EGEE

Enabling Grids for E-science in Europe

Meeting Object: **NA3** **Draft Execution Plan: discussion**

Editor: **John Murison, 17 NeSC**

Meeting Date: **1400 CET, 13th April, 2004**
Meeting Place: **Telephone Conference Call**

Attendees:	2 GUP	Martin Polak
	4 CESNET	Jan Kmunicek
	5 BUTE	Imre Szeberenyi
	13 II-SAS	Viet Tran
	17 NeSC	John Murison (chair)
		Malcolm Atkinson
		Mike Mineter
		Dave Berry
		David Fergusson
		Guy Warner
	34 KU NATFAX	Michael Grønager
	EGEE PMB (for all	Viacheslav (Slava) Ilyin
	(Russian Partners)	(replaces Elena Slabospitskaya)
	51 GRNET	Ognjen Prnjat
		Christos Aposkitis
	52 TAU	David Horn

Apologies:	28 FZK Rüdiger Berlich (given wrong meeting time)
Absent:	
Distribution:	NA3 Partners
Information	

AGENDA

(See http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a041491 for details of this teleconference.)

1 Present
2 Apologies for absence
3 Minutes of conference call on 15th March 2004 at 1400 CET
   See http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a041039
4 NA3 Mailing List: for latest list see 'more information' at http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a041491
5 Draft NA3 execution plan (The plan is available as 'document' at
   http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a041491)   (This is the main item of business.)
6 Any other business
7 Date of next meeting

_____

1   Present

As above. John Murison introduced two new members of the NeSC training team: Dr David Fergusson and Dr Guy Warner.

2   Apologies for absence

As above

3   Minutes of conference call on 15th March 2004 at 1400 CET

Accepted without change

4   NA3 Mailing List

John asked that further changes be emailed to him immediately, as he would ask the EGEE office in CERN to set up the list this week. (To be called **project-eu-egee-na3@cern.ch**)

5   Draft NA3 execution plan

invitation to general comments.

Ognjen Prnjat: difficult to read in order to know how to contribute; lot of bullet points. John replied that they will be filled out and cleaned up.

Michael Gröniger: On need for translation of material: unnecessary in North Europe.

Malcolm Atkinson: at the last EGEE all activities meeting it was agreed that translation not necessary; decision could be made by local hosts. It was suggested that this point should be added to the plan.

John. We attempted initial allocation of activities.

John introduced the allocation of induction courses to NA3 partners, in section 9.

There was first a discussion of the nature of induction courses.

Who are we inducting? EGEE trainers, people in EGEE, people new to EGEE and Grid computing

Malcolm pointed out that if the estimated size of each course was too large, NA3 partners could run extra courses to come up with correct numbers.

John asked each partner in turn whether their allocation of induction courses was acceptable. He also noted that the initial allocation had been to the first or second year of the project: a further specification to yearly quarters would have to be made later.

2 GUP: Martin Polak: acceptable.

4 CESNET: Jan Kmunicek: acceptable - tables are correct. Probably run course in October with about 50/course.

5 BUTE, 6 ELUB, 8 MTA SZTAKI: Imre Szeberenyi: yes acceptable, probably all work together to do February course. JM: also in 2nd yearr? Probably.

Polish partners (11, 12): no-one on line, assumed acceptable meantime.

13 II-SAS: Viet Tran would like to discuss with colleagues. Not with 50 in one course, but possible to do 2 with 25 in first year. Thus they could induct 50 people before April 2005? Yes.

Malcolm Atkinson suggested that acceptances should be confirm by email, with dates: NeSC would ask partners for this and point out that two courses with 25 attendances in each was an acceptable alternative to a single course of 50.

28 FZK: no-one on line, assumed acceptable meantime

31 INFN: no-one on line, assumed acceptable meantime

34 KU-NATFAK: Michael Grønager said that running a course in the 2nd year was fine. JM asked if they would be able to do so earlier. Perhaps, but in 2005 at earliest..

Russian partners (41, 42, 43,44, 46, 47) represented by Viatcheslav Ilyin: 1 in yr 1, 2 in yr 2. The Russian partners were producing a federation execution plan, in which they proposed doing 5 induction courses at different levels. It was necessary to run more, smaller, courses because of the problem of travel budgets. JM noted the need for the federation plan to be compatible with the overall NA3 plan.

51 GRNET: acceptable.

52 TAU (David Horn): allocation was OK. The could perhaps consider doing more, such as a workshop in Q2 or Q3, e.g. on Condor and half on EGEE. Also willing to contribute material for training courses. They were in close contact with Haifa, who have expertise in Condor.

53 ICI (Romania): not represented, but GRNET had had regional discussions last week, and thought theallocation acceptable.

Malcolm Atkinson said that there was now a need to analyse he response. of participants and review plans.

Malcolm also noted that the nature of induction will be discussed at the first NA3 meeting. Bob Jones and Fabrizio Gagliardi would contribute to this discussion.

John then moved on to the proposed allocation of Application developer courses. He asked first for any general comments:

2: Ok but concerned about numbers. Prob 1-15 not 25

4: prob 25 attendees more than likley

5,6,8 Hungary, Imre: ok. Prob OK in 2nd year.

11, 12 Poland: [asked to run in 1st year, not in this phonecall]

13 II-SAS: perhaps 10-15 only, not 25.

28 FZK Germany: not at meeting

31 INFN: not at meeting

34 KU-NATFAK (Denmark): app dev course in first year? Would like it to be in an academic course around Novemebr. Prob ok with 25.

41, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47 (Russia): 1st year, 2 courses with perhaps 15; 2nd year also.

51 GRNET: 1st year? More comfortable to do so in 2nd year. Perhaps Q4 year 1. John asked whether they could accommodate 25 attendees at one meeting? Question was rather of getting sufficient suitable people to attend, not the venue.

JM/MA: big issue is making training of a high enough quality that people willwant to come.

52 TAU (David Horn): How many experts available? Perhaps TAU could work with GRNET.

Malcolm: call on NESC, CERN, leaders of JR, SA activities. Collaborative events are a very good idea, they help convert a group of individuals into a functioning team. We will help build the EGEE community by such collaboration in events.

6 Any other business

Cork attendees:

FZK: Martin & Dieter: will be going.

NeSC: all 6 present at conference call will be attending.

GUP: 1

BUTE (Imre): 2.

CESNET: 6, maybe some from HEP, up to 8.

Slovakia: 2.

Michael, Denmark: 3 or more

Russia: 1 person to represent all six NA3 Russian partners.

GRNET: Ognjen - 1 for NA3, plus others.

TAU (David Horn): one person, divided between NA1 and NA3.

Other points

PEB and NA3 will be circulated about early events.

David, Tel Aviv: Courses for training trainers needed later on?

Jan Kmunicek: success of induction and application developer course depends on materials prepared. We need to focus on materials.

Maybe duration allocated is too long - perhaps consider, initally, 1 day induction course? 2 day developer? Then next year extend to longer courses.

CERN initial induction events in May: half day and then 2 day events to follow.

Certification instructions for induction courses participants to be placed on web.

Question: Relationship with NA2? JM: we will have a joint meeting with NA2 in Cork to establish respective areas of responsiblity. We need to establish a clearer model of NA2-3; expect NA2 to give contacts, but opposite direction also.

MA: NA3 must help with dissemination (cannot just leave it to NA2 and NA4).

MA: most developer workshop attendees will come from NA4. NA2 will be more 'press office' oriented.

Attendees were asked to check emails in next few days, as there is likely to be a lot of organisational activity.

7   Date of next meeting

Not set. (This will be decided later, probably during Cork.)