The Serverless Application Analytics Framework: Reproducible Performance for Performance Modeling

Robert Cordingly
School of Engineering and Technology
University of Washington
Tacoma WA USA
rcording@uw.edu

Wen Shu
School of Engineering and Technology
University of Washington
Tacoma WA USA
shuwen12@uw.edu

Wes J. Lloyd School of Engineering and Technology University of Washington Tacoma WA USA wlloyd@uw.edu

TABLE I. PERFORMANCE MODEL RESULTS SCNMT2 WORKLOADS

DAM (tamanta)	256MB (13)	256MB (13) 512MB		1024MB	(3)	2048MB (1)	
RAM (tenants)	Avg runtime (ms), % Error, RMSE, deg of freedom						
CPU a1→a2	18173,5%, 199, 127		, -1.3%, 1, 58	3741, 0.11%, 36.0, 28		2580, -0.4%, 18.2, 155	
CPU a1→a3	16532,1%, 224, 151		, -0.3%, 7, 414	4218, 0.0 102, , 4		2447, -0.3%, 14.4, 265	
CPU a2→a3	17524,4%, 181, 127		,08%, .7, 58	3575, 0.24%, 43.6, 28		2487,54%, 18.5, 155	
CDU (-4 -2 -2)	CPU a	a1	CPU a2		CPU a3		
CPU (a1,a2,a3)	Avg runtime (ms), % Err, RMSE, deg of freedom						
256(13)→512(6)		10324, 0.28%, 199, 414		8189, -0.13%, 48.0, 58		7722, 0.076%, 41.1, 151	
256(13)→1024(3) 5252, -0. 124, 4		3731, -0.44%, 22.1, 28		3894, -0.0049%, 33.0, 151		
256(13)→2048(1) 2408, -0. 19.0, 2	,	2578, -0.04%, 12.2, 127		2346, -0.33%, 17.3, 151		

TABLE II. PERFORMANCE MODEL RESULTS SCMT2 WORKLOADS

RAM	25	256MB (13) 512M		B (6)	1024MB	(3)	2048MB (1)	
(tenants)	Avg runtime (ms), % Error, RMSE, deg of freedom							
CPU a1→a2	51474,7%, 859, 127		23440,23%, 286, 58		10239,55%, 118, 28		6450,63%, 115, 157	
CPU a1→a3	539	62,38%, 87. 151	27281, 2912	.35%,	13373,-1. 1516, 40	8%,	7240, 1.84%, 954, 266	
CPU a2→a3	57203,49%, 494, 127		25074,.042%, 283, 58		11090,.431%, 174, 28		7011, 4.66%, 900, 157	
0011 (4 0 0)		CPU a1		CPU a2			CPU a3	
CPU (a1, a2,	a3)	Avg runtime (ms), % Err, RMSE, deg of freedom						
256(13)→512(6) 48053,37 6648, 41		,	23439, -0.557%, 265, 58		24936, -0.49%, 235, 151			
256(13)→1024	(3) 21088,032% 2832, 406			10239, 0.555%, 106, 28		12241, -1.02%, 281, 151		
256(13)→2048(1) 8116, 1. 1138, 2			6505, -1.42%, 135, 127		6872, -0.69%, 280, 151			

TABLE III. PERFORMANCE MODEL RESULTS SCSMT2 WORKLOADS

RAM	25	6MB (13)	512MB (6)		1024MB (3)		2048MB (1)	
(tenants)	Avg runtime (ms), % Error, RMSE, deg of freedom							
CPU a1→a2	41820,59%, 1273, 1414		20840,.312%, 728, 652		10174,0.54%, 373, 325		4699, .205%, 321, 1739	
CPU a1→a3	44162,65%, 2037, 1613		20829,4.53%, 2875, 4572		9831, 4.30%, 1290, 4478		5052, 3.16%, 732, 2938	
CPU a2→a3	46539, .24%, 763, 1414		22212,56%, 403, 652		10585,09%, 318, 325		5173,388%, 507, 1739	
0011/4 0 0)		CPU a1		CPU a2		CPU a3		
CPU (a1, a2,	as)	Avg runtime (ms), % Err, RMSE, deg of freedom						
256(13)→512(6) 35216, 0. 8389, 4), -0.39%, 5, 652	197	19711, 0.0476%, 725, 1613		
256(13)→1024	1024(3) 14645, 0.47 2625, 44		,	10173, -1.02%, 568, 325		9049, 1.212%, 838, 1613		
256(13)→2048(1) 5004, 3. 1164, 2						639, 3.38%, 1110, 1613		

TABLE IV. PERFORMANCE MODEL RESULTS SCNMT2 AWS→IBM

RAM (tenants)	256MB (13 / 32)	512MB (6 / 16)	1024MB (3 / 8)	2048MB (1 / 4)			
To the (condition)	Avg runtime (ms), % Error, RMSE, deg of freedom						
CPU a1→i1	n/a	17666,-4.3%,	8013,-3.37%,	4340,-2.38%,			
		1196, 142	665, 236	559, 139			
CPU a1→i2	n/a	16231,-4.1%,	7794,-1.37%,	3639,-0.70%,			
		1991, 369	674, 395	186, 265			
CPU a1→i3	30124,-4.49%,	13960, .13%,	6611. 1.40%,	2920,166%,			
	1752, 171	1176, 99	287, 49	41.49, 42			
CPU a1→i4	24864, -2.7%,	12437,-5.5%,	6641, 3.76%,	2549, 3.47%,			
	2298, 200	2357, 85	633, 70	187, 24			