**EGI-InSPIRE**

Negotiating the SLA with EMI
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# Issues that need resolving

This section tracks the issues that need resolving in either the EMI SLA draft, or issues stemming from the EGI SLA template that are not directly covered in the EMI SLA that need to be covered in a way.

This section is organised as a log of reviews with a list of issues, which over time get resolved down to zero. At that time the SLA draft is accepted for signature.

## First review (up to and including 7 March 2011)

The following table lists issues emerging from the EMI SLA draft v1.1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Section(s)** | **Status** | **Name** | **Description** |
| 1 | 2. & 3. | OPEN | <Customer> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI”. |
| 2 | 2. & 3.  | OPEN | <Customer product or service> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI Production infrastructure. |
| 3 | 4. | OPEN | EMI SLA Manager | Should be a named contact (see EMI draft section 11) |
| 4 | 5.1, 5.4 | OPEN | EMI Support Plan not found | The referenced EMI Support Plan cannot be found on the EMI web. Without this, a final review and acceptance is not possible. |
| 5 | 5.2.1 | OPEN | Fully trained staff | Definition of “fully trained”? Does EMI offer certification and training to satisfy this requirement? |
| 6 | 5.2.3 | OPEN | Network access | This paragraph seems in violation of OLA with resource infrastructure providers.🡪 Tiziana please check this! |
| 7 | 5.2.6 (a), (b) | OPEN | Update notification | There is no explicit mechanism defined in the SLA as to how the notification of available updates takes place. EGI wishes to explicitly include the GGUS ticket based notification mechanism in the SLA. |
| 8 | 5.2.6 | OPEN | Definition of “regularly” | What is EMI’s exact definition of “regularly”? |
| 9 | 5.2.6 (c) | OPEN | Recommended configuration parameters | Does this cover Best Practice documents that are currently prepared under the lead of the DMSU? |
| 10 | 5.3.4 | OPEN | Service exclusions | What has changed compared to “before”? I (Michel) have no idea on what has happened before, so I need input and guidance for the negotiation!🡪 Steven, Tiziana  |
| 11 | 5.3.4 (e) | OPEN | Definition of “approved distribution channel” | What exactly is an approved software distribution channel? What are the criteria and approval procedure? |
| 12 | 5.4 paragraph 3 | OPEN | Problem Management | An explicit link and synchronisation between this EMI defect tracking system, and the GGUS SUs is missing. |
| 13 | 11 | OPEN | Named contacts | What are the named contacts? |
| 14 | n/a | OPEN | DMSU involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with DMSU other than tickets in EMI Service Desk (i.e. EMI 3rd party GGUS SUs). DMSU requires technical experts involved in assessing the problem severity. |
| 15 | n/a | OPEN | SVG/RAT involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with SVG’s RAT other than tickets. RAT requires active technical engagement to assess the security threat of the discussed vulnerability. |

