzy | AY | SAGA (MoU/SLA) | Member | Ap. |
| Charles Loomis | CL | StratusLab (MoU) | Member | No |
| Helmut Heller | HH | IGE (MoU/SLA) | Member | Yes |
| Steve Crouch | SC | IGE (MoU/SLA) | Member | No |
| Andrew Grimshaw | AG | UVACSE (MoU) | Member | No |
| Tomasz Piontek | TP | PSNC (MoU) | Member | No |
| Mariusz Mamonski | MM | PSNC (MoU) | Member (deputy) | No |
| Stephen Burke | BU | EGI.eu Information Service | In attendance | No |

# ACTIONS REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 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 progress14/12: work in progress31/01: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~PS | To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about14/12: work in progress31/01: Patrick tried to contact them again, no feedback and response, suggestion to close. PS: Let me contact submitter, before the end of the TCB. MD: No response by next TCB (TCB-17) means we will close this action and RETURN requirement #881; assign ownership to Peter.TF: There is a misunderstanding in requirements BK: This requirement was not properly communicated, needed further clarification.  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/02 | EGI/TF | Evaluate options for a standard service configuration tool that could be adopted for UMD14/12: work in progress31/01: We opened survey last week; we gave them one month for answer. Survey message sent by TF is available at https://operations-portal.egi.eu/broadcast/archive/id/863 | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 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 TCB14/12: work in progress31/01: work in progress, document to be finalised  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/06 | EGI/TF | To circulate a document with policies about deployment of BDII in NGIs14/12: TF to add scenario of Africa ROC and Italy sites not being part of EGI and depict deployment scenarios of BDII deployment31/01: Policy exist but it is not documented | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/10 | EGI/SAEGI/SN | Evaluate the use cases passed from Helix Nebula for FedCloud engagement14/12: work in progress31/01: We have evaluated use cases 2 weeks ago at the Helix Nebula workshop in Frascati | ~~NEW~~ ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 14/16 | EGI/AKEGI/KE | Contact DPM developers and investigate integration option with Globus Online (GO)14/12: PF wondered which GO could be used; HH confirmed that the production version could be used (globusonline.eu); SN talked to Steven Tuecke and understood that they support GridFTP, they do not see need to support other protocols; if there is a need for new protocols to be supported, then the activity needs to be funded; if DPM supports GridFTP, then this should be able to be used by GO; recommendation is to try to use it and see if/what the failure is so then to go back to GO people to present a specific problem (if any); SN/HH can support escalating requests; SN confirmed that dCache is working on adding some core capability to GridFTP so to not need SRM; HH opened tickets about short-comings identified by KE in previous TCB, one of them was already fixed. 31/01: No progress in general. AK: it depends, we discussed technical details; we are still waiting a bit on implementation. TF: For AK to provide us link to workshop and roadmap that contain that changes. The links provided by AK during the meeting: DPM workshop <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=214478> and DPM roadmap <https://indico.cern.ch/contributionDisplay.py?contribId=29&confId=214478>  | ~~NEW~~OPEN  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 14/18 | EMI/BK | Complete the EMI document on SHA2 readiness14/12: work in progress31/01: BK: This info from product teams shows how difficult the life will be after EMI. TF: Can you give us overview about responsiveness BC: see table <https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=1&resId=0&materialId=0&confId=1303>  | ~~NEW~~~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #120314/12: remains open31/01: remains open (no report as AY did not attend) | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/20 | EGI/BU | Make publicly available all the received documents/feedback for the GLUE 2.0 EGI profile14/12: keep open (HH confirmed that there are no comments from IGE)31/01: work in progress, Stephen is working on the new version, expected at the beginning of February.  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 15/01 | EGI/KE | Follow up on requirement #926 with the submitter31/01: KE sent an update and the ticket can be closed https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=1&resId=1&materialId=0&confId=1303 This one will be followed up by GS and HH  | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 15/02 | EGI/MT | Identify developer who could add contextualisation to OCCI implementation and effort required (funding could come from an EGI mini-project)31/01: TF: This mini-project didn’t get funded  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 15/04 | EGI/TF | By TCB 17, evaluate the set up of a task force to engage with the identified communities to adopt GO31/01: work in progress | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 15/03 | EMI/BK | Provide names of people to be added to the mailing list of EU-DAT/EGI/PRACE collaboration (for IGE, HH to be added)31/01: BK sent a few names https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=1&resId=2&materialId=0&confId=1303 | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |

# AGENDA BASHING

Agenda approved.

