

# ELOCITY S O F T W A R E

# Case Study 4 Slow Response Times



Copyright © 2024 Velocity Software, Inc. All Rights Reserved. Other products and company names mentioned herein may be trademarks of their respective owners.



# Case Study Summary

#### **Velocity Software solves performance problems.**

- As a valued customer, we want to pass this knowledge on to you.
- The following is a case study of a solved real-life performance issue.
- This case study will show:
  - The problem as reported by users
  - The problem observations
  - What was found in the Velocity Software data
  - What was suggested to the customer
  - If provided, follow up from the customer





The Problem

# The Problem:

An LPAR running very large Linux guests using MongoDB were experiencing performance issues/slow response times

# **Problem Observations**:

• Customers were reporting slow response times for their MongoDB applications





# ESAHDR – System Configuration showed:

- Up to date on z/VM release
- SMT is enabled
- Which is the master processor
- Running on IFLs

Report: ESAHDR z/VM Moni Monitor initialized: 04/25/22 Monitor period: 7200 s	at 00:00:00 on 8561 serial 087A08
ZMAP Release Monitor file created:	5.1.3.1 04/25/22 00:00:00
z/VM Version: 7 TOD clock at termination	Release 2.0 SLU 2102 20:00:00
System Identifier Machine Model/Type Multithreading Status(SMT): En	Vxxxxx8 Z15:8561/401
Core Thread count: 2 Enabled Count: 2	
System Sequence Code	000000000047A08
Processor 0 model/serial	8561-401 /087A08 Master
Processor 1 model/serial	8561-401 /087A08
Processor 39 model/serial	8561-401 /087A08
CPU(GP) Capability Factor: CPU(IFL) Capability Factor: CPU Cycles/ns: CPU Cycles/ns (GP):	416 5200 781
Operating on IFL Processor(s) Channel Path Measurement Faci	lity(CPMF) Extended is installed

4





# ESAHDR – System Configuration (cont.) showed:

- Of the 108 IFL processors, only 15 were 'in use' – SMT may not be needed
- 616.6% out of 4000% 'in use' (only 6 threads out of 40)
- Lxxxx3F8 was the top CPU user at 70% (or 4.4 IFLs)

Totals by Processor type: <cpu> &lt;-Shared Processor busy&gt; Type Count Ded shared total assigned Ovhd Mgmt</cpu>	
CP      1      0      1      0.4      0.3      0.0      0.1        IFL      108      0      108      1501      1478.6      21.1      22.2	
Number of logical partitions defined:	21
Main Storage installed (MB): 2867 Main Storage Generated (MB): 2867	
Horizontal/Vertical Scheduling Configuration IFL UNPARKING set to Medium EXCESSuse moderate	, CPUs

CPU utilization:	616.6	of	4000%
CPU charged to users:	598.3%		
System overhead:	18.4%		
Capture ratio:	100.00%		

Top users and user classes by CPU consumption:

•		<-Rela	tive->	<abs< th=""><th>olute</th><th>Percent Cl</th><th>PU&gt;</th></abs<>	olute	Percent Cl	PU>
	UserID	<-Pct (	CPU>	<out of<="" td=""><td>100%&gt;</td><td><out of<="" td=""><td>4000%&gt;</td></out></td></out>	100%>	<out of<="" td=""><td>4000%&gt;</td></out>	4000%>
	/Class	Used	Cum	Util	Cum	Util	Cum
1.	Lxxxx3F8	71.6	72	11.0	11	441.4	441
2.	Lxxxx3FD	13.3	85	2.1	13	82.2	524
3.	System	3.0	88	0.5	14	18.4	542
4.	Lxxxx3FA	2.2	90	0.3	14	13.7	556
5.	Lxxxx411	1.7	92	0.3	14	10.2	566





ESAUSRC – User Configuration showed:

- There are multiple servers with 32 vCPUs with REL 3200
- The storage for each server adds up to more than real storage which is more than necessary for each server

Report: Monitor Monitor j	initializ	ed: 04/25	Configura /22 at 00 00 second	:00:00 on	8561 (:00)		1 08	87 <b>A</b> 08	8	First	t red	cord	ftware 1 anal	Lyzed	i: 04	/2	5/22	15:00	0:00
UserID	ClassID	Account Code	ACI Grp Name	<cp pool=""> PoolName</cp>			al>	</th <th>AX-&gt;</th> <th>Lim</th> <th><coι< th=""><th>int&gt;</th><th>&gt;</th><th></th><th>Qck</th><th>NO</th><th>NO</th><th><vm s<="" th=""><th>Size&gt;</th></vm></th></coι<></th>	AX->	Lim	<coι< th=""><th>int&gt;</th><th>&gt;</th><th></th><th>Qck</th><th>NO</th><th>NO</th><th><vm s<="" th=""><th>Size&gt;</th></vm></th></coι<>	int>	>		Qck	NO	NO	<vm s<="" th=""><th>Size&gt;</th></vm>	Size>
Lxxxx3B2	TheUsrs	Lxxxx3B2			IFL	1600					16	16	ESA	N	N	N	N	244G	244G
Lxxxx3FA	TheUsrs	Lxxxx3FA			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	488G	488G
Lxxxx3FD	TheUsrs	Lxxxx3FD			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	488G	488G
Lxxxx3F5	TheUsrs	Lxxxx3F5			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	488G	488G
Lxxxx3F8	TheUsrs	Lxxxx3F8			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	488G	488G
LXXXX40A	TheUsrs	Lxxxx40A			IFL	400					4	4	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	61G	61G
Lxxxx40D	TheUsrs	Lxxxx40D			IFL	400					4	1	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	61G	61G
Lxxxx400	TheUsrs	Lxxxx400			IFL	400					4	4	ESA	N	Ν	Ν	N	61G	61G
Lxxxx404	TheUsrs	Lxxxx404			IFL	200					2	2	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	31G	31G
Lxxxx408	TheUsrs	Lxxxx408			IFL	400					4	4	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	61G	61G
Lxxxx41B	TheUsrs	Lxxxx41B			IFL	800					8	8	ESA	N	N	Ν	Ν	122G	122G
Lxxxx411	TheUsrs	Lxxxx411			IFL	400					4	4	ESA	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	61G	61G
Lxxxx51E	TheUsrs	Lxxxx51E			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	488G	488G
Lxxxx529	TheUsrs	Lxxxx529			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	N	Ν	N	488G	488G
Lxxxx538	TheUsrs	Lxxxx538			IFL	3200					32	32	ESA	N	Ν	Ν	Ν	488G	488G

