

CMS

(Sent from Chris Brew to Matt Viljoen on 21/4/09)

Since none of the extra functionality in CASTOR 2.1.8 is required by CMS for the 2009-2010 physics run we prefer to remain with the current (stable) release until after data taking.

We are aware that there are possible strong reasons for the tier 1 to want to upgrade (support and pressure from other experiments being two of them) and would not oppose an upgrade provided the following criteria are met:

- o CASTOR 2.1.8 has been deployed in production at CERN and has been shown to be stable and reliable
- o Testing of CASTOR 2.1.8 at RAL in the RAL environment is completed successfully
- o The upgrade can be done early enough that there is sufficient time to solve "unforeseen problems" before the pre run stable period.

We would also like to avoid the period proposed for the STEP '09 testing if possible.

ATLAS

(Sent from Norman McCubbin to Andrew Sansum on 14/4/09)

[View of ATLAS-UK on deployment of CASTOR 2.1.8 ahead of 2009 LHC start-up:](#)

ATLAS-UK has been asked for its view on the deployment at the RAL Tier-1 of CASTOR 2.1.8 (C218) ahead of LHC start-up. We consider the following points to be relevant:

- 1) As of early April, C218 is in production use at CERN, though only for the so-called "tape repack" operation. A significant bug in the job scheduler part of C218 was found in March, and **full** deployment of C218 at CERN is not expected before end April.
- 2) RAL plans to install C218 on its test systems as soon as practicable.
- 3) If the full move into R89 takes place, starting ~end June, the deployment of C218 (to the experiments) would have to happen in early June.
- 4) On any other R89 schedule, the deployment of C218 can probably wait until ~end July. Deployment around this time would need to take due account of the holiday season.
- 5) If C218 is not deployed before the 2009 LHC start-up, and if the current LHC schedule, or something close to it, holds, then the RAL Tier-1 would almost certainly not update (beyond C217) before 2011. **This would require a real commitment from CERN of the continuing necessary support for C217.**
- 6) We note that the CASTOR team at RAL does not want to support different (major) versions of CASTOR on the different instances. This seems very sensible.
- 7) Once started, an upgrade to C218 is almost irreversible.
- 8) **ATLAS' experience of major CASTOR upgrades at RAL has taught us (and surely others) one over-riding lesson: TESTING MUST BE EXTENSIVE, GO BEYOND A MERE 'FUNCTIONAL TEST' TO INCLUDE REASONABLE LOAD TESTING, AND MUST NOT BE RUSHED.**
- 9) Given the situation today, and the importance of adequate testing, ATLAS is very dubious that C218 can be deployed in early June, even if we wanted to.

- 10) ATLAS' experience of C217 since the latter part of calendar 2008 has been very positive. We have had, really for the first time, an extended period of almost trouble-free running. The perception of the RAL Tier-1 (by the ATLAS experiment) has improved very significantly: we are now one of the "good" sites. That was not the situation in the past.
- 11) The ATLAS computing model has no pressing need for any of the features (eg xrootd option) that will be available in C218, though obviously we are keen to benefit from general improvements. We note that the ability to drain disk servers would be helpful, operationally.

On balance, the view of the ATLAS experiment is that, **provided CERN support for C217 can be assured through to early calendar 2011**, we would prefer to remain with C217.

LHCb

Hi Dave and Andrew,

After some discussion within LHCb, the general opinion is for RAL to wait until CERN deploys version 2.1.8 of castor in full production and we find it to be stable there. The instances of castor 2.1.8 that have already been deployed for experiment use are not srm-enabled (though they seem to run fine so far) and so, are not really representative from the LHCb point of view.

So it will be good to push CERN to deploy 2.1.8 as soon as possible, to give us time to evaluate its status at CERN, before we get it installed at RAL. There will be good improvements and some nice features. But these improvements are less important than stable operations for LHCb.

Cheers,

Raja.

ALICE

Dear Matthew,
This is the answer from ALICE.
Regards, Cristina

----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Thu, 2 Apr 2009 11:46:19 +0200
From: Latchezar Betev <lbetev@mail.cern.ch>
To: Cristina Lazzeroni <cl@hep.ph.bham.ac.uk>
Cc: latchezar.betev@cern.ch
Subject: Re: RAL CASTOR 2.1.8 upgrade strategy (fwd)

Hello Cristina,

Thanks for the document. For ALICE, the major reason to update to the new CASTOR 2.1.8 is the much improved integration of xrootd and the new xrootd features. The data access in ALICE is xrootd-only irrespective of the activity (reconstruction/analysis). That said, we do respect fully the site decision on the upgrade schedule. If it is feasible and the site fabric and administrators allow it, we are willing to be a test case for

v.2.1.8 on the ALICE CASTOR instance.

Cheers, Latchezar.

HONE

-----Original Message-----

From: David Sankey [mailto:David.Sankey@stfc.ac.uk]
Sent: Tue 3/31/2009 5:07 PM
To: Viljoen, MJ (Matthew)
Subject: Re: RAL CASTOR 2.1.8 upgrade strategy

At 09:48 +0100 31/3/09, Viljoen, MJ (Matthew) wrote:

>Hi all,
>
>Please find attached a copy of the RAL CASTOR 2.1.8 upgrade strategy
>and timeline, which has now been agreed by the senior management at the
>RAL Tier 1.
>
>Hopefully this document will be useful in deciding your respective
>positions regarding support for such an upgrade at RAL. If you have
>not told us what your positions are, then we would be grateful if you
>could soon.

This upgrade won't really impact hone, but any impact would be minimised by it being sooner rather than later - we're entering a lull prior to reprocessing our data, where once that is under way we then (3Q09) have a follow on surge on MC production which is what we are running on the Grid.

Kind regards,

Dave

MINOS

-----Original Message-----

From: Nick West [mailto:n.west1@physics.ox.ac.uk]
Sent: Tue 3/31/2009 10:58 AM
To: Viljoen, MJ (Matthew)
Cc: cl@hep.ph.bham.ac.uk; de@hep.ph.bham.ac.uk; p.love@lancaster.ac.uk;
g.stewart@physics.gla.ac.uk; Brew, CAJ (Chris); JacksonJames;
d.colling@imperial.ac.uk; Nandakumar, R (Raja); Sankey, DPC (David);
Paul.Kyberd@brunel.ac.uk; Burke, S (Stephen); Worm, SD (Steve)
Subject: RE: RAL CASTOR 2.1.8 upgrade strategy

Hi Matt,

>Please find attached a copy of the RAL CASTOR 2.1.8 upgrade strategy
>and timeline, which has now been agreed by the senior management at the
>RAL Tier 1.
>
>Hopefully this document will be useful in deciding your respective
>positions regarding support for such an upgrade at RAL. If you have
>not told us what your positions are, then we would be grateful if you

>could soon.

As a very small fish (MINOS) in a rather large pool, with only modest demands on CASTOR, our selfish position would be

"If it ain't broke don't fix it"

Of course, from a wider perspective, we understand the need to stay in sync with CERN if only to keep support to reasonable levels. Then our take is that anything that causes us pain is going to cause the big fish (LHC) agony and can rely on the pressure they will exert to get anything fix. So MINOS are content to fall into line with any agreed timescale.

Cheers,

Nick

MICE

Formal response forthcoming

ILC

Formal response forthcoming