

Challenges for scheduling at the Edge

Denis Trystram, Giorgio Lucarelli, Clement Mommessin, Yanik Ngoko

▶ To cite this version:

Denis Trystram, Giorgio Lucarelli, Clement Mommessin, Yanik Ngoko. Challenges for scheduling at the Edge. MCST 2019 - Workshop on Mathematical Challenges in Scheduling Theory, Oct 2019, Sanya, China. pp.1-33. hal-02459551

HAL Id: hal-02459551 https://inria.hal.science/hal-02459551v1

Submitted on 29 Jan 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Challenges for scheduling at the Edge

Denis Trystram Giorgio Lucarelli - Clément Mommessin - Yanik Ngoko*

Univ. Grenoble Alpes, France *QarnotComputing, Montrouge, France Workshop on Mathematical Challenges on Scheduling, Sanya

Oct. 9, 2019

Today, the digital world is *in action*:

The number of digital objects connected to Internet is growing exponentially.

Cyber Physical Systems are in interaction to each other and with humans.

...a Revolution.

Parallel and distributed computing platforms turn towards the *Edge*. Compute everywhere and anywhen.

Hierarchical computing systems (4 levels)

- 1 HPC and Data centers (clouds)
- 2 Fog small clusters (hundreds/thousands cores)
- Edge laptops/smart phones
- 4 IoT sensors

A good example of points 3 and 4 is connecting flights at the airport: Interaction between public and private transports, getting a lot of (local) informations, managing critical situations, etc..

Hierarchical computing systems (4 levels)

- 1 HPC and Data centers (clouds)
- 2 Fog small clusters (hundreds/thousands cores)
- Edge laptops/smart phones
- 4 IoT sensors

A good example of points 3 and 4 is connecting flights at the airport:

Interaction between public and private transports, getting a lot of (local) informations, managing critical situations, etc..

Manage efficiently such complex infrastructures composed of multiple and heterogeneous digital/computing components.

- Large amount of polymorphic data issued from multiple sources.
- Resources appear and disappear.
- New storage capabilities.
- Heterogeneity characteristics of the different architectures, including OS kernels, compilers, etc.
- Network of different types and instability (different latencies).

WHERE running each workflow component?

Some issues/questions:

Compute as close as possible to the sensors/digital components to avoid data transfers (and also for privacy).

Need of new data storage abstraction: object versus file systems data reduction/lossy compression.

Task flow versus data flow: data streaming.

Pictorally



- Report a 3 years project (french nat. Research Agency) with the Qarnot Company ANR
- Describe the problems
- Show and discuss preliminary scheduling solutions
- Simulation tools¹

¹Ideally, build a digital twin of the platform

From Heaters to Computing Resources: "turn IT waste heat into a viable heating solution for buildings."

The actual Qarnot platform (Bordeaux and Paris):

- $\blacksquare \sim$ 1,000 distributed QRads embedding \sim 3,000 diskless computing units
- \sim 20 local servers (QBoxes) with memory disks
- 1 global server (QNode) with a centralized storage server



Credits: https://www.qarnot.com

Qarnot Platform



Two types of computing requests

Cloud tasks:

- Submitted to the QNode
- Have data-set dependencies in the centralized storage
- Have different priorities (low or high)

IoT tasks:

- Submitted to a local QBox
- Have data-set dependencies in the QBox disk
- Have different priorities (low, high or very high)
- Should be executed locally

Tasks/jobs (groups of sequential instances) are submitted on-line.



Main goal: design, implement and test different placement and scheduling policies at both QNode- and QBox-levels.

Involved People:

- A PhD student
- A PostDoc (18 months)
- A engineer (12 months)

Resources appear and disappear over time: the inhabitants decide according to the weather or their schedule!

