

JIAGU: Optimizing Serverless Computing Resource Utilization with Harmonized Efficiency and Practicability

Qingyuan Liu

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Yanning Yang

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Dong Du

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Yubin Xia

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

Ping Zhang

Huawei Cloud
China

Jia Feng

Huawei Cloud
China

James Larus

EPFL
Switzerland

Haibo Chen

Shanghai Jiao Tong University
Shanghai, China

ABSTRACT

Current serverless platforms struggle to optimize resource utilization due to their dynamic and fine-grained nature. Conventional techniques like overcommitment and autoscaling fall short, often sacrificing utilization for practicability or incurring performance trade-offs. Overcommitment requires predicting performance to prevent QoS violation, introducing trade-off between prediction accuracy and overheads. Autoscaling requires scaling instances in response to load fluctuations quickly to reduce resource wastage, but more frequent scaling also leads to more cold start overheads. This paper introduces JIAGU to harmonize efficiency with practicability through two novel techniques. First, *pre-decision scheduling* achieves accurate prediction while eliminating overheads by decoupling prediction and scheduling. Second, *dual-staged scaling* achieves frequent adjustment of instances with minimum overhead. We have implemented a prototype and evaluated it using real-world applications and traces from the public cloud platform. Our evaluation shows a 54.8% improvement in deployment density over commercial clouds (with Kubernetes) while maintaining QoS, and 81.0%–93.7% lower scheduling costs and a 57.4%–69.3% reduction in cold

start latency compared to existing QoS-aware schedulers in research work.

ACM Reference Format:

Qingyuan Liu, Dong Du, Yubin Xia, Ping Zhang, Haibo Chen. 2024. JIAGU: Optimizing Serverless Computing Resource Utilization with Harmonized Efficiency and Practicability. In *Proceedings of ACM Conference (Conference'17)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Serverless computing [34] simplifies the management of cloud applications with features like on-demand execution and autoscaling. Through autoscaling, cloud providers are able to dynamically deploy zero to numerous instances to run a specific function in response to real-time demands, optimizing performance and cost efficiency. Critical to this process are two main components: the autoscaler and the scheduler. The autoscaler utilizes a predefined threshold for each function, called *saturated value* (e.g., requests per second, or RPS), and triggers the creation of new instances as needed when the live load approaches this threshold [5, 8]¹. By doing so, the autoscaler prevents instances from becoming overloaded and guarantees performance, which is generally measured in terms of Quality-of-Service (QoS). When the autoscaler triggers the creation of a new instance, the scheduler is responsible for scheduling the instance to a suitable node. In making these assignments, the scheduler accounts for various aspects, including whether a node can meet a function's resource requirements which developers manually define.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM.

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnnn>

¹This approach typically ensures individual instance loads do not exceed the saturated value, as doing so would lead to the instantiation of additional instances, thereby redistributing the load.




Figure 1: Opportunities of improving resource utilization. “Configured resources” means the allocated resources can be fully utilized. The blue line demonstrates the resource utilization of instances that are serving a saturated value of load, which fluctuates due to the variation in resource interference.

However, current serverless systems still fall short on efficiently utilizing resources. According to traces from AliCloud [66] and our public cloud (i.e., Huawei Cloud, a top-five IaaS provider [4]), most serverless functions can only utilize a small portion of allocated resources. As illustrated in Figure 1, the issue mainly results from two factors. First, to guarantee performance, users usually consider the worst case, and thus specify excessive resources to instances. Even if instances are processing saturated load of requests, they cannot utilize the allocated resources. This causes the resource wastage of part ① in Figure 1. Second, in practice, user loads served by each instance continuously fluctuate. Under-loaded instances usually require fewer resources and are less able to utilize the resources, resulting in resource wastage of part ② in Figure 1.

To mitigate the two issues, nowadays serverless systems can leverage *overcommitment* [40, 66] and *autoscaling* [54]. First, for part ① in Figure 1, overcommitment is an intuitive solution, i.e., deploy more instances on a server. This approach could be implemented by the scheduler, as the scheduler is responsible for deciding how instances are deployed. Second, for part ②, it could be helpful to reduce the load fluctuations within instances, trying to keep the load close to the saturated load for each instance. This can be achieved by the autoscaler, which is responsible for observing load fluctuations and adjusting the number of instances accordingly.

Nevertheless, it is challenging to apply the two approaches while achieving effectiveness with practical cost. First, since overcommitment may lead to performance degradation and QoS violation, it is a common practice to predict performance before scheduling an instance to avoid QoS violation. However, it is challenging to *accurately predict instances’ performance with a practical cost*. Although prior predictor-based schedulers have made great progress [22, 46–48, 66, 70, 79], they fall short in achieving both high accuracy and low cost,

since the two goals can be a trade-off: making accurate prediction requires considering complex *interference* on multiple resources imposed by highly heterogeneous colocated functions, but the complex computation inevitably introduces high overheads. For example, some prior works predict with specially designed machine learning models [79], which is costly for scheduling. Since cold start latency mainly consists of scheduling latency and instance initialization latency, with initialization being optimized by a lot of work to even $< 1\text{ms}$, scheduling with inference ($\sim 20\text{ms}$ or higher) could become a new bottleneck [42]. To compromise, nowadays public clouds still use heuristic policies for scheduling, thus failing to accurately predict performance and providing limited improvement in resource utilization.

Second, to efficiently utilize resources under load fluctuation, the autoscaler needs to quickly respond to the load variation, evict instances and free the resources when the load drops. Intuitively, the faster autoscaling can react to load fluctuations, the more efficiently resources can be used. However, *more sensitive and frequent scaling also means more additional cold starts, resulting in the trade-off between resource utilization and cold start overheads*. It is challenging to achieve both goals simultaneously.

We present two key insights to tackle the aforementioned challenges. First, the trade-off between scheduling costs and efficiency is due to the fact that these complex decisions need to be made at the time of scheduling, which involves costly predictions. Therefore, it can be beneficial if we *decouple prediction and decision making*. Specifically, we can predict in advance the performance of possible incoming instances and save the results. If the incoming instance matches the advance predicted scenario, the scheduling can be made by directly checking the prepared decisions without model inference. This provides a scheduling fast path.

Second, the trade-off between resource utilization and cold starts arises from that instances do not release resources until they are evicted. Instead, we can *decouple resource releasing and instance eviction*. Specifically, operations like sending requests to fewer instances could achieve similar effect of releasing resources as eviction. Releasing resources without instance eviction can be less costly, and thus can be applied with higher sensitivity for better resource utilization.

Inspired by the two insights, we propose JIAGU, a serverless system that harmonizes efficiency and practicability in improving resource utilization, tackling the challenges with two techniques. First, JIAGU achieves accurate and low cost performance prediction with *pre-decision scheduling*, which decouples prediction and decision making, providing a scheduling *fast path* without inference. For every deployed function on a server, JIAGU predicts in advance their *capacities* on that server with a model. A function’s capacity means the maximum number of its instances can be deployed on the server

under the interference of current neighbors without violating everyone’s QoS. To schedule a new instance of a deployed function, JIAGU only needs to compare the function’s capacity with the number of its instances to determine whether the scheduling can be successful or not. Moreover, JIAGU designs an *asynchronous update* approach, which keeps the capacities up-to-date without incurring model inference to the scheduling critical path, and applies a *concurrency-aware scheduling* to batch the scheduling of concurrent incoming instances when load spikes occur. Results with real-world patterns show that >80% scheduling goes through the fast path.

Second, JIAGU designs a *dual-staged scaling* method. When load drops, before instances are evicted, JIAGU first adjusts the routing with a higher sensitivity, sending requests to fewer instances, thus releasing some of the instances’ resources. Then, if the load rises again before idle instances are evicted, JIAGU can get the instances working again by re-routing with minimum overhead. Third, to cope with the case where a node is full and causes idle instances on it can not be converted to the saturated state, JIAGU migrates idle instances to other nodes in advance to hide the overhead of the required cold starts.

We present a prototype of JIAGU based on an open-source serverless system, OpenFaaS [7]. We evaluate it using ServerlessBench [72], FunctionBench [36], and applications with real-world traces from Huawei Cloud. The results show that on real-world traces, compared to a state-of-the-art model-based serverless scheduler [79], JIAGU incurs 81.0%–93.7% lower scheduling costs and 57.4%–69.3% lower cold start latency with *cfork* [25]. It also achieves the highest resource utilization compared to all baseline schedulers (54.8% higher instance density than Kubernetes).

2 MOTIVATION

2.1 Background and Motivation

Notations and terms. The term function denotes the basic scheduling unit within a serverless platform. A function might comprise multiple instances to serve requests. Each instance is allocated with specified resources by user configurations. Quality-of-Service (QoS) is utilized to describe the performance targets for functions. In our platform, QoS is primarily characterized by tail latency; however, the definition can be extended to other metrics.

