

## Questionnaire for NGIs about Network Support: Suggested Answers

### A. Having a general purpose Network Support Unit in GGUS for EGI Users and Site Administrators, for the posting of any problem which might come from the Network.

[ GGUS ]

5) Yes, we think having a team of people acting as first level support for network related matters within GGUS is useful, and we will commit manpower to give a body to it.

4) We think that having a support unit for network matters in GGUS is useful, but we cannot commit any resource/manpower

3) We think that having a GGUS support unit for Network is useful but tickets should be handled automatically according to a given workflow and routed to NRENs/NGIs contacts (or support systems), therefore no need to have a team behind it.

2) We think that a support unit for the Network in GGUS is useless. ( users should directly refer to individual NGIs or NRENs )

1) Other : please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).

### B. Grid users experiencing deteriorating, poor performances in a data transfer

[ PERT ]

5) We think having a global EGI PERT access point for users experiencing poor performances is useful; we also think that forming a team with Grid-added know how is a valuable thing, and we are willing to contribute to such a team providing manpower or resources.

4) We think having a global EGI PERT access point for users experiencing poor performances is useful; we also think that forming a team with Grid-added know how is a valuable thing, but we cannot commit any resource/manpower to such a team.

3) We think that having a global EGI PERT access point for users is useful, but this team (or even tool) should only act as a dispatcher of the issue to the NREN and GEANT PERT teams (therefore no need to add Grid / Middleware know how). So it should only act as a single entry point for users for PERT-like issues.

2) We think that nothing like this is required / useful.

1) Other: please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).

### C. Grid users and Site Administrators being notified in advance of the unavailability of a resource center for a given VO / VRC due to a scheduled maintenance of network related devices (scheduled maintenance) or to an acknowledged fault in link or network device.

[Scheduled Maintenances]

- 6) We think having a global EGI service/tool to warn users and site administrators about scheduled maintenances is useful; we think that a system pushing information to selected Grid users/Site Admins (A) is the option to go for and we are able to commit manpower and resources to build it.
- 5) We think having a global EGI service/tool to warn users and site administrators about scheduled maintenances is a very useful thing; we think that storing this information centrally in one place (B) is the option to go for, and we are able to commit manpower and resources to build it.
- 4) We think having a global EGI service/tool to warn users and site administrators about scheduled maintenances is useful; we think that a system pushing information to selected Grid users/Site Admins (A) is the option to go, but we cannot commit any resource nor manpower to develop nor maintain such a system/service.
- 3) We think having a global EGI service/tool to warn users and site administrators about scheduled maintenances is useful; we think that storing this information centrally in one place (B) is the option to go for, but we cannot commit any resource nor manpower to develop nor maintain such a system/service.
- 2) We think that nothing like this is required nor useful.
- 1) Other: please specify (use comment column in the table at the end of this document).

**D. Grid Site administrators or Grid NGI Operations Center team members experiencing problems in reaching a given end site (CE, SE, InfoSys)**  
**[Troubleshooting on-demand]**

- 4) We think having a Network Troubleshooting on demand tool is useful, and we can provide manpower or resources, if required, to contribute to such a tool, or to perform beta testing.
- 3) We think having a Network Troubleshooting on demand tool is useful, but we cannot commit any resource nor manpower to contribute to or test such a tool.
- 2) We think that having a a Network Troubleshooting on demand tool is useless.
- 1) Other: please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).

**E. VRCs/VOs having further, additional needs in terms of permanent monitoring of specific paths**, i.e. which form of scheduled network monitoring information could be useful to put in place within the NGI sites and other EGI sites ( need to necessarily identify a reduced mash according to a ranking which could be decided also involving the VRCs/VOs)  
**[VRC-e2e-multidomain-monitoring]**

6) We think having a Network Monitoring tool for scheduled network monitoring measurement on a specific subset of the EGI e2e paths is useful, and we can provide manpower or resources, if required, to contribute to such a tool, to **locally deploy** it at our sites, and/or to perform **beta testing**.

5) We think having a Network Monitoring tool for scheduled network monitoring measurement on a specific subset of the EGI e2e paths is useful, and we can provide manpower or resources, if required, to **locally deploy** its required services/components at our sites (but not to directly contribute to it nor beta test it)

4) We think having a Network Monitoring tool for scheduled network monitoring measurement on a specific subset of the EGI e2e paths is useful, but we cannot provide any manpower nor resources to contribute to the development or the testing such a tool, and we are not interested in deploying any local probe or tool at our sites, but still we could afford to use a tool which requires **no local deployment** (like NetJobs)

3) We think having a Network Monitoring tool for scheduled network monitoring measurement on a specific subset of the EGI e2e paths would be in principle useful, but we cannot provide any manpower nor resource to contribute to it, and we cannot afford **deploying anything** locally at our sites.

2) We think that having a Network monitoring tool for scheduled network monitoring measurement on a specific subset of the EGI e2e paths is useless.

1) Other: please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).

**F. Users, Site Administrators and NGI Operation Center teams needing to check and monitor in time if specific grid services at various locations are reachable**  
[ DownCollector ]

4) We think having a DownCollector tool is useful, and we can provide manpower or resources, if required, to possibly deploy a local instance of the tool and make it accessible to other users or a global collector service.

3) We think having a DownCollector tool is useful, but we cannot provide manpower nor resources to contribute to the deployment.

2) We think that having a DownCollector tool is useless.

1) Other: please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).

**G. Grid Sites and users belonging to VRCs having network requirements for the medium and long term**  
[ Policy and cooperation ]

6) We think establishing a permanent EGI group around network support for Policy and Cooperation is useful, and we can contribute with manpower to give a body to this team.

5) We think establishing a permanent EGI group around network support for Policy and Cooperation is useful, but we cannot contribute to it.

4) We think establishing a permanent EGI group around network support for Policy and Cooperation is useful, but we think this group should actually be made by same group of persons dealing with GGUS and PERT. So the 3 proposed teams should actually be merged into a unique network support team dealing with all these three matters : GGUS Support, PERT issues and Policy&Cooperation. We can contribute with manpower to give a body to this team.

3) We think establishing a permanent EGI group around network support for Policy and Cooperation is useful, but we think this group should actually be made by the same group of persons dealing with GGUS and PERT. So the 3 proposed teams should actually be merged into a unique network support team dealing with all these three matters : GGUS Support, PERT issues and Policy&Cooperation. We however cannot directly contribute with manpower nor resources to give a body to this team.

2) We think that having such a Policy and Cooperation Group is useless.

1) Other: please specify (use the comment column in the table at the end of this document).