

EOS Production Sites Network Performance Report: October 2011

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**
 - **GPA 3.83** (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 "Excellent"; only 1 below "Good":**
 - **GSFC MODAPS-PDR to EROS** ("Almost Adequate")
 - Only slightly below "Adequate"

Ratings Changes:

Upgrades: ↑ None


Downgrades: ↓ None

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 = Average Integrated Kbps (where available), otherwise just iperf

Ratings History:



The chart above shows the number of sites in each rating category 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.

Additions and deletions:

- 2011 April: Added RSS to GHRC
- 2011 May: Deleted WSC to ASF for ALOS

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. ESDIS is in process of reviewing its network ICD's with each instrument team. When these ICDs are completed, the database will be updated with the ICD values, and those values will be used here as well.

Until then, the requirements are based on the EOS Networks Requirements Handbook, Version 1.4.3 (from which the original 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 from version 1.4.3. 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

October 2011		Requirements (mbps)		Testing				Ratings		
Source → Destination	Instrument (s)	Current	Old	Source → Dest Nodes	Average 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	
GSFC → EROS	MODIS, LandSat	342.9	345.9	MODAPS-PDR → EROS LPDAAC	23.3	313.7	319.8	AA	AA	
GSFC → JPL	AIRS, MLS, ISTs	101.7	43.6	GES DISC → JPL-AIRS	31.6	131.5	136.1	Good	Good	
JPL → GSFC	MLS	0.6	7.4	JPL-PTH → GSFC-ESDIS-PTH	1.7	85.7	85.7	Excellent	Ex	
JPL → RSS	AMSR-E	0.5	2.5	JPL-PODAAC → RSS	2.69	3.28	4.20	Excellent	Ex	
RSS → GHRC	AMSR-E	0.3		RSS (Comcast) → GHRC		3.61		Excellent	Ex	
LaRC → JPL	TES, MISR	69.3	43.7	LARC-ASDC → JPL-TES	15.4	337.0		Excellent	Ex	
JPL → LaRC	TES	1.5	4.4	JPL-PTH → LARC-PTH	0.58	63.1		Excellent	Ex	
GSFC → LaRC	CERES, MISR, MOPITT	31.3	60.5	GES DISC → LaRC ASDC	35.1	418.1	421.5	Excellent	Ex	
LaRC → GSFC	CERES, MODIS, TES	0.4	0.2	LARC-ASDC → GES DISC	0.64	302.3	302.3	Excellent	Ex	
JPL → NSIDC	AMSR-E	0.2	1.3	JPL-PODAAC → NSIDC	0.007	34.7		Excellent	Ex	
NSIDC → GSFC	MODIS, ICESAT, QuikScat	0.6	0.5	NSIDC DAAC → GES DISC	1.28	179.6	179.6	Excellent	Ex	
GSFC → NSIDC	MODIS, ICESAT, QuikScat	27.6	34.5	MODAPS-PDR → NSIDC-DAAC	9.3	114.4	118.1	Excellent	Ex	
GHRC → NSIDC	AMSR-E	0.5	7.5	GHRC → NSIDC DAAC (ftp)	0.19	8.2		Excellent	Ex	
LaRC → NCAR	MOPITT	0.1	5.4	LARC-ASDC → NCAR		282.4		Excellent	Ex	
EDOS → LASP	ICESat, QuikScat	0.4	0.4	ESDIS-PTH → LASP (blue)	0.0013	8.99		Excellent	Ex	
GSFC → JAXA	QuikScat, TRMM, AMSR	0.1	2.0	GSFC → JAXA	4.0	Testing discontinued: 31 March 2009		Excellent	Ex	
JAXA → GSFC	AMSR-E	0.5	1.3	JAXA → GSFC	2.0			Excellent	Ex	
GSFC → ERSDAC	ASTER	5.4	12.5	GSFC-EDOS → ERSDAC	3.7	92.2	92.5	Excellent	Ex	
ERSDAC → EROS	ASTER	8.3	26.8	ERSDAC → EROS PTH	8.9	182.6	182.6	Excellent	Ex	
GSFC → KNMI	OMI	0.03	3.3	GSFC-OMISIPS → KNMI ODPS	3.3	66.8	67.3	Excellent	Ex	
				Significant change from v 1.4.2 (5/09) to v 1.4.3				Ratings Summary		
				Value used for ratings				HB 1.4.3 Req		
								Score	Prev	
*Criteria:	Excellent	Total Kbps > Requirement * 3			Excellent	18	18			
	Good	1.3 * Requirement <= Total Kbps < Requirement * 3			Good	1	1			
	Adequate	Requirement < Total Kbps < Requirement * 1.3			Adequate	0	0			
	Almost Adequate	Requirement / 1.3 < Total Kbps < Requirement			Almost Adequate	1	1			
	Low	Requirement / 3 < Total Kbps < Requirement / 1.3			Low	0	0			
	Bad	Total Kbps < Requirement / 3			Bad	0	0			
								Total Sites	20	
Notes:		Flow Requirements include: TRMM, Terra, Aqua, Aura, ICESAT, QuikScat, GEOS							GPA	3.83
									3.83	

