EGI-InSPIRE

NGI OLA QUESTIONNAIRE

Document identifier:	EGI-InSPIRE-OLAs-NGI_SK questionnaire answers
Date:	17/06/2010
Activity:	**SA1**
Lead Partner:	**EGI.eu**
Document Status:	**FINAL**
Dissemination Level:	**PUBLIC**
Document Link:	https://documents.egi.eu/document/58

Document Identifier

Date: 17/06/2010

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

EGI-InSPIRE INFSO-RI-261323

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

5 sites

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

2 sites have signed EGEE SLD. None of our sites has signed EGI OLA with NGI_SK yet.

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

-

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

EGI OLA definition has to be finalized.

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

We haven't received any objections to EGI OLA document from our sites.

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

We have no suggestions.

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

Current metrics are adequate for us.

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)

If site misses A/R targets because of longer maintenance works (e.g. reconstruction) and the reason is provided in downtime description in GOCDB, COD ticket should be sent only if the reason is not satisfactory.

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

No special rewards/penalties are needed. Suspension of unreliable sites is sufficient penalty.

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

The system is adequate for us.

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

During the operation of NGI_SK we didn't have enough incidents to be able to make generalisations.

1.3. MONITORING TOOLS

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

We currently don't see any defects.

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

We don't have suggestions regarding OLA monitoring tools.

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?

OLA can remain part of site certificate process.

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

We plan to use generic EGI OLA.

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

We have no objections to 80%/85% thresholds.

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?

After entering production infrastructure new sites should operate at the same minimum A/R levels as other production sites.

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

Core services are critical for operation of whole infrastructure. The thresholds should be higher than the thresholds for normal services (e.g. 90%/90%).

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

-