

Investigation of Data Locality and Fairness in MapReduce

Zhenhua Guo, Geoffrey Fox, Mo Zhou
School of Informatics and Computing
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN, USA
{zhguo,gcf,mozhou}@cs.indiana.edu

ABSTRACT

In data-intensive computing, MapReduce is an important tool that allows users to process large amounts of data easily. Its data locality aware scheduling strategy exploits the locality of data accessing to minimize data movement and thus reduce network traffic. In this paper, we firstly analyze the state-of-the-art MapReduce scheduling algorithms and demonstrate that optimal scheduling is not guaranteed. After that, we mathematically reformulate the scheduling problem by using a cost matrix to capture the cost of data staging and propose an algorithm *lsap-sched* that yields optimal data locality. In addition, we integrate fairness and data locality into a unified algorithm *lsap-fair-sched* in which users can easily adjust the tradeoffs between data locality and fairness. At last, extensive simulation experiments are conducted to show that our algorithms can improve the ratio of data local tasks by up to 14%, reduce data movement cost by up to 90%, and balance fairness and data locality effectively.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

C.2.4 [Computer-Communication Networks]: Distributed Systems – Distributed Applications; D.4.1 [Operating Systems]: Process Management – Scheduling.

General Terms

Algorithms, Management, Measurement, Performance, Design

Keywords

MapReduce, data locality, fairness, scheduling

1. INTRODUCTION

In many science domains, data are being produced and collected continuously in an unprecedented rate by advanced instruments such as Large Hadron Collider, next-generation genetic sequencers, and astronomical telescopes. To process the huge amount of data requires powerful hardware and efficient distributed computing frameworks. For data parallel applications, MapReduce [1] has been proposed by Google and adopted in both industry [2] and academia [3,4]. Lin et al. experimented with text processing applications such as inverted indexing and page rank

[3]. Qiu et al. utilized MapReduce to run biology applications such as sequence alignment and multidimensional scaling [4].

One of the most appealing features of MapReduce is data locality aware scheduling, which enables the scheduler to consider data affinity and bring compute to data. That is different from traditional grid clusters where storage and computation are separated, shared file systems are mounted to facilitate data accessing, and input data are fetched implicitly on demand. Data movement and cross-rack traffic are reduced in MapReduce, which is highly desirable in data-intensive computing. Mostly we want to maximize the percent of tasks that achieve data locality to improve the overall performance. The default scheduling strategy in Hadoop takes a task-by-task approach and is not optimal. In this paper we propose a new algorithm *lsap-sched* that takes into consideration all tasks and available resources at once and yields optimal data locality. The reduction of job execution time is not always proportional to the improvement of data locality. Consider two jobs A and B that run the same application with different input data of the same size. 90% of the tasks in A achieve data locality while 80% of the tasks in B achieve data locality. Although A has better data locality than B , we cannot conclude that the data transfer time of A is shorter than that of B because non data local tasks of B may be closer to their data sources and thus able to fetch data much faster than that of A . In environments with network heterogeneity, the bandwidths of different pairs of nodes may be drastically disparate and data movement costs should not be assimilated.

In addition to data locality, fairness is also important in shared clusters. We want to avoid the scenario that a small number of users overwhelm the whole system and thus render other users unable to run any useful job. Traditional batch schedulers adopt a reservation-based resource allocation mechanism. For each job, a requested number of nodes are reserved for a specific period of time. Although the whole cluster is shared, the use of individual nodes is usually exclusive among users. MapReduce adopts a more dynamic and aggressive approach to allow tasks owned by different users to run on the same node. Capacity scheduler [5] and fair scheduler [6] are two typical Hadoop schedulers that support multi-tenancy and fair sharing. System administrators manually specify rations for job groups that are enforced by the scheduler. Fairness and data locality do not always work in symphony and sometimes they conflict. Strict fairness may result in degradation of data locality, and purely data locality driven scheduling strategy may result in substantial unfairness of resource usage. In our work, we investigate the tradeoffs between data locality and fairness, and propose an algorithm *lsap-fair-sched* allowing users to express the tradeoffs easily.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Conference '10, Month 1–2, 2010, City, State, Country.
Copyright 2010 ACM 1-58113-000-0/00/0010...\$10.00.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Related work is given in section 2. Our proposed scheduling algorithms that yield optimal data locality and integrate fairness are discussed in section 3. The experiments we conducted and their results are elaborated in section 4. Finally we concluded in section 5.

