Operations Management Board (OMB)

Meeting:	Operations Management Board
Date and Time:	14 April 2011
Venue:	Face to face meeting
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=267

Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Organisation	Membership[1]
Tiziana Ferrari		EGI.eu	Member (notes)
Peter Solagna		EGI.eu	Member (notes)
Rolandas Naujikas		NGI_LT	Member
Jelena Tamuliene		NGI_LT	Observer
Luciano Gaido		INFN, IGI	Member
Andres Aeschlimann		Switch, NGI_CH	Member
Torsten Antoni		KIT, NGI_DE	Member, TSA1.7, JRA1
Luuk Uljee		SARA NGI_NL	Deputy Member, TSA1.7
Ron Trompert		SARA, NGI_NL	Member, TSA1.7
Nadav Grossaug		IsraGrid IUCC, NGI_IL	Member
Bozidar Proevski		UKIM, NGI_MARGI	Deputy member
Peter Slizik		II-SAS, NGI_SK	TSA1.8
Erik Yen		ASGC, Asia Pacific ROC	Member
Anders Waananen		UCPH, Denmark	Member
Ramon Diacovo		UFRJ, IGALC	Member
Allan Alvaro Gomes		UFRJ-IF, IGALC	Observer
Claire Devereux		STFC, UK	Deputy Member
John Gordon		STFC, UK	Member
Tore Mauset		UNINETT Sigma, NGI_NO	Member
Mario David		LIP, Ibergrid	Member, TSA1.3
Vera Hansper		CSC/NDGF, NGI_NDGF	Member, TSA1.8
Malgorzata Krakowian		CYFRONET, NGI_PL	Deputy Member, TSA1.7
Marcin Radecki		CYFRONET, NGI_PL	Member
Alex Stanciu		ICI, NGI_RO	Member
Luka Filipovic		NGI_ME	Member
Cyril L'Orphelin		CCIN2P3, NGI_FR	JRA1
Vladimir Slavnic		IPB, NGI_RS	Deputy Member
Kostas Koumantaros		GRNET	Member
Miroslav Ruda		NGI_CZ	Member
Mats Nylen		HPC2N, NGI_SE	Member
Maria F. Iozzi		NGI_NDGF, SIGMA	Observer
Michaela Lechner Barth		KTH	TSA1.3
Gert Svensson		KTH	TSA1.3
Emir Imamagic		SRCE, NGI_HR	Member, TSA1.4
Dimitris Zilaskos (EVO)		AUTH	TSA1.8

[1] Member, Observer, in Attendance

Christos Kanellopoulos	AUTH	TSA1.8
Paschalis Korosoglou	AUTH, GRNET	Observer
Miroslav Dobrucky (EVO)	UI SAV, NGI_SK	Deputy Member
Emrah Akkoyun	TUBITAK, NGI_TR	Deputy Member
Helene Cordier	CC-IN2P3/ NGI_FRANCE	Member
Gilles Mathieu	CC-IN2P3/ NGI_FRANCE	Deputy member
Renato Santana (EVO)	CBPF, ROC_LA	Member
Goncalo Borges	LIP	Member
Eamon Kenny	TCD, IE	Deputy Member
John Casson	STFC	JRA1
Riccardo Brunetti	INFN	Observer
Oliver Keeble	CERN	Invited speaker

