



EGI.eu

OMB MEETING 23 NOVEMBER 2010

Notes

Meeting Agenda: <https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=151>

1 ATTENDANCE

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Tiziana Ferrari (TF) | EGI.eu (chairman) |
| Damir Marinovic | EGI.eu (Policy Team) |
| Mats Nylen | NGI-SE |
| Vera Hansper | NDGF, CSC |
| Helene Cordier | NGI France, IN2P3 and CNRS |
| John Gordon (JG) | UK, STFC and TSA1.5 |
| Ron Trompert | NCF, SARA and TSA1.7 |
| Goncalo Borges | IberGrid, LIP |
| Miroslav Ruda | Metacentrum, CESNET |
| Malgorzata Krarkowian | NGI PL, CYFRONET and COD |
| Marcin Radecki (MR) | NGI PL, CYFRONET and COD |
| Lukk Uljee | NCF, SARA and TSA1.7 |
| Alexander Kryukov | RU-NGI, Moscow State University |
| Paolo Veronesi | IGI, INFN |
| Vladimir Slavnic | IPB |
| Jinny Chien | ASGC |
| Pekka Lehtovuori | CSC |
| Dimitris Zilaskos (DZ) | AUTH/GRNET and TSA1.8 |
| Mario David | IberGrid, LIP and TSA1.3 |
| Jan Aсталos | IISAS |
| Emir Imamagic | SRCE and TSA1.4 |
| Luciano Gaido | IGI, INFN |
| Torsten Antoni | NGI-DE, KIT and TSA1.6 |
| Kostas Koumantaros | GRNET |
| Miroslav Dobrucky | UI SAV |
| Sven Gabriel | NIKHEF, TSA1.2 |
| Josva Kleist | NDGF |

2 SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

ACTION 1 (J. Kleist). To provide more technical information about local legal binding in the Nordic countries preventing the support of the DTEAM VO in Nordic countries.

ACTION 2 (TF) to verify if DTEAM membership needs to be updated. → Email update sent on 03 Dec. No need for DTEAM membership review. See details in email. ACTION CLOSED.

ACTION 3 (DZ): rephrase OLA to clarify that the site obligations that are mentioned in the document are part of a EGI-NGI agreement.

ACTION 4 (TF): contact Lithuania to understand the proposed new suspension policy is acceptable to them. → Update (3/12): the Lithuanian NGI operations manager accepts the proposal. ACTION CLOSED.

ACTION 5 (MR): open a doodle to decide terminology for tests that critical for COD. → Reminder sent on 03 Dec, poll to be closed by the end of 03 Dec. ACTION CLOSED.

ACTION 6 (TF and John G.) to contact NGI managers to increase urgency of this action

3 SUPPORT OF DTEAM VO

During this agenda slot the EGI mandatory support of DTEAM VOs by NGIs is discussed. The agenda summarizes the main discussion points raised during email discussion.

DZ presents pros and cons.

- PROs. DTEAM is a global VO for use in our international task for testing activities by NGIs and site managers. This is particularly important for the investigation of issues, particularly for issues which are dependent on certain configurations, not localized to one site or country. Tests using the DTEAM VO makes it possible to test how widespread a problem is, and to test the interaction between service operated in different administration domains.
Typically anyone who does not have an account on any other VO needs it for any testing or investigations which are not localized to their sites or country. It would seem appropriate that such work is carried out using a global dedicated VO rather than an application VO anyway, in order to not interfere with VO activities (batch systems and authorization frameworks can be configured to provide DTEAM access to a limited share of resources). JG provides a recent example of such need: debugging of FTS transfers between RAL and NDGF.
Testing is also needed to provide developers that supply 3rd line support, a mechanism to conduct tests in the production infrastructure as needed.
Some members of the SVG use the DEARM VO exclusively for their work, not just SVG work but all their development and testing work.
The migration of the DTEAM VOMS service from CERN to GRNET has been recently finalized.
Usage of DTEAM VO is regulated and specified in the framework of the AUP available from the operations portal. VO management will be handled over from CERN to GRNET (Dimitris Zilaskos).
- CONS.

- A national/regional catch-all VO could suffice → not for testing a federated infrastructure under the administrative control of different organizations.
- Is DTEAM really used? → Consumption of resources can be tracked through the existing accounting infrastructure. It amounts to 241,892 jobs and 1784 hours of CPUtime since May 2010. November: 38,450 jobs amounting just 73 hours.

Vera Hansper: Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden), are against the mandatory support of DTEAM, legal restrictions are mentioned imposing that each VO member is individually authorized to access local resources. DZ: this limitation affects all VOs, while is this issue just reported for DTEAM? JG: current security policies need to be revised if local regulations in some countries affect the current membership management model adopted for global VO. TF: authorization of membership to DTEAM individual groups is under the supervision of NGI operations managers, site managers, operations staff and NGI managers and the respective roles are all declared in GOCDB.

Vera Hansper: We feel that having the SVG use this VO is a stretch of the AUP for it. DZ: SVG uses DTEAM for testing reasons, not for monitoring, so this is in compliance with the AUP. The SVG coordinator can be requested to provide some feedback.

