Version: **1.5** Status: **RC Final**

Author: Vangelis Floros Date: 29/06/2008

TNA 4.3.2: Regional Participation

| 1 | Int | roduction | 1 |
|---|-----|---|----|
| | | Motivation | |
| | | dget and resources | |
| | | Partners | |
| | | Allocated Resources | |
| | | orkplan | |
| | 3.1 | Management Liaison | 4 |
| | 3.2 | Technical Support | 7 |
| | 3.3 | Activity representation and signposting | 14 |
| | 3.4 | Tools | 16 |
| | 3 5 | Cross-team collaboration | 17 |

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Regional support teams have played an important role in the past concerning the smooth operation of NA activities in participating regions. In EGEE-III this effort should be intensified with an additional goal to prepare for the transition to the NGI model. Many of the existing centralized user and application support services are expected to migrate to local support teams on the NGI level. The existing teams participating in EGEE-III will most probably get involved in the NGI activities or act as consultants, passing the required know-how, during the establishment of the NGI user and application support services.

This upgraded role of the regional application support teams will be visible also in the EGEE-III workplan. These teams will act as liaisons between EGEE and regional Grid activities. Each team should appoint a Regional Coordinator who will be responsible for the organization and management of the regional team activities, will report to NA4 management and participate in the "extended" NA4 Steering Committee meetings. The teams will also be comprised of technical staff consisting of one or more grid application experts, who will complement the Regional Coordinator in his/her activities and interact with the local applications providing support in various levels.

2 Budget and resources

2.1 Partners

| # | Institute Names | Region | PMs |
|----|------------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| 1 | AS Taiwan, CNU Korea | Asia/US | 42 |
| 2 | SARA | Benelux | 17 |
| 3 | CESNET, JSI | Central Europe | 21 |
| 4 | DKRZ | CERN/Germany/Switzerland | 23 |
| 5 | STFC | France/UK/Ireland | 35 |
| 6 | INFN | Italy | 31 |
| 7 | SIGMA, VR-SNIC | Northern Europe | 16 |
| 8 | SINP MSU | Russia | 12 |
| 9 | GRNET, UCY | South East Europe | 32 |
| 10 | UCM | South West Europe | 33 |

2.2 Allocated Resources

| 2.2 | Allocated Ne | Jour cc. | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|----------|--|-----------------------------------|-----|
| # | Federation/ Partner name | PMS | Staff name | Email | PMs |
| 1 | CERN Fed. | 0 | | | |
| 2 | Benelux | 17 | | | |
| 1 | SARA (FOM) | 17 | Maurice | Bouwhuis | |
| 3 | Central Europe | 21 | | , | |
| 2 | CESNET (CESNET) | 11 | JiriChuboda | Jiri.Chudoba@cern.ch | 6 |
| | | | JaroslavaSchovancova | Jaroslava.Schovancova@cern. ch | 5 |
| 3 | JSI (JSI) | 10 | Andrej Filipcic andrej.filipcic@ijs.si | | 3 |
| | | | BorutKersevan | borut.kersevan@ijs.si | 3 |
| | | | DejanLesjan | dejan.lesjak@ijs.si | 2 |
| | | | Jan JonaJavorsek | jona.javorsek@ijs.si | 2 |
| 4 | DECH | 23 | | | • |
| 4 | DKRZ (FZK) | 23 | Kerstin Ronneberger | ronneberger@dkrz.de | 23 |
| 5 | France | 0 | | | |
| 6 | Italy | 31 | | | |
| 5 | INFN (INFN) | 31 | EnricoFattibene | enrico.fattibene@cnaf.infn.it | 14 |
| | | | Tiziana Ferrari | tiziana.ferrari@cnaf.infn.it | 6 |
| | | | DavideSalomoni | davide.salomoni@cnaf.infn.it | 4 |
| | | | | | |