BK: We should discuss practical things about post-EMI transition in AOB. TF: concerning future release and outlook, what is expected technically? BK: We don’t have details; for EMI 3 we will provide you with more details.

# MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved according to the new procedure (http://go.egi.eu/TCB-15).

# ITEMS OF BUSINESS

## Requirements management

As per today's status, the status of the requirements at the TCB level is as follows:

* 6 waiting for clarifications
* 0 new or reviewed requirements
* 3 endorsed requirements waiting for effort assessment by the TPs
* 0 assessed requirements waiting for prioritisation by the TCB
* 15 planned requirements for which progress updates from TPs are necessary.

Attached was TCB RT dashboard snapshot for more information.

HH: I am not aware of the ticket 3329 Globus middleware publishes GLUE2 data TF: It should have been done before Christmas announcement date. HH: It should be done. Should we put this in UMB? HH: I will check ***Action 16/01: Check completion of the ticket 3329 Globus middleware publishes GLUE2 data***

Clarification by TF 1376 TF: We can close this requirement.

## Task Force Review

There are two TCB task forces. Matteo could not make it for the talk on Federated Task Force.

### Accounting Task Force

BK: We have a task complete support from CREAM, missing configuration and accounting sensors. I can ask whether test were successful; components read.

TF presented updates from the Task Force wiki page https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/TCB:Accounting\_Task\_Force and talking about completed objectives:

1. DONE steer the process of requirements gathering from Resource Centres and NGIs in new areas of development, with a particular focus on storage and virtualization. These requirements will be provided to the EGI technology providers and to the JRA1 product teams. Cloud related accounting requirements and experimentations were lead by the Federated Cloud activity of SA2
2. DONE. Analysed the PY2/PY3 development plans of EMI and IGE project, to make sure that what is proposed matches the requirements of the EGI Community.
3. DONE. Fostered the convergence towards a common accounting solution for UNICORE Resource Centres -- UNICORE accounting will adopt SSM2, which will be supported with EMI 3.
4. ON HOLD. Collect information about NGI business models that require the support of accounting -- on hold. This depends on the output of the pay-per-use experimentation started in December 2012 TF: It can be useful if we want to explore through that activity
5. IN PROGRESS. Coordinate deployment plans of NGIs which publish summarized URs (see status <https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SSM_Migration_Status>)

BK: APEL wants only to support SSMv2.0 in production. ***Action 16/02: BK to check Accounting TF’s objective 5 and the migration status of EMI software.*** ***Action 16/12: TF to check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time before the release of EMI-3***

BK showed email on what is planed on APEL servers. Everybody should migrate to SSM 2.0 but the mail answers shows delays and showstoppers. SN: Client side is available BK: EMI 3 ready by March. TF: Send email to TCB. BK: OK. PS: By the end of February would be good to have it. BK: The whole thing was directed by UNICORE team; it’s a potential success story.

TF was explaining status of deployment table. EDGI in table – development activity was postponed. SN: We don’t have a clear fixed date? TF: No.

HH: IGE offered their GridSAFE SW with the adaptations to PRACE but PRACE preferred to instead work directly with the GridSAFE developers at EPCC.

1. DONE. Discuss EGI accounting development and deployment plans with peer grids to ensure future interoperability. The technical discussion initially steered by the task force was completed by EMI and result of this is the definition of SSM2.

