Operations Management Board (OMB)
and Network Support Workshop

Meeting:	Operations Management Board
Date and Time:	24-25 January 2011
Venue:	Amsterdam, Netherlands
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceTimeTable.py?confId=153#20110124

Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Organisation	Membership[1]
Tiziana Ferrari	TF	EGI.eu	Member
Ulf Tigerstedt		CSC	Observer
Alberto Escolano Sanchez		RedIRIS	Network Task Force
Jeannin Xavier		CNRS	Network Task Force
Domenico Vicinanza	DV	DANTE	Network Task Force
Luciano Gaido		INFN, IGI	Member
Giuseppe Misurelli	GM	INFN	OTAG member
Andres Aeschlimann		Switch, NGI_CH	member
Torshen Antoni		KIT, NGI_DE	member, TSA1.7, JRA1
Kostos Koumentoros	KK	GRNET, NGI_GR	Member, TSA1.8
Helene Cordier		CNRD/IN2P3, NGI_FR	Member
Cyril L'Orphelin		CCIN2P3	JRA1
Daniele Cesini		INFN	JRA1 AM
John Walsh		TCD, NGI_IE	Member
Alvaro Simon		CESGA/Ibergrid	Member, JRA1
Luuk Uljee		SARA NGI_NL	Member, TSA1.7
Ron Trompert		SARA, NGI_NL	Member and TSA1.7
Vladimir Slavnic		IPB NGI_AEGIS SERBIA, NGI_RS	Member
Tore Mauset		UNINETT Sigma, NGI_NO	Member
Mats Nylen		SNIC, NGI_SE	Member
Claire Devereux		STFC UK, NGI_UK	Member
John Gordon	JG	STFC UK, NGI_UK	Member and TSA1.5
Jinny Chien		ASGC, ROC AP	Member
Alexander Kryukov		SIN MSU, e-ARENA, ROC Russia	Member
Peter Solagna		EGI.eu	Member (notes)
Ludek Matyska	PS	CESNET, NGI_CZ	Member
Mario David	MD	LIP, Ibergrid	Member, TSA1.3
Vera Hansper		CSC/NDGF, NGI_NDGF	Member, TSA1.8
Emir Imamagic	EI	SRCE, NGI_HR	Member
Marcin Radecki		ACC CYFRONET, NGI_PL	Member, TSA1.7 COD
Malgorzata Krakowian		ACC CYFRONET	TSA1.7 COD
Mario Reale	MR	GARR	Net. Task Force, TSA1.7
Mingchao Ma	MM	STFC	TSA1.2
Sven Gabriel		NIKHEF	TSA1.2
Pekka Lehtovuori		CSC, NGI_FI	Member

---

[1] Member, Observer, in Attendance

Gilles Mathieu	CCIN2P3, NGI_FR	Deputy Member	
Tomasz Szepieniec	CYFRONET	OLA Task Force	
Henrique Matos	LIP	Observer	

AGENDA BASHING

ACTION REVIEWS

	Action Owner	Content	Status
3			
Net. task force action	M. Reale	to evaluate how to involve PERT experts in EGI support framework and finalize the GGUS ticket workflows for network support	M. Reale
Net. task force action	M. Reale	to write a guide for the deployment of the HINTS and perfSONAR tools.	NEW
07.01	All NGIs	To provide QR3 reports and metrics	NEW
07.02	M. David	To appoint partners contributing to staged rollout of ARC Nagios probes (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1116)	NEW
07.03	T. Antoni	To check the status of the UNICORE sites to be integrated (if these are part of DEISA or not). POLAND: the site to be integrated is NOT part of DEISA.	IN PROGRESS
07.04	OMB	Review a revised version of D4.1 Operations Architecture and provide comments in one week time as necessary. → CLOSED. No comments received.	CLOSED
07/05	E. Imamagic	To discuss the deployment of WMS and BDII services for monitoring of uncertified sites with TSA1.8 leader (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1213)	NEW
07/06	E. Imamagic	To check if uncertified nodes are visible in the MyEGI portal (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1214)	NEW
07/07	T. Ferrari	To circulate a new site OLA document with updated terminology (to keep it consistent with the Architecture Document. (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1215)	NEW
07/08	T. Ferrari	To invite NGIs to join the OLA task force (rescoped), the regionalization task force and the UNICORE task force. → Mail sent on 27/01/2011	CLOSED
07/09	AUTH	To send a list of NGIs missing a DTEAM group. D. Zilaskos will open a ticket to the NGIs affected by the problem.	CLOSED
07/10	COD	To refine the Operations Centre decommissioning procedure to remove the respective DTEAM group as a step of the process (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1216)	NEW
07/11	M. Dreshner	To provide information on which components from EMI 1.0 need to be reinstalled, and which can be updated in place. → waiting input from EMI on this. This is still unknown to EMI. It will become clearer after code freeze.	IN PROGRESS
07/12	NGIs	To report issues with the EMI release plan and in particular with the changes introduced.	NEW
07/13	T. Ferrari	to present transition plans to EMI 1.0 as decided by the EGI Technology Collaboration Board, as soon as ready	NEW

