

# Pole 1: r-COD & 1st line support model

COD-16

Marcin Radecki, Małgorzata Krakowian

ACC CYFRONET

# Agenda

- COD regionalisation - where do we go?
- r-COD questionnaire results
- Aims for COD-16 meeting

# Regionalisation of COD

- to have a **regional team** handling tickets and alarms for sites in their region only

# Regionalisation of COD

- to have a **regional team** handling tickets and alarms for sites in their region only
- ... instead of a **central team** doing the same for all regions

# Model Terminology

**typical COD** - team doing monitoring shifts for entire infrastructure in EGEE-II, that's what we do now

**r-COD** - regional-COD, team dealing with alarms and tickets for their own region, planned for EGEE-III.

**1-st line** - team helping site admins in the region (see EGEE-III WBS TSA 1.2.3)

**c-COD** - central-COD, small team aka „thin layer” coordinating r-CODs, making sure the r-CODs are ”converging” in terms of procedures etc., planning evolution towards EGI

# Advantages - why do we do that?

## regional autonomy

- ability to organize (improve) support at regional level
- closer collaboration of teams within ROC

## r-COD is close to sites

- faster response
- more precise reaction - knows sites' specifics, problems may reappear
- more elaborate

# Advantages - why do we do that?

## regional autonomy

- ability to organize (improve) support at regional level
- closer collaboration of teams within ROC

## r-COD is close to sites

- faster response
- more precise reaction - knows sites' specifics, problems may reappear
- more elaborate

## risks

- divergence of r-CODs
- r-COD with option of helping sites needs more skills and attention

## r-COD status

- special 1st line support dashboard implemented in CIC portal, showing alarms „younger” than 24h, for specified region only
- CE and AP using regional dashboard for handling alarms & tickets in first 24h
- 1st line support teams formed in AP, CE and NDGF
- in CE tickets opening is left to typical COD by now = r-COD not in place



## r-COD status

- special 1st line support dashboard implemented in CIC portal, showing alarms „younger” than 24h, for specified region only
  - CE and AP using regional dashboard for handling alarms & tickets in first 24h
  - 1st line support teams formed in AP, CE and NDGF
  - in CE tickets opening is left to typical COD by now = r-COD not in place
- 
- status of remaining federations is in the questionnaire (next few slides)

# r-COD Questionnaire Results

## r-COD Questionnaire Results

Got response from AP, CE, CERN, DECH, IT, NDGF,  
NE-Benelux, SWE (8/12) RU, SEE, UK/I and... FR missing

# When would you like to start r-COD activity in your region?

[3] we are ready now

[2] in 1-3 months

[3] other, say when....

- IT - 3rd Quarter year 2009
- CERN - 6 months, estimate to be reviewed in 3 months.
- NE - The Benelux federation forms one ROC with the NE-Scandinavia federation. At the moment NDGF is performing c-COD duties already and have indicated to move to the r-COD soon. I understood that they will drop c-COD activity. The Benelux federation intends to join NDGF is this activity.

[0] no, we will not start r-COD at all, we will contribute and depend on usual COD team (as it was in EGEE-II)

# Is it ok for your region to cover typical COD and r-COD activity in parallel for some time?

[3] no, it's not acceptable

[3] yes, but we'd like to shorten this period to minimum, i.e. 1-3 months at maximum

[2] yes, we could do that for longer time, say how long:

- SWE - Until the end of EGEE-III
- NDGF - as long as required

## Do you plan to contribute some of current COD effort to foreseen c-COD in EGEE-III?

**[7]** yes

- IT - we are mainly interested in "COD tools" (failover)

**[0]** no

**[1]** don't know yet

# How do you plan to run r-COD and 1st line support teams in your ROC?

[1] two separate teams

[6] the same team

[0] not decided yet

[1] other, say what:

- IT - 1st line support duties are assigned to a subset of the staff involved in r-COD

# How will r-COD be organized after EGEE-III in your region?

[2] r-COD service will be provided by each NGI

[1] r-COD will be handled on similar manners as now by some ROC-like structure covering all countries in region

[0] EGI will cover our region in terms of r-COD service

[1] other, please specify...

- NDGF - Most likely, NDGF will cover the Nordic countries

[4] not known yet

# What could be the interface between r-COD and c-COD?

## Tools

**[6]** common tool (with regional flavour) for all r-CODs, so c-COD can have a common view on all

**[1]** our r-COD want to have its own tool to control sites

**[0]** new tool has to be developed. Say what features it would need that are missing currently:..

**[1]** other:

- NDGF - A combination of the first two - which is already in effect for us - will probably be realistic.



# What could be the interface between r-COD and c-COD?

## Procedures

**[8]** common document describing rules

**[0]** other:

# What could be the interface between r-COD and c-COD?

## Escalation/Operation

(i.e. how r-COD communicates operational problems that need to be escalated to c-COD)

**[5]** GGUS

**[0]** mailing list

**[2]** new tool has to be developed. Say what features it would need that are missing currently:..

- SWE - A tool adapted to the r-COD-c-COD escalation procedure.
- AP - could have a input interface in COD dashboard for the communication and it can send the msg to r-COD automatically once have any input from r-COD/c-COD

**[1]** other:

- CERN - not clear yet

## Aims for COD-16 meeting

- Define r-COD model in terms of: duties, procedures, tools
  - interfaces to 1st line support and c-COD
  - experience sharing between r-CODs, a knowledge base (?)
  - metrics to assess the work
  - how does this model fit into EGI/NGI?
  - structure of the document to write model definition into
- Define roadmap for involving federations into r-COD model
  - requirements for newcomers, manpower, duties
- Share workload among people involved in the pole 1