

Meeting Object: **Project Technical Board**

Author: **Bob Jones / compiled by Ariane Loersch**

Meeting Date: **15<sup>th</sup> of December 2003**

Meeting Place: **CERN – Building 31, IT Auditorium**

Attendees: WP1: Massimo Sgaravatto (☎ part-time), Francesco Prelz  
WP2: Gavin McGance (part-time), Kurt Stockinger  
WP3: Peter Kunszt, Steve Fisher  
WP4: Maite Barroso Lopez  
WP5: John Gordon, Jens Jensen  
WP6: Cal Loomis (☎ part-time), Steve Traylen (☎ part-time), Eric Fede (☎ part-time)  
WP7: Franck Bonnassieux, Dave Kelsey (part-time)  
WP8: Frank Harris, Ingo Augustin (part-time), Stephen Burke (☎)  
WP9: Julian Linford (☎)  
WP10: Vincent Breton  
WP11: Roberto Puccinelli (☎ part-time)  
WP12: Fabrizio Gagliardi (part-time), Bob Jones, Erwin Laure, Gabriel Zaquine  
Mark Parsons

Apologised: ---

---

## 1. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

There were no comments on the minutes of the last meeting.

## 2. REVIEW OF THE FINAL PROJECT DELIVERABLES

See the agenda page where the deliverables are available: <http://agenda.cern.ch/age?a035885>

### Summary of the deliverables:

D1.7: Minor corrections required  
D2.6: Accepted  
D3.6: Minor corrections required  
D4.6: Minor corrections required  
D5.6: Important modifications required. Another round of review (e-mail based) is required.  
D6.8: Accepted  
D7.7: Minor corrections required  
D7.4: Minor corrections required  
D8.4: Accepted  
D9.5: Minor corrections required  
D10.4: Important modifications required. Another round of review (e-mail based) is required.  
D11.9: Important modifications required. Another round of review (e-mail based) is required.  
D11.7: Important modifications required. Another round of review (e-mail based) is required.

## General points for all deliverables:

- \* Include quantitative data and analyse results produced.
- \* Do not undersell the work performed. A lot has been achieved.
- \* Make sure the title is consistent with that of the latest version of the Technical Annex.
- \* Make sure the title page has the latest IST logo.
- \* Must include the following sections: executive summary, lessons learnt, future directions.

## Detailed points about deliverables below:

### D3.6:

Good but needs to be better aligned with application assessments by making it clear that the early versions were not scalable/reliable (however have been addressed more recently). Job storm tests and scalability tests - need to say why they have not been measured and what could be done. Definitely need a clear story about scalability. Need to address comments by Mark & Erwin. This deliverable needs the above comments to be taken into account and then can be accepted by the PTB.

### D4.6:

Minor corrections required to chapters 4 & 5 based on comments by Bob Jones (paper version given to Maite).

### D7.4:

In a very good shape just need some minor typo corrections and a more consistent style across all chapters. Peter Clarke is asked to read through an updated version and improve the consistency of style.

### D9.5:

Mark Parsons made a number of comments:

Need to check English tenses and give a more positive assessment of the AWG requirements in the table. Page 11 - don't just say the tests were not performed (2 examples of this in the document).

Mark will post his marked-up version to Julian.

### D7.7:

Minor modifications already sent to WP7 and a new version is being prepared.

### D5.6:

Comments received from Mark and Erwin.

Mostly in relation with structure of document - in particular chapter 3 & 7. Need also to clarify the differences between what is implemented and what remains to be done (but not in EDG). Not clear how much of the described MSS access system has been produced by WP5 itself. Ele commands are said to be no longer supported but are used for examples throughout the document. Clarify the role in GGF and how the work of SRM relates to this. What is the future for the work of WP5 - how is it addressed in EGEE? What about SANs?

### D11.7:

The review was performed on v1.0 but v1.1 was delivered on Thursday. This needs to be compared to comments received: Generally too short and does not contain sufficient material. Add section on overall conference - don't report on purely the CNR involvement. Use the document that describes the

2nd project conference as a starting point (it was a good document). Add section giving an analysis of the follow-up foreseen in D11.4. Add a summary section and recommendations for the future. Add material about IST2003. Needs to serious work and must be completed before Christmas.

### D11.9:

More info required from mware WPs.

Action: WP mgrs to read current draft and provide feedback by evening of 18th December.

Currently not positive enough.

Check English and formatting.

Check GRIDSTART document and compare material against D11.9.

Action: Mark Parsons to send URL for GRIDSTART document to WP mgrs.

Action: Roberto to provide updated draft by 23rd December.

Needs very good executive summary.

