

Ripple: A Practical Declarative Programming Framework for Serverless Compute

Shannon Joyner¹, Michael MacCoss², Christina Delimitrou¹, and Hakim Weatherspoon¹

¹Cornell University, ²University of Washington

¹{sj677,delimitrou,hw228}@cornell.edu, ²maccoss@uw.edu

Abstract

Serverless computing has emerged as a promising alternative to infrastructure- (IaaS) and platform-as-a-service (PaaS) cloud platforms for applications with ample parallelism and intermittent activity. Serverless promises greater resource elasticity, significant cost savings, and simplified application deployment. All major cloud providers, including Amazon, Google, and Microsoft, have introduced serverless to their public cloud offerings. For serverless to reach its potential, there is a pressing need for programming frameworks that abstract the deployment complexity away from the user. This includes simplifying the process of writing applications for serverless environments, automating task and data partitioning, and handling scheduling and fault tolerance.

We present Ripple, a programming framework designed to specifically take applications written for single-machine execution and allow them to take advantage of the task parallelism of serverless. Ripple exposes a simple interface that users can leverage to express the high-level dataflow of a wide spectrum of applications, including machine learning (ML) analytics, genomics, and proteomics. Ripple also automates resource provisioning, meeting user-defined QoS targets, and handles fault tolerance by eagerly detecting straggler tasks. We port Ripple over AWS Lambda and show that, across a set of diverse applications, it provides an expressive and generalizable programming framework that simplifies running data-parallel applications on serverless, and can improve performance by up to 80x compared to IaaS/PaaS clouds for similar costs.

1. Introduction

An increasing number of popular applications are hosted on public clouds [22, 23, 33, 44, 54]. These include many interactive, latency-critical services with intermittent activity, for which the current Infrastructure-as-a-Service (IaaS) or Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS) resource models result in cost inefficiencies, due to idle resources. Serverless computing has emerged over the past few years as a cost-efficient alternative for such applications, with the added benefit that the cloud provider handles all data management, simplifying deployment and maintenance for the end user. Under a serverless framework, the cloud provider offers fine-grained resource allocations to users who only pay a small amount for them when a task is executing, resulting in much lower hosting costs.

Several cloud providers have introduced serverless offerings to their public cloud models, including AWS Lambda [4], Google Functions [10], and Azure Functions [11]. In all cases, with small variations, a user launches one or more “functions”,

which the provider maps to one or more machines. Functions take less than a second to spawn, and most providers allow the user to spawn hundreds of functions in parallel. This makes serverless a good option for extremely parallelizable tasks, or for services with intermittent activity and long idle periods.

Big data, scientific, and certain classes of machine learning (ML) analytics are good candidates for serverless, as they tend to have ample task parallelism, and their storage and compute requirements continue to increase exponentially [27, 47, 65, 70]. Hosting such services on traditional IaaS and PaaS clouds incurs significantly higher costs compared to serverless, since instances need to be maintained for long periods of time to ensure low start-up latencies. Alternatively, if optimizing for cost, tasks from large jobs are subject to long queueing times until resources become available, despite tasks being ready to execute. When the input load is bursty the reverse is also true, with provisioned resources remaining idle during periods of low load. While cloud providers have auto-scaling systems in place to provide some elasticity in the number of allocated instances as load fluctuates [3], elasticity is offered at instance granularity. Additionally, scaling out is not instantaneous, resulting in unpredictable or degraded performance, which is especially harmful for short-running tasks.

The premise of serverless is improving *resource elasticity*, and *cost efficiency*. To realize this we need programming frameworks that can (i) extract parallelism from existing cloud applications, (ii) simplify writing new applications for serverless compute, (iii) manage data dependencies between functions transparently to the user, and (iv) automatically handle resource elasticity, data partitioning, fault tolerance, and task scheduling to mask the performance unpredictability public clouds are subject to [21, 34, 35, 45, 66, 67, 74–76].

Serverless frameworks additionally need to be programmable enough for users to express generic applications at a high-level, and flexible enough to circumvent the limitations of current serverless offerings, such as AWS Lambda, which limits each function to 512MB of disk space and a 15 minute runtime. Existing analytics and ML frameworks, like Hadoop [68], Spark [2], and TensorFlow [16], can handle some of these requirements, but need to run over an active cluster by default. This is problematic in the case of serverless frameworks where resources are frequently allocated and reclaimed, requiring the framework to be re-deployed across runs. Additionally, such general-purpose frameworks are storage-demanding, in terms of both memory and disk, consuming a large fraction of the limited system resources allocated per serverless function.

We present *Ripple*, a programming framework designed specifically for serverless computing platforms that run highly data-parallel applications. *Ripple* exposes a high-level declarative programming interface that enables programmers to express the inherent parallelism in their computation, as well as phases that must be executed serially. The framework is general enough to capture execution patterns of a wide range of analytics and scientific applications, including ML analytics and bioinformatics. *Ripple* uses serverless for all computation phases, removing the need for maintaining long-term instances. It also handles work partitioning automatically, assigning input data chunks to serverless functions, and synchronizing them when required. *Ripple* also allows users to express priorities and deadlines for their jobs, implementing a variety of scheduling policies, including round-robin, FIFO, and deadline-based scheduling. Furthermore, *Ripple* leverages information about previously-seen jobs to automatically infer the degree of concurrency (number of Lambdas per phase) that will allow a new job to meet its QoS requirements. Finally, it handles fault tolerance transparently to the user, respawning failing or under-performing tasks.

We evaluate *Ripple* using AWS Lambda. The design of the framework is portable across serverless frameworks, including Google Functions and Azure Functions, with minimal modifications. We focus on three large-scale cloud frameworks, a proteomics framework, DNA compression, and a kNN-based classification service used to identify buildings in satellite imaging data [15, 24, 63]. We show that *Ripple* offers a simple way for users to express the pipelines of complex applications in a few lines of code, and that serverless computing offers dramatic performance improvements for data-parallel applications, especially as the size of their datasets increases. Specifically, we show that *Ripple* can be up to 80× faster than an EC2 cluster, and 30% cheaper than PyWren [49] for a similar runtime. We also demonstrate that *Ripple* automatically handles the resource provisioning of a given job meeting its QoS target, and can support different scheduling and fault tolerance mechanisms that further improve performance predictability. *Ripple* is open-source software under a GPL license.

2. Background

2.1. Advantages of Serverless

Serverless allocates fine-grained resources for a limited time, which reduces the overprovisioning problem current datacenters experience [30–34, 36, 57, 66]. It also simplifies cloud management; users simply upload the code they wish to execute to the cloud, and cloud providers handle the state management and resource provisioning. If an application has ample




Figure 1: Overview of *Ripple*'s operation, from converting a monolithic application to serverless, to profiling and deploying the service to AWS Lambda.

serverless achieves much better performance for comparable cost to traditional PaaS or IaaS platforms [40, 42, 43].

Users only pay when a serverless function is running, making the model well-suited for applications with intermittent activity. Traditional cloud instances can be rented and freed up on-demand, but initializing a new instance takes at least 30s. In comparison, spawning and destroying a serverless function takes a few milliseconds. For short-running tasks that complete in a few seconds, the overhead of instantiating and releasing cloud instances can have a dramatic impact on execution latency. Some of the most popular serverless computing offerings at the moment include AWS Lambda, Google Functions, Azure Functions, OpenLambda, and OpenWhisk [1, 4, 10, 11, 48].

