

**DATE:** 18.04.2011

**Participants:**

Danilo Dongiovanni, Vincenzo Ciaschini, Andrea Ceccanti, Paolo Andreeto, Massimo Sgaravatto, Björn Hagemeier, Krzysztof Benedyczak, Christian Bernardt, Michelle Dibenedetto, Zdenek Sustr, Jon K. Nilsen, Oxana Smirnova, Anders Wäänänen, Valery Tschopp, Oscar Koeroo, Mischa Salle, Giuseppe Fiameni, Oliver Keeble, Lorenzo Dini, Alberto Aimar, Cristina Aiftimiei

**Missing:** AMGA, APEL, DGAS, MPI, gLite InfoSys, gLite Security, SAGA-SD-RAL

**ACTION LIST** (<https://savannah.cern.ch/task/?group=emi-emt>)

#18995 - "orphan" components for EMI-1 – updated with information about supported batch-systems

#20300 - glite-info-provider-service in EMI 1 – should be updated with savannah bugs for all services that are using glite-info-provider-service

**Cristina** – to send remainder to all Pts

#20731 - AMGA Service Reference Card: Wrong link – AMGA not present

#20736 - BDII Service Reference Card: Wrong link – gLite InfoSys not present

#20737 - DPM Service Reference Card: Wrong Link – Oliver will update the tasks and the SRC

#20738 - LFC Service Reference Card: Wrong Link - Oliver will update the tasks and the SRC

**EMI Release Status:**

Cristina:

- in the meeting agenda links to the presentations done during the AHM regarding the Updates and Road to EMI 2:
  - <https://indico.cern.ch/contributionDisplay.py?contribId=49&confId=124206>
  - <https://indico.cern.ch/contributionDisplay.py?contribId=50&confId=124206>
- for what concerns SA1 the Update process consists of cycles of 2 weeks:
  - the first Monday of the cycle “Certified” tasks present in the Emi Release tracker are considered for the Update
  - the SA1 verification starts, followed by the deployment on the EMI testbed
  - the second Thursday the results of the verification and deployment are discussed, and in the afternoon the Update is announced
- for the planing phase – EMT reports provided by SA2 will be used, but they are not yet ready
- instead this time Pts were asked to provide Immediate & High priority RfCs for which they intend to provide fixes
  - received requests from:
    - JobManagement PT – 1 CREAM update and 2 WMS updates, from which one is a vulnerability fix
    - UNICORE PT – 1 UVOS update - Enhancement Request
    - L&B PT – 1 LB update
- Updates Schedule:
  - [http://bit.ly/open\\_due](http://bit.ly/open_due)
  - interested PTs should have a look and start updating mandatory fields

**Discussions:**

Krzysztof – Q: in the savannah task there is a field called 'List of Elements" (Description: A component or release can include several elements that are listed in the EMI Technical Development Plan's official component table) but now in the DNA1.3.2 there are "products". Shouldn't this field change?

Cristina – A: will speak with Balazs, as this field was a request from the PTB

Krzysztof – Q: in the "kebnekaise Updates" presentation, on the slide regarding the ETICS configurations it is mentioned the emi\_B\_1\_dev. Should it be used for the development?

Cristina - A: yes. The sub-systems configurations for the components that need to be updated, should be communicated so that they are attached to the emi\_B\_1\_dev

- an EMI 1 Updates twiki will be created and updated with all the informations regarding the project configurations, NBs, logging of the project-configurations updates

### **STATUS of FTS, HYDRA, STORM:**

- HYDRA – John not present
- FTS - Oliver – they had problems with managing proxies – the problem was caused by a change in the delegation-java. Michail will update the task (<http://savannah.cern.ch/task/?18686>) with more details
- STORM – Michele – discovered some issues during certification, now solved. They expect to have the task in Certified on Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> June

### **Discussions:**

Cristina – following an e-mail from Anders (Subject: Naming of tarballs in EMI) a GGUS request for SA2 was opened - [https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket\\_info.php?ticket=71225](https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=71225)

Lorenzo – for ETICs there should be no problem, probably 1 line of code. The problem is for people using custom packaging and how much effort is needed for them to change.

Discussion between Lorenzo, Anders, Oscar, Oxana, Oliver about standard naming for source tarball, and non existent standards for binary tarball => **the agreed solution:**

- source tarballs should follow the standard (autotools) - PACKAGE-VERSION.tar.gz
- binary tarballs should follow our convention – the same as for rpms – PACKAGE-VERSION.platform.arch.tar.gz

### **QA announcements (Alberto Aimar):**

- no news
- Lorenzo will update the Packaging Policy to reflect the above discussion and decision

### **AOB:**

- no AOBs