



Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Tuesday 9 Aug 2011 - 10:00-16:00
Venue:	Face-to-Face, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/event/501

PARTICIPANTS	2
ACTIONS REVIEW	3
AGENDA BASHING	6
MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	7
ITEMS OF BUSINESS	7
REVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT PROCESS	7
FEEDBACK ON & STATUS OF EXISTING REQUIREMENTS	8
LRMS SURVEY RESULT	8
UCB CONTRIBUTION	8
OMB REQUIREMENTS	8
ACCOUNTING TASK FORCE	9
VIRTUALISATION TASK FORCE	9
STRATUSLAB CLOUDS AND VM RELEASES	9
UPDATE ON RELEASE SCHEDULES & PERFORMANCE	9
EGI CAPABILITIES: INFORMATION MODEL AND INFORMATION DISCOVERY	10
UMD ROADMAP & SUSTAINABILITY	10
AOB	10
DATE FOR NEXT MEETING	11
ACTIONS	12



Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing	Membership
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu CTO	Member & Chair
Tiziana Ferrari[†]	TF	EGI.eu COO	Member
Peter Solagna	PS	EGI.eu Operations Officer	Member (COO deputy)
Gergely Sipos	GS	EGI.eu User Community Support Officer	Member (CCO deputy)
Michel Drescher	MD	EGI.eu Technical Manager	Member
Sergio Andreozzi	SA	EGI.eu Policy Development Manager	In attendance (secretary)
Ales Krenek	AK	EGI DMSU Team Leader	Member
Alberto Di Meglio	AM	EMI	Member*
Steve Crouch	SC	IGE	Member* (deputy)
Andre Merkzy	AY	SAGA	Member*
Cal Loomis[†]	CL	StratusLab	Non voting Member*
John Gordon[†]	JG	EGI Accounting	Observer

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

[†] attended from via telephone



ACTIONS REVIEW

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
03/10	EMI/AM	<p>To provide a list of components for which EMI needs collaboration from EGI sites for scalability testing.</p> <p><i>Document available (see agenda) operations to match up with sites before closing the action.</i></p> <p><i>20/5: TF provided the list to Florida/EMI; they have deadline to participate in it</i></p>	OPEN
03/15	EGI.eu/MD EGI.eu/TF	<p>Explain how EGI software repository can be used by sites for software installation and clarify the sources of software; collect news stories about deploying UMD 1.0 pre-release from operation team and feed to dissemination team to be disseminated at EGI User Forum (merged from 3/19)</p> <p><i>No dedicated document; EMI->UMD; to be discussed in SA2 F2F meeting</i></p> <p><i>20/5: keep it open</i></p> <p><i>09/08: more 1000 downloads, people have found it, we can close it; AM said that some information in the EGI repository website is obsolete, he would like to talk to the responsible person, there are pieces of text copy-pasted from old sources; MD said that the text was reviewed and corrected; SN suggested to email the contact person of the website and escalate to EGI.eu if needed; AM reported about a number of links that point to a top-level page, not specifically to the correct page; AM also recommended to not prefix packages with TP name as it is misleading, it looks like an RPM name and would be better to avoid this</i></p>	CLOSED
03/22	EGI.eu/MD	<p>EGI-InSPIRE D5.4 to be improved to contain a more clear vision on future evolution of UMD Roadmap; add Collaborative Roadmap vision</p> <p><i>20/5: stay open</i></p>	CLOSED
03/25	EGI.eu/MD EGI.eu/SA	<p>To add roadmap for standards adoption in UMD roadmap (probably EGI.eu/MD version D5.4)</p> <p><i>20/5: stay open; TF asked about UMD roadmap and Globus; UMD roadmap defines protocols for info discovery, Globus is going to release IIS which does not provide the identified protocol; SN: should for Globus and UNICORE to publish in BDII or it is acceptable? TF: we should avoid creating islands of information; TF: the UMD roadmap should define a vision in the integration of the info discovery and data; SC clarified that IIS is a site-deployed service</i></p>	OPEN

09/08: keep open and consider also the upcoming Standards roadmap deliverable (D2.12)

03/26 EGI.eu/MD Collect information from technology providers – EMI, IGE & beyond – as to the brokering systems and characteristics/features for UCST; MD to ask UCST a definition of broker system needed by the User Community
20/05: keep open
09/08: need to provide more specific information about what a broker is; MD to ask UCST and then report to technology providers

