



Version 1.1

Amendments history:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Date</i>
<i>Jeremy Coles</i>	<i>All – draft notes</i>	<i>16/11/2007</i>
<i>“</i>	<i>Further revisiosn with summary</i>	<i>28/11/2007</i>

Minutes of the meeting

CERN, 7th November 2007

Agenda:

GDB twiki: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/GridDeploymentBoard>

Minutes: Jeremy Coles

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

Meeting Summary

(John Gordon)

The main issue at the November GDB was the strategy for multi-user pilot jobs. A separate paper on this will be discussed at the MB.

Other issues presented were:-

SL4 Oliver Keble reported on the status of the SL4 and 64-bit releases of the various middleware services. Components are split roughly equally between released; PPS; Certification; Configuration; and Integration. Only CREAM is still at the build stage. Nothing seems critical to make it into productions for the CCRC in February

The strategy for **64 bit** (x86_64) is prioritised in order : WN; Torque_client (distributed with middleware); DPM_disk; UI. Other services depending on the advantage to be gained by 64 bit. The 64 bit WN is undergoing runtime testing.

VOM(R)S Maria Dimou reported from the recent workshop at CERN. A new minor release of VMORS and a major release of VOMS will both go into production in November. Apart from problems with hardware upgrades at CERN her main concern was the loss of key staff in the next few months and how testing and support would suffer.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Accounting Dave Kant reported on recent progress. UserDN accounting has been in place for some time but by default the data does not leave the site. Sites can change this manually but the default will be restored the next time YAIM is run. Changes are required to YAIM to change this. 33 sites are currently publishing and the portal has a user view but we are still waiting for the policy to be agreed before VO Resource managers can be allowed to see their VO's UserDN data.

The VOMS FQAN accounting (Roles and Groups) is included in gLite 3.0.35. This release also contains a checksum of published records both centrally and at the site so a SAM test can highlight discrepancies. http://goc02.grid-support.ac.uk/rss/GRIF_Sync.html

The APEL Portal now publishes a report that mirrors Sue Foffano's Tier2 report. There are still some residual difficulties with sites that belong to one T2 for one VO and a different T2 for another VO. We can't just report pledged VOs for each T2 as most T2s accept all LHC VOs.

Job Priorities Simone Campana reported on progress. The 'short-term solution' is being tested on the PPS. The longer term solution will wait for the report by Christophe Witzig on VOMS Authorisation, due early next year.

CCRC & GSSD both reported on their meetings at the pre-GDB day but since they also report direct to MB I won't repeat.

The December pre-GDB will be a whole day devoted to CCRC. The GDB will have a Monitoring session and a report on this week's Service and Reliability Workshop.

The MB Policy on pilot jobs and its pre-requisites were discussed in detail

One error was spotted in the item on review of the experiment frameworks. Reviewers should consider **all** the framework, not just the distributed parts.

There was a lot of discussion but mainly for clarification. I stressed to the national representatives that they were representing all sites in their countries, not just their own. If there is great resistance to running glexec in setuid mode from the majority of sites then we should know sooner rather than later. It was stressed yet again that pilot jobs which only run under the identity of one user, the owner of the payload, are not an issue. They do not change identity. It was revealed that even single user pilot frameworks transfer and store proxies themselves so perhaps they should also be subject to a security review. This will be reported to the MWSG but ignored here for the purposes on this report.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Security Concerns Romain Wartel and Dave Kelsey reported from recent security meetings. The JSPG had discussed Multi-User Pilot Jobs. The view of the participants in the meeting room at CERN was that there are significant security risks in not switching identity. The users' workload running under the same identity as the pilot job framework would result in the ability of users to take control of the framework and to interfere with the audit logs. We should therefore require identity switching. OSG representatives felt that they needed to consult more widely. The logging-only mode of glxexec is now considered to be unsafe for the reasons above and is not proven to be auditable especially when multiple payloads from different users run on a multi-core, multi-cpu node.

JSPG decided they should concentrate on the requirements for traceability and logging. These are general requirements which apply not only to multi-user pilot jobs, but also to all other forms of job submission including, for example, Grid portals. They hope to get agreement on these general principles which can then be applied to the consideration of any particular service, such as pilot jobs..

Draft words in new "Policy on Traceability and Logging" This will replace the old policy on "Audit Requirements" The words are not yet final and still need more work. The main issue is that risk management is crucial for Grid operations. When security incidents happen it must be possible to identify the cause so that it can be contained while keeping services operational. It must also be possible to take action to prevent the incident happening again.

