Date: 25th October 2010

Place: Thon Hotel, Brussels Centre.

Agenda: https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=149

Participants	Representing
Alberto diMeglio (AdM)	EMI
Balazs Konya (BK)	EMI
Helmut Heller (HH)	IGE
Steve Crouch (SC)	IGE
Tiziana Ferrari (TF)	EGI.eu - Operations
Steve Brewer (SB)	EGI.eu - Community
Steven Newhouse (SN)	EGI.eu
Sergio Andreozzi	EGI.eu
Michel Drescher (MD)	EGI.eu - Technology
Michael Gronager (MG)	DMSU – SA2

1. Meeting Opens

AdM: Can EGI represent the Users?
SN: Yes, we have input from the Users Community and the operations people. Having direct representatives does not scale.
AdM: WLCG might feel itself underrepresented as it feel itself as major user community.
AdM: What do "UMD Capabilities" really mean? EMI feels it has not been officially presented or run through its semantics.
SN: UMD Roadmap has no prioritization at the moment, and we can spontaneously run through the definition of capabilities.

2. Role of the TCB

AdM: I am missing representatives of the other DCIs, have they not been invited?
SN: The focus of this meeting is delivery, particularly of TechProviders that distinctively deliver Software (in the classic sense).
BK: So StratusLab is currently your only envisioned provider for Cloud technology?
 SN: Certainly, from EU-funded projects, but there may be activity in the US, such as EUCALYPTUS, or commercial providers such as Platform, VMWare, etc.
SN: Yes there is a gap between requested capabilities in the UMD Roadmap, and actually "enlisted" Technology Providers in that field.
MG: Why does it have to "come in"? It is already there, you can grab it!
SN: At the moment the notion is that UMD is that "take it from that repository"
BK: Main difference is that UMD roadmap covers EGI community developed software and EGI roadmap is "all"?
SN: Yes, although, broadly, UMD links to those providers that EGI has more influence on -- EGI

Roadmap defines what we have to live with, UMD Roadmap defines the components within that environment that we can control.

AdM starts a discussion about the notion and definition, and consequences of components that once were UMD Roadmap components but are pushed out into the EGI Tech Components space.

SN: Summary, it is mainly a switch of control and maintenance picture, not who effectively maintains that component in which space.

3. The role of SA2 in the TCB

MD shows a template for use cases selection

SC: should we have a "scope" field? to understand to which context the requirement applies to (e.g., one middleware, many middlewares)

4. The EMI Roadmap

BK presents EMIs plans on developing EMI's middleware

SN: To what extend was the decision of EMI not being responsible for "everything" from the middleware consortia?

BK: That was a distinctive decision taken during the preparation of the project.

SN: What about YAIM?

BK: YAIM is not part of EMI, rather standard/generic installation methods native to the distribution is used.

BK: EMI does not deliver any configuration mechanisms other than what's provided by OS distribution.

BK: any component in EMI will have their own configuration mechanisms, though EMI will provide configuration mechanisms.

AdM: OS conferment configuration must be delivered, anything on top is Product Team specific.

TF: What is reactive?

AdM: EMI will react on specific requests, instead of acting proactively.

TF: How does EMI develop phase-out plans?

BK: Product Technical Board decides which components will be phased out when. Components will be evaluated as to be phased out, investigated for phase out, or not being phased out within 3 years.

AdM: As of now no components, at least major components are considered for phase-out.

SN: EMI will take only mature code bases as input. How does EMI see long-term innovation happen?

BK: EMI is only a 3 year project, so there is not much time and effort available for long-term innovation.

AdM: Innovation, if any, will happen only in specific areas, such as Clouds.

BK: There will be no ground-shaking innovation, though.

SN: Does that mean that those 11 components marked for phase out will not be in EM-1?

BK: No, they will be in EMI-1, but most likely not in EM-2

SN: Does the EMI Service Registry replace BDII?

BK: No, it is more ????

TF: What is a service container?

BK and others: A mechanism to run one or more services in a controlled environment.

TF: Is EGI allowed to disclose the information in the deliverable DNA1.3.1

BK: The document is not yet in external review, so in about a month the information will be public.

SN: Is the implementation of the common job submission based around public standards?

BK: No, this is based on EMI-internal agreement.

SN: What are EMIs process of documenting the internal agreements?

BK: This will most likely be done via technical notes within EMI.

BK and others: Agreement, or to agree, in this context means that the agreement is internal, but the topic of the agreement (e.g. OGF UR) may be anything ranging from open standards to internal not yet disclosed interfaces.

SN: #9 in the Data Area is a client topic, but why is dCache not included?

BK: Because dCache is using the same protocol for the backend service.

SN: #12, storage space accounting?

BK: Yes, it accounts how much storage has been used, and needs to be accounted for (for the user being billed)

SN: Security areas #1, what notion of common attributes are envisioned?

BK: The details are known by the Security Area leader, John White

SN: Security #7 Is this Hydra?

BK: Yes.

BK and others: Yes, messaging will replace LDAP between resource and local BDII

SN: "Grid in a Cloud" - in a close collaboration with StratusLab?

BK: yes.

TF: Information providers (whichever MW) are part of EMI?

BK: Yes.

SN: Which level of project objectives are these?

BK: Full project objectives.

SN: Consolidation plans for the infrastructure and security that late in the project, not affected by earlier effort?

BK: No, we are sure that this will not be the case.

SN: Outreach, what is your plans in terms of internal only or external also?

