



Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Thursday 20 January 2011 - 10:00-16:00
Venue:	Amsterdam, The Netherlands
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/event/268

<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>AGENDA BASHING</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>ACTION REVIEWS</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>ITEMS OF BUSINESS</u>	<u>6</u>
RELEASE SCHEDULES	6
CMD LINE PARAMETER HARMONISATION	7
EMI REPOSITORY CHANGES	7
REQUIREMENTS UPDATE	7
SOFTWARE DEPLOYMENT	8
UMD ROADMAP AND STANDARDS	9
SLAS WITH TECHNOLOGY PROVIDERS	9
AOB	9
<u>DATE FOR NEXT MEETING</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>ACTIONS</u>	<u>10</u>



Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing	Membership
Steve Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu CTO	Member & Chair
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI.eu COO	Member
Stephen 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)
Henrik Thostrup Jensen	HJ		Observer
Michael Gronager	MG	EGI.eu DMSU Team Leader	Member
Aberto di Meglio	AM	EMI	Observer*
Balazs Konya	BK	EMI	Observer*
Helmut Heller	HH	IGE	Non-voting Member*
Steve Crouch	SC	IGE	Non-voting Member* (deputy)

* will become non voting member after signing MoU and voting member after signing SLA



AGENDA BASHING

- AM asked if there is a slot which could include how the new software coming out will be advertised to the community; to be discussed in Software Deployment

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the TCB held on 6 December 2010 were reviewed. MD remarked that a Technology provider becomes voting member after signing MoU and SLA. After this addition, the minutes were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

ACTION REVIEWS

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
01/01	EGI.eu/TF	Which distributions should we build on and which packaging formats need to be supported? <i>Three days ago EGI Operations launched a survey covering software components like L&B and gLite cluster; in the survey it was added a question related to what are the relevant OS which should be considered by EGI; by 8 Feb 2011, results will come and will be later provided to EMI/IGE through TCB; (Actions 03/01 and 03/02); AM will show later results of EMI survey where</i>	CLOSED
01/02	EGI.eu/MD	What are the supported standard interfaces? <i>Will be provided in the updated in the afternoon slot and is included in the next revision of the UMD Roadmap</i>	CLOSED
01/03	EGI.eu/MD	Next version of the UMD Roadmap will reflect dependencies between capabilities <i>Done in the current draft of UMD Roadmap, will be showed in the afternoon slot</i>	CLOSED
01/05	EGI.eu/SB	UMD Roadmap needs to include interactive job management capability <i>SB to check if this came up in MS305 and if so identify who we can work with in order to develop it; on-going investigation</i>	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 <i>Stay open</i>	OPEN
01/07	IGE/HH	Circulate links to roadmap documents when they become available	CLOSED



for comment.

*HH circulated a document showing releases of IGE for the next 6/9 months; AM asked about VOMS support while SN asked about the GUI for VO management; HH explained that the GUI will be based on AdHoc generic GUI, SN would like to have more info about interoperability with generic VOMS and Globus-specific one (**action 03/03**)*

01/09	EMI/BK	Provide more information on the planned support for particular security attributes (i.e. converge with eduPerson?) <i>BK provided input from EMI, a solution is still under investigation even though the identified attributes seem to be the best candidate</i>	CLOSED
02/01	IGE/HH	To share a roadmap document for at least the coming 6 months stating the planned development activity <i>Information provided</i>	CLOSED
02/02	EGI.eu/TF	Collect operations requirements for UMD and contribute to MD for the next UMD Roadmap iteration <i>The survey will provide input</i>	OPEN
02/03	EMI/BK	Prepare a report on harmonization for command line parameters and error messages across the three middleware; plan for implementation in EMI1 and EMI2 (due a week before the next TCB) <i>Input provided</i>	CLOSED
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) <i>Input provided</i>	CLOSED
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) <i>Input provided, to be discussed under release schedule</i>	CLOSED
02/06	EMI/BK	To provide a list of bug that will be fixed planned to be fixed in EMI1 <i>Input provided, but AM commented he does not think this is the best way to provide this information</i>	CLOSED
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	OPEN



stability)

