Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Thu 26 September 2013 – 10:00 - 15:15
Venue:	Face to Face, Amsterdam
Agenda:	http://go.egi.eu/TCB-20
Minutes prepared by:	Christian Bernhard, dCache.org

1 Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing	Membership	Presence
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu Director, CTO	Member, Chair	Yes
Michel Drescher	MD	EGI.eu, Technical Manager	In attendance	Yes
Peter Solagna	PS	EGI.eu, Operations Manager	Member, COO deputy	Yes
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI.eu, Chief Operations Officer	Member, COO	Yes
Gergely Sipos	GS	EGI.eu, UCST	Member, CCO deputy	Yes
Catherine Gater	CG	EGI.eu, Deputy Director	Member, Director deputy	Yes
Ales Krenek	AK	EGI DMSU, CESNET	Member	Yes
Matthias Hemmje	MH	University Hagen, Professor	In attendance	Yes
Balasz Konya	BK	Nordugrid	In attendance	Remote
Cristina Aiftimei	CA	INFN	In attendance	Remote
Helmut Heller	HH	EGCF	In attendance	Remote
Steve Crouch	SC	EGCF	In attendance	Remote
Tomasz Piontek	TP	PSNC	In attendance	Remote
Maria Allandes Pradillo	MP	INFN	In attendance	Remote
Christian Bernhard	CB	dCache.org	In attendance	Yes

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting were circulated via email and approved.

2.1 Minute taking rota

The following table indicates, in order of appearance, the duty to take minutes in the TCB. For each TCB meeting the minute taker moves her/his name to the end of the table including the TCB meeting number. Only members (or candidates) of the TCB, except the chair, have the duty to take minutes.

Name	Affiliation	Last TCB minutes
Helmut Heller	EGCF	
Mariusz Mamonski	PSNC	
Steven Crouch	EGCF	
Peter Solagna	EGI.eu	
Tiziana Ferrari	EGI.eu	
Ales Krenek	EGI DMSU, CESNET	
Tomasz Piontek	PSNC	
Gergely Sipos	EGI.eu	
John Gordon	STFC	
Stuart Pullinger	STFC	
Balasz Konya	Nordugrid	
Zdenek Sustr	EGI DMSU, CESNET	
David Wallom	OeRC	
Bernd Schueller	FZ Juelich	
Cristina Aiftimei	INFN	
John White	CERN	
Andrea Ceccanti	INFN	
Patrick Fuhrmann	dCache.org	
Michel Drescher	EGI.eu	TCB-19
Christian Bernhard	dCache.org	TCB-20

3 ACTIONS REVIEW

Note: Actions were reviewed at the end of the meeting (see agenda); however it is recorded here for continuation of the minutes structure.

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
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 17/06: No response from SAGA. SN concludes that EGI.eu needs to review SAGA's representation in the TCB (see **Action 19/08**). 26/09: SAGA did not participate in the last meetings and seem dormant. The SAGA WG at OGF declared itself dormant during the meeting collocated with the EGI TF2013 in Madrid. SN proposes to close this action and to remove SAGA from the TCB membership. Participants discussed clear distinction between members and discussion partners, which led to maintaining two mailing lists (see **Action 20/01**).	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
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 17/06: work in progress 26/09: The referenced platform is the EGI Cloud Infrastructure Platform. Relevant information is available on the EGI website and the EGI wiki.	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
17/01	EGI/SN	Contact SAGA representatives about action 14/18 16/04: work in progress 17/06: No progress (see also **Action 14/09**) 26/06: Closed as per discussion of Action 14/19	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
18/03	EGI/TF	Establish support infrastructure within EGI for Puppet 17/06: work in progress 26/06: Followed up at TF2013 and further discussed at OMB on 27/09.	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED

18/04	EGI/TF	Ensure that activities around config management will align among EGI, MeDIA and HEPIX	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
		17/06: work in progress; HEPIX Working group contacted but no reply so far.	
		26/09: Contact established and activities synchronised	
18/05	EGI/TF	Prepare a survey to understand who is still using GLUE 1	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
		17/06: work in progress; results indicate that WLCG as a whole relies on GLUE1 (see **Action 19/09**)	
		26/09: Survey completed and analysed, results discussed as part of Items of business	
18/08	EGI/MD	Discuss with the FedCloud team what is the possible technical solution to provide a VM marketplace (OpenStack, StratusLab, in-house, …)	~~OPEN~~ CLOSED
		17/06: work in progress; the task members consider endorsing the vmcatcher/vmcaster framework.	
		26/09: The EGI AppDB is currently implementing this functionality.	
18/11	EGI/GS	Talk to VERCE and understand the plans of using EGI and their needs with Globus	OPEN
		17/06: A number of MoU iterations were circulated; signature is imminent.	
		26/09: MoU is drafted on EGI side, waits for VERCE response. SCI-BUS based gateway used to access HPC resources via Globus toolkits. HH states that EGCF would rather prefer directly integrating with the EGI federated Cloud infrastructure.	
19/01	EGI/MD	Include QA and QC processes for Service Providers in the discussed document.	~~NEW~~ OPEN
		26/09: No progress	
19/02	EGI/TF	Circulate a table specifying the response time service level numbers and mappings to the TCB	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
		26/09: Email sent right after TCB-19	
19/03	EGI/MD	Clarify the compulsory use of GGUS in section 4.3 in the discussed document	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
		26/09: Draft includes the clarification, but not circulated yet.	
19/04	EGI/MD	Clarify in name the differences between the two different Community Platform types.	~~NEW~~ CLOSED
		26/07: Proposed names are: "Virtualised Community Platform" (using only EGI Fed Cloud), "Integrated Community Platform" (using only EGI Core Infrastructure) and "Hybrid Community Platform" (using both)	

