UK NGI Operations

John Gordon
10th January 2012

Background

- In the past the NGS was a set of sites, sometimes sharing resources with GridPP sites, supporting its own community running mainly in parallel with GridPP.

- Today's NGS is more about supporting core services for a wider range of communities, including GridPP. E.g. DIRAC, SKA, Elixir, if the UK (or Europe) is to have a common e-infrastructure then eventually all these communities will be using the same identity management, security, accounting, etc.

NGI_UK

- The UK is a member of EGI and the NGI participates in EGI and EGI-Inspire.
- An NGI Management Board exists and meets monthly.
- It has been proposed that for one meeting a month we extend the Ops Team Meeting to discuss NGI issues explicitly.
- If we have issues that cannot be resolved they should be pushed to the NGI MB from where they may also go to the GridPP PMB.
- It may be that you consider some of these issues mainstream for you and worthy of more frequent discussion.
- I have three topics I think would benefit from your engagement.

Helpdesk workflow

There has been much discussion on this in the past couple of months. I won't repeat it all but here is a strawman for discussion.

1.   Change the support details in GOCDB for a site to include the relevant 'other people' from the GridPP web. E.g. Tier2 Coordinators, buddies, etc.
    –   This will result in all the right people getting notified about GGUS tickets and changes to tickets when a site is 'notified' about a ticket. At the moment the NGI Helpdesk Team adds this.
    –   For tickets where a site is not notified the NGI Helpdesk will 'assign' the site as before (or should they Notify?)
2.   NGS helpdesk will not change tickets to 'In Progress'.
    –   The site should do this when they read the ticket, including receiving the notifying email about it.
3.   All sysadmins should have GGUS support rights.
4.   The metrics on UK performance will depend on sites change status to In Progress and Solved **so it important that you do this as soon as possible.**
5.   NGS helpdesk will continue to monitor tickets and may escalate ones which don't get resolved quickly. The helpdesk is manned by students, be gentle with them.
6.   This workflow is not sacrosanct. If there are issues with how the UK works, raise them here. If the issues are more general GGUS ones then the NGI is the way to address GGUS.

NGI Services

- EGI.eu has an strong requirement to measure the availability of EGI and NGI Services. Partly for the reviewers but also to expose the performance of NGIs to potential new user communities to help them make a decision about where to take their work (and their money).

- The EGI Global services (e.g. APEL, GOCDB, GGUS, etc) now have their own GOCDB sites defined and can thus be monitored and availability measurements made. That issue is sorted or will be soon.

- For NGI services the situation is different. For various reasons it is difficult to get an availability measurement for a collection of tests and/or sites. There is work under way to do this but it will take months and EGI-eu are desperate to have something to show their reviewers.

Interim Workaround

- Create a new GOCDB site for each NGI and MOVE particular services into it.
  - Eg the UK VOMS would no longer be attached to Manchester but would be in NGI-UK-CORE (or whatever). Now if VOMS were the only UK core service then there would be no problem. Robert would be defined as a sysadmin and he would get the tickets. W
  - here it becomes more flaky (in my view) is when the set of services becomes much bigger and the pool of sysadmins bigger so the responsibility for handling tickets against this 'site' is more diffuse and there is a risk that no-one takes responsibility and the UK's perceived availability is poor.
- Which NGI Services? The CA and VOMS obviously; recommended Top Level BDIIs probably; a catch-all WMS?
- Then I start to struggle. I would not want to put up catch-all instances of everything just for this topic. If we did then we might be judged on a service that no-one is using and no-one cares about. On the other hand we cannot define all our shiny top-quality services as NGI as that would be the majority of them and this would completely distort the UK site structure.

- You might tell me that I am wrong to worry and that the ROD team could keep track of who is responsible for each service and raise ROD tickets against people not sites for these NGI services.
- I am minded just to define the minimum of NGI services I can get away with. This should have the benefit of giving us a headline high availability but I wanted you all to know about this issue in case it comes back to bite us either as more mandatory NGI services to be moved to this site or new instances to be created, and/or relatively poor UK performance against these new metrics.
- The implications for UK sites are that some services will be moved away from their host sites to appear in a virtual UK site. CA, VOMS, T1 and Imperial TL BDIIs will be the first tranche.
- My interpretation is that we don't have any other UK wide services for all VOs. Is this right? If new VOs come along then we discuss with them and suggest which services they should use (SEs, CEs, WMS, LFC, FTS). This will depend on many factors including which sites intend to support that VO. We don't have instances of these services just waiting for new VOs do we?

Monitoring

- All NGIs run their own instance of Nagios and MyEGI.
  - I am told that the set of tests run is no longer limited to those distributed by EGI. We should test this.
- Oxford should continue to run the NGI nagios extending the test set where necessary but it is not necessarily their job to develop tests.
  - New middleware will have its own probes. New community services should also have probes. The NGI needs some basic expertise in developing nagios probes to kickstart this activity.
- Dave Wallom has been actioned to write down the NGS monitoring use cases. I will discuss with Kashif and the EGI providers and developers to see what is feasible today (a new release of Nagios et al this month meets some of the requirements) and whether any developments are still needed. I will report back on this.
- One implication for the ROD team is that there will be UK sites failing different tests in the dashboard.