

EOS Production Sites Network Performance Report: July 2010

This is a monthly summary of EOS network performance testing between production sites -- comparing the measured performance against the requirements. **Significant improvements are noted in Green, Network problems in Red, System problems and Requirements issues in Gold, Issues in Orange, and other comments in Blue**

Highlights:

- **Mostly stable flows with reduced congestion at GSFC**
 - **GPA 3.65** (same as last month)
- **Requirements:** updated to Handbook 1.4.3 in May '09 (was 1.4.2 previously)
 - Many Requirements dropped significantly (under review)
- **Only 2 flows below "Good":**
 - **GSFC MODAPS-PDR to EROS ("Low")**
 - Was "Bad" Last month
 - MODIS Congestion fixed in July
 - Problem is packet loss due to removal of Portis Firewall at EROS
 - **WSC to ASF ("Low")**
 - Iperf testing is down; sftp test results are lower than iperf
- **Bottlenecks:**
 - **GSFC:** EBnet: 10 Gig upgrade substantially complete.
 - **MAX:** 10 Gig upgrade completed on 29 June
 - Main MODIS subsystems moved to 10 gig MODIS switch in July -- each has a 1 gig connection
 - User flow averages 1000 mbps – only 700 mbps before upgrade
 - Remaining systems to be upgraded individually

Ratings Changes:

Upgrades: ↑ **GSFC → EROS:** Bad → **Low**
GSFC → NSIDC: Good → **Excellent**


Downgrades: ↓ **WSC → ASF:** Good → **Low**

Ratings Categories:

Rating	Value	Criteria
Excellent:	4	Total Kbps > Requirement * 3
Good:	3	1.3 * Requirement <= Total Kbps < Requirement * 3
Adequate:	2	Requirement < Total Kbps < Requirement * 1.3
Almost Adequate:	1.5	Requirement / 1.3 < Total Kbps < Requirement
Low:	1	Requirement / 3 < Total Kbps < Requirement / 1.3
Bad:	0	Total Kbps < Requirement / 3

Where Total Kbps = Integrated Kbps (where available), otherwise just iperf

Ratings History:



The chart above shows the number of sites in each classification since EOS Production Site testing started in September 1999. Note that these ratings do NOT relate to absolute performance -- they are relative to the EOS requirements.

Requirements Basis:

While the long term plan is to use the requirements from the EOSDIS network requirements database, the database does not appear ready to be used for that purpose at this time. Some mission flows have not been included yet (e.g., TRMM), and the network requirements based on rapid reprocessing (e.g., MODIS 27X, AIRS 20X) have not been resolved.

Thus the requirements are based on the EOS Networks Requirements Handbook, Version 1.4.3 (from which the database requirements were derived). Previously, the requirements were derived from version 1.4.2.


One main difference between Handbooks 1.4.2 and 1.4.3 is that most flows which occur less than once per day were averaged over their production period. These flows were typically monthly Level 3 data transfers, which were specified to be sent in just a few hours. However, they could easily be accommodated either between the per-orbit flows, or within the built-in contingency. Previously, these flows were added in linearly to the requirements, making the requirements unrealistically high.

Additionally, the contingency for reprocessing flows greater than 2X reprocessing was reduced. These flows WERE a major component of the contingency, so adding additional contingency on top of these flows was considered excessive.

However, it seems likely that there are some flows which have been omitted. For example, the GES DISC to KNMI requirement for Level 1+ data (without contingency) was 1.4 mbps in version 1.4.2, but only 22 kbps in version 1.4.3. The user flow has been averaging about 1.4 mbps, suggesting that version 1.4.2 was correct, and that version 1.4.3 has omitted something.

Integrated Charts:


Integrated charts are included with site details, where available. These charts are “Area” charts, with a “salmon” background. A sample Integrated chart is shown here. The yellow area at the bottom represents the daily average of the user flow from the source facility (e.g., GSFC, in this example) to the destination facility (JPL, in this example) obtained from routers via “netflow”. The green area is stacked on top of the user flow, and represents the “adjusted” daily average iperf thrupt between the source-destination pair most closely corresponding to the requirement. This iperf measurement essentially shows the circuit capacity remaining with the user flows active. Adjustments are made to compensate for various systematic effects, and are best considered as an approximation. The red line is the requirement for the flow from the source to destination facilities. On some charts a blue area is also present – usually “behind” the green area – representing adjusted iperf measurements from a second source node at the same facility.



