

### 3. Message broker network: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less

Respondent

#	Response
1	We do not yet have experience with using the message broker network, but consider its function to be very important.
2	I filled in that I don't know but that can be caused by the fact that it works like a charm.
3	My main complaint is that all the messaging broker network is acting like a black box and it is hard to debug service problems without having access to information from the messaging broker system. How can I see that a message originated from a given resource at a given site reached its destiny? How can I see if the alarms messages originated at Nagios SAM boxes have reached the appropriate dashboards? These are questions presently unhandled, and some effort should be put in making this "troubleshooting" info more accessible.
4	continue with work on splitting of production and development network, on adding authorization etc.
5	Messages flow in the background so it's difficult to understand what's going on. Sometime we observed messages lost in the workflow nagios-broker-ops portal. Statistics about messages per NGI would be useful to understand the ratio send-received per producer-consumer
6	The EGI message broker network is not used in production.
7	Authorization should be added on topics used by monitoring tools.
8	- Improvement could be made to service documentation - It would be very useful to improve the visibility of logs - Overall service status is not clearly visible
9	2. MBN is used by accounting and infrastructure monitoring systems. It seems the system is working fine, but the issue we recognize is lack of broker network monitoring. Quite often it was not possible to pinpoint the problem between EGI-SAM and Operations Dashboard because the broker network was involved and people had no feedback whether the notification was successfully transmitted over the broker network or not. For example in our opinion the issue reported in this ticket <a href="https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=69993">https://ggus.eu/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=69993</a> did not lead to any concrete solution due to lack of information. We think MBN could be improved in the area of monitoring or/and logging as essential part of critical systems.

### 5. Monitoring tools: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less

Respondent Response

- #
- 1 Nagios probes - In our opinion these can be improved and extended to test even more things in any grid environment. Security monitoring tools - All good, but some tests are still not working like they should.
  - 2 No comments from our side, we consider the monitoring tools to be quite adequate and very important.
  - 3 My main concern regards MyEGI. However, my comments are resumed in the next section where I discuss the usability of MyEGI Portal. No need to duplicate them here.
  - 4 still unclear separation of functionality between MyEGI and operations tool
  - 5 My EGI: Data inconsistencies have been observed between regional nagios results vs data provided by myegi portal and between regional myegi vs central myegi. Very difficult to understand how to debug such inconsistencies. A legend defining the different status (es. Missing, Unknown, Removed) would be useful especially for site managers
  - 6 Better interface for the new services
  - 7 See Question 7, 9, 11
  - 8 Security monitoring should be extended to all middlewares in EGI infrastructure and results should be exposed to site admins and NGI managers.
  - 9 I believe we now have far to many probes and the whole ecosystem is quite heavy in general and rather complex
  - 10 - Documentation on the Nagios box could be greatly improved - See below comments for Nagios probes and MyEGI
  - 11 For MyEGI we are hardly using it.
  - 12 Better integration with standard NMS in order to better correlate Grid and non-Grid services (e.g. SNMP)

**7. MyEGI portal: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | No comment, since we don't have enough experience yet in using the portal.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 2 | Looking in the history the myEGI portal is buggy at times. Sometimes you encounter "server error" type messages. Further, I would like to be able to click through the error messages generated by the tests, just like you could do with SAM. |

- 3 I think the MyEGI needs to improve its usability. A simple example is that the advance search filters of the "Service Sample History" functionality are not working fine. You can not write the name of the site or region you want to check because the search filter functionality only seems to work if you select one of the self-completion options, even if it is the same as the value you entered by hand. Moreover, some of the times, the metrics data from a given test executed in a given resource at a given date is simply not available or not shown. Also people get confused about the options for the profiles, they do not understand what they mean, and so there should be an easy way to translate this to site managers. Also, my overall impression is that the service is too slow, and that once you need to obtain information from MyEGI, it raises you more obstacles than it helps.
- 4 See previous comments
- 5 MyEGI portal could be more responsive.
- 6 History view: 1) WMS/Top BDII history data is not collected 2) Clearer graphical representation of when the tests were performed. Current timeline bar is not accurate enough to check the timestamp of a given failed test.
- 7 Search / filter GUI is a bit complex. Also the user cannot enter directly a region or site: the user must wait for the GUI to auto-suggest an answer and click it.
- 8 History-function by MyEGI, better usability
- 9 it needs to be a bit easier to use and more reliable to be of any real use
- 10 The tool is very useful to us. The overall usability is somewhat lessened by many bugs It is important to us that development continues on this tool
- 11 The service would be more useful for us if there will be an easy way to integrate regional services.
- 12 Optimization for mobile access

