

Globus Toolkit End of Support Discussion

22 August 2017

PRESENT

Matthew Viljoen/EGI (MV) chair
Peter Solagna/EGI (PS)
Baptiste Grenier/EGI
Vincenzo Spinoso/EGI
Andrea Manzi/CERN
Fabrizio Furano/CERN (FF)
Oliver Keeble/CERN (OK)
Giuseppe Fiameni/EUDAT (GF)
Mark van de Sanden/EUDAT (MS)
Brian Bockelman/OSG (BB)
Frank Scheiner/PRACE (FS)
Martin Bidner/PRACE
Björn Schembera/PRACE

APOLOGIES

Patrick Fuhrmann/dCache (PF)
Paul Millar/dCache
Tigran Mkrtchyan/dCache

Introduction and EGI Plans - MV, PS

GT EoS has been announced - we all need to act on this. EGI needs to support critical middleware, PS is looking for support for products not supported elsewhere. PS proposes a coordinated approach.

CERN - OK, FF

CERN predominantly represents the WLCG perspective here; the main software components are GridFTP, GSI and MyProxy. Their gameplan is to help with short-term support while a longer term solution is sought. GridFTP continues to be the main data transfer mechanism

while the community looks for alternative data distribution services, i.e. CERN do not propose to re-implement it.

FF said that DPM's dependency on GT was solely with a legacy protocol (SRM) which could be dropped if necessary.

PS said, regarding MyProxy, we didn't have representation from XSEDE, but discussions are ongoing regarding supporting MyProxy independent of Globus. XSEDE are responsive and willing to participate. PS will try to get a clear statement from them over future support.

OSG - BB

OSG has released a policy statement [<https://opensciencegrid.github.io/technology/policy/globus-toolkit/>] where OSG states they are willing to support GT for stakeholders as long as is needed. They are also intending to work with stakeholders to put together transition plans to alternative solutions, e.g. xrootd (rather than new implementations of existing solutions, e.g. gridftp)

MV asked how external people can follow this work and know who the stakeholders are? BB said that this information should be made available. PS added that this should start to be documented in the short-term

EUDAT - GF, MS

EUDAT mainly use GridFTP, but they are not tied to this and are exploring other possibilities, e.g. http, unicore-ftp, which are becoming viable alternatives. MS stressed the importance of interoperable solutions that work across infrastructures. BB agreed and said that an interoperable transfer solution implies we also have interoperability in authentication.

PRACE - FS

FS said that PRACE requirements are for a secure and production-ready data transfer services. They currently use GridFTP but are exploring alternatives. They would be in a position to contribute up to 40% FTE for continuing maintenance of GT.

FS asked about end of 2018 being when the security patching ends for GT - BB confirmed this.

FS asked about whether there is an alternative to GridFTP currently in production. OK said that both http and xrootd were both usable, currently being piloted, but couldn't be referred to production as yet. However he sees no fundamental problems if the community needs them to move to production.

dCache - MV on behalf of PF

MV outlined the slides that PF had prepared (attached to agenda). There are 4 distinct dCache packages, server, srm-client, dcap client and Nagios probes. dcap has a core library (no globus dependency) and GSI tunnel, which depends on GT. Currently they are evaluating the best way forward. Nagios probes make use of CERN supplied clients. OK pointed out that the GT dependency still exists in these clients.

MV and MS said we haven't covered all impacted software in this meeting - there are others with GT dependencies and substantial user communities which need to be regarded.

Next steps

MV proposed another call towards the end of the year (Nov?) to track progress. OK said that institutes with effort to devote for development/support should be in closer, more frequent contact to coordinate activities (e.g a home for source on github) - this can happen straight away.

PS suggested a mailing list can be used for relevant communication, this could be hosted by EGI, although it should be stressed that the effort is global, not coordinated by any one organization like EGI. There was no objection raised to this in the call. PS mentioned an older Globus Europe mailing list that he will contact to involve relevant experts. OK advised against this list continuing to coordinate any future work, a new dedicated one will be created and experts will be invited to join it.

BB suggested a F2F meeting would help. MV said he could check whether this could be co-located with an event likely to be attended by relevant people.