

Performance is a critical factor for success of any packaged application implementations. The presentation discusses performance assurance for packaged applications on example of Oracle Enterprise Performance Management. While details are related to this particular set of applications, many approaches discussed would be applicable to most packaged applications. The presentation will discuss a holistic performance assurance approach, top-down approach to performance troubleshooting, potential performance issues and ways to address them.





Oracle Enterprise Performance Management (EPM) System includes a suite of performance management applications, a suite of business intelligence (BI) applications, a common foundation of BI tools and services, and a variety of datasources – all integrated using Oracle Fusion Middleware.





Performance Assurance for EPM is ongoing performance risk mitigation during the whole system lifecycle. EPM products are thoroughly tested for performance, but performance of specific implementations depends on how they are designed and constructed (metadata, data, forms, grids, rules, etc.all these artifacts are different for each implementation).



The steps listed are just an outline, some steps will be discussed in more details later in this presentation.



The main point that all these activities should continue through the whole system lifecycle and the same performance metrics should be tracked through all steps.



Performance requirements are supposed to be tracked from the system inception through the whole system lifecycle including design, development, testing, operations, and maintenance. However different groups of people are involved on each stage using their own vision, terminology, metrics, and tools that makes the subject confusing when going into details.

Throughput is the rate at which incoming requests are completed. Throughput defines the load on the system and is measured in operations per time period. It may be the number of transactions per second or the number of reports per hour. In most cases we are interested in a steady mode when the number of incoming requests would be equal to the number of processed requests.

The number of users doesn't, by itself, define throughput. Without defining what each user is doing and how intensely (i.e. throughput for one user), the number of users doesn't make much sense as a measure of load. What users do also defines what components and how intensely they use.



For example, both very deep member hierarchies and flat member hierarchies may cause issues under load.

See documentation and best practices documents for details for specific applications.



Very large objects (web forms, reports) may require some tuning, like increasing JVM heap size, even for one user.

Hardware upgrade (with exception of cpu speed) is usually not beneficial for single-user issues— assuming that there is no inherent issues with hardware configuration like memory is so small that it starts paging even with one user.



Multiple tuning documents are available and should be checked for details. For example:

Essbase Database Administrator Guide, Optimizing Essbase

Hyperion Financial Management (HFM) Performance Tuning Guide, Fusion Edition (Doc ID 1083460.1)



In cases of any long-running, resources-consuming tasks it may be more efficient just to schedule them for the time of minimal load instead of trying to tune and optimize them to run in parallel with high-concurrency load.



It is impossible to predict performance of your application without at least some performance testing.



Running multiple users hitting the same set of data (with same Point of View, POV) is an easy way to get misleading results. If it is for reporting, the data could be completely cached and we get much better results than in production. If it is, for example, for web data entry forms, it could cause concurrency issues and we get much worse results than in production. So scripts should be parameterized (fixed or recorded data should be replaced with values from a list of possible choices) so that each user uses a proper set of data. The term "proper" here means different enough to avoid problems with caching and concurrency, which is specific for the system, data, and test requirements.



Unfortunately, a lack of error messages during a load test does not mean that the system worked correctly. A very important part of load testing is workload verification. We should be sure that the applied workload is doing what it is supposed to do and that all errors are caught and logged. It can be done directly by analyzing server responses or, in cases when this is impossible, indirectly. For example, by analyzing the application log or database for the existence of particular entries.



The suggested "typical" configuration are for average applications designed according to best practices. As far as performance heavily depends on the way applications are implemented, it is difficult to properly size applications that are unique in one or more ways (and many are) without collecting at least some performance information.





Investigate before act. "Shooting in the dark" rarely helps, but adds frustration.



It may be many reasons for bad performance, including lack of hardware resources, inadequate tuning or configuration, issues with custom application design, or even an issue with the product itself (which is relatively slow). And, of course, it may be a combination of issues.



One complication may be that it could be several performance issues disguising each other. It makes investigation more difficult, but still there is no other way as identify and fix every issues one by one. No magic bullets here.



