

TMB 22/04/2009

Attendance: Jeff, Andrei Tsaregorodtsev , Patricia, Massimo, Oliver, Francesco, Maite, Steven (chair)

Action list:

- Documentation from task task #6901: Storage semantics issues for EGEE (beyond HEP): Vangelis is not at the phone

### **General Proxy Store Discussion**

It's been on action list for many months, never discussed (8164)

History (Francesco): task inserted when proxy renewal for cream discussion. The solution implemented was not considered adequate for some sites, including cern, it would be the CE pushing proxy to WN, so WN had process listening in the network and this was considered not acceptable (network configuration, security). Two staged solution: reuse solution from LCG CE (WN fetches proxy from proxy server running on CE node) this is the one in production, reused now for cream CE. Long term solution: several alternatives, most correct is to extend current delegation service to provide pull proxy functionality, call method of delegation service to pull the proxy from there. Not much progress on this because short term solution is not that bad and there are other more urgent things to do, and some people do not consider this as the most correct option.

Extended to be used in other services or only in cream (Oliver)? Use case now is only for cream.

Extend delegation service to make it more general to other services? Then you build something similar to myproxy, why? Delegation service has a value, to use proxies that you have delegated

Proxy renewal bound to VOMS extension, inefficiency, also to be taken into account in this discussion.

Christoph Witzig view on this as EGEE security? Not known

Advice from lcg to not have fixed port opens, that has driven the proxy solution that we have in place at the moments.

Conclusion: Present solution will not change in EGEE III lifetime. The long term solution can be considered for future development. Resolution to close this once we get comments from Cristoph and John, and after knowing who is requesting this.

### **Discussion of Changes for Year II of EGEE-III**

A review of the 'staged-rollout' proposal for UMD that has been developed by SA1 (see paper attached to the agenda)

- Change SLA to SLD
- What level of versioning? Versioning of sw components (RPMs) and sw element (node type)
- Proper versioning requested; clarification of the versioning strategy in response to a bad release

- The provision of pilot and experimental services need to be addressed - probably by the source of the component (experimental from the product team repository & pilot from the EGI beta repository)
- Work out between MU and mw providers how to get RPMs that are always good into the repository (the requirement is to keep the production repository always in a good state)
- The changes in the versioning and in the consistent repository are worth to prototype in the second year of egee III, where more manpower is still available.

### **Work on how to use Savannah to monitor release progress and content (JRA1)**

Jra1 has milestone document with work for next year, and Steven wants to monitor closely the work of the product teams in the next year.

We need a way to describe in savannah the releases the product teams are working on and which components are included in each release.

Conclusion: John will try it out for security, and based on lessons learnt advice will be given to the rest of JRA1 to use it, so we can have a look at this at the SA3-JRA1 face to face meeting, finalize it the week after and include it in the milestone document.

### **UMD Composition (see paper)**

Topic for next days is the scope of UMD meeting, plus the detailed contents of that scope.

Division in site, community and client distributions

Francesco: dangerous to say that site services have priority over community services.

We have to give priorities, especially with a limited funding. More thought needed on this.

Discussion will continue at the next UMD meeting.

### **AOB**

- Decommission of gLite 3.0 components, mail sent from Nick, advising of the removal. Full endorsement.
- Oliver: TMB approves idea to require dev teams to build source rpms? best would be a source rpm that corresponds to a binary release; this is difficult with the present build model; so what we need are source rpms containing the same source than used for the binary. Source rpm should be buildable. Oliver requires that they can always associate a source RPM with a binary. This will not be a reason to delay a release. If it is bad it will be treated like any other bug.