I agree with this last point but I worry about the tactics of formulating a general policy which will then cover pilot jobs. I think this will take too long and I'd rather that pilot jobs are used as a use case to formulate a special instance of this general policy.

Review of gLExec. John White of EGEE reported that two security experts (Andrei Kruger and Alexander Yu) had reviewed gLEexec. They were JRA1 security developers in EGEE. They raised a number of issues which have been passed to the developer, SCG, and GSVG but found no showstoppers. In their opinion it is ready to start being tested by some tame sysadmins and then proceed to certification

gLExec Certification

There is some work still required on glxexec before certification.

- It needs to use syslog. This work is underway.
- YAIM needs to configure gLExec and LCAS/LCMAPS to understand and authorise gLExec, and the whitelist of accounts(s) authorized in glxexec.conf

Testing is required with all batch systems. Volunteers were sought to test glxexec with different batch systems and the following identified. CC-IN2P3(BQS), CERN(LSF), PBS(NIKHEF, CERN), SGE(CESGA), PBSpro(?), Condor(?)

LCAS/LCMAPS Service Version



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



The service version of LCAS/LCMAPS will be required for scalability before general deployment but this should not hold up testing with the shared filesystem version. JRA1 have a prototype based on alpha version of libs. Better libs by December. Shortly after this a version of the service and then one week later the client – ready for testing at that point. By end December there should be something ready for certification.

SA3 then need to figure out a deployment route. Should it run on the CE or be a new node type. Clarify with SA1. This will determine work for packaging. Testing less than 1-2 weeks. , deployment perhaps 6 weeks. This takes us to the end of February.

Review of Frameworks

The security concerns are not concerned just with glxec but with the whole framework running pilot jobs. The frameworks of the 4 LHC experiments need to be reviewed by a small panel. Points at issue include:-

- How proxies are handled and stored;
- How new jobs are launched from within the pilot job. Does this break any batch systems.
- Does the worker job tidy up after itself?

A small group of Ian Bird, Don Petravac, Dave Kelsey and John Gordon were actioned to choose a panel to review the frameworks. The first step should be for the experiments to present documentation of their architectures. The panel will then review this and then interview the relevant experts, perhaps with a questionnaire first. Having all 4 experiments on the panel might make it large but would share experiences.

Summary

Current status of the of the pre-requisites from the WLCG policy

- a) glxec must be reviewed by a recognized group of security experts. **Status Done**
- b) Document pilot job frameworks. **Status Not All Done**
- c) Frameworks to be reviewed **STATUS Team still to be formed**
- d) The frameworks should be compatible with the draft JSPG *Grid Multi-User Pilot Jobs Policy* document. **STATUS not tested**
- e) *glxec* tested with the commonly used batch systems (BQS, PBS, PBS pro, Condor, LSF, SGE). **STATUS not tested**
- f) *LCAS/LCMAPS*: the server version of LCAS/LCMAPS must be completed, certified and deployed. **STATUS Planned**

Progress will be reviewed at the December GDB.



Detailed minutes

1. Introduction (John Gordon)

John began the meeting with a quick review of the actions from the last meeting. He noted that Dave Kelsey was not present to comment on the VO Operations Policy actions. 0710-4 is done and 0710-5 will be covered in the afternoon.

No changes of membership have been announced. John reminded the national representatives that (even if they themselves are from a Tier-1) they are also representing Tier-2s. If the country being represented also wants to get a Tier-2 dedicated representative involved then this is encouraged.

Sue Foffano has had no further responses to questions on composition (Finland, Norway, Sweden, Ukraine).

Oxana Smirnova: Is that about accounting?

John: It is about knowing which sites make up the Tier-2 federations. The Nordugrid Tier-1 is publishing.

OS: The Tier-2s have yet to sign and do not exist. Denmark has signed.

Les Robertson: Overall NDGF has not yet signed and this is becoming a problem.

There are some GDB meeting date changes in 2008. The February meeting moves to the 6th. The April meeting from the 9th to the 2nd to avoid the grid computing symposium

Simon: We could run the GDB in Taiwan too.

John asked for a show of hands indicating who would be happy with the GDB in Taiwan in April. The show of hands was not conclusive therefore:

[Action 0711-1: John to query the GDB list about people's feeling on holding the April GDB in Taipei.](#)

Since the previous GDB a regular Common Computing Readiness Challenge (CCRC) meeting has been established and now takes place on Monday's at 16:00 CET.