ACTION REVIEWS

	Action Owner	Content	Status
3			
		Actions from 14 April OMB meeting	
10.01	All NGIs	Submission of QR4 by May 01	In progress
10.02	T. Ferrari	To correlate the activity of small/medium VOs with the respective countries where usage is decreasing.	OPEN
10.03	T. Ferrari	To distributed a pointer to D1.3.1 (EMI Technical Development Plan), which includes a list of EMI supported components. → CLOSED. Pointer sent on 30/04 (https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/pub/EMI/DeliverableDNA131/EMI-DNA1.3.1-1277540-Technical_Plan-v1.0.pdf)	CLOSED
10.04	M. David	To collect feedback through GGUS tickets about the readiness of SR teams. Progress is tracked at: https://www.egi.eu/earlyAdopters/teams	In progress
10.05	T. Ferrari	To contact EMI through the Technology Collaboration Board and request an official statement about which batch systems are supported by CREAM. → Request sent by T. Ferrari on 19/04 to the TCB, and reminder re-sent on 29/04	In progress
10.06	E. Imamagic, V. Hansper, M. Lechner	To rovide a refined definition of Resource Centre (section 1.2.1 of the Resource Centre OLA) for discussion at the next OMB.	OPEN
10.07	All NGIs	To provide information about site interested in deploying Globus, if any	OPEN
10.08	M. Lechner, G. Svensson	To kickoff the Globus Integration task force. → CLOSED. The first meeting of the task force is scheduled on 04 May at 10:00 (https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=469)	CLOSED
10.09	K. Koumantaros	To provide a proposal to reduce the load of top-BDIIs, reducing the information published	OPEN
10.10	IGI and IberGrid	To work together on a draft of the top-BDII deployment best practice.	OPEN

10.11	T. Ferrari, P. Solagna	To collect information on top-BDII deployment topologies, and about which sites are using which top-BDII	OPEN
Actions from 15 March OMB meeting			
09.03	All NGIs. M. Nylen, V. Hansper, M. Ruda, T. Antoni, R. Santana	All NGIs are requested to provide comments to the Resource Centre OLA (v 1.0) attached to the agenda. Deadline for comments: 31 March. Comments in ticket: https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1526 → revised version of the document discussed at the OMB meeting on 14 April	CLOSED
09.04	All NGIs, R. Santana, NGI_FRANCE, Feyza (NGI_TR)	All NGIs and three appointed reviewers are requested to provide feedback about the Resource Centre registration and certification procedure. DEADLINE for comments: 31 March. https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1527 → comments provided, new version of the site certification and registration procedure under editing	CLOSED
09.05	T. Ferrari	To port the EGI-CSIRT Critical Vulnerability Handling procedure to wiki. → Done. https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SEC03	CLOSED
09.06	L. Gaido	to review PROC07 by the end of the week(https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1530) → procedure reviewed and approved	CLOSED
09.07	V. Slavnic, T. Ferrari	To review PROC08 by the end of the week (https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1531) → procedure reviewed and approved	CLOSED
09.08	V. Hansper	to setup a registration page for the ROD training event as soon as possible and to advertise that the training event can be followed remotely via audioconferencing (information to be distributed to the OMB). https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=1532 → done in preparation of the EGI User Forum	CLOSED
Actions from Jan 2011 OMB meeting			
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)	IN PROGRESS
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) → AUTH/GRNET will provide such a service if there's demand	CLOSED
07/13	T. Ferrari	to present transition plans to EMI 1.0 as decided by the EGI Technology Collaboration Board, as soon as ready → waiting from input from TCB → Mario David's presentation at the OMB meeting on 14 April 2011, and priorities collected for SA2	CLOSED
Actions from Oct 2010 OMB meeting			
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	Open
Note: Actions from previous meetings are closed.			

EGI-InSPIRE Reporting, metrics and news

- **EGI wiki**: T. Ferrari illustrates the content of the EGI Operations wiki pages, encourages NGIs to use such pages and to disseminate them further to the site managers. If extra information is needed or the NGI is willing to contribute content to the EGI wiki, please contact V. Hansper or operations (at) mailman.egi.eu. This is the most effective way to share documentation and avoid duplication of effort.

