

NA4 Face-to-Face Steering Committee Meeting
27-28 March 2008
Paris, Jussieu

Present:

Charles Loomis (CL)
Evangelos Floros (EF)
Frank Harris (FH)
Francisco Castéjon (FC)
Patricia Mendez Lorenzo (PM)
Lydia Maigne (LM)
Vincent Breton (VB)
Johan Montagnat (JM)
Monique Petitdidier (MP)
Horst Schwichtenberg (HS)
Frédéric Schaer (FS)
Gergely Sipos (GS)
Mariusz Sterzel (MS)
Claudio Vuerli (CV)
Christophe Blanchet (CB)
Cécile Germain-Renaud (CG)

I. EC Review of EGEE-II

The EC Review of the EGEE-II project will be held 8-9 July 2008 at CERN. The NA4 contribution to this will consist of two parts: a presentation of the NA4 accomplishments over the project and two demonstrations.

Reminder of schedule:

- * First Rehearsal (19-20 June, CERN/Phone)
- * Dress Rehearsal (3-4 July, CERN)
- * EGEE-II EU Review (8-9 July, CERN)

Review of NA4 Accomplishments

CL will give the NA4 presentation at the review. Typically the presentation is around 30-40 minutes, meaning around 15-20 slides. CL will send out an email asking for contributions to this presentation from each cluster representative. It will be helpful to already start thinking about graphics that can be used for the presentation.

Actions:

- CL: Circulate a request for contributions to the NA4 SC.

Demonstrations

EF will be the master of ceremonies for the demonstration part. It will follow the usual format of a short introduction, two demos, and a short conclusion. EF will give the introduction and conclusion.

In the discussion the important points were:

- Need to demonstrate how the grid is made usable for scientists.
- Reuse existing demonstrations from the UF if possible.
- Demonstrate use from different communities.

The result of the discussion on what demos to prepare was:

- Ask the Health-e-Child demo to present at the review. Although this is an “external” project this would demonstrate uptake of the EGEE services, usage of those tools in an industrial setting, and interaction with the biomedical community. This also shows collaboration between EU-funded grid projects.
- For the second demo, it was decided to reuse (and slightly enhance) the fusion demonstration. This is visually interesting and demonstrates usage in a new (and politically important) domain.
- Alternative demos in case either of the first ones are feasible are: GReIC and fMRI. Both were presented at the User Forum and received recognition from the external advisory committee.

In order to demonstrate some of the tools used to facilitate the use of the grid by scientists, PM will look into creating a “kiosk” type demonstration containing GridView, Dashboard, and perhaps GANGA. This will run continuously in the coffee break area and/or off to the side to highlight these important developments.

Actions:

- EF: Circulate the proposals for the demos to the PEB.
- PM: Look into a “kiosk” display of the GridView, Dashboard, and GANGA.

II. POST mortem for User Forum

See the presentation from EF on recommendations arising from the last User Forum.

Additional comments that came up in the discussion were:

- Encourage people to set up the demos before the event starts. This maximizes the exposure of the work and ensures that demo booths are visibly empty during part of the event.
- Expand the demo/poster session to 2 half-days. To avoid a crunch in the program, the second half-day will probably have to be run along with other parallel sessions.
- Encourage participation from other (selected) related projects. Could start to think of inviting some of them to be on the program committee. Ensure that the invited people are active and willing to promote the event within their projects.

The next User Forum will be in April 2009 co-organized with OGF.

FH shared the feeling that OGF is “speaking down to us”. So we need to be positively “aggressive” with OGF. A selected number of us (probably CL, EF, and FH) should go to Barcelona for next OGF in June 2008 to already start discussing with the organizers on their side.

VB informed us that OGF is in bad shape at the moment and they are losing sponsors. The standards they are developing do not interest the industry anymore. They are open to change the focus and this would be a good time to push better interaction with applications. So there is an opportunity worldwide for us to help OGF to change their focus and to make it more useful for the application areas. We could imagine a more combined program than the last

joint meeting with sessions started by applications giving their needs followed by people from the standards part of OGF.