On-going investigation, SB will circulate before next TCB; AM would like to understand the trend in using WMS, if CREAM becomes widely deployed and enabling direct submission, user communities may be their own workflow on top; AM commented that we should balance request from users together with a model we may want to propose and push

02/08	EMI/AM EGl.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 <i>EMI has provided the required information. The migration plan will be discussed with TF and tracked in Action 03/20.</i>	CLOSED
02/09	EMI/AM	Send to MD the EMI contact person expert for the repository <i>AM provided as contact person for QA and release manager Cristina Aiftimiei</i>	CLOSED
02/10	EMI/AM	To provide the list of software components which will loose YAIM support in EMI1 <i>AM clarified that all components using YAIM will continue to use YAIM; components not using YAIM before will not start using YAIM;</i>	CLOSED



ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Release Schedules

Release schedule for EMI

AM explained that EMI as release of components evolving on the same timeline is not a correct vision; each component has a different release schedule, not EMI as a whole; EMI provides snapshot releases every year as a checkpoint; between every two release, each component evolves according its own schedule; MD commented that the model is similar to Linux distributions; SN commented that EGI needs a release schedule for each component – no such document has been released yet for EMI 1.0; AM said EMI is starting the collection of new requirements which will be used for the preparation of the new technical plan; after that, there will be an implementation plan which will contain the release schedule of the components (implementation plan to be released in June 2011); AM said that requests for improvements can be asked via GGUS tickets continuatively (bug functionalities, minor improvements); AM reinforced the need for a proper tracking tool, SN answered that an agreed tool was put in place for EGI; EGI tracker-> GGUS ticket;

Release schedule for IGE

IGE provided a live document containing the release schedule for their 6-month cycle. IGE will provide information on their requirements deadline (**action 03/04**); BK asked if the releases are official Globus releases or IGE; HH said they are IGE releases;

Globus deployment figures

TF observed that according to the ongoing survey, there are discrepancies on figures in the adoption of Globus; NGIs report different feedback than the one reported by IGE; SN said that it seems people to whom IGE talk to are not well connected to NGIs, so different feedback may come from the same country; (**action 03/05**)

IGE, Globus and EPEL

AM asked to HH if IGE plans to release Globus-modified components to EPEL; in general, interest to understand the relationship between IGE release, Globus and EPEL; (**action 03/06**);

UMD release dates

BK asked about UMD Roadmap and dates; SN said that UMD Roadmap is very much dependent on EMI/IGE roadmap, without a clear plan from its providers, it is not possible to make realistic planning; about UMD 1.0, and its relationship to and EMI 1.0; UMD 1.0 is expected one month later than EMI 1.0

UMD roadmap and vision

AM was expecting to find in UMD Roadmap a plan for a year in advance and long-term view vision based on DCI collaboration roadmap; SN said there in this phase the goal is to align with work with two technology providers, that is why a clear planning from them is important; moreover, there is a separate



deliverable that will trigger discussion on virtualization and input in UMD Roadmap; at the next TCB, StratusLab will probably be invited as well

CMD line parameter harmonisation

EMI viewpoint

EMI presented a work-plan and is fully committed within the constraints of EU projects; BK clarified that harmonization is very complex because there are several middleware included in EMI and inventory will start in March 2011; SN asked if there will be a minimum standard on command line (like all supporting -h); AM discussed about cost/benefit and said that effort limited and full harmonization is not possible, therefore more specific requirements would be useful; SN said there is a positive message for UCB to report to user communities – file specific bug reports/feature requests; a survey will start and users should provide specific requests on what part of command lines and related software components need to be fixed; AM said to SB that specific requests submitted via GGUS tickets are very welcome (**action 03/07**);

IGE viewpoint

SC said that the IGE document provided includes only 3 commands; will be expanded later; HH said that a harmonization plan agreed among EMI/IGE would be better before starting doing the real work; MD mentioned that Linux Standard Base provides a lot of guidelines

Error messages

BK said they are more complex than harmonization of CMD parameter harmonization.

