

080612-Operations Automation Team

12 June 2008

10:01

Date and Location -----

12 June 2008

10:00 - 11:00

Attendees -----

James, John Shade, Guiseppe, Marcin, Kai, Angela, Guillaume, Joanna, Cyril, Emir, Antun, Gilles

Apologies:

Ronald

Subject -----

Operations Automation Team weekly phonecon

Agenda:

- * Section 8 - System Management tools
- * Network monitoring (Guillaume)
- * Accounting (Meeting @ RAL in July ?)
- * AOB
 - Availability/Reliability

Minutes

Guiseppe: Future operational model. We aren't the right body to decide this.

James: I agree. It should be the management that proposes it, but they haven't. We have to put a strawman proposal.

Giuseppe: I agree. Will try and write something on this for next week.

Sharing System Management tools

James: If anyone is interested in holding this area of the OAT.

Angela: I'm interested, but not alone.

James: Ronald expressed similar interest by mail. We'll try and put together a small group.

Network Monitoring

[Responding to issue from last weeks meeting]

Guillaume: Don't see any main reasons why we should devolve DownCollector.

James: Scalability and network connectivity are the 2 main issues.

Guillaume: current do 2K nodes, can handle 4K nodes. For connectivity, have tried with 2 distinct systems, but it's hard to integrate the results.

James: We should at least write the justification

Guillaume: Currently we have no reports - could use the same reporting framework to do network reports.

James: Yes.

Guiseppe: Devolving would be a good thing, unless it's not necessary for a ROC.

James: No reason that a ROC can't run the tests as well.

Cyril: My aim was to use DownCollector for the grid monitoring tools.

James: You think it's more useful for the operation staff?

Cyril: Yes. If we have nagios at site/roc then we probably can use it at central operations

ACTION : Emir/Guillaume: Write 10.2.3- Why DownCollector is there, why it's architecture is what it is, who uses it.

Summary: DownCollector replicates network tests done at ROC at a central level. Can be useful for grid operators as a check when a site is down. Used for Network Quality Monitoring by e.g. ENOC team.

Accounting

We should add a section for this (and configuration management in chapter 10). Just state the general architecture of devolution, and say we'll come up with a concrete plan later.

Meeting at RAL in July.

- Guiseppe to check dates for meeting with DGAS people.

Availability/Reliability

Currently you can see in Gridview, value of details + metrics. This is the raw data. It does not take in the site admin view. This is important since currently there is still errors at central level which is not removed.

Pre-report allows sites to comment, and validated by ROC. This should be taken into account during availability calculation.

James: If this improves the quality of the data, it's a good thing.

John: If there's a central problem, and some ROCs take it and some don't then it skews the numbers.

Marcin: We need a way to put in 'central monitoring failures'.

James: Another related concept is to have multiple calculations in Gridview. So a ROC could have their own calculation

Marcin: Also thresholds should be there (which can be different per site). Perhaps not all in the central Gridview?

James: We've been talking about perhaps having regional instances of Gridview.

AOB

Guiseppe: Emir, what are the non-production services in the GOCDB/BDII proposal

Emir: resources that are local, not for whole level. And test services.

Guiseppe: Are you planning to integrate local and grid monitoring

Emir: It's an information system discussion, not monitoring.

Guiseppe: Just wanted to know if both information would be available for a local monitoring system...

Emir: Yes

Next Meeting: Thur 19th June 10AM CEST