

## Objections to the proposed transition to HEPSPROC06

### CE ROC:

Dear Maite, All,

below I gathered voices in the discussion we had with NGIs in CE about transition to HEPSPROC.

The majority of the countries are against for various reasons, with exception of Austria and maybe Hungary, which haven't taken a stand on this yet.

>From the ROC perspective we think that in case of sites that are not supporting HEP VOs, putting a requirement on them to test a site with a benchmark they need to buy and which is not meaningful to their real users is simply unjustified. Generally, we believe even if HEP users are the majority of the grid clients, for last 6 years we tried to promote this technology as suitable for many other communities. Transition to HEPSPROC would be considered against this direction. Additionally, we believe that more attention put on credibility of published benchmark values would be a better direction to go.

### Austria:

We already ran the benchmark and publish the results based on this benchmark. Our IT department already had a license of the benchmark.

In my opinion the HEPSPROC benchmark is a good way to have a more accurate estimation on the speed of the WNs and it will make different sites more comparable for HEP.

### Croatia:

This solution is extremely incorrect. Future EGI is suppose to serve various user communities and here we are being forced to calculate our CPU efficiency based on a single user community needs. I believe that sites should use something standard and more general and not just a single benchmark within a group of standard benchmark picked by a single user community.

And the last thought, since they're already proposing a biased benchmark, I believe it would be polite to sponsor the proposed benchmark.

### Czech Republic:

I fully agree with "various communities" argument, risen by Croatia. I would recommend to refuse of this proposal. Did they discussed usage of some freely available and more general benchmark?

### Hungary:

no input

### Poland:

First of all we do not see a need for replacing SpecInt, which is a general benchmark, with something which is customized to any specific domain. In case a VO requires an additional benchmark, it should be added as recommendation for sites that support those VOs. This kind of

requirement could be verified by additional tests, which can be considered as mandatory for this specific VO.

The only movement in published benchmark we can accept is the switch to the benchmark which can be verified in the real, competitive environment. Min, Max and mean value of such benchmark should be more useful than never verified Spec value or others.

Slovakia:

Any VO specific benchmark should be run remotely by VO managers and results should be published similar way the application software tags are published.

Slovenia:

Slovenia is against the new benchmark. They feel that the infrastructure should remain on open and freely accessible technologies, usable for all communities on grid.

So, in short-term I would not change anything, but start searching for a solution that provides credible normalization factor.

**SEE ROC:**

Hi Maite, all

There are many voices in our region (including ours) expressing objections concerning the cost of the software and

the fact that a commercial solution is chosen for this purpose.

But to conclude, if the majority decides to go for it, we will comply.