

Cloud pre-GDB Summary

Michel Jouvin
LAL, Orsay
jouvin@lal.in2p3.fr

GDB, March 2013, KIT

Last GDB Summary

- Try to converge on some **concrete steps** implementable in existing (private) clouds that could be tested with real world applications
- Egroup discussion has been good for bootstrapping the discussion and do some kind of brainstorming...
- Converging on a workplan will probably require a more formal meeting
 - > Would be better if it was mostly F2F: Karlsruhe (Tues. afternoon) is probably the only possibility in a reasonable timeframe but at least 2 conflicting meetings (ATLAS, ROOT)
 - > If not possible, fall back to a Vidyo meeting

Pre-GDB Agenda

- ◉ 3 initial topics identified based on January discussions a little bit reorganized after the initial discussion
 - > Image contextualization
 - > VM instantiation and duration
 - > VM scheduling to achieve fairshare-like resource sharing
- ◉ Security model
 - > In particular, is it still a goal/requirement to prevent root access to VMs
 - > Impact on possible/acceptable contextualization strategies
 - > Need for a JSPG policy update?
- ◉ Accounting
 - > VM benchmarking: what to report? How to ensure consistency between sites?

Security...

- Trusted images: definition currently based on a JSPG policy proposed early in the HEPiX WG
 - > Corner stone: no root access to the VM
 - > Endorsed by EGI, WLCG a few years ago...
 - > Probably need to reopen the discussion based on cloud experience
 - Not existing when the first version of the policy was defined
 - Root access is a key feature of every cloud... difficult to prevent it!
 - Role of a policy if root access is accepted?
- Liability and level of traceability currently available
 - > Goal: have the same level of traceability back to the user as we have in the grid (with glxexec)
 - > If root access to VM accepted, how to enforce it

... Security

- Agreement: no root access needed/envisioned for the end users in WLCG VOs
 - > Root access restricted to the user who instantiate the VM: the pilot factory user
 - May need to further refine what actions are allowed/disallowed
 - > This specific user in the VO is liable for root account usage: it is its responsibility to ensure that no other user of the VM is enabled to use it
 - > Identity must be switched to a non root user to execute any payload
 - Need to evaluate/discuss with experts if glexec may be used in the cloud context to trace identity switching
 - > Passing user credential to a VM is better done on an encrypted connection
 - 1 possibility is to do it with SSH using root (the only accessible account)

Image Contextualization...

- ◉ Contextualization: way to pass data to the image at instantiation time
 - > Only clean way to pass credential to an image
 - > Site and/or contextualization
- ◉ User contextualization acceptance strongly related to root access debate
 - > User contextualization is a way to bypass root access restrictions...
 - > ... but in the cloud world user root access to a VM is a basic feature
- ◉ HEPIX proposed a mechanism based on amiconfig
 - > Focus on site contextualization
 - Controlled user contextualization also possible
 - > Well integrated into CERNVM

... Image Contextualization

- ◎ Since then, CloudInit emerged as the new de-facto standard
 - > Based on the same concepts as amiconfig
 - > More data input mechanisms: backward compatible for the user
 - > More user contextualization oriented: a lot of flexibility added
 - Including ability to execute arbitrary scripts
- ◎ Agreement: CloudInit is the way to go for the future but we can live for the time being with CloudInit and amiconfig
 - > CMS already played with CloudInit and amiconfig but no attempt to convert one to the other
 - StratusLab report: non-zero but minor
 - > No real impact on the user/VO if the input data syntax is the same
 - Unfortunately this is not generally the case
 - > Need to wait more concrete plans from CERNVM

VM Instantiation

- Mainly a matter of interfaces...
- General agreement that interfaces are not really important
 - > Most VO using abstract API like libCloud (DIRAC) or CERNVM Cloud
 - CMS may consider DeltaCloud: supported by Condor thus coming for free
 - > One (non convincing) standardized interface recommended/used by EGI federated cloud TF : OCCI (OGF)
 - Interface not well designed
 - Implementations available for several cloud MW but not mainstream for any of them
 - Contextualization not supported
 - > One emerging new standard: CIMI
 - Proposed by the same organization as CDMI (DTMF?)
 - Soon to be proposed as an ISO standard
 - May want to follow further developments with it...

VM Duration...

- ◉ Long-lived VMs are requested by several VOs
 - > But require a way for a VO to shut down a no longer needed VM
- ◉ Main topic is the graceful stop of a VM
 - > Overlap with VM scheduling discussion
 - > Now recognized as a feature required as a counterpart to long-lived VOs
- ◉ Proposal from previous discussions
 - > Based on SLAs, launch a VM with X minimum days of lifetime and Y minimum hours of shutdown notice
 - Probably X is not really needed and Y should be part of the SLA
- ◉ Mechanism to publish information to VM user should be independent from any cloud MW implementation
 - > HEPiX well-known file proposal looks as a good starting point

...VM Duration

- How the file is updated is out of the scope of our discussions
 - Site decision: site should use contextualization to install what is necessary at VM instantiation time to ensure the proper update of the information
 - Eg.: cron job
 - A site can prefer to use a shared file system
- Be pragmatic: start something addressing the main needs but do not try to embrace all the possible use cases
 - First step: demonstrate ability to send an advance notification to the VM user, play with different SLAs for VMs in the normal share of a VO and those above it (sort of spot instances)
 - Termination date for a VM should be given in absolute time
 - Left outside short term plans: ability to reclaim the VO a certain number of VMs rather than specific VMs

VM Scheduling

- “Fairshare-like” resource sharing: agreement that we want to avoid static partitioning of resources
 - > Graceful termination of VMs opens a way to implement this fair sharing still enabling one VO to take advantage of the underused resources by another VO
 - > Difficulty: how the cloud scheduler can discover requests by other VOs that are under their quota
 - Batch systems can do it because they have a queueing mechanism but there is no such feature in clouds. A reason to keep them?
 - Do we want to implement (see implemented!) a mechanism for a VO to let a site know they would like more resources: risk of reinventing a complex system
 - > As an alternative, explore economic models where VOs are given credits and where the price of a VM increases with its duration and the number of VMs owned by a VO.

Accounting

- General agreement about using wall-clock time accounting for the cloud world
 - > Concerns about funding agency reactions if they think we inefficiently use the infrastructure, even though the VO is responsible
- How to report doesn't seem to be problem for private clouds
 - > APEL has demonstrated its ability to do the job
 - See work done by EGI federated cloud TF
 - > This is not WLCG responsibility to report public cloud usage into WLCG central accounting
 - But an experiment is required to do such an accounting
- VM benchmarking: what to report? How to ensure consistency between sites?
 - > Easy to invent a very complex system... Must be avoided!
 - > Not specific to clouds but they may offer a possibility to improve the situation

Conclusions

- ◎ Good/better consensus on important issues to tackle for making possible to use a cloud as a CE replacement
 - > Batch-less interaction with the compute resources
 - > First priority: demonstrate a basic feature to do resource reclaim
 - Graceful termination of VMs
- ◎ Probably the end of a first phase of our work: reach enough consensus on issues to devise a work plan
 - > Still some details to be discussed/done...
 - > But the most important is now to try to implement ideas discussed and review them afterwards
- ◎ Another similar meeting foreseen next Spring
 - > May or June GDB slots: please report known conflicts
 - > Requires some practical work/testing to be done before...