On-demand Container Loading in AWS Lambda

ATC' 23

1

Background: AWS Lambda

- Provide your code or image, we run it as an event when things happen
- No provisioning or managing servers
- Scale up in milliseconds in response to traffic

Background: AWS Lambda

- Container: an isolated environment for your code. sharing host operating system
- AWS Lambda: each container or code runs in one MicroVM customer code(250 MB) or container image (10 GB)

Problem

- Adding container support to AWS Lambda without regressing on cold-start time
	- Meeting Lambda's goals of rapid scale, high request rate and low startuptimes
	- The core challenge is simply one of data movement.

Main idea

- **Sparsity** *—*block-level demand loading Most container images contain a lot of files, but only 6.4% of container data is needed at startup.
- **Commonality** *—*deduplication

Many popular container images are based on common base layers

• **Cacheability** —Tiered Caching

Most of workloads tend to be driven by a smaller number of images

Architecture

• **Worker Manager**: Assignment Service

forward the request to a worker or start a new worker

• **Worker**:

Lots of independent isolated environments to run customer code

Design1: Block-Level Loading

- Collapse the container image into a block device image
	- flattening each tarball to create a single ext4 filesystem
	- overlay a stack of layers using overlayfs.
- Build a filesystem that knows about our chunked container format
	- reads by fetching just the chunks of the container it needs

Design2: Deduplication

- Deduplication-after-encryption.
- Each Lambda worker host to only being able to access the data that have been sent to it.

Do not encrypt the entire manifest. Only the chunk key table is encrypted.

Design2: Convergent encryption

• The same chunk is encrypted by same key.

• Using varying salt in the key derivation step to limit Blast Radius.

Design2: Garbage Collection

- Removing data from the backing store when it is no longer actively referenced.
- Root: a self-contained manifest and chunk namespace
	- While R1 is retired, any manifest that is still referenced in R1 is migrated to R2.
	- In expired state, data is still allowed to be read, but any attempt to access data leads to an alarm.

Design2: Garbage Collection

- Removing data from the backing store when it is no longer actively referenced.
- Root: a self-contained manifest and chunk namespace
	- While R1 is retired, any manifest that is still referenced in R1 is migrated to R2.
	- In expired state, data is still allowed to be read, but any attempt to access data leads to an alarm.

Design3: Tiered Caching

• Three cache tiers

- S3 cache: origin tier that stored all chunks.
- Worker Local Cache: caches chunks that are frequently used on a worker.
- AZ-level cache : caches chunks that are frequently used on workers in availability-zone.

Design3: Tiered Caching

- Read chunk data: reading directly from the local cache firstly
	- If not exists in local cache, the chunk is fetched from the AZ-level cache.
- Write data to block overlay
	- Using a bitmap to check if chunk written to overlay

Design3: Tiered Caching

- AZ-level cache: a fairly standard design of distributed cache.
	- An in-memory tier for hot chunks and a flash tier for colder chunks.
	- Evictiontion is LRU-k -a scan-resistant LRU
	- Using a consistent hashing scheme to distribute chunks.
	- Erasure coding to down tail latency.

Design3: consistent hashing

- Map the chunk to the hash ring
- Map the server's id to the hash ring
- The first server encountered in a counterclockwise direction from the location of chunk is the server corresponding to the chunk.

Design3: Erasure coding

- A single slow cache server can cause wide spread impact because of congestion in the network, or by partial software failure.
- Erasure coding: Any *k* of the (k+r) units are sufficient to decode origin full data.

Theorem: k points can determine a curve corresponding to a polynomial of order k-1

Evaluation

- The majority of functions of all sizes are heavily deduped.
- GET latency is very consistent, with a median of below 50μs.
- PUT latency is less consistent than GET, but performance is still excellent

Evaluation

One week of hit rates on each of the cache tiers Empirical CDF of end-to-end read latency

observed at the local agent

- These three cache tiers are efficient
- A mode below 100μs which represent local cache hits, a mode around 2.75ms which represent L2 hits

Summary

