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**1. Minutes from the last meeting**

**None**

**2. Notes from the meeting and RT actions**

**Wiki**

Tidy up the wiki structure and content responsibilities. (RT=92)

**Website**

Who will be adding content?

SN: Dissemination Officer will look at this when she starts mid July. If there is info you wish to add then let the AMB know.

**SA1 – Tiziana**

O-E-5 Grid operations oversight (COD) to move from Task 8 to Task 7 to be closer to O-N-5 ROD (effort needs to move)

Workflow needed of GGUS services (task 6) to task 7 services. (RT=102)

**Discussion Points**

*Q. Which CAs can be supported by the EGI infrastructure*

A: Discussion at the EGI Council, meeting in September with EUGridPMA (RT=103).

*Q: New NGIs not existing in EGEE ROC. Who authorizes the creation of a new NGI that is part of the EGI collaboration, what is the procedure?*

A: 2 categories – countries that want to join the infrastructure as part of GOCDB. Others that want to join the EGI council formally. For these there is a procedure for this being agreed. For the others, this needs to be thought about – how much do the Council want to support these if they are not contributing to the costs?

Political validation: Council

Technical validation: COD – procedure needed for this.

SN to think about how to include new NGIs that don’t want to be part of the Council. (RT=104) Should everyone be able to join?

Technical validation procedure needed by COD. (RT=105)

*Q: Existing policies – security policies now need approving after being updated.*

A: EGI Security Policy Group is the same as the EGEE Security Policy Group (chaired by Dave Kelsey). Procedures for approving security policies are the same as before. By default, all NGIs are deemed to agree with the security policies.

*Q: What boards need to approve the new policies eg operational policies?*

A: JSPG (now SPG in EGEE) in EGEE the TMB would rubber stamp JSPG polices rather than discuss in depth. WLCG management board provided the same function. Operations Management Board is the first place for this in EGI. Should also inform the User Community Board and Technical Coordination Board as well.

Detailed discussion takes place in the Security Policy Group, other bodies are informed but do not have a detailed refining process. Workflow is needed. Record in the ToR document (MS206).

*Q: All EGEE operational policies need to be update eg removing references to EGEE.*

A: Should all be collected and available and put on website/wiki (Tiziana – RT=106)

*Q: USAG new mandate to be defined. What scope as well as GGUS? VO management tools, VO dashboards*

A: MS206 will establish the mandate and from that decide who is best to be the chair. Also need to supervise work of have MPI, Ganga/DIANE, workflows etc in SA3. Single point for the user community to feed in their requirements.

JS: Ganga bug tracking (in Savannah) currently prioritized by a group at CERN.

TF: In order to make SA3 common services of general interest to different VCRs, input from many and additional communities is needed and USAG can facilitate the exchange of requirements.

SB: USAG looks at the bigger picture – which tools to bring in, which bugs to prioritise.

*Q: Transition of the EGEE Resource Allocation Group eg VO validation and supervision of deregistration, who keeps the signed copy of the VO Operations policy.*

A: Need to look at the VO lifecycle – being looked at by SB, how they relate to the VRCs. VOs could reregister every year to ensure that they are still active. Important that the VO keeps in touch about achievements, needs, need to formalize this – as a tool? Talk to Steven. (RT=107)

Q: How the operations relate to the software providers eg who notifies about updates ready for deployment?

A: Mario taking the lead on this which will be recorded in MS402.

**JRA1 – Daniele Cesini**

Just one main issue common to all the development teams raised at the jra1 kickoff meeting: need a clear and well defined workflow for new requirements and for their prioritization. The proposal is that the OTAG group will be responsible for the collection and prioritization of new requirements/features requests – no objections raised to this - Daniele to write a proposal for the workflow – action open on the rt jra1-queue

**NA3 – Stephen Brewer**

Two key words are community and coordination.

*Q. John Gorden – who do user communities go through for middleware requirements? Straight to the middleware providers for existing products?*

A: This is what the team will do. Starting point is the User Community Board. Communities recognized as a VRC wil be invited to join the UCB. Will be a channel for requirements. UCB could take a view on what it seems as the top priorities, then this is sent to the TCB for discussion with the external middleware providers. TCB is the clearing house and middleware providers will be represented there. Could also formulate your request through GGUS to get on the UCB agenda, for example. Will be recorded and prioritized to be pursued or not.

*Q: Suppose we identify a new user community with its own middleware etc. Who helps them find an NGI to run through?*

A: Not only do we have to enable a VRC with its own middleware to run on the infrastructure, but also GLOBUS and UNICORE. Need to think about how to deliver services – could be through virtualization, VO choose what services they want to run on their VMs. ESFRIs do not want to use gLite because it doesn’t do what they want and/or they’re not comfortable. So have to be able to support multiple middleware stack on the production infrastructure.

*Q: John Gordon. Do the ESFRI communities actually have their own middleware stacks, or do they want a portal which could run anything?* A: Varies from community to community.

*Q: Do the new communities have their own sites already that they want to join to the infrastructure?*

A: Could set up a partitioned infrastructure like this, with some sites running GLOBUS etc.

**SA2 – Steven Newhouse**

*Q: What do we do with support for the batch systems and MPI in GLOBUS?*

A: Looking to sign an SLA with the IGE project. Can also work with EMI to encourage them to find NGI sites that will support these.

**SA3 – Jamie Shiers**

*Issues*

Kick start WP

User community coordination

*What do we need?*

* Remote participation possibilities (audio and video) (RT=95)
* Clarity on procedures (wikis, mailing lists etc) (RT=108)
* D&M formal procedures & timelines (MS101)
* Liaison with NGIs and international coordination
* Completion of formalities (contract) to permit hiring.

*Meetings and presentation*

For internal meetings – upload slides to InDiCo.

For wider circulation presentations – upload the slides to the DocDB or the URL.

*EGI TF 2010*

Suggest to ask each task and subtask to present an update but then schedule extra sessions for other projects to present as well eg Envirogrids (as the SA3 tasks fill all the available slots on their own).

Q: Task leaders meetings? How often? Useful?

**NA2.3 Policy – Sergio Andreozzi**

No issues raised.

**Project Management – Catherine Gater**

Q. Deadline for the PPT details?

A. 16 June – remind people!

**Collaboration – Steven Newhouse**

No issues raised.

**Events – EGITF 2010 – Rob van der Meer**

Project meetings

Topical meetings eg operations, community, technology, training, security.

No issues raised.

**Discussion session – Steven Newhouse**

No issues raised.