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# Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and Surname | Abbr. | Organisation | Membership[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| Emrah Akkoyun |  | ULAKBIM/NGI\_TR | Deputy |
| Luis Alves |  | CSC/NGI\_FI | Deputy |
| Jan Astalos |  | UI SAV, NGI\_SK | Member |
| Goncalo Borges |  | LIP/NGI\_PL | Member |
| Riccardo Brunetti |  | INFN/NGI\_IT | Member |
| Mario David |  | LIP, Ibergrid | Member, TSA1.3 |
| Alberto Di Meglio |  | CERN | Invited participant |
| Claire Devereux |  | STFC/NGI\_UK | Member |
| Feyza Eryol |  | Ulakbim/NGI\_TR | Member |
| Tiziana Ferrari |  | EGI.eu | Chairman |
| John Gordon |  | STFC, UKI | Member |
| Nikola Grkic |  | IPB/NGI\_RS | Deputy Member |
| Emir Imamagic |  | SRCE/NGI\_HR | Member |
| Dave Kelsey |  | STFC | TSA1.2 |
| Kostas Koumantaros |  | GRNET/NGI Greece | Member |
| Malgorzata Krakowian |  | CYFRONET/NGI\_PL | Member |
| Gilles Mathieu |  | IN2P3/NGI\_FRANCE | Deputy Member |
| Mario Reale |  | GARR | TSA1.7 Network |
| Peter Solagna |  | EGI.eu | Minutes |
| Ulf Tigerstedt |  | CSC/NGI\_FI | Member |
| Christos Triantafyllidis |  | AUTH | TSA1.4 Brokers |
| Ron Trompert |  | SARA/NGI\_NL | COD and Member |
| Anders Wäänänen |  | UCPH/NGI\_DK | Member |
| John Walsh |  | TCD/NGI\_IE | Member |
| Alessandro Usai |  | SWITCH/NGI\_CH | Member |

Some participants were connected through Phone Bridges.

# ACTION REVIEWS

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Action Owner** | | | **Content** | | | **Status** |
|  | | | | | | | |
| **Actions from the 19 June 2012 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **22.01** | | T. Ferrari | | | To clarify with GSTAT developers is site coordinates are extracted from GOCDB or BDII 🡪 https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket\_info.php?ticket=83179 | IN PROGRESS | |
| **22.02** | | K. Koumantaros | | | To discuss the current user data retention with the NGI international report Virtual Team | OPEN | |
| **22.03** | | J. Gordon | | | To discuss the current user data retention policy with the UCB | OPEN | |
| **22.04** | | NGIs | | | To discuss the current user data retention policy and a timeline for the erasing of historical user DN information with Resource Centres and propose a timeline for the removal of historical userDN information | OPEN | |
| **22.05** | | J. Gordon for the APEL team | | | To contact sites to republish for the last 12 months in case of problems with encryption of user DNs | OPEN | |
| **Actions from the 29 May 2012 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **22.01** | | T. Glatard | | | To updated the BIOMED VO ID card with minimum resource requirements (to avoid to be supported by too small users) | OPEN | |
| **22.02** | | NGIs | | | To express interest in UI/CREAM deployment through VMs, so that a virtual team can be created to discuss configuration, contextualization etc. 🡪 Deadline: 17 July | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from the 26 March 2012 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **21.05** | | T. Ferrari, COD | | | To review current usage of TEST in GOCDB and in general to formulate a recommendation on how testing should be performed (in terms of usage of GOCDB features) 🡪 COD Requested to provide a report for the July OMB | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from the 26 March 2012 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **20.01** | T. Ferrari | | | | To propose a process for MoU negotiation between VOs and NGIs/RCs | OPEN | |
| **20.02** | T. Ferrari | | | | To organize a EMI/EGI seminar on new features released, deployment aspects and usage aspects from a user perspective 🡪 first meeting on LFC/DPM synchronization | IN PROGRESS | |
| **20.03** | E. Imamagic | | | | to assess the availability of storage occupation tests in Nagios | OPEN | |
| **20.04** | T. Ferrari | | | | to constitute a task force addressing the problems faced by BIOMED in terms of allocation of a sufficient share of resources | OPEN | |
| **20.05** | E. Imamagic | | | | to start the procedure for assessing the impact of GLOBUS/UNICORE probes on daily operations. 🡪 waiting for new SAM release | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from the 24 January 2012 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **18.04** | E. Imamagic | | | | To assess deployment of NGI SAM failover configuration (<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=3457>) | OPEN | |
| **18.05** | E. Imamagic | | | | To distribute documentation on how to trouble shoot the message broker network (<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=3459>) 🡪 IN PROGRESS. Waiting to see the status of the next May SAM update. 19/06: SAM update released to end of June. | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from the 20 December OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **17.04** | T. Ferrari/P. Solagna | | To contact NGIs who are in favour of changing their GOCDB configuration of critical services and implement changes during Jan/Feb and to support the other NGIs in computing their A/R statistics by extracting data from the SAM PI 🡪 now GOCDB supports virtual sites. A module for availability reporting of virtual sites is being implemented in the operations portal. | | | IN PROGRESS | |
| **17.05** | T. Ferrari | | To review the naming scheme of EGI profiles when POEM will be in production 🡪 this action will be completed after the first release of POEM | | | ON HOLD | |
| **17.07** | COD | | To reassess the UNKNOWN test percentage in March 2012 🡪 The unknown percentage has been decreasing. The status will be reviewed in collaboration with COD in May. It will be reviewed after the release of SAM update 17, which should include the feature of a SAM central monitoring controlling NGI SAM Installations | | | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from the 28 November OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **16.02** | M. Ma | | To consult with technology providers and VOs with the aim of updating the EGEE notice about maximum proxy lifetime. 🡪 SA1 milestone for 2012 | | | IN PROGRESS | |
| **Actions from Oct 2010 OMB meeting** | | | | | | | |
| **Action 3.** | TF | | to update as necessary the procedure to retire middleware components (<https://edms.cern.ch/document/985325>). <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=347> | | | OPEN | |
| Note: Actions from previous meetings are closed. | | | | | | | |