| | | | Laura Perini | laura.perini@mi.infn.it | 4 |
|----|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| | | | Giorgio Maggi | giorgio.maggi@ba.infn.it | 4 |
| 7 | Northern Europe | 16 | | l | |
| 6 | SIGMA (SIGMA) | 6 | Tore Mauset | tore.mauset@uninett.no | 6 |
| 7 | VR-SNIC (VR- SNIC) | 10 | | | 0 |
| 8 | Russia | 12 | | | |
| 8 | SINP MSU (RRC KI) | 12 | | | 0 |
| 9 | South East Europe | 32 | | | |
| 9 | GRNET (GRNET) | 20 | MariosChatziangelou | mhaggel@iasa.gr | 8 |
| | | | Slobodan Vrhovac | vhova@grnet.gr | 12 |
| 10 | UCY (UCY) | 12 | Nikolas Stylianides | nstyl@cs.ucy.ac.cy | 6 |
| | | | HaraldGjermundrod | egeemgt@cs,ucy.ac.cy | 3 |
| | | | MariosDikaiakos | mdd@cs.ucy.ac.cy | 3 |
| 10 | South West Europe | 33 | | | |
| 11 | UCM (IFAE) | 33 | Eduardo HuedoCuesta | ehuedo@fdi.ucm.es | 11 |
| | | | Jose Luis VázquezPoletti | jlvazquez@fdi.ucm.es | 20 |
| | | | Ruben Santiago Montero | rubensm@fdi.ucm.es | 2 |
| 11 | UK/Ireland | 35 | | | , |
| 12 | STFC (STFC) | 12 | Abdeslem DJAOUI | a.djaoui@rl.ac.uk | 12 |
| 13 | Glasgow (STFC) | 23 | Morag Burgon-Lyon | m.burgon- lyon@physics.gla.ac.uk | 7,2 |
| | | | Suzanne Scott | s.scott@physics.gla.ac.uk | 12 |
| 12 | Asia | 42 | | • | 1 |
| 14 | ASGC (ASGC) | 36 | | | 0 |
| 15 | CNU (CNU) | 6 | | | 0 |
| | | | | | |
| | Total Fed. (PM) | 262 | | | |

3 Workplan

This section provides detailed analysis of the tasks appointed to the regional support teams, a time frame for implementation, the tools utilized and the metrics used to track the progress of each one. The workplan is broadly devised into three separate supporttracks, namely "Management Liaison", "Technical Support" and "Activity Representation and Signposting". Each one further analyzed in various subtasks.

A number of metrics have been identified in order to facilitate tracking of workgroup's progress from NA4 and project management. These metrics will be included in the quarterly activity reports. Keeping them up-to-date and accurate will be fundamental for the task management. An online form will be setup by NA4 in a centralized web site to collect the above information

3.1 Management Liaison

| Subtask ID | RP1 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|-------|-------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Commu | nication | | | |

Goals

Help communicate important EGEE information (e.g. User Forum CfAs, project newsletters and other project announcements) to local users and research groups. Encourage participation of local applications to EGEE events and especially the two upcoming User Forums. Coordinate with NA4 management in case of casual activities e.g. submission of user polls and application questionnaires, organization of workshops, meetings and other live events.

Benefits

Participation of local communities in the major project events are important both for the success of the events but also for the dissemination of knowledge and staying in touch with the user communities.

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| M-RP1-1 | M10 – 4 th User Forum | Number of users contacted |
| | | Number of contact iterations |
| M-RP1-2 | M22 – 5 th User Forum | Number of users contacted |
| | | Number of contact iterations |

| Subtask ID | RP2 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|---------|-------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Reporti | ng | | | |

The regional coordinator is responsible for reporting to the NA4 management. This includes quarterly reports and in some cases (after specific request) contribution to activity deliverables and milestones.

Benefits

This is one of the major tasks of the regional support teams. It is imperative that NA4 activity has a clear view of the users and applications on a regional level in order to appropriately identify new communities, track requirements and problems and defined actions for support.

Milestonesand Metrics to gauge Progress

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|------------------------|--|
| M-RP2-1 | M03 – Quarterly Report | * Each QR is expected to contain the various |
| M-RP2-2 | M06 – Quarterly Report | metrics collected from |
| M-RP2-3 | M09 – Quarterly Report | within the reporting |
| M-RP2-4 | M12 – Quarterly Report | period |
| M-RP2-5 | M15 – Quarterly Report | |
| M-RP2-6 | M18 – Quarterly Report | |
| M-RP2-7 | M21 – Quarterly Report | |
| M-RP2-8 | M24 – Quarterly Report | |

| Subtask ID | RP3 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|--------|-----------------|--------|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Suppor | t for RESPECT p | rogram | | |

Goals

Help identify candidate software to be included in the RESPECT program. Periodically revalidate RESPECT software.

