

Minutes JRA1 phone 30/09/2010

Minutes JRA1 phone 30/09/2010.....	1
Attendance.....	1
Review of Open Actions.....	1
Milestones and Deliverables.....	2
PM1 Milestones:.....	2
PM2 Milestones:.....	2
PM3 Milestones:.....	3
Quarterly Report.....	3
GOcdb4 Release Plan - UPDATE.....	3
NAGIOS monitoring of new m/w.....	3
NAGIOS: VO monitoring and custom services monitoring.....	4
NAGIOS for automatic certification.....	4
Double NAGIOS instance in one NGI.....	5
Common topology provider.....	5
AOB.....	6

Attendance

CERN: *David Horat (DH), David Collados (DC)*

SRCE: Emir Imamagic

EGI:

INFN: *Daniele (D)*

AUTH: *Christos T. (C)*

KIT: Torsten (T)

CESGA: Javier (J)

STFC: *Gilles (G)*

CNRS: Cyril(Cy)

GARR:

Review of Open Actions

75 - no news

76 - Situation still the same.

77 - Discussed at TF, when important release is important and trivial (CA UPDATE example), SR can be skipped. We should not worry about it. Ticket closed.

79 and children –

Acc and Metrics Portal: work in progress

Ops Portal – work in progress

GGUS – work in progress

Emir can send one probe example

Javier we need a test that download a page and then we can parse that page

Emir will send beginning of next week

Timeline end of the year fine for everybody

80 - see last meeting minutes

86 – can be closed

88 – move to confluence before closing it

201 – see point of the agenda

239: Solved in gocdb4 – ticket closed

284: see pint on the agenda

295: E. - will be completed today

Milestones and Deliverables

PM1 Milestones:

MS701: Define the roadmap for the CIC Operations Portal taking into account the CIC Operations regionalisation of the Portal work plan operational tools and new resource types being used on the infrastructure. (CNRS)

PMB Review

MS702: A report describing the different operational tool product team's development infrastructure and procedures including details of their development infrastructure. (INFN)

PMB review.

PM2 Milestones:

MS703: Operational Tools regionalisation work plan. Specify a work plan identifying the upcoming releases and associated functionality. (CERN)

Reviewed sent this morning from Angela, waiting for the Tiziana one.

PM3 Milestones:

MS704: Roadmap for the maintenance and development of the deployed operational tools (KIT)

A public report describing the roadmap for all the deployed operational tools over the next 18 months defining release and deployment dates.

D: Tiziana reviewed it – dependencies part should be improved, need more details

T: needs timescale for all the tools, some of them are missing

Agreed that everybody should check the review (Torsten to send the link) and send as soon as possible an integration to the contribution for the MS704.

(Same approach for 703 if needed after the review)

Quarterly Report

A report about the activity done in the last 3 months and the plans for the upcoming 3 months.

Daniele got contribution from everybody but ggus. In the afternoon the draft will be circulated.

Torsten will check it in the afternoon.

AMB Review

GOCDB4 Release Plan - UPDATE

Children ticket about test closed – testing completed – wiki page on test feedback updated

No more blocking issues left. Some feedback still need some development – but functionalities are there

Proposed week of release second of October – 14th October

Agreed on 14th .

Announcement can be done today or tomorrow.

Flag for early adopter sites – G: is already there in gocdb4, not flag for sites but for services – is a flag about staged rollout, it can be removed when the staged rollout is over

Naming convention for new m/w types – two proposal, flavor inside the name of the service type (i.e. glite-CE) the other to have two fields, one for flavor and one for service types

G: we recommend not to change all the service types, but we don't have a strong opinion

NAGIOS monitoring of new m/w

D: hottest topic of the moment – we have probes template but clear procedure is not written

E: I'll raise the question tomorrow at the internal meeting – tentative procedure is to open a JIRA bug

D: we need something more detailed

E: we have three levels of things, nagios level, roc critical/ops portal level (raise alarm in the dashboard)/ACE calculation. For the first one you don't need procedure, for the other you need to go to the OMB, but technicalities still need to be provided even for the first level.

D. what about packaging?

E. each probes developers should provide a repository and use the Manchester as a catch all and all the repo will end in the EGI repo in Greece.