2. RELATED WORK

The importance of data locality has drawn some attention in grid computing communities. To incorporate data location into job scheduling and automatically create new replicas for hot data is shown to be beneficial in grid systems and outperforms traditional HPC approaches [7]. Close-to-Files strategy for processor and data co-allocation is shown to be effective with the assumption that a single data file needs to be transferred to all tasks before execution [8]. To support fast data access in data grids, Hierarchical Cluster Scheduling and Hierarchical Replication Strategy are proposed which reduce the amount of transferred data and generate redundant copies of existing data across multiple sites [9]. Different dynamic replication strategies, which increase the possibility of local data accessing, are proposed and evaluated to show that the best strategies can significantly reduce network consumption and access latency if access patterns exhibit a small degree of geographical locality [10].

For MapReduce, several enhancements have been proposed to improve data locality. In an environment where most jobs are small, delay scheduling can improve data locality by delaying the scheduling of tasks that cannot achieve data locality by a short period of time [11]. Purlieus categorizes MapReduce jobs into three classes: *map-input heavy*, *map-and-reduce-input heavy* and *reduce-input heavy*, and proposes data and virtual machine placement strategies accordingly to minimize the cost of data shuffling between map tasks and reduce tasks [12]. LATE shortens the job response time by prioritizing the tasks to speculate and choosing fast nodes to run speculative tasks on in heterogeneous environments [13]. Data locality is theoretically analyzed in [14] which builds a mathematical model and deduces the relationship between significant system factors and data locality. In addition, the impact of data locality on job execution time is evaluated for single-cluster and cross-cluster scenarios. Shared scans of large popular files among multiple jobs have been demonstrated to be able to improve the performance of Hadoop significantly [15]. It relies on the accurate prediction of future job arrival rates.

Some schedulers have been developed for MapReduce that support fair resource sharing. Facebook’s fairness scheduler aims to provide fast response time for small jobs and guaranteed service levels for production jobs by maintaining job “pools” each of which is assigned a guaranteed minimum share and dividing excess capacity among all jobs or pools [6]. Yahoo’s capacity scheduler supports multi-tenancy by assigning capacity to job queues [5]. However, the tradeoff between data locality and fairness is not considered. Dominant Resource Fairness addresses the fairness issue of multiple resources by determining a user’s allocation based on his/her dominant share [16]. Quincy is a Dryad scheduler that tackles the conflict between data locality and fairness by converting the scheduling problem to a graph that encodes both network structure and waiting tasks and solving it using a min-cost flow solver [17]. In our work a different approach is taken. In [18], load unbalancing policy is proposed to balance fairness and performance and minimize mean response time and mean slowdown when scheduling parallel jobs.

3. OUR APPROACHES

3.1 Scheduling in MapReduce

MapReduce uses Google File System [19] as its storage system. Google File System splits files into blocks distributed among nodes, maintains replication and exposes location information to facilitate data locality aware scheduling in MapReduce. In Hadoop implementation, each node has a configurable number of map and reduce slots to which map and reduce tasks are assigned respectively. They can be tuned to maximize the resource utilization of modern servers equipped with multi-core processors without incurring substantial contention. Hadoop adopts a master-slave architecture. Slave nodes periodically communicate with the master node via heartbeat messages which include the availability of task slots. When a slave node reports that it has idle slots, the master node scans the waiting tasks in queue to find the one that can achieve the best data locality. Firstly it searches for a task whose input data are located on that slave node. If the search fails, it subsequently searches for a task whose input data are located on the same rack as the slave node. If the search fails again, it randomly assigns a task. We use *dl-sched* to denote this strategy which apparently only favors data locality and does not consider workload and the fairness of resource usage. We adopt the concept *goodness of data locality* which is defined as the percent of map tasks that achieve node-level data locality [14].

Even if there exist multiple idle slots simultaneously, *dl-sched* considers them one by one. For each idle slot, local optimum is achieved because the “best” task is picked and scheduled. However, global optimum requires all idle slots and tasks be considered at once. Figure 1 gives an example. Initially, there are two tasks T_1 and T_2 in queue, and two nodes A and B with one idle slot on each. Data block B_i is the input data of task T_j , if B_i and T_j are marked with the same pattern. Obviously the input data of T_1 are stored on both A and B while the input data of T_2 are stored only on A . Figure 1(b) shows how *dl-sched* assigns tasks. Assume node A is considered first, the scheduler tries to find the best task for A in the order of $\{T_1, T_2\}$. Because node A stores the input data of T_1 , T_1 is assigned to A . Then node B is considered and task T_2 is assigned to it (because that is the only available slot). As a result, only T_1 achieves data locality. However, there exists an optimal scheduling that makes both tasks achieve data locality, which is shown in Figure 1(c).

3.2 Optimal Data Locality




Figure 1. Demonstrate non-optimality of *dl-sched*

bandwidth information is used to compute assignment costs while constant values were specified in [14]. Optimal data locality is guaranteed by *lsap-sched*.

