

GridPP Technical Board : Minutes of meeting	
Meeting number	1
Date:	9-Jan-2002
Type:	Post Q4
Minutes status	FINAL
Present:	P.Clarke R.Hughes-Jones J.Gordon S.Fisher D.Colling R.Middleton G.McCance(by phone for part) D.Kelsey F.Harris N.Brook P.Anderson A.McNab
Apologies	A.Sansum

1. Summary of ACTIONS

1.1 General Actions

Number	Who	Desc	Status
TB-1-1	P.Clarke	Send blank GridPP reporting table to Paul Anderson and Andrew McNab. Put names of GridPP supported posts in first.	NEW
TB-1-2	R.Middleton	Clarify with PMB which effort should be included in returns to DataGRID, including PPARC student and EPSRC core.	NEW
TB-1-3	R.Middleton	Prepare simple table to publish posts awarded, institute awardee to, PI, and purpose/WP they should work on.	NEW
TB-1-4	All WP Contacts	Submit projected total PM delivery to WP based upon all people in post. Count only GridPP funded posts. Do this for end 2002 and end 2003.	NEW
TB-1-5	P.Clarke	Send round the text reporting template he used for WP7 to report on the GridPP work. GridPP WP managers to test-drive this for next Quarter.	NEW
TB-1-6	All WP contacts	Ensure you send both spreadsheet and filled in template as above to UK TB Chair and EDG manager (R.Middleton) for subsequent quarters.	NEW
TB-1-7	P.Clarke	Send WP7 numbers to R.Middleton for Q4	NEW
TB-1-8	P.Clarke	Set up meeting to define GridPP applications effort management scheme, with F.Harris, N.Brook,R.Barlow.	NEW
TB-1-9	All WP contacts	Send Testbed functionality targets for 1 st Jan and 1 st July in all subsequent years to P.Clarke	NEW
TB-1-10	P.Clarke A.McNab J.Gordon	Define testbed rollout and support in detail for further discussion, and submission to OS committee. Include concept of defining and running validation tests	NEW
TB-1-11	J.Gordon	Talk to David Boyd re support centre involvement.	NEW
TB-1-12	R.Middleton	Try to find a larger room for application writers workshop (using whatever magic possible)	NEW

1.2 WP Specific actions: see tables below

2. Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted without any additions

3. Minutes and matters arising

Being the first meeting, there were no minutes.

timing of meetings was discussed. The following was agreed

AGREED:

- Pre Quarter TB meeting to be held 1 week before end of quarter (to assess submissions about to be made. This will be a VC usually, and will be lightweight
- Post Quarter TB meeting to be held 3 weeks after end of quarter to more formally assess final cumulative outturn of quarter
- Further TB meeting by video to be held 1 month later. Suggest to concentrate on NON LHC experiments.

This gives a one monthly meeting cycle, which seems appropriate for now

4. Post Q4 Review of Work Package Submissions.

Work Package 1			
UK Contact	D.Colling		
PMs OK	NO		
WP Deliv. OK	OK		
UK Deliv. OK	N/A		
Comments from contact	Several new people starting (EPSRC funded), therefore PM commitment will be rectified in future quarters.		
Comments from EDG Management	None reported		
Discussion of TB	Ambiguity over whether EPSRC people can/should count toward returns. See action later to clarify with PMB		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
NONE			

Work Package 2			
UK Contact	G.McCance		
PMs OK	NO		
WP Deliv. OK	OK		
UK Deliv. OK	N/A		
Comments from contact			
Comments from EDG Management	WP Manager wants clarification of effort being reported under PPARC (eg: SCOTGRID)		
Discussion of TB	Clear issue on PM being reported low. PC asked why not 3 PM/quarter being reported. G.McCance said it was because of working on WP3 for 0.5 SM. Agreed this was fine work. Agreed that in general this shouldn't happen without prior agreement (see below). For next quarter all posts will work on WP2. S.Fisher said that the 0.5 SM on WP3 had NOT been reported in Q4		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
TB-1-WP2-1	G.McCance	Rectify discrepancy in PM reported (4 -vs- 4.8) in Q4 report.	NEW

