

PMB discussions/actions on issues identified from the Tier-2 Site reviews.

1) SGE Support – The reviewers noted an increasing interest in the Sun Grid Engine. GridPP currently funds work on the interface to Grid at LeSc but funding was not requested in the GridPP3 proposal beyond April 08. this was discussed at the F2F and additional funding had been considered, but this was not regarded as the highest priority. There was a plan at LeSC to transfer SGE support to an international partner. In conclusion, the problem had been noted and there was a plan in place to address it.

2) The unknown status of SL4 + 64-bitness was a concern at several sites. Currently we are beginning to see some roll out of SL4 on worker nodes. The experiments indicate that SL5 is probably a higher priority than 64-bit compatibility. The following PMB actions were generated:

261.2 DN, RJ, GP: An action on the experiments to define the future outlook for 64-bit applications and resultant effects on hardware purchasing. Experiment reps to define the outlook.

261.1 TD and JG to prepare a PMB statement to be prepared for the MB regarding SL4 releases of basic middleware, which were still awaited and were an issue at sites.

3) GGUS was raised several times - in particular the issue of process management. This is not primarily the fact that the queries were handled on a best efforts basis, but that there appears to be no one (team) responsible for overseeing the whole process and ensuring that tickets get followed up etc. The following PMB actions were generated:

261.3 SB to ask Philippa what specific issues/difficulties could be cited with regard to GGUS problems.

261.4 DB to look through the site-review input in detail in relation to GGUS problems.

261.5 JC and dTeam to carry out a survey on sites' experiences of GGUS, when possible to organise.

4) The 2 hour response time at tier-2 sites was an area of concern. DB noted that the two hour period was to acknowledge a problem rather than solve it, and asked whether sites knew this? Were any statistics available on response time? Information was available on how long it takes to close a ticket, but not to respond to it. DN noted that for the two-hour rule to be effective, someone would need to be on call throughout the entirety of working hours, with no gaps in cover. This was a site problem - someone is not always available to monitor tickets. It was asked how this could be measured, and what do WLCG do about this issue? It was agreed that we need to measure this ourselves and be able to provide data. SB suggested the footprint system

at RAL as a solution. It was agreed that JC would look into this issue and understand the problem in greater detail - sites also need to understand what the two-hour response time means. The following PMB action was generated:

261.6 JC to look into the issue of 2-hour response timing @ Tier-2 sites and understand the problem in greater detail - sites also need to understand what the two-hour response time actually means.

- 5) There was occasional concern about multiple Security policies it was asked which security policy takes precedence (site, GridPP, wLCG)? DK noted that it was an issue of the policy itself - there was a timetable on the new MoU, and also the lack of a security incident response system at sites. It was reported that a new GridPP Security Officer - Mingchao Ma - had recently been recruited and he needs to contact sites and check they have security incident response. This would take place following induction and integration into the new role. The following PMB action was generated:

261.7 DK to ask Mingchao Ma, the new GridPP Security Officer, to contact sites and check they have security incident response systems in place.

- 6) Distributed disk and SRM interfaces. I was asked whether a report needs to be generated on options/strengths/weaknesses? DN reported that some were supported and some not. JC noted that a report from the Storage Group for the GridPP3 proposal had addressed this issue at some level. TD noted that DPM and dCache were recognised, whilst others are considered to be 'developments'. TD reported that a joint document between NGS and GridPP noted that NGS sites support DPM, therefore for interaction purposes DPM is the 'recognised' storage element - 12 out of 17 Tier-2 sites use DPM. DB noted that DPM is standard, dCache is supported, but anything else is not
- 7) Monitoring/Nagios/Ganglia - Interest in Training was expressed at several sites. DB noted that it would be a good topic for a training course. TD agreed, especially a workshop in relation to monitoring. DB suggested that JC could consider setting up some kind of training, and TD suggested Pete Gronbech as a HEPSYSMAN contact. It was agreed that JC would talk to Pete Gronbech and Alessandra Forti. TD suggested including someone from GridView. The following PMB action was generated:

261.8 JC to talk to Pete Gronbech and Alessandra Forti regarding Monitoring/Nagios/Ganglia training, to include someone from GridView.