04/04 EGI.eu/TF To run a survey to understand the weighed interest of batch systems by sites
TF mentioned that this cannot be extracted automatically, need more time
BK stated that NorduGrid run survey on what batch systems are used and which would be interesting to be used; (PBS, SLURM; nobody using Condor)
20/05: keep open
09/08: PS attached to the agenda results of a survey in the requirements section; everybody happy to look at it offline

04/07 All Review communication channels within NGIs (especially large) and their capabilities to properly report to EGI.eu
To be raised at council and PMB
20/05: keep open
09/08: on-going, keep it open

05/02 EMI Document which components have documentation on error messages
20/05: keep it open
09/08: this is embedded in the requirements process so this can be closed

05/06 EMI/BK To provide an email before each TCB meeting containing the new features in the next software components release
20/05: keep it open
09/08: the process to deliver this information is now established and working; AM reported that EMI has also a development tracker which contains features assigned to product team and their status, it is an internal tool containing also an expected delivery date, it is public; TF reported that during the operations meeting which

happens every two weeks, the EMI release manager reports on ongoing developments and upcoming features; Globus sites starting to take part of the infrastructure, it would be nice to have IGE release manager attending; Mattias Ellert (IGE's WP6 leader) mattias.ellert AT fysast.uu.se; IGE has 6-month release cycle

05/07	IGE/HH	To send an XML document example of GLUE 2.0 info as published by the Globus computing <i>20/05: keep it open</i> <i>09/08: keep it open, related to 06/02, 06/09; SN planning to organise a meeting at EGI TF; this may be a third task force to be organised; start organising a mandate in the next two weeks</i>	OPEN
05/08	IGE/SC	To provide a plan for implementation on the information service <i>20/05: keep it open; good input in the discussion on working group for info service</i>	OPEN
05/10	EMI/BK	Send a list of components for which training of user communities can be useful (especially those with a public interface) <i>20/05: keep it open</i> <i>09/08: the Training Marketplace is ready and can promote the training expertise and services of Technology providers. (The marketplace uses EGI SSO based authentication). Added Action 07/13</i>	CLOSED
05/11	IGE/SC	Send a list of components for which training of user communities can be useful (especially those with a public interface) <i>20/05: keep it open</i>	OPEN
06/01	EGI/TF	Open GGUS tickets to EMI to notify which information needs to be fixed in the info service <i>09/08: closed</i>	CLOSED
06/02	EGI/SN	To establish a working group on information discovery to address both short-term and long-term issues related to the info services across the various technology providers	OPEN
06/03	EGI/TF	Ask site managers which stateful services need documentation for upgrade to EMI 1.0 and report to TCB/EMI as integration of ticket 1388	CLOSED
06/04	EGI/MD	Evaluate if it makes sense to establish a working group on logging format to address both short-term and long-term issues related to logging messages across the various technology providers <i>09/08: AM recommended not invent a new standard, reusing existing one; an incremental approach could be to open GGUS ticket</i>	OPEN

		when there is logging problem to fix; SN stated that DMSU could be in the position to provide valuable feedback;	
06/05	EGI/TF	To reopen requirement gathering process and broadcast message as wide as possible to be able to collect existing requirements injected in other systems but never ported into EGI (e.g., CERN savannah)	CLOSED
06/06	EGI/AK	Investigate if DMSU can provide consultancy on LSF 09/08: AK confirms that within DMSU there is no expertise; TF asked to AK about APEL client support; AK said that there is support from DMSU on a best effort basis; DMSU is in contact with APEL developers; AM reported that some component was rejected because EGI did not have expertise to validate; SN said that those components seem not to be widely deployed to trigger sites to become available for staged roll-out; SN proposed to not reject/accept, but to evaluate whether those products should be part of the UMD; TF reported that in the case of LFC with ORACLE backend, SARA volunteers to participate to validation activities; for VOMS with ORACLE backend, CERN was contacted and requested to participate to validation (they are the only site deploying this capability with such a backend) and discussions are still ongoing; SN said to bring them formally in the process	CLOSED
06/07	EGI/TF EGI/MD	TF: Provide a list of priorities for EMI 1.0 MD: to check which can be handled	CLOSED
06/08	IGE/SC EGI/OMB	Provide feedback on which platform are needed for the IGE Globus release; also understand if a working release of IGE with no accounting capabilities can be made available for preview and then solve the accounting issue later 09/08: TF discussed with IGE and they decided to start integration without having accounting because this will take long	CLOSED
06/09	EGI/MD	Evaluate the option to organise a federated information workshop day to raise awareness of importance and clarify the issues on information discovery for Grid/Clouds services, what information to publish, dynamic vs. static information, quality of published data, etc.	OPEN

AGENDA BASHING

No changes requested.



MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the TCB meeting held on 20 May 2011 were reviewed. The minutes were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

Review of Requirements management process

MD presented based on slides available in the agenda page; PS provided more insight focused on the most critical requirements showing critical points and proposed mitigation (see slides); about release dates, AM commented that all the requirements coming from TCB by default are scheduled for the next major release, therefore there is a release date by default; the new features may available before, but they need to go through the whole development process up to packaging and release; status about minor requirements is more visible through the development tracker;

SN asked if we agree having the TCB dealing with big requirements; It has been accepted that only major requirements should go through TCB. Minor requirements (feature requests) should go through GGUS. If a requirement is rejected in GGUS it can still be submitted through TCB. If multiple requirements belong together (need the same solution) then it's better to submit these through TCB. If a requirement with top reaches EMI (i.e. not rejected/returned in TCB/RT) then it will be delivered in the next major release.

It was noted that the prioritisation of requirements submitted via TCB and via GGUS can only happen in EMI and this is an issue for EGI because UCB, OMB, TCB cannot influence this.

PS pointed out that the harmonisation of default port of SRM protocol was endorsed but nobody is following up on the ticket;

MD presented a proposed process to describe the lifecycle of requirements based on slides; discussion around the cost estimation; AM reported that during the EMI review, reviewers pointed out that most of the QA process is very good but not doable for the EMI context (EU project, fixed effort, and sometimes with uncommitted people); they recommended to be more realistic and to not promise anything that cannot be reasonably achieved; AM said that the cost statement from EMI is “we can do it for next major release” or “we will evaluated after next major release”; GS said what about requirements from GGUS, if you have 100 of them; AM said that they consider only the first two levels of priorities;

Discussion around what does it mean that a requirement is endorsed by the TCB; for AM, endorsed means that it went through costing and if he endorses, then he feels committed to deliver; SN: endorsed if there is an agreement within the EGI community;

SN suggested to change “Costed” to “Assessed”; discussion around costing in order to choose what to implement; (see **Action 07/01**)



SAGA clarified that the project has no finite lifetime, finite resources, planning cycles approx. 3-month cycle

Feedback on & status of existing requirements

LRMS Survey Result

PS presented LRMS usage survey; the number of sites is greater than the number of reporting sites because some site is managed centrally; SN asked about the number of cores covered by Torque; in general SN would like to see the number of cores covered by the various LRMS; TF stated that Slurm is mainly used by Nordic countries so they are covered by ARC CE. (See **Action 07/02**)

UCB Contribution

GS presented a document, topical ticket; submitted to the in July TCB;

REQ#2022: AM reported that EMI has a plan for a common data management API; endorsed, but to clarify if it is a requirement or a bug to be submitted for GGUS; AM pointed out that this requirement will be solved by design; SN proposed to split the bucket container between access control and DMS scalability; The “DMS scalability” requirement (with ticket 916, 919, 922) can be set to endorsed, the other one (with ticket 2022, 917, 924) only after UCST confirms that this is a request for new feature and not a bug in the gLite data management services.

OMB requirements

PS presented the requirements based on the document; concerning high availability (HA), AM said that “all services” may be too wide, some service may not need it; CREAM HA is part of EMI2, CREAM LB to be checked; ARGUS HA part of EMI2; MD reported that FTS is being redesigned to achieve higher scalability; AM said that CERN is working on FTS3, but this is not sure to be part of EMI’s portfolio;

For MyProxy, IGE re-deliver it; (see **Action 07/03**)

#1983: AM pointed out that, in general, the improving of error messages is endorsed; LCAS/LCMAPS will be soon phased out since they will be replaced by ARGUS; TF asked about timeline for phase out; AM said that this info is not yet available; integration of EMI components is in progress, as soon as most of the components will integrate it; it is reasonable to think that this will not happen before EMI 3

#2280: requirement from Operations Manager of CERN; not a technical requirement, more a sustainability issue; providers for LSF wanted to go into EMI; out of scope for TCB, this is not a technical requirement; need to clarify if CERN wants to drop support for this (see **Action 07/04**)

#1673: out of scope for TCB, file as GGUS ticket



#2677: out of scope for TCB, file as GGUS ticket; split info service request from exposing the info

#2695: addressed by one of EMI tasks

There are tickets waiting from answers, clarify what are bugs, what are requirements

#1202: TCB endorsed that logging should be comprehensive, etc.; uniform logging format across middleware is a different issue;

