

TMB Minutes. 18/3/2009, 10:30CET

Participants:

=====

Oliver
John
Francesco
Maite
Markus
Steven
Jeff (phone)
Vangelis (phone & minutes)

Apologies from Massimo, Simone, Patricia & Stefano

Previous minutes:

=====

No comments. Approved.

Task List:

=====

#8953

The original issue related to how a client to the Authz service would identify itself so that the Authz service would know which policy to apply to the authorisation request, for when clients from different services would be requesting authorisation decisions from a single Authz service. However, the broader issue was how the access policy for a particular service would be reflected in the information service given that the Authz service could modify a broad access policy. The broad availability of a resource to specific communities would be reflected in the information service, but not modifications to this policy, for example if a specific user was banned.

The talk shifted to GLUE 2.0 discussion and transition from 1.3.

Steven: Is there a GLUE 2.0 task force? No, only one person (Laurence Field) is over-viewing these issues. He should come up with the mappings and policy decisions (especially with respect to authorization).

Jeff: Support for two parallel information providers (one supporting 1.3 and one 2.0) till the transition completes (avoid breaking support for applications depending on 1.3).

Steven: Laurence to coordinate the roll-out on the technical level.

#8326

Will appear on 2nd year work-plan

#8164

Ongoing.

#7932

Milestone for JRA1

#7106

Closed in notes. To be closed for real!

#6901

Looking for volunteer from LS

#6712, #6711

Will become work items on JRA1 workplan for next year.

#6652, #6649

Also part of the GLUE 2.0 working group.

No other issues

Agenda Items

Item 1: Retiring old middleware versions & SA1 Client Support

Nick circulated the documents in the agenda.

Steven: Any objections to make it our policy?

Document approved. Any objections to the policy for those who still need more time to read it can raise it at the next meeting.

Item 2: Discussion of Changes for Year II of EGEE-III

Steven: Full support from the PMB to carry on with the proposed changes. Related with the project's 3-6 month extension. The transition for Y2 will get more discussion. Planning for year 3 (EC will not provide extra money) EGEE should identify the key technical infrastructure that we should keep running between the end of funding EGEE period and start of EGI. No middleware updates (apart from extremely critical security patches). Plan is to get people from JRA1 & SA3 certifying releases from their product teams (enlarged clusters of competence).

Jeff: Potential hole in continuity of the middleware activity?

Oliver: Developers that we know will be part of the product team. JRA1+SA3 people maybe with additional extra effort from CERN. We currently have NxM certification we should have one certification per node type.

Steven: Check the paper on the Agenda it goes deeper than the blueprint about the Middleware transition.

Q? How, given a certified release, it can be deployed in the infrastructure?

Maite: This is not clear at the moment. We need a document to define the above.

Markus: EGI does validation

Oliver: Managed roll out? Quarantined updates? Should be probably managed by EGI.

ACTION: Discuss in SA1 the document and the glue required for SA1 issues (coordinated roll-out). Define extensions to that document to bridge the activity of middleware certification and release roll-out.

Discussion on the EGI-TMB document regarding grouping of gLite components per team for the 2nd year of the project. Basis for the post EGEE era.

Francesco. Discussion on the mailing list in order to take decisions Objective is to improve the process. Minimise communication between product teams. We are converging in product team (there are still some issues to clarify). One product teams is not responsible for only one product. There must be interchangeability of the people working on a specific piece of software.

Jeff: In favor of splitting the WMS.

Question mark for many of the teams. Need to review and finalize the list. New version of the document to be circulated after internal discussion (which actually to a large part took place during the TMB).

Oliver went through the list of node types produced within the gLite distribution identifying gaps:

MPI "homeless". Nobody interested to take responsibility for MPI integration/documentation. Roberto Barbera's group very interested to handle this.

Jeff: Ask the chairman of the MPI group to give a suggestion

VOBox? Francesco: Add collaboration with NA4 to maintain some of the node types.

Jeff: Users are interested only for making their work done.

Markus: Shall we add it to RESPECT?

Jeff: Should look at the VOBox community.

Oliver: Willingness to help from Alice?

Vangelis: In order to be included in RESPECT it should have end user support, mainenance, documentation and the request should be supported by more than one communities.

ACTION: Steven to Email Patricia. Either provide support and propose it for RESPECT or it will vanish as a product.

Long discussion on the release process... Changes and thoughts for the 2nd year with EGI in the horizon. Oliver highlighted essential documents:

- How to make an internal release: NEW! Covers how a change to a component made by one team that other team needs to build upon is released to these teams.
- How to compose a new product release: NEW! How does the product team assemble the components and release it.
- How to do certification for a product: Review and add to current wiki pages as required.
- How a product team releases a new node type to production. NEW! Develop in collaboration with SA1 – see earlier action – to understand the new process.

Steven circulated and updated product/team list after the meeting.

Item 3: Restricting access to Matlab

Vangelis: MATLAB trials have been running for almost a year now. After a couple of success stories we are preparing to move to production. Regarding licenses, generally a resource provider (grid site) should have a license for the server side (MDCS) and offer access to eligible third parties (either academic or commercial). For the third parties and user with PCT license is in principle able to access the site and run MATLAB jobs. Main issue to be solved is the licensing model. This would require a mechanism to restrict access to the software for specific third parties.

Oliver: Generic attribute in VOMS certificate?

Steven: Should start a round table discussion for this.

*** Meeting ended at 12:40CET.