## Second review (up to and including 23 March 2011)

The following table lists issues emerging from the EMI SLA draft v1.1

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Section(s)** | **Status** | **Name** | **Description** |
| 1 | 2. & 3. | OPEN | <Customer> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI”. |
| 2 | 2. & 3.  | OPEN | <Customer product or service> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI Production infrastructure. |
| 3 | 4. | OPEN | EMI SLA Manager | Should be a named contact (see EMI draft section 11) |
| 4 | 5.1, 5.4 | OPEN | EMI Support Plan not found | The referenced EMI Support Plan cannot be found on the EMI web. Without this, a final review and acceptance is not possible. |
| 5 | 5.2.1 | OPEN | Fully trained staff | Definition of “fully trained”? Does EMI offer certification and training to satisfy this requirement? |
| 6 | 5.2.3 | CLOSED | Network access | This section is in compliance with EGI policies. |
| 7 | 5.2.6 (a), (b) | OPEN | Update notification | There is no explicit mechanism defined in the SLA as to how the notification of available updates takes place. EGI wishes to explicitly include the GGUS ticket based notification mechanism in the SLA. |
| 8 | 5.2.6 | OPEN | Definition of terms | What is EMI’s exact definition of “regularly”, and “timely”? |
| 9 | 5.2.6 (c) | OPEN | Recommended configuration parameters | Does this cover Best Practice documents that are currently prepared under the lead of the DMSU? |
| 10 | 5.3.4 | OPEN | Service exclusions | What has changed compared to “before”? I (Michel) have no idea on what has happened before, so I need input and guidance for the negotiation!🡪 Steven, Tiziana  |
| 11 | 5.3.4 (e) | OPEN | Definition of “approved distribution channel” | What exactly is an approved software distribution channel? What are the criteria and approval procedure? |
| 12 | 5.4 paragraph 3 | OPEN | Problem Management | An explicit link and synchronisation between this EMI defect tracking system, and the GGUS SUs is missing. |
| 13 | 11 | OPEN | Named contacts | What are the named contacts? |
| 14 | n/a | OPEN | DMSU involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with DMSU other than tickets in EMI Service Desk (i.e. EMI 3rd party GGUS SUs). DMSU requires technical experts involved in assessing the problem severity. |
| 15 | n/a | OPEN | SVG/RAT involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with SVG’s RAT other than tickets. RAT requires active technical engagement to assess the security threat of the discussed vulnerability. |
| 16 | 5.2.5 | OPEN | Backup procedures | This section does not clarify under which circumstances these backup procedures or systems are needed. It needs to clarify if this is needed just during the troubleshooting session, in which case the requirement is acceptable.On the other hand, a general requirement of this time is not feasible (i.e. we cannot ask any service in production to be fully backed up). |
| 17 | 5.2.6 (a) | OPEN | Upgrades and updates | We cannot guarantee that ANY software update is applied by a production site. For example, if we have update A, then B, then C, I don't see why a site can't skip update B and upgrade from A to C (if A is still supported). A site is free to deploy any component that is still supported. And A site is also free to deploy at its own risk a EMI unsupported component that is supported by the NGI, which does not break interoperability, and which has no vulnerability problems. Of course for unsupported EMI software EGI won't ask 3rd line support |
| 18 | 5.3.2 | OPEN | Support Lifecycle | [http://www.eu-emi.eu/services/lifecycle/support\_periods.htm](http://www.eu-emi.eu/services/lifecycle/support_periods.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) does not exist |
| 19 | Across doc. | OPEN | Definition of terms | “Problem” and “Incident” are not defined. |
| 20 | 5.3.1 | OPEN | Product catalogue | The catalogue is not defined, or no link given. |
| 21 | 5.4.1 | OPEN | GGUS as web based support | This is certainly through fro EGI as a customer, but I'm not aware of discussions about the usage of the same front end for non-EGI users. EGI may want to expose the same front end to the users of other infrastructures (for example PRACE), but that requires discussion and agreement (as this has implications in a fee for service model), and these discussions need to involve EGI (not EMI) as long as this is a EGI funded service. |
| 22 | 6.2 | OPEN | Definition of terms | “Response “ and “Addressing a ticket” are not clearly defined. Those terms need definition before the response times guaranteed in the SLA can be assessed. |

