



Meeting:	Technology Coordination Board (TCB)
Date and Time:	Wednesday 23 Nov 2011 - 10:00-16:00
Venue:	Face-to-face, Amsterdam
Agenda:	http://go.egi.eu/TCB-9

PARTICIPANTS	2
ACTIONS REVIEW	3
AGENDA BASHING	8
MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING	8
ITEMS OF BUSINESS	8
TCB REQUIREMENTS MANAGEMENT PROCESS	8
EGI REQUIREMENTS	8
TASK FORCE FEDERATED CLOUDS REPORT	9
TASK FORCE ACCOUNTING REPORT	10
TECHNOLOGY PROVIDER PERFORMANCE REVIEW	10
GGUS RELATED PERFORMANCE METRICS	12
(EMI) SOFTWARE DELIVERY INTO EGI PROVISIONING SUPPLY CHAIN	12
DCI SUSTAINABILITY	13
AOB	13
DATE FOR NEXT MEETING	14
ACTIONS	15



Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing	Membership
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu CTO	Member & Chair
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)
Zdenek Sustz	ZS	EGI DMSU Team	Member (deputy)
Balazs Konya	BK	EMI	Member* (deputy)
Helmut Heller	HH	IGE	Member*
Alberto Di Meglio	AM	EMI	Member*
Andre Merkzy	AY	SAGA	Member*
Steve Crouch**	SC	IGE	Member* (deputy)
Matteo Turilli	MT	TCB Federated Clouds Task Force	In attendance
Mario Reale**	MR	EGI-InSPIRE	In attendance
Ming Chao**	MC	EGI Security Officer	In attendance

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

** remote participation for a specific topic

ACTIONS REVIEW

ID	Resp.	Description	New Status
03/26	EGI.eu/MD	<p>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</p> <p><i>20/05: keep open</i></p> <p><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></p> <p><i>23/11: MD collected info and presented through slides; about RT 928, there will be a meeting next 9/10 Feb 2012 (http://www.egi.eu/blog/2011/11/18/joint_workshops_on_e_science_workflows_in_budapest.html); BK said that many user communities are going towards pilot-based applications, this will make many middleware components redundant; SN mentioned that there is a meeting planned in late January to identify what services are needed in the long-term; given the inputs in the presentation, the action can be closed</i></p>	CLOSED
05/07	IGE/HH	<p>To send an XML document example of GLUE 2.0 info as published by the Globus computing</p> <p><i>20/05: keep it open</i></p> <p><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></p> <p><i>29/09: a workshop will be organised on federated information;</i></p> <p><i>23/11: this should be superseded by the participation of IGE in info service workshop at the beginning of December; the action can be closed (https://www.egi.eu/indico/event/654)</i></p>	CLOSED
05/08	IGE/SC	<p>To provide a plan for implementation on the information service</p> <p><i>20/05: keep it open; good input in the discussion on working group for info service</i></p> <p><i>23/11: put on the agenda of the info service meeting in Dec 2011; PS to make sure 05/07 and 05/08 are covered</i></p>	CLOSED

05/11	IGE/SC	<p>Send a list of components for which training of user communities can be useful (especially those with a public interface)</p> <p><i>20/05: keep it open</i></p> <p><i>29/09: work in progress, keep open</i></p> <p><i>23/11: HH re-circulated material collected by SC in the TCB list</i></p>	CLOSED
06/02	EGI/SN	<p>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</p> <p><i>23/11: this will be addressed as follow-up of the info service meeting</i></p>	OPEN
06/04	EGI/MD	<p>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</p> <p><i>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;</i></p> <p><i>29/09: Ales provided info, to be revised</i></p> <p><i>23/11: MD presented slides to support the discussion; BK said that there are two EGI requirements about logging (e.g., common format), these requirements cannot be addressed because changed; AM reported that many users developed scripts that parse logs and this legacy should be considered; SN agreed that we do not harmonise what goes into the message; MD said that configuring log file location and level of logging would desirable to be harmonised in the send of following best practices (see action 09/01)</i></p>	CLOSED
06/09	EGI/MD	<p>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.</p> <p><i>23/11: can be closed thanks to the information service day in Dec</i></p>	CLOSED
07/01	EGI/MD	<p>Revised Requirement Lifecycle document and circulate in the TCB</p> <p><i>23/11: is in the agenda, can be closed</i></p>	CLOSED

