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Abstract: Latest distributed computing paradigm is cloud computing and it offers tremendous opportunities to solve large-scale problems. It is critical to evaluate the performance of cloud environments as the adoption and deployment of cloud computing increases. The number of active machines are matched dynamically to resource demands inorder to increase resource utilization. However based on extensive studies, existing solutions have not fully considered the heterogeneity of both workload and resource utilization found in computing environments. Currently, effective and efficient scheduling algorithms are needed for the better use of tremendous capabilities in large scale distributed system. Many such algorithms have been designed and implemented. New scheduling algorithm based on dynamic conventional scheduling Heuristics is designed to use their cons and at the same time overcome their pros. The cloud simulator Cloudsim is used to evaluate the proposed scheduling algorithm by comparing to its performance against the basic heuristics. Variety of scenarios is taken into consideration to show that the simulation results of the new heuristic algorithm leads to significant performance gain. Maximization in resource utilization and reduction in makespan are the two basic criteria used for the performance evaluation of the proposed Algorithm. The proposed algorithm proves that it is efficient than the other heuristic algorithms by reducing the make span and increasing the resource utilization.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Cloud computing is a collection of computing and communication resources located over distributed datacenters that is shared by many different users [1]. Task scheduling and other constraints which have direct effect on user consumption of resources are controlled by cloud infrastructure. In a commercial cloud environment [1], [2] individual providers are focused towards increasing their own revenue and do not care about the utility of users and other providers.

Mapping tasks to machines is an NP-Complete problem; therefore the use of heuristics is one of the suitable approaches. Existing scheduling heuristics can be divided into two classes: On-line mode (dynamic) and Batch-mode (static) heuristics [20]. In the on-line mode, a task is mapped onto a host as soon as it arrives at the scheduler. In the batch mode, tasks are not mapped on to hosts immediately and they are collected in to a set of tasks that is examined for mapping at prescheduled times called mapping events.

To make use of great capabilities of the distributed system, effective and efficient scheduling algorithms are needed. Depending on their goals, these algorithms assign tasks to the best machines which produce better quality of service [17]. In this work the problem of dynamic scheduling of task in commercial cloud environment using algorithmic design is addressed. Considering that scheduling in distributed systems is an NP-hard problem, and the challenge is to propose an efficient scheduling mechanism that yields low completion time (makespan) and high resource utilization compared to the state of the art applications. To address the scheduling problem in a commercial cloud environment a new algorithm for scheduling single tasks on a set of resources is proposed. Afterwards the proposed algorithm is tailored to dynamically schedule tasks.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Several researchers have pointed out the presence of performance problems with the cloud. Recently, [21] highlighted the long tail of response time in Amazon EC2 and related it to the co-scheduling of CPU bound and latency-sensitive tasks on the same hypervisor. In contrast, our focus is on designing systems to adapt to short term variability in the cloud.

Live VM migration techniques [18], [19] handle workload increase on a VM by migrating the VM to a less loaded physical server. Although migrations may involve short downtimes, they may incur additional overhead that may impact application’s performance (e.g., due to iterative memory pre-copying, network bandwidth overhead, cache warm-up, etc.) Further, VM migration across data-centers in WAN environments is even more challenging (due to disk and memory state transfer, network reconfigurations, etc.) [12].

In contrast, Dealer does not involve VM migration, and its lightweight nature enables adaptation at shorter time-scales. Dealer offers several advantages in that it can be used in PaaS cloud platforms (e.g., Microsoft Azure) where VM migrations are not possible. Moreover, techniques like [27] rely on VM-level utilization metrics which may not suffice to detect and adapt to all types of poor performance episodes in the cloud (e.g., storage or network related problems). For instance, a network congestion may negatively impact the performance between two inter-connected VMs; however, VM-level metrics such as network utilization may still be low. On the contrary, Dealer focuses on overall application performance and can detect and adapt to such issues by appropriately reassigning requests to the best combination of replicas.