2.2. Limitations of Serverless

Despite its increasing popularity, serverless still needs to overcome several system challenges. First, while cloud providers make triggering serverless functions easy, they do not currently offer an easy way to share state between functions. If a user wants to combine results from multiple functions, or save state to use later in the pipeline, this state needs to be saved in remote storage – S3 for AWS Lambda – potentially degrading application performance [4, 5]. Second, current serverless functions are resource-constrained, typically being limited to a single CPU, a couple GB of memory, and a few hundred MB of disk space. This limits the type of computation that can be hosted on serverless, especially given the fact that current platforms do not offer a way for users to partition their work to functions in a programmable and systematic way. This is especially challenging for non-expert cloud users running applications with complex workflows, where the degree of available parallelism varies across execution phases. Third, despite the increased visibility cloud providers have into serverless applications as opposed to traditional PaaS- or IaaS-hosted applications, current platforms still do not have a way for users to express a quality-of-service (QoS) target for their applications that the cloud provider must meet. This is especially detrimental in serverless frameworks where resource sharing, even of a single CPU, is much more prevalent

Ripple Programming Interface		
	Description	Arguments
split	Split a file into small data chunks	<code>split_size</code> : (optional) Number of lines per chunk; default 1MB.
combine	Combine multiple files	<code>identifier</code> : (optional) Field to sort resulting items by.
top	Return the top items in a file	<code>identifier</code> : Field to sort items by. <code>number</code> : Number of items to return.
match	Match files to <code>i</code> keyword	<code>find</code> : Property to look for; e.g., highest score sum. <code>identifier</code> : Field to sort items by.
map	Map each item to an input	<code>input_key</code> : Key parameter to set input name to for next phase. <code>map_table</code> : Table containing list of files to map. <code>table_key</code> : Key parameter to set table name to for next phase. <code>directories</code> : (optional) Use table directories to map.
sort	Sort file using Radix sort	<code>identifier</code> : Field to sort items by.
partition	Return <code>n</code> equally spaced ranges (used for Radix sort)	<code>identifier</code> : Field used to partition the items into ranges.
run	Invoke Lambda function	<code>application</code> : The name of the application file to execute. <code>output_format</code> : (optional) Format of the output file.

Table 1: The programming interface of Ripple.

than in traditional cloud systems, and hence applications are more prone to unpredictable performance due to interference.

The challenges and opportunities of serverless put increased pressure on programming frameworks that simplify porting traditional cloud applications on to serverless platforms in a way that masks their current limitations.

3. Ripple Design

We propose Ripple, a general-purpose programming framework for serverless that targets applications with ample parallelism. Ripple follows the model of a high-level declarative language; a user expresses a job’s dataflow at a high level, and Ripple abstracts away the complexity of data partitioning (Sec. 3.1), task scheduling (Sec. 3.4), resource provisioning (Sec. 3.2), and fault tolerance (Sec. 3.3). Fig. 1 shows the high-level overview of the framework.

3.1. Ripple Programming Framework

Ripple exposes a concise programming interface of eight principal functions that users can leverage to express the most common parts of their services’ dataflow, including parallel and serial phases, and dependencies between dataflow stages. Each function can be used in one or more stages of a job. The programming interface is shown in Table 1. Apart from the eight functions in the table, users can also upload arbitrary operations, and invoke them through the run function.

Algorithm 1 shows an example Ripple application for porting a simple DNA compression algorithm to AWS Lambda. The `config` parameter contains the basic setup parameters, such as the default amount of memory to use for functions. The `pipeline` is initialized by specifying the job configuration and the result and logs locations. Next, an input variable

```
import ripple
// Configure region and Lambda resources
config = {
  "region": "use-west-2",
  "role": "aws-role",
  "memory_size": 2240,
}
// Express computation phases
pipeline = ripple.Pipeline(
  name="compression",
  table="s3://my-bucket",
  log="s3://my-log",
  timeout=600,
  config=config
)
// Define input data
in = pipeline.input(format="new_line")
// Declare how to sort input data
step = input.sort(
  identifier="start_position",
  params={"split_size": 500*1000*1000},
  config={"memory_size": 3008}
)
// Declare compression method
step = step.run(
  "compress_methyl",
  params={"pbucket": "s3://my-program"}
)
// Create and upload functions
pipeline.compile("json/compile.json")
```

Listing 1: Ripple Configuration for DNA Compression.

is declared. The input variable declares the data format of the input dataset, which helps Ripple determine how to split and manipulate the data. The input DNA files can be gigabytes in size, significantly more than the 512MB of disk space or 3GB of memory space offered by Lambda. The compression algorithm relies on finding sequences with similar prefixes. Therefore, Ripple calls `sort` on the input file, which sorts the file into 500MB chunks. The user can also provide an

application-specific hint on the split size a function should handle. In this example, `sort` needs more than 2240MB, so the memory allocation is 3008MB instead. The next step compresses the input shards, invoked via Ripple’s `run` function. The application function returns the paths of the files that Ripple should pass to the next pipeline step.

Once the user specifies all execution steps, they can compile the pipeline, which generates the JSON file Ripple uses to set up the serverless functions. Ripple then uploads the code and dependencies to AWS, and schedules the generated tasks.

3.2. Automating Resource Provisioning

One of the main premises of serverless is simplifying resource provisioning, by letting the cloud provider handle resource allocation and elastic scaling. Serverless frameworks today still do not achieve that premise, by requiring the user to specify the number of serverless functions a job is partitioned across. In addition to allowing users to specify priorities among their jobs (Sec. 3.4), Ripple also automates the resource provisioning and scaling process for submitted applications. Specifically, when a new application is submitted to AWS Lambda via Ripple, the user also expresses a deadline that the job needs to complete before [69,72]. Ripple uses that deadline to determine the right resources for that job, depending on whether the job consists of one or multiple phases.

Single-phase jobs: This is the simplest type of serverless jobs, where the input data is partitioned, processed, and the result is combined, and either stored on S3 or sent directly to the user. In this case, Ripple just needs to determine the number of Lambdas needed for processing. Ripple uses a two-step process to determine the appropriate degree of concurrency. First it selects a small partition of the original input dataset, $\min(20\text{MB}, \text{full_input})$, called *canary input*.¹ By default Ripple selects the canary input starting from the beginning of the dataset, unless otherwise specified by the user. It then uses the canary input as the input dataset for two small jobs, each with different data split sizes per Lambda. One job runs with the default split size for AWS Lambda, 1MB, and the other with the split size Lambdas would have if the job used its maximum allowed concurrency limit (1,000 on AWS by default). To track task progress when enforcing different resource allocations, Ripple implements a simple tracing system detailed in Sec. 4. Ripple’s tracing system collects the per-Lambda and per-job execution time (including the overheads for work partitioning and result combining), and uses this information to infer the performance of the job with any split size. Inference happens via Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD), where SGD’s input is a table with jobs as rows and split sizes as columns. SGD has been shown to accurately infer the performance of applications on non-profiled configurations, using only a small amount of profiling information [30, 33, 51, 53], in the context of cluster scheduling, heterogeneous multicore configuration,

¹The 20MB lower limit is determined empirically to be sufficient for our applications, and can be tuned for different services.

and storage system configuration. As new jobs are scheduled by Ripple, the number of rows in the table increases. Given that input dataset sizes varies across jobs, the table includes profiling information on a diverse set of split sizes, including one split size (default=1MB) that is consistent across all jobs.

Once Ripple determines the level of concurrency that will achieve a job’s specified deadline, it launches the full application and monitors its performance. If measured performance deviates from the estimated performance with that degree of concurrency, Ripple updates the table with the measured information to improve prediction accuracy over time.

Apart from specifying per-job deadlines, users can also request that Ripple tries to achieve the best possible performance for a job, given AWS’s resource limits, or alternatively, they can specify an upper limit for the cost they are willing to spend for a job, in which case Ripple maximizes performance under that cost constraint.

Multi-phase jobs: Typical serverless applications involve multiple phases of high concurrency, which may be interleaved with sequential phases that combine intermediate results. The process Ripple follows to provision such jobs is similar to the one described above, with the difference that columns in the SGD table are now ratios of concurrency degrees across phases. Ripple also needs to increase the number of canary runs to ensure high prediction accuracy from two for single-phase jobs to four for multi-phase jobs. Split sizes per phase are selected in $[1\text{MB}, \text{fullDataset}/\text{maxLambdas}]$ as before. If measured performance deviates from estimated, Ripple again updates the corresponding column in the table to improve accuracy the next time a similar job is scheduled.

