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Abstract—The EU-funded XtreemOS project implements an open-source grid operating system based on Linux. In order to provide fault tolerance and migration for grid applications, it integrates a distributed grid-checkpointing service called XtreemGCP. This service is designed to support different checkpointing protocols and to address the underlying grid-node checkpointers (e.g. BLCR, LinuxSSI, OpenVZ, etc.) in a transparent manner through a uniform interface. In this paper, we present the integration of an independent checkpointing and rollback-recovery protocol into the XtreemGCP. The solution we propose is not checkpointer bound and thus can be transparently used on top of any grid-node checkpointer.

To evaluate the prototype we run it within a heterogeneous environment composed of single-PC nodes and a Single System Image (SSI) cluster. The experimental results demonstrate the capability of the XtreemGCP service to integrate different checkpointing protocols and independently checkpoint a distributed application within a heterogeneous grid environment. Moreover, the performance evaluation also shows that our solution outperforms the existing coordinated checkpointing protocol in terms of scalability.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With the growing demand for computing power, grids have become very popular for managing large amounts of resources during the last decade. Grids provide a large-scale distributed platform for the execution of various kinds of computation and data intensive applications (e.g. weather prediction and climate simulation, particle system simulation, etc.) across many heterogeneous resources. Hence, they are vulnerable to all sorts of failures, either caused by hardware, communication or programming errors. Given a long-running scientific application, it is obvious that fault-tolerance becomes a major concern. Fault tolerance techniques based on checkpointer can be used to save the state of these applications on stable storage in order to recover them in the event of failure. Thus, upon failure the execution can be resumed from the last consistent checkpoint while preserving already done computations. Moreover, checkpointing and recovery are essential in the process of dynamic scheduling in order to migrate applications across multiple resources and thereby help optimizing global resource usage.

A lot of work has been done during the last three decades on developing fault-tolerance solutions. That work can be classified into two categories: non-distributed and distributed. The most prominent examples for non-distributed solutions include BLCR [1], Condor [2], libCkpt [3] and OpenVZ [4]. These approaches focus on single node and either save the local state of a process or encapsulate the processes within a container (e.g. OpenVZ) and save the latter entirely. While most of the complexity of those solutions relies on the proper extraction of local resources (e.g. process information, files, signals, message queues, shared memory, etc.) and their recovery, additional complexity is introduced when considering the distributed case.

In distributed systems where parts of the application communicate across multiple resources it is not sufficient to solely rely on the individual checkpoints of the participating processes in order to compute a consistent global state of the application. Here, in-transit messages need to be handled, otherwise orphan-messages and lost-messages can lead to inconsistent checkpoints. Orphan-messages are messages whose receive events are part of the destination process checkpoint but the corresponding send events are lost. In case of a recovery the destination process would receive those messages twice, which could result in unpredictable application behavior. On the other hand, lost-messages occur when the send events are part of the sender-side checkpoint, however the receiving events are lost. As a consequence, protocols and checkpointers are needed in order to address the problem of in-transit messages. In the two common checkpoint protocols, the processes either coordinate their checkpoints or take them independently [5]. Some examples for distributed cluster-level checkpointers include BLCR+MPI [6], which supports both protocols within MPI and DMTCP [7] which integrates the coordinated checkpointing protocol.

Regardless of the checkpointing solution it is obviously not realistic for each grid node to use one specific checkpoint. Therefore, in order to achieve fault tolerance for distributed applications in grids, XtreemOS [8] deploys a heterogeneous grid checkpointing service called XtreemGCP [9]. This service is designed to support different checkpointing protocols and address the underlying grid-node checkpointers...
in a transparent manner through a uniform interface. Despite
the generic design of this service, it currently only im-
ple ments the coordinated checkpointing protocol [10]. Given
a grid environment where data and computing resources of
one application can be distributed across thousands of grid
nodes, coordinated checkpointing can be costly in terms of
scalability [10]. Furthermore, the entire application needs to
be rolled back in the event of a single process failure. Thereby,
additional overhead is added to the communication and storage
infrastructure.