07/14	L. Cornwall	To update the procedure according to OMB discussion.	NEW
07/15	T. Ferrari	To send mail to the OMB mailing list to verify how many NGIs are in favor/against the change → CLOSED. NGIs against are: Croatia, Greece, Ireland, Lithuania,	CLOSED
Actions from Dec 2010 OMB meeting			
Action 6.2	All NGIs	Review document Proposal for extensions to availability and reliability calculations and send your comments and feedback to TF → new site OLA was accepted at the Jan 2011 OMB	Closed
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 -> the migration is now completed.	Closed
Action 6.4	H. Cordier	to investigate the current usage of broadcast (purpose and amount of messages generated) → report sent on 10/02/2010	Closed
Action 6.5	T. Ferrari	to check CERN plans in providing the OPS VOMS service → CERN will continue to maintain the VOMS server for OPS, but VO membership will be managed by E. Imamagic and P.Solagna	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 → Done. Tiziana needs to collect the input and finalize it.	Closed
Action 6.8	TF	To discuss with the UCST the ownership of the VO decommissioning procedure and update the OMB. → Closed. Agreed that OMB needs to review and finalize the VO decommissioning procedure.	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? → a single global OPS VO approved	Closed
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.	Ongoing
Action 6.12	TSA1.3	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) → reassigned to Mario David	Ongoing
Action 6.13	All NGIs	To check the draft site certification manual (https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SiteCertMan) and provide their input.	In progress
Actions from Oct 2010 OMB meeting			
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 the March release of ACE, different profiles can be used, with the possibility to have two independent provides, one for EGI and one for WLCG. A technical solution for availability computation of core services (EGI and NGI) is still to be identified. It's in the JRA1 agenda. A OAT meeting will be organized with CERN to finalize the discussion.	Closed
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) → Part 1. The draft procedure has been presented at the Jan 2011 OMB meeting and will be refined in the coming weeks. Part 2: the comparison of availability statistics with CREAM and vs LCG-CE is part of the WLCG work plan for Feb and March 2011.	Closed
Action 4.7	TF	discussion of a replacement of SAM Administration Portal for the certification of uncertified sites → Closed. The decision is to flag uncertified sites on GOCDB as "non production" and "monitored". Uncertified sites do not produce alarms in the ops dashboard.	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 → Closed. New template available at: https://documents.egi.eu/docum ent/215	Closed
Action 3.	TF	to update as necessary the procedure to retire middleware components	Open

Network Support Workshop

Chair: Mario Reale, GARR

Network Task Force

Introduction of M. Reale to the mandate of the Network Support Task Force: definition of network support use cases and their analysis based on the results of the NGI survey.

Use cases: GGUS, EGI PERT, scheduled maintenance, network troubleshooting on demand, e2e multi-domain troubleshooting, down-collector, policy and collaboration.

Comments: TF. Network capacity upgrades is typically negotiated by Institutions in collaboration with the respective NRENs. This is out of EGI scope.

Support workflows in GGUS

GGUS based Network Support Workflow. Network issues workflow is different from most of the other operational Grid workflows. Network issues involve site managers, the two NRENs that provide network services to the two sites and the backbone that connects the two NRENs' networks. The proposal is to assign automatically the ticket to the sites administrators involved in the network problem. They are both responsible for handling the ticket, they are also responsible of following up the issue with the respective LAN administrators and NRENs. NRENs use own support systems to manage issues.