Work Package 3			
UK Contact	S.Fisher (WP manager)		
PMs OK	OK		
WP Deliv.	<p>GOOD</p> <p>D3.1 : in review process. Will be delivered soon after only short delay</p> <p>D3.2 : in review process. Will be delivered soon on time.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Documentation needs completing.</p> <p>D3.3 : Delivered</p>		
UK Deliv.	as above		
Comments from contact	<p>Going well. Lots of effort in place, as evidenced by good cumulative PM total.</p> <p>New person starting 4th Feb + permission from DataGrid/PPARC to employ another person for 2 years</p> <p>All relevant deliverables well in had in timely way.</p> <p>Significant work going on R-GMA.</p>		
Comments from EDG Management	<p>Criticism over continuing confusion over FTREE –vs- MDS.</p> <p>We believe that people are mostly worried about having clear and definitive instructions from WP3.</p>		
Discussion of TB	<p>TB congratulated WP3 on having its deliverables well in hand.</p> <p>Main discussion was about continuing confusion about which information service other WPs should use. People are unclear whether it is FTREE,MDS or both.</p> <p>PC stated that he felt WP manager should make this high priority along with deliverables, but above R-GMA, until sorted. UK image is suffering at present because for this.</p> <p>SF stated that he considered it essential to install both, but to give clear instructions. In particular if they do publish the same thing then it is merely a change of port number. The TB agreed that both should be installed (as opposed to choosing only one).</p> <p>PC wished to clarify that in long run R-GMA work stands to bring great credit to WP3 – and is prominent in GGF. Thus suggestion to de-prioritise R-GMA is only to do with urgency of Testbed code release.</p> <p>There was also comment from DC and PC that instructions for installation are not yet consistent with code (or so it seemed to them)</p> <p>Experience from UCL was that instructions in installation guide are wrong (but A.Wilson says new ones underway).</p> <p>Ones with RPM are meant to be good, but it was not clear whether they really configure FTREE and MDS to publish same thing, but this may be inexperience on part of UCL.</p> <p>SF requested that all such bugs are reported via Bugzilla. The meeting agreed, but subsequently it has been realised that this is perhaps inappropriate if the bug finding institute is not part of the current integration phase. See main appendix below re roll out management for further discussion.</p> <p>Several staff reported in wrong section (just a start up effect as SF was not at previous meeting). Only “un-funded” staff paid by GridPP to work on WP3 should be reported under “UN-Funded / GridPP”. Others should go under “Un-Funded/Non-GridPP”. See action below.</p>		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description/history	Status

TB-1-WP3-1	S.Fisher	Move reported staff effort as described above, and remove Trinity College effort from all reporting tables	NEW
TB-1-WP3-2	S.Fisher	Take steps to resolve ambiguity/confusion over FTREE/MDS situation in DataGRID	NEW

Work Package 4			
UK Contact	P.Anderson		
PMs OK	OK		
WP Deliv.	OK		
UK Deliv.	N/A		
Comments from contact	Work in WP4 seems to have diverged from original IBM LCFG.		
Comments from EDG Management	None reported		
TB Discussion	No action possible/relevant yet, as UK is minor partner in WP4		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
TB-1-WP4-1	P.Anderson	Check that GridPP funded posts for WP4 are delivering to WP4	NEW

Work Package 5			
UK Contact	J.Gordon (manager)		
PMs OK	NO Still under delivering. But people now in place and this should be rectified in due course.		
WP Deliv.	LATE		
UK Deliv.	As above		
Comments from contact	Now 4 full time people in post so PM problem should get better. D5.1 review of current tech – WP2 gave similar job to some Finns who examined mass-store, which is in wp5 as well. WP5 have text and editing into a doc. D5.2 detailed arch doc. Have a detailed plan for a SE arch. Has been added to the full doc and sent to the reviewers. => these deliverables should be delivered v-soon		
Comments from EDG Management	Naturally still concern on deliverable status and PM under delivery, but management aware of changing situation, and clear statement that deliverables are now well in hand.		
TB Discussion	TB concerned about deliverables, but believable plan in place to deliver Added by PELC: forgot to mention that oversight committee said they will judge us by ability to manage this critical problem. In other words WP5 has to come right be next OS committee meeting or we are in deep trouble within UK, let alone EU. Concern that post allocated to Liverpool has not yet engaged in WP5. [Post was in place in October, but has not yet contributed to WP5 PM commitment]. WP manager to investigate.		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
TB-1-WP5-1	J.Gordon	Investigate Liverpool post. Report to TB Chair /UK EDG manager by end Jan.	NEW

