

Meeting Object: **PEB**

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

Meeting Date: **16/12/2004**

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

Attendees: NA1: Bob Jones, Fabrizio Gagliardi, Marc-Elian Bégin,  
NA2: John Dyer (phone)  
NA3: David Fergusson (phone)  
NA4: Frank Harris, Vincent Breton (phone), Massimo Lamanna  
NA5: Matti Heikkurinen  
SA1: Ian Bird, Cristina Vistoli (phone),  
JRA1: Frédéric Hemmer  
JRA2: Gabriel Zaquine  
JRA3: Joni Hahkala,  
JRA4: Kostas Kavoussanakis (phone)  
GRNET: Fotis Karayannis (EGEE-03 Conference Organisation)

Apologies: JRA3: Ake Edlund, SA2: Jean-Paul Gautier

Absent:

Distribution: PEB Members

Information Minutes from the previous meeting:

<http://agenda.cern.ch/askArchive.php?base=agenda&categ=a044541&id=a044541/minutes>

---

## 1. PROPOSED AGENDA

- a. Minutes of the previous meeting and issues arising
- b. Review of action items
- c. Dissemination
- d. Project Status and Phase 2 (Fab)
- e. PM9 Deliverables
- f. QR3
- g. EGAAP Recommendations: <https://wwwlistbox.cern.ch/earchive/project-eu-egee-peb/doc00153.doc>
- h. Periodic Report: 15 months activity plan
- i. AOB
- j. Next meeting: Thursday 6th of January at 16:00

## 2. AGENDA ITEMS

### a. Minutes of the previous meeting and issues arising

Minutes were accepted.

#### Review attendance

We discussed the attendance to the First EGEE Review in February. The following numbers of attendants was estimated:

- JRA1: 7 (incl. Cluster heads)
- JRA2: 3
- JRA3: 2 or 3
- JRA4: 1
- SA1: 7 (incl. CICs)
- SA2: 1 or 2
- NA1: 7
- NA2: 2
- NA3: 2
- NA4: 5
- NA5: 1 or 2
- **Total: 38 to 41**

There is an issue with the size of the room in the IT Amphitheatre. Fab will check with the EU if we need to have all partners represented during the review, which would reduce the number of participants.

The LHCC coordinators and the IT Group leaders should be invited to the dress rehearsal.

**>>> Action (PO): Invite the LHCC coordinators and the IT Group leaders to the dress rehearsal**

#### Demos

Bob reported that SA1 showed interesting demos, which would be shown on two screens, including:

- Work of the CIC on duty
- Accounting website

This demo will need 30 minutes.

We now have good production services demos. With these demos and the SA1 demo, we decided not to show the gLite demos. The agenda will be updated (Action 102) to reflect this.

Bob also said that the EU requested an extra hour for private discussion.

The added value of gLite, with respect to operations and application, compared to LCG-2, will have to be explained in Frederic's presentation. We should expect questions about interactivity features of gLite to come-up during the review.

The agenda was updated accordingly.

## **b. Review of action items**

See action table here:

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

## **Deliverables and Milestones**

Find updated list of Deliverables and Milestone here:

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

## **New action status:**

98: "Propose names for the different presenters for the EU Review"

Confirmed **and still missing** presenters:

- Welcome: Wolfgang von Rden and/or Jos Engelen
- Status of the Project : Fab
- Technical Overview : Bob
- Status of Production Service : Ian
- Application Assessment of Production Service : Vincent
- Production Demonstrations : **TBD**
- Application Demos running on LCG-2: CGG (Gal Youinou / Dominique Thomas), GEMS (Osvaldo Gervasi / Lagana, A.), gPTM3D (Cecile Germain-Renaud / Romain Texier)
- Middleware Development : Frederic
- Security: Ake Edlund + David Groep for Q&A
- Pre-Production Service Deployment : Ian
- Application Assessment of gLite : Massimo
- Quality Assurance : Gabriel Zaquine
- Relations with Other Projects : Matti
- Training and Outreach: Malcolm Atkinson
- Dissemination: John Dyer and Joanne Barnett
- Plans for the Next Reporting Period : Fab

Presenters have to be present at the rehearsal sessions.

## **On-Going**

99: "Register the key people for the EU Review using the newly created webpage": will be done offline - **On-Going**.

100: "Issue reach-out statement to all EU Grid project on security, aiming at adopting the same security infrastructure". The EU where suppose to issue a statement this week, but this is likely to be delayed to early next year. Matti will follow this up when this statement has been issued.

101: Build a draft programme for the conference - **pending action 102**

102: "Update the draft programme to reflect the agreed changes" – **On-Going**

## **c. Dissemination**

Joanne Barnett has visited CERN for 2 days to coordinate work.

