



Draft (V1)

Amendments history:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Area</i>	<i>Date</i>

Minutes of the meeting

CERN, 15th December 2004

Agenda: <http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a042136>

Minutes: Dave Kelsey

Attendees: See appendix

1. Introduction and actions from October meeting (Kors Bos)

KB welcomed everyone to the meeting. See slides on the agenda for the introductory remarks. He stated that all actions from the October meeting were either complete or covered by today's agenda.

Regarding the minutes of the last meeting (October 2004), KB congratulated Jeremy Coles, in his absence, for producing such excellent minutes. DK agreed to take minutes today. There were no further comments on the minutes so they were accepted as accurate.

KB reminded GDB that the deadline for submission of the experiment Computing Models to LHCC is today, so the presentations here are very timely.

KB briefly presented the ideas behind a new GDB standing working group on Networking. This group, chaired by David Foster, will plan for, put in place and maintain the network for the LCG Service Challenges. The first meeting will happen on 20/21 January 2005 in Amsterdam.



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Discussion on this new networking group followed.

DF commented that there was no desire to replicate the efforts of Dante. The main aim is to fully understand Tier0/Tier1 connectivity and needs. Dante will be invited but, in general, not all of the NRENs.

LR: The Tier1 representatives need to fully understand their national network or invite an appropriate NREN person.

KB: The first meeting will discuss how to operate in future.

LR: but we need to have the correct experts right from the start

DL: if more is known about the agenda in advance, then we can invite the appropriate additional NREN person.

2. Update on the CMS Computing Model (David Stickland)

DS's slides are on the agenda page together with a copy of the document.

The CMS Computing Model document is submitted to LHCC today.

DS stresses the last line of the executive summary. This is an interim report and not the final word. All is subject to revision during the preparation of the TDRs and MoUs.

Full details are in the document and the slides. The following clarifications or comments were made during the talk:

- CMS plan to distribute RAW and RECO as closely coupled data.
- They will do much reconstruction during 1st year.
- "Tape" means secure media, not necessarily tape as such
- Tier2's will receive data from **all** Tier1's
- Slide 15: Red colour means data currently being looked at
- need 1Gbps into Tier2 centres
- costed as though all spent in 2007

JG: *How large is a minimum size centre?*

DS: about half of average; much less doesn't make sense.

VW: *Tier1 manpower costs are important.*

DS: Yes!

LR: once LHCC validates numbers, then Tier1's have to compute their own costs.

VW: objects to just the one slide on ongoing cost evolution.



3. Update on the ATLAS Computing Model (Dario Barberis)

DB showed slides (see agenda – *comment from DPK: these have gone!*). The document is also available from the agenda page. All details are there. Some comments and questions are noted here.

- ATLAS do not foresee a Tier1 or a Tier2 at CERN, rather an analysis facility
- approx 100 people will use this CERN analysis facility
- All costs are in the appendix of the document
- They foresee an average of 20 users at each Tier2
- The document now includes the half year in 2007; figures have increased cf input to Phase2 planning
- There are some similarities with CMS but also some differences!
- Atlas have now established a Tier1 coordination committee.

KB: *is the CMS 20-day buffer the same buffer as your 4 days?*

DB: if links are down for more than 4 days we can't catch up.

DL: *tape to disk ratio? What is definition of tape?*

DB: Tape means “slow access”

DL: but will need to store some “disk” data, i.e. fast access, on fast tape. Not possible to afford twice as much disk as tape.

DB: “tape” means a system including staging disk.

4. Update on the ALICE Computing Model (Federico Carminati)

FC's slides are available on the agenda page. The document will be submitted to LHCC on 17th December 2004 (a two-day extension was granted).

FC comments that his report is less detailed than CMS and ATLAS. They are working on more of a cloud model than a strict hierarchical model, i.e. with no fixed roles.

LR: *You need 800 MB/s out of CERN. Is this average load or what?*

FC: Average over the year. During running will need 600 MB/s (distributing ESDs as well)



5. Update on the LHCb Computing Model (Nick Brook)

NB's slides are on the agenda page as is a link to the document. Full details are there; just a few comments are recorded here.