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) – it 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 67% (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: Continued **Almost Adequate**
 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	346.7	313.7	186.5	23.3	319.8
GSFC-EDOS → EROS LPDAAC	235.8	156.4	36.7		
GES DISC → EROS LPDAAC	395.1	278.0	133.9		
ERSDAC → EROS LPDAAC	205.1	182.6	79.2	8.8	182.6
NSIDC SIDADS → EROS PTH	127.5	90.5	31.6		
GSFC-ENPL → EROS PTH	809.4	725.3	572.0		
GSFC-NISN → EROS PTH	464.6	298.7	202.8		
LaRC PTH → EROS PTH	186.2	124.5	52.0		

Requirements:

Source → Dest	Date	mbps	Rating
GSFC → EROS	CY '08-11	343	Almost Adequate
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-48 tail circuit.





The user flow dropped off mid March, after about 5 months of high user flow, reportedly based on a science user at EROS acquiring MODIS data. This month it averaged only about 6.8% of the nominal requirement (the requirement includes MODIS reprocessing).

In August, thrupt from MODAPS-PDR to LPDAAC improved due to EBnet upgrades. The rating remains **Almost Adequate**.

Iperf performance from GSFC-NISN and GSFC-ENPL was mostly stable since mid May. The GSFC-ENPL host has a direct connection to the MAX; its route is via MAX to Internet2 to StarLight in Chicago.

1.2 ERSDAC → EROS: Excellent.

See section 9 (ERSDAC) for further discussion.



1.3 NSIDC → EROS-PTH: Performance dropped in mid October – under investigation.

1.4 LaRC → EROS: The thrupt from LaRC-PTH to EROS-PTH was stable. The route is via NISN SIP to the Chicago CIEF to StarLight – similar to EBnet sources.

2) to GSFC

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

Web Pages:

- <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/GDAAC.shtml>
- http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Organizations/production/ESDIS_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	243.6	153.4	93.1	
EROS PTH → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	407.7	243.4	97.3	
JPL-PTH → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	87.9	85.7	81.9	1.7
LDAAC → GES DISC	521.1	302.3	161.3	0.64
LARC-ANGe → GSFC-ESDIS PTH	498.0	410.3	333.2	
NSIDC DAAC → GES DISC	262.5	179.6	115.5	1.28
NSIDC DAAC → GSFC-ISIPS	122.6	106.6	78.6	

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: Thruput to GES DISC was noisy but relatively stable this month, similar to last month.

EROS, EROS-PTH → GSFC: The thrupt for tests from EROS and EROS-PTH to GES DISC and ESDIS-PTH were mostly stable, with better results from EROS-PTH.

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

LaRC → GSFC: Performance from LDAAC to 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 again above the requirement.

NSIDC → GSFC: Performance from NSIDC to GSFC (DAAC and ISIPS) was mostly steady this month. The user flow was above the low requirement (reduced from 13.3 mbps in May '09); the rating remains "Excellent".