A REL 3200 setting gives each of the 32 vCPUs only REL 100 (the z/VM default





# ESASSUM – showed:

- Spikes in Processor Utilization
- A sudden change in the I/O subsystem
- Looking for spikes and sudden changes can show where and when problems start and where to start investigations

Report: Monitor				osystem /25/22 a		-	on 856:	l seria	al 087A(	)8 F:	irst :	record	i anal
Time	<-avg	j numl	ber->	Transac Per Minute	Avg.	Utili:	zation	Fixed	Active	<pages,< th=""><th>/sec&gt;</th><th>&lt;-DAS</th><th>5D&gt;</th></pages,<>	/sec>	<-DAS	5D>
04/25/22													
13:15:00	78	45	191	139.3	0.019	662	613	74.9	2765K	0	1	165	0.2
13:30:00	78	45	190	142.1	0.019	625	580	74.9	2774K	0	1	168	0.2
13:45:00	78	45	196	138.9	0.020	1303	1248	74.9	2778K	0	0	163	0.2
14:00:00	78	46	178	140.6	0.020	848	811	74.9	2783K	0	0	168	0.2
14:15:00	78	45	190	140.3	0.016	312	287	74.9	2791K	0	0	164	0.2
14:30:00	78	45	195	139.8	0.020	337	308	74.9	2805K	0	0	165	0.2
14:45:00	78	45	188	140.8	0.020	943	891	74.9	2811K	0	2269	187	1.2
15:00:00	78	45	189	140.0	0.023	596	556	74.9	2812K	0	17K	470	2.9
15:15:00	78	46	179	141.7	0.023	374	341	74.9	2812K	0	20K	661	2.4
15:30:00	78	45	194	139.7	0.020	413	381	74.9	2813K	0	8889	489	1.3
15:45:00	78	47	193	141.8	0.023	417	386	74.9	2813K	0	16K	664	2.2
16:00:00	78	48	191	134.6	0.032	247	232	74.9	2813K	0	5049	379	1.0
16:15:00	78	47	169	122.3	0.025	216	202	74.9	2813K	ō	5164	359	1.1
16:30:00		47	180		0.018	210	196	74.9	2813K	ō		331	1.0





### ESAXACT – Transaction Delay Analysis showed:

- Lxxxx3F8 has a large number of Running samples
- Only 24% of 32 vCPUs are running don't need that many

Report: Monitor										l sei	cial	0872	A08	Fi	irst	reco	ord a	analyz
			<	Pe	ercer	nt no	on-de	orman	nt (V	Vait	stat	tes)-					>	
UserID	<-Samj	ples->																Pct
/Class	Total	In Q	Run	Sim	CPU	SIO	Pag	SVM	SVM	SVM	CF	Idl	I/0	Pag	Ldg	Oth	Lst	Elig
04/25/22										-							-	
14:45:00		2815									0			•				0
Hi-Freq:					1.2	0.0	0.0	0	1.0	0.0	0	94	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
***User																		
Servers	10800							0	10	8.9	0	90	_	0	-		0	0
Velocity	9000	115	1.7	0.9	0	0	0	0	0.2	8.7	0	89	0	0	0	0	0	0
CATech	4500	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TheUsrs	278K	174K	4.6	0.1	1.2	0.0	0.0	0	0.7	0.0	0	94	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0
***Acco	unting	Code 1	Analy	ysis	k ik													
Lxxxx3B2	14400	12319	0.3	0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	0	0	0.1	0	0	0
Lxxxx3FA	28800	15945	1.1	0.1	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lxxxx3FD	28800	27916	4.3	0.2	2.5	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
Lxxxx3F5	28800	16568	0.2	0.0	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0
Lxxxx3F8	28800	25036	24	0.4	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
Lxxxx411	3600	3600	2.9	0.1	3.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	0	0.0	0.1	0	0	0
LXXXX51E	28800	15990	0.2	0	0.3	ō	ō	ō	ō	ō	ō	99	-	0		-	ō	ō
Lxxxx529						õ	õ	õ	õ	ŏ	õ	100	-	-	õ	-	õ	õ
LXXXX538						ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	98	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	ŏ	õ
						-									-	-	-	-