07/02	EGI/PS	<p>Provide the number of cores managed by each LRMS</p> <p><i>29/09: PS to investigate; BK asked about how many sites uses what batch systems; PS said that the info is available for those who answered survey, the info was circulated during last TCB (see related agenda page)</i></p> <p><i>23/11: in the agenda; SN reported from SC12 that there is a possibility of a EGI-wide license for commercial PBS</i></p>	CLOSED
07/03	IGE/SC	<p>Contact the MyProxy dev team to discuss if/how they can meet the requirement from OMB on High-Availability</p> <p><i>29/09: the HA should be considered both at local and global level; investigate high-availability vs. high-throughput deployment; HA to be evaluated at the geographical level</i></p> <p><i>23/11: HH reported that for load-balancing, this is OK; as switch-over not easy to do; PS suggested to add those considerations to the RT ticket;</i></p>	OPEN
07/06	EGI/PS	<p>Set up mailing list and wiki for accounting task force</p>	CLOSED
07/08	EGI/MD	<p>Discuss within SA2 the issue of multiple repositories and the impact of splitting components between them (e.g., see problem with ARC and BDII)</p> <p><i>29/09: there is a report</i></p> <p><i>23/11: MD has a draft to finalise by end of week</i></p>	OPEN
07/09	EGI/SA EMI/AM	<p>Verify what need to be changed in GGUS to enable SLA monitoring</p> <p><i>29/09: there will be a GGUS meeting, SA to contact Torsten Antoni</i></p> <p><i>23/11: there was a meeting in Germany to discuss this topic, a roadmap is expected</i></p>	OPEN
07/10	EMI/AM	<p>Report to OMB the support of IPv6 of the various components</p> <p><i>23/11: AM reported that EMI is part of the HEPIX IPv6 WG for a distributed IPv6 testbed (CERN is part as well); problems that could be found in the code are solved and static checks on code are still available in the test system; the testbed will be used to perform runtime checks</i></p>	CLOSED

07/11	IGE/SC	Report to OMB the support of IPv6 of the various components <i>23/11: HH reported that GRAM v5 does not support IPv6 and it is difficult to get it in; he wondered if it is a urgent requirement; SN stated that at the moment only two sites are IPv6; deployment is slowly increasing, would be useful for the Globus team to come up with a roadmap about when they adopt it (should we ask Globus for such an adoption roadmap?)</i>	CLOSED
07/12	EGI/AK EMI/AM,BK	Discuss a new state for level 3,4 bugs which are not addressed to avoid steady increase of open bugs <i>29/09: no progress, BK to talk to AM on the matter</i> <i>23/11: addressed in the agenda, keep open and reconsider after discussion</i>	OPEN Can this be closed?
07/13	EMI/BK IGE/HH	Technology Providers should register their training capabilities and training services in the EGI training marketplace <i>29/09: BK to contact the EMI NA2 team; IGE open; SAGA/AY DONE;</i> <i>23/11: BK reported that two trainings were registered; there was a problem with the interface with EGI marketplace already communicated;</i>	CLOSED
08/01	EMI/BK IGE/SC StratusLab/ CL SAGA/AM	Each Technology provider should circulate a URL to a webpage describing which standards are supported by the developed technology; the page should evolve to contain a description of what component support what standards <i>23/11: SA to create an EGI page with links to the various pages and collect links from TPs (see action 09/15)</i>	OPEN
08/02	EGI/MD	MD to provide links to presentation given at the EGI TF related to the virtualization task force and directions of IGE/EMI <i>23/11: link send to the list</i>	CLOSED
08/03	EGI/TF	Report which NGIs are available to provide IPv6 testbed <i>23/11: PS to circulate the list of NGIs available to provide IPv6 testbed</i>	OPEN
08/04	EGI/TF	Define a scenario testing for IPv6 in terms of what software deployment is desired (e.g., CE? All gLite/EMI?) <i>23/11: to be discussed in the presentation, keep it open</i>	OPEN
08/05	SAGA/AY	Report on which component is IPv6 ready and which not <i>23/11: AY to check if email was sent to TCB list</i>	OPEN



