

Richard Mclennan <richard.mclennan@egi.eu>

## Re: Actions from MAPPER - EGI telcon of 11 July.

1 message

## Tiziana Ferrari <tiziana.ferrari@egi.eu>

1 September 2011 12:05

To: Richard Mclennan < richard.mclennan@egi.eu>

Cc: daniele.cesini@cnaf.infn.it

Hi Richard comments in-line

- > ACTION for MAPPER: Check that:
- > 1. Monitoring information about QosCosGrid status from these sites is populated into EGI registry
- > 2. Accounting information about QosCosGrid usage from these is populated into EGI APEL

must be checked

Tiziana - can we see if this has been done? Do we need to provide anything to MAPPER for this?

This is an action on MAPPER.

1. monitoring: as the sites are already integrated as part of EGI, monitoring of a basic group of services is in

An open issue is to clarify what "QosCosGrid status" is, because as QosCosGrid services are not part of the registered services in GOCDB, today thay cannot be monitored (so "standard" glite services are monitored from those sites, but not the VO-specific services).

This would be an action for a integration task force

Tiziana, the following is for us - can you answer? If not, can you tell me who I should consult with?

> ACTION for EGI: Check whether any study or investigation has been done in EGI on the effects of advanced reservation on accounting. E.g. How can advanced reservation data integrated normal accounting data?

Today EGI has no probes that collect information about advance reservations, so there is no technical solution from our technical providers. It could be that PL-Grid or MAPPER itself did this development (it has to be discussed). If this is the case, publishing this information centrally through messaging could be a easy integration activity that could be part of the JRA1 roadmap.

VO may be interested in knowing how many resources where reserved by whom within the VO. This could be additional information that could be displayed in the VO-restricted view of accounting information in the accounting portal. I suggest a MAPPER person to attend the accounting workshop during th EGI technical forum, to come along with such a requirement.

- > QosCosGrid enables user access to sites with grid certificates. Users are statically mapped to local user accounts. If a new user requests access to MAPPER, a new account must be created for this person on every site that supports MAPPER.
- > While we are not aware of any EGI policy that would be against this concept, the practical limitations of the approach is recognised. Therefore the first MAPPER applications will work with a pre-defined fix set of sites and with a pre-defined fix set of users. This will not require the mass-creation of user accounts on sites. ACTION for EGI: Check whether there is any policy that is against this user management concept. - Tiziana, can you advise on this pse?

01/09/2011 13:26 1 of 2

This is normal practice, I do not see any problem with this.

Also, note the

following points - do we we need to add any clarification there?

> The QosCosGrid middleware does not have a Virtual Organisation concept. Accounting data, access etc. is implemented for independent sites.

This is a problem for accounting and monitoring (that also affects UNICORE and GLOBUS). A technical task force needs to be set up to address these problems.

> This does not seem to be a problem as long as we know which sites supports QosCosGrid. Management and statistics about these sites can be done manually. (The VO is a human process on top of independent sites) > A more automated mechanisms will be probably needed at a later stage,

but not for the first version.

This is ok, but I would suggest that as soon as a basic pilot has been demonstrated, an the integration task force is set up with the technical people from SA1 and JRA1 to tackle integration of accounting and monitoring.

I suggest the following plan:

- 1. short briefing on progress of the pilot
- 2. definition of integration issues that we (EGI) want to address
- 3. setup of technical integration task force (SA1/NA3 and MAPPER)
- 4. quarterly meetings to brief on status of the testbed and activities

Cheers Tiziana

2 of 2