Meeting Object: **Project Technical Board**

Authors: **Bob Jones / Karin Burghauser**

Meeting Date: **26th of August 2003**
Meeting Place: **CERN – Building 31, IT Auditorium**

Attendees:
WP1: Massimo Sgaravatto, Francesco Prelz
WP3: Antony Wilson (☎)
WP4: Maite Barroso Lopez, German Cancio
WP5: John Gordon
WP6: Francois Etienne, Rene Metery
WP7: Franck Bonnassieux
WP8: Frank Harris, JJ Blaising, Ingo Augustin, Mario Reale, Laura Perini (☎)
WP10: Vincent Breton (☎)
WP11: Mauro Draoli (☎), Roberto Puccinelli (☎)
WP12: Bob Jones, Erwin Laure, Gabriel Zaquine
PMB: Robin Middleton (☎)
Pier Giorgio Innocenti
Paolo Capiluppi (☎)

Apologised: WP9, WP2

1. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING AND MATTERS ARISING

There were no comments on the minutes of the last meeting.

2. RELEASE 2.0 STATUS (RENE METERY)

Rene walked through the current status of the tests.

MyProxy resource still makes problems and is being discussed on the ITeam list. Also the broker gives not easily understandable error messages: "cannot plan (a helper failed)" - this typically means some problems with match-making but it should be clearer. Data mgmt currently also has problems since the service publishing is broken - a new LCFG component fixing that has been produced and needs testing. The file registration time is still quite large.

Compared to the set of tests defined in the release plan there are still 4 open problems:
1) myproxy
2) matchmaking
3) registration speed
4) data mgmt service publishing

For 1) this is working for LCG and has worked once for Steve Traylen. More investigation is needed but it is not considered to be a stopper for the immediate deployment of 2.0 since as a workaround long lived proxies can be used.

For 2) this was only seen today - so maybe an intermediate problem; needs further testing.

For 3) Peter should propose different strategies (like using the API) which could reduce the time but it is understood that it will not meet the requirements in the short time. Changes to the edg-rm and edg-se will be required to make it work. It is not considered to be a stopper for the deployment of 2.0 either.

For 4) New LCFG component is available, needs to be tested.

Strong concerns are raised about the stability of the information system, in particular R-GMA. WP3 proposes that the broker should not only point to one GOUT but to two for resilience reasons. Can the uptime of R-GMA been measure? WP3 should send out recipes of how this can been done (including whether the problem is due to R-GMA or LDAP). This should be one of the priorities to test on the application TB.

An outstanding question is the file/rfio protocols - this has not been tested but should work and it is not yet clear what the applications expect to get back: a well-defined URI or something else? Currently a URI is returned which cannot be passed directly to other programs like rfio clients (needs some string massaging). Should be tested on the application TB by LCs with help of middleware WPs.

The PTB agrees that given 2) and 4) can be resolved we will immediately tag 2.0 and deploy it on the application TB.

3. LCG DEPLOYMENT STATUS (ZDENEK SEKERA)

Zdenek explained the current status of LCG-1 deployment: 10 out of 7 sites are installed, 4 others started. All software installed via LCFG. A 4 weeks old tag is being installed to test the process – all sites will be re-installed with the production tag (18th August).

LCFG found very useful; light version used for BNL which is less stable than full LCFG.

A few problems with specific site hardware have been found and could be resolved either locally or with help of CERN personnel.

The set of software used by LCG-1 can be found on the slides. Software coming from VDT, EDG, DataTAG and LCG.

Currently no showstoppers or critical bugs, system is reasonably solid. Many thanks for the excellent collaboration with EDG, in particular WP1 and 2.

LCG would suggest to move to Globus 2.4 soon. This needs further investigations and should not distract effort from EDG. For EDG this discussion should be postponed until after the final project conference in Heidelberg.

Zdenek explained the deployment strategy for LCG-1 (see slides). They expect to be able to go to 30-40 sites with this strategy based on multiple bdIIs.

JJ reminded that if LCG-1 is to be useful to the experiments, all three protocols, gridFTP, rfio, and file are needed.

4. POST-2.0 PLANNING (ERWIN LAURE)

Erwin defined the boundary conditions for working on post-EDG 2.0, namely continuing to support EDG 2.0 for bug fixing and ensuing all the EDG sw is in a unified CVS repository (need to include WP2 and VOMS in Lyon repository) and is delivered via autobuild.

To handle support of LCG deployed version (production branch) and work on EDG 2.x, a code branch (development) will need to be made. The production branch work will be done on the LCG certification testbed and the development branch on the EDG integration testbed. An open issue is how autobuild will handle branching. This is an open action for WP6.

Another point is that the autobuild PC crashes due to insufficient disk space. An ACTION is put on WP6 to address this issue.

All new software to be integrated must be follow the software process and adhere to the checklist established by the quality group.

The first important change to make to the EDG 2.0 code is to port it to gcc 3.2.2.
The issue of compilers versions was raised. Frank Harris clarified that an agreement in March with the applications said they would accept gcc 2.95 but now they would like to have gcc 3.2.2. from the summer onwards.

Secondly, we should deploy a VOMS server for at least 1 VO.

The most likely scenario is that we will only have 3 weeks before the Heidelberg conference. This means we have at most 2 slots for integration.

Given the list of sw available now from the middleware WPs and the priority lists from the experiments, a discussion on how best to use the slots was held.

Security is an important feature to include in the final release.

Having LCMAPS and LCAS VOMS plug-ins would mean that we can stop using the grid map files. Code is available from WP1 (though not in the EDG 2.0) to make the RB do match-making on VOs rather than users (gridmap file).

The current understanding is that making secure access to CEs is more likely to succeed in this very restricted timescale than providing secure file access.

Antony Wilson added that the registry replication code is already in the EDG 2.0 tag, has been tested on the WP3 testbed and simply requires a configuration change. It was agreed that if WP3 can produce a test-report for this feature and a recipe for the configuration change then it will be scheduled for a test once the gcc3.2.2 port has been made.

It was agreed that the following slots will be allocated:

- First slot for WP4 (LCMAPS, LCAS VOMS plug-in) with WP1 in parallel to do VO based match-making.
- Second slot for WP2 (RLS, java-security).

5. PM33 DELIVERABLES (GABRIEL ZAQUINE)

It was agreed the deliverables (code & manuals) will be taken as whatever is on the application testbed at the end of September.

The reviewers should be from the application groups for the users/developers guide and selected WP6 site managers for the installation guide.
ACTION: Reviewers to be nominated by the WP6, 8, 9 and 10 WP managers.

6. HEIDELBERG

Erwin Laure said the agenda is set and Mauro Draoli added some details of the open day schedule.

7. SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

WP2: Provide description of different possibilities and runtime behavior for file registration.

WP3: Provide recipes for R-GMA uptime measurement at the granularity of LDAP, GIN/GOUT, R-GMA.

WP5: Provide description of how 'file' and 'rfio' URIs are to be used by applications.

WP6: Investigate how autobuild can handle builds for the production (LCG) and development (EDG) branch.

WP6: Increase capabilities (in particular disk space) on autobuild machine.

WP1/4/SCG: Clarify implications for the broker when deploying VOMS.

WP6: Nominate reviewers for installation guide.

WP8/9/10: Nominate reviewers for users guide.

8. NEXT MEETING

Proposed date for the next meeting: early December (1st week) at CERN.