



Enabling Grids for E-science

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

**Steven Newhouse
Bob Jones**

www.eu-egee.org



Information Society
and Media



- **When do NGIs sign-up to EGI?**
 - Core set of NGIs will be defined by summer 2009
 - Commit to plans and paying membership fees
- **Money for mware maintenance included within EGI**
 - How do you maintain sw that you do not develop yourself?
 - This model is currently used by ARC
- **Slide 17: need scale on the axis so NGIs can understand the timelines of their commitment**
- **EC project proposal to be submitted as consortium of EGI.org and NGIs**
 - Proposal written by a team to be defined by EGI Council
 - This implies that NGIs must qualify as partners in an EC FP7 project

- **SSC is the accepted model with support from EGI and Council level representation**
 - SSCs must be multi-national, but can that mean pan-European or regional? Either is fine as long as it avoids duplication. Don't separate on geographical basis but rather thematic basis.
- **SSCs have to be able to “stand on their own feet”**
 - Expect that number of SSCs will grow over time
 - Entry barrier is quite high
 - SSCs expected to be a long term body
- **Currently ~70FTE in EGEE user support compared to ~12FTE in EGI.org**
 - Hence the shortfall must come from other sources (NGIs, user communities etc.)
- **Site Validation Tests**
 - Now ramping-up and important for Biomed community
 - Who will run the testing environment (Sam infrastructure etc.?)
- **Need to clarify if EGI will provide core VO services**
 - These are important tasks for the new user communities.
 - Who will do the case studies and documentation? SSCs?

- **Cross-community interaction is very important**
 - Prioritization of requirements between communities will have to be done at the EGI level
 - User forum/conference is a key event that must continue
- **Confirmed responses from all EGEE cluster that will form SSCs except HEP**
 - Need a response from HEP community about whether they want to form an SSC
- **How do we reach-out to ARC & UNICORE supported user communities to determine if they want to form SSCs?**
- **How will users and VOs not covered by an SSC interact with EGI?**
- **How will the other EC projects for SSCs and communities be structured?**
- **Only form an SSC when it reaches a pan-European level otherwise it can be handled at a national/regional level**
- **What is the bootstrap model for new user communities?**
- **We need to know what will be the commitment of NGIs to user support in order for the planning to advance and understand if this model can work**

- **gLite Open Consortium and UMD are separate structures**
- **How will EGI, gLite Open Consortium and UMD interact?**
- **The EGI blueprint says the MCB contains the mware consortia but is it correct that the providers define policy?**
- **The work of other partners outside Europe are not represented in this model?**
 - Also TCD have expressed interest in continued testing activities
- **Who is responsible for bringing together the 3 mware stacks in UMD?**
- **Key point for gLite Open Consortium is to have commitment from its partners to continue essential support for deployed mware**
- **Action on XX: Put in place the gLite Open Consortium so that it can be used to “test” the middleware relationship envisaged for EGI in the context of the 2nd year of EGEE-III**
 - Mirco & Frederic to agree the name of the leader of this definition task
 - Choice of toolset and its support is part of the responsibility of the gLite Open Consortium
 - Specifically for ETICS, its adoption will have an impact on the ETICS-II project.

- **MU does not do any sw development**
- **How to handle the licensing question if there are UMD conforming components coming from commercial suppliers?**
- **How to bootstrap UMD before EGI starts?**
 - **Who does the work, relaxed conformance criteria?**
- **Devolve central testing and certification tasks to the distributed partners**
- **More emphasis on multi-platform support**
 - **Change approach – porting is the responsibility of the developers**
- **Clear and definitive decision on tools (ETICS, Savannah, CVS, wiki)**
 - **timely tools choice is essential for gLite Open Consortium and UMD**
 - Adopt ETICS and make it part of the gLite Open Consortium?
 - Note migration from one tool to another is “exceedingly expensive”!

- **Is UMD a separate entity or simply a product of the consortia?**
- **Will EGI.org/MU produce a release like we have today?**
- **“appliance” is a combination of components that has some added-value as a set (e.g. WMS)**
- **Will EGI.org actually “delegate” certification?**
 - This is self-certification which is dangerous
 - EGI.org does not have the manpower to do full certification itself
 - Do we do certification as today (detailed interaction between SA1 and developers) or more like the MOT/Controle Technique for a car (tester runs through a check-list and signals any failures then hands it back to the owner).
- **If we have UMD what does interoperability mean?**
 - If UMD is consistent it should not be required internally but will be required for non-EGI based infrastructures
- **How will the relationship between EGI.org and UMD/mware consortia be implemented?**
 - What is the motivation for developers to address issues raised by EGI?
- **Is the MU distributed or co-located?**
 - EGEE experience shows the overhead of a distributed structure does not suit such tasks requiring high reactivity
- **Collaborative attitude of mware consortia is helpful and necessary but not enough!**
- **Action: based on the notes from AA meeting, a set of questions are brought to the UMD meeting on the 4th Feb. Also get involvement of NGIs in mware testing/certification tasks clarified in EGIDS_ deliverable D5.5 (draft for User Forum)**