Therefore, we decided to design and implement a solution
for independent checkpointing within XtreemGCP. In this pa-
per, we present all the necessary steps towards this goal. This
involves transparent dependency tracking among processes,
transparent selection of the underlying grid-node checkpointer,
monitoring of process failures, computing a consistent global
state out of the recorded dependency information and recovery
of an application. Our solution is not bound to a specific
checkpointer and can be transparently used on top of any
existing grid-node checkpointer.

The result of this work is an extended XtreemGCP service
with the support of two checkpointing protocols, which is
able to checkpoint an application distributed across different
grid-node checkpointers. This is the first work dealing with
integration aspects of independent checkpointing in grids. We
believe that our results can help future works to identify
the issues related to implementing checkpointing protocols
in large heterogeneous environments such as grids.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II outlines the
architecture and the components of the XtreemGCP service.
Section III details the theoretical foundations of our work. Sec-
ction IV presents the integration of independent checkpointing
within XtreemGCP. Section V describes the results from the
performance evaluation of our prototype. Section VI discusses
the related work. Finally, Section VII closes the paper with
conclusions and future work.

II. XTREEMOS GRID-CHECKPOINTING SERVICE

In the following section we briefly describe the architecture
of the XtreemGCP service and its components. In particular,
we first introduce the terminology used in the context of
XtreemGCP and then detail the relevant components where
we integrate independent checkpointing.

A. Terminology

We use the term job for any kind of applications (e.g.
parallel, distributed, etc.) running in the grid. Each job is
identified by a unique global job identifier and consists of
one or multiple job units, whereas each job-unit may itself
comprise one or multiple processes running on one grid-node.
The processes of a job-unit are addressed by a unique process
group identifier.

B. Architecture

The architecture of the XtreemOS grid checkpointing ser-
vice is depicted in Figure 1.

At the grid level, a job checkpointer service is in charge of
managing the checkpoint/restart of a job, possibly spanning
multiple grid nodes. It is located on the same node as the
job manager and uses virtual nodes [11] to achieve service
replication and thus high-availability. The job checkpointer is
designed to implement different checkpointing protocols
and control the underlying node-level components (i.e. job-unit
checkpointers) in order to issue checkpoints and restarts of the
corresponding job-units. Moreover, with its global view of a
job, it has the knowledge about all of its job-units and their
locations. Hence, it is capable of taking checkpoint decisions
either issued by grid users or the grid scheduler. When the
coordinated checkpointing protocol is used, it coordinates the
job-unit checkpointers in order to take a globally consistent
checkpoint and restart the job-units in the event of failure.
Furthermore, job meta information is created by the job-
checkpointer. This information is required during the recovery
and contains the resource requirements of the job, information
about the job units (e.g. job-unit ID), location of the job-units
checkpoint images and other job related details.

Each grid node has a job-unit checkpointer. It is addressed
by the job checkpointer during the checkpoint coordination
phase and is in charge of taking checkpoints of job-units
running on a grid-node. This is done by selecting the ap-
propriate translation library (e.g. BLCR, LinuxSSI, etc.) and
addressing its routines by the use of a uniform access interface,
referred as “Common Kernel Checkpointer API” [9]. This
interface abstracts the different kernel checkpointer specific
calling semantics and provides a uniform way to access the
kernel checkpointers in a transparent manner to the job-unit
checkpointer.

A dedicated translation library implements this API for
each kernel checkpointer and provides a mapping of the
grid semantics to the node-level semantics (i.e. grid job to
local process group). It is dynamically loaded by the job-
unit checkpointer during the checkpointing operation and
implements all the necessary routines to address the underlying
kernel checkpointer. In addition, some kernel checkpointers
require extra parameters to be set, such as permissions flags
before being able to initiate a checkpoint. Therefore, additional
routines are available within the translation library. Currently,
two translation libraries exist in order to support the kernel
checkpointers of the XtreemOS PC and cluster flavor. These
checkpointers provide the low-level functionality necessary to take a snapshot of the entire process group, including process memory and other process related resources. Furthermore, they are used during the recovery to restart the process group from a given snapshot.

III. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF INDEPENDENT CHECKPOINTING

In this section, we first give a brief introduction into the concepts of independent checkpointing. Afterwards, we detail our system model and then define how we record the dependencies among the job-units. Finally, we show how this information is used in order to compute a consistent global state of the application.