Components for load and utilization management in serverless platforms. First, router dispatches user requests to available instances of a function, typically employing a *load balancing* strategy to ensure equal distribution of requests among




Figure 2: Schedulers and routers.

instances (Figure 2). Second, autoscaler [5, 8] is responsible for determining the number of instances. It uses a pre-determined RPS threshold, referred to as the saturated load, to determine whether it is necessary to create or evict instances, to avoid instance overloaded or resource waste. Different from creating instances, the autoscaler evicts instances with a *keep-alive* approach, which does not immediately evict instances when the expected number of instances drops, but waits for a “keep-alive duration”. The keep-alive duration can reflect the sensitivity of the autoscaler — shorter duration means higher sensitivity and more frequent evictions. Last, when a new instance is created, a scheduler is responsible for assigning a specific node for it to deploy the instance, which will consider several factors like the resource requirements.

Low resource utilization in serverless platforms. Optimizing resource usage is one of the top cloud initiatives [2], as every 1% increase in utilization could mean more than millions of dollars a year in cost savings. However, production traces show that the resources of serverless platforms are still severely under-utilized (Figure 4). In general, the wastage mainly arises from two parts: part ① and ② in Figure 1.

Part ① is because the resources allocated by the user are usually conservative, considering the worst cases that suffer the severest resource interference. Therefore, the allocated resources could be even higher than the actual demand of instances that are processing saturated load. Part ② is because the load served by each instance constantly fluctuates, and under-loaded instances are less able to fully utilize the resources. For example, Figure 3 shows the average RPS served by an instance for one of the most popular functions in the trace of Huawei Cloud. If the instance is always considered saturated, **51%** of resources could possibly be wasted.

Opportunities for improving resource utilization. To mitigate the issues, serverless systems could adopt two approaches respectively. First is overcommitment for part ①, i.e., the scheduler could deploy more instances on a server. Second is autoscaling for part ②, i.e., the autoscaler dynamically evicts instances when the load drops, reducing the overestimation of resource demands for under-loaded instances. Applying the two approaches, our objective is to simultaneously achieve *effectiveness* in improving resource utilization with *practical cost*.

Table 1: A comparison between JIAGU and previously developed methods. Scalable profiling requires no more than $O(n)$ complexity, where n represents the number of functions, k denotes to the number of instances that can be deployed on a server. Pythia, due to have a model for each function, requires $O(n^2)$ complexity. Whare-map requires $O(n^k)$ complexity to profile all colocation combinations where k denotes to the number of co-runners allowed on a server. Owl profiles the combination of two functions with k instances, requiring $O(n^2k)$ complexity. “Fast scheduling” implies that the scheduler makes an decision within a few milliseconds ($\sim 1\text{ms}$). Gsight requires more than 20ms for scheduling (§7.2).

Workload	System	Year	Efficient QoS-Aware Scheduler with Low Cost?			Handling Load Dynamicity?	
			Prediction model?	Accurate Prediction?	Overhead? Profiling cost? Fast scheduling?		
Serverless	Jiagu		Global statistical model	✓	$O(n)$	✓	Dual-staged scaling
	Owl [66]	2022	Historical information	Limited	$O(n^2k)$	✓	Autoscaling
	Gsight [79]	2021	Global statistical model	✓	$O(n)$	✗	Autoscaling
Monolithic Service	Pythia [70]	2018	Per-function Linear model	✓	$O(n^2)$	✓	Autoscaling
	Paragon [22]	2013	Heuristic	NA	$O(n)$	✓	Autoscaling
	Whare-map [46]	2013	Historical information	Limited	$O(n^k)$	✓	Autoscaling
	Bubble-up [47]	2011	Heuristic	Inaccurate	$O(n)$	✓	Autoscaling
Resource Schedulers	Aquatope [80], Cilantro [16], Sinan [76] FIRM [53], Parties [20], Heracles [43], ...			Resilient to runtime variations with limitations (§8).			




Figure 3: Fluctuation of user load per instance.




Figure 4: Statistics on the ratio of actual resource usage to allocated resources. The data was collected on Huawei Cloud over one month from a region. About 80% of servers only use 8% CPU and 64% memory resources.

2.2 Challenges

However, achieving both efficiency and practicability can be challenging, since the two goals usually have trade-offs.

2.2.1 Challenges for the Scheduler. Although overcommitment helps improve resource utilization, it could also cause performance degradation, possibly resulting in QoS violation. Therefore, a common approach for the scheduler is to predict

instances’ performances when scheduling, maximizing instance deployment density while not violating instances’ QoS. The goal means that the scheduler should *simultaneously* achieve: accurate QoS violation prediction (with scalable profiling overhead) and low scheduling latency. Although prior schedulers have made great progress for the serverless scenario [66, 79] compared with schedulers [22, 46–48, 70] designed for monolithic services, they fall short of achieving both goals. Table 1 summarizes the key differences of prior schedulers against our objectives.

Accurate QoS prediction. The key to accurately predicting the QoS violation is to quantify the resource interference by collocated function instances, which is challenging. First, in the serverless scenario, the number of colocation combinations grows exponentially with the number of functions, and ultimately becomes practically infinite. Therefore, the profiling overhead should be scalable, otherwise it could be impossible to profile such a large number of colocation combinations. Second, resource interference can be complex, while plentiful and heterogeneous functions exert various pressures on multiple resources. The large number of colocation combinations further amplifies the interference complexity.

Some prior schedulers do not meet the goal yet. For example, some schedulers predict based on historical performance information [46, 66], so that their predictive ability is limited and can only predict the performance of profiled collocated instance combinations. Their profiling cost is also unscalable (shown in Table 1). Schedulers that train a model for each function has unacceptable profiling and training overhead [70]. Schedulers using heuristic algorithms are limited in their ability to accurately predict performance due to overly

Table 2: State-of-the-art serverless systems with startup optimizations. “Container startup” presents the runtime startup latency reported by public reports or papers. “Scheduling overhead” presents the overhead of scheduling in a cold startup with model-based methods. We use 21.78ms as the model-based scheduling costs, the average result of our ported Gsight [79] model.

System	Container startup	Scheduling overhead
AWS Snapstart [17]	~100ms	~21.8%
Replayable [68]	54ms	40.3%
Fireworks [62]	~50ms	~43.6%
SOCK [51]	20ms	108.9%
Molecule [25]	8.4ms	2.6x
SEUSS [18]	7.5ms	2.9x
Catalyzer [26]	0.97ms	22.5x
Faasm [61]	0.5ms	43.6x

simplistic models [47], or does not actually predict performance at all [22].

Low scheduling latency. The scheduling process is involved in every instance’s cold start. Given the recent advancements in optimizing the instance initialization cost to a few milliseconds or even sub-milliseconds [14, 18, 25, 26, 33, 51, 61, 62, 67, 68], it becomes imperative to ensure that the scheduling cost remains low as well. Otherwise, the scheduling cost can become the new bottleneck in the startup cost [42]. As shown in Table 2, we use the average scheduling costs of Gsight [79] (our ported version) to illustrate the overhead of scheduling over the total cold startup costs in these systems. Although it can accurately predict the performance and consider serverless-specific features like partial interference, it can incur non-trivial overhead even in commercial systems like AWS Lambda with Snapstart [17] (>20%). Scheduling cost can be dominant for cold starts with state-of-the-art optimizations like Catalyzer [26] and Faasm [61]. In short, schedulers need to make decisions within a few milliseconds to avoid hindering the startup process.

2.2.2 Challenges for Autoscaling. The autoscaling feature commonly helps mitigate the defect. When load drops, the autoscaler would dynamically evict instances, thus freeing space for deploying new instances, preventing those under-loaded instances from wasting resources (typically every instance can be under-loaded because of load balancing). Intuitively, a more sensitive autoscaler could better utilize resources in response to load fluctuation. However, more frequent scaling would also result in more additional cold starts. It means the *trade-off between resource utilization and cold start costs*.

The irregularity of load fluctuations further complicates the problem. Prior works have analyzed production traces and tried to predict the invocation patterns [28, 56, 60, 80], pre-warming instances accordingly to reduce cold starts. However,

user loads exhibit only moderate regularity over extended periods of time (e.g., diurnal patterns), but are extremely unpredictable over shorter intervals. For example, the average coefficient of variable (CV) over the number of requests in a minute could be more than 10 [73] in the Azure trace [60]. The more frequent scaling also means a finer-grained pre-warming prediction and a worse prediction accuracy.

2.3 Insights

We observe two insights that help to tackle the two challenges.

