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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) | No |
| Gergely Sipos | GS | EGI.eu Technical Outreach Manager | Member | No |
| Ales Krenek | AK | EGI.eu DMSU | Member | No |
| Zdenek Sustr | ZS | EGI.eu DMSU | In attendance | 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 |
| Shantenu Jha | SJ | SAGA (MoU/SLA) | Member | Yes\* |
| 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 |

\* joined at 13:30

# 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 progress; 14/12: work in progress; 31/01: work in progress; 08/03: work in progress;  16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~  EGI/PS | To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about  14/12: 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  16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/02 | EGI/TF | Evaluate options for a standard service configuration tool that could be adopted for UMD  14/12: work in progress  31/01: 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  16/04: in agenda, closed | ~~OPEN~~  CLOSED |
| 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  14/12: work in progress; 31/01: work in progress, document to be finalised; 08/03: work in progress; 16/04: BK provided an update | ~~OPEN~~  CLOSED |
| 14/16 | EGI/AK  EGI/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; 16/04: work in progress, HH reported that now GO can be used with SRM | OPEN |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #1203  14/12: remains open; 31/01: work in progress; 08/03: work in progress, SAGA to be contacted (see ***Action 17/01***)  16/04: have been contacted, they want to collaborate | OPEN |
| 16/04 | GS | Develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform  08/03: GS to investigate in the minutes to understand what platform should be considered as the action is not clear  16/04: work in progress | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 16/12 | TF | Check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time in due time before the release of EMI-3  08/03: work in progress  16/04: APEL team said that they will provide an SSM2 production instance, stay open | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 17/01 | EGI/SN | Contact SAGA representatives about action 14/18  16/04: work in progress | ~~NEW~~  OPEN |
| 17/02 | IGE/HH | Send LDAP URL to query GLUE 2.0 related information provided by Globus  16/04: sent | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |
| 17/03 | EMI/BK | Provide an update to the state of planned requirements after the release of EMI 3  16/04: done | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |
| 17/04 | EMI/AM | Circulate the list of members/institutes interested in the EMI Collaboration  16/04: done through the mailing list | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |
| 17/05 | All TPs | Provide the names for TCB/URT  16/04:   * IGE provided the names (TCB: Steve Crouch + Helmut as deputy; for URT is Matthias Ellert) * BK will act as Interim Coordinator until the official coordinator of media is nominated (this should happen within 6 months) | ~~NEW~~  CLOSED |

# 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

## Requirements management

MD went through the requirements dashboard; BK updated all the EMI tickets after the release of EMI3. Some extra updates:

* #2563 is resolved for EMI, therefore should be closed; it still remains open for IGE; HH said that IGE ended at the end of March, only two work packages have been extended till the end of April so to run EGCF in co-location with EGI CF; all IGE effort devoted to technical work formally ended, so there is no more contribution that could be expected.
* #1385 should be returned as something was done but not all that was required.
* #3329 MD to evaluate if this can be marked as delivered (***Action 18/01***).
* EMI, move the identified requirements from planned to delivered (***Action 18/02***).

BK asked what will happen to the tracker after the end of EMI; MD answered that it will stay, but new requirements will be submitted to product teams.

## Task Forces reports

For Accounting, TF reported that QSG and GridSafe integration are in testing.

For Federated Cloud, MD provided slides in the agenda with the update. BK asked what format is used for accounting; MD reported that OGF UR for computing are used with a bit of bending. A member of the federated cloud is part of the OGF UR WG and is tracking the activity; use cases rely on more than one cloud provider. SN reported that the EGI Council had very positive comments on the activities performed so far. Matteo Turilli will step down from chairing the task force and David Wallom will take his role.

## EGI Core Infrastructure Platform

### Configuration Management for Community Platforms

TF presented based on slides. As YAIM support will officially stop after the end of EMI, a survey was run. AM observed that most of the tools offer standard interface to call specific configuration scripts, e.g., with Puppet, YAIM scripts are called, so Puppet will not replace YAIM. Individually, a number of product team started to adopt Puppet and replace YAIM scripts with standard ways specific to the different technologies. Puppet already provided pre-defined scripts to configure services, e.g., Apache. CERN and INFN made an agreement to de-YAIMmify their software components. Puppet is the leading tool with a wide community outside Grid and therefore it will be proposed/supported. It will not be mandated, but suggested for focusing the future effort. AM said that this can be a task force within MEDIA. *(****See Actions 18/03, 18/04****).*

## Information Systems evolution

TF presented based on slides prepared by SB. AM reported that EMIR is going to be supported officially by Juelich after the end of EMI. TF reported that it would not be easy to remove support for GLUE 1 in the short term. BK suggested having a survey to understand who is still relying on GLUE 1 (***see Action 18/05***). OSG stated that will stay with GLUE 1 until there will be no clear use case to move, this may happen thanks to WLCG. About phasing out GLUE 1, one important aspect would be to be sure that operations tools are already all on GLUE 2. MeDIA can act as coordinator to stimulate product teams to remove support from GLUE 1 and move to GLUE 2, EGI operations can work on the deployment and operations tools.

