

Report from OB

28 October 2008
13:56

My talk:

Main points:

- LHC schedule during shutdown - emphasise should not see as reason to change plans - all agreed; T1s & T2s should continue as planned with capacity installation for 2009
Agreed with planning for CCRC'09 as we propose, but ATLAS emphasise the need for testing not only of the Tier 1 tape recall (re-processing) but also for chaotic many-user analysis as far as possible. Also point made about trying to see some of the scaling limits of the services - what does it talk to break?
- EGI
 - I presented concerns over state of EGI_DS blueprint
 - There are still some serious shortcomings in the process and in the blueprint:
 - It is not clear exactly what is being proposed in terms of the roles and functions of the National and central organisations;
 - There is no representation of the user communities, and no description of how those communities interact with the infrastructures; (they own many resources)
 - It is not clear how the present operational infrastructure upon which WLCG depends will evolve and appear in the future;
 - Insufficient resources for central operations
 - Risk of discontinuation of ROCs
 - User support is being challenged
 - Very few of the NGIs are as yet established, and so how they can support the WLCG sites is not clear, in particular during a transition period;
 - Given the state of the current blueprint, it seems unlikely that there will be an organisation in place in time to take over the European grid infrastructure from EGEE in early 2010 with a managed transition process during the preceding year.
 - WLCG position
 - The Tier 1 and Tier 2 sites in Europe will rely on National Grid Infrastructures being in place to provide the support and functions today provided by EGEE
 - ◆ Important for operations and middleware support (maintenance and distribution)
 - ◆ See position statements provided earlier this year and recent updates
 - ◆ Still important that OB/CB members raise this to the NGI and national funding agencies
 - The Tier 0 is probably in a good position – the CERN planning does not rely on external funding; but the capability will be strictly limited to core WLCG Tier 0/CAF tasks
 - Even if there will be a full EGI/NGI it seems optimistic that this will be in place by the end of EGEE-3, and likely that not all NGIs will be in existence when it starts
 - WLCG must have a concrete plan to operate without relying on the European level support, either for an interim period or indefinitely
 - How to proceed:
 - Will now document how each of the core functions that we today rely on will be managed in future
 - ◆ Start with the position statements sent by Tier 1 sites
 - ◆ Consider each of the major functions:
 - ◇ GGUS, operational support, monitoring tools, middleware support, certification, deployment support, service management, etc.
 - ◇ Work with EGEE to understand the expected status of each of these in mid-2010
 - ◇ Negotiate who will manage /contribute to each function if there is no EGI
 - Process agreed - will produce this document; sites have re-affirmed their positions (commitments to MoU). Need to agree responsibilities.

Jamie's talk:

- Recent experience with service problems and post-mortems.
- Responses from CNAF, RAL, and NL-T1 on specific problems. NL clarified that they would not be able to install resources for 2008 or 2009 until June/July 2009.
- Jamie proposes site visits - perhaps we should see this as a management tool with a formal report to help the sites solve their problems, by recommending certain actions.
- Suggested that specific MB actions can be set to (e.g.) ensure that all sites fix config or specific problems in a service uncovered at a site.

C- RSG report - Domenec Espriu

- Did not really discuss contents of report. This has now been sent to the experiments for comments before it is

- more widely distributed. (Was not sent to project). Formally this is a report to the RRB.
- Needs to be given to RRB 2 weeks before meeting (i.e. Now), many FA's state do not want to be surprised by this in the meeting and would like chance to discuss with sites in advance. Seems unlikely.
- Recommends also advancing the RRB cycle if possible as this does not currently fit with procurements (we agree here). Also want to look at 2010 numbers for early next year.
- More worrying is that the RSG now want to review the accounting and monitoring tools (not sure what they expect to say there).
-

Tier 2 issues - Mike Vetterli

- This OB was first with 2 Tier 2 reps invited (as agreed at previous CB and foreseen in MoU). Nominated were Michel Jouvin (GRIF) and Atul Gurtu (Mumbai).
- Presented more or less issues that he showed at last LHCC referees meeting.
- Clear need to T2 installed capacity reporting (as for Tier 1s) --> Flavia today. (Issue about apparent under-use of resources).
- Raised interesting issue of T2 clusters:
 - Many would like advice on how and what hardware to buy
 - Concern over GB-e bandwidth (from storage to WNs on aggregate) - is it going to be sufficient, and should sites plan on alternatives (IB)? Could we have this discussion in MB?