**9. Nagios probes: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                           |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | More checks should be added, there are situations not covered by the current ones. |
| 2 | We are quite satisfied wiht the level of service provided by the Nagios probes.    |

- 3 Regarding Nagios Probes, I'm providing the feedback from my NGI site admins. The confidence on the service has increased and now I think it can be considered as a reliable service. However there are complains that the SAM nagios continues to work as a black box, and problems do emerge when you need to debug. Question like "Which probes are called for each service? Which probes depend on each other?; What are the probes really executing? How can one reproduce the observed problem?" are always appearing from time to time. Site admins main care is to obtain information which helps them to solve their problem, and some documentation should be written aiming that target.
- 4 Eliminate frequent problems with ATP (like missing data).
- 5 Efforts towards a more fine-grained definition of where the source of the failures come from: - Caused by the central services used by Nagios - External/Off-site services (e.g. SRM failures in data management checks under CE scope (WN-Rep)) - Site issue All of them result in A/R penalties for the sites that in the first two cases should not be the case.
- 6 Nagios probes should be more oriented towards checking the services instead of mimicking user behaviour.
- 7 see above
- 8 Adding probes to a regional instance remains difficult

**11. Operations portal: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Availability: Despite the efforts to keep it up and running, we see that it is not always available and queries fail sometimes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 2 | No experience with Security Dashboard, but we consider it of high importance. The VO management tools have not been used by our NGI yet                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 3 | We do not need to use security dashboard until now. So we could not make any comment. We are getting broadcast messages more than one since we are member of multiple VOs or lists. It may be configured to send a message to an e-mail address only once although this e-mail address takes place more than one lists. In the VO management tools, there will a connection between account portal and the VO. We can see the usage statistics from a short path in each VO action lists. |

- 4 I think the Security Dashboard is a very promising tool but the information it shows is a mix of different things. Security issues are checked executing tests sent via a Security Nagios using ops VO. However, everytime a Security Nagios probe fails, an alarm is showed in the dashboard. In my oppinion, the Security Dashboard should only show real security threads while the Security Nagios probe fails should be caught by other operation monitoring tools (ROD Dashboard?) since they are reporting a normal job sumission failure and not a security problems.
- 5 occasional problems with inconsistency between regional and central installation still exists
- 6 Security dashboard has been used only since October with basic functionalities: the integration with the ROD dashboard is planned but not yet in delivered
- 7 Reduce amount of time when Operational Portal is not accessible. Better advertisement of newly added features. Occasional glitches of Security dashboard (which are solved by page reload) should be eliminated. Better documentation of Security Dashboard should be provided.
- 8 Improvements: 1) Automatic alert masquerading (hierarchy) 2) Flapping detection
- 9 Operations dashboard GUI has many unintuitive and inconvenient elements. For instance, it is not possible to click on the "alarm" (bolt of lightning icon); it requires clicks on a non-standard "open" icon to reveal the useful information for a site and a further click to open the nagios alarms (which are only present if there are alarms, so perhaps should open by default) ; clicking the site name brings up information about site rather than opening the the site box, etc. Security dashboard is making progress but has similar usability problems to Ops Dashboard: e.g. can't click on "alarm" icon to be taken to alarm info. VO management tools don't support management of VOMS server certificates.
- 10 Broadcast tool and VO Management tools were not used by NGI\_SK.
- 11 • VO Management tools not used by Operations manager •Security Dashboard: Improvements of the Security Dashboard are planned. Plans are okay for us
- 12 We do not use security and VO dashboards. GUI tends to be slow when loading alarms.
- 13 Far too complicated and overloaded I belive it should be simplified a lot.
- 14 N/A
- 15 Performing as expected. Optimize for mobile access.