BK asked why sites are not recommended to move to EMI 3. TF reported that the decommissioning of EMI process started in March when EMI 3 was not available, EMI 3 is also not yet in UMD. It is up to the site to decide if moving to EMI 2 or EMI 3. AM said that as sites adopting EMI2 is increasing substantially, we should avoid giving confusing messages as to wait for EMI3.

UNICORE is using GLUE 2 running a site BDII.

### EGI Core Infrastructure Roadmap

BK asked if the SAM will be able to accept all EMI probes. TF reported that for all the probes that passed validations would be in SAM update 22. Update 22 will be released at the end of April for testing, then it will move to staged roll-out. Some of the test will be decommissioned, e.g. MPI. AM reported that most of the problems found in EMI 2 have been fixed in EMI 3 but not back-ported.

GOCDB 5 will support scoping context, so that different infrastructures can use the same service instance. HH asked if there is support of SSM2 by APEL so to start publishing data from IGE. BK said that this is not yet available. TF has an open action to investigate. HYDRA and STS will run by a start up company; according to the current plans, no product team will support worker node and user interface.

## EGI Cloud Infrastructure Platform

MD presented based on slides. SN asked the implications on PROC-9. TF reported that certification requires e.g. the verification that accounting data is published, so it needs to be expanded to check that things happen for cloud services as well (***see action 18/06, 18/07***). BK asked what about the VM marketplace from StratusLab, SN said it is still supported but on a best effort basis (***see action 18/08***).

## EGI Collaboration Platform

GS is not present so this will be postponed.

## Transitioning to the new EGI ecosystem support model

TF presented based on slides. Requests that will be supported on a best effort basis will not be logged into GGUS to avoid tickets that will stay forever. A different channel should be considered. Tickets assigned to external support have read/write access, this will change; all tickets to be readable to all, starting with the GGUS release in May. For each support unit, there will be a dashboard to highlight high priority tickets.

AM noted that “Level” in slide “Support Levels” is confusing and needs to be clarified.

AM also mentioned that after discussion during the EGICF13, dCache reported that would like to know what they get back in turn for their support. BK asked what is the commitment level for DMSU in terms of response time; ZS said that 4 working hours should be the figure. Another discussed aspect was how to inform users that a feature/problem was solved in a new release of a software component.

SN asked to AM about viewpoint on the proposed evolution of GGUS. EMI has a support manager who monitors the tickets who automatically go to support units. This monitoring will disappear with the end of EMI. AM said that there should be a re-alignment of product team and support unit. BK said that the doodle provided contains the list of confirmed product teams, so this list can be used to re-evaluate the support units.

Product teams can opt for different commitment levels and SLAs. About revenues, payment in-kind could be booth space for demos, branding (EGI partner), preferential slots in conferences, joint dissemination activities. More ideas can be developed.

SN asked from EMI who is interested in formalizing a relationship with EGI. AM already sent the list of institutes that are interested in commercial-like agreements (***See action 18/09***).

AM asked about the relationship of MEDIA and EGI so to ensure that requirements can go into MEDIA. After discussion, it was noted that the relationship document should also specify the decision making power of the TCB representative (e.g., only representative like MeDIA or with decision-making).

HH commented that IGE started with no/little user base, build up, integrated with EGI tools (e.g. accounting), then it had to find sites wanted to install IGE middleware, after that it had to find users wanted to use it and go to each site negotiating resource access. HH wanted to understand if moving to the cloud, the relationship would be the same. SN answered that moving to cloud, there are different mode of operations: 1) users have money, then it can purchase resources from public/commercial sector, 2) users do not have money and expect to access public funded resources (institutional allocation, national allocation, EGI-level allocation). SN clarified that the situation slightly changes but not fundamentally. HH said that if users have their own resources, want to share them in EGI if they get access to extra resources, otherwise they would compute at home. TF said that many user communities have different models working in parallel: contribute resources and access opportunistic usage of somebody else resources; TF said that the added value is the capability to federate resources across sites. SN said that EGI enables user communities to access resources part of their collaboration in a uniform/consistent way. If users want from EGI free access to more resources, this is not sustainable. HH reported that research communities they talked to want to run their science, they are not interested in federation. SN explained that by using federation, they can reach out remote resources. HH said that one problem of users is that they found difficult to acquire resources from the distributed resource providers, is EGI be able to support on this in the future? SN reported on the federated allocation and provision process.

SS reported on SAGA a similar experience to IGE; SAGA worked to get technology inserted, then to bring users, then to work with NGIs. SN said that at the moment EGI is very demand driven and makes it difficult to make something happen. EGI.eu has no resources to install Globus, SAGA etc. to build community around. The strategy to deal with this has been to have TPs dealing with NGIs and it is understood that for TPs coming from outside, it is difficult to engage. SJ said that just demand driven is not enough, but needs some leadership to be combined. SJ visibility is not like credibility, SJ suggested to introduce a process to separate credible components from non-credible components.

