High Performance, Mission Critical Applications for the war-fighter:

Solutions to network challenges and today's fluid combat environment

To enable agile, robust, dependable information, it must be available when it is needed at speeds that enable it to matter. With Net-Centric systems, the network is the database. To avoid having the network become the problem, data must be delivered so as to meet these goals. Recently accessed data should be available even if the network is off-line. Data should be as current as the network allows.

Information is a force multiplier. Accurate and timely information is a bigger force multiplier. With the advent of GIG-BE, war-fighters have come to expect fast and reliable access to information in garrison and command centers. Unfortunately, network access erodes as war-fighters move to more mobile environments, ships, mobile command centers, special-forces with sat radio, etc. Mobile environments have significantly degraded capabilities to deliver information affecting timely information access. It can be frustrating and lethal not to be able to access information that was available only minutes before when a network connection vanishes. The ability to subscribe to and receive continuous updates at a fine grained level to key information can enable planners and operators to get the details that can cause them to change their minds as the situation changes. With today's much more fluid combat environments, high level commanders need access to more tactical details than ever before. And they need those details immediately.

If it was only possible to hang onto information that was being looked at minutes before, or to browse information in garrison or on the network and have it travel with the war-fighter as they deployed. If only it was possible for that information to be automatically updated whenever that person was on the network. If only it was possible to subscribe at a fine grained level to key information and get alerted as data that affected an operation changed, operators could be aware of the details that planners depended on changed. And if only it was possible to take tactical real-time feeds, to aggregate them and roll them up to high levels, yet have ability to drill down to the detailed information if necessary.

The simplest use case is to maintain access to critical data in the face of network outages. For applications such as the NCES Mediation Service or the IA Security service applications, simple data caching can enable access to data that they have been working on even though the network connection is down. Services would only look in the data cache if they were unable to reach the source data over the network. This could be because the network is down or the service is down or the data source is down.

The next level of capability is to reduce the latency and network bandwidth usage. Simple caching is insufficient to solve this issue for data that has high rates of change or for which changes have serious impact to the application, because the cache may be out of sync with the actual data source. However, if a service or data source actively send changes to the cache(s) (real-time updates when network is available and guaranteed sequential delivery of data change events after a network outage) then it is possible to:

- Get data in face of network outages
- Reduce network band usage
- Speed data access

If the cache supports notification of data changes back to the application, then it is also possible for applications to be aware of data changes to the data they have previously retrieved (i.e. do automatic view maintenance). Most applications today are not written to expect this level of service. But it can have a significant benefit to be aware that data in the application is stale.
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This still doesn’t solve the issues of low bandwidth network and high data change rates. So the next level of capability would be a caching technology that supports those capabilities necessary to only send data of interest to applications, so that unnecessary bandwidth is not spent sending data that is not yet of import to the user. For example, the GCCS-J TMS application is able to manage 100,000 tracks with a 1 minute update rate (which works out to approximately 1,650 update per second of 1k objects or 1 MB per second). With thousands of concurrent users that totals Gigabytes per second. Most users can only look at thousands of object of interest (and zoom down to even less when analyzing a situation such as air defense cover of the straits of Tehran). So by being able to filter the data and detect the delta, bandwidth usage can be reduced an order of magnitude or more. Additionally, if many application users sit at a location, then the ability to tier software so that local server caches can be shared by many local user caches can also significantly reduce bandwidth usage. In this case it can also reduce latency for the 2nd, 3rd and nth local user of that data. For example, in the case of a carrier at sea, sending the same video clip, or thumbnail image to multiple users, results in that data traveling over a very finite pipe more times than is necessary. Ideally, a solution that handled these issues would allow for multiple expressions of fine grained interest, so that if users were interested in multiple subsets of data that had different characteristics they could get them all. e.g. Enemy air tracks and friendly air defense units. Any solution to handle these issues must be capable of scaling to handle any arbitrary rate of data change (so long as the necessary network to send the data is available).