#918: GS said that the status with users is mixed: just pilot, pilot and brokering, just brokering, no pilot jobs

Accounting Task Force

SN stated that there is need for more coordination across TPs on providing/fulfilling requirements; three areas have been identified, one of this is accounting task force; SN presented proposed mandate, duration, expected output and members;

SN asked if use cases discussed during the last year accounting workshop can be presented in EGI TF and ask endorsement from the EGI community; some discussion led to a revised document; GS asked if the usage of resources by applications fall in the mandate of this task force or not;

The EGI Operations Officer will do the coordination of this task force

After modifications, mandate endorsed by TCB (see **Action 07/06**)

Virtualisation Task Force

TF commented that use cases should be distributed to a wider community; SN remarked that they were presented at the User Virtualisation Workshop and that at the EGI TF they can be given another round of publicity; AM asked about what “actively participating resource centre”, after a discussion this was clarified and will be explain better in the task force mandate.

After modifications, mandate endorsed by TCB (see **Action 07/07**)

StratusLab Clouds and VM Releases

CL presented slides on cloud and grid integration; TF asked about impact on I/O intensive application of virtualisation; AM wondered about activities on automated deployment; independently from EMI, many sites are experimenting new configuration tools (e.g., puppets), in order this to happen, he foresees the need for more pressure/coordination; automating configuration is an important aspect that should be considered by the virtualisation task force; CL commented that what is needed depends on what the deployment model is; another issue is the contextualisation;

Update on Release schedules & performance

MD provided a report based on the slides; AM commented that during the verification of VOMS for Oracle 2.2.0, the person performing it made lots of questions about Oracle and seemed not to have



enough skills; discussion around level of expertise required to install a component and about how many EGI sites need this component;

EMI SLA: AM pointed out that the term SLA in the slide is misleading; furthermore the use of “product” is not correct; product is WMS, the slide should refer to “product releases”;

AM reported that the EMI and EGI repositories are managed in a different way; this leads to installation problems of packages; especially, the set up during EGI verification is different from the one of the official release, thus leading to installation problems when a dependency is changed. This aspect needs to be further investigated and fixed. (see **Action 07/08**). Discussion on SLA monitoring in EMI (see **Action 07/9**)

EGI Capabilities: Information Model and Information Discovery

TF presented based on slides; she started discussion about Globus IIS and possible solution for IGE; should IGE consider integrate with EGI information service; suggest to concentrate on GLUE 2.0; AM stated that at the moment ERIS (<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EmiJra1T5TaskForceERIS>) is not meant to be a new service, it is a task force working on consolidation; there is the idea of separating service registry from dynamic information; SN mentioned about the Globus approach of having a central information service; possibility to organise a meeting at the EGI TF.

UMD Roadmap & Sustainability

MD presented based on slides; discussion around slide titled “possible evolution”; the borderline is the commitment to maintenance, not the source; there is a trend on moving from custom software to more generic software; AM asked why MyProxy is considered part of the user community while ARGUS is generic;

AM remarked that since most of the components are from EMI, this process looks like making assumption about EMI sustainability; SN explained that it is an attempt to identify trajectories; AM perceived confusion about responsibility, the responsibility of EGI is to find the communities who want to use the software; SN agreed that the trajectories are in the EMI domain, the attempt is to understand them; GS found this a very interesting taxonomy, but EGI should focus on placing the components at the present;

Because of lack of time, not all slides were discussed; the information is in D5.4, everybody is welcome to read and contribute;

AOB

a) Status assessment of IPv6 compliance activities carried out by the Technology Providers

SN reported that the last allocation of IPv4 addresses raised interest from OMB; AM stated that the dynamic behaviour of the software was never tested; (see **Action 07/10, 07/11**); SAGA does not support it; if IPv6 support is a requirement, they will address it;



b) Discuss and agree the process of assignment of ETA to middleware tickets in GGUS

EMI SLA metrics are about time to get ownership of the ticket, that means assigning to a person of the product team; the assignment means that it is recognised as a bug and there is commitment to fix it although the time to solve is not stated; for security issues, there is some estimation;

In GGUS there are 4 priorities; the two lowest will not be considered by EMI for the current release; product teams work as follow: if they do not have new features to develop, they solve level 1 and 2, then can go to 3 and 4; so far, they never had the time to go to 3 and 4; SN remarked that a reviewer commented about the steady increase of bugs and this is due to this approach; it would be useful to identify a terminal state for those tickets (see **Action 07/12**); AM suggested that the priority should be assessed by DMSU because there is a danger that a bug is not properly assigned the right priority.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 17:25.

