



## Version 1.2

### *Amendments history*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Jeremy Coles</i>	<i>All - full edit -&gt; v1.0</i>	<i>12th March 2007</i>
<i>John Gordon</i>	<i>Minor changes section 1</i>	<i>13th March 2007</i>
<i>Jeremy Coles</i>	<i>Summary and attendees</i>	<i>13th March 2007</i>

## Minutes of the meeting

CERN, 7<sup>th</sup> March 2007

Agenda: <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=8470>

Minutes: Jeremy Coles

Attendees: Please refer to list at the end of the minutes

### Meeting Summary

Prepared by John Gordon

#### ***Introduction (John Gordon)***

Future Meetings: Prague 3-4 April. Tuesday afternoon will showcase the local region. Vancouver 31 August. Transport and agenda will need coordinating with WLCG workshop. Arrive on 30<sup>th</sup> for early start on 31<sup>st</sup>. It wasn't discussed in the meeting but I give notice that I plan to hold the March 2008 GDB away from CERN to avoid the Motor Show. Suggestions welcome for either of the two GDBs to be held outside CERN in 2008.

Consultation. Pre-GDB agendas will remain flexible depending on content which will be defined well in advance. No proposal to move Face to face MB.

Countries with Tier1s should nominate a second (non-voting) representative from their Tier2 community. This is to engage these, sometimes large, sites and get their input, not to improve the information flow out to them. Will progress suggestion to delegate task of further engaging the Tier2s.

Accounting: the reaction to the MB decisions has been disappointing Almost no feedback on how well APEL reports Tier1 use or on success of Storage accounting. JG has started comparing 2006 manual reports with APEL and will circulate a paper.



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



### **SL4 (Markus Schultz)**

Markus reported that there had been some progress since the February GDB. There was now a buildable WN and UI release but it was not yet installable straight from ETICS. With tweaks it had been installed and the WN tested with an SL3 CE which will likely be a common configuration. The SAM tests were successful on 1/3.

The tarball workaround advertised in February had not been installed at many sites. Only 9/210 were advertising SL4.

A solution for WN and UI looks to be in sight but the other nodes will take longer. Data Management is seen as the next priority since new disk servers which run this are also requiring SL4. In general the experiments seemed less agitated than in February. One commented that they were unhappy but realised they could not force sites to use the current solution. Many people were concerned that we could still have components running SL3 when it stops being supported in October, just before LHC data taking starts.

Another major decision will be required if the gLite WMS or CE are not considered acceptable to the experiments. Continuing with LCG versions will require porting to SL4. This is currently not planned and will take considerable effort. The GDB will continue to track but MB is also advised to monitor this situation closely. Ian's proposal on specifying performance criteria gives MB something to monitor progress against.

Markus also described the issues around providing 32bit gLite on 64bit nodes. He suggested 3 options: Provide 32bit versions of the interpreters which means managing external packages; do this only for Python using the Application Area Python version and forget Perl; ask the SL4 team to add the 32bit binaries to the distribution. Markus favoured the third.

### **BDII (Laurence Field)**

Laurence reported on issues with the Information Service which has recently appeared to be a bottleneck and cause of many job and test failures. He highlighted load problems with slapd and timeouts on the top level BDII. He showed correlations of timeouts with numbers of simultaneous queries and data size. Short-term fixes include running the site-level BDII on a standalone machine, running the CE information provider on the site-level BDII and introducing regional top-level BDIIs. This last suggestion has been widely implemented (60 top-level BDIIs) but not all clients point to their regional instance. Also the CERN catchall region is too large. Longer term improvements include more caching in the client and separation of static and volatile information. Long term scalability also needs considering.

### **VOMS**

There were three related talk on deployment of VOMS-aware middleware. In a wider discussion on VOMS it was felt that there were two cases for continued coordination: firstly in user issues like registration and secondly in coordination across



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



implementations (storage, batch, ACLs, generic attributes, etc) so that users don't see differences in behavior between sites. This would also help put an agreed WLCG view including OSG and NGDF to the TCG. I will work with people to prepare a mandate for such a group.

### ***Job Priorities (Jeff Templon)***

Mainly what was reported to MB the previous day so I won't repeat. Got agreement from most T1s to deploy this by the end of March so we should have some progress to report to April meeting.

