

Meeting Object: **Project Technical Board**

Authors: **Kors Bos / Karin Burghauser**

Meeting Date: **3rd of July 2002**

Meeting Place: **CERN – Building 31, IT Auditorium – SUN virtual room**

Attendees: Vincent Breton, Johan Montagnat, J.J Blaising, Ingo Augustin, Franck Harris, Marcus Schulz, Kors Bos, Steve Fisher, Laurence Field, David Foster, Zdenek Sekera, Franck Bonnassieux, Andrew McNab, Peter Clarke, Massimo Sgaravatto, Laura Perini, Francesco Prelz, Jens G. Jensen, Charles Loomis, Lee Momtahan, Maite Barroso Lopez, Dave Kelsey, Mark Parsons, Gabriel Zaquine, Fabrizio Gagliardi, Bob Jones (chairman), Karin Burghauser, Roberto Pucinello (via phone), Julian Linford, Robin Middleton, Tim Folkes, Paul Gelissen, Jeffrey Templon, Peter Kunszt (had to leave early).

Apologised: Olof Barring, John Gordon, Francois Etienne, Pascale Primet

1. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

There are no comments on the minutes of the last meeting.

Bob Jones announces that an extra presentation by Gabriel Zaquine on QA has been added to the agenda.

2. TESTBED STATUS REPORT

By Charles Loomis (see slides attached to the agenda)

Following Charles's presentation there was a discussion concerning the use of the 1.2 testbed.

Question from Federico Carminati on the MDS hierarchy and the information system WP3: Federico wants to know if he is validating WP3 with or without MDS hierarchy.

J.J Blaising proposes to validate whatever is ready and explained that whatever is validated on the development testbed will be moved onto the production testbed. What doesn't work yet will be further tested and validated on the development testbed until it works.

Steve Fisher says that by the end of the week they will release 1.2 with or without hierarchy. If there is no hierarchy WP3 will continue work on it until it is ready for the testbed. Federico Carminati wants to be sure that the testbed works. If the testbed is unstable he suggests to wait until the problems are resolved.

It was decided to wait until the end of the week and Charles Loomis with the ITeam will decide what is included.

Frank Harris asks for documentation to be made available with the release on what is in the testbed software and what will be validated. Fabrizio Gagliardi stresses the importance of having new release notes with each new release and that there must be resources to do that.

3. RELEASE 1.2 STATUS

By Ingo Augustin (see slides attached to the agenda)

Following Ingo Augustin's presentations there was a discussion concerning SE tests:

Federico Carminati wants 1% max failure rate on replication of files by SE. J.J Blaising wants to understand why it is so difficult to configure the SE correctly.

Charles Loomis responds that it is complicated since there are a lot of daemons and a lot of parameters to set. He added that those parameters are site specific. Peter Kunstz wants to get feedback on those studies for WP2. Bob Jones proposes to assign two persons from WP2 to this job to participate in these tests.

Fabrizio Gagliardi says that more people assigned to testing in the middleware WP's are needed. This may be a resource problem. J. J Blaising does not think it is a resource problem but rather of bad usage of the resources we have: the SE should not be deployed in 5 places and all start finding the same bugs in parallel. It has to be made to work in one place first before it is fanned out to more places.

Francesco Prelz feels that the WPM meetings are not longer for technical issues. Fabrizio Gagliardi replied that technical issues need to be brought up there but they can of course not be solved at these meeting since they only last in principle one hour. He added that the WPM meetings are to signal problems and find the people or the resources in order to solve them.

4. UPDATE TO THE SOFTWARE SCHEDULE AND PROCEDURE

by Bob Jones (see slides attached to the agenda)

A draft document is attached to the agenda of this meeting. The document identifies the steps involved, groups responsible and how they interact.

Federico explains that LC's are the interfaces between the middleware and the experiments and cannot be merged into the LCG Certification Team. He adds that the LC's will have to go back to WP8 and do what they were hired for. The Testing Group people have the knowledge about the middleware packages, the LC's about the applications.

Peter Kunstz thinks that the LCG Certification Group is not part of our project nor of our process. They don't belong on the Certification testbed but on the Production testbed. Bob Jones notes that no resources are available for the LCG group at the moment.

Federico Carminati stresses that the applications are essential for the Testing Group. The experience with the LC's shows this.

Maite Barruso Lopez is worried that too many bug reports will come from all those test teams. Already now the LC's stop all development work when they will also start reporting bugs to the ITeam and the developers.

There shouldn't need to be too many development testbed sites (CERN, CNAF, RAL, LIP, NIKHEF)

For 2002 the 3 testing groups on the Cert.Testbed (doesn't exists yet) will be collapsed into one.

Francesco Prelz is worried about developers having two releases (development and production) to work on. Paolo mentions that the experiment's Data Challenges ought to be taken into account in the planning of the development and production testbed. Fabrizio Gagliardi thinks this ought to be organised through WP8. Federico Carminati should find out and give feedback on this.

