

Meeting Object: **PEB**

Editor(s): **Bob Jones, Marc-Elian Bégin**

Meeting Date: **7/10/2004**

Meeting Place: **CERN, 600-R-002 + Phone**

Attendees: NA1: Fabrizio Gagliardi, Bob Jones, Marc-Elian Bégin, NA2: Licia Florio, NA3: Malcolm Atkinson, NA4: Vincent Breton (phone), Frank Harris, Massimo Lamanna, NA5: Matti Heikkurinen, SA1: Ian Bird, Alistair Mills, Cristina Vistoli (phone), JRA1: Frederic Hemmer, Erwin Laure, JRA2: Gabriel Zaquine, Alberto Aimar, JRA3: John White, JRA4: Peter Clarke (phone)

Apologies: SA2: Jean-Paul Gautier

Absent:

Distribution: PEB Members

Information Minutes from the previous meeting:

<http://agenda.cern.ch/askArchive.php?base=agenda&categ=a044242&id=a044242/minutes>

1. PROPOSED AGENDA

- a. Minutes of the previous meeting and issues arising
- b. Review of action items
- c. Feedback from GGF and CHEP
- d. Risk Mitigation: Identification of Champions/Responsibles
- e. Proposal from Taiwan (SA1), MyGrid (NA4) and TeraGrid (SA1)
- f. AOB
 - EGEE-2 conference attendance
- g. Next meeting: Thursday 14th of October at 16:00

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1. Minutes

Minutes were accepted without modifications.

2.2. Issues arising

Following subjects we added to the agenda:

- Travel report (Fab)
- Status on Quarterly Reports (Bob) – Not covered
- Synergy Roadmap (Matti) – Not covered
- EU review agenda (Malcolm) – Malcolm asked to discuss his feedback on the EU review but he had to leave before this point could be covered.

3. ACTION REVIEW AND NEW STATUS

See action table here:

<http://egee-intranet.web.cern.ch/egee-intranet/Project-Structure/boards/PEB2.html>

Proposed new action status:

60: Still waiting for confirmations of participation from other EU projects – **On Going**.

76: We agreed to have a meeting on the 15th of October at CERN to discuss demos. The following people should be present:

- Bob
- Ian
- Markus Schulz
- Frederic
- Erwin
- Massimo
- Johan Montagnat
- Vincent
- Roberto Barbera

Closed

77: Frank will update NA4/SA1 Joint Group Description Document.

80: Roberto Barbera is responsible for these demos – **On Going**

81: Meb and Vincent reported that progress was being made and it will be reported next PEB – **On Going**

Deliverables and Milestones

MJRA3.1: To be checked by Ian and Dave Foster.

DJRA3.1: **Accepted**

DNA3.2: will be ready for review before the next PEB meeting

Find updated list of Deliverables and Milestone here:

<http://egee-jra2.web.cern.ch/EGEE-JRA2/EUDocuments/Deliverables/Deliverables.htm>

CURRENT ACTIVITIES STATUS

3.1. JRA1

During the meeting, Frederic presented the JRA1 activity report. The following points are worth noting:

- VOMS status is unclear as the main developer is currently ill.
- Ian and Frederic reiterated that they are both working under the same understanding that the most urgent matter now regarding gLite is to release something, ASAP, even if the quality is initially not there.
- Frederic and Erwin said that JRA3 were responsible for VOMS, and within JRA3, Joni was responsible.
- Frederic said that for the MetaData Catalog, JRA1 is waiting for feedback from NA4/BioMed
- Ian said that the first services of gLite would be deployed at the same time on the Certification testbed and the Pre-Production Service.
- On the 23rd of October, SA1 will be ready for deployment of first gLite services

Current planned attendance to EGEE 2nd conference:

- CERN: Hemmer, Laure, Kunszt, Guy, Buncic, Barroso (TBC), Di Meglio, Harakaly
- UK: Fisher, Middleton (TBC), Djaoui
- IT-CZ: Prelz, Sgaravatto, Others (TBC)

General Items:

Quarterly Report being prepared.

September timesheets being filled in PPT. Some problems reported.