Interest in data should be able to last for as long as necessary and should not actually require a human being sitting at a screen. Imagine a mission planning system that retrieves data from a number of sources such as tracks, order of battle, and battle damage assessment. In the course of planning the mission, new information could arise, a target gets destroyed, a new enemy SAM unit shows up, which would cause different decisions during planning. Even after the mission started, knowledge of changes to the underlying data could be distributed to participants that needed it. Once data from multiple sources with fine grained detail can be pulled into an application, new questions can be asked of the data not anticipated by the designer of either source. For example, merge MIDB with ‘contains’ information about equipment with track data and ask for all current tracks of EW capable aircraft.

Next are the issues of synchronization when applications that were cut off from the network and are reconnected at a later time. Data synchronization falls into two categories, easy (in that it does not have to know about application context), and hard (application context matters because of potential conflicting updates when the application was off-line). Although the “easy” data synchronization problems involve lots of complex technology to automate the synchronization process, they do not require any work from application developers and are thus deemed easy. The “hard” data problems require only a little technology, but require a lot of domain knowledge and work from application developers, and are thus deemed hard. (At least for the people actually building an application).

Where multiple users can not update the same data in a distributed environment, the servers need to queue data changes to individual clients based on their interests. This may seem a simple challenge but for fast changing data this can create a queue of significant size that exceeds the client’s and network’s ability to ever have the client catch up. In that case a mechanism that conflates changes so that the client only sees the most recent update to each piece of data would minimize the overall size of the queue and maximize the chance of success. If message ordering is to be preserved for all clients, then queuing of messages is also necessary for client applications that fall behind in their ability to process incoming data because they are too busy. If a client “never” recovers for any of the above reasons, then it may be desirable for performance reasons to be able to automatically remove their queues and data interests until they reemerge. By “never”, we really mean that a client falls more than some configurable amount of time or number of messages behind the overall system.

Where multiple users can update the same data, the caching mechanism must have a pluggable way of resolving conflicts. Since a simple last one to update the data “wins” does not work for most applications, application specific code that checks originators, timestamps, version numbers, or other application specific data, must be able to be applied to incoming data to apply correct changes and deny incorrect changes to data. Notification of failed updates because of data conflicts must be propagated back to the original application instance that tried to update the data. A mechanism that validates incoming data can also be used to merge, roll up, or otherwise combine multiple data instances in the data fabric into a single element. This too would depend on application specific code that is invoked as data arrives.

Because this paper is focused on describing potential solutions to challenges for mission critical applications, it is important to consider failure conditions. So far all of the potential failures described have been network issues or edge client issues. Preventing data loss and assuring continuity of operations in the event of server hardware loss is also critical. To assure data integrity across multiple instances of the same application, messages to clients must be delivered even in the event of a server loss. To keep up with data rates for high speed data, this often must be done without committing data to disk. It is critical to replicate ‘in memory’ the server caches and queues of messages
GemFire is a high performance, distributed data management infrastructure. It provides distributed in-memory data caching, application level notification of data changes, configurable ACID properties, query, and enterprise scale. It supports multiple topologies including tiered servers, with edge clients. It supports fault tolerance for hardware and network failures at either the server or client level. This enables support for disconnected operations. Its memory management abilities enable it to be configured to replicate data for high concurrent loads, and for high availability. Data in memory can be grouped into separate Regions to support data placement and to support separating data from multiple applications. The distributed memory management also provides for methods to gracefully expand capacity to meet scalability and performance goals. GemFire has been benchmarked at over 100,000 1k inserts per second while distributing data to 1,000 client VMs. In general it is limited only by network bandwidth and available hardware. In order to provide for the ability to maximize performance and also support the level of concurrency needed for individual distributed applications, GemFire supports both high coherence and loose coherence across the distributed memory space. This included support for distributed transactions in a peer-to-peer environment.