In [17], a multiobjective list scheduling approach for workflow applications is proposed. Based on a set of objectives constraints and weights defined by user, the algorithm attempts to find an appropriate Pareto solution in the region of interest for
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the users. The algorithm is customized and analyzed for four objectives: makespan, cost, reliability, and energy.

The heuristics presented in [22] do not consider task execution times when making their decisions. In [23], a survey of dynamic scheduling heuristics for distributed computing systems is provided. All heuristics, except one, in [23] schedule tasks on different machines using load sharing techniques, without considering task execution times. (The one heuristic in [23] that does not use load sharing, employs deadlines to schedule tasks, and therefore falls out of the problem domain discussed here.) The load balancing heuristic used in this research is representative of the load balancing techniques in [22] and [23].

III. HEURISTIC TASK SCHEDULING ALGORITHM

Minimum execution time (MET) can potentially create load imbalance across machines by assigning many tasks to few machines than to others, whereas the minimum completion time (MCT) tries to balance the load by assigning tasks with earliest completion time. If the tasks are arriving in a random mix, it is possible to use the MET at the expense of load balance until a given threshold and then use the MCT to smooth the load across the machines. The Heuristic Task Scheduling algorithm uses the MCT and MET heuristics in a cyclic fashion depending on the load distribution across the machines. The purpose is to have a heuristic with the desirable properties of both the MCT and the MET.

Proposed Dynamic Heuristic Task Scheduling algorithm is based on the data dependencies among applications and distributing the application among multiple data centers at the task level, leading to more flexible and more efficient task scheduling. In this section task scheduling is defined with respect to two objectives: minimising makespan and maximising resource utilization. Each Individual set of task i is denoted as a pair (i,j) meaning that the task i is assigned to resource j. The schedule of entire workflow is denoted as

\[ sched = \{(i,j)|i \in [n]\} \]  

(1)

To calculate the real completion time of a task, the resource considers a number of internal details such as virtual machine startup overhead, latency delay, current load, computing power, availability, ready time, communication bandwidth, and so on [15]. Here is an assumption that these calculations are performed by each provider internally and therefore ignored in our model.

After the completion of each task the user will be aware of \( t_{real, i,j} \) but will still not know \( c_{real, i,j} \). Based on the real completion time of a single task, the makespan is defined as the time required for executing the whole task without violating the control and dataflow dependencies between its tasks

\[ \text{Makespan} (DAG, sched) = \max_{i \in [n], (i,j) \in sched} \]  

(2)

A. Dynamic Heuristic Task Scheduling Algorithm

The expected execution time \( e_{ij} \) of task \( t_i \) on machine \( m_j \) is defined as the amount of time taken by \( m_j \) to execute \( t_i \) given \( m_j \) has no load when \( t_i \) is assigned. The time \( e_{ij} \) includes the time to move the \( t_i \) code and data from each of their corresponding single fixed sources to machine \( m_j \). The expected completion time \( c_{ij} \) of task \( t_i \) on machine \( m_j \) is defined as the wall-clock time at which \( m_j \) completes \( t_i \).

Let the arrival time of the task \( t_i \) be \( b_i \), and the execution \( e_i \) begins execution \( c_{ij} \). From the above definitions, \( c_{ij} = b_i + e_{ij} \). Let \( c_i \) be the completion time for task \( t_i \), and is equal to \( e_{ij} \) where machine \( m_j \) is assigned to execute task \( t_i \). The makespan [21] for the complete schedule is then defined as \( \max_{i \in [n]} c_i \). Makespan is a measure of the throughput and does not measure the quality of service imparted to an individual task.

Reviewing Biased random sampling and weighted least connection heuristics, it can be seen that depending on the weight assigned to each tasks in MT (meta-task), one of these heuristics has better results than the other one [7]. The independent set of tasks that is considered for mapping at the mapping events is called a meta-task. A meta-task can include newly arrived tasks and the ones that were mapped in earlier mapping events but did not begin execution.