19/05	EGI/all	Investigate where the Gridsite component might be re-used as well	~~NEW~~
		26/09: Gridsite is also used in the EGI Federated Cloud infrastructure. Other usage unknown.	CLOSED
19/06	EGI/TF	Follow-up on STFC's technical support levels.	~~NEW~~
	STFC/AP	26/09: Completed, support levels are changed in GGUS.	CLOSED
19/07	~~EGI/TF~~	Follow-up the described technical limitations with the Operations Portal team.	~~NEW~~
	EGI/PS	26/09: Issue discussed about certification of cloud sites; New version of GOCDB released, handling of test sites changed. Remains open and assigned to PS	OPEN
19/08	EGI/MD	Collate all existing information on cooperation and collaboration (including SLAs, procedural cooperation etc.) into a single document	~~NEW~~
		26/09: The new proposed document structure will be an MoU template ready by mid-October.	OPEN
19/09	EGI/SN	Review SAGA's representation in the TCB	~~NEW~~
		26/09: See **Action 14/19**; SAGA will be removed from the TCB member's list.	CLOSED
19/10	EGI/MD	Include in TCB-20 an agenda slot about phasing out Glue 1.	~~NEW~~
		26/09: Done, see Items of Business	CLOSED
19/11	EGI/MD	Establish a rota for minute taking and the candidates for that.	~~NEW~~
		26/09: Done, rota established and included in the minutes template.	CLOSED
19/12	EGI/MD	Include in TCB-20 a discussion about broadening the TCB scope towards a cross-Infrastructure technical coordination body.	~~NEW~~
		26/09: Done, see Items of business	CLOSED
19/13	EGI/MD	Investigate feasibility of collocating TCB-20 with EGI TF2013	~~NEW~~
		26/09: Done; was not feasible therefore meeting scheduled for 26/09.	CLOSED

4 AGENDA BASHING

No changes to the agenda were proposed

5 ITEMS OF BUSINESS

5.1 Workshop: EGI and Technology Providers

5.1.1 Setting the scene

MD set the scene re-using the slides prepared for the TPDL 2013 panel on e-Infrastructures (https://indico.egi.eu/indico/materialDisplay.py?sessionId=7&materialId=1&confId=1751). Summarising, Technology Providers need to decide which EGI User Communities they want to target, and with which (or by being part of) Community Platform. PS then continues talking about potential modules and contents of a Technology Provider MoU for future collaboration (https://indico.egi.eu/indico/materialDisplay.py?sessionId=7&materialId=0&confId=1751).

Meeting participants discuss whether there are any means to pay the volunteers; SN states that some effort is available, so some activities may be funded but some will not. There might be funding available for integrating new technologies in the EGI production infrastructure, SN continues, for example QCG. Funding sources are discussed; SN states that that is not part of the current EGI-InSPIRE proposal. Instead, new project proposals focusing stronger on innovation may be a possibility. 2015 would be the earliest point in time given the current EC timeline. Site and product mapping for Staged Rollout will be better defined, however with more unfunded Staged Rollout and less funded Staged Rollout. HH states that that, even though a great idea, did not work out for IGE as the coordination of EGI in the end did not help much. SN acknowledges that there was and perhaps still is a problem of achieving a critical mass to convince sites to deploy and stage rollout a product.

Meeting participants discuss the distinction of 2nd and 3rd level support, and how the current 2nd level support in EGI could evolve. Participants explain that for some products, 2nd and 3rd level support are effectively the same. Participants further briefly discuss a proposal to dedicate a small fraction of FTE to a small team to manage the 2nd level support. BK asks for the definition/distinction of 2nd and 3rd level support; PS states that 2nd level support investigates problems and identifies whether the root cause is a bug or not. PS continues that 3rd level support is mainly about fixing bugs.

