

Operations procedures

Maite Barroso

OCC, CERN

Maite.Barroso.Lopez@cern.ch

12 June 2007

Motivation:

- Operation procedures are evolving slowly based on demand of users for a better service
- These demands will only increase: availability, reliability, clear information about interventions, etc
- The existing ones are not always followed...
 - (not announced) Transparent interventions that are not always so transparent
 - Too many broadcasts
- We want to hear direct feedback from sites: how could we improve it? Have they implemented sth at their sites that we can globally use?

Questions sent to the sites

- tools used in daily grid operations
- what features are missing to make your work easier
- examples of the most frequent scheduled interventions at your site
- examples of the most frequent unscheduled interventions at your site
- points to improve in communication with ROC, other sites, Vos, rest of the world...
- How do you plan deployment of updates/new versions so continuous production is not interrupted?
- Communication with users: how are you informed about operational problems at your site reported by local/remote users?
Mail/GGUS/phone/other?
- Correlation of cross-site issues: is the operations meeting enough for this?
How do you do it otherwise?
- What percentage of real site problems are detected and reported by central monitoring (SAM, COD) before you know about them?
- usefulness of the following operations bodies/meetings and suggestions to improve them: -
 - COD
 - your ROC support team
 - operations meeting

- Sites:
 - LIP-Lisbon, SWE, Mario David
 - CY-01-KIMON, SEE ROC, Kyriacos Neocleous
 - FZK-LCG2, DECH ROC, Clemens Koerd
 - NIKHEF-ELPROD, NE, Ronald Starink
 - CYFRONET-LCG2, CE, Marcin Radecki
 - GRIF, France ROC, MICOUT Pierrick
 - CERN-PROD, CERN ROC, Olof Barring
 - JP-KEK-CRC-01 and JP-KEK-CRC-02, AP ROC, Go Iwai
 - CNAF-T1, ROC Italy, Daniele Cesini
- WLCG
- Round table