EMI Repository changes

Multi-platform support

AM showed slides; EMI1 targeted at SL5 (all 64bit, some also 32bit) but individual components can support more platforms; in general, platform support is a major change therefore a clear message from users is important and they should understand the effort that their requests can require; gLite 3.2 is for SL4/64bit (some component supports 32bit, e.g., WN, UI); gLite packages for Debian were released during EGEE but never tested; EMI is missing consistent requirements; HH said that LRZ typically uses SLES (SuSe Linux Enterprise Server) with no possibility of migrating to SL5; SA said that virtualization could mitigate the need for support of multiple platform (e.g., edge services can be deployed via VM, functionalities like WNoD can also mitigate at the job level); main concern is probably client applications

Repository

AM went through slides

Requirements update

EGI requirements tool



SB distributed a printed paper describing the new requirements gathering tool set up by the USCT; AM commented that the current set of requirements added in the tool were covering a wider scope than what needed by the technology providers and wished to see an easy way to access those specific to them (**action 03/08**, when TCB queue get a new item, EMI will put into their GGUS and update the related TCB tickets when there are progress); HH asked if the software providers should access the system or the TCB would provide a list; SN goal to provide direct access;

Requirements from Operations

TF presented slides about operations requirement; MG explained that he does not like survey because it is difficult to run them in a proper and useful way; SB agreed on that, they are an initial step and should provide input to then go back to people and drill down for more details; (**action 03/09, 03/10**);

Software Deployment

MD showing slides related to the UMD Quality Criteria document (**action 03/11**); AM asked what happens 1 May, after EMI 1.0 has been announced; there will be always a gap between the release of a new component and the announcement; EMI certifies the software before public announcement; EGI will performs a second certification afterwards; what does happen if people start download from EMI repository? SN answered that starting from 1 May, after EMI 1.0 release, SA2 will go through verification process; MD asked if it is possible to have snapshot or pre-releases to train EGI certification workflow; (**action 03/12, 03/13, 03/14**);

Training on software deployment

EGI is not funded to provided training, nevertheless a training group was created; there is the need to understand what to provide to the training group; (**Action 03/15, 03/16**); SN observed that in the next EGI User Forum, there are requests for training for gLite/UNICORE/ARC software, but not explicitly for EMI 1.0 training; 5 training sessions from EMI, but branded per middleware (**Action 03/17, 03/18**)

Migration/publicity: we need to understand maturity of repository, what will be part of UMD, feedback from operation team in interest in deploying the new software (**action 03/19**)

Software documentation

TF asked about software documentation; AM answered that all product teams have to release documentation in PDF with common style and there is quality assurance process for the documentation; TF would like to track the status of documentation through TCB mailing list updates;

Software support

AM explained the EMI support strategies through releases; e.g. CREAM 1.7 will be in EMI 1.0; if EMI 2.0 contains CREAM 2.0 and if CREAM 1.7.1 is released meanwhile, when a problem on CREAM 1.7.0 arises, the site first will be asked to upgrade to CREAM 1.7.1 and if the problem persists, action will be taken to fix (**Action 03/20, 03/21**)



UMD Roadmap and Standards

MD presented slides; AM asked about how do standards translate into requirements to EMI; SA observed that we first need to clearly understand the starting point, that is what are the supported standards in the current components; BK asked about who provide certification for standards compliance (**action 03/22, 03/23, 03/24, 03/25**)

SLAs with Technology Providers

MD summarized that MoU out of the way, SLA ongoing negotiation; with EMI some open issue about support plan; IGE does not have its own SLA template, so they will fall back on EGI template;

AM clarified that for EMI, SLA is important as enabler to build a stable SLA-based relationship; after EMI, the plan is to add financial part for support; this is part of the current sustainability plan; SLA had to be constructed; AM trying to involve commercial partners

AOB

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 16:00.

