Minutes of Meeting

Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Monday 6 December 2010 - 14:00-17:00
Venue:	Telecon
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/event/225

Participants	Abbr.	Representing	Membership
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu CTO	Member & Chair
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI.eu COO	Member
Steve Brewer	SB	EGI.eu CCO	Member
Michel Drescher	MD	EGI.eu Technical Manager	Member
Sergio Andreozzi	SA	EGI.eu Policy Development Manager	In attendance (secretary)
Gergely Sipos	GS	EGI.eu User Community Support Officer	Observer
Michael Gronager	MG	EGI.eu DMSU Team Leader	Member
Alberto di Meglio	AM	EMI	Observer*
Balazs Konya	BK	EMI	Observer*
Helmut Heller	HH	IGE	Observer*
Steve Crouch	SC	IGE	Observer*

* will finally become voting members when both MoU and SLA will be into force

AGENDA BASHING

- BK proposed to discuss the requirement tool being put in place in EMI and its relationship with the EGI one
- TF proposed to talk about a pending BDII issue and about declared changes in configuration tools for upcoming EMI releases

SN proposed to include all the above items in the "EGI requirements" agenda item.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the TCB held on 25 October 2010 were reviewed.

As integration to the records, BK added that the EMI registration service will be an extra component to be deployed aside the BDII; in the EMI timeframe it is not envisioned that the BDII will be obsoleted because of its many dependencies. No other additions/corrections were reported.

After this integration, the minutes were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

ACTION REVIEWS

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
01/01	EGI.eu	Which distributions should we build on and which packaging formats need to be supported? *EGI.eu does not yet have an official answer, to be provided within 4 weeks*	OPEN
01/02	EGI.eu	What are the supported standard interfaces? *They will be listed in the next iteration of the UMD Roadmap retrofitting work performed in the Standards roadmap http://bit.ly/e4H078 (UMD Roadmap revision scheduled for the end of January 2011)*	OPEN
01/03	EGI.eu	Next version of the UMD Roadmap will reflect dependencies between capabilities *SN clarified that the work is under way and performed by MD*	OPEN
01/04	EGI.eu	Origin of Kerberos in UMD Roadmap. *SN clarified that the indication came from a reviewer of the document. The principle is that the Grid authentication system needs to be integrated with others (e.g., institutional identity providers).*	CLOSED
01/05	EGI.eu	UMD Roadmap needs to include interactive job management capability	OPEN

		SB to check if this came up in MS305 and if so identify who we can work with in order to develop it	
01/06	EGI.eu	Explore option of a VRC for the European Globus Community Forum	OPEN
		SN and the IGE advisory group will meet in January; it will provide an opportunity to discuss it	
01/07	IGE	Circulate links to roadmap documents when they become available for comment.	OPEN
		HH explained that IGE does not have an official deliverable for this information, nevertheless they have a document and they provide insight about it	
01/08	EMI	Circulate links to roadmap document when they become available for comment.	CLOSED
		BK sent the document to the mailing list and then uploaded in the agenda material (http://bit.ly/fM7aDM)	
01/09	EMI	Provide more information on the planned support for particular security attributes (i.e. converge with eduPerson?)	OPEN
		BK told that the document is still in draft, the action will be postponed to next TCB	

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

User Requirements

Discussion around the attached document (http://bit.ly/g90RxQ)

SB reported that the EGI requirement gathering tool and workflow is being implemented; valuable contributions have been already collected and reported under MS305; MD sent to the list as part of the meeting material a concise document containing a table of requirements classified by category and with removed duplications; the conclusions of the document reported three main priorities that EMI should focus on for its future EMI1 release; AM stated that EMI is unlikely to be able to consider these requirements for EMI1 since the development and test plan is currently being finalized and the code freeze is expected by the end of Feb2011; more discussion was devoted in understanding more about the need for harmonization of command line options and GS reported as an example that when submitting a job, for different options can be used to specify the VO, thus causing confusion among users; after more discussion, BK committed to provide an analysis of the provided high-level requirements and what can be achieved in EMI1 and EMI2 (see Action 02/01, 02/02, 02/03, 02/04, 02/05, 02/06).

