

## LETTER

# SEDONA: A Novel Protocol for Identifying Infrequent, Long-Running Daemons on a Linux System

Young-Kyoon SUH<sup>†a)</sup>, *Member*

**SUMMARY** Measuring program execution time is a much-used technique for performance evaluation in computer science. Without proper care, however, timed results may vary a lot, thus making it hard to trust their validity. In this paper we propose a novel timing protocol to significantly reduce such variability.

**key words:** *Infrequent Long-running Daemon, Execution-Time Measurement*

## 1. Introduction

Measuring program execution time is a much-used technique for performance evaluation in computer science. Despite the importance of accurate and precise execution-time measurement, how to achieve *better* timing has not been well addressed. Surprisingly, there is considerable variability in the measured time. The goal of this paper is to propose a better timing protocol that can significantly reduce such variability and thus enable better timing results without a doubt of their validity.

Consider a simple compute-bound program, what we term *PUT* (program-under-test), as shown in Fig. 1. This program runs a nested for-loop with a specified task length (*tl*) (in seconds). The *tl* value is used to compute the number of iterations (*t*) for which that for-loop is performed to reach the specified task length.

**Algorithm** PerformManyIncrements(*tl*):

```
t = tl * CONSTANT
for k = 1 to t by 1 do
  for i = 1 to UINT.MAX-1 by 1 do
    j += 1
  end for
end for
```

**Fig. 1** Computation by a Program-Under-Test (PUT)

We used 128 seconds as the task length and ran the PUT program (termed PUT128) 800 times. Note that PUT128 was run on a machine, with a specification illustrated in Table 2, in the same timing environment as used in our prior work [1], with (i) non-critical daemons deactivated, (ii) the Network Timing Protocol daemon switched on, (iii) particular CPU features [2], [3] turned off, and (iv) an up-to-date kernel installed.

Fig. 2 shows two plots of the timing results on PUT128. Most of the 800 executions measured in

elapsed time, via `System.currentTimeMillis()` in Java, form the central band of 128,000–129,000 ms, as can be seen in Fig. 2(a). Despite the well-controlled timing environment, there exist over a dozen of executions above that band, or *outliers*. Indeed, these outliers *critically* impact the overall measurement quality: a standard deviation of 1,730 ms and a relative error of 0.01. This result suggests adequately eliminating these outliers while retaining most of the executions.

Our protocol, which we characterize shortly, on the contrary, exactly identified and removed those outliers. In effect, the protocol considerably reduced such variability, as illustrated in Fig. 2(b). Specifically, regarding standard deviation and relative error the protocol presented a significant performance gain up to by three orders of magnitude for the same PUT128 results.

**Characteristics.** There are several important specifics of our protocol. First, we utilize *process time* (PT) rather than on elapsed time (ET). The use of PT is preferred, as it takes into account the time taken for only a “process” (or program) of interest. PT is defined as the sum of ticks (where one tick is equal to 10 msec) in user and system mode. These tick measures are obtainable via `taskstats` C struct, provided by the Linux NetLink facility [4]. Second, the protocol throws out some executions that involve *infrequent, long-running daemon processes*. We observe that such daemon processes substantially impact the execution time of the process. By eliminating those executions, the protocol greatly improves the overall measurement quality, which would otherwise be biased by them.

**Related Work.** McGeoch introduced two basic methods of measuring program time: elapsed time and CPU time [5]. Bryant and O’Hallaron [6] presented two timing schemes of using clock-cycle and interval counters. They proposed a measurement protocol, called *minimum-of-k*, that for observed elapsed ticks the minimum is chosen as the most accurate one. Odom et al.’s work [7] focused on timing long-running programs in a simulation framework via dynamic sampling of trace snippets during program execution. But none of these prior works considers the variability in timing and the impact of daemons that may disturb the timing a lot.


Commercial software tools measure execution time [8]–[10]. Since the tools’ source code is not disclosed, there is no way of figuring out whether they can prevent such a daemon from timing.

Manuscript received April 7, 2017.

