

FINAL NOTES by Maria Dimou & Maarten Litmaath - v.1.1

Middleware Readiness Working Group kick-off meeting (with audioconf)

Thursday, 12 December 2013 from 16:00 to 17:00 hrs CET at CERN (513-R-068)

Agenda: <https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=285681>

Present:

Joel Closier, Renaud Vernet, Alberto Aimar, Joao Pina (EGI Staged Rollout manager), Daniela Bauer,

Simone Campana, Maarten Litmaath & Maria Dimou (chairpersons and minute-takers), Andrea Valassi, Luke ?, Cristina Aiftimiei, Vanessa Hamar (IN2P3), Jeremy Coles (GridPP).

Summary:

There wasn't enough participation from experiments and sites so the discussion concentrated on software **repositories** and the **criteria** for judging a product deployment process successful.

At the next meeting, on 2014/02/06, we shall focus on motivating the experiments to adapt their work-flows and participate in the testing of new middleware versions.

1. Repositories:

EPEL and **MAVEN** are popular and very much used by the Product Teams (PTs) and this is fine. Alberto said, and all agreed, sites use all kinds of repositories depending on the product, e.g. sites take dCache from the PT's own repository, UMD is also used for others.

The fact is we need an additional catch-all repository. This seems to be the WCLG one.

The **WLCG repository** is also used for overriding bad rpms.

It is NOT intended that ALL middleware used by WLCG will be in the WLCG repository.

The **EMI repository** priorities will probably need to be lowered to allow releases in EPEL/Maven/... to take priority instead. Cristina said that INFN will continue maintaining the EMI repository beyond

April 2014.

***** ACTION 20131212-01 ***** Cristina will obtain an official INFN statement on the continuation of the EMI repository beyond April 2014 and for how long. This should be communicated to this WG and the WLCG MB.

Discussing **UMD**, participants reported that sites find it hard to rely on it because it takes longer to present versions as 'certified'. For now, some of the PTs still use EMI.

UMD's advantage is that it provides roll-back possibilities, which EPEL does not. Joao has counted 45 WLCG sites which use UMD, including 3 Tier1s and CERN. The UMD release process is not foreseen to change before 2015-2016. UMD features' summary:

- * built from sustainable NGI contributions to EGI
- * UMD repositories have high priority
- * input rpms are taken from EMI, EPEL and other yum repos
- * update delays usually are outweighed by benefits from Validation and Staged Rollout
- * emergency releases can be done much faster

Further EGI and UMD-related material sent by Joao right after the meeting:

- *The full list of sites and people responsible for that activity can be consulted in the following two pages (need and SSO account):*
 - *Early Adopter teams: <https://www.egi.eu/earlyAdopters/table>*
 - *Middleware Components tested: <https://www.egi.eu/earlyAdopters/teams>*
- *More details, namely the WLCG sites acting as early adopters in the EGI activities, can be*

found in the EGI TF2013 presentation given in the "New developments in WLCG for Run2" session:

<https://indico.egi.eu/indico/contributionDisplay.py?sessionId=53&contribId=248&confId=1417>

- The list of products currently tested in UMD:

https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/EGI_Quality_Criteria_Verification#Verification_engineer_skill_matrix

- EGI testbed configuration used for the verification process:

https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/EGI_Verification_Testbed

- Individual PT plans on their future developments. At EGI we have a regular meeting

(URT: UMD Release Meeting) on which some of the product team present there short term plans. Even if those meetings are more focused on short-medium term plans if WLCG shows any interest we could introduce that topic for discussion. The product team list present at the URT

meeting can be consulted at <https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/URT:Agenda-18-11-2013>

2. Process:

No recommendation from the participants, proceed as per agenda point 2, namely:

***** ACTION 20131212-02 ***** Maarten & Maria, with input from all, will examine the work-flow used by some products and, if they can serve as examples, document their reasons of success. Point to their existing documentation and summarise in a table.

DPM, dCache, [StoRM](#) were the products listed in the agenda. StoRM validation sites include INFN-T1.

Jeremy said that we should look in the Baseline versions table for other important products, not only storage. We shall look into other product candidates after documenting the existing processes for the storage element flavors (not all products on the Baseline page will (need to) be covered).

Joel said, and all agreed, that identifying PRODUCTS is less important than identifying PROCESSES. PTs left homeless after the end of EMI may not go through formal testing as they

should. Our aim is to shelter PTs from the lack of rigorous testing processes. Joel added that a testing suite should be mandatory as a prerequisite from each PT.

Joao said that as EGI UMD does this already by providing testbeds AND as Staged Rollout and UMD are ensured for 2 more years (End of 2015), so PTs won't be 'homeless'. The idea is to even continue beyond 2015 (also end of EGI) with funding by the NGIs, as announced at the 2013/12/11 GDB by Peter Solagna.

Maarten noted that:

- Regular interactions with PTs may help avoid efforts going into directions that are not desirable for WLCG.
- We should find what should be done to avoid discovering surprising changes in the validation phase (e.g. fallout of VOMS client tools reimplemented in Java).
- PTs should evolve their test suites on downstream feedback.
- As the UMD Early Adopter sites include ~30 WLCG sites with 3 Tier-1 we should make use of UMD processes where possible, and add experiment-specific tests.
- UMD does verification indeed, but it cannot do load tests.

3. Communication:

This will be done, for the points tackled so far. via the summary of these minutes, to the next WLCG Operations Coordination meeting

<https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=282475>

4. Experiments:

No ATLAS or CMS participation. This agenda item on experiment involvement was left for next time.

5. Sites:

The site availability reports will become less important, now the accounting reports matter a lot more. We should make sure sites don't get penalised for bad accounting results,

on the contrary, thanked for going through the testing effort.

***** ACTION 20131212-03 ***** Jeremy will send the processes used by UK sites so we can learn from them for the next meeting.

6. EGI:

This item was covered during the 'Repositories' and 'Process' discussions.

7. A.O.B.

Next meeting: If people can't make it on **February 6th at 15:30hrs CET**, please email the e-group!

Action	Description	Status
20131212-01	Cristina to obtain an official INFN statement on the continuation of the EMI repository beyond April 2014 and for how long. This should be communicated to this WG and the WLCG MB.	Pending
20131212-02	Maarten & Maria, with input from all , to examine the workflow used by some products and, if they can serve as examples, document their reasons of success. Point to	Pending

	their existing documentation and summarise in a table.	
20131212-03	Jeremy to send the processes used by UK sites so we can learn from them for the next meeting.	Pending