

TMB Minutes for the meeting on January 21st

Present:

SA3 and Chair: Oliver Keeble

JRA1: John White, Francesco Giacomini, Massimo Sgaravatto, Christoph Witzig

Technical Director: Steven Newhouse (arrived close to the end)

LCG: Markus Schulz

SA1: Nick Thackray, Maria Dimou

NA4 and experiments: Andrea Sciaba, Patricia Mendes, Andrei Tsaregorodtsev, Vangelis Floros

SA2: Xavier Jeannin, Mario Reale

Minutes by Markus Schulz

Actions: Christoph Witzig: describe how the use case for restricting usage of individual service instances to specific VOs can be handled with the new Authorization Framework

Action on SA1: Setup a Cream-CE transition readiness monitoring table

Review of the Authorization Deployment Plan:

=====

CW walked us through the draft document of the Deployment Plan.

There are 6 steps until the framework will be fully deployed

- 1) glxec on the WN with a call out to the Authorization Framework (AF)
- 2) global banning list
- 3) CREAM integration
- 4) AF used by the WMS for access control to the service
- 5) AF used by the WMS during match making
- 6) AF integrate with the data management

CW pointed out that no changes will be requires on the CREAM-CE or WN for phase 1 and 2.

Glexec will handle the call out.

All components will be hosted on one single node at the start.

For more visual people there are nice illustrations in the draft document.

There are two 2 options to interface glxec and the AF. Directly or via Lcas/Lcmaps plugins.

The second option is preferred by CW in the initial stage.

On the long run the direct integration will remove some WN dependencies.

Only local site admin policies will be used.

MS asked for clarification on the fate of SCAS. CW explained that step

1) includes the replacement of SCAS.

CNAF, SWITCH and NIKHEF will be involved in the development of this component and this will ensure not all work has to be redone.

Question from CMS: Will we drop SCAS?

SA3 and Deputy Technical Director: This is the plan. There will be an evolutionary move, code will be reused.

JRA1: This was always the plan.

JT (T1s): Asked for clarification concerning services that might be required for the new glexec on WNs.

CW: This was a misunderstanding, there was never the plan to put daemons on the WN.

Step 2) Once this is present at a number of sites, a central service to ban can be run by OSCT.

Sites can opt in to use this (DNS, VOs and FQNs)

JT: Are there code changes required on the site?

CW: No code changes.

JT: But this will hit only pilot jobs

CW: Yes

Step 3) Cream CE

Now several (7) auth calls from the CE. Could be streamlined, CREAM should use the auth service.

Jeff: For the CREAM_CE we need the commitment to go with the auth service only. There will be two CREAM.CEs with and without auth, This worries me.

CW: We have the commitment from Massimo (JRA1), I don't know how quickly people move to the new service.

Since not all will move at the same time the CE has to be maintained in both versions

Oliver: We could not see how this could be done at config time. If it could be done via YAIM we are very willing to go down this path and have just one CE with two configurations

Jeff: OSG is looking at CREAM and they don't use the same auth service. A config switch would be good.

Does anyone talk to them?

CW: The AF will be a topic at the upcoming MWSG group, which is co-organized with OSG.

Step 4) WMS

WMS handles auth too, needs to be integrated, can be done in parallel.

Jeff: Now?

FG (JRA1): It depends. GACL + LCAS/LCMAPS for the gridFTP.

Problematic.....

CMS: Will the WMS come with a shared auth service between different nodes?

CW: This is a deployment choice.

Some discussion on how service nodes can be dedicated to specific VOs. The answer given is not very clear

Action: Christoph to describe how the use case of restricting usage of individual service instances to specific VOs can be handled.

5) WMS using the auth service for match making

6) Data Management

CW received conflicting feedback. Some say definitely yes, others don't see it.

Agreed is the use of a shared banning list on a site. This can be done either by a callout to the AF or policies can be imported.

CW: There should be a single point to formulate the ban list for the site.

Appendix A describes the different deployment options. This is interesting for larger sites. For smaller sites you can run all services on the same host.

Oliver: Single instance for 4000 WN? Is this possible with all services on the same node?

CW: I don't know, we will provide measurements by February.

Markus: What are the fault tolerant deployment options?

CW: This is covered by Fig 5 and 4.

Markus: How is the state propagated between the different instances?

CW: Propagated directly between instances as in Shibboleth

CMS: WN uses just round robin?

CW: Yes

Appendix B)

On hierarchical policies. Interesting for larger sites.

CERN wide policy, the 4 experiments might have their own and LHCb additional. By that you have a tree of policies on the site.

Jeff: You distribute the policies?

CW: No you can still have local policies on the CEs

Markus: The multi layered policy system can make it difficult to understand the intended behaviour of the service

CW: Yes, there is a risk, but you can gain on administration overhead. The next steps are with the JSPG as planned this week. Then CE

Maria: Can you please link the document to the JSPG web page?

CW: I planned a presentation, I didn't plan to give the deployment document to them. But I can distribute it.

Jeff: Concerning step 1. I heard that the Authorization service is not an authentication service. There is a lack of authentication.

CW: The service only deals with the authorization, the client has to do the authentication work-

Jeff: Who has to write the authentication code if we move away from LCAS?

CW: This code has to be added.

Maria: Tasks in Savannah on new VOMS, is they task 7723 under your umbrella?

Oliver: Task in VOMS admin.

CW: No I have nothing to do with it.

Oliver: To answer Jeff. Point 1 we are covered for the authentication bit. This should be in the next document.

Oliver: Please give CW feedback to prepare a final document for the TMB and GDB.