Network Requirements vs. Measured Performance

July 2010		Requirements (mbps)		Testing				Ratings		
Source → Destination	Instrument (s)	Current	Old	Source → Dest Nodes	Avg User Flow mbps	iperf Median mbps	Integrated mbps	Ratings re HB 1.4.3 Requirements		
		HB 1.4.3	HB 1.4.2					This Month	Last Month	
WSC → ASF	ALOS	96.0	n/a	WSC → ASF (sftp)		67.2		Low	G	
EDOS → LASP	ICESat, QuikScat	0.4	0.4	GSFC-EDOS → LASP (blue)	0.13	29.1		Excellent	E	
GSFC → EROS	MODIS, LandSat	342.9	345.9	MODAPS-PDR → EROS LPDAAC	23.5	227.5	233.1	Low	B	
GSFC → JPL	AIRS, MLS, ISTs	101.7	43.6	GES DISC → JPL-AIRS	36.3	218.2	223.2	Good	G	
JPL → GSFC	MLS	0.6	7.4	JPL-PTH → GSFC-ESDIS-PTH	2.4	74.2	74.2	Excellent	E	
JPL → RSS	AMSR-E	0.5	2.5	JPL-PODAAC → RSS		4.1		Excellent	E	
LaRC → JPL	TES, MISR	23.0	43.7	LARC-DAAC → JPL-TES	0.17	237.6		Excellent	E	
JPL → LaRC	TES	1.5	4.4	JPL-PTH → LARC-PTH	0.15	58.3		Excellent	E	
GSFC → LaRC	CERES, MISR, MOPITT	31.3	60.5	GSFC-EDOS → LDAAC	4.7	317.2	319.5	Excellent	E	
LaRC → GSFC	CERES, MODIS, TES	0.4	0.2	LDAAC → GES DISC	0.11	413.3	413.3	Excellent	E	
JPL → NSIDC	AMSR-E	0.2	1.3	JPL-PODAAC → NSIDC		46.2		Excellent	E	
NSIDC → GSFC	MODIS, ICESAT, QuikScat	0.6	0.5	NSIDC DAAC → GES DISC	0.14	316.4	316.4	Excellent	E	
GSFC → NSIDC	MODIS, ICESAT, QuikScat	27.6	34.5	MODAPS-PDR → NSIDC-DAAC	2.1	81.4	83.3	Excellent	G	
GHRC → NSIDC	AMSR-E	0.5	7.5	GHRC → NSIDC DAAC	0.03	11.3		Excellent	E	
LaRC → NCAR	MOPITT	0.1	5.4	LDAAC → NCAR		337.1		Excellent	E	
GSFC → JAXA	QuikScat, TRMM, AMSR	0.1	2.0	GSFC → JAXA	1.3	Testing discontinued: 31 March 2009		Excellent	E	
JAXA → GSFC	AMSR-E	0.5	1.3	JAXA → GSFC	2.5			Excellent	E	
GSFC → ERSDAC	ASTER	5.4	12.5	GSFC-EDOS → ERSDAC	4.6	78.6	78.9	Excellent	E	
ERSDAC → EROS	ASTER	8.3	26.8	ERSDAC → EROS PTH	4.0	88.8	88.9	Excellent	E	
GSFC → KNMI	OMI	0.03	3.3	GSFC-OMISIPS → KNMI ODPS	2.6	168.5	168.6	Excellent	E	
				significant change from version 1.42 (May 2009) to 1.43						
				Value used for ratings						
								Ratings Summary		
								HB 1.4.3 Req		
								Score	Prev	
*Criteria:	Excellent	Total Kbps > Requirement * 3						Excellent	17	16
	Good	1.3 * Requirement <= Total Kbps < Requirement * 3						Good	1	3
	Adequate	Requirement < Total Kbps < Requirement * 1.3						Adequate	0	0
	Almost Adequate	Requirement / 1.3 < Total Kbps < Requirement						Almost Adequate	0	0
	Low	Requirement / 3 < Total Kbps < Requirement / 1.3						Low	2	0
	Bad	Total Kbps < Requirement / 3						Bad	0	1
								Total Sites	20	20
Notes:	Flow Requirements include: TRMM, Terra, Aqua, Aura, ICESAT, QuikScat, GEOS							GPA	3.65	3.65

This graph shows a bar for each source-destination pair – relating the measurements to the requirements for that pair. The bottom of each bar represents the average measured user flow from the source site to the destination site (as a percent of the requirement). Thus the bottom of each bar indicates the relationship between the requirements and actual flows. Note that the requirements generally include a 50% contingency factor above what was specified by the projects, so a value of 66% (dotted orange line) would indicate that the project is flowing as much data as requested. The top of each bar similarly represents the integrated measurement, combining the user flow with Iperf measurements – this value is used to determine the ratings.



