



SMART MoU Targets (Initiation for the discussion)

Julia Andreeva , CERN, IT/GS

*WLCG 2009 Data-Taking Readiness Planning
Workshop , 14.11.2008*





MoU Targets

Do they well describe the real problems we face every day?

If not what do we do to make them more comprehensive and closer to real use cases?

Are they realistic in terms of time required for problem resolution (regarding experience we got so far)?

What do we do about measurements, automation of the reporting, etc...



Decisions taken so far



-GGUS is the instrument to use for logging of problem resolution process . People should use just and this system should keep all trouble was resolved and whether -MoU categories had to be added important GGUS tickets (team ar

T0

Raw data recording

Event reco or distribution of data to T1

Networking services to Tier-1 centres

All other tier-0 services

All other services

T1

Acceptance of data from the Tier-0 centre

Networking service to the Tier-0 centre

Data-intensive analysis services, including networking to T0,T1 centres outside data taking

All other services

T2

End user analysis facility

Other Services

**Are these categories comprehensive?
Don't they overlap?
Does a shifter can easily define which category the problem has to be allocated to?**

Looks like the answer is 'No' for all questions.



Do we want to change these categories?



Should not they be split following one consistent strategy, either by the functional blocks of the LHC workflow (raw data recording, reconstruction, T0 data distribution, T1 data acceptance, user analysis, etc...), or by critical services (Castor, batch system, SRM, network...)?

The mixture of functional block /service targets would be always confusing and people won't be able to decide to which one the problem should be allocated.

The second strategy assumes that we know the reason of problem from the very beginning (already submitting the ticket), which is not always the case.

In this respect the first choice looks more appropriate, but can it be defined in concrete terms so that categories won't overlap?

If we decide to change the categories they have to be consistent with MoU targets.



Targets for problem resolution

Are they realistic?



<i>Service</i>	<i>Maximum delay in responding to operational problems</i>			<i>Average availability² measured on an annual basis</i>	
	<i>Service interruption</i>	<i>Degradation of the capacity of the service by more than 50%</i>	<i>Degradation of the capacity of the service by more than 20%</i>	<i>During accelerator operation</i>	<i>At all other times</i>
Raw data recording	4 hours	6 hours	6 hours	99%	n/ a
Event reconstruction or distribution of data to Tier-1 Centres during accelerator operation	6 hours	6 hours	12 hours	99%	n/ a
Networking service to Tier-1 Centres during accelerator operation	6 hours	6 hours	12 hours	99%	n/ a
All other Tier-0 services	12 hours	24 hours	48 hours	98%	98%
All other services ¹ – prime service hours ⁴	1 hour	1 hour	4 hours	98%	98%
All other services ¹ – outwith prime service hours ⁴	12 hours	24 hours	48 hours	97%	97%



Examples from the last week



**19 Team tickets over last week.
Most from ATLAS related to Data transfer
Different sites
2 tickets are still open**

Split by MoU category:

Acceptance of data from Tier0 – 7 tickets

All other Tier0/1 services - 4 tickets

Other services – 4 tickets

End user analysis facility – 3 tickets

100 ? – 1 ticket

Most of tickets with “Other services” are submitted by the same shifter and are related to transfer. Just a good example that people are not sure to which category the problem should be allocated and chose the one which would match everything.

Time to resolve the problem varies from few minutes to several days, even for the very critical category like ‘Acceptance of data from Tier0’.



Social aspects



If we want people to use the system (and as a consequence have a good track of what is going on) - the system should be easy to use and effective

A lot of improvements done in GGUS in this respect (team/alarm tickets)

Good idea to integrate it with shifter displays (ATLAS Dashboard shifter UIs)

Still sometime it is bypassed. Try to setup some discipline. Maria started to attend 3 o'clock meetings and check that all reported problems are reported via GGUS as well. Links to the submitted tickets are added to the WLCG Daily Meetings twiki.