- **QR4 report:** the deadline for submission of QR4 is May 01. Instructions will be distributed to explain how to fill in the report. All EGI-InSPIRE partners contributing to SA1 (with the exception of the unfunded partners from the Asia-Pacific region) MUST submit the report. Information will be extracted to produce the project annual report (D1.4). The same procedure adopted to submit QR3 will be adopted for QR4. A wiki editor will be made available. In the future, project metrics will be collected through a dedicated metrics portal, which was recently prototyped. P. Solagna will prepare the wiki QR4 pages shortly after the end of the User Forum (action accomplished).
- MS108 (annual report on EGI Global tasks) and MS109 (annual report on NGI International tasks) are both under review. All NGIs are welcome to check those documents, and in particular MS109. For MS109 a NGI metrics table was prepared to collect SA1 NGI metrics and complement the NGI self-assessment included in MS109. This table will be part of MS109 in the form of an attachment. Thanks to all NGIs who contributed information to MS109.
- A Resource Infrastructure Provider MoU (template at: https://documents.egi.eu/document/87) was recently subscribed between EGI.eu and IGALC (Latin American and Caribbean Grid Initiative). This MoU is important as it sets the grounds for a full integration of the IGALC infrastructure into EGI. The MoU clarifies the framework of the collaboration, as the signing resource infrastructure provider accepts EGI policies and procedures, and accepts to contribute to the evolution of these by participating to the OMB. Ramon Diacovo is Operations Manager of IGALC. The signed MoU will be uploaded on DocDB. Other MoUs are under discussion with South Africa Grid, ROC_LA and India.

Report on EGI Resource Infrastructure

P. Solagna provides an overview of the status of the EGI Resource Infrastructure (March 2011), information available in the slides is extracted from Deliverable D4.2 (see link in the agenda).

All the year 1 project targets were met. The support of MPI is extending to a large fraction of the infrastructure, logical CPUs and number of sites have been linearly increasing (constant trend for several years now). Accounting shows a consistent increase in number of job and consumed normalized CPU time, this increase in utilization is driven by LHC VOs.

Discussion on the low availability reported in January 2011: what is the root cause of this? Tiziana: this could be related to the introduction of new NGIs as independent operations centres (at the end of January SEE ROC closed its operations). This could be related to the fact that sites that were uncertified in month X can in some cases included in availability statistics, if such sites were certified later on between the end of month X and the date when the availability report is generated during month X+1 (the current availability calculation engine has no information about history of certification status). In any case, the availability statistics for the coming months will be monitored to see if any specific support action is needed for the new NGIs or for future NGIs to smooth the transition to production status.

While the large VOs are constant in number, the number of the small and medium VOs seems to be gradually decreasing.

ACTION (T. Ferrari): to correlate the activity of small/medium active VOs with the countries where usage is decreasing.

C. Devereux reports on the status of the migration to the APEL AMQ client. The migration is almost complete. 13 sites still need to be migrated, of which one is a SGAS just publishing locally (configuration will be fixed) and one site was recently certified (INFN-Bologna-T3).

Priorities for EMI 1.0

The release of EMI 1.0 is scheduled around the end of April 2011. EMI 1.0 will include ARC, gLite and UNICORE. The full list of components supported by EMI is available at in the EMI deliverable D1.3.1 (Technical Development Plan).

ACTION (T. Ferrari): to circulate a pointer to EMI deliverable D1.3.1

Being EMI 1.0 a major release, updates of all components will be provided. Following to this, an internal EGI validation and staged rollout phase will start. Because of the large number of components released at a time, effort needs to be focused on the components that are considered to be more important by the NGIs and by the user community.

P. Solagna presents the summary of the feedback collected from the NGIs on components and their priority (see slides attached to the agenda).

Discussion:

- The site-BDII is a site component and has high priority
- dCache was not mentioned as high priority: NGI representatives explain that this is probably due to the fact that traditionally dCache is installed from dCache repositories (even if it was part of the gLite distribution). M. David: dCache is not part of the staged rollout process at the moment. T. Ferrari asks if NGIs wish to confirm that dCache is not a priority. NGI representatives confirm this with the exception of Mats Nylen (NGI_SE).
- Lcas/lcmaps need to be at thigh priority as CREAM depends on them, same for the WN.
- glexec, ARGUS, CREAM have high priority for WLCG (feedback from M. Shultz and J. Gordon); SCAS is deprecated and substituted by ARGUS, which is part of the EMI release.
- FTS: the FTS release available from EMI 1.0 includes minor new functionality. Because of the ongoing data taking activities, FTS EMI 1.0 is not felt to be a priority for WLCG (O. Keeble).
- UNICORE components being deployed by a single production site at the moment are at lower priorities (NGI_DE and NGI_PL agree to this).
- Myproxy binaries are from EPEL. The yaim part (glite-PX) will be maintained by EMI (top priority of this, not being part of gLite 3.2).