1) EROS:

Ratings: ↑ GSFC → EROS: Bad → **Low**
 ERSDAC → EROS: Continued **Excellent**

Web Page: <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/EROS.shtml>
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/EROS_PTH.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
MODAPS-PDR → EROS LPDAAC	357.3	227.5	90.4	23.5	233.1
GSFC-EDOS → EROS LPDAAC	297.7	220.0	86.2		
GES DISC → EROS LPDAAC	211.5	142.6	76.0		
ERSDAC → EROS LPDAAC	90.0	88.8	31.4	4.0	88.9
NSIDC SIDADS → EROS LPDAAC	129.5	119.8	76.3		
GSFC-ESDIS-PTH → EROS PTH	319.3	211.8	105.6		
GSFC-ENPL → EROS PTH	441.5	362.0	233.2		
GSFC-NISN → EROS PTH	439.3	374.0	223.8		
LaRC PTH → EROS PTH	149.3	120.6	51.1		

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	mbps	Rating
GSFC → EROS	CY '08-11	343	Low
ERSDAC → EROS	FY '06 - '10	8.3	Excellent

Comments:

1.1 GSFC → EROS: The rating is based on the MODAPS-PDR Server to EROS LP DAAC measurement, since that is the primary flow. The route is via the Doors to NISN SIP, via the NISN 10 gbps backbone to the NISN Chicago CIEF, then via GigE to the StarLight gigapop, peering with the EROS OC-12 (622 mbps).

The user flow this month was typical of the last few months, and remains far below the nominal requirement (which includes MODIS reprocessing).

In May, the EROS LPDAAC Portus proxy firewall was replaced with a Juniper firewall. At that time, incoming packet retransmission to the EROS LPDAAC increased, and throughput dropped from all sources. Performance to EROS-PTH, outside this firewall, was unchanged, indicating that there was no change to the networks.

MODAPS was moved to the 10 gbps EBnet backbone in February (but with a 1 gig connection). In July the MODIS connection was upgraded to 10 gig (but with each subsystem connected at 1 gig), with improved performance – the rating improves to **Low**.




By contrast, testing to EROS-PTH does not exhibit high packet loss – so performance is higher than to LPDAAC. GSFC-NISN to EROS-PTH would be rated **Adequate**.

The ENPL host has a direct connection to the MAX; its route is via MAX to Internet2 to StarLight in Chicago. Performance is similar to the GSFC-NISN source. Both are mainly limited by the OC-12 to EROS.

1.2 ERSDAC → EROS: See section 9 (ERSDAC) for further discussion.

1.3 NSIDC → EROS: Throughput improved this month (median was 100 mbps last month), due to reduced RTT. Route is via UCB, FRGP, Internet2 from KC (was SLC last month) to Chicago.

1.4 LaRC → EROS: The throughput from LaRC-PTH to EROS-PTH was stable. The route is via NISN to the Chicago CIEF.



2) to GSFC

Ratings: NSIDC → GES DISC: Continued **Excellent**
 LDAAC → GES DISC: Continued **Excellent**
 JPL → GES DISC: Continued **Excellent**

Web Pages:

<http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/GDAAC.shtml>

http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/GSFC_PTH.shtml

http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/icesat/GSFC_ISIPS.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow
	Best	Median	Worst	
EROS LPDAAC → GES DISC	296.5	216.7	106.7	
EROS PTH → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	445.9	373.4	297.1	
JPL-PTH → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	83.1	74.2	66.0	2.4
LDAAC → GES DISC	524.0	413.3	247.3	0.11
LARC-ANGe → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	413.7	361.6	310.3	
NSIDC DAAC → GES DISC	419.2	316.4	164.5	0.14
NSIDC DAAC → GSFC-ISIPS	146.7	145.1	104.5	

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
NSIDC → GSFC	CY '06 – '10	0.6	Excellent
LDAAC → GES DISC	FY '07 – '10	0.4	Excellent
JPL → GSFC combined	CY '06 - 10	3.2	Excellent




Comments:

EROS, EROS-PTH → GSFC: The throughput for tests from EROS PTH to ESDIS-PTH were stable this month. Testing from EROS LPDAAC to GES DISC improved in June with the removal of the EROS proxy firewall.