### ***Access Control for Storage (Maarten Litmaath)***

Maarten had investigated how VOMS roles/groups could be used to control creation of, and access to, files in the various storage systems of interest to WLCG. In summary DPM and StoRM have full support now, dCache has significant support, Castor has minimal support, and BestMan (DRM) has none. We cannot expect grid-wide consistent VOMS-ACL support this year for files or space tokens.

### ***Accounting (Dave Kant)***

Dave reported that accounting by Primary FQAN (the same as used by Job Priorities) has been deployed in APEL but to work correctly requires a patch which is currently in certification. While the UserDN information is encrypted the FQAN is currently not. While it was foreseen that VOs might eventually want to conceal their work patterns by group it was agreed that there was no reason to encrypt it just now as this would delay deployment.

### Detailed minutes

## **1. Introduction (John Gordon)**

John welcomed everyone to his first GDB as chairman. Due to this new role he announced that the new UK representative at the meeting would be Jeremy Coles. He asked to be informed of any other changes in representation.

The meeting moved on to look at future meeting dates. If anyone would like to volunteer to host a GDB John asked them to get in contact with him. For the Prague meeting the pre-GDB will be based on items of interest from the Czech Republic and the neighbouring region and will not be just a technical meeting. The plan is for the GDB to finish at 16:00 on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> April. .

Michel Jouvin asked if there will also be any pre-GDB discussions ahead of the main meeting on the Wednesday itself. John said nothing is planned for this slot at the moment.



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



The Vancouver meeting is scheduled for 31<sup>st</sup> August at Triumf. The WLCG workshop is then 1st-2nd September. There will also be an MB the evening before the GDB – since it is at the Tier-1.

[Action 0603-1: John to check MB time with Les Robertson and agree intention at the MB.](#)

Since the last meeting John has consulted countries/representatives about Tier-2 representation at the GDB. The proposals put forward were:

- 1) Invite all countries with a Tier-1 to nominate a second attendee to attend on behalf of their Tier-2s.
- 2) Progress the suggestion of an individual with the task of consulting and engaging the Tier-2s. (A Tier-2 Tsar)

The consultation will continue. It is likely that different representation models will suit different countries depending on the level of engagement between Tier-1s and Tier-2s and whether a given country has a Tier-1.

There are a number of open GDB actions related to accounting. Issues with normalisation issues etc. are still to be tackled. John will write a paper comparing the manual accounts for 2006 with the APEL data. He will circulate this to T1s. Tier-2 accounting will be looked at from April. Everyone is encouraged to react to the existing actions!

Gilbert noted that some sites are publishing both grid and non-grid work into APEL. It is useful for the experiments to know the grid vs non-grid proportions.

Kors reminded the meeting that there is still a need to follow up on some policy documents in this area. [Action 0703-2 John to follow up on accounting policy documents](#)

## 2. SL4 status and plans (Markus Schulz )

The update given was similar to that presented to the MB yesterday. For one week now successful UI builds have been possible. Still a lot of work required to get a fully working versions of the UI and WN middleware. There is also significant work needed to “clean” the code. Modifications of YAİM (making it more component based) are in progress.

Jeremy asked about the plans in respect of the LCG-RB and gLite WMS. Tony added that support for SL3 ends in October. Markus replied that there were currently no plans to port the LCG-RB and that such porting would slow down the move to software which has a longer term future. In addition the added pressure to make the WMS and gLite CE work may be useful. Ian confirmed that if there was a decision to port the LCG-RB then it is not clear from where the resources/effort would come. The CE is more critical.



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



John: Which do we want to rely on for data taking? Are there any other components in this situation and can we set a deadline for decisions in this area? In data management for example. Markus: Work is competing with requirements for data management. The list of functional improvements currently competes with work on hardening. Jamie: I am nervous with a date in October. It is close to the accelerator start date. Markus: We will not have SRM... and everything on 64-bit in the summer. Jamie: Should we not take the accelerator schedule into account? Markus: The discussion on the CE needs to be started to allow time after any decision is made. Ian: We need to do an assessment in the MB or GDB twice a month. A recent (MB) document mentioned the performance criteria required by the middle of the year and also for the end of the year, and also for the WMS (which was pushed back to INFN) the criteria for burning this into certification. We need to follow up every other week otherwise the developers feel no pressure.