Work Package 6	
UK Contact	A.McNab

PMs OK	??????		
WP Deliv.	????		
UK Deliv.	N/A		
Comments from contact	There is some core work egg security but also a lot of effort over all inst. trying to set up the SW and kit. This is both for GridPP and the experiments. Effort should be counted if the work is going towards the DataGrid Testbed. This effort is usually coming from SYSMANs etc. Could improve with having a set of site acceptance tests and monitoring egg a MC job to run at each site.		
Comments from EDG Management			
TB Discussion	Some discussion about whether it was sensible to try to monitor WP6 effort in same way as other WPs (both job and effort are more diffuse). However no better ideas emerged than (i) ensuring GridPP WP6 posts work on WP6 as per other WPs (ii) monitoring that UK deploys releases and works as part of Grid, i.e. judge WP6 effort by testbed availability milestones		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
NONE			NEW

Work Package 7			
UK Contact	P.Clarke / R.Hughes-Jones		
PMs OK	OK		
WP Deliv.	OK		
UK Deliv.	OK		
Comments from contact			
Comments from EDG Management			
TB Discussion	P.Clarke should integrate security effort into WP7 reporting.		
ACTIONS			
Number	Who	Description	Status
NONE			NEW

1.3 General points arising

ACTION: R. Middleton: Clarify with PMB which effort should be included in returns to DataGRID (PPARC eScience student, EPSRC core, SCOTGRID, etc...)

AGREED: In general staff posts paid for by GridPP/PPARC must work 3 PM/Quarter on stated WP. If this is to be varied then, as a matter of principle, agreement of relevant WP managers and EDG-UK manager should be solicited first.

We agreed that disposition of GridPP funded posts should be in a simple to read public place. S.Fisher asked for this, and also other non UK WP managers have requested this. Current spreadsheet of RM has info, but also has unnecessary history and is not easily interpretable.

ACTION: R. Middleton: Prepare simple table to publish posts awarded, institute awardee to, PI, and purpose/WP they should work on.

Several WPs are still under commitment in PM delivery. In many cases this is forecast to be rectified by end of project. In order to be quantitative all contacts were asked to do a simple projection based upon people now in post

ACTION: All WP contacts: Submit projected total PM delivery to WP based upon all people in post. Count only GridPP funded posts. Do this for end 2002 and end 2003.

1.4 Discussion of Reporting Mechanisms

There was brief discussion of whether the GridPP reporting mechanism so far (i.e. PCs spreadsheet pro-forma) is still useful after trying it for Q4.

The only dissent was S.Fisher who, correctly, objected to having to insert similar information into two spreadsheets (i.e. GridPP and his WP3 one). The meeting agreed, but does not have the Excel'ology' experience to write any translation macros (principally because the only key in the DataGRID version is to find the same text string and add together). Since there are only a few quarters to go, and the GridPP spreadsheet is trivial or complete, it was not felt useful to divert effort to this. If anyone wants to give this as a student project then please do so.

AGREED: Continue to use P.C spreadsheet for now

P.Clarke noted that he had re-vamped the DataGRID Q4 template for use in WP7, and the WP manager had said it was very useful. It is suggested that UK WP contacts (apart from 3 and 5 of course) consider using this.

ACTION [P. Clarke]: will send round the reporting template he used for WP7 to report on the GridPP work. GridPP WP managers to test-drive this for next Quarter.

A further issue was that the UK EDG manager (R. Middleton) had not received all of the text input for the Q4 reporting.

ACTION [All WP contacts]: Ensure you send both spreadsheet and filled in template as above to UK TB Chair and EDG manager (R. Middleton) for subsequent quarters.

Finally it was noted that the WP7 contact (i.e. P.Clarke) had forgotten to send the relevant info to R. Middleton

ACTION:[P.Clarke]: Practice what you preach

5. UK Standing in WP8

F. Harris spoke. The overall message is that we now need to make the UK more participant in WP8 as a result of the new posts which have been awarded.

The TB had brief discussion of how to manage the GridPP WP8 posts. P.C stressed the caveat that such a discussion needs more application people present to be held in full, and that this discussion was to be considered as first thoughts only.

ASSERTION: GridPP funded applications effort will be responsible to the experiments and though them to the WP8 manager .

