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# Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Name and Surname | Abbr. | Representing | Membership |
| Steven Newhouse\* | SN | EGI.eu CTO  | Member & Chair |
| Tiziana Ferrari | TF | EGI Chief Operations Officer | Member |
| Peter Solagna | PS | EGI.eu Operations Officer | Member (COO deputy) |
| Gergely Sipos  | GS | EGI.eu Senior User Community Support Officer | 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 | Member  |
| Alberto Di Meglio  | AM | EMI | Member  |
| Helmut Heller | HH | IGE | Member |
| Andre Merkzy\* | AY | SAGA | Member |
| Mattias Ellert | ME | IGE Release Manager | In attendance |
| Matteo Turilli\*\* | MT | Federated Clouds Task Force | Member |

\* Connected from remote

\*\* Connected from remote for the time slot dedcate

# ACTIONS REVIEW

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 07/09 | EGI/MD | 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**10/02: issues about calculation of response time and office hours were resolved**24/04: MD said this is done, there are dedicated fields (released in GGUS); AM commented that according to present SLA, this is not enough as we are monitoring time of reaction, not time of delivery; PS said that with the new report generator being produced, this should be covered; AM said that SLA could include delivery time, covered in the notes from TCB* | ~~OPEN~~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*23/11: SA to create an EGI page with links to the various pages and collect links from TPs (****see action 09/15****)**10/02: closed for IGE and SAGA, EMI to update the page with components associated to standards; StratusLab still to send the page URL**24/04: StratusLab closing this month; EMI to double-check with Morris Riedel* | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 08/04 | EGI/TF | Define a scenario testing for IPv6 in terms of what software deployment is desired (e.g., CE? All gLite/EMI?)*23/11: to be discussed in the presentation, keep it open**24/04: TF confirmed that this was addressed at the IPv6 meeting, to start with compatibility testing with CE/SE/InfoService* | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 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 TPs24/04: GS circulated a link to an updated wiki page that uses color codes to separate requirements based on state; there is a new short link: go.egi.eu/requirements; the tool is available to technology providers and every stakeholder interested in commenting https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Track\_User\_Support\_Requirements | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 09/05 | EGI/Diss | Promotion of Fed Cloud activities, goal to attract users*10/02: keep it open**24/04: during the Community Forum, there was good exposure, CLARIN and DHC joined as new communities* | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 09/07 | EGI/PS | Provide a written report about the composition of task force and priorities area as will emerge from Dec meeting*10/02: done, present in the wiki page [https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/TCB:Accounting\_Task\_Force](https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/TCB%3AAccounting_Task_Force)**24/04: to be covered in the agenda* | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 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?*10/02: to be closed after agreement on the process**24/04: the process is documented and agreed; expected major clean up to happens after EMI 2* | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 09/10 | EGI/MD | Make sure GGUS will include delivery time for tickets*10/02: MD to check with GGUS team**24/04: current delivery time is measured by when the ticket is closed; otherwise we can decide to add an extra field to be filled*  | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 09/11 | EGI/MD | To share (on a regular basis) SLA violation monitoring data with TPs*10/02: MD to report on a quarterly basis to F2F TCB**24/04: shared, during the meeting it was discussed how to improve the report* | ~~OPEN~~CLOSED |
| 10/01 | EMI/BK | To prepare a doodle and schedule a meeting with MD and Patrick Furman to come up with statement of solutions24/04: MD talked to Patrick during ISGC/Taiwan, has better understanding of the statement of solutions  | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 10/02 | EGI/KE | To collect the list of people who want privileges to update tickets and give them the permissions24/04: done | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 10/03 | EMI/BK~~IGE/HH~~~~SAGA/AK~~StratusLab/CL | To provide the list of components that are reasonably safe to be tested in an IPv6 testbed24/04: EMI: as soon as the testbed is ready, they will give priority to services used by WLCG EMI, StratusLab to provide;SAGA said that all components are safe to be tested | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 10/04 | EGI/MR | Mario Reale to propose appropriate GGUS support unit creation for IPv6 testbed in collaboration with GGUS and EGI Operations24/04: Keep open | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 10/05 | EGI/SN | Discuss with DMSU solution to high number of less urgent tickets | ~~NEW~~OPEN |
| 10/06 | EGI/MT | To inform SN about what TPs need to do in order to enable a demo from the FedCloud for CF12 | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 10/07 | EGI/SN | To circulate EGI strategy plan (draft) to policy boards for contribution24/04: done; EMI is collecting all the inputs and assembling them in a coherent document; EMI is creating a strategy document with 3 to 5 years perspective | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 10/08 | EMI/AM | Alberto Di Meglio to report on ScienceSoft 24/04: AM said that in the Open Science meeting in Rome, there was lot of discussion about doing something for software like providing repositories, handle software as paper (e.g., having persistent links, rate it, link to data); HH asked about why this is needed since there is SourceForce; AM clarified that ScienceSoft is not a repository, but more a catalogue enhanced with many ; AM got offer proposal for collaboration from OpenAire, ScienceSoft can be the provider of content of info while OpenAire could act as repository of formatted document describing the software; GitHub is planned to be recommended as default open repository; AM said that software should not be kept artificially alive; requirements will be collected till June (AM to circulate the summary email to the TCB list) | ~~NEW~~CLOSED |
| 11/06 | EGI/TF | To provide feedback |  |

