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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  | Yes |
| Balazs Konya | BK | EMI Technical Director (MoU/SLA) | Member (Deputy) | Yes |
| Andre Merkzy | AY | SAGA (MoU/SLA) | Member | No |
| 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 | Yes |
| Mariusz Mamonski | MM | PSNC (MoU) | Member (deputy) | Yes |
| 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 progress08/03: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~EGI/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. 08/03: work in progress | 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>08/03: survey closed, analyzing data to be reported at next TCB | 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 08/03: work in progress | 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 documented08/03: updated document with info such as minimum QoS expected, info are in the wiki  | ~~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 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> 08/03: some discussion happened, work in progress  | OPEN  |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #120314/12: remains open31/01: work in progress08/03: work in progress, SAGA to be contacted (see ***Action 17/01***) | 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. 08/03: made public and link sent to TCB; https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Top-BDII\_list\_for\_NGI#top-BDII\_deployment\_policy | ~~OPEN~~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 08/03: closed, BK asked how this will affect as this is important, MD said that this can come from another mini project | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 15/04 | EGI/TF | By TCB 17, evaluate the set up of a task force to engage with the identified communities to adopt GO08/03: TF said that GO is one of the technology that will be evaluated in the EGI/EUDAT/PRACE pilot, goal is to evaluate technology to be used to move data across these infrastructures; so this will be considered in this context; closed  | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 16/01 | HH | Check completion of the ticket 3329 Globus middleware publishes GLUE2 data08/03: HH updated the ticket, the info provider has been provided by IGE and will be released in IGE 3.2 at the end of March and will publish GLUE2 data; TF asked which services publish GLUE2; HH suggested to directly ask IGE Product Teams. BK asked if HH can send ldap URL to be queried and see what kind of info is published (see ***action 17/02***) | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/02 | BK | Check Accounting TF’s objective 5 and the migration status of EMI software. 08/03: all compute/storage elements are able to send account records to APEL using SSM2 except for dCache (dCache is working on it, they have implementation for SSM1.2) | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/03 | TF | Check what is available in terms of documentation on accounting usage and what is missing08/03: TF added links to wiki pages for administrators, now info more accessible with info on how to test SSM2  | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/04 | GS | Develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform08/03: GS to investigate in the minutes to understand what platform should be considered as the action is not clear | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 16/05 | MD | Revise TCB ToR to switch to post EMI/IGE model and see how it impact representation08/03: part of the agenda | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/06 | MD | Add Globus tools in the table 3 Provisional list of Community Platforms and Products in EGI (p.18).08/03: document attached to the agenda | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/07 | BK/HH | Fill in the table from A4 on representation in TCB ToR 08/03: part of the agenda | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/08 | TF/PS/GS/MD | Define the list of potential responsibilities 08/03: part of the agenda for the TCB members | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/09 | MD | Draft ToR for URT08/03: part of the agenda | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/10 | DM | Draft Clause on Attendance as a part of new TCB ToR08/03: part of the agenda | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/11 | MD | Contact other technology providers’ representative to see how they see representation in new TCB.08/03: done with statement part of last session | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 16/12 | TF | Check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time in due time before the release of EMI-308/03: work in progress | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 17/01 | EGI/SN | Contact SAGA representatives about action 14/19 | NEW |
| 17/02 | IGE/HH | Send LDAP URL to query GLUE 2.0 related information provided by Globus | NEW |
| 17/03 | EMI/BK | Provide an update to the state of planned requirements after the release of EMI 3 | NEW |
| 17/04 | EMI/AM | Circulate the list of members/institutes interested in the EMI Collaboration | NEW |
| 17/05 | EMIIGEPSNCSAGAStratusLabUVACSE | Provide the names for TCB/URT | NEW |

# AGENDA BASHING

The agenda is restructured to meet the need for short absence from SN.

# MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were circulated via email and approved (http://go.egi.eu/TCB-16).

# ITEMS OF BUSINESS

## Evolving EGI Technology coordination

### Evolving the TCB

The idea is to split the strategic discussion from more technical through two bodies (TCB and URT). The proposed terms of References are attached to the agenda. The role of Product Manager was added. SN observed that one of the major changes for TCB is to meet less frequently although attendance requirements are required. AM reported on the work of setting up a governance for the post-EMI, scope to discuss topics of common interest such as interoperability, best effort participations, rules for entering being defined; wondering how the post-EMI structure can map into TCB, there will be a coordination body, the executive members could be representative of the collaboration, but cannot make decisions on behalf. It is observed that this is similar to the current situation where AM/BK need to be back to the product teams before committing for decisions. Another aspect is to understand how the EMI Technical collaboration could be represented in the three levels identified by EGI (LoI, MoU, SLA). One strategy is that individual product teams are represented. AM will circulate the document describing the EMI Collaboration in the coming week. EGCF and EMI Collaboration are equivalent from a structure viewpoint. BK asked what commitment by the TCB representative, MD said the ability to do change management on the strategic roadmap of the technology stack at the more technical level. BK said that platform integrator is mentioned in the definition of technology provider, but not used in the document. BK suggested that platform integrator role should better fit into the URT.

