



Meeting:	CHAIN-EGI Workshop on interoperations and interoperability
Date and Time:	Friday 27 Jan 2012 - 10:00-16:00
Venue:	Face-to-face, Amsterdam
Agenda:	http://agenda.ct.infn.it/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=701

Participants	2
Items of Discussion	3
Welcome and note-taker appointment	3
Introduction on the objectives and expectations of the workshop	3
Grid organisation in regions addressed by CHAIN	4
<i>Identify Federation</i>	5
<i>Application Integration</i>	5
SAGA	5
<i>Reaching new users</i>	5
<i>How to better engage</i>	5
<i>Recommendations in D2.2</i>	5
<i>Added Value of the Collaboration</i>	6
AOB	7
<i>MoU Milestone Review</i>	7
ACTIONS.....	10



Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Representing
Steven Newhouse	SN	EGI.eu
Peter Solagna	PS	EGI.eu Operations Officer
Sergio Andreozzi	SA	EGI.eu Strategy and Policy Manager
Ludek Matyska	LM	CHAIN WP4 Leader and MoU Coordinator
Ales Krenek	AK	CHAIN
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI.eu Chief Operations Officer
Roberto Barbera	RB	CHAIN
Kostas Koumantaros	KK	CHAIN



Items of Discussion

Welcome and note-taker appointment

Note-taker: Sergio

Introduction on the objectives and expectations of the workshop

Goal of CHAIN: developing regions and harmonise/align or describe the way they could align with the EGI. The major deliverable is a roadmap for the developing regions (expected at the end of the project, Nov 2012) to align them to EGI. Goal is to put on the table a good set of recommendations.

Goal of the workshop: focus on interoperability and interoperation.

SN asked how to make sure that the contact persons on the CHAIN regions are the right people in terms of government engagements and possibility of working on sustainable e-infrastructures.

LM remarked that this is also CHAIN's concern and one of its goals; as regards sustainability, CHAIN believes that this is mainly an EU term (sustainability document produced exclusively as part of EU co-financed projects); e.g. Asia-Pacific actors do not wonder about sustainability, they claim that they have expectations to continue to receive money.

RB stated that SAGrid is well established with MoU with several universities, still working on getting more recognition; UBUNTUNet is relying on SAGrid for technical services; for Africa in general missing an overall EU action as for LA; CLARA has the contact with the communities; Brazil is a huge region, yet to reach large coverage; for India, the CHAIN partner is the advisor for research, this is a top level contact; India will fund 4 billions to connect all universities; China has two big projects with two different middlewares;

Promoted creation of CAs and many countries already have one; Africa is considering creating a PMA; working also on federated identity management;

LM stated that for Asia-Pacific there is a clear understanding that there will be no independent NGIs; NREN came later in the area, and the commercial providers were pro-active to connect universities, so they did not need NRENS; typically NRENS are a body to decide how to pay to commercial providers with no or minimal added value at the NREN level; in Asia, there are very innovative companies where you discuss what you need and they expand their service offer to address the needs; all the innovation is out of the hands from the academic community; they feel that they can "buy"; even for Grid, they are with the idea of discussing with commercial providers, it is more an entrepreneurial approach, they are less involved directly. Given the differences with organisations outside Europe, we understand that the differences within the European NGIs are very small; it is good to work with these partners to have a different viewpoint and to understand how to work with totally different cultures and organisations.



Grid organisation in regions addressed by CHAIN

RB presenting. About document database, SN explained that EGI_DS documents were valid input, but are old as things move forwards; therefore, there should be attention on how these documents are presented to the CHAIN partners; TF explained that there is a document detailing what NGIs should provide;

LM stated that for interoperation, we may suggest using EMI; they needed to replicate the ROC in some situation because the requirements from EGI for certifications are too strict;

TF: (Recommendation) instead of writing a cookbook that would be obsolete in short time, it would be better to work on a document e.g.: “How to start up a site based on UMD”; at the end of CHAIN, this document can be maintained by EGI; the document should not use any previous knowledge;

KK remarked that the cookbook considers an established situation and supports the alignment

TF: (Recommendation) EGI can validate the documentation produced by CHAIN;

LM stated that in terms of interop in Asia, the following four areas should be considered: India, China, Australia and “the rest”; in the Asia-Pacific region, there is no clear EU action therefore the activities are more bottom-up; the universities do not have a kind of “infrastructure community”, they have more a user-oriented culture more than infrastructure oriented; they do not have the infrastructure “mission”; CHAIN needs to talk directly with people from the application-level; if CHAIN proposes a plug-and-play solution easy to install and operate, there may be room to work; if they need to go through long trainings and certification process, then it is more difficult to engage them;