Users should be educated to run basic network test in order to debug the easiest issues. A web portal with network troubleshooting how-tos is needed.

Comments:

JG: It should be possible to assign a ticket to two sites, given that a network issue includes at least two endpoints. A network issue not necessarily must be addressed to grid people, they are not always the people that can solve the problem. And more, if you assign the ticket to grid people, they are not necessarily the people who can fix the problem

Answer: Currently is not possible to assign a ticket to more than one site. Anyway the site administrators are the people who installed the software, and who can perform the first steps in debugging the network problem.

Comment TF: There should be a GGUS support unit composed by NRENs representative possibly with the involvement of PERT teams who have expertise in network performance troubleshooting. It's a useful collaboration between different service infrastructures (EGI and GEANT/NRENs) and would improve communication and transparency in the handling of the issue. Performance issues involve users,

site managers and network administrators/providers. Having a SU in GGUS that combines those teams would streamline the process.

HINTS

Generally to solve a network problem it is useful to run some basic commands on the affected host in a remote site. HINTS is a software that provides remote access to the main tools needed for network debugging. Authorized HINTS users don't need direct access to the machines, HINTS lunches the test on behalf of the requester user. Bandwidth tests are currently not yet implemented. Sites and authorization are in a hierarchy tree, a site can belong to several operation centers. Site admin can probe their own site, NGI operation centers can probe all NGI sites, GARR can probe all sites. The future maintenance and support of hints has to be discussed. NGI_FR will discuss if deploying the tool at sites.

perfSONAR

perfSONAR is a software for network monitoring. It runs similar probes than HINTS does, not on demand but on a periodic base. Delivers interoperability with USA and Canada network support, intercontinental network support is possible. It needs to be installed into the sites, on a specific box, not virtual machines. It will be released in Spring 2011. The tool is also going to be adopted for monitoring of the LHCOPN. Information from different network domains can be correlated.

Normally, a network connection between two sites in different NGI crosses multiple domains with different SLA. perfSONAR should provide an abstraction level, and gather information from all domains crossed by site-to-site path.

Pros: good service for infrastructure monitoring, open source, good support.

Cons: not easy to install/configure, API not ready yet. Being and end to end monitoring tool, to be useful needs a minimum number of sites supporting it.

Question: Which is the added value of perfSONAR compared with HINTS (o vice versa).

Answer: HINTS is a troubleshooting tool, perfSONAR is a monitoring tool (running active tests in a continuous mode). Could be installed in the same box (to be verified).

RedIRIS

It is a specific distribution of perfSONAR, it contains a specific set of scripts to help site administrators in installing and configuring it for also monitoring of delay

NETJob

Monitoring software that runs network tests using Grid jobs using the DTEAM VO. By running tests from the WNs and by parsing gridftp scripts, the tool provides statistics on real behavior of the grid infrastructure, because it uses Grid jobs, and non out of the box tests on a stand-alone platform.

Comment TF: DTEAM policy requires that usage of site resources is limited.

Discussion

GGUS: adopt two approaches. A. Ask NREN if they want to provide a PERT contact, but also foresee a normal workflow for tickets. After discussion with T. Antoni the suggestion was to start prototyping anyhow a dedicated NetSup Support Unit, currently with GARR behind it. This preliminary approach is accepted by GARR.

PERT: we need to ask NRENS and organize a questionnaire.

Scheduled Maintenances: hand over to JRA1

Net Troubleshooting on demand: HINTS will continues, handed over to GARR, possibly deployed by the French NGI

DownCollector: improve packaging and guides.

Coordination/collaboration body: none, just the net support coordination unit.

e2e MultiDomanin monitoring: keep working on the DVD by the Spanish REDIRIS, coordinating with GEaNT/DANTE - the Spanish will also ensure the coordinate with new perfSONAR releases.

Action 07.01 (M.Reale): to evaluate how to involve PERT experts in EGI support framework and finalize the GGUS ticket workflows for network support

Action 07.02 (M.Reale): to write a guide for the deployment of the HINTS and perfSONAR tools.

