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Executive Summary

This paper presents a performance analysis of publish/subscribe messaging throughput of FioranoMQ® 10.0.0, Tibco EMS v8.0, ActiveMQ 5.9.0, HornetQ 2.4.0, OpenMQ5.0.0, RabbitMQ 3.2.0, and IBM WebSphere MQ 7.5. This analysis provides a head-to-head comparison of these products designed to illustrate the products’ relative performance characteristics for several messaging scenarios.

The test scenarios represent stress level conditions for real world applications. The tests examine performance under load, where a single message broker is required to support many publishers and subscribers.

The testing tool used for these performance tests is highly configurable and can be used to test any JMS broker. Also, this tool allows running and measurement of a wide range of test definitions.

Do note that the different configurations or performance tuning of any JMS broker may potentially yield throughput gains (or losses) for any of these tests. Changes to the test definitions will produce different throughput rates and this should be considered when attempting to map these results to expected performance of any particular JMS application.

All the JMS brokers were configured with out-of-the-box default values and no performance specific product tuning was carried out for any of them. It’s observed from the detailed results that the relative performance of the message brokers varies under various conditions. While performance analysis should always be conducted for a particular messaging environment, the results of these tests suggest that FioranoMQ will deliver messages more efficiently in demanding messaging environments in today’s real-time enterprises.

1. Test Methodology

All the tests described in this section were carried out using a highly configurable testing tool. This tool allows running and measurement of a wide range of test definitions.

This section begins with a brief description of test conditions which are created to test the JMS server. This is followed by a section that describes the tests and their results. The final section provides a brief description of the hardware and software configurations.

1.1 Test Conditions

All the tests were conducted under the following conditions:

- Each client runs on a separate JMS connection.
- All test results are recorded after the client connections have been established and publishers/subscribers and other objects had been created.
- All tests were run multiple times to assure repeatability.
• Performance was measured under maximum load by publishing as many messages as possible using default settings of the server.
• During the test, no other applications were running and using resources on the system under test.
• Dups_ok was used by all consumers.
• All servers were tested in the default mode - which meant running IBM MQ, Tibco EMS in "Evaluation" (non-HA) mode, ActiveMQ 5.9 (default configuration mode), FioranoMQ and others in normal production ready (non-HA) mode.

1.2 Test Scenario’s

The tests were conducted for the most popular messaging models employed using Topics in JMS.

Non-Persistent Publishers & Non-Durable Subscribers

This model is typically used by applications which are exchanging high volume of messages and have a requirement of minimum latency.

Persistent Publishers & Durable Subscribers

This model is typically employed by applications which need maximum level of redundancy and need once and only once guarantee of message delivery irrespective of the client or server failure.

The following tests were conducted based on typical customer use-cases:

a. Topic Scalability Tests: These tests observe the performance characteristics of JMS server with varying # of Pub/Sub clients on a fixed number of topics. The results illustrate the scalability of JMS server as more clients (all working on same JMS Topic) are employed.

b. Server Scalability Tests: These tests observe the performance characteristics of JMS server with varying # of Topics with fixed # of Pub/Sub clients per topic. The results illustrate the scalability of JMS server as more clients (each working on independent JMS Topics) are employed.

c. Persistent Producer, Multiple Durable Consumers: These tests observe the performance characteristics of JMS server when a single persistent publisher is used to publish messages to multiple durable subscribers.

d. Non-Persistent Producer, Multiple Non-Durable Consumers: These tests observe the performance characteristics of JMS server when a single non-persistent publisher is used to publish messages to multiple non-durable subscribers.

In order to generate the highest amount of message load, no processing time is introduced at either side of the client message exchanges. Allowing publishers to send messages as fast as possible in this manner enables these tests to expose the maximum message throughput rates. The test message size was chosen to reflect use cases observed in typical customer proof of concept scenarios.
1.3 Test Duration

All test scenarios were executed for a total of five minutes. Each test execution comprised of five, sixty-second intervals. The first two and last intervals were considered ramp-up and ramp-down intervals, respectively.

Ramp-up intervals are times during which the systems are increasing their message handling capacities, typically via resource allocation in response to the newly introduced client load.

Ramp-down intervals are times in which the systems are decreasing their capacity in response to decreased client loads that result from test completion. The remaining five intervals were considered measurement intervals during which steady-state performance was achieved.

Steady-state is the condition in which message rates exhibit negligible change.

1.4 Environment Setup

All client connections, publishers and subscribers were established before any testing ramp-up periods were started.

Each product’s message store, log files, queues, and topics were deleted and recreated therefore the broker stopped and restarted between each test.