# AGENDA BASHING

Agenda approved.

# MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the TCB meeting held on 10 Feb 2012 **(**<http://go.egi.eu/TCB-10>) were approved as a correct record of the proceedings.

# ITEMS OF BUSINESS

### TCB Requirements

### Submitted/reviewed requirements

User Requirements

#3404 (***In*** ***Clarification***) GS: aligning what information system shows together with local policies; missing the advertisement of the max slots in a computing share per user; the requirement is well-described, operations; GS to investigate feasibility

#3406 (***In Clarification***) TF asked if GS has feeling on how many users adopt DAG; GS thinks they are not many, but some users has integrated it with a portal and do not want to update (see ***Actions 11/01, 11/02***)

#3563 (***Endorsed***) MD asked what Globus version implements the solution to understand if this is already in UMD; EMI takes Globus from EPEL so expect to use the latest version; maybe there is some change needed to do in the code to use the updated functionality; EMI to investigate if they need to change the way they use the functionality

Operations Requirements

#3424 (***In Clarification***) PS stated that there was some progress in between; it is fairly assured that URs are not double-counted by the APEL parser; PS asked John Gordon to list the clients that are expected to be checked

#3546, #3413: product specific requirements that will be submitted directly to product teams via GGUS, therefore they can be removed from the TCB requirements list

### Assessed requirements

TF asked if EMI 2 would have the new Torque version; AM confirmed;

AM: there are 5 new assessed requirements (1778, 1780, 2733, 0924, 0910); the documentation about these requirements will come after EMI-2 (possibly beginning of July); there is an issue with 1778, it does not require a high effort, but it requires coordination in order to have a coherent document, a person is being identified (probably Balazs’s Deputy);

* 1626: in planned status, there will be a prototype in EMI2 to be evaluated; (the statements of solutions are attached to the tickets);
* 2677 is in planned, but never seen; TF clarified that is pretty old and is needed to have accurate accounting of users and to enable to suspend users; PS said that this should be known to VOMS product team; AM to check
* life science requirements to be discussed later

HH: about error messages; they have been assessed and decreased the priority; this will not happen unless there are specific error messages to be addressed; as general requirement, will not be addressed;

TF said that operations is taking pragmatic approach to error messages starting with specific components; working on LCAS/LCMAPS while not aware of error message request for Globus

AY: no requirements

### TCB Requirements process amendments

AM reported that in the past weeks, EMI got many requests from users to be able to discuss directly with developers; this is happening at an informal level, but cause fragmentations (e.g., talk individually to DPM, StoRM); propose to add additional step in the TCB process, after endorsement, organize a meeting between technical people, all relevant people to be put in the same room; EMI wants to be sure that when there are many implementations from the same functionality, this will be discussed collectively with all stakeholders; TCB should force that all stakeholders are involved when see that no progress is happening on a certain requirement. (***See action 11/07***)

TF asked to add an item in AOB to discuss about the need for communication of new features of IGE/EMI (release notes)

## Post mortem discussions

### Globus 5.2 post mortem

TF described the event based on the provided report. AM commented that when testing software components for certifications, they need to use dependencies that are available in production repositories; MD recommended that whenever an header file changes, this should be officially announced.