Note that higher Lambda concurrency does not necessarily translate to better performance for three reasons. First, getting a speedup as Lambdas increase is contingent on the available parallelism in a job’s computation. Applications with a low inherent parallelism will not benefit from a higher degree of concurrency, while also incurring higher costs for the increased number of serverless functions. Second, parallelism does not come for free, as work and data needs to be partitioned and distributed across tasks, and results need to be reassembled and combined before computation can proceed. This is especially the case for multi-stage job pipelines, where parallel phases are interleaved with phases that combine intermediate results. Third, a larger number of concurrent serverless functions also increases the probability that some of these tasks will become stragglers and degrade the entire job’s execution time.

Obtaining a small amount of profiling information before provisioning a new job allows Ripple to identify if either of the first two reasons that would prevent a job from benefiting from higher concurrency are present. The third reason is impacted both by job characteristics, e.g., faulty data chunks can cause some Lambdas to become stragglers, and by the state of the serverless cluster, e.g., some Lambdas can underperform due to interference between tasks sharing system resources. To

address underperforming tasks, we also implement a fault tolerance mechanism in Ripple, detailed below.

3.3. Fault Tolerance

Task failures are common in data-parallel analytics jobs. Furthermore, straggler tasks are a well-documented occurrence, where a small number of under-performing tasks delay the completion of the entire application [17, 19, 20, 46, 55, 73]. AWS Lambda does not provide handlers to running functions, therefore a function’s progress cannot be directly monitored. Instead, Ripple collects execution logs for each Lambda request based on when they write to S3. These logs do not only prevent duplicate requests, but contain payload information to re-execute failed Lambda processes. If Ripple detects that a function has not been logged within the user-specified timeout period from its instantiation, it will re-execute that function. This also helps minimize the impact of stragglers, as Ripple can eagerly respawn tasks that are likely to under-perform.

3.4. Scheduling Policies

Cloud users typically submit more than one job to a public cloud provider. AWS Lambda at the moment implements a simple FIFO² scheduling policy, which means that Lambdas submitted first will also start running first. This does not allow a lot of flexibility, especially when different jobs have different priorities or must meet execution time deadlines.

Ripple implements several scheduling policies users can select when they submit their applications. To prevent conflicts between scheduling policies specified in different jobs, a scheduling policy applies to all active jobs managed by Ripple. Ripple precomputes the best task schedule based on the specified scheduling policies, and enforces scheduling policies by reordering tasks client-side, and deploying them in that order on AWS Lambda. Below we summarize each scheduling policy supported in Ripple.

FIFO: This is the default scheduling policy implemented by AWS Lambda. Functions are executed in the order of submission. Under scenarios of high load, FIFO can lead to long queueing latencies.

Round-Robin: Ripple interleaves the phases of each job to allocate approximately equivalent time intervals to each application. Round-Robin penalizes the execution time of the first few jobs, but reduces queueing delays, and improves fairness compared to FIFO.

Priorities: Priorities in Ripple are defined at job granularity, with high-priority jobs superseding concurrently-submitted low-priority jobs. If a high priority job arrives when the user has reached their resource quota on Lambda (1,000 active Lambdas by default), Ripple will pause low priority jobs, schedule the high priority application, and resume the former when the high priority job has completed. Applications

²Launching Lambdas happens in a “mostly” FIFO order, however the exact ordering is not strictly enforced.

of equal priorities revert to Round-Robin. Unless otherwise specified, we use the FIFO scheduler by default.

4. Implementation

Ripple is written in approximately 5,000 lines of code in Python, including application specific code and configurations. The eight functions shown in Table 1 are also written in Python. A user can create arbitrary functions, as long as the functions adhere to Ripple’s run template. Currently, Ripple supports interactions with AWS Lambda and S3. However, Ripple’s API has been designed to be abstractable to other providers, including Windows Azure and Google.

Job configuration: A user ports a new application by using the Ripple API to create the application pipeline. This pipeline is compiled to a JSON configuration file. The configuration file indicates which Lambda functions to use and the order in which to execute the functions. If the application requires manipulation of file formats that the framework does not support by default—such as newline separated, TSV, FASTA, mzML)—, users simply need to implement a format file for the framework to know how to parse the input files. Users also need to create two tables: one to store the input, intermediate, and output files, and another for the log files Ripple maintains to manage the execution of functions.

To deploy an application, the user follows an automated setup process in Ripple, which takes their configuration file and uploads all necessary code to AWS. The maximum deployment package size AWS currently allows is 50MB. However, AWS provides layers for users to import extra dependencies. Ripple checks the user’s program for a list of common dependencies, such as `numpy` or `scikit-learn`, and links the functions to their corresponding dependencies [12, 13]. If the layer does not exist, the user can create and add the new layer to Ripple. Ripple does not use any additional containerization or virtualization processes beyond what AWS Lambda implements by default.

Tracing and monitoring: Ripple needs to monitor the execution of active functions to adhere to the specified scheduling policies, and ensure performant and fault tolerant operation. Since AWS Lambda does not provide handlers to active functions, Ripple periodically polls S3 to see if a function has finished, and records the function instantiation and completion events in its execution log. The asynchronous nature of Lambda makes identifying failed functions challenging. For every job, Ripple spawns a thread to monitor the job’s progress based on its logs. Ripple waits until the timeout period specified by the user for a given function’s log. If the log does not appear, Ripple re-invokes the function. For scheduling algorithms, such as deadline-based scheduling, Ripple needs the ability to “pause” a job. To enable this, we specify a pause parameter for each job that indicates when functions for that job should stop executing. To re-execute, Ripple re-triggers the pipeline, and checks if the task has already executed. If so,

Application	JSON file	run functions
SpaceNet	16	250
Proteomics	25	86
DNA Compression	13	36

Table 2: Lines of Ripple code for each application. “JSON file” shows the LoC for the configuration file, and “run functions” shows the LoC for the specific logic of the application.

the function simply re-triggers its child processes. We have verified that the tracing system has no noticeable impact on either Lambda throughput or latency.

Testing library: Due to the asynchronous nature of serverless, testing can be difficult as logs are spread over multiple files. Ripple contains logic to make testing code easier. A user can specify files to use as source data and Ripple will locally and serially go through each stage of the pipeline.

Fault tolerance: Finally, Ripple itself may fail for a number of reasons, including network outage, server failure, or internal error. To ensure that such a failure does not leave active functions unmanaged, we maintain Ripple’s execution log in persistent storage, such that, if a failure occurs, a hot stand-by master can take over management of the service.

5. Applications

We use three applications to demonstrate the practicality and generality of Ripple. In all cases, the modifications needed to port the original applications to Ripple are minimal. Ripple exposes a high-level declarative interface, which enables users to take code designed to run on a single-machine and port it to a serverless platform. Below we describe each of the application frameworks we port on Ripple. The logic of the protein analytics and DNA compression applications did not require any changes to be ported to Ripple. The SpaceNet Building Border Identification application was reimplemented in Python, given AWS’s languages limitations. Table 2 shows the Ripple lines of code needed for the Ripple JSON configuration file, and for the run function that is specific to each application’s logic.

5.1. SpaceNet Building Border Identification

SpaceNet hosts a series of challenges, including identifying buildings from satellite images [15]. The developers provide TIFF training and test images of different areas, only some of which contain buildings. We implemented our own solution for this challenge using a K-Nearest Neighbor (kNN) algorithm [14]. For each pixel in the training images, we use the SpaceNet solutions to classify the pixel as a border, inside or outside the building. In the test image, we identify the most similar pixels in the training images, and classify the test pixels accordingly. SpaceNet offers both high resolution, 3-band images, and low resolution, 8-band images. For our experiments, we used the 3-band training and test images. Fig. 2




Figure 2: Pipeline for SpaceNet. The convert shards the input data. map pairs test with training data chunks. The KNN stage performs a brute force KNN. The first combine stage finds the absolute nearest neighbors for every pixel, and the second combine stage combines all results into one file. The last stage colors the identified border pixels.

shows the Ripple pipeline for SpaceNet.