**13. Accounting portal: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent Response

- #
- 1 We have anecdotal evidence that the accounting of MPI jobs, which we consider very important for the sites, is not reliable. However, we may be misinformed and have not deployed or configured our own instance. We also need a reliable storage accounting, we are not certain that this is provided by the accounting portal.
- 2 The data which was sent from the site can be seen from the web page after one or more days according to the load of the accounting servers. There is a need to optimize this service.
- 3 Graphs and interaction should need to be evolved towards new web technologies;
- 4 A users-per-country view (nationality view) is needed by the funding agencies.
- 5 The level of service is acceptable.
- 6 • Usability: The user interfaces is much overloaded, but the GUI answers fast. • We did not see a CSV export function.
- 7 It would be nice to have NGI-oriented view in accounting portal, i.e. amount of resources used by Croatian users in Croatia and in the whole grid. Another nice feature is site utilization percentages (normalized and absolute).
- 8 I would like to see an NGI\_Manager role that is able to get accounting data for all sites in his/her responsibility up to Users DN so that we are able to extract valuable data from catch all VOs
- 9 - Information accuracy: still long delays to get up-to-date information (though this might not be a portal issue as such). Fixing known bugs on displays and calculations should be considered a priority, as this is the sole tools NGI can rely on. - Information completeness: more explanation/documentation would be needed to better understand displayed figures - Usability: The website itself seems not to have changed/improved for a long while. - Other comments: It is still hard to setup a national instance
- 10 We think it is simply working according to expectations.
- 11 Optimize for mobile access.

**15. GGUS: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | The UI is functional, but can do with some improvements.                                                                                                                                                                    |
| 2 | GGUS functionality: The GGUS report generator has very basic functionalities and it is very slow                                                                                                                            |
| 3 | Improvements: 1) Possibility of doing replies in order to insert inline comments                                                                                                                                            |
| 4 | Homepage for supporters with certs could show all tickets on which supporter has responded. User's should be able to associate themselves with sites, ngis, etc. (or via GOCDDB) and see relevant tickets on the home page. |

- 5 More options for advanced ticket routing.
- 6 A functionality that would be useful for our NGI: having a view of all tickets submitted on behalf of a given NGI
- 7 GGUS maintains Web Service interface with regional helpdesks. There were changes to this interface introduced without advance notice leading to failure of connections with regional helpdesks instances. Now it seems the interface becomes stable and no much changes were done recently, so there is lower risk.
- 8 Illogical place to put option to close/verify ticket (in escalation).

**17. GOADB: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | #  | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1  | No further comment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
| 2  | improved support for non-EMI service registration                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 3  | GOADB functionality: no notification for pending role requests                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 4  | GOADB front-end was more user friendly in previous version (GOADB3).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| 5  | Improvements: 1) E-mail alerting of pending roles to be approved                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 6  | Separation of "input" and "visualisation" is a little confusing. It would be useful to be able to add a downtime from the info page for a given site.                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 7  | Functionality can be improved by adding change tracking.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 8  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usability is limited by different access pages for browsing and updating</li> <li>• Reliability of stored data is unclear</li> <li>• GUI <a href="https://goadb4.esc.rl.ac.uk/portal">https://goadb4.esc.rl.ac.uk/portal</a> has not a trusted certificate</li> <li>• Detailed view for multiple sites is missing</li> </ul> |
| 9  | GOADB experiences a lot of downtimes, but this should be solved with HA setup in 2012. The latest version brought some usability improvements.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 10 | the web interface has become rather slow that its always a hassle to use                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 11 | - Usability has greatly improved, but the interface is still not quite user-friendly (downtime views, listings...) - Still many functions could be added to improve delivered service (notifications when an action is required, displaying fields modification history, advanced search functions...)                                                                |

12 We feel that GOCDB has too often and too long outages. However, each downtime is always broadcasted which is good. We are waiting for “write” API to integrate regional configuration management database with the central GOCDB and we see no plans for that. We tried to adapt GOCDB to our region but the code is complicated so regional extensions were difficult. From our perspective it seems that development slowed down and no much progress was achieved since long time. Even small changes takes quite long: still, no notifications for manager are available when somebody applies for a role, people can't check who submitted a downtime. For GUI it is getting better but still there are inconveniences, missing info in views etc.

**19. Catch-all core grid services: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

#	Response
1	While we have used some of the catch-all services, we do not yet have enough experience with them to provide a reasonable response other than "don't know". The Catch-All CA and top-level services for monitoring uncertified sites are quite important for us.
2	More information should be provided on how NGI managers should deal with DTEAM VOMSRS. The usability of the VOMSRS interface is not good, and so, one should enhance information on how to use it. There is very few information on this topic.
3	Only the management of DTEAM VO is used, the web interface (VOMRS) is very poor, vomsadmin interface would be better.
4	This answer is valid only for DTEAM VO management as all other catch-all services are not used by our NGI.
5	catch-all CA is not properly documented/publicized
6	Catch-all services were not used.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catch-all CA – not needed for us, but thanks to Hellasgrid running it. <a href="http://www.grid.auth.gr/en/services/egi-catch-all-ca-service/">http://www.grid.auth.gr/en/services/egi-catch-all-ca-service/</a></li> <li>• Dteam-VO-Management: VOMRS GUI is difficult to use.</li> <li>• Authorization scheme of Dteam-VOMRS should be more flexible for representatives inside the same organization.</li> </ul>
8	Notation for DTEAM management only, as NGI_FRANCE doesn't use other services
9	We used them only once while certifying a new site: WUT, but this services seems important for new communities.

