

## Open Action Items from SA1 Coordination

New action items should be added directly in the SA1ActionItemsDB. There are comments on the page to describe how to do this.

<i>ID</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Creation Date</i>	<i>Due date</i>	<i>Sub</i>
	Action on all ROCs to check gstat2 storage numbers with sites	2009-12-03	2010-02-15	Main.Ma
	Action on GGUS to investigate the site support metrics defined in the SLA. Draft implementation plan by the end of October.			
000047	20091103 Update by Maria. Implementation date is the end Nov. GGUS release. Specifications in <a href="https://savannah.cern.ch/support/?110706">https://savannah.cern.ch/support/?110706</a> 01/12/2009: pending on Maite to have a look at the proposal and give feedback 16/03/2010: ongoing implementation	2009-09-24	2009-10-30	Main.Ma
000058	prepare a procedure to deal with most urgent vulnerabilities, including timelines to start suspending sites, so this can be easily enforced by ROCs.	2009-11-18	2009-11-30	Main.Ma

This was discussed at the EGEE PMB level, with the following conclusion:

SUMMARY: it is the PMB who decides the timeline to start suspending sites. In previous critical vulnerabilities, it was set to 7 days.

The PMB considers the security of the infrastructure as of paramount to the operation and reputation of the project. The potential damage that such vulnerabilities could cause to the infrastructure both in terms of loss of service and the damaging publicity were of great concern to the PMB.

The project has mandated the Grid Security Officer to work with the ROC Security Contacts (as well as the JSPG and GSVG) to pro-actively manage security policy and its operational implementation. The use of the security monitoring tool to mimic normal user site access patterns and to discover non-intrusively the host configuration information in order to infer potential site vulnerabilities was fully supported by the PMB. The PMB was disappointed that despite the established and agreed operational structures, sites were slow in responding, or refused to perform the necessary routine systems maintenance.

All sites are reminded that there is an established policy and procedure that allows a site to be suspended **in general** if the site is deemed to pose an immediate threat for the infrastructure. This is stated in the Grid Site Operations Security Policy (<https://edms.cern.ch/file/819783/2/GridSiteOperationsPolicy-v1.4a.pdf>):

"When notified by the Grid of software patches and updates required for security and stability, you shall, as soon as reasonably possible in the circumstances, apply these to your systems. Other patches and updates should be applied following best practice.

[...]

The Grid may control your access to the Grid for administrative, operational and security purposes and remove your resource information from resource information systems if you fail to comply with these conditions."

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

The federation representative of the PMB are following up within their own regions to understand why their sites were not immediately patched. However, the PMB noted that if the fix has not been installed at a particular site by a given deadline then the PMB reserves the right to remove the offending site from the EGEE production infrastructure in accordance with the established security policy. As the Grid Security Officer we ask you to inform the sites of these issues and as part of the site access agreement, the sites are mandated to follow these instructions or their access to the infrastructure could be curtailed.

We are now approach the deadline for addressing the vulnerability that raised this issue. If, following circulation of this notice, sites are still after 7 days exhibiting these vulnerabilities, please work with the ROC Security Contacts to curtail access of these sites to the infrastructure or ensure that there is a clear upgrade plan in place to eliminate these vulnerabilities.

000118	Maite to check with Spanish NGI if there are any significant issues for the transition, regarding O-E-2.	2010-04-20	2010-04-27	Nick.Th
000119	James will get information on the process for including uncertified sites into the regional Nagios instances. He will then work with Vera to get this information into the operations procedures document.	2010-04-20	2010-05-04	Nick.Th
000120	All ROCs to give details on how many sites still need 32 bit middleware, which middleware services they need this for and how many worker nodes the sites has.	2010-04-20	2010-04-27	Nick.Th
000121	Check on the status of the DPM bug with regard to Gstat 2.	2010-04-20	2010-04-27	Nick.Th
000122	Give feedback on the updated version of the EGI VO Management specifications.	2010-04-20	2010-04-27	Nick.Th
000562	Steve and ROCs to find a few representative sites to understand what the main issues are with the storage installed capacity published in gstat, work with them to solve them, and document the solutions (if relevant). After that, we will re-discuss it here to involve all sites. 01/12/2009: all ROCs to check Gstat2 published capacity with their sites	2009-07-28	2009-08-30	Main.Ma