The All Hands Meeting topics in Padova on November 15-17 being organized (<http://agenda.cern.ch/displayLevel.php?fid=306>)

Progress has been made on the Developer's Guide.

Several Savannah improvements made at CERN are now in the official Savannah tool.

First generated QA reports should be available by next week

The status of Middleware components is as follows (full details at <http://edms.cern.ch/document/468699>):

Component	ID	Status	Schedule to SA1	Initial Schedule	Internal Release	Delay	Resp.
Logging & Bookkeeping	L&B	16	In testing	22-Oct-04	31-Jul-04	8-Aug-04	8 IT/CZ
Workload Management System	WMS	24	In testing*	22-Oct-04	31-Jul-04	30-Sep-04	61 IT/CZ
Computing Element	CE	N/A	In testing	22-Oct-04			0 JRA1
Worker Node	WN	N/A	In testing	22-Oct-04			0 JRA1
gLite I/O	33	In testing		22-Oct-04	31-Jul-04	12-Aug-04	12 CERN/DM
							0
Home Location Register	HLR	14	Internally Released	19-Nov-04	30-Sep-04	30-Sep-04	0 IT/CZ
Relational GMA	R-GMA	4	Internally Released	12-Nov-04	31-Aug-04	30-Sep-04	30 UK
CE-Notification		21	Internally Released	12-Nov-04	31-Aug-04	30-Sep-04	30 IT/CZ
File Transfer Service	FTS	59	Internally Released	N/A	31-Jul-04	22-Sep-04	53 CERN/DM
Job Provenance	JP	18	Dev/Testing		30-Sep-04		7 IT/CZ
VOMS	VOMS	20	Dev/Testing		30-Sep-04		7 JRA3
Replica Calatlog	RC	41/42	Internal Testing		31-Jul-04		68 CERN/DM
MetaData Catalog	MC	48	Appl. Testing on Prototype		31-Aug-04		37 CERN/DM
File Catalog	FC	52	Dev/Testing		30-Sep-04		7 CERN/DM
Combined catalog	CC	55	Internal Testing		31-Aug-04		37 CERN/DM
File Placement Service	FPS	63	Dev/Testing		31-Aug-04		37 CERN/DM
Data Scheduler	DS	67	Dev/Testing		30-Sep-04		7 CERN/DM
Grid Access Service	GAS	89	Dev/Testing		30-Jun-04		99 CERN/ETC
Package Manager	PM	95	Design/Dev/Testing		30-Sep-04		7 CERN/ETC

*: not everthing from the automatic build system

Additional information:

L&B, WMS, CE, and WN have been integrated and are being tested; the process of acquiring all 3rd party components and the delivery of gLite components took longer than expected; testing could only start mid September. The CE has no number in the release plan since it's currently assembled by mainly 3rd party components (GK, Condor-C) and the blahp.

gLite I/O requires an SRM to function.

We see R-GMA and the CE-notification (the CE 'pull' component) as next candidates after the job-submission chain and glite I/O. Both are released internally and subject to integration and testing after the first components are in a reasonable good shape (integration should start next week).

The next component would be the HLR since this is a rather stand-alone component.

The FTS alone is not giving much, it needs to be integrated with the catalogs and the FPS. First versions of the catalogs together with the CC are being deployed on the prototype this week hence we expect internal release next week.

The FPS is due mid October.

Job provenance is still under internal dev. estimate another 2 weeks until internal delivery. This is a proof of concept only.

The VOMS status is unclear as Vincenzo is out of office.

The MC interface is being used by biomed (feedback eagerly expected) and experiments (ATLAS to start with) and we expect changes based on their feedback.

The FC is available on the prototype; interaction details with the RC need to be worked out - expect clarification mid October.

The DS is due for internal release mid-November. In its first instance it will be derived from the FPS.

The GAS exists as a first prototype on the ARDA installation - we don't expect a full release soon.

The PM exists also as a first prototype; discussions on its scope and implementation are still ongoing.

3.2. JRA2

(from Gabriel)

The minutes of QAG 01/10/04 meeting can be found at <https://edms.cern.ch/document/501776>. The meeting was mainly dedicated to the implementation of the measurement plan.