Insight-1: Prediction and decision making can be decoupled. The trade-off between prediction accuracy and scheduling cost arises from the coupling of the prediction and decision making, i.e., the costly model inference is usually made during scheduling. We can *decouple prediction and decision making*. Specifically, the scheduler can assume the interference environment before the new instance arrives, and make advance predictions based on the assumptions. When a new instance arrives and the interference environment at the time of scheduling matches our previous assumption, the scheduling can be made by directly checking the prepared decisions. This provides a scheduling fast path without inference.

Insight-2: Resource releasing and instance eviction can be decoupled. The trade-off between resource utilization and cold start overheads arises from the coupling of resource releasing and instance eviction. Instead, we can *decouple resource releasing and instance eviction*. Specifically, even if an instance is not evicted, we could adjust the routing and do not send requests to it. It consolidates the loads of under-loaded instances to fewer instances to reduce the waste of resources caused by treating under-loaded instances as saturated instances, achieving a similar resource releasing effect as an actual eviction. The overhead of adjusting the routing is much smaller than actual cold start overheads. Therefore, in this way, we could release/reclaim resources with higher sensitivity to cope with load fluctuations, while avoiding excessive additional cold start overheads.

3 DESIGN OVERVIEW

We propose JIAGU, an efficient and practical QoS-aware serverless system that tackles the two challenges of improving resource utilization with the insights. The overall design is shown in Figure 5. First, JIAGU designs a pre-decision scheduling that could make accurate predictions with low scheduling latency (§4). When an instance is created, JIAGU predicts its performance after deployment, trying to increase the instance deployment density without violating QoS to fully utilize the resources. Second, JIAGU adopts a dual-staged scaling design that efficiently utilizes resources under load fluctuation with minimum overhead (§5).




Figure 5: JIAGU overview.

Cluster setting. To apply JIAGU, our cluster is partitioned into three types of nodes. A small proportion of nodes are profiling nodes and training nodes, deploying instances whose runtime information is collected to construct function profiles and the dataset to train the model used by JIAGU’s scheduler. JIAGU schedules instances that actually handle user requests to high-density nodes, maximizing the resource utilization of these nodes. The training, profiling and high-density nodes are homogeneous.

User configurations and QoS. In our platform, when uploading a function, a user is expected to specify the allocated resources (CPU and memory) and the saturated load of the function (optional with default value). The QoS requirement of a function is established by the provider according to the function’s previously monitored performances, as an important reference metric for overcommitment. Moreover, in Huawei Cloud, we can establish specific QoS agreements with top-tier customers, since their workload could be the majority in the cloud.

4 PRE-DECISION SCHEDULING

4.1 JIAGU’s Prediction Model

Prediction model. JIAGU’s ability of QoS-aware scheduling requires accurate prediction of the functions’ performance under resource interference. The prediction model is based on Random Forest Regression (RFR). Specifically, JIAGU’s regression model has the following form:

$$P_{AU\{B,C,\dots\}} = RFR\{P_A, R_A, C_A, R_B, C_B, R_C, C_C, \dots\}$$

Table 3: Profiling metrics.

Metrics	Description
mCPU	CPU utilization
Instructions	Instructions retired
IPC	Instructions per cycle
Context switches	Switching between privilege modes
MLP	Efficiency of concurrent access indicated by Memory Level Parallelism (MLP)
L1d/L1i/L2/LLC MPKI	Cache locality indicated by misses per thousand instructions (MPKI)
TLB data/inst. MPKI	TLB locality indicated by MPKI
Branch MPKI	Branch predictor locality indicated by MPKI
Memory bandwidth	Memory usage and performance

where, $P_{AU\{B,C,\dots\}}$ is function A ’s performance² under the interference of functions B and C . R_A , R_B and R_C is the profile matrix of function A , B and C respectively. JIAGU uses a single instance’s multiple resource’s utilization as its profile (Table 3), and adopts a *solo-run* approach to collect the profile metrics of functions (details in §6). C_A , C_B and C_C are concurrency information of the three functions. The concurrency information includes two parts: the number of saturated instances and the number of cached instances (detailed in §5). P_A is the solo-run performance of function A .

The model is proven effective in our public cloud, and also utilized in prior systems [40, 79]. Moreover, compared to prior data models that predict the performance in the instance granularity [70, 79], since different instances of the same function are homogeneous and performs similarly on the same server, the model predicts the performance in function-granularity. We merge the features of the same function’s instances and introduce *concurrency* as a new feature for a function. This effectively reduces the input dimensions, resulting in less training overhead and possible mitigation of the “curse of dimensionality” [15]. JIAGU is also flexible to utilize other prediction models.

Inference overhead. In practice, a policy may require predicting different functions’ performances under various colocation environments, and the colocation environments can be described by multiple inputs. Notably, learning frameworks (e.g., sklearn[10]) have optimizations to infer multiple simultaneous inputs, which incurs trivial additional cost (§7). Therefore, in the descriptions that follow, if multiple predictions can be merged in the form of multiple inputs, we refer to such inference overhead as “once” inference overhead.

4.2 Capacity and Capacity Table

Inspired by the first insight, to accurately predict instances’ performances without incurring excessive cost to scheduling, we can decouple prediction and decision making. However,

²Although we use P90 tail latency as our performance metrics, it is a general model that can be extended to other metrics like costs.




Figure 6: Analysis of highly-replicated characteristic.

making predictions requires knowledge of what the incoming instance is and what the interference environment on the server is, which is not known until scheduling (decision making). Considering there are infinite number of functions, it is also impossible to traverse all possible interference environments. Therefore, the decoupling can be challenging.

Serverless features that help tackle the challenge. We realize that the *highly-replicated* feature of serverless may help address the issue. The feature can be illustrated with the following statistical analysis on real-world traces collected from Huawei Cloud’s production environment. Specifically, we mainly analyze the concurrency of function instances, i.e., the number of concurrently running instances of a function in a certain time window, rather than the invocation concurrencies in previous studies [56, 60, 75, 80]. We weight the ratio of every concurrency value by itself, e.g., if there are 100 functions that have only 1 concurrency but 1 function whose concurrency is 100, the CDF point should be (1, 0.5) and (100, 1). The distribution is shown in Figure 6-a. Each point (e.g., (x,y)) in the figure indicates that $(y \times 100)\%$ instances belong to functions whose concurrencies are $\leq x$. For example, 56% of instances are from functions whose concurrency is >12 , which is shown more clearly in Figure 6-b. Instances of functions with only one concurrent instance are just 23% of all instances. In conclusion, such analysis shows serverless’s *highly-replicated* feature — **most serverless functions have many replicated instances.**

Introducing capacity for decoupling. The feature means, for a deployed instance on a server, it is likely that more instances of the same function would come in the future. Moreover, considering locality when deploying instances has also been proven beneficial by plentiful prior works [12, 59]. Therefore, to decouple prediction and decision making, we can predict in advance whether the next incoming instance of *existing functions* can be deployed. With this idea, for every server, JIAGU calculates *capacity* for each existing function on that server. JIAGU predicts in advance the function’s new instance’s performance after deployment, and sets the capacity value “true” if the predicted performance meets its QoS. The capacities for

all functions on a server form the server’s *capacity table*. After that, when the scheduler is making scheduling decisions, it can judge QoS violation by simply checking the table without model inference. It is the scheduling “fast path”. In addition, it is only necessary to make predictions on the critical path if the function to which the incoming instance belongs is not in the capacity table. It is the scheduling “slow path”.

4.3 Asynchronous Update

Although introducing capacity could predict the QoS violation of new instances in advance, the deployment of a new instance could impose resource interference to its neighbors, possibly causing their QoS violations. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce a *validation* process, which predicts and checks whether neighbors will violate their QoS after deploying the new instance. However, such validation introduces costly inference for cold starts if done before deployment, or the risk of QoS violation if done after deployment.

To mitigate the defect, JIAGU applies an *asynchronous update* approach. To avoid the cost, asynchronous update refines the way to calculate the capacity, predicting all colocated functions’ performances, and setting the capacity “true” if the predicted performance of each function meets its own QoS. In this way, after deploying the new instance, the predicted performances of either the new instance itself or the neighbors would not violate the QoS. This prevents the validation from affecting the scheduling latency.

Furthermore, when a new instance is scheduled to a server, it triggers updating the capacity table. Now that the validation can be delayed, and this update can be done asynchronously, outside the scheduling critical path. By asynchronous update, the capacity table is always up-to-date with minimum overhead, ensure that the capacity table always reflects real time interference on servers when scheduling.

4.4 Concurrency-aware Scheduling

Decoupling prediction efficiently reduces model inference for individual schedulings. Moreover, one of the extreme invocation patterns in the cloud is the load spike, where the load rises rapidly so that multiple instances are created simultaneously. In such case, the asynchronous update of the previous instance could possibly block the scheduling of the next instance, as shown in Figure 8-a. To mitigate, JIAGU further adopts *concurrency-aware scheduling*, which batches the scheduling of concurrent incoming instances at load spikes.

