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Background

Rapid innovation in cluster computing frameworks
Problem

Rapid innovation in cluster computing frameworks

No single framework optimal for all applications

Want to run multiple frameworks in a single cluster
  » ...to maximize utilization
  » ...to share data between frameworks
Where We Want to Go

Today: static partitioning

Mesos: dynamic sharing
Solution

Mesos is a common resource sharing layer over which diverse frameworks can run
Other Benefits of Mesos

Run multiple instances of the *same* framework
  » Isolate production and experimental jobs
  » Run multiple versions of the framework concurrently

Build *specialized frameworks* targeting particular problem domains
  » Better performance than general-purpose abstractions
Outline

Mesos Goals and Architecture

Implementation

Results

Related Work
Mesos Goals

High utilization of resources
Support diverse frameworks (current & future)
Scalability to 10,000’s of nodes
Reliability in face of failures

Resulting design: Small microkernel-like core that pushes scheduling logic to frameworks
Design Elements

Fine-grained sharing:
  » Allocation at the level of *tasks* within a job
  » Improves utilization, latency, and data locality

Resource offers:
  » Simple, scalable application-controlled scheduling mechanism
Element 1: Fine-Grained Sharing

Coarse-Grained Sharing (HPC):

- Framework 1
- Framework 2
- Framework 3

Storage System (e.g. HDFS)

Fine-Grained Sharing (Mesos):

- Fw. 1
- Fw. 2
- Fw. 3

Storage System (e.g. HDFS)

+ Improved utilization, responsiveness, data locality
Element 2: Resource Offers

Option: Global scheduler
  » Frameworks express needs in a specification language, global scheduler matches them to resources
  + Can make optimal decisions
  – Complex: language must support all framework needs
  – Difficult to scale and to make robust
  – Future frameworks may have unanticipated needs
Element 2: Resource Offers

Mesos: Resource offers
  » Offer available resources to frameworks, let them pick which resources to use and which tasks to launch
  + Keeps Mesos simple, lets it support future frameworks
  − Decentralized decisions might not be optimal
Mesos Architecture

MPI job
MPI scheduler

Hadoop job
Hadoop scheduler

Pick framework to offer resources to

Mesos master
Allocation module

Resource offer

Mesos slave
MPI executor
task

Mesos slave
MPI executor
task
Mesos Architecture

MPI job

MPI scheduler

Hadoop job

Hadoop scheduler

Resource offer =
list of (node, availableResources)

E.g. { (node1, <2 CPUs, 4 GB>),
       (node2, <3 CPUs, 2 GB>) }
Mesos Architecture

- **MPI job**
  - MPI scheduler
  - Mesos master
  - Resource offer
  - Mesos slave
    - MPI executor
    - task

- **Hadoop job**
  - Hadoop scheduler
  - Mesos master
  - Resource offer
  - Mesos slave
    - MPI executor
    - task
    - Hadoop executor

- Framework-specific scheduling
- Pick framework to offer resources to
- Launches and isolates executors
Optimization: Filters

Let frameworks short-circuit rejection by providing a predicate on resources to be offered
  » E.g. “nodes from list L” or “nodes with > 8 GB RAM”
  » Could generalize to other hints as well

Ability to reject still ensures correctness when needs cannot be expressed using filters
Implementation
Implementation Stats

20,000 lines of C++

Master failover using ZooKeeper

Frameworks ported: Hadoop, MPI, Torque

New specialized framework: Spark, for iterative jobs (up to 20× faster than Hadoop)

Open source in Apache Incubator
Users

**Twitter** uses Mesos on >100 nodes to run ~12 production services (mostly stream processing)

**Berkeley** machine learning researchers are running several algorithms at scale on Spark

**Conviva** is using Spark for data analytics

**UCSF** medical researchers are using Mesos to run Hadoop and eventually non-Hadoop apps
Results

» Utilization and performance vs static partitioning
» Framework placement goals: data locality
» Scalability
» Fault recovery
Dynamic Resource Sharing

![Graph showing resource sharing over time for different workloads: Spark, Facebook Hadoop Mix, Large Hadoop Mix, and Torque / MPI.]
Mesos vs Static Partitioning

Compared performance with statically partitioned cluster where each framework gets 25% of nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework</th>
<th>Speedup on Mesos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Hadoop Mix</td>
<td>1.14×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Hadoop Mix</td>
<td>2.10×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spark</td>
<td>1.26×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torque / MPI</td>
<td>0.96×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Locality with Resource Offers

Ran 16 instances of Hadoop on a shared HDFS cluster

Used delay scheduling [EuroSys ’10] in Hadoop to get locality (wait a short time to acquire data-local nodes)

Local Map Tasks (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Static Partitioning</th>
<th>Mesos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job Duration (s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Static Partitioning</th>
<th>Mesos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600 seconds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7×
Scalability

Mesos only performs *inter-framework* scheduling (e.g. fair sharing), which is easier than *intra-framework* scheduling

**Result:**
Scaled to 50,000 emulated slaves, 200 frameworks, 100K tasks (30s len)
Fault Tolerance

Mesos master has only *soft state*: list of currently running frameworks and tasks

Rebuild when frameworks and slaves re-register with new master after a failure

**Result:** fault detection and recovery in ~10 sec
Related Work

HPC schedulers (e.g. Torque, LSF, Sun Grid Engine)
  > Coarse-grained sharing for inelastic jobs (e.g. MPI)

Virtual machine clouds
  > Coarse-grained sharing similar to HPC

Condor
  > Centralized scheduler based on matchmaking

Parallel work: Next-Generation Hadoop
  > Redesign of Hadoop to have per-application masters
  > Also aims to support non-MapReduce jobs
  > Based on resource request language with locality prefs
Conclusion

Mesos shares clusters efficiently among diverse frameworks thanks to two design elements:

» **Fine-grained sharing** at the level of tasks
» **Resource offers**, a scalable mechanism for application-controlled scheduling

Enables co-existence of current frameworks and development of new specialized ones

In use at Twitter, UC Berkeley, Conviva and UCSF
Backup Slides
Framework Isolation

Mesos uses OS isolation mechanisms, such as Linux containers and Solaris projects.

Containers currently support CPU, memory, IO and network bandwidth isolation.

Not perfect, but much better than no isolation.
Analysis

Resource offers work well when:
» Frameworks can scale up and down elastically
» Task durations are homogeneous
» Frameworks have many preferred nodes

These conditions hold in current data analytics frameworks (MapReduce, Dryad, ...)
» Work divided into short tasks to facilitate load balancing and fault recovery
» Data replicated across multiple nodes
Revocation

Mesos allocation modules can revoke (kill) tasks to meet organizational SLOs.

Framework given a grace period to clean up.

“Guaranteed share” API lets frameworks avoid revocation by staying below a certain share.
## Mesos API

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduler Callbacks</th>
<th>Scheduler Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resourceOffer(offerId, offers)</td>
<td>replyToOffer(offerId, tasks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerRescinded(offerId)</td>
<td>setNeedsOffers(bool)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statusUpdate(taskId, status)</td>
<td>setFilters(filters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slaveLost(slaveId)</td>
<td>getGuaranteedShare()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>killTask(taskId)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executor Callbacks</th>
<th>Executor Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>launchTask(taskDescriptor)</td>
<td>sendStatus(taskId, status)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>killTask(taskId)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>