

# User Board Meeting, RAL, 14<sup>th</sup> December 2005

*Present: Tim Barrass, Catalin Condurache, James Ferrando, Matt Hodges, Roger Jones, Mike Kordosky, Raja Nandakumar, Dave Newbold (Chair), Glenn Patrick (Minutes), Dave Sankey, Andrew Sansum, Dan Tovey, Peter Richardson*

## **1. EXPERIMENT REQUESTS FOR 2006**

The main agenda item was the discussion of Tier 1 and Tier 2 experiment requests for 2006, especially Q1 and Q2.

### **1.1 Tier-1 CPU Resources**

The total requests for Q1 came to 1,004 kSI2k and 1,104 kSI2k with an availability of 830 kSI2k and 946 kSI2k respectively. It was felt that this was not a problem and CPU resources could be over allocated if necessary. Some experiments had not made estimates of their Q3 and Q4 requirements. There was some discussion on what was included under the "Neutrino" experiment line in the planning spreadsheet and the large share (198 kSI2k) appropriated to Linear Collider.

***Action 1:** Complete Tier 1 and Tier 2 Q3 and Q4 estimates for 2006 and send to Dave Newbold - all experiments.*

***Action 2:** PhenoGrid to look at balancing Tier 1 and Tier 2 resources and justify if work has to be done solely at Tier 1 (Pete Richardson later pointed out that it did not matter where the resources were located and a Tier 2 bid had in fact been made - Dave Newbold to investigate).*

***Action 3:** Discuss how the high-level planning spreadsheet relates to approved experiments and what is included - Dave Newbold/Glenn Patrick.*

### **1.2 Tier 2 CPU Resources**

As requested, the LHC experiments (ATLAS, CMS and LHCb) had all made plans to exploit Tier 2 CPU resources in addition to their Tier 1 requests. BaBar, CDF and Zeus had also made Tier 2 requests. The totals were all well within the availability.

***Action 4:** H1 to make a Tier 2 request - Dave Sankey.*

***Action 5:** Request Tier 2 Board to make available high-level planning figures on a par with those supplied for the Tier 1 Centre - Dave Newbold.*

### **1.3 Tier 1 Disk Resources**

This was the main problem area throughout all quarters of 2006, with 287.5TB requested for Q1 and an availability of 179TB. The requests were dominated by the BaBar bid (120TB in Q1 rising to 160TB in Q4). There was no representative present from BaBar, but it was thought that the end-2005 MOU commitment was for 110-115TB.

After some discussion, it was concluded that in the allocations:

- CDF would be requested to make more use of tape (30TB had been requested with no associated Tier 1 CPU resources).
- The ATLAS and CMS requests would have to be scaled back to 20-25TB even though LCG MOU have been signed and we are supposed to be committing LHC resources now.
- BaBar may have to be limited to 100TB with the possibility of making more use of tape. A strategic decision would need to be taken by the T1B and PMB on how to proceed further on this.

**Action 6:** *Confirm what use BaBar can make of online tape instead of disk - Andrew Sansum and Dave Newbold.*

## 1.4 Tier 1 Tape Resources

H1 were allocated 25TB of tape in the meeting as a formal bid had not been received for this. The tape requests (303TB in Q1) were all felt to be sustainable and the main issue was that Andrew did not want to buy new media in 2006 until the new robot drives have been installed.

There was some discussion of compression factors for the different experiments, but detailed numbers were not available.

**Action 7:** *Circulate details and performance figures for tape compression of the different experiments - Andrew Sansum.*

## 1.5 Tier 2 Disk Resources

Atlas and CMS had made a nominal bid for Tier 2 disk (5.5TB and 10TB respectively) and PhenoGrid had made a bid for 1.2TB. This was well within the 175TB of available space.

The LHCb computing model is to transfer data from the Tier 2 centres to the nearest Tier 1 for reconstruction, stripping and analysis.

It was a common theme that experiments readily exploited the CPU resources at Tier 2 centres, but moved the data elsewhere and it was not at all clear how the large Tier 2 disk resources could map onto the published experiment models. It was felt that the capability of the Tier 2 data storage management had not been demonstrated.

**Action 8:** *Demonstration of Tier 2 storage capabilities, management features and performance - Deployment Team.*

This ended the discussion on experiment requirements and resources and Dave Newbold proposed to make CPU, disk and tape allocations by the end of the week.

## 2 EXPERIMENT REPORTING FOR GRIDPP

Roger Jones gave a brief summary on the status of the various experiment projects. The GRIDPP reporting process for 2005/Q3 had been slow and protracted and it should not be repeated. More reference should be made to the completion of the agreed milestones (Ganga and LHCb were good examples). Any negative comments on Grid performance should be as specific as possible so that they could be fully investigated.

**Action 9:** *All GRIDPP reporting to be prompt and driven by the agreed milestones - all relevant experiments.*

**Action 10:** *Feedback on Grid performance to be as detailed as possible to allow proper follow up - everyone.*

**Action 11:** *MINOS to look at Grid Portal to exploit Grid resources - MINOS.*

## 3 UB QUESTIONNAIRE

Two previous questionnaires had been produced. These should be followed up in time for the next Oversight Committee. A documentation officer had been appointed and feedback would be sought on whether this has improved matters in this area.

**Action 12:** *Contact those who had previously expressed feedback/opinions in the UB questionnaires to see if matters had improved - Dave Newbold/Glenn Patrick.*

#### **4 TRIAL USE OF NATIONAL GRID SERVICE (NGS)**

There had been a request made by John Gordon for a particle physics application to submit jobs to the NGS. It was thought that there are large resources available, but nobody present could quantify this statement.

***Action 13: Quantify resources available in NGS - Dave Newbold to ask John Gordon.***

***Action 14: Anyone interested in using NGS to contact Dave Newbold - all experiments.***

#### **5 NEXT MEETING**

This was agreed for the week of 20 March 2006. The *Meet O Matic* system would be used to schedule the precise date. It is intended that this should be a face to face meeting (venue to be decided).