

Subject: Re: [LCG MB] Tier-1 Reliability Reports 200904

From: Gonzalo Merino <merino@pic.es>

Date: Tue, 12 May 2009 13:54:57 +0200

To: Alberto Aimar <alberto.aimar@cern.ch>

CC: "worldwide-lcg-management-board (LCG Management Board)" <worldwide-lcg-management-board@cern.ch>

Hello all,

I have a general comment to make regarding the availability/reliability data we collect and report every month. In particular, for the avail/rel figures resulting from VO-Specific SAM tests, my concern is the following: these figures are obtained through GridView using the SAM/FCR data, which comes from the VOs telling which VO-specific SAM tests are considered as "critical" for them.

Looking at one VO as an example, CMS for instance, I see that the SAM tests used for this CMS-specific SAM avail/rel metrics are essentially 1 test per service:

- For CEs: CE-sft-job
- For SRMv2s: SRMv2-lcg-cp

On the other hand, we see that VOs have their own tracking of VO-specific SAM tests. These are typically the views available from the dashboards. Still with the CMS example, according to the dashboard:

<http://dashb-cms-sam.cern.ch/dashboard/request.py/latestresultsview>

The Vo-specific SAM tests defined as "critical" for CMS are the following:

- For CEs: CE-cms-analysis, CE-cms-basic, CE-cms-frontier, CE-cms-mc, CE-cms-prod, CE-cms-squid, CE-cms-swinst, CE-sft-job
- For SRMs: SRMv2-get-pfn-from-tfc, SRMv2-lcg-cp

When experiments report about VO-specific SAM availabilities or reliabilities, I think they do it using the data from the second, complete, set of tests. This result sometimes can be significantly different from the "WLCG default" above, the one in gridview. I think it would be good to unify these sets of critical tests, so that when we talk about "VO-specific reliability" we are sure we are referring to the same thing.

As I said, CMS was just an example I have at hand now, but I believe a similar situation could be happening in the other experiments.

Gonzalo

2009/5/7 Alberto Aimar <alberto.aimar@cern.ch>:

Dear Colleagues

please find attached the Tier-1 Report of April 2009.

Sites comment the very few OPS downtimes. I have asked the Experiments to comment on the VO reports.

T1_Summary_200904.pdf (attached)

I have extracted only April's graphs for OPS + Experiments.

Comments OPS Tests.ppt (attached)

Sites should comment their OPS unavailability periods (see slide 2) and mail their comments to me.

FYI the full Tier-1 reports are always available here:

https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/viewfile/LCG/SamMbReports?filename=Tier1_Reliab_200904.zip

Best regards.
Alberto Aimar.