JPL → GSFC: Throughput was very stable this month. With the modest requirement (reduced from 7.4 mbps in May '09), the rating remains "**Excellent**". The actual user flow remains consistent with the reduced requirement.

LaRC → GSFC: Performance from LDAAC → GES DISC and LaRC ANGe to ESDIS-PTH remained way above 3 x the modest requirement, so the rating continues as "**Excellent**". The user flow this month was way below both the typical flow and the requirement.

NSIDC → GSFC: Performance from NSIDC to GSFC (DAAC and ISIPS) improved at the beginning of July, when FRGP's connection to Internet2 was switched from SLC to KC, reducing RTT to the East. With the low requirement (reduced from 13.3 mbps in May '09), the rating remains "**Excellent**". The ISIPS test node was replaced in April, and testing resumed in May.




2.2 GSFC-ECHO: EOS Metadata Clearinghouse

Web Page: http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/gsfc/GSFC_ECHO.shtml

Test Results:

Source	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
EROS LPDAAC	197.2	150.9	53.5
EROS LPDAAC ftp	9.9	9.7	6.6
GES DISC	516.2	470.6	384.6
GES DISC ftp	300.2	285.7	178.8
LaRC ASDC DAAC	418.3	338.7	255.1
LaRC ASDC DAAC ftp	56.3	55.5	47.1
MODIS-LADSWEB	605.9	518.6	453.9
NSIDC DAAC	227.1	215.3	121.2
NSIDC DAAC ftp	12.2	12.1	7.1



Comments:


Performance is mostly limited by TCP window size – especially on ftp with long RTT. Testing from EROS LPDAAC resumed in June with improved thruput (Testing from EROS had stopped when its proxy firewall was removed on May 18). Testing from GSFC (iperf and ftp), and MODIS LADSWEB also resumed in June, with excellent performance.

2.3 GSFC-EMS: EOS Metrics System

Web Page: http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/gsfc/GSFC_EMS.shtml

Test Results:

Source	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
EROS-PTH	88.5	87.2	74.5
ESDIS-PTH	94.2	94.1	92.5
GES DISC	93.8	93.8	89.3
LARC-PTH	94.0	94.0	90.9
MODAPS-PDR	94.1	94.0	89.0
NSIDC-PTH	n/a	n/a	n/a



Comments:

Testing is performed to GSFC-EMS from the above nodes, iperf only. Results are mostly very steady. Performance limitation is from the 100 mbps fast-E connection. Testing from NSIDC is down due to the removal of NSIDC-PTH – in preparation of moving it to the UCB campus. Testing from NSIDC-SIDADS resumed in August.

3) JPL:

3.1) GSFC → JPL:

Ratings: GSFC → JPL: Continued **Good**

Web Pages: http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/aqua/JPL_AIRS.shtml
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/aura/JPL_MLS.shtml
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/JPL_QSCAT.shtml
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/JPL_PODAAC.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
GSFC-GES DISC → JPL-AIRS	264.3	218.2	115.9	36.3	223.2
GSFC-NISN → JPL-AIRS	260.2	251.9	218.6		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-AIRS	113.6	99.9	75.7		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-PODAAC	171.3	138.5	95.9		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-PODAAC	109.8	65.9	43.5		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-QSCAT	87.8	87.0	73.5		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-QSCAT	60.4	57.3	42.1		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-MLS	363.6	318.8	241.5		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-MLS	166.3	111.6	54.2		

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
GSFC → JPL Combined	FY '08-'10	101.7	Good
GSFC → JPL AIRS	FY '08-'10	98	Good
GSFC → JPL PODAAC	FY '08-'11	1.5	Excellent
GSFC → JPL QSCAT	FY '08-'11	0.6	Excellent
GSFC → JPL MLS	FY '08-'10	2.1	Excellent





Comments: The user flow from GSFC/EOS decreased this month (was 45 mbps last month).

AIRS, Overall: Thruput from **GES DISC** was well above the AIRS requirement, but by less than 3x, so the AIRS rating remains "**Good**". The **JPL overall rating** is based on this test compared with the sum of all the GSFC to JPL requirements – the thrupt is also below 3x this requirement, so the overall rating remains "**Good**".