HH said that now they have users and want to bring into EGI (VERCE, DRIHM). TF reported that VERCE project at the moment is not asking for more resources, many of their partners are part of EGI. They are defining the software interfaces. TF said that technology should provide new functionalities and easy to be deployed. The win-win situation is to have a user community with emerging requirements, and a technology providing the functionalities for that. This worked with QSG but did not work much with Globus. For technologies with redundant functionalities, it is more difficult and at the end are infrastructure providers who select what software components to install. EGI has provided different occasions to promote the software. HH said that DHRIM is very active in their testbed and want to move to EGI soon (***see Actions 18/10, 18/11***).

## EGI support models for Technology Providers

## Implementing the new TCB

Discussed the current TCB ToR (***see Actions 18/12, 18/13***).

AM asked what happens if TCB does not work as expected. AM suggested e.g. to revise the strategy of MoU+SLA as this makes people feel to be committed. AM said that there are many options, it should be simpler, give a clear message that EGI wants to collaborate with everybody. AM suggested two levels: 1) commitment with return, 2) best effort with no return. Communities want to reach the technology providers, if they do not engage with EGI because they see the MoU/SLA barrier, then they may bypass EGI. EGI should be the aggregator point.

## Implementing the new URT

BK said that this is important, it should be frequent and open. One option could be run for 3 months in inclusive mode. TF said that Peter Solagna will be the chair. BK suggested that Cristina Aiftimiei could co-chair Peter as many products are from EMI and Cristina is already the contact point of many PTs. At the end of June/beginning of July, EGI.eu will run a TCB meeting that will evaluate how to move forward (***see Action 18/14***).

# AOB

Closed the meeting 15:30

# 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; 16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/01 | ~~EMI/BK~~  EGI/PS | To get in touch with submitter of requirement 881 to clarify what this is about  14/12: 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; 16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 14/16 | EGI/AK  EGI/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> ; 08/03: some discussion happened, work in progress; 16/04: work in progress; HH reported that now GO can be used with SRM | OPEN |
| 14/19 | SAGA/AY | Provides an analysis about if/how SAGA can fulfil the requirement #1203  14/12: remains open; 31/01: work in progress; 08/03: work in progress, SAGA to be contacted (see ***Action 17/01***)  16/04: have been contacted, they want to collaborate | OPEN |
| 16/04 | GS | Develop high-level overview for those who wish to start using platform  08/03: GS to investigate in the minutes to understand what platform should be considered as the action is not clear  16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 16/12 | TF | Check that an SSM2 production server is available in due time in due time before the release of EMI-3  08/03: work in progress  16/04: APEL team said that they will provide an SSM2 production instance, stay open | OPEN |
| 17/01 | EGI/SN | Contact SAGA representatives about action 14/18  16/04: work in progress | OPEN |
| 18/01 | EGI/MD | Check if #3329 can be marked as delivered | NEW |
| 18/02 | EGI/MD | Check which EMI tickets can be moved from planned to delivered | NEW |
| 18/03 | EGI/TF | Establish support infrastructure within EGI for Puppet | NEW |
| 18/04 | EGI/TF | Ensure that activities around config management will align among EGI, MeDIA and HEPIX | NEW |
| 18/05 | EGI/TF | Prepare a survey to understand who is still using GLUE 1 | NEW |
| 18/06 | EGI/MD | Pick up a cloud site for certification | NEW |
| 18/07 | EGI/MD | Understand what changes are needed in AppDB to publish the VM metadata and the related delivery time for implementation | NEW |
| 18/08 | EGI/MD | Discuss with the FedCloud team what is the possible technical solution to provide a VM marketplace (OpenStack, StratusLab, in-house, …) | NEW |
| 18/09 | EGI/MD | Approach product teams that specify shared or direct engagement with EGI.eu (<http://doodle.com/qnw95wwqyps6b73r>) to understand what SLA level want to engage. | NEW |
| 18/10 | EGI/GS | Understand why DRIHM is active in the Globus testbed and why they are not active in the production infrastructure | NEW |
| 18/11 | EGI/GS | Talk to VERCE and understand the plans of using EGI and their needs with Globus | NEW |
| 18/12 | EGI/DM (Damir Marinovic) | Integrate Oxana comment on the new TCB ToR about anybody in the TCB can raise that a TP should be included, to initiate the discussion and then have consensus or voting or EGI.eu staff making the decision. | NEW |
| 18/13 | EGI/MD | Contact the product teams that are willing to join the TCB | NEW |
| 18/14 | EGI/MD | Identify who should be in the expanded TCB/URT mailing lists; send email to explain to people about the trial period of inclusiveness, what they should provide and what they will get back | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi 22.04.2013, revised 03.05.2013

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse
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