

'Science Gateway primer' Virtual Team

Meeting	Cisco WebEx Conference
Date & Time	Friday 22 Jun 2012, 10:00 CEST / Call ended 11:19 CEST
Host	EGI.eu / Amsterdam, Netherlands

PARTICIPANTS	2
AGENDA	2
NOTES	2
MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING	2
GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION	3
REVIEW TASKS	3
REVIEW OUTPUT	6
ANY OTHER BUSINESS	6
NEXT MEETING	7
POST-MORTEM	7
COMMENT 1 – PRIMER TERMINOLOGY	7
COMMENT 2 – NEW VT TASK PROPOSAL	7

Participants

Name and Surname	Abbreviation	Community/Organisation
Nuno Ferreira	NF	EGI.eu, UCST
Peter Kacsuk	PK	MTA SZTAKI, SCI-BUS,
Tamas Kiss	TK	University of Westminster, SCI-BUS
Elisa Cauhé Martín	EM	University of Zaragoza
Ricardo Graciani	RG	University of Barcelona, DIRAC
David O'Callaghan	DC	NGI_IE - NIL
Mariusz Sterzel	MS	NGI_PL - NIL, ACC Cyfronet
Vicky Huang	VH	Taiwan, ASGC
Kitti Varga	KV	MTA SZTAKI
Tibor Gottdank	TG	MTA SZTAKI
Dusan Vudragovic	DV	NGI_RS - NIL deputy, IPB

Agenda

1. Minutes from previous meeting
2. General project information
 - a. VT leader
 - b. Dissemination & reporting
3. Review tasks
 - a. Agreement
 - b. Task leaders
4. Review output
5. Any other business

Notes

Minutes from previous meeting

- Minutes from the 1st Science Gateway primer VT (SGP-VT) meeting were accepted.

General project information

- **[NF]** The **new VT leader** will be the Hungarian NGI International Liaison deputy, **Robert Lovas**. Due to work scheduling clashes he could not moderate the 2nd SGP-VT meeting.
- **[NF]** **Generic information about the VT** not explicitly provided in the last meeting was added to the 1st SGP-VT minutes for completeness, and **broadcasted today** as well during the meeting:
 - VT leader should report weekly to inspire-na2-leaders@mailman.egi.eu
 - Task leaders should report weekly to the VT leader on time of the weekly report
 - VT members can/should write blog posts during the VT lifetime to keep EGI community informed
 - VT work is reported in the EGI-InSPIRE quarterly reports under NA2 section
 - VT members can be invited by EGI to contribute to all existing dissemination channels
- **[PK, RG, TG]** Both **Peter Kaszuk and Ricardo Graciani** will be **leading the task of writing the Science Gateway primer**. **Tibor Gottdank** will be the **main responsible to collect all feedback** from the VT members into the document. Further info on current status of the primer further ahead in the minutes.

Review tasks

- **[NF]** A few remarks on my side about open actions from last meeting:
 - It was suggested in the 1st SGP-VT meeting to merge some of the tasks. Though I agree with this to speed up the VT output, **I urged to the need of keeping the focus on small tasks** to better meet the VT goals on time.
 - The current list of five tasks can be grouped in 3 containers:
 - Sanitize EGI SG webpages and improve AppDB support to SG
 - Write a primer on SG targeted to developers
 - Promote the VT accomplishments
 - The above task structure suggests 3 task leaders. **After an open call to survey potential task leaders, feedback was received only for the Primer related tasks.**
 - Regarding the suggestions from last meeting to improve AppDB data structure:
 - **Amount of support provided.** I informed the VT members that when registering a new AppDB entry (no matter if it is an app/tool or a Science gateway instance), there is a set of URL types/categories that can be added to the registry, namely: website, documentation, download, support, multimedia and 'try it'.
 - **[RG]** The relevant info is not just a contact URL that it is important, but also what is the expected level of support? Is the project being actively

developed? Are there training opportunities? Users or communities interested in particular solutions need further information to evaluate the level of support they are going to get and the expected lifetime for that support.

- **Availability status.** I informed VT members of the existence of a status field once we register an object to AppDB, currently with the following choices: ‘in production’, ‘ready for deployment’, ‘ready for validation’, ‘ready for portal interface’, ‘ready for middleware’, ‘ready for standalone use/running on a local cluster’.
 - **[PK]** Some comments were made about the availability status in order to properly express the maturity classification of the entries.
- I want to stress that AppDB stores meta-data, it is not currently working as a monitoring system to check the status of its registry entries. Data curation is done manually from time to time. From the IWSG-Life 2012 event, EGI noted the need for curation of the data registered in AppDB. The main question is what should be the review criteria? Regarding the AppDB entries related to this VT team, this discussion already started as seen in the above two comments. “If the review process found is useful then it can be extended for other software areas too” [taken from Gergely Sipos notes].
 - **[RG]** I would like to stress that this AppDB it is only useful if it kept up-to-date and if there is some validation procedure in place that take place not only when new entries are inserted but also with some periodicity later on.
- Today’s meeting was conclusive to show that the primary goal of the VT should address the primer, and only afterword the sanitization of the existing data both in EGI and AppDB relevant entries. This is because the criteria to assess if AppDB is reporting enough info on Science Gateways and respective enabling technologies should also be addressed by the primer.
- It was agreed that **once the criteria of evaluating SG AppDB entries are defined, an EGI RT ticket will be issued** towards to the AppDB developers.
[NF] reinforced the idea that all SG’s (the end product used by the researchers) should be registered into AppDB, as well as SG enabling technologies.
- I introduced to VT members the goal of EGI in monitoring, through the EGI Central Nagios, community built/maintained portals/gateways that offer a service to EGI community. I explained roughly that EGI support services (like AppDB, the training marketplace, ...) are currently in the process of being integrated to the central Nagios instance, and that community portals/gateways should follow the same route. This topic was suggested and accepted to be part of the primer ToC.
 - **[DV]** Some ideas on possible nagios probes emerged, targeting for example some gateway activities like number of jobs, number of users, ...
 - **[DV]** Dusan suggested that accounting information probably could be retrieved from the Accounting portal.