08/06	StratusLab/ CL	Report to OMB the support of IPv6 of the various components	OPEN
08/07	EMI/BK EGI/TF	To investigate how to integrate ARC/Globus info services <i>23/11: topic for the info service workshop</i>	OPEN
08/08	EGI/TF EGI/PS	To provide the list of platforms that need to be supported by EMI for their products; the list specify which products require which platforms <i>23/11: PS to send the results to the list; AM willing to expand the platforms, producing binaries could be possible, the testing costs more; AM suggested to introduce the concept that supporting a platform can be officially supported for a subset of products; SN suggested to wait for the list of required platforms;</i> <i>Action description rephrased to clarify which products require which platform based on BK request</i>	OPEN



AGENDA BASHING

Agenda approved.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the TCB meeting held on 29 September 2011 were reviewed (<http://go.egi.eu/TCB-8>). BK asked to change in page 6 the following sentence “IGE will concentrate on pre-packaged services on VMs while EMI will work on management services for VMs;” to “IGE and EMI will concentrate on pre-packaged services on”. After this change, the minutes were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

TCB requirements management process

MD presented based on slides; BK commented that the new version of the document represents a big improvement, one problem noticed: during the requirement engineering, for each F2F would be nice to have a catalogue of requirements that are filtered out during the requirement engineering as they are useful to EMI; GS said this can be done (*see action 09/02*);

About ‘statement of solution’

BK asked what kind of assessing a requirement is expected by a TP; MD clarified that EGI does not mandate how to assess a requirement, but would like TPs to provide costs or time to solve; AM clarified that EMI is a coordination point among product teams; major requirements have a natural 12-month cycle as it takes time to achieve consensus among product teams; product teams for major things state that cannot; it is discussed and agreed that stating that the TP will not be able to address the requirement is also a statement of solution;

The ‘statement of solution’ should contain a positive statement about cost estimation or time to solve for the requirement or a negative statement about the fact that the requirement cannot be addressed with the motivation

SN: after the discussion, the TCB requirement process was approved

EGI Requirements

PS presented based on slides; there was a discussion about the change of description of a ticket; it is agreed that if the ticket is badly formulated, then this can be modified for clarification; if there is a change in scope, then a new ticket should be created;



AM stated that it should be paid attention to statements such as “YAIM is not fully supported by EMI”; the correct statement is that “YAIM is fully supported by EMI but not all software components rely on it as this not being a mandatory configuration tool”;

SLURM Support

PS informed that SLURM is increasing in adoption replacing Torque where there are scalability problems; PS will run a new survey to understand if sites using CREAM are interested in SLURM support from CREAM; IGE/ARC/UNICORE already support it (**see action 09/03**)

IPv6 – survey results

PS about IPv6, the EGI NetSup is collaborating with HEPIX; MR explained that HEPIX testbed focuses more on HEP applications while EGI more on middleware although some NGI (UK, DE) will provide resources for the HEPIX testbed; at the moment, suggestion is to keep them separated and re-evaluate at the beginning of next year; SN stated that there is more value for NGIs to establish a testbed for both EGI-InSPIRE to test operational tools and also for others (e.g., EMI) to test other software components; AM recollected that the outcome of the HEPIX meeting was that EMI should be encouraged to test components of interest of HEP community; MR wondered if this process means certification; (**see action 09/03**)

Catalogue of Requirements

GS described the CoR (Catalogue of Requirements) attached in the agenda page; BK recommended to add a field “Affected Components” and also a unique identifier;

- First requirement sent back for clarification; GS to check which storage element components are affected (scalability of storage services); BK stated that it is important to clarify always what software components are affected otherwise it is difficult for EMI to troubleshoot the problem
- Second requirement: if a storage get filled up, the middleware should redirect the workload; life science community developed probes; the user should not be faced with the error of a site being filled; this requirement addresses the solution and not only the problem, requires further clarification; GS will contact EMI to elaborate more on this aspect
- Third requirement: endorsed as valid requirement from TCB, EMI will provide the answer

(**see action 09/04**)

Task Force Federated Clouds report

MT presented based on slides; (**see action 09/05**)