The “Job success” measurement tool is currently improved in order to take into account some new features as (reasons of “non success jobs”, site throughput repartition, percentage of users registered (VO) and users “using” the Grid, etc.)

Elodie Sanchez who joined CNRS and JRA2 on June 2004 decided to leave CNRS. She is in charge of the development of JRA2 measurement tool. This is a main issue for JRA2. Hiring someone else will take about three months.

3.3. JRA3

3.4. JRA4

(from Peter Clark)

Deliverables:

DJRA4.1: Delivered to moderators on 30th September

MJRA4.1: Final version uploaded to EDMS

There will be a JRA4 face to face meeting 14/15 October in CERN

3.5.NA1

(from Bob)

Licenses and copyright:

The agreed versions of the copyright, license and disclaimer have been uploaded to the project website:

The license details are here:

<http://public.eu-egee.org/license/license.html>

The copyright is here:

<http://public.eu-egee.org/license/copyright.html>

The disclaimer is here:

<http://public.eu-egee.org/license/disclaimer.html>

(it will be referenced from all the pages as a footnote)

The list of partners involved in the sw development are shown on this page:

<http://glite.web.cern.ch/glite/>

Related projects:

We would like to have the PEB's opinion on EGEE collaboration with these projects before they are discussed at the PMB on Monday:

Taiwan: <http://agenda.cern.ch/askArchive.php?base=agenda&categ=a044313&id=a044313/text>

Mygrid:

http://agenda.cern.ch/askArchive.php?base=agenda&categ=a044313&id=a044313%2Fdocument%2Ftemplate_letter_EGEE-Mygrid.pdf

Teragrid: Ian & Frederic to provide details

3.6.NA2

(from Joanne Barnett)

- The three September deliverables are now under review (DNA2.2.2; DNA2.6.1, DNA2.5). The feedback has already been received for DNA2.2.2 and TERENA will work on implementing the feedback over the next few weeks.

- There are a number of issues arising regarding registration for the conference which Licia Florio will discuss all the issues in full at the local organisers meeting tomorrow (Friday). Can Activity Leaders please encourage people to register sooner rather than later.
- Jo Barnett, Leticia Martignon and Michiel Leenaars (NWO) are working together to organise a press conference at the 3rd conference as well as other PR issues.
- TERENA want the Project Office to provide a database that everyone across the project can input details of events where they have given presentations about EGEE (crucial information for future Dissemination Reports).
- TERENA have not yet supplied new timesheets as are waiting for the Project Office to change the breakdown of tasks on the new sheet, otherwise the information is too difficult to translate from one to the other.
- TERENA is busy with organising IST2004 which is progressing.

3.7.NA3

(from David Fergusson)

3.8.NA4

AWG

We will have next week on October 13th our first face-to-face meeting.

Preliminary agenda is on

<http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a044310>

NA4/SA1 activities

- . crucial for biomed to get Task Force going now
- . FH meets with Ian Bird on Friday to discuss issues
- . ROC managers meeting revealed we need to clear up our relations with ROCs (starting with France and Spain)
- . Agenda for Oct 14 being drafted today

MNA4.1 Discussions under way between Cal Loomis, Marc-Elian Begin, Eric Fede and Rene Metery to clarify the milestone

Application specific issues

Biomed notes for AWG 7/10/04

There is not one single site on LCG2 accepting the biomed VO and deploying MPI.

The biomed activity sector has its meeting October 8th where the demo for EC review will be selected.

HEP notes for AWG 7/10/04

----- F.Harris,M.Lamanna

- Timesheet situation under control
- Discussion on testbed for ARDA promising (after long series of delays)
- ARDA Workshop announced again. Joint session with OSG foreseen

<http://lcg.web.cern.ch/LCG/peb/arda/workshops/oct04.htm>

- Participation at CHEP

<http://chep2004.web.cern.ch/chep2004/>

Sessions on experiences with grids etc. very useful. See talks.
Experiments did much on LCG, but needed very close liason with LCG.
Data management still a problem (ALICE and LHCb used Alien File Catalogues...)
Site certification very critical.

