Meeting Object: **Project Technical Board**

Authors: **Bob Jones / Karin Burghauser**

Meeting Date: **13th of June 2003**

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

Attendees:	WP1: Massimo Sgaravatto
	WP2: Peter Kunszt
	WP3: Steve Fisher
	WP4: Maite Barroso Lopez, German Cancio
	WP5: John Gordon (via phone)
	WP6: Francois Etienne (via phone), Eric Fede, Charles Loomis (via phone)
	WP7: Franck Bonnassieux
	WP8: Frank Harris, Laura Perini, JJ Blaising, Ingo Augustin
	WP9: Julian Linford (via phone), Luigi Fusco (via phone)
	WP12: Bob Jones, Erwin Laure, Gabriel Zaquine, Fabrizio Gagliardi
	PMB: Robin Middleton
	TST: Gilbert Grosdidier
Apologised:	WP10 and WP11

1. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

There were no minutes for the previous meeting which was dedicated to the review of the March deliverables.

2. DELIVERABLE REVIEW

D11.6 Second Annual Conference and Grid Forum

Gabriel Zaquine as moderator. Reviewers: Bob Jones, Rosy Mondardini and Kors Bos.

The deliverable has been postponed from PM 26-30 in order to accommodate the Barcelona conference. The review has not started really, since only a preliminary draft has been received.

Contents:
- IRF activities (Budapest conference, AcrossGrid conference, Barcelona conference)
- Supporting actions to IRF
- Results of performance indicators (missing)
- Conclusions (missing)

Mauro Draoli has promised to send a complete document today so the review can start next week. No recommendations can be passed to PTB now. If the document comes out today reviews can be sent at the end of next week to PTB.

No decision can be taken by the PTB at this moment.

D9.4 EO application platform inteface

Franck Bonnassieux as moderator. Reviewers: Frank Harris, D.J. Colling and Gavin McCance.

All three reviewers stated that they are generally satisfied with it being an interested and well written deliverable.

Requested changes:
  - Lengthen the abstract
  - Structure update and chapter renaming
  - Correct document amendment procedure
  - Clarification on what actually exists and was planned
  - More comments on common layers development with WP8/10: Frank will send a paragraph on that
  - Not all points as specified in the technical annex are covered, should at least mention them.
  - Data mgmt (7.1.4) needs to be changed to reflect release 2.0 software
  - Ambiguity on support of different grid implementations
  - Make reference to GAT from GridLab and explain how it compares: Bob will contribute a suitable paragraph

Schedule:
  - A new version has been received Wednesday evening with replies to comments
  - It looks OK at the first glance
  - Data mgmt still needs some update
  - Reviewers should send comments before next Wednesday (18th)
  - Bob Jones' and Frank Harris' input will be sent to WP9 early next week
  - The document will be send to Mark Parsons end of next week

Summary:
  - Very competent reviewers
  - WP9 very responsive to comments

The PTB provisionally accepts the document based on the recommendations of the moderator, provided the last points mentioned by the moderator and discussed at the PTB are corrected and Mark Parsons approves the deliverable as well.

3. EDG2.0 INTEGRATION STATUS

By Charles Loomis (see slides attached to the agenda)

Current sites involved in integration:
- CERN (Louis Poncet)
- NIKHEF (Jeff Templon)
- RAL (Steve Traylen)
- CNAF joint recently,
- LYON about to join

Frequent tags (~1 a day) the last 2.5 weeks; most changes for WP1,3,5. CHANGES file in edg-release module contains details Lots of outstanding bugs at the moment, but much less severe. We passed the 'does not work at all' stage - now a lot of little bugs need to be addressed.

Licensing:

2 packages (L&B and VOMS) link against MySQL - this is a GPL library! For the L&B only the server is involved - could distribute that under GPL or recode it to use MySQL++ which is LGPL.

VOMS uses MySQL++ which is LGPL, but it links against MySQL which is GPL; not clear if this is OK.

All the others use Java JDBC interface which is LGPL; Connector/J Driver (mm.mysql descendant) may be a problem in future.

Peter Kunszt's opinion is that even using the driver under GPL is not a problem under Java - the situation for C/C++ is different. Is Java re-distribution OK? Charles Loomis' opinion is yes but it needs to be checked for the September release by lawyers.

MySQL is currently in the repository - that should also be checked, but since it's GPL it should not be a problem. Another possibility is to ask the MySQL people whether they are comfortable with our license - but chances seem to be quite low. WP1 will investigate the feasibility of going to MySQL++. German asked whether system headerfiles could be a problem - no.

- VDT/Globus: compilation problems with edg-gatekeper and WP1 on autobuild; working version of MyProxy still missing.

