

LHCb input (1)

- Whether your experiment would be interested that opportunistic resources are accounted in APEL

We would like the facility to have accounting records sent to APEL and included in WLCG reports for non-pledged resources. We would need to confirm with the relevant resource providers whether they want to be included or not, but I expect many would want the recognition.

- If yes, what are possible scenarios?

The resources we have in mind would be managed by Vcycle or Vac so we would just use their existing support for publishing to APEL. However, APEL relies on sites being in the GOCDB, which means EGI membership, which would be a big overhead for commercial providers allowing us to use their resources as part of joint research projects.

- Whether these opportunistic resources are already accounted in the experiment-specific systems?

Yes, everything is recorded in the DIRAC accounting since we use the DIRAC job management everywhere.

LHCb input (2)

- How/whether benchmarking of such resources performed?

It's only done with DB12-in-job for our internal purposes. The Vac resources use the site's HS06 measurements, but they are in GOCDB so they look like conventional grid sites to APEL. The Vcycle resources don't have HS06 benchmarks. If we were using DB12 for APEL accounting, I expect we would use the measured value (maybe at the job end too?) in the job records.

- How these resources are described regarding topology?

They're excluded from the LHCb VO Feed at the moment (there's a flag in the DIRAC configuration system to say whether a site is part of a pledge or not.)

LHCb input (3)

- Would it be possible to retrieve accounting data for the opportunistic resources from the experiment-specific systems via APIs?

Yes. I think you'd need an LHCb approved credential at the moment. We could make it more anonymous if it was being used in production.

My preference would be to do it via APEL messages from the resource provider (e.g. Vcycle) though, as that will work for all the experiments running as part of that resource. I think sites would prefer that too.

For LHCb, I think we would be happy for it to be done either way.