AM: 1) tried in EMI to attract security people, for them it is not clear what the security model will be, the perception is that in any case, either there is the need for re-implementing everything from scratch or re-use what is there; when the model will be clear, they are more likely to engage; 2) the perception of people that attended the EMI All Hands meeting session on this activity was that there is no clear



understanding of what users want; Morris Riedel is in charge of EMI Virtualisation strategy, the activity is about understanding what is going on and the engagement needed from EMI;

AM also reported that he received suggestions that EMI should not be involved, instead it should start an independent survey to understand what requirements can be satisfied based on the EMI products; based on that, EMI will try to understand what they can satisfy and if they need more complex action that is not addressable by EMI and that should be delegated to somebody else;

SN wondered if users want to use cloud directly; perhaps no, they want more flexibility on deploying their own software stack; with the current infrastructure, this is not currently achievable;

MT reported that in the UK a lot of money that are channeled into research to users are spent in Amazon; NGS built a small prototype and managed to attract 200 users in few months demanding for more, this is considered as very good uptake

AM stated that users want cloud because: 1) trendy, want to try; 2) easy of use; AM remarked that EMI is dealing with large communities with specific needs; they do not need cloud, they are afraid of disruption from current services; SN remarked that EGI targets also other user communities who require a different set of services for which virtualization would give the right level of flexibility

MT stated that the task force is doing pre-design, each participant should be exposed to all the work in order to have the clear picture; therefore the participation of EMI would be important since the beginning

SN stated that the process for building the blueprint is in place, EMI people working on ARGUS/VOMS are welcome and free to join; if there is need for development, having TP closely integrated in the activity is important; EGI can contribute with SA1 for integration, probes, etc.

Task Force Accounting report

PS: mailing list setup, wiki to be prepared (*see action 09/06*); the output of the workshop done in Lyon is the starting point; work will start in Dec 2012 (see action composition of task force and priorities/areas);

SA reported that there is an IGE Milestone on accounting that is delayed waiting for requirements from EGI "IGE M5.2: Report on services for extension of accounting mechanisms for recording service usage (June 2011)" (<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1512>).

MT mentioned that STFC/Allison Parker should be part of the task force as she follows the cloud activity on accounting

Technology Provider performance review

MD presented based on slides;

"Less urgent" tickets

SN clarified that the issue about less urgent tickets is expected as it was also in EGEE; the reviewers raised concern on the handling of them; AM remarked that the less urgent tickets, by design, are not



considered if more urgent are present or after a new major release; if less urgent tickets change their relevance over time, their priority should be raised; there are maintenance release cycles taking 3 weeks that consider top priority/very urgent; EMI products should not be released for urgent/less urgent tickets in this maintenance release cycle but only in the major release;

SN provided the following suggestion for discussion:

- 1) Regularly review less urgent tickets and confirm they are still less urgent
- 2) Understand if less urgent are fixed

ZS commented that 1) can only be done by polling the requestor; usually users reporting the issue set the priority and rarely they change it; SN reported that during the EGEE experience, it was realized that people working in the infrastructure should also have a voice in the request priority as this may affect the infrastructure itself; suggestion that DMSU should check that for the infrastructure the “less urgent” for users are also “less urgent” for the infrastructure;

AM observed that it may happen that less urgent tickets may be solved during code refactoring but not released, the solution may live in code branch waiting for a major release or when a higher priority bug triggers a release, many less urgent tickets may move in “awaiting release”; SN observed that this can lead to unpredictability of solving time; AY recognized that in software engineering it is not possible to predict complexity to solve a ticket; the urgency does not relates to the effort needed to solve it;

After discussion, this is the final suggestion:

1) DMSU to review on a monthly basis the state of “less urgent” tickets (e.g., 1. they are still “less urgent” or should the severity be increased? 2. are they in state “awaiting release”? 3. Do they refer to old software versions so became not relevant?)

