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Part I: Context

## Vocabulary

- CPU Utilization: That thing that comes out of 'top'. ;)
- Slot: An allocation for a job thread to be dispatched.
- Job Run Time: The time a job is allocated to CPU(s)
- Reserved Time: Run time multiplied by slots reserved
- CPU Time: Quantity of CPU time consumed by job
- Job Efficiency: CPU time divided by reserved time


## The Good Ole Days

When I was a kid...
Simulation batch jobs were single threaded and consumed precisely one, full CPU. i.e. jobs were almost $100 \%$ efficient.

## The Good Ole Days

## Well... OK... That was never really true,...

It was true that a remarkably large number of jobs were very efficient. True enough in fact that the standard practice of the day was to configure compute clusters to run one job per CPU core, and achieve nearly $100 \%$ CPU utilization.

In typical LSF speak: The slot:core ratio was 1.

Historical Job Efficiency (Representative)


## Today

Average job efficiency is pretty low.
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## Today

Running with slot : core $=1$ wastes significant resources.
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## Today

Is it safe to run with slot: core $>1$ ?
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## Running with slot: core $>1$

- Increase system utilization
- Increase throughput
- Creates a risk of decreased individual run time
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## Running with slot : core $>1$

- Increase system utilization
- Increase throughput
- Creates a risk of decreased individual run time

This presentation discusses techniques to quantify and limit the risks.
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## Running with slot: core $>1$

By quantifying and limiting the risk, we transform the question of setting higher slot: core values into one of business priorities and a well formulated risk-benefit analysis.

## Part II: Thought Experiments

## Some Thought Experiments

Next we consider three thought experiments in which we take a simplistic point of view using averages. This line of thinking is fine for thought experiments intended to provide insight into general system behavior, but it is wholly inappropriate for decisions regarding the configuration of production compute clouds.

## A thought experiment (Number 1)

The Scenario
Average job efficiency is $90 \%$. Compute servers have 4 cores.
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## A thought experiment (Number 1)
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## A thought experiment (Number 1)

## The Scenario

Average job efficiency is $90 \%$. Compute servers have 4 cores.

## Observations

- System utilization is capped at $90 \%$
- $40 \%$ of a CPU is wasted


## A thought experiment (Number 2)

The Scenario
Average job efficiency is $80 \%$. Compute servers have 4 cores.
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## A thought experiment (Number 2)
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## A thought experiment (Number 2)

## The Scenario

Average job efficiency is $80 \%$. Compute servers have 4 cores.

## Observations

- System utilization is capped at $80 \%$
- We have $80 \%$ of a CPU wasted.
- We have room for a 5 th job (i.e. $80 \%$ of a CPU)!


## A thought experiment (Number 2)

Opportunity!
If we set slot:core to $5: 4$, then

- Systems would be utilized at $100 \%$
- Throughput improves by $20 \%$
- Job run time is not impacted!


## A thought experiment (Number 2)
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## A thought experiment (Number 3)

The Scenario
Average job efficiency is $90 \%$. Compute servers have 12 cores.
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## A thought experiment (Number 3)



## A thought experiment (Number 3)

The Scenario
Average job efficiency is $90 \%$. Compute servers have 12 cores.

## Observations

- System utilization is capped at $90 \%$
- We have more than an entire CPU wasted!


## A thought experiment (Number 3)

## Opportunity!

If we set slot:core to $13: 12$, then

- Systems would be utilized at $97.5 \%$
- $30 \%$ of a CPU is still wasted!
- Throughput improves by $7.5 \%$
- Job run time is not impacted!