- The trigger rate has recently increased by approx a factor of 10.
- Now using real data for systematic studies
- Will store RAW data with rDST at stripping stage (important for analysis during early years)
- local analysis will be outside the scope of the computing document
- Costs haven't really changed since the Hoffman report, even with the shift from cpu to mss.

DL: *Many thanks to all experiments for using the same parameters (in general), but the CERN numbers are different per experiment, because different assumptions about Tier1, Tier2 etc. at CERN. Will someone do the aggregation?*

NB: but all experiments present the numbers for external Tier1.

LR: it seems reasonably easy to extract the required info from what has been presented.

KB: *LHCb networking requirements?*

NB: The numbers are in the document. LHCb has smaller requirements for Tier1-Tier2 cf others.

The meeting broke for lunch at 12:35.

6. Start of the Quattor Working Group (German Cancio)

GC presented the mandate, status and plans of the Quattor working group. See slides on the agenda page for full details.

JG: *are there any external C&T tests today?*

GC: No. But there are guinea pig sites.

MS: good time to extend to external sites is when C&T moves to stress testing.

MM: *why not EGEE as well?*

GC: Starting with LCG-2. Nobody address gLite right now.

MM: But we need a solution for gLite.

KB: We need to find volunteer effort to do this. This work is concentrating on LCG-2. Propose that Mirco's suggestion is sent to the Quattor group mailing list. Someone may be interested and have time. INFN people can contribute.



7. Update on Service Challenge Milestones (Les Robertson)

LR presented updated numbers (see slides on agenda) based on input from this morning's presentations. Since the October GDB there has been feedback from both experiments and the PEB (agreed by PEB yesterday), but will need more updates following the experiment LHCC submissions. LR stressed that the CERN to T1 (summed) bandwidth requirement has now increased from 1.3 GB/s to 1.8 GB/s. We must run at twice this rate to cover downtime.

JG: *Is the steady running, i.e. ramp-up, after each service challenge new?*

LR: The experiments need to validate for extended periods. Aim for an individual experiment doing a 50% test (but not all experiments at once)

JG: this is more aggressive in terms of networking kit

LR: need to discuss in Jan/Feb what the plan is both in terms of implications for kit and for people. Manpower and ramping-up experience is an important part of the challenges.

MM: *which tool to do disk to disk transfer?*

LR: that has to be agreed, in view of the experiment plans. We need to be close to what experiments actually want, e.g. by the end of March.

KB: Tier1 centres need to provide input to firm up these milestones. Tier1 centres should consider how to ramp up for presentation in January.

8. Report from the Security Working Group (Dave Kelsey)

DK presented a report from the Joint Security Policy Group. The slides on the agenda page give full details. A document (see agenda page) on Site Registration Policy and Procedures was presented for first discussion. Following discussion it was agreed that we need a formal specification of the site approval by its associated ROC.

MS: There have been some regional disputes, so we need to have an escalation procedure for sites refused by their ROC, e.g. to EGEE PMB or GDB.

An updated version of the Site Registration document will be presented to the GDB later.

DK raised the question of removing some old policy/procedure documents, e.g. the 3 GOC guides, which are not currently being followed, as these perhaps detract from the value of the important policy documents. It was agreed that JSPG should review and remove obsolete documents.



9. Status of Grid Accounting (John Gordon)

JG presented the current status of Grid accounting (see slides on agenda).

IB: We have had some discussions re feeding-in Grid3/OSG data as they are using the same (or similar) schemas. We need a contact person in NorduGrid to investigate input of their accounting data.

ACTION 0412-1: a NorduGrid representative to contact Dave Kant at RAL.

DL: *Once we have accounting data, can we transfer into Euros?*

JG: technically feasible, but politically not everyone will want to do it.

DL: there is pressure to consider private provision of resources so costs are important

LR: more useful to have a presentation from each centre as to their costs.

LR: Whatever accounting data there is will be presented to RRB in April 2005.

IB: sites need to install the package. Can be done in LCG 2.2.0 and is part of 2.3.0. They will encourage/force sites to upgrade in January.