J. J Blaising wants to know more about GLUE. None of the GLUE software can be incorporated before release 1.4.

Steve Fisher asked when the 2.0 and 1.4 will be merged. Bob Jones can not see the time for a separate 1.4 and 2.0. We need to reconsider the number and dates for the software releases because experience has shown that the initial 2 month cycle is too short – particularly if we want to improve the quality of the software through in-depth testing. Fabrizio adds that it is important for the project to put more emphasis on the quality aspects of the software to ensure it can be used by a large number of users. If this means that the release frequency is slowed-down and the amount of new functionality to be included is reduced then so be it.

Fabrizio Gagliardi counts backwards: if 2.0 is needed for the road-shows in November then we have to be ready by September. Therefore it may be better to accept 1.2 for the roadshows. Version 2.0 has to be ready for the EU in January. So November 1st is the deadline for 2.0, minus one month for the ITeam. This means that the deadline for the WP's is October 1st. Fabrizio concludes that a decision has to be taken end August concerning what functionality will go in 2.0.

Maite Barroso Lopez proposed to bring this up at the next WPM weekly meeting so the WP managers would have time to react.

It was agreed that Budapest will be the place and the time to make those decisions.

5. REPORT ON SECURITY GROUP MEETINGS

by Dave Kelsey (see slides attached to the agenda)

- A CA meeting in Prague was held last week. The document for TB1 is now updated for TB2. It takes two or three months to be accepted as a CA. Some of the Cross Grid partners will be accepted through an email procedure before the next CA meeting.
- A WP7 security meeting was held at CERN yesterday. VOMS was discussed: Virtual Organisation Membership Service. Not certain for which release.
- Authorisation is more important than Authentication. The VO procedures to establish trust have to be defined. Trust build up takes time and is a lot of work. Dynamic accounts will be used in testbed 1.3. This is difficult for permanent files.

6. PRIORITY TO QUALITY

by Gabriel Zaquine (see slides attached to the agenda)

Following Gabriel's presentations there was a discussion concerning the quality policy.

Peter Clark stresses that a quality policy is needed and asked for a method and assurance. This should be bottom up and not top down and another taskforce should not be needed. Peter asks what is budgeted in time for the WP members for coding, bug fixing and quality assurance.

Francesco Prelz says that the time needed for bug fixing and documentation is always underestimated. He managed to have a code clean-up recently in WP1, but this is only a first step towards quality control.

Steve Fisher says that in WP3 1/3 of the time is spend on coding and 2/3 on unit testing and zero on bug fixes (as they have not received any bug reports).

In WP4 there is a person responsible for the quality of the code.

It was agreed that a person within each WP is to be nominated (by the WP manager) for quality.

7. DELIVERABLE REVIEW

D11.5 First annual conference and grid forum

Maite Barroso Lopez as moderator.

The deliverable was endorsed by the PTB.

D11.8 Dissemination DataGrid, Tutorial and demo

Gabriel Zaquine as moderator. The deliverable is late and will not be ready before the end of July.

The deliverable will be reviewed electronically and possibly accepted by the PMB at the Project Conference in Budapest in September.

D1.4 Definition of the architecture for resource co-allocation framework and parallel job partitioning

Johan Montagnat as moderator.

Mark Parsons thinks it is basically a good deliverable, satisfying the requirements. There are some minor changes to the English. He questions some parts of the technical content:

- The log monitor is difficult to maintain because the format of the messages will change over time (recognize as a risk in the WP1 project).
- DAGman is nice but challenging and another risk in the program (Francesco recognizes this but mentions that there is collaboration on this point with Condor and iVDGL).
- 2-phase commit text is unclear
- Underestimate the load on the LB server. Need to think about managing and granularity: don't accept jobs with too high parallelisation requirements f.e. (Bob mentions that Logging and Bookkeeping is getting more attention in the ATF).
- 5.4 is also unclear: it should refer to another document where it is better described

Mark accepts the deliverable. He will send these comments by email to Francesco and it will take another few hours to make the corrections.

The deliverable will be accepted after these changes.

D7.3 Intermediate report on Network infrastructure and services

Julian Linford as moderator.

Mark says he needs a week to read the document. For the reviewers and the PTB the deliverable is OK.

The deliverable can be endorsed by email after that Mark's comments have been received.

D9.6 From testbed to full-scale EO application Report on the EO Application scaling

Tim Eves as moderator.

Bob Jones questioned the whole document because it deals with software from before the EU review and is also dealt with in D8.2 and D6.4.

Mark Parsons questions the following parts:

- In section 3 there is no clear picture of what has been achieved. This may be a presentation issue.
- There are many negative comments in section 3. It doesn't indicate if anything has actually been done.

- Overall in section 3 it does not read like work from a collaboration. The EDG is described as a software provider. Julian explains this was the position of ESA at that time. They now are changing this attitude by putting people in place to work on developing the testbed rather than just using it. Peter Clark finds what is said, "unrealistically negative" with even a table about the testbed on what was working and what not.
- In section 4, table 1 (the table Peter refers to): the table has a negative flavour and the comments do not show what is important and what is not. Mark is afraid that we will get serious problems this way for the next review by the EU.

Fabrizio Gagliardi asks if ESRIN has a Loose Cannon for their application. Julian Linford replies he has 2 ft's for the installation of the EDG software and the ESRIN application.