BK: Libraries worth spread over more than one area or product, as much as possible.

SN: Agreement surely happens before releasing in April 2010?

BK: Yes we are working on the agreements, and the release of (e.g. Execution Service interface) it/them will happen in April 2010.

TF: Storage Accounting, is that in the first year supported?

BK: No, it is scheduled for the third year.

SN: What is your process around this roadmap?

BK, AdM: This is our current understanding, so changes are possible except for the first year.

SN: In essence, this means new features may not be release until April 2012?

AdM: Essentially yes, unless it is small requests that do not break backwards compatibility

DSA1.2 Software Release plan

SN: Is it alright to email out the links to the documents in the reference section in the presentation within the TCB mailing list?

AdM: Yes, TCB is alright.

5. The IGE Roadmap

- IGE started this month, no answers to all questions. Went through UMD Roadmap, v.3 Information system: we cannot say nothing so far; we will investigate IIS: new Globus info system; http://www.ci.uchicago.edu/wiki/bin/view/IIS/WebHome GLUE 2.0, plan to cooperate for new requirements discussion around information vs. monitoring; should be use.
- Middle 2011: support BES; GridWay will be an IGE product.
- OGSA-DAI is there.
- Metadata catalogue: globusonline.org; there will be a globusonline.eu.
- File transfer: GridFTP can be a limit for certain clients; plans to work on LTA (kind of SAML-based dropbox) Goal: being able to move data in/out the Grid using a notebook and no need to run GridFTP server.
- File transfer scheduling: GridFTP server performs restart; no clear about use cases from EGI, needs clarification.
- Parallel jobs: Gram5 supports MPI
- Credential management: Shibboleth is spreading in Germany; What is the real requirement for kerberos? SN: do not remember at the moment
- User management: VOMS capabilities will be taken by EMI. Idea of using AdHoc as GUI front-end to VOMS for VO management.

6. Requirements collected in EGI

SB presented the relationships between user communities organised in VRC/VO with EGI
AdM: wanted to understand how the community can be represented/are actually represented; how do you handle competing VOs which do similar research and do not want to share?
SB: EGI can collect requirements and feed technology providers.
TF described the collection of requirements for operations; discussion move to how sites part of EGI and using Globus should be considered in EGI. What kind of commitments about operations?
SN: NA3 brings requirements from user communities, SA1 from operations, so they are represented in TCB.
AdM: is concerned about to receive correct requirements; this is a shift since initial design of TCB; if the process works, then fine.
SN: if the requirements do not satisfy the users, it is not your fault.
AdM: how to manage requirements that we may get out-of-band from this process? I'd like to find a way to merge these.
SN: mechanics of the process around this; all of us are getting requirements; danger is that we are going to the same people asking the same questions
MG: questionnaires do not give visibility on who is filling them, maybe not all are reached.
SN: Propose to send out regularly, e.g. every month, properly branded questionnaires.
AM: composition of community, services used, platform used, happiness about services; initial wish was to have some result from QR2, in 5 days; now I'll try to have by QR3.

7. Requirements collected by IGE

SC: IGE representing needs of Globus community in EU
TF: From the slide seems that IGE could be a VRC representative for the Globus user community
SN: The only objection is about not having a technology-based VRC
MD: Would like to see a way to measure when a requirement is fully met
SN: UMD Roadmap is mainly to set up the areas of discussion; then these can be used
SC: Discussion around requirements collected by IGE; These can be derived from the UMD Roadmap.

8. Updating the UMD Roadmap

SN: Next update is at month 9 (Jan 2011). Will be revised to incorporate input from today + input from revisions of internal documents of EMI/IGE. Will include components from EMI/IGE, interfaces, etc.
MG: During CHEP, last week, there was the issue about support of XROOTD.
AdM: The three storage services in EMI support in some form this; this example is a typical case of how do we manage an out-of-band requirements; EGI did not received yet formally but we got it from WLCG.
SN: We should consider seriously requirements.
BK: What about virtualization? Capabilities are mentioned in the UMD roadmap.
SN: Issue about batch system support?
AdM: If a batch system is supported by a computing service, this will stay; what we do not deliver is the batch system package itself, such as Torque.
TF: To send a list of essential probes used for monitoring to EMI; if some is related to a certain product team, the PT should take care of it; this can go in EMI-1 release if the requirement is provided soon.
TF: Mentions about sysadmin wanting that Grid services should have/maintain a log for at least 3 months.
HH: in Germany, you cannot store data about a person for more than 1 week;
SN: to ask to SPG

9. AOB

HH: How often we meet f2f? I'd prefer videocalls for budget reasons.
SN: We can alternate; quarterly f2f; we adjust the agenda deepening on the type of event (f2f vs. telecon).

Actions:

01/01: EGI.eu: Which distributions should we build on and which packaging formats need to be supported?
01/02: EGI.eu: What are the supported standard interfaces.
01/03: EGI.eu: Next version of the UMD Roadmap will reflect dependencies between capabilities.
01/04: EGI.eu: Origin of Kerbros in UMD Roadmap.
01/05: EGI.eu: UMD Roadmap needs to include interactive job management capability.
01/06: EGI.eu: Explore option of a VRC for the European Globus Community Forum.
01/07: IGE: Circulate links to roadmap documents when they become available for comment.

01/08: EMI: Circulate links to roadmap document when they become available for comment.

01/09: EMI: Provide more information on the planned support for particular security attributes (i.e. converge with eduPerson?)