TF: I would keep this Task Force open until issues resolved raised by BK

GS: Place for documentation for new user communities? TF: At the moment accounting on CPU consumption is available. GS: Can I harvest that info from infrastructure? TF: If portal is used, APEL is collecting data from computing elements; collecting snapshots of portal is for discussion. SN: Do we have 2 sets of manuals – how to federate new users using middleware and other one on how can I get my custom view of subset of usage TF: VO manager has complete view and it is available. ***Action 16/03: TF to check what is available in terms of documentation on accounting usage and check what is missing.*** PS: You don’t have receipt for every single site, there is not one. BK: This path should be documented. TF: You can check accounting per country and per NGIs.

### Federated Task Force

MD explained and present newest updates on the Task Force activities. We have a rough user interface; the data will be available in data production.

BK: Is there any change how should users use the infrastructure? What do you have to offer to user community? MD: IaaS augmented by portals. SN: Two mini-projects that will be funded related to user environments, deploying VMs to resources. Idea is to wrap underlying test bed resources with something more user friendly – platform deployers. MD: Biggest focus was to get federation up and running; this is on the road to production; they are getting more solidified for usage. BK: How do you benefit from federated cloud? SN: you use standards implemented by OpenNebula to use standard interfaces; it is similar functionality to WMS; we are exploring non-WMS option. There are Graphical/portal based tools. BK: It would be nice to have user centric document and this is what you can do for user. SN: We need to do it better than for gLITE. BK: Are there plans for test bed in Manchester? MD: Yes. GS: Structure is already there for user centric document. Go to http://www.egi.eu/infrastructure/cloud/ ***Action 16/04 GS to develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform.***

## Evolving EGI

This topic was about retrospection of the workshop, focused on technology insertion, roadmapping and platform provisioning. It was agreed to focus discussion on Platform Integrators (PIs) for the next agenda point.

## Evolving Technology Providers

Possible topics to discuss were the role of Platform Integrators, Technical repository & provisioning infrastructure, Security vulnerabilities handling, Platform dependencies, Re-use of software engineering vs. re-use of deployment, Scope and definition of platforms (Core Infrastructure, Cloud Infrastructure, Collaboration Infrastructure, Community Platform) and Drafting Community platforms (Identify platform integrators).

HH: What is the role of platform integrators? MD: The role of a Platform Integrator is defined as defining the scope a specific platform serving its target community, and assembling a number of software components into regular releases of that platform. Naturally, this role includes ensuring that the included software and services provided by Product Teams work well with each other. If they don’t, a Platform Integrator may replace an ill-behaving component with another, better fitting alternative. EGI.eu will be its own Platform Integrator for the EGI Core Infrastructure, EGI Cloud Infrastructure and EGI Collaboration platforms. It seems to be much cheaper than 100 customs solutions.

BK: Is EMI platform integrator? MD: You are doing much more; PIs are using preexisting things and glue them together, not development. SN: EMI glues individual product team outputs. PIs are producing the whole distribution, particular service or application. PI is expert middle person between product teams. HH: PIs will also do certification. MD: Yes, it is responsible for that outcome and working good together, relationship between PIs and Product Teams are less tight and close. SN: Other integrators and communities, dCache is PI. HH: What about dCache and IPV6? If there is no close contact, whatever it delivers it will deteriorate very quickly. SN: If IPV6 is important to us, consumers will pressure dCache. HH: WLCG will say we want IPV6. SN: Bio-community has an adoption of taking DPM and developing it in their on community, switch to other products or clubbing them together. This is not a perfect solution; this is the model that pushes the responsibility back to communities that uses technology. HH: I though EGI is the one who does it, we want have leverage unless will start paying developers. BK: CERN is the only one possible PI who can afford it. SN: Yes, but UNICORE themselves are PI; this is model we have to work with for some time. There are no funds available coming through EGI, this have to be looked post EGI-InSPIRE. MD: We just ensure that integration is working, test whether it works, so it is not actual integration work. BK: Lack of resources on PI level can happen. OK, this is broken, fine, leave it, we don’t have resources to fix it. MD: EMI is providing us with the choice; PIs look at available elements and make specific choice, decision must be justified; if users are not happy they will come back. Repositories need to be separated; if PIs decide to include certain component it must be physically available in platforms repositories. Platform is self-contained.