- In section 5.1 and 5.2 it looks as if the text were written before there was a testbed at all and section 5.3 onwards talks about the future.

Mark proposes that ESA would rewrite the document with a different emphasis. It could be much shorter but should concentrate on the work really done by ESA and its partners.

Peter Clarke suggests not accepting this deliverable as it stands. The PTB supports this decision. Bob Jones, Peter Clarke and Mark Parsons will send their comments to the moderator who will convey them to ESA and push for a fast submission of a new version. This will be reviewed by the PTB electronically and before the next PTB.

8. TECHNICAL COORDINATOR'S REPORT

by Bob Jones (see slides attached to the agenda)

Bob reported on the following subjects: Architecture Group, EDG Testbed 2 Retreat, Project Conference, Tutorial and Licence.

Report from architecture group

The architecture group has had two meetings of two half days each. A full tour of the architecture of each WP's has been completed. List of prioritised requirements from the WP's. Contents and dependencies between main software components of testbed 1.1 have been clarified. Input from NorduGrid, Condor, CrossGrid people. OGSA has been discussed. Work on Use Cases has also been done. The group is working on an updated D12.4 (Architecture document). There will be a stronger emphasis on integration than in the original document. The group is trying to organise a BOF at GGF5.

EDG Testbed 2 Retreat, 27 & 28 August

A Testbed 2 Retreat (like last year) is being organised for August 27-28 in Chavannes, Switzerland (near CERN) with invited people in order to discuss architecture, plans for testbed 2 and 2003 and cross WP issues. The exact agenda will follow shortly.

Project Conference in Budapest

The 5th Project conference will take place in Budapest from 2nd to 5th of September. The conference will be held on the Campus site that is situated 30 minutes by train from Budapest city. The

conference will start Monday morning (there will be optional meetings on Sunday September 1st) and will close Thursday at lunchtime.

Regarding the accommodation, some of the rooms are on the site, the rest are within walking distance. The early registration is before July 20. The web page will be updated soon.

Tutorial

The aim of the Tutorial is to have a set of presentations of total 7 hours from an end user point of view covering; introduction to grids and EDG, architecture and testbed overviews, facilities provided by middleware and security issues. 6 hours hands-on exercises making use of EDG middleware. There will be a dry run at CERN on August 29 and 30. The hands-on exercises will be used for the CERN School of Computing. The basis for the EDG road-show is to be taken to different sites. This will not be the demo for SC2002 and/or IST2002, but the material from the tutorial could be used for that purpose.

Licence

The draft license was discussed at the Paris project conference and at the previous PTB meeting. Most points are now solved. The licence will be discussed with Globus again at GGF5.

One of the outstanding issues is: *Which names to put on copyright (EDG or partners)?* PMB is addressing this. This License is to be integrated in the next release after EDG 1.2

9. GRIDSTART OVERVIEW AND STATUS

by Fabrizio Gagliardi (see slides attached to the agenda of the meeting)

A short summary of Fabrizio's presentation is provided below:

- GRIDSTART is a EU funded accompany measure coordinated by EPCC, Edinburgh, which aims to improve dissemination of the results of the EU funded Grid projects (10 projects in the contract so far), increase visibility at international level, especially GGF, and foster technical coordination among the architects of these projects.
- Goals: Address overlapping areas and concerns leverage common efforts and resources. Increase contribution at international level. Promote EU participation to international standard bodies (GGF). Provide common inputs and feedback to the EU. Promote collaboration with international leading GRID developers. Stimulating uptake by industry.
- Current status: A Kick-Off meeting was held end of April 2002. A roadmap has been sketched.
- Next steps: To map the roadmap to GGF working groups. Integrate new EU projects in GRIDSTART and develop plans for new EU FP6.

10. OTHER ITEMS

Fabrizio Gagliardi stresses the importance to start making plans for the future because the project is now half way in time. Plans are needed now and something should be submitted to the EU early next year in order to get new funding and to avoid that people start looking for new jobs elsewhere. He encourages the WP managers to put efforts on dissemination and to look at their collaborations with and relations to other projects.

11. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the PTB will be on October 2nd 2002.

12. SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING ACTIONS

Meeting of 3 July 2002:

- **Releases.** Bob Jones to plan a new software release procedure and schedule. Each middleware WPs to provide information to Bob in order to do this. The schedule will be addressed at WPM weekly meeting.
- **Tests.** Clear definitions of tests are needed. One person for tests per WP to be defined. ITeam test plan needed also. Testing group has a document. Loose Canons need to define it as well as the LCG Cert team.
- **Quality.** Each WP manager to nominate a person within the WP for quality.

Meeting of 10 April 2002:

- **Testing group.** Who are the members of the testing group? Clarify the relationship between to the release policy. Send a reference to the draft document that has been put into EDMS (has been done).
- **Licences.** Check who has to be put in to the form as the Copyright Holder. Clarify how this has to be handled if multiple groups contribute to the same package. Bob: Audit of the licenses used by the external packages has to be done by release of 1.3 and the text has to be finalized. The template has to be made available for discussions.
- **Testbed access rules.** A description of how a site joins the Testbed has to be made.