

UKHB

Presentation:

Made by Christian Soettrupp.

The presentation material has not been received so far.

Notes:

- Integrating Condor with ARC, U of Wisconsin is quite responsive and willing to help. Condor should have full support of ARC by next release.
- Information system is available at arc-bdii.cern.ch, done by Laurence Field (SA3). Not fully tested; can't be before having fully working WMS.
- WMS is a big problem, list-match fails. This problem is hard to debug, no ready-made debugging statements are currently inside the WMS code, and hence the process is very long. Faked by adding a helper resource, this is now successful but not really usable in production environment.

SA3 surprise was that this showstopper was not really known to anyone outside UKHB, in particular to SA3 personnel so a long discussion has developed to understand better the actions taken by UKHB to resolve it (the following abbreviations are used in the following: CH – Christian Soettrup, MS – Markus Schulz, LF – Laurence Field, OK – Oliver Keeble, ZS – Zdenek Sekera, AH – Andreas Unterkircher, GD – Gergely Debreczeni):

- AH: did your contacts with JAR1 help?

CH: Not really, answers were very slow and often incorrect.

LF: WMS developers should know who CH is, the introduction has been done.

MS: CC Claudio Grandi, MS, AH, LF in any email to WMS developers. State you work for the integration activity. Say important EGEE project is stuck because of lack of help from JAR1. Blow it up, but don't stand still waiting!

ZS: Why can't you attach an interactive debugger and continue that way?

CH: This could be done.

CH: ARC will also have eventually BES (OGF Batch Execution Service) interface but not in the time of the project (then one could interface to CREAM).

OK: There are twice a week EMT meetings where JAR1 is present, all these problems can be brought up there.

ZS: It seems you are really stuck with WMS. Suppose you go to developers and they solve the problem. Once that is done you could probably send a job. Is the WMS the only remaining problem to solve?

CH: No, there are also some data issues.

LF: One should spend at least a week with JAR1 developers.

- CH: It takes a long time to build WMS with ETICS.

LF: ETICS takes ~40-60 mins to build WMS the first time, rebuilding takes for me about 5 mins.

CH: I build more.

MS: Contact ETICS for help. Or contact SA3, we will get you in touch with ETICS support.

- MS: Your focus seems to be more on helping ATLAS (there has been a mail exchange about it). Is there a genuine interest at UKBH to achieve interoperability? From outside it doesn't look like, really. Look at the plan.

CH: Yes there is an interest, but we are much too late now. Time left is not enough, perhaps, to get WMS stuff in there. We are short of manpower in Copenhagen. We have never done such a project before.

- MS: lots of goals had already been worked on before the project started. Interoperability to Nordic countries has always been seen as very important for EGEE. We need to change the strategy: help experiments to adapt to ARC rather than achieve full gLite/ARC interoperability. Let's look at the plan: out of 12 PM UKBH has already spent 9 PM. And MS continues by citing milestones – none achieved. You cannot catch up with the plan in remaining 3 months. One can't stop thinking that available resources were used for other things. A credible plan would have to include additional resources. Remember the interoperability discussion has started already in 2005!

MS: It is possible to install 2 CEs (some large sites) for ARC and gLite. This is not the desired way, better is perhaps the portal solution as used in Canada. GD should send some info about this to CH.

- MS: New plan is needed until end of next week: JAR1 meeting & alternative (portal). Demo solution would be straightforward.

ZS: Say something like June/15 we have to have a decision if the WMS way works.

MS: Are you willing to write a plan?

CH: yes, but next week is difficult.

MS: Decision will be made on May/31. You have to have something. Primary goal: send a job from gLite to NorduGrid. We want that ATLTAS can submit.

- To get out of the deadlock, MS suggests the following:
 - A new plan will be elaborated by UKBH that will include realistic options that can be achieved within the remaining time.
 - This plan should include several variants:
 - If JAR1 efficient support is obtained with 2 weeks from now, the June/15/2007 should be considered a break-even point to see if it is still feasible and reasonable to include WMS.
 - What can be achieved if the above is not possible, decision being made June/15/2007.
 - Would the alternative approach (similar to Canada-way) using Condor be a reasonable, though optimal, alternative? To this LF has noted that Canadian grid is a Condor pool. That is different then using a CE to submit jobs to ARC. ARC cannot reuse a lot from Canada. It might be more useful to do a BLAH interface to ARC. Canada solution might not work because they deal with different sites interfaces. The gateway approach might not give any time gains.