There was recently a workshop in Asia. Simon gave a short statement on this event:

SL: It was a good chance to greet a few colleagues. The whole thing was one week. The first few days consisted of tutorials - foundation stuff on gLite and applications. This was



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



followed by a Tier-2 workshop – this is the second (the first was in India) such event. The final day was an EUIndia workshop day. There was a CMS site visit in Taipei. Slightly less than one hundred people attended for all three events. The coverage is vast as there is a need to promote other eScience application areas in Asia. Countries covered included Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia. There are still issues for some of these countries that are solved elsewhere. We are making progress to certify sites, they need more updating, also communications need to be developed. One important step has been the setting up of an Asia Pacific coordination committee. Glenn Moloney (Melbourne) will run this body and he will present an update to the LHCC Comprehensive Review. He will also organise various events to speed up adoption of and promote EGEE/WLCG technologies in Asia.

John mentioned that an OPN workshop was happening at about this time and the GDB may hear back on this workshop next time. There are other workshops such as the one at HEPiX of which people should be aware.

Topics for December meeting are likely to include user support; monitoring and an update from the resource scrutiny group.

2. VOM(R)S Workshop (Maria Dimou)

The workshop was on the 22nd October. An event like this happens twice a year. (<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/VomsWG>). It was a difficult workshop as there are many changes to install and get to production. The certifier was present and worked to get things through during the workshop.

Two machines are currently used at CERN:

lcg-voms.cern.ch – used for user registration & vomw-proxy attribution

voms.cern.ch – deals with gridmap file preparation; voms-proxy attribution.

Linux High Availability on SLC4 has not been used so far. This function split has been in use since December 18th 2006.

JG: What is the effect of this? Can VOs do anything?

MD: They can configure it ... also if they want to view membership with the VO admin tool they can not do it on lcg-voms.

JG: So there is nothing destructive?

MD: No, but it is annoying to contact lcg-voms and have no reply. The gridmap file represents the present content of the VO.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



DD: At the workshop the VOMS team agreed to do a test at CNAF. Why has it not happened?

MD: I told them and they said yes they would do it.

?: Andrea Chao....

MD: But he is not the admin

?: I will follow up

DD: Did you discuss their procedure – using streams or not?

Registering services in VOMS

MD: The idea is to be able to trace back to the DN of the person who put the service into VOMS. The VO admin doing all approvals does not scale. Also how they know the service from a given site is valid for the VO?

?: My CA supports robot certificates

MD: This was not about robots certificates

Dario B: Perhaps I have not understood, but what are the hundreds of services you mention?

Romain Wartel: Authenticate services against each other – example the WMS renews proxies on behalf of VO.

MD: This request started with a ticket.

DB: I'm thinking about data management where the service is one per VO

MD: This is not what came out of the requirement discussion. There is scaled with site number.

DB: Then it does not belong to the VO

RW: It is for the site to tell the VO that there are some things it needs to trust in order to run a service for a VO. If I provide ATLAS services – why will you trust me?

DB: Because we trust the grid sites by definition.

MD: We should not be with this as we were with generic attributes. There we did not know who wants what and why.

MK: Who is requesting it?

JG: The workshop seems too infrequent at two a year. Perhaps the JSPG is a better forum. Now you highlight it **I propose we broadcast a message saying this is not required and that we need use cases to continue.**

RW: Host certificates are registered on VOMS services. Host certificates are approved by sites not VOs, so that is an issue.

Action 0711-2: JG to take advice on who to ask (JSPG) about VOMS requirements

IB: Before effort is invested we need to have clear use cases for what is missing.

MD: All members of JSPG were involved and the outcome was announced.

IN: Some confusion may leak from the biomed requirements – an example is the proxy renewal on the RB to redecorate VOMS proxies at the VOMS service.

Claudio Grandi: Understood, there is no need to have data on the site



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



MD: The issue is for the sites that have not upgraded – LFC, VOM(R)S and VOMS admin – for now the latter (VOMS admin) will tolerate email addresses.

IB: There is a bigger issue, the VOMS admin like other grid middleware is making changes which are not backward compatible.

CG: This is not the case

IB: Then last the two bullets (Others -> the sites) are not quite right.

MD: The VOMS host certificates changed last November and are still not at all sites.

JG: Then broadcast the changes

MD: Yes we do.

IB: Is VOMS admin2 in production?

MD: It will be by the end of November

CG: I don't understand the 3rd bullet that JRA1 has not yet decided whether voms-admin-2 and 2.5 will be both supported

CG: The point is that anything where new functionality is introduced there will be several close releases. There are other changes that need to be released. We release something now – this is the same for every component and is needed to be backward compatible

RW: Many people can not upgrade as soon as possible this component. In particular a security hole would be nice to patch quickly – this needs to be taken into account if you have two versions supported.

CG: We will support all the versions installed - make security patches for 1.2 even if solved in v2 where v2 not yet certified.