## A thought experiment (Number 3)



## Recap

The Idea
The idea is simple: Use left over CPU capacity for more jobs
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## Recap

The Optimist
At $75 \%$ job efficiency, I can run $33.3 \%$ more jobs!!!
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## Recap



## Recap

The Realist
Nope.
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## Recap

In short, the realist recognizes the previously mentioned limitations of the simplistic approach we have taken with our thought experiments.
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## Part III: Compute Cluster Vulgarities

## Job efficiency varies as the job runs

CPU Utilization of a Single 12-way Multithreaded Job on a 12 Core Host


## Job efficiency varies between jobs

CPU Utilization Under Mixed Job Load on a 12 Core Host
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## Batch scheduling job placement must be considered

## Scheduling polices can..

- Lump together jobs of similar efficiency
- Pack jobs onto systems till they appear full
- Avoid systems that look full but are not


## Part IV: Probability Theory

## Dice!!
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## Rolling One Die

| Face | Ways To Roll | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 2 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 3 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 4 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 5 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 6 | 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
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## Rolling Two Dice

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
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## Rolling Two Dice

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

$6 \cdot 6=36$ different ways to roll a pair of dice.
Of those 36 we see 3 different ways to get a total of 4 .
Thus the probability of rolling a 4 is $\frac{3}{36}=\frac{1}{12}=0.083333 \overline{3}$.

## Rolling Two Dice

| Total | Ways To Roll | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2 | 1 | $1 / 36$ | $\boxed{ }$ |
| 3 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 4 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 5 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 6 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 7 | 6 | $6 / 36$ |  |
| 8 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 9 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 10 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 11 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 12 | 1 | $1 / 36$ | $\square$ |
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## Rolling Three Dice

| 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  | 6 | 3 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  | 1 |  | 45 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 1 |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |  | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 2 |  |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |  | 10 | 2 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  | 3 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 3 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  | 12 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  | 4 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |  | 1 | 12 | 4 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 13 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 5 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  | 2 | 13 | 5 |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 14 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 6 |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 3 | 14 | 6 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  | 15 |
| 4 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  |  | 5 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 | 6 | 6 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 |
| 1 |  |  |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 11 | 12 | 1 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 13 |
| 2 |  |  |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |  | 12 | 13 | 2 |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 14 |
| 3 |  |  |  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 10 | 11 | 12 |  | 13 | 14 | 3 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 4 | 4 |  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 14 | 15 | 4 |  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  | 5 | 5 |  | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |  | 15 | 16 | 5 |  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  |  | 6 |  | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 |  | 16 | 17 | 6 |  | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |  |  |

## Rolling Three Dice


$6^{3}=216$ different ways to roll three dice with 6 sides.
Of those 216 we see 27 different ways to get a total of 10 .
Thus the probability of rolling a 10 is $\frac{27}{216}=\frac{1}{8}=0.125$.

## Rolling Three Dice

| Total | Ways To Roll | Ways To Roll | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 216$ | $\square$ |
| 4 | $1+2$ | 3 | $3 / 216$ |  |
| 5 | $1+2+3$ | 6 | $6 / 216$ |  |
| 6 | $1+2+3+4$ | 10 | $10 / 216$ |  |
| 7 | $1+2+3+4+5$ | 15 | $15 / 216$ |  |
| 8 | $1+2+3+4+6$ | 21 | $21 / 216$ |  |
| 9 | $2+3+4+5+6+5$ | 25 | $25 / 216$ |  |
| 10 | $3+4+5+6+5+4$ | 27 | $27 / 216$ |  |
| 11 | $4+5+6+5+4+3$ | 27 | $27 / 216$ |  |
| 12 | $5+6+5+4+3+2$ | 25 | $25 / 216$ |  |
| 13 | $6+5+4+3+2+1$ | 21 | $21 / 216$ |  |
| 14 | $1+2+3+4+5$ | 15 | $15 / 216$ |  |
| 15 | $1+2+3+4$ | 10 | $10 / 216$ |  |
| 16 | $1+2+3$ | 6 | $6 / 216$ |  |
| 17 | $1+2$ | 3 | $3 / 216$ |  |
| 18 | 1 | 1 | $1 / 216$ | $\square$ |
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## Computational Efficiency

## Rolling 2 Dice

Computing the probabilities for rolling two dice, each with six sides, required us to form a table with $6 \cdot 6=36$ entries. The computational complexity of this problem is $\mathcal{O}\left(6^{2}\right)$.

## Computational Efficiency

## Rolling 3 Dice

Computing the probabilities for rolling three dice, each with six sides, required us to form a table with $6^{3}=216$ entries. The computational complexity of this problem is $\mathcal{O}\left(6^{3}\right)$.