JIAGU further refines the way of calculating capacity, considering not only whether the next instance can be deployed, but also how many next instances can be deployed, as shown in Figure 7. The capacity value of each function is no longer a bool value, but a specific numerical value indicating how




Figure 7: Calculating capacity. It finds the maximum concurrency value as the capacity which every colocated function’s predicted performance can guarantee its QoS.




Figure 8: Concurrency-aware scheduling enables batch scheduling for one function’s multiple instances.

many instances of the function can be deployed with current neighbors. For example, for a server where there are 2 $f1$ and 3 $f2$ instances, with $f1$ and $f2$ ’s capacities are 4 and 6 respectively. It means that 4 $f1$ instances can be deployed with 3 $f2$ instances, while 6 $f2$ instances can be deployed with 2 $f1$ instances. Then, as shown in Figure 8-b, when multiple instances of the same function arrive, if the function’s capacity on the server is sufficient to accommodate those new instances, the scheduling and the asynchronous update can be done once for scheduling multiple instances.

4.5 Put It All Together: Scheduling Example

Now we describe the complete scheduling process and provide an example. As shown in Figure 5, when a function’s new instance is created, JIAGU will first select a node for it using a node filter (detailed in §6). Then, based on the node’s capacity table built in advance, the scheduler decides whether to schedule the instance via a fast path or a slow path.

Figure 9 demonstrates an example. First, an instance of $f3$ incomes and the node filter selects the node in Figure 9 for it. The scheduler checks the capacity table and finds that there is no entry for $f3$. Therefore, the scheduler calculates $f3$ ’s capacity using the prediction model (as shown in Figure 7). The result means that 3 $f3$ ’s instances can be deployed under current numbers of $f1$ and $f2$ instances, so the new instance of $f3$ can be deployed on that server. It is the scheduling slow path involving a costly model inference.




Figure 9: Scheduling example on a node.




Figure 10: Dual-staged scaling. In the example, the release and keep-alive duration are 10 and 60 seconds respectively.

Then, when load spike occurs, two instances of $f3$ are created and come to the node. The scheduler checks the capacity table that the number of $f3$ ’s instances will not exceed its capacity after deployment, so that the scheduling decision is made quickly without model inference. This is the scheduling fast path. The deployment also triggers an asynchronous update of the capacity table, which can be done outside the scheduling critical path. The scheduling of two instances are batched, triggering only one update of the capacity table.

When load drops and an instance of $f3$ is evicted, such event will also trigger an update to the capacity table. The increased capacities of $f1$ and $f2$ mean that the resources can be reutilized by the scheduler to deploy more instances later. Of course, this update would hardly affect the scheduling.

5 DUAL-STAGED SCALING

Motivated by the second insight, JIAGU designs dual-staged scaling to efficiently utilize resources under load fluctuation while minimizing cold start overheads.

Dual-staged eviction. The key technique of the scaling approach is dual-staged eviction. When load drops and so as the expected number of instances decreases, instead of directly evicting instances after the keep-alive duration as shown in Figure 10-a, JIAGU introduces a “release” duration (Figure 10-b). The “release” duration is (much) shorter than the keep-alive duration, i.e., the “release” operation is more sensitively triggered before eviction. After the expected number of instances drops for the release duration, the autoscaler first

triggers the “release” operation, which changes the routing rules, sending requests to fewer instances, but does not actually evict any instances. The instances that do not actually process requests are called cached instances, while other instances that are still processing requests are called saturated instances, as shown in Figure 10-b. In the example, the load of four instances are consolidated to three instances. Therefore, when considering resource interference, the scheduler would consider only three saturated instances instead of four, thus reducing resource wastage caused by overestimation of loads. After the “release” operation, the decrease in the number of saturated instances will also trigger an asynchronous update and may increase the capacities of other functions on the server. It means that the resources can be reutilized by the scheduler to deploy more instances.

Logical cold start. If the load rises again and the expected number of instances exceeds the current number of saturated instances, if there are cached instances at this point, JIAGU triggers a “logical cold start”. Specifically, JIAGU’s scheduler chooses a cached instance, then the router re-routes requests to the selected instance, letting it return to a saturated instance. This “logical cold start” is fast since the re-routing only takes $< 1ms$, while a real instance initialization is far more costly.

On-demand migration. If the number of saturated instances of a function on a server drops and new instances of other functions are deployed to the server, the function’s capacity could be updated and reduced. Thus, after a while, the server could possibly be “full”, i.e., the conversion of the function’s cached instances to saturated instances on that server could result in the number of saturated instances surpassing its capacity. At this moment, if the load rises again, JIAGU has to re-initialize instances on other feasible nodes, rather than merely trigger “logical cold starts”. To avoid incurring such additional “real cold starts”, JIAGU learns in advance how many cached instances are no longer converted to saturated instances by comparing the capacity with the sum of the numbers of both types of instances. Then, it migrates these cached instances to other feasible servers in advance. Therefore, such additional cold start overheads can be hidden right away and will not affect the running of instances.

Real eviction. If the load does not rise again after the initial drop, finally after the keep-alive duration, the cached instances are actually evicted. After a while, if the load rises again and there are no cached instances, it will trigger the autoscaler to initialize new instances, which involves “real cold starts”. It is consistent with the traditional autoscaling approach.

6 IMPLEMENTATION

We implement JIAGU based on OpenFaaS [7], with 4.5k+ LoCs changes. JIAGU is also developed and discussed at Huawei Cloud.

OpenFaaS architecture. OpenFaaS is a high-level controller based on Kubernetes (K8s), which schedules instances with the K8s scheduler and deploys instances with K8s resources (e.g., K8s *Deployment* and *Service* [3, 11]). It receives user requests from its gateway, and makes instance creation/eviction decisions with its autoscaling logic. OpenFaaS relies on Prometheus [9] to monitor the RPS of user requests and autoscale instances accordingly. The autoscaler calculates the expected number of instances of a function by dividing the overall RPS by the predefined saturated load. By default, it applies a 60-second keep-alive duration.

JIAGU’s scheduling controller. JIAGU’s scheduling logic is implemented as a centralized controller, which manages the model, capacity tables, and other information required by the scheduling. It works together with a plugin for Kubernetes scheduler in the prototype, allowing for interaction between the scheduler and the controller and enabling the scheduler to obtain placement decisions for incoming instances. It also implements asynchronous update, where the scheduling results are returned first before performing the update. Moreover, it is responsible for choosing instances for “logical scaling” for dual-staged scaling with its scheduling algorithm.

Implementing dual-staged scaling. To implement dual-staged scaling, JIAGU adds new rules for Prometheus to monitor RPS, and calculates the expected number of saturated instances according to the monitored values. It applies a 45 (or 30, this sensitivity can be configured) seconds “release” duration, i.e., if the expected number of saturated instances decreases and last for 45 (or 30) seconds, it notifies the router for changing its routing rules. To re-route, the scheduling controller chooses an instance and labels it as “cached”. The “cached” instances are excluded by the function’s corresponding K8s *Service* [11] so that new requests will not be routed to them. When load rises and the expected number of saturated instances increases, it immediately triggers a logical cold start, i.e., the scheduler chooses a cached instance and unlabels it.

Profiling and model training. JIAGU adopts a *solo-run* approach motivated by Gsight [79] to collect the profile metrics of functions. To profile a function, JIAGU additionally deploys an instance to the profiling node exclusively, executes the function by the instance under the saturated load, and profiles the resource utilizations using tools such as *perf* for a duration. Moreover, to construct and maintain a training dataset, JIAGU further collects the performance metrics of various colocation combinations at runtime.

User configurations for functions. How users properly configure their functions [44, 54] (e.g., configure resources and the saturated value) is out of the scope of the paper. Even if a user can wisely configure their functions, the traditional approach of scheduling and autoscaling could still suffer from

interference and load fluctuations (shown in Figure 1), leading to resource under-utilization.

Node filter and management. The node filter described in Figure 5 prioritizes worker nodes in JIAGU. For a new instance, it grants higher priority to nodes that have deployed instances of the same function, as scheduling on those nodes possibly follows a fast path. While the current implementation focuses on this simple priority scheme, future work may explore extending it with additional scheduling policies, such as placing multiple instances of the same function on a single node to benefit from locality [12, 59]. In cases where no usable nodes are available for an instance, JIAGU will request the addition of a new server to the cluster. Similarly, an empty server will be evicted to optimize costs.