3. Job Priorities (Simona Campana)

JG: What do you mean “priorities at the batch system level?”

SC: ATLAS production 80%: users 20%. With continuous job submission with both roles it takes time to stabilise. We tested only for one day which is not long enough.

JG: Can you see ways to subvert it?

DC: That is the next test.

On the subject of volunteering for testing....

IB: This needs a torque site and a something else site

SC: CERN can do PBS (as they deliver today). They'll also do LSF. The point is to get less familiar sites involved.

JG: Any volunteers?

No response.

Oliver Keeble: This is not in the standard release process – waiting for PPS feedback.



4. gLite 3.1 / SL4 Status (Oliver Keeble)

gLite 3.1 status page: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/Glite31NodeTracker>

Definitions of the states:

Integration – do we have all the rpms we need?

Configuration – installs fine. Can it be configured correctly?

Certification – Collected as set of rpms. Patch submitted and in standard release process

LCG-CE will be released to production next week.

CREAM-CE – SL4 version targeted date for start of certification is January. [there are outstanding batch system questions]

CG: On SL4 this passed the acceptance tests. Now we are going through the check list – YAIM configuration etc. ready for certification.

CG: For the CREAM-CE, some problems with APEL on LSF. Something manual is required on PBS.... So there are configuration issues to be resolved.

JG: APEL needs YAIM4 otherwise things you do get undone.

OK: Are you saying that batch system support from LCG_CE transfers?

CG: Some things to be done in this area

WMS/LB on SL3: production release as part gLitr3.0. Set of updates soon.

WMS/LB gLite 3.1/SL4: rpm list from ETICS.

JG: Any time estimate?

OK: First installation about now. For the configuration, YAIM developers have not yet had access.

JG: Any stress testing by VOs?

IB: That's where we did the testing

MS: We can have someone in SA3 running tests but cannot get resources.

JG: So this failed to get on the PPS?

IB: You can install it as a service but tests for scale happen in production. 15,000 jobs for 4 days for example only happens in production.

SL: What are issues around the checkpoint?

OK: It is not whether the WLM dies after 5 days. "checkpoint" is here just referring to the type of release.

BDII: will go to production next week (no GRIS)

DPM & LFC: waiting for YAIM component to complete certification

gLite-SE_dCache – ready for certification



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



gLite-SE-Classic – finalising configuration. A fix is needed for the information providers.

gLite-MON – finalising configuration

gLite-PX – in certification (patch being certified by partners)

gLite-VOMS – in certification

gLite-AMGA_postgres – in certification.

?: What database is behind this?

OK: Postgres and MySQL are both in SL4. Berger said either ok.

JG: How many AMGA servers?

OK: Perhaps one

Glite-ftm – released

FTS-2 – released. Deployment at T1s in January

gLite-VOBOX – in certification

Comment on supporting 64-bit. For WN want 32-bit libraries alongside 64-bit. This constrains the rpm versions... the dual architecture using meta-rpms is proving problematic. An approach using groups is being looked at. A group here is something defined in the repository itself (not something obvious – you will not see glite-WN in the rpm list).

JG: In the past we have seen some things in certification for a long time. Can we expect all things in production?

OK: Things in PPS now – yes. AMGA no outstanding issues. PX none. VO box has a few issues. VOMS is near. DPM & LFC, I would be surprised if they do not get through. FTS I'm not sure. WMS – I would hope but there is no guarantee.

JG: With CCRC in February, things not in by the end of the year won't make it. Is this a problem for anything? Some are (basically) SL3 (builds) with no new functionality on SL4.

MS: The WMS version is that with all improvements and fixes.

OK: The overhead of maintaining 3.0 and 3.1 is an issue for all components

CG: There are critical fixes in the SL4 versions.

JG: So there is nothing to stop the CCRC? Are the experiments happy?

CG: The critical thing may be CREAM. We know that could improve dramatically the number of jobs handled. It might be worth sites trying to use it but that is a choice of each site.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



IB: Let's not pretend this will be in place for CCRC!

PC: The SL4 version is that with bug fixes. If it is not in production then there is no point just putting fixes in there.

OK: Agreed – the SL3 version has to remain supported until the SL4 version is available.

JG: Which means critical bug fixes

OK: In some cases the code base is identical. If there is a code branch then both are to be supported.

MS: It is not just SL3/SL4 – the versions are based on different VDT version. You have to make sure to harmonise with both versions and that is the real challenge.

CG: This also means you certify twice.

PV: There will always be these cases – single platform and compiler

OK: Debian is next on the list. Nobody would argue against multi-platform support

Question on 64-bit....