TF: (Recommendation) sites can be in the EGI GOCDB also if they do not comply with OLA; they will show up as uncertified; the procedure of registration in GOCDB is different than the one of certification

RB: Nagios server is installed at GARR but to be moved in Algeria; Accounting is also being set up by Algeria

SN: if the focus of CHAIN is to move regions to maturity, the project should push them to develop the expertise to manage supporting services (e.g., Nagios, accounting)

RB: the objective of the project is to move all the services supporting the CHAIN regions outside the EU

SN reported that during a meeting with IGI, an issue came out about different AppDB instances which reduce network effect; wondered what the differences are in order to eliminate them and merge the content in the EGI AppDB;

RB stated that the structure of AppDB is the same besides two extra attributes added in CHAIN:

- status of application has more values “production, under design, ...”
- link to application gateway (see **Action CH:3**)



Identify Federation

SN asked how to deal with selection of the IdP when there is a long list

LM explained that this is under research and the standards does not provide a solution yet

SN understands why the registration of robot certificates are registered in the various VOs, but this is not a very desired solution for the long-term

Application Integration

SN asked how did you identify which applications to include in the portal?

RB reported that they identify needs for application and then create portlets and embed; RB packages the solution, training people to work on liferay; it is possible to perform the test in a separate machine representing standard EGI worker node;

SAGA

RB: CHAIN uses JSAGA, wondering about evolution of plugins to align with future EMI releases; would help to have a formal statement from EGI about the importance from middleware developers to support SAGA in order to enable portals to use resources exposed through different middlewares.

Reaching new users

RB reported that in the past there was the approach to expose the gLite interface to new users; nowadays, two steps, 1) application integration through portlet development; 2) ask users with no knowledge to use it.

Discussion about opportunity to make the EGI SSO an IdP; discussion of problem of IdP federation and the long list of IdP among which to choose;

How to better engage

Consider expanding the Infrastructure MoU with areas such as policy, dissemination, community engagement

Recommendations in D2.2

Notes also taken directly in the document by TF.

TF: Interoperations: the wording of some sentence in the summary sent to sounds a bit negative vs. EGI (when mentioning EGI-centric view). LM: this is a summary, not what it is written in the deliverable

TF: Recommend regions that are mature to operate as a federation of countries; when a member of a region becomes mature enough, then could develop as NGI

LM: when regions are not mature enough, they are welcome to become part of EGI that would not be over-ruling



SN: three aspects: governance, operations, tool; the governance I don't see scaling that much over the current 40; having a network of regions can be a viable solution; cooperation about tools could start immediately, the cost for these tools is the big part (not the operation) therefore by having recognition of their adoption via MoU this would enable EGI to have more strength and support for further funding requests; it is expected that also people outside Europe could contribute (e.g., Africa has great developers who could contribute);

Sustainability: LM: a term they are not used to; SN suggested to change the way this is presented (e.g., financial roadmap);

Recommendation 12 is not well taken

Recommendation 13: to clarify that it is the EGI helpdesk

Add recommendation on GOCDDB and messaging

Recommendation 23: for UMD, EGI.eu should be contacted, not EMI

Added Value of the Collaboration

SN stated that there is the need to improve the added value of the collaboration, e.g., by measuring the adoption of EGI tools and having formal endorsement on them via MoUs; or exchanging better solutions that EGI could reuse; LM: there can be more focus on this for the remaining part of the project



AOB

MoU Milestone Review

Date	Activity	Additional Information	Description of the current state/achievements ¹	Status
07/20 11	M4.1	The milestone is achieved by advertising the start of the collaboration	OK	DONE
09/20 11	M3.1	Survey of the current middleware platforms used in Regional Grid Infrastructures and the current adoption of open standards within the Regional Grid Infrastructures (roadmap led by CHAIN, Giuseppe Andronico)	Part of the information is available in the CHAIN Deliverables D2.2 and D4.1.G. Andronico has produced a presentation on the possible steps forward.	OPEN: EGI would like to receive a table similar to what is done in the EGI standards roadmap D2.12 (section 4.2) https://document.s.egi.eu/document/721
09/20 11	M6.1	Report to CHAIN about the identification of research groups that are part of EGI VRCs and active in CHAIN's regions of interest (report led by EGI-InSPIRE, Steve Brewer)	Info should be provided by Steve Brewer, on the CHAIN side Rafael Mayo is responsible to confirm.	DONE
09/20 11	M1.1	Requires a roadmap for interoperation and integration aligned with the EGI Model and based on CHAIN's understanding of Regional Grid Infrastructures and their possible evolution (roadmap led by CHAIN, Ludek Matyska)	See G. Andronico presentation and CHAIN Deliverable 2.2; relevant part of the D2.2 is provided below	DONE: this should be considered as input to the roadmap; roadmap by the end of project

¹ Please provide just brief description; any additional information should be presented as a separate section below.



