



## Version 1.0

*Amendments history:*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Date</i>

## Minutes of the meeting

CERN, 22<sup>th</sup> June 2005

Agenda: <http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a045322>

Minutes: Jeremy Coles

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

### 1. Introduction (Kors Bos)

A new T0/T1 document is available. Networking will be the focus of the next GDB. **Please could each Tier-1 prepare a summary (2-slides) of network plans (see talk). Kors will send out a reminder email. For the Service Challenge 3 focus of the July meeting please could all Tier-1s prepare a 2-slide summary on status, issues and plans? Please could the experiments also prepare summary slides on experiences so far?**

Dates of next meetings were discussed. July 19-20 (SC3). September 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> will go ahead (UK clash noted). October 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> (on the subject of service challenges and accounting. HEPIX overlap understood). October meetings will be in Bologna.

LHCC review is a problem. Trying to overlap with end of SC05 (Seattle).

EU hearings in Brussels also take place in same period. Therefore due to complications the meeting will be held at CERN on 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> November. **Please provide feedback to Kors on dates.**

LCG project organisation is due to change in Phase 2. Tier-1s are not presently represented in the PEB. For phase 2 the CB is new and the POB becomes the OB. The PEB becomes the MB but with T1 representatives. The GDB remains similar to now. With this change a difficulty has been uncovered. GDB and MB overlap is very high and both have decision making structures. Kors presented some thoughts on what needs to be considered for the new structure (see slides). Les commented that the management structure is a proposal from the MoU task force setup by the funding agencies (via the



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



RRB) and thus has fair representation. If changes are being sought or recommended this should be done in conjunction with this MoU task force group (chaired by David Jacobs). All changes will need to go via the RRB.

A storage task force was created at HEPiX. It will report to the HEPiX Board, and to the LCG project via the Grid Deployment Board. Vicky voiced concern about why a HEPiX body has any standing to create a body that reports to the GDB which is an LCG body. She strongly rejects to the manner in which this has progressed.

Les noted that the Phase 2 planning committee was making a similar recommendation and the decision was made to merge the HEPiX initiative with this recommendation. The Tier-2 planning group should not use HEPiX forum to do planning. In addition, at the first LHC meeting it was agreed that HEPiX would be used for technical discussions. Another body would not be setup – this was a conclusion of the first workshop.

It was asked if the GDB, even though it has not approved this group, would like to hear a report from this group. There is a HEPiX board with Fermilab representation but they do not speak on anything other than information exchange. Mirco suggested that as a technical working group (without being empowered to making formal strategic decisions) this should be fine. In response it was asked what mandate and formal reporting structure the group has. If they have no standing then why would the GDB listen to them?

It was concluded that an assembled set of information from experts is useful though one may take issue with the last stated aim of the group to “Formulate a plan to implement the required storage in a timely fashion”. The group has started (in UK and Germany) and is needed but it is not decision making in scope, but its assessments and recommendations will be useful. It was acknowledged that more formal procedures should be followed in the creation of any future groups.

Supercomputing 2005: The Nordic countries will also participate. It was noted that the UK booth is not just PPARC (Particle Physics). That FNAL and SLAC are the same booth. Bruce Gibbard will be the BNL contact.

Plans to run another Operations Workshop were discussed. The proposed date of 7<sup>th</sup> October has problems on several fronts. The ROC managers suggest the end of September or a week earlier. More input is needed to set the date – OSG participation is expected.



## 2. IHEPCCC (Guy Wormser)

The makeup of IHEPCCC (which replaces the European HEPCCC committee) was presented. The only question related to whom the committee reports – ICFA.

## 3. Security (Dave Kelsey)

The JSPG met at CERN on 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup> June 2005. Matters arising were dominated by new policy wording and incident response procedures. Dave talked through the outcomes.

### User AUP

The User AUP was reviewed and went out to the GDB list. There was no response. There was a small response from the ROC managers. It was approved by the OSG Council on 31<sup>st</sup> May 2005.