DB: ATLAS will come along with 32-bit applications. Are we assured there will be no mix up?

OK: YAIM can identify the sub-system architecture. Anyway, 32-bit libraries are installed in parallel

JG: The move from SL3 to SL4 removed many things. Is it only the compatibility libraries going back?

OK: The OS libraries will come automatically. We will add 32-bit libraries for linking – that is have parallel architecture installs.

5. WLCG Planning (Harry Renshall)

Tier-1 capacity planning replies are needed for 2008. Assumptions are being made for CCRC planning.

The integral is not too far off generally, but ALICE has a poor match. CMS is 30% down on its tape requirements at T1s.

For May 08: CPU should be there. The blip is 10-20% on tape – resources should be empty by 1st May. ALICE will want to keep 30% raw data. ATLAS will clear it all. CMS is currently unsure.

----- **Lunch 12:20** -----



6. Accounting (Dave Kant)

JG: NIKHEF – are they deliberately encrypting?

DK: Yes

JG: So they encrypt so they can decrypt locally and not just publish?

DK: They could encrypt using the APEL mechanism

DB: I thought VO manager's had a right to access information. If a job runs at NIKHEF this means I can not see who ran it

DK: Correct – at the portal level. We are talking about data being published. Because we can not decrypt it, we are not able to published it in the portal at the user level.

JG: The high-level checks. Does this mean the SAM test?

DK: You do not always know if a site has published all records. You look at the job records published and compare these with a check on the site accounting database information.

JG: For the mapping of local user group to VO, we could have a mapping table at the site as part of the configuration?

DK: Yes, that is a good idea. Then the same unix group ID is mapped to VOs.

JG: How does the CE map onto the specInt if the machines?

DK: Cluster mapping....

JG: There is a group looking at WN configuration and glue sub-clusters. You may have same problem going from the ID to which glue sub cluster it was in.

PC: This mapping to SI2k assumes clusters behind the CE are homogeneous?

JG: At the moment – glue makes that assumption – average for the cluster

DK: One way to address this is if we put some bit of m/w on the WN so that when it is upgraded/rebooted it reports WN ID host name with benchmark test and APEL can read it and match it.

JG: Other groups are looking at adhoc benchmarking.

APEL future work:

DK: The MoU has bits in it showing what sites signed up to and this could be included.

LR: You were referring to the fact that some sites mention just the experiment name. Just identify the sites and apply a special rule for them

DK: Yes – it is in the issues later

DK: Can you use an expired certificate to encrypt data? I wanted to avoid this problem so used keys.

?: There are MoU pledges for storage

DK: Great, if so then we can put them on the accounting display. Can we have them in the same spreadsheet?



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Sue/LR/JG: Yes

LR: There is no reason why VO resource managers could not maintain a spreadsheet.

DK announced that he would soon be leaving the project and wished everyone well.

DB: Who is following on in the project and what about the question of R-GMA?

JG: RGMA is not persistent. Dave's database does not depend on it. We've been handing over (two people at RAL) for the last month. There will be a short period where some of the new developments will not move forward, but should continue

7. Operational Security Update (Romain Wartel)

Incident issues covered:

- worried about use of KCA robots
- no CRL for KCAs available to the sites
- Not possible to easily block valid proxy certificates at the autorisation level
- Incident reporting and follow-up

There is an OSCT-DC (duty contact) but clarification of their role is required

- Security issues have been identified in the CDF framework
- VO frameworks impact the security of the infrastructure – there must be an audit

DB: What is there to take home – you do not tell us what to do next I don't know about the incident you mentioned.

RW: The headnode at a site was compromised and proxies on that node were exposed.

JG: One thing to look at is how experiments use/store proxy certs.

MS: Block user NDs

RW: Use could be prevented via authentication level CRL, but we do not use them and it involves a lengthy process.

JG: I am concerned that LCAS/LCMAPS or the GUMS equivalent is not used by some services, for example on the storage elements

MS: Would help but still need central place to publish. LCAS is not used everywhere because of difficulties until GT4 widely used. It is not compatible with earlier VDT versions with call out.

JG: So new versions are coming

CG: Yes in 3.1. New services will use it (WMS etc.) and DPM has its own way based on IDs



RW: It would be nice to have a central way to deal with such problems. Blocking 1 or 2 users maybe but not 1000s at the same time.

8. Pilot jobs (John Gordon)

KB: For production are all 4 expts going to use pilot jobs?

JG: LHCb, ATLAS and ALICE have a requirement for pilot jobs but not sure about CMS

PC: For us it is interesting for analysis jobs.