A. Overview

Unlike coordinated checkpointing where processes coordinate their checkpoints to take a consistent global checkpoint, independent checkpointing allows the processes to initiate checkpoints independently. Therefore, it requires that all the non-deterministic events (i.e., reception of messages) are logged with checkpoints on stable storage in order to be able to detect and resolve inter-process dependencies during the recovery.

There exist two independent checkpointing approaches: with full and with partial message-logging. The latter solution is solely based on checkpoints and the recorded event information. Therefore, it is vulnerable to the so-called *domino effect* [5]. Depending on the application communication pattern, this effect can enforce the entire application to roll back to its initial state, losing the entire computation. On the other hand, independent checkpointing with full message-logging is based on the piecewise deterministic (PWD) [12] assumption which requires to record all the data necessary in order to replay the events in case of failure. It is therefore not affected by the domino effect but introduces additional complexity to record and replay the data in the same order as it was initially received.

In this paper we focus on independent checkpointing with partial message-logging.

B. System model

Our system model considers exclusively jobs whose job-units communicate by exchanging messages. Further, we assume a reliable communication protocol (i.e., TCP), which delivers the messages in the First-In-First-Out (FIFO) order. The job-units can interact either using a client-server or a peer-to-peer networking model. At the beginning of the execution, each job-unit halts, takes an initial checkpoint and continues to run. In the event of failure, job-units stop according to the fail-stop model [13]. Failures which occur during the checkpoint operation are not tolerated as they may introduce a non-deterministic behavior in the kernel checkpointer. Each job-unit has access to a fault-tolerant distributed storage (i.e., XtreemFS [14]) in order to store the dependency information and checkpoints. This information can be transparently accessed by XtreemGCP during the job-unit recovery.

C. Recording the dependency information

Independent checkpointing requires the knowledge of all inter-job-unit dependencies in order to compute a consistent global state in the event of failure. Therefore, it is necessary to identify which information needs to be recorded and how to record it. In our system the dependency recording is inspired by the work done in [15] and works as depicted in Figure 2. Thereby, we use arrows to represent messages and circles to illustrate checkpoints.

![Fig. 2. Dependency information recording](image)

We define $c_{i,x}$ as the $x - th$ checkpoint ($x \geq 0$) of the job-unit $JU_i$ ($0 \leq i \leq N - 1$) and denote $x$ as the checkpoint index and $N$ as the number of job-units. Two checkpoints $c_{i,x}$ and $c_{j,y}$ are considered as inconsistent if either $x < y$ and a message was sent after $c_{i,x}$ and received before $c_{j,y}$ or $x = y$ and a message was sent before $c_{j,y}$ and received after $c_{i,x}$. Further, we define $I_{i,x}$ as the checkpoint-interval between two consecutive checkpoints $c_{i,x-1}$ and $c_{i,x}$. When a job-unit $JU_j$ sends a message to $JU_i$ within the interval $I_{i,x}$, the pair $\langle i, x \rangle$ is attached. $JU_j$ receives the message in the interval $I_{j,y}$ and records a dependency between $c_{i,x-1}$ and $c_{i,x}$. Thereby, one message received by job-unit $j$ from a job-unit $i$ within the same interval $I_{j,y}$ is enough in order to establish a dependency.

D. Recovery line computation

In order to compute a consistent global state, we first need to acquire all the recorded dependency information and then generate a set of consistent checkpoints, also referred to as the recovery line. In this section we use a concrete example to illustrate the process. Figure 3 shows a job composed of three job-units which communicate and record the dependency information according to the previously introduced definitions.

![Fig. 3. Example job with three job-units](image)

Shortly after issuing the third checkpoint $c_{2,2}$, job-unit 2 fails and the recovery line computation is started by generating a checkpoint graph and applying the rollback-propagation algorithm [15] on it.
Figure 4 depicts the checkpoint graph and the final recovery line for our example job. Here we use dashed circles to represent the current state of the remaining job-units.

