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Take-away points

• Designed, implemented, and evaluated a new approach to time-sharing parallel applications with performance isolation
• Approach based on periodic real-time scheduling of nodes combined with global feedback control of real-time constraints
• Provides a simple way to control execution rate of applications while maintaining efficiency
• Despite only isolating and controlling CPU, memory, comm I/O, and local disk I/O follow
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Batch parallel workload

• Use tightly-coupled resources (e.g. cluster)
• Synchronizing collective communication
• Bulk Synchronous Parallel (BSP) model
  – Computation and communication
• If run on time-sharing machines
  – Nodes must be carefully scheduled
  – One thread may stall the whole application
Batch parallel workload (cont.)

• Space-sharing resources to avoid stalls
  – Exclusive resource use
  – Limit utilization; CPU idle during comm or I/O
  – Likely block other processes
  – Coarse control of execution rate & response time

• We propose performance-targetted feedback controlled real-time scheduling.
  – Time-sharing with performance isolation
  – Fine control of execution rate & response time
  – Resource utilization proportional to execution rate
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Periodic Real-time Scheduling Model

• Task runs for slice seconds every period seconds

[JACM 1973]
Periodic Real-time Scheduling Model

• Task runs for **slice** seconds every **period** seconds
  – “1 hour every 10 hours”, “1 ms every 10 ms”
    • Does NOT imply “1 hour chunk” (but does not preclude it)
  – **Compute rate**: \( \text{slice} / \text{period} \)
    • 10 % for both examples, but radically different interactivity!
  – **Completion time**: \( \text{size} / \text{rate} \)
    • 24 hour job completes after 240 hours

• Unifying abstraction for diverse workloads
EDF Online Scheduling

- Dynamic priority preemptive scheduler
- Always runs task with highest priority
- Tasks prioritized in reverse order of impending deadlines
  - Deadline is end of current period

EDF=“Earliest Deadline First”
VSched tool

• Provides soft real-time (limited by Linux)
• Runs at user-level (no kernel changes)
• Schedules any set of processes
• Supports very fast changes in constraints

[Lin et al, SC’05]
VSched tool

• Supports (slice, period) ranging into days
  – Fine millisecond and sub-millisecond ranges for interactive processes
  – Coarser constraints for batch processes
• Client/Server: remote control scheduling
• Publicly released
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Overview

Administrator / User

Max application execution rate

Target execution rate

Error threshold

Control system

Application
Our control system

Application Execution Rate (% of $R_{\text{max}}$)

$\sum (r_{\text{target}} - \varepsilon)$

Control Algorithm

Optional Constraint:
% utilization = % of $R_{\text{max}}$

$r_{\text{target}} - \varepsilon \leq U \leq r_{\text{target}} + \varepsilon$

Same (period, slice) constraint is used for each VSched
Input

- $R_{\text{max}}$: max app execution rate
- $r_{\text{target}}$: set point; % $R_{\text{max}}$; supplied by user or system admin
- $r_{\text{current}}$: feedback input; current app execution rate; % $R_{\text{max}}$
- $\varepsilon$: error threshold; %
- $U$: current utilization; slice/period
- $r_{\text{target}} - \varepsilon \leq U \leq r_{\text{target}} + \varepsilon$: optional input from user
Control algorithm

- Define error $e = r_{\text{current}} - r_{\text{target}}$
- Goal
  - Error is within threshold: $|e| \leq \varepsilon$
  - Schedule is efficient: $U = r_{\text{current}} \pm \varepsilon$
Control algorithm

• Define error $e = r_{current} - r_{target}$
• Goal
  – Error is within threshold: $|e| \leq \varepsilon$
  – Schedule is efficient: $U = r_{current} \pm \varepsilon$

• Multiple (period, slice) schedules exist for a given utilization $U$
Multiple “best” \((\text{period, slice})s\) that achieve desired utilization

- Ideal control curve: \(r_{\text{current}} = r_{\text{target}} = U\)
- Inappropriate (period, slice) combinations

**MFLOP/s:** million floating point operations per second
Using only local schedulers is not enough

• Best schedule is application dependent
  – Differing comp/comm ratios, granularities, and communication patterns
  – Making the right choice should be automatic.

• User or system admin may want to dynamically change app execution rate.
  – System should react automatically.