KB: So the scope is quite large?

JG: It depends on the fraction of usage – production still dominates.

SC: Should not also the VO participate in this review activity? The person submitting wants to check the mechanism is a reliable switch otherwise it counts against that person!

RW: They are very welcome to help check – and not just this component.

JG: You want to be involved in the framework review and glxec will likely be a core part of that.

Gluxe-on-WNc review (John White)

Two JRA1 developers reviewed the glxec code. The method and feedback are in the presentation.

[Action 0711-3: glxec-on-WNc to be field tested by some sysadmins. \(John White will meet with Ulrich? to take this forward\)](#)

JG: In the spirit of the MB approach, I don't see a requirement of the logging only mode

JW: JRA1 will provide it

JG: What about the null mode

JW: This will not be delivered. There are other issues in the paper such as how to identify sites not supporting it.

Oxana Smirnova: Is it available as a standalone from CREAM?

MS: This can be on a shared file system not just WNs

OS: They are comfortable about running it?

JW: This was a code review. Hence we want to give to sysadmins from tomorrow.

MS: In reading the policy draft, this is linked to the service version of LCAS. What would the CE do, also link to the service version of LCAS/LCMAPS?

JW: It is up to sites and deployment – I suggest we should run with a service

CG: The idea is to run with the service everywhere. If a site needs to cache information for local performance they can do so, otherwise we lose most of the capability

MS: Rollout service version first and then?

J: Realistically the WN version will come first



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



OS: What about non-RHEL systems?

JW: They take VDT and compile it themselves so anyone else should be able to do this

?: After certification will it go to PPS next?

KB: So now we have a security group rubber stamp, do the experiments [get involved]?

?: Which version of glxexec will you test?

JW: The setuid one.

KB: The policy statement

JG: We next get the reaction of the sites

LR: This is getting towards a proposal. We have a summary policy and need to check if it is acceptable to all sites. Next we need to understand the consensus.

KB: Why can't we just deliver it?

JG: The MoU does not require pilot jobs

Luca dell'Agnello: And with the policy approved implementation follows? INFN has concerns.

LR: The MB reacted to the concern by adding a line to the policy. All pre-conditions are met.

JW: We will provide a logging mode – so not switching is an option

JG: The JSPG would rather not run with this.

IB: Then run in logging mode

JG: This mode exposes everyone.

RW: One site doing this exposes everyone in the VO.

LdA: When is it foreseen to have glxexec logging available?

JW: It is being developed right now.

JG: There is logging in setuid mode. LCAS/LCMAPS does it.

ML: syslog should be used and is being implemented right now.

[Action 0711-4 Pass on the issue of proxies being stored all over the place to the middleware security group \(JG\)](#)

Frameworks

JG: The bits that move things out to sites – but corrected not just remote stuff

PC: DIRAC submitted to security group over a year ago (EGEE security group) but no feedback.

JG: One question asked

JW: We gave feedback at the time

JG: It sounds like it never made it back

OS: Will the code be available for the review?

JG: Code review is one thing – this is more an architecture review.

RW: Self review is also useful – check compliance against recommendations.

?: There are operative aspects involved.

JG: The proxies are only stored centrally when the user is actively doing something.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



JG: Any volunteers for the review team? DK suggested: Ian; John; Dave; Bob would put together a team.

IB: I don't mind picking people!

[Action 0711-5. – JG, IB, DK and BJ to put together an experiment frameworks review team](#)

Gllexec and batch:

JG: It is taken for granted that Lyon would do BQS testing.

- CERN – LSF
- We will ask CESGA about SGE
- Condor again comes back to CESGA

[Action 0711-6 – JG to ask/inform/request sites about testing gllexec with the various batch systems](#)

PBS

ML: This is run as the reference batch system.

MS: We should call it Torque.

JG: sudo could be used to test the effect. Is this do-able by the end of the year?

IB: Is the behaviour clear?

PC: ...and what has to be tested?

MS: Accounting. Clean up. Wall clock time checks and internal accounting

JG: This needs common tests

[Action 0711-7 – JG to talk to Davide about common batch system tests](#)

JG: What is the JRA1 answer for LCAS/LCMAPS

CG: We have a prototype based on the alpha version of the libraries. Better libraries will be available by December. Shortly after this the service will be available and then one week later the client – it will be ready for testing at that point. By the end of December there should be something ready for certification.

JG: What about SA3?

MS: The service version LCAS/LCMAPS. We need to figure out a deployment route – on top of CE?. Perhaps a new node type. This needs to be clarified with SA1. This will determine the work needed for packaging. Testing will take less than 1-2 weeks.

