EGI.eu

6TH OMB MEETING: 21 DECEMBER 2010

Notes

Meeting Agenda: https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=152

1 ATTENDANCE

Tiziana Ferrari (TF)	EGI.eu (Chairman)
Damir Marinovic	EGI.eu (Policy development team)
Mats Nylen	NGI-SE
Vera Hansper	NDGF, CSC
Helene Cordier	NGI France, IN2P3 and CNRS
Ron Trompert	NCF, SARA and TSA1.7
Goncalo Borges	IberGrid, LIP
Malgorzata Krakowian	NGI PL, CYFRONET and COD
Lukk Uljee	NCF, SARA and TSA1.7
Paolo Veronesi	IGI, INFN
Dimitris Zilaskos (DZ)	AUTH/GRNET and TSA1.8
Jan Astalos	IISAS
Emir Imamagic	SRCE and TSA1.4
Torsten Antoni	NGI-DE, KIT and TSA1.6
Kostas Koumantaros	GRNET
Onur Temizsoylu	Tubitak Ulakbim
Emrah Akkoyun	NGI TR, Tubitak Ulakbim
Tore Mauset	UNINETT Sigma
Andres Aeschlimann	NGI CH, SWITCH
Mingchao Ma	UK NGI, STFC and TSA1.2
Claire Devereux	UK, STFC
Anders Wäänänen	NGI-DK, UCPH
Foued Jrad	DE, KIT
Daniele Cesini	IGI, INFN and JRA1

2 SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Action number	Action Owner	Content	Status
Action 6.1	E. Imamagic	To provide a wiki page that explains the Nagios test terminology, including the difference between test and probe. ACTION CLOSED (07-01-11). See page at https://wiki.egi.eu/w/index.php?title=Critical_SAM/Nagios_Probes	Closed
Action 6.2	All NGIs	Review document Proposal for extensions to availability and reliability calculations and send your comments and feedback to TF	New
Action 6.3	D. Zilaskos	to provide a mechanism to monitor the site progress and the issues related to the migration of the DTEAM VOMS server	New
Action 6.4	H. Cordier	to investigate the current usage of broadcast (purpose and amount of messages generated)	New
Action 6.5	T. Ferrari	to check CERN plans in providing the OPS VOMS service	In progress
Action 6.6	T. Ferrari	To distribute the summary of the requirements gathered for EMI 1.0 for final check and integration if needed. ACTION CLOSED → Xls file distributed to the noc-managers list	Closed.
Action 6.7	All NGIs	To send feedback and any new or missing requirement for EMI 1.0, and to prioritize the existing requirements list	New
Action 6.8	TF	To discuss with the UCST the ownership of the VO decommissioning procedure and update the OMB.	New
Action 6.9	G. Borges	To file the two discussed VO renaming requirements into the new RT requirements queue**.** ACTION CLOSED → see RT ticket https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=881	Closed
Action 6.10	All NGIs	To send comments on the usage of a single EGI monitoring VO (OPS). Are they in favour or is this proposal rejected?	New
Action 6.11	TF and Mario D.	TF and M. David will check the list of partners currently involved in staged rollout and the list of partners formally committing to Staged Rollout according to the Consortium Agreement.	New
Action 6.12	All NGIs	to review the current list of non-assigned components and volunteer to the staged rollout of those that are of interest to them (check table at https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Components)	New
Action 6.13	All NGIs	To check the draft site certification manual (https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SiteCertMan) and provide their input	New
Actions from Nov 2010 OMB meeting			
Action 5.1	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 CLOSED → individual Nordic countries contacted by TF	Closed
Action	D.	To rephrase OLA to clarify that the site obligations that are	Closed