5.2. Proteomics

Tide is a protein analytics tool used for analyzing protein sequences [24]. Tide takes experimental data and scores them




Figure 3: Proteomics with Tide [24]. We first split the input into shards. Next, Tide, determines the protein composition of each chunk. The output is processed by Percolator.

against theoretical sequences, defined in a file containing protein sequences predicted from the genome sequence [24, 39]. Experimental sequences are in mzML format, an XML-based format [25, 59], and theoretical sequences are in FASTA format [38]. Results from Tide are often given to an ML application called Percolator to score the confidence of the protein composition identification [50]. We evaluate both Tide and Percolator in a single pipeline. Fig. 3 shows the Ripple pipeline for the proteomics application.

5.3. DNA Compression

METHCOMP is an application to compress and decompress DNA methylation data [63]. The data from this pipeline are stored in a BED format, which is newline delimited [6]. This format remains human-readable, but readability comes at the expense of high storage costs. Nonetheless, METHCOMP is both memory- and disk-intensive and the algorithm does not use threads or multiple cores by default. Figure 4 shows the Ripple pipeline for the METHCOMP application. The compression pipeline was modified to sort the input dataset.

6. Methodology

We run each application on AWS Lambda using Ripple. Unless otherwise specified, we run experiments in regions that had a max concurrency of 1,000 functions. We compare Ripple to two other setups; AWS EC2 with resource autoscaling [3],




Figure 4: Pipeline for DNA compression. The input BED file is sorted using Radix sort. This involves finding pivots in chunk segments. Once pivots are found, the file is split, and chunks are compressed in parallel.

and PyWren [49].

EC2 Autoscaling: We use the Amazon Elastic MapReduce (EMR) cluster to compare Ripple to EC2 autoscaling. EMR only allows servers to be added if usage for one or more resources (CPU, memory) is above a certain threshold for more than five minutes. Figure 5 shows how Tide scales using EMR’s default policy if a job is sent every 10 seconds for an hour. A server is added if CPU utilization is above 70%, and removed if CPU utilization is below 30%. The bottom portion of the graph shows the number of pending jobs. The default 5 minute scaling policy could not handle rapid load increases, taking almost 2 hours to process all requests and an additional 2 hours to terminate all servers.

To show that even a more agile version of EC2’s autoscaling has suboptimal elasticity compared to Ripple, we also implemented a version of EC2 autoscaling that increments and decrements instances at 10s granularity. We implemented this policy using the boto3 API, and ran all jobs inside Docker containers to simplify scaling out [7, 8]. Since the Docker containers often needed significant disk space, for every EC2 machine, we allocated a 26GB volume of persistent storage.

PyWren: PyWren is an open-source programming framework for serverless, and the most closely-related prior work to Ripple [49]. PyWren is designed following the MapReduce style of distributed processing, with mappers running on AWS Lambda as a single map phase, followed by reducers running on traditional EC2 instances.

Below we describe each application’s setup in Ripple, PyWren, and EC2.

6.1. SpaceNet Building Border Identification

We use 1,000 images to train the border classifier. The feature vector for each pixel was the RGB value of the pixel and its 8 surrounding neighbors. We store these results in an S3 bucket. For each test image, we use the 100 closest neighbors to classify a pixel. Finally, we color the identified border pixels. For all implementations, we use the scikit-learn library to compute kNN using brute force [13]. For SpaceNet, we ran all Lambda experiments in a region where the max concurrency was 5K functions.

Ripple setup: We create a function to convert TIFF testing images to their feature vectors. Given the amount of training and testing data, we split testing images into subsets of 1,000 pixels, and mapped each subset to a subset of training data to

run kNN. This typically resulted in approximately 180 subsets of pixels, each paired with around 40 chunks of training data, and a total of 7K Lambdas. Results are combined in two phases; the first phase found the absolute 100 nearest neighbors for each pixel, and the second phase concatenated the partial outputs. Each pipeline stage is triggered when the output of the previous phase is written to S3.

PyWren setup:

For fairness, we attempted to run all parallel tasks on Lambda; however, the first combine step caused out of memory errors on Lambda; we subsequently moved the combine tasks to a r4.16xlarge EC2 instance.

EC2 setup: Computing the k nearest neighbors is very memory intensive, so we use r5a.xlarge machines.




Figure 5: Tide runtime on EC2 for a uniform simulation using the default autoscaling policy (in 5min intervals).

6.2. Proteomics

Ripple setup: Tide frequently consumes more than the max 3GB offered by Lambda. Therefore, the first step is splitting the mzML input file into small chunks. We then run Tide on each file. Afterwards, we combine the results in a single output file. For all experiments, we used human FASTA files.

PyWren setup: Tide is both CPU- and memory-intensive, therefore we use Lambda for parallel phases, and a t2.xlarge EC2 instance for serial computation.

EC2 setup: We again use t2.xlarge instances.

6.3. DNA Compression

Ripple setup: We first use Ripple’s sort to sort the input so that similar sequences are near each other, and subsequently compress each data chunk.

PyWren setup: We again use Lambda for parallel phases, and a t2.xlarge EC2 instance for serial computation.

EC2 setup: As before, we use t2.xlarge instances.

7. Evaluation

Below, we answer five questions, pertaining to the performance, cost, fault tolerance, and scalability of Ripple, as well as its ability to preserve the QoS requirements of diverse jobs.

- How able is Ripple’s provisioning system to preserve QoS for incoming jobs (Sec. 7.1)?
- How robust is Ripple across job distributions (Sec. 7.2)?
- How does Ripple compare to PyWren (Sec. 7.3)?
- How does Ripple scale as job concurrency increases (Sec. 7.4)?




Figure 6: (a) Error between execution time estimated by SGD in Ripple across the three applications, and measured execution time with the corresponding resource configuration. (b) Performance with Ripple compared to using the default 1MB data chunks per Lambda, and the maximum number of Lambdas allowed, across the three applications.

Application	Cost		
	Ripple	1MB	Max Lambdas
SpaceNet	\$2.77	\$3.81	\$4.61
Proteomics	\$0.42	\$0.61	\$0.53
DNA Compression	\$0.36	\$0.51	\$0.42

Table 3: Cost across applications for (i) Ripple, (ii) the default split size, and (iii) the max number of concurrent Lambdas.

- How does the fault tolerance mechanism in Ripple affect application performance (Sec. 7.5)?

7.1. Automated Provisioning

Performance estimation accuracy: We first examine Ripple’s ability to correctly provision resources in a serverless cluster. We assume that jobs from all three applications are submitted, and for simplicity, each job is trying to maximize its performance, instead of specifying a particular deadline. As discussed in Section 3, Ripple will first launch two short-lived canary runs for each job, with different degrees of concurrency, apply SGD to infer their performance with all other concurrency degrees, and determine the configuration that minimizes execution time for each new job. Fig. 6a shows the distribution of error between the performance estimated by Ripple using Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) and the actual performance measured on an AWS Lambda cluster when running with the corresponding degree of concurrency. Errors are low across all three applications, which allows Ripple to accurately determine the number of Lambdas per execution phase that will maximize an application’s performance. The higher errors at the tails of the three violin plots correspond to the first few jobs that arrive, at which point Ripple’s knowledge of application characteristics is limited, and the number of applications in the SGD matrix is small. As more applications arrive in the system, the estimation accuracy improves.

