Minutes Nagios A/R probe meeting

Attendance: Marcin Radecki, Malgorzata Krakowian, Luuk Uljee, Emir Immamagic, Ron Trompert

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss rt ticket: https://rt.egi.eu/rt/Ticket/Display.html?id=289. Here a nagios probe is requested to measure availability and reliability of sites.

First Marcin starts the discussion about our response to Tiziana's comments:

> - waiting just 5 days before a failure is reported seems too short. For
> example
> after 10 days of 50% availability can be compensated by 20 days of
> availability
> at 80%. My feeling is that alarms could be triggered start after 1/3 of
> the
> month, e.g. 10 days, but a better estimation (also looking at the
> common low
> availability figures) could be done looking at the average
> unavailability of a
> site. Dimitris could you extract this value?

The COD does not agree to this. We feel that 5 days is OK. The purpose of this probe is not to let a site know that there is a problem, but to let a site know that it is not going to meet the OLA requirements. This 5 day period leaves enough time for sites to meet the OLA requirements at the end of the month.

- COD rightly requires underperfomance is not notified every day: "we
> don't
> want to notify site admins every day about the problem". This
> requirement is
> difficult to implement if you have fluctuations. For example, your
> availability
> goes from 50% (dayX), to 80% (dayX+1) and back to 50 (dayX+2). In this
> case,
> assuming the probe runs daily, will the probe fail again on day X+2
> with
> consequent alarm?

The idea is that when the probe raises an alarm because of low availability, a ticket is raised. This ticket will stay open until the A/R is above the threshold. The ticket will be closed then.

- It would be important to explore the policy of the probe: when a
> WARNING
> status is returned? WARNING status could be used before the return
> status turns
> into CRITICAL

This is a good idea. We suggest an alarm at 75% and a warning at 75%. Sites looking at their regional nagioses have an early warning this way.

- "The ROD will generate a ticket with an expiration date set at the
> end of the
> month". Does this mean that no ticket is opened during the course of
> the month?
> if not, how are the site admins warned of the failing performance?

The idea is that a ticket is raised when a/r fall below a certain threshold. The ticket will remain open until the A/R is above the threshold again. Then it will be closed.

The remainder of the meeting is about the probe itself.

Ron asks Emir if it is feasible to implement the probe as desired by the COD. Emir says that a sliding window is easier to implement. Emir says it is not necessary for this probe to strictly follow the OLA. Marcin explains that it is a warning for sites that they are not going to fulfill the OLA requirements ans that therefor, the probe should follow the OLA.

It is decided to aks Tiziana and Peter's opinion on this. When we have the answer, another meeting will be organised on the short term to finalise the requirements regarding this probe.

After this Daniele Cesini's email is discussed.

```
>1) the thresholds on a/r that trigger the alarm
>2) the definition of the time window to calculate a/r
>3) the services to which the alarm will be associated - site_bdii is a good candidate
but missing in arc and unicore

>Maybe today you can focus on 1) and 2) then internally to jra1 we can >discuss 3)
that is more on implementation.
```

Points 1 and 2 have been discussed and 3 is left for JRA1.

Emir asks the question about who will maintain the probe. For the middleware the maintenance of the corresponding probes is pushed to the EMI product teams, but who will maintain this A/R probe? SAM team has no resources and Emir can do this for a short period of time. This will be discussed internally within JRA1.