5.3	Zilaskos	mentioned in the document are part of a EGI-NGI agreement. ACTION CLOSED → new site-NGI OLA draft discussed at the Dec 2010 OMB meeting	
Action 5.6	TF and J. Gordon	To contact NGI managers to solicit migration to AMQ APEL client → ACTION CLOSED. TF contacted the major NGIs before Christams	Closed
**Actions from Oct 2010 OMB meeting**		
Action 4.1	TF	To request the gLite collaboration to publish an official end of support schedule on the web, when the final schedule will be approved → CLOSED. Available at: http://glite.web.cern.ch/glite/packages/R3.1/	Closed
Action 4.2	TF, D. Cesini	to contact developers of the ACE component to discuss how OLA changes will impact the tools, and inform the OMB about the related timescales. → a new tool requirements document was drafted in Dec 2010 (DZ), and will be presented by TF at the WLCG MB as soon as ready	In progress
Action 4.3	DZ and OLA task force	to draft a procedure for the introduction of new service types/Nagios tests to be included in availability/reliability computations. In addition, the task force should consider the possibility to distribute different league tables (with and without CREAM test results for comparison reasons)	In progress
Action 4.5	V. Hansper	to contact ARC developers to define a solution/workaround to avoid BDII freshness failures in sites deploying ARC, and update the NOC managers mailing list → CLOSED. Sites deploying ARC but not operated under NGI_NDGF were not affected by the introduction of this new test.	Closed
Action 4.6	E. Imamagic	to clarify Nagios probe terminology (use of CRITICAL), at this page https://wiki.egi.eu/w/index.php?title=Critical_SAM/Nagios_Probes → Closed (see today OMB agenda)	Closed
Action 4.7	TF	discussion of a replacement of SAM Administration Portal for the certification of uncertified sites → this discussion will be reiterated at the Jan OMB	In progress
Action 4.8	S. Diaz	to verify the possibility to implement a workaround to preserve accounting information of decommissioned ROCs/NGIs → this requirement has been documented in a OTAG RT ticket, it will be addressed in the medium term acc. portal roadmap within OTAG	Closed
Action 4.9	M. Ma	to discuss responsibilities (COD vs other entities) in case of site suspension for security issues → Closed. The decision is that site suspension for security issues will be decided and implemented by the EGI CSIRT through a dedicated procedure	Closed
**Actions from Sep 2010 OMB meeting**		
Action 3.3	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	In progress
Action 3.	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	On hold
**Actions from Aug 2010 OMB meeting**		
Action	T. Antoni	Update of GGUS support mailing lists (RT ticket 70) → mlist	Closed

Action 2.1		updates will be part of the SU re-engineering plan discussed at today's OMB meeting	
Action 2.2	TF	(rt 235) define security duties and roles for constituents of EGI infrastructure → these duties and roles will be defined in the EGI-NGI OLA under drafting	Closed
Note: Actions from previous meetings are closed.			

3   INTRODUCTION

TF welcomed everyone to the meeting of the OMB and then presented status of EGI operations wiki and Deliverable 4.1 Operations Architecture. If somebody have comments for the wiki page please send to TF.

Next OMB and OTAG meeting will be face-to-face in Amsterdam and will start on 24 Jan (11:00) and will end on 25 Jan at 13:00. The OTAG will take place in the afternoon of the 24th of Jan.

Discussion of the calendar of the next OMB meetings.

DECISION. the approved 2011 calendar is the following:
- Tuesday 15 February (phone),
- Tuesday 15 March (phone),
- Thursday 14 April (face-to-face, co-located with the EGI User Forum – Vilnius), the day is currently tentative and depends on room availability, the final day will be communicated as soon as possible).

---

4   UPDATE FROM LAST OMB: TERMINOLOGY AND OLA

Terminology concerning Nagios tests was discussed during the November OMB meeting. After the doodle conducted by COD, the following terminology is now **APPROVED**:
- CRITICAL: it is one the possible status values returned by a Natios test. For the time being CRITICAL will be only used to refer to this.
- AVAILABILITY: a Nagios test that is used for availability/reliability computations.
- OPERATIONS: a Nagios probe that is used to generate notifications to the Operations Dashboard.

TF requests Vera Hansper to make sure that manuals, documentation and procedures are updated accordingly (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=911).

E. Imamagic: there is a difference between "Test" and "Probe". Probe refers to the piece of code that implements a Nagios test. Test refers to the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of a test to be performed.

> **Action 1 (E. Imamagic): To provide a wiki page that explains the Nagios test terminology, including the difference between test and probe.**

Site OLA. At the Nov OMB various changes have been agreed, which are applicable to the site OLA (aka SLD during EGEE). A revised version of the NGI-site OLA has been produced by Dimitris Zilaskos, and TF asked all NGIs to review this new version and provide comments.