WMS

SN reported that small communities have problems in operating a WMS due to the complexity of the service therefore asked EMI what are the plans for EMI1; AM stated that the main change will be the support for SL5; TF reported that 150 WMS instances are currently active (among these, 50 are used by CMS and ATLAS) with a throughput of 40K jobs/day per instance; SN reported that if CMS and ATLAS plan to no longer rely on WMS, is it worth to spending effort on its development?; AM appreciated that, anyway given the commitment to release support (see later discussion in obsoleting old software releases by EMI) it is unlikely that support will be dropped during the EMI life; SN asked to run a survey to better understand needs and usage from User Communities (see Action 02/07)

Requirement tools

SB briefly described the plans for the EGI requirement tool which workflow is presented in page 10 of MS305; such a tool will be used for requirements coming from end-users and grid operators; the tool is being implemented to be transparent, thus improving visibility on each other requirements; BK reported that EMI is currently using Savannah for requirements gathering; there is plan to be aligned with the EGI requirement tool but EMI will continue to maintain its internal tool for other parties (e.g., PRACE, OSG).

EMI Roadmap Document

AM described the slides attached to the agenda item; dates for requirements gathering and software releases where explained moreover it was stated that at the end of EMI project, they expect to contribute at least 80% of the client parts core components and major services to the most relevant OS distributions;

How many major software releases are supported by EMI

For each software component, EMI will support the current and previous major versions while obsoleting the former. For instance, if major WMS versions appear in EMI1 and EMI3, but not in EMI2, then with EMI3 the support for the WMS release part of gLite 3.2 will be dropped; on the other side, if major WMS versions appear in both EMI1 and EMI2, then with EMI2 the support for WMS release part of gLite 3.2 will be dropped.

EMI deadline for requirements collection

It was appreciated that EGI was not ready to contribute in time to requirements gathering for EMI1 (deadline Sep 2010) because of the short-term notice and because of the start-up phase of the organization; during the meeting it was clarified by AM that for EMI2, requirements sent by the end of February 2011 will be considered; requirements sent after February 2011 and before the end of April 2011 may be considered; requirements sent after April 2011 will go to EMI3.

At the end of April 2011, EMI will issue a detailed development and test plan for EMI2; a similar document is being finalized for EMI1 and will be shared with EGI as soon as it is available

EMI1, dependencies on software repository and upgrade plans

AM explained that some of the current software components rely in the DAG software repository for installing external packages which are not included in standard OS releases; DAG is not considered anymore a valid solution since has lots of limitations, it is not stable and is not timely updated; all software components in EMI1 will use software packages present in EPEL (http://fedoraproject.org/wiki/About_EPEL); this will mean that software packages may change name and versions, thus raising issues when EMIX software components replace pre-EMI versions; the recommended solution is to install from scratch the EMI software components when they need to replace pre-EMI versions (see Action 02/08);

AM stated that this change has a strong operational impact, nevertheless will bring many benefits in the long term, therefore a positive message should be prepared for Grid operators

Configuration Tools

AM introduced another major strategy change for EMI releases; developers will be motivated to refactor the software files location in the file system in accordance to the best practices in use by each OS; in other words, file should move away from /opt and be moved to the proper locations; another major push will be to use the standard OS ways to configure the installed software (e.g., configuring WMS or StorM should follow the same best practice as configuring MySQL or Apache HTTPD); this means that when the developers will gradually move to the new configuration approach, the support for YAIM will not be guaranteed; TF raised serious concerns from the operations viewpoint; AM reassured that for EMI1 changes are expected only for minor software components; moreover he stated that new services will follow directly the new strategy; TF requested to have the list of software components that are expected to loose YAIM support in EMI1 so that an appropriate training can be planned for the EGI user forum (see Action 02/10)

