



User Feedback from the POOL Project

Dirk Düllmann,
LCG-POOL

LCG Application Area Internal Review
20-22 October 2003



SPI Services used by POOL



- POOL was the first project using SPI services
 - POOL has actively contributed to the definition of SPI services and LCG policies maintained by SPI
- POOL is relying on many (almost all) SPI services
 - SCRAM Support
 - External Software Library
 - S/W distribution kits and installation scripts
 - Documentation Tools
 - CVS repository
 - Testing Tools
 - Nightly Builds



Savannah



- POOL relies on Savannah as project portal
 - Problem reporting and tracking
 - Support call tracking
 - Internal task allocation and tracking
- Experience with problem tracking is positive
 - Support call tracking misses some of the functionality (eg cc list, email notification on call assignment to developers)
 - Some enhancements could even further improve the system
 - Eg automatic escalation after some timeout
 - Insuring that calls have a originator email or name
 - No real showstoppers found
- FAQ feature found too simple for larger FAQs
 - (Un)fortunately not our problem yet...
- Few additions would make Savannah also useful for service projects (in contrast to s/w development)
 - Eg Meeting minutes and intervention logs



SCRAM Support



- SCRAM and LCG ToolBox
 - Common ToolBox for all projects is essential to insure compatibility across the project
 - Need to include definition of all supported platforms - including compilation flags which may affect the C++ ABI
 - Usually quick response to change requests
 - Coverage during the vacation period and toolbox testing before release are essential and are now addressed
- CVS Repository
 - Works without any problems...
- NICOS build system
 - POOL has been integrated
 - Not too much benefit so far, but expect this to become important as soon as more platforms are deployed and used in development



Testing Framework



- Oval has been adopted throughout POOL for integration testing
- CppUnit used in some areas but pure unit testing harder to apply generally in POOL because of interdependencies
- So far still rely on specialized python script to fully automate the POOL testing for partial releases
 - POOL has non-trivial dependencies between different test via their data files
 - Also Data format regression tests impose additional requirement specific to POOL
- Plan to move to QMtest
 - First experience is positive



External Software Library



- Professional installation and documentation of all available software
- Library is getting quite large already
 - Should maybe reflect the difference between build-for-test and build-for-production platforms
 - Eagerly updating all packages on "for test" platforms may generate a lot of effort
 - Keep a reference count for who has requested/is using a particular package
 - Keeping packages forever without at least a single clear requestor/owner is resource consuming



LCG Software Distribution



- Useful end user installation scripts for local installation
 - Facilitates development eg on a laptop
 - Used successfully eg for the Computing School in Karlsruhe
- Installing all possible dependencies results in 1.5GB installation - some streamlining required
 - May want to strip server components
 - May want more customized partial installations
- Several tar / rpm based formats in preparation
 - Integration with LCG-1 mechanisms required
 - In close collaboration with LCG GD Area



Documentation Tools



- POOL Reference Documentation is based on doxygen service provided by SPI
 - POOL developers just follow the doxygen guidelines defined by SPI
 - After a release has been tagged the complete documentation shows up "automatically" within a day
- Positive experience with this SPI service
 - Only minor problems still to be sorted out
 - Remove test applications from the documentation parsing (duplicate classes and types)
- ViewCVS
 - Very useful not only for developers but also project admins
 - Use regularly the check-in database to find out what happens inside the larger POOL CVS tree



Summary



- POOL fully relies on many SPI services
 - And actively participates in their definition
 - Service level for POOL is found very adequate
- POOL has followed the evolution of LCG policies maintained and checked by SPI
 - Being the first project is sometimes a disadvantage
- Insuring a consistent/identical build and testing procedure between the LCG AA projects is non-trivial
 - Because of different project requirements
 - The task would be simplified by centralizing the task
 - The load generated by the frequent internal releases in POOL is significant