



Enabling Grids for E-scienceE

Overview of EU Review report and next steps

Bob Jones – Technical Director
10-11/03/2005

www.eu-egee.org



- **EU Review Report - Management**
- **Plans for the next 15 months**
- **Deliverables/Milestones until end of the project**

- **Very good start**
 - “As a general conclusion, the reviewers found that the overall performance of the project is very good”
 - “The project personnel is found to be excellent ”
 - “The project management team is appraised for its remarkable achievement to set up this consortium ”
 - “All first period deliverables are accepted with the exception of deliverable DNA1.3.1 which needs to be slightly revised ”
 - “The project appears to be on track regarding the finances ”
- **We need to implement the recommendations specified in the review report**

- **Management of complexity and related risks, now that the project ramp-up phase is complete, is a concern**
 - Link to “top risk” management work done in PEB - revise
- **The big question is how all current users can be kept happy**
 - Take input from user review (MNA4.3)
 - Manage expectations by not over-promising/committing (applications, mware)
- **The presented migration plan from LCG-2 to gLite might not work out as expected as many existing users would not start migration from LCG-2 to gLite until a definite timetable to stop operation of LCG-2 is announced**
 - Produce migration plan during April/May taking into account infrastructure (all – not just production), applications, mware, training, documentation (not just gLite) & dissemination material

- **The real need for a Grid infrastructure of the size and geographical distribution of EGEE for some of the presented applications remains somewhat unclear**
 - Be more selective with supported applications (EGAAP, “internal” applications)
- **It is not obvious for these applications that a similar enablement could not have been done without a Grid infrastructure**
 - Clarify the “grid advantages” for applications (NA4)
- **The application users (except the LHC experiments) at the review did not clearly demonstrate the scientific benefits of the EGEE Grid in the context of production usage, as the use cases were somewhat still experimental**
 - Bring selected existing bio-medical & generic applications to production status before next review (PM18)
- **All deliverables are of high quality although they could have been more concise which would ease the reading process**
 - Take into account for PM12 onwards deliverables

- **Testing and software packaging will be critical to success. Reinforce these also intellectually very demanding activities even further.**
 - JRA1 testing and integration manpower is lower than originally foreseen in the TA. This will be reinforced.
- **Work hard on event-based monitoring techniques, triggering preventive maintenance actions, to improve the stability of the Grid infrastructure.**
 - SA1 operations improvements
- **Improve the middleware deployment process (technical, organisational) even further to increase the stability of the infrastructure and consequently improve the job success rate and reduce the load on the support team.**
 - SA1 operations improvements
- **Implement a strong mechanism to quickly isolate unstable sites in the production Grid.**
 - SA1 operations improvements

- **Choose new application areas with greatest care: capture user and application requirements in detail and determine the impact on Grid infrastructure and services. The decision to deploy any new application (and if yes, when) should be based on a very careful analysis of all associated technical and non-technical risks.**
 - Be more selective with supported applications (EGAAP, “internal” applications)
 - Importance of MoUs before starting work
- **The ambition to quasi-fulfil industrial or commercial requirements should be relaxed until the end of the current contract.**
 - Do paper work but not implementation so work could continue in EGEE phase II
- **If examples can be found of scientific work that could not have been done without the EGEE development (e.g., necessarily distributed process, truly enormous calculations), they will be a strong motivation for future development.**
 - Identify “success stories” for applications
- **The *concertation* effort among the various grid activities that was undertaken by EGEE needs to be formalized in order to be effective. A deliverable reporting on the progress and results of the *concertation* effort will facilitate that task. It is suggested that such a deliverable be prepared for the next review, close to the end of year 2005.**
 - New NA5 deliverable or can we move an existing one?

- **The proposed research continues to being very relevant**
- **The consortium has demonstrated to perform very well in the ramp-up phase of the project and the project appears to be on track regarding the finances**
- **Therefore, the project should continue, however, implementing all recommendations presented in the review report**
- **Because of the short timetable for the completion of the project, it is essential that intermediate milestones be completed according to plan**
- **Draconian decisions may be necessary to ensure the required user migration, technical actions, etc.**

- **Send questions and comments to the EU by 18 March**
 - Need your input by Monday 14th March
- **Update the TA section 5 by end March including:**
 - Addressing comments and recommendations from the reviewers
 - 15 months plan

- **A focused review (“lightweight”) will take place in end November/beginning December 2005**
- **Will review a subset of PM18**
 - gLite migration status plan until end of the contract
 - Thorough assessment of administrators/application developers/users satisfaction
 - Progress on the recommendation expressed by the review panel in this report
- **Above list might change**



Enabling Grids for E-scienceE

NA1

Bob Jones – Technical Director

10-11/03/2005

www.eu-egee.org



- **Project ends at PM24 (end March 2006)**
 - In past projects (e.g. DataGrid) we have asked for a short extension of 3 months (extra time but not extra money) to complete work and spend remaining budget
 - EGEE will be different – we are likely to have spent all the budget by PM24 so an extension cannot be funded
 - So final review will follow very shortly afterwards (April/May)
 - New project (EGEE II) will likely start 1st April (to allow personnel contracts to be continued)
 - Hence we will have to start the new project and prepare for the review at the same time
 - Better try to lighten the end of the project so this becomes possible

