DWAITQUAID 1.0.0 TOILOWS PETIOTHALICE LESIS OF DWAITQUAID 0.0.0 AND MINIMOS (PIECEUTIN PRODUCT DIAMONT) VEISIONS 0.7.0 AND 0.0.0. The results should be comparable when the new features are not enabled (especially DCL which may impact performance noticeably

when a big number of devices is sending data) and when the new emulator version does not use data variations and BIG data

Dwarfguard 1.0.0 performance tests.

There are two different test types in Dwarfguard testing: - stability tests ... runs for a number of hours. Tests stability under standard conditions and raises flags in case of memory leaks. - benchmark tests ... to measure different HW / VMs for comparability and clue for sizing deployments.

Proves Dwarfq deployment with particular sizing is able to handle the tested number of devices.

Test sets: Stab-4-672

2025-01-30 Test sets: Stab-16-2-H1

2025-01-30 Test sets: Stab-16-2-H1

General Dwarfguard 1.0.0 performance testing verdict:

PASSED

not

performed

PASSED

not

performed

Stability basic

tests Stability

medium test

Stability max

(30000) test Stability long

test

The subject of early adopter version testing are stability and benchmark testings. Find out more in test overview.

The Dwarfg 1.0.0 is intended to be used for up to 60000 devices.

Next to the test results, HW specs for environments, test description and methodology is given in the document.

As mentioned earlier (Testing summary), there are three types of performance tests. All are here because we need to measure:

- number of accepted and dropped requests (and resulting percentage) FOR ALL TESTS
- time for benchmark tests
- memory usage for stability tests
- CPU utilization (%) for stability tests
- dwarfgd log review to make detail search for warnings and errors (for stability tests)

Next to measurements there are a few important calculated metrics:

- ideal maximal throughput (benchmark test)
- typical maximal throughput (20% of ideal) (benchmark test)
- number of pushes per second (benchmark test)
- maximal recommended # of devices per deployment type (HW / VM specs)

Environment specs		CPU cores	CPU threads	RAM MiB	stability test	benchmark
Proxmox Linux container Intel Xeon E5 2.2GHz 4C HT	C1	1	1	512		
	C2	2	2	1024		
	C3	4	4	2048		
	C4	8	8	4096		
	A1 (small)					
AWS instance	A2 (medium)					
	A3 (big)					
Baremetal AMD E350@1.6 GHz 2C	H0	2	2	16384		
Baremetal Core i5 1.7GHz 4C HT	H1	4	8			
Baremetal Core i7 2.7GHz 4C HT	H2	4	8	32768		
Baremetal Core i7 3.2GHz2 GHz 6C HT	H3	6	12	32768		

Tests specs	ID	SSL?	# of devices	push/work T	# of loops	# of minutes	Human-time	Notes
	Stab-2-2	Yes	1000	2/2	N/A	120	2 hours	
	Stab-4-2	Yes	3000	4/2	N/A	120	2 hours	
	Stab-8-2	Yes	10000	8/2	N/A	120	2 hours	
Stability	Stab-16-2	Yes	30000	16/2	N/A	120	2 hours	
	Stab-4-48	Yes	3000	4/2	N/A	2880	48 hours	
	Stab-8-48-top	Yes	40000	8/2	N/A	2880	48 hours	
	Stab-4-672	Yes	3000	4/2	N/A	40320	4 weeks	
	Bench-6-SSL	Yes	1200	6/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-6-noSSL	No	1200	6/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-12-SSL	Yes	2400	12/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
Benchmark	Bench-12-noSSL	No	2400	12/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-24-SSL	Yes	4800	24/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-24-noSSL	No	4800	24/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-48-SSL	Yes	9600	48/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	Bench-48-noSSL	No	9600	48/1,2,4,8	10	N/A		1.0: Varied data
	•	•		-	-	-		

	Bench-48-noSSL	No	9600	48/1,2,4,8	10	N/A	N	1.0: Varied data			
									-		
Test run map 1.0.0	C1	C2	C3	C4	A1	A2	A3	H0	H1	H2	H3
Stab-2-2											
Stab-4-2											
Stab-8-2											
Stab-16-2									Yes		
Stab-4-48											
Stab-8-48-top											
Stab-4-672											
Bench-6-SSL									Yes		
Bench-6-noSSL									Yes		
Bench-12-SSL									Yes		
Bench-12-noSSL									Yes		
Bench-24-SSL											
Bench-24-noSSL											
Bench-48-SSL											
Bench-48-noSSL											

