DATE: 14.06.2011

Participants:

Andrea Ceccanti, Michelle Dibenedetto, Danilo Dongiovanni, Jon K. Nilsen, Massimo Sgaravatto, Oxana Smirnova, Valery Tschopp, Giuseppe Fiameni, Enol Fernandez, Mattias Ellert, Anders Wäänänen, Michail Salichos, Eamonn Kenny, Christian Bernardt, Andres Abad Rodriguez, Maria Alandes Pradillo, Cristina Aiftimiei

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

Previous meeting minutes (06.06.2011):
 - no comments received
 - discussion on changing « Lies of Elements » - Action on Cristina

ACTION LIST (https://savannah.cern.ch/task/?group=emi-emt)
#18995 - "orphan" components for EMI-1 – should be transformed in a twiki page under EMT – Action on Cristina
#20300 - glite-info-provider-service in EMI 1 – PT should add if their services are using the right info-provider script – Remind PTs (Cristina)
#20731 - AMGA Service Reference Card: Wrong link – AMGA not present
#20736 - BDII Service Reference Card: - closed
#20737 - DPM Service Reference Card: Wrong Link - TO send reminder to Oliver(RicardoR)
#20738 - LFC Service Reference Card: Wrong Link - TO send reminder to Oliver(RicardoR)
Cristina – last week problems with ETICS NBs – Andres – problems with the certificate on submitting-node

Discussion:
Christian B– it was understood that they have to report only tkts that are either bugs or features concerning EMI release. They have a support unit were tkts are coming every day, should they be reported if they are not coming from GGUS?
CristinaA – if the tkts are recorded in the dCache tracking system, they should be reported. But on the EMT we will consider only the Immediate & High priority bugs.
AndreaC – the official communication chanel for support requests is GGUS
ChristianB – from production sites we are receving requests for support that are not always going through GGUS
EamonnK – therea are also bugs found in the integration stage, they are reported directly – is this acceptable?
AndreaC – this will require changes in the ChangeManagement Policy
MariaAP– the official support channel is GGUS, and is the only one to be used. In the RfC created later there is a field were the detection area should be mentioned, like production, integration, or other.
AndreaC – this is for what EMI is concerned.
ChristianB – for tkts that are coming for non-EMI released components, because we have sites that are not using yet EMI versions – this should not be reported?
MariaAP – Francesco should answer this, because it depends if the work done for those tkts is founded or not by EMI.
OxanaS – there are other cases when tkt or isssues are reported by people not using the SL, and other

OS are not supported by EMI. This tkts are recorded directly into the internal tracker. But if bug is discovered in Ubuntu it is still valid for SL, and has to be fixed ofr SL, even if it didn't come from GGUS.

MariaAP – if the tkt is within the EMI context it should come through GGUS

OxanaS – people that are not using SL, are not using GGUS beceuse they are not using or supported by EMI

MariaAP – if the problem afects EMI you can open an RfC whitout any connected GGUS. For the detection area: if the problem is discovered in production and comes from a GGUS tkt, there should be « detection area: production » and a link to the GGUS tkt, if it's coming from production but with no GGUS tkt, only the « detection area: prodcution »

AndreaC – we should report any development that will afect any EMI release. In case it is connected with a suportGGUS tkt it will be linked to the GGUS tkt, otherwise it can be just an RfC that contains a problem that was discovered and affects an EMI release.

EMI Release Status:
CristinaA:
- in the agenda there is a link to the twiki page containing information about the EMI 1 Updates:
    - https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EMI1Updates
- contains details about the Updates Process:
    - https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EMI1UpdatesSchedule
- contains Release Checklist and ETICS configurations details
- In the agenda there is also a link to the schedule of the Updates, next products to be updated:
    - http://bit.ly/certified_tasks
    - this week - EMI 1 Update 1: WMS Emergency Update **16.06.2011**
    - next week, 23.06.2011 – CREAM & StoRM
- FTS status – (Michail) – in the beginning of next week they will be ready. During this week still on-going tests to be completely sure about the status. Task will be Certified on 27.06.2011
- HYDRA – John – problems building due to service discovery – transformed in action:
    - https://savannah.cern.ch/task/?20933
- New tasks:
    - proxyrenewal:
        - https://savannah.cern.ch/task/?20914
    - gridsite:
        - https://savannah.cern.ch/task/?20915
- MPI – request for a task containing the fix for a problem that caused the EGI-rejection:
    - https://ggus.eu/tech/ticket_show.php?ticket=71304
    - due on 27.06.2011
    - test plans should be updated to include also the testing with EMI CREAM
- ARC products – tasks are missing even if requested, the fixes are ready to be released. Once opened the tasks will be Certified very fast.
- No EMT reports available for the week.

Discussions:
GiuseppeF – Q: QC has to verify even small updates for components? Even minor version of components?

CristinaA – yes, if the task is Certified. Not a complete verification, for example not the whole documentation, but to check if the information needed for the release is present.

GiusepepF – for the major release it wasn't possible to test all the components. How can we afford to

test even the minor releases? We need to clarify how many releases will be during the year and if we can really do this work according to the effort that we have. Because if for each component there will be 10 minor releases, this will mean 10 deployment tests, 10 verification reports. It's a lot of effort specially for the deployment

AndreaC – depends on how many releases we have. For minor releases there should not be big issues, the deployment should be painless. For the documentation there should not be a complete verification

MariaAP – can we say that documentation will be completely reviewed for major releases and that we will track in the EMI-EMT tracker the problems that we discover when doing the review, as we are doing now, and make sure that those tasks/actions are done during the upcoming updates?

CristinaA - yes

GiuseppeF -Q: if we discover a bug in a component that is released in EMI 1, should we create a new task in savannah if that bug should be released in a new minor update of the component? At the moment we could have problems, as there could be no components in savannah .

AndreaC – you should create an RfC, and the EMT should choose when it should be fixed

GiuseppeF – in which traker should be opened a bug, and for which task? There are EMI 1 bugs that affects components but there are no tasks in savannah for them.

CristinaA – if the GGUS tkt is assigned to a certain PT, the PT should put the tkt in "in progress", decide if it is a real bug or a request for support, in the sense of configuration problems on the site.If it is a bug it should be transformed in a RfC in the Pts tracking system.

GiuseppeF – the problem is that from the SA1 we have no tools to check if what is reported in GGUS have a correspondence in the PT tracker, we don't have any instruments to compare those values. I'll talk with you, Francesco

CristinaA – and with Mathilde that is providing a weekly list of open bugs.

MariaAP – SA2 will provide the EMT report where there will be listed the immediate priorities RfCs, and for which no communication was received from the Pts.

QA announcements (Maria Alandes Pradillo):
- in EMI Update we will have a window of 15 days to do releases?
  - Cristina – the "15" days are for SA1 to prepare the release, for products that are Certified at the beginning of this period
  - details are contained in the Updates Process:
  - https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/EMI1UpdatesSchedule
- SA2-QA is working on new versions of the policies after the lessons learned in EMI 1, making sure they are updated and valid for EMI 2
- in the upcoming weeks announcements for updated policies will arrive and you will have time to comment on them and give feedback

AOB:
Discussions:
ValeryT – email on going about nagios pugins. Is there any web-site wiki page, anythign about this topic?
CristinaA – the right person to ask is Laurence Field
DaniloD – wiki page: https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/NagiosProbes

MassimoS (question seen after the meeting on the dashboard): - will we have some official statements about EMI-1 update policies ? I.e. fixes only for rfcs with high and immediate problems ? Everything that doesn't break backward compatibility ?