- VOBOX: at the moment is not a component maintained by EMI

An updated version of the slide with the revised list of priorities was uploaded over lunch, and re-discussed at the beginning of the afternoon session for approval.

DECISION. The OMB approves the following list of components and related priorities for UMD 1.0

- **Top priority: LFC, DPM, StoRM, VOMS, WMS, UI, CREAM (BLAH, APEL, DGAS, SGAS), ARC (CORE, gridFTP), Glite-MPI, BDII site and top, GFAL, LCAS/LCMAP (other top priority components have dependencies to them), WN, glite-PX (myproxy metapackage and yaim configuration – binaries of myproxy are from EPEL)**
  - **ARGUS and Glexec**
- **Lower priority: Amga, UNICORE**
- **Not a priority: dCache, FTS**

The OMB will be requested to further restrict the list of components in the "top-priority" category in case of problems from at SA2 with the proposed list.

At the end of the OMB meeting the list of priorities approved is communicated to the EGI-InSPIRE SA2 group.

From gLite to EMI: Staged Rollout and production infrastructure

(M. David)

Currently there are 42 EA teams; these cover components from gLite, UNICORE, ARC, Globus and SAM. Currently only gLite components, StoRM and SAM/Nagios are undergoing the SR process. gLite is tracked in CERN savannah patch tickets, while SAM and StoRM in the EGI RT queue for staged-rollout.

The Staged Rollout wiki pages will be updated in next few days, containing instructions for EA and SR managers.

As a general policy, after the first SR cycle that includes all the EMI components, only the components that change version between subsequent EMI releases will undergo validation. Validation will not be generally applicable to all minor releases. Several components will undergo together staged rollout if they constitute a "product" i.e. if they are mutually dependent. The products will be defined when the release notes with information on first-level dependencies will be available from EMI.

Some dry runs from EMI RC3 are undergoing, to exercise the workflow and tools (involved components are VOMS – which didn't pass because of a missing package in the EMI repository, VOMS Admin and ARC).

EMI components will be compatible with current production components (no backward incompatibility will be introduced in EMI 1.0), but there is no upgrade path from the current deployed services: the EMI services require a full re-installation of the nodes.

For EA, clear procedures and documentation on critical steps for stateful services are needed.

M. David already received commitments from some EA teams for the EMI-1 components. The EA are supposed to answer to new patches announcements.

SR managers are:

- ARC: Christian Ulrik Soettrup (Danish NGI) and Sergio Maffioletti (Swiss NGI)
- gLite: Mario David
- UNICORE: Mathilde Romberg

ACTION (M. David) to collect feedback through GGUS tickets about the readiness of SR teams.

J. Gordon: Where stage rollout fits in the UMD?

M. David: When EMI releases, the release is fetched into the EGI repository. Components are then verified (basic installation and configuration test of the components, missing packages etc.). After verification they are passed to SR.

L. Gaido: Will be condor supported?

M. David: PIC is not supporting Condor anymore. Condor is not supported by CREAM at the moment.

ACTION (T. Ferrari) to contact EMI through the Technology Collaboration Board and request an official statement about which batch systems are supported by CREAM.

M. David, G. Borges: Torque will be most probably the last component tested by SR. CREAM at the moment supports only LSF.

Support calendar for lcg-CE

T. Ferrari presents a proposal for the end-of-support schedule of lcg-CE (note: lcg-CE is not part of the list of components supported by EMI, it is currently supported by CERN). The proposed scheduled is aligned with the end-of-support calendar of gLite 3.2:

- End of standard updates: **31 October 2011**

- End of security updates: **30 April 2012**

DECISION. The OMB approves the lcg-CE end-of-support calendar: 31 Oct 2011 for the end of standard updates, 30 April 2012 for the end of standard updates.

GOCWIKI decommissioning and documentation workshop

(V. Hansper) GOCWIKI will be switched off (approximately in the next 6 month) by September 2011. Every partner who has important and up-to-date information on that wiki should contact the Operational Documentation Team (operational-documentation@mailman.egi.eu) and ask for the migration of the relevant pages.

