



Enabling Grids for E-science

## Summary of EGEE review

*Bob Jones, EGEE Technical Director  
CERN*

*15/02/2005*

[www.eu-egee.org](http://www.eu-egee.org)



- **Wednesday, 09/02/05 PM:** *Dieter Kranzlmüller*
  - Overview: Status of Project
  - Status of Production Service and applications
- **Thursday, 10/02/05 AM:** *Mirco Mazzucato*
  - Networking, User Training and Induction
  - Application Demonstrations
- **Thursday, 10/02/05 PM:** *Manuel Delfino*
  - Development/Re-Engineering (gLite)
  - Security and deployment
- **Friday, 11/02/05 AM:** *Robin Middleton*
  - Dissemination, Outreach, and Policies
  - Plans for Next Period
  - Conclusions
- **Friday, 11/02/05 PM:** *Fabrizio Gagliardi*
  - Feedback from Reviewers

## **5 independent experts nominated by EU:**

- Phil Andrews
  - Karsten Decker
  - Satoshi Matsuoka
  - Jean Pierre Prost
  - Leandros Tassiulas
- 
- **EU project and administration officers:**
    - Kyriakos Baxevanidis
    - Christopher Kowalski

- **EGEE has made a very good and quick start**
  - mgmt task equivalent to starting a medium sized enterprise
- **Starting from LCG-2 gave rapid application start-up**
  - Migrating to gLite is encouraged given the identified shortcomings of LCG-2
- **The quality of the deliverables produced is very high**
  - >60 deliverables/milestones during the first 9 months
- **Good penetration in scientific communities**
  - But not much in others: executives/politicians
  - Training and education is impressive by design and implementation
  - Produced a detailed and precise write-up of the in-depth operational needs of a structure this size
  - A diversity of applications has been shown

- **Migration plan from LCG-2 to gLite**
  - Need to define a definite end-date for LCG-2 to encourage migration of applications
  - Some application demos did not demonstrate the scientific advantage of the grid
  - Need to keep current users happy and manage expectations
  - The long-term planning for (network) communication infrastructure is not very clear and must be improved upon
    - Not clear what JRA4's BAR, NPM will bring as advantages to the applications

- **Manpower**
  - Staff retention is a major issue for a 2 year project
- **Industry Forum**
  - is a good idea but needs a stronger engagement and commitment by a more diversified industrial and commercial community
- **gLite**
  - March deadline for gLite is very ambitious - understand this refers to pre-production but migration to production service must be planned
  - Must strengthen resources in testing tasks
  - Migration should be application driven: identify those applications which will be the first to migrate
  - Keep long-term view of working towards standardization
- **Dissemination**
  - Good but should work better for non-technical communities (politicians, executives)

- **All deliverables accepted**
  - Excellent quality but can be more concise
  - Minor text corrections to periodic report
    - Contract amendment was requested by project no EU
    - TERENA was not requested by EU to organise IST event – it waqs a common agreement

- **Period can be changed from 9 to 15 months**
  - Must be requested by the project
    - As contract amendment with updated TA
  - A new deliverable related concertation across EU projects will be requested
  - Drop management report & cost claims at PM18
  - Intermediate, focussed review after PM18 (likely early Dec'05)
    - Exact subjects to specified later
    - Will take into account PM18 deliverables
- **Expanding resources**
  - Partners encouraged to make use of new EU calls (March'05) to submit related proposals where extra resources are required
    - Support for new communities etc.
- **A written version of these verbal conclusions will be provided within 2 weeks**