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> EGEE Conference in Athens, Fotis confirmed that double rooms in the conference hotel will be 120 EURO per night including tax and breakfast.

On the 4<sup>th</sup> EGEE Conference planned for October 2005, the PMB discussed the issue of having it held in Edinburgh; however this was not confirmed by the British delegation. We need this clarified ASAP. David said that it would be very difficult to match the cost requirements.

**>>> Action (Fab): Contact Robin Middleton (PMB member) for a confirmation of the British hosting of the 4<sup>th</sup> EGEE Conference in the UK.**

It was also mention that it is not clear whether a second EGEE Review will be required. The second IST event end of 2005 has not being confirmed either.

## **d. Project Status and Phase 2 (Fab)**

Fab gave a summary of the project status and gave information on the work required leading to the EGEE extensions and the next phase. The original project concept was purposely to have little effort allocated for new applications support in NA4, hoping that the new applications would bring their own funded effort.

Activities and boards such as EGAAP, Gilda, NA4/NA3 could and should submit proposals to the EU to get extra funding to support these new applications or relevant support work. Fab also said that the call will close on the 17<sup>th</sup> of March. He also said that a potential champion of such calls could be Malcolm and people in Catania. Such proposals would get the support of Fab, the PEB and the PMB.

Fab also gave the composition of the Task Force responsible for preparing the phase 2 EGEE proposal. Frank asked if there was a “Grid expert” in the team. Bob said that the Task Force would prepare an outline which would be distributed to the PEB. [Here](#)’s the composition of the TF. Fab has been travelling in the past months to build consensus on EGEE phase 2 between the different stakeholders. He also said that the budget for the FP7 could be substantially increased, which would be good for EGEE but would also attract competition. He also said that the budget for phase would be similar to the current project. Frank asked how the different grid will project like GridPP, Diamond, etc will converge. We concluded that the PEB needs to help shaping-up the future of EGEE and the Grid.

The PMB must be present at the EU Review and we need to encourage them to be at the dress rehearsal.

#### e. PM9 Deliverables

The status of the deliverables can be found [here](#).

All PM9 deliverables have been received. Bob extended his thanks to all authors for their effort.

Fotis left the conference,

#### f. QR3 - not be covered during the meeting

The PO has received all the QRs. Please accept special thanks from Anna Cook.

#### g. EGAAP Recommendations

[Here](#)’s the recommendation from the EGAAP on new applications.

Frank said that NA4 doesn’t have the resources to support these new applications. Vincent said that these applications were selected such that they do not add any extra strained on the NA4 resources. The only exception is Planck, and they already have identified a VO Manager. We need however to address how will we continue to include new applications and coordinate this with the other activities such as SA1 and NA3.

Bob said that the EGAAP recommended applications didn’t include a project plan, including required man-power, resources and dates.

**>>> Action (Guy Wormser and Vincent): Organise “Mini-MOU” for recommended applications in order for PEB to make informed decision on the applications**

#### h. Periodic Report: 15 months activity plan

As agreed during the last PEB meeting, all activity needs to produce a short (1/2 to 1 page) on the plan for the next 15 months. The PO needs this info by the 4<sup>th</sup> January, in order to have enough time to integrate this in the PR.

**i. AOB**

No AOB where raised.

### 3. CURRENT ACTIVITIES STATUS

#### 3.1. NA2

(from John Dyer)

A significant amount of time has been invested in producing the formal deliverables. These have included:

- 1) The Dissemination Plan update
- 2) NA2 Quarterly Report for period Oct-Dec 2004

In addition, NA2 has undertaken the review of DNA4.3.1 during the last week.

Jo Barnett attended a dissemination meeting with the PO in CERN on 15 and 16 December 2004.

The TERENA bookkeeper has submitted an estimated cost claim for TERENA.

Work that remains to be done includes the integration of the PEB session requirements into the framework program that has been proposed.

#### 3.2. NA4

(from Frank)

##### **DNA4.3**

This has been submitted for review

##### **NA4/SA1 Joint meeting of Dec 9**

<http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a045453>

This was very well supported and minutes are being written.

The main outcomes

Meeting endorsed Cal's proposed lightweight VO proposal (with some clarification being made by Cal on associated migration to 'full' VO set-up)

Meeting well understood importance of supporting Comp Chem and MAGIC in getting onto EGEE a.s.a.p. This is proceeding and FH remains in active contact with Osvaldo Gervasi(Comp Chem) and Harald Kornmayer(MAGIC)

## HEP status

ARDA input for the definition of the gLite RC 1.0 (special release for ALICE and maybe other LHC experiments) submitted to the LCG/EGEE top management

The last 2 presentations (and demos) inside the CMS and ATLAS

- Collaborations went quite well (similar successful presentations took place in the last 2 weeks for LHCb and ALICE). Each presentation corresponds to the corresponding experiment prototype system.

