



Meeting Summary

March 8 GDB meeting @ CERN

John Gordon

Introduction (John Gordon)

Future Meetings: Prague 3-4 April. Tuesday afternoon will showcase the local region. Vancouver 31 August. Transport and agenda will need coordinating with WLCG workshop. Arrive on 30th for early start on 31st. It wasn't discussed in the meeting but I give notice that I plan to hold the March 2008 GDB away from CERN to avoid the Motor Show. Suggestions welcome for either of the two GDBs to be held outside CERN in 2008.

Consultation. Pre-GDB agendas will remain flexible depending on content which will be defined well in advance. No proposal to move Face to face MB.

Countries with Tier1s should nominate a second (non-voting) representative from their Tier2 community. This is to engage these, sometimes large, sites and get their input, not to improve the information flow out to them. Will progress suggestion to delegate task of further engaging the Tier2s.

Accounting: the reaction to the MB decisions has been disappointing Almost no feedback on how well APEL reports Tier1 use or on success of Storage accounting. JG has started comparing 2006 manual reports with APEL and will circulate a paper.

SL4 (Markus Schultz)

Markus reported that there had been some progress since the February GDB. There was now a buildable WN and UI release but it was not yet installable straight from ETICS. With tweaks it had been installed and the WN tested with an SL3 CE which will likely be a common configuration. The SAM tests were successful on 1/3.

The tarball workround advertised in February had not been installed at many sites. Only 9/210 were advertising SL4.

A solution for WN and UI looks to be in sight but the other nodes will take longer. Data Management is seen as the next priority since new disk servers which run this are also requiring SL4. In general the experiments seemed less agitated than in February. One commented that they were unhappy but realised they could not force sites to use the current solution. Many people were concerned that we could still have components running SL3 when it stops being supported in October, just before LHC data taking starts.

Another major decision will be required if the gLite WMS or CE are not considered acceptable to the experiments. Continuing with LCG versions will require porting to SL4. This is currently not planned and will take considerable effort. The GDB will continue to



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



track but MB is also advised to monitor this situation closely. Ian's proposal on specifying performance criteria gives MB something to monitor progress against.

Markus also described the issues around providing 32bit gLite on 64bit nodes. He suggested 3 options: Provide 32bit versions of the interpreters which means managing external packages; do this only for Python using the Application Area Python version and forget Perl; ask the SL4 team to add the 32bit binaries to the distribution. Markus favoured the third.

BDII (Laurence Field)

Laurence reported on issues with the Information Service which has recently appeared to be a bottleneck and cause of many job and test failures. He highlighted load problems with slldap and timeouts on the top level BDII. He showed correlations of timeouts with numbers of simultaneous queries and data size. Short-term fixes include running the site-level BDII on a standalone machine, running the CE information provider on the site-level BDII and introducing regional top-level BDIIs. This last suggestion has been widely implemented (60 top-level BDIIs) but not all clients point to their regional instance. Also the CERN catchall region is too large. Longer term improvements include more caching in the client and separation of static and volatile information. Long term scalability also needs considering.

VOMS

There were three related talk on deployment of VOMS-aware middleware. In a wider discussion on VOMS it was felt that there were two cases for continued coordination: firstly in user issues like registration and secondly in coordination across implementations (storage, batch, ACLs, generic attributes, etc) so that users don't see differences in behavior between sites. This would also help put an agreed WLCG view including OSG and NGDF to the TCG. I will work with people to prepare a mandate for such a group.

Job Priorities (Jeff Templon)

Mainly what was reported to MB the previous day so I won't repeat. Got agreement from most T1s to deploy this by the end of March so we should have some progress to report to April meeting.

Access Control for Storage (Maarten Litmaath)

Maarten had investigated how VOMS roles/groups could be used to control creation of, and access to, files in the various storage systems of interest to WLCG. In summary DPM and StoRM have full support now, dCache has significant support, Castor has minimal support, and BestMan (DRM) has none. We cannot expect grid-wide consistent VOMS-ACL support this year for files or space tokens.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Accounting (Dave Kant)

Dave reported that accounting by Primary FQAN (the same as used by Job Priorities) has been deployed in APEL but to work correctly requires a patch which is currently in certification. While the UserDN information is encrypted the FQAN is currently not. While it was foreseen that VOs might eventually want to conceal their work patterns by group it was agreed that there was no reason to encrypt it just now as this would delay deployment.

Not everything that was presented during the meeting is listed here. For a more complete report the official minutes should be consulted. They are linked to from the agenda page.