Profiling and inference with SGD incur some scheduling overheads to each application. For the examined applications, profiling overheads range from 260ms for jobs with 1-3 stages to 6s for jobs with many stages, like the kNN classification. Inference overheads are less than 60ms in all cases. Aggregate

overheads are always less than 4% of the job’s execution time.

Performance predictability: Fig. 6b shows the distribution of execution time for 100 jobs of each application class with Ripple’s provisioning mechanism, compared to (i) using the default 1MB data chunk size, and (ii) always using the maximum number of Lambdas that AWS allows (1,000 for our setting). Across all application classes Ripple achieves the best performance, especially in the case of kNN classification, where resource demands are high, and incorrect provisioning has a severe impact on execution time. More importantly, performance with Ripple is highly predictable, despite the framework not having control over where serverless functions are physically placed on AWS. This is in part because Ripple selects the number of Lambdas to be sufficient to exploit the job’s parallelism, but not high enough to cause long queueing delays from AWS’s resource limit, and in part because of Ripple’s straggler detection technique. Straggler respawning reduces variability by respawning the few tasks that are underperforming due to interference or faulty data records.

In comparison, execution time for the 1MB and maxLambdas policies varies widely and experiences long tails, especially when using the maximum concurrency allowed. There are two reasons for this. First, when using the default data chunk size with very large input datasets, as is the case with the examined applications, the number of total Lambdas that need to execute exceeds the total allowed limit by a lot, leading to long queueing delays, as functions wait for resources to become available. Even if AWS’s resource limit increased, fine-grained parallelism does not come for free, incurring overheads for work partitioning, synchronization, and combining the per-function outputs. Second, when using the maximum number of allowed Lambdas with large datasets, e.g., 500GB, each function is still responsible for a large amount of data, 333MB in this case. Given the strict time limit Lambdas have today, this causes several functions to time out and be respawned by AWS. Note that this is not a case of a function becoming a straggler, and Ripple’s straggler respawning technique would only increase the system load further by respawning functions that will time out again.

Table 3 also shows the cost for each policy across applications. Ripple incurs the lowest cost, since it avoids excessive task queueing and respawning. The maxLambdas policy has the highest cost in the resource-intensive SpaceNet application which results in many Lambdas timing out and needing to rerun, while for the other two scenarios, the excessive number of Lambdas used by the 1MB default split size policy incurs the highest cost, since the increased number of Lambdas does not also result in faster execution.

7.2. Workload Distributions

We now show Ripple’s elasticity under different job arrival distributions, compared to Amazon EC2. We examine uniform, bursty, and diurnal load patterns.




Figure 7: Tide performance under uniform load, with 1 job per 10s. (a) and (b) show the total vCPUs used (green), and the total (brown) and running jobs on the top (red). In the bottom, we show the pending jobs waiting to run (yellow).




Figure 8: Tide performance under bursty load (1 job/min). Every 90 min, a burst of 100 jobs arrives. (a) and (b) show the used vCPUs (green), and the total (brown) and running jobs (red). The bottom shows the pending jobs (yellow).

Uniform: In the case of the Tide proteomics framework, we create a uniform workload by sending a new job every 10s for an hour. Figure 7 shows that both for EC2 and Lambda, due to the frequency of job arrivals, there is always at least a task running, with Ripple being able to immediately scale to meet the resource demands. EC2 was able to handle the input load once enough machines were launched, but as a result of the initial adjustment period, it took an additional 6 minutes to finish the entire scenario. With Ripple, the average job completion time was $4.5\times$ faster than EC2, 2min on average, whereas the average job completion time for EC2 was approximately 8.5min. The cost for Lambda is also lower compared to EC2. Similarly, DNA compression achieves $8\times$ faster execution with Ripple compared to EC2 under a uniform load (85s with Ripple as opposed to 11min with EC2).

We also examine a uniform workload distribution for SpaceNet, where we sent one job every 5 minutes for an hour. Figure 10 shows the results for Ripple and EC2. Both Ripple and EC2 were immediately able to handle new incoming requests; however, due to the memory requirements of each classification job, the average job completion time for Ripple was more than an order of magnitude faster (i.e., $80\times$ faster) at 4.5 minutes, with EC2 requiring approximately 6 hours to complete an equal amount of work.

Bursty: We now initiate a Tide job every minute for 8 hours.




Figure 9: Tide performance under diurnal load. Over 30min, we increased the jobs from 0 to 15 and back to 0. (a) and (b) show the used vCPUs (green), and the total (brown) and running jobs (red). The bottom shows pending jobs (yellow).




Figure 10: SpaceNet performance under a uniform workload. Over an hour, we send 1 job every 5min. Both graphs show the vCPUs used by running jobs (green), as well as the total number of jobs actively processed (red).

Every 90min, we additionally send a burst of 100 jobs to emulate a sudden load spike. Figure 8 shows that, while the burst is happening, Ripple used almost 700 vCPUs for approximately 400 concurrent functions, which allowed it to immediately handle all 100 jobs with no performance degradation for any individual job. EC2, on the other hand, incurs the VM instantiation overhead, and hence takes a long time to scale resources to meet the requirements of all 100 jobs. The figure shows that initially most jobs remained idle in the admission queue as they are waiting for more instances to be spawned. After the initial burst, EC2 did a better job at handling the burst; however, this was mostly because the machines were not given enough time to terminate during the non-bursty periods. Ripple, on the other hand, was able to handle the bursts by rapidly scaling up and down the number of active Lambdas, without incurring high costs by retaining unused resources during periods of low load. As a result, the average job completion time was $5\times$ faster for Ripple at about 2min, compared to 10min for EC2. The results are similar for DNA compression, with Ripple achieving $8\times$ faster execution compared to EC2.

Diurnal: Finally, we examine a diurnal job arrival distribution, which emulates the load fluctuation of many user-interactive cloud applications [37, 56, 57, 60]. During a 30 minute interval within a larger 4 hour period, we progressively increase the number of arriving jobs, and then progressively decrease back to zero new jobs. We repeat this pattern multiple times within




Figure 11: Comparison between PyWren and Ripple for SpaceNet: (a) shows the cumulative cost of Lambda for Ripple and PyWren, as well as the cost of EC2 and overall cost for PyWren; (b) shows a comparison of the number of vCPUs used at each point in time by the two frameworks.




Figure 12: Performance of 100 versus 1,000 concurrent Tide jobs. The graphs show a breakdown of the number of Lambdas actively used during each execution phase.

the 4 hour period. Figure 9 shows the diurnal results for Ripple and EC2. The results show that the average job completion time was $6.75\times$ faster for Ripple at about 2 minutes, whereas it was 13.5 minutes for EC2.

7.3. PyWren Comparison

We now use the SpaceNet application to compare Ripple and PyWren. We send one SpaceNet job to each framework. To allow for the increased compute and memory requirements of SpaceNet, we perform this experiment in an AWS region where the max function concurrency was 5,000 Lambdas. Figure 11 shows a comparison of the number of vCPUs and the cumulative cost for each framework. The runtime for Ripple was 25.7% faster at about 140 seconds, while the runtime for PyWren was about 176 seconds. Part of the reason is that Ripple can explicitly invoke the next stage of the pipeline, whereas stages in PyWren have to wait for S3 results. For SpaceNet, the maximum concurrency of a stage is 6,764 functions. This meant PyWren had to launch almost 7K functions simultaneously. Because Ripple provisions each execution phase separately, it did not need 7K functions for every stage of the pipeline, avoiding resource and cost inefficiencies. This translates to a \$2.77 cost for a single run for Ripple and \$3.61, for PyWren. The cost of the EC2 machine during this period was \$0.13. The rest of the cost difference was caused by the difference in the runtime of individual serverless functions.




Figure 13: (a) CDF of Lambda completion time for 20 DNA compression jobs, with and without Ripple’s fault tolerance. (b) Comparison between normal and re-spawned tasks by Ripple.