Monitoring may be done with OS-level tools (such as Performance Monitor for Windows and vmstat, ps, sar for UNIX), although it is usually nor the best choice for ongoing production monitoring.

Things to monitor: system-level resource utilization metrics, process-level metrics for key processes, database metrics.



Understanding what component is doing what is very important. During performance testing, for example, you need to know what components you need to pay attention to. And, vise versa, seeing activity on a component during monitoring, you may guess what kind of workload may cause this activity.



It doesn't mean that other components never had performance issues – it just mean that they are used mostly by few users or for one-time kinds of activities, usually with low concurrency. Due to the time limitation, only the most high-concurrency products and paths are discussed. The presentation mainly discusses the products typically having the highest concurrency in most EPM implementations: Hyperion Planning, Hyperion Financial Management, Hyperion Essbase, and reporting solutions (Hyperion Financial Reporting and Hyperion SmartView). Actually a detailed discussion even about a single product hardly may fit a single presentation timeframe, so here these products are mentioned rather as examples to illustrate the advocated approaches. Further details could be found in manuals and product-specific documents.

More information in the Component Architecture documents at http://www.oracle.com/technetwork/middleware/bi-foundation/resourcelibrary-090986.html



This is a simplified HFM component diagram for the components and flows usually involved in high-concurrency transactions. The components needed most attention from the performance point of view highlighted with yellow and red glow.

The choice of components / highlighting is based on the author personal experience only and was simplified to fit presentation slides. Other components may be important from performance point of view too.

OHS stands for Oracle HTTP Server.

*Foundation consisted of two components, Shared Services and Workspace, before version 11.1.2.



The main components for Planning from the performance point of view are Planning Web application (a J2EE application) and Essbase as its main datastore. Relational Database is used mostly as the repository, so usually is not a bottleneck.



The main components here from the performance point of view are Financial Reporting Web application and data sources.

To illustrate the importance of request flow understanding: Financial Reporting Print server is used only for pdf printing. So it is one of the most important components to monitor if pdf printing is involved and completely irrelevant if there is no pdf printing.

*There were three components (Financial Reporting Web applications server, Reports Server and Scheduler Server – last two standalone Java applications) instead of single Financial Reporting Web applications server before version 11.1.2.



Each component may be mapped to one or several system processes. Most Web applications are represented by HyS9<name> processes on Windows and Java processes on *unix. Use ps -ef| grep <name> on *unix to find PID for specific component.

Key processes for HFM applications server are HsvDataSource and for Essbase - ESSSVR. One such process is spawn per application, so it may be multiple such processes (while orchestrating HsxServer and ESSBASE processes respectively usually don't use much resources). Key process for HFM Web server is w3wp.

A combination of all artifacts, including metadata, data, forms, rules, etc. is traditionally referred in EPM as an application. It creates some terminological confusion: the product itself may be referred to as an application and one specific implementation inside such product is referred as an application. Talking about performance assurance in this presentation we usually mean an implementation for the given product.



Essbase application logs provides timing for all transactions. Look for 'Elapsed Time' records.