IB: There is a need to test this service can support large farms

MS: We have some experience doing scalability tests. So it is not “super-difficult”. First what are the common deployment strategies? Can they support a new node etc. I estimate a total of 6 weeks, assuming people are available and there are no other high priorities.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



JG: And SA1?

IB: The question is exactly how you set this up. Once the tests are done, deployment could be done quickly if configuration scripts and documentation are in place.

MS: This is not known now.

IB: If these things are known then it would be quick. There is nothing to stop us starting to do this with the LCAS/LCMAPS version that we have using shared file systems.

JG: If it is on the critical path (here I am talking about for the end of February 2008) then work with the current version.

glexec deployment

MS: Another library is required. This will be looked at by sysadmins. I would hope these people come up with tests. So when it is in certification this is not a huge issue anymore, so it will be like a normal patch – 30-40 days including PPS etc.

JG: The important point is to have a safe configuration. Other than LCAS/LCMAPS are there other configuration issues?

MS: Make sure ISd is allowed to call (white-list credentials)

PC: What should we set up?

MS: UID and GID.

PC: Is this linked to the VOMs role?

CG: Probably

MS: So we need to understand how this works with job priorities.

SC: May have smart user who submits 1×10^6 jobs and gets all the CPU.

MS: For VOs that only do production then there are no competition problems.

MS: If they change their mind then the site needs to change its white-lists

JG: This is certainly a configuration issue.

JG: So for timescales:

Glexec review – one week before the group is up and remit agreed.

Batch system testing – this is similar

glexec certification – end of the year

JG: LCAS/LCMAPS in server mode is on the critical path. We are starting to go down the path of some sites deploying versions early.

[Action 0711-8 JG to compile a summary of the pilot jobs/glexec discussion for the MB](#)

RW: A stronger statement – I'm not aware of any security group that objects.



5. CCRC'08 Planning Status (Jamie Shiers)

JS: Do we have any idea when job numbers will be available from ATLAS? We can not progress with out them.

KB: We're working on it

JS: Slide ?? still misses the description of required services

[Action 0711-9: Sites to confirm resources available for CCRC as given in Harry's talk.](#)

*Discussion of production SRMv2.2

JG: You talked about agreement on services needed. Yesterday Flavia had a gap identified here, are multiple user jobs needed in May?

PC: Yes (for LHCb)

KB: Yes, but not for February.

JC: By functional blocks, do you mean blocks of work introducing new functions in sequence of challenge as this could also mean things stopping progress.

JS: The former.

5. GSSD update (Flavia Donno)

FD: We are looking for someone to represent the experiments and talk about storage space and tokens at T2s during the Edinburgh workshop.

DB: We have a high-level understanding in ATLAS, but not in the language of tokens.

Wrap-up (John Gordon)

Many topics came up – some can wait

- There were actions on pilot jobs
- A status report on pilot jobs should be given at the next meeting
- Tier-1s should be running by January – best to check back on progress in January

5. AOB

No other business.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



The meeting closed at 16:45

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



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
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 lcms 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
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
0704-1	Update slide 17 of presentation and formulate a request for documentation to be provided by the middleware developers to explain options with components (needed by Quattor maintainers)	Michel Jouvin	Open
0704-2	Follow up on VOMS coordination group mandate wording with Maria Dimou	Ian Bird	Done
0705-1	Get feedback from Markus and Alessandra on previous feedback from sites on glexec.	John Gordon	Open
0706-1	Check use cases and VOMS need for failover with the developers and VOs	Maria Dimou	Open
0706-2	Provide description of implementation(s) of VOMS based ACLs and submit this to the experiments to confirm it satisfies their requirements.	Flavia Donno	Open
0706-3	Review the membership and approach of the Job Priorities Working Group	Erwin Laure	Open
0706-4	Nominate someone to join the grid services monitoring work	Oxana Smirnova	Open
0706-5	Follow up on how best to proceed with site-experiment negotiation on what VO SAM tests are to be monitored	John Gordon	Open
0706-6	Setup group to gather and prioritise GridView requirements	Ian Bird/ John Gordon	Open
0706-7	Follow up c) with Dave Kelsey	John Gordon	Open