MR: to plan for a second edition of the network support workshop at the Technical Forum Sep/2011

OMB Part 1: Status of operations, roadmap for 2011 and architecture

Quarterly metrics

Deadline for submission of QR3 reports and metrics is 10 Feb 2011.

All contributions must be submitted in the dedicated wiki page. The biggest difference with the 2nd QR is that installed capacity metrics are now aggregated per NGI, a breakdown per site is not needed anymore. On the accounting portal it is possible to choose the right metric to get normalized elapsed CPU time both for SI2k and HEP_SPEC.

Action 07.03 (ALL NGIs): QR3 report and metrics by February 10 2011

SA1 activity roadmap for 2011

The proposal of activities for 2011 is illustrated task-by-task. See slides.

SA1.2 Security. A new security challenge model is proposed for 2011 involving the EGI CSIRT coordination part (not only the site).

Comment JG: Challenges are very instructive for site managers, but the challenges process is too long, it will take years to challenge all the sites. It would be important to have a lightweight challenge procedure in order to challenge as many sites as possible.

Within SA1.2 the current SSC process structure will be revised to involve more sites.

A Security Dashboard will be developed in the framework of the Operations Dashboard, to show the security status of the sites, it is a useful tool for the NGI security groups but also to ROD and site managers. A Nagios instance will continue to run vulnerability probes, and to collect the results. The security dashboard will provide more information unified with existing operational tools, and will provide more visibility to information.

H. Cordier: is an inventory of middleware vulnerabilities available? MM: not at the moment, but the list of components that are assessed is publicly available.

SA1.3 Staged Rollout. Staged Rollout will be used to test fixes to known security issues in the deployed grid middleware, so vulnerability testing in SR is relevant to declare a software component ready for production.

Interoperability. Integration with Nagios. GM: There are no early adopters for ARC Nagios-probes.

Action (MD): to identify ARC partners interested in contributing to SR of ARC Nagios probes.

Once staged rollout is in place, the procedures for COD/ROD are not different for ARC sites, they just need to be applied correctly by ARC sites.

The integration of UNICORE in monitoring and accounting has several implications that need to be jointly addressed: VO management in UNICORE sites, url-based mechanism to refer to service instances that has an impact on GOCDB, names for unicore services in GOCDB, UNICORE Nagios probes and integration in accounting.

DECISION. The OMB approves the creation of a UNICORE integration task force, coordinated by M. Lechner, with the contribution of TSA1.4, PL, DE and UK (for accounting and GOCDB).

SA1.4 Deployment of tools. The SA1.4 program of work is exposed. About the development of failover solutions, it is pointed out that the Nagios deployment in failover mode has high priority. The failover configuration needs to take into account also the dependency of on auxiliary services such as myproxy, wms etc. whose high availability is consequently necessary too.

TF: for auxiliary core services, SA1 will liaise with SA2 for the writing of best practices for deployment of core middleware services in failover or cluster mode. The plan is to have such best practices

SA1.5 Accounting

Presentation of plan for migration of publishing of summarized usage records from direct database insertions to active MQ.

Before moving to regional deployment several aspects need to be addressed centrally (they are pre-requisites): 1. Changes to the messaging schema and 2. Summary records inserted through active MQ.

JG: are the UNICORE sites that will be integrated also part of DEISA?

ACTION (NGI_PL, NGI_DE): to check the status of the UNICORE sites to be integrated.

Accounting for UNICORE: it is a EGI requirement for EMI.

SA1.6 Helpdesk

Comment about report generator TA: What was implemented was what users needed: no need for graphical description of the report. TF: graphics are currently useful to generate quarterly reports and prepare material for the project review. We need to make sure that the report generator of GGUS includes the metrics needed in InSPIRE SA1 (such as response time to tickets).

SA1.7 Support. No specific comments

SA1.8 Availability and core services. No specific comments

DECISION. The OMB approves the proposed activity roadmap for 2011. In case of additional issues, please comment via e-mail before the next OMB (15 Feb 2011).

