



LHCC + C-RSG review



Ian Bird
LCG Project Leader



Review of WLCG

- To be held Feb 16 at CERN

- LHCC Reviewers:
 - Amber Boehnlein
 - Chris Hawkes
 - Jean-Francois Grivaz
 - + other LHCC

- C-RSG:
 - Domenec Espriu
 - + other RSG members



Draft agenda

- My draft proposed agenda: (covering their requests)

10.00	Project overview and status report - Ian Include: planning, milestones, resources status (installation, pledges, use), status of planning for new Tier 0, etc.
10.30	Report from service delivery/operations - Jamie Includes summary of Tier0, Tier1, and Tier2 experiences from ops and site viewpoints.
11.00	Applications Area status - Pere
11.30	Middleware and MSS status and summary - XXX
12.00	Brief summary of situation with EGI/EMI etc proposals (depends on level of feedback from EC - may not have much until March) - XXX
14.00	Experiment reports - to include experience with first data, issues arising, resource planning for 2011: we must consider that there will be accelerator running in 2011 - we need to construct a realistic scenario. Fallback is no 2011 running with no increase in resources? Outcome of this meeting must be a scenario that we present to the RRB in April - something has to be said. 45 min per experiment?
17:00	Summary and conclusions



First feedback from Domenec

- I agree that by the C-RBB in April we must present a clear report and recommendations to the funding agencies that are now completely on the dark in what respects the projections for the computing needs in 2011 and 2012
- I am quite happy with the idea of devoting the morning session to an evaluation of how the LCG computing has been performing
- The proposed agenda (by Ian) sounds about right to me.
 - I would probably not include the discussion on the EGI etc as it may distract us from the main objective.
 - As for the experiments I would like to hear in this morning session a qualitative discussion of the pitfalls they have encountered (if any) and how they have been circumvented, how's the software being performing and so on. That is, more focus on the physics issues.
- For the afternoon session I think we just need four presentations by the experiments where they report on:
 - 1. Preliminary estimates on the usage they have made of the LCG resources including montecarlo, reconstruction, group and chaotic analysis compared to their previous estimates and distribution of the previous one over tier1 and tier2. We do not need at this point numbers with 4 significant figures, nor even definitive ones. The experiments are expected to report to us in writing by March 1st, so this would provide a good interaction opportunity to get feedback from us and for us to see how they are doing.
 - 2. Projection for the needs in 2011 and 2012. Again, these need not be definitive. A formal requests is expected again around March 1st. In doing so I would assume the following scenario
 - Run for 2010 complete until around november or so -they need to reprocess and analyze all this
 - For 2010 I would assume a 6 month shutdown. It may be longer, but certainly not shorter, so we should prepare for the best. After that expect a long run until Xmas 2011.



Response

Dear Domenec and Amber,

- I agree that the experiments should report on what has been learned.
- In the Management Board the issue of reporting to the C-RSG in writing by March 1st has been discussed, and the prevailing opinion of all is that this does not make sense. There will be no data with which to plan any real improvement of requests over what presently exists. That is why I think it is essential that on Feb 16 we agree (project, LHCC, and C-RSG) on what we should say in the C-RRB. We need to agree on assumptions with regards to the LHC schedule, and we need to agree that for the 2011 procurements there will be no better information than that we currently have. Don't forget that the procurement cycles have to start in April to meet April 2011 installation deadlines. We could of course agree that there is a delay in this deadline for 2011, and that procurements could start later - but this still really means that they must start in the summer.
- By Feb 16 we will have as much information as we are going to get. We have to agree a common position at that time, and we have to send a clear message to the RRB and to the CERN management (to clarify the schedules as early as possible). This is probably the most important outcome of this review.