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**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.
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# OLA NGI questionnaire

## ****OLA status****

1. Number of certified sites in the NGI: **3 sites**

2. Number of sites that have already signed an OLA or comparable document: **3 sites signed EGEE SLD**

3. In case of a comparable document being used, describe deviations from the metrics used in the original EGI OLA document: **There are no deviations.**

4. What is the main obstacle to the adoption of the OLA by all sites?  **There are not obstacles.**

5. Which are the main considerations / objections of sites to the OLA? **OLA has to contain reasonable requirements taken into account funding mechanisms for sites (e.g. sites are not funded for 24/7 support, sites don’t necessarily have backup plans for severe hardware failures).**

6. Describe any modifications that you would consider to the OLA metrics definitions? **GGUS ticket reaction is too short, we recommend 1 working day.**

7. Are there any metrics that should be added/removed from the OLA? Include a brief justification for your answer. **The EGEE SLD targeted sites directly. The EGI OLA will be signed with NGI and it will include metrics for activities performed by NGI managers and operations staff (e.g. availability of NGI operational tools).**

## ****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? **Current policies are sufficient.**

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

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

## ****Monitoring Tools****

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

15. Describe any improvements that you would consider to the OLA monitoring tools currently used (e.g. NAgios, GridView)? **More service-oriented probes. Current probes are monitoring resources from the user perspective. It would be good to have more probes provided by tool developers which would check status of individual services.**

## ****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? **It should remain part of site certificate process.**

17. How do you (or would you) manage OLAs in your NGI? **We follow the procedures defined during the EGEE.**

18. Would you object to an increase of the minimum Availability/Reliability thresholds to 80% and 85% and respectively? **This could be a problem for smaller sites. In case of fatal hardware failures sometimes takes longer to get spare parts or replace some components, especially in case when sites don’t have high quality conditions.**

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 that this grace period would be useful.**

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

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