> **Action 2 (All NGIs): Review the revised NGI-site OLA and send comments to the noc-managers mailing list.**

5 DTEAM: MANDATORY SUPPORT AND DTEAM MIGRATION STATUS

TF: After the November OMB, the Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden) have been consulted and after discussion, these countries agreed to the mandatory support of DTEAM by all production sites. In Dec 2011 the DTEAM use cases and usage during 2010 will be re-assessed (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=912).

> **DECISION. Support of DTEAM VO is MANDATORY for all EGI production sites from Jan 2011. Use cases and usage of DTEAM VO will be reassessed in Dec 2011.**

DZ provides a status update about the current DTEAM VOMS migration status (see slides). DZ emphasizes that the migration of the DTEAM VOMS server requires configuration changes in the sites and NGI operation centres need to proactively followup this and support their sites.

TF: How many sites have issues with the migration? DZ: about 150 sites, which corresponds to half of the production infrastructure. TF: it is important to warn NGI managers to make sure that the migration process is closely watched in each country.

DZ: The managers were closely cooperating with us to identify and correct issues.

G. Borges: For us it would be easier to followup problems if access to logs were possible.

DZ: access to log files is limited to CERN VO managers. DZ will ask CERN to find appropriate mechanism for everybody to see logs, or alternatively will configure a Nagios server to monitor the migration.

> **Action 3 (DZ): to provide a mechanism to monitor the site progress and the issues related to the migration of the DTEAM VOMS server.**

Complaints concerning the large amounts of broadcast messages received were received.

H. Cordier: How many sites did complain about the broadcast messages? DZ: So far one from UK.

Action 4 (H. Cordier): to investigate the current usage of broadcast (purpose and amount of messages generated)

E. Imamagic: who will be responsible of running the DTEAM migration Nagios server? DZ: a Greek partner, this is still under internal discussion. Emir: the DTEAM Nagios is an example of VO-dedicated instance and the set-up should be easy even if documentation is scarce.

Emir: how will the tests be run? DZ: one test/day per site.

Emir: are there plans to migrate the OPS VOMS server too? K. Koumantaros: no requests received so far. TF will check CERN plans.

Action 5 (T.Ferrari): to check CERN plans in providing the OPS VOMS service

6 EGI OPERATIONS REQUIREMENT GATHERING PROCESS

TF gives a presentation proposing a process for requirements gathering, the corresponding timeline for requirements gathering for the UMD roadmap (see slides). It is important to gather all the requirements in a structured and transparent way. The deadline for EMI 2.0 requirements is the end of February 2011. The process of requirements gathering is based on a dedicated RT queue (see slides). The ticket should record the status of the requirement (new, under processing, accepted, rejected etc.). In case of accepted requirements, the corresponding feature release number and schedule should be recorded in the RT ticket too, for transparency.

The OMB is in favour of the proposed process.

All the operations requirements gathered in October 2010 for EMI 1.0 have already been informally discussed at the TCB. Finalization and prioritization is needed. For EMI 1.0 all requirements will be gathered in xls file. TF will circulate the current xls draft.

Action 6 (T.Ferrari): to distribute the summary of the requirements gathered for EMI 1.0

H. Cordier: not only requirements need to be gathered but also experience, this is particularly useful for Nagios probes, and the EGI wiki can be used for this. Are site managers responsible of feeding requirements to EGI?

TF: no, requirements are gathered internally by the respective NGI, and internally prioritized. Every NGI operations manager will be responsible of providing this input to the OMB.

During the discussion it is clarified that the recent EMI survey distributed on EGI mailing list is an independent EMI survey, where all individuals are free to reply. This has nothing to do with the OMB future requirements gathering process, and OMB surveys.

TF: OMB surveys will be distributed in early January for EMI 2.0

All NGIs are requested to prioritize the EMI 1.0 requirements included in the xls distributed file (see action 6). If any outstanding ticket is present in GGUS about critical middleware issue, the issue/requirement needs to be reported in the xls file.

Action 7 (All NGIs): To send feedback and any new or missing requirement for EMI 1.0, and to prioritize the existing requirements list.

T. Antoni: once internally discussed and prioritized, requirements will be communicated to the technology providers – EMI in this case - through GGUS

K. Koumantaros: a requirements gathering process and a periodic review of the existing ones are needed to flag rejected requirements or those that become obsolete.