PODAAC: **ESDIS-PTH** (connected at 1 gig to the 10 gig EBnet backbone) replaced EBnet-PTH as a test source in April. Performance is lower than previously from EBnet-PTH, but still way above the 1.5 mbps PODAAC requirement (possibly related to tuning), rating "**Excellent**".

QSCAT: Thuput from **ESDIS-PTH** to QSCAT was also lower than from EBnet-PTH, but is also well above the modest requirement, rating "**Excellent**". Testing from **GSFC-NISN** has even higher thrupt.

MLS: Thruput from **ESDIS-PTH** was mostly stable, but thrupt was even better from **GSFC-NISN**. The rating remains "**Excellent**".



3.2) LaRC → JPL

Rating: Continued **Excellent**

Web Pages:

- http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/JPL_TES.shtml
- http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/terra/JPL_MISR.shtml
- http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/JPL_PTH.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
LaRC DAAC → JPL-TES	331.6	237.6	144.3	0.17	237.6
LaRC PTH → JPL-TES	160.4	113.5	77.4		
LaRC PTH → JPL-TES sftp	12.6	12.2	8.6		
LaRC ANGE → JPL-PTH	54.2	52.1	49.2	6.9	53.6
LaRC PTH → JPL-PTH	50.4	44.4	24.3		
LaRC PTH → JPL-PTH sftp	31.4	31.3	31.1		
LaRC DAAC → JPL-MISR	64.5	54.0	24.8	5.4	54.0
LaRC PTH → JPL-MISR	82.9	82.3	52.6		

Requirements:





Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
LaRC DAAC → JPL-TES	FY '07 – '10	7.0	Excellent
LaRC DAAC → JPL-MISR	FY '07 – '10	32.9	Good
LaRC → JPL-Combined	FY '07 – '10	39.9	Excellent

Note: User flow data between LaRC and JPL data is now obtained from the NISN router at JPL. Thus integrated graphs are again available for this path.

LaRC→ JPL (Overall, TES): Median performance from LaRC ASDC DAAC to JPL-TES remains well over 3 x the TES and combined requirements, so the TES and Overall ratings remain "Excellent". There were several periods of congestion observed from ASDC DAAC. Sftp performance from LaRC-PTH to JPL-TES is quite low, limited by the Sftp application on the TES node. User flow to TES is very low.

LaRC→ JPL-PTH: Sftp results are better from LaRC-PTH to JPL-PTH (than to TES) because JPL-PTH uses a larger TCP window size. The JPL-PTH integrated graph shows the overall LaRC to JPL user flow (vs. the overall requirement). The user flow in June was again mostly for MISR.

LaRC → JPL (MISR): the median thrupt is above the requirement, by more than 30%, so the MISR rating remains "Good". Thrupt is even better from LaRC-PTH, and both sources get better iperf thrupt when user flow is low.



3.3) JPL → LaRC

Rating: Continued **Excellent**

Web Page: http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/LARC_PTH.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
JPL-PTH → LaRC PTH	69.7	58.3	57.5	0.15	58.3

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
JPL-PTH → LaRC PTH	FY '07 – '10	1.5	Excellent



Comment: This requirement is primarily for TES products produced at the TES SIPS at JPL, being returned to LaRC for archiving; it was reduced from 4.4 mbps in May '09 (and had been reduced in April '08 from 52.6 mbps). In June thrupt switched to its lower bimodal state (thruput often switches between 60 and 85 mbps). The rating remains "**Excellent**". The user flow is now measured (at JPL), but is very small.

4) GSFC → LaRC:

Rating: Continued **Excellent**

Web Pages: <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/LARC.shtml>
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/LARC_ANGe.shtml
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/LARC_PTH.shtml

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
GES DISC → LaRC ASDC	352.2	308.2	171.7	4.4	309.1
GSFC-EDOS → LaRC ASDC	424.3	317.2	105.4		
ESDIS-PTH → LaRC-ANGe	418.9	394.2	308.7		
GSFC-NISN → LaTIS	398.8	385.6	335.3		

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
GSFC → LARC (Combined)	CY '09 – '11	31.3	Excellent




Comments:

GSFC → LaRC ASDC: The rating is based on the GES DISC to LaRC ASDC DAAC thrupt, compared to the combined requirement. The integrated thrupt remains well above 3 x this requirement, so the rating remains "**Excellent**".

The GES DISC results improved in June '09 when the GES DISC moved to the 10 Gig EBnet LAN, as did results from EDOS with its move to the 10 Gig in October '09.