#### ESALPAR – Logical Partition Analysis showed:

- Shows there are too many vCPUs assigned
  - There are 20 vCPUs on the LPAR mostly Vertical High and Vertical Medium in use but still with idle threads

ime	Phys CPUs	Name	No	Artition-> Pool Name	VCPU Addr	<%Assi Total	gned> Ovhd	VCPU TYPE	Weight/	Total util	Emul time	User ovrhd	Sys ovrhd	Idle time	Stl Pct	Idle Time	cp1/
4/25/22																	
4:45:00	109	Vxxxxx	c8 08		0	62.5	0.7	IFL	60 VHi	86.7	81.3	2.3	3.0	110.6	2.64	35.32	0,
					1		0.7	IFL	60 VHi	89.2	84.3	2.2	2.6	108.4	2.48	35.46	2 .
					2		0.7		60 VHi	87.7	82.6	2.4				35.58	4
					3	65.4	0.7		60 VHi	91.0	86.2	2.2				37.09	6
					4	65.5	0.7		60 VHi	91.0	86.2	2.2				37.07	8
					5	65.8	0.7		60 VHi	91.5	86.6	2.3		105.9			10
					6	65.0	0.7		60 VHi	90.2	85.2	2.3		107.1		36.76	12
					7	64.9	0.7		60 VMe	90.1	85.2	2.3		107.2		36.70	14
					8	64.0	0.7		60 VMe	89.5	84.5	2.4		107.8			16
					9 10	36.7 20.7	0.4		60 VLo	52.4	49.9 27.5	1.1		47.7		19.46	18
					11	13.9	0.3		60 VLo 60 VLo	29.6 20.6	27.5	1.1	1.0			10.75 6.70	20
					12	9.6	0.1		60 VLO 60 VLO	14.6	19.5	0.8	0.8			4.38	22 24
					13	5.5	0.0		60 VLO	8.4	8.1	0.1	0.2			2.47	26
					14	3.4	0.0		60 VL0	5.2	5.1	0.1	0.1			1.41	
					15	3.0	0.0		60 VL0	4.9	4.7	0.1	0.1		190	1.17	30
					16	0.3	0.0		60 VLo		0.4	0.0	0.0			0.19	
					17	0.0	0.0		60 VLo		0.0	0.0	0.0		200	0.00	
					18	0.0	0.0		60 VLo				0.0			0.00	
					19	0.0	0.0	IFL	60 VLo			0	0.0	0	200	0.00	
					трлр	673.2				43.1 89							



# ESALPARS – Logical Partition Analysis Summary showed:

- There are too many vCPUs causing overhead
  - Thread Idle percentage is high and
  - Shared Processor busy Ovhd/Mgmt are also high usually indicative of a thrashing situation

			-> < :h										Wait	<-Three	ad-
lime	CPUs	Slid	e Name	Nbr	CPUs	Туре	Total	Ovhd	Weight	Pct	/SYS	/CPU	Comp	Idle	cnt
04/25/22															
15:30:00			Vxxxxx8	8 08	20	IFL	347.0	6.2	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	243.3	2
15:31:00			Vxxxxx8	8 08	20	IFL	341.6	6.5	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	233.0	
15:32:00	)		Vxxxxx8	8 08	20	IFL	397.9	6.4	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	235.4	
15:33:00			VxxxxxX	8 08	20	IFL	351.7	6.2	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	216.5	
5:34:00			Vxxxxx8	8 08	20	IFL	340.3	6.4	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	241.6	
5:35:00			Vxxxxx8	8 08	20	IFL	372.3	6.3	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	263.3	
5:36:00			Vxxxxx8				334.9					40.2		238.8	
5:37:00			Vxxxxx8				356.3					40.2		243.6	
5:38:00			Vxxxxx8			IFL		6.1				40.2		248.1	
5:40:00			VXXXXXX	8 08	20	IFL	374.3	5.9	60	7.5	0.37	40.2	No	241.1	
otals b	v Proce	essor ty	mpe:												
			<-Shared H	roces	ssor 1	ousy-	>								
ype Cou	nt Ded	shared	Total Lo												
	08 0	108		642.8	3 25.	1 25.	2								
	08 0				7 28.0										
FL 1	08 0	108	1697.7 1	641.5	5 28.3	3 27.	8								
FL 1	08 0	108	1680.6 1	626.9	9 27.3	1 26.	6								
IFL 1	08 0	108	1730.3 1	675.0	27.9	9 27.	4								



# What the Data Showed (Utilization data)

ESACPUU – CPU **Utilization Analysis** showed:

> The vCPUs from the z/VM perspective (40 threads)

 Shows the parking of **Vertical Low** vCPUs (threads 18-39)