• Soft local real-time scheduler
  – Deadline misses will inevitably occur, causing timing offsets b/w app threads to accumulate.
  – Must monitor & correct for these slow errors.
Schedule selection and drift

Application execution rate with feedback control
1:1 comp/comm ratio on 2 nodes

Upper threshold: positive error of 3%

Lower threshold: negative error 3%

Application execution rate without any feedback control

r_{current} calculated in the end of every iteration
Control algorithm (cont.)

• Define error $e = r_{current} - r_{target}$
• Goal
  – Error is within threshold: $|e| \leq \epsilon$
  – Schedule is efficient: $U = r_{current} \pm \epsilon$
• If $|e| > \epsilon$, decrease period by $\Delta_{period}$ and decrease slice by $\Delta_{slice}$, such that $U = r_{target}$
  – Startup period 200ms; if period $\leq \text{min}_{period}$, reset period
• If $|e| \leq \epsilon$, do nothing
• Simple linear search
  – Maintains $U$ and searches (period, slice) space from larger to smaller granularity
Multiple “best” \((\text{period, slice})\)s that achieve desired utilization

\[ U = \frac{\text{slice}}{\text{period}} \]
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Evaluation framework

- IBM e1350 cluster (Intel Xeon 2.0 GHz, 1.5 GB RAM, Gigabit Ethernet interconnect, Linux 2.4.20)
- BSP benchmark; Patterns; all-to-all communication
- NAS benchmark; IS (integer sort)
- Each node runs VScied, and a separate node runs the controller.
Evaluation framework

• IBM e1350 cluster (Intel Xeon 2.0 GHz, 1.5 GB RAM, Gigabit Ethernet interconnect, Linux 2.4.20)
• BSP benchmark; *Patterns*; all-to-all communication
• NAS benchmark; IS (integer sort)
• Each node runs VSched, and a separate node runs the controller.
Evaluating control algorithm

• Three comp/comm ratios
  – high (5:1) ratio, medium (1:1) ratio, and low (1:5) ratio
• Different $r_{\text{target}}$ (% of $R_{\text{max}}$)
• Different error threshold $\varepsilon$

• $\Delta_{\text{period}} = 2\text{ms}$, $\Delta_{\text{slice}}$ adjusted such that $U = r_{\text{target}}$
Quick and stable control of app execution rate

- **Medium (1:1) comp/comm ratio**
- **Application execution rate**
- **Target execution rate**
- **Upper threshold: positive error of 3%**
- **Lower threshold: negative error of 3%**
Evaluating control algorithm (cont.)

• Three comp/comm ratios
  – high (5:1) ratio, medium (1:1) ratio, and low (1:5) ratio

• Different $r_{\text{target}}$ (% of $R_{\text{max}}$)

• Different error threshold $\varepsilon$
  – Minimum threshold: the smallest $\varepsilon$ below which control becomes unstable

• $\Delta_{\text{period}} = 2\text{ms}$, $\Delta_{\text{slice}}$ adjusted such that $U = r_{\text{target}}$
System in oscillation when error threshold is too small

While system is oscillating, it appears to degrade gracefully.
Evaluating control algorithm (cont.)

• Three compute/communicate ratios
  – high (5:1) ratio, medium (1:1) ratio, and low (1:5) ratio
• Different $r_{\text{target}}$
• Different error threshold $\varepsilon$
  – Minimum threshold: the smallest $\varepsilon$ below which control becomes unstable
• $\Delta \text{period} = 2\text{ms}, \Delta \text{slice adjusted such that } U = r_{\text{target}}$
• **Response time**
  – for stable configurations, time between when $r_{\text{target}}$ changes and when $r_{\text{current}} = r_{\text{target}} \pm \varepsilon$
Response time of control algorithm

1:1 comp/comm ratio

Application execution rate

Upper threshold: positive error 3%

Lower threshold: negative error 3%

Response time = 32 seconds (two iterations)
Dynamically varying execution rates

Upper threshold: positive error of 3%

Lower threshold: negative error 3%

1:1 comp/comm ratio
Summary of alg limits on our testbed & benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High (5:1) compute/communicate ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.16 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium (1:1) compute/communicate ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.33 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low (1:5) compute/communicate ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.01 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Small error threshold
- Low response time
- Tiny communication cost
- Results largely independent of comp/comm ratio
Ignore external load

1 full busy thread
External load (1.0 contention) applied after iteration 15
3:1 comp/comm ratio

Upper threshold: positive error of 3%
Lower threshold: negative error 3%
Time-sharing multiple BSP applications

What happens as we increase the number of benchmarks running simultaneously?
Time-sharing multiple BSP applications (cont.)