![Checkpoint Graph](image)

The generation of the checkpoint graph works as follows. We draw a directed edge from $c_{i,x-1}$ to $c_{j,y}$ if and only if $i \neq j$ and a message was sent during $I_{i,x}$ and received in $I_{j,y}$, or $i = j$ and $y = x + 1$. Afterwards, we use the rollback-propagation algorithm to compute the recovery line. Therefore, we first create a set of checkpoints and include the dependency information associated with the last checkpoint from the failed job-units as an element into the set. In addition, we include the dependency information associated with the current state of the other still running job-units as an element into the set. We then sequentially examine the dependency information of the elements in the set and mark all elements which are reachable by following the edges of all element in the set. Afterwards, we iterate over the marked elements and replace each marked element with the previous checkpoint of the same job-unit. In the next step the dependency information of the elements in the set is examined again and all the elements are marked which are reachable by following the edges of all element in the set. The two latter steps are repeated until there are no marked elements left in the set. The result is a set of checkpoints which represents the consistent global state (i.e. recovery line).

IV. INTEGRATION OF INDEPENDENT CHECKPOINTING IN XTREEMGCP

The following section presents the design decisions and integration aspects of independent checkpointing in XtreeGCP. Therefore, we first detail how the dependency information can be recorded transparently to the application in a heterogeneous environment. Afterwards, we describe the process of independent checkpointing, which involves the interaction between the job-units and the corresponding job-unit checkpointer. Finally, we detail the recovery process and introduce the supported networking models and recovery scenarios of the proposed solution.

A. Transparent dependency tracking

During job execution, all the non-deterministic events (i.e. reception of messages) need to be recorded in the distributed storage (i.e. XtreemFS [14]) for a potential recovery line calculation (see Section III). Therefore, we have developed a library which is dynamically loaded by each job-unit using the library interposition [16] mechanism available on Linux systems during job submission. This mechanism works by initializing the `LD_PRELOAD` environment variable with the desired shared library. Once submitted, all the job-units are dynamically linked against this library, and all communication-related system calls are redirected. In the used library we currently redirect all the `send()` and `receive()` requests in order to attach/extract the dependency information transparently and save it on distributed storage (i.e. XtreemFS [14]). Furthermore, we use this library to transparently increment the version number of the checkpoint and assign a tag to the dependency information during the checkpoint. In particular, this is done by intercepting the `fork()` call and transparently registering a callback using the callback mechanism provided by XtreemGCP. This callback is then executed during the checkpoint. Figure 5 shows the interaction between the job-units, our library and the distributed storage.

![Dependency Tracking](image)

B. Application checkpoint

The ultimate goal of independent checkpointing is to provide support for the job-units to take checkpoints independently. Therefore, we have developed another shared library which is statically linked to each job-unit providing an interface to the programmer in order to trigger checkpoints out of the application at any point in time. Thereby, the main task of this library is to communicate with the job-unit checkpointer and request it to take a checkpoint. Moreover, it communicates with the interpose library introduced before and instructs it to increase the version number of the checkpoint and save the dependency information on distributed storage during a checkpoint.

We have modified the job-unit checkpointer accordingly to handle the communication, initiate the checkpoints on demand and update the job meta information in case when the checkpoint was successful. The procedure of independent checkpointing is depicted in Figure 6. When a checkpoint is triggered by the job-unit, a blocking checkpoint request is sent to the job-unit checkpointer. The job-unit checkpointer processes the request, detects the underlying kernel checkpointer of the grid-node and calls the translation library to initiate a checkpoint. Thereby, potentially already existing checkpoints need to be removed before a new one can be created. This happens always when some of the job-units fail and need to be recovered from one of the previous checkpoints. Thus, they will start triggering checkpoints whose images already exist on the distributed storage. Therefore, we have modified the translation libraries to integrate the cleanup functionality before initiating the checkpoint.
In case of a successful cleanup and checkpointer, the job-unit checkpointer updates the job meta information on the distributed storage and sends back a reply to the job-unit. After the reception of the reply the job-unit continues its execution.

In addition to independent checkpointing, job-checkpointer can be configured to initiate checkpoints periodically. Last but not least, checkpointing is triggered when a migration request is issued either by the user or the XtremGCP service. Now, we detail the networking models and recovery use cases we have identified. Furthermore, we describe the integration aspects.

1) Supported networking models: The job-checkpointer is in charge of managing the recovery of a job and its job-units. Therefore, it detects the job-units based on the recorded job meta information and executes the appropriate checkpointing protocol to perform the recovery. However, no matter which protocol is used, the recovery process is asynchronous. Thus, job-units are restarted in parallel by the corresponding job-unit checkpointer. Thereby, some job-units are restarted faster than others due to different resource requirements (i.e. cpu, memory, etc.) and try to deliver messages to job-units which potentially were not restarted yet.

