



Operations Management Board (OMB)

Meeting:	Operations Management Board
Date and Time:	17 May 2011
Venue:	EVO meeting
Agenda:	https://www.egi.eu/indico/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=431

<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>ACTION REVIEWS</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>MIDDLEWARE REQUIREMENTS: OVERVIEW OF FEEDBACK FROM EMI</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>EMI RELEASE PREVIEW AND LARGE SCALE TESTING</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>FOR APPROVAL: RESOURCE CENTRE OLA</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>LIST OF OBSOLETE SITES UNCERTIFIED/SUSPENDED/CANDIDATE</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>FOR APPROVAL: RESOURCE CENTRE REGISTRATION AND CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>UPDATE ON EGI OPERATIONS INTEROPERABILITY (GLOBUS AND UNICORE TASK FORCES)</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>WMS/TOP-BDII FOR UNCERTIFIED RESOURCE CENTERS</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>AOB</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>NEXT MEETING</u>	<u>8</u>



Participants

Name and Surname	Abbr.	Organisation	Membership ¹
Andres Aeschlimann		Switch, NGI_CH	member
Emrah Akkoyun		TUBITAK, NGI_TR	Deputy Member
Torsten Antoni		KIT, NGI_DE	member, TSA1.7, JRA1
Jan Astalos		UI SAV, NGI_SK	Member
Maite Barroso		CERN	Member
Goncalo Borges		LIP	Member
Jinny Chien		ASGC, Asia Pacific	Member
Mario David		LIP, Ibergrid	Member, TSA1.3
Claire Devereux		STFC, UKI	Member
David Bouvet		NGI_FRANCE	Deputy Member
Feyza Eryol		TUBITAK, NGI_TR	Member
Tiziana Ferrari		EGI.eu	Chairman
Luciano Gaido		INFN, IGI	Member
John Gordon		STFC, UKI	Member
Vera Hansper		CSC/NDGF, NGI_NDGF	Member, TSA1.8
Emir Imamagic		SRCE, NGI_HR	Member, TSA1.4
Alexander Kryukov		E-ARENA, ROC Russia	Member
Kostas Koumantaros		GRNET	Member
Malgorzata Krakowian		ACC CYFRONET, NGI_PL	Member, TSA1.7 COD
Michaela Lechner		KTH	TSA1.3
Pekka Lehtovuori		CSC, NGI_FI	Member
Mats Nylen		NGI_SE	Member
Marcin Radecki		CYFRONET, NGI_PL	Member, TSA1.7
Serge Salamanka		UIIP NASB, NGI_BY	Member
Mihajlo Savic		Uni. B. Luka, NGI_BA	Member
Vladimir Slavnic		IPB NGI_AEGIS SERBIA, NGI_RS	Deputy Member
Peter Solagna		EGI.eu	Minutes
Gert Svensson		KTH	TSA1.3
Steven Traylen		CERN	Member
Ron Trompert		SARA, NGI_NL	Member, TSA1.7
Luuk Uljee		SARA NGI_NL	Member, TSA1.7
John Walsh		TCD	Member
Dimitris Zilaskos		AUTH	TSA1.8

¹ Member, Observer, in Attendance

Notes: Some attendees were joining the meeting via the EVO phone bridge.

ACTION REVIEWS

Action Owner		Content	Status
3			
Actions from 17 May OMB meeting			
11.01	L. Gaido	To collect more information about the services for which more documentation should be provided and supply it in ticket 1388	OPEN
11.02	P. Solagna	To provide an overview page with the requirements already discussed by the OMB. → CLOSED the page is available at https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/OMB_Requirements	CLOSED
11.03	T. Ferrari	To open a requirement collection campaign to ask for requirements still valid and submitted during EGEE times.	CLOSED
11.04	T. Ferrari	To circulate an update version of the Resource Centre OLA incorporating the proposed changes. → updated draft circulated on 27-05-2011	CLOSED
11.05	Operations Managers	<p>DECISION.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All sites that became CANDIDATE during 2010 must complete their certification process or be switched to CLOSED All sites that became UNCERTIFIED during 2010 or earlier and are NOT part of a local infrastructure (not integrated into EGI), need to finish their certification or to be CLOSED All sites that became SUSPENDED during 2010 must be re-certified or CLOSED. <p>DEADLINE: June 17 2011</p>	OPEN
11.06	P. Solagna	To investigate the need of a mandatory downtime and its recommended duration during the certification procedure → Propagation of site information depends on the frequency at which tools query GOCDB. Top-BDII queries GOCDB every hour, Nagios every 3 hours (after the site appears in top-BDII). Accounting data is published on a daily basis. → the site certification procedure is modified to remove any constraint on the duration of the maintenance downtime.	CLOSED
11.07	T. Ferrari	To create a EGI Operations Glossary	OPEN
11.08	NGIs supporting GLOBUS	To specify the timeline for the integration of own GLOBUS resources into EGI	OPEN
Actions from 14 April OMB meeting			
10.01	All EA teams	Answer about the availability to test EMI-1 components → All components planned for UMD 1.0 have EA sites with the exception of LFC (oracle) and UNICORE WS 6.4.0. Investigations ongoing (https://www.egi.eu/earlyAdopters/teams)	IN PROGRESS
10.02	E. Imamagic, V. Hansper, M. Lechner	Edit Resource Centre OLA according to their comments → feedback provided and incorporated in UMD v1.5 discussed during the meeting	CLOSED
10.03	All NGIs	Provide information about site interested in deploying Globus, if any → this action can be closed. Information was passed on to the NGIs during the Vilnius meeting	CLOSED
10.04	K. Koumantaros	Provide a proposal to reduce the load of top-BDIIs, reducing the information published	IN PROGRESS



