Application Level Concurrency in Haskell: Combining Events and Threads

Steve Zdancewic Peng Li

University of Pennsylvania

(Research presented at PLDI 2007)

Building Network Services

- Network Services:
 - Web servers, games, chat rooms, peer-to-peer systems, …
- Concurrency is necessary:
 - Mostly I/O-bound: many idle threads
 - "C10K problem" 10,000 clients on one server? [www.kegel.com/c10k.html]

Threads Simple programming model

VS.

Events Scalability & Performance

• This talk: An attempt to reconcile these two approaches.



Clients

A Multithreaded Network Service



Event-driven Network Service





Spectrum of Solutions

- Flash Web Server [Pai, Druschel, Zwaenepoel 1999]
- SEDA: Staged event-driven architecture [Welsh, Culler, Brewer, 2001]
- Capriccio: Scalable threads [von Behren, et al. 2003]
- User-level threads / co-routines / continuations / etc. [Wand 1980], [Shivers 1997], [Claessen 1999], [Fisher & Reppy 2002],...
- Libraries/Compiler support for event-driven programs
 - Python's "Twisted" Package [twistedmatrix.com]
 - Automatic stack management in C++ [Adya, et al. 2002]
- Domain-specific languages
 - Erlang
 - Flux [Burns, et al 2006]

Best of Both Worlds?



- Client Code: Threads
 - One thread \leftrightarrow One client
 - Familiar programming model
 - Blocking I/O
- Internal Representation
 - Hidden from the programmer
 - Automatic transformation from thread abstractions to events
- Scheduling:
 - Event driven
 - Customizable
 - Non-blocking I/O
- Application level:
 - Threads & scheduler implemented in high-level language

This Work: Network Services in Haskell

- Claim: High-level programming languages can simplify programming of network services while yielding good scalability and performance.
- Demonstrated using Haskell [www.haskell.org]
 - Pure: strong, expressive type system that isolates effects
 - Lazy: computations are performed 'on demand'
 - Functional: first-class functions

Outline

- Application-level cooperative concurrency in Haskell
 - Thread programming and Traces
 - Schedulers and Event processing
 - CPS translation and monads
- Examples
- Performance

• Future Directions & Conclusions

Implementing this Hybrid Model



Example Server Code

```
server s = do \{
 sock <- sock_accept s;</pre>
 sys_fork (session sock);
 server s;
}
session sock = do {
 n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
 ...<code>...
 sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
 ...<code>...
 sys_nbio (write ...);
 sys_ret;
```



```
server s = do {
   sock <- sock_accept s;
   sys_fork (session sock);
   server s;
}
session sock = do {
   n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
   ...<code>...
   sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
   ...<sys_nbio (write ...);
   sys_nbio (write ...);
   sys_ret;
}</pre>
```







```
server s = do {
  sock <- sock_accept s;
  sys_fork (session sock);
  server s;
}
session sock = do {
  n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
  ...<code>...
  sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
  ...<sys_nbio (write ...);
  sys_ret;
}</pre>
```



```
server s = do \{
 sock <- sock_accept s;</pre>
 sys_fork (session sock);
 server s;
session sock = do {
 n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
 ...<code>...
 sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
 ...<code>...
 sys_nbio (write ...);
 sys_ret;
```



```
server s = do \{
 sock <- sock_accept s;</pre>
 sys_fork (session sock);
 server s;
session sock = do {
 n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
 ...<code>...
 sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
 ...<code>...
 sys_nbio (write ...);
 sys_ret;
```



```
server s = do \{
 sock <- sock_accept s;</pre>
 sys_fork (session sock);
 server s;
session sock = do {
 n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
 ...<code>...
 sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
 ...<code>...
 sys_nbio (write ...);
 sys_ret;
```



```
server s = do {
   sock <- sock_accept s;
   sys_fork (session sock);
   server s;
}
session sock = do {
   n <- sys_nbio (read ...);
   ...<code>...
   sys_wait sock EPOLL_READ;
   ...<sys_nbio (write ...);
   sys_nbio (write ...);
   sys_ret;
}</pre>
```



Trace Datatype

• Reflect the trace of system calls as a datastructure:

```
-- A lazy tree of system calls/events

data Trace =

SYS_RET

| SYS_FORK Trace Trace

| SYS_YIELD Trace

| SYS_NBIO (IO Trace)

| SYS_WAIT Socket EPOLL_Event Trace

| ...
```

- Key use of Haskell's laziness:
 - Trace datatype represents potentially infinite trees
 - Nodes of the tree are computed only when needed
- Strong, expressive types:
 - IO Trace is the type of computations that do some I/O and then produce a trace.
- Nodes provide the event abstraction



Scheduling the events

traversing the tree!



Scheduling the events

traversing the tree!

Example: Round robin is just breadth-first traversal.





Threads to Events?