Report: Monitor									erial (			05/01,		Pg 6150
Time	< <-Use Actv	-Load ers-> In Q	Tran /sec	CPU	СРИ Туре	< Total util	<mark>CPU</mark> Emul time	J (perc User ovrhd	Sys ovrhd	is) Idle time	Steal time	MThrea Core/ Thread	d <-Ve Enti ment	rtical> tle- Park seconds
				-										
04/25/22														
14:45:00	45	188	2.3	0	1FL TET	42.8	39.9	1.2	1.8	55.9	1.3	0/ 0 0/ 1	0.79	0
												1/ 0		
						44.0			1.3	54 7	1 3	1/ 1	0.79	ő
					IFL	44.3	41.8	1.2	1.4	54.4	1.3	2/ 0	0.79	ŏ
					IFL	43.3	40.8	1.2	1.3	55.4	1.3	2/ 0 2/ 1 3/ 0	0.79	ŏ
					IFL	46.2	43.8	1.1	1.3	52.6	1.2	3/ 0	0.79	ō
				7	IFL	44.8	42.4	1.1	1.3	54.0	1.2	3/ 1	0.79	0
				8	IFL	46.0	43.5	1.1	1.3	52.8	1.2	3/ 1 4/ 0	0.79	0
				9	IFL	45.1	42.6	1.2	1.3	53.7	1.3	4/ 1 5/ 0	0.79	0
									1.4	52.4	1.3	5/ 0	0.79	0
					IFL		42.8		1.3	53.5	1.3	5/ 1 6/ 0	0.79	0
						45.6	43.1	1.1	1.4	53.1	1.3	6/0	0.79	0
						44.6			1.3	54.1	1.3	6/1	0.79	0
					IFL IFL	45.8 44.3	43.3	1.1	1.4	52.9	1.3	7/0 7/1	0.79	0
						44.5			1.3					
						44.4			1.3	54.2	1.3	8/ 0 8/ 1	0.79	ŏ
						26.7	25.4	0.6	0.7	23.4	49.9	9/ 0	0.36	443.8
					IFL	25.8	24.5	0.6	0.7	24.3	49.9	9/ 1	0.36	443.8
				20	IFL							0/0		
				21	IFL							0/ 1		
				22	IFL							1/ 0		
						10.3						1/ 1		
					IFL	7.3	7.0	0.1	0.2			2/ 0		
					IFL	7.3	7.0	0.1	0.2			2/ 1		
					IFL							3/ 0		
				27	TEL	4.2	4.1	0.1	0.1	5.1	90.7	3/ 1 4/ 0	0.06	816.0
				20	IFL	2.0	2.5	0.0	0.0			4/ 0		
				30	TFL	2.6 2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0			5/0		
					TFT.	2.4	2.3	0.0	0.0			5/1		
					IFL	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0			6/ 0		
				33	IFL	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	98.7	6/ 1	0.01	888.0
				34	IFL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	99.8	7/ 0 7/ 1	0.00	898.0
				35	IFL	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	99.8	7/ 1	0.00	898.0
				36	IFL	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	100.0	8/ 0	0.00	900.0
				37	IFL	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	100.0	8/ 1	0.00	900.0
				38	IFL	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	100.0	9/ 0	0.00	900.0
				39	IFL	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	100.0	9/ 1	0.00	900.0 900.0 900.0 900.0
System:						943.1	891.3	23.9	27.9	1125	1932	./ .	0.40	17151





### ESADSD2 – DASD Performance Analysis showed:

- High response and service times indicates queueing
- PAV is turned off (all zeroes) paging devices are singlethreaded, response times will suffer

-	rt: <mark>ESA</mark> tor init		DASD d: 04/29				alysis ) on 85	61 sei	rial 08	7A08					Corpo yzed:					3 05/01 )	1/22	₽g
Dev No.			<ssce Total</ssce 			_				<se< th=""><th>ervice</th><th>time</th><th>25&gt;</th><th><q1< th=""><th>aeuein</th><th>.g-&gt;</th><th>QLen</th><th>gths</th><th></th></q1<></th></se<> <th>econd&gt;</th> <th>&lt;-Rat</th> <th>te/Sec</th>	ervice	time	25>	<q1< th=""><th>aeuein</th><th>.g-&gt;</th><th>QLen</th><th>gths</th><th></th></q1<>	aeuein	.g->	QLen	gths		econd>	<-Rat	te/Sec
15:0																						
** *T	op DASD	by Dev:	ice busy	7***																		
5111	V5111B	3390-9	2031	0	8.7	8.7	33.8	33.8	7.0	2.6	0.1	0.7	1.7	4.4	0	0	0.1	2	34	0	0	0
52.22	V52227	3390-9	2078	0	8.3	8.3	34.6	34.6	5.3	2.4	0.1	0.8	1.5	2.9	0	0	0.1	1	35	0	0	0
5333	V5333C	3390-9	2071	0	8.2	8.2	34.5	34.5	3.4	2.4	0.1	0.7	1.5	1.0	0	0	0.0	0	34	0	0	0
5444	V54449	3390-9	2166	0	8.2	8.2	36.1	36.1	7.3	2.3	0.1	0.6	1.5	5.1	0	0	0.2	2	36	0	0	0
5555	V55558	3390-9	2004	0	8.1	8.1	33.4	33.4	4.9	2.4	0.1	0.7	1.6	2.5	0	0	0.1	1	33	0	0	0
5666	V56666	3390-9	2029	0	7.9	7.9	33.8	33.8	3.8	2.3	0.1	0.7	1.5	1.5	0	0	0.0	1	34	0	0	0
5777	V5777A	3390-9	2028	0	7.7	7.7	33.8	33.8	2.3	2.3		0.7		0	0	0		_	34	0	ō	0
	V58885		2027	ō	7.5	7.5	33.8		2.2	2.2		0.7		ō	ō	ō	-	-	34	0	ō	ō
	V59994		2050	0		7.4	34.2			2.2			1.4	-	õ	ō	0.1	-		ō	ō	õ
	V5aaa3		2016	ŏ		7.4	33.6			2.2			1.4		ő	Ő	0.1	1	34	ŏ	ő	ŏ



