'Science Gateway primer' Virtual Team

Meeting	Cisco WebEx Conference
Date & Time	Monday 12 November 2012, 10:00 CET / Call ended 11:03 CET
Host	EGI.eu / Amsterdam, Netherlands

Participants

Name and Surname	Abbreviation	Community/Organisation
Peter Kacsuk	PK	MTA SZTAKI, SCI-BUS,
Nuno Ferreira	NF	EGI.eu, UCST
Elisa Cauhé Martín	EM	University of Zaragoza
Shayan Shahand	SS	Academisch Medisch Centrum, LSGC VRC
Wibke Sudholt	WS	CloudBroker GmbH

Agenda

1. Apologies
2. Amendment of minutes from previous meeting? (minutes not released yet)

   https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/VT_Science_Gateway_Primer/meetings

3. Discussion on the primer document
   - check new contributions for version 0.1
   - discuss copyright issues
   - missing parts?
   - cross-checking?
4. AppDB requirements
   - any contributions?
5. SG forum on the EGI website
   - one announcement added (Code Camp)
   - more activity is needed
6. EGI CF participation
7. Extension request
8. Schedule of next meeting
9. Any other business

Notes

Apologies

Silvia Olabarriaga, Robert Lovas.

Minutes from previous meeting

[NF] Minutes from previous meeting not released. No amendments done.

Discussion on the primer document

Contributions

[PK] Sent an updated version of his contribution to the Primer document before the call.

[WS] 1st full version of her contribution on the topic 'Science Gateways and Clouds' was sent to the mailing list. The focus of this chapter will be about three aspects of clouds affecting SG's: frontend, backend and business models of clouds. A short introduction to clouds is also provided. The chapter is open for comments from the VT members.

[NF] The contribution from [WS] will be merged by Tibor into the master document along with [PK]'s last updates, and a new version will be circulated later through the mailing list.

[PK] Where should this Cloud related chapter be inside the Primer? It is not in current ToC.

[NF] It will be included as a separate chapter.

[PK] Suggests adding this chapter right after the SG functional features chapter. Will inform Tibor about it.

[PK] Added more information to the Primer about workflows and repositories, as well as a few minor corrections to previous content.

[SS] Worked offline on his contribution (the SG functional features chapter) which will be sent out very soon.

[PK] Contribution should be sent to the mailing list, Tibor will pick it up from there. The chapter [SS] is contributing too already has a lot of material. What is your contribution plan to it?

[SS] The skeleton of this chapter was design by me and Silvia, and content was started to be fed into it. Whatever is missing there will add it. Will take into consideration [PK] recent update to that chapter as well to not have content clashes.

[EM] Working on current chapter 4 about SG comparison. What do we want for this chapter?

[NF] Having a chapter where a table containing relevant technologies for a specific topic (SG's in this case) and match them against a set of properties/characteristics that define them, would make life easier for a SG developer to pick he's own choice based on the information provided at the table (technology comparison tables similar to the ones Wikipedia offers was given as an example). The set of properties/features available in this table should come from the SG experts.

[PK] Agrees with [NF], but points that such a table could be very big in terms of features/functionalities we expect from a gateway. Categories could be created in order to split the features into different tables.

[PK] Tasks for [EM]:

- Create two sets of tables, SG frameworks and SG instances (application oriented SG's). Each one of these SG types will have a frontend functionalities table (eg. monitoring, visualization, workflow editor, …) as well as a backend functionalities table (eg. Support for monitoring, worflow management, …). At the end 4 tables will be available:
    - SG framework frontend functionalities
    - SG framework backend functionalities
    - SG instance frontend functionalities
    - SG instance backend functionalities
- Afterword's all SG developers should fill in this table. This is the major gap in this field since there's no comparison table between the different technologies. We need to approach these SG developers showing them that by filling in the table requested info, it will increase their visibility amongst the SG community. Give them a deadline.

[**SS**] Should we make a distinction in the above tables between SGs in production from SGs under development? The SG business is really dynamic, thus what is the goal of having this information in a table that will change along the time? Are we looking to a set of best practices? If this is the case, we could just give a few examples on success stories instead of providing a 'full' listing of SGs.

[NF] The goal of the Primer is to be a set of best practices, thus it is not our goal to collect everything out there. About the question concerning making distinction between a SG at a production or development stage, is already captured as a request from [PK]. The AppDB should distinguish SG in different status and this can be reflected in the tables that [EM] will create as another feature/functionality column.

[PK] Agrees with [NF].

[SS] If this info is in the AppDB why should we replicate it in the primer, a document that by definition is static?

[NF] We are not replicating the work at this stage, because AppDB currently does not make a clear distinction between SGs in production mode from other statuses. This is a requirement from this VT group that will be pushed to the AppDB developers.

[PK] Another important difference between the tables [EM] is creating and the AppDB. In the AppDB unfortunately a user registering a SG related entry can put information that is not correct. In the tables that we are creating, we put the information that we VT believe it should be relevant for SG developers while providing a proper description of the gateway. AppDB developers can then follow the ideas we are putting together in order to have AppDB registry SG entries in sync and updated with our set of best practices.