## 3.3. NA5

(from Matti)

NA5 has been busy producing DNA5.2 and DNA5.1.2. First is in the review process, latter will be finalized by Patrich Aerts and be presented to ESFRI on the 17th, which means that the text will be frozen.

Input for the EAC answer received, stored for further processing.

## 3.4. JRA2

(from Gabriel)

- A meeting was organised on 10/12/04 between JRA2, NA4 and SPI, to clarify which tool is appropriate for Requirements process (updates and follow-up). JRA2 with SPI support will provide for the beginning of January, a prototype customising Savannah with needed features for "Requirements".

<http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a045658>

- JRA2 is developing for the EU review the following statistics gathered from the LB database:

- o Jobs length
- o Jobs repartition per VO
- o Failed jobs repartition
- o Jobs success rate and throughput by site (if possible)

- Web pages for QA metrics follow-up have been set up. The collection of metrics reported is extracted from the Quarterly Reports and will be updated over time.



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

### 3.5. JRA3

(from Ake)

#### 1. Site Access Control Architecture, DJRA3.2

Iterating with JSPG, and ROCs.

Plan for review:

The PEB nominated moderator and reviewers (i.e. Massimo et al.) will review the current version excluding the sections in italics and those that are empty (obviously). David will take into account this feedback and produce a second version by 3<sup>rd</sup> Jan which must have no more italics or empty sections.

The results of this second round will be reported at the PEB meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> Jan.

#### 2. Security Modules

Modules ready for Release candidate 1 (RC1) are: SOAP over HTTPS, Authorization framework, Authorization framework based on VOMS, Resource Access Control (LCAS, LCMAPS, gatekeeper).

Other Security modules from JRA3 aiming at RC2 are: Message level security; Delegation; Authorization PIP and PDP; Mutual AuthZ; Key Management for Biomed applications; Grid enhancements for OpenSSL, will be part of 097/098, i.e. the Feb/March release of OpenSSL; Secure port provisioning for GRID clusters.

- Highlight: VOMS, good progress, and JRA3 will get a branch for debugging.

#### 3. Reports

QR3 sent to PO on Monday, with minor update on Wednesday.

### 3.6. JRA4

(from Kostas)

#### Deliverables and milestones

[PM9] DJRA4.2 paper deliverables submitted on time. Prototype code ready on 15 December. Deployment still problematic though long illness of key staff; alternative plans to bypass the problem underway.

## Staff changes

N/A

## Sub-Activities

- NPM (Network Performance Monitoring). See DJRA4.2 report.

- BAR (Bandwidth Allocation and Reservation). Architecture document for BAR prototype drafted. Collaboration with SA2 on requirements refinement underway. Staff on leave, so the activity is winding down.

### 3.7. SA1

Work to migrate the production grid service from LCG-2.2 on RedHat7 to LCG-2.3 on SLC has started.

As from January 17th, lxplus.cern.ch will point to a cluster of SLC3 machines, making SLC3 the default operating system at CERN. By this date, the SLC3 batch systems will be configured as 2.3.0 worker nodes and a dedicated CE will be available. Batch capacity will be migrated from RH7.3 to SLC3 according to usage over the following weeks.

### 3.8. SA2

(Jean-Paul)

MSA2.2: This milestone describes the framework of the architecture for network resources and request management inside EGEE. It draws the outline of the design of the network functionalities inside the EGEE middleware and highlights some of the key decisions that have to be made in order for these functionalities to be implemented in interaction with the networking environment and to meet the applications expectations. It is available at the location: <https://edms.cern.ch/document/509455>.

TSA2.5: The work on SLAs has began with a thought on the open issues linked to this task and a document "Open issues and model for network services provisioning from GEANT and the NRENs towards EGEE" will be released by the end of the year.

Requirements follow-up: First work accomplished is the review of all the 33 requirements for networking activities (SA2 and JRA4). The requirements became more precise, some of them have been split, redundancies have been eliminated. The EGEE requirements database will be completed with only functional requirements for Christmas.

QoS experiment: After the definition of EGEE services classes and simultaneously with the work on a Network Operational Interface on one side and the work on SLAs on the other side it seems relevant to implement QoS for an EGEE application. This experiment will be useful:

- \* To have a real QoS use case in EGEE
- \* To have a better approach for the SLAs through the encountered problems,
- \* To express the network requirements to the middleware.

The work began in December. The involved people are from GATE application, SA2, JRA4, SA1 for EGEE and Dante, Renater, RedIris for the NRENs, the 1st step is a feasibility study and the definition of an accurate SLR.

### 3.9. 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>