## Closed Action Items from SA1 Coordination

Show Closed Action Items  Hide Closed Action Items

<i>ID</i>	<b>Description</b>
000043	Action in all ROCs to include the SLA agreement as part of the site certification process on their procedures.
000044	Action on OAT deployment (James and Nick): provide a set of milestones to achieve decision 1. It should include detailed dates for remaining developments to be finished (central dashboard interfaced to Nagios, availability etc), deployment testing by some regions, and releases. 01/12/2009: need further discussion
000046	Action on OAT deployment of providing a draft schedule to the regions on what is expected from them to roll Decision 1 in production. 01/12/2009: need further discussion
000048	Action on OAT deployment to publish checklist for release of operations tools, including packaging, documentation repositories, licensing and wide testing BEFORE it is released. 01/12/2009: checklist updated, this action can be closed
000049	request change of name of HEPSPC06 benchmark.

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

Update 20/10/2009: request made to Hepix, proposal to change it to SPEC-CPP06

Update 03/11/2009: Hepix did not agree to the change of name

Clarify site state transitions, including difference between suspended and uncertified.

000050 Mail sent to Helene to find out if this is already documented somewhere.

01/12/2009: clarified today, this action can be closed

Review document describing functions and responsibilities of new ROCs,

000051 <http://indico.cern.ch/getFile.py/access?sessionId=7&resId=0&materialId=2&confId=71024>

03/11/2009: no feedback received

Notify ROC managers of the outcome of the Gilda discussion at the security meeting on Thursday 22nd October

Done by Dave and Romain:

2. Gilda (training) security issues

Romain reported on the EGEE plans to integrate the Gilda training resources into the production infrastructure. There have been several e-mail threads on this. The issues were discussed earlier this week at the SA1 operations meeting. Romain reported that many concerns were raised about this and not just security-related ones.

The security concerns include the fact that the Gilda CA does not have robust enough identity vetting procedures and is not accredited by IGTF.

Gilda has a separate VO which has been registered with EGEE and one suggested approach has been to leave it and decide to support the Gilda VO and to also trust the Gilda CA. The sites would then have to agree to take on an

000052 SCG discussed the security issues at some length and concluded that:

a. The risks are more complex than individual sites agreeing to take on the associated risks. Any risks associated with Gilda work running at EGEE production sites potentially threatens the whole infrastructure.

b. SCG is very concerned that EGEE procedures have allowed the Gilda VO (which violates currently adopted policies) to be officially registered. SCG recommends that the Gilda VO should not be registered with EGEE. NGIs handle training at the national level and already have a local training CA. Perhaps this would be the best way to follow?

c. SCG strongly recommends that Gilda certificates should not be issued online without appropriate identity vetting of the applicant.

d. The Gilda Portal should meet the requirements of the recently adopted VO Portal Policy.

000059 - Propose plan to migrate to HEPSPEC06

Done, proposed and agreed at SA1 coordination meeting 19/01/2010

CIC dashboard team, James and Maite to finalize the plan to deliver a central dashboard interfaced to Nagios,

000060 documenting dependencies in testing and deployment, and acceptance criteria

01/12/2009: done, can be closed

000061 Maite to inform NA4 about EGEE CREAM-CE deployment decisions

01/12/2009: done

000062 XXX to follow up on CREAM CE test failures to improve the situation in production

01/12/2009: excellent work done by the CCOD team, this can be closed

000063 Nick to publish EGEE service baseline list

Done: <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/SupportedServiceVersions>

000075 Action on Michaela to make the agreed changes to the suspended/uncertified state proposal as discussed today

Done

000076 Action to summarize the Gilda proposal as agreed today, and distribute it to ROC managers and EGEE managers

04/12/2009: summary sent to ROC managers

000077 Action on Nick to document and publish the procedure to enforce the EGEE baseline with ROCs and sites

Done, see:

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

<https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/EGEE/SupportedServiceVersions>

<https://edms.cern.ch/document/985325/1>

Find dates and location for next F2F SA1 coordination meeting, if possible, colocated with the other SA1 meetings (OAT, COD, etc)

UPDATE 13/01/09: Propose to have next face-to-face SA1 meeting in June at CERN. Can't have it with COD  
000339 Finland in June as EGEE review rehearsals and review itself are in June.

Proposing to have it some time during week of 8th – 12th of June at CERN. Maite will send out proposed dates to Managers.

