



MINUTES (RESULTS) EGI_DS WP3 Phone Meeting

20 November 2007, 14:00 – 15:30

Agenda

Indico: <http://web.eu-egi.org/MaKaC/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=7>

14:00 Appointment of notetaker (05') (→ *Antonio*)

14:05 Meeting agenda (10')

14:15 Discussion of the draft functions (1h00')

- operations (15') (Jamie Shiers)
- mw (15') (Laura Perini, Milano University and INFN)
- other functions received (15')
- drafting new functions (15')

15:15 next meetings and steps (10')

15:25 AOB (05')

ok agenda approved

Participants

EGI WP3 Members

- Jamie Shiers (JS), CERN
 - Juergen Knobloch (JK), CERN
 - Klaus Ullmann (KU), DFN
 - Dieter Kranzlmüller (DK), GUP
 - Helene Cordier (HC), CNRS
 - Laura Perini (LP), INFN
 - Antonio Candiello (AC), INFN
-



Results

1. Operations

(Jamie) outline & discussion

Main points:

Ok about the rethinking of functions through the **services approach** proposed by Klaus. There is also another point to change to take into account all the operations – the division between **central & local**.

Mail sent by Karin & Klaus to structure a service structured part which services:

“Dear colleagues, we have digested now the input from Laura (mw) and Jamie (op) to a certain degree. We think that we need something which is not in contrast to that but which complements both presentations: we need in our view a presentation of mw and op as “services”. The collection of services build the “portfolio” of the EGI and will be sold to the NGIs. The reason is that we have to collect NGI demands for EGI services as we do not assume that NGIs will pay EGI without knowing what they are paying for - in other words they will buy services from EGI. Some of the NGIs will buy all offerings some of them may decide to buy only a subset of services. It is up to us to sense this appropriately in our description. We want to offer you an easy example from the networking side in order to clarify what we mean: DFN offers general security services. It is possible to describe the security services on one page (on the same level of abstraction as mw and op). This presentation is not useless but for a decision for a DFN university to buy (or not) a (sub)set (for example DFN-CERT service or DFN-PKI service) it is not enough. For that purpose we have a list of services which a member organisation is able to buy on our web. By the way: if you look into the old DANTE planning paper the same approach has been chosen. An EGI-service description should comprise the main technical boundary conditions (for example op system etc.) and in a few lines only the service which it is delivering. We think this additional work is not very much for mw and op experts. Such a list of services will enable NGIs to say: Service A is useful for me I will buy it. Service B is only useful if EGI offers it at a price of n ?/a otherwise it is cheaper to produce it within the NGI. In our opinion the “service portfolio” of EGI will be a basic component for the business model we have to describe for EGI. We think this is the decision framework we should be looking for.”

The NGIs have in this way the option to choose which services they wish. Service orientation. NGIs’ money for EGI are chosen on a service by service basis.

For Jamie (**operations**) it is an easy exercise. Laura (**middleware**) - a good idea also for middleware (service orientation will be pursued for both functions) . High level **services list** to work. Laura asks Jamie for the new draft services oriented some day before next meeting.

No more comments



2. Middleware

(Laura) outline & discussion

Laura - comments received. From Klaus (services, ok already discussed) . Cesnet comments by Ales (separation in subfunctions). Middleware development standard r&d – not a good idea to partition. Point 3 of middleware draft different partitioning. Help structuring functions. Cluster activity. Too detailed for the actual level. Wait f2f meeting to decide the partitioning.

(email: Ales Krenek, ljocha@ics.muni.cz "*Mainly, I don't like too much having middleware areas (data management, workload management, etc.) as subfunctions, IMHO it would yield a model that is too rigid and gets outdated rather soon. Instead, I'd suggest a subdivision more or less resembling that of row 2 (activities) to be the core subfunctions. Below I propose a slightly different angle of view, following a lifecycle of a middleware subsystem: R&D, Engineering, and Maintenance. The activities then remain Development, Standardization, and Coordination, all spanning across all the subfunctions.*")

The development & release part is to be **structured in services**. Some body deliver. Structure of **middleware coordination** is right for this kind of activity? Possibly NGIs or even outside eu projects. Laura recalls Mirco proposal for a specific structure in Egi (the **middleware institute**).