The UK National Grid Service have asked about legal issues. By having something minimal are we giving away too many rights? Is data protection covered sufficiently? JSPG decided to consult some legal experts. Conflicting feedback so far therefore this is not ready for GDB approval! Will come back to GDB and ROC managers as soon as possible.

### VO Security Policy

No external comments. Linked to VO AUP; need to review how binding this is for Grid/Infrastructure policy. The same question arises about what users need to read it fully, be able to read it or just be aware of it? Comments welcome.

### New Incident Response

It is based on the OSG document and covers: reporting, handling of sensitive data, registering of security contacts, mail list and reporting process: <https://edms.cern.ch/document/428035>. **Please encourage site security contacts to review document.**

A question arose about conflicting interests between for example EGEE/LCG and some national project. If someone is a member of both then there may be problems. JSPG tackling this by strong collaboration but national grids have little representation. Sweden would like to collaborate more – interest and ambition to be as fully connected as possible. Named individuals can be put forward.

Les reminded the GDB that it represents LCG computing and therefore it needs to be careful not to agree things within that are not appropriate elsewhere and would lead to conflicts.



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



The Nordic countries mentioned that they have no grid security issues to be addressed. Users agree to local policies and sites agree to report incidents. NorduGrid maintain that a crime is a crime in the country where the user submitted the job. There are no grid policies. They understand that this approach may not scale.

Dave concluded stating that we need to avoid users having to register at all sites! We want users to register only with their VO.

### 4. Service Challenges (James Casey)

James presented a report on the workshop at CERN last week. The main point of contention was on the “VO boxes” at all sites issue. Convergence of SC3 and LCG2 production requires more work. Service levels for the SC3 throughput phase will be “best effort”.

Many errors and retries detected at FTS level – SRM will go for 15 minutes and then job retries succeed. At CERN, pilot services are connected to the same high-bandwidth network as the production network but are only visible to T0 and T1. A new version of FTS is required for the service phase because the current version does not do inter-VO scheduling and this presents a risk since it will be a major rewrite. Current installation has separate instances for each VO.

LFC – POOL interface is now available. All experiments are working/investigating to integrate LFC into their software. This pilot service allows integration tests. LHCb have problems with using LFC on WNs - python binding to libraries appears to be the cause.

Support routes (for problem reporting and discussion) are covered later in this meeting. This connects more with service phase when data managers experience problems. For the throughput phase it is also about contacts across sites – what is a good meeting time? There will be 24x7 support at CERN.

Meeting that only reviews status at CERN is not going to be complete. Tier-1s at least (representing Tier-2s) need to call in at the beginning. But the meetings should not replace the formal tracking of problems. Notes/actions from meeting should get entered into the Wiki for sites not able to make the meeting.

The Nordic Tier-1 will have difficulty committing to daily meetings. The US view was that we need the communication about problems but timing is a concern. Even if US participates in meetings it is unlikely those attending will know what has been going on. It was clear that nobody can commit people to daily meetings but having the forum to join as necessary would be useful. It was suggested that the weekly phone meetings at 17:30 could be extended.

For SC3 there is a need for a strong mandated set of requirements from the experiments.



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Preparations for SC3 are running late. Experiments are ready to take part in SC3 but it is not clear whether we can support everything that is requested. Experiments expect SC3 to lead to deployment of components into production.

A question was asked about whether there is enough bandwidth during the throughput phase for experiments to run tests in parallel? The answer was no, but the phase is really only 10 days. The rest of the time can be used for experiment testing. Resources will be in place by August for fuller testing.

What are the metrics for success for the setup phase? Use cases from experiments are required to better define these, otherwise it will be difficult to ensure that everyone is ready at the start of September. The idea of experiment standard or test jobs was put forward and generally agreed. This is required not just for SC3 but for general preparations. A measure of success going forward is needed. The Tier-1s also need to know what the experiments are trying on a given day/week to better support these activities.

Jamie Shiers is collecting information which is pushing in this direction. Plans are becoming more precise. There is enough detail for month by month breakdown by experiment but a common format is needed. A uniform schedule will need to be made visible to everyone along with metrics (for example FTS able to provide x throughput to Tier-1s). Realistic service by service, site by site and experiment by experiment plans (that are not open ended) are needed.