- **[RG, PK]** The SG primer task leaders drafted a new ToC for the document and gave an overview of its contents, below:
 1. Introduction
 - a. Some background and summary of current status
 - b. Mandate
 - c. Target audience
 2. Definitions
 - a. Terms that are necessary to understand what we call a "Science Gateway"
 - b. Distinction between an "enabling technology", a "SG framework", and "SG instance"
 3. For SG (framework) developers and maintainers
 - a. What it is their role
 - b. What it is expected from them
 - c. Who are these players in Europe and what are their production and in which maturity level (it could be just a list of pointers to the EGI App Database that is the result of the other Task in our VT)
 4. For SG (instance) developers and operators
 - a. What it is their role
 - b. What it is expected from them
 - c. Who are these players in Europe and what are their production and in which maturity level (it could be just a list of pointers to the EGI App Database that is the result of the other Task in our VT)

- Some notes from the task leaders with respect to the above ToC:
 - We will need to separate instances that are built and supported by people "external" to the community to which the SG is target (by pure support centers) from those that are built and supported by "experts" that are directly related with the community for which the SG is prepared.
 - This defines the structure of support, defining the terminology and a clear chain of responsibilities in the different levels.
 - **[RG]** In the ToC we should make a clear distinction between SG's making use of their own technology or SG instances making use of support teams.

- **[NF]** Regarding the proposed ToC:
 - The integration of community portals/gateways into EGI SAM central instance topic suggested and accepted to be part of the ToC.
 - Suggested the inclusion of a comparative table between existing SG enabling technologies. Can we use the XSEDE (former TeraGRID) "[Developer-recommended software for Science Gateways](#)" as a template? The idea was well accepted and something alike should be included in the primer.

- Relevant EGI policies and procedures should also be present in the ToC. This was accepted by the VT members. A first assessment of these policies was already done in consultation with the EGI policy and operations teams, and are listed in the following table:

Policy/Procedure	Policy group	Title	Apply to
Policy	SPG	Grid Security Policy	Infrastructure/Users
Policy	SPG	Portal Policy	Users
Policy	SPG	Traceability and Logging Policy	Infrastructure/Technology Providers/ Users
Policy	SPG	Security Incident Response Policy	Infrastructure/Users
Procedure	OMB	Production Service Decommissioning Procedure	Infrastructure

[taken from [EGI.eu Policies and Procedures table](#)]

- **[PK]** A brief overview of the SCI-BUS project was given, focusing on how the project deals with portlets. While there are general portlets, others are more specific to Science Gateways. It was mentioned that the portlet repository should not be included. Also pointed out that there's the need of maintaining the repository jointly with EGI.
- **[PK]** An open call for contributors to the primer chapters was made.
 - **[DV]** will contribute to the monitoring chapter.
 - **[DV]** expects that other items will be included in the primer ToC. Later he can re-assess if there's anything relevant to contribute as well to those parts.
 - **[NF]** I can take this one, since I already started the assessment of which policies/procedures the developers should be aware. **[RG]** suggests that this should be a small chapter with pointers to the relevant info.

Review output

- Nothing to report.

Any other business

- Nothing reported.

Next meeting

To be decided in the following doodle poll: <http://www.doodle.com/s3f8zp6af2zpfrw>

Please complete the poll by the end of business day on the 28th June 2012.

WebEx meeting details (or other platform) will be sent afterwards.

Post-Mortem

Comment 1 – Primer terminology

Comment done on the proposed ToC:

[DC] It would be good to align well with the [EGI glossary](#) and particularly I'm thinking of Platform Integrators, Platform Operators and Technology Providers.

Comment 2 – New VT task proposal

[RG] In parallel with the startup of this VT, I had been discussing with people from CESGA on how to proceed to produce some Nagios monitoring probes for the DIRAC portal that we have deployed for IBERGRID (the Spanish/Portugese NGI). After some mail exchanges they were proposing to create a VT to do it under the EGI umbrella.

Since we already discussed this topic in the more general terms in the last VT meeting, I wonder if you could consider adding the development of the Nagios probes that we agreed in the VT as a new Task in the VT. CESGA could provide some support about what it is needed and each team with an enabling technology will be responsible to develop the corresponding probes and so that they can be submitted to existing instances based on them.

[NF] To be discussed in the next VT meeting.