TOR VERGATA
UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA

Macroarea di Ingegneria
Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile e Ingegneria Informatica

Addressing Deployment Challenges in Data Stream Processing

Corso di Sistemi e Architetture per Big Data

A.A. 2021/22

Valeria Cardellini

Laurea Magistrale in Ingegneria Informatica

DSP deployment challenges

- Let's consider two challenges when deploying DSP applications

a) How to place DSP operators on underlying computing infrastructure (i.e., operator placement)

b) How to determine and adapt at run-time the number of replicas per operator (i.e., operator parallelism)

DSP operator placement

- Goal: determine which distributed computing nodes should host and execute each application operator, with the goal of optimizing application QoS



Placement: Edge-Cloud continuum

- **Edge/Fog + Cloud computing**: allows to increase scalability and availability, reduce latency, network traffic, and power consumption
- But placement becomes more challenging

Placement: challenges

- Significant network latencies
  - E.g., geo-distributed resources
- Heterogeneous computing and networking resources
  - E.g., capacity limits , business constraints
- Computing/network resources can be unavailable
- Data movement around the network

- Plus peculiarities of DSP applications:
  - Computational requirements may be unknown a-priori and change continuously
  - Long-running applications

→ Need to adapt to internal and external changes

Placement: frameworks

- Most frameworks use simple placement policies
- Apache Storm
  - Round Robin as default strategy
  - Resource Aware Scheduler as alternative https://storm.apache.org/releases/2.0.0/Resource_Aware_Scheduler_overview.html
    - Takes into account resource availability on machines and resource requirements of workloads
    - But requires user to specify memory and CPU requirements for individual topology components

Placement: different approaches

- Several operator placement policies in literature that address the problem but:
  - Different assumptions (system model, application topology, QoS attributes and metrics, …)
  - Different objectives
  - Not easily comparable
- Main methodologies:
  - **Mathematical programming**
    - Optimal operator placement problem: NP-hard
    - Does not scale well, but provides useful insights
  - **Heuristics**
    - Majority of policies

Placement: different approaches

- Who is the decision maker?
  - **Centralized** placement strategies
    - Require global view (full resource and network state, application state, workload information)
    - ✓ Capable of determining optimal global solution
    - ✗ Scalability
  - **Decentralized** placement strategies
    - Take decision based only on local information
    - ✓ Scalability, better suited for run-time adaptation
    - ✗ Optimality is not guaranteed

ODP: Optimal DSP Placement

- We proposed ODP
  - Centralized policy for optimal placement of DSP applications
  - Formulated as Integer Linear Programming (ILP) problem
- Our goals:
  - To compute the **optimal placement** (of course!)
  - To provide a **unified general formulation** of the placement problem for DSP applications (but not only!)
  - To consider multiple **QoS attributes** of applications and resources
  - To provide a **benchmark** for heuristics

V. Cardellini, V. Grassi, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, Optimal Operator Placement for Distributed Stream Processing Applications, DEBS '16

ODP: model

DSP application



Operators

- C_i: required computing resources
- R_i: execution time per data unit

Data streams

- $\lambda_{i,j}$: data rate from operator i to j

ODP: model

Computing and network resources



Computing resources
- C_u: amount of resources
- S_u: processing speed
- A_u: resource availability

(Logical) Network links
- $d_{u,v}$: network delay from u to v
- $B_{u,v}$: bandwidth from u to v
- $A_{u,v}$: link availability

ODP: model

Decision variables

- Determine where to map DSP operators and data streams



ODP: some QoS metrics

- **Response time**
  max end-to-end delay between sources and destination



- **Application availability**
  probability that all components/links are up and running
- **Inter-node traffic**
  overall network data rate
- **Network usage**
  in-flight bytes

$$\Sigma_{\text{links} \in l} \ \text{rate}(l)\text{Lat}(l)$$

ODP: optimal problem formulation

Tunable knobs to set the optimal placement goals

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},r} F(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y},r)$$

subject to:

Latency

$$r \geq \sum_i \sum_u \frac{R_i}{S_u} x_{i,u} + \sum_{(i,j)} \sum_{(u,v)} d_{(u,v)} y_{(i,j),(u,v)} \qquad \forall p \in \pi_G$$

Availability

$$a(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_i \sum_u a_u x_{i,u} + \sum_{(i,j)} \sum_{(u,v)} a_{(u,v)} y_{(i,j),(u,v)}$$

