Preface

Motivation

This book arose out of an attempt to meet two key objectives. The first was to communicate the theory and practice of performance analysis to those who need it most, viz. IT professionals, system administrators, software developers, and performance test engineers. Many of the currently available books on computer performance analysis fall into one of three distinct camps:

1. Books that discuss tuning the performance of a particular platform, e.g., Linux, Solaris, Windows. These books explain how you can turn individual software “knobs” with the hope that this will tune your platform.
2. Books that emphasize formal queueing theory under the rubric of performance modeling. These books are written by mathematicians for mathematicians and therefore are burdened with too much Greek for the average IT professional to suffer through.
3. Books that employ queueing theory without the Greek but the performance models are unrealistic because they are essentially academic toys.

Each of these categories has pedagogic merit, but the focus tends to be on detailed particulars that are not easily generalized to a different context. These days, IT professionals are required to be versed in more than one platform or technology. It seemed to me that the best way to approach the performance analysis of such a panoply is to adopt a system perspective. The system view also provides an economy of thought. Understanding gained on one system can often be applied to another. Successful performance analysis on one platform often translates successfully to another, with little extra effort. Expressed in today’s vernacular—learn once, apply often.

Second, I wanted to present system performance principles in the context of a software tool, Pretty Damn Quick (PDQ), that can be applied quickly to address performance issues as they arise in today’s hectic business environment. In order to meet the pressures of ever-shortening time horizons, performance analysis has to be done in zero time. Project managers cannot
and will not allow their schedules to be stretched by what they perceive as inflationary performance analysis. A performance analysis tool based on a scripting language helps to meet these severe time constraints by avoiding the need to wrestle with compilers and debuggers.

**Why Perl?**

Defending the choice of a programming language is always a losing proposition, but in a recent poll on slashdot.org, Perl (Practical Extraction and Reporting Language,) was ranked third after Bourne shell and Ruby in terms of ease of use for accomplishing a defined set of tasks with a scripting language. Python, Tcl, and Awk, came in fifth, seventh, and eighth respectively, while Java (interpreted but not a scripting language) came in last. Neither Mathematica nor PHP were polled. On a more serious note, John Ousterhout (father of Tcl), has written an essay (home.pacbell.net/ouster/scripting.html) on the general virtues of scripting languages for prototyping. Where he says prototyping, I would substitute the word modeling.

I chose Perl because it fitted the requirement of a rapid prototyping language for computer performance analysis. The original implementation of PDQ was in C (and still is as far as the library functions are concerned). To paraphrase a leading UNIX™ developer, one of the disadvantages of the C language is that you can spend a lot of time in the debugger when you stab yourself with a misreferenced pointer. Perl has a C-like syntax but is much more forgiving at runtime. Moreover, Perl has arguably become the most ubiquitous of the newer-generation scripting languages, including MacPerl on MacOS (prior to MacOS X). One reason for Perl’s ubiquity is that it is designed for extracting text and data from files. Why not for extracting performance data? It therefore seemed like a good choice to offer a Perl version of PDQ as an enhancement to the existing toolset of system administrators. By a happy coincidence, several students, who were also system administrators, began asking me if PDQ could be made available in Perl. So, here it is. Bonne programmation!

How should PDQ be used? In my view, the proper analysis of computer performance data requires a conceptual framework within which the information hidden in those data can be revealed. That is the role of PDQ. It provides a framework of expectations in which to assess data. If you do performance analysis without such a framework (as is all too common), how can you know when you are wrong? When your conclusion does not reconcile with the data, you must stop and find where the inconsistency lies. It is much easier to detect inconsistencies when you have certain expectations. Setting some expectations (even wrong ones) is far better than not setting any.

I sometimes liken the role of PDQ to that of a subway map. A subway map has two key properties. It is an abstract representation of the real situation in that the distances between train stations are not in geographical
proportion, and it is simple because it is uncluttered by unimportant real-world physical details. The natural urge is to create a PDQ “map” adorned with an abundance of physical detail because that would seem to constitute a more faithful representation of the computer system being analyzed. In spite of this urge, you should strive instead to make your PDQ models as simple and abstract as a subway map. Adding complexity does not guarantee accuracy. Unfortunately, there is no simple recipe for constructing PDQ maps. Einstein reputedly said that things should be as simple as possible, but no simpler. That should certainly be the goal for applying PDQ, but like drawing any good map there are aspects that remain more in the realm of art than science. Those aspects are best demonstrated by example, and that is the purpose of Part II of this book.

Book Structure

Very simply, this book falls into two parts, so that the typical rats-nest diagram of chapter dependencies is rendered unnecessary.

Part I explains the fundamental metrics used in computer performance analysis. Chapter 1 discusses the zeroth metric, time, that is common to all performance analysis. This chapter is recommended reading for those new to computer performance analysis but may be skipped in a first reading by those more familiar performance analysis concepts. The queueing concepts encoded in PDQ tool are presented in Chaps. 2, 3, and 5, so these chapters may also be read sequentially.