Date for Next Meeting

To be held by telephone 28 Feb 14:00-17:00

Next F2F meeting potentially first week of April



ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
01/05	EGl.eu/SB	UMD Roadmap needs to include interactive job management capability <i>SB to check if this came up in MS305 and if so identify who we can work with in order to develop it; on-going investigation</i>	OPEN
01/06	EGl.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 <i>Stay open</i>	OPEN
02/02	EGl.eu/TF	Collect operations requirements for UMD and contribute to MD for the next UMD Roadmap iteration <i>The on-going OMB survey will provide input</i>	OPEN
02/07	EGl.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) <i>On-going investigation, SB will circulate before next TCB; AM would like to understand the trend in using WMS, if CREAM becomes widely deployed and enabling direct submission, user communities may be their own workflow on top; AM commented that you can ask people what they want, but also you can push a model; (action 03/26 to collect information from technology providers – EMI, IGE & beyond – as to the brokering systems and characteristics/features);</i>	OPEN
03/01	EGl.eu/TF	Communicate to IGE/EMI results of survey related to which OS and which packaging format for software are required by user communities (originated from 01/01)	NEW
03/02	EGil.eu/SB	Communicate to IGE/EMI which OS distributions are required by user communities to be supported for their applications (originated from 01/01)	NEW
03/03	IGE/HH	Provide information about interoperability of the AdHoc-based GUI for VOMS with generic VOMS and Globus-specific VOMS	NEW
03/04	IGE/HH	Circulate a slide with deadlines for considering requirements in IGE release schedule	NEW
03/05	IGE/HH	HH to identify the sites that are running Globus; pass the list to TF to check with NGIs if there are communication issues	NEW



EGI.eu/TF			
03/06	IGE/HH	Will Globus-modified IGE components be released into EPEL? What is the relationship between the Globus release and IGE-modified Globus components? Are changes going to be retrofitted into Globus? How will new Globus releases be integrated into new IGE releases?	NEW
03/07	EGI.eu/SB	Go back to user communities about better error messages request and ask for specific requirements, not just generic issues	NEW
03/08	EGI.eu/SB	Extend the requirements tool to be able to tag and search requirements for TCB; two queues are suggested: TCB and TCB-candidate	NEW
03/09	EGI/MG	Provide an analysis of issues emerging from operations besides bug fixes	NEW
03/10	EMI/AM	Provide a list of components for which EMI needs collaboration from EGI sites for scalability testing	NEW
03/11	IGE/HH	Provide contact points for IGE regarding Release Management, Release tooling support and Quality Assurance.	NEW
03/12	EMI/CA EGI.eu/MD	Cristina Aiftimiei and MD to pick up component from EMI and test the workflow from GGUS ticket to complete EGI certification; the goal is to test the process	NEW
03/13	EGI.eu/MD	Collect repository structure information and evaluate the changes needed by EGI Software Repository structure in order to support EMI/IGE distributions	NEW
03/14	EGI.eu/TF EMI/AM	Define what services should advertise in the information service the information of which distribution they are part of (e.g., "EMI 1.0")	NEW
03/15	EGI.eu/MD	Explain how EGI software repository can be used by sites for software installation and clarify the sources of software	NEW
03/16	EGI.eu/SB	Investigate training requirements related to new EMI 1.0 release	NEW
03/17	EMI/AM	To investigate clearer branding around EMI Training sessions at the User Forum	NEW
03/18	EGI/MG EGI.eu/MD	Interact with GRNET to have proper information about repository and plan for when it will be ready	NEW
03/19	EGI.eu/TF	Collect news stories about deploying EMI 1.0 pre-release from operation team and feed to dissemination team to be disseminated at EGI User Forum	NEW
03/20	TCB	Define migration strategies from EMI 0.X to EMI 1.0	NEW



03/21	EMI/AM	Prepare official slides plan for documentation, support for release, repository info as official statements; release strategy EMI X.0 and intermediate releases; evaluate if can be presented to be presented at new week's OMB.	NEW
03/22	EGI.eu/MD	EGI-InSPIRE D5.4 to be improved to contain a more clear vision on future evolution of UMD Roadmap; add Collaborative Roadmap vision	NEW
03/23	EMI/BK	Provide information about what are the supported standards by EMI components	NEW
03/24	IGE/HH	Extend the release roadmap to include supported standards by each component	NEW
03/25	EGI.eu/MD	To add roadmap for standards adoption in UMD Roadmap (probably version D5.4)	NEW
03/26	EGI.eu/MD	Collect information from technology providers – EMI, IGE & beyond – as to the brokering systems and characteristics/features for UCST.	NEW



Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi, 24.01.2011

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newshouse

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Copyright © EGI.eu. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

The work must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: "Copyright © EGI.eu (www.egi.eu). Using this document in a way and/or for purposes not foreseen in the license, requires the prior written permission of the copyright holders. The information contained in this document represents the views of the copyright holders as of the date such views are published.