BK continues asking whether there will be funds available for 3rd level support. SN answers that funds may be available for core EGI services, but not for higher-level services. In that context, participants quickly establish that dCache is considered a resource access service, not a higher-level service.

SN briefly summarises the concept of EGI Technology Champions. This programme is open only for individuals, not institutes or collaborations. EGI may support Technology Champions with travel and meeting subsistence, but not salary. Training to Technology Champions may be part of such a funding scheme.

BK asks for the exact requirements for Product Teams. PS replies that the products must be compliant with EGI's Quality Criteria, and that quality assurance reports are required and regularly collected. BK further asks for the situation in Staged Rollout; PS answers that in this context Quality Criteria verification is more important; Staged Rollout may be driven by both EGI and Product Teams. PS further clarifies that integrating with EGI's software provisioning process means that the software will be exposed as being included in the repository of validated software (i.e. the UMD).

5.1.2 Discussing collaboration and service level targets

MD recaptures the existing taxonomy describing the collaboration between EGI and Technology Providers (https://indico.egi.eu/indico/materialDisplay.py?sessionId=9&materialId=0&confId=1751).

Briefly summarised:

Technology Providers (TP) may act as:

- Product Team (PT),
- Platform Integrator (PI),
- Service Provider (SP)

The collaboration between EGI and a TP may be classified as:

- Community,
- Contributing,
- Integrated (staged rollout and QCs mandatory)

TPs may commit to the following service level profiles:

- Unspecified – No commitment whatsoever
- Best effort – Covers all service level targets, but no guarantees on any commitment.
- Base
- Medium
- Advanced – represents the service levels that were established with EMI and IGE
- Extended
- Premium

HH observes that EGCF is not listed as a Technology Provider. TP mentions that PSNC is not listed, either. During the lunch break, MD updated the slides reflecting this.

SN introduces a new Technology Provider in attendance; Matthias Hemmje (MH) representing University of Hagen, Germany. MH describes the expertise and involvement, summarised as follows:

- Participating as funded partner in the SCIDIP-ES project
- Supports preservation of earth preservation data
- Packaging and persisting metadata (including persistent identifiers)
- Expertise on data and tools for data representation
- Prepares for moving into H2020 with its portfolio

TF asks whether there is any relationship between EUDAT and SCIDIP-ES, MH states that there is none so far.

BK requests a clarification of Product Team vs. Platform Integrator. Participants discuss and clarify that a Platform Integrator maintains connection to dependencies, manages all concerning this, no external dependencies are maintained within EGI repositories they are all packaged with the product.

BK further states that an integrated collaboration level previously did not mean a must for staged rollout. He also states that the step between contributing and integrated is very high. SN: There were thoughts about PTs doing their own staged rollout? MD answers that the final slides now include the statement "or equivalent". BK further states that the service level definition changed. In the displayed definition Nordugrid could be classified as providing premium support.

CB asks whether there are numbers mapped to the different levels of support. TF answers yes there are; currently GGUS implements "Base", "Medium" and "Advanced" (see slides, #5)

5.1.3 Evolving service level targets

MD explains that, currently, only "Ticket response time" is defined as a service level target. MD presents four new potential service level targets:

a) **Ticket solution time**
   This proposal attempts to indicate how well TPs are providing support. It assumes that any ticket should be closed in a reasonably short time, and that actual bugs should be tracked in separate tickets.
   Participants decided to postpone this potential service level target until at least April 2014.

b) **Software Quality Assurance**
   This target indicates how well Technology Providers adhere to EGI's Quality Criteria. This information is already collected as part of the EGI Software Provisioning process and was provided to EMI and IGE as part of the service level management meetings.
   Participants decide to include software quality assurance as an additional service level target. (see **Action 20/02)**.

c) **ETA accuracy**
   This metric is already implemented in GGUS and is actively used as a means of informal service level management.
   Participants decide to include software quality assurance as an additional service level target. (see **Action 20/03)**.

d) **Training**
   This service level target came up as a suggestion from BK during the discussion of service level target profiles.

SN suggests to include an open content section "Other" where TPs may indicate other services that are not formalised. This section may include training services, TP-provided test-beds (e.g., for alpha testing)

SN appoints MD to provide these changes in a new MoU template for Technology Providers by mid October.

5.1.4 Technology Provider plans for H2020

TF asks Technology Providers for their future plans, seeking potential collaborations for future funding calls for H2020.

PSNC (QCG platform):

- iRODS support
- Continue cooperation with EUDAT through the MAPPER project

Nordugrid (ARC platform):

- HPC Cluster support
- HEP clusters - ARC tower service
- Windows GUI
- Usage record for Jura(?)

TF asks BK whether SRC continues to support OGF Execution Service (ES). BK replies that the EMI specification for ES is much more advanced than ARC's ES which implements about 90%. Nordugrid plans to further expand its support for ES.