7.4. Job Concurrency

We now evaluate how well Ripple scales with the number of concurrent jobs. Figure 12 shows the per-stage execution time breakdown for 100 concurrent Tide jobs versus 1,000 jobs. 100 concurrent jobs do not generate enough Lambdas to reach the function limit, while 1,000 concurrent jobs almost immediately hit this limit. The fluctuation in the number of active Lambdas across phases for both concurrency levels is approximately the same, despite the higher concurrency experiment reaching the upper Lambda limit. The total runtime was about twice as long for 1,000 concurrent jobs and, in general, used twice the number of serverless functions.

7.5. Fault Tolerance

We now quantify the effectiveness of Ripple’s fault tolerance mechanism. We run 20 DNA compression jobs in parallel, and force a 10% failure probability on each task. In the case of Ripple, under-performing tasks, i.e., tasks not making sufficient progress are proactively re-spawned to avoid performance degradation. Figure 13 shows the impact of the fault tolerance mechanism on execution time, compared to the baseline AWS system. When no fault tolerance is used, only 4 jobs complete successfully without their Lambdas reaching the 5 minute timeout limit, and being terminated. Instead, when Ripple proactively detects and re-spawns stragglers, all jobs complete within AWS Lambda’s time limit, as seen in the CDF of Fig. 13a. Fig. 13b shows the tasks that had to be re-spawned by Ripple to avoid degrading the overall job’s execution time.

8. Related Work

8.1. Programming Frameworks for Serverless

The past few years a number of programming frameworks for serverless have been designed that either target specific applications, or focus on generality.

PyWren: PyWren targets general-purpose computation, and offers a simple programming framework in Python that evaluates the viability of serverless for distributed computing applications [49]. The authors show that embarrassingly parallel workflows, such as computational imaging, solar physics, and object recognition, can be implemented in a straightforward way using AWS Lambda. PyWren divides computa-

tion into *map* and *reduce* phases, similar to the MapReduce model [29], with mappers using Lambdas to run in parallel, while reducers rely on long-running EC2 instances for serial computation. Locus [64] extends PyWren, and uses a mixture of S3 and Redis to scale sorting on Lambda.

PyWren highlights the potential of serverless for jobs with a single parallel phase and computationally-expensive serial phases, such as *reduce*, which can run on a long-running EC2 instance. Unfortunately the fact that PyWren still relies on long-running instances for serial execution phases reduces the performance and cost benefits of serverless. Additionally, since PyWren uses both serverless and EC2 for the job’s workflow, cloud maintenance remains complicated for users who must manage both serverless and on-demand resources. Finally, since PyWren provisions Lambdas for the entire job once, it cannot adjust to the different degrees of parallelism different computation phases often have, hurting resource efficiency, and limiting the complexity of supported tasks.

EMR Cluster: EMR Cluster dynamically adjusts the size of a cluster depending on a user’s resource needs [9]. Spark can run on top of EMR Cluster, and users are charged on a per-second granularity. However, it can take several minutes to launch a new machine in an EMR Cluster, unlike serverless, where functions are initialized in under a second.

mu: *mu* is a serverless framework targeting a specific class of applications, namely video processing, and is used by the ExCamera video encoding service [43]. *mu* uses AWS Lambda for both map and reduce tasks, each framed as a short-lived worker. In addition to AWS Lambda, *mu* requires a long-lived EC2 server for the Coordinator, and another long-lived EC2 server to act as the Rendezvous Server. The Coordinator assigns tasks to workers and tracks application state, and the Rendezvous Server passes messages between workers.

GG: *gg* is a serverless framework where dependencies between tasks, such as distributed compilation, are explicitly known in advance. Similar to *mu*, *gg* exploits serverless to parallelize interdependent tasks [41], showing significant speedups for computation with irregular dependencies, such as software compilation. However, *gg* requires the dependency tree for a task to be pre-computed, making it impractical for cases where job dependencies are not known in advance, or when dependencies depend on the input.

SAND: SAND is a framework designed to simplify interactions between serverless functions [18]. Currently, public clouds do not provide a way for the user to express how functions interact with each other, optimizing instead for individual function execution. SAND co-locates functions from the same pipeline on the same physical machine, and reuses the same containers for a pipeline’s functions. While beneficial for performance and resource utilization, SAND assumes full cluster control to enforce function placement to machines, which is not possible in public cloud providers.

Pocket: The short execution times of Lambda functions

require fast communication between functions and storage. Like Locus, Pocket addresses this by dynamically scaling storage to meet a given performance and cost constraint [52, 53]. Pocket relies on user-provided hints on the performance criticality of different jobs, their storage requirements, and their provisioning needs in terms of Lambda functions.

While all these frameworks highlight the increasing importance of developing systems for serverless compute, they currently do not provide the automated resource provisioning, scheduling, and fault tolerance mechanisms cloud applications need to meet their QoS requirements.

8.2. Dataflow Frameworks

Dataflow frameworks have been an active area of research in both academic and industrial settings for over 15 years, particularly in the context of analytics and ML applications.

Analytics Frameworks: MapReduce [29] innovated using parallel, stateless dataflow computation for large analytics jobs, while Spark [2] focused on improving the performance and fault tolerance of interactive and iterative jobs by adding in-memory caching to persist state across computation phases. DryadLINQ [71] is another example of a framework that provided abstractions on top of a MapReduce-like system, enabling developers to write high-level programs, which the system transparently compiles into distributed computation.

ML Frameworks: GraphLab [58] and Naiad [62] are both programming frameworks optimized for ML applications. DistBelief [28], TensorFlow [16], and MXNet [26] provide similar capabilities, focusing on deep neural networks. All three provide higher-level APIs for defining dataflows which consist of stateless, independent workers and stateful servers for sharing global parameters. TensorFlow’s dataflow graph is static; unlike Ripple, it cannot handle dynamically-generated computation graphs. Ray [61] enables dynamic graphs, but its design is specific to reinforcement learning pipelines, while Ripple targets general parallel computation.

9. Conclusion

We presented Ripple, a high-level declarative programming framework for serverless compute. Ripple allows users to express the dataflow of complex pipelines at a high-level, and handles work and data partitioning, task scheduling, fault tolerance, and provisioning automatically, abstracting a lot of the low-level system complexity from the user. We port three large ML, genomics, and proteomics applications to Ripple, and show significant performance benefits compared to traditional cloud deployments. We also show that Ripple is able to accurately determine the degree of concurrency needed for an application to meet its performance requirements, and further improves performance predictability by detecting straggler tasks eagerly and respawning them. Finally, we showed that Ripple is robust across different job arrival distributions and different degrees of concurrency, and implements a number

of scheduling policies, including round-robin, priorities, and deadline-based scheduling.

Code Availability

Ripple is open-source software under a GPL license (<https://github.com/delimitrou/Ripple>), and is already in use by several research groups.

Acknowledgements

We sincerely thank Robbert van Renesse, Zhiming Shen, Shuang Chen, Yanqi Zhang, Yu Gan, and Neeraj Kulkarni for their feedback on earlier versions of this manuscript. This work was partially supported by NSF grant CNS-1704742, NSF grant CNS-1422088, a Facebook Faculty Research Award, a VMware Research Award, a John and Norma Balen Sesquicentennial Faculty Fellowship, and generous donations from GCE, Azure, and AWS.