#### ESAUSP2 – User Percent Utilization showed:

• Lxxxx3F8 was using a lot of CPU at the time of the issue

Report:   Monitor :													Softwar cord and	_	
UserID /Class	<(Perc	cent)>	T:V ·	- <res:< td=""><td>ident&gt;</td><td>Lock</td><td>&lt;</td><td>WSS</td><td>&gt;</td><td>Paged</td><td><pgs s<="" td=""><td>Second:</td><td>&gt; <spool &gt; Alloc</spool </td><td><i0 se<="" td=""><td>cond&gt;</td></i0></td></pgs></td></res:<>	ident>	Lock	<	WSS	>	Paged	<pgs s<="" td=""><td>Second:</td><td>&gt; <spool &gt; Alloc</spool </td><td><i0 se<="" td=""><td>cond&gt;</td></i0></td></pgs>	Second:	> <spool &gt; Alloc</spool 	<i0 se<="" td=""><td>cond&gt;</td></i0>	cond>
04/25/22															
14:45:00		891.3	1.03	720M	720M	9022	719M	719M	9M	318K	114.0	1720	207949	0	0.0
***Key U	User An	nalysi	5 ***												
TCPIP	0.13	0.05	2.55	7769	7769	639	7130	7130	7130	3980	0.3	11.8	76	0	0
***User	Class	Analys	sis**	k											
Servers					10615	646	24K	10154	846	15039	0.4	19.5	153159	0	0.0
Velocity	0.54	0.52	1.04	9237	7213	2	11K	7384	738	6306	0.7	11.6	22038	0	0
CATech	0.00	0.00	1.13	3801	2849	4	5306	2998	600	2639	0.1	2.7	5156	0	0
TheUsrs	914.5	890.7	1.03	719M	719M	8370	719M	719M	14M	294K	112.8	1686	27596	0	0.0
***Top I	User An	nalysis	5***												
Lxxxx3F8	663.5	652.0	1.02	127M	127M	491	127M	127M	127M	17636	1.1	104.5	75	0	0
Lxxxx3FD	143.0	133.5	1.07	127M	127M	500	127M	127M	127M	13411	24.8	91.1	117	0	0
Lxxxx538	31.85	31.32	1.02	109M	109M	1452	109M	109M	109M	18729	0.2	108.2	48	0	0
Lxxxx3FA	20.98	20.08	1.04	92M	92.4M	530	92M	92.4M	92M	18770	0.0	108.3	76	0	0
Lxxxx411	10.81	10.35	1.04	12M	11.6M	395	12M	11.6M	12M	12741	17.7	99.3	62	0	0
Lxxxx51E	5.17	5.05	1.02	6.3M	6273K	355	6.3M	6274K	6M	18781	0.1	108.3	49	0	0
Lxxxx3F5	5.03	4.90	1.03	127M	127M	491	127M	127M	127M	18008	6.5	107.6	80	0	0
Lxxxx3B2	4.75	4.60	1.03	64M	63.7M	475	64M	63.8M	64M	16838	17.5	110.1	73	0	0
Lxxxx400	4.54	4.41	1.03	6.3M	6327K	395	6.3M	6328K	6M	14295	3.2	93.2	61	0	0
Lxxxx529	4.47	4.34	1.03	16M	15.6M	355	16M	15.6M	16M	18578	0.0	108.0	49	0	0





Report: ESAUSPG

User Storage Analysis

# ESAUSPG – User Storage Analysis showed:

- Multiple servers have ulleta huge amount of storage
- Lxxxx538 started • holding storage below the 2G line
- Paging started • thrashing (Megabytes Paged Out)

UserID /Class	<mai< th=""><th>in Storag</th><th>e&gt;</th><th>egaBytes)&gt; Paged Out</th><th>Page</th><th></th><th>Moved</th><th></th></mai<>	in Storag	e>	egaBytes)> Paged Out	Page		Moved	
04/25/22								
14:30:00				0	0	0	0	
TheUsrs				0	0	0	0	1769
		alysis***						
Lxxxx3FD			0	0	0	0	0	11
Lxxxx3F8			0	0	0	0	0	4
Lxxxx538	421606	421505	101	0	0	0	0	34
Lxxxx3FA			6	0	0	0	0	93
Lxxxx411	45343	45343	0	0	0	0	0	135
14:45:00	2811K	2809K	1698	1241	1548K	102635	0	233532
TheUsrs	2811K	2809K	1668	1147	1517K	101501	0	198997
J goT***		alysis***						
LXXXX3F8			0	69	94026	955	0	270
Lxxxx3FD	497558	497558	0			22318	0	15886
Lxxxx538	427501	426021	1480		97357			43
Lxxxx3FA						33		142
Lxxxxx411						5 15935		
15:00:00	2812K	2810K	1914	20765	11217K	4105K	0	12788
TheUsrs		2810K			11202K			11688
		alysis***						
LXXXX3F8				1344	658447	183132	0	9162
Lxxxx3FD						1139K		
Lxxxx538					546979			29226
Lxxxx3FA			168			5704		1662
Lxxxx411			0			883815		91732
15:15:00	2812K	2811K	1915	49630	12540K	5000K	0	15318
TheUsrs	2812K	2811K	1909			4979K		14091
		alysis***					-	
Lxxxx3FD			0	518	1100K	1071K	0	35984
Lxxxx538						169221		40030
Lxxxx3F8			1,00			335159		1293
LXXXX3FA						218475		12484
2 million of the	000007	000000	200	0002	.01000	210110		10.00



14



# What the Data Showed (Utilization data)

ESALNXS – Linux **VSI System Analysis** showed:

- Lxxx3F8 has 32 vCPUs – Linux uses all of them, even though only one major process was running (from ESALNXP)
- Spin locks result from too many vCPUs