<sup>†</sup>Dept. of Scientific Platform Development, Korea Inst. of Sci. and Tech. Info. (KISTI), Daejeon, 34141, Korea

a) E-mail: yksuh@kisti.re.kr

DOI: 10.1587/transinf.E0.D.1



(a) Initial Elapsed Time Measurement (b) Program Time After Our Protocol

**Fig. 2** An Example of Measurement Results on a Compute-bound Program-Under-Test

**Contribution.** Our contributions are following.

- We show empirical evidence that measuring execution time can be seriously affected by daemons.
- We present an algorithm to identify and eliminate such daemons that are infrequent, long-running.
- We propose a novel timing protocol that can considerably reduce variance via the elimination.
- The evaluation results on real-world programs show a support for the effectiveness of the protocol.

The rest is organized as follows. We next elaborate on the proposed timing protocol. In turn we evaluate the performance of the scheme using real workloads.

## 2. Proposed Scheme

In this section we propose a novel execution time measurement scheme, called *SEDONA* (Selective Elimination through Detection of infrequent, lOngruNning dAemons). Our scheme (1) utilizes PT (process time) to avoid absorbing timing noise from other co-running processes and (2) identifies and eliminates executions including daemon processes that are infrequent and long-running via a *cutoff* measure.

Our SEDONA protocol consists of a total of ten steps, as described in Fig. 3. Note that this protocol (algorithm) is applicable to any arbitrary Linux system.

**A Running Example.** First, we set up the same measurement environment as described earlier in Section 1, to eliminate known timing factors (Step 1). We then run a program-under-test (called PUT) of Fig. 1 with a task length of 128 sec, termed *PUT128*, 800 times (Step 2). (We render Fig. 2(a) using the 800 samples from this run.) We use 128 seconds because that is long enough to perhaps experience an infrequent daemon. We run it 800 times to capture infrequent daemons that perhaps run every few hours or even once a day. Note that we collect all daemon processes as well as the PUT and their measures through the Netlink interface from the kernel before and after each timing.

Fig. 4(a) plots all the 800 elapsed times (ETs) of the run of *PUT128*. The plot clearly shows three rows; that is, the top and middle rows represent over a dozen

**Algorithm** The SEDONA Timing Protocol:

Step 1. Set up the timing environment.

*/\* Daemon-cutoff times are derived from Steps 2 through 9. \*/*  
Step 2. Perform a single PUT run (specifically, *PUT128*) for many samples (specifically, 800).

Step 3. Consider each pair of elapsed time measurements to be a dual-PUT measurement and examine a scatter-plot to see if it displays an *L*-shape.

Step 4. Zoom into the central cluster to ensure that it is symmetric (roughly circular).

Step 5. Compute the maximum and standard deviation of the process time for each daemon encountered within the central cluster samples.

Step 6. Identify for each sample in the *L*-shape infrequent, long-running daemon executions.

Step 7. Determine potentially periodic daemons based on the *L*-executions and for each daemon compute the minimum process time from those executions identified.

Step 8. Perform Steps 1–6 above for a single run consisting of a small number of executions (specifically, 40) of *PUT16384*.

Step 9. Compute the cutoffs for each identified daemon.

Step 10. Discard an execution including a daemon of which process time is greater than the respective cutoff time.

**Fig. 3** Summary of the SEDONA Timing Protocol

of outliers far from the rest of the samples clustered in the bottom row. We will now drill down into these outliers to show how to reliably eliminate the indirect influence of some “infrequent, long-running daemons” on PT (process time) of the PUT.


To identify such daemons, we use a novel scatter plot: those of *pairs of successive samples*. So samples #1 and #2 form the first pair and samples #3 and #4 form the second pair. Such a pair is termed “*dual-PUT*.” A sample of dual-*PUT256*, for instance, consists of two consecutive (odd and even) samples of *PUT128*: sample #1 of dual-*PUT256* is equivalent to samples #1 and #2 of *PUT128*.

Fig. 4(b) presents such a scatter plot of 400 samples of a run of dual-*PUT256* constructed from a run of the 800 *PUT128* samples (Step 3). The *xy*-plane corresponds to the dual-*PUT* samples. For example, sample #2 of a run of dual-*PUT256* is plotted as a point with samples #3 and #4 of a run of *PUT128* on the respective *x* and *y* axes. In that sense the *x* (*y*) axis is named as “Odd (Even) Sample’s ET.” There are two quite obvious outliers with ETs of 163,913 ms (rightmost) and 161,785 ms (uppermost), respectively.

We informally term this phenomenon of a scatter plot of a dual-*PUT* run an “*L*-shape,” and attribute it to the presence of infrequent long-running daemons.

