

## Postmortem gLite-3.0.0

*postmortem*

*an examination of a dead body to determine the cause of death.*

*an analysis or discussion of an event held soon after it has occurred, esp. in order to determine why it was a*

*failure : an election postmortem on why the party lost.*



Enabling Grids for E-scienceE

# Bug-Issue-State-Progress Tracking (before and after the release)

[www.eu-egEE.org](http://www.eu-egEE.org)



- **During release preparation:**
  - Savannah
    - LCG components
      - *Release relevant and general problems mixed*
    - gLite components
      - *Release relevant and general problems mixed*
  - Pre-production mailing list
  - Open issues via Wiki Page
    - Here issues are jointly **listed**
    - bug numbers **referenced**
    - Status changes **manually updated** -----> **consistency with bug trackers?????**
  - Test status
    - Some components via Web result page
    - Some components via e-mail messages (works/doesn't)
    - Impossible to link test results with status of release
    - **Situation improved with additional Wiki table for test tracking**
      - *Manually updated (trust?)*

- **During Rollout:**
  - Savannah
    - LCG components
      - *Release relevant and general problems mixed*
    - gLite components
      - *Release relevant and general problems mixed*
  - GGUS ticketing system
    - Install problems
    - User problems
    - Software problems
    - Configuration problems
    - **Answered or transferred to Savannah**
      - *Who closes when what?*
  - Mailing lists & private communication
    - We did not manage to stick to the rule
      - *“If it is not in a tracker it is not a problem”*
- **Never a clear, visible status of the problems -----> Doubt, Rumours, ....**

- **In depth research needed to answer questions like this:**
  - Which bugs are fixed in gLite-3.0.0-RC2?
  - Is bug #1216 fixed in gLite-3.0.0-RC2?
  - Which tag version/RPM version fixes bug #1786?
  - New bug opened during certification outside the cert process
    - Does this affect the version on the certification testbed?
  
- **Some changes underway:**
- **Merging all Savannah tracker**
  - With additional information
  - Need for Savannah “data mining tools”
    - Security issues (all DB tables of all project owned by one user)
  
- **New integrated process (in progress)**
- **GGUS ticketing not resolved**

# Communication (?)

- **Project management -> release team**
  - Release team was aware of the target release date (May 1st) and derived dates
    - -6 weeks pre-pro (was missed!!!)
  - End user documentation team assumed 1st of June
- **Project management -> experiments**
  - Different views in the experiments about what will be in the release and how long this can be negotiated
    - ATLAS ( gLite-CE not needed)
  - Release date clear
- **Project management/ release team -> developers**
  - **Release date took several of the developers by surprise**
    - Assumed 1st of June as closing date
    - Totally unaware of the date
- **Release team -> ROCs**
  - Pre-release before eastern was not seen as an indication that the release will come on time
- **Release team/ ROCs -> sites**
  - Most of the sites are not aware of the release schedule

- System Elements:

- Release Coordinator
- Developers
- Integrators
- CertTestBed Manager(s)
- Testers

This has to be more formalized  
(+ common sense)

- Problem statement:

- All have to *synchronize some* of their activities with each other and some need to have an *aggregated*, up to date, *status* view
- Most problems need more than one iteration on each comm. channel
- “some of their activities” -----> 100% are 100% active
- -----> communication handshakes fail without being noticed for hours
- **This was extremely expensive**
  - Time
  - Source of conflicts



- **Spreading the gospel (Announcing releases)**
  - Shotgun approach
    - Rollout, glite-announce, ROCs, forward to all management lists ...
  - Rollout list
    - a discussion forum where all kinds of interesting ideas are floated
    - new releases are treated like this
    - frequently ignored/ seen as an recreational activity
  - Release pages
    - Static, only visited when people got the signal
  - ROCs
    - Don't reach the extension projects
    - Different speed limits
- **Need to use gLite-announce as a one way channel**
- **Convert rollout to a discussion list/ newsgroup**
- **Maintain an interesting news page**

- **Rumors and scaremongering**
  - A lot of time and energy is devoted to verify or falsify rumors
  - Constant review mode for SA3/SA1
  
- **Bashing CERN-IT based activities and staff is widespread**
  - Samples:
    - No gLite-CE ever worked
    - gLite-3-0 was release without testing
    - .....
  - This has a severe effect for the “moral” in the trenches
  - People try to avoid making mistakes by all means -----> productivity meltdown
  
- **We have to report openly and truthfully**
  
- (and .... maybe we have to bite back a bit more)



Enabling Grids for E-science

# Documentation

[www.eu-egee.org](http://www.eu-egee.org)



- **Problems**
  - Too much
  - Not enough
  - New and old
  - Quality
  - Hard to find
  - Wrong/outdated
  - Too aggregated
  - No “one stop” shop
  - Branding
  - Hard to maintain
  - Documentation from partners not linked
  
  - Not read

- **Too much**
  - We basically provided LCG-2.7 + gLite-1.5 + gLite-3.0 specific
  - Separated already information on non included components
- **Not enough**
  - Material on boot strapping a site has to be added again
    - Was there in early LCG-2 releases
    - What is a site, central services etc.
    - Which notes, hardware requirements, how to start
- **New and old**
  - Site managers get confused by finding different instructions for the same components ( tarball UI)
- **Quality**
  - Need to proof read documentation and check links before release
  - Wiki material has to be reviewed and removed/updated

- **Hard to find**
  - Documentation is scattered between several pages
  - Several Wiki sites with information
  - Guide to documentation needed
    - short summary for all documents
- **Wrong/outdated**
  - See “quality”
  - Good example “Testing your site”
  - Review!!!
- **Too aggregated**
  - YAIM description and install guide is mixed
- **No “one stop” shop**
  - We need a high level intro
- **Branding**
  - No uniform naming of documents/ services
  - No classification of documents
  - No common appearance

- **Hard to maintain**
  - Some of the documentation can be only build by an elite
  - Can have site effects
- **Documentation from partners not linked**
  - Example:
    - Material that covers other batch systems
    - Special setups via NAT
- **Not read**
  - Especially the “Release Notes” are not read by half of the sites