2) Understand if less urgent are fixed after each major release

(see action 09/08, 09/09, 09/10)

About Support Unit (SU) vs. Product Team (PT)

AM mentioned that usually there is a 1-to-1 mapping of SU to PT, it is not always the case; MD claimed that if there is no direct mapping, then it is difficult to assign the tickets; ZS confirmed that the rate of tickets that need to be assigned to generic SU is very low, therefore this is not an issue

AM asked that EMI is looking for ways to monitor SLA violations; asked how was done for EGI; MD answered that this is not yet possible from the report generator; it was done thanks to direct access to the database (*see action 09/11*)



GGUS related performance metrics

ZS reported that the topic was discussed during TCB no.7 but no recording was available in the minutes; there are not very much distinction between top prio/very urgent and urgent/less urgent; they are managed in pairs;

AM stated that asking the TP to provide the estimate to fix after analyzing is fair; after EMI-2, there is the plan to increase the maintenance release cycle to 4 weeks because of time required to certify on different platforms; AM was not comfortable with providing an average time to fix; he suggested to propose a time to fix for each problem and then met that one; SN observed that by checking median solution time from MD slides, 7 days for top priorities is likely not achievable, 30 days for very urgent are more achievable;

Suggestion:

- *top priority: solution time estimated on a per ticket basis*
- *very urgent: expected solution time is 45 days*
- *for urgent/less urgent: typically next major release or another opportunity*

About escalation

HH reported that IGE does not have a maintenance release cycle; BK raised the issue of escalation about setting tickets priority; SN stated that if there is no consensus on priorities between EMI and DMSU and MD, then escalate to SN and AM

About statistics

BK asked for detailed statistics of solved tickets at 1st/2nd level; PS reported that they are part of SA1 reporting and they were presented also in Lyon

AM wondered if the statistics include also consider that tickets are passed to 3rd level and then escalated back to 2nd level; this could be the reason of some very short resolution time for some tickets which seems to short; MD to check (**see action 09/12**)

SN reported that roadmap of new reporting system is blocked by an issue related to the definition of office hours for EMI; AM acknowledged that explaining the need to deal with issues like having a person in Germany that can work only Mon/Tue

(EMI) Software delivery into EGI provisioning supply chain

AM reported that the default model will become that components will be released directly in EPEL or DEBIAN; by the end of EMI, all products should be maintained independently and managed using open source procedures; the XML file required by EGI will not anymore be available as not part of the process so this should be addressed in advance; developers already asked “my product is now in EPEL, can I stop releasing it as EMI component”? AM also reported that if products will not be able to become mature to



inject in EPEL/DEBIAN, then they will disappear; at the moment, it is not sure that all components will be in EMI2;

SN asked a commitment to continue produce XML till EMI 2 (30 apr 2012); AM accepted; the release of XML will be provided within few days as normal operations; “update 9” was an exception; after that, new packages will be announced as done by other open source projects; there is the need for a nominated packager for each product team; this is an important threshold to evaluate if a product will stay afterwards or not; release java components in EPEL/DEBIAN is almost impossible; for java will be Maven probably instead of EPEL;

DCI Sustainability

Not discussed

AOB

About EGEE Operational Security Coordination Team operational notice (two documents attached to the agenda; Ming Chao, MC joining); a notice is there since EGEE: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/EGI_CSIRT:Operational_notices/proxy-lifetime-02-11-2007

MC pointed out that users can produce long living proxies as they wish; the VO controls the VOMS attribute part, some VO does not follow this notice; SN claimed that sites should enforce the policies and grid middleware should enforce them; PS reported that in the security requirements presented today there was a requirement to let the site the max life of proxies accepted

AY mentioned that SAGA workflow needs long-lived proxy (i.e. more than 24h).

What is needed:

1. Need to reach a general consensus on stressing this issue, it will take some time to solve; **send the operational notice to OMB and VO manager list**
2. Technology providers to check if their middleware support proxy renewal (*see action 09/13, 09/14*);
 - a. IGE: GRAM supports proxy renewal (not automatic, via myproxy); GridFTP, not needed as this checks one time in the beginning and the check is valid till the session is active; GSI-SSH is the same like GridFTP, check done at login, if the proxy expires, the session is still valid till it is closed;
 - b. EMI: WMS is OK; FTS does not (action for IGE/EMI)
3. Evaluate if there is a fundamental issue leading to the need for having proxy longer than 24h
4. Evaluate the update the operational notice as SPG or CSIRT policy



There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 16:05.

