

# **WLCG-OSG-EGEE Operations meeting**

## **Report of Contributions**

Contribution ID: **1**

Type: **not specified**

## SC4 weekly report and upcoming activities

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:10 (10 minutes)*

See new and updated information at

<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/SC4ExperimentPlans>

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 2

Type: **not specified**

## AOB

*Monday, 10 July 2006 17:35 (5 minutes)*

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 3

Type: **not specified**

## Issues to discuss from reports

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:55 (25 minutes)*

<br><font color="red">

<i>Reports were <u>not</u> received from:</i><br>

<li>WLCG T1 sites: <b>BNL; NDGF; TRIUMF</b></li>

<li>EGEE ROCs: <b>South East Europe; UKI</b></li>

<li>VOs: <b>ATLAS; ALICE; BioMed</b></li>

</font><p>

<small>

<li>1. Problem with ranking last week: some sites were reporting free slots but it was not the case. Lots of jobs were queued at these site (example:CERN, Nikhef, cyfronet-lcg,..). Also, at CERN, for example, there are 2 CEs pointing to LSF but they are not reporting the same information. <i>(LHCb VO)</i></li>

<p>

<li>2. Would it be possible for all Tier-1 sites to follow some convention for naming their SRM endpoints for tape and disk? <i>(LHCb VO)</i></li><p>

<li>3. If a glite-CE and an lcg-CE share the same batch system, should the VO software tags also be shared (since essentially the software is available on WNs executing jobs, no matter which CE was used to install it)? <i>(South East ROC)</i></li><p>

<li>4. A new Alice site does not provide an SE. Is it OK that this site does not contain an SE? Are there any concerns? <i>(Asia Pacific ROC)</i></li><p>

<li>5. Propose to have reference files on published (WIKI) path available on all sites (T1, T2) to allow quick functional tests by dteam/ops members. <i>(DECH ROC)</i></li><p>

<li>6. SFTs should not require a special queue so that they always run. Can mandate that there needs to be <i>some</i> solution so that SFTs always run, but NOT that this mechanism needs to be a queue. Acceptable mechanisms are:<br> a) NONE – for large sites, simply giving ops VO a high priority will be sufficient, worker nodes are turning over frequently enough that no action is needed aside from high priority;<br> b) standing reservations for OPS users;<br> c) OR a special queue if a site chooses to go this route.<br><br> If we use a queue for everything, the number of queues will soon exceed the number of worker nodes for most small sites... <i>(NIKHEF)</i></li><p>

<li>7. A new site is being certified to join the PPS. In PPS there is no way to run the SFTs on a site which is not certified yet, and this is a problem when adding a new site. <i>(SouthWest Europe ROC)</i></li><p>

<li>8. Sites would like to know what is the difference between the SFTs in Production and in PreProduction. Will they all eventually be controlled by the SAM framework? <i>(SouthWest Europe ROC)</i></li><p>

</small>

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 4

Type: **not specified**

## Grid-Operator-on-Duty handover

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:05 (5 minutes)*

<li> From <b>Italy</b> <small>(backup: SouthEast Europe)</small> to <b>Russia</b> <small>(backup: CERN)</small> </li>

<br>

<small>

<p> <b>Tickets:</b><br> Created: 54<br> Updated: ?<br> Closed: 46<br> 2nd e-mail: 19<br> Quarantine: 26<br> Reopened: 0<br> Unsolvable: 4<p>

<b>Discussion points:</b><br> <li> SFT site history pages show an incomplete entry (missing timestamp). Savannah bug filed: 17980. </li>

</small>

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 5

Type: **not specified**

## VO software installation

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:20 (10 minutes)*

**Primary author:** ALESSANDRA FORTI

**Presenter:** ALESSANDRA FORTI

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 6

Type: **not specified**

## New version of CIC portal

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:30 (5 minutes)*

**Primary author:** GILLES MATHIEU

**Presenter:** GILLES MATHIEU

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 7

Type: **not specified**

## OPS VO status update

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:35 (5 minutes)*

**Primary author:** PIOTR NYCZYK

**Presenter:** PIOTR NYCZYK

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 8

Type: **not specified**

## Action plan for Information System instabilities

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:40 (5 minutes)*

&lt;small&gt;

<b>Action 1:</b> Update the BDII to reduce load during an update, implement caching, update critical BDIIs and submit new codes as a patch<br>

<i>Result:</i> This should smooth out the problem.

<p> <b>Action 2:</b> Create a wilki page to inform large sites how to move the site-level BDII of the CE.<br> <i>Result:</i> This should stop all the site from disappearing and reduce replication failures. <p> <b>Action 3:</b> Update Yaim to have a site-level BDII.<br> <i>Result:</i> Makes

it easier for a site to set up a site-level BDII. <p> <b>Action 4:</b> Modify the use of the information providers so that the batch system is queried from the site-level BDII.<br> <i>Result:</i> Eliminates the problem of the CE disappearing. </small>

**Primary author:** LAURENCE FIELD**Presenter:** LAURENCE FIELD**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: 9

Type: **not specified**

## New version of FCR tool

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:45 (10 minutes)*

**Primary author:** JUDIT NOVAK

**Presenter:** JUDIT NOVAK

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: **10**

Type: **not specified**

## Review of action items

*Monday, 10 July 2006 17:20 (15 minutes)*

**Session Classification:** not yet classified

Contribution ID: **11**

Type: **not specified**

## Feedback on last meeting's minutes

*Monday, 10 July 2006 16:00 (5 minutes)*

**Session Classification:** not yet classified