- **Messaging system and test & availability description DB are not mentioned in the EGI blueprint even though they are used today and should be considered as central tasks**
- **Many of the operations tools currently used by EGEE will not be easily deployable in EGI unless it is the same partners doing it**
 - We do not have the experience of “packaging” such tools for deployment by others
- **Missing international tasks:**
 - SLA monitoring and enforcement
 - PPS/pilot service (needed?)
 - Etc.
- **Lots of tasks left to the NGIs which will need to be highlighted**
- **Do we need SLAs between EGI.org and NGIs as well as NGIs and sites?**
- **How will the tools work when we have multiple mware stacks (i.e. UMD)?**
 - Expected to be part of a separate operations EC project?
 - Experience already exists with OSG and has started with ARC
- **Operations transition would be simplified if**
 - Existing tools are adopted by EGI
 - Current tool maintainers and operators become part of EGI (i.e. confirmed as NGIs) and agree to continue to do this in EGI

- **Manpower levels assume all NGIs are mature, participating in EGI and have the necessarily trained personnel available**
 - Highly distributed effort means less efficiency (this is the reason behind the “cluster of competence” model used in EGEE-III)
- **No real home for the business activities with EGI**
 - The structures put in place by EGEE (EBAs, business forum etc.) appear to have no future so can just “archive” contacts etc. (but these go cold quickly)
 - Do some responsibilities go the gLite Open Consortium
- **Dissemination manager must be in place before the end of EGEE-III**
- **What happens to the real-time monitor?**
- **Actions:**
 - establish dialog between EGEE/NA2 business structures and EGI_DS
 - Include questions about knowledge transfer structures (such as Grid Computing Now! In the UK) in future NGI questionnaires

- **Need to clarify the contributions of the NGIs to the external liaison tasks**
 - (either via national funding or EC)
- **Expect higher-level roles to be attributed to NGI members representing whole of EGI**

- **Is the resource capacity installed the right metric?**
 - Very difficult to verify if declared capacity is correct and accessible
 - Is not the capacity consumed over a given time a better metric?
 - WLCG is putting mechanisms in place to measure installed capacity
 - Staff level grouped over funded and unfunded - it would be better to show funded and unfunded separately
 - Installed nodes in Sweden run gLite and ARC so what should be recorded in gstat?
 - SA1 needs to know if these sites are accessible via a gLite UI and is currently discussing this point with Norway and Germany

- **EGI should have a small independent, competent network team and the persons should be dedicated to this task**
 - Should not be left to individual NRENs
 - Interface between EGI and network providers
 - Assess and check the end-to-end quality of the network used by the grid
- **ENOC “Network support centre” will be a role for an NGI**
- **Network monitoring tools is additional task (not funded in EGEE-III) for which some work is on-going but this will not be fully implemented by the end of EGEE-III. Not foreseen in EGI**
- **Advanced network services are not foreseen**
- **World-wide networking is important and EHI needs to have a coordination function to ensure network is seen as world-wide need not just European-wide**
- **LCGOPN is a private network for the LHC community**
 - Cannot become general purpose since the traffic patterns associated with physics data analysis are unknown
 - But similar networks are likely to be needed for other communities in the future
- **Action: Xavier to provide task description for the EGI network team which can then be used to identify a NGI willing to take on this role**

- **List of accredited trainers by country will be gathered via the EGEE country reports**
- **Action: Robin to identify those countries that currently do not have a training group**
- **How will training across UMD (gLite/ARC/UNICORE) be handled? EGEE/NA3 should approach ARC & UNICORE to discuss this for the future**
 - Training should be discussed in UMD context/meetings
- **Should there be a training SSC or just part of generic/new users SSC?**
 - Who could lead such an SSC?
- **Do we really need a training-infrastructure?**
 - Currently don't have a training VO on the production infrastructure for all countries
 - How do training event organisers get temporary certs for trainees so they could use a training VO?
 - Trainers want both: federal t-infrastructure
- **Action: NA3/NA4 mgmt to discuss training SSCs to determine if creation is necessary and identify potential lead organisations**

- **Found sessions very useful**
 - Not always a consensus found (for middleware & deployment)

- **Middleware:**
 - Action: the specific use-cases should be further developed between EGEE and EGI
 - JRA1, SA3, EGI task force?

- **Deployment:**
 - What level of checks do NGIs perform on receiving a new release?
 - Is it handled in the same way as a laptop owner receiving a
 - Who is responsible for delivering the service?
 - How strict can EGI be about deadlines for deploying releases?
 - NGIs decides if it will deploy or not
 - NGIs have obligations to the VOs it serves and the NGIs it collaborates with in the context of EGI
 - If EGI.org is mandated to provide a service then it must be able to subsequently mandate NGIs

- **Did you find this meeting useful?**
 - How could the programme have been made better?
 - Are there some important subjects we did not cover?

- Bob/Steven: Upload tidy summary slides and produce short text with list of actions (by 3rd Feb.)
 - Make available to EGI_DS for their mgmt board meeting (5th Feb)
 - *Also for Juergen Knobloch as input to EGI deliverable D5.5 (transition plan) & Laura Perini for updated functions document*
 - *Draft of these documents expected for user forum (1st week of March)*
- Track actions via AMB/PMB
- Establish list of tasks for each NGI
- Establish list of tasks to be attributed to specific NGIs that perform these on behalf of EGI
- Such tasks will need to be explained in these lists so NGIs can understand the effort required and the profile required so they can nominate people
- Still think EGEE needs its own “transition” document
 - Track what happens to EGEE tasks during the transition
 - Act as input to revision of EGEE-III DoW for 2nd year
 - Table of contents to be prepared by Steven/Bob