The ability of applications to register interest in data with fine-grained queries, using OQL, a superset of SQL 92, from the Object Data Management Group (ODMG), enables applications and users to dynamically have the data they need move to clients from one or more servers. Applications receive a result set from the query. Then applications continue to receive notification as data changes on the server change the query results. Updates, deletes, and inserts are sent to the client result set to provide automatic view maintenance. Client applications receive a call-back and can take appropriate actions in response to the data changes. This ability like all of the data delivery mechanisms in GemFire is fault tolerant. Servers have the ability to automatically queue data for clients that are slow receiving data or are currently off the network. Data and queues can be replicated across multiple servers. If a server dies, clients seamlessly switch to an alternate server and continue receiving data from where they left off.

GemFire also provides for the ability to run regular queries that do not continue to send data changes to the application. Regular queries can be written to bring back less than the full object. For large objects, such as Air Tasking Orders, which can exceed 40 MB, this ability can significantly increase performance and reduce network bandwidth, when users are only interested in a small subset of the data.

GemFire provides for data persistence. This combined with the continuous query capabilities enable the easy creation of client applications that can be shutdown, moved, restarted, and periodically brought on the network to send or receive data changes. For the issues of conflict resolution that emerges when data can be updated at multiple locations GemFire provides multiple mechanisms to plug in application defined code to handle conflict resolution. There are two major ways to handle this issue. The first is to have updates travel via a separate GemFire Region to a process that is used to scrub data inserts. For the GCCS-J TMS-E application prototype, this method is used as all user changes, pass back into the correlation engine. The other methods is to have server-side plug-ins, called cache-writers,
compare the input data to the current state of the data, and then decide which data state is correct, using time-stamps, authoritative source, version numbers, or other application specific data. If this method needs additional reference data to make the correct decision, this data could easily be stored inside GemFire in another Region. Since client application block when inserting data into GemFire, changes that are rejected are immediately visible to end-users. Note, this method only works when users are on-line. For off-line changes, data must flow to an alternate region where data can be examined using the first method.

GemFire also provides the enterprise scale management capabilities needed to deploy large groups of distributed caches. It is highly instrumented. Its capabilities include distributed management, monitoring, alerting, and administration of the distributed system. All of these capabilities are exposed through the industry standard management API’s JMX. It also provides for retrospective analysis of performance. It is highly configurable and tunable over with over 100 configuration parameters.

Given NCES’s vision statement to “enable the secure, agile, robust, dependable, interoperable data-sharing environment for DOD where war fighter, business, and intelligence users share knowledge on a global network”, a distributed caching capability that provides for disconnected operations, high speed data distribution, notification of data changes, and enterprise level fault tolerance and management could provide significant capabilities to further this vision.
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Exponential growth

- Data on network
- Data to process
- Computer speed
  - CPU
  - Bus
  - Disk
Decrease in:

- Decision time
- Time to build/deploy systems
- Time to adapt systems
Operational challenges... at the edge.

- Power
- Space
- Bandwidth
- Reliability
- Availability
- Scalability
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Demands on IT

- Systems that keep pace with events and data
- Elasticity: Scale up/out to meet throughput and user demand as it changes
- Self-scaling down to reach a lightweight tactical edge
- Systems that present desired information and can see across stovepipes
- Keep power, space, and related costs down
Deployed Data management technologies are not keeping pace with
- data volumes,
- compression of decision windows, and
- extension of the edge...

WHY?
- RDBMS are based on 1970’s architecture based
- Speed of Light vs Speed Sound
- Data synchronization is not addressed by core technology
- Active / live in motion data vs. sleeping - poll driven data
Scale-Out Software Strategies
From Tier-Based Architectures to Partitioned Data Fabrics...