There will be a documentation workshop in Zurich in June, NGIs are invited to contribute. There is an open doodle to express availability to participate.

GLUE 2.0 support in storage management

(Oliver Keeble) See slides attached to the agenda for details.

LDAP rendering will continue in EMI. The GLUE 2.0 schema addresses a number of issues in the GLUE 1.3 version: srm, subcluster, CE/SE. It is an extensible schema. The EMI steps for the migration to GLUE 2.0 have been:

- To define the abstract schema,
- To define the LDAP rendering,
- To implement the schema in the BDII and roll out,
- To write and deploy information provider.

EMI-1: GLUE 2.0 info providers will be available for all 3 SEs (dCache, DPM and StoRM).

Information will be published in GLUE 1.3 format as well as GLUE 2.0 format, and no extra configuration is needed to publish GLUE 2.0. Clients capable of consuming GLUE 2.0 information will be gradually released after EMI 1.0.

M. David: Is the implementation for other areas at the same point of maturity as data management?

O. Keeble: the publishing of GLUE 2.0 is complete for the data area, but the directors of other areas need to be consulted for more information about their areas.

EMI decided to publish several GLUE 2.0 optional attributes such as “free space”. Feedback from EGI on needs for extra information is welcome.

K. Koumantaros: Even if most of the data is static, what is the impact of publishing GLUE2 in parallel with GLUE1?

Answer from L. Field provided on 18/04/2011 as follow up of the OMB meeting: “I heard that the issue of GLUE 2.0 migration came up at Vilnus. In GLUE 1.x 40% of the information is taken up with the GlueLocation entry. This entry is not required and a request to stop the publication of this entry was made a few months ago. This action will reduce the total amount of information in the information system. GLUE 2.0 is a more efficient model so that 40% reduction should be more than enough for

expressing the same 60% of Glue1.x information that is left. So basically during the migration we should have a zero net increase in total information."

M. David: There is a large part of site information configured by site admin in yaim. A large amount of this information can be fetched automatically from the machine. (e.g. sysop, arch,..). From the site side, it is hard to check all the information reported in the information system, and this level of automation would improve the accuracy of the published information.

V. Hansper: Does EMI offer a generic information system that publish glue2.0 information as alternative solution to BDII?

O. Keeble: all information providers in EMI 1.0 should publish information formatted in Glue2.0, through a LDAP server.

K. Koumantaros : This is a requirement for EMI: provide a open interface for information publication.

T. Ferrari: Plans for EMI-2 are that information will be published via messaging, details need to be checked in EMI Deliverable DNA1.3.2 which is the technical development plan for the second year of the project. This document is currently under preparation.

Resource Centre OLA

T. Ferrari presents the changes introduced in the latest version of the document (see slides). The latest version has a considerably expanded terminology section, consistent with the Operations Architecture deliverable.

The parties to the agreement are Resource Centre and Resource Infrastructure Provider, respectively represented by the Resource Centre Operations Manager and Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager). The OLA is applicable to all certified Resource Centres associated to a Resource Infrastructure Provider that is a member of the European Grid Initiative Foundation, or officially collaborates with EGI as defined in a Resource Infrastructure Provider MoU. The OLA is not binding while a site is flagged as "suspended" or "uncertified".

- V. Hansper: Will there be changes in GOCDB roles to fulfill the roles described in the OLA? T. Ferrari: Yes, we can consider this in the ongoing revision of GOCDB roles.
- E. Imamagic: Four hours for a reply to a ticket are really a short time (this is currently only specified for alarm tickets, otherwise the threshold is 8 hours). **Decision: the 4 hour maximum response time for alarm tickets will be removed. It will be added later on if needed**.
- A. Stanciu. In Romania some sites are not associated to NGI. This OLA cannot be applied to these sites. How to manage them? T. Ferrari: all sites that are certified by one NGI need to accept the OLA, and likewise the NGI must guarantee support to them. The certification procedure currently

under definition already requires the approval of the OLA to be a necessary step to proceed with certification.