Standards discussion

Postponed to next meeting for lack of time, an email for items to be discussed was sent to the list during the meeting

EGI requirements

The discussion was carried out within the User Requirement time slot

AOB

SLA Negotiation

MD expressed the wish to start negotiating SLA as soon as possible; concerning the EMI MoU, the final revised version will be sent back to SA and SN after the end of the meeting

Survey

AM wanted to understand what are the plans for the EGI survey as it was agreed to unify EMI and EGI questions into it; he appreciated that this will not be launched before January 2011 and he showed concerns on the urgent need for understating aspects such as the supported platforms required by the community; due to lack of time, SB offered to discuss this topic offline

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 17:00.

Date for Next Meeting

To be held face-to-face in Amsterdam in January 2011, Doodle launched

http://doodle.com/4dccwxx726dxpn72

ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
01/01	EGI.eu/TF	Which distributions should we build on and which packaging formats need to be supported? *EGI.eu does not yet have an official answer, to be provided within 4 weeks*	OPEN
01/02	EGI.eu/MD	What are the supported standard interfaces? *They will be listed in the next iteration of the UMD Roadmap retrofitting work performed in the Standards Roadmap http://bit.ly/e4H078 (UMD Roadmap revision scheduled for the end of January 2011)*	OPEN
01/03	EGI.eu/MD	Next version of the UMD Roadmap will reflect dependencies between capabilities *SN clarified that the work is under way and performed by MD*	OPEN
01/05	EGI.eu/SB	UMD Roadmap needs to include interactive job management capability *SB to check if this came up in MS305 and if so identify who we can work with in order to develop it*	OPEN
01/06	EGI.eu/SN	Explore option of a VRC for the European Globus Community Forum SN and the IGE advisory group will meet in January; it will provide an opportunity to discuss it	OPEN
01/07	IGE/HH	Circulate links to roadmap documents when they become available for comment. *HH explained that IGE does not have an official deliverable for this information, nevertheless they have an document and they provide insight about it*	OPEN
01/09	EMI/BK	Provide more information on the planned support for particular security attributes (i.e. converge with eduPerson?) *BK told that the document is still in draft, the action will be postponed to next TCB*	OPEN
02/01	IGE/HH	To share a roadmap document for at least the coming 6 months stating the planned development activity	NEW
02/02	EGI.eu/TF	Collect operations requirements for UMD and contribute to MD for next UMD Roadmap iteration	NEW
02/03	EMI/BK	Prepare a report on harmonization for command line parameters and error messages across the three middleware; plan for	NEW

		implementation in EMI1 and EMI2 (due a week before the next TCB)	
02/04	IGE/HH	Prepare a report describing the command line parameters and error messages conventions being used in Globus (due a week before the next TCB)	NEW
02/05	EMI/BK	Prepare a summary on how the EMI1 development plans can address the requirements listed in summary document attached to the User Requirements agenda item (http://bit.ly/g90RxQ) in order for the UCB to prepare a positive message to be sent to the users (due a week before the next TCB)	NEW
02/06	EMI/BK	To provide a list of bug that will be fixed planned to be fixed in EMI1	NEW
02/07	EGI.eu/SB	To collect requirements from user communities about job scheduling and WMS (focus on both functional and non-functional; ask if they are happy with the functionalities of WMS and need more stability)	NEW
02/08	EMI/AM EGI.eu/TF	To provide a concrete description of the implications that EMI1 will bring when updating pre-EMI services with regard to the change of reference repository (DAG->EPEL); understand how to mitigate the transition; document to be provided not later than 15/12/2010	NEW
02/09	EMI/AM	Send to Michel Drescher the EMI contact person expert for the repository	NEW
02/10	EMI/AM	To provide the list of software components which will loose YAIM support in EMI1	NEW

Minutes prepared by   Sergio Andreozzi, 08.12.2010

Minutes Approved   TCB Chair Steven Newshouse

_____