UPDATE 03/02/09: Meeting will be on June 9th at CERN.

000340 Propose one site per ROC to deploy a CREAM CE as proposed by Antonio Retico in slide 7 of his presentation  
16/12/08 to the SA1 coordination meeting. Please, send a mail to [antonio.retico@cern.ch](mailto:antonio.retico@cern.ch) with contact information.

UPDATE 19/05/09:

Maite received a detailed list from Antonio. The meeting decided this action can be closed.

WLCG milestone requires all sites with CREAM CEs installed to declare them beginning of June.

UPDATE 19/02/09:

Production grid: 17 nodes --> I propose to close this action and open one for the missing ROCs

\* (UK-Ireland)

\* RAL

1: 1000.gridpp.rl.ac.uk

1: 2000.gridpp.rl.ac.uk

1: 3000.gridpp.rl.ac.uk

1: 700.gridpp.rl.ac.uk

2: 500.gridpp.rl.ac.uk

\* (Russia)

\* RU-Protvino-IHEP

3: ce0004.m45.ihep.su

\* (Asia Pacific)

\* KR-KISTI-GCRT-01

3: ce01.sdfarm.kr

\* IN-DAE-VECC-01

3: gridce01.tier2-kol.res.in

3: gridce02.tier2-kol.res.in

\* (Central Europe)

\* HEPHY-UIBK

3: test-lcgCE.uibk.ac.at

\* (France)

\* ESRF

4: grid-ce02.esrf.eu

\* (South East Europe)

\* HG-02-IASA

20: cream-ce01.marie.hellasgrid.gr

\* (South West Europe)

\* PIC

1: ppsce02.pic.es

1: ppsce03.pic.es

1: ce-test.pic.es

\* (Germany-Switzerland)

\* FZK-LCG2

48: cream-1-fzk.gridka.de

\* GSI

1: grid29.gsi.de

UPDATE 17/02/09:

Mail will be sent (by whom?) to all ROCs to get update. Alexander confirmed that Russia have a CREAM CE installed.

UPDATE 03/02/09:

Italy update: starting today the installation

APROC update: no response. Last interaction recorded by Antonio: timeline requested on January 20, no reply

SEE update: in Greece, progress but no news, will be ready by next week

Nordic: working according to plan.

Benelux update: working according to plan.

UKI update: Antonio is in contact with the site

SWE: Antonio is in the loop. We are deploying in pre-production, when successful will install it in production.

FR: Nothing changed from last time

CE: scheduled installation, will be ready in 2 weeks

RUSSIA: agreement reached, one site will install it. Will update you later this week on which site and by when installed.

UPDATE 13/01/09: Which ROCs are proposing to install and CREAM CE?

- Italy: Intend to have production instance at tier-1 site within next 2 weeks.
- Asia Pacific: (no response)
- SEE: Planning to install at least one in next couple of weeks.
- Nordic: Will be at least 1 month for KTH. Due to lack of staff.
- Benelux: We plan to install a CREAM CE on febr. 12 and 13.
- UK: 2 being installed but not working yet.
- SWE: Setting one up at PIC now. Other sites waiting for ICE WMS.
- France: Planning to have it in March but site admin is now off sick for 2 months, so unsure.
- CE: No decision which site but decision to be made Monday 19 Jan.
- Russia: (no response)

UPDATE: 5 May 09:

Antonio checked several days ago to see how many CREAM queues are available in prod. 40 for ALICE, 10 for

Italy: Installed. 1 in prod on Turin

• AP: (not present)

• SEE: (not present)

• SWE: 3 CREAM CEs: 2 in PPS (but published in production), 1 in production (but only supports OPS and d

• France: In progress

• CE: 1 installed

• Russia: 1 installed

• UK/I: at least one installed

• SEE: at least one installed

• Benelux: One at SARA

- NE: not sure

UPDATE: 19 May 09:

Maite will upload the document received by Antonio R. and close this action.

Definition of core services: distribute the list of core services per region, so it is analyzed by Helene, Maite, Nick (ROC representative); they should clean them, and distribute the proposal to the ROCs.

000341 UPDATE 13/01/09: In progress.

UPDATE: 17/02/09: Not needed any more. Gilles announced that confusing "Core" flag will be removed in G soon as coordination with CIC portal is done (after Catania).

