

# Middleware Tickets Follow-up

Zdeněk Šustr and Aleš Křenek, CESNET

TCB-9, Amsterdam, October 23, 2011

- In many cases matter of subjective view
  - no set of strict rules to be followed mechanically exists
  - tradeoff between perfectness and available resources
- Agree on general guidelines here
- Delegate the decision to DMSU
  - assign the priority on reassigning the ticket to TP
  - this is the authoritative statement by EGI
- Provide an escalation mechanism
  - TP can raise objections through TCB mailing list
  - the specific case will be reviewed

- *Top priority*
  - serious security vulnerability with a known exploit etc.
  - software defect that paralyzes large part of EGI infrastructure
- *Very urgent*
  - security vulnerability without known exploit
  - software defects, configuration issues, etc. that affect many users or sites and
  - no feasible workarounds are possible
- *Urgent*
  - issues that affect higher number of users or sites
  - workarounds are known and acceptable for the time being
- *Less urgent*
  - issues affecting very specific users only
  - cosmetics

- TPs commit to reallocate effort to solve these issues
- Fix are expected in short time
  - *Top priority* – 1 week
  - *Very urgent* – within next planned release, not later than 1 month
- Exceptions must be announced and justified explicitly
  - it may be impossible to stick with the default deadlines
  - specific reasons must be understood and agreed
  - it is not feasible to cover these deadlines by strict SLA
- DMSU monitors these deadlines

- Fixed by TP on best-effort basis
- Move to *Future release* (new state to be added) if not affordable to be addressed in the next major release
- Must be revisited after major release with one of the following:
  - return to *In progress*, i.e. to be solved in upcoming release
  - closed as *Unsolved* (those that become irrelevant)
  - commented explicitly why keeping in *Future release*

- [https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SLA\\_Metrics](https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SLA_Metrics)
- M.DMSU.1: “Number of issues assigned to TP”
  - leave as is, break up by priority
- M.DMSU.2–5 are obsolete
  - all were based on the abandoned “ETA per ticket” approach

- new: “Average and median time to fix issues (per priority) by TP”
- new: “Number of high-priority issues fixed overtime”
  - tickets that were not closed with the default timeframe
  - non zero values indicate underestimation of TP support effort
- new: “Number of high-priority issues not handled in time”
  - i.e., out of M.DMSU.6, those without acceptable justification
  - non zero values indicate serious problem in EGI-TP communication
- new: “Number of tickets in *Future release* state”
  - steady growth indicates bad control of the backlog
  - must be always correlated with release planning