10.05	All NGIs	If HA is in place, provide documentation on the deployed solution. Otherwise provide information about topology of the service: what site points to which BDII → NGI are invited to participate to the top-BDII survey (http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22CFA95837Z/)	IN PROGRESS
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) → ARC is now fully part of SR (https://www.egi.eu/earlyAdopters/teams)	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.			

Middleware requirements: overview of feedback from EMI

P. Solagna presents the feedback received from EMI about the OMB approved requirements discussed in February. Many of the requirements are endorsed by EMI (this will be reflected soon in the status of tickets, which can be checked at https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Track_UMD_Requirements under “OMB tagged Requirements”). For requirements that the OMB opened to notify a suspected bug, EMI requires to open a GGUS ticket instead, so the relevant NGIs that opened RT tickets are requested to 1. Open the GGUS ticket and 2. To report the GGUS ticket url into the existing RT ticket for traceability.

Three requirements have been rejected as more information is needed by EMI to understand the problem and the related use cases (see details on slides).

Overview of tickets rejected

- The tickets: 1188 (UnicoreGUI), 1187 (Unicore SMS) and 1184 (Unicore brokering and matchmaking) have been returned because the components are not in EMI (Note: not all the ARC and UNICORE development efforts are part of the EMI DoW). NGI_PL is in contact with the developers and will forward directly the requirements to the product teams.
- Ticket 1202 (Logging format): J. Templon has provided more information about logging requirements [Note. After the OMB EMI was informed that the missing information is now available].
- Ticket 1388 (Documentation for service migration and high availability): NGI_IT (original requester) will analyse the services documentation (stateful services like SEs for migration) to indicate more clearly for which services documentation on migration of databases is missing.

A new requirement was presented and approved about the harmonization of the port numbers used by default by SRM interfaces (requirement 1674).

T. Ferrari: Purpose of the past requirements collection campaigns was to collect any type of requirement that would be applicable to EMI software including requirements previously discussed in different forms in EGEE times (savannah, GGUS), but still valid and not part of EMI.



In order to gather a comprehensive view including requirements from EGEE, a new campaign will be opened. Tiziana proposes to advertise this through a broadcast reaching the site managers and the lcg-rollout mailing list. K. Koumantaros: the existing official communication channels should be used. T. Ferrari: In the broadcast site managers will be invited to submit requirements in consultation with the respective Operations Centre. Cases of duplication will be handled prior to discussion at the OMB.

DECISION. The OMB approves that site administrators are directly notified through a broadcast of the existence of the EGEE requirements survey.

A wiki page will be prepared to provide an overview of the existing requirements (ACTION, P. Solagna). T. Ferrari will inform the WLCG MB.

Deadline to provide feedback: 30 June.

EMI release preview and large scale testing

T. Ferrari. Presentation on behalf of the EMI project about the middleware preview and large scale testing activities carried out and coordinated by EMI. NGIs and Resource Centres are encouraged to participate. This is an activity that is not part of the EGI-InSPIRE Description of Work but nevertheless is very beneficial. Release preview and large scale testing are different activities than software verification (EGI-InSPIRE SA2) and Staged Rollout (EGI-InSPIRE SA1).

Preview and large scale testing are prior to the EMI official release of a product, and occur BEFORE EGI verification and staged rollout.

NGIs are invited to contact the site managers to ask if any additional partner is willing to participate to software validation (EGI-InSPIRE SA2) - currently under the responsibility of IberGrid.

FOR APPROVAL: Resource Centre OLA

T. Ferrari presents various changes proposed by V. Hansper/E. Imamagic/M. Lechner/D. Zilaskos to address various issues related to the definition of resource centre, and an additional set of changes proposed by NGI_FRANCE (H. Cordier). All those changes are incorporated in version 1.5 of the OLA attached to the agenda. Summary of final changes proposed:

- Definition of Resource Centre (Section 1.2.1, Terminology): remove “necessary to make resources accessible to users” to match the case of those sites which do not offer resource capacity.
- Definition of Resource Centre Operations Manager (Section 1.2.2, Terminology): the addition proposed by NGI_FRANCE “The Resource Centre Operations Manager can delegate the respective Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager to be the operations contact of the Resource Centre” is not accepted. The reason for this is that any entity can decide to be



delegated by another entity if there's agreement between the parties involved. The proposed addition is rejected.