Date for Next Meeting

To be planned



ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
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 23/11: this will be addressed as follow-up of the info service meeting	OPEN
07/03	IGE/SC	Contact the MyProxy dev team to discuss if/how they can meet the requirement from OMB on High-Availability 29/09: the HA should be considered both at local and global level; investigate high-availability vs. high-throughput deployment; HA to be evaluated at the geographical level 23/11: HH reported that for load-balancing, this is OK; as switch-over not easy to do; PS suggested to add those considerations to the RT ticket; 28/11: information added to the ticket: https://rt.egi.eu/guest/Ticket/Display.html?id=2278 other info available here: http://grid.ncsa.illinois.edu/myproxy/ha/ to be closed at next TCB	OPEN
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) 29/09: there is a report 23/11: MD has a draft to finalise by end of week	OPEN
07/09	EGI/SA EMI/AM	Verify what need to be changed in GGUS to enable SLA monitoring 29/09: there will be a GGUS meeting, SA to contact Torsten Antoni 23/11: there was a meeting in Germany to discuss this topic, a roadmap is expected	OPEN
07/12	EGI/AK EMI/AM,BK	Discuss a new state for level 3,4 bugs which are not addressed to avoid steady increase of open bugs 29/09: no progress, BK to talk to AM on the matter 23/11: addressed in the agenda, keep open and reconsider after discussion	OPEN Can this be closed?

08/01	EMI/BK IGE/SC StratusLab/ CL SAGA/AM	Each Technology provider should circulate a URL to a webpage describing which standards are supported by the developed technology; the page should evolve to contain a description of what component support what standards <i>23/11: SA to create an EGI page with links to the various pages and collect links from TPs (see action 09/15)</i>	OPEN
08/03	EGI/TF	Report which NGIs are available to provide IPv6 testbed <i>23/11: PS to circulate the list of NGIs available to provide IPv6 testbed</i>	OPEN
08/04	EGI/TF	Define a scenario testing for IPv6 in terms of what software deployment is desired (e.g., CE? All gLite/EMI?) <i>23/11: to be discussed in the presentation, keep it open</i>	OPEN
08/05	SAGA/AY	Report on which component is IPv6 ready and which not <i>23/11: AY to check if email was sent to TCB list</i>	OPEN
09/01	EGI/MD	Set up a small working group with representatives from operations and tech providers to rationalise existing requirements on logging in line with best practices for implementation from developers and best practices for deployment; outcome should be reported at the next TCB	NEW
09/02	EGI/GS	Two weeks before next F2F TCB, provide a list of requirements that were filtered out from the requirement selection process to TPs	NEW
09/03	EGI/MR	To clarify with HEPIX what is the difference between HEPIX and EGI IPv6 testbeds and evaluate how these can be integrated together	NEW
09/04	EGI/GS	Clarify requirements no.1 with submitter and no.2 with EMI as presented	NEW
09/05	EGI/Diss	Promotion of Fed Cloud activities, goal to attract users	NEW
09/06	EGI/PS	Set up wiki page for the accounting task force	NEW
09/07	EGI/PS	Provide a written report about the composition of task force and priorities area as will emerge from Dec meeting	NEW
09/08	EMI/AM	Check when EMI provides estimation of solving time for top prio/very urgent tickets (when taking ownership or when start working time?)	NEW
09/09	EGI/DMSU	Review "less urgent" tickets and verify e.g., 1. they are still "less urgent" or should the severity be increased? 2. How many are in state "awaiting release"? 3. do they refer to old software versions so became not relevant?	NEW
09/10	EGI/MD	Make sure GGUS will include delivery time for tickets	NEW



09/11	EGI/MD	To share (on a regular basis) SLA violation monitoring data with TPs	NEW
09/12	EGI/MD	To check if solution time of 3rd level tickets include case of tickets that are reassigned to 2 nd level (to evaluate reasons for some very short solution time)	NEW
09/13	IGE/HH	Send an email to TCB list informing about the ability of software components to support proxy renewal and full support of RCF 3820 28/11: email sent by HH: https://mailman.egi.eu/mailman/private/tcb-discuss/2011-November/000293.html (to be closed at next TCB)	NEW
09/14	EMI	Send an email to TCB list informing about the ability of software components to support proxy renewal and full support of RCF 3820	NEW
09/15	EGI/SA	Create an EGI page with links to the various pages related to standards for TPs	NEW



Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi, 28.11.2011

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.