There is no conclusion yet on the “agents and daemons” discussion.

### **5. The Nordic Data Grid Facility** (Brian Vinter, Oxana Smirnova)

A summary of the Nordic facilities was presented (see slides).

With the SRMs there is currently some problems with the components. LFC has not yet been evaluated but no problems are foreseen. No sites contain LCG dedicated resources so sites wishing to be part of SC3 will need to install SLC3 or RHEL in place of Debian. In general the tools and services offered/required by CERN are not suitable for distributed centres (DPM and LFC are not ported for use with Debian).

Mass Storage systems need an SRM. Existing tools were written for specific situations so there is no current distributed instance for storage. NorduGrid was represented at the Baseline Working Group meetings.

The distributed Tier-1 nature was discussed. To be a Tier-1 the requirement is against levels of service and by being distributed this is more achievable, however new technologies need to be developed to make the distributed make up work. (Triumpf is also working in a distributed manner). The political situation was mentioned – resources are for the Nordic sciences, there are no dedicated clusters and this is part of the reason the



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



region developed its own middleware. Others at the meeting argued that most Tier-1s are in fact mixed too and suggested worker nodes could have ports of a few packages to get things working quickly.

Currently an interim organisation is in place – so overall leadership is not strong. A new organisation will be in operation from January 2006. At present Brian Vinter is the contact point for Nordic facilities. A problem to be tackled is the IP address limitation (a gridFTP issue) as it was thought that having 4 or 5 SRM entry points should not pose a problem.

*Meeting broke for lunch.*

### **6. Installation Tools (German Cancio Melia)**

More information is needed on the future strategy in respect of gLite and YAIM advances.

NIKHEF have found their investment in Quattor to be worthwhile. German suggested that for any sites running more than 50 machines Quattor is a good solution.

### **7. Baseline Services**

Do any of the services require special attention in the Nordic region? (slide 6).  
The ambition of the Nordic countries is to adopt a well defined schema.

Is the solution to database services 3D replication? Where there is a need (e.g. T0 to T1) the answer is yes. FTS requires separate databases (it is not distributed). At present there are no examples of distributed queries.

Since the grid is not uniform how do you find out about new services? The information has to be in the information system – the end points will need to be published. Is there a well defined place in the schema where these things are defined? At present it refers mainly to head nodes / service nodes.

### **8. Discussion**

Information about when a site is ready to be put into SC production can be provided easily. Somewhat more involved is producing a set of numbers that reveal that the service provided is reliable. It is possible to extend the information system to have a flag to mark a site ready for production. A set of tests is needed for the services – these can be added to the standard SFTs. To produce these tests deployment need to know what the



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



experiments require. It was suggested that the catalogues are the most important aspect for the experiments.

How is this to be taken up? Who is going to define/develop the tests (based on use cases)? It was thought this would be a combination of Jamie Shiers and Ian and that the matter should be taken to the PEB. **Jamie needs to write the detailed workplan with milestones and the set of standard use cases needs to come from the experiments.** These will help define the metrics to define if the service is “functional”. **Kors will remind all parties of what is needed from them.**

### 9. Interoperability with NorduGrid/ARC

The Advanced Resource Connector (ARC) was reviewed (see slides).

Ian mentioned that a lot of work has been done with OSG in getting commonality on components. He suggested that the same group can work with NorduGrid. What is the common solution that everyone should move towards? Many already using VDT.

Another view was that it is hard to take a top down approach. A bottom up approach is currently being used by working directly with the experiments/applications people. At the LHCC review ATLAS suggested the current way of working should not be a long term situation. There need to be formal agreements. Torre will coordinate for NorduGrid. **Ian was thought to be the person on the LHC side to take forward these discussions.**

### 10. User Support

Ian presented a proposal for a new support route for LHC VOs as a prototype for a GGUS group using “Shiva” - a system developed in India. It is clear that there are existing ticket handling systems and this one must interface with them; this will be via email.

