

Meeting Object: **Project Technical Board**

Author: **Kors Bos**

Meeting Date: **2<sup>nd</sup> of October 2002**

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

Attendees: Laurent Bobelin, Frank Harris, Markus Schulz, Kors Bos (Secretary), Steve Fisher (via vrvs), Zdenek Sekera, Massimo Sgaravatto, Laura Perini, Francesco Prelz, Charles Loomis, Lee Momtahan, Maite Barroso Lopez, Dave Kelsey, Gabriel Zaquine, Fabrizio Gagliardi, Bob Jones (Chairman), Robin Middleton (via vrvs), Jeffrey Templon (via vrvs), Peter Kunszt, Olof Barring, John Gordon, François Etienne, Pascale Primet, Francois Fluckiger (via vrvs), Paolo Capiluppi (via vrvs), Ian Bird, Eric van Herwijnen, Regina Tam, Timothée Silvestre, Mauro Draoli, Piergiorgio Cerello, Rene Metery,

Apologised:

---

In these minutes only the discussions during or after the presentations are summarised. The presentations themselves can be found in the slides which are attached to the agenda for this meeting.

## 1. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

(Bob Jones, no slides)

Minutes accepted. Action points from last meeting:

- **Releases.** Done. Presentation later during this meeting.
- **Tests.** Done. Presentation later during this meeting
- **Quality.** Done. Presentation later during this meeting
- **Testing group.** Done. Presentation later during this meeting
- **Licences.** Done. Communicated by email.
- **Testbed access rules: *Not done:*** *A description of how a site joins the Testbed has to be made.*

## 2. TESTBED STATUS REPORT

(Charles Loomis, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Logging & Bookkeeping (L&B) buckled (mainly because of <dg-job-status -a>) under very large number of requests. Some discussion how this can be improved. Clear the database of old events? More servers for L&B per Resource Broker (RB)? This will teach us how many users we can serve per RB. It happened with 20 users from the Cern School of Computing (CSC) and some users from the Atlas taskforce. Asynchronous notification by email so <dg-job-status -a> is not needed. The use of R-GMA is foreseen for asynchronous notification.

What happens when a RB goes down during the execution of a job? Can one still retrieve the output when it comes back up? Cannot get the output back until the RB comes up again and the job will be re-attached if the job is still running. If the job had finished before the RB comes back up the job will be re-submitted.

We can have many RBs, even one per UI. This was the original idea from Globus but we thought we needed one RB per group (experiment).

### 3. ATLAS EDG TASKFORCE UPDATE AND WP8 EXPERIMENT PLANNING

(Frank Harris, slides attached to the agenda of this meeting)

Not all points from Oxana slides are understood. We may have to wait for the document to come out. The Atlas Task Force (TF) has to get together with the WP1 people and/or the Iteam and/or use bugzilla. Some problems may have come from a misunderstanding of the JDL.

Request from the Atlas TF: can an output file be specified in the JDL? Massimo: needs some new attributes but could be added. Not easy and not as logical as putting into the script. Point will be taken offline to WP1, WP2, ATF and the Atlas TF.

Will the testbed operational over Xmas? Cal: NO! There is no staff for running the testbed in production mode over Christmas.

### 4. RELEASE PLANNING STATUS

(Bob Jones, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Jeff Templon asks: There will be no 1.2.2 with LCFGNG and RH7.2? According to the scheme presented, it will come at the end of November.

This release plan is for the development testbed and the software will only be moved to the production testbed when proven stable and when documentation is available. There is a procedure for this (see later this meeting).

First 5 points of Bob's list have no dates attached to them but should be finished by the end of October 2002.

Short discussion on the non-recognition of EDG certificates by some US labs like Fermilab. It's actually is a DOE site issue and not just Fermilab. This is an issue and needs to be pursued by LCG. Dave Kelsey assures us that discussions are going on.

When we can use autobuild we can use RH7.2 We will keep running both a RH6.x and a RH7.x for a while also to prove we can maintain two systems concurrently.

### 5. PLANNING FOR LCG1

(Ian Bird, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

How can you make a selection of software components which will go on the LCG testbed without trying them? EDG experience from the testbed counts. Is there sufficient knowledge in the LGC working groups to do their job and aren't the people that populate those working groups the same people as the ones in the EDG work packages? Some overlap will be unavoidable. What will be the production system by July next year? Is this the EDG testbed? Ian: No, it is what is needed to make the data challenges for the experiments possible. Fab: there is agreement to see if the EDG production testbed can become the LCG production testbed with their support staff. But then the LCG has to accept WP9 and WP10 applications. Cal Loomis remarks that WP9 and 10 also bring resources to the testbed. Bob Jones suggests to make LCG presentations like this one part of the standard PTB presentations.