Benefits

Facilitate the expansion and growth of RESPECT program. Identify software specifically targeting the requirements of local user communities and applications.

| Milestonesar | nd Metrics to gauge Progress | |
|--------------|--|---|
| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
| M-RP3-1 | Sprint 1: M04-M05. Two months period for identifying and evaluating candidate software that will be potentially useful for local communities | Number of software packages identified Number of software packages evaluated Number of software packages proposed for RESPECT Number of software packages used in the region and already listed in RESPECT |
| M-RP3-2 | Sprint 2: M10-M11. Two months period for identifying and evaluating candidate software that will be potentially useful for local communities | Number of software packages identified Number of software packages evaluated Number of software packages proposed for RESPECT Number of software packages used in the region and already listed in RESPECT |
| M-RP3-3 | Sprint 3: M22-M23. Two months period for identifying and evaluating candidate software that will be potentially useful for local communities | Number of software packages identified Number of software packages evaluated Number of software packages proposed for RESPECT Number of software packages used in the region and already listed in RESPECT |
| M-RP3-4 | Sprint 4: M16-M17. Two months period for identifying and evaluating candidate software that will be potentially useful | Number of software packages identifiedNumber of software |

| for local communities | packages evaluated |
|-----------------------|--|
| | - Number of software packages proposed for RESPECT |
| | - Number of software packages used in the region and already listed in RESPECT |

3.2 Technical Support

| от топпинатоврет | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------|---|-----------|----|--|--|
| Subtask ID | RP4 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 | | |
| Subtask Name | First line Application Porting support | | | | | | |

Goals

Provide first line local support for legacy and new applications. This includes initial consultation for a proper way to adopt grid technologies, introduction of the various tools available and suggestions for a specific gridification path. In cases further and more specialized support is required the users should be directed to the NA4 Application Porting Team. The decision to forward the request to the latter should be based on the complexity of the application taking into account the limited resources (mainly in terms of funding) of regional participation. Request for application porting supported should follow a formal procedure, initiated by opening a ticket in GGUS, flagged appropriately as porting request. The Application Porting team should acknowledge reception of request in which case the ticket is closed and the task is no longer responsibility of the regional support team.

Benefits

The main beneficiaries of this subtask are the new user communities that enter the grid and received a first line of localized grid application porting support. This will potentially facilitate their first steps in using the EGEE infrastructure and in the long run will increase the size and penetration of EGEE in many new and diverse scientific disciplines and applications. In the NGI era application support of this level is envision to be one of the main tasks of local teams.

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| M-RP4-1 | M03 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |

| | | Number of users impacted |
|---------|------------------------|---|
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-2 | M06 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users impacted |
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-3 | M09 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users impacted |
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-4 | M12 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users |

| | | impacted |
|---------|------------------------|---|
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-5 | M15 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users impacted |
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-6 | M18 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users impacted |
| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter |
| | | Number of support requests received |
| | | Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
| M-RP4-7 | M21 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported |
| | | Number of users impacted |

| | | Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter Number of support requests received Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |
|---------|------------------------|---|
| M-RP4-8 | M24 – Quarterly Report | Number of applications supported Number of users impacted Number of new applications introduced during the past quarter Number of support requests received Number of tickets opened for Application Porting Team |

| Subtask ID | RP5 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|---------|----------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Regiona | al VOs Support | | | |

The team should identify and propose the establishment of new regional VOs in order to facilitate deployment of applications and collaboration of regional teams that have exhausted the capabilities of regional catch-allVOs.

