

SA3 Feedback and the Future

Oliver Keeble - oliver.keeble@cern.ch JRA1 All-hands, Helsinki

www.eu-egee.org





EGEE-II INFSO-RI-031688

EGEE and gLite are registered trademarks



Summary

- SA3 a reminder
- gLite 3.1
 - Release process
 - Integration
- Reassessment of building
- Dependency Challenge
- Feedback



Mission statement from the Technical Annex

- "The goal of the SA3 activity is to manage the process of building deployable and documented middleware distributions, starting by integrating middleware packages and components from a variety of sources"
- We are the ones in between you and deployment
- ~30 FTEs
 - test writing, testbed management, information system, configuration, testing, certification, integration
- Assuming 60 Changers (JRA1 + LCG, VDT etc)
 - Changers/Testers ~ 5
 - Changers/Integrators ~ 10



gLite 3.1 - status

Worker Node is in production

- User Interface is in PPS
- glite-CE is being tested in SA3
- WMS is being handled separately, but a full gLite 3.1 version is available
 - Effort on workload should be transferred to the 'final product' as soon as practical
- APEL build issue
- Many nodes can be tested take them!
- What potential issues can we look out for
 - proxy format
 - python2.2
 - grid ftp services



gLite 3.1

Current Status

https://grid-deployment.web.cern.ch/grid-deployment//cgi-bin/reports.cgi?action=package

Node	slc3 ia32 gcc323	slc4 ia32 gcc346	slc4 x86 64 gcc346
glite-WN	X	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-UI	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-WMS	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-LB	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-MON	X	X	<u>×</u>
glite-BD <mark>II</mark>	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>0</u>
glite-PX	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>
glite-CE	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-TORQUE_utils	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-TORQUE_client	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-TORQUE_server	×	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-VOMS_oracle	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>0</u>
glite-VOMS_mysql	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>0</u>
glite-SE_dpm_disk	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-SE_dpm_mysql	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-SE_dpm_oracle	<u>o</u>	<u>o</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-AMGA_server	×	X	<u>×</u>
glite-AMGA_client	×	<u>×</u>	<u>×</u>
glite-SE_classic	N/A	N/A	N/A

EGEE-II INFSO-RI-031688



Drilling down

Enabling Grids for E-sciencE

EGEE-II: SA3 Activity glite-WN_slc4_ia32_gcc346

Package	Version	Status
a1_grid_env	2.0.0-1	Found
c-ares	1.3.0-4	Found
CGSI_gSOAP_2.6	1.1.15-6	Found
classads	0.9.8-2	Found
cleanup-grid-accounts	1.0.2-1	Found
dcache-client	1.7.0-28	Found
DPM-client	1.6.3-1	Found
edg-gridftp-client	1.2.6-1	Found
fetch-crl	2.6.3-1	Found
GFAL-client	1.9.0-2	Found
glite-data-api-perl	1.1.1-1	Found
glite-data-catalog-api-c	2.0.0-5	Found
glite-data-catalog-api-perl	2.0.0-3	Found
glite-data-catalog-cli	1.7.3-1	Found
glite-data-catalog-interface	2.0.0-8	Found
glite-data-srm-api-c	1.1.0-3	Found
glite-data-srm-api-perl	1.1.0-2	Found
glite-data-srm-cli	1.2.8-2	Found
glite-data-transfer-api-c	3.1.0-2	Found
glite-data-transfer-api-perl	3.1.0-1	Found
glite-data-transfer-cli	3.3.0-2	Found
glite-data-transfer-interface	3.1.0-4	Found

Please find your favourite node type and check the lists

EGEE-II INFSO-RI-031688



- Patch for each platform
 - glite_OS_arch
 - gLite 3.0 / SL3 / i386
 - gLite 3.1 / SL4 / i386
 - gLite 3.1 / SL4 / x86_64
 - Maybe....
 - gLite 3.1 / SL3 (already building)
 - gLite 3.0 / SL3 from ETICS?
 - Don't forget Debian
- In the beginning, a patch may be an entire new node type
- Maintain patch-free turnaround for unreleased services
- Developers we can make repositories available for you to try the installation and fix problems
 - How can we make this as quick as possible?

