

TTT meeting, 25th June 2024

Attending: Matt, DaveK, Marcus, Luna, Maarten, Linda

Apologies: David C

Actions, recap

-Keeping 4th Tuesday of the month timeslot.

-[TTT Presentation](#)

(https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/15Tj6WM1FupKNINVqkYmFrAZy8P_1SMkkmkysqLKxheDLusp=sharing) at [EUGridPMA \(https://indico.nikhef.nl/event/5541/\)](https://indico.nikhef.nl/event/5541/) after last meeting.

CHEP submission accepted.

Action on Matt to push some of the documentation improvements (such as pointing towards dteam, highlight that WLCG is a dev VO)

- No progress, tried to raise awareness in the UK and get some testers but no joy (yet).
- Will continue to add to the [scratch google doc \(https://docs.google.com/document/d/1AQeB_t9RMMttSZDLA7H2uhQeXkss91wVxXZbzbusp=sharing\)](#)

Busy times in general for everyone in the last month given the C7 EOL.

Using GitHub for discussions

<https://github.com/TTT-WG/TTT-WG/issues>

Somewhere to continue discussions offline.

Even just a place to collate google doc links would be useful, but we will want to check/lockdown accesses (on the docs or the issues)

Some possible thoughts

-dteam

-chep

-take discussion points from previous meetings

-dos and don'ts, tips and tricks.

-Service piloting, e.g. xrootd

-Generate into issues after meeting, please add.

Central Banning Post-ARGUS/X509

At least in the UK the absence of ARGUS or ARGUS-like central banning is felt by the sites and become a concern.

We've established that central banning as we knew it won't happen, but I believe the answer for whatever processes, policies and procedures replace it need to be defined sooner rather than later.

Our original thoughts on this from previous meetings is central banning is replaced by reactive Issuers.

But do Issuers share information of problem users?

"Recommendation to Issuer Admins"

What to do with longer lasting tokens for issuers?

ML: Set of recipes would be handy to have (might exist? to refer to or copy). Have complete or consistent services.

Service dependent configuration. Compute just ARC or HTCondorCE. Data Management is another matter, but DM never integrated with ARGUS.

Tokens are a completely different landscape, limited to what you can do with a token. Some discussion on what you can do with a token, lifetimes etc.

Present at MB eventually, but this is at least 0.5 year into the future before we converge on these choices and start implement them.

Some discussion on this.

ML -Rucio has concept of embargo'd data, which is a complication for tokens - a data flow for non-WLCG groups. Rucio team is taking this on board.

Reminder that tokens shunt datamanagement to the VO. For rucio this puts it even more control, for example rights to namespace.

Explanation on how argus banning works (20 years ago). Doesn't work very well with pilots as blocks the VO.

Incidents were very rate, ARGUS was overkill. DM management not well integrated. Not looked into elsewhere.

Abuse of compute is still the biggest fear.

Some more history with glexec, ultimately replaced with containers etc.

It would have been nice to have user information traced into jobs easier. The motivation is often simply dealing with user errors rather than security issues, but this is a common usecase.

Cgroups etc to constrain jobs will hopefully reduce the need for this.

Not a priority at this time.

DM - the big protection is that a write token doesn't have delete powers (not so with voms proxies).

ML having a meeting with some experts to steer DM with tokens over the coming months.

The orthogonal tuning axes of Scope, Lifetime and Audience. No need to make one size fit all. Lots of experience in data challenge 24.

Steer towards central services being different to what users are getting for grid jobs.

Need to work within the capabilities of Rucio/DIRAC/PanDA etc. Will have a much more secure grid.

We can have it all! There's a pot of tokens at the end of the rainbow.

Once we get large scale data management working then we'll be much of the way there. On the user side we can hide a lot of the complexity within client utilities, and use tools like Vault or MyToken. Need to find an accepted middleground there. We have until early 2026 for this (longer if needed).

-Open an issue on this. Then decide how we document knowledge like this.

--Related, AARC working on documentation and recommendations for token lifetime. Whilst recommendations would differ, the logic behind the decisions should be consistent.

WLCG 2.0 aiming for this Summer.

Question on lifetime of token and if a near end or too long lived tokens are rejected. This is another issue, something like this was deployed for lcms but something we can think about before we make a decision/recommendation on.

CHEP Submission Planning

~8-10 slides of content, not a lot of space!

Abstract: <https://indico.cern.ch/event/1338689/contributions/6010998/>

Kick this to an issue. One of the first TTT presentations had a good start, the work is to eventually INFORM POLICY, contribute to the knowledge of what is reasonable to expect. Site admin perspective, but a lot of important stuff is happening at sites.

Go back to these and add issues for the stuff proposed there.

AOB

Action on Matt to distill Git Issues from this and previous meetings.

Next meeting in this current slot would be 2pm BST/3pm CEST on the 23rd of July

-- no objections.