John: One month ago the experiments were unhappy with the timescales. Is this still the case? Matthias: ... what about schedule/milestone dates? Markus: For slide 9, the times are from today. Matthias: The planning all seems effort based and not milestone based. Markus mentioned that the developers are in a close loop and meeting with others (like SA3) twice per week to track progress. Ian: They are not here having to defend themselves. Although Claudio sits in the TCG, the developers are generally shielded. John: Then you have the backing of this meeting to re-iterate the feeling of this meeting to Claudio and the developers. Jeff: I suggest you invite Bob Jones to participate in this discussion!

---

Markus continued with the second part of his presentation on the 64-bit challenge.

John: Who has deployed the interim solution and are the experiments happy or unhappy with it? Markus: About 9 sites are publishing SL4 [a comment was made that not all sites are publishing correctly so there may be 12 sites running on SL4]. Matthias: CMS are a little unhappy but we can not force sites to use this interim solution. Markus: There is an update on the PPS. John: I know from the UK response that sites are not happy with multiple moves to SL4. Ian: The tarball was available for some time. John: But it uses different installation methods to what many sites have now adopted. Michel: We [LAL] are running our configuration for over 1-year now. No problems from the experiment side. Main issues are with the middleware. The main problem with VO software was running on 64-bit machines. We can run the CE with some 32-bit machines. Markus: It is inevitable with users and sites having a mixture with various groups moving forward at different rates. John: The grid should be adaptable. The problems come with the data – being at a site that does/does not upgrade as needed by the users.

Gonzalo: Is this the SL3 middleware on SL4? Markus: Yes, packaged in two ways – in tarballs and rpms. For a while the rpm package had a problem with updates but this is now fixed and the solution is being tested on the PPS. Gonzalo: So if a site goes to this



mixed state does it need to setup special software repositories for the experiments?  
Markus: We need to come up with a correct convention to publish this in the information system. Jeff: What about running with other Linux variants? Markus: Use the libraries widely published by LAL

### 3. BDII – the EGEE Information System (Lawrence Field)

Questions were received at various points during the talk... John: My impression was that most regions in EGEE have a top-level BDII. The question is how to get resources pointing (lcg-utils and RBs etc) at them. Is this for regional coordination? Steve Traylen: We asked the sites to do this recently. User's select their own top-level BDII so they are more difficult to change... ATLAS mentioned that they changed their approach last week – i.e. away from the default configuration on UIs and batch workers. Users can override default settings. One reason users sometimes select alternatives is that some top-level BDIIs contain extra sites.

Kors: ATLAS checks the top-level BDII in region and then goes to the CERN BDII. Users try the default setting first. Fabio: Are all regional top-level BDIIs supposed to refresh from same source? Lawrence: Yes – from the FCR. This is just a web-page so should scale – it only needs to support the number of top-level BDIIs (about 60).

John: Ian put forward a document suggesting 200,000 jobs per day per large experiment by the end of the year. Can it cope? Lawrence: I looked at the accounting yesterday. The problem is the clients all querying the same BDII. With deployment changes we can meet these requirements. Ian: Is there something we can do in the next few months to split the load between the static and dynamic information? Lawrence: It depends on priority and effort but could be done. For queries the work needs to be done on the client side so we need to rethink the site level BDII. John: Change clients to talk to site BDIIs? Query more locally? Ian: Like a squid cache. John: And this helps because in the LHCb example many of the queries are for static information like the port for gridFTP. Lawrence: And the priority of slapd is so low that when the CE gets loaded it [slapd] gets killed. John: Regional BDIIs also get overloaded. Ian: So we should cache information at sites so queries are not going to ....John: So you have a top level and bottom level querying mechanism, will there be a timing issue?

Olivier van der Aa: Is the gLite CE still running the MDS? Lawrence: Yes, we would like to use the BDII. John: What is the action plan? Lawrence: On slide 18 – we have started already on the short term issue. Medium term will start soon. Ian: Some items are done – caching for example... lcg-utils and gfal changes will be done after SRM 2.2 changes. Kors: Is there any region without a top-level BDII? Steve: No. But some countries under CERN, like Canada can have a large number of sites.