10. Escalation of operations problems (Ian Bird)

See IB's slides on the agenda page. IB reported that they have been trying the CIC-on-duty weekly rotation for a month or more. Things are now improving.

The big issue is what to do about sites that don't respond or react in a timely way. Experiments already ignore "bad" sites out anyway, but this needs to be tackled as an operational issue. IB proposed to remove bad/problem sites from the information systems and maps.

Given limited discussion or reaction LR asked GDB whether there was agreement on the approach presented by IB.

JG: *you need to publish the metrics.*

IB: the document quotes the deadlines. Will be discussed in operations meetings and they need to agree the criteria.

DL: *Many classifications of quality or just two (good/bad)?*

IB: Keep it simple; just two.

MS: but the situation is more complex, in that the status may be different per application.

Overall there were no objections to IB's proposal. GDB agreed.



11. LCG and OSG Operations Workshops (Markus Schulz)

See MS slides on the agenda page (one file for items 11 and 12)

MS reported on the LCG/EGEE Operations Workshop of 2-4 November 2004 and also the US Open Science Grid (OSG) workshop of 1-3 December 2004, which he had also attended.

Full details are in the slides. A small number of points are reported here:

- An ongoing issue: how to remove a site? This is technically difficult and there may be data which is needed remotely.
- The key issue: need to agree the split between local, regional and central approaches to operations
- US Grids are interested in LCG/EGEE logging and bookkeeping as right now they have none.
- Follow up discussions with US Atlas last week raised interesting issues, e.g. for VOMS in Grid3. Spare US ATLAS cycles can be used by *US* CMS (not CMS generally)
- For interoperability, OSG worker nodes can install and run LCG s/w in user-mode (with shared file system to get to many nodes)
- Operations will be linked via the Grid3 OC and CERN CIC.

12. Transition to Scientific Linux (Markus Schulz)

See same MS slides on the agenda page (one file for items 11 and 12)

We need clear statements by each VO as to when they are ready to move to SL3

KB: all 4 experiments stated on the GDB mail list that they are basically ready.

MS: but via the EIS team we get a different message

KB: need to escalate EIS contact and computer coordinator to talk and agree

TC: can use the new UI on CERN lxplus

KB: NIKHEF have already upgraded to SL3, following the GDB list information

TC: The CERN plan is that the default O/S (on lxbatch) will move to SLC3 on 17th January 2005.

ACTION 0412-2: TC to send details to the GDB mail list.

It was agreed that all sites need to work to a similar timescale.

MM: *regarding YAIM, we need a VO-dependent script to configure VO software*

MS: I don't agree. We don't aim to install VO-specific software. There are also security issues with trying to do this.



13. AOB and next meetings

KB presented the plans for meetings in January 2005.

KB noted that there is little time between this meeting and the January GDB, but it is still worthwhile going ahead, given the need to have a clear idea of the service challenge milestones by the end of the month. He wishes to receive input from the large Tier 1's at the next GDB. It was agreed that the other issue to be addressed is mass storage.

KB reminded GDB of the first meeting of the Networking group in Amsterdam on 20 - 21 January for which some names are still needed.

The next Service Challenge meeting will be held at RAL on 27/28 January. Tier0 and RAL Tier1 participation are required but other Tier1 input would also be useful.

KB asked for feedback on the proposed dates of GDB meetings in 2005. Two possible problems were identified with the September and November dates, because of possible clashes with other events. The very late date in December (21st) was also questioned but it was confirmed that CERN will only close on 23rd December next year. KB noted that it may be possible to hold GDB in Vancouver in November by combining with attendance at the SC2005 event in Seattle. KB will discuss further on the mail list.

ACTION 0412-3: KB to discuss/finalise meeting dates and locations.

The next meeting of GDB will be at CERN on 12th January, 2005.

KB closed the meeting at 16:20 and gave everyone his best wishes for 2005.