The Proposed algorithm uses iterative scheduling heuristic that first orders the tasks in a list and then schedules them in the established order. The tasks are ordered according to longest path from each task to the exit task, including the task itself. The rank of task according to the following iterative function is given below

\[ \text{rank}(i) = \{ \text{load}(i) + \max(\text{comm}(i,j)) + \text{rank}(j) \} \]  

(3)

\[ \text{load}(i) \]

While there are tasks in MT  
For all tasks \( t_i \) in MT  
For all machines \( m_j \)  
\( MT = \min_tr({f_i}, r_e(R)) \) for each input task \( t_i \)  
For all tasks \( t_i \) in MT  
if \( (CT_{ij} <= MT) \)  
Assign \( t_i \) to resource \( m_j \) that obtains \( CT_{ij} \) else  
Assign \( t_i \) to resource \( m_j \) that obtains \( CT_{i,s} \)  
Delete assigned task from MT.  
Update resource availability information based on the mapping of tasks  
End While , End for  
For All Task, reselected  
For all Machine j with  
\( (CT_j >= \text{MeanCT}) \)  
Compute New \( CT_{ij} = CT(t_i, host_j) \)  
if \((\text{NewCT}_{ij} >= MT) \)  
Update resource availability information based on the mapping of tasks  
Compute New\( CT_{in,a} \) (goto 6) , End if  
End for  
End for

Fig 1: Dynamic Heuristic Task Scheduling Algorithm

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS
Task partitioning scheduling heuristics is used for computing static schedules (offline); and iterative rescheduling is used for computing dynamic schedules (online). Depending on what scheduling performance is desired in cloud there exist different performance metrics for evaluating these algorithms. The experimental testing of our heuristic is performed in 2 scenarios.

Scenario I: A few short tasks along with many long tasks.

Scenario II: A few long tasks along with many short tasks.

Number of resources is chosen to be 10. Four different numbers of tasks has been chosen: 200, 400, 600 and 800, to be sure of efficiency of the proposed heuristic [10]. The task arrivals are modeled by a Poisson random process.

Task workloads and data sizes to be transmitted between the tasks from historical data and running this workflow is extracted using ASKALON environment in the Australian grid. An assumption is made such that the resources are fully connected by a 10 GB ethernet network. For each task, a set of compute resources \( R \) is formed by selecting only those resources that have minimum transfer time (MTT).

- For single and internetworked clouds:
  - \( MT_T = \text{min}(tr\{f_i, r_j \in R\}) \)
  - where \( f_i = \text{input file} \)
  - \( t_i = \text{task} \)

The Transfer time value is obtained from the task resource matrix for all the resources.

\[ CT_{i,j} = CT(task_i, host_j) \]

Makespan: Makespan is a measure of the throughput of the heterogeneous computing systems, such as cloud. It can be calculated as the following relation:

\[ \text{Makespan} = \text{max} \{CT_i, t_i \in MT_T \} \]

The less the makespan of a scheduling algorithm, the better it works.

Average resource utilization rate: Average resource utilization of total resources is calculated through the following relation:

\[ Ru = \frac{\Sigma ru_j}{m} \]

where \( ru \) is in the range 0 to 1.

The commercial cloud environment \( m \) comprises of \( m \) selfish cloud providers, such as amazon and go grid. Cloud information directory service is used to store information about the resources belonging to the existing cloud providers. Proposed scheduling algorithm is used directly in the layers of the cloud architecture by selecting the most adequate resources in terms of makespan and resource utilization.

An assumption is made such as the resource \( j \) is able to calculate the real completion time \( t_{\text{real}}_{i,j} \) and the real resource utilization \( r_{\text{real}}_{i,j} \) for executing every task \( i \). For each resource the real completion time of a task is sum of two components: the time to transfer the input data and the effective execution time.

