End-to-end Performance Isolation through Virtual Datacenters

Sebastian Angel UT Austin and NYU

Hitesh Ballani, Thomas Karagiannis, Greg O'Shea, Eno Thereska Microsoft Research

Research



Enterprise datacenter (single tenant)



Enterprise datacenter (single tenant)

Cloud datacenters (multiple tenants)

Cloud datacenters offer services implemented by appliances

• Persistent storage



Key-value store



Blockstore

Middleboxes





Encryption device



Traffic optimizer









Network and appliance throughput varies by up to 5X in datacenters due to contention at shared resources [SIGCOMM'11]



Network and appliance throughput varies by up to 5X in datacenters due to contention at shared resources [SIGCOMM'11]

Applications experience degraded and unpredictable performance

Tenants should get end-to-end guarantees

Isolate tenants across the network

• Oktopus [SIGCOMM'11], ElasticSwitch [SIGCOMM'13]

- Isolate tenants at appliances
 - DRFQ [SIGCOMM'12], Pisces [OSDI'12], IOFlow [SOSP'13]



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



Large Read request (request itself is a tiny header)



We need a new abstraction that encapsulates the semantics of end-to-end guarantees

Outline

- ✓Introduction
- Virtual Datacenter (VDC) abstraction
- Throughput metric
- Architecture of Pulsar
- Experimental evaluation

Virtual Datacenters (VDC) encapsulate end-to-end guarantees



Virtual Datacenters (VDC) encapsulate end-to-end guarantees



Virtual Datacenters (VDC) encapsulate end-to-end guarantees



Admission control is performed when placing tenants' VDCs



Outline

- ✓Introduction
- ✓ Virtual Datacenter (VDC) abstraction
- Throughput metric
- Architecture of Pulsar
- Experimental evaluation

Standard throughput metrics have major tradeoffs

- Relative metrics: % share of the appliance
 - ✓ Provider: easy provisioning
 - Tenants: performance variability still present

Standard throughput metrics have major tradeoffs

- Relative metrics: % share of the appliance
 - ✓ Provider: easy provisioning
 - > Tenants: performance variability still present

Absolute metrics: requests/second or bytes/second
Provider: provisioning based on costliest request
Tenants: absolute throughput guarantees

Request cost varies with request characteristics



Request cost varies with request characteristics

Guaranteeing requests/second requires conservative provisioning



• Provider selects a (fixed) virtual cost function for each resource

• Provider selects a (fixed) virtual cost function for each resource



• Provider selects a (fixed) virtual cost function for each resource



• Guaranteed virtual capacities are defined in tokens/sec

• Provider selects a (fixed) virtual cost function for each resource



Virtual request cost strikes a good compromise between tenants and the provider

• Tenants can translate their guarantees to other metrics for their workloads

• Provider has more flexibility when provisioning the datacenter

Virtual request cost strikes a good compromise between tenants and the provider

• Tenants can translate their guarantees to other metrics for their workloads



Guarantee: 32 Ktokens/sec

• Provider has more flexibility when provisioning the datacenter

Virtual request cost strikes a good compromise between tenants and the provider

• Tenants can translate their guarantees to other metrics for their workloads



Guarantee: 32 Ktokens/sec

Workload:

- 8 KB PUTs --> 2 PUT/sec
- 32 KB GETs --> 1 GET/sec

• Provider has more flexibility when provisioning the datacenter

Outline

- ✓Introduction
- ✓ Virtual Datacenter (VDC) abstraction
- ✓ Throughput metric
- Architecture of Pulsar
- Experimental evaluation

Design goals and decisions

• No modification to appliances, switches, guest OSes, applications

• Preserve work-conservation

• Enable rich policies that are easy to change
Design goals and decisions

- No modification to appliances, switches, guest OSes, applications
 - Perform enforcement entirely at end-hosts via a rate enforcer
- Preserve work-conservation

• Enable rich policies that are easy to change

Design goals and decisions

- No modification to appliances, switches, guest OSes, applications
 - Perform enforcement entirely at end-hosts via a rate enforcer
- Preserve work-conservation
 - Allocate unused resources to tenants and VMs that can use them
 - Requires coordination between rate enforcers
- Enable rich policies that are easy to change

