

# MaxMem: Colocation and Performance for Big Data Applications on Tiered Main Memory Servers

Amanda Raybuck  
The University of Texas at Austin

Wei Zhang  
Microsoft

Kayvan Mansoorshahi  
The University of Texas at Austin

Aditya K Kamath  
University of Washington

Mattan Erez  
The University of Texas at Austin

Simon Peter  
University of Washington

## ABSTRACT

We present MaxMem, a tiered main memory management system that aims to maximize Big Data application colocation and performance. MaxMem uses an application-agnostic and lightweight memory occupancy control mechanism based on fast memory miss ratios to provide application QoS under increasing colocation. By relying on memory access sampling and binning to quickly identify per-process memory heat gradients, MaxMem maximizes performance for many applications sharing tiered main memory simultaneously. MaxMem is designed as a user-space memory manager to be easily modifiable and extensible, without complex kernel code development. On a system with tiered main memory consisting of DRAM and Intel Optane persistent memory modules, our evaluation confirms that MaxMem provides 11% and 38% better throughput and up to 80% and an order of magnitude lower 99th percentile latency than HeMem and Linux AutoNUMA, respectively, with a Big Data key-value store in dynamic colocation scenarios.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Big Data applications increasingly look to tiered main memory to increase memory capacity beyond machine-local DRAM with low overhead [14]. High-capacity disaggregated memory such as via Compute eXpress Link (CXL) [37] and non-volatile memory (NVM) [1] allow for systems with direct application access to terabytes of main memory, without the overhead of swap-based (i.e., non-main) slow memory tiers. Still, both technologies provide lower performance, in terms of access latency and bandwidth, compared to direct-attached DRAM. Hence, applications must tier data among low-capacity fast memory and high-capacity slow memory to achieve desired performance and cost.

To improve system utilization, application colocation on tiered memory systems is desirable. Big Data applications have extremely large memory footprints and migrating their state among servers is very resource intensive. Hence, tiered memory systems for Big Data applications seek to maximize colocation, but must also deliver quality of service (QoS) among colocated processes and do so in scenarios with dynamically changing workloads and memory requirements.

To minimize overhead that would otherwise negate any benefit of increased utilization, tiering mechanisms must also be lightweight. This is in opposition to existing approaches, which are conservative in their allocation of slow memory [14], have high slow tier access overheads [24, 42], or are static [1, 27, 33].

We present MaxMem, a tiered main memory management system that improves colocation performance for Big Data applications running on servers with large slow memory tiers. MaxMem uses an application-agnostic and lightweight memory occupancy control mechanism to provide QoS among many Big Data applications sharing tiered main memory simultaneously. MaxMem is designed to be easily modifiable and extensible, without complex kernel code development. Specifically, MaxMem uses these techniques:

- **QoS-aware tiered memory management policy (§3.1).** We design a QoS-aware memory management policy based on *fast-memory miss ratios* (FMMRs). FMMRs are a direct way to measure and specify tiered memory QoS for memory latency sensitive applications.
- **Lightweight memory access sampling and binning (§3.2).** Memory access frequency has a large impact on FMMRs. Efficient QoS support for multiple applications requires MaxMem to determine how frequently each part of each application’s working set is accessed and how much of each working set to migrate to fast memory. MaxMem quickly and scalably identifies a *memory heat gradient* for each tiered memory process by binning pages into heat groups. Based on QoS requirements and heat groups, MaxMem migrates the hottest and coldest pages among fast and slow memory to rapidly approach per-process target fast-memory miss ratios.
- **Flexible user-space tiered memory management (§3.3).** Inspired by user-space tiered memory management services, such as HeMem [33] and TMTS [14], we design MaxMem to operate completely in user-space. This allows simple development and modification of policy and mechanisms without error-prone kernel development. To do so efficiently, we split MaxMem into a library and *central manager* components (§3.3), both running at user-level. We make the following contributions:

- We study existing tiered main memory systems, detailing why they limit collocation of multiple applications (§2).
- We design (§3) and implement (§4) MaxMem to improve collocation performance with dynamic Big Data application workloads on tiered main memory.
- We evaluate and compare MaxMem to state-of-the-art hardware and software tiered main memory systems (§5). In particular, we compare MaxMem to static memory partitioning using HeMem [33], as well as to automatic non-QoS management with Intel’s hardware two-level memory caching (2LM) [1] and Linux’s AutoNUMA [2], on a system with tiered main memory comprising DRAM and Intel Optane persistent memory modules.

