

DRAFT minutes of first NA4/SA1 meeting Sep 15 2004

M.-E.Begin,F.Harris 20.9.04

Present

H.Cordier(CNRS),R.Rumler(CNRS),G.Romier(CNRS),Y.Legre(CNRS),
F.Donno(CERN/INFN),A.Mills(CERN/RAL),N.Thackray(CERN),
M.-E.Bégin (CERN) - Secretary,
F.Harris(CERN/Oxford) - Chairman

and by phone

J.Montagnat(CNRS) -Biomedicine,
W.de.Cerff(KNMI) -Earth Science,
O.Gervasi(Perugia) - Comp Chemistry

Apologies

I.Bird(CERN),J.Gordon(RAL),C.Vistoli(INFN),M.Dimou-Zacharova(CERN)

Agenda with transparencies uploaded

<http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a043996>

The minutes below document the key discussions and actions arising. They do not attempt to duplicate all the detail present in the talks.

1)Introductory Comments (F.Harris)

FH reminded people that the meeting was a follow on from recommendations of the July Catania meeting

<http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a041952>

where the joint NA4/SA1 session had recommended the setting up of a group with a well defined mandate to deal with strategic and policy issues associated with getting new VOs up and running. A draft proposal had been produced and ratified by the PEB...

<https://edms.cern.ch/file/498141/1/na4sa1-140904.doc>

This first kick-off meeting was to deal with specific Biomedical problems, since it is mandatory that we get the Biomed VO up and running as a matter of priority, since it is one of the 2 key Pilot areas. We will use the lessons from this exercise as input to getting VOs running for the new agreed application areas (2 of which were participating by phone to this meeting).

2) Mandate and Membership of NA4/SA1 WG (F.Harris)

FH emphasised that that we wanted to keep meetings rather compact, and thus attendance at meetings would be driven by the agenda. The members of the WG were the non-HEP managers, the ROC/CIC managers, and appropriate nominated managers and technical experts from NA4 and SA1.

Each meeting would be minuted and produce a list of actions, and, where appropriate, specific recommendations to the PEB. FH will chair this group for the first few months (probably up to EGEE review in Feb), and then it will be appropriate for a non-HEP person to drive the group, namely Y.Legre(YL), the Biomedical VO Manager.

J.Montagnat(JM) asked that the mandate spell out more clearly the need for establishing clear communication channels between VOs and the service providers. The current Biomed experience with trying to use LCG-2 has showed that this need spelling out with respect to all levels of user support.

ACTION 1.1 *FH to update the mandate to explicitly reflect the need for defining the communication channels between the VO users and the LCG/EGEE service providers*

During discussion the following were proposed as possible means to facilitate communication between users and LCG/EGEE service providers

- | create 2 new mailing lists (?)
- Setup Bugzilla/Savanna server for bug/problem tracking

Comment: This should be done with SA1, not as a stand alone BioMed thing

Clarification was requested regarding the organisation of the weekly LCG Operations meetings for which we must organise non-HEP participation.

ACTION 1.2 *FH to check with Ian Bird(IB) regarding the participation of non-HEP applications to LCG weekly operations meetings.*

Clarification was also requested as to the relationship of the NA4/SA1 WG to the OAG in the TA..

ACTION 1.3 *FH to check with Bob Jones(BJ) and IB regarding the role of the OAG in the project, and the relationship of NA4/SA1 WG to it. We must avoid duplication of activities.*

3) Aims and organization of Biomed VO (Y.Legre)

JM emphasized that the VO definition is fundamental since it has repercussion on several aspects. We must have granularity in users rights for access to data due to the sensitive nature of Biomedical data. RM commented that currently, a user can only be part of 1 VO at a time(?). And all sites have to configure manually the VO and associated users.

ACTION 1.4: *YL + JM to clarify the VO/rights/deployment policy definition for both current deployment on LCG-2 and in the future on gLite. This is best done by presenting clear use cases.*

JM said that a lot of documentation already exists from DataGrid on security issues

and this could be repackaged. AM asked if it was reasonable to attempt to deploy BioMed applications on the grid, considering the security implications. FH answered that this was a principal aim of EGEE and we absolutely had to do it, and we must demonstrate real progress before the EU review in Feb. Marc-Eliau Bégin(MEB) said that it emerged from the PTF meeting yesterday that the issues for VO management are not very clear and that use-cases are needed to clarify definition/deployment/configuration of VOs with gLite.

YM commented that that it was not clear how a local system administrator contacts SA1 for support. RR said that the SA1/ROC/CIC in France should be the platform to address these questions.

Comment: Who's that?

ACTION 1.5 Rolf Rumler(RR)/YL to document and disseminate user support procedures for Biomed community

JM reminded the meeting that the urgent system requirements for BioMed include:

- Replica Location Service
- MPI
- RB

OG commented on the need of Comp Chemistry for MPI.

Comment: What was that again?

ACTION 1.6 FH to confirm with LCG/EGEE that MPI is supported in LCG-2

JM also reported the outcome of his discussions with Bob Jones regarding the urgency of getting Biomed applications running on LCG-2. The recommendations from BJ were:

- NA4 need to offload administration of grid to SA1
- NA4 needs to focus on application support
- A Biomed +middleware Task Force should be set up

ACTION 1.7 Vincent Breton(VB) + FH to ask at the PEB how we set up Biomed + middleware Task Force as soon as possible (also see ACTION 1.11)

The meeting was informed that 2 BioMed loose cannons have been recruited. These presumably would be integrated into the Biomed Task Force as soon as possible.