LUNCH 12:00



## VOMS

### 4. Job priorities (Jeff Templon)

Jeff gave an update on progress in the job priorities area. He noted that some of the answers to questions about site setups had strange groups showing up in shares which indicate a country priority (e.g. /ATLAS/country). Fabio questioned what the final stage would be for this “temporary solution”. John: This is a short term evaluation of a longer term solution. Jeff: I support what John said. We do not have guarantee this is a final and permanent solution. We are pushing this deployment to avoid mistakes made in the past, which is to design a complete solution before having wider experience. Does it do what is required? ATLAS was clear about the requirements. CMS were similar in their requests. LHCb and ALICE do not care so much (with their generic user ID approach). Frederico: It is not 100% irrelevant for ALICE. A small number of roles are needed but it is not on the critical path. Fabio: Is the CMS information available somewhere? Jamie: It is not known to me (ECM). Fabio: Then we need other roles enabled? Maarten: For the longer term we will probably need something different. There are many worries that this implementation will not scale at all. Do batch systems honour these shares....we needed a workaround for the most urgent issues.... Fabio: I just wanted to make sure this is understood. Jeff: I’m not convinced this will scale – but this is a prototype.

Kors: This came out of the requirements we posed to solve a few problems like how to set user Monte-Carlo with a lower priority than reconstruction. It solves incidents like that where a general user used many hours of the ATLAS T1 share.

Luca: CNAF deployed a few days ago. I spoke to the LSF plug-in developer who confirmed it was working. [Jeff checked but could not see it]. Gonzalo: PIC are deploying the new information provider in the PPS? John: ASGC information system is setup but not publishing correctly. John: RAL has it implemented but not publishing – say 2 weeks. Ulrich: CERN were late in deploying because we were hit by scalability issues. We have shares in production already. We are not yet publishing but can do this quickly after some more checks on things that may not work. Fabio: What is the scale issue? Ulrich: It was with the plugin when there are 15,000-20,000 jobs in the queue. We needed to filter out local jobs. The new plug-in provided by Jeff is 2-3 times faster. Fabio: What is this version and where is it!? Jeff: It is listed as an official patch (g-Lite middleware contributed patch) and is now in certification and testing. There is no functionality difference just the way queries are done.

Jeff: Having just checked, INFN are not publishing but ASGC seem to have fixed some of their problems.

[Action 0703-3: Jeff to send out link to latest patch.](#)



## 5. Access control for storage (Maarten Litmaath)

Maarten's talk contained the background status and some revealing questions. On slide 4 he mentioned that Grid-wide consistent VOMS-ACL support is not [expected] for this year. How much [of the functionality] will be required for next year? Can we survive with what we have?

Maarten: At present, only primary FQANs are looked at. John: Compare this with unix where the file is owned by a unix group attached to your shell. But when reading access is based on any of which you are a member....Maarten: It uses the primary group ID unless the directory has a secondary group ID, in which case that is inherited. The ACL says who is allowed to do it but ... Jean-Philippe: For the permission to create a file the primary group and secondary groups are used. For directories, then it is either yours or the parent. For space tokens or namespace, DPM checks all primary and secondary groups. We do not have space tokens – files are in the space where placed at put time. For reading only permissions in the namespace are checked.

Kors: Is there a hierarchy? Can an admin remove files from say the Higgs group. JP: The permission to remove is from the namespace. So for “Group Higgs” only people in that group can remove the file. Maarten: Is it a problem to have ATLAS admins to be a member of all groups? Kors: So, it is impossible for a general Higgs user to write in the production area? JP: Yes by default

The talk continued onto service priorities – privileged groups/roles for QoS, higher bandwidth – and matters such as quotas not being an SRM feature. Maarten was asked if he could circulate the report mentioned on slide 7, he said that Flavia would be forwarding it to the list.

John: I would like to know the experiment requirements – can you work with what is available now? Maarten: There is a monitoring subgroup looking at what is missing too. They should have some interaction. Jeff: Do we define the semantics of glue such that it publishes information or move to an accounting sensor on the SE? This needs a decision. Maarten: There has been a lot of discussion. We thought we had allowed for these things to be published by the schema. We can do an LCG schema addition but this may create more trouble than it solves and then it is better to have dedicated sensors.

Maria Dimou: A generic attribute was requested to give priority on transfers for VOMS aware services. It is to be used in one case to identify the path to the storage. We have struggled with getting the requirements in this area. The implementation is promised for March. Maarten: We may use generic attributes to implement some of the things discussed. John: We will have a discussion after the third talk.

