

Here are the notes from the PEB face-to-face PEB meeting where we reviewed the 4 key PM9 deliverables.

Agenda page: <http://agenda.cern.ch/age?a045048>

where the presentations are available.

The moderator reports for the deliverables are available via the deliverables webpage:
<http://egee-jra2.web.cern.ch/EGEE-JRA2/EUDocuments/Deliverables/Deliverables.htm>

Present: Frank Harris (NA4), Bob Jones (NA1), Cristina Vistoli (SA1), Ake Edlund(JRA3), David Fergusson(NA3), John Gordon(SA1, part-time), David Groep(JRA3), Matti Heikkurinen(NA5), Erwin Laure(JRA1), JP Gautier(SA2), Gabriel Zaquine(JRA2), Dieter Kranzmuller(NA1), Massimo Lamanna(NA4), Kostas (JRA4, phone), Ian Bird (SA1), Maite Barroso (JRA1, part-time), Frederic Hemmer (JRA1, part-time), Marc-Elian Begin (NA1, part-time), Massimo Sgaravatto (JRA1, phone, part-time), David Kant (SA1, phone, part-time)

DNA4.3.1 (slides)

Ian: LHCb concurrent jobs: true number was more like 3500

Ian: Earth Science – how do they get the 40% LCG efficiency – needs some investigation – have GOME people been in contact with SA1 to try and explain this. This figure must be verified before it is put in the report.

Ian: interactive access (firewall sockets) are currently left open but is not clear this will be the same in the future. Work is on-going to offer this facility via a service.

Check terminology – high-throughput computing.

LHCb and ATLAS efficiency numbers should be updated with the results of their work over the Christmas period.

Moderator (Meb) – recommends it to the PEB. Biomed section is particularly interesting.

Dieter: Cannot see the astro-particle physics applications and CrossGrid. Need to be careful because EGEE and CrossGrid have a common EU reviewer. Need to check Harold if this is correct.

Gabriel: can we clarify for metrics astro-particle physics is not the same as astronomy. Agreed not the same.

Recommend that the new group (NA2/NA3/NA4/SA1) consider chapter 6 of this deliverable (Suggestions for meeting needs of new applications).

Gabriel: we need to understand if moving from batch job productions usage to HEP analysis whether this will scale-up sufficiently the number of users to meet our project metric of 3000 registered users after 2 years. Bio applications used through a portal also has more users than actually registered.

We will need to have a plan (if not a solution) for how we are going to address the support for the commercial application software by the time of the review.

DNA4.3.1 – is recommended by the PEB.

DNA3.3.1 (slides)

Clarify in table on FTEs/federations that this is manpower allocated to NA3. Perhaps have a separate table indicating effort contributed from the rest of the project to training work (try looking at training task in WBS and reported via PPT).

It is important to correctly record the effort coming from the rest of the project for training (people are reminded to use the tasks in PPT for this) so that we can quantify how much extra effort is required for any future project proposals.

Check wording for “Non-EGEE experts” so it is consistent with JRA2 QAG wording.

Still missing participation numbers from Catania NA4 workshop. Events where quality feedback figures are not collected are not included in these figures.

Erwin: said it is very difficult to find the relevant material in the NA3 training archive - for example LCG2 installation gives 0 results for a search but it is known several of these sessions have been held. It is currently a lot easier to find this material via the CERN school of computing site or Flavia’s tutorial in Nov’04. This needs to be improved before the review because the reviewers are likely to look at this archive.

DNA3.3.1 – is recommended by the PEB.

DSA1.3 (live webpages and slides)

Currently deployed on 22 sites but will increase as LCG-2.3.0 is installed at more sites.

Other systems are known to exist – TeraGrid, OSG(?), OMII ComputationalMarkets (not in first release available now), DGAS (EDG WP1/EGEE JRA1)

Maite (moderator): most of comments were about website not the document. All problems fixed and reviewers recommend for acceptance.

Matti: NorduGrid claim they use a system called SGAS.

It is important that this material is included in the EU review – Ian will include details in his SA1 talk.

We must explain what our intention is for relations to alternative accounting systems mentioned above.

Explain clearly that DGAS in gLite intends to build on this service to implement resource access control.

There will be divergence between the numbers collected between this system and those for the metrics collected by JRA2.

This deliverable contains material which will be relevant to the EGEE response to the eIRG white paper.

Following a question from Frank Ian said they were going to insist that sites installed correct version of RGMA so they could enter into accounting. Otherwise sites will be excluded.

Another point raised by Frank was why Biomed do not enter into accounting. John Gordon said this was being pursued with Biomed.

DSA1.3 – is recommended by the PEB.

DJRA3.2 (slides)

This deliverable contains material which will be relevant to the EGEE response to the eIRG white paper.

Overview of security features quite detailed but for the EU review we need to put it in simpler terms explaining what user requirements (especially Biomedical) will actually be addressed in first release of gLite.

For network connectivity issues (i.e. network access from WN), JRA3 dynamic connectivity service (DCS) needs to be discussed with SA1, NA4 and JRA4 to see if this can become a potential solution. Must also be compared to commercial solutions (in the routers).

Massimo: the document was not ready to be reviewed at the start but it has improved significantly during the review. Some reviewers were not able to review the document,

notably SA1 (not at all), NA4 (only early version). We do need a clear statement from SA1 and NA4 about the validity of this document.

Frank thinks the only way to ensure the applications requirements are satisfied by looking at a specific use case against this architecture. Ignacio is perhaps the best person to be able do this from NA4.

Meb: do we understand how the Package Manager will fit into this architecture?

We should ask Ian Neilson and Dave Kelsey to give their opinion on this document as well as Ignacio from NA4.

This deliverable will be recommended pending positive responses from SA1 and NA4 by the 18th Jan.

There followed a general discussion about how to handle the load of performing reviews for such deliverables to avoid overloading key individuals. Bob proposed formalising the review responsibility for partners for remaining deliverables and milestones in the next TA update. Ian was not convinced this will ensure we will have sufficient expertise during the review process. Other suggestions are welcome.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting of the PEB will be on Thursday 20th Jan at 16:00 following the normal format.