Operational Experiences with Disk Imaging in a Multi-Tenant Datacenter

Kevin Atkinson, Gary Wong, and Robert Ricci





























Properties of disk images and their usage have consequences for:

Storage
Caching
Pre-loading
Distribution

What does the working set look like?

What does the working set look like? What do the images themselves look like?

What does the working set look like? What do the images themselves look like? What are the key factors in pre-loading?

The dataset

- * Four years (2009-2013): 279,972 requests
- * Users: 1,301 individuals, 368 organizations
- * Unique images: 714
- Emulab
 - * ~600 PCs
 - * Facility / user image model

User Behavior

"Emulab is a pretty odd beast and its users are even weirder." "Emulab is a pretty odd beast and its users are even weirder."

-Reviewer D

"Emulab is a pretty odd beast and its users are even weirder."

> -Reviewer D [Emulab user]

Facility vs. user images

Facility	User	
55.6%	44.4%	

Facility vs. user images



Facility vs. user images



Most users stick to facility or user images
 Heaviest users use their own images













Facility images have a smaller, lighter tail
 Most popular image < 13% of requests











Daily working set



Images used during day

Daily working set



Images used during day











Image Contents

Base



Base





Derived

Base





Derived

Base



Derived

Percentage of blocks that need to be written to transform the base image into derived

Derived: User image Base: Most similar facility image

Derived: User image Base: Most similar facility image



% similarity

De-duplicating storage an attractive option
 Differential loading has potential



% similarity

Pre-Loading









Ratio of free pool size to number of images

Probability of satisfving request



Pre-loading: Rate



Reload rate (normalised to mean arrival rate)

Pre-loading: Rate



Reload rate (normalised to mean arrival rate)

Pre-loading: Rate



Reload rate (normalised to mean arrival rate)

Conclusions

General conclusions

* Deduplicating, two-tier storage attractive Caching can be effective Image lifespan, idle periods Treat facility and user images differently * Facility better targets for pre-loading * Differential loading requires new strategies Potential savings, outline of optimization problem * Images per organization, WSS per week

Explore the data, reproduce our results:

http://aptlab.net/p/tbres/nsdi14

No dominant images



No dominant images



No image dominates long-term, popular images change frequently

Image lifespan



Image lifespan



Image lifespan





Savings from deltas



Percentage of facility images pre-loaded

Images per organization



Images used

Idle images



Maximum interval between requests (days)

WSS per week



Images used during week

Top images

	RHL90-STD [D]	21,993	7.9%
	FEDORA10-STD	18,042	6.4%
	UBUNTU10-STD	14,402	5.1%
	RHL90-STD	13,182	4.7%
	FC4-UPDATE	12,097	4.3%
u	715/10	11,156	4.0%
	FBSD410-STD	8,916	3.2%
	FEDORA8-STD	8,153	2.9%
u	237/69	7,512	2.7%
u	296/35	7,179	2.6%
u	787/24	6,243	2.2%
	UBUNTU70-STD	6,021	2.2%
	UBUNTU12-64-STD	5,834	2.1%

Size considerations

- * Small facilities with few idle disks
 - Pre-loading not valuable
- * Large facilities focus on:
 - Scalable reloading mechanisms
 - Prediction and optimization for user requests