

Attendance:

-----

Gilles, Cyril, Giuseppe, David, Helene, Tiziana, Steve

Apologies

-----

James, Christos, Joanna, Emir

Minutes

-----

- Giuseppe managed to set up a new broker and have it working Some communication

- GILDA gridmap view from Nagios: no more information

- Update from Christos on the Robot certificate issue:

Yesterday the issue with the robot certificates and the CERN CA was almost resolved. That means that we (EUGridPMA) came up with an accepted solution but we will have to wait a period of 2 weeks for comments from other PMAs (TAGPMA and APGridPMA).

After this period (or even during it) CERN CA should modify its policy in order to introduce the robot certificates. When this is done CERN CA will be able to issue the so long waited robot certificate for the monitoring service.

MRS/MDDDB/Central Nagios + Nagios@ROC

-----

David: new Nagios box moved to new hardware

3 new ROCs are deployed there (LA, Canada, IGALC) - done yesterday.

New release in the next few days including MyEGEE for Oracle.

ATP package including the ATP web with programmatic interface. PI is using J-Son format. Work will be done on packaging.

Tiziana raises an issue which has been discussed during last SA1 coordination meeting:

It is important that we have a validation component against which we can validate regional nagios instances. This central Nagios instance should be validated asap. Particularly important as we are getting closer to the end of the project. We should not validate regional instances only against the CERN one but again a central validation component.

David says there are no deadlines at the moment for replacing the CERN nagios by such a central component.

Helene raises the point that it seems we are heading towards a change of priorities. Priority was to validate Central Nagios and lead to alarm workflows with central Nagios first, then the regions. It may be easier from Nagios point of view to validate the regions only when we are sure that the central one is validated.

David agrees with Helene, this should be done in parallel. ROC nagios deployed at CERN is used to generate availabilities and make comparison to SAM in order to validate the system centrally. In the same time the ROCs that have deployed their own Nagios should compare with the central one.

For Helene, the point is that regional instances cannot go to production unless the central one is validated. We need timelines - when to tell regions to validate their regional nagios.

There have been some reports from France that some tests which have the same name in nagios and SAM produce different results when run in the same conditions.

David thinks there might be some misunderstanding - it might only have happened on non critical tests. It is suggested here that such reports should be sent to the nagios support mailing list (contact circulated) as soon as problems occur so that it can be investigated.

There will be some e-mail followup on that issue, and someone from SAM/Nagios will attend COD22 meeting next week.

#### Operations Portal - Regional Dashboard

Interoperations with nagios is not ready yet, because of major showstoppers exposed by Cyril:

- differences between results from SAM and Nagios (as per above)
- differences between nagios box in CERN and regional Nagios box in Italy
- links to the help and result details were not correct.
- ROC name missing in records

About regional discrepancies: Giuseppe asks whether there are there other ROCs with similar discrepancies. Apparently the UK one has the same problems.

Cyril hasn't received precise feedback on that from other ROCs, but probably because other ROCs have only checked whether the dashboard was working or not, and not especially looked at test discrepancies. As per above, feedback on Nagios issues in the dashboard should be reported to the Nagios mailing list - this has been circulated.

About the links issue: Romain and David are working on this so this one should be solved by next week.

The release of the regional dashboard package will be postponed until the central nagios is validated and once the integration with GOCDB4 is complete.

Helene: The show-stoppers raised from acceptance criteria of "dashboard" that clearly depends on the Nagios info source upstream at <https://forge.in2p3.fr/projects/opsportaluser/boards/show/8> Any update on this topic should be uploaded there directly or indirectly. Topics should be fixed before a new round of "acceptance criteria" can be issued to all federations - with CE/FR reporting at minimum

workplan, decisions on priorities should be re-assessed at next SA1 in Amsterdam.

GOCDB

-----

New model integrating unique identifiers is now in place on GOCDB4. The GOCDB4 based PI is ready for testing, it will have stable URLs so that anyone who starts migrating now won't have to change anything later on. The documentation is also ready, this will all be published and advertised later on today through the GOCDB-discussion and the OAT mailing lists.

The overall delay induced by the extra work of integrating unique identifiers in GOCDB4 is estimated to around 3 weeks.

APEL

----

The script to build ACL on the broker by getting Monboxes host DNs from GOCDB is under development

APEL certification: in the new procedure this is now up to the product team to certify their packages. APEL team is still trying to figure out how to do that. Apparently there is a need to install a certification testbed which requires much more time and effort than was expected. There might be some delays induced.

Tiziana says the new client could be useful to DGAS developers.

Gstat2

-----

Mail update from Joanna:

There is no significant update from GStat, and we are uniting our strengths to finish coding and release gstat2 official version around the end of January. If you need any more information in respect of gstat2, please feel free to let us know. Thank you all in advance.

NCG

---

Mail update from Emir:

right now I'm working with Christos and Konstantin on integrating security probes.

AOB

---

Next meeting: with COD-22 next week and All Activities meeting the week after, it has been decided not to fix any date for next meeting at the moment. This will be synchronised by e-mail.