



EGI-InSPIRE

OMB MEETING 13 SEPTEMBER 2010

Notes

Meeting Agenda: <https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceTimeTable.py?confId=124>

1 ATTENDANCE

Tiziana Ferrari (TF)	EGI.eu (chairman)
Torsten Antoni	NGI-DE, KIT and TSA1.6
Luciano Gaido	IGI, INFN
Mats Nylén	NGI-SE
Andres Waananen	NGI-DE, UCPH
Josva Kleist	NDGF
Vera Hansper	NDGF, CSC
Mario Reale	IGI, GARR TSA1.7
Ludek Matyska	Metacentrum, CESNET
Claire Devereux	UK, STFC
Helene Cordier	NGI France, IN2P3 and CNRS
Tim Dyce	APGU, UNIMELB
John Gordon	UK, STFC and TSA1.5
Ron Trompert	NCF, SARA and TSA1.7
Cyril L'Orphelin	CC-IN2P3 and TSA1.4
Goncalo Borges	IberGrid, LIP and TSA1.3 representative (on behalf of Mario David)
Edgard Znots	NGI Latvia, IMCS UL
Miroslav Ruda	Metacentrum, CESNET
Alex Stanciu	NGI-RO, ICI
Hakan Bayindir	Tubitak Ulakbim
Malgorzata Karkowian	NGI PL, CYFRONET
Marcin Radecki	NGI PL, CYFRONET
Christos Kanellopoulos	GRNET, AUTH and TSA1.8
Christos Triantafyllidis	GRNET, AUTH and TSA1.4
Lukk Uljee	NCF, SARA and TSA1.7
David Durvaux	BELNET, Belgium



Dusan Vudragovic	NGI AEGIS, Serbia
Alexander Kryukov	RU-NGI, Moscow State University
Mingchao Ma,	UK NGI, STFC and TSA1.2
Andres Aeschlimann	NGI CH, SWITCH
John Walsh	Grid Ireland
Boro Jakimovski	NGI MARGI, Macedonia
Antun Balaz	NGI AEGIS, Serbia
Riccardo Brunetti	IGI, INFN
Nicolai Iliuha	RENAM, IMI Moldova
Alexei Altuhov	MD Grid NGI, Moldova, RENAM

2 SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

ACTION (All NGIs): all partners to send TF the list of members expected to claim effort under SA1.1

ACTION (V. Hansper): <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=344> to request that operational ARC support in GGUS is enabled for sites that deploy ARC. Note. This is different from ARC middleware support, which will be provided by the DMSU and EMI and is going to be discussed and implemented by SA2.

ACTION (all NGIs): all NGIs to provide information about blocking deployment issues that are preventing them to upgrade to a gLite 3.2 component. Information on such critical deployment issues needs to be provided in ticket: <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=263>

ACTION (TF): TF to produce a new version of the infrastructure MoU and circulate it for comments <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=345>

ACTION (M. David): to clarify the staged rollout duration. 1 day of staged rollout is not felt to be sufficient to capture deployment issues, and similarly critical patches should undergo a (shorter) staged rollout whenever possible. <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=346>

ACTION (TF): to update as necessary the procedure to retire middleware components (<https://edms.cern.ch/document/985325>). <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=347>

ACTION (TF): to verify which communication channels can be put in place to consult VOs about their dependency on 32-bit clients and lcg-CE.

Action closed on Sep 28: TF spoke to Steve Brewer (EGI.eu community officer), and passed information on the current gLite collaboration plan and asked Steve Brewer to collect input (using NA3 user support contacts and/or the VO broadcast tool).

ACTION (M.Ma, R. Trompert for COD): to work on an updated suspension procedure to be circulated the first week of october for discussion on the OMB mailing list.

ACTION (M.Ma, R. Trompert for COD): to work on an updated suspension procedure to be circulated the first week of october for discussion on the OMB mailing list. <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=247>

