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What has changed since CHEP’18?

FogKV became DAQDB and is available @github: github.com/daq-db/daqdb.

Intel Optane DC Persistent Memory is now available.

DAQDB has been integrated into ATLAS TDAQ framework.

Distributed mode has been enabled.
DAQDB highlights

Designed for Intel Optane DC Persistent Memory providing data persistence with strong performance and affordable capacity.

Second-line NVMe-based storage to further extend the capacity.

Data structure based on Adaptive Radix Trie (ARTree) for efficient range queries.

DAQ-specific API featuring compound keys, range queries, and next event retrieval.
DAQDB PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Persistent data structure with volatile data in first-line buffer
Collection starting after readout

Embedded locally

![Diagram of readout and collector threads]

Remote server

Server node:
*Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8280L CPU @2.70GHz, 6TB of Intel(R) Optane (TM) DC persistent memory, 192GB of DDR4 DRAM*

Client node:
*Intel(R) Xeon(R) Gold 6252 CPU @2.10GHz*

Centos 7.7, kernel 4.19, OFED 4.7
Mellanox ConnectX-5(R) with eRPC in raw Ethernet mode
Minidaq application
https://github.com/daq-db/daqdb/tree/master/apps/minidaq
https://erpc.io/
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Good multi-core scalability while filling and emptying DAQDB with a single server CPU. Get requests profit from lockless access.
Server is CPU-bound, while client is latency-bound. eRPC adds segmentation latency with 1kB MTU.
At 10kB server is memory-bound. Memory and network IO add extra latency for the client. The collectors outperform now the readout.
Readout and collection in parallel
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DAQDB is in the performance range required by ATLAS/CMS for local access, but requires optimization in remote mode.
Small impact on readout with data collection happening in parallel.
DAQDB being integrated with ATLAS TDAQ

Complete dataflow simulation:
- Writer application with embedded DAQDB.
- DAQDB client application for getting ATLAS fragments.

Next steps
- Optimization to reach target throughput.
- Standalone applications for fine-tuning.
- Multiple writer/reader applications.
SUMMARY & OUTLOOK
Lessons learned so far

Persistent memory proves to be a good candidate for lower-cost and higher-capacity buffering solution for DAQ than standard DRAM.

Initial performance evaluation of DAQDB gives promising results as for a generic KVS solution for DAQ.

`GetAny` as first DAQ-oriented feature is functional.

ARTree has non-negligible performance/memory overhead and requires more effort in implementation. Simpler data structures might be good enough.
Outlook

Implementation and evaluation of second-line buffer.

Optimization of distributed mode of operation, move to asynchronous mode.

Alternative data structures.

Multi-node scaling.
A JOINT WORK ON A GENERIC KVS FOR DAQ

Looking for contributors!

https://github.com/daq-db/daqqdb
ARTree 256-element node lock is the bottleneck @100B value size

--82.44%--DaqDB::MinidaqRoNode::_Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>--77.00%--DaqDB::KVStore::Alloc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--76.92%--DaqDB::ARTree::AllocValueForKey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--76.92%--DaqDB::ARTree::AllocValueForKey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--70.56%--DaqDB::TreeImpl::findValueInNode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--32.80%--pmemobj_mutex_lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--27.52%--pmemobj_mutex_unlock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--5.00%--DaqDB::KVStore::Put
Memory IO is the bottleneck @10KB

--93.78%--DaqDB::MinidaqRoNode::_Task
   --59.54%--pmem_memcpy_nodrain
   --20.13%--DaqDB::KVStore::Alloc
      --20.11%--DaqDB::ARTree::AllocValueForKey
         --13.11%--DaqDB::TreeImpl::findValueInNode
            --5.65%--pmemobj_publish
            --5.98%--pmemobj_xreserve
   --13.48%--DaqDB::KVStore::Put