Figure 4(c) zooms into the lower left region, focusing on the tight cluster of samples. Interestingly, this plot continues to exhibit an *L*-shape, with perhaps a dozen or more *L*-samples in the left and bottom arms of the “*L*”, and again no samples in the upper right portion of the scatter plot.

We continue zooming until we get to Figure 4(d), which shows a central cluster (Step 4). We confirm the symmetry of the ET measurements in the central cluster: there is no *L*-shape, and thus no *L*-samples, and thus no obvious infrequent long-running daemons.



**Fig. 4** Successive Scatter Plots of PUT128 with 800 samples (equivalent to Dual-PUT256 with 400 samples) in Steps 2–4

We then perform Step 5, which computes the maximum process time and standard deviation of PT (process time, note the switch in emphasis from ET to PT) of the daemon processes (i.e. `flush-9:0`) observed in the central cluster samples in Fig. 4(d).

In Step 6 we identify, for each daemon in the *L*-samples, those that are actual long-running daemon executions. We define such executions as those whose PT is over two standard deviations above the maximum PT for that daemon in the central cluster samples. In the running example `flush-9:0`, `jbd2/md0-8`, and `md0 RAID1` are determined as infrequent, long-running. We also identify “extra” infrequent daemons: `bash`, `grep`, `rhn-check`, `rhnsd`, `rhsmcertd`, `rhsmcertd-worke`, and `sshd`, those found only in the *L*-samples but not in the central cluster.

For each of the infrequent daemons we use a heuristic to determine the daemon’s periodicity: the daemon must occur regularly in a sequence of samples. For instance, `rhn-check` appears roughly every 112 samples (or almost every four hours). Four others (`flush-9:0`, `jbd2/md0-8`, `md0 RAID1`, and `rhn-check`) all occur together and have a periodicity of about every 559 samples (5x longer, or just about 20 hours).

Next, we can compute for each so-identified infrequent, long-running daemon its minimum time in the *L*-samples (Step 7). This computation provides a rough, initial distinction of a “long-running” daemon, or the valley between the maximum PT from the central cluster and the minimum PT from the *L*-samples, to differentiate “short-running” from “long-running” executions of the daemon. For those daemons (i.e. `grep`) never appearing in the central cluster, this initial analysis concludes only that they are infrequent.

In Step 8 we repeat Steps 1–6, but instead with the much-longer running PUT16384 (4.5 hours per sample versus 2 minutes), to see if any of our identified infrequent daemons are actually frequent at that much longer PUT execution time. We find some frequent daemon processes appearing in both of the clusters of dual-PUT256 and dual-PUT32768, each consisting of pairs of two successive samples of PUT128 and PUT16384. That said, the central cluster also contains other processes not seen in the dual-PUT256 central cluster: `grep`, `rhn-check`, `rhnsd`, `rhsmcertd`, `rhsmcertd-worke`, and `sshd`. But these daemons were categorized in the dual-PUT256 analysis as *infrequent*, several having periodicities estimated at four or twenty hours. When PUT128 had a “short” program time (or, two minutes), daemons with a periodicity of hours are infrequent. But with PUT16384 with a “long” program time (or, 4.5 hours), some of those daemons are now frequent, and appear in the central cluster.

In Step 9 we compute the cutoff for each of those infrequent, long-running daemons so identified, based on the runs of PUT128 and PUT16384 as collected in Tab. 1. Here is how to compute the cutoff. For the cutoff of such a daemon with PUT128, we take the midpoint between the maximum of that daemon’s PTs in the central cluster (or 0, if absent) and the minimum of those in the *L*-samples. For the cutoff of such a daemon with PUT16384, we do the same. We then compute a “task time” as 5% of the inferred periodicity. This 5% ensures that such infrequent daemons will impact only a small percentage of the shorter PUTs, while presumably being associated with much larger cutoffs for the very long PUTs. We also include daemons that (a) were identified as infrequent and long-running from PUT128 and (b) were not identified as so in the PUT16384 *L*-samples, but may have in the dual-PUT32768 central cluster. We then take the *maximum* of the two cutoffs for the final cutoff PT (the last column of Tab. 1). (Note that different cutoff data from Tab. 1 may be yielded on a different kernel.)