## The UMD Release Team: Roles & Responsibilities

MD introduced the new ToR based on the TCB ToR. This body tracks the implementation of new software features and ensure that components will be available when needed for integration. The URT follows up on agreed requirements to ensure that they will be available. HH asked if representatives from each product team are really wanted, HH could provide a representative for each product team. PS said that it is not strictly needed to have a representative for each product team, on the other hand, it is not enough to have platform integrators. PS would expect to have more frequent meetings (e.g., 2 weeks), but not regular F2F meetings. Product teams can have independent release schedules, but they should be reported to the URT. BK suggested that the need for providing the release schedule should be in the ToR. TF reported that this is already covered in Section 3 of the ToR, the third bullet point can be refined when EMI Collaboration and EGCF are clear. HH does not have a formal document describing the collaboration such as a ToR, nor this is envisioned for now.

## Requirements management

<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Dashboards/4269/TCB%20RT%20dashboard>

### In clarification

881: will stay in clarification

1983: in the hands of ops community, will stay in clarification till next TCB and then can go down in specific product request to be managed through GGUS

### Endorsed

HH said that for IGE, 3230 this is out of scope, 2563 late to be considered by IGE, can be passed to EGCF; MD commented that this would require EGCF participating in the TCB.

BK said that for EMI there is no new development at the moment, so they are not taking new requirements;

PSNC said that 3230 and 2563 are out of scope for QSG stack.

### Planned

IGE: 3329 delivered

EMI: BK will go through and inform what will be delivered with EMI3, e.g., CREAM will not be in EMI 3, but only in EMI 3.1, the release is next week (see Action ***17/03***).

## Task Forces reports

### Accounting Task Force

TF reported about interaction with OSG, policy issue in discussion with D. Kelsey around the possibility to share accounting records; the accounting portal can gather information but not publish;

### Federated Cloud Task Force

MD reported based on slides. Accounting is working for OpenNebula and OpenStack at the moment. Accounting for WNoDeS is underway.

## EGI Technology Provider ecosystem evolution

### Commitment statements from current TPs

MD understood that EGCF would provide minimal commitment unless EGI provides budget. HH suggested also trying and contacting the specific product teams and understanding if free collaboration can be provided. SN reminded that in the past we discussed the option of having UMD release coordination and asked if this function has overlapping with EGCF coordinator. HH said that there would be an overlap if outsourcing coordination to EGCF and post-EMI.

PSNC would be a self-sufficient platform including QSG interoperable with UNICORE (e.g. submitting jobs to them). MD said that this will be a community platform to be deployed either on bare metal or on VMs. HH said that Globus can do the same, they can run on VM and also on bare metal. HH said that EGCF couldn’t be the platform integrator without extra funding; the alternative is that product teams participate and EGI does the coordination. BK asked if HH sees that who is the technology provider and who is the product team, HH said that EGCF will the technology provider that will represent the product teams behind Globus.

AM asked if the chair of the EGCF can represent the members, HH said that the chair cannot make the decision, but report to EGCF for discussion and then report back decisions. HH proposed to have agenda known in advance with the decisions to be taken so to speed up the decision making process. AM said that during EMI, the funding has given power to provide some guidance, in the EMI collaboration as this will disappear, less guidance is possible therefore more consultation with product teams is needed before coming up with decisions to be reported at TCB.

AM will circulate the list of members/institutes that are interested in the EMI collaboration, then EGI.eu can follow up to understand the level of engagement through MoU (see action ***17/04***). An idea could be to outsource the coordination of UMD to one of the members. AM said that institutes may pretend money for SLA if they do not see common interest in the collaboration; if an alignment can be found in the common goals, the collaboration may happen without money. AM said that most of the partners said that the change from 30 April to 1 May is streamlining their goals, they will try to support their reference community. AM discussed with some of the partners how to establish common SLA with EGI, their main point is that they need to have allocated people for dedicated SLA, not fraction of people; this is not justifiable unless the money they get will pay for at least one person, otherwise they are not interested at all.

StratusLab statement was provided but no representatives are at the call. CL informed that would continue as community with no clear constraints, i.e., on a best effort basis; everything new will require some direct or indirect funding from EGI ecosystem (e.g., user communities).

No statement from SAGA or UVACSE.

EGCF will elect the person participating in the TCB/URT in the meeting taking place at the EGI Community Forum (See Action ***17/05***).

## AOB

None

## Date of Next Meeting

Proposed face-to-face third week of April 15/19/25/26; HH will not attend the GlobusWorld so no problem for overlapping. 22/04/2013 concluding EMI event in Geneva where results are summarized and kick-off the post-project collaboration; all invited.

# OPEN 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 progress; 14/12: work in progress; 31/01: work in progress; 08/03: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~EGI/PS | To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about14/12: work in progress; 31/01: 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. 08/03: work in progress | 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>08/03: survey closed, analyzing data to be reported at next TCB | 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 progress; 31/01: work in progress, document to be finalised; 08/03: work in progress | 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> ; 08/03: some discussion happened, work in progress  | OPEN  |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #120314/12: remains open; 31/01: work in progress; 08/03: work in progress, SAGA to be contacted (see ***Action 17/01***) | OPEN |
| 16/04 | GS | Develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform08/03: GS to investigate in the minutes to understand what platform should be considered as the action is not clear | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 16/12 | TF | Check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time in due time before the release of EMI-308/03: work in progress | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 17/01 | EGI/SN | Contact SAGA representatives about action 14/18 | NEW |
| 17/02 | IGE/HH | Send LDAP URL to query GLUE 2.0 related information provided by Globus | NEW |
| 17/03 | EMI/BK | Provide an update to the state of planned requirements after the release of EMI 3 | NEW |
| 17/04 | EMI/AM | Circulate the list of members/institutes interested in the EMI Collaboration | NEW |
| 17/05 | All TPs | Provide the names for TCB/URT | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi, 18.03.2013

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse
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