Monitoring WG Meeting

_____
_____

Overview:

Ian: Will try to provide an overview of this group in this meeting.
    Walk-through of the GDB Presentation.

Steve F: Are we putting intelligence into the system? Are they in the visualization.
James: The aim is to put the info back into the local fabric in order to allow them to seem this.
IanB: the intelligence in the system will be in the visualization system.

Ruth: Will follow up on the US end of getting the info from the questionnaires. And endorse that writing the description of "up/down" is good. OSG believe that empowering the sites for responsibility on the uptime of their own site is good. They like things coming back to their own site and fabric monitoring system.

Alessandra: how many replied to questionnaire?
Ian: 20. Most said Nagios - all info is in fabric monitoring, and sites would like it to come back to their local system.

Ian N: Any ideas on how to define the 'availability' of a service.
Luigi: How to define the information in the most general way and dispatch it in the most general way. Is developer of CEMon, and know how to publish this out in a general way. Often this information needs to formatted in different ways.
James: We need to work out the low-level details e.g. processes, etc… and then the interaction with the developers

Sergio: In GridICE, we developed sensors to track status of the daemons, but we do the work yourself, without the interaction of the developers. We look at a good service, and learn what is up, what is good. And when the RB changes, we need to learn again!
James: Perhaps you could take a lead in this - and provide a presentation
German: We have these too, and our experience is very similar - we only know after getting the service.
IanB: It's not likely that the developer will provide the whole list, but it's a start.
German: We need to provide a questionnaire to developers - e.g. log file name, timestamp values, numeric values to be plotted, regexp for errors in logs.
Sergio: A good point to force developers to write a good logfile. One mandate is to for a general way to publish things and it's up to the developers.
James: I'm not so sure a general way is good, since the information is different.
Sergio: Yes, we need the information definition and the sensors from the developers.
Ian: This is a good long term plan, but we should be pragmatic, and use the log files for now.

James: We're starting only the sensor and view group now.

IanN: What about SAM results? And publishing back
Alessandra: Don't understand getting SAM tests back.
James: They want local alarms (e.g. SMS)
Alessandra: So we publish data to multiple people?
James: Yes - many consumers - CIC, Exp frameworks, Sites.

Piotr: We do this already withy an XML feed, so then poll the information from nagios on the site.
Digamber: We could produce a central portal, so there's always somewhere that users can see the data.
James: Often problems with central services, sites would like things local.
Alessandra: It's important that we improve the remote sensors to remove central service problems from the reports to the sites.
Ian: Again we need to focus on the underlying data, to improve it's quality. Also we need to consider security.

German: Tool survey. What is different meaning of the word sensor/agent/…
James: Maybe good for next week's meeting.
German: If there are URLs or documents there already, that would be a starting point.

Sonvane: Need to make sure that sensors are only run once, and not generate extra load on services
James: This is done by the local fabric system.

Organisation for WLCG Meeting:

BOF Session:
        Presentation of the three groups (Group Chairs)
        Summary of questionnaire (Ian N)
        Summary of monitoring data characteristics (James)

Extra session for other presentations.

Sergio: Current state of GridIce grid sensors
German: low-level LEMON sensors and requirements to be passed onto service monitoring documentors
Marcin Radecki: Use of Nagios in Polish Region

Next meeting: Friday 19th Jan 3PM CEST.