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Scripted applications

- Development timeline:
  - Scientific software developer produces sequential code for application research
  - Produces small batch runs for parameter sweeps, plots
  - Small scale batches organized through the shell and filesystem
  - This model scales up to about an 8 node cluster
  - Additional scaling possible through the application of grid tools and resources
  - What if the application is capable of (and worthy of) scaling further?
Swift and related tools

- Separate workflow description from implementation
- Compile and generate workloads for existing execution infrastructures

```
rawdata = sim(settings);
stats = analysis(rawdata);
...
write script
compile
deploy
execute
allocate resources
select resources
<sites.xml>
...
```
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Default I/O

- In a standard Swift workflow, each task must enumerate its input and output files.
- These files are shipped to and from the compute site.

- This RPC-like technique is problematic for large numbers of short jobs.
Data generation and access

- Current I/O systems work recognizes the challenges posed by large batches of small tasks

- Characterized by:
  - Small files
    - Small, uncoordinated accesses
    - Potentially large directories
  - Whole file operations
  - Metadata operations
    - File creates
    - Links
    - Deletes

- Overall challenges
  - BlueGene/P:
    - I/O bandwidth: down to 400 KB/s /core
    - File creation rate: only 1/hour /core (Raicu et al.)
Related work

- **Filesystem optimizations**
  - PVFS optimizations for small files (Carns et al. 2009)
    - Improved small object management
    - Eager messages
  - BlueFS client optimizations (Nightingale et al. 2006)
    - Speculative execution in the filesystem client
    - Mitigates latency

- **Scheduling and caching**
  - BAD-FS (Bent et al. 2004)
  - Data diffusion (Raicu et al. 2009)

- **Collective models**
  - Enable programmer support
  - Borrow from strengths of MPI, MPI-IO functionality
  - Expose patterns explicitly (MapReduce, etc.)
Collective Data Management

- Provide primitives that the programmer can use explicitly
  - May already be used via custom scripts
  - Generally difficult to specify with sequential languages

- Broadcast (aggregation, map):

- Scatter (two-phase):

- Gather (aggregation, reduce)
Cache techniques

- Cache pinning (specify critical data)

- Workflow/data-aware scheduling
I/O reduction

- Let applications continue to move large quantities of small data over POSIX interfaces
- Prevent these accesses from reaching the filesystem
I/O reduction

- The purpose of each potential CDM technique is to reduce accesses to the filesystem
- In our case studies, we sought to estimate the maximum possible reduction that a carefully-written application could achieve on our target system model
- In a default scripted workflow, all accesses go to the FS
- As a start, we used an I/O reduction defined as:

  \[
  \text{reduction} = 100\% - \frac{\text{I/O seen by FS}}{\text{I/O seen by apps}}
  \]

  - in bytes

- Other interesting quantities could measure file creates, links, or a count of accesses regardless of size
Case studies: High-level view

- OOPS: Open Protein Simulator
- DOCK: Molecular docking
- BLAST: Basic Local Alignment Search Tool
- PTMap: Post-transformational modification analysis
- fMRI: Brain imaging analysis
- Simple MapReduce-like structure
- Broken down into scatter and gather operations
- Intermediate data can be cached. Produces much final output
Like MapReduce with two inputs
If cache is used to implement broadcast, must prevent pollution
Produces trivial final output – I/O reduction may exceed 99%
DOCK

- Significant input size
- Pipeline-like accesses
- Produces trivial final output – I/O reduction may exceed 99%
- Significant input size
- Pipeline-like accesses and iterations
- Produces trivial final output – I/O reduction may exceed 99%
Pipeline-like accesses and iterations
- Uses links to create an intermediate index
- Produces trivial final output – I/O reduction may exceed 99%
Observations

- Great deal of potential optimizations
  - Many of which are previously studied
  - Difficult to implement with sequential programming models

- Small files
  - Large input data sets must be read efficiently
  - Many small files are created, written once, and possibly read again multiple times, primarily by transmission to other compute jobs
  - Developer basically knows this – must be able to express it

- Patterns
  - MPI-like concepts such as broadcasts, gathers, and even point-to-point messages help describe the I/O patterns
  - Can be exposed to the developer through scripting abstractions
Summary

- Investigated I/O performance characteristics of five scalable applications
  - Laid out workflow job/data dependencies
  - Compared with well-studied patterns
  - Performed coarse studies of file access statistics
  - Looked at idealized potential optimizations (gedankenexperiments)

- Portability
  - Running on the BG/P not unlike running on the grid
  - Benefit from existing software systems
  - Work within the typical scientific development cycle

- Lots to do
  - Proposed new software toolkit and language integration
  - Largely based on existing tools; package and expose to developers
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