## Third review (up to and including 30 March 2011)

The following table lists issues emerging from the EMI SLA draft v1.1

Legend for the issues list

* Green - Issue that is not critical but needs changing.
* Yellow - Issue with alternative suggestions to EMI
* Red - Critical issue that hinders assessing and accepting the SLA (draft)
* Issues that appeared in a previous review but are removed are clearly no issues at all (anymore).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Section(s)** | **Status** | **Name** | **Description** |
| 1 | 2. & 3. | OPEN | <Customer> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI”. |
| 2 | 2. & 3.  | OPEN | <Customer product or service> placeholder | Placeholder should be replaced with “EGI Production infrastructure. |
| 3 | 4. | OPEN | EMI SLA Manager | Should be a named contact (see EMI draft section 11) |
| 4 | 5.1, 5.4 | OPEN | EMI Support Plan not found | The referenced EMI Support Plan cannot be found on the EMI web. Without this, a final review and acceptance is not possible. |
| 5 | 5.2.1 | OPEN | Fully trained staff | Definition of “fully trained”? Does EMI offer certification and training to satisfy this requirement? |
| 7 | 5.2.6 (a), (b) | OPEN | Update notification | There is no explicit mechanism defined in the SLA as to how the notification of available updates takes place. EGI wishes to explicitly include the GGUS ticket based notification mechanism in the SLA. |
| 8 | 5.2.6 | OPEN | Definition of terms | What is EMI’s exact definition of “regularly”, and “timely”? |
| 9 | 5.2.6 (c) | OPEN | Recommended configuration parameters | Does this cover Best Practice documents that are currently prepared under the lead of the DMSU? |
| 11 | 5.3.4 (e) | OPEN | Definition of “approved distribution channel” | What exactly is an approved software distribution channel? What are the criteria and approval procedure? |
| 12 | 5.4 paragraph 3 | OPEN | Problem Management | An explicit link and synchronisation between this EMI defect tracking system, and the GGUS SUs is missing. |
| 14 | n/a | OPEN | DMSU involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with DMSU other than tickets in EMI Service Desk (i.e. EMI 3rd party GGUS SUs). DMSU requires technical experts involved in assessing the problem severity. |
| 15 | n/a | OPEN | SVG/RAT involvement | There is no clear commitment in engaging with SVG’s RAT other than tickets. RAT requires active technical engagement to assess the security threat of the discussed vulnerability. |
| 16 | 5.2.5 | OPEN | Backup procedures | This section does not clarify under which circumstances these backup procedures or systems are needed. It needs to clarify if this is needed just during the troubleshooting session, in which case the requirement is acceptable.On the other hand, a general requirement of this time is not feasible (i.e. we cannot ask any service in production to be fully backed up). |
| 17 | 5.2.6 (a) | OPEN | Upgrades and updates | We cannot guarantee that ANY software update is applied by a production site. For example, if we have update A, then B, then C, I don't see why a site can't skip update B and upgrade from A to C (if A is still supported). A site is free to deploy any component that is still supported. And A site is also free to deploy at its own risk a EMI unsupported component that is supported by the NGI, which does not break interoperability, and which has no vulnerability problems. Of course for unsupported EMI software EGI won't ask 3rd line support |
| 18 | 5.3.2 | OPEN | Support Lifecycle | [http://www.eu-emi.eu/services/lifecycle/support\_periods.htm](http://www.eu-emi.eu/services/lifecycle/support_periods.htm%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank) does not exist |
| 19 | Across doc. | OPEN | Definition of terms | “Problem” and “Incident” are not defined. |
| 20 | 5.3.1 | OPEN | Product catalogue | The catalogue is not defined, or no link given. |
| 21 | 5.4.1 | OPEN | GGUS as web based support | This is certainly through fro EGI as a customer, but I'm not aware of discussions about the usage of the same front end for non-EGI users. EGI may want to expose the same front end to the users of other infrastructures (for example PRACE), but that requires discussion and agreement (as this has implications in a fee for service model), and these discussions need to involve EGI (not EMI) as long as this is a EGI funded service. |
| 22 | 6.2 | OPEN | Definition of terms | “Response “ and “Addressing a ticket” are not clearly defined. Those terms need definition before the response times guaranteed in the SLA can be assessed. |

### Review outcome

1. Template PDF seem broken with ToC, and formatting
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
2. Issues and clauses that are specific to EGI must be recorded in an Annex included in the specific SLA that EGI is willing to sign.
Applies to: EGI draft
3. Sections 2, 3 – Placeholder text should be replaced with concrete customer name
Applies to: EGI draft
4. Section 4 – The EMI SLA Manager must either be a concrete person, or be listed as a communications contact in section 11.
Applies to: EGI draft
5. Section 5.1 – Reference to EMI Support Plan (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
6. Section 5.2.1 – The definition of “fully trained staff” is unclear and needs exact definition. Otherwise a new clause 5.3.1 (c), describing training services that would qualify attendees as “fully qualified” personnel, is required.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
7. Section 5.2.5 – The first paragraph is redundant and should therefore be removed.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
8. Section 5.2.6 – The entire section is in this form unacceptable to EGI, and does not add value to the SLA. The whole section should be replaced with the following text:
*“The Customer is aware that Products, which are not within the agreed Support Life periods, are not timely updated to fix critical issues and are used outside the recommended configuration parameters are not entitled to be supported from EMI Technical Experts. EMI Technical experts can ask the Customer to upgrade, apply updates and restore the recommended configuration parameters before further investigating any reported issue.”*
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
9. Section 5.3.1 – EGI requires a static list of EMI Products that are reviewed in regular intervals.
Applies to: EGI draft
10. Section 5.3.2 – Reference to EMI Product lifecycles (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
11. Section 5.3.4 (3) – The EGI Software Repository must be mentioned as an approved software distribution channel.
Applies to: EGI draft
12. Section 5.4 – Reference to EMI Support Plan (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
13. Section 5.4 paragraph 2, section 5.4.1 – The paragraphs suggest that EMI wishes to use GGUS as part of their generic service offering to all its customers. GGUS clearly belongs to EGI, and any EMI service offering using GGUS for customers other than EGI must be covered with an appropriate SLA. Otherwise any reference to GGUS as third level tool for support must be moved into the Annex specific to the EGI draft.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
14. Section 5.4 paragraph 3 – EMI internal tracking systems and processes of problem and incident management are of relevance only to EMI and therefore not part of the interface between EGI and EMI (or any other customer of EMI, unless agreed as being part of the interface). Therefore the relevant sections must be removed from the paragraph. The agreed interface between EGI and EMI for 3rd level support is GGUS, and therefore formal communication and responses of available updates to issues reported in GGUS must be given in the relevant GGUS ticket(s).
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
15. Section 6.1 – Telephone support should be added as a tertiary support channel, available only on demand. Web support should remain primary support channel, and Email support should remain secondary support channel.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
16. Section 6.2 – The guaranteed response times for issues of severity levels 2, 3 and 4 seem too long, and customers may consider EMI unresponsive based on the provided times.
EGI as a specific customer accepts response times of: 1 day (24 hours) for severity 2, 5 working days for severity 3, and 20 working days for severity 4 service requests.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft
17. Section 6.2, Service requests with severity 4 – The EGI DMSU is considered responsible for assessing Service Requests of this severity and feed them (or parts thereof) as requirements in the Requirements assessing process in EGI’s TCB.
Applies to: EGI draft
18. Section 6.3 – This touches issue 13, EMI considering GGUS as part of its general service offering (or exclusive to EGI), and therefore needs clarification.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

