Subject:	**ANSWER TO EAC FEEDBACK**
Author(s):	**Marc-Elian Bégin, Bob Jones**
Distribution	**PEB**

Note: original EAC text extracted from Final presentation in Den Haag from Thierry Priol in black. Blue text (right justified): proposed actions.

Comment: PO responsible for overall editing

General comments
- The EAC is very pleased by the momentum of work that has been achieved since the 1st conference at Cork

- There are both good management practices and strong motivation of the participants to match the project objectives

- A sustainable scenario for the next 4/8 years concerning the EGEE Grid production infrastructure must be developed

    The EGEE-02 Task Force is limited in scope to 2 years, which is less than this. We therefore need another body. The eIRG looks more at long term issues and has influence. We need to relate this to FP7. We also need political and industrial involvement.

Comment: Fab and the PMB responsible for this section

- EGEE should not solve problems in an isolated manner that others have to solve
    - Security, network,…

    Need to promote our work better. This refers to cross-project collaboration, more than standard body (e.g. GGF and not just within the EU but also with the US and Asia (including via LCG). We need to collaborate more with other projects. Good example is security – the goal is to share the same security infrastructure. We need to reach-out to the US, national and industrial partners/projects. We already hosted an EU Concertation event, we should host the one after March's.

Comment: Overall editing of the answer: Matti. Ake will cover the security aspect, Ian our involvement with the US, Frederic for GGF, Matti on the EU and Kostas/Peter on computer networking

Foreseen risk
- There exists a high risk that the project may not meet its objective due to conflicting requirements and interests in the development of the gLite middleware
    We need something else than a technical body like the PTF. We need more political involvement. However, we need to be able to stand back between releases and bring all the inputs together (e.g. applications, deployment, development) and prioritise the next set of features accordingly. This text will be updated following the conclusions of the Management Task Force.
- The project is facing a difficulty in the development of gLite with two possible scenarios
    - Focus JRA1 integration and testing on AliEn components
        - High-energy physics application will take benefit of such a scenario
    - Continue delivery to pre-production service as planned
        - Most of the applications will benefit of such a scenario
- Such situation must be addressed urgently by the Project Director having in mind the objective of the project
    - "Enabling Grids for e-Science in Europe"

Comment: Cal is responsible for cleaning-up the Reqs

- We recommend thus to follow the <u>second scenario</u>

From Fab's slides:
The Project Mgmt Board unanimously supported the plan to adhere to the project work-plan (Annex 1) and ensure a release of gLite is ready for deployment in March 2005

<u>ALL</u> effort (funded or unfunded, full-time or part-time) in JRA1 will be concentrated on bringing a selected set of high priority components to production-ready status. *This process is currently taking place.*

Any groups that wish to take earlier versions of gLite are welcome to do so but the support of these deployments is not the responsibility of JRA1

This text will be updated following the conclusions of the Management Task Force.

Middleware
- Need better support for the management of licensed software
We had several discussions about this in Den Haag, but not clear solution yet. We need to address this issue through a new dialogue with commercial software vendors and application developers. Need to work one-on-one with companies to explore solutions and influence licensing policy.
- The main requirement for a middleware is its robustness and stability
Need to focus on key essential features first and get them right (part of plan above. Avoid spreading our resources to thin on too many less important features. Need to make sure enough resources are made available to support testing and deployment efforts.
Testing teams (JRA1/Testing, NA4/Testing and LCG-2/Certification) working together to thoroughly test the released gLite components/services. However, this only refers to functionality testing, it doesn't address configuration errors, which is to be addressed by the configuration strategy JRA1 is pursuing (How much of that will be in RC1?)
Pre-Production Service (PPS) is an important tool to assess deployment issues, on a small scale
We also need to involve more the Industry Forum, the eIRG and UK NGS.

- A common security infrastructure with other EU projects must be established
See point above on "General comments".
EGEE need to take a leading role on this topic. Which also means promoting our already leading work better.
Standardising on VOMS ans TLS is the current approach to establishing a solid and effective Grid security infrastructure for Europe, which can be suitable for the other projects on the timelines of the first EGEE project. With common Authentication infrastructure (i.e. EUGridPMA).

On the longer term, we should work /with/ those other projects, also via GGF, via an extended MWSG, via TF-EMC2, or whatever, to reach a more flexible authorization system that caters for other needs as well (e.g. digital libraries, student courses, etc) in line with what's described in the white paper (The Hague version 2.0). MLS is likely to be a longer term solution, which is more adapted to interoperability with other grid infrastructures (e.g. WS-Security).
Collaborate with OSG, OMII, etc
Automate VO management, less error and more secure.
The pseudonymity feature is to be provided though an external trusted third party that will have a role similar to that of a trusted CA and in the short term a client based encryption.
See further details from Ake in attached document:
http://agenda.cern.ch/askArchive.php?base=agenda&categ=a044542&id=a044542%2Fmoreinfo%2FEGEE_Security_Overview.ppt

Comment: Responsibility for licenses to the Industry Forum and Guy Wormser, and propose GEMS and/or CGG as a reference example

Support, training & Documentation
- The project is producing a substantial amount of documentations and they must be kept updated
- The project involves a lot of participants. A "who knows what" register could help
- We recommend to build up a documentation tree for the VOs/users especially for new users
- Specific effort to be made to improve the documentation allowing autonomous installation of the gLite middleware

Several solutions exist: building an "EGEE-like Digital Library" to provide an integrated search engine to the EGEE content; however this will not be possible for Diligent to support this in the short term..

Improvement to content organisation through improve web site layout?

Comment: Malcolm will explain the EGEE Training strategy and plan

Applications & Demonstrations
- Play an important role to demonstrate the capability of the underlying Grid Middleware and not only the applications themselves
  - High responsibility of the persons who make the demonstrations
    Will be improved through the demo rehearsal process
- Demonstrations should be prepared with a common template
  - Follow a unified approach
    A template will be prepared by Bob/Meb
- Applications must identify the benefits of a grid infrastructure compared to classical ones
  - What have been made that was not allowed using classical computing infrastructure
- The EAC found that gPTM3D was the most successful demonstration
    Already being selected