

TPC update

A. Forti

WLCG IS TF

22 November 2018



General

- 4 sites:
 - RAL, Manchester, Liverpool, Glasgow
 - Freedom to set things up as each site preferred
 - As many ways as sites
 - Tried 2 formats
 - Flat and Hierarchical
 - Some confusion on the attributes
- One of the aims to move to json is to give us the ability describe non standard grid resources.
 - Asked to represent VAC resources as well



GOCDDB

- Different views
 - Glasgow and Liverpool and RAL global json added the GOCDDB link at site level minimal effort one link for everything
 - Glasgow: 1 batch system, 1 queue, and multiple CEs
 - https://goc.egi.eu/portal/index.php?Page_Type=Site&id=627
 - Liverpool 2 batch systems each with 1 queue and 2 CEs
 - https://goc.egi.eu/portal/index.php?Page_Type=Site&id=232
 - RAL: 1 batch system, 1 queue, 4 CEs
 - https://goc.egi.eu/portal/index.php?Page_Type=Site&id=570
 - Manchester 1 json per cluster attached to each CE
 - 2 batch systems, 3 queues each, 2 CEs
 - https://goc.egi.eu/portal/index.php?Page_Type=Service&id=2695
 - https://goc.egi.eu/portal/index.php?Page_Type=Service&id=2696



Attributes

- Not much comment about the attributes themselves
- Some misunderstanding on which set of attributes
 - Glasgow had an old schema
 - RAL, Manchester and Liverpool followed the google doc one
- Google doc better defined
 - “resourcename” vs “id”
 - Could add “resourcetype”: batch_system, vac, cloud, boinc,.....
 - Mechanism to extend attributes
 - Mandatory vs optional: “gpu”, “MPI”, “OS”,.....
 - In the hierarchical model: “queues”, “computingelements”
 - Could add prefixes to better identify what things are for
 - res_, ce_, qu_, gl_
 - Nobody really liked it, preferred hierarchical structure



Flat vs Hierarchical

- Flat json were provided but considered “broken” with the same issues as Glue and REBUS.
 - Even if we can make it work
- Consensus that 1 global file with a hierarchical structure
 - Pros
 - Minimises repetition and inconsistencies
 - Better describes different type of resources
 - See Liverpool example with VAC
 - Decouples resources attributes from CE services
 - Minimises links in GOCDB
 - Cons
 - We cannot get the CEs to write them
 - Dedicated CEs pointing to the same batch system add some complication with the ACLs: queues and CEs have to be matched
 - Is it a real use case?



Misc

- Language
 - We keep on talking about json but over the years has seen the advent of YAML
 - This would further simplify writing these files
 - Glasgow wrote a hierarchical example in YAML
- Physical location of the files
 - Interesting to note nobody even tried to put the jsons on the CEs.
 - All used either an http server or gitlab



Conclusions

- This is would make publishing much easier once some rules are established
 - Writing a json takes about 15-20 minutes if one wants to check things
- Favourite structure: hierachical single file that can be added at site level in GOCDB
- Attributes should be extendable
 - Mandatory vs optional
- Language: YAML would be even simpler than json
- Need an information consumer
- Will have more dedicated meetings with other sites in the future



Links

- RAL:
 - Flat json
- Glasgow:
 - Flat json
 - Hierarchical json
 - Hierarchical YAML
- Liverpool:
 - Flat json
 - Hierarchical json
 - Includes VAC resources
- Manchester
 - ce01 flat json
 - ce02 flat json
 - Hierarchical json

