

EGI-InSPIRE

NGI OLA QUESTIONNAIRE

Document identifier:	NGI_CH response.doc
Date:	09.09.2010
Activity:	SA1
Lead Partner:	EGI.eu
Document Status:	FINAL
Dissemination Level:	PUBLIC
Document Link:	https://documents.egi.eu/document/58

Copyright notice:

Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration.

EGI-InSPIRE (“European Grid Initiative: Integrated Sustainable Pan-European Infrastructure for Researchers in Europe”) is a project co-funded by the European Commission as an Integrated Infrastructure Initiative within the 7th Framework Programme. EGI-InSPIRE began in May 2010 and will run for 4 years.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA. The work must be attributed by attaching the following reference to the copied elements: “Copyright © Members of the EGI-InSPIRE Collaboration, 2010. See www.egi.eu for details of the EGI-InSPIRE project and the collaboration”.

Using this document in a way and/or for purposes not foreseen in the license, requires the prior written permission of the copyright holders.

The information contained in this document represents the views of the copyright holders as of the date such views are published.

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

OLA NGI QUESTIONNAIRE.....4

OLA NGI questionnaire

1.1. OLA STATUS

1. Number of certified sites in the NGI

Four sites are certified, three gLite sites and one ARC site.

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

Zero

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

N/A

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

The OLA should be formulated such that non-gLite sites (ARC in our case) could sign it, too. More will become clear in case the final OLA will be presented to the sites for review.

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?

We don't see any need for changes right now.

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

No.

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)

Sites should automatically get their latest monthly league table data, preferably before the official announcement. There should be a public space (e.g. Wiki) where sites can post corrections and explanations in case they do not reach the required availability. (e.g. "installation of new cluster led to high downtime", which is a very different reason than "sys admin had no time to fix problems"). This will allow understanding availability and reliability issues better over a bigger time period.

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

The league table is considered to be sufficient.

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

Yes, the system is adequate enough.

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

Due to lack of experience no clear answer can be given at the moment.

1.3. MONITORING TOOLS

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

N/A

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

N/A

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?

The OLA should remain part of the site certification process.

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

Given that we are working in an academic environment, we consider informal collaboration more promising.

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

This depends on the provided rationale. We would probably also adopt a consensus between the main NGI's.

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?

No, although we wouldn't recommend to do this.

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

Higher thresholds for EGI core services would certainly be helpful, depending on how critical the specific service is. Their availability/reliability will have a direct impact on the quality of the Grid as a whole, while not necessarily having a direct impact on the sites. Here, one could also just directly specify a certain redundancy in the implementation.

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

N/A

