

**DATE:** 14.02.2011

**Participants:**

John White, Cristina Del Cano Novales, Giuseppe Fiameni, Danilo Dongiovanni, Anders Wäänänen, Andrea Ceccanti, Björn Hagemeyer, Zdenek Sustr, Krzysztof Benedyczak, Paolo Andretto, Morris Riedel, Martin Savko, Jon K. Nilsen, Mattias Ellert, Valery Tschopp, Marco Cecchi, Patrick Fuhrmann, Riccardo Zappi, Christian Bernardt, Paolo Andretto, Lorenzo Dini, Maria Alandes Pradillo, Alberto Aimar, Pedro Andrade, Alberto Di Meglio, Cristina Aiftimiei

**Missing:** AMGA, gLite InformationSystem, SAGA

Meeting entirely dedicated to the «**EMI 1 “Kebnekaise” release preparation schedule**», attached to the meeting agenda, and on the EMT mailing-list

- No comment on point 1., 2.
- 3. no new requirements are defined in the checklist, they are taken from the existing Policies documentation. It will help developers to have a summary of all the things they have to do to be able to release components in EMI
- 5. requested Release Notes should be made available in the EMI-Releases tracker ;

**Action on Cristina** – to circulate the part referring to the Release Notes contained in the Change Management Policies

- 6. by 23 Feb should be deployed on the testbed, and can be used by the PTs to certify their components. Details on interoperability testing will be made available as soon as there is a common agreement on who has to do/implement them.
- 7, 8, 9 – different code freeze according to the criticality of the components

**Q (AndreaC):**

- the deadlines depend on the Packaging Policies. Components that do not respect the “MUST” on the Packaging Policies will be rejected? The possibility to produce src.rpm is not obvious for components that are using maven, they are not conform to EPEL guidelines.

**Balasz:**

- Testing & Certification done by the PT means: there will be available a checklist; the PT/PT leader will go through the checklist and declares if a component satisfies or not the requirements. By the deadline the PT has to provide a report with the certification status, explaining the reasons of not meeting the requirements. Reports are needed ASAP to be able to evaluate the real situation. What is needed is a code good enough for the RC1 together with the certification report.

**Valery:** - publishing the requirements this week and asking for the certification in 2 days seems to short

**Morris:** - the checklist is not fundamentally different from what is available since long time

**Lorenzo:**

- Friday there was a discussion on what should be put in the Packaging Policies for the best situation, but this doesn't mean that if PTs are not 100% their components will be rejected.

**Balasz:** Are there strong objections about this strict deadlines? 23 Feb – critical components and 2 March other components

**NO objections**

- 10, 11, 12 – RC1 available and deployed on the testbed, QC-team validation and validation reports attached to the EMI Releases tracker

**Q (GiuseppeF):**

- the QC in case a PT doesn't respect the criteria - should reject a component and ask for clarification? Who is going to evaluate the justification of each PT?

**AlbettoA** – QC should only report, not to stop a release, The decision is of PEB or PTB

**Q(GiuseppeF):** QC team has only 1 person

**Cristina:**

- the new “emergency” QC team will be formed with members from NA1 (FloridaE), SA1 (GiuseppeF), SA2 (to be decided) and JRA1 (AndreaC)

**Q(GiuseppeF)** – SA2 should update the Production Release Criteria

**Maria:** - it will be ready this week

- 13, 14, 15 – RC2 ready, available for technical preview, installed on the testbed
- 16, 17 – latest dates for components and documentation from Pts
- 18, 19, 20, 21 – preparation and deployment of the EMI 1 Release

**PedroA:**

- a lot of time was spent in building components, while the effort on packaging started only few days ago, and this can cause problems
- PTs are limited by the infrastructure and the tools; effort was put in improving the etics-client during the last week; more attention should be put on the availability of the tools

**Massimo:**

- for the gLite JobManagement component that need the modification of the yaim-module can start only when all the relevant components are ready

**Danilo:**

- which are the components will be available on the EMI repository?

**Cristina:**

- on 18 Feb all components that build will be available on the repository

**Lorenzo: Communication on the conclusions of the Packaging meeting and info about the new etics-client**

- Friday (11. Feb) a meeting on Packaging TaskForce took place, triggered by AndersW and other ARC people because they have components already EPEL compliant, and we wanted to figure out how can we let them release those components without making huge changes in the infrastructure.
- Participants: SA1, SA2, PTB and PEB members
- The result was a plan for the infrastructure and some policies about packaging
  - for the infrastructure – everybody agreed that big changes in the infrastructure using other build system is not suitable, especially because we have already under development the new system that was planned for EMI 1, and this is what is delivered this week - the improvements in the etics-client and in the infrastructure are that after the normal ETICS build, a Mock build executes from source packages and regenerates rpms in a pristine environment
  - another change – provide minimal WN images with minimal packages installed
  - another change – the etics-client installs the rpms that are defined by the components in order to verify that the dependencies are in place
- after the release of the new etics-client (1.5.0) the EPEL-WNs (with all packages) will slowly

be replaced with the new images, and allow to etics-client sudo privileges to install rpms in the image according to dependencies;

**AndreaC:**

- will the configuration have to change?
- The case of maven – that Pts expected be installed in the build-nodes
- How do we know that we'll have maven correctly packaged?