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	n/a	n/a	n/a
EROS LPDAAC ftp	12.3	12.3	11.0
GES DISC	n/a	n/a	n/a
GES DISC ftp	93.0	93.0	83.3
LaRC ASDC DAAC	n/a	n/a	n/a
LaRC ASDC DAAC ftp	n/a	n/a	n/a
MODIS-LADSWEB	n/a	n/a	n/a
NSIDC DAAC	n/a	n/a	n/a
NSIDC DAAC ftp	11.4	11.3	9.2



Comments:


The echo node was moved at the end of September. Most ftp tests continued working (except from LaRC ASDC), but iperf tests need new firewall rules before resumption of testing. Ftp performance was stable from EROS and NSIDC, but initially dropped from GES DISC, then improved late in the month with further reconfiguration. FTP performance is mostly limited by TCP window size – especially on ftps with long RTT.

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	87.2	80.2	54.1
ESDIS-PTH	94.3	89.3	79.2
GES DISC	93.7	89.8	80.4
LARC-PTH	94.0	94.0	90.0
MODAPS-PDR	94.1	94.1	92.0
NSIDC-SIDADS	92.7	92.1	81.9



Comments:

Testing is performed to GSFC-EMS from the above nodes, iperf only. Results are very steady. Performance limitation is from the 100 mbps Fast-E connection. The EMS testing will be transitioned to the new test node (FS1) next month.

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	201.9	131.5	60.4	31.6	136.1
GSFC-NISN → JPL-AIRS	293.7	283.0	249.5		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-AIRS	235.9	192.3	137.9		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-PODAAC	90.7	72.2	48.0		
MODAPS-PDR → JPL-PODAAC	203.1	115.3	39.5		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-QSCAT	87.1	83.4	74.4		
ESDIS-PS → JPL-QSCAT	91.5	80.0	44.0		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-QSCAT	79.8	68.7	46.4		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-MLS	284.6	258.0	195.0		
ESDIS-PTH → JPL-MLS	238.2	169.1	102.6		




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 to JPL combined was below normal this month.

AIRS, Overall: Integrated thrupt from **GES DISC** remained slightly above 30% above the AIRS requirement, 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 remains above 1.3 x this requirement, so the overall rating also remains **Good**.




PODAAC: The PODAAC node was switched in May – testing to the new node began mid May, but failed in late August, and was fixed in mid October. Performance is lower than to the old node, but is still way above the 1.5 mbps PODAAC requirement, rating **Excellent**.



QSCAT: Thuput from **ESDIS-PTH** to QSCAT improved around 1 June (by disabling TSO) to be similar to **GSFC-NISN**, and remains well above the modest requirement, rating **Excellent**. User flow from GSFC to QSCAT averaged only about 0.2 kbps this month.

MLS: Thruput from **ESDIS-PTH** was mostly stable, but thrupt was 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	429.4	337.0	125.2	0.10	337.0
LaRC PTH → JPL-TES	175.8	153.4	118.6		
LaRC PTH → JPL-TES sftp	3.08	3.06	3.00		
GSFC-NISN → JPL-TES sftp	3.18	3.17	3.13		
LaRC ANGE → JPL-PTH	78.8	74.7	74.7	15.4	74.8
LaRC PTH → JPL-PTH	65.5	46.5	27.0		
LaRC PTH → JPL-PTH sftp	31.8	31.8	31.7		
LaRC DAAC → JPL-MISR	69.8	60.6	37.2	1.5	60.8
LaRC PTH → JPL-MISR	84.7	64.5	38.2		

Requirements:






Source → Dest	Date	Mbps	Rating
LaRC DAAC → JPL-TES	FY '07 –	7.0	Excellent
LaRC DAAC → JPL-MISR	FY '07 –	62.3	Almost Adequate
LaRC → JPL-Combined	FY '07 –	69.3	Excellent

Note: The overall LaRC → JPL flow (15.4 mbps) was much higher than last month's 4.9 mbps. Only about 10% of the LaRC to JPL flow this month was for MISR (usually around 80%). The JPL-PTH integrated graph shows the overall LaRC to JPL user flow (vs. the overall requirement).

