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Some slides stolen from Claudio Grandi’s talk at CHEP’03
Accepts job submission from users
Stores info about job in a DB
Builds a wrapper around the job (*jobExecutor*)
Sends the wrapper to the local scheduler
The wrapper sends to the DB info about the job
Use of R-GMA in BOSS (the idea)

1. UI (BOSS)
2. BOSS DB
3. Receiver
4. WN
5a. Farm servlets
5b. Receiver servlets
6. Registry

BOSS wrapper
  Job
  Tee
  OutFile
  R-GMA API

Flow:
- UI (BOSS) to Sandbox
- Sandbox to BOSS DB
- BOSS DB to Receiver
- Receiver to Registry
- Registry to Farm servlets
- Farm servlets to Receiver servlets
- Receiver servlets to BOSS DB
- BOSS DB to WN
- WN to BOSS wrapper
- BOSS wrapper to Registry
Use of R-GMA in BOSS

- Publish each update into R-GMA as a separate message – separate row
- Each producer gives host and name of “home” BOSS DB, and jobId; this identifies it uniquely
- Receiver looks for all rows relating to its DB; uses jobId and jobType to do SQL UPDATE
Use of R-GMA in BOSS

• R-GMA smoothes “firewall” issues
• Consumer can watch many producers; producers can feed multiple consumers.
• Provides uniform access to range of monitoring data (WP7 network, etc.)
• Can define minimum retention period but no guarantees
Scalability Tests With CMS, Boss and R-GMA

Stolen from Rob Byrom’s slides at

http://agenda.cern.ch/fullAgenda.php?ida=a036755

Test Motivation

• Want to ensure R-GMA can cope with volume of expected traffic and is scalable.
• CMS production load estimated at around 2000 jobs.
• Initial tests with v3-3-28 only managed about 400 - could do better $\subseteq$. 
Test Design

• A simulation of the CMS production system was created.
  – A Java MC simulation was designed to represent a typical job.
  – Each job creates a stream producer.
  – Each job publishes a number of tuples depending on the job phase.
  – Each job contains 3 phases with varying time delays.
  – Emulates “CMSIM” message publishing pattern, but so far with 10 hour run time compressed into a minute …
  – … so actually have fewer simultaneous jobs than real case, but overall a much higher rate of message production.
Test Design

• An Archiver scoops up published tuples.
  – The Archiver db used is a representation of the BOSS db, but stores history of received messages, rather than just a cumulative update.
  – Archived tuples are compared with published tuples to verify the test outcome.
Topology
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Test Setup

• Archiver & SP mon box setup at Imperial.
• SP mon box & IC setup at Brunel.
• Archiver and MC sim clients positioned at various nodes within both sites.
• Tried 1 MC sim and Archiver with variable Job submissions.
• Also setup similar test on WP3 testbed using 2 MC sims and 1 Archiver.
Results (i.e. Status)

- 1 MC sim creating 2000 jobs and publishing 7600 tuples proven to work without glitch (R-GMA v3.4.13)
- Demonstrated 2 MC sims each running 4000 jobs (with 15200 published tuples) on the WP3 testbed.
- We believe that R-GMA will scale to number of jobs required…
Plans

• But these have not been real jobs – need to confirm performance with full-length and real jobs, at full scale and under real conditions: i.e. with R-GMA infrastructure shared with rest of Grid monitoring
• Check R-GMA functionality in LCG2
• Properly integrate into BOSS source tree