We distinguish between two networking models: client-server and peer-to-peer. In the former model each job-unit operates exclusively either as client or as server. Therefore, the recovery process is straightforward. The job-checkpointer first restores the server job-units and then the client job-units, avoiding the possible conflicts introduced through parallelization. In the latter model each job-unit operates as client and server simultaneously. Thus, the job-checkpointer first computes a consistent global state and then initiates the recovery of the job-units without taking into account the recovery order. Afterwards, we use the dependency tracking library to interpose the connect() call and send a connection request message consisting of the IP address and the port of the target job-unit to the job-unit checkpointer, which then forwards the message to the assigned job-checkpointer. The job-checkpointer verifies if the target job-unit has already been restored and sends back a reply message to the source job-unit. During this period the source job-unit remains blocked and continues its execution in case of a positive feedback. This way we can make sure that the target job-unit has always been restored before others can send messages to it.

2) Permanent application failure: In the previous section we have introduced the two networking models supported by our architecture. Now, we detail the first recovery scenario which assumes a permanent application failure. In such a case, the job checkerpointer computes a consistent global state based on the last taken checkpoint of each job-unit and restores the job-units afterwards. The recovery itself can be either initiated by the user or done automatically by the system upon failure detection. Figure 7 illustrates this workflow.

First, the job checkerpointer identifies the job-units belonging to the job based on the recorded job meta information. Then, the dependency information is loaded and the consistent global state of the application is generated using the rollback-propagation algorithm introduced in Section III. Finally, the job checkerpointer initiates the recovery of the job-units using one of the two previously introduced networking models. Therefore, it addresses the job-unit checkpointer in order to select the appropriate kernel checkpoint and restart the job-units. Thereby, sockets need to be recreated first as most of the available kernel checkpointers (e.g. BLCR, LinuxSSI, etc.) nowadays do not support the saving and restoring of sockets. In fact, they are ignored during the checkpoint. Hence, sockets are not part of the checkpoint and need to be recreated during the restart, otherwise job-units will fail to resume their execution. We use the XtremGCP callback mechanism to register a restart callback and recreate them within this callback before starting the job-units execution.

3) Partial application failure: The second recovery use case supported by our work deals with the most common grid environment scenario where some job-units fail while others keep running. In order to support the recovery of the failed job-units we have extended the job-checkpointer by a failure monitoring module. This module keeps track of the failed job-units and is required during the recovery. Figure 8 depicts our modifications and the workflow of the failure monitoring. First, the job-unit checkpoint detects a failure based on the exit-code of the job-unit and informs the corresponding job-checkpointer. This information is then stored within the job-checkpointer failure monitoring module for later usage.
Once the failure has been detected, recovery can be initiated. Therefore, failure monitoring information is extracted, a checkpoint graph is generated and the recovery line computation algorithm is run. Depending on the resulting recovery line, one or multiple still alive job-units need to be rolled back to some previously taken checkpoint due to existing dependencies. In this particular case the job-checkpointer requests the status of the currently running job-units from the failure monitoring module. In case the job-units are still running they are stopped and the recovery from the set of checkpoints given by the recovery line is started analogous to the first case. After a successful recovery the job-unit status needs to be updated inside the job-checkpointer and its failure monitoring module. Thus, the job-unit checkpointer sends an update message to the job-checkpointer upon successful recovery.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

A. Experimental setup

To evaluate the implementation, we have configured a heterogeneous environment composed of six AMD Opteron 244 1.8 GHz nodes, running Debian GNU/Linux 5.0 ("lenny"). Each node is equipped with 1GB RAM, 1GB swap and a gigabit network card. We have chosen the first four nodes to operate in a single-PC mode and installed a modified version of BLCR (v0.8.2) for XtremEOSS on them. Moreover, 2.6.20.20 vanilla-kernel is used. The remaining two nodes are running the latest LinuxSSI kernel (v1.0-rc2) and thus form an SSI cluster. LinuxSSI is a Single System Image (SSI) cluster operating system based on Kerrighed [17] which serves as the basis for the XtremOSS cluster flavor. In all experiments we use the Networking File System (NFS) to provide storage for the checkpoints, dependency and the job meta information to all the nodes.

