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Wide-area distributed instrument: DYNES

- Internet2 AL2S and ION services
- Regional services: DYNES or stitched VLANs, e.g., MARIA, FRGP
Local Data Manager (LDM)

• Software used by the Unidata Internet Data Distribution (IDD) system to deliver meteorology-related data to at least 450 computers at 240 sites (mostly universities)
• “Push” (not “pull”) of routinely-generated data-products
• 30 data feeds provide radar, satellite, text bulletins, lightning, model forecasts, surface and upper air observations, ...
• Receives over 14 GB/h, 24/7 (usage is increasing).
• Transmits over 650 GB/h, 24/7, with 99.999% reliability (usage is increasing).
• Uses RPC over unicast TCP connections
• Code: http://www.unidata.ucar.edu/software/ldm/
IDD in the USA
Global Internet Data Distribution

Unidata IDD
North American data delivery and sharing network

IDD-Brasil
South American peer of North American IDD

IDD-Caribe (planning)
Central American peer of North American IDD

Antarctic-IDD
Support of US Antarctic research community
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Layer-2 vs. IP vs. AL multicast

• Compared to AL multicast
  - network switches/routers making copies should (ideally) result in lower CPU and bandwidth resources for data distribution (for same latency)

• L2 virtual circuits vs IP datagrams
  - Problems with IP multicast
    • complexity of IP multicast routing
    • receivers without credentials joining
    • congestion related packet loss
  - L2 virtual circuits have setup phase and rate guarantees

• Issues with L2 paths
  - lack of ubiquitous deployment (DYNES)
  - VC setup delay (but our app. has continuous traffic)
Virtual Circuit Multicast Transport Protocol (VCMTP)

- Reliable multicast transport protocol designed for the type of data distributed by LDM
  - Almost continuous streams of small files
  - Hundreds of receivers not millions

- VCMTP design choices
  - Reliable multicast over Layer-2 virtual circuits
  - Retransmission requests/retx over TCP
  - Tradeoff throughput of fast receivers with robustness of slow receivers
    - Knob: per-file retransmission timeout factor
  - Asynchronous and message-based API
  - Receiver: per-file notification or batched notification
  - Code: https://github.com/Unidata/vcmtp
Project goals

• Integrate VCMTP with LDM
• Compare AL, IP and Layer-2 multicast across DYNES hosts (ten planned)
• Test on UNM PRObE with 100+ receivers
Problems encountered/some solutions

• DYNES: thanks to Brian Cashman
  - Stitching VLANs on a per-network basis
  - Dynamic control-plane software (combination of OSCARS and OESS): TBD
  - Some sites on AL2S, some on ION
  - Need L2 traceroute: used IP addr. for VLANs/obs host

• LDM-VCMTP software integration
  - Need changes in VCMTP code; students graduate!

• IP multicast: have had problems

• L2 multipoint: haven't tested on AL2S

• Anticipate needing QoS config. (guaranteed rate)
  - Currently not supported by OESS on AL2S?
Questions/comments?
email: mvee@virginia.edu