As seen on the Integrated graph, the average user flow remains much lower than the requirement.

ANGe (LaTIS): Testing to ANGe was moved from EBnet-PTH to ESDIS-PTH in April, with similar steady performance. Testing to LaTIS (Darrin) from GSFC-NISN was similar, also with consistent results.



5) Boulder CO sites:

5.1) NSIDC:

Ratings: GSFC → NSIDC: ↑ Good → **Excellent**
 JPL → NSIDC: Continued **Excellent**
 GHRC → NSIDC: Continued **Excellent**

Web Pages: <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/NSIDC.shtml>
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/NSIDC_SIDADS.shtml
http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/NSIDC_PTH.shtml

The NSIDC DAAC was disconnected from NISN PIP in December '09 – all flows now go via the UCB campus, usually via FRGP to Internet2. Note that NSIDC-PTH was still connected to and using NISN PIP until mid May, when it was removed in preparation to switch its connection to UCB. Also, UCB dropped its peering with NISN SIP in January, so that route is no longer used.

At the beginning of July 2010, FRGP changed its connection to Internet2 to be at Kansas City (KC) instead of Salt Lake City (SLC). This reduced RTT between sites in the East. This resulted in performance changes in some cases.

Test Results: NSIDC S4PA

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
MODIS-PDR → NSIDC DAAC	109.9	81.4	39.8	2.1	83.3
GES-DISC → NSIDC DAAC	258.1	181.5	61.8		
GSFC-EDOS → NSIDC DAAC	221.1	164.9	54.9		
GSFC-ISIPS → NSIDC (iperf)	128.6	102.1	67.7		
JPL PODAAC → NSIDC DAAC	49.3	46.2	28.1		
GHRC → NSIDC DAAC (iperf)	24.7	11.3	4.6		
GHRC → NSIDC DAAC (ftp pull)	16.3	9.9	2.1		

Requirements:





Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
GSFC → NSIDC	CY '07 – '10	27.6	Excellent
JPL → NSIDC	CY '07 – '10	0.2	Excellent
GHRC → NSIDC	CY '07 – '10	0.5	Excellent

Comments: GSFC → NSIDC S4PA: This rating is based on testing from the MODIS-PDR server to the NSIDC DAAC, since this is the primary production flow. The requirement was reduced in May '09 from 34.5 mbps (was 64 mbps in April '08). MODIS performance increased at the beginning of July, when MODIS was moved to a 10 gig switch, with separate 1 gig connections for most subsystems. The integrated thrupt from MODAPS is above the requirement, no by slightly more than 3x, so the rating improves to "**Excellent**". The user flow decreased this month, and was substantially below this reduced requirement. Testing was added this month from EDOS. It's performance is similar to that fro GES DISC, and higher than from MODIS

GSFC-ISIPS → NSIDC: Iperf thrupt is similar to MODIS.


JPL PODAAC → NSIDC S4PA: The requirement was reduced from 1.34 mbps in May '09. Thrupt from PODAAC to NSIDC has been mostly stable since testing was moved to use Internet2 in September '09; the rating remains "**Excellent**".

GHRC, GHRC-ftp → NSIDC S4PA: GHRC (NSSTC, UAH, Huntsville, AL) sends AMSR-E data to NSIDC via Internet2, with the return route now via Internet2 peering with NISN SIP – reducing performance due to its longer RTT. The median thrupt is more than 3x the requirement (reduced from 7.5 mbps in May '09), so the rating remains "**Excellent**". The ftp performance is limited by the TCP window size and RTT. User flow averaged only 30 kbps this month (way below the requirement).



Test Results: NSIDC SIDADS, PTH

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
GSFC-ENPL → NSIDC-SIDADS	143.7	140.4	124.0
GSFC-NISN → NSIDC-SIDADS	62.1	61.1	49.7
ESDIS-PTH → NSIDC-PTH			
MODIS-PDR → NSIDC-PTH			
JPL PTH → NSIDC-PTH			



GSFC → NSIDC-SIDADS: Thruput via Internet2 to SIDADS from ENPL and GSFC-NISN improved with the reduced RTT due to the FRGP to Internet2 connection move from SLC to KC.

NSIDC-PTH: Testing to NSIDC-PTH was stopped in mid May when the test node was removed in preparation to switch its connection to UCB.


