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**EMI:**
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Cristina Aiftimiei (CA)

Danilo Dongiovanni (DD)

Tomasz Wolak (TW)

**EGI:**Emir Imamagic (EI)  
Marian Babik (MB)  
Tiziana Ferrari (TF)  
Peter Solagna (PS)

Daniele Cesini (DC)

## Introduction

DC gives an introduction on what we should discuss today, few slides attached to the agenda.

We agreed that EMI-JRA1 will develops probes: new developed probes coverage available here

<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EMI/NagiosProbes>

for gLite/dCache ARC and UNICORE. Probes are released with some dependencies removed, Metapackage is now DONE, EGI UI/WN SAM-NAGIOS environment configuration was agreed, but missing - waiting for information from EGI on what environment configuration means - Requested INFO TO EGI

EGI-JRA1 will integrate into the probes SAM framework, but is waiting for EMI metapackage and environment configuration -> EMI in turn waiting for info from EGI.

Today we should remove this deadlock and agree on how to proceed.

Discussion on environment configuration started at the Lyon Technical Forum (09/2011) and an rt ticket was opened by EGI, it will be discussed in the TCB, so it would be good if we have an agreed solution before the TCB discussion. Minutes of the Lyon meeting reported in EGI rt ticket 3748 “Environment for emi-nagios mp” (<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=37848> ). Today we need to clarify this requirement and in particular the sentence: “and each probe will be responsible for handling its dependencies. In addition, environment configuration needed to execute each probe will be provided (this would replace the need to configure middleware user interface (UI) as part of the SAM framework configuration).”

If we have time before closing the meeting we should also discuss the following topics:

* Integration and testing of the EMI probes
* Release timeline and end of support of the gLite UI
* Problems reported by old probes with new EMI-2 services

## Discussion

### Dependencies and environment

MB: Now we are shipping SAM with glite ui - yaim variables need to be set up – we would like not to install and configure the whole UI, but only the packages really needed by the probes – probes should be shipped as a meta package that contains all the needed dependencies. About configuration there are two types of configuration in here:

1) probe configuration for paths, services etc. needed by the probe itself

2) nagios parameters to run the probes (i.e. how often the probes is run)

SAM team will take care of 2). Probe developers should provide a way or a tool to have 1) - probe is a script, everything needed to run  it should be shipped with the probe.  
  
CA: so, each PT should take care of the environment to run its probe  
  
DD: this is slightly different from what discussed in Lyon: probes are executable and the configuration is part of the rpm – this is easy for probes that are run locally on the service but it’s much more complex for probes that involve more than one service and are run remotely, i.e WMS, CE, WN probes  
Currently testing of a probe is done locally on the service, this is what we agreed on.

EI: all probes should have the proper dependencies, i.e. arc probes on arc clients and so on – this is in the minutes  
  
CA: it was not explained to the PTs  
  
EI: but some probes, i.e. those from UNICORE and ARC come with dependencies. The requirements of having probes with dependencies comes also from NDGF.

(discussion on how clients are managed by the 3 mw stacks in EMI)  
  
CA: for the dependencies there should be no problem, not that difficult, while configuration could be more problematic  
  
EI: it should be sufficient to use the same UI conf functions  
  
TF: but what do you expect from this work? less dependencies to be installed? Do we have an estimation of how many dependencies we save?  
EI: it will be less packages - i.e. if the probes use only the py library we can remove all the other lib - and the principle of cleaner is better holds.  
  
CA: However I think it won’t be 10 to 100 reduction. And in any case we need to discuss internally in EMI, we cannot decide right now.

EI: timeline for the discussion to happen within EMI?  
  
CA: we can discuss this week and provide the info to the PT than we wait for the PT answers

**ACTION1: discuss the dependencies requirement internally to EMI as soon as possible**

PS: back to the configuration topic - which configuration do you expect other than dependencies? i.e. - now UI is configured and SAM takes the environment from that, voms server endpoints,   
common configuration variables etc..  
We should keep SAM admins effort at the same level of today, we cannot ask to run 20 configuration functions, one for each probe.  
  
