#### **High-Performance I/O for Computational Grid Applications**

Ron Oldfield and David Kotz

 ${raoldfi,dfk}@cs.dartmouth.edu.$ 

Department of Computer Science, Dartmouth College

http://www.cs.dartmouth.edu/~dfk/armada/

#### **Computational Grids**

Networks of geographically distributed heterogeneous systems and devices

Data-intensive grid applications

- Access large remote datasets (terabyte-petabyte)
- Datasets often need pre/post-processesing
- Often computationally intensive
- Examples
  - Climate modeling
  - Astronomy
  - Computational Biology
  - High-energy physics

- Application deploys a graph of distributed objects (*ships*)
- Requests cause pipelined data flow through graph
- Graph has two distinct portions:
  - from the data provider (describes layout of data set)
  - from the application-programmer (pre/post-processing)



- Application deploys a graph of distributed objects (*ships*)
- Requests cause pipelined data flow through graph
- Graph has two distinct portions:
  - from the data provider (describes layout of data set)
  - from the application-programmer (pre/post-processing)



- Application deploys a graph of distributed objects (*ships*)
- Requests cause pipelined data flow through graph
- Graph has two distinct portions:
  - from the data provider (describes layout of data set)
  - from the application-programmer (pre/post-processing)



- Application deploys a graph of distributed objects (*ships*)
- Requests cause pipelined data flow through graph
- Graph has two distinct portions:
  - from the data provider (describes layout of data set)
  - from the application-programmer (pre/post-processing)



#### Armada

Armada is not a data storage system. Armada is not a parallel file system.

The *data segments* that make up a *data set* are stored in conventional data servers as fi les, databases, or the like.

The Armada graph encodes most functionality provided by the I/O system:

- programmers interface,
- data layout,
- caching and prefetching policies,
- interfaces to heterogeneous data servers.

#### Armada can...

With Armada, one can...

- build a graph for parallel access to a group of legacy files,
- present many similar data sets through a standard interface, and
- provide transparent access to derived "virtual" dataeither cached or calculated as needed.

#### Restructuring

Problems with the example application:

- Potential bottlenecks in composed graph
- original graph restricts placement alternatives for filter



Armada restructures original graph to improve data flow.

#### Placement

After restructuring:

- 1. Armada deploys ships to appropriate administrative domains to optimize data flow, then
- 2. domain-level resource manager decides placement of individual ships.



#### **Talk Outline**

- Introduction
- Framework details
  - Ships
  - Graph Representation
- Restructuring graphs to improve data flow
- Partitioning graphs and placing ships
- Experiments
- Conclusion

Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



*Distribute* ships partition requests or data to multiple output streams.



Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



*Merge* ships interleave requests or data from multiple input streams.



Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



*Data-processing* ships manipulate data, either individually, or in groups as it passes through the ship.



Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



*Optimization* ships improve I/O performance through latency-reduction techniques like caching and prefetching.



Armada includes a rich set of extensible ship classes.



#### Client-interface ships

convert method calls to a set of requests for data.



*Storage-interface* ships access storage devices to process requests.

#### **Properties of Ships**

Properties of ships are

- used by restructuring and placement algorithms
- assigned by the programmer
- encoded in the ship's definition

Properties identify whether a ship

- is data- or request-equivalent
- increases or decreases data flow,
- is parallelizable

A sequence A is *equivalent* to sequence B (denoted  $A \equiv B$ ) if B is a permutation of A, or if B is a set of subsequences that partition A.

Examples:

$$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \equiv \{2, 3, 5, 1, 4\}$$
  
 
$$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \equiv \{\{2, 3\}, \{1, 4, 5\}\}$$
  
 
$$\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \equiv \{\{2, 3\}, \{1, 5, 4\}\}$$

In other words, order does not matter.

A sequence A is *equivalent* to sequence B (denoted  $A \equiv B$ ) if B is a permutation of A, or if B is a set of subsequences that partition A.

 A request-equivalent ship produces request sequence equivalent to its input.
A data-equivalent ship

produces data sequence equivalent to its input.

Most structural ships are both request and data-equivalent.

A sequence A is *equivalent* to sequence B (denoted  $A \equiv B$ ) if B is a permutation of A, or if B is a set of subsequences that partition A.

Distribution ships partition requests or data

- $S_1$ ,  $S_2$ , and  $S_3$  are subsequences of R.
- $R \equiv \{S_1, S_2, S_3\}$



A sequence A is *equivalent* to sequence B (denoted  $A \equiv B$ ) if B is a permutation of A, or if B is a set of subsequences that partition A.