EGEE-II INFSO-RI-031688

7

gLite 3.1 integration process

- Creation of meta-packages and repositories has been decoupled from ETICS.
 - Integration requires package name and version
 - ETICS uses configuration names and component names
 - No easy mapping
 - Require bulk operations on many lists
 - Would like to query across multiple lists
 - Large speed advantage
- ETICS is the 'build factory', ETICS repository is the interface
 - Integration is then done at the package level
 - Metapackages are maintained as simple text files with module and version information.
- Metapackages are decoupled from configuration
 - Config is not shipped in metapackages
 - Yaim will allow developers to take over more config if they wish

eGee

egee

List Management





New approach to the build - 1

- Enabling Grids for E-sciencE
- Problem with multiple builds
 - Inefficient
 - Does not maximise testing
 - Final 'release build' often problematic
 - Slows everything down
- The primary goal is to allow a developer to perform a build, in a controlled environment, whose products cannot be changed and whose build log is archived with the artifacts.
- Why? Because this means a developer can produce a release candidate.
- New activity demarcation line will be patch level integration



• **SA3**

- enforces build acceptance criteria (eg the build was remote)

Enabling Grids for E-sciencE

 freezes current glite_branch_3_1_0 and then maintains baseline (NOT necessarily what is in the release, but tracking API extensions and changes)

JRA1 developer

- experiments with a particular tag, producing local builds until s/he is happy
- updates configuration and triggers a 'release candidate' build (this will be remote)
- tests the RC build
- registers it if tests pass
- submits a patch, referencing the artifact in the ETICS repo. At this point the config is locked



Build Workflow





- ETICS requirements
 - Registration of build artifacts on fulfilment of project defined conditions (Policy)
 - Archiving of build arguments and build log with artifact and build information (R1.1 or even before)
 - Configuration locking on successful build of the artifact or store of the build information in a reusable form (R1.2)
 - Local manipulation of build tree (not affecting ETICS server) for experimentation (R1.1)
 - Two stage build then register

Enabling Grids for E-science

 ...what else? Is there a problem with an update which crosses subsystems? Does the developer still have to synchronise with a subsystem manager?





- Dependency Challenge
 - PMB endorsed plan
 - https://edms.cern.ch/file/840168/1/EGEE-II-NA1-TEC-gLiteRestructuring-v0.4.doc
 - Driven by Markus and Claudio
- Progress so far
 - ALL metapackages have been reviewed, reduced rpm lists are now available
- Stage One
 - Teams will be set up to review the dependencies
 - Publish acceptance criteria for external/internal dependencies (Joachim, reviewed by JRA1)
 - Both deps on the OS and fully external deps will be considered as multiplatform support is affected in both cases
 - Support level (platform, 64bit)
 - Commonly used in project
 - Not available via another package
 - Maintenance status of package
 - Duration: 1 week



Dependency Challenge

• Stage Two

- Understand what can be removed, what can be handled by a few extra lines or changes
- SA3 and JRA1 (Markus and Claudio) David, Maarten , Steve Fisher (Alastair)
- Can progress in parallel for different components
- Duration: Potentially infinite ----> limit to not more than 2 weeks

• Stage Three

- Implement those changes that can be implemented within 1 week (according to the developers)
- Duration: Developers 2 weeks, testing 2 weeks



• Documentation

eeee

- The lack of detailed documentation of the architecture and design of the WMS has impacted the development of interoperation with ARC.
- Reproducibility IC experience
 - A developer running a service is never reproducible
- Reactivity
 - Can wait a week trying to find someone

- Standardisation on the use of /etc/init.d/ startup scripts, via an attempt to move all supplied packages to adhere to the basic Linux Standard Base specification
- All RPMS provided by the project should aim to follow the guidelines from the fedora project and should be split into subpackages where appropriate with a general categorisation of:
 - common, client, server, documentation.
 - maximal client separation
 - keep the fat on the server





• Please find me to discuss this stuff!



• Extra slides...





EGEE-II INFSO-RI-031688



Current status – gLite 3.0

- What is a distribution?
 - Different from a codebase
 - Please understand what gLite 3.0 means to the Service Activities!
- gLite 3.0 distro
 - Bunch of tags
 - Built against an Operating System (SL3)

- With a bunch of externals (VDT 1.2, ...)
- Release process
 - I'm here to answer questions...
- According to the GIIS monitor;
 - Over 200 sites (not all active)
 - Over 30000 CPUs
 - 14TB of storage



• Why don't we pass tags to production?

- SA3 ensures that software
 - is built in a controlled environment
 - is what is required in production
 - can be installed
 - is made available with as part of a complete service
 - can be configured through a generic interface
 - has been tested
 - is released and advertised in a known location
 - has appropriate documentation available