### VOMS/membership renewal

TF described the event based on the provided report. SN stated that this event highlighted some issue on the procedures in the EGI side and some issue in clarifications from EMI side; it is recognised the prompt response from VOMS team in responding;

MD triggered the appointed criteria team and they have a draft on the criteria for VOMS, the default time is sufficient (2 weeks), they will document and be part of the next iteration of the quality criteria in 6 months time;

TF asked what happens when there is an incident response and EMI/IGE are not anymore present; to be discussed in the sustainability item

## Technology Provider release plans update

### EMI release plans for EMI-2 and EMI-1

AM presented based on slides available in the agenda.

#### Porting to Debian6

Porting to Debian6 is more problematic than expected. The main issue is more managerial than technical, the main user community is not interested in debian6 and is discouraging developers to spend time on it. The problem with Hydra is mainly about manpower, Univ. Helsinki has little effort spread across many activities, the problems are known but nobody is working on it. The goal is still to have it in EMI2, but there is high risk it cannot go through to the first release. About the EDGI bridge, the one for UNICORE may be in a subsequent update of EMI2, for CREAM/ARC will be available.

#### Package name changes

For some product, there will be changes in some package name due to adaptation to EPEL. Within EMI, package names are OK, the problems is if some external application relies on them. gsiGSOAP in EMI had “\_2.7” which will be drop in EMI2 (the new one does not obsolete the hold one). The “\_2.7” will not be present in EMI2, therefore this should be considered by EGI in UMD.

#### Security Token

TF asked about the security token, AM confirmed that this will not be in EMI2 initial release because they are the same people from Hydra and are overloaded (there is no release schedule for it). WebDAV will be supported by dCache and DPM (DPM after the initial release of EMI2).

#### GLUE 2.0 support

All services have support for GLUE 2.0. Coverage is 97%, 2 services to be fixed.

#### Upgrade to EMI2

MD asked if it is recommended to upgrade to EMI2 for all products, as all products present in EMI1 will be in EMI2. All EMI1 components will be supported only for 6 months after the release of EMI2.

All CERN components are identical between EMI1 and EMI2; CERN by policy develops and supports only one version of their products. As result of CERN policy is that there were products with same name and version and different content. This has been now explicitly/definitely forbidden to them. AM stated that all Nagios probes will be provided for all services, some issue with SL6, only 3 probes maintained by EGI (AM to send details to TF about what probes are supported by EGI, ***see Action 11/03***).

### IGE release plans

HH based on slides reported that next release is V3.0 in September, as soon as this will be out, there will be no update on the previous ones. New things: GRAM-BES implementation that integrates with Globus. IGE will take over jGlobus as main users seem to be in Europe, the mainstream Globus people are not interested in maintaining it. About the release of IGE, this depends on the Globus release; last time they delayed for few months. AY asked who will implement DRAAMA2 for Globus, HH said Uppsala University. MD reported that there were some problem with GridSAM; HH stated that when the GRAM-BES will be out, than GridSAM will be not anymore the primary BES interface of IGE. SN stated that it could be considered to have a SAM-based testing for a BES compatibility testing.

## Technology Provider performance

MD reporting. AK said that if a ticket is assigned to 1st line support with ‘very urgent’, if they do not agree, they need to react within the deadline expected for ‘very urgent’ in order to avoid SLA violation and ask to renegotiate the priority.

SN asked about the age profile for open ‘urgent’ tickets as there are around 30 stable open tickets (are the same or tickets get closed and new arrive?). Proposal to add mean time for open tickets. MD suggests standard deviation. AM asked also about total tickets, better to compare. The report should restructured to present:

* open tickets and mean time open
* closed tickets and mean time to solve

## TCB Task Force reviews

### Federated Clouds Task Force

MT presenting based on slides. SN asked who is leading the two new areas: brokering (Alvaro Simon), Federation profile (Alexander, Michel, Matteo). About the BluePrint, there is a structure, but the main focus is on the testbed due to work for TF and summer period.