Merge ships interleave requests or data

- $R_1$ ,  $R_2$ , and  $R_3$  are subsequences of S.
- $\{R_1, R_2, R_3\} \equiv S$



#### **Ships that Change Data Flow**

*Data-reducer:* a ship that decreases the data flow

- filter
- compress
- reduce (min, max, sum)

*Data-increaser:* a ship that increases the data flow

- cache
- decompress

#### **Parallelizable Ships**

*Parallelizable*: a ship that can transform into multiple ships

- process requests and data in parallel
- parallelized by "swapping" with structural ships
- parallel version produces *equivalent* output

Types of parallelizable ships: *replicatable*, *recursive* 

#### **Parallelizable Ships**

*Parallelizable*: a ship that can transform into multiple ships

- process requests and data in parallel
- parallelized by "swapping" with structural ships
- parallel version produces *equivalent* output

Types of parallelizable ships: replicatable, recursive

Right-parallelizable



#### **Parallelizable Ships**

*Parallelizable*: a ship that can transform into multiple ships

- process requests and data in parallel
- parallelized by "swapping" with structural ships
- parallel version produces *equivalent* output

Types of parallelizable ships: replicatable, recursive

#### Left-parallelizable



- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally



- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally





- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally





- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally





- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally





- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally



- Syntactically easy to describe (we use XML)
- Easy to manipulate internally



#### **Graph Restructuring**

Goals:

- remove bottlenecks (increase parallelism)
- allow effective placement of ships

We restructure by *swapping* adjacent ships in the SP-tree

- increase parallelism by swapping *parallelizable* ships with *structural* ships
- reduce network traffic on slow links by
  - moving *data-reducing* ships toward data source,
  - moving *data-increasing* ships toward data dest

#### **The Restruct Algorithm**

The RESTRUCT algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to S
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$

4. mark N clean

## **The Restruct Algorithm**

The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

S

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$

4. mark N clean


The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The RESTRUCT algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-fi rst) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$





The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-fi rst) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-fi rst) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

- 2. else if N is a parallel node
  - (a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N
- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE child left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$
- 4. mark N clean



The RESTRUCT algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append  $child \mbox{ to } S$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-fi rst) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

- 2. else if N is a parallel node
  - (a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N
- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node  ${\cal S}$
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$
- 4. mark N clean



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

- 2. else if N is a parallel node
  - (a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N
- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node  ${\cal S}$
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-fi rst) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$



The **RESTRUCT** algorithm traverses the SP-tree (depth-first) from node N, revisiting when necessary (all series and parallel nodes are initially marked *dirty*).

1. if N is a leaf or clean (base case)

(a) return

2. else if N is a parallel node

(a) **RESTRUCT** each child of N

- 3. else if N is a series node
  - (a) create a new series node S
  - (b) while N has children
    - i.  $child \leftarrow$ remove leftmost child of N
    - ii. append child to  ${\cal S}$
    - iii. SLIDE *child* left
  - (c)  $N \leftarrow S$

4. mark N clean

Assign S to N



Conditions for swapping two series-connected ships (labeled A and B)

- A and B are commutative (A or B is request-equivalent and A or B is data-equivalent)
- swapping A and B is *beneficial* to the application (see next slide), and
- the graph resulting from a swap is an SP-DAG (we allow four configurations).

Conditions for swapping two series-connected ships (labeled A and B)

- A and B are commutative (A or B is request-equivalent and A or B is data-equivalent)
- swapping A and B is *beneficial* to the application (see next slide), and
- the graph resulting from a swap is an SP-DAG (we allow four configurations).

(A) Non-structural, (B) Non-structural



Conditions for swapping two series-connected ships (labeled A and B)

- A and B are commutative (A or B is request-equivalent and A or B is data-equivalent)
- swapping A and B is *beneficial* to the application (see next slide), and
- the graph resulting from a swap is an SP-DAG (we allow four configurations).

(A) Non-structural, (B) Distribution, Parallel node



PARALLELIZE right

Conditions for swapping two series-connected ships (labeled A and B)

- A and B are commutative (A or B is request-equivalent and A or B is data-equivalent)
- swapping A and B is *beneficial* to the application (see next slide), and
- the graph resulting from a swap is an SP-DAG (we allow four configurations).

