

Center of Efficient, Secure, and Reliable Computing (CESR) North Carolina State University

> solihin@ece.ncsu.edu http://www.ece.ncsu.edu/arpers

Motivation

Two trends

- Utility/On-demand computing
 - A server shared by programs from many clients
 - Programs need "Quality of Service" (QoS) guarantee
- Multicore chips (Chip Multi-Processor/CMP)
 - Building blocks for utility computing servers
 - Do not naturally support QoS
 - Due to shared platform resources (caches, bandwidth)
- Goal
 - Build software and architecture support for providing QoS



NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Shared Cache in CMP Server



Shared resources present new performance and fairness challenges



Impact of Cache Space Contention



- Application-specific and Coschedule-specific
- Significant: Up to 4X cache misses, 65% IPC reduction
- Other benchmarks affected, too

CMP-based server needs to provide Quality of Service



NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Current Multicore Chip (CMP) Node



Problems:

- OS Priority does not provide "guarantee"
- OS Priority does not control platform resources
- The same priority yields different performance under different load





Current Server



NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Quality of Service Models

Job QoS Request:

- # procs
- mem size



- Platform Resources
- Resource Performance
- Overall Performance



Reject **Negotiate QoS**



Job done

NC STATE UNIVERSITY



ARPERS

QoS Models

- Multiple Models
 - Resource Usage Model (RUM)
 - Cache size, bus bandwidth, etc.
 - Resource Performance Model (RPM)
 - e.g. miss rate
 - Overall Performance Model (OPM)
 - e.g. exec time, TPS
- Multiple Service Tiers, e.g. for RUM:
 - Gold: 16GB Mem, 4MB Cache, 6GB/sec bandwidth
 - □ Silver: 4GB Mem, 2MB Cache, 3GB/sec bandwidth
 - □ Standard: 2GB Mem, 1MB Cache, 2GB/sec bandwidth



Cache Performance Prediction model



- Validated against detailed CMP simulation
- Average error of 3.9%
- Correctly identifies all hyper contention cases



QoS Support in CMP

- Enforce Resource Partitioning Policies
 - Cache and Bandwidth Partitioning
- Enforce Fairness in Resource Usage
 - How is cache fairness measured? Cache fairness metrics
 - □ How is fairness improved?
 - Static and dynamic fair caching policies
 - What benefits fairness gives?
 - Improved fairness, but also improved throughput!









NC STATE UNIVERSITY









Solihin - NGS Workshop 2007



ARPERS

State of the Project

Completed

Performance Monitoring and Modeling

- Cache Space Contention in CMP [HPCA 2005]
- Replacement Policy Performance Model [Sigmetrics 2006]
- Performance impact of OS activities [ISPASS 2007]
- QoS Models and Architecture
 - Fair Caching, Cache partitioning [PACT 2004]
 - QoS Models' Impact on Performance [Sigmetrics 2007]
- □ Prototype of OS with QoS Support [dasCMP 2007]

Ongoing

- Job Admission Control and Scheduler
- Broader Impact
 - □ HPCA 2007 Tutorial
 - □ Software: <u>Analytical Cache Performance Prediction</u> (ACAPP) Toolset
 - Industry Collaboration with Intel and RedHat



ARPERS

System Integration of QoS Components

Wall-clock time of 6 jobs in different mode



Solihin - NGS Workshop 2007



NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Acknowledgement

Collaborators:

- Ravi Iyer, Intel
- Li Zhao, Intel
- Will Cohen, RedHat
- Students:
 - □ Seongbeom Kim, PhD (VMWare)
 - 🗆 Fei Guo, PhD
 - Fang Liu, PhD
 - Radha Venkatagiri, MST
- Other Research @ ARPERS (<u>Architecture Research for PE</u>rformance, <u>Reliability</u>, and <u>Security</u>)
 - □ Helper Threads
 - Secure Architecture and Operating System
 - Support for Software Reliability





NC STATE UNIVERSITY

Q & A

Thank you

