

Operations Group

Tom McGlynn

Mark Taylor

Registry of Registries Transfer

- Complete with no (known) hiccups
- Code issues needed to be resolved.
- Incomplete notice to some parties involved in transfer

Building Systems in the VO

- Embedding existing systems in GWS framework
 - Enables putting legacy systems on web very flexibly
 - May require special case coding
- China VO
 - Complete framework with elements for outreach, publication, storage, research support. VOSpace support for community.
 - Managing distributed VMs

How do we
build robust
& reliable
services?

Software Reliability in V.O.

- Low level probes NAGIOS ✓
Monitor
- Mirrors ✓

HTTP Redirector

Auto Recovery of VMs

Don't let astronomers be testers.

DNS round-robin

Mirrored DNS's
Multiple Physical Machines

Don't flood servers with validation

Can VOS1 Availability be separated from service

Amazon DNS

Automated failover can be problematic

Cache info about failures

Keep our code at level that reflects well on us

Don't put in potentially dying E-mail addresses,
(institutional)

Uni Sydney Guest USERNAME: IV
PWN: 25409

EDUROAM also available.

Building Robust code

Many ideas brought forward

- Automated checking of system components
- Multiple physical (and virtual) machines under load balancers
- Self healing VMs
- Mirroring
 - Can we do automated failover or is that dangerous?
 - New technologies: HttpRedirector, Amazon DNS services
 - Cache info about failures so next query doesn't need to wait to fail
 - DNS round-robin
- Should VOSI isUp queries be allowed to be at different site?
- Don't flood servers with validation queries.
- Don't put obsoletable contact info (emails) in registry and elsewhere
- Critical code needs proper engineering

- Astronomers are not quality assurance testers

VO Health

- Presentations from VOParis, ESA and NAVO on validation/monitoring results: “weather reports”.
- Number of completely non-responsive services has been substantially reduced.
- Updated procedure from VOParis for removal of such services in future.
 - endorsed IVOA note
- ESA sees little change in validation statistics and has identified some issues with >90% failure rates.
 - Some may be validator issues.
 - Should we treat all “must”s the same
- Per NAVO: Average site uptime (including some non-responsive sites) is ~96%. Weights small sites same as VizieR.
- Fraction of non-VizieR, non-HEASARC services passing validation is 26% (but even this is much higher than ESA would give for same criterion).
- Need to separate out largest sites to get useful statistics
- Need for SIAv2 (testing) and DataLink (?) validators

How should we characterize VO health

- Tables (per center/service) of validation statistics and up time?
- Responsiveness
- # of VO services
- Want to give realistic assessment and not show services as failing with non-critical errors.
- Provide overview summary for IVOA next May