

## Review of WLCG Tier1 Accounting. for July 2007

John Gordon 22/8/2007 v3

### Summary:

I have reviewed the differences between the accounting taken from the APEL Portal and the corrections reported by the sites in their manual reports for April and May. There is a definite improvement each month. In July only 7/12 sites were happy with their published APEL cpu numbers. The best month achieved was May 8/12. 10/12 sites have been green at one time. The remaining two are: AGSC, and NDGF. NDGF are starting tests now. AGSC report but the numbers are not correct.

No fundamental problem in sites publishing correctly but reliability is not complete so sites still need to check and republish. Tests exist to highlight this but they are not yet in SAM. .

	AGSC	BNL	CERN	CNAF	FNAL	FZK	Lyon	NDGF	NIKHEF	PIC	RAL	Triumf
March	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Red	Red	Green	Green	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow
April	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green
May	Yellow	Green	Green	Red	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Green	Green	Green	Green
June	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Red	Green	Green	Green	Red	White	Green	Green	Green
July	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Yellow	Green	Green	Green

### July:

Of the 12 sites (CERN + Tier1s) in the WLCG April Report:-

- 7 sites (BNL, CNAF, FNAL, FZK, PIC, RAL, Triumf) showed complete agreement between their local records and APEL. (cf 7 in June)
- 1 site (NDGF) had no July data published in APEL cf 2(NIKHEF and CNAF) in June..
- 4 sites (ASGC, CERN, Lyon, NIKHEF) published to APEL but reported discrepancies between APEL and their local records. Cf 3 in June.

### Details:

- IN2P3 split their data into Grid and non-Grid but there totals are a few percent higher than APEL. Cause unknown.
- NIKHEF figures agree but SARA's don't. This has now been fixed.
- NDGF are ready to test reporting into APEL from SGAS and are setting up the tests.
- CERN only reported about 25% of their cpu into APEL. Cause not known. Data being republished.

- ASGC only reported about 60% into APEL. They have since republished all of July.
- CNAF were late reporting. The numbers in their report were greater than those extracted from APEL on 8/8 but were identical to those in APEL when they submitted the report.