Benefits

Many general purpose, multi-disciplinary but also discipline-specific VOs have strong regional flavour and are being established in order to serve specific needs of local teams. Sometimes it might not be clear who is responsible for these VOs (e.g. for managing subscriptions, software installation etc). The regional support teams are natural candidates to take over this role although in many cases the administration effort can be considerable. With the envisioned upgraded role of regional support teams in the EGI/NGI model it will be beneficial to aim strong involvement of the teams in VO support tasks.

| Milestonesand Metrics to gauge Progress | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|
| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics | |
| M-RP5-1 | M03 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed | |
| | | Number of new regional VOs established | |
| | | Number of software packages installed in local VOs | |
| M-RP5-2 | M06 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed | |
| | | Number of new regional VOs established | |
| | | Number of software packages installed in local VOs | |
| M-RP5-3 | M09 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed | |
| | | Number of new regional VOs established | |
| | | Number of software packages installed in local VOs | |
| M-RP5-4 | M12 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed | |
| | | Number of new regional VOs established | |
| | | Number of software packages installed in local VOs | |
| M-RP5-5 | M15 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed | |
| | | Number of new regional VOs established | |
| | | Number of software packages installed in local VOs | |

| M-RP5-6 | M18 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed Number of new regional VOs established Number of software packages installed in local VOs |
|---------|------------------------|--|
| M-RP5-7 | M21 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed Number of new regional VOs established Number of software packages installed in local VOs |
| M-RP5-8 | M24 – Quarterly Report | Number of regional VOs managed Number of new regional VOs established Number of software packages installed in local VOs |

| Subtask ID | RP6 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|--------|-----------------|--------|------------|----|
| Subtask Name | Docume | entation Review | and Lo | calization | |

Review existing documentation; provide suggestions for improvement, open bugs in GGUS etc. For a selected number of support documents localize them according to language specific local community requirements. Documentation review will be organized in coordination with the DUS in four individual sprint periods.

Benefits

Significant volume of documentation, some of which exposing high quality, has been developed locally by various regional grid specialists and support teams. Collectively this material provides an important source of know how that should be exploited by the Direct User Support (DUS) documentation subtask. Regional teams can relieve much of the burden of searching and evaluating existing documentation in various regions that otherwise will fall in the responsibilities of DUS team. On the other hand DUS having a central role in documentation development, will ensure consistency, will identify overlap among provided

material, end consolidate the otherwise desperate knowledge in a central body of information.

Conversely, much of the support material developed in the context of DUS varies from region to region. A typical use case is this of certificate issuing procedures, which are specific for each country. Here the regional teams should provide the necessary effort for localizing and keeping this information up to date. Notice, that although ideally localization would ideally mean translation to different spoken languages used in the region, realistically the limited time and resources reserved for regional participation does not permit such activities. Nevertheless, and keeping an eye to the future, one would expect that such tasks will be one of the responsibilities of NGI-wide application support teams.

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|--|--|
| M-RP6-1 | M02-M03: 1 st sprint. Collection of existing local documentation. Review and feedback to DUS | Number of documents evaluated Number of suggested documentation send to DUS |
| M-RP6-2 | M08-M09: 2 nd sprint. Review of documentation created by DUS. Selective documentation localization. | Number of documents evaluated Number of suggested documentation send to DUS Number of documents localized |
| M-RP6-3 | M14-M15: 3 rd sprint. Review of documentation created by DUS. Update of existing localized documents. Localization of additional material | Number of documents evaluated Number of suggested documentation send to DUS Number of local documents evaluated Number of new documents localized |
| M-RP6-4 | M20-M21: 4 th sprint. Review of documentation created by DUS. Update of existing localized documents. Localization of additional material | Number of documents evaluated Number of suggested documentation send to |

| | DUS |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| | Number of local documents evaluated |
| | Number of new documents localized |

3.3 Activity representation and signposting

| Subtask ID | RP7 | Start Month | 1 | End Month | 24 |
|--------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Web site installation and maintenance | | | | |

Goals

Setup and maintain a web site as a central point for coordination in the region with information about the team and support opportunities from EGEE. The site should provide information about the project, the NA4 activity, the structure and responsibilities of the team and the support opportunities available for the local communities. The site should be kept up to date throughout the project duration. Various statistics about the site traffic should be gathered and periodically reported.

