

Using Network Performance Data in Facilities Operations

Shawn McKee/University of Michigan

ATLAS T1/T2/T3 Jamboree / CERN

December 11th, 2012

Introduction

- ❄ This talk focuses on how the ongoing and developing activities in networking might be incorporated into our Facilities operations
 - ❑ Networking could benefit from better information about planned use
 - ❑ Facilities could benefit from better optimization and use of network resources
- ❄ I will discuss two main aspects of “Networking” broadly:
 - ❑ **Monitoring** – What information is (or should be) available and how to benefit from this information
 - ❑ **Control** – The ability to negotiate with networking services to acquire dedicated bandwidth on-demand or scheduled
- ❄ Note that while this Jamboree is ATLAS, much of the ongoing effort is LHC-wide and this is reflected in the slides
- ❄ Feel free to ask questions at anytime during the presentation...

Motivations for Common LHC Network Monitoring

- ❄ LHC collaborations rely upon the network as a critical part of their infrastructure, yet finding and debugging network problems can be difficult and, in some cases, take months.
- ❄ There is no differentiation of how the network is used amongst the LHC experiments. (Quantity may vary)
- ❄ We need a standardized way to monitor the network and locate problems quickly if they arise
- ❄ We don't want to have a network monitoring system per VO!

Network Monitoring for LHC: Goals/Purpose

❄️ **Goals:**

- ❄️ **Find and isolate “network” problems; alerting in a timely way**
- ❄️ **Characterize network use (base-lining)**
- ❄️ **Provide a source of network metrics for higher level services**

❄️ **First step:** get monitoring in place to create a baseline of the current situation between sites

❄️ **Next:** continuing measurements to track the network, alerting on problems as they develop

❄️ **perfSONAR’s main purpose is to aid in network diagnosis** by quickly allowing users to isolate the location of problems. **In addition it can provide a standard measurement of various network performance related metrics over time as well as “on-demand” tests.**

Current Network Monitoring

- ❄ We have a nice existing system (the ATLAS Dashboard) which is tracking end-to-end transfer results between sites.
 - ❑ Very good to understand how the overall system is performing
 - ❑ Difficult to understand if performance issues are from the network or the end systems or some complex interaction of the two
- ❄ We also have a broadly deployed network monitoring infrastructure based upon perfSONAR
 - ❑ Measures characteristics of the network path between sites
 - ❑ Gathers bandwidth, latency, packet loss and routing information
 - ❑ Not yet covering all our sites
 - ❑ Not yet “integrated” in our facilities operations

WLCG perfSONAR-PS Deployments

- ❄ We want to measure (to the extent possible) the entire network path between LHC resources. This means:
 - ❑ We want to locate perfSONAR-PS instances as close as possible to the storage resources associated with a site. The goal is to ensure we are measuring the same network path to/from the storage.
- ❄ There are two separate instances that should be deployed:
latency and bandwidth
 - ❑ The **latency instance** measures one-way delay by using an NTP synchronized clock and send 10 packets per second to target destinations. We also **traceroute** using this instance.
 - ❑ The **bandwidth instance** measures achievable bandwidth via a short test (30 seconds) per src-dst pair every ~n hour period

Modular Dashboard: Centralized Info

- ❄ Having a large number of perfSONAR deployments is great for instrumenting our networks, but all these instances are not easy to track, summarize or understand.
- ❄ The current modular dashboard is being used to track a large number of LHC perfSONAR-PS installations:

<https://perfsonar.racf.bnl.gov:8443/exda/>

The dashboard provides a highly configurable interface to monitor a set of perfSONAR-PS instances via simple plug-in test modules. Users can be authorized based upon their grid credentials. Sites, clouds, services, tests, alarms and hosts can be quickly added and controlled.

Example of Dashboard showing LHCONE

← → ↻ <https://perfsonar.racf.bnl.gov:8443/exda/?page=25&cloudName=LHCONE> 🔍 ☆ ☰

RACF
Grid Group

The Production Instance of perfSONAR Dashboard

Status as of: Mon Dec 10 10:02:47 EST 2012

Cloud LHCONE

Sites of LHCONE cloud

BNL	AGLT2	INFN Napoli	SARA	ASGC	PIC
KIT	TRIUMF	Toronto	Prague	Tokyo	LRZ-LMU
GRIF-LAL	DESY-HH	MWT2(UC)	GRIF/LPNHE		