D: how many metapackages? nagios-arc nagios-unicore...? Or just one that is able to monitor everything?

E. The best option is to have one, but there could be problems with the dependencies – we can have one but we should document that manual installation of the client is needed. It depends on the availability of a UI/WMS that is able to submit to all m/w

E. and C. : no dependencies of probes, we don't validate new probes, we can't test them all.

D. Conclusion: we need a procedure to include the probes – we put the probes in the Manchester repo – we will have a nagios box that is able to submit to new m/w provided that a UI is able to submit – Action on Emir to follow the issue – when we have the procedure we can fine tune it according to the ngis request

(unicore probes should be here: <http://sourceforge.net/projects/unicore-life/files/>)

NAGIOS: VO monitoring and custom services monitoring

See previous point

NAGIOS for automatic certification

We have an otag ticket about this (ticket 302):

<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=302>

the request from IBERGRID to have a nagios that is able to submit tests to uncertified sites using the production infrastructure.

We could not find a solution to the problem internally to JRA1 only. Changes on how the BDII conf file is built and how the clients submit to the CEs are needed and this is completely out of the JRA1 control. Moreover changes on ACE are probably needed.

We already provide a procedure to use NAGIOS for certification of sites within an NGI:

<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/MonitoringUncertifiedSites>

but this implies a parallel infrastructure (nagios+wms+bdii+clients) in each NGI that is what the IBERGRID wants to avoid because it's seen as a multiplication of effort. In this respect the request seems reasonable.

A proposal that came out today is that it could be possible to have a single NAGIOS instance using a parallel infrastructure (wms+bdii) that "sees" all the uncertified sites present in the GOCDB. A fine tuning of the

procedure quoted above is needed but doesn't require a big effort and you will have a single parallel infrastructure that can be used by every NGI for the purpose.

The "only" problem is to find an NGI that will look after this super-mega-nagios instance that submits to all uncertified sites (or we can think to a system to submit only to uncertified sites that request certification).

Proposal to be presented to SA1.

Double NAGIOS instance in one NGI

D: Request that arrived unofficially at the tf. Is this already working?

E: no, there can be problems with ACE.

Cy: this is not a problem for the dashboard since we create only one record

C: it's going to create problem to ACE

D: ACE is another thing that is out of our control

C: there could be other high availability solution, but having two instances will create problems

D: anyway is in the plan?

Not clear to be investigate.

D: if in the meanwhile we have guidelines on how to implement high availability we can distributed them. We can also ask to sitemanager if they have something in place already.

Common topology provider

DC presents slides (attached to the agenda) on how ATP works

D: which the rate for data acquisition

DC: every 30mins a nagios check grabs the information

G: why do nagios and gstat get information from both atp and gocdb-

DC: gstat contact atp for the store capacity

G: they contact gocdb for GIS url, that maybe is also present in atp.

D: are atp db present in the ngi box?

DC: yes it is installed in all boxes

D: do you grab the flag for cert/uncertified sites from gocdb

DC: yes, but we don't have the history for this information

D: are json and xml feeds already available?

DC: yes, but the current interface will be improved in the next release

D: how is the db queried?

DC: using the xml feeds

C: regional atp connect directly to gocdb in example or with the central db

DC: it contacts directly the gocdb. No synchronization with the central DB

D invite the development team to investigate the possibility to use the atp as topology provider for their tools.

J: we will think about it to see if we can use it

AOB

New ops portal release – D: Cyril do you need help for testing

Cy: not it sure be fine – test for the new void card part is done, the rest are minor changes

D: any problems with the last GGUS release (yesterday)

T: no problem with the last GGUS release (yesterday) – nom ajor thinks, more ngis, new vos and renames few m/w support units, now the navigation can be moved on the left or on top, you can switch it. Next release will be a major release – we'll move the support unit as agreed with emi (III level) and we need to change the permission for user, III level can be seen only by the DMSU.

D: EGI logo on web pages. The branding guidelines are now available (Dissemination handbook on the docdb) – but what it is missing are the copyright guidelines for the code. Asked yesterday at the AMB – they will provide a new document for the code.

D: Next meeting in one week on Thursday 14/10/2010 at 10.00.