References

- [1] Apache openwhisk. <https://openwhisk.apache.org>.
- [2] Apache spark. <https://spark.apache.org/>.
- [3] Aws autoscale. <https://aws.amazon.com/autoscaling/>.
- [4] Aws lambda. <https://aws.amazon.com/lambda/>.
- [5] Aws step functions. <https://aws.amazon.com/step-functions>.
- [6] bedmethyl. <https://www.encodeproject.org/wgbs#outputs>.
- [7] Boto 3. <https://boto3.amazonaws.com>.
- [8] Docker. <https://www.docker.com/>.
- [9] Emr cluster. <https://aws.amazon.com/emr/>.
- [10] Google cloud functions. <https://cloud.google.com/functions/>.
- [11] Microsoft azure functions. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/functions/>.
- [12] Numpy. <http://www.numpy.org/>.
- [13] scikit-learn. <https://scikit-learn.org/>.
- [14] An introduction to kernel and nearest-neighbor nonparametric regression. *The American Statistician*, 1992.
- [15] Spacenet on amazon web services (aws). *The SpaceNet Catalog*, 2018.
- [16] Martín Abadi, Paul Barham, Jianmin Chen, Zhifeng Chen, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek G. Murray, Benoit Steiner, Paul Tucker, Vijay Vasudevan, Pete Warden, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. Tensorflow: A system for large-scale machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI'16*, pages 265–283, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2016. USENIX Association.
- [17] Faraz Ahmad, Srimat T. Chakradhar, Anand Raghunathan, and T. N. Vijaykumar. Tarazu: optimizing mapreduce on heterogeneous clusters. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. London, UK, 2012.
- [18] Istemi Ekin Akkus, Ruichuan Chen, Ivica Rimac, Manuel Stein, Klaus Satzke, Andre Beck, Paarijaat Aditya, and Volker Hilt. Sand: Towards high performance serverless computing. *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC'18)*, 2018.
- [19] Ganesh Ananthanarayanan, Ali Ghodsi, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. Effective straggler mitigation: Attack of the clones. In *Proceedings of the USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*. Lombard, IL, 2013.
- [20] Ganesh Ananthanarayanan, Srikanth Kandula, Albert Greenberg, Ion Stoica, Yi Lu, Bikas Saha, and Edward Harris. Reining in the outliers in map-reduce clusters using mantri. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*. Vancouver, CA, 2010.
- [21] Aman Bakshi and Yogesh B. Dujodwala. Securing cloud from ddos attacks using intrusion detection system in virtual machine. In *Proc. of the Second International Conference on Communication Software and Networks (ICCSN)*. 2010.
- [22] Luiz Barroso. Warehouse-scale computing: Entering the teenage decade. *ISCA Keynote, SJ, June 2011*.
- [23] Luiz Barroso and Urs Hoelzle. *The Datacenter as a Computer: An Introduction to the Design of Warehouse-Scale Machines*. MC Publishers, 2009.
- [24] WS Noble BJ Diamant. Faster sequest searching for peptide identification from tandem mass spectra. In *Journal of Proteome Research*, 2011.
- [25] Matthew C Chambers, Brendan Maclean, Robert Burke, Dario Amodei, Daniel L Ruderman, Steffen Neumann, Laurent Gatto, Bernd Fischer, Brian Pratt, Jarrett Egerton, Katherine Hoff, Darren Kessner, Natalie Tasman, Nicholas Shulman, Barbara Frewen, Tahmina A Baker, Mi-Youn Brusniak, Christopher Paulse, David Creasy, Lisa Flashner, Kian Kani, Chris Moulding, Sean L Seymour, Lydia M Nuwaysir, Brent Lefebvre, Frank Kuhlmann, Joe Roark, Paape Rainer, Suckau Detlev, Tina Hemenway, Andreas Huhmer, James Langridge, Brian Connolly, Trey Chadick, Krisztina Holly, Josh Eckels, Eric W Deutsch, Robert L Moritz, Jonathan E Katz, David B Agus, Michael MacCoss, David L Tabb, and Parag Mallick. A cross-platform toolkit for mass spectrometry and proteomics. *Nature Biotechnology*, 2012.
- [26] Tianqi Chen, Mu Li, Yutian Li, Min Lin, Naiyan Wang, Minjie Wang, Tianjun Xiao, Bing Xu, Chiyuan Zhang, and Zheng Zhang. Mxnet: A flexible and efficient machine learning library for heterogeneous distributed systems. *CoRR*, abs/1512.01274, 2015.
- [27] Charles E. Cook, Mary Todd Bergman, Robert D. Finn, Guy Cochrane, Ewan Birney, and Rolf Apweiler. The european bioinformatics institute in 2016: Data growth and integration. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 2016.
- [28] Jeffrey Dean, Greg S. Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Quoc V. Le, Mark Z. Mao, Marc Aurelio Ranzato, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, Ke Yang, and Andrew Y. Ng. Large scale distributed deep networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1, NIPS'12*, pages 1223–1231, USA, 2012. Curran Associates Inc.
- [29] Jeffrey Dean and Sanjay Ghemawat. Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*, pages 137–150. San Francisco, CA, December 2004.
- [30] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Paragon: QoS-Aware Scheduling for Heterogeneous Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. Houston, TX, USA, 2013.
- [31] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. QoS-Aware Scheduling in Heterogeneous Datacenters with Paragon. In *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, Vol. 31 Issue 4. December 2013.
- [32] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Quality-of-Service-Aware Scheduling in Heterogeneous Datacenters with Paragon. In *IEEE Micro Special Issue on Top Picks from the Computer Architecture Conferences*. May/June 2014.
- [33] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Quasar: Resource-Efficient and QoS-Aware Cluster Management. In *Proceedings of the Nineteenth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*. Salt Lake City, UT, USA, 2014.
- [34] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. HCloud: Resource-Efficient Provisioning in Shared Cloud Systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty First International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, April 2016.
- [35] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. Bolt: I Know What You Did Last Summer... In The Cloud. In *Proc. of the Twenty Second International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, 2017.
- [36] Christina Delimitrou, Daniel Sanchez, and Christos Kozyrakis. Tarcil: Reconciling Scheduling Speed and Quality in Large Shared Clusters. In *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SOCC)*, August 2015.
- [37] Christina Delimitrou, Sriram Sankar, Aman Kansal, and Christos Kozyrakis. ECHO: Recreating Network Traffic Maps for Datacenters of Tens of Thousands of Servers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*. San Diego, CA, USA, 2012.
- [38] Lipman DJ and Pearson WR. Rapid and sensitive protein similarity searches. *Science*, 1985.
- [39] JK Eng, AL McCormack, and JR Yates. An approach to correlate tandem mass spectral data of peptides with amino acid sequences in a protein database. In *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry*, 1994.