- Available resources when heating is required (QRad is ON)
- Unavailable when ambient air is too warm (QRad is OFF)
- \rightarrow Also depends on the task priority

Network uncertainties:

- Link failures
- Congestion/contention

Remind: The only computing power is in QRads

Make **global decisions** at QNode-level:

- Decide where to dispatch (groups of) instances
- Ensure global load-balancing

Make local decisions at QBox-level:

- Schedule instances on QRads
- Regulate room temperature (via DVFS frequency scaling)
- Ensure heating needs are satisfied

Need to reach 100% of platform usage. \rightarrow An idle QRad is a lack of heating Various objectives for different actors:

- Cloud users: Minimize waiting/completion time of tasks
- IoT tasks: Responsiveness
- Inhabitants: Minimize the gap to target temperature.
- Qarnot: Maximize tasks throughput (profit) Minimize lack of heating

Periodic reports (\sim 30 sec.) from QBox to QNode with:

- Number of resources available for each task priority
- Amount of free space on disk

QNode-scheduling:

- Sort QBoxes by least available resources first (no temperature knowledge)
- Sort tasks by highest priority first
- For each task, dispatch as many instances as possible

QBox-scheduling:

- Retrieve data-set dependencies
- Schedule high priority instances on coolest QRads
- Schedule low priority instances on warmest QRads

Frequency and temperature regulator in each QRad:

- In general: speed scaling (DVFS) on each multi-core to adapt power consumption
- When too warm: instances are killed and re-submitted to the QNode
- When too cold (lack of heating): "background" compute-intensive instances are generated (best-effort blockchain mining²)

²Open problem: it could be improved

Several policies for the QNode dispatcher:

- Standard
- Locality-Based
- Replicate 3 times data set on the Least Loaded Disk
- Replicate 10 times (again with LLD)
- FullReplicate (allows instantaneous transfers)

Implementation with standard Qarnot scheduler at QBox-level. For the moment, no local tasks are considered.

QBox-level Scheduling



Target temperature diagram

QBox-level Scheduling



Power diagram

Main problem: testing on the production platform is not conceivable (and it would take time...).

 \rightarrow Simulation is needed!

Remark: the theoretical analysis is difficult.

Main problem: testing on the production platform is not conceivable (and it would take time...).

 \rightarrow Simulation is needed!

Remark: the theoretical analysis is difficult.

SimGrid³: Large-scale distributed system simulator with execution and communication models.

 \rightarrow Used to simulate platform (including temperature) and tasks execution.

Batsim⁴: Infrastructure simulator for jobs and I/O scheduling. \rightarrow Used to drive the simulation, submit tasks and communicate with the decision process.

Pybatsim⁵: Batsim's Python API exposing methods to easily communicate with the Batsim process.

 \rightarrow Used to implement both QNode and QBox schedulers.

³https://github.com/simgrid/simgrid

⁴https://gitlab.inria.fr/batsim/batsim/tree/temperature ⁵https://gitlab.inria.fr/batsim/pybatsim/tree/temperature Dedicated module for convert computations to temperature.

- 2 solutions have been developed:
 - Learning on actual logs (problems: old generation of Qrads and missing contextual informations).
 - Analytic expression (given by physicians).

Remark: better than what is available today at Qarnot (empirical law which causes a lot of instabilities).

Run 4 times the logs on a week (between may 3 and june 1, 2019).

The simulated platform was composed of 3390 QMobos of 669 QRads, managed by 20 QBoxes.

Two metrics studied:

- mean waiting time
- bounded slowdown (normalized average stretch)





Two sets of tasks:

S₁ global tasks.
 off-line (sequential) tasks with their release dates (corresponding to data transfers).

S₂ local tasks.
 Sequential tasks arriving on-line.
 Not too many (10 to 20 %), usually small ones.

Qarnot platform is rather homogeneous (uniform machines).

Notice here that rejection (interrupt a task and re-execute it elsewhere) makes sense.

Two directions are under investigation.

Single objective.

Minimize max flow time for \mathscr{S}_2 under the capping on sum flow for $\mathscr{S}_1.$

Bi-objective.

Minimize average flow time or tardiness for \mathscr{S}_1 and minimize max flow time for \mathscr{S}_2

Qarnot platform.

- Preliminary results assuming periodic arrivals in S₂: Study the problem for one machine, then extend.
- Interface between global and local schedulers: add a module which gives the pressure of local tasks.
- Learning algorithms have been developed (get a better idea of the leaving habits).

Extend to more general edge platforms.

General message: It is not so easy to build a bridge between theory and practical tools.

- Model of the actual Qarnot/edge platform.
- Simulator (almost complete).
- We proposed several scheduling problems .
 Some are still under investigation Theoretical analysis remains to be done
- A preliminary solution has been implemented and assessed on real execution traces.