Start Gale			End Date		Server Selection		User Selection	Task Filter
6/29/2011			8/29/2011		AL X		A *	Al
								Rules Scan Rules Extract Consolidation Chart Logic
Task Audit								Custom Logic
Lise.	ACRIMIT	Time Started	Time Ended		DOVO	Deso	rigition	Data Load
adminightable Directory	Lagon	6/29/2011 4 48:031	PM 6/09/0011	4148103.994	HPM648CT	1		Data Extract
		6/29/2011 1:30:14	PM 6/28/2011	1130114-PP4	HEM648ET	1		Dela Extract si
adminightable Directory	Lagon							
admini@Hiative Directory admini@Hiative Directory	Consolidation	6/29/2011 10:35:51	AM 6/29/2011	10:37:05 AM	PERSONAL T	1 Cone	alidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual	Data Retrieval
admini@Plative Directory admini@Plative Directory admini@Plative Directory	Consolidation Consolidation	6/29/2011 10:25:51 6/29/2011 10:34:30	AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011	10:37:05 AM 10:35:50 AM	HPMS-RET	1 Cone	alidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual alidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual	Data Retrieval
admin@Hative Directory admin@Hative Directory admin@Hative Directory admin@Hative Directory	Consolidation Consolidation Consolidation	6/29/2011 10:35:53 6/29/2011 10:34:30 6/29/2011 10:31:13	AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011	10: 37: 05 AM 10: 35: 50 AM 10: 34: 35 AM	HPMS48CT	1 Cone 1 Cone 1 Cone	olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual	Data Retrieval Data Clear Data Clear
admini@Flative Directory admini@Flative Directory admini@Flative Directory admini@Flative Directory admini@Flative Directory	Canaolidation Consolidation Consolidation Date Load	6/29/2011 10:35:51 6/29/2011 10:34:30 6/29/2011 10:31:13 6/29/2011 10:27:08	AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011	10:37:05 AM 10:35:50 AM 10:34:35 AM 10:31:13 AM	HPMG48ET HPMG48ET HPMG48ET	1 Cons 1 Cons 1 Cons 1 Cons	olidation CompletedThe Scanario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scanario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scanario is Actual	Cata Retrieval Data Retrieval Data Cear Cata Copy Journal Entry Journal Retrev
admin@Hiative Directory admin@Hiative Directory admin@Hiative Directory admin@Hiative Directory	Consolidation Consolidation Consolidation	6/29/2011 10:35:55 6/29/2011 10:34:30	AM 6/29/2011 AM 6/29/2011	10:37:05 AM 10:35:50 AM	HEMO-RET	1 Cone 1 Cone	olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual olidation CompletedThe Scenario is Actual	Deta Ret Data Cler

Started and ended times for many HFM tasks may be found in Task Audit (data retrieval only for Financial Reporting) in most convenient form. In the logs it would be separate records for starting and for ending tasks.



The more issue would be investigated and narrowed down, the more chances that support would be able to help.





Many issues have a very recognizable pattern and happen often enough to be aware about them.



Verify that adding hardware will solve the problem. For example, if the server is maxed out with 150 users and you need to support 200 users, there is a good chance that adding a second server will solve the problem (to be sure it need to be tested). However, if the server is maxed out with 10 users and you need to support 200 users, it is better to re-visit design and tuning; adding hardware doesn't look like a good option.



Dynamic members is an example of issues that can't be found without multiuser workload. It may be fine with one user and expose itself only under concurrent load.



To investigate JVM memory issues in most cases you need to monitor actual heap size (that usually require additional tools, some comes with Application Servers). In some cases Java process memory may be monitored if initial – Xms and maximum –Xmx heap size set to different values, but results may be obscured by the way OS manage memory.



RAID-5 is optimized for reading, not writing. It introduces significant overheads for extensive writing.



HTTP compression adds overheads, so it may be not a good solution for LAN users.



What each request is doing is defined by the *?Action=* part. In some context/versions, during the recording, you get multiple *GETCONSOLSTATUS* requests, the number of *GETCONSOLSTATUS* requests recorded depends on the processing time. If playback such script, it will work in the following way: the script submits the consolidation in the *EXECUTE* request and then calls *GETCONSOLSTATUS* three times. If we have a timer around these requests, the response time will be almost instantaneous. While in reality the consolidation may take many minutes or even hours (yes, this is a good example when sometimes people may be happy having one hour response time in a Web application). If we have several iterations in the script, we will submit several consolidations, which continue to work in background competing for the same data, while we report sub-second response times.

Consolidation scripts require creating an explicit loop around GETCONSOLSTATUS to catch the end of consolidation.



Another example is HFM Web Data Entry Forms. To parameterize such script, we need not only department names, but also department ids (which are internal representation not visible to users – should be extracted from the metadata repository). If department ids are not parameterized, the script won't work – although no errors will be reported.

