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Service-to-service load balancing

capacity utilization
safely make use of aggregate capacity of replicas

failure management
route around replicas when they inevitably fail
SERVICE-TO-SERVICE LOAD BALANCING

non-cooperative
multiple load balancers which make decisions independently

client-side
embedded within each replica of a service

load balancing
over sessions (OSI L5) and requests (OSI L7)
EXAMPLE SERVICE TOPOLOGY

All clients connect to all servers.
1. Select two instances uniformly and randomly.

2. Of the two, select the ‘best’ instance.

// select two indices within `vec`, uniformly
// and randomly, without replacement.
val a = rng.nextInt(vec.size)
var b = rng.nextInt(vec.size - 1)
if (b >= a) { b = b + 1 }

val nodeA = vec(a)
val nodeB = vec(b)

// If both nodes are in the same health status, we pick
// the least loaded one. Otherwise we pick the one
// that's healthier.
val aStatus = nodeA.status
val bStatus = nodeB.status
if (aStatus == bStatus) {
  if (nodeA.load <= nodeB.load) nodeA else nodeB
} else {
  if (Status.best(aStatus, bStatus) == aStatus) nodeA else nodeB
}
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PER REQUEST: P2C

fair request distribution
request load is even with homogenous replicas

efficient
fully concurrent, constant time for selection + comparison

decoupled selection + comparison
allows for sophisticated definitions of load
PER SESSION: IT’S A MESH!

**wasted resources**
everyone talks to everyone

**no isolation**
independently discover the same problems

**low concurrency**
poor load metric performance without concurrent requests
How can we reduce the number of sessions?
RANDOM APERTURE

**random**
replicas selected within a random window

**dynamic sizing**
can grow or shrink based on feedback controller

**highly concurrent**
aperture is smallest subset to satisfy concurrency
RANDOM APERTURE
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RANDOM APERTURE: UNFAIR

RPS PER SERVER / TIME

clients deployed random aperture
RANDOM IS STATISTICAL

Results in a load distribution that closely resembles a binomial distribution.

Minimizing the “banding” requires tuning which can only be eliminated when the aperture is the size of all the backend replicas.
CONFIGURED RANDOM APERTURE

Input:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>binomial distribution</th>
<th>number of trials</th>
<th>$n = 500,000$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>probability of success</td>
<td>$p = 0.001$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical properties:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard deviation</td>
<td>22.3495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variance</td>
<td>499.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skewness</td>
<td>0.0446542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurtosis</td>
<td>3.00199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIGURED RANDOM APERTURE

RPS PER SERVER / TIME
Distributing the configuration burden for core pieces of infrastructure will likely converge to poorly configured infrastructure.
How can we improve aperture?

fairer  distributed
less config  subset
DISCRETE COORDINATES
The replicas which are acting in concert to dispatch requests.

Each instance in the peer ring only needs to know about its unique id and the number of peers.

Domain: [0, 1)
The ring which will be receiving requests.

Each peer computes this ring via metadata received from service discovery.

Domain: [0, 1)
COMPOSITE RINGS

0: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]
1: [3, 4, 5, 6, 0, 1, 2]
2: [5, 6, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4]
SESSION HISTOGRAM

Service A
0: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]
1: [3, 4, 5, 6, 0, 1, 2]
2: [5, 6, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4]
MULTIPLE SERVICE RINGS

Service A

0: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]
1: [3, 4, 5, 6, 0, 1, 2]
2: [5, 6, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4]

Service C

0: [5, 6, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4]
1: [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 0]
2: [3, 4, 5, 6, 0, 1, 2]
CONTINUOUS COORDINATES

Services fully occupy the same domain.

Load balancers can map from their respective range to discrete destinations.
P2C + FRACTIONAL LOAD

Each load balancer picks two coordinates randomly within its range and maps them to discrete destinations.

This inherently respects the fractional boundary conditions.
// compute the offset and width of this balancer.
val offset = coord.offset
val width = apertureWidth

// select two coordinates, randomly and uniformly,
// within our range [offset, offset + width) and map
// them to the destination ring.
val (a, b) = destRing.pick2(offset, width)

val nodeA = vector(a)
val nodeB = vector(b)

val aStatus = nodeA.status
val bStatus = nodeB.status
if (aStatus == bStatus) {
  // what proportion of a and b, respectively,
  // fall within [offset, offset + width)?
  val aw = destRing.weight(a, offset, width)
  val bw = destRing.weight(b, offset, width)
  // weight the load w.r.t to the ring proportions
  // to avoid biasing towards the node picked less often.
  if (nodeA.load / aw <= nodeB.load / bw) nodeA else nodeB
} else {
  if (Status.best(aStatus, bStatus) == aStatus) nodeA else nodeB
}
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MULTIPLE SERVICE RINGS

[Diagram with rings labeled Service A, Service B, and Service C]
CONTINUOUS COORDINATE MODEL
air request distribution
with distinct services talking to the same destination ring

distributed
light coordination around metadata to construct rings

fewer sessions
aperture size naturally falls out of representation
DYNAMIC APERTURE SIZE

The aperture can grow/shrink so long as the peer ring completes whole rotations around destination ring.
RESILIENCY

peer size heuristics

Nodes are placed closer to their final position by inferring the size of the ring when receiving updates.
coalesce updates
Changes are buffered and combined in order to avoid transient ring states.
RESILIENCY

entropy

The destination ring is pseudo-randomized to avoid any synchronization across distinct peer rings.
Production Results
MIGRATION FROM RANDOM APERTURE TO D-APERTURE

RPS PER SERVER / TIME
MIGRATION FROM RANDOM APERTURE TO D-APERTURE

78% reduction in relative standard deviation request rate
MIGRATION FROM RANDOM APERTURE TO D-APERTURE

Drop from ~280K to ~25K aggregate connections (91%)
SECOND-ORDER RESULTS

20-25% less CPU used
Total garbage collection (GC) time cut in half
75% fewer failures
~20% reduction in latency at 99.9th percentile
REDUCTION IN REQUEST RETRIES
LIMITATIONS

**unequal workloads**
If different clients have unequal demands of the client we again get to unbalanced load on the backend.

**bursty traffic**
Bursts of traffic break the assumption that incoming load is ‘smooth’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FUTURE WORK**

**flexible node capacity**

Some nodes will be better than others, heterogeneous hardware etc, and we can size serving units accordingly.
THIS IS FINE
THIS IS FINE - LOOK MA! I’M INSTANCE 100 OF 90!
As we re-deploy instance 1, instance 3 overflows around the ring.

THIS IS FINE - LOOK MA! I’M INSTANCE 100 OF 90!
THIS IS FINE – UPDATES, SMUPDATES...
THIS IS FINE – UPDATES, SMUPDATES...

Peer Instance 1

Everyone Else
We’re hiring – including in Singapore!
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github.com/twitter/finagle