#### Parallel node, (A) Merge, (B) Non-structural



PARALLELIZE left

Conditions for swapping two series-connected ships (labeled A and B)

- A and B are commutative (A or B is request-equivalent and A or B is data-equivalent)
- swapping A and B is *beneficial* to the application (see next slide), and
- the graph resulting from a swap is an SP-DAG (we allow four configurations).

Parallel node, (A) Merge, (B) Distrib, Parallel node



PARALLELIZE right and left

## **Beneficial Swap**

A swap is deemed *beneficial* if it increases parallelism, moves a data-reducing ship closer to the data source, or moves a data-increasing ship closer to data destination.

Algorithm to decide a benefi cial swap of adjacent ships A and B

- 1. Assign a preferred direction to each ship (1 for right, -1 for left, or 0)
  - Merge ships prefer to go right (increase parallelism)
  - Distribution ships prefer to go left (increase parallelism)
  - Data-reducing ships prefer to swap toward the data destination
  - Data-increasing ships prefer to swap toward the data source
- 2. return true if preferred direction of A is greater than preferred direction of B
- 3. else return *false*





























#### Placement

Hierarchical graph partitioning

- 1. Partition the ships into k sets (each set represents an administrative domain).
- 2. Partition the ships within each domain to processors provided by domain-level schedulers.

#### The Graph Partitioning Problem

Given graph G(V, E) with weighted vertices and weighted edges, partition the vertices into k sets in such a way to balance the sum of the vertices and to minimize the weights of the edge crossings between sets (NP-hard [Garey et al., 1976]).

Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



Chaco Graph Partitioning Software [Hendrickson and Leland, SNL]

- 1. Construct graph from SP-tree
- 2. Assign edge weights
- 3. Assign vertex weights
- 4. partition graph (using CHACO)
- 5. for each domain
  - (a) request procs from domain
  - (b) partition sub-graph



#### **Experiments**

Examined four configurations of the example application with a filter that removed exactly 50% of the data.



# **Experiment Setup**

The area between the blobs represents the WAN

- each LAN connected to the WAN by single router
- each WAN link has limited capacity



Ran experiments on the Emulab Network Testbed

- Three LANs, each with...
  - Five 850 MHz Pentium III processors
  - 100 Mbps switched network (0.15 msec latency)
- WAN consisted of...
  - Three network links with 2.0 msec latency
  - Bandwidth ranged from 2 to 100 Mbps

### **Results: Effective Throughput**



## **Results: Effective Throughput**


# **Results: Effective Throughput**



# **Results: Effective Throughput**



# **Results: Effective Throughput**



### **Related Work**

Parallel processing of I/O streams

- **PS**<sup>2</sup>[Messerli, 1999]
  - data-fbw model with automatic parallelization
- DataCutter [Spencer et al., 2002]
  - component-based, analytic model to decide parallelization

Armada does not force the whole application into a data-flow model Armada widens data flow for parallel clients and parallel servers

Operation re-ordering to improve data fbw, e.g., in databases

- dQUOB [plale et al. 2000]
  - optimize query tree to move high-fi Itering portions close to data
  - exploit well-defined properties associated with query processing

Armada provides a more general approach

### **Future Work**

**Real Applications** 

- fMRI application (80 TBytes of brain image data)
- Seismic application (3 TBytes of synthetic seismic data)
- Can components be reused between applications?
- How much can performance benefit?

Modifi cations to BENEFICIAL and COMMUTATIVE

Placement

- incorporate domain-specifi c information into the partitioner (compute capacity, memory capacity, etc...)
- dynamic re-deployment when network conditions change

Tuning for cluster computing (in addition to the grid)

### **Summary**

#### The Armada framework

- allows data provider to describe complex distributed data sets
- allows the application to describe processing required before computation
- data-fbw model provides a "latency-tolerant" approach useful for wide-area computing

#### Restructuring algorithm

- arranges graph to provide end-to-end parallel I/O
- enables effective placement of data-processing components to reducing network traffic over slow network links

#### Placement

 hierarchical approach: application-level assignment to domain, domain-level assignment to processors.

Experiments show that restructuring is beneficial in both low and high-bandwidth environments.

#### The High-Performance I/O for Computational Grid Applications

Ron Oldfi eld and David Kotz

Department of Computer Science, Dartmouth College

http://www.cs.dartmouth.edu/~dfk/armada/

Supported by Sandia National Laboratories under contract DOE-AV6184.