III. Transition from EGEE-II to EGEE-III

Coordination (CL, EF)

Points arising from discussion:

- (FH) NA4 events (at least public ones) should be announced well in advance and agendas should be available for those meetings.
- (CL) Should work to have all meetings and agendas in a central place. All of the meetings (and other news items) should be announced on the NA4 web.
- (VB) Need to build a network with regional support people (there is quite a bit of effort there) and we need to have named people responsible for each region.
- (CL) The list of regional contacts needs to be available on the NA4 web.
- Need simplified reporting procedures (perhaps web based form).
- (VB) The responsibilities for the regional support personnel need to be explicitly stated.
- Must ensure that the regional personnel are well connected with the NGI in the same region.

VO Support (FS)

Points arising from discussion:

- (CL) Need to make sure that we organize a couple of meetings specifically for the VO managers. Must ensure that we collect the necessary requirements and provide the tools necessary for effective VO management.

Application Porting Support (GS)

No additional points from the discussion.

HEP Cluster (PM)

Additional points arising from discussion:

- VB asked if the HEP cluster will support AMGA for sure. PM confirmed that the LCG is committed to supporting AMGA and it is planned to build a new working group at CERN to do this.
- (CL) Need to make sure that we have strong contacts with the non-LHC parts of the HEP community, particularly those like D0, CDF, H1, and Zeus that are already strong users of the grid.
- (FH) Need to ensure that there is a tight working relationship with those INFN people that are working as part of the HEP cluster.

LS Cluster (VB)

Specific points:

- (VB) AMGA is a very important tool in which we want to contribute. The Asian partners are the interface with PRAGMA (avian-flu monitoring). The Life Science

Cluster is working closely with Korean groups in Drug Discovery. However it is going to be difficult to keep the momentum because of the budget cut.

- Metrics are difficult because it is hard to get an overall view of the life science activity. The activity is spread over many institutes and occurs within many different VOs.

FH raised a side point on the user satisfaction. In EGEE and EGEE-II, we had user surveys for this. We will not have similar things for EGEE-III because of the large cost (in effort) for creating and analyzing them compared to the little new information that is collected. There was general agreement that we need some information like this, but only if it can be collected easily.

VB raised the point that there is little effort left in the clusters so that we must rely on the regional support and other support teams to handle the reporting and other tasks.

ES Cluster (HS)

Additional points from discussion:

- (HS) Tools and information will be elsewhere for ES, so there is no point in centralizing this information on EGEE services. Just provide links to those places on the NA4 web site.
- (VB) Same will be true in the life sciences.

Grid Observatory (CG)

Additional points from discussion:

- The primary targets are people in computer science and engineering.
- EGEE (eventually EGI) is uniquely placed to be able to provide such information.
- (FH) Need to make sure that a comprehensive view of the grid is obtained including versions of software, status of sites, etc.

AA Cluster (CV)

Additional points from discussion:

- (CL) For both the training and documentation aspects, the AA cluster needs to take advantage of the effort in the direct user support task and in the training activity. The people in the AA cluster should only concentrate on those aspects that are tightly tied to AA-specific functionality.
- (CV) To minimize expenses, cluster meetings should continue to be done in conjunction with EGEE Conferences and User Forums. (CL) We may need to add some time before or after the User Forums to accommodate requests like this. With the change of focus for the EGEE Conferences, this should not be a problem.

Fusion Cluster (FC)

Additional points from discussion:

- The workflow orchestration part of the activity is fully funded by EUFORIA. A tight coupling between EUFORIA effort and the EGEE effort is envisaged to maximize the impact of both projects in the fusion community.

- (CL) Need to be very clear about the responsibilities with respect to both projects so that the EU does not get the impression that it is double-funding this work. And thus the writing of an MOU is very important.

CC Cluster (MS)

Additional points from discussion:

- Need to ensure that commercial software is available to scientists. The Gaussian VO was created for this, but has not been a very workable model because scientists often need multiple software packages and moving information, etc. between VOs is not very simple.