

Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE Fédérale de Lausanne

EPFL Presentation | 02.2014



	EPFL	History	
1853	1968 Instit	- Act on the Federal tutes of Technology 1969	Today
Maison Bischoff, rue Saint-Pierre in Lausa	anne Former Hotel Savoy, 29-33 avenue de Cour	rin	
Ecole spéciale de Lausanne	EPUL	EPFL	
Students Faculty	11 39	9 1,293 56	9,868 (2013) 329 (2013)



Fast-paced development (1969-





EPFL at the heart of national

ETH Domain = 2 Federal Institutes of Technology & 4 Research Institutes (2013) **endeavours**



EPFL's three missions according to the Federal Act







13 Study Programmes, 316 Research Labs

ÉCOLE POLYTECHNIQUE Fédérale de Lausanne

5 Schools 7 Interdisciplinary Centers 13 Sections Transport, Energy, SB Neuroprosthetics, Design 2 Colleges (EPFL+ECAL Lab) etc... **Mathematics** Chemistry Physics CDM **26 Institutes** IC ENAC Management of Technology **Computer Science** Architecture, Civil **Financial Engineering** Engineering, Environmental **Communication Science** Science & Engineering CDH **316 Laboratories and Research Groups** STI SV Human & Social Sciences **Electrical Engineering** Life Sciences Microengineering & Technology Mechanical Engineering Bioiengineering Materials Science



Origin of Students (Bachelor+Master+PhD)







Study programs at EPFL





(Pfl

Very productive Swiss science

The world's highest science productivity since 1990 ... (OECD 2010)



Average of relative citations, figures by Thomson Reuters

... and one of the highest collaboration rates



Index of international collaboration, figures by Thomson Reuters

(Pfl

European Ranking 2013 – The EPFL is well-placed

(Eng. & Technology)

QS (Eng. & Technology)	THE (Eng. & Technology)	Shanghaï (Eng./Tech. & Computer Science)	Leiden (PP (top-10%) indicator)
1. University of Cambridge	1. University of Cambridge	1. University of Cambridge	1. EPFL
2. ETH Zurich	2. University of Oxford	2. EPFL	2. Weizmann Institute of Science
3. Imperial College, London	3. ETH Zurich	3. Imperial College, London	3. University of Cambridge
4. EPFL	4. Imperial College, London	4. University of Manchester	4. ETH Zurich
5. University of Oxford	5. EPFL	5. ETH Zurich	5. University of Oxford
•	•	•	
•	•	•	
•	•	•	•
Main Criteria			
Reputation. Citations/paper. Student/faculty ratio.	Reputation. Citations/paper normalised by publication field, across all fields.	Most cited scientists. Number of papers published. % of papers published in top 20 science journals.	Citations/paper normalised by volume and publication field, across all fields. 300 largest European universities.



Global Ranking 2013 – U.S. on top, EPFL close behind...

(Eng. & Technology)

QS (Eng. & Technology)	THE (Eng. & Technology)	Shanghaï (Eng./Tech. & Computer Science)	Leiden (PP (top-10%) indicator – World)
1. MIT	1. MIT	1. MIT	1. MIT
2. Stanford University	2. Stanford University	2. Stanford University	2. Uni. of Calif, Santa Barbara
3. University of Cambridge	3. Uni. of California, Berkeley	3. Uni. of California, Berkeley	3. Stanford University
4. Uni. of California, Berkeley	4. California Institute of Technology	4. University of Texas	4. Princeton University
5. ETH Zurich	5. Princeton University	5. University of Illinois	5. Harvard University
		•	
•		•	
8. EPFL	15. EPFL	15. EPFL	13. EPFL
Main Criteria			
Reputation. Citations/paper. Student/faculty ratio.	Reputation. Citations/paper normalised by publication field, across all fields.	Most cited scientists. Number of papers published. % of papers published in top 20 science	Citations/paper normalised by volume a publication field, across all fields. World's 500 largest universities.

journals.



European Recognition - ERC Grants (European Research Council)









Great Technology Adventures







Start-Up development





EPFL Campus

15



High-Performance Transaction Processing on Non-uniform Hardware Topologies

Danica Porobic danica.porobic@epfl.ch DIAS, EPFL





(Pfl

Multisocket multicores



Communication latencies vary by an order-of-magnitude

Impact of Islands: TPC-C Payment

Thread Placement Communication granularity 4socket x 6cores 4socket x 6cores 160 12 140 10 Throughput (Ktps) 39% 120 Throughput (Ktps) 8 100 4.5x 6 80 60 4 40 2 20 0 0 ? Shared Shared nothing everything Spread OS Island

Islands significantly impact OLTP applications



Scaling-up on a 8-socket machine

8socket x 10cores Probing one row



19



Outline

Introduction

• Impact of Hardware Islands on OLTP

• Adaptive Transaction Processing for Islands

• Conclusions



OLTP System Configurations



Shared-everything

Shared-nothing

Island shared-nothing



Partition sensitive microbenchmark

- Single-site version
 - Probe/update N rows from the local partition



- Multi-site version
 - Probe/update 1 row from the local partition
 - Probe/update N-1 rows uniformly from any partition
 - Partitions may reside on the same instance



(Pfl

N=10

Multi-site transactions: reads

4socket x 6cores



More nodes -> faster performance drop



Where are the bottlenecks? Read case



Communication overhead dominates



Multi-site transactions: updates

4socket x 6cores



Update distributed transactions are more expensive



Where are the bottlenecks? Update case



Several overheads contribute to the cost



OLTP on Hardware Islands

- Shared-everything: stable, but non-optimal
- Shared-nothing: fast, but sensitive to workload
- Island shared-nothing: a robust middle-ground

- Challenges:
 - Optimal configuration depends on workload and hardware
 - Expensive repartitioning due to physical data movement

Can we have one system that adapts to all cases? 27



Outline

Introduction

• Impact of Hardware Islands on OLTP

• Adaptive Transaction Processing for Islands

Conclusion

Critical path of transaction execution



Many accesses to shared data structures



System state is still shared



Perfectly partitionable workload 8socket x 10cores Probing one row Shared-nothing PLP Throughput (MTPS)

Inter-socket accesses to system state are a bottlenecka

Number of sockets

(Pfl

ATraPos: Island-aware SE





Perfectly partitionable workload

8socket x 10cores Probing one row





Naive partitioning and placement

8 socket x 10 core 800K rows per table

Probing 1 row each from **A** and **B**



Cores are overloaded with contending threads 34



ATraPos partitioning and placement

2100

1800

1500

1200

900

600

300

0

PLP

Throughput (KTPS)

8 socket x 10 core 800K rows per table

Probing 1 row each from $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{A}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{B}}$



Ignoring Islands -> synchronization overhead

balanced



ATraPos partitioning and placement

8 socket x 10 core 800K rows per table

Probing 1 row each from $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{A}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{B}}$



Throughput (KTPS 1500 4.8x 1200 900 600 300 0 PLP **ATraPos ATraPos** HW-aware Load balanced

2100

1800

ATraPos: balanced load + reduced synchronization³⁶



ATraPos improves performance of TATP by 3.1-6.7x⁷



Dynamic workloads





ATraPos gracefully adapts to any change

Summary

- OLTP on Hardware Islands
 - Shared-everything: stable, non-optimal performance
 - Shared-nothing: fast, sensitive to workload
 - Island shared-nothing: a robust middle ground
 - Optimal configuration depends on workload and hardware

- Adaptive transaction processing for Islands
 - Minimal inter-socket accesses in the critical path
 - Workload and HW-aware partitioning and placement
 - Lightweight monitoring and repartitioning

Thank you!