

ISSUES DISCUSSED AT TCG on October 18th 2006

Issue number 1:

“Fine grained list of RPMs per service component (and not only per node/service. Those lists should include all dependencies both internal and external, and should be available in a official and stable url). Does the information at this URL: <http://glite.web.cern.ch/glite/packages/R3.0/deployment/> satisfy this requirement?”

SA3: the link reported on the issue will be maintained. For a finer grain list SA3 will investigate the possibilities to use the ethics facilities.

Issue number 3:

“Reduce dependency of OS: e.g. better support for the UI/WN tarball (it should be certified and released at the same time as the WN/UI RPMs are certified and released.)”

For the specific examples of the UI/WN tarballs, the problem is now fixed and in the future they will be deployed with the standard releases.

About the porting to OS different from SLC, this is a big and complex issue and it is already faced by an SA3 activity that will take all the time needed. Ethics could help also in this. JRA1 is doing some work in the components in release3.1 in order to have them more portable.

Issue number 4:

“Documentation: release notes should contain all information on: required configuration changes; detailed deployment instructions (for example, must service be re-started after upgrade); bugs fixed by the update; new functionality introduced by the update; etc.”

SA3 says that information are published but probably not properly read by sysadmins and sitemanager. Information about patches and upgrades are published since the upgrade to savannah (more than two months ago).

The link to this info is not very visible on the glite web portal (glite.org) - it is only in the news section - and will be put in greater evidence. (DONE: <http://glite.org> → Packages). The possibility of making a pdf with the release notes will be investigated.

Issue number 5:

“New services should come with clear and complete error messages. This should be part of the SA3 checklist (if it isn't already); new components should not be accepted if they don't bring this.”

JRA1: the activity of improving error messages is already ongoing inside jra1

Issue number 10:

“Implement VO quotas on shared disk pools provided by DPM or dcache. Publish the quota and also available space, per VO, based on this quota.”

The publication of VO available space on a SE will be there with the new glueschema. There is some work on VO quotas on SE, but it has not been a priority, because the priority was the implementation of the srm2.2. At the moment can be used some mechanism such as space reservation, but this not a real VO quota implementation.

Issue number 12:

“Provide better and clearer log system, with a standard logging format. This should be part of the SA3 checklist (if it isn't already); new components should not be accepted if they don't bring this. Also, the logging system must be able to store the logs on a remote host (as the "syslog" system does).”

The issue of logging standardization has been recognized as a valid and urgent issue. Action raised on JRA1 to implement the syslog functionalities for the internal developed components. For what concern external component JRA1 cannot have any control. Using syslog automatically enables the remote logging possibility.

Issue number 14:

*“Provide service management interface for all middleware services (start/stop/status, etc.). **Clarifications:** We don't mean "start/stop/status" of linux services. We are actually talking about administration tools which are more or less node-specific. For example, add/remove/supend a VO from a node, add/remove/close a CE queue, close a site (on site BDII), close a storage area, etc. We don't want to launch a node configuration. A good example is the [FTS](#), you can dynamically add or remove a transfer channel by the way of a command. The [FTS](#) node is easier to administrate.”*

The issue has been received. It is decided that in a first phase it will be implemented a system to monitor all the services and components status inside a node. The use of gridice sensors will be investigated for the monitoring purposes. As site representatives we clarified that the request is not only for a monitoring tool, but for an administrative tool (i.e. enabling/disabling VO). The development of such tools is postponed to a second phase.

Issue number 17:

“Failover in clients and user tools. E.g. enable user data management tools to use redundant BDII's to look up information. So if the primary BDII specified by LCG_GFAL_INFOSYS does not respond a backup BDII can be used instead. This will eliminate the need to setup HA BDII service which most sites do not have.”

This is an issue and should be analyzed for any service/client. JRA1 is working on this already (clients of wmpoxy are an example). In the end the most complicated thing is to have a failover mechanism for the site and top level IS. Having that all the other failover mechanisms will be easier to implement.

Issue number 18:

“Pass parameters to LRMS: In order to improve the efficiency of LRMS, some information from user's job description should be passed to the CE through the RB as, for instance, the required amount of memory, the required size of scratch space, the required CPU max. time.”

This is an already ongoing activity of JRA1 and blah should allow something like that.

Issue number 20:

“make it easier to tailor the MW to specific fabrics needs (e.g. Quattor, batch systems, etc.)”

It is not clear the exact meaning of this issue. There is a request to clarify this item.

Issue number 21:

“need clear concepts for maintenance and garbage collection for each persistent/core MW node (like RB/WMS and storage services)”

This was recognized a real issue by everybody. For some items JRA1 will provide guidelines about garbage collection, i.e. LB database. For other items it should be agreed somewhere the period we want to store data i.e. sandbox of not collected jobs, logs etc. It is still not clear were this agreement should be done (SA1?)

The discussion of other (not voted at the time of the tcg discussion) issues was postponed.

There is the request by everybody to do not change the link of the issues list. And not to change the order of the issues so that the page can be linked in the TCG pages and the issues safely addressed with their number.