5.2) LASP:

Ratings: GSFC → LASP: Continued **Excellent**

Web Page: <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/LASP.shtml>

Test Results:


Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
GSFC EDOS → LASP (blue)	37.0	29.1	11.7
ESDIS-PTH → LASP (iperf)	85.9	75.5	49.3
ESDIS-PTH → LASP (scp)	3.1	3.1	2.6
GSFC ENPL → LASP (green)	176.8	163.5	81.1



Requirement:

Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
GSFC-EDOS → LASP (blue)	CY '07 – '10	0.4	Excellent

Comments: Thruput from EDOS to the LASP blue network via NISN PIP improved and got much steadier with EDOS' move to the 10 gig backbone, in October '09. The median thruput from EDOS remains well over 3x the requirement, so the rating remains "**Excellent**". The average user flow this month was typical at 130 kbps




ESDIS-PTH also tests to the test node on LASP's blue network with improved thruput.

SCP testing was restored in April from ESDIS-PTH to the upgraded LASP test node. When SCP testing was discontinued to the old LASP node in November '09, thruput was very steady at 0.45 mbps, so the current performance is approximately a 7X improvement.

Performance from GSFC-ENPL to a node on LASP's green network via Internet2 improved with the reduced RTT.

5.3) NCAR:Ratings: LaRC → NCAR: Continued **Excellent**Web Pages <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/terra/NCAR.shtml>**Test Results:**


Source	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			Requirement
	Best	Median	Worst	
LaRC ASDC	428.0	337.1	142.5	0.1
LaRC PTH	179.0	164.5	63.5	
GSFC-ENPL-GE	290.8	186.3	79.1	n/a
GSFC-ENPL-FE	93.6	93.5	93.3	
GSFC-NISN	304.0	302.5	235.6	



Comments: NCAR (Boulder, CO) has a SIPS for MOPITT (Terra, from LaRC), and has MOPITT and HIRDLS (Aura, from GSFC) QA requirements.

Thruput from all of the East coast nodes to NCAR improved at the beginning of July, when FRGP changed its connection to Internet2 to KC instead of SLC, reducing RTT. Thruput from LaRC ASDC was noisy, but the median remained well above 3 x the reduced requirement, so the rating remains “**Excellent**”.

From GSFC-ENPL-GE, with a Gig-E connection to MAX, the median thruput also improved. From GSFC-NISN, the route is via NISN to the MAX (similar to the route from LaRC). Performance from all sources is noisy but mostly stable. The average user flow from GSFC this month was only 650 kbps (much lower than the old 5.1 mbps requirement).

**6) ASF**Ratings: IOnet: X Discontinued
WSC → ASF: ↓ Good → **Low**Web Page: <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/ASF2.shtml>**Test Results:**

Source	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			Requirement	Rating
	Best	Median	Worst		
WSC				96	Low
WSC-SFTP	69.7	67.2	52.4		
GSFC					
GSFC-SCP	18.2	18.1	18.0		

Comments: IOnet: The ASF IOnet host and firewall was reconfigured in October '07, and all IOnet testing stopped at that time.

Testing to ASF is for the ALOS mission. The route from WSC is via NISN SIP, peering with Internet2 at one of several possible peering points (usually StarLight in Chicago). Internet2 connects to the “Pacific Northwest Gigapop” (PNW) in Seattle. From there the University of Alaska – Fairbanks (UAF) has a dedicated OC-12 circuit to campus, then via campus LAN to the Alaska Satellite Facility (ASF). In February policing was installed at the WSC source at 250 mbps. This steadied the thruput significantly.




The ASF iperf server went down in June, so the only testing remaining is sftp. The median sftp thruput was steady, but is below the requirement by more than 30%, so the rating drops to “**Low**”.

From GSFC, thruput is lower, even though the RTT is also lower. This is under investigation.

7) Remote Sensing Systems (RSS):Web Page <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/aqua/RSS.shtml>Rating: Continued **Excellent****Test Results:**

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			Reqmt
	Best	Median	Worst	
JPL → RSS	5.67	4.05	1.48	0.5



Comments: RSS (Santa Rosa, CA) is a SIPS for AMSR-E (Aqua), receiving L1 data from JAXA via JPL, and sending its processed L2 results to GHRC (aka NSSTC) (UAH, Huntsville, AL). This month the thruput from JPL was noisy, as usual -- periods of low performance are believed to be attributable to correspondingly high user flow (User flow data remains unavailable on this circuit). The requirement was reduced with handbook 1.4.3 (was 2.5 mbps previously). The median iperf was more than 3 x the reduced requirement, so the rating remains “**Excellent**”.