Network bandwidth and node capacity constraints

$$B_{(u,v)} \geq \sum_{(i,j)} \lambda_{(i,j)} y_{(i,j),(u,v)} \qquad \forall u \in V_{res}, v \in V_{res}$$

$$\sum_i C_i x_{i,u} \leq C_u \qquad \forall u \in V_{res}$$

Assignment and integer constraints

$$\sum_u x_{i,u} = 1 \qquad \forall i \in V_{dsp}$$

$$x_{i,u} = \sum_v y_{(i,j),(u,v)} \qquad \forall (i,j) \in E_{dsp}, u \in V_{res}$$

$$x_{j,v} = \sum_u y_{(i,j),(u,v)} \qquad \forall (i,j) \in E_{dsp}, v \in V_{res}$$

$$x_{i,u} \in \{0,1\} \qquad \forall i \in V_{dsp}, u \in V_{res}$$

$$y_{(i,j),(u,v)} \in \{0,1\} \qquad \forall (i,j) \in E_{dsp}, (u,v) \in E_{res}$$

ODP: scalability issue

Placement problem is NP-hard: does not scale well!



We need **heuristics** to compute the placement in a feasible amount of time

Centralized placement heuristics

- Example of centralized heuristic that aims to reduce inter-node traffic
- **Aniello et al.**: co-locate pairs of communicating tasks on same computing node as to minimize inter-node communication and balance CPU demand

  Greedy heuristic – Key idea:
  - Rank task pairs according to exchanged traffic
  - For each pair:
    - » If task pairs have not been yet assigned, assign them to same node
    - » If either is assigned, consider least loaded node and those where they have been assigned. Work out the configuration which minimizes the inter-process traffic

L. Aniello, R. Baldoni and L. Querzoni, Adaptive online scheduling in Storm, DEBS '13

Decentralized placement heuristic

- Heuristics goal: reduce network usage
  - Network usage metric combines link latencies and exchanged data rates among DSP operators:

$$\sum_{\text{links} \in l} \text{rate}(l)\text{Lat}(l)$$

- **Pietzuch et al.** exploit **spring relaxation** idea:
  - DSP application regarded as a system of springs, whose minimum energy configuration corresponds to minimizing network usage
- Features
  - Decentralized policy to minimize network impact
  - Adaptive to change in network conditions

P. Pietzuch et al., Network-aware operator placement for stream-processing systems, ICDE '06

Decentralized placement heuristic

1. Represents DSP application as an equivalent system of springs



Decentralized placement heuristic

2. Determines operator placement in the cost space by minimizing the elastic energy of the equivalent system



Network of springs tries to minimize potential energy E

$$E = \sum_{l \in L} DR(l) Lat(l)^2$$

Streams as springs, that restore a force F = ½ • k • s:
- k (spring constant): exchanged data rate on link
- s (spring extension): latency on link



Decentralized placement heuristic

3. Maps its decision back to physical nodes



ODP as benchmark

Distributed placement heuristic that minimizes network usage

Pietzuch et al. : $\min EE(\boldsymbol{y}) = \min \sum_{(i,j)} \sum_{(u,v):u\neq v} \lambda_{(i,j)} d^2_{(u,v)} y_{(i,j),(u,v)}$



V. Cardellini, V. Grassi, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, [Optimal Operator Placement for Distributed Stream Processing Applications](), DEBS '16

Not only placement

- Stream processing workloads are characterized by:
  - High volume and production rate
- Exploit replication (i.e., operator parallelism): concurrent execution of multiple operator replicas on different data portions
- How to determine the number of replicas?



Operator placement and replication



ODRP: Opt. DSP Replication and Placement

- We proposed **ODRP**
  - Centralized policy for **optimal replication and placement** of DSP applications
  - Formulated as Integer Linear Programming (ILP) problem that extends ODP
- Our goals:
  - Jointly determine optimal **number of replicas** and their **placement**
  - Consider multiple QoS attributes of applications and resources
  - Provide a unified general formulation
  - Provide a benchmark for heuristics
- Limitation: scalability, in practice we need heuristics

V. Cardellini, V. Grassi, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, Optimal operator replication and placement for distributed stream processing systems, *ACM Perf. Eval. Rew.*, 2017.