It was mentioned that the ROC Managers have started a "Monday afternoon" ROC managers meeting. We should investigate the desirability of sending application representatives to selected meetings (according to the agenda), in order to present critical issues regarding applications deployment (see action 1.3 above)

4) ROC operation and VOs (A.Mills)

AM emphasized that the SA1 operation was being put in place and we needed clarification on its role in specific issues. For example the mechanisms for brokering for resources in the LCG/EGEE community. This key issue provoked lively discussion. FH commented that we should have some project wide policy on this presumably formed by the PMB which included national representatives. One would hope that such a group could form a policy taking into account their knowledge of

Comment: I think here you're missing the important observation from Ian that the OMC/CIC/ROC only met twice so far, where it was suppose to be an established process by now (don't want to be contentious, but this is important)

policies and constraints in their communities. There may be policy differences in different countries, but these can be passed down to sites (resource centres). It certainly does not seem reasonable for application areas to be negotiating for resources for many different site, although of course they will into the project their own sites and resources.

Comment: I'm not sure I understand what you're trying to say here

ACTION 1.8 *FH to bring to the attention of the PEB the need for a project policy regarding negotiation for resources for applications.*

AM made a plea that we write down realistic plans with specific people nominated to perform tasks. This was supported by the meeting.

There was a strong request that Biomed write down a clear concise summary of their request for services. i.e. they should make best efforts to summarise their requirements for hardware, software and support in a quantitative manner. This should give estimates for the current situation and looking ahead for the lifetime of the project. This information is distributed around various existing documents but needed to be gathered together in a concise manner

ACTION 1.9 *YL/JM to write Biomed overview of requirements for services (top level view). This should include both the immediate needs and the longer term planning (e.g for deploying Biomedical applications on many sites having started on their well established sites.)*

5) CIC Operation and VOs (R Rumler)

RR explained that the EGEE procedure for new VOs was that the new VO must deal with its local CIC for the following services

- Grid user registration service (CERN registrar/CIC)
- VO user management service (CIC)
- RB (anywhere + at least one at CIC)
- Replica manager + replica catalogue (CIC)
- Production sites

It should be noted that

- CIC contacts ROCs to find production sites, controls progress
- CIC takes care of failover procedures for all its services
- CIC is VO contact for usage statistics, accounting

As already discussed it is not clear how 'ROCs find production services'. (**see Action 1.8**)

The meeting discussed the sequence within the project regarding establishing a new VO. The following was defined:

- 1- EGAAP selects new applications
- 2- NA4/SA1 Working Group collects technical and detail

- requirements (e.g. CPU, storage, software, user support...)
- 3- PEB reviews requirements
- 4- New VO requirements passed to SA1

RR summarised the current experience with the French CIC and Biomedicine. There had been delays in setting up services due to everyone being on a learning curve. They were pursuing the 'guaranteed failover' of services. There was a problem in finding additional Biomedical sites, both from the aspect of negotiation and from the fact that the technical procedures were manual.

A document is being drafted describing the Biomedical VO set-up and the past/current Biomedical experience.

ACTION 1.10 RR to circulate draft describing Biomedical VO set-up and experiences

YM emphasized that a current real issue for Biomed was the manpower to support the core grid services both in LCG and in the Biomed community. (see Actions 1.5 and 1.7)

Comment: Ditto

6) Current experience with LCG support for HEP(F.Donno)

Flavia Donno(FD) presented the current procedures within LCG for supporting the HEP experiments at various levels. These procedures had evolved over a period of time, and communication was facilitated by having well defined human contacts both in LCG and in each experiment.

The EIS (Experiment Integration and Support Team) has helped LHC Experiments to integrate their production environment with the Grid Middleware and utilities. They have given support during all steps of the integration process i.e. helping understanding of the middleware functionality, testing new prototypal components, getting on to the LCG Infrastructure.

The EIS has also provided vital support functions with the provision of manuals, guides, and User Scenarios.

During experiment production running (Data Challenges) the EIS has provided many other services, without which the production running would not have been possible.

- Monitoring experiment specific production system (even in shift)
- Provide full user support
- Configuring experiment specific utilities (acrontab, etc.)
- Chasing misconfigured sites and solving site-related problems
- Suggesting better site configuration for resource usage
- Monitoring GRID and Experiment Specific Services
- Provide Security Advice

The ensuing discussion focused on how the new LCG/EGEE infrastructure could provide the same combination of services to Biomedicine and new applications. This is clearly essential if we are to be successful in the non-HEP application domains. RR commented

that in principle the services would be available in LCG/EGEE but we were getting up to speed and training people.

FH commented that we should take the recommended Biomed/EGEE Task Force as a base for defining how these services can be provided now, at whatever level is possible today. Although the Global Grid User Support (GGUS) exists via a Web interface we must identify real people both from the service and the application ends (and it can't be Flavia and co as they are already overloaded).

ACTION 1.11 *FH+YL+RR Follow up the formation of Task Force and mapping to todays reality in Biomedicine and LCG/EGEE (identify accountable people...)*

7) Actions and the next meeting

- Minutes to be circulated and agreed with WG
- Minutes circulated to project prior to PEB on Sep 23
- Actions followed up and some matters brought to PEB

We have agreed next meeting morning of Oct 14 at CERN. This follows the Oct 13 meeting of NA4/AWG at CERN.