Measurements and automation of the reporting



Suppose we have well defined comprehensive MoU targets, are we able to measure that they are met and create complete and reliable reports?

Just looking in the GGUS data, it seems that we have all necessary information in the GGUS DB (problem description, information about site, VO, submitter, all important time stamps, MoU mapping)

There is a room for improvement for visualization. Add graphics showing distribution of tickets by MoU category, VO, site, urgency, time required for problem resolution.

Clickable plots might be very handy to provide first global overview with the possibility to dig in and provide more detailed data up to a concrete ticket content.

Generating of reports following the management requirements.

But the main point here is whether we have necessary data in GGUS data base and the answer is “YES”



Backup slide. Team Tickets of the last week.



Search parameters: [Special attributes:Team-Tickets; Timeframe:lastweek; Order by:Ticket-ID (desc);]

19 Tickets found

Ticket-ID	Type	Virt. Org.	Resp. Unit	Status	Date	Last Update	Info
43344	Team	atlas	ROC_France	verified	2008-11-07	2008-11-07 11:04	Atlas jobs failing at IN2P3-CC
43363	Team	atlas	ROC_SW	verified	2008-11-07	2008-11-10 13:51	File transfers are failing at UAM
43366	Team	atlas	VOSupport	assigned	2008-11-07	2008-11-10 14:49	Validation jobs are failing at CERN-UNVALID with e...
43399	Team	atlas	ROC_SW ▶ show assigned persons	verified	2008-11-08	2008-11-10 14:17	File transfers are failing at IFIC-LCG2
43400	Team	atlas	ROC_SW ▶ show assigned persons	verified	2008-11-08	2008-11-10 13:31	File transfers are failing because of the error a...
43401	Team	atlas	ROC_CE ▶ show assigned persons	verified	2008-11-08	2008-11-10 14:22	File transfers are failing CYFRONET-LCG2_DATADISK...
43404	Team	atlas	ROC_North ▶ show assigned persons	assigned	2008-11-08	2008-11-10 12:03	Problem transferring one ATLAS file from NDGF to Ly...
43411	Team	cms	ROC_SW ▶ show assigned persons	verified	2008-11-09	2008-11-09 14:01	CMS Transfers from CERN to PIC failing since Sat N...
43428	Team	atlas	ROC_DECH	verified	2008-11-10	2008-11-10 10:29	No valid proxy at LRZ LMU
43443	Team	atlas	ROC_Asia/Pacific	verified	2008-11-10	2008-11-13 08:46	EXEPANDA_DQ2_STAGEIN errors at Taiwan-LCG2
43450	Team	atlas	ROC_Asia/Pacific	solved	2008-11-10	2008-11-12 16:06	Problem transferring ATLAS files from CERN to ASGC
43458	Team	atlas	ROC_CERN	solved	2008-11-10	2008-11-11 17:22	Problem with PYTHONPATH on CERN grid queues
43477	Team	atlas	ROC_North	solved	2008-11-11	2008-11-11 12:04	Problem delivering ATLAS data to SARA from T0 and ...
43495	Team	atlas	ROC_Italy	solved	2008-11-12	2008-11-13 10:17	Problem delivering ATLAS data to CNAF (STORM)
43511	Team	atlas	ROC_DECH	solved	2008-11-12	2008-11-13 10:12	EXEPANDA_DQ2PUT_FLECOPYERROR error at FZK-LCG2_DA...
43541	Team	atlas	ROC_SW ▶ show assigned persons	solved	2008-11-12	2008-11-12 16:35	Permission problem in one ATLAS directory at PIC.
43558	Team	atlas	ROC_Italy	solved	2008-11-12	2008-11-13 09:51	Problem delivering ATLAS data at CNAF (STORM)
43596	Team	atlas	ROC_France	solved	2008-11-13	2008-11-13 14:31	Trouble getting files from Lyon
43601	Team	atlas	ROC_North ▶ show assigned persons	verified	2008-11-13	2008-11-13 16:47	FTS errors at SARA cloud