Process Name	Cutoff PT on PUT128	Cutoff PT on PUT16K	Task Time	Final Cutoff PT
<code>bash</code>	1 msec	—	—	1 msec
<code>flush-9:0</code>	64 msec	—	< 1 hour ≥ 1 hour	64 msec 48 msec
<code>grep</code>	1 msec	12 msec	—	12 msec
<code>jbd2/md0-8</code>	4 msec	—	< 1 hour ≥ 1 hour	4 msec 11 msec
<code>md0 RAID1</code>	35 msec	—	< 1 hour ≥ 1 hour	35 msec 51 msec
<code>rhn-check</code>	281 msec	12,828 msec	< 12 min ≥ 12 min	281 msec 12,828 msec
<code>rhnsd</code>	2 msec	12 msec	< 12 min ≥ 12 min	2 msec 12 msec
<code>rhsmcertd</code>	1 msec	1 msec	—	1 msec
<code>rhsmcertd-worke</code>	57 msec	—	< 12 min ≥ 12 min	57 msec 119 msec
<code>sshd</code>	2 msec	23 msec	—	23 msec

**Table 1** Collected Infrequent, Long-running Daemons and Their Final Cutoff Process Time (Step 9)

Based on Tab. 1, we discard any sample containing an infrequent, long-running daemon execution over the corresponding cutoff. We thus end up dropping just fifteen of the 800 PUT128 samples and only two of the forty PUT16384 samples. As a result, the

overall measurement quality—the standard deviation and relative error—for PUT128 was improved by three orders of magnitude (as shown in Fig. 2) and by about two orders of magnitude for PUT16384.


### 3. Evaluation

We now evaluate the performance of SEDONA compared to that of the original timing scheme, termed ORG, based on elapsed time. Our experiments were conducted on a machine described in Table 2.

OS	Red Hat Ent. Linux (RHEL) 6.4 with a kernel of 2.6.32
CPU	Intel Core i7-870 Lynnfield 2.93GHz quad-core processor
RAM	4GB of DDR3 1333 dual-channel memory
HDD	Western Digital Caviar Black 1TB 7200rpm SATA Drive

**Table 2** Machine Configurations

First, we compared the performance of the two approaches using real-world programs such as insertion sort, termed SORT and matrix multiplication (in column major), termed MM. In this comparison SEDONA outperformed ORG, as can be seen in Fig. 5. As workload size increased, the performance gap between the two were increasingly widened, reaching up to by 6x.



(a) SORT - Standard Deviation (b) MM - Standard Deviation

**Fig. 5** Performance Comparison on Real-world Programs

In turn, our evaluation proceeded with SPEC CPU2006 benchmarks [11], providing various compute-bound real applications. The results are provided in Table 3. Note that in the table the results for 481 and 483 benchmarks are omitted because of some runtime error and incurred I/O, respectively.

Table 3 shows that SEDONA bettered ORG, on the standard deviation and relative error across the very different SPEC benchmarks. To be more specific, all the benchmarks revealed a smaller standard deviation from SEDONA as compared to that of ORG. Our timing protocol quite effectively filtered out infrequent daemon executions in the industrial workloads. The relative error of SEDONA was also lower than that of ORG for almost every benchmark. For example, about a 10x margin between the two resulted from 434.

SEDONA also scaled well for the SPEC workloads, with regard to growth of relative error as the execution time lengthened. For the short benchmarks (e.g. 400, 403, 410, 434, 445, and 999: those taking under 100 sec), our scheme outperformed the ORG method by about 3.5x, on average. The SEDONA protocol continued its dominance against the conventional technique for the medium-length benchmarks (e.g. 447, 456, 470, and 473). Even for the long-running benchmarks (e.g. 416, 436, and 454, both >1,000 sec), the relative error of SEDONA was still lower than that of ORG.

