

Operations Management Board

17-08-2010 10:30 – 12:10

Attendance:

Tiziana Ferrari, Miroslav Dobrucky, Pablo Rey, Ron Trompert, Renato Santana, Edgars Znots, Antun Balaz, Gergely Sipos, Gilles Mathieu, Andres Aeschlimann, Paolo Veronesi, Dimitris Zilaskos, Luuk Uljee, Angela Poschlad, Goncalo Borges, Mario David, Mats Nylén, Alexei Altuhov, Mingchao Ma, Tadeusz Szymocha, Dusan Vudragovic, Gilles Mathieu 2 phone bridges

Introduction

T. Ferrari

Review of actions:

The list is managed in RT. For access you need the sso account and the related password.

<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Search/Results.html?Query=Queue%20%3D%20%27noc-managers%27%20AND%20%28Status%20%3D%20%27new%27%20OR%20Status%20%3D%20%27open%27%20OR%20Status%20%3D%20%27stalled%27%29>

#70: Update of GGUS support mailing lists

Middle term action for GGUS/Torsten: ongoing

#235: (TSA1.2) define security duties and roles for constituents of EGI infrastructure

#236: (TSA1.5): find two candidate NGIs for migration to APEM AMW client

#368: (TSA1.8) propose a suspension procedure to manage sites that fail to provide justifications

#263: gLite 3.2 migration plans

Connected with Mario's talk

We need to migrate from gLite 3.1 to gLite 3.2 and all NGIs are asked to answer the questionnaire sent out. The deadline is the 31th of August. An RT ticket for each NGI will be opened to collect the missing information to be provided to EMI. Please give your answers to Mario as soon as possible

No questions for actions.

Find approval of two new procedures:

1) NGI creation and validation: https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Operations:NewNGIs_creation - ready for production

2) New mechanism to collect statistics for availability and reliability:

https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/Availability_and_reliability_monthly_statistics#Description_of_the_process

The approval of such procedures was already a topic for discussion at the last OMB. No feedback was received after the email call for final comments. Both procedures are considered now as validated and fully in production. All NGIs need to explain those procedures to the respective operations staff and the site managers to make sure the community is aware and the procedures are fully understood.

Concerning procedure 2) just one part needs refinement: we need a procedure put in place when a site misses to provide a justification. The procedure for this needs to be the same for all operational tickets that are not properly handled by the respective site managers. COD will draft a new procedure for this (it will be a revision of an existing EGEE procedure). This new draft procedure will be discussed at the next OMB. T.Ferrari asks for comments. No feedback.

Decision. Both procedures are now validated and approved.

Milestones:

https://wiki.egi.eu/wiki/SA1_Milestones - There is a number of SA1 milestones for the first few project months. Most of milestones are in good state.

#MS401: (INFN) describes the current status of deployment of regionalized tools – in good shape

#MS402: (Spain) Procedure to deploy new software versions in the infrastructure – in good shape

#MS403: (GGUS) Describes the status of the EGI helpdesk. A bit behind schedule, still under internal discussion.

#MS404: Describes the current OLA in place- almost done

Open questionnaire: sent by Dimitris. Please provide feedback and input if your NGI did not do by now.

#MS405: Describes the procedures for security incident follow up and iddeware vulnerability issues

#MS406: (Spain) Ongoing. operational tools

Draft will be distributed as soon as it is ready. A questionnaire will be sent out then to collect the deployment plans of all NGIs. A JRA1 tool regionalization roadmap will be distributed as background information to the NGIs.

#MS407: Ongoing. Integrating Resources into the EGI Production Infrastructure

Draft is ready and reviewed. After review the draft will be circulated.

This milestone might get a bit late (1-2 weeks) since so many people are on vacation. Internal discussion ongoing this week to get status and progress.

From RAG to EGI: VO validation

Gergely Sipos – EGI.eu (user community support team)

The talk gives an overview on the current status of the EGI registration and validation process of new Virtual Organizations (VOs).

The process remains almost the same as in EGEE with only minor changes. Users can register VOs in the same way as they did in EGEE using the CIC portal. The CIC portal is the main tool to keep track of the registrations. RAG responsibilities have been reassigned from EGEE to EGI.

A public document will be available soon describing the overall workflow.

The slides show the description of steps which must be taken by the VO, the CIC portal and the VO supervisor in the registration and validation process starting with filling out the VO ID card. The last step of the validation process is the invitation of sites to support the VO.

Ongoing and future work: the EGEE procedur document could not be updated by now. Gergely is cooperating with EGEE RAG staff for a revision. Working with the CIC portal team on improvements.

Please notify users that new VOs can be registered any time, and a EGI procedure exists for this.

No questions.

(TSA1.4) Transition to GOCDB4: status and future steps

Gilles Mathieus (*RAL-STFC*)

GOCDB4 is splitted in different instances:

- **GOCDB4 Regional Input System:** Regionally deployed GOCDB – containing only local information
- **Central Input System** emulating the regional GOBDBs in the beginning
- **Central GOCDB4** visualization portal where all EGI information will be visible (read-only mode)

Towards the final GOCDB4 deployment different steps will be passed. Currently all requests to GOCDB3 are redirected to the new interface. In future all tools will query GOCDB4 directly.