### 6. TESTING GROUP ACTIVITIES

(Laurent Bobelin, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Ingo Augustin: how efficient is the testing group? How many bugs are dealt with by the testing group? So far all bugzilla reported bugs are dealt with by the Loose Canons (LCs). Only if the testing group can take over this job it can be considered operational.

Gabriel Zaquine wants to see the list of tests? That list has not been made yet but the list of elements which will be tested is there. Based on that list of elements the coverage of 70%, 100% as showed in the slides is based. Bob Jones insists that the list of tests is more important.

Input from other people who test things is needed to make the test suite more complete.

Lee Momtahan claims that 100% coverage is meaningless as long as you can not say what the metric is.

## 7. TESTING AND VALIDATION PROCEDURE DOCUMENT

(Zdenek Sekera, slides and document attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Ingo Augustin: is the ITeam, the EDG ITeam? No, then who is it? And the Application Test Group? Zdenek says this is WP8 but Ingo claims he doesn't have the resources for this. Jeff Templon says: it doesn't exist!

Jeff claims that he proposed many changes to Zdenek's document in Chavannes and nothing has been changed in the document. Jeff says that any discussion is meaningless if nothing of what is discussed makes it into the document. The document only reflects Zdenek's opinion and cannot be presented as the opinion of the community.

Zdenek is release manager for both EDG and LCG. Maite Barroso asks if he now will attend all WP Managers meetings and who decides which changes go into the release and which don't? Zdenek says that the WP Managers have the say about what fixes go in the releases and not the release manager. He will attend the WP Managers meetings.

Frank says we are in a difficult startup period of both EDG and LCG.

Markus Schulz thinks that the LCG release manager will now decide what will go into the EDG software. Zdenek denies this. Ian Bird says there is a confusion because many people are in common. As long as the focuses don't diverge EDG and LCG should do many things in common and by the same people.

Bob Jones says that the short document made by Jeff during the Chavannes meeting has to be integrated into the document

We have to check the document for where it mentions the application testing group because it doesn't exist. We also have to check the document to see what is says about who decides what goes into the releases.

Gabriel wants to see a planning, a gant chart so we know when these steps will be implemented. Zdenek promises to provide this.

## 8. PENDING DELIVERABLES

(Gabriel Zaquine, slide attached to the agenda for this meeting)

### D7.3 Intermediate report on Network infrastructure and services

(moderator Julian Linford)

Mark made comments electronically and said the deliverable could be endorsed after these corrections and short explanations had been made. This has not been done yet. Pascale Primet says that the person who was in charge has left but that she will find someone else to do this.

*The PTB decides this deliverable pending until these changes are made and a final version has been*

*distributed via the PTB mailing list. Action on the moderator.*

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

(moderator Kors Bos)

The comments from Pete Clark, Bob Jones and Mark Parson were incorporated and the following version was re-read by those people again. It was then sent to the PTB electronically with one week reaction time. As no further comments were received it was sent to the EU.

*The PTB took note and complimented Julian for his hard work which resulted in a interesting deliverable.*

## **D11.8 Dissemination DataGrid, Tutorial and demo**

(moderator Gabriel Zaquine)

Still ongoing. Comments received from the reviewers. New section of the website (Part I) is OK except for the English. Also better graphical layout would improve the deliverable. The other parts need to be significantly improved and are unacceptable at this stage. Mauro will meet with Rosy tomorrow morning on the details of the criticism.

Gabriel shows the new website. Some discussion on Genius on whether it is part of EDG. If it is which WP manager influences its development? Bob Jones explains that Genius could be used on a separate testbed for this WP11 demo. There may also be a license issue. We have to clear out the relationship between Genius and EDG. Send the URL to more people so they can feed more comments to the reviewers.

*The PTB decides to not accept the deliverable in this state. The Part I can be made public on the web but needs more work on the layout and syntax. The other parts need serious changes. Action on the moderator to follow this up.*

## **9. ORGANISATION OF THE DEMONSTRATIONS IN NOVEMBER**

(Mauro Draoli, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Some discussion on the content of the EDG/Geant demo. Not clear what it will be. Is critical because it will be visible for many EU officials. Action on Mauro and Pascale to better define this demo.

## **10. FAB: SECOND REVIEW**

(Fabrizio Gagliardi, no slides)

Proposal to move forward the second review because we may all be very busy in the beginning of 2003 writing a new proposal while we also would have to prepare for the review. Delaying it is impossible because then the EU will be very busy with the next round of proposals. So Kyriakos would agree to shift it forward by 1 month and make the cut off date for the deliverables November 30<sup>th</sup>. Then the review could be on January 31 2003. A PTB was already planned for the 29<sup>th</sup>. D6.6, D8.3, D9.3 and D10.3 will not be required for the review then. We need to reserve the whole of the last week of January 2003 for this event.

