NOTES by Maria Dimou v.1

2nd Middleware Readiness Working Group meeting (with audioconf)

Thursday, 2014/02/06 from 15:30 to 17:00 hrs CET at CERN (513-R-068)

Agenda: https://indico.cern.ch/e/MW-Readiness_2

Present (alphabetical order):

Local: David Cameron (ATLAS), Simone Campana (WLCG Ops Coord), Alessandro di Girolamo (ATLAS), Maria Dimou (chair & notes), Lukasz Janyst (xrootd & EOS), Oliver Keeble (DPM, LFC & FTS), Maarten Litmaath (co-chair & ALICE), Alberto Peon (T0 & HEPiX Config WG), Markus Schulz (CERN IT/SDC Leader).

Remote: Cristina Aiftimiei (EMI), Joel Closier (LHCb), Jeremy Coles (GridPP), Jose Hernandez (CMS), Joao Pina (EGI Staged Rollout manager), Chris Walker (Queen Mary Site).

1. **Minutes** of the kick-off meeting: Approved. They can be found in status FINAL HERE.
2. **Actions** from the kick-off meeting: All DONE. Details at the end of this file.
3. **Decisions:**

A. Concerning MiddleWare (MW) **products:** The WG concluded on a short-list of MW products that will be Verified for Readiness (see product table here!) to start with. Readiness Verification is a phase *after* testing done by the developers and *in addition* to the staged rollout, when applicable. The Readiness Verification will take place at **sites** which:

1. Are used by the Product Teams (PTs) for their testing before releasing AND
2. Have expert VO representatives on site.
3. Are given sufficient space (>=1TB) to run the *most recent and already tested* MW versions on a parallel-to-production infrastructure.

B. Concerning the **procedure:**
1. Install clients in CVFMS common area grid.cern.ch.
2. Use HammerCloud (HC) for 'verifying' them.

3. Test clients and services in a similar way, on the parallel infrastructure.
4. Agree with the Monitoring team to separately present the results from this parallel infrastructure. Thus, the Site Availability figures remain untouched.
5. Select a WLCG MW officer who will:
    a. check the Readiness Verification results,
    b. decide on the need to also run under load,
    c. wait for selected sites to run the new versions also in production and then ⋯
    d. announce to the WLCG Operations Coordination meeting these versions ⋯
    e. using an *EXTENDED* form of today's [Baseline versions table](#) that will include (as an additional column?) the latest Verified for Readiness MW versions. Prerequisite OS versions and language bindings, are decided at the Architects' Forum (AF).

C. The detailed plan will be prepared, by making [the Experiment Workflows' table](#), more concrete, following [the ATLAS's example](#) and will be discussed at our next (3ʳᵈ) meeting, mid-March. ***** ACTION 20140206-01 *****

D. Conclusion on repositories: PTs will continue using the one of their preference. Concerning the EMI repo, beyond April 2014, INFN sent the following official statement to the WG (also forwarded to the WLCG MB by Maria): *INFN acknowledges the importance of the EMI repository for the Grid middleware community and it is very committed in continuing to ensure its long term maintenance. At this moment discussion is going on with EGI/UMD to understand what could be the better way to ensure this maintainance. As soon as we have all the details we'll make them available. Meanwhile we can guarantee that any change to the present support model will be announced with at least 6 months in advance, so that all interested parts can have enough time to organise.*

4. Next meeting: Mid-March. Please select from [THIS doodle](#) !

5. A.O.B. The meeting decided that the GGUS submission form fields on OS and command used and error message obtained can be deleted ([see the form with the fields included here](#)).

Action	Description	Status
20140206-01	**David, Alessandro, Maria, Maarten** to work through the details of [the ATLAS plan](#)	Pending.

	and generalise it for the other VOs. If new e-groups are needed, create them.	
20140206-02	**Simone** to send the WG his note to the WLCG MB on site rewarding for their participation to the Readiness Verification effort.	**Pending.**
20131212-01	**Cristina** to obtain an official INFN statement on the continuation of the EMI repository beyond April 2014 and for how long. This should be communicated to this WG and the WLCG MB.	**Done.** Text by INFN via Cristina on 20140205 here![1]
20131212-02	**Maarten & Maria, with input from all,** to examine the work-flow used by some products and, if they can serve as examples,	**Done.** Table for Products and Experiments in https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/MiddlewareReadiness

---

[1] INFN acknowledges the importance of the EMI repository for the Grid middleware community and it is very committed in continuing to ensure its long term maintenance. At this moment discussion is going on with EGI/UMD to understand what could be the better way to ensure this maintainance. As soon as we have all the details we'll make them available. Meanwhile we can guarantee that any change to the present support model will be announced with at least 6 months in advance, so that all interested parts can have enough time to organise.

	document their reasons of success. Point to their existing documentation and summarise in a table.	
20131212-03	**Jeremy** to send the processes used by UK sites so we can learn from them for the next meeting.	**Done**. Text by Jeremy on 20140206 here![2]

---

[2] During the 13th December meeting it was mentioned that availability reports will become less important, and that the accounting reports will matter a lot more. I pointed out that in the UK we allocate funding to Tier-2 sites using an algorithm that currently incorporates the site availability as a measure of their performance. The data being collected and used is available to view at http://pprc.qmul.ac.uk/~lloyd/gridpp/metrics.html. It was concluded that this may impact site involvement in some testing scenarios.

The metrics are calculated/used in different ways based for each of the experiments. It turns out that for CMS the availability no longer has any direct metric. For ATLAS and LHCb the impact has decreased. Having looked into this further there is general agreement that accounting is indeed what really matters now and we will look to update the remaining metrics (it has a small impact anyway).

In summary, the availability mattered more in the days when sites got credit for putting resources online even if there was not enough work to use them. Whilst in GridPP we do still take account of availability this is set to change so is not something this WG needs to consider.