Generic applications

1) GILDA

- CERN has joined GILDA because GILDA will be used for the CERN's 50th anniversary demo on Oct, 16.

- GILDA has even become inter-continental: the Universidad de los Andes in Merida (Venezuela) has joined the GILDA testbed since this morning (Oct, 6). The new GILDA testbed is visible at:

<https://gilda.ct.infn.it/testbed.html>

- GILDA is being used in 3 concurrent tutorials in Catania, Vilnius and Madrid. No major problems have been seen with almost 100 certificates issued. The list of GILDA tutorials has been updated and it is visible at <https://gilda.ct.infn.it/tutorials.html>

- MPI jobs have successfully been tested on all GILDA sites and a portfolio of MPI applications have also been added to the GILDA Grid Demonstrator

- GILDA has now a specific User Interface + Resource Broker supporting

DAGs (not yet available on LCG2!). DAG jobs have successfully been tested and tomorrow (Oct, 7) there will be the first VRVS conf with Ian Taylor and his colleagues from GridLab to resume the integration of the TRIANA graphic workflow editor in GENIUS

- GATE (the well known biomed application) has been ported on GILDA and nicely demonstrated by Lydia Maigne at the GEANT4 Workshop in Catania. GATE can also be demonstrated at IST2004

- a series of GEANT4 exemplar applications have been ported on GILDA and included in the GILDA Demonstrator. Very good feedback and interest received by the GEANT4 community during the Workshop held in Catania this week

- SciLab, a free clone of MatLab, is being tested on GILDA to allow applications using the commercial tool to be able to test their macros on GILDA

2) APPLICATIONS

New applications have been ported/tested on GILDA:

- the first successful tests of Egeode, the package from CGG which is the EGEE Earth Science industrial application, have been performed

- the RPM of the Montecarlo code of the MAGIC experiment (Astro-particle physics) is almost ready

- an application of restoration of old movies in high definition digital videos has successfully been tried on GILDA in collaboration with CSP (a private company in Turin, Italy)

3.9. NA5

(from Matti)

eInfrastructures related work: phone conferences, initiating the white paper work, discussions about parallel session chairmen and sub-editors of the white paper sections. A skeleton of the white paper should be tacitly approved on Friday.

Antonio Fuentes has been actively networking in the GGF meeting and is at the moment in Mexico discussing national Grid infrastructures there.

More detailed notes will follow.

3.10. SA1

3.11. SA2

4. AGENDA ITEMS

a. Minutes of the previous meeting and issues arising

See section 2.1.

b. Review of action items

See section 3.

c. Feedback from GGF and CHEP

GGF

This item will be discussed during the next meeting, after all participating activities will have sent their trip report to the PEB.

>>> ACTION PEB (NA1, NA2, NA3, NA4, JRA1, JRA2, JRA3): Send Trip Report to PEB on GGF

CHEP

Frederic said that gLite was mentioned too many times, and in different contexts. It also seems that the understanding of what gLite represents and includes is not always clear. He said that this year's CHEP conference was one of the best in several years, with high quality plenary sessions.

Frank also said that the conference was good. He said that there were several mentions of LCG-2. Experiments have reported good experience in using the grid. The Americans and the NorduGrid people are also reporting an average job success rate of 60%.

Ian said that GridPP are also reporting that their biggest challenge was operations.

Bob asked all participants to make sure they mention their trips in their Quarterly Reports.

Gabriel said that the quality measurement tool, for the month of September reported, for CERN, a success rate of 90%. Ian said that we had to be careful with these figures, since the real success rate (including data retrieval not monitored by the tool) was lower than that.

We then discussed gLite progress, following JRA1's activity report (see 3.1)

d. Risk Mitigation: Identification of Champions/Responsible – Not covered

Several PEB members reported that they didn't understand the term: "Champion", in this context, we agreed not to use this term and use "responsible" instead. The "responsible" for risk mitigation element is responsible for the implementation and follow-up of the mitigation technique and will report to the PEB on a regular basis. Bob asked all the PEB members to

review the text in this section and recommend people for the next PEB meeting. A separate email will be sent.