TF: all requirements so far collected in the OTAG queue will be migrated by D. Cesini (JRA1 Activity Manager) into the RT requirements queue. Requirements that NGI expressed through GGUS and are still valid need to be migrated to the xls file.

DECISION: The requirements gathering proposal is accepted and will be prototyped in 2011.

---

7 MANAGING VO NAME CHANGES

G. Borges presents discussion points: a requirement to EMI enabling data movement between VOs (either at user level or at any other level) and the definition of an operation procedure for VO end-of-support at the site level and at the infrastructure level. Both points are relevant to ease VO renaming and VO decommissioning (see slides for mode details).

H. Cordier: the usage of VO alias should be considered in case it can help in these two use cases. In particular, a VO alias can be used if a VO name is not using the DNS recommended structure.

K. Koumantaros requests a clarification of the use case.

R. Trompert: A user who is member of two VOs cannot easily move data around because his proxy would belong to only one of the two VOs.

D. Zilaskos: The user could present proxies from both VOs.

K. Koumantaros: suggest the following requirement: provide fine grained ACL management capabilities and give VO managers the ability to control data / users and in general more tools for their VO management.

DZ: VO renaming is a specific case of VO decommissioning.

TF: the VO decommissioning procedure is currently under the ownership of the User Community Support Team - UCST. The Policy Development Process already presented at the OMB foresees that a procedure that spans different domains (operations and user support in this case) is discussed within the UCB and the OMB before it is approved.

G. Borges and several OMB members feel like VO decommissioning has many operational implications and the OMB should own this procedure.

TF will discuss this with the UCST at EGI.eu.

Action 8 (TF): To discuss with the UCST the ownership of the VO decommissioning procedure and update the OMB.

Action 9 (G. Borges): To file the two discussed VO renaming requirements into the new RT requirements queue.

---

8   SINGLE EGI MONITORING VO

The need to support a single EGI VO for monitoring reasons (Nagios) instead of individual regional monitoring VOs is discussed (E. Imamagic, see slides). The presentation illustrates the pros and cons of a single monitoring VO (OPS). At the moment two people per NGI are accepted as members of the OPS VO. The OPS VO is used at the moment for the monitoring of the national sites. High availability of the OPS VOMS service is needed as instabilities of this service affect the availability computations. In case of a regional OPS VO, and in case of instabilities of the corresponding regional VOMS service, EGI is not responsible of re-computing the availability and reliability league tables (while re-computation is now granted in case of downtime of the central OPS VOMS service).

NDGF is currently using a regional OPS VO. E. Imamagic: this setup is a legacy of EGEE necessary as the entire SAM framework for ARC sites (operated under NDGF) used to be separated from the new Nagios-based framework. With the unification of ARC sites monitoring within the central Nagios service, the usage of a regional OPS VO needs to be reconsidered as ARC and gLite and other sites should be monitored in a single way (no custom solutions).

TF: a dedicated meeting with NDGF representatives, Emir and other relevant partners will be organized in January 2011. Are other NGIs in favour of proposal?

G. Borges for Ibergrid. The Nagios framework has been regionalized to allow flexibility and to use a single NGI Nagios service which would include not only EGI sites, but also those that are regional and are not officially part of EGI. For the latter category, for example no alarms should be generated in the operations dashboard, these shouldn't be considered for availability computation. "Regional" sites should be flagged as such in GOCDB.

E. Imamagic for SRCE. A small NGI may have difficulties in running a highly-available NGI VOMS service for a regional OPS VO. Generally speaking, a single GLOBAL VO is needed for availability computation. The VO needs to be GLOBAL for comparison reasons.

K. Koumantaros: a single GLOBAL OPS VO seems to be an easier solution.

R. Trompert: in favour of a single OPS VO.

This discussion will be recapped at the January OMB meeting. In the meanwhile, all NGIs are invited to comment via email.