22 <- 24	DJRA1.7	Final report on middleware re-engineering	CERN
22 <- 24	DJRA2.3	2nd Annual report on EGEE Quality Status, including software and Grid operations	CSSI
22 <- 24	MJRA3.10	Security operational procedures (third revision)	KTH/PDC
21 <- 24	DJRA3.4	Assessment of security infrastructure report	KTH
22 <- 24	DJRA4.6	Report on bandwidth allocation and reservation	UEDIN
22 <- 24	DJRA4.7	Report on network monitoring	UEDIN
24	DNA1.1.8	Quarterly periodic report	CERN
24	DNA1.3.3	Periodical report	CERN
22 <- 24	DNA1.4	Report on Gender Action Plan	CERN
	DNA2.7		
22 <- 24	MNA2.6	Final Dissemination & usage Report addressing the issues of public participation and awareness	TERENA
21 <- 24	MNA3.4	Second external review of User Training and Induction with feedback	UEDIN
21 <- 24	DNA3.3.3	Training Progress Report update	UEDIN
Combine with DNA4.3.3 <-24	DNA4.4	Final Report of Application Identification and Support Activity	CNRS
22 <- 24	DNA5.5	Final progress report on International Cooperation Activities	CERN
22 <- 24	DSA1.8	Assessment of production infrastructure operation and outline of how sustained operation of EGEE might be addressed	CRNS(IN2P3)
21 <- 24	DSA1.9	Release notes corresponding to expanded production Grid infrastructure operational	INFN
21 <- 24	DSA2.3	Revised SLAs and policies	CNRS
24	MNA1.3	Successful completion of third and final review	CERN
24	MNA4.4	Successful completion of third and final review	CNRS
24	MSA1.5	Third review and expanded production Grid infrastructure (50 Resource Centres) operational.	CERN

- **Concern: management of complexity and related risks, now that the project ramp-up phase is complete.**
 - The transition from the ramp-up phase to normal, steady operations of the production infrastructure is potentially risky, especially with two software stacks to support and maintain.
- **It is felt that the presented migration plan from LCG-2 to gLite may not work out as expected as many existing users will not start migration from LCG-2 to gLite until a definite timetable to stop operation of LCG-2 is announced.**
- **Other essential questions are how to maintain the excellent momentum and how to keep all current users happy.**

- **Given the portfolio of management activities and based on the knowledge that managing an endeavour of that size under the given time constraints is a Herculean task, the resources allocated to non-technical management efforts appear to be too small.**
 - Not sure what they mean here – ask for clarification?

- **People make the difference. Invest in staff retention immediately. Good staff retention management will be key to success**
 - Given a 1st successful review, ensure a proposal for EGEE phase II is submitted in Sep'05 (i.e. 6 months before the end of EGEE) and convince main partners to renew contracts for an interim period that will be extended if the proposal is invited for negotiations by the EU (Oct'05)
- **Consider further methods to reinforce project management**
 - Funding?
- **Make document deliverables lighter, better restrict the content to the abstraction level of the respective document. Reduce the redundancy among the different documents wherever possible**
 - Reduce duplication between QRs and PRs

- **Make the PPT tool used for time and effort recording available to other projects and investigate commercialisation**
 - Discuss with IT/AIS to understand what would be required to package PPT for other projects
- **Prove in all activities the added value of largely distributed versus centralised developments**
 - Need to justify the dispersion of partners and roles in ALL activities
- **The ambition to quasi-fulfil industrial or commercial requirements should be relaxed until the end of the current contract**
 - Do paper work but not implementation so work could continue in EGEE phase II

- **Successful project reviews – intermediate PM21 (December 2005) and Final beyond project end PM26 (May 2006)**
- **Ensure all deliverables and milestones are met and reported correctly according to the *revised* programme of work**
- **Coordinate contract amendments when appropriate with the European Union (one ongoing for submission at end March 2005, none foreseen after)**

- **Liaise closely with the dissemination and outreach activity to coordinate the remaining two project conferences and all dissemination activities**
- **PPT tool and financial reporting: Interim quarterly ICC exercises in place and final financial reporting at project end, with PPT tool support ongoing**
- **Budget monitoring**

- **Close collaboration with activity managers and federation representatives will be paramount to ensure a successful conclusion to the project**
- **Change to TA: Original periods of 9 and 6 months changed to ONE period of 15 months. Resource levels will be kept despite staff turnover**
- **Prepare proposal for EGEE phase II**

- DNA1.1. x: Quarterly reports
- DNA1.3.3 (PM24) Periodic report
- DNA1.4 (PM24) Report on Gender Action Plan
- *New milestone: Successful completion of interim technical review*
- MNA1.3 (PM24) Successful completion of third and final review