3 INTRODUCTION

T.Ferrari, see slides

- discussion of reporting of management effort for SA1 (participation to OMB meeting and reviewing of deliverables and milestones). It is recommended that this effort is claimed under TSA1.1 (Management), no explicit effort allocation exists currently in the DoW for NGIs. Only NGI operations managers and deputies are allowed to claim effort under TSA1.1 for attending OMB meetings. Effort to be claimed under SA1.1 will need to be taken from another existing SA1 tasks to avoid overspending. It expected that SA1.1 management effort will be a small percentage of the overall effort allocated to a partner. People performing review work will be added in PPT under TSA1.1 on request to allow them to claim effort if needed. **ACTION:** all partners to send TF the list of members expected to claim effort under SA1.1
- Next QR2: the deadline for submitting QR2 is the 26th of October. An updated version of QR2 including metrics will be distributed by TF at the beginning of October.
- Next meetings: 26 October, 23 November, 21 December, 25 January 2011 (proposed schedule agreed by present partners)
- Status of milestones and deliverables reviewed. Expected contributions of NGIs:
 - for MS406 (deployment plan for the distribution of operational tools): a questionnaire will be distributed soon to NGIs, editor of the milestone is S.Diaz.
 - for MS407 (integrating resources into the EGI production infrastructure): expected input from NGIs who plan to operate different middleware stacks and resources in the future. Get in touch with Michaela Lechner for involvement.
- Review of actions: all open actions are progressing. Check slides and RT for detailed information.
- OMB draft terms of reference: this document illustrates the governance of the OMB board. Please all NGIs managers read the document and provide feedback if not already done.
- TCB: first meeting expected soon, middleware providers who have signed a MoU with EGI-InSPIRE will be represented in the TCB.
- Proposal of 6 month roadmap for SA1 presented for discussion.

4 MOU AND OLA FOR EGI RESOURCE PROVIDERS

S. Andreozzi (see slides)

Presentation of the policy team at EGI.eu, reason of being for MoUs in EGI-InSPIRE, discussion of operations OLA. Several topics addressed in the OMB were discussed later on during the dedicated OLA workshop (see minutes of the OLA workshop).

Discussion of Infrastructure MoU: “Mutual use of resources” needs to be properly explained in the MoU to clarify that site managers are always finally responsible of deciding the VOs who are authorized to use the site resources. TF will amend this point in the Infrastructure MoU draft, and will circulate a new version as soon as available.

J. Walsh: discussion of intellectual property issues related to the MoU

5 CURRENT STATUS OF ARC INTEGRATION WITHIN MONITORING ACCOUNTING AND EGI OPERATIONS

V. Hansper (see slides)

ACTION (V. Hansper): <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=344> to request that operational ARC support in GGUS is enabled for sites that deploy ARC. Note. This is different from ARC middleware support, which will be provided by EMI and is going to be discussed and implemented by SA2 people with the EMI project representatives.

6 GLITE 3.1 TO GLITE 3.2: MIGRATION PROPOSAL

G. Borges (see slides)

Purpose of this presentation is to define a gLite 3.1 transition plan in agreement with the gLite Collaboration.

SL4 end of support scheduled on Feb 2012, but Redhat 4 end of support scheduled at the end of October 2010.

Summary of decisions after the discussion session. These decisions have been distributed via email to the OMB list for further refinement during the technical forum week.

- **Per-component schedule.** EGI-InSPIRE operations request the gLite collaboration to provide a proposal including a per-component end-of support schedule. For some components, dependencies are such that end-of-support of a gLite 3.1 component (eg: VOMS) can be scheduled only if interoperation of its gLite 3.2 version can be guaranteed with other depending gLite 3.1 / gLite 3.2 supported services.
- **Documentation.** EGI-InSPIRE operations request comprehensive database migration guidelines. If documentation is currently missing then it should be provided, in particular for the following components, EGI TSA1.3 will check this together with glite product teams:
 - DPM
 - LFC
 - VOMS
 - MON-APEL (<http://goc.grid.sinica.edu.tw/gocwiki/glite-APEL>)
 - dCache
 - HYDRA (when it becomes available in glite 3.2)
 - AMGA (when it becomes available in glite 3.2)
- **Freeze** of a gLite 3.1 component for components which are also released in gLite3.2 - DPM, LFC, L&B, VOMS, CREAMCE and MON (APEL has the equivalent gLite 3.2 service) - is accepted under two conditions:
 - o compatibility with other supported gLite3.1 / gLite3.2 components is guaranteed;
 - o fixes to critical bugs in gLite 3.2 are not pending. For example, BDII has been reported as a service that suffered from instability. Critical bugs affecting gLite 3.2 have been recorded in GGUS, and the operations community has lost track of progress when savannah bugs were migrated to a different bug tracking system. SA1 will collect a comprehensive list of urgent fixes that are felt to be needed on gLite 3.2 components before its gLite 3.1 equivalent can be frozen, and will hand this list to the gLite collaboration after internal discussion within the project.

The project agreement for the immediate freeze of a given gLite 3.1 component depends on the amount of fixes felt to be urgent collected by SA1.

