# A large scale analysis of hundreds of in-memory cache clusters at Twitter

Juncheng Yang,Yao Yue,Rashmi VinayakCarnegie Mellon UniversityTwitterCarnegie Mellon University





# Background

#### In-memory caching is ubiquitous in the modern web services

To reduce latency, increase throughput, reduce backend load



# How are in-memory caches used? Do existing assumptions still hold?

Cache use cases

Write-heavy workloads

Object size distribution and evolution

Time-to-live (TTL) and working set

### In-memory caches at Twitter

- Single tenant, single layer
  - Container-based deployment
- Large scale deployment
  - 100s cache clusters
  - 1s billion QPS
  - 100s TB DRAM
  - 100,000s CPU cores

# Trace collection and open source

- Week-long unsampled traces from one instance of each Twemcache cluster
  - 700 billion requests, 80 TB in size
  - Focus on 54 representative clusters
- Traces are open source
  - <u>https://github.com/twitter/cache-trace</u>
  - <u>https://github.com/Thesys-lab/cacheWorkloadAnalysisOSDI20</u>

### Cache use cases

- Caching for storage
  - Most common and use most resources
- Caching for computation
  - Increasingly popular
  - Machine learning, stream processing
- Transient data with no backing store
  - Rate limiters
  - Negative caches



# Write-heavy workloads



# 35% of clusters are write-heavy (more than 30% writes)

#### Implication for future research:

- Optimization needed for write-heavy workloads
  - Challenges: scalability, tail latency

# Object size



#### **Object sizes are small**

- 24% cluster mean object size < 100 bytes
- Median 230 bytes

#### Metadata size is large

- Memcached uses 56 bytes per-obj metadata
- Research systems often add more metadata
- -> Reduce effective cache size

Implication for future research:

• Minimizing object metadata to increase effective cache size

# Object size



#### Value/key size ratio can be small

- 15% cluster value size <= key size
- 50% cluster value size <= 5 x key size

#### Small value/key size ratio

- Name spaces are part of keys
  - o Ns1:ns2:obj or obj/ns1/ns2

Implication for future research:

• A robust and lightweight key compression algorithm can increase effective cache size

#### Size distribution can be static



#### **Most of the time, it is not static** The workload below shows a diurnal patterns



### Size distribution over time



#### Sudden changes are not rare

Implication for future research:

- Size distribution changes pose challenges to memory management
- Innovations needed on better memory management techniques

# Time-to-live (TTL)

- How long an object can be used for serving requests
- Set during object writes
- Expired objects cannot be served

# TTL use cases and usages

#### • Bounding inconsistency

- Cache updates are best-effort
- Periodic refresh
  - Caches for computation store computation based on dynamic features

#### Implicit deletion

- Rate limiter
- GDPR compliant



#### TTLs are usually short

# Short TTLs lead to bounded working set sizes

There is no need for a huge cache size if expired objects can be removed in time.



#### Implication for future research:

- Efficient proactive expiration techniques are more important than evictions
- Innovation needed on efficient TTL expiration

#### **Production statistics**

- Small miss ratio and small variations
- Request spikes are not always caused by hot keys

#### **Object popularity**

- Mostly Zipfian with large parameter alpha
- Small deviations

#### **Eviction algorithms**

- Highly workload dependent
- Four types of results
- FIFO achieves similar miss ratios as LRU

# Summary

- Key observations and implications
  - Non-trivial fraction of write-heavy workloads
  - Small objects -> expensive metadata
  - Dynamic object size distribution
  - Short TTLs -> proactive expiration > eviction
- Traces open sourced for the community

Traces are available at <u>https://github.com/twitter/cache-trace</u> <u>https://github.com/Thesys-lab/cacheWorkloadAnalysisOSDI20</u>

Contact: juncheny@cs.cmu.edu