- 8) The complexity of installing new VOs. It was asked what the technical problems were? TD noted that these were neither clear nor well-documented. DB asked whether it could be documented? TD agreed that this would be a good idea and would help, however SB reported that it was a complicated process. JC noted that the complexity

occurred in implementing in the middleware, which affects other accounts. It was agreed that SB would extract current procedures and examine what instruction is currently available and in what ways it can be improved. The following PMB action was generated:

261.9 SB to extract current procedures with regard to documenting of VO installation, examine what instruction is currently available and in what ways it can be improved.

9) Policy on killing jobs. It was suggested that guidelines need to be defined, and it was asked what WLCG or EGEE policy was? No policies were known. DB suggested a GridPP policy. TD noted that this was ad hoc at present and agreed that something was required to indicate when sites stop jobs. It was agreed that TD would ask Graeme Stewart to record issues and get thoughts from him as to the best way to deal with this issue - he may be able to give a practical response. The PMB action below resulted in a draft policy being prepared and discussed with wLCG:

http://www.gridpp.ac.uk/pmb/docs/GridPP-PMB-113-Inefficient_Jobs_v0.5.doc

261.10 TD to speak to Graeme Stewart regarding a possible GridPP policy on killing jobs at sites - GS to advise on issues involved and provide suggestions as to the best way to deal with this.

10) Software licences: This related to funding and negotiation issues with companies. There was a potential role for NGS - how was NGS progressing this issue? It was agreed that GridPP would prefer not to be involved in this issue at present.

11) Travel funding for Tier-2 staff in the future It was noted that there had been questions at the site reviews regarding travel funding for Tier-2 staff. This was in the context of the request for Site Admins to have more close contact with Experiments. Does this need to be mentioned in the Travel Policy? It was agreed that travel requests would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. DN noted that this could be a larger issue in the future as more close contact with the Experiments is expected. It was agreed that RM would draft an extra line for the Travel Policy.

262.1 RM to draft an extra line for the Travel Policy relating to Tier-2 staff/Experiment contact.

12) Policy on local users. It was accepted by all sites that any form of local use which did not come in via the standard grid mechanisms (and hence get tensioned with other grid access) did not count towards the GridPP contribution. It was noted that 'GridPP contribution' is what gets accounted (grid-enabled) rather than what is available. It was agreed that SL would clarify this with the Tier-2 Board. It was noted that this item (12) and item (22) [definition of what 'available' means in relation to site availability and SAM tests] should be raised (by DK) at the Deployment Board in two weeks' time.

262.2 SL to clarify GridPP contribution (what is accounted rather than what is available) with the Tier-2 Board.

262.3 DK to raise items (12) [re accounted GridPP contribution] and (22) [re site availability via SAM tests] at the Deployment Board in two weeks'time.

13) Poor response time of middleware developers

14) Poor condor support. DB noted that these issues were once removed from GridPP and needed to be raised at the GDB. Regarding Condor, this was a nodes issue, and it was agreed that JC would ascertain the specific problems in this area - these seemed to relate to mapping; old versions; and batch system support. It was noted that old Condor versions in CE can cause batch problems. Regarding No (13), DB noted that this was a more generic problem to be raised at high-level. The original issue had come from London. Was there still something concrete to be done? TD noted that EGEE was the correct forum for this but the TCG should receive issues from the Tier-2s. The TCG should be publishing their agendas a bit more in advance to allow for feedback. It was noted that the Tier-2 sites don't know to whom they should address their questions - they could be advised to go through the TCG representative. GGUS could also be used, or if it was a middleware issue, Savannah. TD asked whether it was possible to use GGUS for general issues. SB noted that this was difficult. It was agreed that the first iteration should be with the TCG representative, then a ticket could be raised if necessary.

262.4 JC to ascertain the specific problems in relation to Condor support issues.

262.5 Regarding poor response time of middleware developers: DK to propose the following recommendation to the Deployment Board: to recommend that if specific issues were involved, GGUS should be used. If issues were general, the TCG representative at the Tier-2 site should be informed. The TCG rep in turn should raise the issue as appropriate at the TCG meetings.