DSP deployment challenges

- How to self-adapt at run-time the deployment?
- DSP applications are:
  - long-running
  - subject to varying workloads
  - with computational requirements unknown a-priori



- Which main mechanisms do we need for run-time adaptation?
  - **Migration**: move operators from one node to another
  - **Elastic scaling**: change parallelism at application and/or infrastructure level

EDRP: Elastic DSP in Storm

- Elastic DSP Replication and Placement (EDRP)
  - We augmented Distributed Storm with MAPE capabilities and optimal centralized placement and reconfiguration policy that keeps into account reconfiguration costs



V. Cardellini, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, G. Russo Russo, Optimal operator deployment and replication for elastic distributed data stream processing, CCPE 2018

EDRP: still some limitations

- Centralized optimization algorithms do not scale for large problem instances
- Centralized MAPE architecture does not scale in geo-distributed environments
  - Distributed components but logic is still centralized
  - But fully distributed solutions have limitations
- Which solution for Edge-Cloud continuum? **Decentralize MAPE**

How to decentralize control?

- Many patterns for decentralized control
  - Each one having pros and cons



Figure 1: Hierarchical MAPE: master-worker pattern



Figure 2: Hierarchical MAPE: regional pattern



Figure 3: Hierarchical MAPE: hierarchical control pattern



Figure 4: Flat MAPEs: coordinated control pattern



Figure 5: Flat MAPEs: information sharing pattern

D. Weyns et al., [On patterns for decentralized control in self-adaptive systems](). In *Software Engineering for Self-Adaptive Systems II*, 2013

How to decentralize control?

- Our approach:
  - **Hierarchical distributed** architecture to support run-time adaptation
  - Based on efficient distribution of **MAPE** control loops



EDF: Elastic and Distributed DSP Framework

- Augmented Distributed Storm with MAPE capabilities and elasticity control



V. Cardellini, F. Lo Presti, M. Nardelli, G. Russo Russo, [Decentralized self-adaptation for elastic Data Stream Processing], *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 2018

EDF: Local elasticity policy

- Limited local view of the system (e.g., utilization level and input data rate of its operator)

- Two classes of elasticity policies
  - Classic threshold-based policy
    - Cons: empirical experience to choose thresholds
  - Based on Reinforcement Learning
    - Collection of techniques revolving around the basic idea of learning to make optimal decisions through interaction with controlled system
    - Goal: learn to select good actions *online*, based on paid costs (or gained reward)
    - *Pros: what* the user aims to obtain, instead of *how* it should be obtained

Reinforcement Learning



- We considered:
  - Baseline **model-free** learning algorithm (Q-learning)
  - **Model-based** learning algorithm that exploits what is known or can be estimated about the system dynamics

Sutton and Barto, Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction, 2020

EDF: Local elasticity policy based on RL

- At each step RL agent performs an action, looking at current state
- Chosen action causes payment of immediate cost and transition to a new state
- To minimize expected long-term (discounted) cost, RL agent keeps estimates $Q(s, a)$
  - Q-function: expected long-run cost that follows the execution of action a in state s:

Algorithm 1 RL-based Operator Elastic Control Algorithm

1: Initialize the Q functions
2: **loop**
3: choose a scaling action a_i (based on current estimates of Q)
4: observe the next state s_{i+1} and the incurred cost c_i
5: update the $Q(s_i, a_i)$ functions based on the experience
6: **end loop**

EDF: Local elasticity policy based on RL

- Q-learning: classic model-free RL algorithm
- Q-learning: choose next action
  1. Either exploits agent knowledge about system, i.e., the current estimates Q, by greedily selecting the action that minimizes the estimated future costs
  2. Or explores by selecting a random action to improve its system knowledge
     - We consider ε-greedy action selection method

- Q-learning: update step

$$Q(s_i, a_i) \leftarrow (1-\alpha)Q(s_i, a_i) + \alpha \left[c_i + \gamma \min_{a' \in \mathcal{A}(s_{i+1})} Q(s_{i+1}, a') \right]$$

EDF: Some results

- DSP application: DEBS'15 GC
- Q-learning vs. model-based RL







Avg. response time = 475 ms
Downtime = 11%

Avg. response time = 176 ms
Downtime = 3.2%

Exploit advanced RL techniques

- We have exploited more advanced RL techniques to tackle with heterogeneous resources
  - To deal with large state spaces, Function Approximation and Deep Learning techniques can be integrated into RL algorithms
  - Goal: to build approximate representations of state space and achieve near-optimal solutions with reduced memory demand
- See our tutorial at Performance 2021: Reinforcement Learning for Run Time Performance Management in the Cloud/Edge

Other DSP deployment challenges

- How to manage DSP applications in Edge/Fog and Mobile Computing platforms?
- What about serverless DSP in the Edge-Cloud continuum?
- How to provide security guarantees?

Thesis opportunities