

Average EC2 Uptime?

Asked 15 years, 11 months ago Modified 3 years ago

Viewed 20k times  Part of [AWS](#) Collective



14

Curious as to 99.95% uptime REALLY means; Is it really going to go down 7 minutes a month? Please post your longest/average uptimes on EC2, thanks.



amazon-ec2

amazon-web-services



Share

Improve this question

Follow

edited Jun 27, 2009 at 7:48



Spencer Ruport

35.1k ● 12 ● 87 ● 150

asked Dec 30, 2008 at 1:38



capotej

2,971 ● 3 ● 21 ● 16

1 $0.0005 * 1 \text{ month} \approx 21.9 \text{ minutes}$ not 7 – [Will Bickford](#) Dec 30, 2008 at 2:09

9 Answers

Sorted by:

Highest score (default)



16

Usually uptime is calculated in a yearly basis. So if you have a Service Level Agreement for 99.95% this means:



$365 * 0.0005 = 0.1825$ days or 4.38 hours



If during a year of service there is an outage and your system is down for more than that, then you are liable for compensation.

As of your question, I have a server running unstopped in EC2 for about 3 months now. I would say that their uptime is good, but if you have a mission critical application you definitely need to have a fail-over solution. A good uptime only means that they will be able to respond to an outage quickly. Even a 99.9999% uptime won't be able to save you if you aren't prepared for an outage.

Share Improve this answer

Follow

answered Dec 30, 2008 at 6:57



[kgiannakakis](#)

104k ● 28 ● 161 ● 197



11



Read the SLA carefully (<http://aws.amazon.com/ec2-sla/>) they only count "Region Unavailable" as downtime, and what is more they only count it as downtime if the region is down for 5 consecutive minutes.

“Annual Uptime Percentage” is calculated by subtracting from 100% the percentage of 5 minute periods during the Service Year in which Amazon EC2 was in the state of “Region Unavailable.”

By my count this mean any downtime of less then 4 minutes is not countable. Also if they do break the SLA they are only in for %10 of the month in which you had largest downtime bill. So if they where down for all of January and your bill was \$100 they would apply a \$10 credit to your account.

I would have a hard time convensing my boss that this is a serious product with a SLA like that.

Share Improve this answer

answered Feb 4, 2009 at 16:25

Follow



David Waters

12k ● 7 ● 43 ● 77

The wording of this has changed. The link is still good, so have a careful read of that. PS I am now able to convince my boss that this is a serious product :) – [David Waters](#) Jul 31, 2018 at 4:58 ✎



9



SLA's are useless. They only measure how much risk the company is willing to take on and have no bearing on actual uptime. I've seen SLA's, with heavy penalties, offered when the company knew the could not meet the SLA in order to land the sale.



I have one client with 400+ days of EC2 uptime and another with 300+ days as measured by web pulse, this is by far the most reliable service I've worked with.

Share Improve this answer

answered Oct 25, 2009 at 0:08

Follow



Rob Osborne

4,997 ● 4 ● 34 ● 43



For my single instance running in the US-East availability zone, 9 months, 0 downtime.

8

Share Improve this answer

answered Feb 26, 2009 at 14:00



Follow



Marc Hughes

5,858 ● 3 ● 38 ● 47



20 Answer was from back in '09... 3 years straight now for that machine. – [Marc Hughes](#) May 18, 2011 at 17:19

12 I finally retired that machine, around 4 years uptime with no downtime. – [Marc Hughes](#) Jan 2, 2014 at 16:12



5



Since Amazon switched to provide an SLA, I've never had an instance go down on me. When I've had instances go down in the past, Amazon has always sent a message informing me that the instance is degraded before it actually disappeared, so I've had time to start up a new instance.



The previous answer makes a good point, though; EC2's service model dictates that you write your apps to handle failover to a new server if you're not prepared for extended down time.

Share Improve this answer

answered Jan 15, 2009 at 22:58

Follow



[gareth_bowles](#)

21.1k ● 6 ● 54 ● 82



4

conrad@papa ~ \$ uptime
04:42:36 up 495 days, 8:51, 8 users, load
average: 0.02, 0.02, 0.00



Share Improve this answer

answered Jan 20, 2009 at 9:43

Follow



Will



2 Is the 0.02 load average from `sshd` and `uptime` ? :)
– [Matt Connolly](#) Mar 27, 2012 at 6:43

FYI: 09:37:18 up 1127 days, 19:58, 1 user, load average:
0.01, 0.03, 0.00 – [Mark J. Bobak](#) Aug 28, 2017 at 13:41



3

Checking out the [AWS Service Health Dashboard](#) will get you a good idea of any current or past issues. My experience is that the AWS uptime is better than most "traditional" hosting options (even full-blown redundant RackSpace setup...).



However, simply going with AWS for uptime is like getting a car for the keychain (ok, almost.. ;)). With an architecture utilizing AWS the big benefit is scaling (without upfront costs).

Share Improve this answer

answered Jan 18, 2009 at 11:48

Follow



stpe

3,619 ● 3 ● 34 ● 39



2



SLA... Guaranteed uptime...

These are all very nice taglines. But when the servers aren't available for an hour (March 1, 2012, in the EU region) and the clients start calling, then it won't help you that they still have a 300 days uptime.



And when the lightning struck 1 out of 3 of their datacenters in the EU, we all found out that they have no off-site redundancies, and the fact that they have 3 datacenters doesn't mean a thing.

One must love the phrase "degraded performance", that actually means: "cross your fingers and pray that your data will still be available after the catastrophe passes".

I'm still trying to look for any official/non-official statistics about the availability percentages of all of their datacenters.

No luck thus far...

Share Improve this answer

answered Mar 2, 2012 at 5:56

Follow



bizna

712 ● 9 ● 25



0



I've never had downtime on EC2, however, I do keep local backups and make daily images of my machines and port them to another availability zone, just in case. I use twilio to alert me if a machine is unreachable with a phone call to all my devices. Then I can just log in to EC2 and fire up a machine in another availability zone; worst case I'll be down for a few minutes.

Which in my case, is potentially pretty sucky, because my machines are doing 24/7 Forex trading.

My rule: know the potential cost of downtime, and be willing to invest that much in redundancy assuming it will happen - because it will.

That said, EC2 has never let me down. Helps probably that my servers are not in an area of the country where natural disasters are common. If you're in an earthquake zone, tornado alley, or a potential hurricane path, downtime truly is an inevitability.

Share Improve this answer

answered Nov 27, 2021 at 23:55

Follow



[embarrassinglybadpython](#)

1

As it's currently written, your answer is unclear. Please [edit](#) to add additional details that will help others understand how this addresses the question asked. You can find more information on how to write good answers [in the help center](#).

– [Community Bot](#) Nov 28, 2021 at 0:27