Partitioned data fabrics collocate the data and processing

Server-centric tier-based architectures separate the Data and the Processing

Traditional tier-based data strategies limit concurrency (and throughput) by creating contention, coherency, and latency effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Storage Type</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Latency (CPU Cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Cache</td>
<td>KB</td>
<td>~1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2, L3, ... Cache</td>
<td>MB</td>
<td>~5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Main Memory (can be shared)</td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>~200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GB</td>
<td>~30,000 (shared)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-Attached Storage (can be shared) (shared)</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td>~10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TB++</td>
<td>~20,000,000++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network-Attached Storage</td>
<td>TB++</td>
<td>~1,000,000,000++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shared disk access will include additional overhead based on interconnect technologies, and contention/coherency control
Currently messaging needs are met by technology that is orthogonal to the "database" -

- Requires fat pipes
- Separate processes
- Not dynamic
- Doesn’t know anything about the data
- Relies on disk...
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So what is the ideal solution

- 'speed of light' infinitely scalable data management with no bottle necks or single points of failure
- Distributed (WAN/LAN) with data synch
  - support for disconnected operations and low bandwidth environments
- Dynamic Membership (systems come and go)
- Built-in in-process messaging
- Query (like a database)
- Subscribe to Changes using Query
- Push processing to the data (Map-Reduce, Scatter-Gather)
- Secure
- Easy to insert into a system
An EDF uses select features from all of these products and combines them into a low-latency, linearly scalable, memory-based data fabric.
Why YAPOM? Yet Another Piece of Middleware?

- **Execution Excellence**
  - Make your applications run 4 to 40 times faster
  - Ingest / Digest / Distribute vast amounts of data with extremely low latency

- **Higher ROI of IT investments & Lower Cost Per Transaction**
  - A 4x Performance Increase is like getting 3 **free computers** that take **no space or electricity**

- Enables applications to survive network outages and distressed networks

- **Data Awareness** – especially across applications/systems

- **Supports** High Availability, Fault Tolerance, and Site Failover with zero additional design/development costs
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• Use Cases
Use Cases

- **Multistage Data Processing**
  - Increase performance, reduce costs
- **Common Data Backbone**
  - Scale economically and incrementally, reduce costs
  - Break data stovepipes (not process),
  - Detection and propagation of events, simple and reliable
- **Barrier Event Detection**
  - Performance, Data Awareness
- **Multisite Data Management**
  - Share data globally, built-in COOP and HA
- **Real Time Situational Awareness**
  - Fine grained data subscriptions, event detection, DIL/disconnected ops
- **Data Awareness**
  - High Performance SOA, Break data stovepipes, Data driven eventing
- **Joint Space Operations Center Prototype (and Wall Street Risk Management)**
  - High Speed Data Ingest
- **US Intelligence Agency Detection & Alerting Solution**
  - Low Latency Service Bus
Customer Use:
Sequential Transaction Processing

Today’s “traditional” multi-stage transaction processing architecture using RDBMS’s Message Buses or both.

Customers such as JPMC, UBS, Nomura, Merrill, have seen a 4 to 40 times processing speed up & reduced end to end latency.

Process more data
Reduce hardware
Add more calculations

Optional GemFire Server
**Data Management Solution - Common Data Backbone**

- **Shared Resources**
- **Predictable Latency**
- **Scalable**
- **Consistent Data Models**
- **Reports Reconcile**
- **Common Functions/Code**
- **Real Time**
- **Events Propagated**

When the Data Fabric Holds objects:
- O-R Mapping Churn is avoided (saving CPU & I/O)
- Common Java code can execute in the fabric

When the Data Fabric Holds Relational Tables:
- Existing SQL Applications can plug in more easily
- Use Distributed Functions for common code
real-life use case: Common Application Backbone

- **Shared Infrastructure**
  - Multiple business critical functions can share common infrastructure, common data, common calculations
  - Reduces data-center cost/complexity

- **Continuous availability**
  - All data is always available as and when needed.
  - No single point of failure
  - Obviates the need for third party H/A clustering software

- **Common analytics for all calculations**
  - Intra day trader risk and end of day Flash P&L, and close-of-day risk batch all use the exact same inputs and calculations so results are more precise and easier to reconcile
Compute Grids Deployed with GemFire

GemFire® real life use case: Major Bank
Barrier Event Detection

Buy 10000 COKE@46.67

Trade

Archival, OLAP & Regulatory RDBMS

Database Node

Storage Device
Batch processing delays were costing money and limiting opportunities.