Kors: Slides 2 and 3 show things we can use. No timescale is given for the others. Maarten: This year we can forget about consistent ACL VOMS management. It is not





unthinkable that it could even take another year. To get an impression, how nasty would it be if had to wait for availability everywhere? DPM is fine, but the T1s will not have certain features for a while. JP: Different SEs will not support ACLs for example. For this year we provide a service to replicate ACLs from one SE to another.

## 6. Accounting Using VOMS roles and groups (Dave Kant)

Encrypted data is now implemented at FZK and RAL

John: In Maarten's talk, there were things in the glue-schema about who was allowed access to storage space. Can that be used? Dave: Yes we would extract it. John: Into something like a Tier-2 tree view? Dave: I need to look into it.

Ian: This issue of encrypting the FQAN. Has anyone posited this as a problem that needs to be solved? Is there a requirement for doing this? John: It is up to the experiments. The information can be used to identify individuals. Also this would show how much CPU individual physics groups are doing. When will you [the experiments] be worried? Is it a requirement at all? Luca: It could be an FQAN for only one user! Maria: Everyone understands, it was never said the user DN itself should not be public. Ian: The role group part. Maria: In VOMS today the information is viewable! Ian: From the FQAN can you determine the user? Is it a real risk? Do we want to get stuck on this? If worried then we will need to encrypt. John: nobody wants it short-term. Maarten: Probably in the longer term we will want to encrypt.

Jeff: If it is implemented it is important to have the full chain whether encrypted or not. There is proliferation of groups and it will be unpredictable what a first FQAN will be. The APEL system, LCMAPs, gPlazma and DPM will all interpret the outcome slightly differently. LCMAPS uses the first group but wild carding is also possible. DPM starts with the primary and steps through the FQANs until it matches. There are different frameworks for matching so the outcome is arbitrary. Maarten: How can APEL then tell anything at all? It has to be the primary! Jeff: It is obvious to me need to use the same mapping route. John: We need VOMS use-cases that have to specify the role they want to take. I want to run this job in role of production manager. It is what the user specifies. The middleware should not be taking account of all possibilities

Jeff: If you provide a list of different FQANs the request may come into a site where there is an exact match on the primary one. At a second site there is not an exact match. Some things have wild cards that will match /ATLAS/\*. Storage may look at the second or third FQANs and come up with different results.

Discussion:



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Maarten: It is important sites do this mapping. Users should not be able to shop around if there is not an exact match. In LCMAPS, if it can not be mapped then a fatal error results. We should require other such matching mechanisms to have the same result. JP: For permissions to have correct ownership it must consider all primary and secondary FQANs. Accounting must only be done on the primary group. Permissions must be done using all FQANs.

John: How is the situation viewed by the experiments? Lat: We have a problem with proxy renewal but this is not really VOMS. Maarten: It is a bug being fixed. Stephen (ATLAS): We have a secondary groups issue much of the time. John: Secondary groups here means those you are a member of but not using. Ian: You are perhaps referring to DPM which supports VOMs but not secondary groups which is in a new version. John: This is implementing ACLs across the site. Jeff: It is also a user education issue. Writing alone is not enough, the user also needs to turn it on when using a proxy. JP: Secondary groups are all FQANs except the first. Nick (LHCb): We want glxexec so we can select priorities.

John: Back to the ATLAS issue. There is no public explanation for a third dimension/view covering the funding agency. What is the use case? Stephen: I think this came up in conversation with French members where they request resources to be set aside. Site resources are not all pledged in MoU and they want to set some aside for specific users. Maria: Attributes were introduced to represent this dimension. It was a surprise but implemented. The problem is how it will work given such a vague requirement. John: The attribute is a random string that can be attached to an individual and this is persistent when a VOMS proxy is obtained. Gilbert: This dimension may also be a physics group – for example for a physics conference. John: We can not do “French and Higgs Group” scheduling but can deal with “French Higgs group”. Maria: LHCb wanted it [general VOMS attribute] to associate the user DN with their AFS login ID ... after this other VOs were asked if they would use it. Then came nine months of silence. Now everybody wants it but for different reasons. CMS want to use it to give access to specific web-pages, perhaps ALICE do not want anything. John: How do you use VOMS proxy on the web? Maria: ... Stephen: A Tier-2 site also asked for priority for their users. John: Are multiple attributes allowed? Maria: Just one – that can have different parameters for each VO. Jeff: This underlies the importance of what I was saying. We need one implementation. Tacking on attributes may not be implemented outside a given region.... Kors: It is important to get something out with basic functionality to test – that is prototype early. Maarten: Most users will use one VOMS proxy, it is a sparse matrix. Most users do not have Admin needs. There may be 20 groups but any individual may be in 2 perhaps.