- [40] Sadjad Fouladi, John Emmons, Emre Orbay, Catherine Wu, Riad S. Wahby, and Keith Winstein. Salsify: Low-latency network video through tighter integration between a video codec and a transport protocol. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 18)*, pages 267–282, Renton, WA, April 2018. USENIX Association.
- [41] Sadjad Fouladi, Dan Iter, Shuvo Chatterjee, Christos Kozyrakis Matei Zaharia, and Keith Winstein. A thunk to remember: make-j1000 (and other jobs) on functions-as-a-service infrastructure. 2017.
- [42] Sadjad Fouladi, Francisco Romero, Dan Iter, Qian Li, Shuvo Chatterjee, Christos Kozyrakis, Matei Zaharia, and Keith Winstein. From laptop to lambda: Outsourcing everyday jobs to thousands of transient functional containers. In *2019 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 19)*, pages 475–488, Renton, WA, July 2019. USENIX Association.
- [43] Sadjad Fouladi, Riad S. Wahby, Brennan Shacklett, Karthikeyan Vasuki Balasubramaniam, William Zeng, Rahul Bhalerao, Anirudh Sivaraman, George Porter, and Keith Winstein. Encoding, fast and slow: Low-latency video processing using thousands of tiny threads. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 17)*, pages 363–376, Boston, MA, March 2017. USENIX Association.
- [44] Yu Gan, Yanqi Zhang, Dailun Cheng, Ankitha Shetty, Priyal Rathi, Nayantara Katarki, Ariana Bruno, Justin Hu, Brian Ritchken, Brendon Jackson, Kelvin Hu, Meghna Pancholi, Brett Clancy, Chris Colen, Fukang Wen, Catherine Leung, Siyuan Wang, Leon Zaruvinisky, Mateo Espinosa, Yuan He, and Christina Delimitrou. An Open-Source Benchmark Suite for Microservices and Their Hardware-Software Implications for Cloud and Edge Systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, April 2019.
- [45] Yu Gan, Yanqi Zhang, Kelvin Hu, Yuan He, Meghna Pancholi, Dailun Cheng, and Christina Delimitrou. Seer: Leveraging Big Data to Navigate the Complexity of Performance Debugging in Cloud Microservices. In *Proceedings of the Twenty Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, April 2019.
- [46] Rohan Gandhi and Amit Sabne. Finding stragglers in hadoop. In *Technical Report*. 2011.
- [47] Stuart Geman and Donald Geman. Stochastic relaxation, gibbs distributions, and the bayesian restoration of images. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 6(6):721–741, November 1984.
- [48] Scott Hendrickson, Stephen Sturdevant, Tyler Harter, Venkateshwaran Venkataramani, Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau. Serverless computation with openlambda. *8th USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 16)*, 2016.
- [49] Eric Jonas, Shivaram Venkataraman, Ion Stoica, and Benjamin Recht. Occupy the cloud: Distributed computing for the 99%. *CoRR*, abs/1702.04024, 2017.
- [50] L Kall, JD Canterbury, WS Noble J Weston, and MJ MacCoss. Semi-supervised learning for peptide identification from shotgun proteomics datasets. 2007.
- [51] Ana Klimovic, Heiner Litz, and Christos Kozyrakis. Selecta: Heterogeneous cloud storage configuration for data analytics. In *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 18)*, pages 759–773, Boston, MA, July 2018. USENIX Association.
- [52] Ana Klimovic, Yawen Wang, Christos Kozyrakis, Patrick Stuedi, Jonas Pfefferle, and Animesh Trivedi. Pocket: Ephemeral storage for serverless analytics. *USENIX ATC*, 2018.
- [53] Ana Klimovic, Yawen Wang, Christos Kozyrakis, Patrick Stuedi, Animesh Trivedi, and Jonas Pfefferle. Pocket: Ephemeral storage for serverless analytics. October 2018.
- [54] Christos Kozyrakis, Aman Kansal, Sriram Sankar, and Kushagra Vaid. Server engineering insights for large-scale online services. *IEEE Micro*, 30(4):8–19, July 2010.
- [55] Jimmy Lin. The curse of zipf and limits to parallelization: A look at the stragglers problem in mapreduce. In *Proceedings of LSDS-IR Workshop*. Boston, MA, 2009.
- [56] David Lo, Liqun Cheng, Rama Govindaraju, Luiz André Barroso, and Christos Kozyrakis. Towards energy proportionality for large-scale latency-critical workloads. In *Proceedings of the 41st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. Minneapolis, MN, 2014.
- [57] David Lo, Liqun Cheng, Rama Govindaraju, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Christos Kozyrakis. Heracles: Improving resource efficiency at scale. In *Proc. of the 42nd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. Portland, OR, 2015.
- [58] Yucheng Low, Joseph Gonzalez, Aapo Kyrola, Danny Bickson, Carlos Guestrin, and Joseph M. Hellerstein. Graphlab: A new framework for parallel machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/1006.4990, 2010.
- [59] Lennart Martens, Matthew Chambers, Marc Sturm, Darren Kessner, Fredrik Levander, Jim Shofstahl, Wilfred H. Tang, Andreas Rompp, Steffen Neumann, Angel D. Pizarro, Luisa Montecchi-Palazzi, Natalie Tasman, Mike Coleman, Florian Reisinger, Puneet Souda, Henning Hermjakob, Pierre-Alain Binz, and Eric W. Deutsch. mzml - a community standard for mass spectrometry data. In *Molecular and Cellular Proteomics*, 2010.
- [60] David Meisner, Christopher M. Sadler, Luiz André Barroso, Wolf-Dietrich Weber, and Thomas F. Wenisch. Power management of online data-intensive services. In *Proceedings of the 38th annual international symposium on Computer architecture*, pages 319–330, 2011.
- [61] Philipp Moritz, Robert Nishihara, Stephanie Wang, Alexey Tumanov, Richard Liaw, Eric Liang, Melih Elibol, Zongheng Yang, William Paul, Michael I. Jordan, and Ion Stoica. Ray: A distributed framework for emerging ai applications. In *Proceedings of the 12th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI’18*, pages 561–577, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2018. USENIX Association.
- [62] Derek G. Murray, Frank McSherry, Rebecca Isaacs, Michael Isard, Paul Barham, and Martín Abadi. Naiad: A timely dataflow system. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles, SOSP ’13*, pages 439–455, New York, NY, USA, 2013. ACM.
- [63] Jianhao Peng, Olgica Milenkovic, and Idoia Ochoa. Methcomp: a special purpose compression platform for dna methylation data. *Bioinformatics*, 34(15):2654–2656, 2018.
- [64] Shivaram Venkataraman Qifan Pu and Ion Stoica. Shuffling, fast and slow: Scalable analytics on serverless infrastructure. *NSDI*, 2019.
- [65] Benjamin Recht, Christopher Re, Stephen Wright, and Feng Niu. Hogwild: A lock-free approach to parallelizing stochastic gradient descent. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. S. Zemel, P. L. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K. Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 693–701. Curran Associates, Inc., 2011.
- [66] Charles Reiss, Alexey Tumanov, Gregory Ganger, Randy Katz, and Michael Kozych. Heterogeneity and dynamism of clouds at scale: Google trace analysis. In *Proceedings of SOCC*. 2012.
- [67] Thomas Ristenpart, Eran Tromer, Hovav Shacham, and Stefan Savage. Hey, you, get off of my cloud: Exploring information leakage in third-party compute clouds. In *Proc. of the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. Chicago, IL, 2009.
- [68] Konstantin Shvachko, Hairong Kuang, and Sanjay Radia. The hadoop distributed file system. 2010.
- [69] Anand Srinivasan and Sanjoy Baruah. Deadline-based scheduling of periodic task systems on multiprocessors. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 84(2):93–98, October 2002.
- [70] Zachary D. Stephens, Skylar Y. Lee, Faraz Faghri, Roy H. Campbell, Chengxiang Zhai, Miles J. Efron, Ravishankar Iyer, Michael C. Schatz, Saurabh Sinha, and Gene E. Robinson. Big data: Astronomical or genomics? *PLoS Biol*, 2015.
- [71] Yuan Yu, Michael Isard, Dennis Fetterly, Mihai Budiu, Úlfar Erlingson, Pradeep Kumar Gunda, and Jon Currey. Dryadling: A system for general-purpose distributed data-parallel computing using a high-level language. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation, OSDI’08*, pages 1–14, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2008. USENIX Association.
- [72] Matei Zaharia, Dhruba Borthakur, Joydeep Sen Sarma, Khaled Elmelegy, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. Delay scheduling: a simple technique for achieving locality and fairness in cluster scheduling. In *Proceedings of the European conference on Computer systems (EuroSys)*. Paris, France, 2010.
- [73] Matei Zaharia, Andy Konwinski, Anthony Joseph, Randy Katz, and Ion Stoica. Improving mapreduce performance in heterogeneous environments. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*. San Diego, CA, 2008.
- [74] Yinqian Zhang, Ari Juels, Alina Oprea, and Michael K. Reiter. Home-alone: Co-residency detection in the cloud via side-channel analysis. In *Proc. of the IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. Oakland, CA, 2011.
- [75] Yinqian Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K. Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. Cross-tenant side-channel attacks in paas clouds. In *Proc. of the ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. Scottsdale, AZ, 2014.
- [76] Yinqian Zhang, Ari Juels, Michael K. Reiter, and Thomas Ristenpart. Cross-vm side channels and their use to extract private keys. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. Raleigh, NC, 2012.