The following lists of risks were presented to the PEB by MEB, explaining that they contain the risks presented during the last meeting and augmented following the discussion of the last meeting:

Following last weeks discussion, here are the augmented risks we are proposing:

- 1- Lack of buy-in (interest) from:
 - New sites / VOs (linked to Applications - NA4)
 - National networks and programmes (linked to PMB)
 - User community and applications (linked to Applications - NA4)

The success of EGEE will partly be evaluated on our ability to attract new communities and bring existing communities together; therefore it is a great risk if we fail to reach this expected target.
- 2- Late delivery of the EGEE Service. There is the risk that the gLite based grid service will not be ready in time (within the timeline of the current EGEE contract).
- 3- Relevance of product/middleware features with respect to the expected functionality. This risk includes two folds:
 - Wrong or insufficient feature set implemented: e.g. lack of security in the implementation
 - Instable software (i.e. poor quality) due to a wrong balance between innovation and robust/hardened distribution of development effort
- 4- Poor level of quality of service (deployment). For example:
 - Even secure software can be breached if badly deployed and installed.
 - Low level of deployed nodes and sites
 - Expensive and complex VO management
 - Migration: big bang style. This could scare new users and discourage old ones
- 5- Poor internal communication within EGEE between the technical and non-technical activities.
- 6- Poor external perception, in terms of:
 - Late delivery of the EGEE Service (related to point 2)
 - Relevance of product/middleware features (related to point 3)

This risk could include point 1 to 4. The difference between points 1 to 4 and 6, is that points 1 to 4 are true problems (e.g. gLite is late) where point 6 is a perception problem (e.g. gLite is on time, but this is not perceived so on the outside).

Mitigation and proposed Responsibles

Following the above risks, the mitigation of these risks (find in *italic* the elements that were modified during the discussion) and proposed Responsibles for the mitigation:

- 1- Lack of buy-in
 - Through dissemination (e.g. presentations, press releases and press conferences) the ‘successes’ of EGEE are well broadcasted – **Responsible: ?**
 - Well defined procedure for the “Virtuous Cycle”. We also need to make sure that the cycle is deployed and working – **Responsible: Virtuous Cycle (?)**
 - Enlargement of the project membership, by bringing under our wing non-signatory partnership – **Responsible: Virtuous Cycle (NA4? - ?)**

- 2- Late delivery of the EGEE Service
 - The PEB has procedures in place to verify the programme of work is progressing according to plan, through weekly meetings and its well established review process. We need to make sure that the review process is seriously followed and that the required effort is invested by the reviewers and moderators – **Responsible: JRA2 (Gabriel)**
 - The project management (e.g. PEB, Activity Leaders) can perform a certain level of reorganisation in the programme of work, if required– **Responsible: PEB/PD**
 - A fallback strategy is to state that we have LCG-2 with incremental improvements augmented by a partial deployment of gLite components and services – **Responsible: SA1 (Ian)**
 - Beyond what is defined in the programme of work, gLite is adopting for its development a fast release cycle, taking into account early NA4 feedback, which will give early signs of schedule problem and time to take corrective actions – **Responsible: JRA1 (Frédéric)**

- 3- Relevance of product/middleware features
 - Ensure that we have inputs on the architecture and design documents from all the project stakeholders and application domains – **Responsible: ?**
 - Good integration of JRA3 (security) inputs and products in gLite – **Responsible: JRA3/Dave Kelsey**
 - Implement requirements from: – **Responsible: ?**
 - a. SA1 on deployment – **JRA1/SA1 Joint Meetings**
 - b. NA4 on applications – **Requirements Documents**

- 4- Poor level of quality of service
 - We have a well structured and organised series of testbeds and services, across JRA1/SA1/NA4 – **Responsible: SA1/JRA1/Testing Team**
 - Ensure deployment experts are well trained on security aspects (involving JRA3 and possibly NA3) – **Responsible: NA3 (+ JRA3 and JRA4 recommendations)**
 - Good guidelines for security and safe default values (e.g. configuration) – **Responsible: JRA3/Testing**
 - Make sure (through review) that DJRA1.1, DJRA1.2 and DJRA3.1 are kept consistent and relevant – **Responsible: JRA3/Dave Kelsey**
 - Monitoring tools for Grid production service – **Responsible: SA1 (Ian)/JRA2 (Gabriel)**

