



Enabling Grids for E-scienceE

Parallel Session

Change request to MW

Frédéric Hemmer

*EGEE-III All Activity Meeting, Brussels
27-28 January 2009*

www.eu-egee.org



- **Real example: CREAM CE (BLAH) has to support SGE**
 - Assumption that it does not require external funding
 - Assumption that it is covered by the Middleware providers “contract”/obligation
- **How is the request reported**
 - EGEE: Through Savannah or GGUS, will go to TMB (not for a bug). We do not track change requests
 - EGI.org: Assumption that Middleware Coordination Board (MCB) track changes requests. Eventually validated. Assumption that the CTO will prioritize.
 - MCB contacts the developer, timelines/resources are estimated, MCB confirms – discussion whether developer can veto or not (maintenance or not - issue) – EGI.org does not appear to have control over the developers

- **Who develops specifications**
 - Requester come with use case
 - Not clear who makes specifications
 - Providers specifies what will be provided for satisfying this use case
 - Discussions between requester and provider
 - MCB endorse final specification (e.g. SGE v2.3.4)

- **Who defines acceptance criteria for the changes**
 - Demonstrating it is a different thing
 - Middleware Unit defines the tests for the changes

- **Who tests the changes**
 - Not clear. How do you get the licenses?
- **Who integrates the changes**
 - RPM comes from provider. Or can be rebuild from source by UMD.
 - Or is it gLite consortium?
- **Who checks the integrated change is deployable**
 - UMD acceptance criteria. MU. Where/when is operation involved?
- **Who checks that the change solves the original problem?**
 - Requester

- **How is information (documentation/training/deployment) about this change communicated?**
 - The one making the release? UMD? gLite Consortium?
 - Why would a site take a UMD distribution or the gLite one?
 - Because of additional testing