Vera H: We cannot widely distribute VO access to our resources, many unknown people in this VO,

TF: The approval of membership is under the responsibility of NGI managers. We can review the current members list.

ACTION (TF) to verify if DTEAM membership needs to be updated.

As more technical information is needed, Josva Kleist is invited to join the meeting, but because of audio-conferencing problems discussion is impaired.

Josva K: The problem is that most sites have fairly strict requirements to who can authorize access. It must be a named person - not a role. At "my" site i must know who can authorize access. J. Gordon: this is true for all VOs.

ACTION (J. Kleist) is requested more details about the legal issues mentioned during the OMB meeting.

DECISION. All NGIs with the exception of Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden approve the mandatory support of the DTEAM VO in EGI. More discussion is needed to understand the technical issues mentioned during the meeting for Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

Until these technical issues are understood and resolved the Nordic countries will optionally support DTEAM, and all other NGIs are requested to mandatorily support DTEAM from 01 January 2011.

4 OLA ROADMAP PROPOSAL

DZ presents the proposal on behalf of the OLA Task Force (see proposal at <https://documents.egi.eu/public/ShowDocument?docid=259>).

Section 2.1: removal of thresholds limiting the minimum amount of resources that can be provided.

DZ: Since EGI progresses to a service oriented infrastructure, sites may offer certain services without the traditional set of computational and /or storage resources. For example a site may offer only a



WMS service, or a top BDII or different service. To reflect this situation in the OLA there are 2 proposals for consideration:

1. Sites to be required to offer as minimum a site bdii and at least one additional service, as agreed with its NGI. This means that the NGIs decide which are the minimum resources to be provided by their sites. This requires changes only in the OLA text and can be adapted immediately

2. Site provides a site BDII and defines the services it provides on its own, or in an agreement with the VOs it supports. This means that sites define the minimum resources/set of services they provide on their own, in line with an OLA between them and the VOs they support. This requires the “virtual site” concept (similar to the VO feed mechanism) to be integrated into operations tools like GOCDB and thus depends on their development roadmap.

DZ: the two possibilities above are NOT excluding each other. The 2nd proposal is more interesting for the future in order to have different availability computations for different VOs.

TF: NGIs need to adopt a basic NGI-EGI agreement, and should be free to add additional constraints/requirements to the basic OLA according to the local needs.

The discussion concentrates on the need to require that a site BDII service is mandatory for a site. J. Gordon: a physical BDII can support more sites, so there is no need to operate a site BDII per site.

V. Hansper: the OLA needs to be middleware agnostic, so references to specific implementations need to be replaced with EGI capabilities.

H. Cordier: we need to clarify that the OLA is a EGI-NGI agreement not a EGI-site agreement, as NGIs are responsible of managing relationships with the respective sites.

TF: agreed. Wording will be adapted. The OLA under discussion, defining the mutual basic NGI-site obligations in EGI, can be structured as a chapter of a more general EGI-NGI OLA. The plan for the future is to require sites to agree to a basic OLA during certification, without need to collect signatures.

ACTION (DZ): Rephrase OLA to clarify that the site obligations are part of a EGI-NGI OLA.

Decision. Changes proposed in Section 2.1 of the OLA are approved according to option number 2 (Site provides a information discovery capability (e.g. a gLite site BDII) and defines the services to provide on its own, or in an agreement with the VOs it supports).

Section 2.2 GGUS tickets response thresholds

Section 12 of the current OLA requires that sites and NGIs acknowledge GGUS tickets within 4 hours. However on several occasions, especially in the OLA questionnaire distributed to NGIs during August 2010, there was feedback that this limit is too low for small sites. To address these concerns while not degrading the quality of services there are 2 proposals:

1. Response to tickets is set to a maximum of 8 business hours.
2. Alarm tickets and team tickets are to be acknowledged no later than 4 hours. The mechanism to achieve this (for example an SMS to site admin) can be defined into an agreement between the site and the VO.

J. Gordon: usage of Alarm tickets is currently limited to T1WCLG sites, but this can be extended to any other sites or VOs that may need them. H. Cordier: BioMed uses team tickets. John G: Require acknowledgment of alarm team tickets.

TF suggests that in the proposal only alarm tickets are mentioned, such that alarm ticket maximum response time is set to 4 business hours (for those VOs that are using this type of GGUS functionality). Team tickets will be removed from the proposal.

H. Cordier: what is the procedure for a VO to request the usage of alarm tickets?

TF: The GGUS VO-support Support Unit can be contacted to request this capability, or alternatively the need is discussed in the framework of a User Support Advisory Group meeting.

DECISION: this amendment is approved with the editorial improvement discussed above.

2.3 Required Grid middleware

DZ: the current OLA requires a site to run supported versions of EGI endorsed middleware. This can be more correctly rephrased to “run middleware which is in line with the UMD roadmap”.

H. Codier: where can information about supported middleware can be retrieved from?

TF: we currently have an agreed calendar for gLite 3.1 but not for other deployed software. TF will request at the next TCB that a complete calendar is agreed. This can be put on the EGI wiki, and the OLA could provide a reference to the wiki instead of vaguely refer to the UMD roadmap.