Report: Monitor	initia	lized:	LINUX V 04/25/2	2 at	00:00	:00 oi	n 856	l ser:	ial O				
Node/ Time	<lo Users</lo 	oad Nu Procs	mbers> MaxProc	CPU NBR	<proce Total</proce 	essor Syst	Pct User	Jtil> Idle	NICE Time	<cpu Krnl</cpu 	Over IRQ	head%> Steal	IO Wait
LINUX3F8			0	Tot	616.4	13.1	598	2541	0	0.7	4.2		0.3
				1	20.0	1.2	16.2	77.5	0	0.1	2.5	2.5	0.0
				2	24.9	0.6	24.2	73.5	0	0.0	0.1	1.6	0.0
				3	24.6	0.5	24.0	73.7	0	0.0	0.1	1.7	0.0
				4	27.2	0.5	26.5	71.0	0	0.0	0.1	1.8	0.0
				5	27.9	0.5	27.3	70.3	0	0.0	0.1	1.8	0.0
				6	22.6	0.5	22.0	75.9	0	0.0	0.1	1.5	0.0
				7	22.1	0.5	21.5	76.4	0	0.0	0.1	1.5	0.0
				8	23.5	0.5	22.9	74.9	0	0.0	0.1	1.6	0.0
				9	22.5	0.5	21.9	76.0	0	0.0	0.1	1.6	0.0
				10	20.9	0.4	20.4	77.6	0	0.0	0.1	1.5	0.0
				11	21.6	0.4	21.1	76.9	0	0.0	0.1	1.5	0.0
				12	18.6	0.4	18.2	80.1	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				13	17.3	0.4	16.8	81.4	0	0.0	0.1	1.2	0.0
				14	18.5	0.4	18.1	80.1	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				15	19.1	0.4	18.6	79.6	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				16	19.7	0.4	19.3	78.9	0	0.0	0.1	1.4	0.0
				17	17.6	0.4	17.1	81.2	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				18	16.8	0.4	16.3	82.0	0	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
				19	18.7	0.4	18.2	80.0	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				20	20.3	0.4	19.9	78.3	0	0.0	0.1	1.4	0.0
				21	16.8	0.4	16.4	82.1	0	0.0	0.1	1.1	0.0
				22	16.3	0.4	15.8	82.7	0	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.0
				23	15.9	0.3	15.6	83.1	0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
				24	19.4	0.3	19.0	79.3	0	0.0	0.1	1.3	0.0
				25	15.6	0.2	15.3	83.4	0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
				26	18.8	0.3	18.4	79.9	0	0.0	0.1	1.2	0.0
				27	18.3	0.4	17.8	80.5	0	0.0	0.1	1.2	0.0
				28	15.1	0.3	14.8	83.9	0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
				29	15.6	0.3	15.2	83.5	0	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.0
				30	12.5	0.3	12.1	86.7	0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0
				31	13.2	0.3	12.9	85.9	0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0



# ESALNXP – Linux HOST Process Statistics showed:

- Lxxxx538 had a MongoDB process that was ramping up (CPU/Storage)
- This ended up needing more storage than was available

_	SALNXP nitialized							_				
node/ Name	<process ID</process 			PRTY Valu						<stor Size</stor 		
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0	2.82	0.57	1.56	0.08	0.61	13K	487	211K
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0	12.4	0.67	7.85	0.40	3.44	14K	533	219K
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0	61.8	5.48	52.7	0.16	3.45	46K	31K	698K
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	_		2.24						1.4M
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-						126K		
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-						149K		
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-						173K		
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-						204K		
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-		4.50						
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	-		1.18						
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0						208K		
Lxxxx538 14:45:00	0	0	0	0	20.6	1.67	19.0	0.01	0.00	208K	193K	3.1M
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0	23.6	1.76	21.2	0.08	0.55	208K	193K	3.1M
mongod-g	45390	1	0	20	20.6	1.16	19.4	0	0	195K	193K	2.9M
Lxxxx538	0	0	0	0	72.2	4.80	67.4	0.01	0.00	208K	193K	3.1M
mongod-g	45390	1	0	20	69.5	4.00	65.5	0	0	195K	193K	2.9M





# ESAUCD2 – Linux UCD Memory Analysis showed:

- Way too much real storage is allocated but not being used
- Very little swap space is being used