John: Is there still space for a coordination group. There was an action for a group to come up with a new mandate.

[Action 0703-4 John Gordon to follow up on a VOMS coordination group mandate.](#)



John: Are we happy? The TCG is well defined but missing Nordugrid and OSG etc. Are the experiments happy that all things are being fed through? The TCG is more about setting priorities but does not commission work too.... Ian: It does!

Nick: The requirements from the GDB could be useful expressed directly to the TCG. John: How do we take this forward. Set up a sub-group? Ian: The issue here is that there are different people in the TCG and GDB representing the same group, so the two see different priorities based on the personal input. It is good to see the GDB requirements but then we need to avoid the TCG experiment representatives coming up with different priorities. John: How do we formally take this forward? There are no volunteers to setup sub-group. Maria: At a workshop last week the smaller VOs did not know about the TCG as being the place to submit requirements. John: The meeting here is essentially for WLCG stakeholders, it is not a GDB for everyone. Ian: NA4 is setup for smaller VOs – Cal is vocal in the TCG about opinions expressed to him. John: Maria, perhaps this is feedback for Cal.

[Action 0703-5: John to refer Cal to Maria concerning the representation of some smaller VOs.](#)

## **7. GDB March 07 News of reporting and resource tables (Harry Renshall)**

There was a brief discussion about using the Tape1Disk0 terminology in respect of ALICE. Harry agreed to change slide 3 wording. [His point was that ALICE manage tape space and that impacts disk but they do not manage the disk – point 3].

For the ATLAS tests: RAL – has not said when it will be ready. It is currently testing CASTOR with ATLAS. ASGC will be in but taken out for a power upgrade.

Gonzalo: PIC disk put in place gets filled quickly. It is now at 99% used.

On the CMS part:

Fabio: Is it the responsibilities of sites to clean tapes?

Harry: The experiments will not recycle tapes so this is up to the sites. They will clean the catalogues but I am not sure about disk.

Gilbert: Not all T2s have signed the MoU. Can we get a clear view on those that have yet to sign?

## **8. Grid Storage System Deployment (GSSD) (Maarten)**



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



There will be a continuation of the storage classes working group with an enlarged scope.

### John's postscript on topics for future meetings:

- We hope SL4 is not an issue next time but would like to hear that – status report.
- Taken an action to review working groups. An update on the status of the Quattor working group is overdue.
- Progress towards SRM 2.2
- Progress on job priorities
- Mechanism for GDB input to reach the TCG/developers

## 9. AOB

There was no other business.

MEETING CLOSED AT 16:50

### Actions:

Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
0602-4	Phrase the requirement on how to use policies in the WLMS	Cal Loomis	Open
0603-3	Follow up to ensure all sites in country are publishing accounting data or contact John Gordon with issues preventing this happening	Country representatives	Open
0604-6	Drive forward discussions on the VOMS and protocol issues	Ian Bird	Open
0605-3	Provide feedback (with reasons) to Dave Kelsey or Kors Bos on whether the security policy presented by Dave is acceptable.	All	Open
0605-4	Tier-1s to report back to GDB on what proportion of their current WLCG work is not reported/accounted within WLCG	Tier-1 managers	Open
0606-7	Take up and discuss technical solutions for removing shared credentials from the VO boxes	Markus Schulz	Open
0607-9	Ensure the default YAIM is properly configuring lcas lmaps for the sgm accounts (and that it works!)	Jeff Templon	Open
0609-1	Follow up on NDGF security policy position	Les Robertson	Open
0609-2	Look up statistics for automated on-call system and send information to GDB	Bruce Gibbard	Open
0609-6	Send storage type sampling script to John Gordon.	Jeff Templon	Open
0609-7	Move accounting to work in decimal units	Tier-1s/sites	Open
0610-5	Provide more detail on who is supposed to sign the site policy for each "organisation" mentioned in the security policy document	Dave Kelsey	Open
0610-6	Send the site operational procedures policy to the list again for comment ahead of approval and ensure lawyers at sites have a chance to review the document	Dave Kelsey	Open
0701-3	Check the CPU and storage accounting figures being published for the site	Sites	Open