- **Principles for migration.** As a general principle, a gLite 3.1 component can be replaced by a gLite 3.2 version when the software providers certify that the gLite 3.2 component functionality and performance is equivalent or better than in gLite 3.1. EGI-InSPIRE staged rollout of a technical service is a mechanism that SA1 put in place to verify that this condition

- is actually seen in a production environment.
- EGI-InSPIRE SA1 will work towards improving the effectiveness of staged rollout, by having more NGIs involved in staged rollout and in having staged rollout services that are effectively part of a production infrastructure.
 - EGI-InSPIRE SA1 needs the support of SA2 to jointly develop quality criteria.
- **User community.** The user community needs to be involved in the definition of the end-of-support schedule. Commitment to testing gLite 3.2 is expected from those user communities that rely on gLite 3.1 components, when such components are declared to be candidates for end-of-support.
 - **lcg-CE and CREAM.** During the OMB meeting held on Sep 13th 2010, the need of lcg-CE support was discussed. No VOs – in addition to ATLAS and LHCb – were reported to be relying on lcg-CE, so there is no evidence of need of lcg-CE support outside the WLCG community at the moment. The July 17th release of Condor fixes the known issues that prevented CondorG-CREAM interoperability. The need of a new test campaign was discussed at the latest Grid Deployment Board, J. Gordon reported that an update is expected at the next GDB.
 - **WLCG** requires a set of baseline service versions to be deployed by all sites for stability reasons. End-of-support / end-of-life schedules need to be jointly defined to ensure consistency of plans.

ACTION (all NGIs): all NGIs to provide information about blocking deployment issues that are preventing them to upgrade to a gLite 3.2 component. Information on such critical deployment issues needs to be provided in ticket: <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=332>

ACTION (M.David): to clarify the staged rollout duration. 1 day of staged rollout is not felt to be sufficient to capture deployment issues, and similarly critical patches should undergo by default a (shorter) staged rollout whenever possible. Deviations from this should be treated as an exception. <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=346>

ACTION (Tiziana): to verify which communication channels can be put in place to consult VOs about their dependency on 32-bit clients and lcg-CE.

J. Gordon. Acceptance criteria of gLite 3.2 components (and generally speaking of new components) need to be verified. This should happen through the staged rollout process. EGI-InSPIRE should have quality acceptance verification tools/test suites.

Discussion of EGEE-III procedure for declaring end of life of a given service. This procedure should be updated if necessary to make it fit the EGI operations scenario and should then be adopted in future discussions for phasing out of middleware services (negotiation of end of standard and security support, retirement from the infrastructure).

ACTION (TF): to update as necessary the EGEE-III procedure to retire middleware components (<https://edms.cern.ch/document/985325>). <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=347>

7 NEW COD ESCALATION PROCEDURE

R. Trompert (see slides)

It is difficult to keep track of sites that were suspended, a better tracking is needed in order to provide information on state transitions.



A site can belong to different infrastructures and should be easily associated to an arbitrary list of infrastructures through GOCDB.

H. Cordier: it is important to remember that the usual principle of giving primary authority to NGIs to suspend is still valid in EGI. This means that NGIs should suspend first before COD intervention. COD proceeds for suspension only if the NGI does not appropriately handle the issue or is unresponsive.

M. Ma: security also has a suspension procedure. It would be good if a single suspension procedure was defined.

ACTION (Mingchao, Ron for COD): to work on an updated suspension procedure to be circulated by the first week of October for discussion on the OMB mailing list. Minchao to provide a pointer to the current suspension procedure for security issues. <https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=247>

8 DOCUMENTATION, BEST PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES: ROADMAP

V. Hansper (see slides). Involvement of NGIs needed to proceed on a list of open actions as described in slides.

9 ACCOUNTING: STATUS OF MIGRATION AND ROADMAP

The migration to the AMQ APEL client has been progressing well during the transition phase of August. No showstoppers were observed preventing ALL NGIs to migrate now.

All NGIs are encouraged to start the migration to the AMQ as soon as possible.

T. Ferrari: it is important that accounting information collected centrally is complete for reporting reasons.

The plan is to decommission the R-GMA central accounting repository by the end of 2010 if everything goes well with the AMQ APEL client deployment, but this plan will be reviewed in case of a significant infrastructure portion still waiting to be migrated.

10 COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration. EGI-InSPIRE (“European Grid Initiative: Integrated Sustainable Pan-European Infrastructure for Researchers in Europe”) is a project co-funded by the European Commission as an Integrated Infrastructure Initiative within the 7th Framework Programme. EGI-InSPIRE began in May 2010 and will run for 4 years. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, and USA. The work must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: “Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration”. Using this document in a way and/or for purposes not foreseen in the license, requires the prior written permission of the copyright holders. The information contained in this document represents the views of the copyright holders as of the date such views are published.