Hyperparameter configuration. The implementation involves configuring several specific parameters, including the profiling time and the definition of model convergence. Setting these parameters requires careful consideration of trade-offs based on the actual scenario. For example, collecting more samples when new functions arrive may result in a more accurate model but also incur higher overhead. In our evaluation, all parameters remain consistent and aligned with our practices in Huawei Cloud.

Performance predictability in the cloud. QoS violations are mostly predictable, especially when using tail latency as the QoS metric, which considers the overall performance of multiple requests over a period of time. It is consistent with the observations in our production environment and prior works [40, 48, 70, 79]. In Huawei Cloud’s production environment, JIAGU keeps monitoring the QoS violation and adopts two ways to handle the incidental unpredictability. First, the random forest model is naturally feasible for incremental learning, and we continuously collect runtime performance metrics and retrain the model periodically with the up-to-date training set in case the behavior of functions changes. Second, if the prediction error does not converge after several iterations, JIAGU disables overcommitment and uses traditional conservative QoS-unaware policy to schedule the instances of the unpredictable function on separate nodes. JIAGU can perform well and improve resource utilization in real world.

7 EVALUATION

7.1 Methodology

Experimental setup. We use a cluster of 24 machines for evaluation. Each machine is equipped with an Intel Xeon E5-2650 CPU (2.20GHz 48 logical cores in total) and 128GB memory, running Ubuntu LTS 18.04 with Linux 4.15 kernel. One machine is dedicated to OpenFaaS control plane components (gateway, scheduler, JIAGU’s controller, etc.). The machine is also responsible for sending requests and collecting QoS and

utilization results. The other machines are worker machines responsible for executing or profiling function instances.

Baseline systems. We compare JIAGU with three baseline systems: Kubernetes, Gsight [79] and Owl [66]. Kubernetes scheduler is one of the mostly used serverless scheduler systems in production [1, 6]. Gsight [79] and Owl [66] represent state-of-the-art predictor-based and historical information-based serverless scheduling systems. Since they do not open source the implementation, we implement comparable prototypes of them. Moreover, we evaluate three versions of JIAGU. Jiagu-30 and Jiagu-45 denote prototypes with 30 and 45 seconds “release duration” of dual-staged scaling respectively, while JIAGU-NoDS disables dual-staged scaling.

Scheduling effect metrics. To evaluate the scheduling effect, we compare JIAGU with our baseline scheduling algorithms by two metrics. First is the *QoS violation rate*, which is the percentage of requests that violate QoS in all requests to all functions. The QoS constraint is chosen to be 120% of the tail latency when the instance is saturated and suffers no interference, consistent with previous work [20, 66, 79, 80] and in-production practice. In the evaluation, we aim to achieve a QoS violation rate of less than 10% so we predict the p90 tail latency accordingly. Second is the *function density*, higher density means better resource utilization. We normalize traditional Kubernetes scheduler’s function density to one, meaning that instances are deployed with exactly the amount of configured resources. One of the goals of JIAGU is to increase function density (>1) as much as possible while achieving an acceptable QoS violation rate ($<10\%$).

Workloads and traces. The workloads and traces for our evaluation are consistent with prior work [20, 66, 79, 80]. We use six representative functions in ServerlessBench [72] and FunctionBench [36] for evaluation, including model inference (rnn), batch processing applications (image resize, linpack), log processing, chameleon and file processing (gzip). All functions are configured with the same amount of resources. To ensure the robustness of our system to perturbations in the benchmark inputs, we optionally add zero-mean Gaussian noise to the inputs.

We use various traces for evaluation. First, we use real-world traces since they possess a similar level of complexity as in the production environment. For each set of real-world traces, we randomly select six invocation patterns from real-world Huawei Cloud traces and map each pattern to a function with similar execution time. We generate a total of four different sets of real-world traces to prevent the evaluation results from being influenced by randomness in the traces. The four traces are also selected from real-world traces from various regions. Second, we use specially constructed traces to evaluate the scheduling performance in extreme scenarios.




Figure 11: Performance analysis under extreme scenarios. It includes scheduling cost, number of model inferences per schedule and cold start latency optimizations. We normalize results and label concrete numbers (ms) in the figure.




Figure 12: Performance analysis on real-world traces. It includes scheduling cost, number of model inferences per schedule and cold start latency optimizations. We normalize results and label concrete numbers (ms) in the figure.

7.2 Scheduling Performance Analysis

In this section, we evaluate the scheduling costs on OpenFaaS with different traces in two aspects. First, we evaluate the average scheduling costs of the two algorithms. Second, we simulate how JIAGU can optimize the cold start in conjunction with one of the state-of-the-art instance initialization optimizations, container fork (cfork) [25], which can create an instance in about 8.4ms. We also analyze the cold start with Docker (about 85.5ms). In each test, we compare JIAGU’s default version (Jiagu-45) with Gsight, whose performance is normalized to 1.

Performance under extreme scenarios. We first analyze the extreme performance of JIAGU using specific traces. For the best case, we use a timer trace with only one function. It assumes that the function is invoked and instances are scaled at a fixed frequency. The results (Figure 11-a) show that Gsight suffers a scheduling overhead 11.9x larger than JIAGU. This is because almost all scheduling decisions of JIAGU go through the fast path in this case. Considering cold start latency (Figure 11-b), Gsight’s is 126.3% longer than JIAGU when using cfork because of its costly scheduling. For the worst case, we construct a rare trace where the function concurrencies recurrently change from 0 and 1, so that every scheduling process will go through the slow path. The results show that JIAGU’s performance degraded to a similar level as Gsight.

When using Docker in both cases, the cost of instance initialization becomes the bottleneck. We believe that as a

growing number of efforts have limited initialization overhead to <10ms [14, 18, 25, 26, 33, 51, 61, 62, 67, 68], the reduction in scheduling costs will be increasingly meaningful.

Performance with real-world traces. We then analyze JIAGU’s scheduling costs with four real-world traces. The results (Figure 12) show that for real-world traces, JIAGU achieves 81.0%–93.7% lower scheduling costs than Gsight. This is because JIAGU’s scheduling policy can drastically reduce the number of model inferences (83.8%–92.1%), so that the inference overhead is amortized over multiple cold starts. For cold start latency, when applying JIAGU with cfork, the reduced scheduling costs lead to 57.4%–69.3% lower cold start latency than Gsight.

In conclusion, JIAGU’s scheduling algorithm can significantly reduce model inference times and result in lower scheduling costs, leading to better cold start latency.

7.3 Scheduling Effect on OpenFaaS

This section describes how JIAGU improves resource utilization while guaranteeing QoS. We analyze JIAGU and the baseline systems by the two metrics, function density and QoS violation rate, with the four real-world traces. The density result is the average value during the evaluation weighted by duration.

According to Figure 13, all QoS-aware schedulers improve function density compared with Kubernetes (which is normalized to 1). Without dual-staged scaling, Gsight and JIAGU (Jiagu-NoDS) achieve higher function density than Owl. It





Figure 13: Normalized function density. Density on K8s is normalized to 100%. JIAGU achieves the highest density with all of the real-world traces.



(a) QoS violation of Trace A.

(b) Reduced cold starts.

Figure 14: QoS violations and reduced cold starts. Applications are chameleon (Cha), gzip, image resize (Img), lincpack (Lin), log processing (Log) and RNN.

shows Owl’s limitation of allowing only two colocated functions prevents optimal scheduling decisions. With dual-staged scaling, JIAGU further optimizes resource utilization. Higher sensitivity performs better in improving the instance density. Specifically, Jiagu-30 achieves up to 54.8% higher function density than Kubernetes, 22.0% higher than Gsight and 38.3% higher than Owl, while the QoS violation rate is comparable with Gsight and Jiagu-NoDS. It is because when user load drops, JIAGU can quickly utilize the resources of the unsaturated instances. Moreover, on four traces, all schedulers achieve an acceptable QoS violation rate of less than 10%, and the four results are similar. Therefore, we only show the result on Trace A (Figure 14-a).

Reducing cold starts by migration of cached instances. This section describes how many additional cold starts can be avoided by migrating cached instances. According to Figure 14-b, for 45 seconds sensitivity, all re-routing operations are logical cold starts, needless to migrate instances. With 30-second sensitivity, only a small proportion of re-routing, i.e., < 20% for four traces and 0 for Trace B, requires “real” rather than “logical” cold starts, which can be avoided by migrating cached instances in advance. It illustrates that with dual-staged scaling, JIAGU has the additional choice of greatly improving resource utilization at minimum cost.




Figure 15: Model accuracy. (a) is the error rate of the prediction models. (b) shows that the prediction error drops with new samples.




Figure 16: Prediction errors of various models.




Figure 17: Model performance. (a) is the training time and the total number of dimensions of the two models. (b) JIAGU’s model inference overhead with the number of inputs increases.

