LCG Management Board

1. Minutes and Matters arising (Minutes)

The minutes of the last meeting were approved.

2. Action List Review (List of actions)

There was no update to the action list.

3. LCG Operations Weekly Report

Summary of status and progress of the LCG Operations. This report covers the WLCG activities since the last MB meeting. All daily meetings summaries are always available here:
https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LCG/WLCGOperationsMeetings.

Jean-Philippe Baud presented the slides attached to the agenda. The following comments were noted:
Slide 20: The SRM problems are various and not related to a specific part of the software. The CREAM-CE software is still unstable and is being worked on by INFN. On a positive side, the number of sites running the CREAM-CE has increased to around 120.

Philippe Charpentier raised that the NL-Tier1 is effectively unusable since almost 7 days due to a database problem. LHCb cannot run any jobs at that site. Maurice Bouwhuis explained that the whole RAC database system went down due to a hardware failure and a problem to restore the system is being followed up with Oracle.

4. Targeted support for the WLCG information system

Laurence Field presented the slides attached to the agenda. The following comments were noted:
Slide 8: 'rogue' implies poorly managed
Slide 11: MB members are asked to inform their Tier1 and Tier2 site admins that gstat provides debugging tools. This is described in the Data Management trouble shooting guide:
https://tomtools.cern.ch/confluence/display/IS/DM_Troubleshooting.

The reason for the large number of top level BDIIs, beyond the Tier1s, is due to a lack of policy

during the EGEE project on who should install them. The BDII to be used is decided either by a site or an Experiment. A site decides which BDII should be used by default but in some instances, the Experiments can override this in their configuration. Although it is not possible to *enforce* that certain BDIIs are used, a policy could be defined and referred to when mis-configurations are discovered, e.g. via GGUS tickets.

It was noted that a SLA for top level BDIIs should be defined (in particular covering 24*7 support). It was pointed out that problems found at certain points in the information system may have originated elsewhere in the system and traversed through a number of services before being discovered. The role of Information Officer was proposed which would cover two main functions. Taking overall responsibility from an operations perspective to ensure that these global issues are more effectively handled. This could be by coordinating the response to problems that may involve many actors and providing documentation and training where necessary. The other function would be to provide an overall architectural function for the infrastructure, e.g. ensuring the use of the information was correctly documented and coordinating the development and deployment for use cases which require components from many actors, such as installed capacities.

The MB agreed to the proposal for a set of well managed top-level BDIIs instances. The need for an Information Officer role to take responsibility for the end to end service was also agreed. The role will be further defined once this person is identified. In the meantime, alarm tickets can be opened for top level BDII operational problems and CERN will look into the workflow for handling problems with the CERN top level BDII.

Action: Laurence Field to define a set of managed top-level BDDII instances for WLCG (how many and where).
Action: Ian Bird to follow up on naming an Information Officer.

5. Policy on support for national computing infrastructures

Some sites provide additional computing resources for a defined set of national/local users. This raises the question of whether Grid infrastructure can be used for accessing such resources. LHCb considers resources to be shared and does not wish to restrict access to specific sets of users in its centrally managed configurations. CMS and ATLAS accept the creation of VOMS groups for national/local users and in return can benefit from the additional resources when they are not fully used. These additional resources can be considered as Tier3s and as such are outside the scope of the MOU. No WLCG policy can be defined for this. Each Experiment can take its own decision.

A separate point is that Experiments want to connect some sites, which provide a service similar to a Tier 2, prior to them signing the MOU. This creates a procedural problem, e.g. how do they get in the BDIIs? Who will monitor them? There is also a (human) support issue. EGEE had a mechanism (catch-all ROC) for this but EGI does not. Ian Bird agreed to raise this point with the Overview Board at their meeting on 3 Sep.

6. Expected evolution of resource requirements 2013-2015

At the next MB on 7 Sep, Domenec Espriu has been invited to discuss how we proceed with the review of resource usage for the next RRB in October. A common set of plots for all the Experiments and how to present them should be agreed. Resource requirements for 2013 (and 2014) will also be required for the RRB. The Experiments are asked to have an idea of their requirements, e.g. based on the experience with data so far. For the machine cycle, the accelerator schedule as presented by Steve Myers at ICHEP can be used.

7. AOB

7.1 Overview Board

The Overview Board will meet at CERN on 3 Sep. The agenda is here:
http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=70499.

7.2 Next meeting: 13 July 2010

The next MB meeting will be on Tuesday 7 Sep 2010 (F2F meeting).

8. Summary of New Actions

1. Laurence Field to define a set of managed top-level BDDII instances for WLCG (how many and where).
2. Ian Bird to follow up on naming an Information Officer.