LHCONE Throughput Matrix

	---	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
0:BNL (lhcmon.bnl.gov)	---	1.34	0.28	0.08	0.00	0.33	0.05	0.00	0.10	0.13	0.02	0.14	0.04	0.01	0.07	0.11	0.37	0.11	
1:AGLT2 (psmsu02.agit2.org)	1.34	---	0.05	0.11	0.34	0.28	0.04	0.05	0.07	0.19	0.02	0.03	0.28	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.35	0.22	
2:AGLT2 (psum02.agit2.org)	0.28	0.05	---	0.07	0.24	0.28	0.05	0.00	0.08	0.13	0.03	0.07	0.27	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.27	0.22	
3:ASGC (lhc-bandwidth.twgrid.org)	0.08	0.11	0.07	---	0.16	0.28	0.02	0.00	0.04	0.06	0.01	0.11	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.11	0.31	0.22	
4:CERN	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	---	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.13	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.37	0.01	

LHCONE Latency

0:BNL (lhcperfmon.bnl.gov)
1:AGLT2 (psmsu01.agit2.org)
2:AGLT2 (psum01.agit2.org)
3:ASGC (lhc-latency.twgrid.org)

Main Page

All Clouds

Individual Clouds:

- USATLAS
- USCMS
- IT
- LHCOPN
- LHCONE
- CA-ATLAS
- UK
- LHC-FR

Inter Cloud Tests:

- AGLT2-IT
- FR-US
- ATLAS-UK

Primitive Services

- perfSonar Sites
- List of Hosts
- List of Matrices
- List of Alarms
- List of Clouds
- List of Sites
- List of Schedulers
- Probes
- Manage Users
- Define or Edit Alarms

RACF dashboard

- perfSONAR dashboard (old)
- RACF dashboard (test)
- perfSONAR dashboard (old, test)
- Dashboard documentation

See <https://perfsonar.racf.bnl.gov:8443/exda/?page=25&cloudName=LHCONE>

perfSONAR Dashboard Efforts

- ❄ There is an ongoing effort to produce the next generation of the dashboard which is scalable and preserves the existing functionality of the current dashboard
 - ❑ Effort is now being moved to GitHub under a modified BSD license
 - ❑ Everyone interested is welcome to participate
- ❄ OSG will be hosting the new dashboard “service” in the future and will also provide a packaged version of the code to allow those interested to deploy their own version
 - ❑ This service will also provide a source of network data, accessible through the developing user API

Plans for WLCG Operations

- ❄ Simone will present the details about the near-term plans during the GDB tomorrow but summarizing here:
 - ❑ Encouraging all sites to deploy and register two instances ASAP
 - ❑ All sites to use the “mesh” configuration (central configs)
 - ❑ One set of test parameters to be used everywhere
 - ❑ GDB: <http://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=155075>
- ❄ The current dashboard is being used as a central source for network information. This will continue but we need to make sure we are gathering the right metrics and making them easily accessible for our applications and infrastructure
 - ❑ We need to encourage discussion about the types of metrics our frameworks and applications would like concerning the network

Network Monitoring Deliverables

- ❄️ What does a perfSONAR deployment provide for us?
 - ❑ We get measurements of the **network** behavior along relevant paths
 - ❑ The system schedules non-conflicting tests between sites
- ❄️ The **latency measurements** provide one-way latency via NTP-synced clocks at each end.
 - ❑ More interesting is the measurement of packet-loss it provides. With 600 packets/minute we can see marginal paths via their loss metric
- ❄️ The **bandwidth measurements** deliver an estimate of achievable bandwidth along paths
 - ❑ Useful to set expectations and indicate problematic paths
 - ❑ Tracking versus time provides a way to identify when problems start
 - ❑ Comparison with ATLAS Dashboard can differentiate networks vs end-site problems
- ❄️ The **traceroute measurements** track routing changes

Facility Use of Network Metrics

- ❄ Once we have a source of network metrics being acquired we need to understand how best to incorporate those metrics into our facility operations.
- ❄ Some possibilities:
 - ❑ Characterizing paths with “costs” to better optimize decisions in workflow and data management
 - ❑ Noting when paths change and providing appropriate notification
 - ❑ Optimizing data-access (FAX) or data-distribution (DDM) based upon a better understanding of the network between sites
 - ❑ Identifying structural bottlenecks in need of remediation
 - ❑ Aiding network problem diagnosis and speeding repairs
 - ❑ In general, incorporating knowledge of the network into our processes
- ❄ **We will require testing and iteration to better understand when and where the network metrics are useful.**

Network “Control”