Here SRM \( _{i,m,n} \) is the number of user request that must be directed between component \( i \) in data-center \( m \) to component \( j \) in data-center \( n \), for every \(<component, data-center > \) pair. In determining the split ratio matrix, algorithm considers several factors including i) the total response time; ii) stability of the overall system; and iii) capacity constraints of application components.

In the discussion, a combination refers to an assignment of each component to exactly one data-center. The algorithm iteratively assigns a fraction of requests to each combination. The SRM matrix is easily computed once the fraction of requests assigned to each combination is determined.

Cloud Simulator is used for the evaluation of proposed algorithms as cloudsim is a new, generalized and extensible simulation toolkit and application which enables seamless modeling, simulation, and experimentation of emerging cloud computing system, infrastructures and application environments for single and internetworked clouds.

The existing distributed system simulators were not applicable to the cloud computing environment due to evaluating the performance of cloud provisioning policies, services, application workload, models and resources under varying system, user configurations and requirements. To overcome this challenge, CloudSim can be used. In simple words, CloudSim is a development toolkit for simulation of Cloud scenarios. CloudSim is not a framework as it does not provide a ready to use environment for execution of a complete scenario with a specific input. Instead, users of CloudSim have to develop the Cloud scenario it wishes to evaluate, define the required output, and provide the input parameters.

The algorithm begins by checking if the delay is unacceptably high. In such case, if \( NewCT_{i,j} \geq MeanCT \), the threshold is lowered. Otherwise the threshold remains unchanged and the component capacity is lowered to the threshold. If \( CT_{i,j} \) is comparable to Delay, it is an indication the component can take more load. If \( NewCT_{i,j} \leq MeanCT \), then the threshold is too conservative, and hence it gets increased.

Further ComponentCapacity is set to slightly higher than the threshold to experiment if the component can absorb more requests. If however \( NewCT_{i,j} = MeanCT \), then ComponentCapacity is set to Thrash to allow more requests be directed to that component.

All experiments were conducted on Microsoft Azure by deploying each application simultaneously in two data-centers. In all experiments, application traffic to one of the data-centers is controlled by Proposed Algorithm, while traffic to the other one was run without Proposed Algorithm. The objective was to not only study the effectiveness of Proposed Algorithm in enhancing performance of traffic but also ensure that Proposed Algorithm did not negatively impact performance of traffic.

A. Dynamic heuristic task scheduling Algorithm – scenario I
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B. Dynamic heuristic Task Scheduling Algorithm - Scenario II

Fig 2: Shows Average Makespan Vs Number of Cloudlets

Fig 3: Shows Average Resource utilization Vs Cloudlets

Fig 4: Shows Average Makespan Vs Number of Cloudlets

C. Static Vs Dynamic Scheduling - Scenario I

Fig 5: Shows Average Resource utilization Vs Cloudlets

Fig 6: Shows Average Makespan Vs Cloudlets

Fig 7: Shows Average Resource utilization Vs Cloudlets
D. Static vs dynamic scheduling - Scenario II

Fig 8: Shows Average Makespan Vs Cloudlets

Fig 9: Shows Average Resource utilization Vs Cloudlets

V. CONCLUSION

Dynamic capacity provisioning has become a promising solution for data centers in recent years. However, existing work on this topic has not addressed a key challenge, which is the heterogeneity of workloads. In this paper, we first provide a characterization of both workload and machine heterogeneity found in one of the compute clusters. To achieve high computing throughput in a cloud environment, this new scheduling algorithm was proposed. We proved a lower bound on the expected makespan by developing a dynamic Heuristic Task scheduling algorithm, which is based on the Mean of minimum completion time of all unassigned tasks in a meta-task.

Evaluation of our new heuristic was done through a simulation environment called Cloudsim. The performance of the proposed dynamic Heuristic Task scheduling algorithm was compared with existing dynamic scheduling algorithms, i.e., Biased Random sampling and weighted least count algorithms. The experimental results show that the Dynamic Heuristic Task Scheduling Algorithm outperforms the Existing Algorithm in terms of makespan and resource utilization.
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