

NOTES by Maria Dimou

### **3rd Middleware Readiness Working Group meeting** (with audioconf)

Tuesday, 2014/03/18 from 14:30 to 16:00 hrs CET at CERN ( 513-R-068 )

**Agenda:** [https://indico.cern.ch/e/MW-Readiness\\_3](https://indico.cern.ch/e/MW-Readiness_3)

**Present** (alphabetical order):

**Local:** David Cameron (ATLAS), Joel Closier (LHCb), Maria Dimou (chair & notes), Ben Jones (T0 & HEPiX Config WG), Oliver Keeble (DPM, LFC & FTS), Maarten Litmaath (co-chair & ALICE), Nicolo Magini (CMS), Andrea Manzi (DPM), Stefan Roiser (LHCb), Andrea Sciaba` (CMS), Daniele Spiga (HammerCloud)

**Remote:** Cristina Aiftimiei (EMI), Jeremy Coles (GridPP), Patrick Fuhrmann (dCache), Thomas Hartmann (KIT Data Mgmt), Xinli (Simon) Liu (Triumf)

**Apologies:** Jeremy for joining late due to another meeting, Joao Pina (EGI Staged Rollout manager).

1. **Minutes** of the 2nd meeting of 2014/02/06 Approved. They can be found [HERE](#).

2. **Actions** from the 2nd meeting: All **DONE**. Details at the end of this file.

3. **Comments on the [Procedure Guidelines for VOs & Sites](#)**

a. The use of SAM is also possible. The Guidelines should not mention HammerCloud as the only solution. (Andrea S and all). This point covers agenda item 4.7.

b. CERN IT/SDC will help VOs and sites to configure the parallel infrastructure for the Readiness Verification of new MW versions. (Oliver)

c. Operational issues should be at the discretion of the WLCG MW Officer, following interaction with the sites. (Patrick and Maria)

d. Keep software and configuration changes apart to avoid unpleasant surprises in operation. (Joel)

#### 4. Comments on Additional MW products in the [Product Teams' table](#) of the twiki

All MW products suggested in [Agenda](#) (item 4) shall be included in the table. Nevertheless, their inclusion in the Readiness Verification process will be left for a later date.

The WLCG MW Officer's interaction with Product Teams, VOs and Sites should become more clear via WG discussions in email and at the next meeting, before we expand into the inclusion of more products.

#### 5. Impressions from ATLAS *Volunteer Sites' Readiness Verification*:

Agenda item 5 couldn't be discussed because the [ATLAS MW Readiness Validation procedure](#) was not accessible for WG members without CERN login. This is now solved. Discussion at the next meeting.

#### 6. Next (4<sup>th</sup>) meeting: Thursday 15 May 2014 at 10h30am CEST at CERN with audioconf.

#### 7. A.O.B. None

Action	Description	Status
20140318-01	MariaD to edit the Guidelines and Product Table on the MW WG <a href="#">twiki</a> .	Pending.
20140318-02	Maarten to add the ALICE row on the MW WG <a href="#">twiki</a> ( <a href="#">Experiment Workflows' section</a> ).	Pending.
20140206-01	David, Alessandro, MariaD, Maarten to work through	Done. General Guidelines by MariaD <a href="#">HERE</a> .

	the details of <a href="#">the ATLAS plan</a> and generalise it for the other VOs. If new e-groups are needed, create them.	
<b>20140206-02</b>	<b>Simone</b> to send the WG his note to the WLCG MB on site rewarding for their participation to the Readiness Verification effort.	<b>Done.</b> Simone's doc <a href="#">HERE</a> is now in the WLCG MB approval process.
<b>20131212-01</b>	<b>Cristina</b> 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.	<b>Done.</b> Text by INFN via Cristina on 20140205 here! <sup>1</sup>
<b>20131212-02</b>	<b>Maarten &amp; Maria, with input from all,</b> to examine the work-flow used by some products	<b>Done.</b> Table for Products and Experiments in <a href="https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/MiddlewareReadiness">https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/MiddlewareReadiness</a>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

	and, if they can serve as examples, document their reasons of success. Point to their existing documentation and summarise in a table.	
<b>20131212-03</b>	<b>Jeremy</b> to send the processes used by UK sites so we can learn from them for the next meeting.	<b>Done.</b> Text by Jeremy on 20140206 here! <sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.