# Introduction

Tiziana Ferrari/EGI.eu

The July OMB meeting is rescheduled to the 17th of July. The calendar of meetings until Dec 2012 is approved. A link to the PY2 EGI-InSPIRE review slides is provided.

Three NGI actions are currently open:

* July
  + express interest in deployment of UI and CREAM VMs by July OMB
  + comments to draft procedure for renaming of sites: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Draft\_PROC
* 03rd August: submission deadline of QR9 report and metrics (EGI-InSPIRE partners)

The problem of too few sites reported in the GSTAT geo view is reported. **ACTION (T. Ferrari): to clarify with GSTAT developers is site coordinates are extracted from GOCDB or BDII**.

**EMI middleware long-term support plans**

A. Di Meglio/CERN

EMI 1 and EMI 2 will be both supported according to the EMI support policy in the coming months. For the EMI 3 release focus will be on consolidation of new products and features. EMI is assessing the sustainability of its assets: software, global tasks (such as release management, coordination of product teams, testbeds, etc.), coordination. According to the result of this assessment a transition plan will be defined. A survey was circulated in May to collect information on support plans of the various products (with a timeline of 12-18 months). The results of this survey are documented in a spread sheet attached to the agenda.

According to the survey most of the software activities will continue without any discontinuity (most of them, as several gaps have been identified). In several areas support will be continued but just to address the needs of individual communities, depending on the partners, in order to reduce the scope. For some products, all users will be supported. Other partners may reduce the scope of support to specific activities/communities.

* Delegation java: Uni. Helsinki will stop support, but one of the three product teams will take it up
* Yaim core: nobody has committed support so far. No clear solution at the moment. EMI has no plans to decommission yaim, will be supported until the end of EMI. The plan of EMI is as follows: either support is found or phasing out is started during EMI PY3.
* Ginfo is a service discovery client (see M. Alandes presentation at GDB), colelcting information from EMIR and top BDII as substitution of lcg info sites. A. Di Meglio: Ginfo is not an EMI product.
* Hydra: currently developed by Uni Helsinki, support will be stopped at the end of EMI. Support will be provided by a commercial company, keeping development in open source with support with fee.
* BDII will be supported by CERN but reduced in functionality (mo more 3 flavors). Only 1 version of the product will be supported and used for dynamic information. T. Ferrari requests that documentation on this is made available. A. Di Meglio: the evolution of BDII is a long-term plan that goes beyond the lifetime of EMI. No EMI documents are available about this.

By EMI 3 ETICS will be no more used for building of packages, development of ETICS will stop at CERN and INFN, standard build coordination will be based on open source mechanisms. Timing of releases is still needed.

By September the discussion of which global tasks EMI partners would like to continue will be finalized. There is currently disagreement within the EMI consortium about the future of the current EMI coordination task. EMI will define the structure/organization needed in order to make this happen. The funding scheme of this global task is also under discussed. ScienceSoft can be the coordination provider, and also offer software engineering services in addition.

