



## Meeting Summary

May 2008 GDB meeting @CERN

### ***Introduction (John Gordon)***

Following the request from the Collaboration Board, GDB will consider running a GDB meeting with a bias towards Tier2s. July was proposed and suggestions for topics requested. T1s and country reps requested to consult their Tier2s. I will also mail directly via CB list. Several people present stated that there was no problem and Tier2s were well represented but these views mainly came from Tier2s who participated in GDB or whose Country/Tier1 did engage closely with Tier2s.

It has been noticed that Tier2 accounts show cpu usage at T2 sites and federations and compares this with the pledges. This doesn't tell you much if you don't know the fraction of the pledge actually installed. We are now looking for a way of obtaining and storing this information. This is not straightforward. Total resources at a site may be used for more than WLCG, whereas the pledge is a specific WLCG number. Infrastructure solution like GOCDB or gstat (BDII) cannot identify VO-specific resources. A possibility would be to manually report to the LCG Office. A proposal will be made.

### ***Security Service Challenges (Romain Wartel)***

Romain presented the recent level 3 security challenges carried out against CERN and Tier1s. A job was run at a site and left processes running. A ticket was raised against the site calling attention to this and asking the site to treat the DN as malicious and to take appropriate actions. Marks were awarded for communication, containment, and forensics and targets set for each. In general the results were encouraging with most sites exceeding the overall target or narrowly failing. However, no site passed all categories and two T1s ASGC and CNAF failed badly. The MB should assure itself that the problems with these sites are understood and would not occur with a real incident.

### ***Policy Update (Dave Kelsey)***

Dave described several policy documents (almost) ready for formal approval

- VO Operations Policy
- Pilot Jobs Policy
- Traceability and Logging Policy
- CA Approval (new IGTF profiles)

Dave then described the New mandate (main points)

- *Jointly owned by/recommends to WLCG & EGEE*



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



- *Policy for WLCG designed to be applied to all of its Grid infrastructures in so far as this relates to WLCG activities*
    - *i.e. OSG, NDGF and other national Grids and/or individual Grid sites which participate in WLCG*
  - *May also provide advice on any security matter*
  - *Aim for simple/general policies that are useable by NGIs*
  - *JSPG does not formally approve policies but recommends to management bodies and the JSPG plans for next two years*
    - Need to revitalise membership (More ROCs, NGIs and VOs)
      - New OSG member is Jim Basney
    - Review all policy documents to make even more simple/general
- Any MB members with experienced security people might like to volunteer them to contribute to the work of the JSPG.

Now that a well-organised set of bodies oversees the worldwide CAs for academic and research grids the authentication field is relatively stable. The same cannot be said of Authorisation so people are looking at similar international trust mechanisms. International VOs need this if they are to use more than one Grid. The EUGridPMA has formed a group to work on this (Chair D Kelsey) and hopes to use the IGTF to spread the work more widely. One example would be standards for running VOMS. and accreditation of VOs.

### ***Worker Node Working Group (Steve Traylen)***

A major topic of this group was how to define and organise heterogeneous clusters of cpus into homogeneous sub-clusters so that the WMS could direct appropriate work to them. The software for this would be ready to be rolled out in a month or so but until it was installed everywhere sites could not start to define sub-clusters.

### ***Pilot Job Frameworks***

The evaluation group was of the opinion that LHCB's framework looked likely to be approved. They will report in more detail to the June GDB. After previous MB discussion, a few sites volunteered to test LHCB's framework with the existing glxexec and LCAS to permit testing of the framework in parallel with SCAS development. This started but sites had problems with glxexec.

LCAS developers proposed a method of using LCAS across a cluster with a partitioned set of uids, unique to a WN. A meeting of the TCG advised against this (with LHCB in agreement) They were worried that once this was released SCAS would not gain acceptance but more importantly they much preferred the single decision point of SCAS to the complicated configuration required on WN.

There is general agreement on using SCAS. The coding is complete, in prolonged developer testing, Estimate end of June before certification starts.



Tests on the framework with existing glxec will continue in parallel. CERN plan to configure a non-trivial PPT cluster for this.

### **SAM**

Three talks on aspects of SAM

**Certification (Judit Novak)** set out the procedures for testing and certification of the generic SAM tests.

**CMS Tests (Andrea Sciabo)** described how CMS certified its tests and how their shifters chase up failures

**ATLAS Tests (Alessandro di Girolomo)** ATLAS run all the generic tests using ATLAS credentials as well as their VO-specific tests. They outlined some requests to the SAM team as well as showing a dashboard view of test results.

### **Storage Update (Flavia Donno)**

Showed the issues behind the Addendum to the WLCG SRM MoU. The relevant dates are:-

- **19 May**: technical agreement among the developers
- **23 May**: experiment agreement. Document submitted to a few site representatives for comments.
- **2 June**: document finalization with time estimation for implementation.
- **10 June**: submission to the MB for approval. Start of the implementation phase.

When Flavia presented the detailed proposals of what will change there was much questioning of the use cases behind the changes. More work is required here during the consultation of the experiments happening now.

### **GGUS Direct Ticket Routing (Maria Dimou)**

Maria described the mandate of the EGEE User Support Advisory Group which oversees the work of GGUS and then showed the plan for implementing emergency ticket routing in GGUS. This looked a viable plan to achieve the requirement first expressed in the MB for experiments to alert sites about emergencies without the delays inherent in any route with additional manual intervention.

Since these plans will not be implemented until the end of June and they also depend on some external dependencies it is still necessary for sites to accept signed email direct from a restricted list

### **EGI-DS (Jamie Shiers)**

Jamie's is concerned about the implications for WLCG of the progress and direction of EGI-DS. His proposals are:



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



- From today, get actively involved in the process of defining EGI operations and the transition from the current status – through EGEE III into EGI and beyond
- There is an EGI\_DS meeting tomorrow in MUC in which to carry this forward
- And the OGF in Barcelona, which already includes from EGI\_DS events
- We must be pro-actively involved in defining the agenda of – and preparation for – the EGI\_DS workshop at CERN June 30
- This must continue thru EGEE '08 in Istanbul and beyond
- At any point along this path we might decide to go a separate route – we must be clear about this and also the goals of targeting as broad a spectrum of application communities as possible.