### DL.7:

Reviewers generally happy but find the document overall a bit pessimistic - add a more positive spin given all the work performed and results achieved. Contributions to /dialog with Condor should be described. Definitely needs quantifiable scalability results. Can come from LCG and CrossGrid testbeds - just needs to be acknowledged.

### D10.4:

Review was not detailed enough - many points only noticed by WP mgrs. Many comments by Mark Parsons & Erwin Laure concentrate on bio applications but not enough info on how grid was used. Results of WP10 work are poorly presented - Don't just say "we tried this and it did not work" but rather "we had difficulties here but were able to do this." The document should make use of the agreed AWG classifications for the status of the requirements as met by EDG.

The document showed that WP10 had difficulties in making good use of the EDG testbed since they were not linked closely enough to the mware WPs. There is no equivalent of the Loose Cannons for WP10. Really needed more technical experts dedicated to their cause. AWG has helped to pull together the different applications. However, the information flow between the bio representatives and the mware people has not worked well enough. The WP10 became disillusioned by their progress and hence preferred to look for other solutions. In the future (i.e. EGEE), the bio applications need to have dedicated technical personnel who know their domain well and grid technology. Need to ensure the biologists can use the grid to publish results to be seen as successful.

This document needs to be modified and reviewed again in particular by Massimo S., Peter K. and Steve F.

### Response to reviewers questions

Erwin displayed and reviewed the document online. Details comments and corrections were made to the document, below is a list of outstanding actions.

### Section 1

#### Question 2

Mark Parsons added that GT2 functionality will be maintained in GT3 until end of 2004.

## Question 3

Discussion on usefulness of user support. Need to insist on following the correct support lines for EGEE since the scale of the number of users will make the situation different. However, people dedicated to the application groups (like the Loose Cannons) are very important but need to come from the application community not the mware WPs.

WP6 to add more details about how other projects using EDG sw (CrossGrid, LCG etc.) have provided some first line support. Are still not at a level of production usage where non-expert users can work independently.

Action: Francois Etienne to complete the response with this input.

## Question 5

Action: Dave Kelsey to expand on text concerning LCMAPs, LCAS etc. In terms of security, we have not met the confidentiality security requirements necessary for WP10 (as described in D7.7). Need to clarify the responsibility between the application and the mware for these requirements.

## Question 6

Needs quantitative data included in WP1 deliverable.

## Section 3

Question: strategy to promote and deploy EDG

Action: John Gordon to add paragraphs about UK deployment.

## Section 6

Question 1: Industrial input.

Action: Steve Fisher to get input from IBM

Action: Gabriel Zaquine to get input from CS

Question 3: Industrial Forum

Action: Roberto Puccinelli to provide input on industry forum and IST and conferences

## Section 7:

Question 4: future dissemination

Action : Roberto Puccinelli to give numbers of people involved in Industry forum, tutorials etc (take data from quarterly reports).

Action: Roberto Puccinelli to update link on public pages to simply download of software and documentation (see links provided by Erwin).

Action: Erwin will then ensure the grid technology repository is informed on EDG sw availability.

## Annual report:

Action: Gabriel/Bob/Fab/Erwin: give list of points to be included in the annual report Clarify quantitative data: events held, publications produced, number of hits on the website

Overall points for the review:

Overall questions the reviewers want to know about:

- What has the EU spent its money on, what was produced, how will it be used in the future. Follow outline for presentations made by Gabriel and updated during the PTB. Don't go into technical details but the reviewers will be interested in scalability and security. What happens to the testbed in the future? Can we still submit jobs at the review? Will the webpages be supported after the end of the project.
  
- Need to compare the Technical Annex to the final deliverables and indicate if we have fulfilled our contract obligations. Where we have been late with software releases we need to understand why:
  - \* Effects of reliability and robustness of underlying/external software packages
  - \* Further constraints and obligations coming from external, supported projects (LCG, CrossGrid etc.)
  - \* Preparation for EGEE
  - \* Work on OGSA investigationsMust remember to provide a reading list for the reviewers.
  
- Focus on exploitation and dissemination view  
Good dissemination being done but not being reported correctly. All Deliverables to have a section explaining "lessons learnt" and "future directions" Make it clear that have we delivered against contract: show what did EU get for its money. Identify what resources have been consumed and what has been produced for each WP (e.g. itemize each sw produced). Identify the exploitation measures for the future to show how the products of EDG will live on and be used in the future.

## 2. NEXT MEETING

No further PTB meetings are foreseen before the EDG review in February and the completion of the deliverables will be handled by email and via the WP managers weekly meetings. The date of **1st March (10:00-16:00)** has been tentatively reserved as a follow-up meeting to the review.