## Computational Efficiency

## Rolling $n$ Dice

Computing the probabilities for rolling $n$ dice, each with six sides, would require us to form a table with $6^{n}$ entries. The computational complexity of this problem is $\mathcal{O}\left(6^{n}\right)$.

## Computational Efficiency

## What if the dice had $m$ sides?

Computing the probabilities for rolling $n$ dice, each with $m$ sides, would be just about the same problem. Just more rows a columns in our table! Thus the computational complexity would become $\mathcal{O}\left(m^{n}\right)$.

This is very, very bad...

## Fundamental Probability Reminder

If the probability of $E_{1}$ is $p_{1}$, and the probability of $E_{2}$ is $p_{2}$, then
The probability of both $E_{1}$ AND $E_{2}$ occurring is $p_{1} \cdot p_{2}$
The probability of $E_{1}$ OR $E_{2}$ occurring is $p_{1}+p_{2}$

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

|  | $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $11 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $11 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $12 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |

Compute the probability of each roll (the product of the probabilities of each face), and then sum down diagonals (the 6 diagonal is highlighted in yellow).

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

|  | $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $11 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |
| $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $11 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ | $12 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}\right.$ |

Thus the probability of rolling a 6 :

$$
\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)^{2}=\frac{5}{36}
$$

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

This technique hasn't saved us any computation effort for the two dice case. It has simplified the algorithm - multiply \& add instead of count, search, and add. The real power of the technique is that it easily generalizes to dice with different face counts, and to unfair dice (that is a die which has different probabilities per face).

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

Now we roll one fair die with 6 sides, and one loaded die with 4 .

| Total | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 2 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 3 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 4 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 5 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 6 | $1 / 6$ |  |


| Total | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 1 | $2 / 15$ |  |
| 2 | $2 / 15$ |  |
| 3 | $9 / 15$ |  |
| 4 | $2 / 15$ |  |

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

|  | $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{115}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{115}\right)\right.$ |
| $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |

Here we have a 6 sided die, and a loaded die with 4 sides!

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

|  | $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{9}{15}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{2}{15}\right)\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |
| $2 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |
| $3 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |
| $4 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |
| $5 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |
| $6 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{6}\right)\right.$ | $7 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $8 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ | $9 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{10}\right)\right.$ | $10 \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{1}{45}\right)\right.$ |

The probability of rolling a $6: \frac{1}{45}+\frac{1}{45}+\frac{1}{10}+\frac{1}{45}=\frac{1}{6}=0.16666 \overline{6}$.

## Rolling Two Dice (again)

| Total | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2 | $2 / 90$ |  |
| 3 | $4 / 90$ |  |
| 4 | $13 / 90$ |  |
| 5 | $15 / 90$ |  |
| 6 | $15 / 90$ |  |
| 7 | $15 / 90$ |  |
| 8 | $13 / 90$ |  |
| 9 | $11 / 90$ |  |
| 10 | $2 / 90$ |  |
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## This algorithm in R

d1 and d2 hold the probabilities for each die, and probs is the resulting combined probability table.

| 1 | d1 | $<-\operatorname{rep}(1 / 6,6)$; |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | d2 | $<-\mathrm{c}(2 / 15,2 / 15,9 / 15,2 / 15)$ |
| 3 | ptab | $<-\mathrm{d} 1$ \%*\% t (d2) |
| 4 | stab | $<-\operatorname{row}(\mathrm{ptab})+\mathrm{col}(\mathrm{ptab})$ |
| 5 | rrange | $<-\min (s t a b): \max (s t a b)$ |
| 6 7 | probs | ```<- sapply(rrange, function(r) sum(ptab[stab=r]))``` |

Note: This is code is for illustration. It is super simple to understand, but is kinda silly - like explicitly constructing the matrices..

## Applying What We Have Learned

OK. That loaded dice thing was interesting, but how will that make it faster to compute the probability of throwing a whole hand full of dice?