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". User flow to TES is very low.

Sftp performance from LaRC-PTH to JPL-TES is quite low, apparently limited by the Sftp server on the TES node. An additional Sftp test to JPL-TES from GSFC-NISN (not graphed), gets similar poor results to LaRC-PTH. The Sftp window size on the new TES node is quite large, and is thus not the problem. Instead, it appears that the TES sftp application is throttling the sender. Note that Sftp results are much better from LaRC-PTH to JPL-PTH (than to TES), even though iperf results from the same source are better to TES than JPL-PTH.

LaRC → JPL (MISR): The MISR node was replaced in mid October – the throughput is lower than with the old node – will be retuned. It remains BELOW the new requirement, so the MISR rating remains **Almost Adequate**. The average user flow to MISR was only about 2.4% of the new requirement.




3.3) JPL → LaRCRating: 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	63.1	63.1	63.0	0.58	63.1

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). This month the thrupt was again stable at the lower of its two common states – 63 and 85 mbps. The rating remains “**Excellent**”. The small user flow was consistent with the requirement.

**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	546.3	418.1	302.9	35.1	421.5
GSFC-EDOS → LaRC ASDC	518.5	331.0	100.9		
ESDIS-PTH → LaRC-ANGe	439.3	385.7	261.2		
GSFC-NISN → LaTIS	472.1	446.9	413.2		

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 increased in August, due to disabling of TSO on **GES DISC**. It remains well above 3 x this requirement, so the rating remains “**Excellent**”.

Thruput to ASDC from **GSFC-EDOS** was much lower than from **GES DISC** until it was returned in mid August, with improved results.

As seen on the integrated graph, the user flow was variable, fairly consistent the requirement.

ANGe (LaTIS): Testing to ANGe from **ESDIS-PTH** gets steady performance. Testing to LaTIS (Darrin) from **GSFC-NISN** was similar, with very consistent results.



5) Boulder CO sites:


5.1) NSIDC:

Ratings: GSFC → NSIDC: Continued **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 or NLR. Thus the DAAC competes with the students for network capacity, and there was often significant diurnal variation.

NSIDC reports that the circuit from UCB to FRGP was increased from 1 gbps to 10 gbps on approx 10 July. No performance change was observed at that time, however. Performance did improve a bit at the end of July, but dropped again in October.




Test Results: NSIDC S4PA


Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integrated
	Best	Median	Worst		
MODAPS-PDR → NSIDC DAAC	146.1	114.4	62.1	9.3	118.1
GES-DISC → NSIDC DAAC	155.6	115.5	59.1		
GSFC-EDOS → NSIDC DAAC	130.8	90.0	18.6		
GSFC-ISIPS → NSIDC (iperf)	113.0	92.7	67.2		
JPL PODAAC → NSIDC DAAC	36.8	34.7	32.9		

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 MODAPS-PDR server to the NSIDC DAAC, since this is the primary production flow. The requirement was reduced in May '09 from 34.5 mbps (and was 64 mbps in April '08). Thruput from MODAPS-PDR to NSIDC improved in August due to EBnet upgrades, but dropped in mid-October – under investigation. Thruput from GES DISC to NSIDC also improved a bit in August due to disabling of TSO on the GES DISC test node.



The integrated thruput from MODAPS remains above the requirement, by more than 3x, so the rating remains "Excellent". The user flow was somewhat lower than last month's 12.4 mbps, at about 33% of the reduced requirement. Testing from other GSFC sources, including GES DISC, EDOS, and ISIPS, is similar to MODAPS.

JPL PODAAC → NSIDC S4PA: The requirement was reduced from 1.34 mbps in May '09. Thruput from PODAAC to NSIDC has been mostly stable with a similar diurnal cycle since testing was moved to use Internet2 in September '09; the rating remains "Excellent". Testing was discontinued when the PODAAC node was replaced in mid October, but was resumed in November.




