Minutes JRA1 phone 17/06/2010

[Attendance: 1](#_Toc264549326)

[Review of open action: 1](#_Toc264549327)

[GOCDB4 release plan: 2](#_Toc264549328)

[NGIs NAGIOS Validation 3](#_Toc264549329)

[AOB 4](#_Toc264549330)

# Attendance:

CERN: *David H. David C.*

SRCE: *Emir*

EGI: *Tiziana*

INFN: *Daniele*

AUTH: *Christos T. Lampros M*

KIT: *Helmut D.*

CESGA: *Javier*

STFC: *Gilles*

CNRS: *Cyril*

# Review of open action:

#52: done can be closed  
#71: no progress  
#74: ggus and gocd reviewd. gilles: work ongoing, last step before the release  
#75: no progress  
#76: gilles to write a summary of the current status. Christos: work ongoing to use PROD broker network (CERN,SRCE,AUTH) for APEL. Development needed but not directly related to the broker's software (fuse/ActiveMQ). The development will be on extending the tool that will create and maintain up-to-date configuration based on external sources (i.e. the current immediate requirement is to have list of APEL boxes's certificate DNs from GOCDB). APEL provided us with a configuration script they are using at the moment but we have to migrate it to the tools that we already have at the brokers in PROD network.

#77: will be included in ms702, not different from what was presented at the kickoff meeting  
#78: request to update the ticjet to everybody  
#79: no progress. Tiziana comment: during nagios validation it is important to validate the availability. Emir ops-monitor already do it  
#80: no progress  
#81: emi develops probes   
#82: no details, use evo for now  
#86: skipped  
#88: Emir working on it  
#89: documentation should come from the m/w provider. Tiziana: get in touch with spanish collegues to agree on making  quality requirements for probes documentation vo probes for analogy - same workflow  
#90: emir: we have probes but someone should tell us if they need improvements and which of them are critical   
        Daniele to double check the status of existing probes are then Tiziana will discuss this with sa1  
  
Milestone & deliverables

MS701 (cyril) : almost finished, send draft next week  
MS(702) Daniele: draft avalable on friday or first days of next week  
  
GOCDB4 release plan:  
  
Gilles uploaded two documents, one containing the plan and one the identified tools dependencies with possible showstopper.  
Tools that need some development in order to be compatible are:

* the CIC portal
* the  accounting portal
* something inside APEL

Cyril: we have just one script to migrate - it is ready - we have to check it - next week there should be the green light  
Gilles: bdii is not a showstopper, already compatible - verified in the last days  
working on the APEL side and should be ready soon

Javier: acc portal working on it : during the next week we should be ready   
  
Daniele: we must be sure before making the announcement that we don't break anything in the internal tools, in the  bdii config generator and in the metric calculator...not to destroy production. Is nagios and all its components ok?   
  
Gilles: nagios is ok with gocdb4  
  
Gilles present the plan (see document attached to the agenda):  
to be done in two steps  
1. Decommissioning the GOCDB-PI  
2. Replacing GOCDB3 by GOCDB4 input system  
Action 2. cannot be rolled back, action 1. can  
  
Daniele: we cannot do anything before the egee3 review (will be 23-24 June) so we have time to be sure that bdii, nagios and metrics are ok with gocdb4 PI.   
Then we can make the announcement at least two weeks in advance of the large scale test  
For the communication channels: Giacomini gave us the EMI new EMT contact list to get in touch with EMI developers ([emt<<at\_nospam>>eu-emi.eu](mailto:emt@eu-emi.eu))

7-8-9 Jul there is the wlcg workshop we can plan the large scale test for the week after - agreed to start on 13 jul  
  
Tiziana suggests to use ggus ticket to track the tools interoperability - agreed to be used also on the gocdb4 deployment - parent ticket to gocdb and sons to the tools support unit if available  
  
Tiziana suggests to maintain a testbed to check interoperability among the tools - both internal and external  
Daniele: for the internal tools is not a problem, for the third party will try to understand what can be done  
  
Gilles completes the presentation of the plan described in the document.  
Daniele: we should replace the first T1 with a T0. At T0 we will be reasonably sure that all the internal dependencies, nagios and availability calculation will not be broken by the transition to gocdb4 - this can be done in a week  
  
Christos: is it safe to release during summer?  
Daniele, Gilles: the part1, that is the one that can affect tools, will be done during July, the second part is more about changing in the user interface, affect the habits of the users, but will not break tools  
Christos: ok, but a 24hrs test in July is not enough - 48 hrs or more  
Agreed on 48hrs at least  
  
**To summarize, the agreed schedule is as follow:**

* open the parent ggus ticket - can be done immediately
* in 1 week we should solve the  sons ggus tickets  on compatibility for  BDII config generator, internal tools and metrics calculation
* after 24 Jun (end of the egee3 review) we will announce using all possible communication channels the large scale test that will start on 12 jul afternoon. Gilles will also add banner on the gocdb interface.
* Until 15 jul we will run using gocdb4 PI and let's see if major issues arise
* On 15 jul decide if the test was successful so that we can announce the official decommissioning of gocdb3 PI before the end of july
* the step 2. of the plan (replacing the input system) will continue during summer as described in the document to have gocdb4 fully operation before the technical forum in September

# NGIs NAGIOS Validation

DavidC.:   
https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/ValidateROCNagios  
have been upadated recently with the last validating procedure.  
version 0.11 of this edms document:  
https://edms.cern.ch/document/1071800  
describe officially the procedure.  
The procedure implies automatic tests for the comparison of two nagios boxes results  
  
Daniele: this should be enough for the NGIs requirements, so it seems that nothing has to be done on the jra1 side. SA1 to discuss the procedure and circulate the comments  
  
Christos: ngi Serbia already validated nagios using the v11 document and the roc SE nagios box  
  
Tiziana: SA1 agreed that Marcin will make format adjustments to the procedure and then it will be passed to the NGIS for comments

# AOB

No AOB from anyone.