15) Upgrades - minor vs major - Upgrades (minor vs major) guidance required - DB noted that this was an information issue about forthcoming upgrades, where not much info was known in advance. JC reported that Alessandra Forti had presented a report on the problems, and CERN has begun to address them. More clarity would be useful as to what issues there were with current releases. The PPS does commit to feeding back issues but this may not be happening. Rollouts are often automatic therefore users depend on the release notes. DB noted that at high level we should urge for better release notes; a lower action would be to ensure that the PPS provide additional information in the UK. It was agreed that JC would raise this with Pete on the PPS, and ask if there was anything else that could be done.

262.6 JC to raise the issue of PPS feedback information relating to upgrades issues with someone on the PPS, and ask if there was anything else that could be done.

16) Tier-2s piggy-backing on Tier-1 purchases. Tier-2s piggy-backing on Tier-1 purchases -. Critical dates in the purchase procedure would need to be publicised well in

advance and information needs to be given as to what the purchases are. AS suggested that something could be added to the tender document to allow additional Tier-2 purchases on the back of, but separate from, the Tier-1 purchases. AS would speak to procurement and ask them about the possibility that sites might want to make parallel purchases - a sentence could be added to the tender document. TD would send the Tier-1 url to the Tier-2 Board via SL. [Done following the meeting].

262.7 AS to speak to procurement and warn them that sites might want to make parallel purchases - a sentence could be added to the tender document.

17) Concern over proliferation of semi-official site tests. Regarding the ATLAS tests, the policy is that all converge with the SAM tests despite conflicting requirements. SB noted that there was a previous communication issue relating to SL's tests - sites did not appear to know about these. DB noted that the tests were there to try to help sites become more productive and not cause them additional problems, but it was acknowledged that the information in future needs to be managed. TD noted that Site Managers could read the PMB Minutes - all information was available. DB noted that the PMB encourages experiments to develop experiment-specific tests and we will help sites to develop these tests, it is part of the ongoing improvement process. It was agreed that the PMB opinion is that there is no proliferation of tests, but that sites did need to be made aware of requirements. RM suggested that they needed a policy statement. TD noted that the issue was now concluded and that all sites had now completed their implementation of SAM tests. DB summarised by noting that accounting of resources at sites was based purely on the SAM tests and not Experiment-specific tests, but that GridPP would work with sites to develop the latter to better serve the experiments.

18) Lack of ability to pass job requirements to the batch system - JG noted that the GLite CE can pass information. The RB looks at the user requirement and matches it to a queue. It was noted that the system fills with jobs that can't be optimised. JG would investigate this issue further and report-back.

263.2 JG to further investigate the lack of ability to pass job requirements to the batch system and report-back (Tier-2 review issue).

19) Virtualisation - UCL had wanted to know GridPP direction/support in this area. JC noted that Marian had started looking at virtualization. He currently has some nodes on the PPS which are on virtual machines - his intention was to put the PPS SAM client in such an environment. It was noted that Grid-Ireland also had a lot of experience in this area which GridPP could draw upon. JC reported that there might be some support available via the TB-SUPPORT list and helpdesk, but at the moment we are still looking at this area and do not have a definite direction. It was agreed that this is largely uncharted territory for GridPP and a diversion away from the standard GridPP environment. The issue was in abeyance at present.

20) Changing experiment requirements - JC noted that this related to such things as the

ATLAS ACL change requests. Some sites thought there needed to be more structure to change requests. VO views might be cited as another area where difficulties have been encountered. There was also the difficulty of consistency of feedback - on SL4 JC has heard different positions depending who he talks to within an experiment. It was reported that the 39 Tier-2s in CMS are in regular contact. JG concluded that this was an issue for the Experiments to deal with in the first instance.

21) Level of noise for site problems. JC noted that this covered things like false-positive problems in the site SAM results. It was agreed that people are paying more attention now to the SAM results. Issues should be raised in the weekly Ops reports meetings.

22) Definition of "what is available". JC noted that if sites are going to be measured against one measure of availability, is it the number coming from GridView (even if there are (many) questions about how accurate it is in measuring availability for the experiments). It was agreed that, yes, GridView and the SAM reports come from the same database, but if there is not a consistent query then you won't get the same number out of the same data.

23) Enforcement of MoUs/SLAs. JC noted that the process is known but other than getting less funding in the future, were there any other enforcement options? It was agreed that this issue was not for public debate at present.