In conclusion, with the prediction-based scheduler and dual-staged scaling, JIAGU can achieve high resource utilization while limiting QoS violations with less scheduling overhead than state-of-the-art model-based scheduling policy.

7.4 Prediction Analysis

Prediction accuracy. We evaluate the prediction accuracy of our model, as shown in Figure 15. We define the prediction error rate of a model as $\frac{|\hat{P}-P|}{P}$, where \hat{P} and P are predicted performances and real performances, respectively. First, we analyze the accuracy of the model used by previous evaluations. The model could accurately predict the performance of the six functions, with similar prediction error to Gsight (Jg and Gs in the Figure). Second, we evaluate the overfitting of the model by splitting the test set into two equal-sized sets (Jg-1 and Jg-2). The model achieves similar prediction error on the two different sets, showing that it does not overfit to a specific test set. Third, we evaluate the model’s scalability, i.e., how the model can predict the performance of increasing number of functions (30 and 60 functions). The result

shows that more functions do not affect the prediction precision. Fourth, we evaluate how the model is resilient to the changes in function’s behavior. Each time, we train the model with five functions, and add the remaining function to the system, collect performance metrics as new samples and retrain the model once a sample is added. Figure 15-b shows that the performance prediction error of the new function drops rapidly under increasing number of samples, and converges after about 5–30 samples. It means that it takes limited time to retrain an accurate model after collecting a couple of samples.

Finally, we evaluate the model choices, comparing JIAGU’s random forest regression (RFR) with ESP [48], XGBoost, linear regression, and three multi-layer perception (MLP) models with 2,3,4 layers respectively. The result (Figure 16) confirms our choice of RFR model considering its high accuracy, low training overhead and capability of incremental learning, etc. Possible other models or algorithms (e.g., ridge regression) can be explored to improve JIAGU in future work.

Model performance. We evaluate JIAGU’s model training and inference costs. Figure 17-a shows that JIAGU’s model has evidently better training performance and lower number of input dimensions. Moreover, Figure 17-b demonstrates that the model inference costs increase only 2 milliseconds even when the number of inputs increases to 100. Therefore, although JIAGU batches multiple inputs to the prediction model when calculating the capacity, it will not significantly increase the inference overhead.

In conclusion, JIAGU’s model can predict the performance accurately with a much lower number of input dimensions and training overhead.

8 RELATED WORK

Resource schedulers. Another widely studied (and orthogonal) scheduler is the online resource scheduler [13, 16, 19–21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 38, 39, 43, 45, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 69, 71, 74, 77, 78, 80], which tunes the allocated resources according to functions’ online performance to guarantee QoS and improve resource efficiency. Many of them are designed for long running services [19, 20, 27, 29, 30, 43, 45, 52, 53, 55, 57, 69, 71, 74, 77, 78], which are challenging to apply directly to transient serverless instances. In addition, some serverless resource schedulers [13, 58, 80] use algorithms like Bayesian Optimization to search the resource configuration space and make optimal decisions based on runtime performance. They are resilient to runtime performance variations but still fail to guarantee QoS before convergence.

Request schedulers. Rather than scheduling instances, many prior works tackle the problem of assigning instances for requests. Atoll [63] overcomes many latency challenges in the serverless platform via a ground-up redesign of system control and data planes, utilizing deadline-aware scheduling.

Hermod [35] analyzes and tunes different design choices on OpenWhisk and improves function performance. Fifer [31] queues requests to warm containers to reduce the number of instances and prewarms instances with LSTM resource interference to optimize the cold starts. Sequoia [65] is deployed as a proxy to control user requests and enabling QoS. Neither of them considers resource interference. Golgi [40] applies a model for the router, predicting requests’ performance and sending them to overcommitted instances if the performance does not violate QoS, or otherwise to non-overcommitted instances. It can avoid QoS violation for a fixed number of instances, but does not guide for how many overcommitted instances need to be deployed, while excessive number of overcommitted instances could cause resource under-utilization.

Other optimizations. There are many related serverless optimizations [32, 37, 41, 44, 55, 56, 64, 65]. For example, Orion [44] proposes a system optimized for serverless DAG by proposing a new performance model and a method for colocating parallel invocations. FaasFlow [41] proposes a worker-side workflow schedule pattern that enables better scalability and performance. All of these systems can benefit from JIAGU with a better and more effective scheduler to also improve the resource utilization for cloud vendors without introducing high scheduling costs.

9 CONCLUSION

This paper presents our experience in optimizing resource utilization in Huawei Cloud for serverless computing with JIAGU. JIAGU decouples prediction and decision making to achieve efficient and fast scheduling, and decouples resource releasing and instance eviction to achieve fast reaction to load fluctuation without incurring overmuch cold start overhead. Our results show JIAGU brings significant benefits for resource efficiency using real-world traces.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2023. Apache OpenWhisk is a serverless, open source cloud platform. <http://openwhisk.apache.org/>. Referenced 2023.
- [2] 2023. Cloud computing trends and statistics: Flexera 2023 State of the Cloud Report. <https://www.flexera.com/blog/cloud/cloud-computing-trends-flexera-2023-state-of-the-cloud-report/>.
- [3] 2023. Deployments | Kubernetes. <https://kubernetes.io/docs/concepts/services-networking/service/>.
- [4] 2023. Gartner Says Worldwide IaaS Public Cloud Services Market Grew 41.4% in 2021. <https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2022-06-02-gartner-says-worldwide-iaas-public-cloud-services-market-grew-41-percent-in-2021>.
- [5] 2023. Knative Autoscaling. <https://knative.dev/docs/serving/autoscaling/>.
- [6] 2023. Kubernetes Scheduler. <https://kubernetes.io/docs/concepts/scheduling-eviction/kube-scheduler/>.
- [7] 2023. OpenFaaS - Serverless Functions Made Simple. <https://www.openfaas.com>.