5) Boulder CO sites (Continued):

5.1) NSIDC: (Continued): Test Results: GHRC to NSIDC

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
GHRC → NSIDC DAAC (nuttcp)	12.9	7.9	2.9
GHRC → NSIDC DAAC (ftp pull)	16.7	8.2	1.4

GHRC, GHRC-ftp → NSIDC S4PA: GHRC (NSSTC, UAH, Huntsville, AL) sends AMSR-E data to NSIDC via NLR / Internet2. The rating is based on reverse nuttcp testing. The median nuttcp throughput is more than 3x the 0.5 mbps requirement, so the rating remains "Excellent". Performance dropped in mid October (nuttcp: small drop, ftp: big drop). Under investigation





Test Results: NSIDC SIDADS, NSIDC-PTH

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)		
	Best	Median	Worst
GSFC-ENPL → NSIDC-SIDADS	133.3	125.1	93.2
GSFC-NISN → NSIDC-SIDADS	62.6	62.4	45.7
ESDIS-PTH → NSIDC-PTH	52.6	48.3	39.5
MODAPS-PDR → NSIDC-PTH	51.6	47.0	32.3
JPL PTH → NSIDC-PTH	67.5	67.4	43.6

GSFC → NSIDC-SIDADS: Thruput via Internet2 to SIDADS from ENPL and GSFC-NISN was very steady.

NSIDC-PTH: Thruput to NSIDC-PTH from MODAPS-PDR dropped in mid October – under investigation. Performance from JPL PTH was very steady. Performance from ESDIS-PTH improved in late October due to retuning.



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
ESDIS-PTH → LASP blue (iperf)	9.20	8.99	8.18
ESDIS-PTH → LASP blue (scp)	3.76	3.62	2.92
GSFC ENPL → LASP green	56.6	40.7	31.1



Requirement:

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

Comments: In mid January '11, LASP's connection to NISN PIP was rerouted: it previously was 100 mbps from CU-ITS via NSIDC; this was changed to a 10 mbps connection to the NISN POP in Denver.


Thruput was consistent with the new circuit limitation. The median thruput from ESDIS-PTH remained well over 3x the requirement, so the rating remains "Excellent". Testing from EDOS was discontinued in September due to no longer having a requirement. It is planned to add testing between LASP and GES DISC as there is a requirement for this flow. The average user flow this month was above normal at 1.3 kbps, but still way below the requirement.

Performance from GSFC-ENPL to a node on LASP's green network via Internet2 / UCB was much higher, but dropped in mid October – like several other UCB systems.




5) Boulder CO sites (Continued):**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	416.2	282.4	164.6	0.1
LaRC PTH	180.4	171.2	131.9	
GSFC-ENPL-GE	310.7	200.5	126.4	n/a
GSFC-ENPL-FE	94.1	94.0	93.8	
GSFC-NISN	313.4	257.0	192.3	



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


From LaRC: Thruput from LaRC ASDC was much less noisy (2.5:1 best : worst ratio, vs. 18:1 last month), and the median (also daily worst) remained well above 3 x the requirement, so the rating remains “**Excellent**”. Thruput from LaRC-PTH is much steadier, so the inference is that the congestion was isolated to the ASDC DAAC.



From GSFC: From GSFC-NISN, the route is via NISN to the MAX (similar route and performance as from LaRC). From GSFC-ENPL-GE, with a Gig-E connection to MAX, the median thruput was comparable. Performance from all sources is somewhat noisy but mostly stable. The average user flow from GSFC this month was 0.67 mbps, typical of recent months. Testing was returned in late October, with improved results.

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


Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			Reqmt
	Best	Median	Worst	
OMISIPS → KNMI-ODPS	100.1	66.8	43.6	0.03
GSFC-ENPL → KNMI-ODPS	232.6	218.6	125.8	



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 again based on the results from OMISIPS at GSFC to the ODPS primary server. The thruput decreased in mid August, but remained much more than the tiny requirement, so the rating remains “**Excellent**”. Thruput was higher from GSFC-ENPL (outside the ESDIS firewall).

The user flow averaged 3.3 mbps this month, (hard to see on the integrated graph). This is consistent with the previous 3.3 mbps requirement, but is much more than the current 0.03 mbps requirement (This new requirement remains under review). The rating would still be “**Excellent**” compared with a requirement of 3.3 mbps.