- 5- Poor internal communication

- Promote awareness of non-technical activities issue to technical activities – **Responsible: NA3**
- Make sure that technical people contribute in reviewing training material and plans – **Responsible: NA3**
- Ensure that, like NA3, all other non-technical activities remain pro-active in seeking needed information – **Responsible: NA2 + NA3**

6- Poor external perception

- Well focus dissemination plan and announcements to high profile events. These events will also need to include high profile keynote speakers. One possibility is the Health Grid event in April 2005. – **Responsible: PEB + Virtuous Cycle**

e. Proposal from Taiwan (SA1), MyGrid (NA4) and TeraGrid (SA1)

Taiwan (proposed by SA1)

Ian presented this opportunity. He concluded that they already are doing Grid operations.

In this case, we need not to mention any country in particular, but a region.

Simon C. Lin (Director Computing Centre, Academia Sinica) has a serious team and is already involved in SEE-Grid.

They are interested in BioMed applications.

>>> ACTION PEB (NA4/Yannick Legré): To contact the Taiwan BioMed community to start the integration process

Ian suggested that Taipei becomes a ROC. However, their level of resources is unknown, for Physics and BioMed.

The PEB concluded by accepting this proposal from Taiwan.

MyGrid (proposed by NA4)

Vincent presented this opportunity. Here are the highlights:

- Best Virtual Lab in the world
- Strong involvement in BioMed
- They would interface with gLite services

Peter echoed Vincent in saying that they have an excellent reputation and are high profile, but asked whether we have their commitment.

Malcolm said that there are a lot of other BioMed projects in the U.K., therefore we need not to commit to only this one. He also said that some projects are already running on ScotGrid and are moving to LCG-2.

A discussion followed about the fact that the situation of a project moving to EGEE is different when the project already has an infrastructure, as opposed to when they don't have yet an infrastructure.

Following this discussion was another, where Malcolm said that the external perception was that joining EGEE was an expensive business. This is where the VO is supposed to provide support.

Erwin said that we first need to focus on a small and focused number of applications.

We then discussed other BioMed related applications, such as e-Diamond and MamoGrid.

Bob said that they only need high-level support to help their proposal process. The project would start at the earliest in spring 2005. They also need the letter by tomorrow.

We concluded that we will either clarify the commitments of EGEE or send a general support with no EGEE commitment.

TeraGrid

Their proposal is only at a very high level.

Erwin proposed that it would make more sense for them to work with DEISA and we make sure we work with DEISA.

Though they Globus software, TeraGrid is more about interconnecting super computer through dedicated networks, than a Grid.

Matti pointed out that we don't have an agreement with DEISA.

As a conclusion: We need to have more details on their proposal before we can commit.

>>> **ACTION PEB (NA1/Fab): Ask TeraGrid (Ian Foster) further details on their proposal**

f. AOB

Travel report (Fab)

Fab read his email sent to the PEB about his resent travel. He mentioned the idea of collaboration with Miron (NMI) in submitting a common proposal to the EU and NSF. The following points could be part of such a common proposal:

- 1- Building a common test suite for gLite/NMI interoperability. This could include the JRA1/CERN cluster. Erwin said that JRA1 already had discussions between NMI and Alberto Di Meglio on collaboration on integration systems.
- 2- International Interoperability of Grids
- 3- Support of joint schools

He also reiterated the importance of having a well attended 2nd EGEE Conference.

>>> ACTION PEB (All): Send estimates of how many people each activity is expecting to send at the 2nd EGEE conference.

Status on Quarterly Reports (Bob) – Not covered

Synergy Roadmap (Matti) – Not covered

g. Next meeting Thursday 14th October 16:00

5. PEB PROGRAMME OF WORK THROUGH TO THE FIRST EU REVIEW

See Programme of Work table here:

<http://egee-intranet.web.cern.ch/egee-intranet/Project-Structure/boards/PEB2.html>