Algorithm skeleton of *lsap-sched*

```

Input: instant system state
Output: assignment of tasks to idle map slots
Algorithm:
  TS ← the set of unscheduled tasks
  ISS ← the set of idle map slots
  C ← empty |TS| x |ISS| matrix
  for i in 1:|TS|
    for j in 1:|ISS|
      set C[i][j] according to (1)
  expandToSquare(C, 0) # expand to a square matrix
  R = lsap(C) # solve it using LSAP
  R = filterDummy(R) # filter out dummy tasks
  return R

```

Generally, the more idle slots and tasks there are, the more *lsap-sched* outperforms *dl-sched*. The real cluster traces show the maximum utilization is seldom reached. CPU utilization was only 10% in Yahoo’s M45 cluster [22] and below 50% mostly in a Google cluster [23]. So on average a significant portion of slots is available when new tasks are submitted and *lsap-sched* is expected to perform substantially better than *dl-sched*. For the extreme case where a cluster operates near its maximum capacity, the performance advantage of *lsap-sched* is attenuated if new tasks are scheduled immediately. Instead, scheduling can be delayed by a short period to accumulate a sufficient number of idle slots before *lsap-sched* is applied. As our experiments below illustrate, the ratio of idle slots does not need to be high for *lsap-sched* to yield significant performance improvement. For typical MapReduce clusters where most jobs are small, scheduling delay of several seconds is sufficient to generate performance boost.

3.3 Integration of Fairness

We next investigate the integration of fairness into *lsap-sched*. Both capacity scheduler [5] and fair scheduler [6] take the same approach that jobs are organized into different groups by appropriate criteria (e.g. user-based, domain-based, pool-based). This approach is adopted by us as well.

We do not enforce strict fairness which constrains each group cannot use more than its ration strictly, because it results in the waste of resources. We loosen the constraint. If there are excess idle slots to run all tasks, we just schedule them immediately to make full use of all resources even if some of the groups have used up their rations. If idle slots are insufficient, we need to selectively run tasks aiming to comply with ration specifications.

We enhance *lsap-sched* to support fairness by carefully tuning the cost matrix C . The assignment cost of a task can be positively related to the resource usage of the group the task belongs to. In other words, for groups that use up or overuse the allocated capacity, their tasks have high assignment costs so that the scheduler does not favor them. Oppositely, the assignment costs of tasks from groups which underuse their allocated capacity are low so that they get higher priority.

Let G represent the set of groups that a system administrator configures for a cluster, and i -th group is G_i . Each group contains some number of tasks and each task can only belong to exactly one group. Given a task T , function $group(T)$ returns the group which T belongs to. Each group is assigned a weight/ration w which is the portion of map slots allocated to it. The sum of the weights of all groups is 1.0, which is formulated in (4). At time t ,

$rt_i(t)$ is the number of running tasks belonging to group G_i . Formula (5) calculates the ratio of map slots used by group G_i among all occupied map slots, which measures the real resource usage ratio of each group. For group G_i , the desired case is that s_i and w_i are equal, which implies real resource usage exactly matches the configured share. If s_i is less than w_i , group G_i can have more tasks scheduled immediately. If group G_i has used its entire ration, to schedule more tasks, it needs to wait until some of its tasks complete or there are sufficient idle slots to run all tasks. A *Group Fairness Cost* GFC is associated with each group to measure its “priority” of scheduling and calculated via (6). Groups with low GFC have high priority so that their tasks are considered before the tasks from groups with high GFC.

Data locality sometimes conflicts with fairness. For example, it is possible that the unscheduled tasks that can achieve data locality are mostly from groups that have already used up their rations. And thus we get into the dilemma that tradeoffs between fairness and data locality must be made. To integrate data locality and fairness, we divide assignment cost into two parts: Fairness Cost (FC) and Data Locality Cost (DLC) (shown in (7)). From the aspect of fairness constraints, FC implies the order of tasks to be scheduled, and tasks with low FC should be scheduled before tasks with high FC. The range of FC is denoted by $[0, FC_{max}]$. DLC reflects the overhead of data movement and has the same meaning as the cost definition described above in section 3.2. The weights of FC and DLC can be implicitly adjusted by carefully choosing the value ranges. Table 1 gives examples of how fairness-favored scheduling, data locality-favored scheduling and both-favored scheduling can be achieved. The range of FC is $[0, 100]$ for all the examples, while that of DLC varies. DLC with range $[0, 20]$ makes the scheduler favor fairness because FC has a larger impact on the total assignment cost. DLC with range $[0, 200]$ makes the scheduler favor data locality because the loss of data locality bumps up the total assignment cost significantly. DLC with range $[0, 100]$ makes the scheduler favor both fairness and data locality, because the loss of data locality and fairness impacts overall assignment costs to the same extent.