Discussion: worry about the deliverables which are not presented. We will have to state officially that we agreed with the EU to go this road. Problem is also the cost claims which have to be prepared before the year is over. This may cause problems for some of the partners. This will not influence the

release plan which Bob Jones presented earlier. The feeling is that enough progress has been made since the first review last February: production quality, stability, licensing, and scalability. There was an idea to demonstrate to the reviewers the development testbed as well as the production testbed. Frank believes that if we can show we have a stable production testbed on which we can produce a large dataset that will be a fantastic achievement which we should present to the EU. The new features on the development testbed are then less important. Problem with those dates for the British needs to be resolved.

People think it is possible to do the review in January. We exclude some deliverables from the review. We will demonstrate what we have on the production testbed with fixes for the show-stoppers and what we have achieved on the development testbed. Final decision will be taken next Monday after the meetings in Brussels and Fabrizio will inform us by email.

The Project office will clarify the date, length, and reviewed deliverables with the EU to ensure that WP are not seen as being late with their deliverables.

## 11. GLUE ACTIVITIES

(Flavia Donno, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Some confusion of inbound and outbound connectivity of the worker nodes. Need to come back to this point in more detail (action on Flavia).

Olof Barring asks about her remarks on installation tools, about a working group within DataTag on this subject. Flavia would like to standardize on one way of doing things. The pacman vs. rpm duality costs too much time and effort. If there is an activity in DataTag on this Olof would like to be part of it. Flavia explains that the working group is planned but hasn't started yet.

## 12. ATF

(Lee Momtahan, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

CRCs were mentioned to be a good technique for the ATF. A lack of feedback is noticed between the members of the ATF (WP representatives) and the participants of the work packages. The diagrams and the minutes from the ATF are on the web and all developers are encouraged to look at those. Some discussion on optor as an example where the ATF signals problems before even the design has started.

## 13. REPORT ON THE QUALITY GROUP

(Gabriel Zaquine, slides attached to the agenda for this meeting)

Ingo protests against the expectation that WP8 provides a quality document because it is not supposed to work on quality of the EDG software. Gabriel will provide and distribute the QA document after it has been defined at their next meeting.

## 14. AOB

Next meeting will be January 29 and will be dedicated to the second EU review.

Meeting finishes at 16:45

## 15. DECISIONS MADE AT THIS MEETING

- 1- *The operation of the testbed will not be guaranteed over **Christmas**.*
- 2- *WP Managers decide about **what fixes go into the releases** and not the release manager.*
- 3- *There doesn't exist an **application test group** and WP8 doesn't have the resources to create it.*
- 4- *The PTB decides the **D7.3** deliverable pending until these changes are made and a final version has been distributed via the PTB mailing list.*
- 5- *The PTB took note of **D9.6** deliverable being finalised and complimented Julian for his hard work which resulted in an interesting document.*
- 6- *The PTB decides to not accept deliverable **D11.8** in this state. The Part I can be made public on the web but needs more work on the layout and syntax. The other parts need serious changes. Action on the moderator Gabriel Zaquine to follow this up.*

## 16. ACTIONS FROM THIS MEETING

1. Pending action from last meeting: A description of how a site joins the Testbed has to be made (action on François Etienne).
2. Oxana's document about the Atlas Task Force will be distributed as soon as it comes out. (action on Frank Harris)
3. Point on specifying the output file in the JDL will be taken offline to WP1, WP2, ATF and the Atlas TF (action on Bob Jones to make sure this happens).
4. Make LCG presentation part of the standard PTB presentations (action on Bob Jones)
5. Release manager to always attend the WP Managers meetings (action on Zdenek).
6. The short document made by Jeff during the Chavannes meeting has to be integrated into the Testing and Validation Procedure document (action on Zdenek).
7. Check the Testing and Validation Procedure document for where it mentions the application testing group because it doesn't exist (action on Zdenek).
8. Include a planning, a gant chart into the Testing and Validation Procedure document so we know when the steps will be implemented. (action on Zdenek).
9. Follow up deliverable D7.3 so it gets finished (action on Julian Linford).
10. Find someone to make the last changes to deliverable D7.3 (action on Pascale Primet)
11. Follow further deliverable D11.8 (action on Gabriel Zaquine)
12. Determine the relationship between Genius and EDG. Send the URL to more people so they can feed more comments to the reviewers (action on Bob Jones).
13. Better define the Geant/EDG demo (Action on Mauro Draoli and Pascale Primet).
14. Problem for the British with dates for the second EU review needs to be resolved (action on Fabrizio).
15. Final decision on the dates of the second EU review will be taken next Monday after the meetings in Brussels and we will be informed by email (action on Fabrizio).
16. Provide and distribute the QA document after it has been defined at the next QA meeting (action on Gabriel Zaquine).