7) Remote Sensing Systems (RSS): Ratings: JPL → RSS: Continued **Excellent**
 RSS → GHRC: Continued **Excellent**

Web Page <http://ensight.eos.nasa.gov/Missions/aqua/RSS.shtml>

Test Results:

Source → Dest	Medians of daily tests (mbps)			User Flow	Integ.	Req
	Best	Median	Worst			
JPL → RSS (NISN)	5.62	3.28	0.86	2.69	4.20	0.49
JPL → RSS (Comcast)	41.9	41.0	33.6			
RSS (Comcast) → GHRC (UAH)	4.44	3.61	2.36			0.34
RSS (Comcast) → GHRC (NISN)	4.24	3.44	2.34			

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).




RSS currently is using a NISN SIP circuit: 4 x T1s to NASA ARC (total 6 mbps). User flow data on this circuit is being obtained from the NISN SIP router at ARC.

The integrated graphs show that periods of low iperf performance are attributable to higher user flow. 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**”.

In April '11, a new Comcast circuit was installed, rated at 50 mbps incoming, and 12 mbps outgoing. Testing from JPL began on this circuit in April, with results consistent with the specs, as shown above.

RSS → GHRC: In addition, the new server at RSS connected to the Comcast circuit allows “3rd party testing”, as does the server at GHRC. Testing has therefore been initiated from RSS to GHRC, with results around 4 mbps, both to a UAH address and a NISN address at GHRC. Either result yields a rating of “**Excellent**” re the 0.34 mbps requirement.

Plans are being developed to switch the production flows to the Comcast circuit by the end of CY '11, leading to the removal of the T1s.



8) 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	95.6	92.2	19.0	3.7	92.5
GES DISC → ERSDAC	46.6	36.0	18.5		
GSFC ENPL (FE) → ERSDAC	82.8	79.7	79.4		
GSFC ENPL (GE) → ERSDAC	535.7	394.6	258.6		
ERSDAC → EROS	205.1	182.6	79.2	8.9	
ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER IST	68.2	64.1	53.6		

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: As of approximately 1 September, the ERSDAC test node is now connected at 1 gbps – formerly was 100 mbps. The median thrupt from most nodes improved. A new test from GSFC ENPL was able to get average thrupt about 400 mbps. However, some nodes have been using QoS (HTB) to reduce loss previously seen in the 1 gig to 100 meg switch at Tokyo-XP – those nodes remain limited by their HTB settings, and did not see much improvement.




Performance from EDOS improved from a median of 77 mbps in August, and is now limited by HTB. Thrupt remains well above 3 x the reduced requirement; the rating remains “Excellent”. The integrated chart shows that the user flow is stable, and consistent with the new requirement.

Thrupt from GES DISC to ERSDAC did not improve. It had been thought to be limited by packet loss at the GigE to FastE switch at Tokyo-XP, but as that limitation has been eliminated, another culprit must be identified. It now seems likely that the problem is closer to GSFC, perhaps within EBnet – since GES DISC has high loss to several destinations. This configuration is planned to be upgraded soon.

The FastE connected GSFC-ENPL-FE node is limited to 100 mbps by its own interface, and gets very steady thrupt.

ERSDAC → JPL-ASTER-IST: The median thrupt dropped a bit with the ERSDAC Gig-E upgrade (possibly due to a similar burst overload situation), but remains well above the [unstated] requirement (IST requirements are generally 311 kbps), so the rating remains “Excellent”.

ERSDAC → EROS: The thrupt improved with retuning (again) in mid October, after the ERSDAC Gig-E upgrade; it remains well above the reduced requirement (was 26.8 mbps previously). The new 8.3 mbps requirement is much closer to the actual flow user flow (which was very high this month). The median thrupt is more than 3 x the reduced requirement, so the rating remains “Excellent”.



9) 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 user flow this month averaged 3.3 mbps from GSFC to JAXA (with several peak periods above 10 mbps), and 96 kbps from JAXA to GSFC (with peaks above 2 mbps). Comparing these values to the new requirement 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.

