EGI-InSPIRE

NGI OLA QUESTIONNAIRE

Document identifier:	EGI-InSPIRE-OLAs-NGI questionnaire.docx
Date:	**24/08/2010**
Activity:	SA1
Lead Partner:	EGI.eu
Document Status:	FINAL
Dissemination Level:	PUBLIC
Document Link:	https://documents.egi.eu/document/58

PROJECT SUMMARY

To support science and innovation, a lasting operational model for e-Science is needed − both for coordinating the infrastructure and for delivering integrated services that cross national borders.

The EGI-InSPIRE project will support the transition from a project-based system to a sustainable pan-European e-Infrastructure, by supporting 'grids' of high-performance computing (HPC) and high-throughput computing (HTC) resources. EGI-InSPIRE will also be ideally placed to integrate new Distributed Computing Infrastructures (DCIs) such as clouds, supercomputing networks and desktop grids, to benefit the user communities within the European Research Area.

EGI-InSPIRE will collect user requirements and provide support for the current and potential new user communities, for example the ESFRI projects. Support will also be given to the current heavy users of the infrastructure, such as high energy physics, computational chemistry and life sciences, as they move their critical services and tools from a centralised support model to one driven by their own individual communities.

The objectives of the project are:

1. The continued operation and expansion of today's production infrastructure by transitioning to a governance model and operational infrastructure that can be increasingly sustained outside of specific project funding.
2. The continued support of researchers within Europe and their international collaborators that are using the current production infrastructure.
3. The support for current heavy users of the infrastructure in earth science, astronomy and astrophysics, fusion, computational chemistry and materials science technology, life sciences and high energy physics as they move to sustainable support models for their own communities.
4. Interfaces that expand access to new user communities including new potential heavy users of the infrastructure from the ESFRI projects.
5. Mechanisms to integrate existing infrastructure providers in Europe and around the world into the production infrastructure, so as to provide transparent access to all authorised users.
6. Establish processes and procedures to allow the integration of new DCI technologies (e.g. clouds, volunteer desktop grids) and heterogeneous resources (e.g. HTC and HPC) into a seamless production infrastructure as they mature and demonstrate value to the EGI community.

The EGI community is a federation of independent national and community resource providers, whose resources support specific research communities and international collaborators both within Europe and worldwide. EGI.eu, coordinator of EGI-InSPIRE, brings together partner institutions established within the community to provide a set of essential human and technical services that enable secure integrated access to distributed resources on behalf of the community.

The production infrastructure supports Virtual Research Communities − structured international user communities − that are grouped into specific research domains. VRCs are formally represented within EGI at both a technical and strategic level.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OLA NGI QUESTIONNAIRE

1.1. OLA STATUS

1. Number of certified sites in the NGI

   53 production sites plus 5 GILDA sites

2. Number of sites that have already signed an OLA or comparable document

   37 sites

3. In case of a comparable document being used, describe deviations from the metrics used in the original EGI OLA document.

   The document we have used so far has some differences, but we are in the process of revising it now:
   - 2 grid administrators (1 FTE) are requested at each site
   - Max response time to tickets is 6 hours
   - Minimum storage: 5 TB, minimun number of cores: 10
   -

4. What is the main obstacle to the adoption of the OLA by all sites?

   The main reasons are:
   - it is not specified what are the ROC commitments
   - some sites have man power problems
   - no penalty has been foreseen so far if a site does not sign the document

5. Which are the main considerations / objections of sites to the OLA?
   - see above

6. Describe any modifications that you would consider to the OLA metrics definitions?

   Some kind of flexibility should be foreseen in order to ease the extension of the grid infrastructure. Some sites could provide grid resources discontinuously. Of course this must not affect the overall stability and reliability

7. Are there any metrics that should be added/removed from the OLA? Include a brief justification for your answer.

   The possibility of extending the OLA to include metrics related to core services hosted by a site should be evaluated

1.2. ENFORCEMENT METHODOLOGY

8. Are there any improvements you would propose to apply in your NGI to the current enforcement methodology of the OLA? (Monthly League Table, justifications for breach of A/R metrics)

9. What kind of rewards/penalties for sites would you consider for over/underachieving sites?

   No rewards needed, current suspension criteria are enough as penalty for sites. But some kind of penalty should be foreseen for ROCs that are not responding adequately

10. Do you find the current system for providing justifications for A/R failures adequate? If not why? What else would you use?

The current system could probably be improved, but it is important that justifications be required. Some justifications are already provided within the GOCDB, in particular for the downtime events.

11. Do the justifications in general adequately describe the incident, main cause and the recovery strategy used?

In some cases they adequately describe in other cases they don't.

1.3. MONITORING TOOLS

14. Describe any defects that you've encountered with the OLA monitoring tools currently used (e.g. Nagios, GridView)?

There have been problems (incomplete monitoring) until the monitoring of the CREAM CE has been included

15. Describe any improvements that you would consider to the OLA monitoring tools currently used (e.g. NAgios, GridView)?

1.4. FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

16. Do you think that the OLA should remain part of site certificate process or there is a different procedure you would like to use?

Yes

17. How do you (or would you) manage OLAs in your NGI?

OLA must be signed before the certification process starts, like it is now. A periodic check (and signing again) should be done.

18. Would you object to an increase of the minimum Availability/Reliability thresholds to 80% and 85% and respectively?

No objection but some flexibility should be foreseen: some 'important' sites should have higher thresholds while some other (smaller) sites could have lower availabilities.

19. Would you object to permitting a grace period of 6 month for new sites were availability and reliability thresholds are 70% and 75% respectively?

We don't think it will be useful.

20. What thresholds would you like to see for EGI core servicers? Do you agree with 80%/85% as in sites?

We agree

21. Please provide any additional comments that were not covered with the previous questions