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What is AsyncStageout (ASO)

ASO takes care of transfer management for CMS users

A physicist runs jobs through the CRAB workload management system

Job’s output is stored in a temporary area of the storage element of the site where the job ran (local storage)

All outputs are then transferred to the site belonging to the user’s institution (remote storage)
ASO general architecture

ASO uses **FTS** to perform the transfers

Requests from CRAB jobs are posted into a DB (CouchDB)

The DB stores the state of transfers and other relevant info
ASO usage

In production since June 2014

Key component of CMS computing

September: managed over 600k file transfers in a day

Improves previous model where transfers were done from WN and:

- Sometimes could cause DDoS of CMS Tier 2 storage systems
- Transfer failure was the primary reason of job failures
- Resulted in loss of cpu because of failures (need to rerun the job) and because WN CPU is sitting idle during the transfer

Critical parameter in operation is the number of transfers requests

- User transfers consist of many small transfers (differently from central production)
- Pressure to the ASO transfer CouchDB database instance
ASO CouchDB

Suffers of performance limitations: the particular choice (CouchDB) is not well suited for frequently changing data.

Internally created a new document every time you need to update some data (e.g. need to change the state of a transfer).

Size of DB and caches grows too fast and a daily compaction run.

Burst of transfer requests that arrives during compaction can create a downward spiral where documents cannot be processed by ASO.
Problems with ASO CouchDB

During that period transfers ready to be processed by the ASO application piles up and database become unresponsive

Delay in time to provide physicist results of their jobs

Waste of resources since eventually workload management system gives up and jobs have to be run again

Queue of 600k documents ready to be transferred

Drops indicates that the database could not answer to the request
Explored solutions

Horizontal scalability

The ASO tool is structured to be horizontal scalable (more CouchDB, ASO instances), but…

ASO CouchDB instances requires special hardware that is difficult to deploy (not from standard offers from CERN IT)

Aim to find a way to reduce load on CMS operators, not to increase it!

Use a different technology

Couch used for historical reasons, never profited from the map/reduce paradigm typical of no-SQL databases

How to choose among the different database management systems available?

Other components of the workload management system already uses Oracle

No need of special hardware since it is among the services offered by CERN IT
Current state

Oracle solution has been implemented. Required changes:

- ASO backend software
- Job wrapper that insert the transfer request in the database and other parts of the workload management system (CRAB)
- New REST interface on top of the Oracle schema to also allows authen/authz and insert data from the WN using user’s certificate

Early scale tests at the production rate do not show any problem

Production rate of 3k jobs/10m

15k jobs/10m average for scale test
Conclusions

The code for the migration of the CMS transfer database to Oracle is in production since the October release.

Solved problems in Oracle connection management

   By grouping multiple SQL queries into single Oracle request

Currently using both CouchDB and Oracle at the same time to make sure that:

   Functionally all the corner cases and potential bugs have been addressed (in case integration test suite does not cover them all)

   There are no hidden scalability bottlenecks

Plan to parasitically increase Oracle share over the time until CouchDB is switched off.
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