Monads in Haskell

- A monad is a datatype that describes programs written in a domainspecific "embedded" sublanguage:
 - Each monad provides some primitive commands
 - Users can create "embedded programs" in the monad by composition

```
-- Monad interface for a parameterized datatype M (excerpt)
class Monad M where
return :: a -> M a -- return a value
(>>=) :: M a -> (a -> M b) -> M b -- sequential composition
```

Example: IO monad

-- Example primitive IO operations: hGetChar :: Handle -> IO Char hPutChar :: Handle -> Char -> IO ()

```
double :: Handle -> IO ()
double h = do {
    x <- hGetChar h;
    hPutChar h x;
    hPutChar h x;
}</pre>
```

double :: Handle -> IO ()
double h =
hGetChar h >>= (\x ->
hPutChar h x >>= (_ ->
hPutChar h x >>= (_ ->
return ()
)))

CPS Conversion, Monadically

- A continuation is just a function that produces a Trace
- The datatype of CPS computations makes the continuation explicit
- All of this is hidden in a library

```
-- CPS Monad
newtype CPS a = CPS ((a -> Trace) -> Trace)
class Monad CPS where
 return x = CPS (\langle c \rangle - c x)
 (CPS g) >>= f = CPS (\langle c -> g (\langle x -> let CPS h = f x in h c))
-- Complete a trace by putting SYS_RET at the leaves
build_trace :: CPS a -> Trace
build trace (CPS f) = f (c \rightarrow SYS RET)
-- CPS primitive commands:
sys ret = CPS (\land -> SYS RET)
sys_fork f = CPS (\c -> SYS_FORK (build_trace f) (c ()))
sys_yield = CPS (c \rightarrow SYS_YIELD(c()))
sys_nbio f = CPS (c \rightarrow SYS_NBIO (do x <- f; return (c x)))
```



















Outline

- Application-level cooperative concurrency in Haskell
 - Thread programming and Traces
 - Schedulers and Event processing
 - CPS translation and monads
- Examples
- Performance

Future Directions & Conclusions

Example Threaded Code



Example Event System Architecture

- Each event loop ("worker") runs in an OS thread synchronized using queues
- Example configuration:
 - Worker pool for CPU-intensive computations
 - Worker pool for blocking IO operations
 - Dedicated worker threads for monitoring epoll & AIO events



Scheduler Implementation

- Epoll: high-performance "select()" on Linux
- AIO: asynchronous file I/O
- Wrap underlying C functions using Haskell's FFI

```
-- epoll event loop

worker_epoll sched = do {

-- wait for some epoll events

results <- epoll_wait;

-- write each thread in results to the ready_queue

mapM (add_thread (ready_queue sched)) results;

worker_epll sched;
```

Performance?

- Implementation
 - Concurrent Haskell GHC 6.5 on Linux 2.6.15
- Haskell is a pure, lazy, functional language
 - Significantly slower than C
 - Uses garbage collection
- CPS threads are cheap and lightweight:
 - Everything is heap allocated (no thread-local stack)
 - Actual space usage depends on needed thread-local state
 - Memory footprint for a minimal thread is just 48 bytes
 - GC accounts for < 0.2% of the runtime in our experiments
- Events are efficient:
 - Constant number of OS threads means less overhead
 - Event-driven scheduling makes it easy to use high-performance epoll and AIO interfaces

Disk head scheduling performance



FIFO performance with idle threads



Test App: Web Server



Qualitative Experience

- Implementing other features:
 - Exceptions
 - Timers
 - Mutexes, locks, and other synchronization mechanisms
- Easy to customize the schedulers
- Plugging in a user-level TCP stack (also in Haskell):
 - Defining/interpreting new system calls: 22 LOC
 - Event loop for incoming packets: 7 LOC
 - Event loop for timers: 9 LOC
 - Minimal changes elsewhere in the code



www.liveops.com

- Presentation at CUFP 2007
 - Replaced Java-based servers with monadic CPS/event style servers written in OcamI.
 - Supports 5,000 simultaneous users connecting via SSL
 - Sustains 700+ TPS (with bursts of 1,500 TPS) during peaks
 - Two major feature releases since initial deployment (mid-2006)

"Although developed independently, this work is the same vein as (and, in some ways, validates) Peng Li and Steve Zdancewic's 'A Language-based Approach to Unifying Events and Threads'..." -- Chris Waterson CUFP 2007

Outline

- Application-level cooperative concurrency in Haskell
 - Thread programming and Traces
 - Schedulers and Event processing
 - CPS translation and monads
- Examples
- Performance

Future Directions & Conclusions

Multiprocessor Support

- Run one worker_main thread per CPU
- OS threads synchronized using Software Transactional Memory (STM)
- Use Haskell's STM monad
 - Application-level thread library can still implement mutexes or locks if they are more applicable
- Porting the implementation to use a multiprocessor was *very* easy



Future Directions

- More experience with STM and multiprocessors
- More experiments with custom schedulers
- Languages other than Haskell?
 - Ocaml, SML, Scheme, C#? (STM support may be harder)
- Provide different language support for concurrency?
 - Provide only minimal support for concurrency in the runtime itself
 - Move most scheduling into libraries
 - Provide good syntactic support for CPS
 - Integrate with STM?
- Peng Li and the GHC developers at MSR Cambridge
 - Proposed re-design of the Haskell runtime system

Conclusions



- We should strive to get the best of both worlds:
 - Expressiveness and simplicity of threads
 - Scalability and flexibility of event-driven systems
 - Application-level concurrency in Haskell
 - CPS and explicit trace datastructure to represent events
 - Programmers write code in threaded style
 - Schedulers traverse the trace to drive the computation
- Haskell code can be found at: www.cis.upenn.edu/~lipeng

Thanks!





. . .

Multiprocessor Speedups (Best Case)



 Each processor runs one copy of worker_main as a kernel thread

STM Synchronization Overheads (Worst Case)

- 1 Application-level thread per processor.
- Each thread increments a shared integer: 3/4 of the transactions roll back.
- Each processor runs one copy of worker_main as a kernel thread.

QuickTime[™] and a TIFF (Uncompressed) decompressor are needed to see this picture.