Design goals and decisions

- No modification to appliances, switches, guest OSes, applications
 - Perform enforcement entirely at end-hosts via a rate enforcer
- Preserve work-conservation
 - Allocate unused resources to tenants and VMs that can use them
 - Requires coordination between rate enforcers
- Enable rich policies that are easy to change
 - Simplicity is key
 - Perform coordination through a centralized control plane

Compute server



Compute server



Compute server



Rate enforcer

- Estimates the demand of every VM
- Emulates request cost at different resources by applying cost functions
- Enforces allocation provided by controller

Compute server





Compute server





Compute server





Compute server



Compute server

















- Tenant-specified policy
 - Specifies how VDC resources are divided to VMs

- Tenant-specified policy
 - Specifies how VDC resources are divided to VMs



- Tenant-specified policy
 - Specifies how VDC resources are divided to VMs



Example policies:

- Divide 20 tokens/sec fairly across all active VMs
- Give all 20 tokens/sec to VM 3 (whenever it is active)

- Tenant-specified policy
 - Specifies how VDC resources are divided to VMs

- Provider-specified policy
 - Specifies how spare resources are given to tenants' VMs

- Tenant-specified policy
 - Specifies how VDC resources are divided to VMs

- Provider-specified policy
 - Specifies how spare resources are given to tenants' VMs
 - Example policies:
 - Distribute spare resource fairly across all tenants' VMs
 - Distribute spare resources in a way that maximizes profit

Compute server





Congestion control protocols estimate network capacity

- Basic idea
 - Each network flow probes for a higher capacity estimate
 - Decreases allocation on observing congestion

Congestion control protocols estimate network capacity

Basic idea

- Each network flow probes for a higher capacity estimate
- Decreases allocation on observing congestion

Challenges

- Congestion signals are not present or noisy
- Distributed operation is complex
- Estimation is tightly coupled with allocation

Centralized estimation algorithm

- Maintain window for capacity estimate
- Refine window based on congestion signals







Time









We rely on two congestion signals

- Aggregate throughput < Capacity estimate
- VDC-compliant workload
 - Helps find capacity for VDC-compliant workload
 - Detailed example in the paper!

Implementation

Rate enforcer

- Filter driver running on Hyper-v
- Enforces allocations using a multi-resource token bucket

Controller

- Stand-alone server
- Allocation mechanisms include DRF [NSDI'11], H-DRF [SOCC'13]
- Installs relevant cost functions in rate enforcers

Evaluation questions

1. Can Pulsar isolate tenants and meet their guarantees?

2. Can Pulsar estimate appliance capacity?

3. What are the data- and control-plane overheads?
Experimental setup and testbed



- Network: Mellanox 40 Gbps RDMA RoCE full-duplex
- 10 compute servers (total of 113 VMs)

Workloads and expected throughput

- 4 Tenants: A—D (tenants share at least one resource)
- Workloads are generated with parameters from Hotmail traces

Workloads and expected throughput

- 4 Tenants: A—D (tenants share at least one resource)
- Workloads are generated with parameters from Hotmail traces
- Expected throughput (tokens/second):

Tenant	A*	В	C*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8

Tenant	A*	В	С*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8

Tenant	A*	В	С*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8



Tenant	A*	В	С*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8



Tenant	A*	В	С*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8



Tenant	A*	В	С*	D
Guarantee	400 M	1600 M	800 M	800 M
VMs	49 (many flows)	48	8 (large IO window)	8



Can Pulsar estimate appliance capacity?

Pulsar estimates capacities and copes with changing workloads

In-memory Key-value store



Pulsar estimates capacities and copes with changing workloads



Time (seconds)

Pulsar estimates capacities and copes with changing workloads

In-memory Key-value store



Time (seconds)

What are the data- and control-plane overheads?

Data- and control-plane overheads are reasonable

Data-plane

• Overhead from rate enforcer < 2% (15% for small requests)

Control-plane

- 256 bytes/sec for each VM
- Setting up cost functions at rate enforcers takes 83 µs
- Can compute rich policies for 24K VMs and 200 appliances

Summary

- Virtual Datacenter (VDC) abstraction
 - Captures tenants' end-to-end throughput guarantees

- Pulsar implements the VDC abstraction
 - Simple data-plane rate limiting and centralized control-plane
 - No changes to appliances, switches, guest OSes, and apps
 - Reasonable data- and control-plane overheads

• See you at the poster session!