Above example shows how data locality and fairness can be balanced. We need to quantitatively determine the *FC* and *DLC* of tasks dynamically. Formula (8) shows how to calculate *DLC*, in which α is a configuration parameter fed by system administrators and implicitly controls the relative weight of *DLC*. If α is small, *FC* is dominant and the scheduler favors fairness. If α is large, *DLC* stands out and the scheduler favors data locality. If α is medium, *FC* and *DLC* become equally important. The calculation of *FC* is trickier and more subtle. As we mentioned, a GFC is associated with each group. One simple and intuitive strategy is for each group the *FC* of all its unscheduled tasks is set to its GFC. This implies all unscheduled tasks of a group have identical FC, and thus the scheduler is inclined to schedule all or none of them. Consider the scenario where FC dominates. Initially a group G_i underuses its ration just a little and has many unscheduled tasks. If group G_i has the lowest GFC, all its tasks naturally have the lowest FC and are scheduled to run before

Table 1. Examples of How Tradeoffs are Made

Fairness-favored		Data Locality-favored		Both-favored	
FC*	DLC*	FC	DLC	FC	DLC
[0, 100]	[0, 20]	[0,100]	[0,200]	[0,100]	[0,100]

* FC: fairness cost; DLC: data locality cost

other tasks so that group G_i uses significantly more resources. After scheduling, the resource usage of group G_i changes from slight underuse to heavy overuse. The reason why resource usage oscillates between underuse and overuse is the tasks in each group, no matter how many there are, are assigned the same FC. Instead, for each group we calculate how many of its unscheduled tasks should be scheduled based on the number of idle slots and its current resource consumption, and set only their FC to GFC. In (9) AS is the total number of all slots and $AS \cdot w_i$ is the number of map slots that should be used by group G_i . Group G_i already has rt_i tasks running so we have $AS \cdot w_i - rt_i$ slots at disposal (termed *sto* – *Slots To Occupy*). Because G_i can use only sto_i more slots, accordingly the FC of at most sto_i tasks is set to GFC_i and that of other tasks is set to a larger value $(1-w_i) \cdot \beta$ (β is the scaling factor of FC). So the tasks of each group do not always have the same FC. The number of unscheduled tasks for group G_i is denoted by ut_i . If ut_i is greater than sto_i , we need to decide how to select sto_i tasks out of ut_i tasks. Then data locality comes into play, and the tasks that can potentially achieve data locality are chosen. Details are given in the proposed algorithm below. Note parameters α and β , which are used to balance data locality and fairness, are specified by system owners based on their performance requirement and desired degrees of fairness.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|G|} w_i = 1 \quad (0 < w_i \leq 1) \quad (4)$$

$$s_i(t) = \frac{rt_i(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^{|G|} rt_j(t)} \quad (1 \leq i \leq |G|) \quad (5)$$

$$GFC_i = \frac{s_i}{w_i} \cdot 100 \quad (6)$$

$$C_{ij} = FC(i, j) + DLC(i, j) \quad (7)$$

$$DLC(i, j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if data locality is achieved} \\ \alpha * \frac{DS(T_i)}{\max_{1 \leq c \leq R_i} \{BW(ND(T_i, c), N(S_j))\}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$sto_i = \max(0, AS \cdot w_i - rt_i) \quad (9)$$

Based on above discussion, scheduling algorithm *lsap-fair-sched* is proposed and shown below. The main difference than *lsap-sched* is how assignment costs are calculated. Lines 7-8 find the set of nodes with idle slots. Lines 10-12 find the set of tasks whose input data are stored on nodes with idle slots. So these tasks have the potential to achieve data locality while all other tasks will lose data locality definitely for current scheduling. Lines 13-16 calculate *sto* of all groups. Lines 18-27 calculate task FC. Lines 29-33 calculate DLC. Line 35 adds together matrices FC and DLC to form the final cost matrix, which is expanded to a square matrix shown in line 36. After that, a LSAP algorithm is used to find the optimal assignment which is subsequently filtered and returned.