A central wiki will be setup to host information for all regional teams. Individual teams may want to establish their own separate wiki. This should follow the instructions about look&feel and structure centrally defined by NA4. In the latter case the teams are also responsible for the required metrics regarding wikivisibitily.

Benefits

This web site will be the main tool to communicate between the individual teams and the local users and applications.

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|---|---|
| M-RP7-1 | M03 – Web site available with basic information | Number of wikipages maintained |
| M-RP7-2 | M12 – First year operation of web site. Defined metrics should be included in the first yearly report | Number of wikipages maintained Number of hits. Statistics about visitors |
| M-RP7-3 | M24 – Final web site content and structure. Defined metrics should be included in the final year report | Number of hits. Statistics about visitors |

| Subtask ID | RP8 | Start Month | 6 | End Month | 18 |
|--------------|----------------------------|-------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Local Application Registry | | | | |

Collect information about local applications and user communities active in the region and keep a registry accessible from the regional web site. Information collection will be organized in three separate one-month sprint periods.

Benefits

Awareness of size and strength of local users community and identification of driving disciplines will help NA4 understand the regional requirements, identify new potential user communities and expand the exploitation of the infrastructure. This task is also important for the preparation of NGI in order to have a realistic view about the size of grid communities in the region and the main applications exploiting the grid technology.

Milestonesand Metrics to gauge Progress

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|--|--|
| M-RP8-1 | M06 – 1st sprint period. Initial collection of information | Number of applications Number of users Number of disciplines |
| M-RP8-2 | M12 – 2nd sprint period. Refresh and update of local community information | Number of applications Number of users Number of disciplines |
| M-RP8-3 | M18 – 3 rd sprint. Final update of the user and application local registry. | Number of applications Number of users Number of disciplines |

| Subtask ID | RP9 | Start Month | 3 | End Month | 13 |
|--------------|---|-------------|---|-----------|----|
| Subtask Name | Collaboration with other regional support teams | | | | |

Goals

Contact other support teams in the region, active in the area of grid application porting and consultancy, funded or unfunded in the context of other EGEE-III activities or collaborating grid projects.

Benefits

In many regions application support services are offered either ad-hoc or organized by funded or unfunded teams. Some of these teams might be involved in other activities of EGEE (e.g. SA1) or collaborating projects, and through their expertise they have gained in grid technologies are in position to consult local (e.g. co-located in the same institute) grid users and provide a first line of application gridification support. This ad-hoc support is by all means welcomed but we should verify that these teams are aware of the regional activities and support opportunities and they are kept up-to-date with the evolution of the project being informed for various user-oriented events etc. The EGEE regional support teams re-enforce this way their key role in the region and avoid double effort in outreaching and consulting existing supported applications. This activity also paves the wave for the upcoming NGI model by establishing EGEE's regional teams as centers of gravity for the local application support activities in the region.

| M-ID | Milestone Description | Metrics |
|---------|--|---|
| M-RP9-1 | M3: 1st Sprint. Identify existing support teams inside EGEE and in related | Number of teams in the region |
| | projects | Number of applications supported per team |
| | | Number of disciplines supported per team |
| M-RP9-2 | M13: 2 nd Sprint. Refresh the list of external application support teams and the communities they support | Number of teams in the region |
| | | Number of applications supported per team |
| | | Number of disciplines supported per team |

3.4 Tools

A set of software tools will be required for supporting the activities of each regional team. These tools will be either provided by the project or will be the responsibility of the team itself. In detail the following software support tools are considered:

- Web site (wiki), one per regional team.
- Public mailing list (one per region).
- Global mailing list (includes all regional support teams)

- GGUS for ticket handling or Local helpdesk systems if available
- Progress report site (centrally installed and operated from EGEE). Used to collect quarterly reports and other input.

3.5 Cross-team collaboration

Apart from the NA4 management, regional support teams should be in close collaboration with the following EGEE support teams and activities:

- Direct User support team, in order to be aware of support material available for application developers and users. Also in order to provide feedback to DUS about missing or erroneous documentation.
- Application Porting team for new applications that need gridification guidelines
- Regional NA3 teams, in order to convey requests for trainings.