Definition of core services: check the list of core services in your region, to be distributed by Gilles & co, and feedback about it

000342 UPDATE 13/01/09: List isn't ready yet. Will distribute the list before the next meeting.

UPDATE: 17/02/09 Linked to 341 and closed.

Site suspension: Maite to distribute the proposal agreed at the SA1 coordination meeting, 16/12/08; Helene and Nick to comment

000343 UPDATE 13/01/09: The proposal given by Maite will be tried for 3 months and re-evaluated at that point. Also will include a comment that the ROC of the problematic site can request that the OCC gets involved earlier than the proposed process. All cases of site suspension that require the intervention of the OCC will be reported in the Quarterly Report.

Make a proposal for a better coordination of regional certification after the releases, so more sites can profit from information

000344 UPDATE 13/01/09: Maite will get an update from Antonio.

UPDATE: 17/01/09: this was discussed at last meeting, together with the post-mortem of releases:

<http://indico.cern.ch/getFile.py/access?sessionId=8&resId=1&materialId=0&confId=44167>

The action can be closed.

Review and give comments to the "Proposal for a process for retiring obsolete services and old versions of services"

000345 <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=44163>

UPDATE 13/01/09: No further comments were received so it is considered approved.

Propose the list of versions to be supported for the mw clients

UPDATE 13/01/09: Nick has been discussing with various interested groups. He will send out a list of the mw clients that SA1 should support. The list can then be modified as required.

000346

UPDATE 03/02/09: Nick will send the related document to the ROC managers list asap

UPDATE 17/02/09: Nick will send the related document to the ROC managers list ASAP

UPDATE 05/05/09: Done several weeks ago. Close.

First draft of regional operations model for each ROC ready

000347 UPDATE 13/01/09: In progress. Note deadline is End Of Jan! Would be very useful to have this in time for All Activities meeting - please can all ROCs get this information to Maite several days before the All Activities meeting if at all possible.

000366

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

Need to decide what metrics will be needed for the new seed resources (e.g what is available, what is being used per site, etc.). Also, need to identify if these metrics can already be measured or if modifications to the tools are

UPDATE 03/02/09: some progress, but nothing ready yet. Maite asked for a draft to be sent the ROC managers as possible.

UPDATE 17/02/09: Maite will evaluate document and distribute it.

UPDATE 05/05/09: Draft has now got comments from RAG. Close to version for ROC managers to review.

UPDATE 19/05/09: New requirement to be added:

- A check in the metrics on the number of jobs and CPU usage **outside** seed resources (if any)
- To measure whether the VOs in a period of more than 6 months do start using the production infrastructure or their own resources.

Tracking of the deployment of the ROC NAGIOS instances.

UPDATE 03/02/2009:

CE: done; SEE: done it; France: we have nobody assigned to it, and have no effort for it currently as we have some problems; UK: one site has a local instance, we are looking into deployment it for the ROC; Italy: installation DECH: we tried to install it, but we have a problem. We cannot complete the configuration with YAIM.

UPDATE 17/02/09:

000370 Steve will provide a status. Kai confirmed that SWE have a regional Nagios. Shu-Ting said AP also have one. France will also have one (for dashboard testing).

UPDATE 18/05/2009:

From Wen Mei (ROC\_DECH): We have ROC NAGIOS installed, upgrade to the latest version. The Yaim component is able to be completed and the Nagios based ROC DECH monitoring is running. All the sites and VOs are monitoring and are checking all the available services found by the Nagios probes. We had problem to create and retrieve MySQL credential and the problem has been fixed now.

This can be closed. to be continued through the OAT.

Comment on the proposal for Grid Configuration Data, as discussed at the SA1 coordination meeting on Feb 3

UPDATE 17/02/09:

\* Not all are on the OAT discussion list. James said "we're still debating" (about GOCDB vs Information System). IS approach is a good idea, but might be too late. We need estimations on how much effort would each option require and who would do it (not clear in the IS case)

UPDATE 5/5/09:

000372 \* Technical discussions at OAT F2F week between Gilles + Laurence. Have worked out the similarities between GOCDB and GLUE information models. Work is now on BDII side to expose the information that could be merged into the GOCDB. From Gilles :

Any info to insert in a regional GOCDB will then be inserted from a defined XML format, no matter whether it comes from a web interface, another GOCDB, an external tool or a siteBDII.