[SS] One of the goals in the chapter about SG functionalities was to provide a framework of functionalities that describe a gateway. Probably these could be used while building the tables then.

[PK] Agrees with [SS]. Furthermore, the remaining chapters of the Primer should be used to create the features/functionalities we want to have in the final set of the SG comparison tables.

[NF] Another contribution was sent to the Primer from Hsin-Yen Chen about SG visualization.

Copyright issues

[NF] The topic about copyright/authorship rights on the Primer document was raised by Silvia Olabarriaga. The EGI Strategy and Policy team (SPT) was contacted to assess the situation. An email was circulated to the mailing list with their comments. For the reference the email contents is translated bellow:

- Virtual Teams are EGI owned and their activities were established under EGI-InSPIRE funding. Management of VT's is done by EGI.eu members/partners associated to this funding.
- Copyright license, included in the document in attach, is non-exclusive and very open (check http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0). This means that all documents produced by the VT are free to use, share and make commercial use of the work by others with the exception of attribution.
- We agree that all projects involved in the contribution to the Primer should be publicly acknowledged. An *Authors List* table (including their organization/project and function) was included in the document, as well as an *Acknowledgement* section.
- The MoU between EGI and SCI-BUS does not have any relevance for the EGI SGP-VT, since it is only related to activities and work plans defined in the MoU.

[NF] These changes will be incorporated in the primer and will be sent to the mailing list.

[PK] and **[WS]** agree with the answer provided by EGI SPT.

Primer missing sections

[NF] Yes, there are some missing sections that were targeted to be present in the initial ToC drafted by the VT members, namely the accounting section (from Ricardo Graciani) and identity federation (from Roberto Barbera).

Cross checking

[NF] All VT members should read the Primer document in order to maintain a coherent and fluent text.

AppDB requirements

[NF] The first batch of requirements from this VT (specifically from [PK]) towards the AppDB was stored in the EGI RT system. These requirements were not pushed to the developers because we should do it once we have all requirements registered. Are there any more requirements from your side to be addressed?

[NF] sent the link to the RT ticket. Evryone has access rights and should read the stored requirements and provide back to the VT mailing list further input.

[PK] will read carefully the RT ticket thread and will come back. It is important to have an agreement from inside the VT about these requirements which were [PK] suggestions. For the next VT meeting this should be the priority topic. Everyone should read current requirements and comment on them.

[NF] The aim is to have the requirements implemented in AppDB by the time the primer will be released.

SG forum on the EGI website

[NF] The SG topic under the EGI forum received its first post. The forum is a new tool, not much activity up to the moment. Are there any suggestions on how we could improve the dissemination of this tool?

[PK] It is important to push the users to use this forum. Each project that contributed to this VT should promote the forum. [EM] will promote it inside SCI-BUS.

[NF] Will disseminate the forum as well though the EGI dissemination channels, like the blog, the newsletter, …

[PK] The SG workshop in Prague was well attended. To [NF]: do you the contacts (email) for the audience?

[NF] No.

[PK] In the next workshop we should collect the audience contacts, because they will be the target to disseminate any SG related activities.

EGI CF participation

[NF] Is there interest from the VT members to have a dedicated workshop on gateways in the next EGI Community Forum 2013 (8-12 April)?

[PK] Agree having a workshop on SGs. By that time the Primer will be ready and the AppDB will be up to date with the VT recommendations.

[SS] is interested in attending the EGI.CF.2013 and providing support to the workshop.

[EM] will write the first proposal for the workshop.

[NF, PK] will help preparing the workshop proposal submission.

[EM] Half of the day or a full day?

[NF] Speak with Gergely since he is involved in this event.

[PK] Probably it will be a good idea to couple a workshop on Science Gateways with a Workflows workshop, thus SG should target ½ day.

[NF] The first draft for the workshop should be ready next week, since the deadline for submission is the 30th November.

Extension request

[NF] Robert Lovas will ask EGI Director Steven Newhouse for an extension period of 1 month (15th Dec) for this VT to be able to finish the aimed tasks.

[PK] Agree with the extension to produce a quality Primer document.

[WS] Agree with the extension to be able to read the full Primer and comment on them.

[NF] Steven Newhouse will want to have a look at the current status of the Primer. The draft version should be released by next week after our weekly meeting.

Next meeting

To be decided in the following doodle poll: http://doodle.com/q2ct2dtw94pszi84

Please complete the poll by the end of business day on the 14th November 2012.

WebEx meeting details will be sent afterwards.

Any other business

[PK] We will finish the Primer and we will provide our recommendations to AppDB as well. What about the dissemination? We should try to get as much feedback as possible from the community such that in

the remaining month of this VT (if the extension period is accepted) could be used to do a community peer-review of the Primer contents.

[NF] The Primer will be public available by next week then to receive comment from the community. All VT members will play a major role on this by disseminating the primer inside your own communities.

Post mortem

Nothing to report.