BK: UMD release will be then limited to core components. MD: e.g. many LINUX distributions do the same. BK: Here we have entire distribution implemented; difference between UNICORE distribution and WLCG distribution. SN: There is no money to fund product teams and PIs; what would you suggest? BK: Defining of EGI core platform is a good exercise. SN: Having more architectural coordination role would be useful? BK: About UMD repository platforms I am little bit skeptical; integration means that you build software together. SN: Are you suggesting separate repository for each PI? BK: You assume that you will have special area for each PI in repository. SN: Are you saying that added cost of running your own repository is smaller? In addition, should repository provide virtual integration? BK: It would be useful. MD: Part of the EGI repository domain, you would like to see deployment. BK: To prepare and integrate platform you need. SN: Is this easy to do? PS: We need something more than simple testing. BK: Either you do it from the source from packages from binaries. PS: Post build test, we already do verification. This is not a big work compared to what we do now. We may provide source repository, but they already have it to provide build facility for them to build code; making sure they are not up to date code from other products.

Discussing Figure 2 of **Post-EMI/IGE support for Technology Providers document**. GS: What is missing is integration part and that is huge effort. MD gave example. SN: Shift of VI is important. HH: Do you have commitment it will happen? SN: 2 projects we are funding; roadmap is a try to move form site administrator lockout. HH: Now is experimental, shall it be in production infrastructure? MD: This is our goal. SN: On Helix Nebula meeting Tim Cook was saying complementary things; momentum is growing, there is no guarantee but we are going down the right road just to see how quickly we can go down the road. HH: It is a great thing; it would solve so many problems, very beneficial. Accounting on VM level there is an issue of double accounting. MD: OK, just accounting on VM level decide what you want to do, in your case Globus, we get accounting already from that infrastructure, why bother accounting from one more additional level. Setting up of new relationships frees up from new inertia. In Virtual environments we will care less what other communities are doing, there will need to interact with platform they chosen.

HH: My advice is to forget about PIs and go to cloud solutions. Save the effort, no user community beside WCLG will be able to do it. Then do work is on user community so save them work. SN: If they are appliances there for them to use, than great; students can develop or via yellow pages for PIs.

After the end of the meeting some of the more technical topics were discussed in more detail.

## AOB

BK: What is the role of the TCB in the future? SN: We have 2 options: either stick with PI model when we have EMI consortium. BK: Not necessarily that the consortium can be PI. SN: Decompose EMI in key service areas? For example, INFN is a PI for CREAM and integrate all dependent services. INFN is responsible for any issues in that case. BK: INFN will not be not to act as PI. SN: Core platform doesn’t have anything essential in it e.g. CREAM. MD: Platform integrator of core and cloud infrastructure will be EGI.eu. GS: But software doesn’t come from EGI.eu. PS: Many product teams don’t have interest in participating in TCB. SN: You should have somebody who is voice of customers - Product Manager approach. Core Infrastructure Platform Product manager is somebody from EGI.eu Operations team; the same thing about Cloud Infrastructure Platform. With how many Product managers we end up with? Technical discussions take place out of TCB meetings. TCB responsibility is coordination and communication between platforms represented by product managers. ***Action 16/05 EGI.eu to look to revise TCB ToR to switch to post EMI/IGE model and see how it impact representation.*** Do you want to stay represented for the existing EMI and IGE products? HH: Person elected by EGCF, not necessarily me. HH: I would welcome if you put Globus tools in the table (p.18 Table3 Provisional list of Community Platforms and Products in EGI). DM: OK. ***Action 16/06 Add Globus tools in the table 3 Provisional list of Community Platforms and Products in EGI*** ***(p.18).***