- ❄ Going beyond monitoring the network, we can imagine **negotiating with the network to do what you want.**
- ❄ **Is that possible?** It certainly has not been possible in the past but that is changing. Many networks are now providing services for the creation of “virtual circuits”
- ❄ There is lots of ongoing work in **Software Defined Networking (SDN), OpenFlow** being a primary example.
 - ❑ Network providers may favor this mode of providing additional bandwidth in the future because of cost and management reasons
 - ❑ We need to understand what options are available and how best to take advantage of them within ATLAS
 - ❑ The future may hold new options for us...will we be ready?
- ❄ **The question is how best for ATLAS to capitalize upon this capability?**

Existing Virtual Circuit Capabilities

- ❄ There are numerous projects/services related to reserving guaranteed bandwidth point-to-point: ION, OSCARS, Autobahn, DYNES, NS1 and many others.
- ❄ These services are often “production quality” in terms of the characteristics (availability and robustness) but are also “development” in the sense of the application use-cases and interfaces that may eventually be needed.
 - ❑ There is an opportunity for discussions to update/optimize APIs
- ❄ Setting up circuits requires a negotiation process and takes **~minutes** to instantiate circuits or bandwidth guarantees.
 - ❑ This is important when considering which tasks will benefit from controlling the network path
 - ❑ This setup time will presumably decrease at the underlying technologies mature.

Using Network Control

- ❄ For our ATLAS infrastructure to effectively utilize “network control” we need the following:
 - ❑ Information about which paths support “control” interactions
 - ❑ Details of the negotiation process and API(s) involved
 - ❑ Understanding of the workflow and dataflow requirements of our planned work (on various timescales)
 - ❑ Priorities between competing tasks
 - ❑ Estimates of the network usable capacities
- ❄ My belief is we need to work incrementally and iteratively to integrate network control capability into our systems.
- ❄ **The LS1 period gives us a chance to provide the needed software changes to enable “network control” as an option in our infrastructure.**

Ongoing LHC Networking Activities

- ❄ The WLCG Network Working Group led by Michael Ernst
- ❄ A WLCG operations sub-group (led by Simone Campana and Shawn McKee) is guiding the installation of perfSONAR at all Tier-2 sites (Tier-1's already instrumented)
- ❄ OSG has a new Networking Area (led by Shawn McKee) focused on hardening perfSONAR-PS, evolving the perfSONAR modular dashboard and providing OSG network services
- ❄ Two funded research efforts focused on the overlap between LHC software systems and networking:
 - ❑ **Advanced Network Services for Experiments (ANSE)**, NSF funded (Caltech, Michigan, Vanderbilt and U Texas Arlington)
 - ❑ **Next Generation Workload Management and Analysis System for Big Data**, PANDA integration with networking, DOE funded (BNL, U Texas Arlington)
- ❄ These efforts need to interact with each other **AND** the Vos
- ❄ <https://indico.cern.ch/conferenceDisplay.py?confId=215393>

Network Monitoring Challenges Ahead

- ❄ Getting hardware/software platform installed at all sites
- ❄ **Dashboard development:** Need additional effort to produce something suitable quickly. Ensure it meets our needs...
- ❄ Managing site and test configurations
 - ❑ Testing and improving “centralized” (VO-based?) configurations
 - ❑ Determining the right level of scheduled tests for a site, e.g., Tier-2s test to other same-cloud Tier-2s (and Tier-1)?
 - ❑ Address 10G vs 1G tests that give misleading results
- ❄ **Alerting:** A high-priority need but complicated:
 - ❑ Alert who? Network issues could arise in any part of end-to-end path
 - ❑ Alert when? Defining criteria for alert threshold. Primitive services are easier. Network test results more complicated to decide
- ❄ Integration with VO infrastructures and applications

How to Make Progress?

- ❄ Using the LHCONE case as an example it seems possible to make significant progress in getting a standardized monitoring infrastructure in place quickly.
- ❄ Need to improve installs to be “set-it and forget-it”
- ❄ Integration with the experiments software stacks and DDM systems is now a high-priority (LS1 is an opportunity)
 - ❑ First network monitoring metrics
 - ❑ Next: SDN (Software Defined Networking)
- ❄ All VOs need to be aware of the need for network monitoring and the possibilities for sharing a common solution. Requires VO “pressure” to get sites to deploy
- ❄ Begin testing the use of metrics within the facility operations
- ❄ Plan for incorporating “network control” capabilities

Discussion/Questions

Questions or Comments?

Improving perfSONAR-PS Deployments

- ❄ Based upon the issues we have encountered we setup a Wiki to gather best practices and solutions to issues we have identified:
<http://www.usatlas.bnl.gov/twiki/bin/view/Projects/LHCperfSONAR>
- ❄ This page is being shared with the perfSONAR-PS developers and we expect many of the “fixes” will be incorporated into future releases.
- ❄ Please feel free to add to the Wiki (either directly or by emailing me updates/changes/additions).