**Lorenzo:**

- this is a good reason to not be 100% compliant starting from tomorrow
- aware that VOMS and UNICORE use maven and that is complicated to have a maven package soon

**Andrea:**

- will my builds work with the new client?

**Lorenzo:**

- yes, it will continue to work because the build doesn't change
- the only difference is that a new option will be added at the end of the Nbs, that enables at the end of the normal build process a Mock process will be executed in a pristine environment, so that the packages that are produced correctly will have a higher priority
- at the end of the process there will be a list of packages with 3 colors: red > → no package exists; orange/yellow → package was build by ETICS directly to binary; green – the packages work also from source.rpms
- the client doesn't break your build, you will have an orange package
- this allows people using ETICS to hepp-on using ETICS with small changes, and to ARC people to build in a pristine environment and produce EPEL compliant packages
- this new client will be also dynamic for the external dependencies/properties
- for the Mock environment, there are a set of yum repositories that will be used, in addition to the basic ones (OS, EPEL), add etics-externals – this repo should be moved to emi-externals
- as soon as the rc0, rc1, etc are available, there will be an yum repository, that will be added to the list of repositories used by Mock to pick up packages.
- **News:**
  - The EMI Packaging Policies was updated; at the next EMT will be discussed; The doc is still a draft of the project
  - “What happens if a PT directly publish packages as EPEL”
    - This is not allowed, every PT must follow the EMI quality assurance release process to be able to release packages

**MartinS:**

- what happens with packages like lfc, that is already in EPEL, when we will run the repackaging of ETICS, will the version available from ETICS will be picked up or the ones from the EPEL?

**Lorenzo:**

- if there is a version in EMI newer than the one in EPEL, considering that this package will be available from the RC0, RC1 yum repos;
- Every dependency will pick-up the newer version in EMI 1; This is the right behaviour
- together with Cristina, we are planning a stable testing repository; maybe an incremental repository, so that in case a NB fails, it remains available the previous one.

**Massimo** – for RC0 what project-config will be used?

**Cristina** – emi\_B\_1\_rc

**Massimo:** - you expect tagged software, not branching?

**Cristina** – yes

**Anders:** - clarification on the “not allowed to put software in EPEL”

**AlbertoDM:**

- this is not a trivial issue, there were also comments about this, including the WLCG pre-deployment board
- what it is not allowed is for a PT to use software created in EMI and to create packages directly to EPEL without going through the EMI procedures
- if the outcome of this procedure is to produce packages that are fit for being pushed into EPEL, nobody prevents anybody to do this
- we cannot put in EPEL something that is more advanced than what we have in EMI repos, that will end up in UMD repos.
- Packages that we put in EMI repos and pushed to UMD repos should be exactly the same as the ones in EPEL, or newer, after going through the EMI procedures.

**Summary:**

- one cannot put in EPEL something that is newer or different from what we release with EMI

**QA Policies:****Maria:**

- the names of the documents changed from Guidelines to Policies, reflecting the fact that Pts MUST follow what is written there
- twiki pages will be updated to reflect this change, as well as PDF files
- the “checklist” is a step by step list of things to do to be able to release in EMI

**AOBs:****AndreaC:**

- what are the recommendations for yaim, as this is a tool used by most of gLite PTs

**Cristina:**

- EMI is offering support for yaim for the components that already implement it, meaning that if a PT didn't use yaim until now, it shouldn't start now.
- the packaging – the Packaging Policies must be followed also for yaim.

**AndreaC**

- VOMS is configured with yaim, and many site-admins rely on yaim to configure VOMS; in order to comply with Packaging guidelines, yaim-voms has to be repackaged; in order to repackage it needs the yaim-core. The work on yaim can have an impact on the schedule.
- It is acceptable that yaim-modules and packages are not compliant with the Packaging Policies for EMI-1

**Cristina:**

- in my opinion it is acceptable;
- yaim will have to undergo anyhow internal changes to reflect the different changes in the paths of a lot of components

**Cristina:**

from the moment the new etics-client is ready, in order to speed-up the build process, changes will be done to configurations with problems; Everything will be logged in the Emi 1 twiki page.