All inputs reviewed.

Now Laura starts breakdown in services. As for now no specific redrafting.
Wait till end of the week for comments on this function.

3. Other functions received

- it has been missed the discussion on **application support** (meeting too crowded) (Jamie points the function as fundamental)

comments till end of the week

- industry take up

some inputs has to come – Jamie for Cern has to send some info about some information about the Cern experience on specific collaboration project with industries.

- other functions

Laura signals: **not much mail activity** in the last 2 weeks



- list functions missing

middleware & operations focus on the next meeting

f2f meeting 1,5h for mw and 1,5h for operations; but we need to agree in the structure of all of the functions.

→ At Monday 3rd we need to have **all the drafts** of the other functions

Ended discussion on functions

4. Drafting new functions

Already discussed in point (3).

5. Conclusion

Next meetings:

- face to face munich **7 December 2007** (see mail threads) 10:30
- face to face 31th of January (more than a day?, @ cern should be fine)

Jamie ... alert! too few f2f meetings to converge in time for march

The next meeting has to be longer. The NGIs need to know in advance (in February) the function drafts if we want them ready for the approval process. The deliverable in march is near the final draft of functions.

Next months WP3 activity program:

- f2f 7/12 → output **mw & ops** (finalized) + first draft of **almost** all functions
- mail work → output **other** functions
- f2f 31/1 → output **all** functions
- early febr. → **draft** to preview to NGIs

Jamie we need the drafts **before** the march meeting if not we need to work at the meeting. We need 1h x function to discuss not 15 minutes.

Need for 3 days to discuss functions before workshop. So ...

- **3 days**: Hyp. **29 – 31 jan 08 @ Cern**

*Laura: we need **more mail activity** ...*

Minutes: there are some minor correction in the past minutes. We need that minutes **more in time**. It will be better **short** minutes than too much **delay**.



6. AOB

Laura. There is some need to **extend** the participation to the mailing lists & meetings to some other people. JK says that should be **the national institutions** that **decide** who participates and then it is simply a matter of communicating that to **Magdalena**. Nobody seems against, Laura asks explicitly Dieter's opinion as she thinks the same kind of rule should be adopted by all WP, but DK had to leave and is no more connected. JK agree to send a mail to WPL list to this effect.

JK points to the need to know the membership of the current list, LP says Magdalena can also transmit the **list of the current participants**, maybe however a more automatic system would be nice.

There was no other business. The meeting closed around 15:30.

7. Function drafting

Following the situation of drafting of functions

#	Function	Drafting	Name	State	Notes
1	Operation of a reliable Grid infrastructure	CERN	Jamie	Draft	primary: in discussion
2	Coordination of middleware development and standardization	INFN	Laura	Draft	primary: in discussion
3	Development and operation of build and test systems	CERN		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
4	Components selection, validation, integration and deployment	CERN		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
5	Mechanisms for resource provisioning to Virtual Organisations	GRNET		Not Yet	fortis promised eow
6	Application support	CERN	Jamie	Draft	needs discussion
7	Training efforts	STFC		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
8	Outreach and dissemination	INFN	Diana	Draft	
9	Industry take-up	INFN	Antonio	Draft	in discussion. There will be input from Cern
10	Contribution to the Open Grid Forum (OGF) and other standardisation bodies	INFN		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
11	Policy, Strategy, e-IRG	STFC		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
12	Representation of European Grid efforts, international cooperation, and ESFRI	GRNET		Not Yet	requested by 30th nov
13	Security	STFC	Michael	Draft	
14	Management	DFN	Klaus	Draft	in discussion