Date for Next Meeting

To be planned for a week before/after the EGI TF; Doodle: <http://www.doodle.com/ygu3hrxu322i9c7f>



ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
03/10	EMI/AM	To provide a list of components for which EMI needs collaboration from EGI sites for scalability testing. <i>Document available (see agenda) operations to match up with sites before closing the action.</i> <i>20/5: TF provided the list to Florida/EMI; they have deadline to participate in it</i>	OPEN
03/25	EGI.eu/MD EGI.eu/SA	To add roadmap for standards adoption in UMD roadmap (probably EGI.eu/MD version D5.4) 20/5: stay open; TF asked about UMD roadmap and Globus; UMD roadmap defines protocols for info discovery, Globus is going to release IIS which does not provide the identified protocol; SN: should for Globus and UNICORE to publish in BDII or it is acceptable? TF: we should avoid creating islands of information; TF: the UMD roadmap should define a vision in the integration of the info discovery and data; SC clarified that IIS is a site-deployed service 09/08: keep open and consider also the upcoming Standards roadmap deliverable (D2.12)	OPEN
03/26	EGI.eu/MD	Collect information from technology providers – EMI, IGE & beyond – as to the brokering systems and characteristics/features for UCST; MD to ask UCST a definition of broker system needed by the User Community <i>20/05: keep open</i> <i>09/08: need to provide more specific information about what a broker is; MD to ask UCST and then report to technology providers</i>	OPEN
04/07	All	Review communication channels within NGIs (especially large) and their capabilities to properly report to EGI.eu <i>To be raised at council and PMB</i> <i>20/05: keep open</i> <i>09/08: on-going, keep it open</i>	OPEN
05/07	IGE/HH	To send an XML document example of GLUE 2.0 info as published by the Globus computing <i>20/05: keep it open</i> <i>09/08: keep it open, related to 06/02, 06/09; SN planning to organise a meeting at EGI TF; this may be a third task force to be</i>	OPEN

<i>organised; start organising a mandate in the next two weeks</i>			
05/08	IGE/SC	To provide a plan for implementation on the information service <i>20/05: keep it open; good input in the discussion on working group for info service</i>	OPEN
05/11	IGE/SC	Send a list of components for which training of user communities can be useful (especially those with a public interface) <i>20/05: keep it open</i>	OPEN
06/02	EGI/SN	To establish a working group on information discovery to address both short-term and long-term issues related to the info services across the various technology providers	OPEN
06/04	EGI/MD	Evaluate if it makes sense to establish a working group on logging format to address both short-term and long-term issues related to logging messages across the various technology providers 09/08: AM recommended not invent a new standard, reusing existing one; an incremental approach could be to open GGUS ticket when there is logging problem to fix; SN stated that DMSU could be in the position to provide valuable feedback;	OPEN
06/09	EGI/MD	Evaluate the option to organise a federated information workshop day to raise awareness of importance and clarify the issues on information discovery for Grid/Clouds services, what information to publish, dynamic vs. static information, quality of published data, etc.	OPEN
07/01	EGI/MD	Revised Requirement Lifecycle document and circulate in the TCB	NEW
07/02	EGI/PS	Provide the number of cores managed by each LRMS	NEW
07/03	IGE/SC	Contact the MyProxy dev team to discuss if/how they can meet the requirement from OMB on High-Availability	NEW
07/04	EMI/AM	Check with CERN if #2280 CERN wants to stop support of the providers; depending on the answer, EGI to check list of sites supporting LSF and verify who is available to support them	NEW
07/05			DELETE
07/06	EGI/PS	Set up mailing list and wiki for accounting task force	NEW
07/07	EGI/MD	Set up mailing list and wiki for virtualisation task force	NEW
07/08	EGI/MD	Discuss within SA2 the issue of multiple repositories and the impact of splitting components between them (e.g., see problem with ARC and BDII)	NEW
07/9	EGI/SA	Verify what need to be changed in GGUS to enable SLA monitoring	NEW



EMI/AM			
07/10	EMI/AM	Report to OMB the support of IPv6 of the various components;	NEW
07/11	IGE/SC	Report to OMB the support of IPv6 of the various components;	NEW
07/12	EMI/AM EMI/AM	Discuss a new state for level 3,4 bugs which are not addressed to avoid steady increase of open bugs	NEW
07/13	EMI/BK IGE/HH SAGA/AM	Technology Providers should register their training capabilities and training services in the EGI training marketplace	NEW



Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi, 01.09.2011

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse

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.