SN interjects that strategic plans are needed, covering e.g. user needs, benefits for users of the current developments, etc. This should be more centered on the requirements that are gathered rather than having only development plans in place.

INFN (PT for a HTC platform):

Currently, INFN can only commit to maintaining current product portfolio; new features and further development will need to be covered through project funding.[1]

EGCF (TP for Globus Toolkit):

- Continue basic support for UMD as promised
- Move towards EGI cloud platform with Globus appliances to address feedback from communities: we need more Globus sites in EGI!
- Globus Online: sharing

HH states that EGCF will continue to provide support for all released products, at least until April 2014. For the future (and H2020) EGCF plans to concentrate on Globus appliances (virtual machine images with pre-installed Globus toolkit components) for EGI's federated cloud, as the uptake of Globus components in the UMD by resource providers within EGI was not satisfactory in the past.

Software descriptions (fact sheets) for EGCF software can be found at the following locations:

---

[1] https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=9&resId=5&materialId=0&confId=1751

- http://www.egcf.eu/showcases/
- http://www.egcf.eu/software/
- http://www.egcf.eu/maintaining-the-egcf-software/

TF states that project level collaborations should drive innovation; a requirements gathering campaign should be started. TF proposes a workshop in November that will involve the User Communities. The details of this workshop should be discussed in the next few days (see **Action 20/05)**.

To further the collaboration with TPs, and extending the service portfolio, MD asks Technology Providers for fact sheet and other material for products and services provided by Technology Providers. Participants agree that fact sheets exist for products coming out of for EMI and IGE.

5.2   Evolving the TCB

BK opens the discussion stating that there should be one forum in Europe that brings together the TP in Europe. Related to that would be the e-IRG (e-Infrastructure Reflection Group).

MD shows a proposal coming from the EIROforum detailing a proposal for a User Community Forum (https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=8&resId=0&materialId=0&confId=1751).   SN states that a similar activity could be founded for technology providers; conducting regular meetings, but outside EGI. A document would have to be formulated similar to that, but focusing on Technology Providers.

Meeting participants further discuss how to approach this. SN states that the EGI TCB cannot satisfy the needs of such a Technology Provider forum; however agrees with BK and MD that such a forum is needed. MH states that have two boards (bodies) one gathering requirements and talking to the community the other gathering the TPs and then bridging the gap between both. HH encourages that EGI should take the challenge and set up such boards.

SN concludes the discussion that even though a forum is needed no one is volunteering to take on developing such a proposal for Technology Providers.

TF, in a final question asks where the MEDIA initiative led to, and was provided with the link http://mediasw.org.

5.3   Retiring GLUE-1

TF   presents   current   state   of   discussions   in   the   OMB   based   on   slides (https://indico.egi.eu/indico/getFile.py/access?sessionId=6&resId=0&materialId=0&confId=1751).

End of May 2014 is planned to stop publishing GLUE1 information; this requires extensive testing of user community tools. This will be organized via the UCB (see **Action 20/06)**.

6 AOB

6.1 Date of next meeting

A Doodle poll will be circulated post-meeting; TCB-21 is expected to take place around beginning of December.

With no further items of business to discuss, the TCB-19 meeting concludes at 15:00 CEST.

7 OPEN ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
18/11	EGI/GS	Talk to VERCE and understand the plans of using EGI and their needs with Globus 17/06: A number of MoU iterations were circulated; signature is imminent. 26/09: MoU is drafted on EGI side, waits for VERCE response. SCI-BUS based gateway used to access HPC resources via Globus toolkits. HH states that EGCF would rather prefer directly integrating with the EGI federated Cloud infrastructure.	OPEN
19/07	~~EGI/TF~~ EGI/PS	Follow-up the described technical limitations with the Operations Portal team. 26/09: Issue discussed about certification of cloud sites; New version of GOCDB released, handling of test sites changed. Remains open and assigned to PS	~~NEW~~ OPEN
19/08	EGI/MD	Collate all existing information on cooperation and collaboration (including SLAs, procedural cooperation etc.) into a single document 26/09: The new proposed document structure will be an MoU template ready by mid-October (see **Action 20/04**)	~~NEW~~ OPEN
20/01	EGI/MD	Provision for a TCB members-only mailing list, and a TCB-discuss mailing list	NEW
20/02	EGI/MD	Develop definition and objectives for a new TP service level target "Software Quality Assurance".	NEW
20/03	EGI/MD	Develop definition and objectives for a new TP service level target "ETA accuracy".	NEW
20/04	EGI/MD	Provide a first draft of the MoU by mid-October	NEW
20/05	EGI/TF	Develop and host a workshop on future (H2020 related) funded collaborations	NEW
20/06	EGI/TF	Inform UCB and other relevant bodies of the final retirement of GLUE-1 by end of May 2014. Organise, through the UCB, testing of user community tools.	NEW