Roll-out plan:

GOCDB4 Central Visualization Portal: Next release end of August

GOCDB4 regional input system: planed for end of September

Questions:

Tiziana: Which NGIs are willing to join the testing phase?

Gilles: Not yet fixed. Testing procedure is available. Different roles are needed to validate the functionality.

Asking for volunteers:

Renato Santana, Goncalo Borges and Angela Poschlad volunteer

Goncalo: We had discussed privileges of who can put a site to certified. What is the conclusion?

Gilles. Two technical solutions are possible.

- Simple one: People with special role on NGI level have the right to do this. This would have to be done on the NGI level. It was also discussed that the security officers should be able to suspend a site. But then they would not be able to change it back.
- Complicated one: Define which roles can make which transition. This is technical not complicated but it requires a lot of maintaining. If we need that we will go to that direction.

General consensus on implementing the simpler option for the moment.

Gilles: the GOCDB input system release expected on August 25 will include the fix.

Mingchao: Information on security alerts is currently sent to certified sites only. Should CSIRT also inform non-certified sites?

Tiziana: Non production sites are not yet interested in the information not being in prodcution.

Mingchao: Large number of sites has been excluded from the mailing list when taking only certified sites. There are some sites taken part in the infrastructure but are currently not certified for whatever reason. Many sites are currently in uncertified suspended or candidate state (about 70 instances). A

small number of sites can be added by hand to a specific single sign on group. If the number gets too big this is no solution.

Renato: How can a site get certified without current information on security issues?

Mingchao: Certified means ready in the sense of technical issues.

Gilles: Security email contact is mandatory for the certification process.

Tiziana: Site validation procedure does not exist and an action was opened. Main problem seems to be sites staying in uncertified and suspended state for very long. Given the present status, then it is preferable to have uncertified/suspended sites in the notification loop for security issues.

Action on Tiziana: How long can be site in the status uncertified?

<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=278>

Tiziana: Gilles, you mentioned that you are thinking adding information through regionalized input systems. What is the status and who are the testers? Are more NGIs welcome to joint the testing phase?

Gilles: regional input system is technically the same as the central one. If one is working the other should work as well. We need some experience with multiple regionalized GOCDs writing to the central one in parallel. Some NGIs already joint the testing process and currently no more NGIs should join for the moment, results of tests from current test NGIs will be gathered first..

Gilles: The time of changes in the certification status will be stored. Required from gridview for availability statistics.

TSA1.5) APEL client transition to ActiveMQ, and accounting workshop: questionnaire

Tiziana

Discussion on transition from RGMA to AMQ.

Proposal was to start with few NGIs and draft the outcome at the Technical Forum.

Situation so far: France and Serbia NGIs volunteered to participate that transition. UK and Ireland also volunteered to participate. Some Spanish sites and Germany are also interested.

France and Serbia have started the official process. This is tracked through the following tickets:

- https://gus.fzk.de/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=60863
- https://gus.fzk.de/ws/ticket_info.php?ticket=60814

- UK will deploy the service but has not started creating a ticket for reporting, Ireland also interested in migrating.
- Some Spanish sites will get involved as well.
- NGI_DE: negotiations ongoing.

TSA1.8) Open issues of the availability followup procedure. OLA Questionnaire

Dimitris Zilaskos

Status update is given. The current availability/reliability algorithm incorrectly takes into account sites that have been registered at a later stage (this depends on the date when the accounting data summarization happens). This can lead to league tables that include sites that during that month were still uncertified, or can include statistics for the whole month for sites that joined the production during that month, without taking into account the certification date (and thus leading to poor availability statistics for that month).

This has to be changed in the future. NGI are advised that if such a situation happens, the corresponding COD ticket needs to be immediately closed explaining that the site was recently certified.

How to handle sites that fail to provide justifications to the poor availability/reliability scored? Currently this is followed up as a general operational issue, a single operations ticket escalation ticket will be redefined starting from the existing COD escalation procedure. There's an open action on COD (<https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=247>).

OLA questionnaire was sent out. So far only three answers were submitted.

AOB)

- 1) Tiziana reminds OMB members about the questionnaires waiting for feedback
 1. OLA questionnaire, already mentioned by Dimitris
 2. Accounting questionnaire, circulated by John Gordon – input required to properly structure the accounting workshop
 3. NGI gLite transition plans from 3.1 to 3.2: and RT ticket will be opened soon
 4. to come: deployment plan for regionalized tools
- 2) Quarterly reports still missing from few NGIs
- 3) Tadeusz: Have all sites to publish accounting data including training (GILDA) sites? Does a production site has to publish data?
Action for Tiziana: Follow up with Italian GILDA sites. GILDA sites from the Italian NGI all publish accounting information. The GILDA AUP explicitly mentions that accounting records can be collected. Currently GILDA sites are certified and in production and as such should publish accounting records.

Next meeting will be a face to face meeting during EGI Technical Forum in Amsterdam, 13th September 14:00. It will be a meeting with SA1 task leaders.