MD: What structure they want, get feedback from technology providers? BK: Calling it Platform Integrator in the table is not good idea. SN: EMI should look for some organization that will not take all responsibilities of what EMI did, but we don’t want to deal with 70 product teams. Can you discuss with Alberto who can it be? BK: We had survey and most of the product teams want to interact with TCB directly. SN: We need to have limited number of members in order for discussion to be possible. They can be subscribed to TCB mailing list but having 70 additional members is not possible. BK: In reality we have around 10 product teams - CERN (data), INFN (compute and also data plus VOMS0), DESY, Nordic, UNICORE, Security (include libraries, VOMS etc.), Czech team CESNET), dCache. SN: Transitions from representation of 2 to representation of 7 or 8 representatives. We can handle representation of this grouping. BK: Preliminary discussion at the end of the EMI and one of the results could be it can be one person representing all of these products. SN: I can contact Alberto and inform him that TCB could have these 5 partners on board with clearly ownership of specific products; offer a wild card. BK: We will give you table similar to this one in A4 of the documented products assigned; if nobody you can fill in gap with responsible product team. ***Action 16/07 BK and HH (both middleware providers) to come with representation to us about TCB ToR.***

BK: List of products and these products delegate representation rights. SN: In addition what they bring to table next to the face, their technical expertise work? We are not after written commitment but about what responsibilities they can perform. ***Action 16/08 TF, PS, GS, MD to define the list of potential responsibilities for the TCB members.***

MD: Frequency of meeting, what about every 6 weeks? PS: It will be more technical work, probably need for more frequent meetings. SN: Similar model to WLCG; delegate technical work to URT and report by URT chair to TCB. ***Action 16/09 Draft ToR for URT.*** Potential responsibility is to keep list of components for each Platform that EGI endorses and that list be presented to TCB when changes.

BK: Part that I liked the most from the document attempt to define EGI Core Infrastructure Platform Appendix A.1. Not only the list of service but also connection with interface. BK: Technical Services GOCDB is from core to platform not the other way around. Gridmap files? SN: architectural component Gridmap; XSEDE architectural use cases. BK: Maybe to rename Technical Services to Real Services?

SN: What is software release plan after the 1st May? BK: No plans in this moment. Security updates for EMI 2 end of the project for Security of EMI 3 only for 12 months. Twelve months of full support but no functionality TF: Is this documented on the web page? BK: Yes <http://www.eu-emi.eu/releases> TF: What about IGE? HH: We carry on for a packaging for 1 year, until April 2014; definitely security fixes and new releases but on the best effort basis; we do it best we can but no promises.

SN: We should also discuss representation from other technology providers e.g. StratusLab or anyone else represented in TCB - SAGA, PSNC, Andrew Grimshaw (UVASCE). In new ToR we should include attendance cause so for example If representative misses two F-2-F meetings or if they don’t attend 3 meetings in row, been face-2-face or telecom, it should be brought to chair attention by secretary. HH: After IGE, we will not have money for traveling. ***Action 16/10 Draft Clause on Attendance as a part of new TCB ToR*** and ***Action 16/10 Contact other technology providers’ representative to see how they see representation in new TCB.*** BK: If TP is not providing any software why should they been TPs? SN: We have model that you can sit around the table with MoUs but for voting you need to have signed SLA. It is also possibility what you suggested – in 1 year time stop considering them if they don’t contribute software to the infrastructure.

HH: I personally would welcome fewer F-2-F meetings; just my personal point of view. SN: URT appearing some of the discussions; most of today topics fit URT discussions. If this is so maybe quarterly TCB meetings might become more appropriate.

# Date of next meeting

Next meeting will be somewhere in March, few dates proposed in Doodle: <http://doodle.com/cgw2xei3hbrwtshu>.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 14:30.