**21. Coordination of interoperability of operations: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent Response



- #
- 1 While we have not used this functionality yet, we consider it of great importance to the stability of the national infrastructure, where we are expected to maintain OSG, UNICORE in addition to the standard gLite release from EMI.
- 2 We only use one middleware stack on the resources that we contribute to the EGI infrastructure.
- 3 In my regions there is not much people interested in other middlewares rather than gLite. Therefore, I must say that I do not know much about this activity although I know that some work is happening on this area.
- 4 In Italy only gLite/EMI stack is used. We are not aware of “desktop grids”.
- 5 Within the NGI\_AEGIS only gLite middleware stack is used.
- 6 It is unclear how much interoperation really is. Statistics about the different infrastructures need to be in place.
- 7 We have only gLite based services in production infrastructure.
- 8 Full integration of Globus and UNICORE is urgently needed at all levels and in all services. (It’s done for GGUS)
- 9 It would be nice to have clear roadmap for full integration of some of these middlewares into EGI production.
- 10 The task force coordination was excellent in the early days of EGI. For us it seems the pace of works was much faster than now. This task can be improved by regular meetings, defining tasks and monitoring them. Currently we feel that the integrators from the EGI site are working on their own pace which could be improved by monitoring.

**23. Coordination of staged rollout: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | We have not used this service. However, we do rely on the certification process for the middleware updates and consider this important to our proper operations.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2 | I think the SR activity is a very important activity and it has been working OK. The main problem seems to be able to bring more NGIs / sites on board since it seems to be the same people always doing the same activities. The diversity and the different deployment scenarios are important pieces to judge if a given product can be massively installed or not. |
| 3 | More time could be allowed for testing of proposed changes.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| 4 | The level of service is acceptable. No suggestions for improvement.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

- 5 We are not sure if some improvements could be done for coordination with EMI but the overall outcome of this activity is affected negatively by the fact that critical software components are delivered late. Examples are WMS and Storm SE. We had to install some components directly from EMI repository despite the fact it was not recommended.

**25. Coordination of requirements gathering, process and tools: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

#	Response
1	no further comment.
2	The process for delivering requirements seems properly organized. What I think is missing is a process that shows in a public summary (single snapshot) which of the requirements were not accepted and why, which are pending, which were accepted, and in which version of a given service will these requirements be fulfilled. Site admins do ask if the requirements they raised will be followed or not, and there is no alternative way than to go to the original RT ticket and check the status. Moreover, they do never know in each version of the service will their requirements be fullfill. Also the time frame to raise the requirements is fuzzy. We are, at this point, raising requirements to EMI 3.0 but we still do not know if EMI 2.0 functionalities will fullfill the requirements raised for EMI 2.0.
3	Some requirements are open since Feb 2010. RT is very unfriendly. A template for requirements collection would be usefull (ex: Product tool, Requirement request, Use case example, more details (coming from discussions), priority....)
4	Perhaps more regular elicitation of requirements would be useful.
5	The level of service is acceptable. No suggestions for improvement.
6	Requirements are difficult to handle in RT: no deep links to Tickets, missing fields, missing user-friendly search functions (because of the missing functionality GGUS has still to use Savannah and additionally the RT)
7	- RT is reasonably easy to use - Requirement collection, especially when done through surveys, should allow NGI manager to view what sites have answered – which is not necessarily the case when this goes through mailing lists

- 8 It would be very desirable if the coordinator worked more autonomously on behalf of NGI. We perceive the role of the coordinator as body investing in expertise, being able not only to pass requirements but evaluate, contribute and correctly position them in the overall architecture and strategy. This way the EGI requirements will steer development in more concise way, the EGI will be able to define common trends, priorities and the NGIs will obtain an added-value.

