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- Implemented write through cache functionality leveraging local NVMe disks for Azure Cassandra
- Contributed bug fixes to open source LDAP plugin for Apache Cassandra
Our Services

Azure Managed Instances for Apache Cassandra
• We run Apache Cassandra 3.11, 4.0, 4.1 (and soon 5.0) as-a-Service in Microsoft Azure
• We have a wide variety of customers, some large ones with mission critical work loads

Azure Cosmos DB for Apache Cassandra
• We run an Apache Cassandra CQL compatible wire protocol to store data in Azure Cosmos DB
• We have a wide variety of customers who value request based pricing, elasticity, and scalability
Agenda

- Our performance setup
- C* 3.11, 4.1, and 5.0 on various Azure SKUs
- Write through cache and performance
- The trouble with measuring NoSQL transaction performance
- Early results with NoSQL Bench’s small economy workload
What is Cassandra?

- Cassandra is a NoSQL distributed Database
- It’s linear scalable
- Fault tolerant
- ...
Our performance test setup

• Script which deploys a three node cluster with parameterized SKU and Cassandra version
• Runs NoSQLBench with a workload of our choosing
• Reports results into our log analytics database
Our performance setup

Run pipeline
Select parameters below and manually run the pipeline

Branch/tag
37 users/geeshbe/cassandra-5.0
Select the branch; commit, or tag

Cassandra Version
- version: 3.11
- version: 4.0
- version: 4.1
- version: 5.0

Data SKUs
- sku: Standard_D514s_v2
  location: eastus2
- sku: Standard_E16s_v5
  location: eastus2
- sku: Standard_E32s_v5
  location: eastus2
- sku: Standard_E16as_v5
  location: eastus2
- sku: Standard_L16s_v3
  location: eastus2
- sku: Standard_L32s_v3
  location: eastus2

Jump SKU
Standard_D32s_v5

Cycles
100000000

Enable system diagnostics

ManagedCassandraPerformance
- where PreciseTimeStamps = PreciseTimeStamps
- extend latency_max_s = latency_max / 1000000000
- project-reorder PreciseTimeStamps
- order by sku, throughput desc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PreciseTimeStamps</th>
<th>TIMESTAMP</th>
<th>cassandra_version</th>
<th>sku</th>
<th>disks</th>
<th>nodes</th>
<th>cycles</th>
<th>threads</th>
<th>lat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-02 01:44:08.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-02 01:40:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-03 10:21:57.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-03 10:20:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-01 23:05:28.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-01 23:05:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-02 00:36:20.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-02 00:35:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-02 02:20:52.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-02 02:20:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-09-29 10:41:18.000000000</td>
<td>2023-09-29 10:40:00.000000000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-09-26 21:43:56.000000000</td>
<td>2023-09-26 21:40:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-03 10:36:55.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-03 10:35:00.000000000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-02 02:56:44.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-02 02:55:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-10-01 20:39:03.000000000</td>
<td>2023-10-01 20:35:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-09-30 10:38:31.000000000</td>
<td>2023-09-30 10:35:00.000000000</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-09-26 17:36:19.000000000</td>
<td>2023-09-25 17:35:00.000000000</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>Standard_L32s_v3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1000000000</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our workloads

- Small: small data 10 byte of value for text fields
- Bulky: 4K-5K sized text to bust system/page cache to measure disk read/write performance
- We can run them read, write, and mixed (both read and write)
Disclaimers

- C* 5.0 is an alpha version so performance numbers will definitely be different with the final release
- Our setup is not for serious nor official benchmarking and as such numbers are for informational purpose only and are not official Azure numbers
  - Our standard for official benchmarking is published (not proprietary) workloads and done by independent researchers
- We only were able to perform one benchmark run due to time constraints and bugs in 5.0. Ordinarily, we aim for multiple to minimize cloud introduced tail latencies (see our talk from last years) and outliers
Results for various SKUs
Write Through Cache
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Source: https://discord.com/blog/how-discord-supercharges-network-disks-for-extreme-low-latency
Why do we need a write through cache?

- Our current setup allows only 5,000 IOPS per network disk and we need more for read heavy workloads
- Azure compute is phasing out dedicated write-through cache in later SKU versions so we needed our own implementation
- Network disk tail latencies can heavily influence performance
Caveats & Alternatives

• Why can’t you just run on local disk?
  • Azure will lose the disk if the vm gets migrated to a new host
  • There is no guarantee there can’t be a regional outage and you will lose all disks in that region and potentially data
  • This allows for the app to work right after an outage though with higher latency

• Why can’t you just use better network disks?
  • Cost

• Why can’t you use bcache or others?
  • Indeterministic performance because of warming up the cache. Our solution will have predictable latency once the local NVMe disk is rebuild

• We don’t want the latency hit during rebuild
  • Take the node out of rotation during rebuild
Results for various SKUs
Results for various Azure SKUs

