

#### ICPP/2020/EDMONTON/CANADA RUGUST 17-20, 2020

#### Selective Coflow Completion for Time-sensitive Distributed Applications with Poco

#### Shouxi Luo

Joint work with Pingzhi Fan, Huanlai Xing, and Hongfang Yu





#### Outline

- Coflow patterns in DCN
- Existing solutions
- Two trade-offs
- Poco: key designs, service model, and parallelized solver
- Evaluation
- Summary

#### **Coflow patterns in DCN**



#### "Each coflow is a collection of flows between two groups of machines with associated semantics."

Source: HotNets (2012) - Coflow: A networking abstraction for cluster applications

#### Coflow patterns in DCN

In many cases, coflows are bounded with deadlines

- 1. SLA-requirements
- 2. Time-slotted fair-sharing for concurrent jobs.
- 3. ..

The problem/design goal: How to let more coflows meet their deadlines?

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]

[1] SIGCOMM (2014) - Efficient Coflow Scheduling with Varys[2] IEEE ICC (2016) - Decentralized Deadline-Aware Coflow Scheduling for Datacenter Networks

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]

Limits: overlooking the fact that, many distributed applications can tolerate incomplete data delivery by design

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]

Limits: overlooking the fact that, many distributed applications can tolerate incomplete data delivery by design



<u>Source</u>

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]

Limits: overlooking the fact that, many distributed applications can tolerate incomplete data delivery by design



- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]

Limits: overlooking the fact that, many distributed applications can tolerate incomplete data delivery by design



- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]
- Maximize the marginal partial throughput to explore the tolerance of partial transmission
  - Con-myopic[3]

[1] SIGCOMM (2014) - Efficient Coflow Scheduling with Varys

[2] IEEE ICC (2016) - Decentralized Deadline-Aware Coflow Scheduling for Datacenter Networks

[3] IEEE Infocom (2018) - Online Partial Throughput Maximization for Multidimensional Coflow

- Meeting hard deadlines with admission control
  - Varys[1]
- Deal with soft deadlines with preemptive, prioritized scheduling
  - D2CAS[2]
- Maximize the marginal partial throughput to explore the tolerance of partial transmission
  - Con-myopic[3]

#### Limits: inflexible, no performance guarantee

[1] SIGCOMM (2014) - Efficient Coflow Scheduling with Varys

[2] IEEE ICC (2016) - Decentralized Deadline-Aware Coflow Scheduling for Datacenter Networks

[3] IEEE Infocom (2018) - Online Partial Throughput Maximization for Multidimensional Coflow

#### Two trade-offs

$$v_f = \int_0^t r_f(t) dt$$

#### Two trade-offs

$$v_f = \int_0^t r_f(t) dt$$

$$r_f(t) \le c_e - \sum_{f' \in \mathcal{F}_e \setminus \{f\}} r_{f'}(t)$$

#### Two trade-offs

$$v_f = \int_0^t r_f(t) dt \qquad r_f(t) \le c_e - \sum_{f' \in \mathcal{F}_e \setminus \{f\}} r_{f'}(t)$$

#1 Timeliness  $\iff$  completeness

#### #2 The completeness of (co)flow A $\iff$ that of (co)flow B

#### Poco: a POlicy-based COflow scheduler

#### Poco: key designs

Two key designs

### Poco: key designs

Two key designs

- 1. Enable applications to specify coflow requirements explicitly.
  - ✓Timeliness/deadlines
  - ✓ Completeness/level of tolerance

#### Grammar

$C_i$	::=	$(\mathcal{F}_i; \mathcal{R}_i)$	Application-specified coflow request
$\mathcal{F}_i$	::=	$\{\cdots, f_{i,j}, \cdots\}$	Transfer demands of cofow $C_i$
$\mathcal{R}_i$	::=	$\{\cdots, (\tilde{G}_{i,k}; \phi_{i,k}), \cdots\}$	Completeness requirements
fi, j	::=	$(\tau_{i,j}; v_{i,j}; p_{i,j})$	Details of the <i>j</i> -th subflow in coflow <i>i</i>
More	Not	ation	
$\tau_{i,j}$	:	Expired time of flow $f_{i,j}$	(we have $\forall j : \tau_{i,j} = \tau_i$ in this paper)

- $v_{i,j}$ : Remaining volume of flow  $f_{i,j}$
- $p_{i,j}$ : Path of flow  $f_{i,j}$
- $G_{i,k}$ : Set of flow(s) in the same completeness group
- $\phi_{i,k}$ : Completeness requirement

## Poco: key designs

Two key designs

- 1. Enable applications to specify coflow requirements explicitly.
  - ✓ Timeliness/deadlines
  - ✓ Completeness/level of tolerance