# NEW ACTIONS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 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 progress14/12: work in progress31/01: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~PS | To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about14/12: work in progress31/01: Patrick tried to contact them again, no feedback, no response suggestion to close. PS: Let me contact submitter, before the end of the TCB. MD: By the next of the TCB see whether they answer; now it is PS ownership of actionTZ: There is misunderstanding in requirements BK: This requirement was not properly communicated, needed further clarification.  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/02 | EGI/TF | Evaluate options for a standard service configuration tool that could be adopted for UMD14/12: work in progress31/01: We opened survey last week; we gave them one month for answer. Survey message sent by TF is available at <https://operations-portal.egi.eu/broadcast/archive/id/863> | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 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 TCB14/12: work in progress31/01: work in progress, document to be finalised  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/06 | EGI/TF | To circulate a document with policies about deployment of BDII in NGIs14/12: TF to add scenario of Africa ROC and Italy sites not being part of EGI and depict deployment scenarios of BDII deployment31/01: Policy exist but it is not documented | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/16 | EGI/AKEGI/KE | Contact DPM developers and investigate integration option with Globus Online (GO)14/12: PF wondered which GO could be used; HH confirmed that the production version could be used (globusonline.eu); SN talked to Steven Tueckel and understood that they support GridFTP, they do not see need to support other protocols; if there is a need for new protocols to be supported, then the activity needs to be funded; if DPM supports GridFTP, then this should be able to be used by GO; recommendation is to try to use it and see if/what the failure is so then to go back to GO people to present a specific problem (if any); SN/HH can support escalating requests; SN confirmed that dCache is working on adding some core capability to GridFTP so to not need SRM; HH opened tickets about short-comings identified by KE in previous TCB, one of them was already fixed. 31/01: no progress in general. AK: it depends we discussed technical details; we are still waiting a bit on implementation. TF: For AK to provide us link to workshop and roadmap that contain that changes. The links provided by AK during the meeting: DPM workshop <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=214478> and DPM roadmap <https://indico.cern.ch/contributionDisplay.py?contribId=29&confId=214478>  | ~~NEW~~OPEN  |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #120314/12: remains open31/01: work in progress | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 14/20 | EGI/BU | Make publicly available all the received documents/feedback for the GLUE 2.0 EGI profile14/12: keep open (HH confirmed that there are no comments from IGE)31/01: work in progress, Stephen is working on the new version, expected beginning of February.  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 15/02 | EGI/MT | Identify developer who could add contextualisation to OCCI implementation and effort required (funding could come from an EGI mini-project)31/01: TF: This mini-project didn’t get funded  | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 15/04 | EGI/TF | By TCB 17, evaluate the set up of a task force to engage with the identified communities to adopt GO | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 16/01 | HH | Check completion of the ticket 3329 Globus middleware publishes GLUE2 data | NEW |
| 16/02 | BK | Check Accounting TF’s objective 5 and the migration status of EMI software.  | NEW |
| 16/03 | TF | Check what is available in terms of documentation on accounting usage and what is missing | NEW |
| 16/04 | GS | Develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform | NEW |
| 16/05 | MD | Revise TCB ToR to switch to post EMI/IGE model and see how it impact representation | NEW |
| 16/06 | MD | Add Globus tools in the table 3 Provisional list of Community Platforms and Products in EGI (p.18). | NEW |
| 16/07 | BK/HH | Fill in the table from A4 on representation in TCB ToR  | NEW |
| 16/08 | TF/PS/GS/MD | Define the list of potential responsibilities for the TCB members | NEW |
| 16/09 | MD | Draft ToR for URT | NEW |
| 16/10 | DM | Draft Clause on Attendance as a part of new TCB ToR | NEW |
| 16/11 | MD | Contact other technology providers’ representative to see how they see representation in new TCB. | NEW |
| 16/12 | TF | Check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time in due time before the release of EMI-3 | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Damir Marinovic, 01.02.2013

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse
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