Currently, our prototype implementation supports independent checkpointing and recovery for distributed applications using the first networking model, discussed in Section IV-C1. We have installed our extended version of the XtremGCP service on all nodes and measured the time to record the dependencies, to checkpoint the application and to perform the recovery.

B. Synthetic distributed client-server application

We have developed a synthetic distributed client-server application and executed it on top of our heterogeneous environment consisting of single-PC nodes and a SSI cluster. Thereby, we start our server job-unit on one of the single-PC nodes and distribute the remaining five client job-units to the other nodes. Each time a job-unit starts it triggers an independent checkpoint and continues its execution. Furthermore, in order to simulate random independent checkpoints each client job-unit defines two numbers $x \geq 0$ and $y > x$, randomly selects a number in the interval $[0, y]$ and continues its execution. Afterwards, the random number is compared with $x$. In case of a match independent checkpoint is triggered, else a message (2 Bytes) is sent to the server. In our experiments we have preassigned $x$ to 4 and $y$ to 6. Similarly, the server job-unit simulates whether it will take a checkpoint or not.

In addition to random checkpointing, failures need to be simulated. This can be either simulated by an external kill event or by the job-unit itself using the exit call. We use the latter approach and terminate the job-unit in case of a match of the two numbers.

In the following we present our experimental results using this application. The results are based on 10 measurements for each test series and the computation of the arithmetic mean.

C. Dependency tracking

The dependency tracking mechanism intercepts the send and receive calls of the job-units in order to attach and extract the dependency information, used during the recovery. Hence, we have measured the overhead introduced by this procedure. The result from our evaluation is that this overhead is under 1µs and thus negligible. We explain this with the way how we manage the interception process. In order to attach a dependency information, we do not need to copy the message into a buffer. In fact, we split the send and receive sequences and first send the dependency information, followed by the unmodified message. As the dependency information is small, there is only a minimal additional overhead.

D. Application checkpoint

Figure 9 shows the times of independent checkpointing for a single job-unit running on top of a single-PC node and the LinuxSSI cluster.

![Figure 9: Time to checkpoint a single job-unit](image)

We can note that independent checkpointing on top of BLCR is slower approximately by a factor of 4 than with LinuxSSI. Particularly, independent checkpointing on BLCR takes 430 ms and LinuxSSI 110 ms. We explain this with the integration of BLCR within the XtremGCP service. In LinuxSSI the kernel-checkpointer routines can be accessed...
directly by the use of `ioctl()` calls, whereas checkpointing with BLCR needs to be synchronized with semaphores, message queues and local files. Therefore, the checkpointing process is slower. However, the time to checkpoint the job-units is still significantly lower than when using the coordinated checkpointing protocol (see Section V-F).

E. Application recovery

Figure 10 shows the time needed to compute the recovery line for a job composed of one, three and six job-units respectively. The time taken to compute a recovery line for one job-unit is approximately 26.4 ms. We explain this time with the need to load the dependency information from the storage, as no recovery line computation is done in this case. When increasing the job-unit count to three and six, the time increases to 71 ms and 131 ms respectively. Hence, the time to compute the recovery line is proportional to the number of job-units. We think that the reason for that is twofold. With tripling the number of job-units, the amount of dependency information to load is tripled too. Moreover, our application did not show the strong domino effect which could potentially increase the time to compute the recovery line for applications of higher complexity (i.e. dependencies).

![Fig. 10. Time to compute the recovery line](image)

Figure 11 indicates the time to restart the application. This time includes the time to compute the recovery line and the time to restore the job-units. Here, the time to restart one, three and six job-unit takes approximately 7.3, 7.7 and 8.1 seconds. We explain this good scalability with the parallel restart of job-units in XtreemGCP. Obviously, bigger job-unit data sizes in conjunction with the previously mentioned domino effect could result in larger restart times.