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
0702-3	Discuss the future of a VOMRS-VOMS task force and consider possible mandates for the group	Dave Kelsey, Maria Dimou et. al.	Open
0702-4	Check Harry' resource tables and understand what they mean	Tier-1 sites	Open
0703-1	Check the Victoria MB time with Les Robertson and agree intention at the MB	John Gordon	Open
0703-2	Follow up on accounting policy documents	John Gordon	Open
0703-3	Send out a link to the latest patch	Jeff Templon	Open
0703-4	Follow up on the VOMS coordination group mandate	John Gordon	Open
0703-5	Refer Cal Loomis to Marian Dimou concerning the representation of smaller VO requirements in TCG discussions	John Gordon	Open

### List of Attendees

X means attended

V means attended via VRVS

Country	Member		Deputy	
Austria	Dietmar Kuhn	X		
Canada	M Vetterli		R Tafirout	X
Czech Republic	Milos Lokajicek		Jiri Kosina	
Denmark	John Renner Hansen		Anders Waananen	
Finland	Klaus Lindberg		Jukka Klem	X
France	Fabio Hernandez		Dominique Boutigny	
Germany	Klaus-Peter Mickel		Holger Marten	
			Jos van Wezel	
Hungary	Gyorgy Vesztergombi	X	Dezso Horvath	
India	P.S Dhekne		B. Vinod Kumar	
Israel	Lorne Levinson	V		
Italy	Mirco Mazzucato		Luciano Gaido	
Japan	Hiroshi Sakamoto		Tatsuo Kawamoto	
Netherlands	Jeff Templon	X	Ron Trompert	
Norway	Jacko Koster		Farid Ould-Saada	
Pakistan	Hafeez Hoorani			
Poland	Ryszard Gokieli	V	Jan Krolkowski	
Portugal	Gaspar Barreira		Jorge Gomes	
Russia	Alexander Kryukov		Vladimir Korenkov	
Spain	Manuel Delfino		Xavier Espinal	
Sweden	Niclas Andersson		Tord Ekelof	
Switzerland	Christoph Grab	X	Marie-Christine Sawley	
Taiwan	Simon Lin		Di Qing	X



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Country	Member		Deputy	
United Kingdom	John Gordon	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jeremy Coles	<input type="checkbox"/>
United States	Ruth Pordes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bruce Gibbard	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERN	Tony Cass	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
ALICE	Alberto Masoni	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yves Schutz	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Federico Carminati	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
ATLAS	Gilbert Poulard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Laura Perini	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Dario Barberis	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
CMS	Lothar Bauerdick	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tony Wildish	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Stefano Belforte	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
LHCb	Ricardo Graciani	<input type="checkbox"/>	Andrei Tsaregorodstev	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nick Brook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Leader	Les Robertson	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
GDB Chair	Kors Bos	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
GDB Secretary	Jeremy Coles	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Grid Deployment Mgr	Ian Bird	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Markus Schulz	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fabric Manager	Bernd Panzer	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Manager	Pete Mato Vila	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Security WG	David Kelsey	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Quattor WG	Charles Loomis	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Networking WG	David Foster	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Officer	Alberto Aimar	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

### Also present in the meeting room:

Steve Traylen (CERN)  
 Matthias Kasemann (CMS/CERN)  
 Michel Jouvin (France)  
 Oliver Keeble (CERN)  
 Jamie Shiers (CERN)  
 Stephen Gowdy (ATLAS/SLAC)  
 J Knobloch (CERN)  
 Luca del'Agello (INFN-CNAF)  
 Gonzalo Merino (PIC)  
 Harry Renshall (CERN)  
 Ulrich Schwickerath (CERN)  
 T Kleinwort (CERN)  
 Fabio Hernandez (CC-IN2P3)

### VRVS

Jose Hernandez - Madrid



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Frederique Chollet - Annecy  
Marek Domaracky - Bern  
Olivier van der Aa - London  
David Colling – London  
Dave Kant – RAL  
Pete Gronbech - Oxford  
Gabriel Stocica  
Lief Nixon – Linkoping

### **Additionally on VRVS PM:**

Pierre Girard – Lyon  
Paul Gelissen – Bern  
Jos Van Wezel – Karlsruhe  
Les Robertson – CERN  
Elizabeth Sexton Kennedy – Switzerland  
Helene Cordier (Lyon)  
Owen Synge (DESY)