Algorithm skeleton of *lsap-fair-sched*

Input:

α : DLC scaling factor for non data local tasks
 β : FC scaling factor for tasks that are beyond its group allocation

Output: assignment of tasks to idle map slots

Functions:

`rt(g)`: return a set of running tasks that belong to group g .
`node(s)`: return the node where slot s resides
`reside(T)`: returns a set of nodes that host the input data of task T

Algorithm:

```

1 TS ← the set of unscheduled tasks
2 ISS ← the set of idle map slots
3 w ← rations/weights of all groups
4 ut ← the number of unshed. tasks for all groups
5 gfc ← GFC of all groups calculated via (6)
6 INS ← ∅ # the set of nodes with idle slots
7 for slot in ISS:
8   INS ← INS U node(slot)
9 # tasks that can potentially gain data locality
  DLT[1:|G|] = ∅
10 for T in TS:
11   if reside(T) ∩ INS ≠ ∅:
12     DLT[group(T)] = DLT[group(T)] U T
13 for i in 1:|G|
14   diff = w[i] · AS - rt[i]
15   if diff > 0: sto[i] = min(diff, ut[i])
16   else: sto[i] = 0
17
18 fc[1:|TS|][1:|ISS|] = 0 #fill with deflt value
19 for i in 1:|G|
20   tasks = G[i] #a list of tasks in group i
21   NDLT = tasks - DLT[i] #non-local tasks
22   fc[tasks] = β · (1-w[i]) #default value
23   if |DLT[i]| ≥ sto[i]:
24     tasks = DLT[i][1:sto[i]] #choose a subset
25   else if ut[i] > sto[i]:
26     tasks = DLT[i] U NDLT[1:(sto[i]-|DLT[i]|)]
27   fc[tasks] = gfc[i] #assign GFC to some tasks
28
29 dlc[1:|TS|][1:|ISS|]=1
30 for T in UDLT[i]:
31   for j in 1:|ISS|
32     if co-locate(T, ISS[j]): dlc[T][j] = 0
33     else: dlc[T][j] = α · DS(T) / BW(T, ISS[j])
34
35 C = fc + dlc
36 if C is not square: expandToSquare(C, 0)
37 R = lsap(C)
38 R = filterDummy(R)
39 return R

```

In above strategy, some tasks may get starved although the possibility is remote (e.g. tasks with bad data locality may be queued indefinitely). FC and DLC can be reduced for the tasks that have been waiting in queue for long time, so that they tend to be scheduled at the subsequent scheduling points.

4. EXPERIMENTS

In the experiments below, the main considered system factors include the number of nodes, the number of slots per node, the ratio of idle slots, and replication factor. One factor is varied while others are fixed in each test. We have conducted simulation experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed algorithms. We are preparing FutureGrid to support direct evaluation. Because we do not have access to real MapReduce production clusters, we need to mimic multi-user mode by setting some factors artificially (such as slot utilization, workload, and bandwidth usage). We expect to have FutureGrid results to add to published paper if accepted.

4.1 Overhead of LSAP Solver

We measured the time taken by *lsap-sched* to compute optimal task assignment in order to understand the overhead of solving LSAP. We varied the number of tasks from 100 to 3000 with step size 400, and the number of idle slots was equal to the number of tasks for each test. They represent small-sized to moderate-sized

clusters. The corresponding cost matrices were constructed and fed into LSAP solver. It took 7ms, 130ms, 450ms, and 1s for the LSAP solver to find optimal solutions given the matrices of sizes 100x100, 500x500, 1700x1700 and 2900x2900. So the overhead is acceptable in small-sized to medium-sized clusters. Note in our tests, values in the matrices were randomly generated, which eliminates the possibility to mine and explore useful patterns of cost distribution. In reality, the cost of data movement exhibits locality for typical hierarchical network topologies, which can be used to speed up the execution potentially.

4.2 Improvement of Data Locality


In this test, we evaluate how *lsap-sched* impacts the percent of data local tasks. In the simulated system, the number of nodes varied from 100 to 500 with step size 50, and each node had 4 slots. Replication factor was 3. The ratio of idle slots was fixed to 0.5 and enough tasks were generated to utilize all idle slots. The results are shown in Figure 3. Figure 3(a) shows the goodness of data locality for *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched*. Obviously, the goodness of data locality is pretty stable for both algorithms: *dl-sched* achieves 83% while *lsap-sched* achieves 97%. Their differences are shown in Figure 3(b), which implies *lsap-sched* increases the goodness of data locality by 12% - 14%. This indicates that *lsap-sched* consistently outperforms *dl-sched* significantly when the system is scaled out. In addition, we observe that the improvement oscillates in Figure 3(b). Our conjecture of the cause is that the number of all possible data and slot distributions is gigantic and only a portion of them was covered in our tests.

Then we varied replication factor from 1 to 19 and fixed the number of nodes to 100. The goodness of data locality was measured and is shown in Figure 4(a). The increase of replication factor yields substantial data locality improvement for both *lsap-sched* and *dl-sched*; and *lsap-sched* can more efficiently explore the increasing data redundancy and thus achieve better data locality. Common replication factors 3 and 5 yield surprisingly high data locality 72% and 88% respectively for *lsap-sched*.

