NOTES by Maarten Litmaath & Maria Dimou

4th Middleware Readiness Working Group meeting (with audioconf)

Thursday, 2014/05/15 from 10:30 to 12:00 hrs CEST at CERN (513-R-068)

Agenda: https://indico.cern.ch/e/MW-Readiness_4

Present (alphabetical order):

Local: Alberto Aimar (CERN/IT-SDC mgnt), Maria Alandes Pradillo (WLCG Ops Coord chairperson), Wahid Bhimji (DPM Collaboration, Edinburgh), David Cameron (ATLAS), Lionel Cons (Monitoring expert, developer), Maria Dimou (chair & notes), Oliver Keeble (DPM, LFC & FTS), Maarten Litmaath (ALICE & notes), Nicolo Magini (CMS), Andrea Manzi (DPM), Alberto Peon (T0 & HEPiX Config WG), Stefan Roiser (LHCb), Andrea Sciaba` (CMS & WLCG Ops Coord chairperson).

Remote: Gerd Behrmann (NDGF), Joel Closier (LHCb), Jeremy Coles (GridPP), Andreas Petzold (KIT), Joao Pina (EGI) Pavel Weber (KIT).

Apologies: Cristina Aiftimiei (EMI).

1. **Minutes** of the 3rd meeting of 2014/03/18. Approved. They can be found HERE.

2. **Actions** from the 3rd meeting: **20140318-01 Then Pending, now Done. 20140318-02 Postponed**. Details in the Action List table.

3. **Discussion on MW versions, in production & under verification, and how to "discover" them.**

MariaD thanked again the T0 and all T1s for the input they provided HERE on:

1. The use of BDII for publishing MW versions installed and running in production.
2. The way they use the current Baseline versions' table to check if they are up-to-date.

4. Proposal by Lionel on the future of publishing versions running and testing at the site

Lionel's investigation tried to answer the question "What is a MW package?". The discussion at the meeting concluded to *an agreement by the WG for sites to publish the rpms they run and for Lionel to collect them, save them in a database and compare them to a 'reference version'.* Check his slides HERE to follow the discussion highlights:

- EMI-2 and -3 repos now have the same versions for e.g. 'BDII Site' but the actual packages contained are different.
- The BDII example shows that there can exist an N-to-N relation between rpms and packages.
- Disk server rpms currently are not exposed at all, neither are system packages.
- Commonly used terms like 'EMI product', 'Meta-package' (when it was still used), 'MW package'. 'rpm version', 'high-level MW service version' have all numbers and they are all different.
- The high-level MW service version number is not satisfactory, because it is derived from one rpm and not updated when sub-components change.
- Nevertheless, it is interesting for the PT, to see which versions of their product are in use on the infrastructure.
- On the other hand, this version number cannot be increased every time, because a Product Team (PT) cannot do that for its product when the repository receives a new version of a sub-component from *another* PT (Examples: DPM depends on BDII, CREAM depends on CANL).
- 'MW packages' would correspond to Meta-packages or EMI products" but **we need fine-grained monitoring of individual rpms.**
- To Gerd's question about sites with non rpm-based OSs, e.g. Debian or tar balls, Lionel said that, if we were to use Pakiti, it supports Debian. Concerning tar ball installations (recommended for UI, WN) their version tracking could be left for a later stage or be recorded in CVMFS.

- At the time of the presentation we were thinking of re-using Pakiti. Its advantage is that it is shipped by the security team with a dedicated test job running on the WN, the site admin needs to install nothing! Its configuration would be: site name, list of rpms to be monitored, destination for publishing results.

- We should monitor only MW rpms and make sure the results are not public.

- We can't use the BDII for this as it only publishes the high-level MW service versions and not all their contents and it is public! Hence, the need to develop a tool.

- The *Volunteer* sites will be asked to install and configure the tool that will 'discover' the MW rpm versions installed in operation and under test for readiness verification.

- **The importance of the MW Officer evaluating the results is clear because:**
    o some rpm version can be '*bad'* for one service/VO, while OK for another, even on the same site.
    o some sites may not be affected by a particular bug, e.g. depending on their configuration: it may not always be easy to mark some version '*bad'.*
    o some sites run a newer '*unknown'* version than the validated one, e.g. NDGF and their newest dCache version and this is OK for them.
    o a PT does some checks that their new version runs smoothly with other products but they can't be exhaustive, this is why the MW Readiness verification effort is necessary!
    o The MW Officer can find out what is being tested precisely on the *Volunteer* sites' validation infrastructure, gain experience with the monitoring results and maybe propose it for wider adoption at a later stage.

5. **Discussion on the *Volunteer* sites' set up –Should they give their parallel infrastructure different site name?**
    o declaring separate sites in the GOCDB is expensive in terms of effort
    o also, in the case of ATLAS (AGIS) the relevant services are marked as test instances, while in the GOCDB the site name does **not** change **and** AGIS needs them to have the production status.

o   We need to find case by case site set-up solutions to avoid bad availability results and unwanted tickets to the site.

6. Next (5ᵗʰ) meeting: Wednesday 2ⁿᵈ July 2014 at 16:00hrs CEST at CERN with audioconf.

7. A.O.B.

On MariaD's question about final conclusion on the baseline version table usage, Nicolo` replied that the site managers' answers HERE show that through their own procedures T0 and T1s essentially comply with the table. Moreover, the table is particularly important for the T2s!

Action	Description	Status
20140318-01	**MariaD** to edit the Guidelines and Product Table on the MW WG twiki.	**Pending.** By the time these notes are published the Guidelines have been updated. The additional products will be included on the Twiki page and discussed next time.
20140318-02	**Maarten** to add the ALICE row on the MW WG twiki (Experiment Workflows' section).	**Postponed.** ALICE has other priorities at the moment.