

authors: COD Team
13.12.2012

Intro

This document is an attempt to define the role of Grid Oversight activity in the structure of the EGI. In order to properly define particular processes within the activity, it is necessary to realize the principles that lie behind the existence of it.

What COD is now

We believe Grid Oversight is an activity aimed at monitoring of the infrastructure and solving arising operational issues. These issues can be of different complexity and importance, and may be caused by various reasons on regional or central level. For the scalability reasons the Grid Oversight has hierarchical structure: teams on regional (ROD) and central (COD) level contribute to it, solving problems within their scope.

Incident & Problem Management

Speaking in ITSM terms the processes in which COD is naturally interested in are these of Service Operations area, especially Incident Management and Problem Management. The oversight of Incident Management is organized in an escalation process and COD is the body to which incidents that can not be handled on regional level are escalated. Problem Management exists however it takes place rather in a basic, intuitive form.

Service Transition

In order to perform the oversight activities the teams require tools helping in problem and incidents follow-up. Being a representative of RODs, COD team is involved in the Service Transition area. Especially in the evaluation of operational tools, where new features should be consulted with COD, in preparation of procedures and informing RODs about changes. This currently happens partially through OTAG meetings.

OLA Monitoring & Reporting

Availability/Reliability of services, TOP-BDII availability or ROD performance index are metrics included in RC or RP OLAs. Handling these reports can be referred in ITSM terms as „OLA reporting” which is covered by Service Level Management area. In EGI we have two types of OLA: Resource Center OLAs and Resource Provider OLAs. RC OLAs are defined on local level (for which RODs are responsible) whereas Resource Provider OLAs define the agreements between operations centers (RPs) and EGI. However, these OLAs are related because missing of a local OLA will most likely cause missing of an RP OLA. For that reason, problems arising with RP OLAs require cooperation of COD and ROD.

What problems COD experiences

Incident & Problem Management

Incident Management processes are well established and we see no outstanding issues in there, however we could think of extending the issues escalated to COD from these reported in Operations Dashboard to any issue related to ROD daily work. Interaction in the latter area is scarce. In Problem Management area COD could follow-up repeating incidents seeking for structural problems and keep the Known Error database (related to the operational processes). To our knowledge no specialized Known Error DB exists within the EGI scope.

Missing part are:

- tools for showing trends in metrics
- better data interface allowing access and enabling more advanced analysis

OLA Monitoring & Reporting

All NGIs committed to fulfil RP OLA statements however it seems that the current reporting process does not bring much improvement in services itself. Some NGIs are quite good, some tend to be tired with GGUS tickets asking for justification of poor performance, and their explanations does not differ much each month. It may be caused that NGIs have different understanding of obligations related to OLAs.

We believe that in EGI we lack awareness regarding the role of RODs related to RP OLA observation. As a reason for that we find the settlement of the RP OLAs: we believe this document is little observed because RODs are not aware of or care about obligations it brings upon their centers. In order for them to be able to perform their job properly, they also need monitoring tools as well as real power to improve the center's performance.

COD in EGI **lacks some real tools** that will allow it to really improve the level of OLA observance. We need tools to:

- monitor the RP performance in long-term scale to discover structural problems with RPs
- influence RODs

We also need to be able to take part in the proces of implementation of new tools by specifying the requirements or consulting the existing requirements. In order for the operational tools to be useful, we would like to take part in designing their functionalities.

Service Transition

Changes to operations tools are barely discussed with COD. COD engagement in driving changes is too low.

Suggested solutions

OLA Monitoring & Reporting

Within OLAs area we propose the following rules of cooperation between ROD and COD:

1. ROD is the first team responsible for supervising the RC OLA. It is ROD's responsibility to monitor whether the RC OLA is observed and react when it is not (OLA monitoring). ROD can

also monitor RP OLA from the NGI side.

2. COD is the team responsible for solving structural and long-term issues related to violations of RP OLAs (OLA reporting) and monitoring of ROD performance rather than acting on single incidents which was done in the past.

What these rules ensure for the Grid Oversight is that the whole structure is scalable: when a new RP is introduced, ROD is the team responsible for monitoring arising issues, and COD makes sure they do it properly and helps solving operational and structural problems that cannot be solved by RODs by themselves.

Also, for good functioning of the Grid Oversight activity it is important that the tools supporting the teams in their work are useful and reliable.

Based on that, we see the roles in Grid Oversight as follows:

1. ROD
 - responsible for monitoring compliance with Resource Center OLAs in their scope
 - Carrying out tasks defined in the RP OLA
 - solving arising issues related to observing of the RC OLA
2. COD
 - coordinating RODs' work
 - introducing new RODs
 - introducing new processes: writing operational procedures, coordinating them on central level, informing RODs
 - initiating changes in operational tools
 - provide support for RODs

In terms of OLAs EGI could consider also

- accepting different thresholds for different NGIs
- building a common understanding of duties related to OLAs among NGIs
- invest in increasing maturity of ITSM in NGIs

COD team could help in coordination of abovementioned activities by identifying and overcoming structural problems. Our expertise is being build upon PL-Grid activity of implementing changes to reach higher ITSM maturity.

Summary

COD can extend its activity towards monitoring of other OLA metrics and even SLAs by contributing to development, set up and running necessary processes within Grid Oversight structure. However this activity need to be supported by operations tools automating the COD and ROD daily work. It is also possible that Grid Oversight structure is reused for Resource Allocation processes.