Finally, we set the total number of idle slots to 100 and increased the number of tasks from 5 to 100 so that they used more and more idle slots. Results are shown in Figure 4(b). Data locality degrades slowly as more tasks are injected into the system, and the degradation of *lsap-sched* is much less severe than that of *dl-sched*. When the number of tasks is much smaller than that of idle slots, the scheduler has the great freedom of picking the best slots to assign tasks. As their numbers become close, more tasks need to be scheduled in one “wave” and the cherry-picking freedom is gradually attenuated. This explains why the increase of the number of tasks has negative impact on data locality.

4.3 Reduction of Data Locality Cost

In above tests, we measured the percentage of data local tasks. In



(a) Data locality of *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched* (b) Percent of improvement

Figure 3. Comparison of data locality (varied # of nodes)





Figure 4. Comparison of data locality (varied rep. factor and # of tasks)

reality, performance depends upon not only the goodness of data locality, but also the incurred data movement penalty of non data local tasks. In this test, we measure the overall data locality cost (DLC) to quantify the performance degradation brought by non data local tasks. The DLC of any non data local task was set to 1 regardless of the proximity between the location of compute and input data, which assumes that the cluster is homogeneous. The same test environment as above is used. Figure 5(a) shows the absolute DLC. As the number of nodes is increased, the DLC of *dl-sched* increases much faster than that of *lsap-sched*. So *lsap-sched* is more resilient to system scale-out than *dl-sched*. We also computed the DLC reduction of *lsap-sched* against *dl-sched*, and show results in Figure 5(b). We observe that *lsap-sched* eliminates 70% - 90% of the DLC of *dl-sched*.




(a) Overall DLC of *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched* (b) Reduction of DLC (in percent)

Figure 5. Comparison of data locality cost (with equal net. bw.)


Previously, constant value 1 was used as the DLC of non data local tasks, which does not reflect the fact that pairwise network bandwidths are not uniform (e.g. intra-rack throughput is usually higher than cross-rack throughput). In this test, we complicate the tests by setting non-constant costs. We simulated a cluster where each rack has 20 nodes. Again the DLC of data local tasks is 0. The DLC of rack local tasks (i.e. computation and input data are co-located on the same rack) follows a Gaussian distribution with mean and standard deviation being 1.0 and 0.5 respectively. The DLC of remote tasks follows another Gaussian distribution with mean and standard deviation being 4.0 and 2.0 respectively. This setting matches the reality that cross-rack data fetching incurs higher cost than intra-rack data fetching. We varied the total number of nodes from 100 to 500 and measured DLC. Firstly the ratio of idle slots was set to 50% and DLC is shown in Figure 6. *lsap-sched* still outperforms *dl-sched* significantly by up to 95%. By comparing Figure 5 and Figure 6, we observe that rack topology does not result in performance degradation. *dl-sched* is rack aware in the sense that rack local tasks are preferred over remote tasks if there are no node local tasks. So it avoids assigning tasks to the nodes where they need to fetch input data from other racks with best efforts. *lsap-sched* is naturally rack aware because the high cross-rack data movement cost prohibits non-optimal task assignments. So both *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched* can effectively utilize the network topology information. Then we decreased the ratio of idle slots from 50% to 20%, which

implies there was a fewer number of idle slots. Results are shown in Figure 7. Compared with Figure 6, the DLC of *dl-sched* is decreased and the DLC of *lsap-sched* is increased, so that the performance superiority of *lsap-sched* over *dl-sched* becomes less significant which is between 60% and 70%. When there are only a small number of idle slots, the room of improvement brought by *lsap-sched* is minor. For the extreme case where there is only one idle slot, *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched* becomes equivalent approximately. The more available resources and tasks there are, the more *lsap-sched* reduces DLC. The utilization of typical production clusters rarely reaches up to 80% [22, 23]. So we believe *lsap-sched* can offer substantial benefit in moderately-loaded clusters.

Then we fixed the number of nodes to 100 and increased replication factor from 1 to 13 with step size 2. The other settings were identical to the test above except each node has 1 idle slot. As replication factor is increased, we expect positive impact on DLC because the possibility of achieving better data locality increases theoretically. Test results are shown in Figure 8. Firstly, DLC drastically decreases as replication factor is increased initially from small values, and the decrement of DLC becomes less significant as replication factor gets larger and larger. Secondly, when replication factor is 1, *lsap-sched* and *dl-sched* perform comparably. *lsap-sched* has much faster DLC decrease than *dl-sched* as replication factor grows, and it almost thoroughly eliminates DLC when replication factor is larger than 7. Figure 8(b) shows a low replication factor (e.g. 3) is sufficient for *lsap-sched* to outperform *dl-sched* by over 50%. Note the number of slots per node was set to 1 in this test, and increasing it can bring larger improvement.