Running Pricing and Risk calculations in batch mode required special applications to be written that created a ‘buffer’ to ensure that regulatory obligations were not violated.

With GemFire:
Real-time event detection, easier integration of new products, and control workflow to minimize business risk and meet all regulatory requirements.

8 CPUs re-price 6000 complex and exotic instruments in under 3 minutes.

No longer need to tie up so much of our working capital to “run the bank”
GCCS-J and GemFire
Agile Client

User Interface with
Continuously updated
Fused Operational Picture

Continuous Queries
Client Initiated, Server Side Filter

Correlation
Servers
Site 1

TMS-S
Servers
Site 2

TMS-S
Servers
Site N

Client w/ GemFire

Client w/ GemFire

70+ data feeds
Extending Real-time Data Analysis

Continuous Analytics that fuse multiple data sources

Local Query and Analysis

Client w/ GemFire

Server GemFire

BDA Servers

MIDB Servers

TMS-S Servers

...
GCCS-J: JOPES SSE, SORTS SSE and Critical Global Sites

Total 655 World Wide Sites
- Comb Cdrs to Components
- US Army - - 200+ sites
- US Navy - - Ashore/Afloat
- USAF - - MAJ COM & Bases
- USMC - - 25 Remotes
- Combat Support Agencies

JOPES SSE => 4 Enclaves
SORTS SSE => 2 Enclaves
Global-J Global => Many Sites
1. Mission planning starts to
   - Destroy enemy SAM position
   - Gets data from other sources
     -- BDA, MIDB, etc

3. Mission planner syncs with sources before finishing mission plan; sees changes
   Reworks mission to target 2

5. Mission executer deals with changes at run-time.

2. BDA update - SAM position is destroyed
   Mission planner does NOT see this!

4. BDA update – target 2 destroyed
   Mission planner does NOT see this!
1. Mission planning starts to
   - Destroy enemy SAM position
   - Gets data from other sources
     -- BDA, MIDB, etc

3. Mission planner sees change
   Reworks mission to target 2

5. Mission executer is notified on way to
   target and is sent an alternate target

2. BDA update - SAM position is destroyed
   Mission planner gets change notification

4. BDA update after mission is started–
   target 2 destroyed
   Mission planner’s application is notified
Detection & Alerting Solution Overview

- **Network - Enterprise Bus**
  - Standing Query Results & Generation, Alerting Query Results, Local Caching (High Throughput)
  - Web Service Systems/Enterprise Bus (Low Speed Data Access)

- **Knowledge Bases**
  - Data Caching, Standing Queries, Messaging, Distribution
    - GemFire Enterprise (GemStone Systems)

- **Geospatial Stream Event Detection**
  - SpatialRules (ObjectFX)

- **Non-Geospatial Stream Event Detection**
  - Event Processing Platform (StreamBase)

- **Data Transformation/Tagging**
  - GUPI (ECI)

- **Historical Sources**

- **Input Sources**
24 years in 24x7x365 global support of highly mission-critical systems.

Over 200 Global Customers

Over 50,000+ computers running GemFire …!
Why YAPOM? Yet Another Piece of Middleware?

• **Execution Excellence**
  – Make your applications run 4 to 40 times faster
  – Ingest / Digest / Distribute vast amounts of data with extremely low latency

• **Higher ROI of IT investments & Lower Cost Per Transaction**
  – A 4x Performance Increase is like getting 3 free computers that take no space or electricity

• **Enables applications to survive network outages and distressed networks**

• **Data Awareness** – especially across applications/systems

• **Supports High Availability, Fault Tolerance, and Site Failover with zero additional design/development costs**