GRAAP-WG Meeting, GGF17 10-12 May 2006 Tokyo, Japan

Dynamic Agreement: A Function Based Approach to WS-Agreement

Based on publication by **Rizos Sakellariou** and **Viktor Yarmolenko**, *On the Flexibility of WS-Agreement for Job Submission*, Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Middleware for Grid Computing MGC '05, vol. 117, 1-6 (Nov. 2005)



Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council



e-mail: viktor.yarmolenko@manchester.ac.uk http://www.gridscheduling.org



Background

Parallel Job submission using SLAs



And many more (such as pricing policies, system topology, external factors) all in the context of Service Level Agreements.

Introduction

Our current interest in WS-Agreement



Motivation

Example with parallel job scheduling







- SLO: T_S the earliest time the Job is allowed to start SLO: T_F – the latest time the Job is allowed to finish SLO: N_{CPU} – number of CPU nodes required for the Job
- **SLO:** t_D projected Job duration time for N_{CPU} nodes

SLO: t_{UP} – uniprocessor Job duration time (CPU-hours)

BVL: V_{pr} - the price for executing the JobBVL: V_{pn} - the penalty for failing the JobBVL: V_{tot} - final value of the agreement (optional)



Possibility to describe agreement terms as functions



Universal Terms – Useful Variables & Functions

- UT: t_{curr} current wall clock time
- UT: $R_{ld}(t_{curr})$ Resource load @ time: current or any other UT: t_S – actual Job execution start time

UT: $f_{norm}(t, low, high) - binary function$





Guarantee Terms as Functions

 $N_{CPU} = 12 \qquad t_D = 2$

CPU

Variable Number of CPUs per Job

SLO:
$$N_{CPU} = \{2, 3, 4, ...\}$$

SLO: $t_D = \frac{t_{UP}}{N_{CPU}}$
SLO: $t_{UP} = 24$

SLO: $X_{other} = const$

 $N_{CPU} = 8$ $t_D = 3$ $N_{CPU} = 7$ $t_D = 3.43$ $N_{CPU} = 6$ $t_D = 4$ 12 ∞ Ш t_D t_D $N_{CPU} = 4$ $t_D = 6$ 3 2 || N_{CPU} N_{CPU} Time



Pricing

From simple pricing to time dependant

Standard: willing to pay a fixed amount as long as the job starts and finishes within T_s and T_F

$$V_{CL}(T_{ex}) = \begin{cases} 1, \ T_{S} = T_{ex} = (T_{F} - t_{D}) \\ 0, \ T_{S} > T_{ex} > (T_{F} - t_{D}) \end{cases}$$

ASAP: willing to pay a higher rate if job starts earlier, but still within T_s and T_F times

$$V_{CL}(T_{ex}) = \begin{cases} (1 - \frac{T_{ex} - T_S}{T_F - t_D - T_S}), T_S = T_{ex} = (T_F - t_D) \\ 0, T_S > T_{ex} > (T_F - t_D) \end{cases}$$

Guarantee Terms as Functions





Guarantee Terms as Functions

Suddenly life becomes more interesting





User



Resource

Experiment

Set of ~800 Job requests, for which a solution exists where the 100% utilisation is possible on Resource (600 hours x 64 CPUs). Generated 10 independent sets Capacity of 64 CPUs and available for 600 hours

Scheduling by the earliest deadline first (single iteration)

$$\langle t_D \times N_{CPU} \rangle = 21.85$$



Experiment Variable CPU Scenario (Original vs. Expressive SLA)









Only Single Negotiation is Allowed





Experiment

Multiple Negotiations Allowed





Was it all worth it?

- Reduction in traffic associated with negotiation of Resource
- Reduction in user-service interaction
- Extended Agreement gives more power to resource allocation, scheduling, management, aggregation of services

Rizos Sakellariou and Viktor Yarmolenko, *On the Flexibility of WS-Agreement for Job Submission*, Proceedings of the 3rd International Workshop on Middleware for Grid Computing MGC '05, vol. 117, 1-6 (Nov. 2005)

http://www.gridscheduling.org