> **Action 10 (All NGIs): To send comments on the usage of a single EGI monitoring VO (OPS). Are they in favour or is this proposal rejected?**

9   GGUS SU RESTRUCTURING: UPDATE ON STATUS

T. Antoni updates the OMB on the status of GGUS SU restructuring (see slides).

The DMSU SU, the corresponding sub-support units, and all EMI and IGE support units will be hosted on a XGUS dedicated instance. This is an implementation detail introduced to ease the management of ticket submission rights between different Sus (only TPM is authorized to submit to DMSU, and only the DMSU is authorized to submit tickets to 3rd line support units). The XGUS implementation will be completely transparent to users, and all tickets will be visible, just submission rights will be restricted.

The new set of SUs will be introduced with the January GGUS release. This will be transparent to users and will not cause any disruption to the GGUS service.

10 STAGED ROLLOUT METRICS

G. Borges (see slides) gave a presentation assessing the current status of Staged Rollout on behalf of M. David.

It is important that all NGIs that committed effort in the Consortium Agreement to the Staged Rollout activity, effectively contribute to it.

S. Newhouse in his function of EGI-InSPIRE technical director expressed the requirement that components that are released by a technology provider, but do not undertake a staged rollout process are NOT qualified as validated, and consequently are NOT release for deployment in the production infrastructure. This means that all components deployed need to be staged rollout by a partner.

> **Action 11 (TF and Mario D.): TF and M. David will check the list of partners currently involved in staged rollout and the list of partners formally committing to Staged Rollout according to the Consortium Agreement.**

> **Action 12 (All NGIs): to review the current list of non-assigned components and volunteer to the staged rollout of those that are of interest to them (check table at https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Components)**

K. Koumantaros: for a more efficient use of available effort, we need to plan ahead our staged rollout activities according to the expected future release schedules.

11 AOB

EGI User Forum

- Training. TF: If you have any suggestions for specific training at EGI User Forum send it to the OMB list.
- EGI User Forum call for abstracts is still open (https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceCFA.py?confId=207), deadline is 24 Dec 2010. The call includes various tracks relevant to operations: Management and/or exploitation of emerging computing technologies (desktops, virtualisation, clouds), Integration, sharing and exploitation of national and international e-Infrastructure, Delivery of operational e-Infrastructure services to its users.
- Migration to APEL Active MQ: the deadline is end of January 2011. TF will contact major NGIs that still haven't managed to significantly progress in this (DONE before Christmas).
- Site certification manual: a draft is available (see V. Hansper's slides) and is ready for comments. Please all NGIs check this draft and send comments to Vera and the operations documentations list

> **Action 13 (All NGIs): To check the draft site certification manual (https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SiteCertMan) and provide their input**

- Change to org.apel.APEL-pub.

M. Krakovian: COD team received from IT NGI ROD request to change the threshold for switching org.apel.APEL-pub results from warning to critical state in NAGIOS. Currently RODs have to wait 30 days in warning status before it is flagged as critical. This affects the possibility to have alarms into operational dashboard because the dashboard itself raises alarms only for critical status. Hence, suggestion would be to modify the old threshold decreasing it to 7 days.

John Gordon requests this change to be postponed till the migration to the new AMQ APEL client is completed to ease migration. This may take a long time though.

P. Veronesi: this request to change the condition that triggers a CRITICAL test result is motivated because 7 days of no data published are a strong symptom of the accounting service to be malfunctioning, and Italy needs to proactively support the site in fixing this. 30 days of no accounting data published is way too much.

K. Koumantaros: in favour of postponing this change after completion of the migration.

R Trompert: If accounting is not published for one day, there is something wrong.

Paolo V: Italian request is to have alarms about APEL test in the Italian dashboard after 7 days for Italian sites. Why this request should be approved by some other NGIs?

Emir I: APEL generates results for all NGIs – it's a test run centrally.

DECISION: The discussion will be recapped at the next OMB.

- H. Cordier: the migration of the Biomed VOMS has been poorly managed. 6 months were needed to complete these. More than 10 CEs were not updated and the disruption caused to user was major. TF: it is important that such changes that impact a large portion of the infrastructure are presented regularly at the Monday operations meetings, in order to make NGIs aware of the impact of a given change.
- H. Cordier: France will provide monitoring services to the nascent Israel NGI. After email interations, the French NGI has been requested to not proceed with this as the Israel Nagios service was under validation in the framework of the SEE ROC decommissioning. Israel will make an effort in running its own Nagios service, and SEE ROC services will be continued after Dec 2010 to avoid disruption to users.

12 COPYRIGHT NOTICE