- [8] 2023. Openfaas Autoscaling. <https://docs.openfaas.com/architecture/autoscaling/>.
- [9] 2023. Prometheus - Monitoring system and time series database. <https://prometheus.io/>.
- [10] 2023. scikit-learn: machine learning in Python. <https://scikit-learn.org/>.
- [11] 2023. Service | Kubernetes. <https://kubernetes.io/docs/concepts/services-networking/service/>.
- [12] Mania Abdi, Samuel Ginzburg, Xiayue Charles Lin, Jose Faleiro, Go-har Irfan Chaudhry, Inigo Goiri, Ricardo Bianchini, Daniel S Berger, and Rodrigo Fonseca. 2023. Palette Load Balancing: Locality Hints for Serverless Functions. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth European Conference on Computer Systems (Rome, Italy) (EuroSys '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 365–380. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3552326.3567496>
- [13] Nabeel Akhtar, Ali Raza, Vatche Ishakian, and Ibrahim Matta. 2020. COSE: Configuring Serverless Functions using Statistical Learning. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2020 - IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*. 129–138. <https://doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM41043.2020.9155363>
- [14] Istemi Ekin Akkus, Ruichuan Chen, Ivica Rimac, Manuel Stein, Klaus Satzke, Andre Beck, Paarijaat Aditya, and Volker Hilt. 2018. SAND: Towards High-Performance Serverless Computing. In *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 18)*. 923–935.
- [15] R.E. Bellman. 2003. *Dynamic Programming*. Dover Publications. <https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=fyVtp3EMxasC>
- [16] Romil Bhardwaj, Kirthevasan Kandasamy, Asim Biswal, Wenshuo Guo, Benjamin Hindman, Joseph Gonzalez, Michael Jordan, and Ion Stoica. 2023. Cilantro: Performance-Aware Resource Allocation for General Objectives via Online Feedback. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 623–643. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi23/presentation/bhardwaj>
- [17] Marc Brooker. 2022. Lambda Snapstart, and snapshots as a tool for system builders. <https://brooker.co.za/blog/2022/11/29/snapstart.html>. Referenced Dec 2022.
- [18] James Cadden, Thomas Unger, Yara Awad, Han Dong, Orran Krieger, and Jonathan Appavoo. 2020. SEUSS: skip redundant paths to make serverless fast. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 1–15.
- [19] Quan Chen, Zhenning Wang, Jingwen Leng, Chao Li, Wenli Zheng, and Minyi Guo. 2019. Avalon: Towards QoS Awareness and Improved Utilization through Multi-Resource Management in Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Supercomputing (Phoenix, Arizona) (ICS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 272–283. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3330345.3330370>
- [20] Shuang Chen, Christina Delimitrou, and José F. Martínez. 2019. PARTIES: QoS-Aware Resource Partitioning for Multiple Interactive Services. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Providence, RI, USA) (ASPLOS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 107–120. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304005>
- [21] Shuang Chen, Angela Jin, Christina Delimitrou, and José F. Martínez. 2022. ReTail: Opting for Learning Simplicity to Enable QoS-Aware Power Management in the Cloud. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA53966.2022.00020>
- [22] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. 2013. Paragon: QoS-Aware Scheduling for Heterogeneous Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Houston, Texas, USA) (ASPLOS '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2451116.2451125>
- [23] Christina Delimitrou and Christos Kozyrakis. 2014. Quasar: Resource-Efficient and QoS-Aware Cluster Management. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Salt Lake City, Utah, USA) (ASPLOS '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 127–144. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2541940.2541941>
- [24] Christina Delimitrou, Daniel Sanchez, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2015. Tarcil: Reconciling Scheduling Speed and Quality in Large Shared Clusters. In *Proceedings of the Sixth ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (Kohala Coast, Hawaii) (SoCC '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2806777.2806779>
- [25] Dong Du, Qingyuan Liu, Xueqiang Jiang, Yubin Xia, Binyu Zang, and Haibo Chen. 2022. Serverless Computing on Heterogeneous Computers. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Lausanne, Switzerland) (ASPLOS 2022)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 797–813. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507732>
- [26] Dong Du, Tianyi Yu, Yubin Xia, Binyu Zang, Guanglu Yan, Chenggang Qin, Qixuan Wu, and Haibo Chen. 2020. Catalyzer: Sub-Millisecond Startup for Serverless Computing with Initialization-Less Booting. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Lausanne, Switzerland) (ASPLOS '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 467–481. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373376.3378512>
- [27] Joshua Fried, Zhenyuan Ruan, Amy Ousterhout, and Adam Belay. 2020. *Caladan: Mitigating Interference at Microsecond Timescales*. USENIX Association, USA.
- [28] Alexander Fuerst and Prateek Sharma. 2021. FaasCache: keeping serverless computing alive with greedy-dual caching. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 386–400.
- [29] Yu Gan, Mingyu Liang, Sundar Dev, David Lo, and Christina Delimitrou. 2021. Sage: Practical and Scalable ML-Driven Performance Debugging in Microservices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Virtual, USA) (ASPLOS '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 135–151. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446700>
- [30] Yu Gan, Yanqi Zhang, Kelvin Hu, Dailun Cheng, Yuan He, Meghna Pancholi, and Christina Delimitrou. 2019. 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 (Providence, RI, USA) (ASPLOS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304004>
- [31] Jashwant Raj Gunasekaran, Prashanth Thinakaran, Nachiappan C. Nachiappan, Mahmut Taylan Kandemir, and Chita R. Das. 2020. Fifer: Tackling Resource Underutilization in the Serverless Era. In *Proceedings of the 21st International Middleware Conference (Delft, Netherlands) (Middleware '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 280–295. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3423211.3425683>
- [32] Zhipeng Jia and Emmett Witchel. 2021. Boki: Stateful Serverless Computing with Shared Logs. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (Virtual Event, Germany) (SOSP '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 691–707. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483541>

- [33] Zhipeng Jia and Emmett Witchel. 2021. Nightcore: Efficient and Scalable Serverless Computing for Latency-Sensitive, Interactive Microservices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Virtual, USA) (ASPLOS 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 152–166. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446701>
- [34] Eric Jonas, Johann Schleier-Smith, Vikram Sreekanti, Chia-Che Tsai, Anurag Khandelwal, Qifan Pu, Vaishaal Shankar, Joao Carreira, Karl Krauth, Neeraja Yadwadkar, et al. 2019. Cloud programming simplified: A Berkeley view on serverless computing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03383* (2019).
- [35] Kostis Kaffes, Neeraja J. Yadwadkar, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2022. Hermod: Principled and Practical Scheduling for Serverless Functions. In *Proceedings of the 13th Symposium on Cloud Computing (San Francisco, California) (SoCC '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 289–305. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3542929.3563468>
- [36] Jeongchul Kim and Kyungyong Lee. 2019. Practical cloud workloads for serverless faas. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*. 477–477.
- [37] Ana Klimovic, Yawen Wang, Patrick Stuedi, Animesh Trivedi, Jonas Pfefferle, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2018. Pocket: Elastic Ephemeral Storage for Serverless Analytics. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 18)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 427–444. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi18/presentation/klimovic>
- [38] Neeraj Kulkarni, Gonzalo Gonzalez-Pumariaga, Amulya Khurana, Christine Shoemaker, Christina Delimitrou, and David Albonesi. 2020. CuttleSys: Data-Driven Resource Management for Interactive Applications on Reconfigurable Multicores. In *53rd IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*.
- [39] Qian Li, Bin Li, Pietro Mercati, Ramesh Illikkal, Charlie Tai, Michael Kishinevsky, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2021. RAMBO: Resource Allocation for Microservices Using Bayesian Optimization. *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters* 20, 1 (2021), 46–49. <https://doi.org/10.1109/LCA.2021.3066142>
- [40] Suyi Li, Wei Wang, Jun Yang, Guangzhen Chen, and Daohe Lu. 2023. Golgi: Performance-Aware, Resource-Efficient Function Scheduling for Serverless Computing. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (<conf-loc>, <city>Santa Cruz</city>, <state>CA</state>, <country>USA</country>, </conf-loc>)* (SoCC '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 32–47. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3620678.3624645>
- [41] Zijun Li, Yushi Liu, Linsong Guo, Quan Chen, Jiagan Cheng, Wenli Zheng, and Minyi Guo. 2022. FaaSFlow: Enable Efficient Workflow Execution for Function-as-a-Service. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Lausanne, Switzerland) (ASPLOS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 782–796. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507717>
- [42] Qingyuan Liu, Dong Du, Yubin Xia, Ping Zhang, and Haibo Chen. 2023. The Gap Between Serverless Research and Real-World Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (, Santa Cruz, CA, USA.) (SoCC '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 475–485. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3620678.3624785>
- [43] David Lo, Liqun Cheng, Rama Govindaraju, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2015. Heracles: Improving Resource Efficiency at Scale. In *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Portland, Oregon) (ISCA '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 450–462. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2749469.2749475>
- [44] Ashraf Mahgoub, Edgardo Barsallo Yi, Karthick Shankar, Sameh Elnikety, Somali Chatterji, and Saurabh Bagchi. 2022. ORION and the Three Rights: Sizing, Bundling, and Prewarming for Serverless DAGs. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 303–320. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/mahgoub>
- [45] Amiya K. Maji, Subrata Mitra, Bowen Zhou, Saurabh Bagchi, and Akshat Verma. 2014. Mitigating Interference in Cloud Services by Middleware Reconfiguration. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Middleware Conference (Bordeaux, France) (Middleware '14)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2663165.2663330>
- [46] Jason Mars and Lingjia Tang. 2013. Whare-Map: Heterogeneity in "Homogeneous" Warehouse-Scale Computers. In *Proceedings of the 40th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Tel-Aviv, Israel) (ISCA '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 619–630. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2485922.2485975>
- [47] Jason Mars, Lingjia Tang, Robert Hundt, Kevin Skadron, and Mary Lou Soffa. 2011. Bubble-Up: Increasing Utilization in Modern Warehouse Scale Computers via Sensible Co-Locations. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Porto Alegre, Brazil) (MICRO-44)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 248–259. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2155620.2155650>
- [48] Nikita Mishra, John D. Lafferty, and Henry Hoffmann. 2017. ESP: A Machine Learning Approach to Predicting Application Interference. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Autonomic Computing (ICAC)*. 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAC.2017.29>
- [49] Joe Novak, Sneha Kumar Kasera, and Ryan Stutsman. 2020. Auto-Scaling Cloud-Based Memory-Intensive Applications. In *2020 IEEE 13th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*. 229–237. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CLOUD49709.2020.00042>
- [50] Joe H. Novak, Sneha Kumar Kasera, and Ryan Stutsman. 2019. Cloud Functions for Fast and Robust Resource Auto-Scaling. In *2019 11th International Conference on Communication Systems & Networks (COMSNETS)*. 133–140. <https://doi.org/10.1109/COMSNETS.2019.8711058>
- [51] Edward Oakes, Leon Yang, Dennis Zhou, Kevin Houck, Tyler Harter, Andrea Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi Arpaci-Dusseau. 2018. SOCK: Rapid Task Provisioning with Serverless-Optimized Containers. In *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 18)*. 57–70.
- [52] Tirthak Patel and Devesh Tiwari. 2020. CLITE: Efficient and QoS-Aware Co-Location of Multiple Latency-Critical Jobs for Warehouse Scale Computers. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. 193–206. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA47549.2020.00025>
- [53] Haoran Qiu, Subho S. Banerjee, Saurabh Jha, Zbigniew T. Kalbarczyk, and Ravishankar K. Iyer. 2020. FIRM: An Intelligent Fine-Grained Resource Management Framework for SLO-Oriented Microservices. USENIX Association, USA.
- [54] Haoran Qiu, Weichao Mao, Chen Wang, Hubertus Franke, Alaa Youssef, Zbigniew T. Kalbarczyk, Tamer Başar, and Ravishankar K. Iyer. 2023. AWARE: Automate Workload Autoscaling with Reinforcement Learning in Production Cloud Systems. In *2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 387–402. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc23/presentation/qiu-haoran>
- [55] Francisco Romero, Mark Zhao, Neeraja J. Yadwadkar, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2021. Llama: A Heterogeneous & Serverless Framework for Auto-Tuning Video Analytics Pipelines. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (Seattle, WA, USA) (SoCC '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–17.