The UK monitoring mechanisms need to ensure that the above is true. Clearly flexibility is needed as work on WP8 is more “diffuse” than work on other WPs

Discussion was stopped at this point. A meeting will be set up shortly to take this further, as well as the equivalent for non DataGRID applications effort (BaBar, ...)

ACTION [P.Clarke]: Set up meeting to take next steps in formulation of GridPP applications effort management scheme, with F. Harris, N. Brook, R. Barlow.

6. Project Plan for oversight committee

P.Clarke reported that the Oversight Committee wants to see the full testbed functionality and dependencies of applications thereon on the project plan.

To this end all WP contact are asked to submit the planned “functionality” which will be delivered within their workpackage in 6 month intervals (1 Jan and 1st July). Please note: you are simply required to make a sensible distillation of details which appear in other DataGRID documents (egg integration team documents specifying 2 monthly functionality targets). You do not have to get it agreed with the WP. All we are being asked to do is put best guess common sense on the project chart

ACTION [All WP Contacts]: Send Testbed functionality targets for 1st Jan and 1st July in all subsequent years to P.Clarke

7. EDG Testbed Rollout

P.Clarke also reported that the Oversight Committee had requested more formal details of our planning for testbed rollout in the UK (i.e. rollout to all PP sites according to some manageable scheme) and subsequent support. (including NON LHC experiments).

A useful discussion was held, which briefly resulted in the following agreement:

For each testbed release

1. Phase 1: It is made to work first on a set of signed up core sites, in particular including those with the WP6 funded posts. The interaction to make it work is ad hoc communications between the team concerned, plus the Globus users email list. For these sites there will be a commitment to support.
2. Phase 2: It is then made to work on a set of signed up sites who are willing to re-install from the official instruction set, and hence flag any failures in the canonical procedure. These sites should NOT fix problems using inside expert fiddling, but should report problems back to the core sites.
3. Phase 3: At this point it is supposed to be guaranteed that installation/upgrade works. For those sites who are not in Phase 1 or 2 we envisage a more formal support through the eScience support centre helpdesk and the UK Globus users email list, and a FAQ site.

This scheme needs to be defined and written down in more detail. also the interaction with the

A KEY point which came up in the discussion was the idea of defining and running standard validation tests from, say, RAL, to each outlying site, in order to accept it onto the production Grids

AGREED: Validation programs to be developed

ACTION {P.Clarke, A.McNab, J.Gordon} : Define testbed rollout and support in detail for further discussion, and submission to OS committee. Include concept of defining and running validation tests

ACTION [J.Gordon]: Talk to David Boyd re support centre involvement.

SINCE Meeting: David Boyd has agreed that the CLRC eScience support centre will work with us to provide a support contact point for UK HEP sites. This is excellent news indeed and will benefit us all. Details are to be worked out as part of action above.

8. Information exchange

A brainstorm discussion of possible mechanisms and formats for information exchange took place. Some ideas emerging were:

- Work on vertical slices for a week
- Weekly phone meetings
- Pick themes and have meeting on theme
- When doing project definition within Experiment, bring in people from WPs to help define.
- Big mailing list – don't stop people arguing as long as possible
- 4 groupings based upon broad inter experiment collaborations.
- Ask experiments to identify issues – then hold meetings to cover.
- Plenary meeting foreseen – followed by one hands on meeting per WP area ????
- FAQ page
- CUF
- Mail list for developers/loose cannons/early adopters – then turn into FAQ – then turn into “teach in” sessions for all the other less “engaged people”

To be taken further after teach in meeting, and when more application posts are in place.

9. Application Developers Workshop

The application writers workshop was confirmed for 31st Jan at RAL

The room already booked is almost certainly too small

ACTION R. Middleton : Try to find a larger room with whatever magic is possible

The purpose of the meeting was clarified as being targeted at an audience of potential Experiment Grid Application adapters, i.e.

- (i) Interfacing between an existing application program and Grid services (e.g. file access)
- (ii) Writers of a GUI to interrogate grid and submit job across it (e.g. GANGA like in LHCb/ATLAS terms)

10. AoB

There was no AoB

11. Next Meeting

The next meeting was fixed for

- 8th Feb
- H323 Video conference
- Connect at 9.00. Meeting Start at 9.30
- Gatekeeper 128.40.64.25 (or 128.40.37.237 if first one fails)
- :phone number: *391234

