

ATLAS opinions for WLCG-TEG-OPS

Ueda I.
2012.01.23.

WLCG central body for operations and monitoring (WG1:1.1+1.3, WG2:R4.1)

- **Would be very significant**
 - ▶ a single body (rather than 4) would reduce duplication of efforts
- We better have manpower to **“do things”** rather than just *“coordinate”*
 - ▶ WG2:R4.1 “as done until now” is not sufficient.
- **High priority** for some aspects, eg.:
 - ▶ Network monitoring (WG1:1.3) and actions based on it
 - ▶ CVMFS deployment (WG3:1) and monitoring
 - should come with a **good monitoring** of
 - the health of the system
 - propagation of the sw from stratum-0 – stratum-1s – sites

Bridge sites and experiments perspectives on availability and usability (WG1:1.5)

- Very much agree with the concept and the direction
 - ▶ Two values should basically converge — worry for two different names
 - ▶ A different name makes sense when experiments do not intend to use sites when their availability is low but not zero — but better think if such sites are really “available”
- New services should be added as soon as possible (either via GOCDB or not)
- High priority

Accounting (WG2:R2.x) + Information Services (WG2:R3.2)

- Published information should be valid and accurate
 - ▶ Accounting should be kept independently to the technology evolution of the underlying elements
- Information Services – should take the “rocky way” = evolve
 - ▶ with time scale ~ **1 year** at least for something to start trying
 - ▶ ATLAS, not being able to rely on the today's information system, has put efforts in the direction not relying on BDII.
 - Unless the “rocky way” comes rather soon, ATLAS will be going away more and more
 - ▶ It costs both ATLAS and for sites extra efforts
 - ATLAS inventing its own stuff and sites needing to report to ATLAS in addition to the information system