Minutes – Grid Operations Meeting – 20 September 2010
Attendants: around 34

1. Information (Mario) :
Glite 3.1 to 3.2 migration, information, document, feedback from the NOC managers and SA1.
Discussion about the glite clients (WN, UI) support in sl4/sl5 32 bits: do we really need it?

WLCG priorities for glite:
https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/LCGprioritiesgLite#23_09_2010_Under_Preparation

jra1mdw workplan: these are the plans for glite releases/versions of several components:
http://bit.ly/22we3i

RT ticket about glite 3.2 migration plans
https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=263

Fri Sep 17 15:11:24 2010 Mario David - Comments added [Reply] [Comment]

It's requested that all NOC managers and/or SA1 members use this ticket to give the following information.

- Are there bugs, issues, that prevent sites to migrate the glite 3.1 services to glite 3.2 services?
- Where these bugs or issues reported somewhere? (GGUS, cern savannah, lcg-rollout mlist, others)
- Do you have knowledge of VOs/applications still running/needing sl4 or that are compiled in 32 bit
that do not run in SL5 64bit WNs?

This DOES NOT refer to the following issues reported in the questionnaires:
- having old HW in 32 bits
- lcg-CE vs CREAM

Furthermore we have knowledge of the following two major issues/bugs in the current glite 3.2 services.
- bdii problem due to openldap servers 2.3 in SL5, that the 2.4 partially solves but is not yet in the sl5 distro.
- interaction between voms of glite 3.2 and WMS in 3.1 because of gridsite (patch being taken care)

- Known issues: jpackage repository for sl4 Malgorzata)
check:
https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/
GenericInstallGuide310#jpackage_and_the_JAVA_repository

- UNICORE components to be added to the GOCDB:
Final Decission on the GOCDB names for some important globus and UNICORE resources.

This is the result of discussions that occurred at the technical forum.

- GRAM5
- globus-GRIDFTP
- globus-GSISSHD
- UNICOREX
- unicore-registry
- unicore-gateway

gLite migration plan (Mario)

About the migration of gLite 3.1 to gLite 3.2 components
Mario David, Tiziana Ferrari, Gonçalo Borges

1. Terminology

Freeze: no additional functionality is added to a component. Just patches for critical bugs or security vulnerabilities are released. A frozen component is still supported by developers and operations staff. The definition of a critical bug will have to be negotiated between the involved parties (gLite and EGI).

End-of-support: no additional functionality, no security and critical bug fixes, no support from the developers. The component is still supported by the operations community, can be deployed unless security issues arise or impacts on the interaction with other production services.

End-of-life: the component should be retired from the production infrastructure and is not supported by the operations community.

2. Executive summary

- Per-component schedule. EGI-InSPIRE operations requests the gLite collaboration to provide a proposal per-component end-of support schedule. For some components, dependencies are such that end-of-support of a gLite 3.1 component (ex: VOMS) can be scheduled only if interoperation of its gLite 3.2 version can be guaranteed with other depending gLite 3.1 / gLite 3.2 supported services.

- Documentation. EGI-InSPIRE operations request comprehensive database migration guidelines. If documentation is currently missing then it should be provided or URL pointers to it, in particular for the following components, EGI TSA1.3 will check this together with glite product teams:
  - DPM
  - LFC
  - VOMS
  - MON-APEL (http://goc.grid.sinica.edu.tw/gocwiki/glite-APEL)
  - dCache
  - HYDRA (when it becomes available in glite 3.2)
  - AMGA (when it becomes available in glite 3.2)

- Freeze of a gLite 3.1 component for components which are also released in gLite3.2 - DPM, LFC, L&B, VOMS, CREAMCE and MON (APEL has the equivalent gLite 3.2 service) - is accepted under two conditions:
  - if compatibility with other supported gLite3.1 / gLite3.2 components is guaranteed;
  - if fixes to critical bugs in gLite 3.2 are not pending. For example, BDII has been reported as a service that suffered from instability. Critical bugs affecting gLite 3,2 have been recorded in GGUS, and the operations community has lost track of progress when savannah bugs were migrated to a different bug tracking system. SA1 will collect a comprehensive list of urgent fixes that are felt to be needed on gLite 3.2 components before its gLite 3.1 equivalent can be freezed, and will hand this list to the gLite collaboration after internal discussion within the project.
  -

The project agreement for the immediate freeze of a given gLite 3.1 component depends on the amount of fixes felt to be urgent collected by SA1.

- Principles for migration. As a general principle, a gLite 3.1 component can be replaced by a gLite 3.2 version when the software providers certify that the gLite 3.2 component functionality and performance is equivalent or better than in gLite 3.1. EGI-InSPIRE staged rollout of a technical service is a mechanism that SA1 put in place to verify that this condition can be actually be observed in a production environment.

o EGI-InSPIRE SA1 will work towards improving the effectiveness of staged rollout, by having more NGIs involved in staged rollout and in having staged rollout services that are effectively part of a production infrastructure.
o EGI-INSPIRE SA1 needs the support of SA2 to jointly develop quality criteria.

- User community. The user community needs to be involved in the definition of the end-of-support schedule. Commitment to testing gLite 3.2 is expected from those user communities that rely on gLite 3.1 components, when such components are declared to be candidates for end-of-support.

- lcg-CE and CREAM. During the OMB meeting held on Sep 13th 2010, the need of lcg-CE support was discussed. No VOs – in addition to ATLAS and LHCb – were reported to be relying on lcg-CE, so there is no evidence of need of lcg-CE support outside the WLCG community. The July 17th release of Condor fixes the known issues that prevented CondorG-CREAM interoperability. The need of a new test campaign was discussed at the latest Grid Deployment Board, J. Gordon reported that an update is expected at the next GDB.

- WLCG requires a set of baseline service versions to be deployed by all sites for stability reasons. End-of-support / end-of-life schedules need to be jointly defined to ensure consistency of plans.

Note. An operational procedure for retiring end-of-life middleware services was defined in EGEE-III (https://edms.cern.ch/document/985325/2). This procedure will be updated as necessary for adoption in EGI.