Upgrade to VDT 1.1.8-8 pending; currently using 1.1.8-6; 1.1.8-8 will be deployed on LCG certification TB first so immediate problems should have been sorted out there. We should wait until LCG tested it; release 2.0 should be released with VDT 1.1.8-8 - so MyProxy will not work with it; otherwise the functionality should not be compromised. Not clear if CondorG changes required by WP1 are in 1.1.8-8. These changes are necessary for the stability of WP1 (jobs may stay in 'READY' forever if there are problems with job-submission).

- Tagging EDG 2.0:

Basic requirements written down.

Suggestion: measure Globus/CondorG success/failure rates independently of our software and use those to set thresholds for tagging. I.e. EDG software should reach its efficiency in relation to efficiency measured by normal globus-job-submit and condor-submit (the latter can only be run from the RB machine and there are questions with the environment settings for users different than the RB - WP1 will provide CondorG tests). Proxy-renewal tests will be suspended until working MyProxy has been received.

Most of the tests are already in edg-site-certification module and all new tests should be added in that as well.

RPMs with final functionality should be received today to tag/deploy a version mid-afternoon. Early/mid-next week: install all sites from scratch after removing developer root access to them. Find machines for multiple LRC servers - need at least 4 (2 HEP experiments, WP9, WP10). Late next week start validation.

4. TESTBED USAGE AND SUPPORT

by Eric Fede (see slides attached to the agenda)

4.1. Application TB status and plan (current and plan for 2003)

- Only 3 sites will stop supporting EDG application testbed and switch to LCG: CERN, INFN/MILANO, FZK

- Some sites want to join EDG and LCG: UK RAL,IC; IN2P3; INFN: CNAF, CATANIA, TORINO, PADOVA, BARCELONA

The list covers only those sites from which answers have been received so far; in particular the UK is going to provide more sites to EDG. We would like to know that by the time of the 2.0 rollout. Total 15-20 sites with ~800 CPUs will remain in the EDG application testbed.

We will cross-check this list with the list maintained by LCG.

All the services currently running in EDG will be preserved - only CEs and SEs will be lost. Information in the list should eventually be cross-checked with the information stored in the information service.

WP6 should check with sites joining LCG and EDG if they will continue to support the services currently run by them (in particular the brokers). Laura Perini reported that sites in Italy will continue to support their services. Eric reported that also Lyon will continue to support their services.

VO based breakdown: several sites support all VOs; EO and biomed are the least supported.

Conclusion:
- Enough sites and resources remain in EDG to have a useful service
- All EDG VOs are supported

4.2. User Support Status

- Main support resources is still the ITeam mailing list; the problems with this structure are that it is a bit chaotic and no history of answers in there.

- User support interface (poor usage) is too slow but structured, good for users that discover EDG.

- Until the end of the year both systems will be supported.

- User support should be pro-active in moving people from the iteam to user support structure. However, this is hard to do due to lack of manpower. Currently 3 people assigned to it, but not full time (Nadia, Sophie, Eric).

- Maybe the applications could install a kind of pre-filter inside their community. This is already happening to some extent in WP8.

- Maybe the ITeam list could be closed and all non-member submissions are filtered by user support.

- Julian Linford reminded that tutorials are also a valuable source of information - people should be pointed to appropriate user support there.

5. TESTING STATUS

by Gilbert Grosdidier (see slides attached to the agenda)

Targeting 2 areas:
- Site validation
  Installation check, checks after changes, regular checking

- Middleware validation
  Globus/CondorG testing (VDT developers)
  Unit tests for subsystem (EDG developers)
  Basic functional tests of components
  Basic grid functionality on local TB
  Full grid functionality on full TB

Targeting LCG certification TB and EDG integration TB.

Have a bash framework (intrusive) and a perl one (which is less intrusive and can be directly done from the UI). Some of the unit testing will require access to service nodes.

Priorities:
  1. Validate/migrate existing certification tests to EDG 2.0 (mostly done)
  2. Develop missing certification tests for EDG 2.0
  3. Migrate site validation tests to EDG 2.0

Point 3 is a problem since INFN manpower has been deducted from testing team. Current manpower is only 3 FTE (2 CNRS + 0.5*2 IFAE), 3 more member from IFAE expected and 3 more people from Russia added. There is some confusion about French manpower contribution to the testing team which will be discussed offline.

Distribution:
So far tarballs have been distributed; as of last week EDG CVS repository is used: edg-tests and edg-site-certification. A simple procedure was designed to install them side by side. An automated script is under way for producing tarballs and RPMs.

Some tests have been migrated to 2.0 - some are still missing (see slide 7 of the talk). Test-driver has a rich set of option for steering the tests - that way modifications inside the tests are avoided.