## Applying What We Have Learned

Remember this? The probability table for throwing two fair dice..

| Total | Ways To Roll | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2 | 1 | $1 / 36$ | $\square$ |
| 3 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 4 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 5 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 6 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 7 | 6 | $6 / 36$ |  |
| 8 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 9 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 10 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 11 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 12 | 1 | $1 / 36$ | $\square$ |

## Applying What We Have Learned

How about we throw one fair 6 sided die, and one wonky die with the same probability rules as the pair of dice we did before?

| Total | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 2 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 3 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 4 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 5 | $1 / 6$ |  |
| 6 | $1 / 6$ |  |


| Total | Ways To Roll | Probability |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 2 | 1 | $1 / 36$ | $\boxed{ }$ |
| 3 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 4 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 5 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 6 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 7 | 6 | $6 / 36$ |  |
| 8 | 5 | $5 / 36$ |  |
| 9 | 4 | $4 / 36$ |  |
| 10 | 3 | $3 / 36$ |  |
| 11 | 2 | $2 / 36$ |  |
| 12 | 1 | $1 / 36$ |  |

## This idea in code

Die face probabilities in daDie, and number of dice in numDi. The resulting combined probability table ends up in probs.

```
numDi <- 15
daDie <- rep(1/6, 6);
probs <- daDie
for(i in 2:numDi) {
    ptab <- daDie %*% t(probs)
    stab <- row(ptab) + col(ptab)
    rrange <- 1:max(stab)
    probs <- sapply(rrange,
                                function(r) sum(ptab[stab=r]))
    names(probs) <- rrange
}
```

Note: Again... This is code is for illustration. It is super simple to understand, but is kinda silly - like explicitly constructing the matrices..

Probability Distribution For Rolling 15 Dice (fair, 6 sided dice)
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Part V: Computing Risk

## Weren't we talking about slot:core ratios?

That was fun! How do I set my slot:core ratio again?
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Job Efficiency Histogram
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## A probability problem

The Question
Randomly pick $n$ single threaded jobs, and place them on an $n$ core compute server. What is the utilization of that compute server?

## A probability problem

What kind of answer can we provide?
We can't know what the utilization will be, but we can approximate the server utilization given any $n$ job efficiency values and report the probability of all the possibilities.

## A probability problem

## How?

Yep. We are going to think about that graph as if it were a loaded, 100 sided die!


2 Jobs on 2 Cores
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## 5 Jobs on 4 Cores



Probablity Of Overaload (16 core server)
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## Probability is not Risk

## What is risk?

The classical actuarial definition is that risk is the product of the probability of an even and the cost of that event.

$$
R=p \cdot C
$$

## Probability is not Risk

## Cost?

It can be difficult to quantify cost for many events; however, sometimes we can proxy cost with business impact measured in other terms.
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## Probability is not Risk

How about "runtime" as a cost?
In general if we oversubscribe a system by a particular percentage with very efficient jobs, we can expect jobs to potentially run about that same percentage slower. This isn't always true on Linux, but it is a reasonable place to start.

## Probability is not Risk

How do you phrase this to leaders?
We can get a $20 \%$ improvement in throughput at a cost of around $\% 4$ of our jobs running about $\% 15$ slower.

## Probability is not Risk

How do you pick a risk level?
Simply present the risk levels of the various options (perhaps with a graph like last one we looked at) to your leadership team, and ask them to select a level of risk they are comfortable with.

## FAQ

I just need to think about dice?
Our probably experiment was pretty simple, but it actually works for may sites. So if you are lucky, it may be all you need. For TI we had to also take into consideration

- Queue structure \& LSF scheduling parameters
- Job arrival \& resource requirement patterns


## FAQ

How do I check if my model works?
One of the most effective ways is to compute a theoretical server utilization at your current slot:core ration, and then compare it to a histogram of real server utilization.

埌 TEXAS InSTRUMENTS

## FAQ

## How do I check if my model works?

Simulation! i.e. run your new cluster configuration through a cluster simulator, and simply observe the behavior. If it matches your model, then you probably have a good model.

## How do I check if my model works?

Simulation! i.e. run your new cluster configuration through a cluster simulator, and simply observe the behaviour. If it matches your model, then you probably have a good model.

## FAQ

## Risk mitigation?

Job scheduling load thresholds based on true CPU run queue lengths and CPU utilization will go a long way towards keeping systems from getting overloaded.
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## Thank You!
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