

Rucio Community Workshop 2019

Notes

Session 1	2
Session 2	2
Session 3	2
Session 4	2
Discussion Day 1	2
Session 5	2
Session 6	2
Discussion Day 2	2

Session 1

- Keynote 1: Concepts and Architectures for the Next Generation Academic Networks
 - Quite many points to be tracked and discussed over future Rucio dev meetings.
E.g. how the application layer can propagate info to the network one
- DUNE
 - Metadata: what is missing?
 - Datasets defined using metadata → They do complicated queries
 - Interested in relations between files → more than simple key/value searches
 - 20-30 metadata items per file
 - At what level is the metadata? Only file?
 - Also on object/observation level?
 - To be discussed also with other experiments like ATLAS. Flexible metadata recording and querying might be interesting
 - PostgreSQL
 - FNAL fully focusing on postgres
 - No scalability issues
 - Backend for Rucio?
 - Everyone interesting in PostgreSQL!
 - Staging area
 - Usage of tapes a challenge for the feature
 - Should work together on this!

Session 2

- ATLAS
 - No questions
 - Open points: what can we do together? Monitoring, accounting, lifetime of files, operational intelligence (automation of operations)
 - not only a common operational effort, but a common operational strategy
e.g., "we would like to have this" → "you can do it like that"
- CMS :
 - Dry-run of rules would be a beneficial!
 - Validation of migration to TAPE :
 - Concerns that the source replica is not deleted before being migrated to TAPE
 - DDM candidates other than Rucio ?
 - Home grown Dynamo
 - Requirement on ACLs ?
 - No requirement

- Integration DDM/WFSM
- BELLE2 :
 - Many technical questions that will be addressed offline or during the Friday afternoon session
 - Naming scheme :
 - Propose naming scheme is the same as CMS except the fact that the filename are unique for CMS
 - ATLAS has expertise in migration from LFC to Rucio. Can provide expertise and help
 - Shutdown like LS2 ?
 - No
 - Migrate in-between during short stops?
 - Postgres (10) doesn't allow partitioning
 - (well, yes, but only range and list partitioning, not dynamic enough)
 - 11 will
- FTS :
 - Possibility to have FTS instances talking to each other?
 - One FTS instance for all of CERN?

Session 3

- XenoN1T/XenoNnT
 - Will you keep XenoN1T installation?
 - Recommendation for new Rucio users?
 - Use the Rucio API as often as possible!
 - Documentation improved a lot!
 - Python 3.6?
 - Right now Rucio not tested against 3.6, only 3.5 - but very similar
 - Gfal on Python 3 not tested yet, but is available
- IceCube
 - Why adler32?
 -
 - Archive Containers
 - Better documentation!
 - :-)
 - Should be improved!
 - Communities can help a lot in improving the documentation!
 - 150 pages of "installing and running rucio" journal from LIGO (cannot share publicly)
 - Better demo needed
- CTA (Telescope, not tape ;-)

- Policy: Protect data for at least one year?
 - ivoa compliance?
 - <http://www.ivoa.net/documents/PR/ResMetadata/RM-20040323.html#rm>
- Rucio Database @ ATLAS
 - Lots of expertise need to run Rucio DB?
 - Possible to run Postgres without all this DBA expertise?
 - Popularity of different partitions?
 - Some extremely popular, some are not
 - Cache fusion
 - PostgreSQL
 - Big database run in postgres (dCache, big web projects etc)
 - Confidence that big Rucio instances should also be able to run on Postgres (but with tunings...)
- Rucio for an SKA Regional center
 - Generic metadata support is important to have.
 - Alternative method of authentication (WebUI)
 - Lightweight CLI
 - Permissions/ACLs
 - Policies
 - Reading too much from tape etc.

Session 4

- NSLS-2
 - Integration of globus online if FTS not suitable?
 - working GO transfertool implementation?
 - Advice from Rucio community about “data layout”
- XDC
 - Storage events
- CTA (The tape, not the telescope)
- LCLS-II

Discussion Day 1

Topics to discuss:

1. Drop of Python 2.6 support for Rucio Clients
 - a. Confirmed
2. Release model
 - a. Do we need LTS releases?
 - i. request from UK: security LTS release (once per year) would be useful
maybe last patch release from previous feature release cycle
 - ii. try not to overcomplicate

- b. Any particular observations from current upgrade procedures?
 - i. validation of releases beyond "alpha"/"beta" testing
- 3. Support model
 - a. (how-to/tutorial?) contribute to documentation!!
 - b. mission of cern is also to work with other communities

Session 5

- Keynote II: The Nordic e-Infrastructure Collaboration (NeIC)
 - new project cycle >2020
 - Collaboration also possible with non-european countries? E.g. Canada?
 - Yes, very much so, if the objectives align
- EGI
 - Multi VO instance?
 - Would be desirable; DIRAC is run in multi-vo way for EGI
 - ONEDATA support → More applicable for FTS?
 - Being looked into via XDC
 - OI DC support
 - Will be addressed in Rucio via XDC
- LSST
 - Feature requests: register existing files, customized folder/file structure, AAI, switch for protocol src-dst mapping, customised transfertool-"loader" (local transfertool that does something a-la atlas LSM but for async)
 - Mapping between source/destination protocol
 - Some pairs are blocked, even if FTS could stream it, or even if e.g.dCache could do http to gsiftp
 - Globusonline needed for NERSC?
 - no, can use gridftp (client-side loadbalancing across NERSC DTNs)
 - problem with GO is hardware-token, needs person every two days pushing a button, cannot be automated
 - will give recommendation to NCSA
 - Dynafed
 -

Session 6

- RAL/IRIS
 - Integration with Dirac. 1 FTE for 2 years
 - Multi-VO support expected Sept. 2019
 - Sharing monitoring (+monitoring interpretation/knowledge)
- ARC
 -

- Eiscat3D
 - data embargoes becoming important!
 - What tools for analysis ?
 - Currently matlab. For Eiscat3D, not possible. Not known yet

Discussion Day 2

Topics to discuss:

1.