Most of the items set up as criteria for cutting 2.0 are supported by test suite; missing pieces: replication to MSS, register storm, proxy renewal, matchmaking

Future work:
- Develop unit testing with help of WPs
- Install/config testing comes later

EDG should provide missing tests for release 2.0 criteria to testing team. Test suite should go through the autobuild and produce a rpm. Test team should extend tests based on tests being done by others on the application TB, like LCs.

6. REPORT ON WP2/5 WORKSHOP

by Jens Jensen and Peter Kunszt

The workshop was held on Tuesday with break-out sessions on Wednesday and Thursday. An outcome is a joint planning document for WP2/WP5 activities which will be maintained up to date (see attachment to talk). The document outlines the work-plan with priorities, timelines and tasks for people involved.
WP5 is waiting to get a Castor SE configured at CERN. A WP5 RPM did not get installed but will be included in today's tag. No joint testing has been performed yet using the MSS. Secure access is necessary as well to work with multiple VOs.

Priorities for WP2 & WP5 are based on the outcomes from the Barcelona sessions and subsequent discussions. Concerning testing, joint WP2/WP5 tests can be performed on a LCFGng based development testbed that includes CERN hosts with access to Castor and RAL hosts with access to the Atlas MSS.

There are now weekly joint WP2/5 meetings and associated emails lists. People will be working between CERN and RAL. Peter will report on the outcome of the WP2/WP5 meetings (Tuesday) at the weekly WP managers meeting the following day.

The WP2 recommendation to LCG is to wait for further testing before considering adopting the SE and this will be discussed within WP5 as well.

7. SEPTEMBER RELEASE PLANNING

by Erwin Laure (see slides attached to the agenda)

Erwin outlined the overall planning with the timeline towards the September release. He highlighted that there is a very short period before September which is the primary vacation period so people must be very conservative about their work-plans.

He outlined the major changes foreseen to EDG 2.0 for September but clarified that the general direction is to improve stability and scalability.

Erwin then reviewed the priorities for each middleware WP noting that the highest priority for everyone is bugfixing and support for EDG 2.0.

During a discussion about priorities the general consensus of the users and project management remarked that the work-plans and lack of information about personnel planning over the summer means that the middleware plans are looking far too ambitious. The WP mgrs present said they were having difficulties gathering holiday plans since many people only planned at the last minute but they would take responsibility for ensuring sufficient coverage. Bob said that he found this a very risky approach but if the WP mgrs took responsibility for this internally then they will be held to account.

Erwin described the plans for how to migrate to gcc3.2. This implies moving the integration testbed to gcc 3.2 as soon as the gcc 2.95 version has been deployed on the application testbed. The idea is to fix bugs found in EDG 2.0 will be fixed directly via the LCG certification testbed and also integrated during the slots working up to September.

It became clear that the migration to the new compiler is critical - current WP1 has severe problems with gcc2.95 that can only be fixed with a move to gcc 3.2 and the experiments have requested the migration to be performed during the summer.

An important aspect is when LCG will upgrade to gcc 3.2 since the support for releases with different compiler versions will be very difficult to handle in terms of personnel, testbed environments and rolling-out bug fixes.

EDG management will discuss the compiler issue with LCG management offline.

Moving to the actual release procedure, Erwin identified some of the major problems found during EDG 2.0 integration.

Massimo Sgaravatto pointed-out that the GLUE schema issue is even more complicated because it involves the agreement of many parties that are not involved in the EDG project. Charles added, that one problem was that mainly developers never read the developers guide and hence were not aware of the guidelines.

Erwin outlined the revisions being made to the release procedure that are intended to address the issues found during EDG 2.0 integration.

Peter Kunszt asked how we could make this plan match reality? Erwin replied by preparing well in advance of the allocated slot and to restrict the WP work-plan so that the WPs aim at one or two well tested and structured components rather than 7 or 8 half finished components.

Erwin ended by saying the plan is very ambitious and the best way to address these problems is to be very conservative. Frank Harris reiterated this point and said making a good working EDG 2.0 by the end of the project will constitute a great success.

Massimo Sgaravatto asked about extra functionality that was mentioned in the technical annex? Fabrizio Gagliardi responded that given a working and successful EDG 2.0 release the 3rd review will be a success and that extra functionality will be done in EGEE.

8. AOB

Latest news of EGEE proposal review

by Fabrizio Gagliardi

Fabrizio explained that on the 11th June he was informed that the 7 independent reviewers gave scores of above threshold for the EGEE proposal. They have addressed 10 questions about the proposal to be answered at a special hearing in Brussels on 1st July. He also went through the questions and discussed the planning for how to prepare responses.

Proposed date for the next meeting
Tuesday 26th August at CERN