

## **1. SA1 TASKS/SUBTASKS AS DEFINED AT THE BEGINNING OF EGEE III**

### **TSA1.1: Grid Management**

- Monitoring and enforcement of Service Level Agreements
- Application – Resource Provider Coordination. The Resource Allocation Group is co-chaired by NA4 and SA1

### **TSA1.2: Grid operations and support**

- Grid Operator on Duty (Coordination + Regional contributions)
- Oversight and management of Grid operations
- Pre-production service
- Middleware deployment and support:
- Interoperations – local, regional, international
- Monitoring tools to support Grid operations. This includes any effort to develop and/or support grid operations tools. The operations Automation group effort is also included here.
  - SAM
  - GOCDB
  - CIC
  - Gstat
  - Grid Accounting
- Operations requirement collection and follow up

### **TSA1.3: Support to VOs, Users, Applications**

- User support: It includes the user support model and procedures, GGUS management and tools, and TPM

### **TSA1.4: Grid security**

All coordinated under a single general task

- A security team responsible for coordinating all aspects of operational security, including responding to security incidents,
- A team dealing with security vulnerabilities in the middleware and deployment,
- Responsibility for developing and maintaining the Security Policy and procedures jointly with other Grids
- Ensuring the continued existence of a federated identity trust domain, and encouraging the integration of national or community based authentication-authorisation schemes.

### **TSA1.5: Activity Management**

## 2. AREAS OF WORK FOR THE SECOND YEAR

- **Complete/clean/organize operations process, policy and procedure documents in all SA1 areas, to ensure that it reflects current practices. Identify responsible areas for each of them, so it can be mapped to the associated EGI responsibility**
  - o Responsible: Diana Bosio, CERN
  - o New milestone to have it ready in PM 19 (November 2009)
- **Complete the implementation of the messaging system**
  - o Responsible: OAT, James Casey, CERN
  - o PM13 (May 2009): Together with NA4 and JRA1, define an API to support operations, application and potentially middleware (e.g. FTS, L&B) messaging requirements that can be supported by the messaging system, can be wrapped to provide a compatibility library for existing RGMA users (if needed) and satisfies current and short term needs of the broader EGEE development community.
  - o PM 14 (June 2009): Develop a firm plan to remove RGMA as a dependency within the operations infrastructure. NB: all operations tools will use a single messaging infrastructure to simplify support burdens.
- **Define and document all operation tool interfaces**
  - o Responsible: OAT, James Casey, CERN
  - o PM 15 (July 2009) Document the interfaces currently being used by operations to integrate with the NGIs (includes GGUS interface to regional helpdesks)
- **Ensure that operations tools are exportable from their current environments and are shown to be deployable and work by other operations teams**
  - o This includes repository for the code, packaging, support/maintenance channels (mailing list, savannah, etc), documentation
  - o Responsible: OAT, James Casey, CERN
  - o Milestones: the OAT ones, M1, M2, M3. This is a pre-requirements to roll-out the regional tools to the regions
- **Metrics: implement operation metrics as defined in MSA1.3 plus portal to view all of them (NGI dashboard)**
  - o Plan with changes required in different areas already done by OAT
  - o Involves most operation tools (and GGUS)
  - o Responsible: CESGA, coordinated through the OAT

- Milestone?
- **Decommission COD and migrate 1<sup>st</sup> line support to the regions, with limited or no central effort (C-COD max 1 FTE according to central tasks in EGI Blueprint)**
  - Responsible: Helene Cordier, IN2P3
  - All ROCs doing R-COD by PM 20 (December 2009)
- **Define new model for rolling out grid middleware to the production infrastructure, adapted to the NGI needs and to the new EGI/UMD mw scenario.**
  - Responsible: Antonio Retico, CERN
  - Migrate present PPS/roll out model to the new one; document process, role and responsibilities. PM18 (October 2009)
- **Define and implement metrics to measure the availability of all operation tools**
  - Responsible: all operation tool teams, coordinated by OAT, James Casey, CERN
  - Milestones: M3 of the OAT?

### 3. GENERAL PRIORITIES FOR THE SECOND YEAR

#### For operation tools

- Priority to have solid, widely deployed solutions before the end of the year. Anything not in this condition by October 2009 will have to be integrated into the EGI plans. According to the OAT plan this includes:
  - OAT M1 features, April 2009
    - Report in June F2F at CERN on where we are with it
  - OAT M2 features, July 2009
    - Report at SA1 F2F in September
  - OAT M3 features, October 2009
- I think the timelines are aggressive/optimistic, so, counting some delay and some time to deploy it in production, the plan ends there.
- General priorities for operation tools:
  - Document interfaces to NGIs (the ones implemented at the OAT M2 release; from then, ensure that all milestones document/update the interfaces)

- Use messaging system
  - Finish tools to support the R-COD model (regional monitoring plus regional dashboard)
  - Metric implementation
- The rest is low priority; things will be stopped if these priorities are not met
- **Deployment priorities for ROCs/sites**
  - Grid mw:
    - CREAM CE
    - What else? List to be completed
  - Operation tools
    - Regional monitoring (Nagios)
    - All sites to have a solid site monitoring solution in place by the end of the year (site nagios is the reference one)
    - The rest of the distributed tools are optional
    - Publish required data according to defined interfaces

### **Areas with low priority:**

The ones that in the EGI model are described to be fully under NGI responsibility:

- Interoperation with national and regional Grids: this is a task that it is already done by individual partners with loose communication and no coordination. I see no benefit in keeping it under SA1 funding.
- Any effort in operations tools not aligned with the OAT
- Isolated regional testing/certification of mw releases; if you want to account this under SA1 effort, share your effort with the community