**27. 1st line support: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | The process is very clear. Delays have not been experienced from EGI, mostly from our side. The escalation process has been done properly in all cases. |
| 2 | Training events for TPM people should improve the quality of their work.                                                                                |
| 3 | TPM should be more responsive.                                                                                                                          |

**29. 2nd level support: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Sometimes it is difficult to know which unit is responsible for fixing a problem, specially when it involves CREAM and ARGUS. The ARGUS team is really responsive, while the CREAM one not always. And sometimes the errors fit in a category between both. |
| 2 | no further comment.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 3 | We have never used it.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 4 | Obviously these depends on the teams themselves. My experience is thay some reply really fast (like the VOMS, WMS or CREAM supports) and others I have to ask second and third time until I get an answer (like DPM or information systems)                 |
| 5 | Training events for DMSU supporters should improve the quality of their work.                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 6 | Answer based on the 14 GGUS tickets opened by NGI-DE in 2011.                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 7 | Sometimes tickets are bounced from team to team, so coordination could be a bit better.                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 8 | Support is generally of good quality, but workflows are sometimes not easy to actually follow, especially for issues that require to involve different teams.                                                                                               |

**31. 3rd level support:suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent Response

- | # |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | we have not used 3rd level support yet.                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2 | Never used this.                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 3 | Same answer as before.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 4 | It highly depends on specific support units, some units are better than others.                                                                                                                                                               |
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough tickets to make a rating</li> <li>• Users reported, that IGE does not help to migrate from GT4 to GT5</li> <li>• Some EMI-Tickets from 2011 are still open (e.g. 71366, 73823)</li> </ul> |

**33. Operations coordination: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | We have not had experience yet with operations coordination                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| 2 | Generally efficient, but some OMB meetings deal with matters that could be handled in smaller more focused meetings for relevant people.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| 3 | Deadlines given to fulfill some actions can sometimes be quite short, especially when considered actions require involving many people within the NGI. This is however inherent to all big international projects...                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| 4 | Although the EGI.eu operations staff work very hard it seems for us the coordination of partners is sometime weak. This is visible when some partner is not delivering according to plans or according to expectation from DoW. No effective measures are taken to face such situation. Moreover the project needs to find its way to foster (or revive) the spirit of collaboration. Also it seems for us that works on deliverables could be done in more collaborative manner. |

**35. Grid oversight COD: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Very responsive, but usually just to warn/complain and when asked for help not willing to do so. Probably it's not in their responsibilities, but when you don't know what to do (as ROD shifter, for example) this is very annoying. |

- 2 I think COD could be a little bit more reactive to requests from the NGIs giving them the same level of attention NGIs give to COD requests. Along the year I have provided some suggestions that I think are still unhandled (it could be due to manpower issue, which I fully understand). For example some of the ROD metrics should be normalized to the amount of resources under an NGI since it is completely different to have one NGI with 3 sites and one NGI with 30 sites. Other example is that ROD metrics should take into account SAM Nagios downtimes automatically.

**37. Availability/Reliability management: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | The "Resource infrastructure Provider" A/R only started 3 months ago, and it will start to be really enforced on January 2012. So, I guess we can only have a real conclusion about this precise process once it is applied in practice. |
| 2 | Occasional problems with central services being responsible for poor availability/reliability ratings.                                                                                                                                   |
| 3 | Improve visibility/documentation (e.g. used profiles, tests...)                                                                                                                                                                          |

**39. Coordination of operations security: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                           |
|---|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | EGI security team has been extremely helpful to our NGI when dealing with the leaving of our main security officer |
| 2 | Evaluation time in SVG could be improved, but we understand the reason is lack of manpower.                        |

**41. Documentation: suggestions for improvement and comments if you ranked 3 or less**

Respondent

- | # | Response                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Many times it is difficult to find the correct documentation, since the EMI docs are not always very detailed and you have to go all the way to the TWIKI. We recognise the effort done in this area, because now everything is better documented than in the gLite 3.1/2 era, but some extra effort must be done.      |
| 2 | The documentation is in a good state, but it is sometimes quite hard to find what we are looking for. However, this may be resolved by spending more time reading and understanding the layout of the documentation. For a new team member, it is not immediately clear where to find information from the EGI website. |

- 3 Wiki is an excellent tool which can be used as an help. But sometimes we could not reach what we want form the wiki page. Sometimes, the documentation structure seems to be complex.
- 4 I think the EGI Wiki is a bit confused, and each OPS activity follows its own guidelines on how to structure information which makes difficult to navigate or find a given web page
- 5 Documentation should be more complete and up to date.
- 6 Can be difficult to find relevant documentation on the wiki using search or starting from home page.
- 7 Documentation texts need minor cleanups.
- 8 As an NGI we do not provide any documentation thus we are not coordinated. Documentation in our global task is coordinated by EGI.eu operations staff and this is done well.