Report: Monitor	ESAUCD2 initial:	ized: (	LINUX ( 04/25/2	UCD Mer 22 at (	nory A 00:00:	nalysi: 00 on (	s Repo: 8561 se	rt erial (	087 <b>A</b> 08	Velo Firs	city S t reco	oftware rd ana:	e Corpo lyzed: (	rate Z 04/25/22
Node/ Time/ Date	< <mark>Rea</mark> Total	l Stora Avail	age> Used	< Total	-SWAP : Avail	Storage Used	e> MIN	Total Avail	< CMM	Stora Buffer	ge in Cache	Use Ovrhd	> Shared	Error Message
04/25/22 15:30:00 ***Node														
TheUsrs *** Node			2055K	480K	480K	7.5	234.4	2468K	0	398.4	1219K	836K	8.0	
Lxxxx3B2	245373	168K	73681	32768	32765	2.8	15.6	200K	0	28.7	53220	20433	0.6	
LXXXX3FA	490922	135K	344K	32768	32768	0	15.6	167K	0	30.0	266K	80051	0.5	
Lxxxx3FD	490922	9775	470K	32768	32763	4.8	15.6	42538	0	28.7	273K	197K	0.6	
Lxxxx3F5	490922	459K	20810	32768	32768	0	15.6	491K	0	28.7	9904	10878	0.6	
LXXXX3F8	490922	4120	475K	32768	32768	0	15.6	36888	0	28.7	231K	244K	0.6	
LXXXX40A	61210	30962	30248	32768	32768	0		63730	0	26.0	29447	775.4	0.5	
Lxxxx40D	61210	52589	8621	32768	32768	0	15.6	85357	0	26.0	7923	671.7	0.5	
LXXXX400	61210	45945	15265	32768	32768	0	15.6	78713	0	26.0	8432	6807	0.5	
Lxxxx404	30516	22106	8411	32768	32768	0	15.6	54874	0	26.0	7855	529.8	0.5	
Lxxxx408	61210	53003	8207	32768	32768	0	15.6	85771	0	26.0	7055	1127	0.5	
Lxxxx41B	122598	99697	22901	32768	32768	0	15.6	129K	0	30.0	7889	14982	0.5	
Lxxxx411	61210	19750	41460	32768	32768	0	15.6	52518	0	26.0	16569	24866	0.5	
LXXXX51E	490861	464K	15285	32768	32768	0	15.6	496K	0	22.6	4482	10780	0.5	
Lxxxx529	490861	429K	51329	32768	32768	0	15.6	461K	0	22.6	21736	29570	0.5	
LXXXX538	490861	72014	409K	32768	32768	0	15.6	102K	0	22.6	210K	199K	0.5	





# ESAUSTR – User Storage Analysis showed:

- The Made IBR hit the 2% line (agelist default is 2%)
- A few minutes later, the Made IBR increased exponentially
- (The correct users aren't releasing pages)

				User Storage Analysis 04/25/22 at 00:00:00 on														
UserID /Class	Size		Resi-	Server UFO Activ	<	IBR-	>	<age:< th=""><th>List&gt;</th><th><unre< th=""><th>eferd</th><th>&gt; slots</th><th>Made</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></unre<></th></age:<>	List>	<unre< th=""><th>eferd</th><th>&gt; slots</th><th>Made</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></unre<>	eferd	> slots	Made					
04/25/22 TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs	4231K 4231K 4231K 4231K	2681K 2765K 2774K	2681K 2765K 2774K	2681K 2763K 2772K	0.9 10.9 10.9	0.1 1.5 1.5	0.8 9.4 9.4	5.4 64.3 64.3	103 1533 1532	0	0 0 0	0 0 0		<-	2%	line		
TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs TheUsrs	4231K 4231K 4231K 4231K 4231K	2783K 2775K 2791K 2805K 2812K	2783K 2775K 2791K 2805K 2811K	2781K 2773K 2789K	10.6 10.8 10.6 10.6 12.9	1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	9.1 9.3 9.1 9.1 11.4	64.3 64.3 64.3 64.3 31.5	1536 1535 1532 1530	0 0 0 0.0	0 0 0 37.0	0 0 0 1147 20588	0.0 2.4 0 0	<-	Fal	l off.	clif:	f
TheUsrs TheUsrs									1851 2319			5434 49453	720 687					





#### ESAPSDV – Page and Spool Device showed:

- There are an adequate amount of paging devices, but they are on differently-sized devices which can cause issues
- The average SSCH/RSCH queuing was very high
- Again, this shows that PAV/HPAV is off (all zeros)

-	rt: ESAN											Velo First						
NO.	Serial	Avail	Used	%Use	Max	Read	Writ	Queue	+RSCH	Time	Time	Select	Singl	Read	Write	/Sec	Read	Write
Page	Devices	3																
5111	V5111A	12M	744K	6	744K	505	1267	0	33.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	36	11
5222	V5222B	12M	743K	6	743K	531	1274	0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	10
5333	V5333C	12M	744K	6	744K	560	1290	0	33.8	0.1	0.1	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	11
5444	V54440	5897K	739K	13	739K	533	1285	0	33.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	10
5555	V55551	5897K	743K	13	743K	498	1286	0	33.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	36	10
5666	V56662	5897K	745K	13	745K	517	1268	0	33.9	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	10
5777	V57773	5897K	744K	13	744K	512	1286	0	33.3	0.1	0.1	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	10
5888	V58884	12M	744K	6	744K	526	1282	0	33.8	0.1	0.1	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	11
5999	V59995	12M	746K	6	746K	515	1279	0	33.6	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	10
5aaa	V5aaa6	12M	745K	6	745K	523	1286	0	33.4	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	37	11
5bbb	V5bbb7	12M	742K	6	742K	528	1287	0	34.5	0.1	0.1	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	38	10
5ccc	V5ccc8	12M	744K	6	744K	509	1288	0	32.8	0.0	0.0	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	36	10
5ddd	V5ddd9	12M	741K	6	741K	552	1249	0	35.8	0.1	0.1	100.0	0	0	) 0	0	39	11
Tota	L Page	130M	10M	7	10M	6808	17K											





# ESABLKP – Block Paging Analysis showed:

- Service times were climbing
- Block reads and size were climbing (optimal size is 10 pages)
- Block Steal and Unreferenced pages climbing
- Single User page reads climbing
- All show stress on the storage system