- <https://doi.org/10.1145/3472883.3486972>
- [56] Rohan Basu Roy, Tirthak Patel, and Devesh Tiwari. 2022. IceBreaker: Warming Serverless Functions Better with Heterogeneity. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (Lausanne, Switzerland) (*ASPLOS '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 753–767. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507750>
- [57] Krzysztof Rządca, Paweł Findeisen, Jacek Swiderski, Przemysław Zych, Przemysław Broniek, Jarek Kusmierek, Paweł Nowak, Beata Strack, Piotr Witusowski, Steven Hand, and John Wilkes. 2020. Autopilot: Workload Autoscaling at Google. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems* (Heraklion, Greece) (*EuroSys '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 16, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387524>
- [58] Aakanksha Saha and Sonika Jindal. 2018. EMARS: Efficient Management and Allocation of Resources in Serverless. In *2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*. 827–830. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CLOUD.2018.00113>
- [59] David Schall, Artemiy Margaritov, Dmitrii Ustiugov, Andreas Sandberg, and Boris Grot. 2022. Lukewarm Serverless Functions: Characterization and Optimization. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture* (New York, New York) (*ISCA '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 757–770. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3470496.3527390>
- [60] Mohammad Shahradd, Rodrigo Fonseca, Íñigo Goiri, Gohar Chaudhry, Paul Batum, Jason Cooke, Eduardo Laureano, Colby Tresness, Mark Russinovich, and Ricardo Bianchini. 2020. Serverless in the wild: Characterizing and optimizing the serverless workload at a large cloud provider. In *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*. 205–218.
- [61] Simon Shillaker and Peter Pietzuch. 2020. Faasm: lightweight isolation for efficient stateful serverless computing. In *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*. 419–433.
- [62] Wonseok Shin, Wook-Hee Kim, and Changwoo Min. 2022. Fireworks: A Fast, Efficient, and Safe Serverless Framework Using VM-Level Post-JIT Snapshot. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems* (Rennes, France) (*EuroSys '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 663–677. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3492321.3519581>
- [63] Arjun Singhvi, Arjun Balasubramanian, Kevin Houck, Mohammed Danish Shaikh, Shivaram Venkataraman, and Aditya Akella. 2021. Atoll: A Scalable Low-Latency Serverless Platform. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing* (Seattle, WA, USA) (*SoCC '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 138–152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3472883.3486981>
- [64] Vikram Sreekanti, Chenggang Wu, Xiayue Charles Lin, Johann Schleier-Smith, Joseph E. Gonzalez, Joseph M. Hellerstein, and Alexey Tumanov. 2020. Cloudburst: Stateful Functions-as-a-Service. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 13, 12 (sep 2020), 2438–2452. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3407790.3407836>
- [65] Ali Tariq, Austin Pahl, Sharat Nimmagadda, Eric Rozner, and Sidharth Lanka. 2020. Sequoia: Enabling Quality-of-Service in Serverless Computing. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing* (Virtual Event, USA) (*SoCC '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419111.3421306>
- [66] Huangshi Tian, Suyi Li, Ao Wang, Wei Wang, Tianlong Wu, and Haoran Yang. 2022. Owl: Performance-Aware Scheduling for Resource-Efficient Function-as-a-Service Cloud. In *Proceedings of the 13th Symposium on Cloud Computing* (San Francisco, California) (*SoCC '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 78–93. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3542929.3563470>
- [67] Ao Wang, Shuai Chang, Huangshi Tian, Hongqi Wang, Haoran Yang, Huiba Li, Rui Du, and Yue Cheng. 2021. FaaSNet: Scalable and Fast Provisioning of Custom Serverless Container Runtimes at Alibaba Cloud Function Compute. In *2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference, USENIX ATC 2021, July 14-16, 2021*, Irina Calciu and Geoff Kuenning (Eds.). USENIX Association, 443–457. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc21/presentation/wang-ao>
- [68] Kai-Ting Amy Wang, Rayson Ho, and Peng Wu. 2019. Replayable execution optimized for page sharing for a managed runtime environment. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019*. 1–16.
- [69] Ziliang Wang, Shiyi Zhu, Jianguo Li, Wei Jiang, K. K. Ramakrishnan, Yangfei Zheng, Meng Yan, Xiaohong Zhang, and Alex X. Liu. 2022. DeepScaling: Microservices Autoscaling for Stable CPU Utilization in Large Scale Cloud Systems. In *Proceedings of the 13th Symposium on Cloud Computing* (San Francisco, California) (*SoCC '22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3542929.3563469>
- [70] Ran Xu, Subrata Mitra, Jason Rahman, Peter Bai, Bowen Zhou, Greg Bronevetsky, and Saurabh Bagchi. 2018. Pythia: Improving Datacenter Utilization via Precise Contention Prediction for Multiple Co-Located Workloads. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Middleware Conference* (Rennes, France) (*Middleware '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 146–160. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3274808.3274820>
- [71] Hailong Yang, Alex Breslow, Jason Mars, and Lingjia Tang. 2013. Bubble-Flux: Precise Online QoS Management for Increased Utilization in Warehouse Scale Computers. *SIGARCH Comput. Archit. News* 41, 3 (jun 2013), 607–618. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2508148.2485974>
- [72] Tianyi Yu, Qingyuan Liu, Dong Du, Yubin Xia, Binyu Zang, Ziqian Lu, Pingchao Yang, Chenggang Qin, and Haibo Chen. 2020. Characterizing Serverless Platforms with ServerlessBench. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419111.3421280>
- [73] Hong Zhang, Yupeng Tang, Anurag Khandelwal, and Ion Stoica. 2023. SHEPHERD: Serving DNNs in the Wild. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. USENIX Association, Boston, MA, 787–808. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/nsdi23/presentation/zhang-hong>
- [74] Xiao Zhang, Eric Tune, Robert Hagmann, Rohit Jnagal, Vrigo Gokhale, and John Wilkes. 2013. CPI2: CPU Performance Isolation for Shared Compute Clusters. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems* (Prague, Czech Republic) (*EuroSys '13*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 379–391. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2465351.2465388>
- [75] Yanqi Zhang, Íñigo Goiri, Gohar Irfan Chaudhry, Rodrigo Fonseca, Sameh Elnikety, Christina Delimitrou, and Ricardo Bianchini. 2021. Faster and Cheaper Serverless Computing on Harvested Resources. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles* (Virtual Event, Germany) (*SOSP '21*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 724–739. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483580>
- [76] Yanqi Zhang, Weizhe Hua, Zhuangzhuang Zhou, G Edward Suh, and Christina Delimitrou. 2021. Sinan: ML-based and QoS-aware resource management for cloud microservices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*. 167–181.
- [77] Yanqi Zhang, Weizhe Hua, Zhuangzhuang Zhou, G. Edward Suh, and Christina Delimitrou. 2021. Sinan: ML-Based and QoS-Aware Resource Management for Cloud Microservices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (Virtual, USA) (*ASPLOS*

- 2021). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 167–181. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446693>
- [78] Yunqi Zhang, Michael A. Laurenzano, Jason Mars, and Lingjia Tang. 2014. SMiTe: Precise QoS Prediction on Real-System SMT Processors to Improve Utilization in Warehouse Scale Computers. In *Proceedings of the 47th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (Cambridge, United Kingdom) (MICRO-47)*. IEEE Computer Society, USA, 406–418. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO.2014.53>
- [79] Laiping Zhao, Yanan Yang, Yiming Li, Xian Zhou, and Keqiu Li. 2021. Understanding, Predicting and Scheduling Serverless Workloads under Partial Interference. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (St. Louis, Missouri) (SC '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 22, 15 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3458817.3476215>
- [80] Zhuangzhuang Zhou, Yanqi Zhang, and Christina Delimitrou. 2022. AQUATOPE: QoS-and-Uncertainty-Aware Resource Management for Multi-Stage Serverless Workflows. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1 (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (ASPLOS 2023)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3567955.3567960>