???: Question when will this come? Can you give a time scale?

Christ: Next week we will discuss the time line. March in certification.

Markus: The deployment of new services will take very long. Sites are under very high pressure and are very slow at taking on new services.

Jeff: Since 1) is just a config change and one additional service, this should be easy.

Oliver pressed forward and we moved to the next item on the agenda:

Minutes and Action list:

No comments

Task lists:

Task 6901: Storage Semantics issue.

=====

Much of the document was verbatim from the user guide.

Andrea pointed out several options to handle the situation.

1) Contribute

2) Stand alone with different focus

Vangelis: 3) drop the document and focus on the use cases and populate them with the official use cases,

Oliver: We would leave nothing behind that came from the User Guide and create a standalone document

Vangelis: They went through the user guide and took useful pieces and added use cases and trouble shooting instructions.

We have to get in touch with all user communities add use cases and trouble shooting guides.

Andrea agreed

Jeff: I want to make sure that the user guide will cover the interactions between authorization in catalogues and storage and space tokens

Andrea: We are updating the storage section and add the authorization.

Oliver: DUS and User Guide interaction planned?

Andrea: Up to recently I was not aware of the DUS

Vangelis: I will establish the contact between the people involved.

Oliver: We have agreed on the role of the user guide and that NA4 will manage a standalone use case document and that the user guide relevant material will be added to the user guides.

The material taken from the UG was not attributed this should change.

Vangelis: This was only a draft.

Task 8164:

=====

Grid wide proxy store and delegation service

Steven's comment: This is mentioned in the CREAM document, is this the same?

Oliver: No, this is the old LCG_CE mechanism

Question: What is reverse delegation?

John White:

Could be used by the WN, you pull in a delegated proxy (pull proxy) now only put.

Oliver: Not much meat to discuss

John: Generic store has not been discussed yet, reverse delegation will be needed. Decision on nature of the store > 3 months. We have bought some time by using on the CE the LCG-CE mechanisms

Oliver: John, please update the task,

CREAM transition plan:

=====

Nick: Do we want to go through the document?

No!

Oliver: Timescale for replacement of the LCG_CE by CREAM?

Nick: The clock starts when all criteria are met.

Markus: People confuse the replacement with the start of the rollout.

Steven: Fork jobs have been excluded?

Nick: This was to exclude the fork job on the CE head node.

Massimo: No fork has been implemented on the Cream-CE, this is only possible if the CE is a WN at the same time.

Steven: How representative is the ALICE experience?

Answer: It isn't, because ALICE doesn't use proxy renewal

Item 5) Plan for Proxy renewal . Answer: YES

Item 6) Monitoring: What does it mean: "adequate"

Answer: Same level as current CE, but doesn't map 1:1. Operations Activity has to agree. OPS will provide the monitors. PPS has done already quite some work on this.

Item 7) Second auth system on the CE, gJaff

Plan or implemented plan to move away from it, what is required?

Answer: PLAN is the requirement.

Massimo: gJaff has been removed, relevant lines have been integrated into the code.

Action on SA1: Setup a transition readiness monitoring table

Question: Why 5000 jobs/ CE

Markus: This number came from me. This is the minimal number required to make a deployment at large sites with several thousand job slots feasible. They can afford only to run a reasonable number of CEs (<<100)

Interops with OSG?

Answer: OSG is involved and a CREAM-CE will be added to the interoperability testbed.

Risk: No support for LCG-CE on SL5.

When will this be: Several years from now, (2012)

Review of filed IPV6 bugs.

=====

JRA1 workplan has been linked to the bugs

Mario raised the bugs.

Francesco: Tasks are listed in the link, there are several tasks for all relevant components.

We only looked at Mario's bugs.

Twiki page from JRA1 is dealing with the topic.

Progressing, some components, DPM and LFC, have already been ported.

CREAM and CE-MON are in the next patch.

VOMS client is ready soon.

VOMS server when we move to openssl (voms 2.0) in autumn WMS next version.

BLAH CVS fixed, next release will fix open IPV6 bugs.

LB in progress

FTS with the next code changes.

Important, but not a time critical task.

Fixing the bugs doesn't mean that the service is IPV6 compliant.

After some clarification SA2 agreed to provide a testing environment and Mario and Xavier will assist.

Steven: Vast majority of bugs have fixes?

Francesco. Yes, as part of the background activity.

Mario: Process. What is SA3's role? Only IPV4 regression tests after fixes?

FG: Bugs can be put to fixed when the tool for IPV6 compliance agrees. Certification verifies that IPV4 is not broken. SA2 will do the verification on IPV6.

Mario: Why do we set the bugs to fixed? We have not only code level bugs, but functional bugs, too. Should we post them?

FG: Yes, all, not only automatic code checker problems. The code checker should be run by Mario

Oliver: We have no IPV6 testbeds, but many tests. Please talk to Louis Poncet. We hope to get on the long term a IPV6 testbed, but this will take some time.

Mario: Is it clear that SA3 will do the regression tests on IPV4?

Oliver agreed.

Mario: We are organizing a poster for OGF on IPV6 and gLite, We will circulate the poster, 2 sites for demos at the booth.

AOB:

=====

Steven: Next meeting of IPG at OGF: Resource allocation & portal policies. Draft circulated. Feedback from Maite is expected, please sent feedback.

Oliver:
gLite roadmap. One developer gave feedback.

Steven:
RGMA?

Oliver: We will not expect functional enhancements, it will not be actively depreciated because APEL uses it, but APEL has a migration plan to ActiveMQ.

Next meeting 4 February.