DECISION. This editorial improvement to the text specified the supported middleware is accepted.

2.4 Site support of at least one non-monitoring VO

DZ: Section 12.1 of the site-NGI OLA requires the site to support at least one community VO, in addition to monitoring VOs. However, this does not sufficiently cover the case of sites supporting training activities. The proposal is to change this requirement for a site to support at least one non-monitoring VO. John G: Agree, but specify that the **users VO can have different scope**, for example can be either regional or global, and **needed to registered in the Operations Portal**.

DECISION. This amendment with the editorial improvements herein discussed is approved.

2.5 Increase site suspension thresholds

Section 14 of the site-NGI OLA requires the site to be removed from the production infrastructure if it achieves less than 50% Availability for 3 consecutive months. As the infrastructure matures, it is possible to increase the quality of service provided to communities by increasing this threshold to 70%. Preliminary evaluation of the impact of such a change shows no significant change (3-4 extra sites per month would meet the new suspension threshold proposed). DZ will continue to monitor the impact in the coming months.

The OLA TF proposed that the enforcement of this new suspension policy starts on the 2nd year of the project, with the first suspension procedure with the new threshold starting in May 2011.

H. Cordier: is the suspension threshold applicable to availability performance or reliability performance? TF: Availability performance. Text will clarify this.

TF proposes that all suspension cases will be removed from the OLA, and put into a suspension policy document (to develop), which mentions all suspension cases. In this way we can keep the OLA separated from the suspension policies, that could change more frequently.

H. Cordier: Exemption use case should be stated, for example for a site under decommissioning.

TF: The OLA will clarify that the decommissioning phase can be for a maximum of three months. A site decommissioning procedure needs to be defined.

V. Hansper: Baltic countries especially Lithuania may have issues with the proposed change of the suspension policy.

ACTION (TF): contact Lithuania to understand the proposed new suspension policy is acceptable to them.

DECISION. The new suspension procedure is accepted and will come into force on May 01 2011. DZ will monitor the impact of the new suspension policy from Dec 2010.



2.5 Thresholds for core services

There's general consensus on the need to include core middleware services operated by the NGI in monthly OPS availability statistics. No suspension policy will be defined until sufficient statistics are gathered about the availability that NGI are currently delivered. The target is to start distributing availability statistics starting from May 2011.

DECISION. NGI core middleware service statistics needs to be gathered on a monthly basis and need to be assessed to define the minimum availability/reliability that can be realistically requested. A related suspension procedure will be defined when such thresholds are agreed. Target of having statistics available: May 2011.

5 PROCEDURE FOR SETTING NAGIOS TEST CRITICAL FOR COD

See full procedure description and slides.

Initially a proposal is presented to clarify the terminology used to qualify Nagios test, in particular the use of CRITICAL. H. Cordier: what is the meaning of CRITICAL when used in gstat? TF: it is used to characterize the output of a Nagios test, so this use is legitimate.

DECISION. There is an agreement in using this term JUST to determine the result of a Nagios test (which can be WARNING, OK, ERROR, CRITICAL etc.).

The term "availability test" is approved to flag those Nagios tests whose results are also used for availability/reliability computations.

Lack of agreement on terminology to qualify test that can produce a notification to the dashboard and a consequent alarm. A doodle will be opened (action on Marcin).

Discussion on the timeline for turning a test to critical for COD. The current procedure foresees that after approval of the OMB, the NGI operations have an extra month to check the behaviour of the probe in production. If the probe is felt to be not ready for this, during the month a notification can be sent to OMB.

Marcin R: Slide 5, 6 Helene C: Should be coherent with former choice of terms Marcin R: OK.

TF requests to change step 1 in order to track the start of the procedure through GGUS, this would replace the e-mail to COO. Agreement.

DECISION. The procedure is approved and will come into force from Jan 01.

MR will incorporate the changes discussed. The procedure will then be updated to replace CRITICAL with the term of choice defined with the doodle.

6 SECURITY SERVICE CHALLENGES AND EGI CSIRT

Sven G. gave presentation (see slides)

Discussion of deadline for suspension for security patching for status of CVE-2010-4170. Last day for patching is Thursday 25 Nov. About 60 sites are reported to be still vulnerable.



Discussion on suspension procedure. R. Trompert: COD should just intervene in case of lack of responsiveness, suspension for security reasons should be followed by EGI CSIRT.

The policy for security suspension will be discussed at the next OMB.

7 MIGRATION TO APEL AMQ CLIENT: STATUS UPDATE AND DISCUSSION OF ROADMAP

John G: Migration is not completed and far from finished. Figures from the last week say no more than 60% in total. What are the problems? Several NGIs haven't started the process yet.

DECISION The deadline for upgrade and decommissioning of RGAM is postponed to end of Jan 2011.

ACTION (TF and John G.) to contact NGI managers to solicit the migration.

8 AOB

TF: Next OMB meeting will be on 21 December.

All other AOB points are postponed for e-mail discussion.

9 COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Copyright © EGI.eu. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported 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, USA.

The work must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: "Copyright © EGI.eu (www.egi.eu). 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.