(a)Overall DLC of *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched*(b)Reduction of DLC(in percent)
Figure 6. Comparison of DLC with 50% idle slots (rack aware)



(a)Overall DLC of *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched*(b)Reduction of DLC(in percent)
Figure 7. Comparison of DLC with 20% idle slots (rack aware)

4.4 Evaluation of *lsap-fair-sched*

We have shown that theoretically fairness and data locality can be integrated together by carefully setting Fairness Cost and Data Locality Cost. In this experiment, we conducted a series of simulations to evaluate our proposed algorithm *lsap-fair-sched*. For each group, formula (10) calculates the *fairness distance* between the actual resource allocation s_i and the desired allocation specified via weights w_i . Value 0 indicates that the group uses exactly its ration. If its value is greater than 0, the



(a)Overall DLC of *dl-sched* and *lsap-sched*(b)Reduction of DLC(in percent)
Figure 8. Comparison of DLC w/ rep. factor varied (rack aware)

resource usage of the group either exceeds or is less than its ration. So its value indicates the compliance with administrator-provided allocation policies, and smaller is better usually. Formula (11) calculates the mean of fairness distance of all groups and serves as a metric to measure the fairness of resource allocation. At initial time instant 0, the fairness distance is denoted by $d(0)$. Then submitted tasks are scheduled, and at time t the fairness distance becomes $d(t)$. If the scheduler is fairness-aware, usually $d(t)$ should be smaller than $d(0)$ which implies fairness is improved. Given an initial state, we use $d(0)-d(t)$ to measure to what extent *lsap-fair-sched* improves fairness, and larger is better.

$$d_i(t) = |s_i(t) - w_i| / w_i \quad (10)$$

$$d(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{|G|} d_i(t)}{|G|} \quad (11)$$

In our tests, there were 60 nodes; each node had 1 slot; half of all slots were idle; replication factor was 1; and there were 30 running tasks and 90 tasks to schedule. In addition, there were 5 groups to which tasks belong. Weights for groups were $\{2^0, 2^1, 2^2, 2^3, 2^4\}$ and normalized to $\{2^0/31, 2^1/31, 2^2/31, 2^3/31, 2^4/31\}$ so that they add up to 1.0. The groups to which running tasks belong were randomly assigned. The DLC of non-local tasks was varied and results are shown in Figure 9. Initially, DLC is small compared with FC so that FC dominates the total assignment cost and *lsap-fair-sched* improves fairness most. Gradually, as the DLC of non-local tasks increases, data locality gains larger weight so that data locality improves and fairness deteriorates. After the DLC of non-local tasks gets sufficiently large, data locality becomes the dominant factor so that scheduling favors data locality mainly. Another observation is that improvement/deterioration of data locality/fairness is not smooth, and the curves are staircase shaped. During the continuous increase of DLC, not every small increment makes DLC become dominant. There are some critical steps that cause “phase transition” and make the assignment costs of some tasks become larger than that of other tasks that had larger cost before, so that data locality becomes dominant in scheduling. Oppositely, the non-critical increase is not sufficient to influence scheduling decisions.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we conducted an in-depth investigation of data locality and fairness in MapReduce. We illustrated the default Hadoop scheduling strategy *dl-sched* does not guarantee optimal data locality. Then we used a cost matrix to represent the associated data movement costs of all {task, slot} pairs, and reformulated the scheduling problem into a new problem that tries to find an assignment that minimizes the sum of assignment cost. We proposed augmented *lsap-sched* that gives optimal data locality by utilizing the well-known problem LSAP. The




Figure 9. Tradeoffs between fairness and data locality

conducted simulation shows *Isap-sched* can improve the goodness of data locality and reduce the overall DLC substantially. In addition, we investigated fairness and noticed the conflict between fairness and data locality. The assignment cost is split into two parts: fairness cost and data locality cost. We enhanced *Isap-sched* to balance fairness and data locality based on the user-provided weights. Corresponding experiments show that the relative importance of fairness and data locality can be tuned effectively and conveniently. The desired setting is system specific and depends upon fairness requirements and the typical workload of submitted MapReduce jobs. We are implementing our algorithms in Hadoop and expecting to get real results later that will be added to this paper if accepted.