1.5 Measurement

Performance data was collected during the five-minute measurement intervals only. No data was collected during ramp-up and ramp-down intervals. Tests were run twice, and measurements were averaged to obtain final results.

1.6 Topology

The topology contains two machines: One for running the clients and the other for running the server. The system configurations are detailed later in this document. These systems having 1GB NIC cards were interconnected using a 1 GBPS peer to peer connection.
## 2. Performance Results

### 2.1 Topic Scalability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Subscribers Type</th>
<th>Message Size (bytes)</th>
<th>Subscription Rate (messages / sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiorano MQ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>67876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/1</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>99726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/25/1</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>103094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50/1</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>103660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Topic Scalability**

![Graph showing topic scalability](image-url)
## 2.2 Server Scalability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Subscriber Type</th>
<th>Message Size (bytes)</th>
<th>Subscription Rate (messages / sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Fiorano MQ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/10/10</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>76298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/25/25</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>83270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50/50/50</td>
<td>Non-Persistent</td>
<td>Non-Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>84330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Server Scalability

![Server Scalability Graph](image)
2.3 Persistent Publisher, Durable Subscribers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Subscriber Type</th>
<th>Message Size (bytes)</th>
<th>Subscription Rate (messages / sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fiorano MQ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>3818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/1</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>33894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/1</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>47448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/50/1</td>
<td>Persistent</td>
<td>Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>50519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Persistent Publisher, Durable Subscriber

![Graph showing subscription rates for different MQ versions and topic counts.](image-url)
2.4 Non-Persistent Publisher, Non-Durable Subscribers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>Message Type</th>
<th>Subscriber Type</th>
<th>Message Size (bytes)</th>
<th>Subscription Rate (messages / sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Persistent</td>
<td>Non Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>Fiorano MQ 10 Rabbit MQ 3.2.0 Active MQ 5.9.0 IBM MQ 7.5.0_2 Open MQ 5.0.0 Tibco EMS 8.0 HornetQ 2.4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1/1</td>
<td>Non Persistent</td>
<td>Non Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>67876 14298 39137 3176 23476 31905 52581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/10/1</td>
<td>Non Persistent</td>
<td>Non Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>101096 13676 52868 20059 23307 93083 68741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/1</td>
<td>Non Persistent</td>
<td>Non Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>104637 13578 52148 29941 6103 101425 66163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/50/1</td>
<td>Non Persistent</td>
<td>Non Durable</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>101853 13491 49046 35905 9071 102432 71002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non Persistent Publisher, Non Durable Subscriber

![Graph showing subscription rates for different MQ versions and configurations]
3. System Configuration

3.1 Hardware Configuration

Server System

- Linux CentOS 2.6.18-92.el5 (x64)
- 2 Quad Core Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU 5405 @ 2.00GHz
- 64 bit 16 GB RAM

Client System

- Linux CentOS 2.6.18-92.el5 (x64)
- Quad Core Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU 5405 @ 2.00GHz
- 64 bit 16 GB RAM

Network Settings

- Client and Server were on the same network
- Network Speed: 1GBPS

3.2 Software Configuration

- Java Runtime Environment, Standard Edition (build 1.7.0_45-b18)
- FioranoMQ v 10.0.0
- RabbitMQ 3.2.0
- Tibco EMS v 8.0 (In persistent tests, the TIBCO topics were set to failsafe to ensure persistence to disk)
- ActiveMQ v 5.9.0
- HornetQ 2.4.0
- OpenMQ 5.0.0
- IBM WebSphere 7.5
About Fiorano Software

Founded in 1995, Silicon Valley based Fiorano is a California Corporation with proven leadership in enterprise middleware and peer-to-peer distributed systems. Fiorano’s innovative event-driven, dataflow SOA platform integrates applications and complex technologies into an enterprise nervous system, increases business process performance, yields higher message throughput and enhances availability through agent-based visual composition that bridges the capability gap between business models and their implementation – the model is the application, ready to run.

Global leaders including ABN AMRO, Boeing, British Telecom, Capgemini Telecom, Chicago Mercantile Exchange Group, McKesson, NASA, POSCO Steel, Qwest Communications, Rabobank, Schlumberger, Lockheed Martin, United States Coast Guard and Vodafone have deployed Fiorano to drive innovation through open, standards-based, dataflow SOA applications built in just days, yielding unprecedented productivity.

The Fiorano SOA Platform built on the Fiorano Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) and Fiorano Message Queue (MQ), together deliver the industry fastest, lowest latency, highest throughput real-time messaging (asynchronous and synchronous) to power high performance, highly available, and collaborative workflow applications whose application services are distributed throughout the IT landscape. Fiorano’s distributed, peer-to-peer agents abstract complexity of developing and deploying services to unlock value in a customer’s enterprise architecture framework.