Dario had had a (similar but different) discussion with Flavia. He thought that this is a simple way to get something working quickly. History functionality is not yet available in GGUS and nor are many interfaces. Therefore there is some concern that the GGUS system being ready to handle the support required for SC3. This (just mentioned approach) offers an alternative.

SC3 applications need to be correctly set up and a team need to be available who understand both these and the infrastructure. Many of the problems being experienced are with the interfaces. A joint group approach is needed. Having both groups (deployment and experiment) diagnosing problems will lead to a quicker resolution. To set this up quickly names from the experiments are needed. .



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



There was a question about the workflow. How are ROCs and CICs impacted? Ian answered that people are already doing this work. ROCs and CICs will get problems in the same way as now. There may be more problem reports because more people are using the grid but this is not creating more work for the ROCs.

A general email address should be used for this support route. It was agreed to evaluate progress at the next meeting. **Names for the list from each experiment are required.**

## 11. AOB

David Stickland remarked that as the TDRs are now finished, and as a show of solidarity, CMS would like to offer a gift to Les for getting everyone this far! [The gift was a framed print of the CMS computing topology].

### Actions:

Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
0412-1	Contact Dave Kant at RAL re input of NorduGrid accounting data	A NorduGrid representative	Ongoing
0501-4	Provide feedback to KB on proposed meeting dates for Q3 and Q4 2005	All	Open
0502-1	Experiments to provide information on their planning	Experiments	Done
0502-2	Arrange Data Management Workshop at CERN 5 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> April	KB/JC	Closed
0502-4	Follow up on INFN accounting records with Cristina Vistoli	KB	Done
0502-5	Tier-1s not in SC2 or 3 to provide planning information	Tier-1 reps	Ongoing
0502-7	Appoint coordinator to work on LCG participation in Super Computing 2005	WVR	Ongoing
0502-8	Read Site registration Policy and procedures document and raise concerns before document endorsed at next GDB in March	All	Done
0503-1	GDB representatives to put forward names to attend joint SC/Networking/GDB meetings.	All	Done
0503-2	Send out request for Tier-2 representative information	KB	Done
0503-3	Review and confirm the Tier-2 information at the following link : <a href="http://lcg.web.cern.ch/LCG/PEB/gdb/LCG-Tiers.htm">http://lcg.web.cern.ch/LCG/PEB/gdb/LCG-Tiers.htm</a>	All	Done
0503-4	Specific action to clarify Italian entries for 0503-3 in light of a potential misunderstanding	Laura Perini	Done
0503-5	Ensure that all sites in country are publishing data	All	Open
0503-6	Mail Ian Bird with a formal request for an EGEE representative for OSG and a Storage Group contact to help with SRM testing	Ruth Pordes	Done
0503-7	Begin common work list for OSG-EGEE to enable further discussion on scope and priorities for joint working	Vicky White	Ongoing
0503-8	Provide OSG with information about policy implementers in EGEE	Ian Bird	Open
0505-1	Sites to provide Jamie Shiers with details of storage to be available for SC3 and plans for 10Gb connections to Tier-1s.	SC3 sites	Open





## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Item No.	Description	Owner	Status
0505-2	Write short note on what the issues of running Phedex and FTS together actually are and what the options are – schedules for each Tier-1 separately	Tier-1 managers	Open
0505-3	All countries to provide scale of stand that can be devoted to LCG at SC05. Named contacts (for setting up stand and who knows about space) are also to be provided.	GDB country representatives	Open
0505-4	Circulate a note on the proposed 8 <sup>th</sup> & 9 <sup>th</sup> November meeting in Vancouver	Kors Bos	Open
0505-5	Announce applications workshop on 1 <sup>st</sup> -2 <sup>nd</sup> June to GDB list	Kors Bos	Open
0505-6	Provide names of people who will represent the various centres in the grid collaboration board (if the same people are not contacts for technical information additional names should be provided) – For each person a telephone number and email address is required.	GDB country representatives	Open
0505-7	GDB members to review AUP by next GDB in June	All	Open
0505-8	Provide comments on the VO Security Policy Document (it is a short document!) to Ian Neilson	All	Open
0505-9	To send questionnaire questions to GDB list to provoke comments	Francois Grey	Open
0506-1	Prepare a 2-page summary on network status for network meeting at CERN on 19 <sup>th</sup> July.	Tier-1 managers	Open
0506-2	Prepare a summary for the next GDB meeting (20 <sup>th</sup> July) on SC3 status issues and plans	Tier-1 managers	Open
0506-3	Prepare a summary of SC3 experiences so far for the next GDB meeting. Progress on test jobs should also be covered.	Experiments	Open
0506-4	Provide feedback to Kors on proposed GDB dates and arrangements	All	Open
0506-5	Encourage regional/site security contacts to review the new incident response procedures	Country representatives	Open
0506-6	Develop use cases that can be used to test SC3 infrastructure. (Provide sample test jobs).	Experiments	Open
0506-7	Write detailed SC3 plans with milestones – agree and incorporate experiment use cases.	Jamie Shiers	Open
0506-8	Remind experiments to follow up on test jobs request. Follow up with Jamie and Ian for SC3 planning to include experiment use cases.	Kors Bos	Open
0506-9	Continue discussions on interoperability with NorduGrid – work towards a formal agreement on what is to be achieved.	Ian Bird	Open
0506-10	Provide Ian with contact names for the new user support tool (Shiva)	Experiments	Open



# LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



## List of Attendees

X means attended

V means attended via VRVS

Country	Member		Deputy	
Austria	Dietmar Kuhn	X		
Canada	Randy Sobie		Robert McPherson	
Czech Republic	Milos Lokajicek			
Denmark	John Renner Hansen		Anders Waananen	
Finland	Klaus Lindberg		Jukka Klem	X
France	Denis Linglin		Fabio Hernandez	X
Germany	Klaus-Peter Mickel		Holger Marten	X
Hungary	Gyorgy Vesztergombi	X	Dezso Horvath	
India	P.S Dhekne			
Israel	Lorne Levinson			
Italy	Mirco Mazzucato	X	Luciano Gaido	
Japan	Hiroshi Sakamoto	X	Tatsuo Kawamoto	
Netherlands	Peter Michielse		Arjen Van Rijn	
Norway	Peter Kongshaug		Farid Ould-Saada	
Pakistan	Hafeez Hoorani			
Poland	Michal Turala		Jan Krolkowski	
			Marcin Wolter	
Portugal	Gaspar Barreira		Jorge Gomes	
Russia	Slava Ilyin		V. Korenkov	
Spain	Manuel Delfino		Andreu Pacheco	
Sweden	Niclas Andersson	X	Tord Ekelof	X
Switzerland	Christoph Grab	V	Allan Clark	
			Marie-Christine Sawley	
Taiwan	Simon Lin		Di Qing	X
United Kingdom	John Gordon	X	Jeremy Coles	
United States	Vicky White	V	Bruce Gibbard	V
CERN	Tony Cass	X		
ALICE	Alberto Masoni		Yves Schutz	
	Federico Carminati	X		
ATLAS	Gilbert Poulard	X	Laura Perini	X
	Dario Barberis	X		
CMS	Tony Wildish	X		
	David Stickland	X		
LHCb	Ricardo Graciani	X	Andrei Tsaregorodstev	



## LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Country	Member		Deputy	
	Nick Brook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Leader	Les Robertson	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>
Fabric Manager	Bernd Panzer	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Manager	Torre Wenaus	<input type="checkbox"/>	Oxana Smirnova	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Communication Systems Mgr	David Foster	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
SC2 Chair	Matthias Kasemann	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Security WG	David Kelsey	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Service Challenges	Jamie Shiers	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Quattor WG	Charles Loomis	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Networking WG	David Foster	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>

The following also attended:

Name	Area		
James Casey	CERN	Min Tsai (AM)	CERN/EGEE
Edoardo Martelli	CERN		
Brian Vinter	NDFG		
Ryszanol Gokieli	Poland		

Also attending remotely:

Name	Area		
Mireia Dosil	Bareclona		
Paul Gelissen			
Anderz Waananen	Copenhagen		