SN said that PMB wants to add an SA2 task dedicated to the dedicated task force. NGIs have been asked what effort they want to reassign from their activities.

### Accounting Task Force

TF reported based on slides.

#### EMI and accounting clients

TF asked about the position of EMI about accounting client support for SSM. AM stated that SSM is not an EMI product. AM stated that the EMI Executive Board decided not to have DGAS in the project, DGAS server was not there, DGAS client will not be supported in EMI2; there was a discussion of having a single accounting client but the decision was rejected as required a new development; last discussion about this is that the DGAS client will support SSM but outside EMI effort (INFN effort). As far EMI is concerned, APEL will be the only one.

#### EMI and messaging infrastructure

TF asked about reliable messaging service viewpoint from EMI team. AM stated that the messaging team is half person, EMI will not work on it. The goal of the team was to evaluate the use of messaging and what could be the benefit, the outcome was that there is not a meaningful advantage.

EGI is committed to long-term secure messaging framework. EGI will be the owner of defining the technical solution and then EMI will follow by adapting the accounting clients. AM reported that APEL team said that they do not have effort to develop sensors for the storage part. TF asked if there is commitment from EMI to have probes for storage between EMI2 and EMI3; AM answered yes, but with no direct support from APEL team.

HH stated that PRACE is going to use GridSAFE as solution across T1. This does not imply they will use UNICORE accounting.

SN claimed that the EGI Council would like to have better knowledge of usage by VO and NGI. TF said that user DN information is needed in usage record in order perform accurate aggregations per country. According to an assessment conducted earlier in 2012, NIKHEF (who did not propagate user DN for security concerns about the messaging infrastructure) will migrate to messaging thanks to the improved security framework of the broker network. Similarly, Italy, who is currently not publishing user DNs in summary records, will fix this in a future release of DGAS. Some diagrams displaying NGI international usage are already available in the accounting portal: these need to be further refined, and requirements were already submitted to the Product Team as product of an EGI virtual team.

## Technology Provider sustainability plans

### IGE Sustainability plans

HH said that one sustainability approach is through EGCF that will survive after IGE. EGCF does not have any funding; therefore EGCF will not provide software to EGI. EGCF is mainly about organizing meetings, e.g. Globus Conference in Europe. It will work based on in-kind contribution, cannot do any SLA. EGCF provides a way to engage with Globus/US in order to facilitate support. Globus/US should continue to release software components, but not those IGE specific (***see Action 11/04***). EGCF will not do software adaptation.

IGE 2 will be considered if opportunity arises, in the best case, there will be a gap.

SN asked that when IGE get closer to the end, IGE partners should provide a statement about what kind of effort they can commit during the last part of EGI-InSPIRE after IGE is over. IGE is ending at the end of April 2013.

AM stated that during the review, the reviewers said that sustainability should be much longer than 3 months otherwise there is no real sustainability plan. HH stated that they were not asked, but they were asked to come up with a sustainability plan. No current discussion about ScienceSoft collaboration.

### EMI Sustainability plans

AM said that there was an initial discussion between CERN & INFN and this was expanded to the other partners later on. There is an intention to find a way to continue the collaboration among the EMI partners. Discussion ongoing about form and scope. The first step is to list all the EMI products, attach the name of the institutes that wish to support with scope (for whom they want to support). By the end of next week, EMI will collect the declaration of scope. This information will be shared and the EMI sustainability plans will be presented by the EGI Technical Forum. CERN plans are already communicated; they will only provide support for their components only for WLCG (not for other scientific communities). Institutes have a sustainability plan as they have funding to do activities within their scope outside EMI. The problem is what happens if a different community not in the scope of an institute needs a support. AM said that for fixing critical or security bugs, it should not be a problem as this is a main concern for the primary adopters of the product. As for using GGUS after EMI, it is to be seen.