Note that with the present configuration (passive servers at both RSS and GHRC), the RSS to GHRC performance cannot be tested.

8) KNMI:Web Pages http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/aura/KNMI_ODPS.shtmlRating: Continued **Excellent****Test Results:**

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			Reqmt
	Best	Median	Worst	
OMISIPS → KNMI-ODPS	196.0	168.5	98.5	0.03
GSFC-ENPL → KNMI-ODPS	113.0	97.5	76.7	



Comments: KNMI (DeBilt, Netherlands) is a SIPS and QA site for OMI (Aura). The route from GSFC is via MAX to Internet2, peering in DC with Géant’s 10 gbps circuit to Frankfurt, then via Surfnet through Amsterdam. The rating is based on the results from OMISIPS at GSFC to the ODPS primary server, and remains “**Excellent**”. This performance improved dramatically at the end of February with MODIS’ move off of the congested EBnet GigE. The best to worst ratio is now only 2:1 (was 12:1 in February). The user flow averaged 2.6 mbps this month, hard to see on the integrated graph. This is more consistent with the previous 3.3 mbps requirement than the current 0.03 mbps requirement (This new requirement remains under review).



9) ERSDAC:

Ratings: **GSFC → ERSDAC: Continued Excellent**
ERSDAC → EROS: Continued Excellent
ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER-IST: Continued Excellent

Web Page : <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/ERSDAC.shtml>

US ↔ ERSDAC Test Results

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
GSFC-EDOS → ERSDAC	84.5	78.6	37.0	4.6	78.9
GES DISC → ERSDAC	26.9	22.6	14.4		
GSFC ENPL (FE) → ERSDAC	89.4	89.3	88.9		
ERSDAC → EROS	90.0	88.8	31.4	4.0	
ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER IST	89.9	89.7	89.5		

Requirements:

Source → Dest	FY	Mbps	Rating
GSFC → ERSDAC	'05 - '09	5.4	Excellent
ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER IST	'07- '09	0.31	Excellent
ERSDAC → EROS	'07- '09	8.3	Excellent





Comments:

GSFC → ERSDAC: The median thrupt from EDOS improved in October '09 with EDOS' move to the 10 Gig EBnet, avoiding the congestion on the 1 Gig EBnet. It remains well above 3 x the reduced requirement; the rating remains "Excellent". The integrated chart shows that the 4.6 mbps user flow is stable, and consistent with the new requirement.

Thruput from GES DISC to ERSDAC is limited by packet loss at the GigE to FastE switch at Tokyo-XP. The GES DISC GigE source does not see any bottlenecks until this switch (The Internet2 and APAN backbones are 10 Gbps). It thus exceeds the capacity of the switch's FastE output circuit, causing packet loss. But the FastE connected ENPL node is limited to 100 mbps by its own interface, so does not suffer performance degrading packet loss – and the performance is much higher. EDOS uses QoS (HTB) to limit its burst rate, and thus gets much better thrupt that GES DISC – thrupt similar to ENPL-FE.

ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER-IST: The median thrupt is very stable, and remains well above the [unstated] requirement (IST requirements are generally 311 kbps), so the rating remains "Excellent".

ERSDAC → EROS: The thrupt is stable and remains well above the reduced requirement (was 26.8 mbps previously). The new 8.3 mbps requirement is much closer to the actual 4.0 mbps flow (especially when contingency is added). The median thrupt is more than 3 x the reduced requirement, so the rating remains "Excellent".



10) US ↔ JAXA

Ratings: **US → JAXA: Continued Excellent**
JAXA → US: Continued Excellent

The JAXA test hosts at EOC Hatoyama were retired on March 31, 2009 (the end of the Japanese government's fiscal year). No additional testing is planned for AMSR or TRMM. All testing to JAXA-TKSC for ALOS was terminated at the end of June '09.

However, the user flow between GSFC and JAXA continues to be measured. As shown below, the average user flow this month was 1.3 mbps from GSFC to JAXA (with peaks about 6 mbps), and 82 kbps from JAXA to GSFC (with regular peaks to 2.5 mbps). Comparing these values to the new requirements of 0.1 mbps produces a rating of "Excellent" in both directions. Note that the user flow to JAXA is much more consistent with the old 2.0 mbps GSFC → JAXA requirement.

