Baseline Services Group
Status of SRM discussions

Storage Management Workshop
5th April 2005

Ian Bird
IT/GD

SRM

- The need for SRM seems to be generally accepted by all
- Jean-Philippe Baud presented the current status of SRM "standard" versions
- Sub group formed (1 person per experiment + J-P) to look at defining a common sub set of functionality
    - ALICE: Latchezar Betev
    - ATLAS: Miguel Branco
    - CMS: Peter Elmer
    - LHCb: Philippe Charpentier

- ⇨ Expect to define an "LCG-required" SRM functionality set that must be implemented for all LCG sites
    - May in addition have a set of optional functions

- Bring discussion to Storage Management workshop this week

Status of SRM definition

CMS input/comments not included yet

- SRM v1.1 insufficient – mainly lack of pinning
- SRM v3 not required – and timescale too late
- Require Volatile, Permanent space; Durable not practical
- Global space reservation: reserve, release, update (mandatory LHCb, useful ATLAS,ALICE). Compactspace NN
- Permissions on directories mandatory
  - Prefer based on roles and not DN (SRM integrated with VOMS desirable but timescale?)
- Directory functions (except mv) should be implemented asap
- Pin/unpin high priority
- srmGetProtocols useful but not mandatory
- Abort, suspend, resume request : all low priority
- Relative paths in SURL important for ATLAS, LHCb, not for ALICE

SRM for LCG

- Need to rapidly confirm the "LCG" required functional set
  - This is what the experiments need
- SRM implementations for LCG sites must take this into account
- Open issue:
  - Duplication between srmcopy and a fts ?
  - need 1 reliable mechanism – is it srmcopy or fts?
- LCG should (has) a SRM test suite that encapsulates this functionality –
  - Should be the agreed verification mechanism that an SRM implementation fits the requirements

4

Access control

- clear statements that the storage systems must respect a single set of ACLs in identical ways no matter how the access is done (grid, local, Kerberos, …)
  - Users must always be mapped to the same storage user no matter how they address the service
- ACLs should be based on roles rather than DN
  - DN not stable over long term
- Integration of SRM with VOMS?

- Currently no good solution to access control?