Operations architecture

This talk exposes the proposed Operations Architecture that is described in Deliverable 4.1. Operations Architecture, focusing mainly on new common terminology. The key proposed concepts are:

- Resource Centre and Resource Centre Operations Manager
- Resource Infrastructure Provider
- Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager and the Operations Centre
- Local Services and Global Services

Discussion on the Resource Infrastructure Provider term.

TF: it is equivalent to NGI in Europe. However, NGI is not a general term that is applicable to a European Intergovernmental institution such as CERN or to other partners outside Europe. On the other hand, procedures and policies need to rest on terminology that is applicable to all partners.

JG: Defining the Resource Infrastructure Provider as a legal entity responsible for the NGI, it would be hard to involve them in the EGI activities. And the institution elected as legal entity for being part of EGI, can not be responsible for sites not belonging to that institution.

TF: not all NGIs in Europe are currently legal entities, nevertheless these are already constituting as Joint Research Unit, with a common Institution (which is a legal entity) representing the others in the EGI council. The JRU MoU binds the related Institutes. A legal entity is needed to approve an Operational Level Agreement.

The Architecture document only proposes that the Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager is appointed by the Resource Infrastructure Provider, the Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager does not necessarily need to be affiliated with that legal entity.

L. Matyska: Propose that at least inside EU, resource infrastructure providers are equivalent to NGI and so represented in the EGI council (a Resource Centre can only be represented by the national NGI). TF: accepted, it will be clarified in the document.

JG: pictures need to be rectified to correctly represent the case of an Operations Centre which is a different – as legal entity – from a Resource Infrastructure Provider. For example in UK STFC runs operational services for NGS. TF: agreed.

HC: The EGI OLA is a best practice. TF: OLA covers three areas: a. the services which must be provided by the resource center, b. the services which must be provided by a Resource Infrastructure Provider, c. the services that EGI.eu provides, and for all three cases the OLA specifies the minimum service performance. For this reason, when accepted by the OMB, it will bind all the relevant partners. The OLA is a pre-requisite for a RC and Resource Infrastructure to be certified and integrated. As such it cannot be considered a best practice.

Discussion on the proposed role of a Resource Centre Operations Manager. This role is felt to be needed in the process of agreeing to site policies and to the site OLA. The Resource Centre Operations Manager can work in a team of site administrators, but she/he's the contact to the Resource Infrastructure Provider and takes responsibilities if the site does not comply to a mandatory requirement. The Access Port Manager is a similar role that is used by the networking community to represent the relationship between a NREN and a local area network.

Question: There will be a procedure for the creation of the operation center? TF: We already have one, it is the NGI validation procedure.

DECISION. TF will amend the document according to what discussed. A new version will be distributed to the OMB shortly after the meeting, which will be ready for extra comments for 1 week from the day of distribution. All representatives are requested to check the definition of Resource Centre Operations Manager. If no additional comments will be received, the document will be considered approved, it will be revised in 12 month time.

Infrastructure MOU

The Resource Infrastructure Provider MoU has been finalized. It is under discussion with ROC_IGALC for finalization (under the auspices of the GISELA project). South Africa (SAGrid) will also sign the MoU in Spring 2011.

OMB part 2

Monitoring

Monitoring for un-certified sites and nodes

- Monitoring of uncertified sites is still an open issue. Objective: add uncertified sites to the monitoring framework, but not raise alarms in Operations Portal and not generate A/R reports for the site.

Possible solutions could be:

- Add uncertified sites to production ROC/NGI SAM/Nagios instances,

- Deploy central SAM/Nagios instance for uncertified sites,

- Integrate uncertified sites into production (requires changes in mw services).

DECISION. The proposal to add uncertified sites to production ROC/NGI SAM/Nagios instances, list of WMS services and BDII services need to be deployed to support uncertified sites.

Action (E. Imamagic): to discuss this with TSA1.8 (core services) leader.

For monitoring of uncertified (test) nodes in certified sites, the "production" field in the gocdb can be used. The solution for this is to have test nodes marked 'monitored' but not 'production'. The issue has been raised the last week, the needed modifies to the operations portal are not yet done. The dashboard does not get alarms from uncertified sites and nodes (Gilles: a clear approach would be to not generate alarms at the node level).

