070209-WLCG Mon telecon
09 February 2007
14:58

Subject -------------------------------------

Summary of progress so far:

IanN: Sensor Description
Took German's presentation, and formed a spreadsheet out of it. Tested with Gavin McCance for
FTS. Found we needed another round on the document, and also a covering document to explain
the terms.

Should have the form for the next week.

Steve: Can we change service availability to status
James: Seems likely, since
Piotr: For SAM, we've done work on this - status is a measure, which could contain other
information, e.g. WARNING - and availability is out of that. Availability is binary, or as in SLS
with a few levels.
German: Service availability is 0-100, and service level is "WARNING", "DEGRADED", …

James: This seems good - I'll change the document to 'status'.

Piotr: Different types of availability - instantaneous availability of a service, showing how much
of the service is up - integrated availability, which is percentage over time.
James: We can come back to this, since this is the sticking point for my production of simple
probes.
Emir: 'Health' is also a good term for this availability of a service (numeric).

James: Description of probes.

Sonvane: Do we need a script to correlate these?
James: not really, since this is in the

German: I sent the document around showing the values we'd like.
James: We cover this now - test name, node name, vo name, status, timestamp,

Piotr: This is based on the SAM philosophy
German: Ok, generally good - VO shouldn't be a mandatory field.

Michel: It shouldn't be the probe returning 'availability'
James: Read it as 'status'
Michel: But it still can't make that decision - it should just return a metric

Piotr: came into this in SAM, for instance differences depending on the user - e.g. we have a
probe that checks host cert expiry - if 1 week to go, for users, service is 'fully available', but for
operator, an alarm is needed.
German: Then, you should add classes : users, operators
Piotr: sensors should be user-class agnostic. In SAM, we have a severity scale which defines
statuses. e.g. OK, WARNING fully functional, but operators should look, ERROR - service down,

CRITICAL- can also affect other services. And post-processing system, which, depending on the probe will map these classes into actions at different levels, e.g.

Michel: In the multi-node case, something above the nodes needs to correlate from the probes on individual services.
German: Disagree, based on the CERN experience - it's better to probe from the outside, rather than trying to reconstruct the user status
...

SUMMARY: Need to work out where the complexity lies, but people feel that the probes should be very simple.

ACTION: Still to work out what are the 'status' codes and meanings from a probe.

James: For category B, I'd like the same probe to run against the service, both internally and externally.

Piotr: Work on publication of information back into the site
General idea is HTTP/XML exposed on the systems with information.
Currently HTTP Query - limited parameter types can be passed in. e.g. simple array, strings, no timestamps...
Will give some recommendations for what can be passed in - URL query string where possible.
Will give some extra RPC style methods - e.g. XML RPC style...

Then work on response format.
Also, a common list of attributes - especially what we can query about e.g. site name, node name

James: Also provide what is the authoritative source for the values in an attribute
Piotr: This is important, and we've run into it already... e.g. SiteName in BDII/GOCDB.

IanN: Julia - do you have input into this?
Julia: We use the BDII - but we have also internal mapping for the name as they like to see it.

IanN: When is your effort to get something?
Piotr: Need this,

James: Is the RTM a good place to do this next.
Gidon: We have an xml feed for the real-time data.
Michel:

Emir: This can also be done for Nagios.
IanN: And for the experiment dashboards?
Julia: We already expose the data.

Sonvane: authn/authz?
German: Not part of the input/output format, but somewhat more of the transport.
Ian : looking at some sort of classification. More worried about authz for input.

ADMIN: We're trying to find another slot for the meeting other than Friday afternoon - of the people who replied, Tuesday seems best....

Next meeting : Tue 20th @ 16:00

_____

_____