



LCG High Level Milestones 2007

Alberto Aimar
25 June 2007

Feedback Received

O.Smirnova

3 milestones are *not applicable* to NDGF and potentially other sites that do not deploy gLite, namely:

WLCG-07-31: NDGF neither has a concept of a WN in gLite sense, nor uses Scientific Linux

WLCG-07-34: NDGF does not use gLite UI, and there is no analogous component

WLCG-07-38: idem, though in this case I think gLite CE (not UI) is meant; NDGF does it deploy it anyway. There is an analogous component, but of course its release cycle is not linked to gLite one.

Comment: Changes accepted for the 3 milestones above.

H.Marten

Rename: procurement -> Resource installation (procurement must be done much earlier by the sites)

WLCG-07-16 rename to: MoU 2007 pledges installed

WLCG-07-17 rename to: MoU 2008 pledges installed

Both these milestones date = 1.July and 1. April, respectively, to avoid misunderstanding with beginning/end of month

Comment: Changes above done.

WLCG-07-21 & -22 Although I believe that -22 is already done at GridKa: are the timescales realistic? We had already specified a milestone to be due in the same month of the milestone definition (the VO-box SLA) and this is still overdue for most of the sites. We shouldn't repeat this mistake here.

Comment: The installation of top-level BDII has been discussed/requested many times (since February) in the GDB and MB. So it was already expected.

WLCG-07-30 what do you mean by "HEP MoU"?

Comment: This is the set of features agreed by all SRM Implementations and the Experiments. .

WLCG-07-31 to be clarified: I understood so far that experiments as well as sites wish to move to SL4. So, do you mean WN package gLite (3.x) installed on SL4, or do you mean native compiled SL4 WN-package (gLite3.1) installed on SL4?

Comment: The installation of native SL4 binaries is expected, they are available since a few weeks.

LHC Computing Grid Project

I already mentioned in the last GDB that the latter is not possible (at least for us) in June. We currently have a mixture of SL3 and SL4 with gLite3.0.x WN packages and have to first migrate everything to SL4 before doing the next step of upgrading gLite3.0.x to gLite3.1. Also: please remove at least the "C" in SLC4 - we don't run CERN Linux.

WLCG-07-32 to -34 I guess you mean UI on SL4?

Comment: Change done.

WLCG-07-34 Of we can test the UI in pre-prod but why do we need it to be installed at the Tier-1s in production? Isn't that designed as a component to be installed on users desktops for grid access?

Comment: This depends on whether the sites have centrally installed machines for interactive work and launching the grid jobs (e.g. lxplus cluster at CERN). If at a given the users have to install the UI on their desktop the milestone does not apply to that site.

WLCG-07-36 to -38 please change UI to gLite CE

Comment: Changes done.

WLCG-07-41 as far as I understood, Alice is using xrootd for T1-T2 transfers. Is the software ready for all types of MSS and are T2s ready to install and test this? Or did you mean "interface functionality" tested at some sites and accepted by Alice? Moreover, do we (WLCG) have support from xrootd developers for maintenance and further developments?

Comment: This is a milestone in order to make sure the xrootd interfaces suit ALICE's needs. The deployment at sites and support is an important issue and may generate other milestones.

G.Merino

It concerns milestone WLCG-07-20 "FTS 2.0 deployed in production". The due date for this milestone appears as "September" in the planning.

CMS will be in the middle of its CSA07 extensive testing during September, so I wanted to ask to the CMS people whether they will request Tier-1s to run FTS-2.0 for the CSA07. If this is so, I believe that the service should be deployed in production before September, in order to have some days for testing it.

If CMS is not planning to run CSA07 with FTS-2.0 in the Tier-1s, then we should make clear the milestone is due by the "end of September" (i.e. after CSA07).

So the question is: CSA07 with or without FTS-2.0?

Comment: The reason for setting end of September was that, even with the release ready by end of July, August was considered too tight for setting it for the milestone. Site will have August and September for installing FTS 2, but the sooner the better.

L.Dell'Agnello

BTW: at the operations meeting yesterday the issue of migrating WNs to SL(C) 4 has been discussed but none of the experiments representatives present could state that this OS is certified by them (and the PPS ???).

LHC Computing Grid Project

To clarify (at least for LHC experiments), do you (Alice, ATLAS, CMS, LHCb) agree on the migration of WNs to SL(C) 4.4 with gLite 3.1 and certify your software is ready?

Comment: Discussed last week at the MB and being defined at the Operations meetings.

Please keep in mind that in our case we will move the queues without duplication of the queues (e.g. the exp D with the queue "d" based on wns with SLC 3.x/gLite 3.0 from a certain moment will have the same queue "d" based on wns with SLC 4.x/gLite 3.1)

In any case the timescale is short for us and we will not be able to fulfill this requirement in June (our estimate is for the first decade of July).

D.Barberis

- The current (old) production release 12 was built on SLC3 but can be run also on SL(C)4 (in 32-bit mode). This is already happening in many sites.

- The forthcoming release 13, the first version of which was installed last week and which is now undergoing validation tests, is built in 3 versions: SLC3, SLC4/32-bit, SLC4/64-bit. For manpower reasons, we are now validating the SLC3 and SLC4/32-bit versions.

All we ask from the sites is that they:

1) publish their configuration correctly and avoid mixing nodes with different operating systems;

2) until further notice, provide the 32-bit compatibility environment on their 64-bit SLC(4) nodes.

Ph.Charpentier

This is the situation for LHCb concerning SLC4 migration (I use here the LCG convention for platform names, even if 64-bit is no longer only AMD ;-)

* Our current production software is available for both `slc3_ia32_gcc323` and `slc4_ia32_gcc34`

* Part of our analysis software still only builds on `slc3_ia32_gcc323` (but can run on `slc4` provided 32-bit compatibility is ensured)

* Our latest development releases are available and certified on the 3 platforms (above + `slc4_amd64_gcc34`)

For user's jobs, we have to be able to target a specific platform as it should be the same flavour as that on which he/she has built his/her application. Hence, as for ATLAS, the CEs should be homogeneous, and should publish their platform in a consistent way. Until then, all SLC4 WNs should have 32-bit compatibility such that all 3 flavours can run on them (without benefiting of course of better performances).

Our suggestion would have been of course to use the convention established for long in LCG, but assuming it is not possible, a correspondence table would make it, as the compiler can (for the time being) be assumed explicit, and anyway we ship all needed libraries with our applications. We would be grateful be pointed to a proper documentation on which convention is use in the GLUE schema for this specification (I have seen some twiki pages, but they look very cryptic).

Note that from the VO perspective we do not care which platform the CE, SE, RB is running on... We are only interested in WNs (to answer Luca's question). I am afraid I do not understand Holger's statement concerning the move of queues? The only important issue is that a CE supports a consistent set of queues (all SLC3 or all SLC4).

LHC Computing Grid Project

Y.Schutz

The ALICE situation with respect to SLC4 migration is the following:

1. All our software is compiled with gcc 3.2.3 (on all platforms in existence, 32- and 64-bit)
2. It runs on SLC3 and SLC4 (gcc 3.4) with compatibility libraries installed.
3. We prefer not to mix SLC3 and SLC4 machines in the same queue.
4. To run in native 64-bit mode, we will need a 64-bit VO-box on the site, installed with 64-bit version of SLC4.