10% utilization for each benchmark

1:1 comp/comm ratio; 3% threshold

3 benchmarks

4 benchmarks
Time-sharing multiple BSP applications (cont.)

• Maintain reasonable control as we scale
• Certain degree of oscillation
  – Local scheduler schedule interrupt
  – Individual host, num of processes increases
    • Smaller chance of running uninterrupted throughout its slice
    • Smaller chance of starting its slice at same time.
Time-sharing multiple BSP applications (cont.)

- Maintain reasonable control as we scale
- Certain degree of oscillation
  - Local scheduler schedule interrupt
  - Individual host, num of processes increases
    - Smaller chance of running uninterrupted throughout its slice
    - Smaller chance of starting its slice at same time.

Less synchronized with processes on other nodes
Global controller invoked more often
System begins to oscillate

However, degradation is graceful, and long term averages are well behaved.
Effects of local disk I/O

• Modified benchmark to write to disk in every iteration; fsync()
• 1) high comp/comm ratio
  – 0, 1, 5, 10, 20, 40, 50 MB/node/iter disk I/O
• 2) 10MB/node/iter disk I/O
  – different comp/comm ratios
Effectively control execution rates

- Application's execution rate: 10 MB/node/iter
- I/O

Upper threshold: positive error of 3%
Lower threshold: negative error 3%
Positive bias; app runs faster than desired

More I/O, a larger proportion of app execution time is outside of control

Application's execution rate
40 MB/node/iter
I/O

Upper threshold: positive error of 3%

Lower threshold: negative error 3%
Effect of local disk I/O

- Modified benchmark to write to disk in every iteration; fsync()
- 1) high comp/comm ratio
  - 0, 1, 5, 10, 20, 40, 50 MB/node/iter disk I/O
- 2) 10MB/node/iter disk I/O
  - different comp/comm ratios
Effectively control execution rates despite significant amounts of network and disk I/O.

2:1 comp/comm ratio plus 10 MB/node/iter disk I/O.
Degrades gracefully when limits are exceeded

1:3.5 comp/comm ratio plus 10 MB/node/iter disk I/O
Effect of local disk I/O (cont)

- Modified benchmark to write to disk in every iteration; fsync()
- 1) high comp/comm ratio
  - 0, 1, 5, 10, 20, 40, 50 MB/node/iter disk I/O
- 2) 10MB/node/iter disk I/O
  - different comp/comm ratios

- Effectively control exe rates of apps performing significant amounts of network & disk I/O
- Points at which control begins to decline depends on comp/comm ratio & amount of disk I/O
Effects of physical memory use

- Modified benchmark to control its mem working set size
- 1.5GB physical mem; cluster node
- Run 2 instances of benchmark on 4 nodes
- 1.3GB (700 + 600) combined working set
Despite significant memory use, our system maintains control.
Conclusion

• Designed, implemented, and evaluated a new approach to time-sharing parallel applications with performance isolation

• Approach based on periodic real-time scheduling of nodes combined with global feedback control of real-time constraints

• Provides a simple way to control execution rate of applications while maintaining efficiency

• Despite only isolating and controlling CPU, memory, comm I/O, and local disk I/O follow.
Future work

• Apply our approach to wider range of workload, e.g.
  – Web applications (complex comm & sync behavior)
  – High-performance parallel scientific applications (requirement not known a priori)

• Exploit direct feedback from end-user to solve optimization problem
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Related work

• Gang scheduling
  – Fine-grain scheduling
  – Schedule all app’s threads at identical times on different nodes
  – Complex code
  – High cost of communication for synchronization

• Implicit co-scheduling
  – Reduce communication by inferring remote scheduler
  – Complexity in inference & adapting local schedule
  – Difficult to control execution rate, response time and resource usage

• Feedback based control in many other domains