EI: I expect the EMI probes metapackage to come with a conf file similar to the yaim site.def. I don't expect each probe will have a separated yaim. Something like: extract from the yaim configuration what is really needed

CA: we have 24 conf function of yaim, specific to ui there are only 12 and among the amga clients, saga and so on, rgma....probably we will have about 10 functions remaining

EI: that's all the conf that is needed for all the problem  
  
CA: however in terms of dependencies we won’t save a lot  
  
EI: Ok, but it's cleaner. Moreover, if you don’t use the glite mw you can install only some probes rpms, without all the mp – and in this case is ok to lose the configuration since the most general use case is the whole mp plus the configuration  
From PTs we expect clean dependencies used by their scripts and from the configuration point of view to tansform UI general conf in a probes mp yaim

Probes MP testing  
DD: about testing: some are executed locally, some form the ui, if we have a probes mp without the UI is another service to test  
  
DC/CA: yes  
  
DD: PTs have two ways, local and from a ui - now we have to install the mp in a new machine  
  
EI: you will have a nagios service with mp install  
  
DD: yes, exactly we have another service to test. Do we have a real benefit in terms of sustainability?  
  
EI: cleaner means easier to maintain. from the maintainability perspective it is better to have cleaner system. how do you test the mp you have now?  
  
(Discussion on maintainability)

DD: certification process that was agreed in Lyon is:  
1) probes from EMI will be deployed  
2) Emir provide a SAM instance  
now 2) is not needed. Is this correct?  
  
MB: yes, that's correct - the process of testing will be easier, since we do not mix two release streamlines  
  
TS: but today nagios is submitting test – it’s useful to have a service that submit test, if the integration is done only after by EGI you lose automatic submission and you will have to submit manually.  
  
EI: if you want we provide support needed to bootstrap a NAGIOS with the probes MP  
  
DD: ok, we can do this unofficially. We (EMI) should not be responsible for integration problems, we should not test the integration that is an EGI responsibility – we will use the (pre)integration just to submit automatically the tests needed to test the MP

End of security support for the gLite UI  
DC: ask about the timeline for the end of support of the glite ui – End of Sept 2012

CA: why don't you use the emi ui?  
  
 EI: we prefer not to ask site admins to reinstall everything twice in the case that the probes MP will be available  
  
DC: we will have an EGI internal discussion if it is the case to ask for an extension of the support.

Legacy probes vs new SL6 services   
Discussion on 83127 (Nagios config error on sl6 WN)  
<https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=83127>

GM: will it be fixed on U17?

MB: no

EI: it’s a python ldap problem in wn. Did you try to install it?  
  
MB: however it is a general discussion – old probes vs new services (sl6)

TF: now we have legacy probes - is a problem of routing tickets - probes will be a mixture - need discussion on how to route the probes, only people that knows what is going on, 2nd or 3rd level can answer

EI: we will provide documentation and the 2nd level should be able

TF: who takes care of adapting the probes in case something goes wrong?

EI: nobody, EMI-2 should be backward compatible

TF: there should be a reported compatibility problem with the EMI WMS client?

CA: should not impact on probes

TF: however we have to be careful and check in case of failing tests.

EI: SR should catch things

ARC probes in U17  
Tiziana: arc probes from EMI will be available in U17. is this correct?  
  
EI: no it's not correct. Only UNICORE probes will be taken from EMI. arc cannot be installed clearly in glite ui etc...

## ACTIONS and DECISION

1. **ACTION1**: discuss the dependencies/environment requirement internally to EMI as soon as possible and report to EGI the conclusion. The requirement is:
   1. Each probe responsible for its dependencies
   2. EMI will provide a metapackage that install all the probes without the UI
   3. EMI will provide a Probe MP yaim using the needed yaim functions from the UI - the site.def should contain only the variables needed to configure the probes MP
   4. EGI will take care of the NAGIOS side configurations (i.e. how often the probes are submitted)
2. **ACTION2**: internal discussion in EGI if we need to ask for an extension of the security support for the gLite UI
3. **Testing:** EMI will be responsible for testing the MP – a new service should be tested – but EMI will not test the integration in SAM and will not be responsible for that integration - in this way we do not mix two release streamlines. EGI will give support unofficially to include the probes MP in NAGIOS to run the test automatically.
4. **Legacy Probes:** 2nd level support should take care of problems related to legacy probes on new sl6 services (documentation needed)