(Note by minute taker: I feel it is important to record the unhappiness of many of the remote participants of this meeting with the poor performance of the technology during this meeting. In the morning, there were many problems with the VRVS mainly due to general networking problems at CERN. In the afternoon we moved to another room and decided to move to phone conference links, but there were problems both with the booking of the conference and the lack of suitable phone lines in the meeting room. A very frustrating experience for those trying to connect from outside CERN)



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Actions from the meeting:

Item No.	Description	Owner
0412-1	Contact Dave Kant at RAL re input of NorduGrid accounting data	A NorduGrid representative
0412-2	Distribute details of the CERN migration to SLC3 to the GDB mail list	Tony Cass
0412-3	To discuss and finalise dates and locations of 2005 GDB meetings	Kors Bos



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



List of Attendees

X means attended
V means attended via VRVS

Country	Member		Deputy	
Austria	Dietmar Kuhn	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Canada	Randy Sobie	<input type="checkbox"/>	Robert McPherson	<input type="checkbox"/>
Czech Republic	Milos Lokajicek	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Denmark	John Renner Hansen	<input type="checkbox"/>	Anders Waananen	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finland	Klaus Lindberg	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jukka Klem	X
France	Denis Linglin	X	Fabio Hernandez	<input type="checkbox"/>
Germany	Klaus-Peter Mickel	<input type="checkbox"/>	Holger Marten	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hungary	Gyorgy Vesztergombi	<input type="checkbox"/>	Dezso Horvath	<input type="checkbox"/>
India	P.S Dhekne	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Israel	Lorne Levinson	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Italy	Mirco Mazzucato	X	Luciano Gaido	<input type="checkbox"/>
Japan	Hiroshi Sakamoto	X	Tatsuo Kawamoto	<input type="checkbox"/>
Netherlands	Peter Michielse	X	Arjen Van Rijn	<input type="checkbox"/>
Norway	Peter Kongshaug	<input type="checkbox"/>	Farid Ould-Saada	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pakistan	Hafeez Hoorani	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Poland	Michal Turala	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jan Krolkowski	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Marcin Wolter	X
Portugal	Gaspar Barreira	<input type="checkbox"/>	Jorge Gomes	<input type="checkbox"/>
Russia	Slava Ilyin	<input type="checkbox"/>	V. Korenkov	<input type="checkbox"/>
Spain	Manuel Delfino	<input type="checkbox"/>	Andreu Pacheco	V
Sweden	Niclas Andersson	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tord Ekelof	X
Switzerland	Christoph Grab	<input type="checkbox"/>	Allan Clark	<input type="checkbox"/>
		<input type="checkbox"/>	Marie-Christine Sawley	<input type="checkbox"/>
Taiwan	Simon Lin	<input type="checkbox"/>	Di Qing	X
United Kingdom	John Gordon	X	Jeremy Coles	<input type="checkbox"/>
United States	Vicky White	V	Bruce Gibbard	<input type="checkbox"/>
CERN	Tony Cass	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
ALICE	Alberto Masoni	X	Yves Schutz	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Federico Carminati	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
ATLAS	Gilbert Poulard	X	Laura Perini	X
	Dario Barberis	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
CMS	Tony Wildish	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
	David Stickland	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>



LCG Grid Deployment Board Meeting



Country	Member		Deputy	
LHCb	Ricardo Graciani	V	Andrei Tsaregorodstev	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Nick Brook	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
Project Leader	Les Robertson	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
GDB Chair	Kors Bos	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
GDB Secretary	Jeremy Coles			<input type="checkbox"/>
Grid Deployment Mgr	Ian Bird	X	Markus Schulz	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fabric Manager	Bernd Panzer			<input type="checkbox"/>
Application Manager	Torre Wenaus		Oxana Smirnova	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication Systems Mgr	David Foster	X		<input type="checkbox"/>
SC2 Chair	Matthias Kasemann	V		<input type="checkbox"/>
Working Group Chairs	David Kelsey	X		<input type="checkbox"/>

The following also attended via VRVS during the morning:

Yevgeniy Lyublew (Moscow JINR)
 Christine Leroy (DAPNIA)
 Jean-Louis Latsagne (Geneva)
 Alexey Chepigin (Dubna JINR)
 Gian Luca Volpato (Manno CH)
 Gregory Denis
 Fairouz Uhlsson-Malek (Grenoble)
 Mike Vetterli (Vancouver)
 Gabriel Petras
 Taipei (who?)
 Emanuela Cavallo (Bari)