EMI will present the output of this discussion at the Technical Forum.

The EMI repository will exist as long as necessary but will shrink down, relying more on EPEL. EMI may contain newer version, EPEL will be the main distribution channel.

See the xls file attached to the agenda to see plans per product. “Baseline support” means that everything needed will be provided, but in most of the cases baseline support depends on available funding.

FP7: no funding available. Horizon 2020 could provide funding for innovation projects. A workshop is being organized by the EC with a focus on data management, the workshop has the purpose of discussing how software can be funded and managed.

ScienceSoft can be promoted as general coordination mechanism across all projects (this has the support of EMI reviewers). Users however should be ready to pay for support of individual products. Fees for services are being investigated.

T. Ferrari: the July OMB will be dedicated to the discussion of the impact of the long-terms support plans of EMI on EGI operations.

# GPGPU Virtual Team and Survey

J. Walsh/TCD

J. Walsh presents the objective and milestons of the GPGPU virtual team. A survey will be finalized by end of June and will be distributed to users and NGIs.

J. Gordon. STFC is installing the 2nd GPGPU biggest system in Europe. 50% users using own developed libraries, the others rely on open source libraries. Many users only rely on ssh login, usage of federated ID management is being promoted but with some difficulties.

Plan:

* A survey will be prepared by the end of June and further distributed to users and NGIs (NGIs are expected to collect feedback from site managers).
* Input will be collected and collated in August
* An overview of the results will be presented during the Resource Centre forum at TF12.

# FOR APPROVAL: VO Decommissioning procedure

P. Solagna/EGI.eu

The procedure draft was adjusted to take into accounts comments received from BIOMED (no other comments were received so far). Purpose of the procedure is the controlled and documented decommissioning of a VO.

J. Gordon: it is very likely that when a VO is ready for decommissioning, after having being inactive for a long time, when a VO manager is no longer available to be the owner of the decommissioning process. However, most of the VOs have a tight connection with NGIs, so the NGI hosting the respective VOMS should be consulted. A policy is needed to define who is entitles to request the decommissioning.

P. Solagna: the current procedure only documents the technical steps needed once the decommissioning is approved.

D. Kelsey: traceability has to be ensured after decommissioning, e.g. audit logs have to be preserved according to the existing security policies. For example, VOMS logs have to preserved and kept. VO specific tools should be replaced by “tools and services”.

P. Solagna: Steps 7 and 8 already have a reference to the VO registration policy. In addition, the service decommissioning procedure already includes references to the relevant policies.

There is general consensus about keeping NGI operations informed about VOs for which decommissioning is requested (before decision is taken).

DECISION. The importance of VOMS logs will be further stressed in the procedure. VO tools will be replaced as according to the discussion. A Policy defining who is entitled to request the VO deregistration will be drafted in parallel, we will then decide if it has to be included in the procedure or if it should be a standalone document. Input for this policy exists in the VO decommissioning acceptance procedure drafted in document <https://documents.egi.eu/document/971> (G. Borges).

# Status of software provisioning for UMD 2

M. David/LIP

M. David presents the status of verification and SR of EMI 2 products.

SL5 BDII-site, BDII-top, LFC and DPM will skip software provisioning, but will pass directly to the release area, this is because these versions are already released in production in EMI1 and UMD1.

Slide 3 lists the high priority products, while Slide 4 the lower priority products. The proposal is to proceed with unverified low-priority products once the provisioning cycle is completed for the high priority ones.

With UMD 2 a single queue for verification and SR will be available (“sw-rel”), this will allow to streamline communication between verifiers and early adopters (one ticket per product will be available), and the two stages can now be run in parallel.

By having a Testing and Untested UMD repository, a single file for configuration of UMD repositories will be possible.

* Repo “testing” contains all packages of products under staged rollout at any given moment.
* Repo “untested” contains all packages of products under verification at any given moment.

From a software provisioning point of view, the replacement of a source repository (e.g. EMI) with EPEL will be handled easily. Middleware products can be taken from many repositories in this way, but the software provisioning process is still dependent in this way on the upstream release process from external providers.

The UMD future schedule and release policy are discussed.

Schedule:

* 10 July: UMD2 first release including all high priority products (if successful in verification and staged rollout).
* 30 July: UMD2 2nd release including all products with lower priority (this date could be slightly postponed to August if WMS release plans from EMI are confirmed. This will be discussed in a separate meeting once the EMI release plan is confirmed.)