Report: Monitor i					ging An at 00:	-		561 se	rial (	87 <b>A</b> 08	Fir	st recor	rd analy	zed: 04	1/25/22
Time	<-Use	ers->	Tran /sec	Serv Time (ms)	<-Rea	ads->	<-Blo <-Ste /sec	eal->	<migi< th=""><th>ate&gt;</th><th>Block Fault /sec</th><th>-</th><th>ck Excep Read&gt; System</th><th><no re<="" th=""><th></th></no></th></migi<>	ate>	Block Fault /sec	-	ck Excep Read> System	<no re<="" th=""><th></th></no>	
14:00:00	46	178	2.3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
14:15:00	45	190	2.3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
14:30:00	45	195	2.3		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0	0
14:45:00	45	188	2.3	0.0	4.4	18.7	64.5	26.9	0	0	4.4	0.1	0.2	0	37.9
15:00:00	45	189	2.3	1.2	123.8	18.9	391.3	27.8	0	0	123.8	73.3	7.7	0	3668
15:15:00	46	179	2.4	3.0	148.2	18.7	434.4	27.5	0	0	148.2	207.3	18.5	0	4582
15:30:00	45	194	2.3	2.6	99.3	18.3	111.7	30.0	0	0	99.3	173.4	11.2	0	3236
15:45:00	47	193	2.4	3.3	128.7	17.6	329.3	28.7	0	0	128.7	185.4	41.2	0	3692
16:00:00	48	191	2.2	4.1	59.9	19.1	53.6	31.3	0	0	59.9	78.3	7.5	0	1900





# ESAOPER – Operator/System Console showed:

- Parking was very active at the time of the issue
- Parking thrashing causes cache issues
- Too many vCPUs and incorrect weighting causes parking thrashing

	PER Opera ialized: 04/24			stem Log 23:45:04 on 8561 serial 087A08 First
				30 CPUUtil= "12.1", Projected= "13.0"
14:40:03 CPU	J Park from 30	to	28	CPUUtil= "11.6", Projected= "12.1"
14:40:05 CPU	J Park from 28	to	26	CPUUtil= "11.1", Projected= "12.0"
				28 CPUUtil= "11.7", Projected= "12.0"
				CPUUtil= "11.0", Projected= "12.0"
				28 CPUUtil= "11.7", Projected= "12.4"
				CPUUtil= "11.0", Projected= "12.0"
				28 CPUUtil= "10.0", Projected= "12.2"
				32 CPUUtil= "13.2", Projected= "14.4"
				34 CPUUtil= "14.2", Projected= "15.1"
14:40:37 CPU	J Park from 34	to	32	CPUUtil= "14.3", Projected= "14.5"
				34 CPUUtil= "7.78", Projected= "15.5"
				36 CPUUtil= "6.78", Projected= "16.1"
				CPUUtil= "5.50", Projected= "15.9"
14:41:15 CPU	J Park from 34	to	32	CPUUtil= "5.38", Projected= "14.2"
				CPUUtil= "5.20", Projected= "13.0"
14:41:19 CPU	J Park from 30	to	26	CPUUtil= "5.33", Projected= "11.3"
14:41:21 CPU	J Park from 26	to	20	CPUUtil= "4.63", Projected= "8.79"
14:41:23 CPU	J Park from 20	to	18	CPUUtil= "5.54", Projected= "7.50"
				22 CPUUtil= "7.62", Projected= "9.16"
				CPUUtil= "8.27", Projected= "8.93"
				CPUUtil= "6.42", Projected= "7.89"
				20 CPUUtil= "6.73", Projected= "8.46"
				CPUUtil= "5.64", Projected= "7.06"
				20 CPUUtil= "7.31", Projected= "8.41"
				CPUUtil= "6.82", Projected= "7.82"
14:43:13 CPU	Unpark from	18 t	to	22 CPUUtil= "7.52", Projected= "9.07"



# What was the actual problem?

- Lxxxx538 started a process that was ramping up its Mongo database
- Lxxxx538 was holding a lock but got paged out
- The other large systems were spinning waiting on that lock (Lxxxx3F8 was a victim, not the culprit)
- There wasn't enough storage for that system to get paged back in
- Once everything starts backing up, the problems grow exponentially
- Eventually that lock was released and things recovered – but it had the potential to happen again





# Performance Enhancement Suggestions:

1 – The "T-Shirt" size approach that is often used when moving Linux servers from xSeries boxes to the z/VM platform causes them to have excessive resources

- Several large Linux servers had more vCPUs than were needed
  - Verify only the necessary amount of vCPUs are allocated
- Several large Linux servers had more storage than was needed
  - Verify only the necessary storage is allocated
- Use swap space
  - Use swap space to allow servers to use very fast and efficient virtual disk when extra storage is needed





# Performance Enhancement Suggestions:

- 2 Lower the number of vCPUs of the Linux servers
- This will help reduce processor parking and cache issues
- Each large server had 32 vCPUs when 16 would suffice
- Verify Parking settings
  - If needed, set unparking to large SET SRM UNPARKING LARGE this leaves more cores unparked which helps with processor cache issues
  - If needed, set excessive use to high SET SRM EXCESSUSE HIGH
     this allows the system to use more unentitled CPU capacity





# Performance Enhancement Suggestions:

3 – Verify the SRM agelist settings are correct for the environment

- The replacement for xstore is the agelist
- Instead of up to 20% xstore available, now the default is 2% pageable storage – this works better for smaller servers
  - If needed, set the SRM agelist size to 5% SET SRM AGELIST SIZE
    5.0% to give a bigger buffer area
  - If needed, set the early writes to yes SET SRM AGELIST EARLYW
    YES to allow unused pages to be written out early
  - If needed, set the keep slot to yes SET SRM AGELIST KEEPS YES
    to keep storage addresses longer





# <u>What the customer reported</u>:

• The suggestions were implemented and no further issues have been reported