Action (E. Imamagic): to check if uncertified nodes are visible in the MyEGI portal.

Question: how to gather the list of sites under certification.

Answer: A site under certification should has been registered in the GOCDB and have a working site-bdii.

OPS VO: global vs regional

The OPS VO has been kept to make easier the transaction from centralized to EGI model. Groups can be used for limiting access to users not belonging to the NGI. If NGI want group management, they should provide VO group managers. A regional VO can be always used to monitor local sites that are not part of EGI.

The next Nagios release (31 Jan) will provide more documentation about Nagios VO instances, and multi-vo Nagios. It will also support robot certificates, which are already provided by CAs such as UK, IT, PL, NDGF, NL.

For the time being the OPS VOMS service will be provided by CERN, but membership will be managed by EGI. The OMB discusses the real necessity of handling group membership (link in DTEAM) considering that just two members will be accepted per NGI.

DECISION. The OMB approves the usage of a global OPS VO for monitoring reasons for the time being. VOMS will be run by CERN also in the future, VO Managers will be SA1.4 task leader (E. Imamagic) and Peter Solagna (EGI.eu) as deputy.

Unscheduled downtimes for operational tools

Unscheduled downtimes could occur in case of network failures, power failures or tool failures (like database problems). The failures could be intercepted by monitoring tools (like ops-monitor.cern.ch), by other tools like Nagios instances or detected by users.

The proposed procedure is to use the broadcast tool (GOCDB also is not sufficient as it could be in downtime itself) to warn community about the downtime, specifying: cause of the problem, functionalities affected and estimated duration of downtime. A post-mortem analysis can be always supplied in the end of downtime report.

DECISION. The OMB accepts the proposal and a refined procedure will be presented for final approval.

Milestones are: provide mail template for broadcasts, finish wiki page with procedure, procedure to be approved in the March OMB.

Procedure for adding new probes to SAM release

Use case: if a site admin or an NGI implemented a Nagios probe, he/she could ask to include it in the SAM release. Proposal: any partner can request such change, the request is filed on the EGI RT "requirements" queue, and the request is discussed in OTAG as urgent issue.

If a probe is not useful for most of the community it could be rejected, given that at site level, or NGI level, any probes could be deployed. There are guidelines for probes development, and sample probes are provided in python or perl.

Question: WN aren't currently tested.

Answer: Plans to add WN tests? Not at the moment, there are scalability problems to be considered for Nagios if thousands of WNs have to be tested.

DECISION. The OMB accepts the draft procedure and a refined procedure will be presented for final approval.

Procedure for modification of the set of AVAILABILITY tests

The new system for availability monitoring will be ACE developed by WLCG, built on top of a new database, the MRS (metric result store). ACE, from the March release, will support multiple algorithms and profiles . There will be a profile used by EGI for official A/R report (it may differ from the profile used by WLCG A/R if necessary). ACE will replace gridview.

There will be a trial period with a comparison between the results of gridview and ACE. ACE will become the official computation engine and will phase out gridview after an initial trial. A comparison will be also carried out to compare league tables (for the OPS VO to start with), with LCG-CE and with CREAM to

assess the impact of the decommissioning of lcg-ce. For this latter comparison, only ACE will be used (the comparison requires two different profiles one for lcg-ce and the other for cream, and the multi-profile capability is only offered by ACE). This comparison will be done in the pre-production phase of ACE.

QUESTION: how an own NGI profile can be added? ANSWER: initially profiles will be added manually by the CERN team. For getting a profile added, the procedure is to open a ticket for the SAM NAGIOS support unit in GGUS. In the future (after summer), a GUI will be available to allow other partner to perform editorial operations. The AUTHZ aspects of this have to be understood.

Assumption 1: anyone can submit a request to modify the set of availability tests. In all cases, a new profile must pass a one-month comparison with the older one for final acceptance.

Assumption 2: an AVAILABILITY test needs also to be an OPERATIONS test to raise alarms in the dashboard.

Comment TF: a better channel to submit this kind of request should be the Noc-managers list. The probes are already available and known.

Answer: RT ticketing system keeps track of requests evolution.