	Execution Time (ms)		Standard Deviation (ms)		Relative Error	
	ORG (in ET)	SED. (in PT)	ORG	SED.	ORG	SED.
400	454	445	3	2	$6 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
401	536,639	528,517	1,185	1,161	$2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2 \times 10^{-3}$
403	26,109	25,695	138	96	$5 \times 10^{-3}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$
410	7,938	7,801	46	19	$6 \times 10^{-3}$	$2 \times 10^{-3}$
416	1,015,342	999,846	965	876	$1 \times 10^{-3}$	$9 \times 10^{-4}$
429	235,811	232,209	623	600	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
433	480,586	473,256	743	725	$2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2 \times 10^{-3}$
434	16,495	16,242	75	7	$5 \times 10^{-3}$	$5 \times 10^{-4}$
435	990,575	975,445	947	900	$1 \times 10^{-3}$	$9 \times 10^{-4}$
436	1,160,742	1,143,078	3,914	3,843	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
437	581,635	572,775	1,492	1,475	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
444	591,201	582,229	294	281	$5 \times 10^{-4}$	$5 \times 10^{-4}$
445	84,435	83,164	91	28	$1 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-4}$
447	521,846	513,493	150	108	$3 \times 10^{-4}$	$2 \times 10^{-4}$
450	341,030	335,848	99	91	$3 \times 10^{-4}$	$2 \times 10^{-4}$
453	258,797	254,496	623	582	$2 \times 10^{-3}$	$2 \times 10^{-3}$
454	1,721,804	1,695,613	678	627	$4 \times 10^{-4}$	$4 \times 10^{-4}$
456	410,533	404,328	85	50	$2 \times 10^{-4}$	$1 \times 10^{-4}$
458	589,541	580,591	542	513	$9 \times 10^{-4}$	$9 \times 10^{-4}$
459	798,917	786,726	2,143	2,132	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$3 \times 10^{-3}$
462	595,188	586,120	3,326	3,274	$6 \times 10^{-3}$	$6 \times 10^{-3}$
464	649,838	639,939	601	563	$9 \times 10^{-4}$	$9 \times 10^{-4}$
465	895,754	882,106	883	797	$1 \times 10^{-3}$	$1 \times 10^{-3}$
470	349,830	344,510	143	94	$4 \times 10^{-4}$	$3 \times 10^{-4}$
471	367,589	361,959	2,114	2,072	$6 \times 10^{-4}$	$6 \times 10^{-4}$
473	362,587	357,090	359	317	$1 \times 10^{-3}$	$9 \times 10^{-4}$
482	654,208	644,223	2,436	2,392	$4 \times 10^{-3}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$
998	128	127	0.6	0.6	$4 \times 10^{-3}$	$4 \times 10^{-3}$
999	128	127	0.8	0.6	$6 \times 10^{-3}$	$5 \times 10^{-3}$
Averages			852	815	$3 \times 10^{-3}$	$2 \times 10^{-3}$

**Table 3** Performance Evaluation on the SPEC Benchmarks

To summarize, our proposed SEDONA protocol can achieve *better* accuracy, precision, and scalability in measuring the execution time of real compute-bound programs than the ET-based existing method. The experimental results demonstrate the general applicability of SEDONA to timing any CPU-bound program.

### 4. Conclusion

We proposed a novel timing protocol called *SEDONA*, and performed an empirical evaluation to show that it is more precise and accurate than the extant method.

### References

- [1] Currim, S. et al., “DBMS Metrology: Measuring Query Time,” ACM TODS, vol.42, no.1, pp.3:1–3:42, Nov. 2016.
- [2] Intel, “Intel Turbo Boost Technology 2.0.” <http://intel.com/content/www/us/en/architecture-and-technology/turbo-boost/turbo-boost-technology.html>, accessed 2016.
- [3] Intel, “Enhanced Intel SpeedStep® Technology.” <http://intel.com/content/www/us/en/support/processors/000005723.html>, accessed 2016.
- [4] Linux Programmer’s Manual, “Netlink - Communication between Kernel and User Space (AF.NETLINK).” <http://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man7/netlink.7.html>.
- [5] C.C. Mcgeoch, **A Guide to Experimental Algorithmics**, Cambridge University Express, 2012.
- [6] E.R. Bryant and D.R. O’Hallaron, **Computer Systems: A Programmers Perspective**, Addison Wesley, 2002.
- [7] Odom, J. et al., “Using Dynamic Tracing Sampling to Measure Long Running Programs,” SC’05, p.59.
- [8] Intel, “VTune™ Amplifier XE 2013.” <https://software.intel.com/en-us/intel-vtune-amplifier-xe>.
- [9] TimeSys Corporation, “Timesys LinuxLink.” <http://www.timesys.com/embedded-linux/linuxlink>, accessed 2016.
- [10] Wind River, “Wind River Workbench.” <http://www.windriver.com/products/product-notes/workbench-product-note.pdf>, accessed 2016.
- [11] C.D. Spradling, “SPEC CPU2006 Benchmark Tools,” SIGARCH Comp. Arch. News, vol.35, March 2007.