Average Read Latency for Readonly Bulky Workloads with 16 Cores

- Standard.L16s_v4
- Standard_DS14_v2
- Standard.F16s_v6
- Standard.FMax_v6

[cassandra_version: 3.11]
[cassandra_version: 4.1]
[cassandra_version: 5.0]
Performance Testing NoSQL Transactions
Results for various Azure SKUs
What are Transactions in Cassandra

• Accord protocol
• Cross partition, masterless
• One roundtrip fastpath
• Half the nodes can be down and it’s still on the Fast path
The state of NoSQL Benchmarking

- **Database Transaction Unit or Cloud Database Benchmark (Microsoft)**
  - “The DTU benchmark measures the performance of a mix of basic database operations that occur most frequently in online transaction processing (OLTP) workloads.”
  - Reached out to the maintainer but they referred me to HammerDB

- **Hammer DB (TPC Council)**
  - “Gold standard” for transactional performance measurements simulating financial institution, flight reservations, etc.
  - But: database lying outside of the top 20 databases will be considered for inclusion in HammerDB.
    - **Does HammerDB support NoSQL/Non-relational Databases?**
      HammerDB extended support to both Redis and Trafodion SQL on Hadoop to assess the viability of supporting further NoSQL and non-relational databases. As HammerDB focuses upon workloads designed for testing relational databases, support for further NoSQL databases is not planned at the current time.
      - **HammerDB is a GUI tool, is there a command-line version?**
        Yes, a command-line version was introduced a version 3.0.

The state of NoSQL Benchmarking

Are current benchmarks adequate to evaluate distributed transactional databases?

• Small Bank
  • Simulates a small banking system, where each customer has a pair of accounts, one for savings and the other for checking.

• Peak Bench
  • defines a package of workloads simulating intensive transactional processing requirements by designing a fine control in contention generation.

• YCSB+T
  • Is just a PR on YCSB which isn’t even merged?!

Conclusion:
“a new benchmark exploring all the choke points together with an easy-use support tool is imperative for promoting both development and fair benchmarking.”

Source: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2772485922000187
What is YCSB+T

• YCSB+T aims to measure in addition to performance, scalability, availability, and replication:
  • **Transactional Overhead**: compare database operations wrapped in transactions and without
  • **Consistency**: detect consistency anomalies with a validation stage

Source: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6818330
What is YCSB+T

• The Small Economy model works as follow:
  • Load Phase
    • Set each account (identified by key account number) to an initial specified total_cash
  • Transactional Phase:
    • `doTransactionInsert()` creates a new account with an initial balance captured from `doTransactionDelete()` operation described below.
    • `doTransactionRead()` reads a set of account balances determined by the key generator.
    • `doTransactionScan()` scans the database given the start key and the number of records and fetches them from the database.
    • `doTransactionUpdate()` reads a record and add $1 from the balance captured from delete operations to it and write it back.
    • `doTransactionDelete()` reads an account record, add the amount to the captured the balance (capture used in `doTransactionInsert()`) and then deletes the record.
    • `doTransactionReadModifyWrite()` reads two records, subtracts 1 from the one of the two and adds 1 to the other before writing them both back.

Source: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6818330
What is YCSB+T

• The Small Economy model works as follow:
  • Validation Phase
    • Checks the sum iterates all the keys and adds up the account balance and validates the total against the total stored after the load stage using the total_cash
    • One would expect more anomalies to be introduced as operations are performed which leads to a simple anomalie score:

\[
\gamma = \frac{|S_{\text{initial}} - S_{\text{final}}|}{n}
\]

Source: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6818330
Adopt YCSB+T small economy model to NoSQLBench

- NoSQLBench is an OpenSource performance test solution and also used in our performance test setup
- Since YCSB+T never got merged we decided to port the workload to NoSQLBench
- We ran into several issues which might affect performance and need addressing in the NoSQLBench codebase or we need to tune our workload accordingly
- Cassandra’s transactions are focused on batches and “read-before-write” – they are less useful for other operation but YCSB+T wants to wrap all operations in transactions to figure out the transactional overhead for “science”

Source: https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6818330
Then there’s that

Scott Andreas 20 days ago
German, a presentation on performance in 3-4 weeks could be tight (I wouldn’t plan to give one on that timeframe if I were the presenter).

Scott Andreas 20 days ago
cc @Blake who is working on dependency pruning which will improve performance in contended cases / in the presence of frequently-transacted keys.

German Eichberger 20 days ago
I blame @Patrick McFadin for talking me into it 😞

Patrick McFadin 20 days ago
Legit

German Eichberger 20 days ago
Yes, probably need to be more meta - and more the how than real results

Patrick McFadin 20 days ago
I am to blame for a lot of things. And if your research is awesome I will take all the credit 😏

Blake 20 days ago
I don't think it's possible to give a meaningful talk on accord performance right now, as there are some performance critical pieces still in development (edited)
Results – or the lack thereof

- ACCORD had bugs which didn’t allow for a number of transactions to work but they should be fixed and were related to Transactional Metadata
- Latest version in branch doesn’t play nicely with k8ssandra management API we use in our setup in lieu of nodetool
- Result: I have got nothing...
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Questions & Thank you