Potentially the only work needed to move towards a solution where sites publish their endpoints or downtimes in their sBDII would be on your side... in the sense that it would require:

- a separated branch for storing this info in Glue at Site level
- a publisher that formats this info into the defined XML expected by GOCDB

UPDATE 11/06/09: no further feedback received. The action can be closed.

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

Send to the ROC managers a list of services which are not yet catered for in the managed roll out of new releases

- 000373 UPDATE 17/02/09:  
\* Antonio to send a file. Related to 344 and should be closed  
Identify one site per service for the managed roll out of new releases
- 000374 UPDATE 17/02/09:  
Collapse into previous one (373).  
Roadmap summary for regionalisation of operations in 2009
- UPDATE 03/02/2009: the schedule for Helene will be available in a document which will be available in the next two weeks.
- 000375 UPDATE 17/02/09: DECH & Russia input still missing (but may be in back-log of Helene's mails).
- UPDATE 05/05/09: Entry date of last 4 ROCs June 15. They need to give feedback by 11 May. Close.
- 000376 Roadmap summary for regionalisation of operations in 2009  
Roadmap summary for regionalisation of operations in 2009.
- 000377 UPDATE 03/02/2009: we are ready, but we need the possibility to have some special implementation for our ROC, for instance to have per country view. We need to discuss the implementation details with Helene  
Operations manual: Recommendation to separate the process from its implementation through the tools in next version so it is easier to maintain and it is not tool-dependent.
- 000416 UPDATE 05/05/09: In progress.  
This is done in the most recent version, released on 18th September 2009, and available here:  
<https://edms.cern.ch/document/840932>  
Read UMD and staged roll out documents
- 000417 UPDATE 05/05/09: See discussion in this meeting's minutes.
- UPDATE 11/06/09: Discussed at several meetings and at the F2F meeting. This can be closed.
- 000418 UKI, SE, DE-CH, RU to get in contact with Helene to provide names for starting the R-COD  
Create a document describing the new model for the TPM in year 2 of EGEE III.
- 000488 Done, stored in <https://edms.cern.ch/document/1000210/> and sent to Maite and ggus-info@cern.NOSPAMPL  
09/06/2009: this was discussed at the F2F meeting at CERN
- 000489 All ROCs to describe how they see the TPM working within their region in the second year of EGEE III.  
09/06/2009: this was discussed at the F2F meeting at CERN
- 000490 In the document titled "Changes to the EGEE III DoW for Year II", in the table on operations tools, clarify that the entry  
is referring to the OAT M3 milestone.
- 000491 In the document titled "Changes to the EGEE III DoW for Year II", in the table on operations tools, in the "Notes" column, for the Operations Portal, clarify the meaning of "Provide a regional view."
- All ROCs to review the Installed Capacity document(  
[https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/pub/LCG/WLCGCommonComputingReadinessChallenges/WLCG\\_GlueSchemaUserGuide](https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/pub/LCG/WLCGCommonComputingReadinessChallenges/WLCG_GlueSchemaUserGuide))  
and raise any objections before 2 June.  
No objections raised.
- 000493 All ROCs to review and give comments on milestone MSA 1.9  
11/06/09: this is now done.  
Define messaging deployment scenario based on early experience, matching scale needed and regional needs.
- 000516 By next F2F meeting, so regions can plan HW and expertise  
Done at the SA1 F2F meeting in Barcelona.
- 000517

## SA1\_CoordinationTasks < EGEE < TWiki

Define C-COD model to be prototyped in next 3 months (who will do it, how many FTEs)

Discussed at SA1 coordination meeting, <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=63028>

Define Key Performance Indicators for R-COD

- Format similar to MSA1.3, seed resources metrics, etc

000518 - To be automated and displayed by the related tools/teams

Done. first results shown at the F2F meeting in EGEE09:

<http://indico.cern.ch/getFile.py/access?sessionId=13&resId=0&materialId=2&confId=67238>

000519 discuss with SA3 and JRA1 to define an implementation to the "production repository always consistent" requirement

This requirement is moved to the staged rollout discussions, being followed up by Antonio Retico

000520 Discuss and agree mw support with product teams/mw providers so it is properly staffed in the (near) future

**CENTRALLY COORDINATED FEW (2-3) FULL-TIME TPM TEAMS**

Refine and put in place the agreed TPM model in Y2:

- More automation in ticket assignment to regions

- Role of the central TPM teams: ticket assignment (of the few not automatically routed), escalation, monitoring

Update for 2009-06-30 meeting (Maria):

new TPM model updated to reflect the decision of the f2f SA1 mgmt meeting of 2009-06-09.