6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0910812 to Indiana University for "FutureGrid: An Experimental, High-Performance Grid Test-bed." Partners in the FutureGrid project include U. Chicago, U. Florida, San Diego Supercomputer Center - UC San Diego, U. Southern California, U. Texas at Austin, U. Tennessee at Knoxville, U. of Virginia, Purdue U., and T-U. Dresden.

7. REFERENCES

- [1] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat. 2008. MapReduce: simplified data processing on large clusters. *Commun. ACM* 51, 1 (January 2008), 107-113.
- [2] Yahoo! Launches World's Largest Hadoop Production Application, Yahoo! Developer Network, <http://developer.yahoo.com/blogs/hadoop/2008/02/yahoo-worlds-largest-production-hadoop.html>
- [3] J. Lin and C. Dyer. 2009. Data-intensive text processing with MapReduce. In *Proc. of HLT-NAACL (Tutorial Abstracts) 2009*. pp.1~2
- [4] X. Qiu, J. Ekanayake, S. Beason, T. Gunarathne, G. Fox, R. Barga, and D. Gannon. 2009. Cloud technologies for bioinformatics applications. In *Proc. of workshop MTAGS '09*. ACM, New York, NY, USA
- [5] Hadoop's Capacity Scheduler http://hadoop.apache.org/core/docs/current/capacity_scheduler.html.
- [6] Matei Zaharia, "The Hadoop Fair Scheduler" <http://developer.yahoo.net/blogs/hadoop/FairSharePres.ppt>
- [7] K. Ranganathan and I. Foster. 2002. Decoupling Computation and Data Scheduling in Distributed Data-Intensive Applications. In *Proc. of HPDC'02*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 352-.
- [8] H. H. Mohamed and D. H. J. Epema. 2004. An evaluation of the close-to-files processor and data co-allocation policy in multiclusters. In *Proc. of CLUSTER'04*. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 287-298.
- [9] R. Chang, J. Chang, and S. Lin. 2007. Job scheduling and data replication on data grids. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.* 23, 7 (August 2007), 846-860.
- [10] K. Ranganathan and I. T. Foster. 2001. Identifying dynamic replication strategies for a High-Performance data grid. In *Proc. of GRID'01*. London, UK: Springer-Verlag, pp. 75-86.
- [11] M. Zaharia, D. Borthakur, J. Sarma, K. Elmeleegy, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica. 2010. Delay scheduling: a simple technique for achieving locality and fairness in cluster scheduling. In *Proc. of EuroSys '10*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 265-278
- [12] B. Palanisamy, A. Singh, L. Liu, and B. Jain. 2011. Purlieus: locality-aware resource allocation for MapReduce in a cloud. In *Proc. of SC'11*. ACM, New York, NY, USA
- [13] M. Zaharia, A. Konwinski, A. D. Joseph, R. Katz, and I. Stoica. 2008. Improving MapReduce performance in heterogeneous environments. In *Proc. of OSDI'08*. USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 29-42.
- [14] Z. Guo, G. Fox, and M. Zhou. 2012. Investigation of Data Locality in MapReduce. In *Proc. of CCGrid'12*. To appear.
- [15] P. Agrawal, D. Kifer, and C. Olston. 2008. Scheduling shared scans of large data files. In *Proc. of VLDB Endow.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 958-969, Aug. 2008.
- [16] A. Ghodsi, M. Zaharia, B. Hindman, A. Konwinski, S. Shenker, and I. Stoica. 2011. Dominant resource fairness: fair allocation of multiple resource types. In *Proc. of NSDI'11*
- [17] M. Isard, V. Prabhakaran, J. Currey, U. Wieder, K. Talwar, and A. Goldberg. 2009. Quincy: fair scheduling for distributed computing clusters. In *Proc. of SOSP '09*
- [18] B. Schroeder and M. Harchol-Balter. 2000. Evaluation of Task Assignment Policies for Supercomputing Servers: The Case for Load Unbalancing and Fairness. In *Proc. of HPDC '00*
- [19] S. Ghemawat, H. Gobioff, and S. Leung. 2003. The Google file system. In *Proc. of SOSP '03*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 29-43.
- [20] R.E. Burkard, M. Dell'Amico, and S. Martello. 2009. Assignment problems. *SIAM, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*
- [21] R. Wolski, N. Spring, and J. Hayes. 1999. The network weather service: a distributed resource performance forecasting service for metacomputing. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.* 15, 5-6 (October 1999), 757-768
- [22] S. Kavulya, J. Tan, R. Gandhi, and P. Narasimhan. 2010. An Analysis of Traces from a Production MapReduce Cluster. In *Proc. of CCGRID '10*
- [23] L. A. Barroso and U. H. Olzle. 2007. The case for energy-proportional computing. *Computer*, vol.40, no.12, pp.33-37