For those familiar with UNIX platforms, a good place to start might be Chap. 4 where the connection between queues (buffers) and the load average metric is dissected at the kernel level. Linux provides the particular context because the source code is publicly available to be dissected—on the Web, no less! The generalization to other operating systems should be obvious. Similarly, another starting point for those with a UNIX orientation could be Appendix B A Short History of Buffers (pun intended) which summarizes the historical interplay between queueing theory and computer performance analysis, commencing with the ancestors of UNIX viz. CTSS and Multics.

Irrespective of the order you choose to read them, none of the chapters in Part I requires a knowledge of formal probability theory or stochastic methods. Thus, we avoid the torrent of Greek that otherwise makes very powerful queueing concepts incomprehensible to those readers who would actually benefit from them most. Any performance analysis terminology that is unfamiliar can most likely be found in the Glossary (Appendix A).

Part II covers a wide variety of examples demonstrating how to apply PDQ. These include the performance analysis of multicomputer architectures in Chap. 7, analyzing benchmark results in Chap. 8, client/server scalability in Chap. 9, and Web-based applications in Chap. 10. These chapters can be
read in any order. Dependencies on other chapters are cross-referenced in the text.

Chapter 6 (Pretty Damn Quick (PDQ)—A Slow Introduction) contains the PDQ driver’s manual and, because it is a reference manual, can be read independently of the other chapters. It also contains many examples that were otherwise postponed from Chaps. 2–5.

Appendix F contains the steps for installing Perl PDQ together with a complete list of the Perl programs used in this book. The more elementary of these programs are specially identified for those unfamiliar with writing Perl scripts.

Classroom Usage

This book grew out of class material presented at both academic institutions and corporate training facilities. In that sense, the material is pitched at the graduate or mature student level and could be covered in one or two semesters.

Each chapter has a set of exercises at the end. These exercises are intended to amplify key points raised in the chapter, but instructors could also complement them with questions of their own. I anticipate compiling more exercises and making them available on my Web site (www.perfdynamics.com). Solutions to selected exercises can be found in Appendix H.

Prerequisites and Limitations

This is a book about performance analysis, not performance tuning. The world is already full of books explaining how to tune this or that application on this or that platform. Whereas performance tuning is about particulars, the power of performance analysis comes from discerning general principals. General principals are often best detected at the system level. The payoff is that a generalizable analysis technique learned once will find application in solving a wide variety of future performance problems.

Good analysis requires clarity of thought, and clear thinking benefits from the structure of formalism. The formalism used throughout this book is queueing theory or what might be more accurately termed queueing theory lite. By that I mean the elements of queueing theory are presented in a minimalist style without the need for penetrating many of the complexities of mathematical queueing theory, but without loss of correctness. That said, a knowledge of mathematics at the level of high-school algebra is assumed throughout the
text (it is hard to imagine doing any kind of meaningful performance analysis without it), and those readers exposed to introductory probability and calculus will find most of the concepts transparent.

Queueing theory algorithms are encoded into PDQ. This frees the performance analyst to focus on the application of queueing concepts to the problem at hand. Inevitably, there is a price for this freedom. The algorithms contain certain assumptions that facilitate the solution of queueing models. One of these is the Poisson assumption. In probability theory, the Poisson distribution is associated with events which are statistically random (like the clicks of a Geiger counter). PDQ assumes that arrivals into a queue and departures from the service center are random. How well this assumption holds up against behavior of a real computer system will impact the accuracy of your analysis.

In many cases, it holds up well enough that the assumption does not need to be scrutinized. More often, the accuracy of your measurements is the more important issue. All measurements have errors. Do you know the magnitude of the errors in your performance data? See Sect. D.7 in Appendix D. In those cases where there is doubt about the Poisson assumption, Sect. D.8 of Appendix D provides a test together with a Perl script to analyze your data for randomness. One such case is packet queueing.

Internet packets, for example, are known to seriously violate the Poisson assumption [See Park and Willinger 2000]. So PDQ cannot be expected to give accurate performance predictions in that case, but as long as the performance analysis is conducted at the transaction or connection level (as we do in Chap. 10), PDQ is applicable. For packet level analysis, alternative performance tools such simulators (see e.g., NS-2 http://www.isi.edu/nsnam/ns/) are a better choice. One has to take care, however, not to be lulled into a false sense of security with simulators. A simulation is assumed to be more accurate because it allows you to construct a faithful representation of the real computer system by accounting for every component—sometimes including the proverbial kitchen sink. The unstated fallacy is that complexity equals completeness. An example of the unfortunate consequences that can ensue from ignoring this point is noted in Sect. 1.7.

Even in the era of simulation tools, you still need an independent framework to validate the results. PDQ can fulfill that role. Otherwise, your simulation stands in danger of being just another pseudo-random number generator. That PDQ can act like an independent framework in which to assess your data (be it from measurement or simulation) is perhaps its most important role. In that sense, the very act of modeling can be viewed as an organizing principle in its own right. A fortiori, the insights gained by merely initiating the construction of a PDQ model may be more important than the results it produces.
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