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
0706-8	Raise glxexec questions at the Stockholm operations workshop	Ian Bird	Open
0708-1	Provide feedback on the VO Operations policy	Reps/All	Open
0710-1	Comment on VO Operations Policy (final call next week); comment on Pilot Jobs Policy (v0.3)	All	Open
0710-2	Seek better definitions of VO roles – such as VO manager, VO operator etc – as they relate to policies.	Dave Kelsey	Open
0710-3	Circulate more requirements/issues information to the VOMS attributes group	??	
0710-4	Follow up on Markus's comment about glxexec being used in OSG already and how experiences might be shared.	John Gordon	Open
0710-5	Send statement to MB regarding pilot jobs and glxexec. Request MB to consider and forward to CB for comment.	John Gordon	Open
0711-1	Query the GDB list about member feeling for holding the April 2008 GDB in Taipei	John Gordon	
0711-2	Take advice on who to ask (JSPG) about VOMS requirements	John Gordon	
0711-3	Get glxexec-on-WNs field tested by some sysadmins	John White/John Gordon	
0711-4	Pass on the issue of proxies being stored all over the place to the middleware security group	John Gordon	
0711-5	Put together an experiment frameworks review team	JG,IB, DK and BJ	
0711-6	Ask/inform/request sites about testing glxexec with the various batch systems	John Gordon	
0711-7	Talk to Davide about common batch system tests	John Gordon	
0711-8	Compile summary of pilot jobs/glxexec discussion for MB	John Gordon	
0711-9	Confirm resources available for the CCRC as given in Harry's talk (November GDB)	Country reps	

List of Attendees

X means attended

V means attended via VRVS

Country	Member	Present?	Deputy or Technical Assistant	Present
Austria	Dietmar Kuhn	X		
Canada	Reda Tafirout		Mike Vetterli	
Czech Republic	Milos Lokajcek	X		
Denmark	John Renner Hansen		Anders Waananen	
Finland	Klaus Lindberg		Jukka Klem	X



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



France	Fabio Hernandez		Dominique Boutigny	
Germany	Klaus-Peter Mickel		Holger Marten, Jos van Wezel	,V
Hungary	Gyorgy Vesztergombi		Dezso Horvath	
India	P.S Dhekne			
Israel	Lorne Levinson			
Italy	Mirco Mazzucato		Luciano Gaido	
Japan	Hiroshi Sakamoto	X	Tatsuo Kawamoto	
Netherlands	Jeff Templon		Ron Trompert	
Norway	Jacko Koster		Farid Ould-Saada	
Pakistan	Hafeez Hoorani			
Poland	Ryszard Gokieli		Jan Krolikowski	
Portugal	Gaspar Barreira		Jorge Gomes	
Romania	Mihnea Dulea			
Russia	Alexander Kryukov		Vladimir Korenkov	
Spain	Jose Hernandez		Xavi Espinal	
Sweden	Leif Nixon		Tord Ekelof	
Switzerland	Christoph Grab	X	Allan Clark, Marie-Christine Sawley	
Taiwan	Simon Lin	X	Di Qing	
United Kingdom	Jeremy Coles	X	John Gordon	X
United States	Ruth Pordes	V(pm)	Michael Ernst	
CERN	Tony Cass			
ALICE	Alberto Masoni	X	Yves Schutz	
	Federico Carminati			
ATLAS	Kors Bos		Stephen Gowdy	
	Dario Barberis	X		
CMS	Matthias Kasemann		Patricia McBride	
LHCb	Ricardo Graciani		Andrei Tsaregorodstev	
	Nick Brook			
Project Leader	Les Robertson	X		
GDB Chair	John Gordon	X		
GDB Secretary	Jeremy Coles			
Grid Deployment Mgr	Ian Bird	X	Markus Schulz	X
Fabric Manager	Bernd Panzer			
Application Manager	Pere Mato Vila			
Security WG	David Kelsey			
Quattor WG	Michel Jouvin			
Networking WG	David Foster			
Planning Officer	Alberto Aimar	X/V		

Others present at CERN

Olof Barring – CERN

Harry Renshall – CERN



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



I Ueda – Tokyo, Japan
Jamie Shiers – CERN
Maria Dimou – CERN
Andrea Sciaba – CERN
Promabesh Konti Thamdis – PRCAT-INDORE, India
Gawiav Sacena – VECC, Kolkatta, India
Luca dell’Agnello – INFN
Gilbert Poulard – CERN ATLAS
Maria Girone – CERN
Gonzalo Merino – PIC
Dirk Duellmann – CERN
Remi Mollon – CERN
Philippe Charpentier – CERN/LHCb
John White – HIP (Helsinki)
Oxana Smirnova – NDGF
Patricia Mendez Lorenzo – CERN
Sue Foffano
Simone Campana
Romain Wartel
Erwin Laure
Ian Neilson
Oliver Keeble

On VRVS

Frederique Chollet
Jose Hernandez
Stephen Burke
Flavia Donno
Gilbert Pinot
Etienne Urbah
Mark van de Sanden
Latchear Betev