Question: Who will perform the profile comparison? ANSWER: TSA1.8

Answer: CERN will perform validation for CE, CA, ARC and wlcg related probes. EGI will be responsible of validating changes to EGI-specific profiles. The need for different WLCG and EGI profiles (for the OPS VO), needs to be assessed. For the moment there is no need to split into two different profiles.

The procedure will be refined and re-discussed for final approval.

OLA Status update

DECISION. No comments received since Dec 2010 on the site OLA, it is consequently approved. T. Ferrari will update the document to adopt a terminology consistent with the Architecture document.

The mandate of the existing OLA task force is reviewed to start addressing the NGI and EGI.eu parts of the OLA.

Action TF: TF will send an email asking for new members to join the task force.

Comments: UK, PL, FI express interest in being involved in the OLA task force.

DTEAM best practices

Dteam is currently part of the NGIs procedures, the membership to this service VO can not be managed centrally. The slides briefly show the procedures for VO group creation (in the NGI creation procedure) and decommissioning. COD should create a group for the NGI and ask for a group manager in NGI.

Action (AUTH): to send an email telling which NGIs are missing a group in DTEAM

COD and decommissioning of a Operations Centre (that has already been cleared): during decommissioning the respective group has to be removed. COD needs to be in contact with the DTEAM VO Managers for this.

Action (COD): to refine the Operations Centre decommissioning procedure to remove the respective DTEAM group as a step of the process.

Middleware

EMI release process
See details on slide.

EMI needs input on requested OS platforms: at the moment sl5 is mandatorily supported even if for some products more platforms are individually supported. Examples of these are fedora, Ubuntu, debian etc. Individual components will be available and supported for several platforms already in Emi 1.0, this will be clearly presented in the release notes. During 2011 selected components could be already ported to different platform on an individual basis before EMI 2.0.

Question: what will happen after EMI3.0 (EMI project lasts for three years)?

Answer: A sustainability strategy has to be defined. The objective is to bring as many component into mainstream OS distribution, by doing so they can be supported by a standard open source community. Then the middleware could be supported buying support contract from companies or the product teams directly.

EMI will end of requirements collection in March for EMI 2.0. Technical plans will be then released by the end of April. Comment TF: That means that the first internal review by EGI requirements should start at the begin of February.

EMI release can be viewed like a distribution: set of packages compatible within each other. After a major release, independent releases are expected for components (which can consequently have different release cycles). No backward incompatible changes will be introduced.

EMI1 will be supported by SL564, a large set of client/libs are supporting SL532bit but not all.

Comment TF: NGIs should focus on requirements for EMI2.0 and survey.

EMI1 introduces a number of backward incompatibilities affecting the deployment. Manu services will have to be upgraded from scratch (in-place installation will be possible just for a minority of the components). This is due to a new repository structure, based on EPEL. EPEL is fully compatible with fedora and other fedora-like distributions. DAG will be abandoned. Having to upgrade packages from DAG to EPEL means that names will not be compatible and YOU configurations will be affected.

EPEL will include a supported version of globus from IGE, all new globus releases will be available as well.

Configuration tools: all services using yaim today will have to be supported in EMI 1.0, while components that today do not use yaim, will continue to be so in EMI 1.0.

TF: for which components in-place installation is going to be impossible? The list is not known yet.

J. Gordon: VDT versions include fixes needed by glite. Will these be available from IGE? A. DI Meglio: IGE will collaborate with VDT.

According to fedora guidelines, binaries will not be relocatable, but source tar balls will be.

The major changes introduced by the release are:

- Use of single repository instead of multiple repositories, mainly gLite: on single repository contains all packages for a given EMI release

- each repository is structured as: base, updates, security

After a major release (base), all the update to base will be put in the updates branch.

Using the EMI repository, you should have an entry for EMI, one entry for operating system in the yum repos, and remove all DAG repositories. Installation root will be under /usr (/opt will be abandoned).

Configuration files will be in /etc.

YAIM, services currently using yaim for configuration will still use it in EMI1.

Comment EI: Should we stop to migrate services, because from April we have to re-install from scratch. Will services have to be installed from scratch?

Action M. Dreshner: To provide information on which components from EMI 1.0 need to be reinstalled, and which can be updated in place. → waiting input from EMI on this. This is still unknown to EMI. It will become clearer after code freeze.

