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# OLA NGI questionnaire and answers

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

1. Number of certified sites in the NGI

18 certified Sites are currently registered in NGI\_DE. We expect the number to rise as soon as the regional GOCDB is deployed in our region. Then some former D-Grid sites will join NGI\_DE.

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

 12 of the sites had signed a service level description (SLD) in EGEE III. This document was EGEE specific, i.e. after EGEE the SLDs are not valid anymore.

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

 The main difference in the ROC-DECH SLD was the sentence: "This Declaration, which is not legally binding ..." . Furthermore some statements on first line support and regular meetings were included.

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

 Most sites are reluctant to sign legally binding agreements or some site responsible persons are not allowed to sign such a paper and the process involving the legal department is quite complex.

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

 Some sites which have signed the more restrictive SLA of WLCG, do not see the necessity of signing another document.

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

 NGI\_DE would like to have a motivation for the value of the required availability/reliability.

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

 The OLA should be more independent from gLite, e.g. globus and UNICORE do not have anything like a site BDII; so a site BDII cannot be required. But a site security officer should be required.

## ****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)

 The methodology is ok.

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

 Penalty: banning from production, rewards: listed on a web page(?)

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 procedure is ok.

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

 Justifications describe the incident in general adequate.

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

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

 Globus and UNICORE are missing in the monitoring tools.

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

 Add more middleware flavours to the tools. GridView: Give a simple way to not just get plots but also the numbers.

## ****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?

 An OLA should exist but it should not be a requirement to sign it. Nevertheless, the certification and the certification status should be depending on the requirements defined in NGI’s standard OLA.

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

 NGI\_DE would prefer a simple management, e.g. in Wiki page.

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

 NGI\_DE would like to have a motivation for any value. In general we think that 80% availability is reasonable but the reliability should be increased since EGI wants to offer a production infrastructure (even the availability might be higher). Some VOs probably want to have a better availability/reliability.

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 objection from NGI\_DE.

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

 What do you define as core services? For GOCDB, GGUS, TopLevel BDIIs I expect a much higher availability/reliability than 80%/85%! Better is 90%/95% and higher.

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

 No further comments right now.