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Quatttor Survey

• Reflects situation at end of September 2010
• 22 answers from different sites in 10 countries
  – Including 1 non-European country (China)
• Most questions with a limited set of answers for easier analysis
  – But no accuracy at the % level
  – 1 site ~ 4.5%
• Quatttor managing 40K machines
  – Based on the sites who answered
  – ½ at MS
Site Profiles

- From small to very large
- Most sites running only one production instance

Number of Instances per Site

Number of Nodes per Site
Deployment Time

- Large majority of sites with a full deployment (compile) time below 5 mn
- Good correlation between number of nodes and deployment time
  - A few strange exceptions (eg. LPSC)
Quattor Users

• Used by small teams (<5) in 2/3 of sites
• ¼ of sites without a Quattor expert on site
  – Rather positive than negative...
  – But the community must face the challenge

Number of users: 27% 36% 18% 14% 5%
Number of Experts: 50% 23% 23% 4% 36%

11/10/2010 Quattor Status Report
Type of Services

- gLite dominating but other significant usages
  - At almost every site
Configuration DB

• Vast majority using SCDB
  – CDB at Leuven?
• But a large interest for Aquilon

Considering Aquilon

- May be 10 53%
- Yes 2 10%
- No 7 37%
QWG Usage

• ¾ of sites using QWG
• QWG usage driven by gLite configuration
  – Includes OS configuration
• « OS only » site is also a gLite site managed by YAIM
  – Add YAIM support in QWG?
Management of VMs

- 80% of the sites use Quattor to configure VMs
- Mostly a few tens of VMs
  - Main exception: MS (2,5K)
  - CERN planning a few 100s
  - Golden images?
- 50+% of the sites are not using a VM Manager
  - Other = None?
  - But hypervisor-related QWG templates are not used
  - 1 request for KVM support
- All VMs managed separately
Initial Installation

• All used everywhere except CERN
  – A couple of sites who didn’t answer still use it only for that

• Sites using QWG handle file system partitioning using the standard templates

**Correlation QWG/AII**

- **Yes**: 15 sites
- **No**: 1 site

![Correlation Chart](chart.png)
Monitoring in QWG

- Current monitoring templates used by 30% of sites
  - Half of them contribute to the templates
- Almost 50% sites potentially interested
- No strict correlation between interest and use of QWG templates
Documentation

• Effort paid: majority of sites consider the documentation at least reasonable
• But the majority would also not rate it as good
• An area that we should focus on in the next months/years
  – Several suggestions/requests
Miscellaneous

• Several open questions about wishes and main issues
• Main complain remains the steep learning curve and the difficulty to get new people in
  – Difficulty to debug problems, trace variable used...
• Several wishes related to package deployment
  – Easily trace what is installed
  – Reduce the number of packages installed
  – Support for non-RPM packages
Monthly Meetings...

• A decision from the last meeting in Thessaloniki
  – Attempt to follow-up on actions decided at a workshop to increase our efficiency as a community
  – Discuss new needs
  – Have more collective decisions

• Succeeded to have 1 meeting every month since Bruxelles meeting
  – Held by video-conference (EVO)
  – Attended by 5-10 people, most of them regularly
  – Some progress on monitoring, still many actions requiring effort...
Some others may join in the future
It’s good not everybody willing to join...
Contributors

• A few new contributors to QWG
  – RAL (Ian/Derek), Strasbourg (Jérome)
  – Very few left so far...

• MS contributing new components
  – Still not a seamless process to integrate them on SourceForge

• Quattor still depends on a very limited number of persons
  – Despite Ohloh says we are 1 of the largest project in the world...!!! (http://www.ohloh.net/p/quattor)
  – Several of thems having other responsibilities
  – Enlarging the community is the main response
Conclusions

• The survey gives a comprehensive view of the Quattor community status
• Overall feedback is encouraging
  – Nobody saying he is about to abandon Quattor
• Room and suggestions for improvements
  – Need to use as efficiently as possible our limited effort
  – Monthly meeting is critical to plan and coordinate our work
• Enlarging the community remains the principal challenge to ensure Quattor’s future