

Minutes of Information System Meeting with users, 19th November 2013

Present from IT-SDC: Maria Alandes IT-GT (MA), Laurence Field (LF), Alessandro di Girolamo (AG), Maarten Litmaath (ML), Stefan Roiser (SR), Andrea Sciaba (AS)

Present from EGI: Stephen Burke (SB)

Present from OSG: None

Other interested people who attended the meeting: None

Agenda available in Indico

<https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=278660>

1. Introduction

This meeting is to report about the status of the BDII, GLUE 2.0 validation and WLCG Global Information Registry prototype.

2. Action item review

Available in <https://its.cern.ch/jira/browse/GRIDINFO-24?filter=-1>

3. Status of BDII

MA presents the performed releases. The latest release contains a set of bug fixes, the most relevant one related to a bug fix in the ldap info provider that was affecting top BDIIs who were missing to publish some sites. It also contains the production version of glue-validator. The release is available in EMI 2 and 3 and also in UMD 2 and 3. More details in: http://www.eu-emi.eu/releases/emi-3-monte-bianco/updates/-/asset_publisher/5Na8/content/update-9-07-10-2013-v-3-5-2-1#BDII_top_v_1_1_3.

MA announces that there are no more releases scheduled except for a new version of the top BDII metapackage to decommission the FCR mechanism. AS asks whether FCR is already disabled in SAM BDII. MA will check this with PES.

MA presents the BDII deployment status and mentions that most BDIIs are up to date to the latest version but that many BDIIs are still running version 5.2.12. MA will follow this up with EGI to understand whether this could come from EMI 1 repos still enabled. ML mentions that EMI 1 was decommissioned and in principle it is not used.

MA explains that most of the information currently published in GLUE 2 is coming from SW tags. ATLAS and LHCb could already delete these tags and AG and SR will contact the right people to request this after the meeting. This will decrease a lot the amount of information being published.

MA explains that her packaging status is still pending and that she plans to work on this before the end of the year.

Action items:

- *Check FCR mechanism is not installed in SAM BDII (MA)*
- *Check with EGI if BDIIs may run a version coming from EMI 1 repository (MA)*
- *Delete ATLAS and LHCb SW tags from the BDII (MA, AG, and SR).*

4. Status of GLUE 2 validation

MA explains that EGI has changed its plans to deploy glue-validator in Nagios. Many sites are failing the probe and there is an internal EGI policy to not deploy probes that failed in more than 75% of the sites. The strategy now is to follow up on sites with errors and open manual tickets to try to improve the situation. EGI is also busy with the SHA-2 campaign and once this is over, there will be more effort on GLUE 2. Hopefully by the early 2014, the probe could be finally deployed.

MA presents the results of the last GLUE 2 validation. Results show that obsolete entries have decreased probably due to the fact that some sites have upgraded to the last version.

MA informs that she has opened 3 GGUS tickets against DPM, dCache and StoRM to try to get storage capacity numbers properly published. StoRM has confirmed already that there is indeed a bug in the info provider and that they are working on it. AG adds that at least for ATLAS, this effort could focus only on space tokens which are what they care for. MA agrees to put focus on space tokens only.

MA summarises the on-going activities to have cloud resources published in the BDII. There is now a draft circulating in the GLUE WG to have an extension that could also define cloud resources properly. MA is also in contact with EGI to see whether it is possible to have cloud resources already published in the BDII. More details in upcoming meetings.

SR also mentions some inconsistent numbers published by pic. MA will follow up this.

Action items:

- *Check pic storage capacity numbers for LHCb (MA)*

5. Status of WLCG Information Registry

LF would like to propose to stop any further development on the GSR. The reason for this proposal is that experiments currently have their own configuration DBs tightly coupled with their frameworks and working fine, even if manual work is needed to a greater or lesser extent in some of the cases. LF adds that the GSR brings little value compared to AGIS, who is already doing aggregation of the different sources of information, so probably it is worth putting the effort in improving AGIS instead of GSR. LF also thinks that GOCDB/OIM could be enhanced to include more static information since everybody has agreed that GOCDB/OIM is the authoritative source of information to get the list of resources. If needed, OIM info could be replicated to GOCDB to have

only one entry point. LF finally concluded that for him it was clear that the way to go was to improve/extend GOCDB and OIM instead of developing the GSR further.

AS mentions that a single API could also be developed to interact with both OIM and GOCDB. LF replies that ginfo could be extended to do this.

MA concludes that all these ideas will be put together in some slides to be presented at the Common Projects meeting to get feedback and see in which direction we should go. For more details, please check: <https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=283484>

6. Next meeting

17th December 2013.