09/20 11	M4.2	Joint session at EGI Technical Forum	WS organized by CHAIN at the next EGI CF – delayed to March 2012	DONE
10/20 11	M2.1	A roadmap to improve the integration of operational tools supported by EGI that are used in the different Regional Grid Infrastructures represented in CHAIN, including an implementation plan identifying what is missing and what should be modified and by who (roadmap led by CHAIN, Roberto Barbera).	Due to the strict rules of EGI to register sites and ROCs in the official web services, several e-Infrastructures have cloned the EGI tools (GOCDB, Nagios, XGUS, Dashboard). This exercise has been very fruitful and it has allowed e-Infrastructures to get acquainted with EGI tools and procedures. CHAIN will continue monitoring whether there are sites ready to sign OLAs/SLAs with EGI.	DONE: in this workshop, EGI got feedback on how to improve tools that will be fed in EGI operational tools; GOCDB is not fully regionalised yet
11/20 11	M3.1	Gap analysis on existing issues and other barriers that prevent the adoption of open standards identified in the EGI Standards Roadmap (roadmap led by CHAIN, Giuseppe Andronico)	CHAIN is going to promote the usage of a subset of the standards reported in the EGI Standards Roadmap. This will be obtained finalizing the on going CHAIN Interoperability Plan and concerting with CHAIN partners resources to deploy standards on the basis of the plan. Some preliminary input is available with D2.2 and D5.2.	DONE: The recommendations should be more specific on the standards to use; after M3.1 is completed with clear mapping of components to standards, provide more specific recommendations in M3.2 due at the end of March
11/20 11	M4.3	Requires a report on dissemination activities including the list of publications issued by CHAIN that benefited from the usage of EGI (report led	D5.2 sent to Catherine Gater	DONE



		by CHAIN, Federico Ruggieri)		
12/2011	M7.1	Report from CHAIN to EGI-InSPIRE on: 1) identification of new and emerging NGIs that could interoperate with EGI; 2) NGI guidelines documentation (report led by CHAIN, Ognjen Prnjat); 3) reuse of EGI documentation in new/emerging NGIs	1. South Africa 2. NGI guidelines provided at CHAIN wiki (wiki, WP2, strategy and sustainability) 3. Mainly SEEGRID documentation is used (TF commented that lack basic information, high-level description)	DONE

There being no further business, the meeting concluded.



ACTIONS

ID	Resp.	Description	Status
CH:1	RB	Provide a table with organisations collaborating with CHAIN	NEW
CH:2		CHAIN to consider writing “How to start up a site based on UMD” were no previous knowledge is expected; this should replace the cookbook and be maintained by EGI after the end of CHAIN	NEW
CH:3	Gergely Sipos, RB, Marios Chatziangelou	Pass requirements from CHAIN to EGI AppDB so that CHAIN can move the data into the EGI AppDB and we maximize the network effect by avoiding islands of information; main requirements are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• For each app, add status (e.g., production, under design,...)• For each app, add link to gateway• Define API to store data• Define view to extract CHAIN-related apps	NEW
CH:4	RB	Provide a list of countries involved in each collaboration in the Africa area (this can be extracted by the KB)	NEW
CH:5	TF, SA, SN	To discuss how to evolve Infrastructure MoU to better engage with CHAIN regions; expand to consider less mature regions, therefore evolve towards the style of projects MoUs (e.g., communication, user communities, policy)	NEW
CH:6	GA	M3.1 Giuseppe Andronico to provide a table where for each middleware component, relevant standards are reported; consider standards available in the EGI Standards roadmap D2.12 (see section 4.2)	NEW
CH:7	AK	Review representation of EGI_DS documents on the CHAIN wiki so they are clearly marked as historical and EGI is referenced as state of the art (EGI will provide links to replacements (own deliverables) where appropriate	NEW
CH 8	EGI.eu	Consider how to provide global coordination of regional e-Infrastructure providers	NEW