SN is concerned about the fact that knowing the plans in September is late as EMI is ending 6 months later, so would not leave enough time to EGI to plan. AM said that EGI should avoid asking directly to product teams about their sustainability plans; this is seen as not helping the discussion; EMI is working on keeping the EMI collaboration alive and the discussion should be made together. AM is keen to involve EGI in the discussion and share the information as soon as they get available.

TF reported on the survey distributed to NGIs about their sustainability. AM confirmed that asking NGIs what they need is fine, asking what they are going to support is disrupting. The end of EMI is the end of a line of funding, but the collaboration should continue.

SN stated that from EGI viewpoint, when the EMI coordination disappears, there is not clear view about what it will be guaranteed. EMI has been funded to also define how to continue its services after EMI. AM is trying to make the EMI collaboration a legal entity, some partner is willing to do, some partner is not.

TF asked if EMI3 will be supported for the last year of EGI-InSPIRE. AM stated that the current statement is that EMI3 will be released at the end of Feb13 and then will be supported for 2/3 months after the end of EMI. The reviewers asked to make an effort to extend the support.

## AOB

### Terms of Reference review and update

MD presented the proposed changes. AM asked for more control by the TCB members on subscriptions to the mailing list. Proposed amendment. The new ToR will be circulated to the list for final approval.

### NGI Training needs

TF presented based on slides. TF asked AM about the effort available in EMI to do training. By contract, each EMI member should contribute to dissemination and training, therefore costs can be covered. AM asked that for training events at the EGI TF, this should be organized pretty fast. After TF receives the EMI training agenda, she will work with Emidio on the topic. Hot topics will be VOMS Administrator for VO manager and LFC+DPM. (***See action 11/05***)

### Storage Accounting

AM said that it was agreed by DPM/StoRM/d-Cache to implement the sensors for storage accounting using APEL SSM. They are discussing with John Gordon to have an EGI profile to assure they publish the same data. This should come by 31/05 by this is not sure to be met. They need an EGI profile for the information that is needed to be published. Storage accounting format is in public comment in OGF therefore this should be the right time to provide feedback. (***See action 11/06***)

## Date for Next Meeting

Next TCB: doodle for 3h phonecall on 2-3-4/July

http://www.doodle.com/wsxifqrgdt5g962b

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 16:45.

# ACTIONS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ID | Resp. | Description | Status |
| 10/03 | EMI/BK~~IGE/HH~~~~SAGA/AK~~StratusLab/CL | To provide the list of components that are reasonably safe to be tested in an IPv6 testbed24/04: EMI: as soon as the testbed is ready, they will give priority to services used by WLCG EMI, StratusLab to provide;SAGA said that all components are safe to be tested | OPEN |
| 10/04 | EGI/MR | Mario Reale to propose appropriate GGUS support unit creation for IPv6 testbed in collaboration with GGUS and EGI Operations24/04: Keep open | OPEN |
| 10/05 | EGI/SN | Discuss with DMSU solution to high number of less urgent tickets | OPEN |
| 11/01 | EMI/AM | To assess relative cost of solving “Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows” #3406 | NEW |
| 11/02 | EGI/GS | UCB to assess with the community what is the possible interest in getting “Implementation of realistic cyclic and dynamic Workflows” done #3406 | NEW |
| 11/03 | EMI/AM | To send reference to ticket about probes problems in SL6 that are maintained by EGI/GRNET; info to be sent to Tiziana Ferrari | NEW |
| 11/04 | IGE/HH | To send the list of software components that are IGE specific and that will not be supported by Globus/US after IGE | NEW |
| 11/05 | EMI/AM | To provide the EMI training agenda to EGI/TF | NEW |
| 11/06 | EGI/TF | To provide feedback to OGF storage accounting document in public draft | NEW |
| 11/07 | EGI/MD | Amend TCB requirement process to reinforce the message that endorsed requirements affecting many products should require involvement of all stakeholders | NEW |

Minutes prepared by Sergio Andreozzi, 11.05.2012

Minutes Approved TCB Chair Steven Newhouse
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