![Fig. 11. Time to restart the application](image)

F. Performance of coordinated and independent checkpointing

In [10] we have evaluated the coordinated checkpointing protocol using a similar client-server application within a heterogeneous environment consisting of single PC-nodes and an SSI cluster. Therefore, we have measured the time it takes to checkpoint this application when it opens up 50 communications channels and sends 100 Byte packets periodically every five seconds. The result from this evaluation was that it takes approximately 4.25 seconds to synchronize the processes, buffer the messages and close the sockets. In addition, 2.12 seconds more are spent in order to reestablish the connections, unblock the communication and deliver the possible in-transit messages after the checkpoint has been taken. Consequently, in total approximately 6.36 seconds were needed to checkpoint this application. Furthermore, when it was not necessary to close and reestablish the connections, improved checkpointing duration of 3.37 seconds was measured.

Nevertheless, the results show that even if it is sometimes possible to keep the connections open during the checkpoint, additional global synchronization overhead still increases the checkpoint duration approximately by the factor of 8 compared to the usage of the independent checkpointing protocol. Our previous measurements (see Section V-D) confirm this with checkpointing times of just 430 ms and 110 ms for LinuxSSI and BLCR respectively. Hence, we believe that especially in the context of grids, independent checkpointing is a more scalable solution.

VI. Related Work

A lot of research has been done in order to provide fault tolerance for distributed applications during the last two decades. This has led to the development of many checkpointing protocols (e.g. [18], [12], [19], etc.) and a few cluster level software frameworks with fault tolerance support. CoCheck [20] supports the coordinated checkpoint/restart protocol using the Condor checkpointer. Further, LAM/MPI [21] provides coordinated checkpointing support for MPI applications using either the BLCR or a “self” checkpointer. In the latter case it is the responsibility of the application to perform the checkpoint/restart functionality.

The most related work on supporting independent checkpointing can be found in the implementation of Starfish [22] and MPICH-V2 [23]. Starfish, implements coordinated and independent checkpointing for MPI applications. MPICH-V2 integrates independent checkpointing with full message-logging using the Condor checkpointer. Moreover, in [24] the authors have implemented independent checkpointing with full message-logging and evaluated their implementation within a homogeneous environment consisting of traditional workstations. However, our solution differs from all these approaches as it is not limited to the MPI context and implements independent checkpointing in a transparent manner within a heterogeneous grid environment across different checkpointers (e.g. BLCR, Condor, LinuxSSI, OpenVZ, etc.).

In terms of XtreemGCP architecture similar work can be found in the CoreGRID grid checkpointer [25]. However, it is currently limited to the use of Virtual Machines (VMs) and does not provide any support for checkpointing distributed applications. Even though virtualization helps preventing resource conflicts during recovery, coordination is still necessary.
for jobs spanning multiple grid nodes. In contrast, XtremGCP supports either coordinated or independent transparent checkpoint/restart of jobs those job-units are running on multiple heterogeneous grid nodes.

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

To the best of our knowledge, this work is the first demonstration of the design and implementation of independent checkpointing within a heterogeneous grid environment. Although we did not propose any new checkpointing protocol, we have detailed the design and implementation aspects of independent checkpointing in grids. In particular, we have detailed how to transparently record the dependency information, detect failures within a distributed application, compute a consistent global state and finally how to recover a distributed application using the independent checkpointing protocol within a heterogeneous environment. Our work has resulted in an extended version of the XtremOS grid checkpointing which now supports the independent checkpointing protocol. Moreover, we have evaluated our implementation within a heterogeneous environment consisting of traditional PC-like nodes running BLCR and a Single System Image (SSI) cluster.

The results show that independent checkpointing is more suited for grid environments than coordinated checkpointing. In fact, coordinating a checkpoint in a grid environment where jobs can span across hundreds of nodes and be riddled with communication links is often inefficient and can not scale. Nevertheless, our implementation has some limitations which we plan to address in the future. The first limitation regards the networking model we currently support. This model supports job-units which either act as a client or a server. We have proposed a solution for supporting the alternative peer-to-peer networking model (see Section IV-C1) which is scheduled for future implementation. Further, independent checkpointing with partial message-logging is vulnerable to the domino-effect. Therefore, we plan to extend our implementation with full message-logging support. Another limitation regards the recovery process. Currently, the user is in charge of initiating the recovery. We think about enabling the XtremGCP service to automatically initiate the recovery in the event of failure.

Finally, besides improving the current implementation we plan to evaluate independent checkpointing in conjunction with the existing support for incremental checkpointing [26].
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