WLCG Service Report

Jamie.Shiers@cern.ch

~ ~ ~

WLCG Management Board, 3rd February 2009

GGUS Summary

VO affected	USER	TEAM	ALARM	TOTAL
ALICE	1	0	0	1
ATLAS	22	9	0	31
CMS	3	0	0	3
LHCb	0	4	0	4

- Nothing special – at USAG CMS & ALICE reminded that they should use GGUS routinely.
- A faq page is in preparation explaining differences between TEAM and normal tickets that now go directly to sites.

ASGC Update

- Jason connected to last Thursday's 3D meeting (despite local time!) and confirmed that they were on target to put "3D" related services back in production 1st week February

- The mid-February (pre-CASTOR F2F@RAL) deadline for a clean CASTOR+SRM+DB installation may well be too aggressive – to be followed

- What can we learn from this experience?
    - Standard configurations help: it is easier to diagnose problems, easier for sites to help each other and easier to avoid problems in the first place by following a well-trodden route;
    - Manpower + knowledge levels to support key WLCG services need to be clarified and eventually reviewed – what are affordable / reasonable support costs for e.g. "curating a PB"?

lcg-cp Issue

- This was an item that spiked in the middle of the week (reported as fixed Thursday) but highlights one or more weaknesses in the testing & roll-out procedure

Without wishing to be too specific to this particular problem, some better coordination of testing & roll-out appears to be called for

- (Expecting some comments from groups / experiments concerned / affected)

☺ **(OK, yes, we could try to coordinate through the daily OPS meeting…)**

Oracle service-related issues

- LFC & FTS at **FZK** down over weekend due to problem with Oracle backend – Oracle support involved - **"SIR" pending**

- Later in the week the migration of the LFC b/e at **NL-T1** to a RAC environment came with a huge performance loss – believed to be due to the "mainly write" load from ATLAS (plus the "new world record" in #files / day reported by ATLAS yesterday) compared to R/O access from LHCb LFC

- More big Id problems... This week at **RAL** again.

- ☺ **ASGC** DB now back in production and will be resynchronised

Other Service Issues

- The usual level of operational issues continues – but with improved (or at least improving) reporting (by e-mail or at the meeting)

- Its hard to get the balance exactly right but IMHO the level of detail provided now is ~right

- Its probably cheaper to provide a report than not – it's a very convenient way of communicating with the community (bi-directionally)

- **However, some significant problems do not get reported to the meeting IMHO this should be corrected asap (example follows)**

- **It has been suggested that a dedicated WLCG section of the weekly joint operations meeting is now redundant: this would help streamline meetings + save some time!**

- The fix for the FTS delegation bug has been back-ported to FTS 2.1 and it is in the hands of the certification team under patch #2760

Severe file loss at FZK

- We (CMS Facilities Operations) were informed yesterday evening by the FZK dCache/Tape Admins, that there is a **severe file loss at FZK**. They discovered a bug in a script, responsible for the migration of files between the dCache write-pools and the tape library. In some specific constellation, if the TSM/TSS process of the tape library was killed/restarted for some reason, a wrong error code was passed from the migration script to dCache and the files were marked as being on tape, although they never made it there.

- The admins provided us now a list of about **500 lost files which could not be recovered** on e.g. a read pool on our site. Our admins ensured us, that the issue is understood and the bug is fixed, but nevertheless, this is a real mess.

Summary

- **Business as usual…**

- **To all – please make sure that service issues are reported to the daily operations meeting.**

- This (obviously and necessarily) includes things that are probably reported elsewhere (e.g. CERN IT "morning meeting", CASTOR MM etc.) but it is very important that we have a complete picture of the overall status of the service and in particular significant problems (hint: if you put "severe" or "critical" or "major" in the subject its definitely significant!)