- Definition of Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager (Section 1.2.5 Terminology): replace "in scope" with "their".
- Responsibilities of the Resource Infrastructure Operations Manager (Section 5.1): the responsibility to inform about changes in the OLA will be moved to Section 1.1 (Document Amendment Procedure). The frequency of the changes is discussed. G. Borges: a minimum duration of validity of the document should be stated (e.g. 1 year). As the changes will be infrequent anyway, this restriction is felt to be unnecessary.
- (Section 5.1): text "to ensure that GOCDB contact information for their Resource Centres in scope is available and accurate." Will be removed as the OLA later on in the same section already mentions this.
- The proposed definition of the Services Covered (Section 7) is accepted. J. Gordon: how does the availability calculation engine handles a site with only one BDII (and no CE and SE)? D. Zilaskos: this does not cause any problem to the availability computation.

DECISION. The OMB approves the Resource Centre OLA with the changes defined above.

ACTION. T. Ferrari will circulate an updated version for a final check.

List of obsolete sites UNCERTIFIED/SUSPENDED/CANDIDATE

Many sites have been in UNCERTIFIED/SUSPENDED/CANDIDATE status for a long time (for more than one year) – see the list of sites attached to the agenda. 12-JAN-10 is the date of migration from GOCDB3 to GOCDB4. This date in the attached files indicates that the site switched to UNCERTIFIED/SUSPENDED/CANDIDATE before the transition to GOCDB4, so a long time ago.

The current practice is that a site shouldn't stay for more than 4 consecutive months in SUSPENDED status. Similarly a site will be in CANDIDATE status only during certification (see the discussion on the registration and certification procedure later on in the agenda).

J. Gordon: because a regionalized version of the GOCDB is not currently available, UKI adopted the following practice: a regional site (not part of EGI) is registered in the EGI GOCDB as "UNCERTIFIED" and remains such for the time being. T. Ferrari: this is acceptable as interim solution.

DECISION.

- **All sites that became CANDIDATE during 2010 must complete their certification process or be switched to CLOSED**
- **All sites that became UNCERTIFIED during 2010 or earlier and are NOT part of EGI, but rather of a local infrastructure , need to finish their certification or to be CLOSED**
- **All sites that became SUSPENDED during 2010 must be re-certified or CLOSED.**



DEADLINE: June 17 2011

FOR APPROVAL: Resource Centre Registration and Certification Procedure

P. Solagna presents the latest version of the Resource Centre Registration and Certification Procedure.

Discussion:

1. The procedure needs to clarify that a Resource Centre must be registered and certified by the Operations Centre active in the country where available.
2. Compulsory downtime: two days in compulsory downtime to wait for “propagation” of site information in the tools (accounting portal, etc.) seems to be excessive. This needs to be double checked with the tool developers. K. Koumantaros: the compulsory downtime could be optional (**ACTION on P. Solagna**).
3. Instead of providing definitions in the procedures, it would be good to have a Glossary. T. Ferrari; a EGI glossary is under discussion. As the consolidation of this may take some time, an interim internal one for operations can be created (**ACTION on T. Ferrari**).

Update on EGI operations interoperability (GLOBUS and UNICORE task forces)

M. Barth provided an update on the status of the works of the GLOBUS and UNICORE task forces. All NGIs interested in the deployment of the GLOBUS middleware stack are requested to provide a timeline for the desired integration of resources (**ACTION**).

WMS/top-BDII for uncertified Resource Centers

T. Ferrari summarizes the expressions of interest in the usage of a WMS and top-BDII for the monitoring of uncertified sites: a few NGIs have expressed interest; the list of interested partners includes infrastructures of different sizes. K. Koumantaros: are medium and large NGIs entitled to use such a service? T. Ferrari: several NGIs current operating a small number of sites have expressed their interest in the service. Because of those demands T. Ferrari proposes that the service – which will be operated in a best-effort manner - is deployed and opened to all interested partners regardless of the size of the respective infrastructure. In case of scalability or other deployment problems, the support of an NGI will be discussed on a case-by-case. Usage of the service will be reviewed in 12 month time. The OMB approves.



AOB

A. Torsten is awaiting input for milestone 403, only 11 answers were received (1/4 of the total), the deadline is extended to Friday 20/05. After that the milestone will be delivered without the missing answers. If an NGI didn't change anything in its helpdesk framework, the partner could just quickly assess this.

NEXT Meeting

21 Jun 10:00

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.