Question: in case of reinstallation, how many yaim variables can be re-used in EMI1.0? Answer: in general the changes are not in the yaim variables

Action for all OMB members: to report issues with the EMI release plan and in particular with the changes introduced.

EGI release process
Availability of new releases is always notified through GGUS to EGI, while the various internal steps (software in validation, in staged rollout, in production) are tracked with RT. An automation mechanism in development. Software ready for deployment will be notified by the SA2 team, not by the Technology Provider. A EGI dedicated repository (operated by GRNET) will be made available for download of pacakges.

Question: software in stage rollout are the binaries or the sources? Answer: the binaries

Question: no releases are in production without SR, who is responsible?

Answer: step done by EA teams

Question: what about Globus dependencies? How dependencies on independent EPEL packages are going to be handled?

Answer: EMI will pick up Globus for EPEL repositories in collaboration with IGE, instead of getting it separately from other repositories. The management of dependencies on external EPEL packages is part of the integration work under EMI.

Whatever we release and is in the EGI repositories, is supported by EGI, other services not EGI verified is your own responsibility.

Question JG: EMI 1.0 must be valid for 2 years, so external dependencies will be on EPEL for 2 years?

Answer: if not EMI should provide the dependencies for EMI 1.0, if they are not longer in EPEL

SR should just expose components to normal use by users, no specific tests should be performed by the sites.

Action (TF): to present transition plans to EMI 1.0 as decided by the EGI Technology Collaboration Board, as soon as ready.

Migration to APEL AMQ client

Still a significant part of sites needs to migrate to the new Active MQ APEL Client (about 90 sites). This component was released in June 2010. For this reason the decommissioning of the central R-GMA accounting repositories will be postponed to end of February.

DECISION. The decommissioning of R-GMA central repositories is postponed to end of February 2011. End of February is a firm deadline. After Feb 2011 all sites that haven't migrated, won't be able to publish centrally. Usage records will be accumulated locally and published centrally after they have migrated.

Procedures for review

Critical security handling procedure

Details of the procedure on slides. Discussion on the role of suspension: is COD the only body responsible of suspension (executor of the suspension) or should EGI CSIRT hold the responsibility of suspending in case of vulnerability issues? COD: As EGI CSIRT hold the expertise needed to decide if a site is eligible for suspension or not, having COD to be the material executor of the suspension adds little value (just an extra delay in the suspension execution).

DECISION. EGI CSIRT (Coordinator and deputy) will have the right to suspend sites in case of security issues. For all other operational issues, COD is responsible of suspending. This distribution of responsibilities will be reviewed in 12 months. All suspension cases will be tracked on wiki on a single suspension page: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Underperforming_sites_and_suspensions

All NGIs are requested to provide more comments.

Action (L. Cornwall): To review the procedure to reflect this change in role.
M. Ma: a security critical issue can damage the reputation of the project (for example in case of defacement, or of a large Resource Centre that needs suspension and affecting users): this needs to be considered.

Site certification
The current procedure is in draft status: all NGIs are requested to provide feedback (https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SiteCertMan).

The operations wiki space is under revision: navigation bars will be added to simplify browsing. Categories have been defined to classify pages.

OTAG meeting (dedicated to GOCDB)
Minutes of the OTAG meeting will be distributed on the OTAG mailing list by D. Cesini.

Highlights of the meeting:

- A task force will be created to define a set of common use cases for regionalization of the tools
- A task force will be crated to discuss issues related to the registration of UNICORE resources in GOCDB, other integration issues such as usage of VOs in UNICORE, development of probes and accounting. The use cases will be then presented to the developers.
- APEL PUB: discussion on the change of policy of the probe, to turn the result to CRITICAL after 7 days of no accounting data published centrally. NGIs against this change: GR, IE. **Action (T. Ferrari): To send mail to the OMB mailing list to verify how many NGIs are in favor/against the change.**

Date for Next Meeting
Next OMB : 15 Feb 2011

Next F2F OMB: EGI User Forum, 14 Apr 2011

Minutes prepared by   Peter Solagna, 28 Jan 2011

Minutes Approved   Group Chair Name

                          _____