- V. Hansper: It would be better to specify that the storage can be distributed. **Decision: section 7 will be changed to clarify this**.
- G. Borges: What will happen if sites rejects the OLA? T. Ferrari: the new document is not adding restrictions, on the contrary it is relaxing existing conditions.
- M. Lechner: the site has to provide local resources according to section 1.2.1. E. Imamagic: what if a site provides only BDII and WMSes? **Decision: improve definition of Resource Centre in section 1.2.1. ACTION on V. Hansper, E. Imamagic and M. Lechner to provide some draft text for discussion.**

DECISION. The OMB does not approve the Resource Centre OLA in its current form. The definition of "Resource Centre" will be improved.

Impact of increasing minimum availability and reliability thresholds

The OMB in October 2010 approved the revision of the current suspension policy for performance issues, which currently requires a Resource Centre to be suspended if for three consecutive times the monthly availability falls below 50%. In October the OMB was in favor of an increase of this threshold to 70%, provided that the impact on the infrastructure were acceptable. D. Zilaskos has been assessing this impact in the past months, C. Kanellopoulos presented the results of this comparison. The comparison shows that the increase of the threshold would have a minor impact (see slides).

DECISION. The OMB approves a change in the suspension policy for performance problems. Currently sites that fail to provide a minimum monthly availability of 50% for three consecutive months are eligible to suspension. The 50% threshold is increased to 70%. This change in the policy will come into effect on 01 May 2011.

All NGIs are kindly requested to communicate this decision to all Resource Centres administrators.

Globus Integration

T. Ferrari presents information on Resource Centres that are currently deploying Globus, and about Centres that may be potentially interested in deploying Globus – see lists attached to the agenda (information source: H. Heller, IGE Project).

Action (all NGIs): All NGIs are kindly requested to get in contact with those Centres to understand their interest in being integrated into the NGI infrastructure, and through the NGI, into EGI.

Action (M. Lechner, G. Svensson): to set up a Task Force to tackle Globus integration issues. The IGE project will participate to the works of the task force with one member.

Task Force Volunteers: Croatia, Germany, Romania, Poland, Netherlands, (feedback from V. Hansper). M. Lechner and G. Svensson will chair the Task Force.

Top-BDII Topology and High Availability

BDII are core services needed by all VOs to discover services and get status information. WLCG requests 99% availability and max 10s response time. NGIs need to provide highly available top-BDII services. Different actions can be undertaken to improve the robustness of the services currently offered:

- Develop and distribute best practices to deploy BDII in cluster with DNS based load balancing (useful for new NGIs).
- Deployment of top-BDIIs in HA, implement clusters of top-BDII across different NGIs if possible
- Implementation of failover from the client perspective
- Extension of the availability framework to include BDII in NGI availability monthly statistics

Failover from client: optional yaim variable to define a list of BDIIs to support failover in the GFAL clients. The first BDII in the list could be the NGI one, the other ones could be services offered by partner NGIs, carefully selected to optimize network latency and distribute load.

NGI_IT has BDII deployed in HA, and is preparing documentation for it.

T. Ferrari: Italy and Ibergrid deployment scenarios can be used as a starting point. Smaller NGIs can share their instances to run in cluster mode.

Several NGIs consider the current performance of the top-BDII acceptable, but are interested in investigating HA solutions.

K. Koumantaros. The information published is continuously increasing. Most of the information is not used. This is overloading the top BDIIs. T. Ferrari: Is not clear how to address this issue. But a proposal would be good.

Action (K. Koumantaros): work on proposal on how to address the issue.

T. Ferrari: Do you think that a task force could be set up to tackle this problem?

G. Borges: Ibergrid is exploring HA solutions because there were problems.

M. Ruda: we have no problems for maintenance we have a parallel machine to use as a backup in NGI_CZ.

Turkey: we are also supporting SEE countries with the top bdii, no problems at all.

T. Ferrari: there is work ongoing to have a top-BDII deployment best practice available, this will be used as starting point.

ACTION (T. Ferrari, P. Solagna) will get in contact with small NGIs to collect information on top-BDII deployment scenario, what sites are pointing to which BDII to clarify the situation.