Policy: after the 30 July release, UMD will be released quarterly. Any site that wants new versions can enable UMD testing and unverified repositories, by doing so these sites will have a change to report about their early adoption activity. Intermediate releases will be made available for urgent bug fixes. The urgency of a bug fix is notified and discussed for approval at the Monday operations meetings by sites, NGIs, and the DMSU representative.

**DECISION. The OMB approves the proposed schedule and policy**.

A. Di Meglio: is the EPEL repository disabled in order to prevent sites from getting software from EPEL? M. David: the EPEL repository is enabled, but we recommend it is assigned lower priority. Higher priority is given to the UMD repository, so that a new version in EPEL won’t trigger an update.

A. Di Meglio: it would be useful if verification and staged rollout could happen before a product is released in EPEL. In case of no EMI coordination, this will simplify the software provisioning process of EMI.

This further improvement will be evaluated after Technical Forum 2012 when EMI will provide more information about the level of coordination that will be ensured after the end of the EMI project.

# Sites not publishing User DN: status and actions

J. Gordon/STFC

The current policy for management of sensitive data defines 13 months to be maximum time during which User DN information has to be kept (Section 7 of the Grid policy on the handling of user-level job accounting)[[2]](#footnote-2): “The Sites are responsible for deleting the local accounting records according to local personal data retention policy. This needs to be long enough to ensure that all records have been successfully transferred to the ADC database. The ADC is responsible for deleting the copies of the individual accounting records in the central database, or for removing or anonymising personal identifying information, e.g. the CommonName or e-mail components of subject DNs, from these records, at the latest one year after receipt of the data in the ADC. Personal identifying information, e.g. the CommonName component, contained in aggregated data must be treated in the same way.”

This gives 13 months to produce annual reports that require categorization of accounting information relying on user DN information.

G. Borges: User information was displayed on request in the accounting portal. By erasing data we will lose information from the beginning of the project. User data is not visible to NGIs at the moment, but NGI views are requested.

EGI should the retention period that is sensible for the infrastructure. We have to prove this is reasonable. K. Koumantaros proposes an extension to 18 months to allow time to produce NGI reports and to have the needed features in place in the tools. The OMB proposes to re-assess the current policy with all relevant stakeholders and to discuss an interim solution that would allow the generation of NGI annual reports.

ACTIONS:

* K. Koumantaros: to discuss the current user data retention policy with the NGI international report Virtual Team
* J. Gordon: to discuss the current user data retention policy with UCB

The timeline for the erasing of historical user DN information will be discussed after the retention timing is assessed and agreed.

Site Status of publishing UserDN in May 2012 are shown on the agenda, where NULL means no accounting published at all. NGIs should instruct Resource Centres to start publishing now but not to republish old data yet to avoid overload in the central DB. CESGA will produce a gantt chart similar to VO publishing to help sites identify when they might need to republish. Until then, no action is required by site managers.

DECISION. RCs are failing in publishing user DN information, will be requested to republish for the last 12 months.

N. Grkic: Is it possible to publish without name information at the site level in the accounting portal? J. Gordon: Identifying a person through anonymized data sometimes is possible.

A small number of sites (15) failed to encrypt their UserDNs for a period. This is probably due to using wrong jdk for bouncycastle (should use openjdk). The problem seems to have corrected itself (or been corrected). The problem is big at CESGA, smaller at RAL and GRIF, negligible at others. APEL Team will instruct sites: APEL will contact sites for the last 12 months with a GGUS ticket.

Action (J. Gordon for the APEL team) to contact sites.

# GOCDB custom service types: status update

P. Solagna/EGI.eu

Several custom service types were recently requested for addition to GOCDB. A bug in the ATP synch code of SAM was found, which causes truncation of service types prefixes which leads to non-unique identification of service types. This bug will be fixed in the upcoming SAM update.

The status of the new service type requests is as follows:

**Services on hold**  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.Bazaar  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.BazaarSAT  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.GridSpace2  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.BAT.agent  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.QStorMan.UserInterface  
CUSTOM.pl.plgrid.KeyFS

**Services in production**  
CUSTOM.org.vinetoolkit.VinePortal  
CUSTOM.pl.psnc.MigratingDesktop  
CUSTOM.pl.cyfronet.InSilicoLab

**Service type to be discussed within OTAG**  
com.adaptivecomputing.TorqueClient

# AOB

Next OMB meeting will be on the 17th of July.

1. Member, Observer, in Attendance [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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