2. Explore the trade-offs explicitly with a monolithic (time-slotted) Linear Program model.

 $\checkmark$  Requirements  $\rightarrow$  linear constraints

#### Grammar

$C_i$	::=	$(\mathcal{F}_i; \mathcal{R}_i)$ Application-specified coflow request
$\mathcal{F}_i$	::=	$\{\cdots, f_{i,j}, \cdots\}$ Transfer demands of cofow $C_i$
$\mathcal{R}_i$	::=	$\{\cdots, (\tilde{G}_{i,k}; \phi_{i,k}), \cdots\}$ Completeness requirements
fi, i	::=	$(\tau_{i,j}; v_{i,j}; p_{i,j})$ Details of the <i>j</i> -th subflow in coflow <i>i</i>
More	Not	ation
$ au_{i,j}$	:	Expired time of flow $f_{i,j}$ (we have $\forall j : \tau_{i,j} = \tau_i$ in this paper)
$v_{i,j}$	:	Remaining volume of flow $f_{i,j}$
$p_{i,i}$	:	Path of flow $f_{i,i}$
$G_{i,k}$	:	Set of flow(s) in the same completeness group
$\phi_{i,k}$	:	Completeness requirement
		Maximize $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{ F_i } \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{i,j}} r_{i,j,t} \Delta_T$ s.t. (4)
		$\left(\sum_{(i,j)\in G_{i,k}}\sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{i,j}}r_{i,j,t}\Delta_T \ge \phi_{i,k},  \forall i,k $ (4a)
		$(4) \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_{i,j}} r_{i,j,t} \Delta_T \le v_{i,j},  \forall i, j $ $(4b)$
		$\sum r_{i,j,t} \le c_{e,t},  \forall e,t \tag{4c}$

i

 $r_{i,i,t} \geq 0, \quad \forall i, j, t$ (4d)

 $(i,j):e \in p_i$ 

#### Poco: service model



Provide guaranteed performance with admission control

Challenge: How to solve large-scale LPs efficiently?

#### Challenge: How to solve large-scale LPs efficiently?



Parallelize the computation by leveraging the **specific** structure of the LPs







Minimize 
$$w^{\mathsf{T}}x$$
 s.t.  $Ax = b$   
The core of interior-point method:  
solve equations iteratively  
 $AD^{k}A^{\mathsf{T}}d_{v} = v$ 



Obviously,  $AD^kA^T$  is positive-semidefinite, having the Cholesky decomposition of  $LL^T$  in most cases. Accordingly, the original problem can be solved efficiently via Lg = v. then  $L^Td_y = g$ . In case it is not positive-definite, the equations can be solve with other approximated methods.

Solution: parallelize the computation by leveraging the specific structure of the LP



Solution: parallelize the computation by leveraging the specific structure of the LP





$$\boldsymbol{B}_{i} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{1,i,j,1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{1,i,j,\pi_{i,j}} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{|\Gamma|,i,j,1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{|\Gamma|,i,j,\pi_{i,j}} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix}_{j=1,\cdots,|F_{i}|}$$

$$\hbar_{o,i,j,l} \coloneqq \begin{cases} 1 & \kappa_o^e \in p_{i,j} \land l \le \pi_{i,j} \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Subflow (i, j) goes through the *o*-th link and is active during the *l*-th time slot/range



$$\boldsymbol{B}_{i} \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{1,i,j,1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{1,i,j,\pi_{i,j}} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{|\Gamma|,i,j,1} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{\hbar}_{|\Gamma|,i,j,\pi_{i,j}} & \boldsymbol{0} & \cdots & \boldsymbol{0} \end{bmatrix}_{j=1,\cdots,|F_{i}|}$$

$$\hbar_{o,i,j,l} \coloneqq \begin{cases} 1 & \kappa_o^e \in p_{i,j} \land l \leq \pi_{i,j} \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Subflow (i, j) goes through the *o*-th link and is active during the *l*-th time slot/range

$$D^{k} = diag(\frac{x_{1}^{k}}{s_{1}^{k}}, \frac{x_{2}^{k}}{s_{2}^{k}}, \cdots)$$

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A_{1} & & \\ A_{2} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ B_{1} & B_{2} & \cdots & B_{n} \end{bmatrix}$$

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} L_{1} & & \\ & \ddots & \\ M_{1} & M_{2} & \cdots & M_{n} \end{bmatrix}$$







Note: in rare cases the involved matrix is not positive-definite, we can solve the associated  $d_{y}$  with approximated methods



#### Benefits:

- Explore the sparsity of A explicitly
- Make both Cholesky decompaction and solving parallelized

Note: in rare cases the involved matrix is not positive-definite, we can solve the associated  $d_{y}$  with approximated methods



(a) Under various block size

(b) Under various block amount

#### Parallelization speeds up the solving greatly.

- Naive implementations upon scipy/numpy,
- Ubuntu 18.04, Intel Xeon(R) Silver 4210 CPU, 16G RAM, Python3

#### Evaluation

- Flow-level simulator in Python3
- Inputs
  - Synthesized with Facebook traces
  - Completeness-requirement: 0.9, deadline: 1 + U[1; 2]
- Baselines
  - Con-Myopic
  - FS (per-flow fair-sharing)
  - Varys
- Metrics
  - Percentage of coflows that meet their requirements
  - Achieved completions/delivered data volumes

#### **Evaluation**



# Poco outperforms existing solutions greatly.

(a) Requirement-satisified coflow

Poco is very flexible.





(c) Transmitted volume

(d) Achieved completeness of flow

# Summary

#### Росо

- 1. Enables distributed applications to specify their requirements explicitly along with their coflow requests;
- 2. Explores the trade-offs explicitly with a monolithic (time-slotted) Linear Program (LP) model;
- 3. Parallelizes the solving of LP using the specific structure of the model.

Refer to the paper for more details

Join our slack discussion: Parallel Algorithms II (Thursday, August 20th, 12:30pm-1:00pm)

Drop me emails at sxluo[at]swjtu.edu.cn