Stability tests										
ID / Environment →									Stab-8-48-top H3	
		Devices	1000	3000	10000	30000		3000	40000	3000
		Emulator threads	2	4	8	16			8	4
		Set: Time / minutes	120	120	120	120	120	2880		40320
		Set loop time / sec	200	200	200	200	200	200		200
μм	cnaac	CPU cores	1	2	4	8	8	2	12	2
1100		RAM / MiB	512	1024	2048	4096	32768	16384	32768	1024
		Available MiB OS					30680.00			
		Used MiB OS					1358			
		dwarfgd RSS (MiB)					56			
Resources		Available MiB OS					30230			
Resources		Used MiB OS					1807			
		mamasd RSS (MiB)					408			
		avg load 15					0.63			
		avg load 15 / cpu core	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00
		Processesd loops					22			
		Total time					7382			
	Test numbers	Real Loop time/sec (1)	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	336	#DIV/0!		#DIV/0!
		Estimated data-pushes	36000	108000	360000	1080000	1080000	2592000	34560000	36288000
		Performed Pushes					930000			
		Estim. Avg reqs/sec	5.00	15.00	50.00	150.00	150.00	15.00		15.00
		Rough avg reqs/sec (1)	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	125.98	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
		Data ERR/retries	0	0	0	0	0	0		
		push errors (%)	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.00	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
		push errors (1=100%)	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0.000000000	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Errors	Crashes	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Results	LIIOIS	Reboots	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		Log entries					4		0	
							1 mid-air, 3			
Cald		Log analysis					delayed DCL			
		RSS increase MiB	0		0	0	352	0		
		RSS increase %	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	628.57	#DIV/0!		
		MiB per device	0.000		0.000	0.000	0.012	0.000		
		RAM utilization %	0.00		0.00	0.00		0.00		
		Max safe # of devs	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	723888	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	
		RAM utilization note					perfect (low)			

CPU utilization note Summary perfect (low) **PASSED** TBD Verdict

The results are not exact as the total time includes registration time. In reality, there are a little bit more requests per second and the loop time is a little shorter than that.

(Warning) Configuration profile with default values for a firmware creation attempted more than once in parallel. As all of the Advantech router device types in this test

share the same profile, this is perfectly possible to happen. No impact on the system or data. The DCL (data change log) table contains data value changes for all the devices. Any DB synchronization errors results in a delay of the synchronization to a later time.

Notes

Log analysis explained

(1)

Mid-air profile

collision

Delayed DCL

Results are # of processed device data pushes per second									
	Spec:	C1	C2	C3	C4	H0	H1		H3
	CPU thr	1	2	4	8	2/2	4/8	4/8	6/12
	RAM	512				16384	16384	32768	32768
	HW	Inte	Xeon E5 2	2CPU 4/8 e	ach		Core i5	Core i7	Core i7
	Arch		Ser	ver		L PWR	Mol		Desktop
	GHz		2.	2		1.6	1.7	2.7	3.2
Test	Handlers								
	1						250.06		
6-SSL	2						250.45		
0-33L	4						253.91		
	8						253.71		
	1						320.94		
6-noSSL	2						329.16		
0-11033L	4						332.17		
	8						334.71		
	1						343.76		
12-SSL	2						346.07		
12-33L	4						347.26		
	8						347.45		
	1						379.64		
12-noSSL	2						386.51		
12-11033L	4						389.76		
	8						394.93		
	1								
24-SSL	2								
24-33L	4								
	8								
	1								
24-noSSL	2								
24-11033L	4								
	8								
	1								
48-SSL	2								
40-33E	4								
	8								
	1								
48-noSSL	2								
-0 11000L	4								
	8								
Ideal max devs		0		0					
Safe ma	ax devs	0	0	0	0	0	52012	0	
				Notes/co	lors explain	ed			

Findings

higher number of requests per second. The difference between SSL and noSSL test is visible in the 6-thread emulator run but not that much in 12-thread emulator run. Likely reason for that is that the 12-thread run was fully utilizating the emulator HW just by data generation while in the 6-thread run the machine had some reserves that were seen when the SSL was disabled. Number of pushes/second in comparison with testing of 0.8 was significantly lower in the 12-thread

The number of Dwarfquard handling threads has negligible effect on the throughput. The likely reason is that the processing ability for requests is much higher than the emulation ability even though the emlator HW was upgraded. Meaning that in the real situation, the system would be able to process

run and it is another indication that the emulator HW was utilized. The emulator used for the test of version 0.8 was incapable of creating varied data and used smaller data pushes than the newer emulator version. Generating varied data is much more demanding than sending the same datafile over and over again, supporting the idea.

Comparison of some data with later versions Notes:

Findings for 1.0.0

0.6.0

0.7.0 - introduced

DCL

0.8.0

1.0.0 - introduced varied data in

omulator

The measurements and comparison are based on the basic stability (Stab-16-2) and basic performance (originally Bench-4-SSL but that got replaced by Bench-6-SSL-2 in 0.8.0) test results.

C1

C2

C3

C4 H1

C1

C2

C3

C4 H1

C1

C2

C3

C4

H1

H0

H1

verv hard.

throughput are considered ok.

coupled with stronger emulator HW.

RAM – RSS MiB

% of previous KiB per device

Each minor version adds a lot of functionality but also brings optimizations. Comparable results (100%) are considered success and results within 101-120% of resources usage and 99-80%

Testing methodics is updated (and testing tools improved) with every version making comparison

Computed memory consumtion per device stayed virtually the same although the 1.0.0 version manages slightly more data for each device - this is caused by optimizations mainly in the DB

Throughput of the 6-thread SSL benchmark stayed virtually the same which is on one side an excellent result as since v1.0.0 the emulator sends varied data which require considerably more computations but on the other hand, as noted on the performance slide, the emulator is probably incapable of utilizing the Dwarfguard so in reality the peak push/second is much higher and in the next version we should use either weaker HW for Dwarfquard or much more threads for testing

storage layer of the Daemon. Total memory footprint has risen but only slightly.

% of previous Pushes/sec % of previous