### Issues sent to EMI

Template PDF seem broken with ToC, and formatting
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

2.     Issues and clauses that are specific to EGI must be recorded in an Annex included in the specific SLA that EGI is willing to sign.
Applies to: EGI draft

3.     Sections 2, 3 – Placeholder text should be replaced with concrete customer name
Applies to: EGI draft

4.     Section 4 – The EMI SLA Manager must either be a concrete person, or be listed as a communications contact in section 11.
Applies to: EGI draft

5.     Section 5.1 – Reference to EMI Support Plan (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

6.     Section 5.2.1 – The definition of “fully trained staff” is unclear and needs exact definition. Otherwise a new clause 5.3.1 (c), describing training services that would qualify attendees as “fully qualified” personnel, is required.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

7.     Section 5.2.5 – The first paragraph is redundant and should therefore be removed.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

*8.* Section 5.2.6 – The entire section is in this form unacceptable to EGI, and does not add value to the SLA. The whole section should be replaced with the following text:
*“The Customer is aware that Products, which are not within the agreed Support Life periods, are not timely updated to fix critical issues and are used outside the recommended configuration parameters are not entitled to be supported from EMI Technical Experts. EMI Technical experts can ask the Customer to upgrade, apply updates and restore the recommended configuration parameters before further investigating any reported issue.”*
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

9.     Section 5.3.1 – EGI requires a static list of EMI Products that are reviewed in regular intervals.
Applies to: EGI draft

10.  Section 5.3.2 – Reference to EMI Product lifecycles (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

11.  Section 5.3.4 (3) – The EGI Software Repository must be mentioned as an approved software distribution channel.
Applies to: EGI draft

12.  Section 5.4 – Reference to EMI Support Plan (links to document on the EMI website) is non-functional. Critical for further review and acceptance of the SLA.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

13.  Section 5.4 paragraph 2, section 5.4.1 – The paragraphs suggest that EMI wishes to use GGUS as part of their generic service offering to all its customers. GGUS clearly belongs to EGI, and any EMI service offering using GGUS for customers other than EGI must be covered with an appropriate SLA. Otherwise any reference to GGUS as third level tool for support must be moved into the Annex specific to the EGI draft.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

14.  Section 5.4 paragraph 3 – EMI internal tracking systems and processes of problem and incident management are of relevance only to EMI and therefore not part of the interface between EGI and EMI (or any other customer of EMI, unless agreed as being part of the interface). Therefore the relevant sections must be removed from the paragraph. The agreed interface between EGI and EMI for 3rd level support is GGUS, and therefore formal communication and responses of available updates to issues reported in GGUS must be given in the relevant GGUS ticket(s).
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

15.  Section 6.1 – Telephone support should be added as a tertiary support channel, available only on demand. Web support should remain primary support channel, and Email support should remain secondary support channel.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

16.  Section 6.2 – The guaranteed response times for issues of severity levels 2, 3 and 4 seem too long, and customers may consider EMI unresponsive based on the provided times.
EGI as a specific customer accepts response times of: 1 day (24 hours) for severity 2, 5 working days for severity 3, and 20 working days for severity 4 service requests.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft

17.  Section 6.2, Service requests with severity 4 – The EGI DMSU is considered responsible for assessing Service Requests of this severity and feed them (or parts thereof) as requirements in the Requirements assessing process in EGI’s TCB.
Applies to: EGI draft

18.  Section 6.3 – This touches issue 13, EMI considering GGUS as part of its general service offering, and therefore needs clarification.
Applies to: SLA template, EGI draft