- More automation will be evaluated later as the number of tickets the TPM gets are only about 35 per week.

Work item on this is savannah #108496

- Role of the central TPM teams should be in the updated OLA.

If 'central TPM teams' refers to 'central coordination tasks', these will be in section 6 of the User Support strategy

Central coordination tasks are:

a.continuous training

b.documentation update

c.intervention on tickets being late or misrouted

d.ticket monitoring, analysis and reporting to the relevant project management bodies.

Update for 2009-09-01 meeting (Maria):

The following was sent to USAG, ROC-managers, TPM and VOs' mailing list on 2009-07-09:

000521 "We need the following actions done before our next meeting on 2009-08-27:

\* ROCs to bid for the TPM role in the new model

\* SA1 management to allow discussion slot at their Sept. 1st meeting in

case we need a plan B,

i.e. if there are not 4 ROCs to do TPM shift according to the new model"

As per mid-August, bids were received from IT and NE.

Update for 2009-10-06 meeting (Maria):

USAG @ EGEE'09 summary: <http://indico.cern.ch/materialDisplay.py?materialId=4&confId=68477>

SA1 @ EGEE'09 summary: <https://savannah.cern.ch/support/?108496#comment5>

Yet another step to automation: Allow assignment to the ROC by the submitter:

<https://savannah.cern.ch/support/?108708#comment5>

Update from SA1 coordination meeting in Barcelona:

The decision taken at today's SA1 coordination meeting about the new EGEE TPM model is to continue with

rota involving all teams for some time longer, and migrate directly to the NGIs that will be awarded with the a

EGI global task, O-E-7: Triage of Incoming Problems. The estimated timeline is to stay with the present TPM

the end of the year, and to migrate to the EGI model by the beginning of 2010. This is only a tentative timeline

we don't know who the awarded NGIs will be, and the transition plan needs to be agreed with them. As soon

known, it will be the task of the USAG to work out a feasible transition plan with them and to put it in place.

000522 Distribute new template for "quarterly country reports"

Done

000538 Give to Maite the list of the ROCs and partners that did not contribute to DSA1.3 for escalation to the AMB.

Done and sent to Bob Jones for escalation.

At the next TMB, bring to the attention of the VOs the proposal for the new HEP spec metric for comments.  
Discussion scheduled for 11th August

000539 Agreement at the SA1 coordination meeting on 009-10-06:

Any site serious about being in the Grid should be able to afford this. If money is a problem for a site then this information should be collected (this is up to the ROCs to do).

We will change the name to make it HEP neutral.

Ask the sites for comments on the proposal for the new HEP spec metric and report at the SA1 coord meeting 28th.

Discussion scheduled for 11th August

000540 Agreement at the SA1 coordination meeting on 009-10-06:

Any site serious about being in the Grid should be able to afford this. If money is a problem for a site then this information should be collected (this is up to the ROCs to do).

We will change the name to make it HEP neutral.

000541 Comment on the May availability-reliability reports.

000543 Comment on the c-COD model and metrics presented by Marcin at the SA1 coord meeting on June 30th.

No comments received

000544 Write a proposal for the SA1 transition to the staged roll-out releases.

Done and presented at SA1 coordination meeting on 28th July

000545 Send a reminder e-mail to the ROC managers with all the details on the services that would require to undergo deployment tests.

000546 ROCs with sites running 3.0 VOMS servers should upgrade to gLite 3.1.

Follow up with gridview changes to downtime procedures, and new report with low availability/reliability caused reported in GOCDB

000561

Done. The reports are being produced on a monthly basis since September. - John

000563 Modify ops procedures to include new proposal on downtimes.

Done, available here: <https://edms.cern.ch/document/1032984>

## Page settings.

These page can only be changed by:

- Set ALLOWTOPICCHANGE = WLCGOpsMeetGroup

---

This topic: EGEE > SA1\_CoordinationTasks

Topic revision: r1 - 2008-12-16 - AntonioRetico



Copyright &© by the contributing authors. All material on this collaboration platform is the property of the contributing authors.

Ideas, requests, problems regarding TWiki? Ask a support question or Send feedback