Our evaluation of the latency-sensitive FlexKVS [20] key-value store in several static and dynamic consolidation scenarios with background workloads, such as GapBS [10] and GUPS, shows that MaxMem can uphold QoS in these scenarios. MaxMem always achieves the configured target FMMR, providing up to 76% and 80% lower 90<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile tail latency, while providing 11% better throughput for FlexKVS in consolidated workload mixes compared to HeMem. Compared to AutoNUMA, MaxMem provides up to an order of magnitude lower 90<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentile tail latency, while providing 38% better throughput. MaxMem provides QoS with dynamically changing workloads, while HeMem cannot provide dynamic QoS and AutoNUMA cannot provide QoS at all.

## 2 BACKGROUND

Tiered main memory enables applications access to memory capacities beyond the reach of direct-attached DRAM. To do so, commercially available tiered memory systems are configured using two memory tiers: *fast memory* and *slow memory*. In tiered memory systems, the fast memory tier offers lower latency and (typically) higher bandwidth than the higher-capacity slow memory tier. Fast memory is currently provided by direct-attached DRAM, while slow memory is currently provided by high-capacity NVM (e.g., via Intel’s Optane [1] persistent memory modules). CXL-based disaggregated memory is expected to be offered as another option for the slow memory tier (e.g., via Samsung’s CXL memory expanders [36]). We use Optane for the slow memory tier in this paper, as it is the only retail option. However, we intentionally ignore NVM-specific performance effects (e.g., read/write asymmetry and access granularity), as we target tiered memory generally and we expect our results to generalize to CXL-based slow memory<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup>CXL performance in terms of unloaded latency is expected to be similar to that of Optane [27, 37]. Regarding bandwidth, Microsoft reports a CXL-based slow memory configuration [27] that is comparable to the read bandwidth available in our evaluation platform (§5) [33].

We characterize the performance properties of Big Data workloads and motivate collocation on tiered memory servers (§2.1). We then describe why current tiered memory systems limit Big Data application performance and collocation (§2.2).

### 2.1 Big Data Workload Collocation

Modern applications are increasingly memory-intensive. Web applications access large in-memory key-value stores to build dynamic web pages [16], graph processing systems scour large in-memory datasets to quickly answer analytical questions [4], and machine learning systems train on huge in-memory datasets to maximize a reward function [28]. These applications have large memory capacity requirements. Further, *latency-sensitive* (LS) applications have response latency requirements, while *best-effort* (BE) ones do not.

Dedicating servers to individual Big Data applications risks underutilizing expensive memory and compute capacity and is wasteful. Hence, and due to their varying requirements and behaviors, LS and BE tasks are often colocated on servers [39]. This allows operators to increase server utilization by running BE tasks during periods of low LS task utilization. To continue to provide QoS to LS tasks, the operating system is tasked to promptly reallocate potentially oversubscribed resources when an LS burst arrives. For CPU, network, and storage, this involves context switching and deficit round robin scheduling of requests to these resources, given task priorities. For memory, existing approaches may kill lower priority tasks to free memory when high priority tasks require it [35] or migrate tasks to machines with appropriate resources [14].

Killing or migrating Big Data applications is undesirable. Big Data applications have extremely large memory footprints and recreating or migrating their state is very resource intensive. Instead, we wish to improve server utilization by dynamically managing available tiered main memory, aggressively allocating from both memory tiers, while providing lightweight memory access. This is in contrast to existing approaches, which are conservative in their allocation of slow memory [14], have high slow tier access overheads [24, 42], or are static [1, 27, 33]. Given the burstiness of LS tasks, these approaches lead to the underutilization of tiered memory and a hard limit on the number of applications that may be simultaneously scheduled for execution on a machine.

### 2.2 Existing Tiered Memory Systems

In this paper, we explore the design of tiered main memory management for Big Data applications that do not fit into the fast tier of a single server. Big Data applications require us to focus on lightweight mechanisms and policies that improve application collocation and performance with a large slow tier, rather than focusing on slowdown versus the fast

tier. Big Data applications also cannot be easily migrated to other servers due to their large state, limiting the opportunity of distributed mechanisms. In this section, we study existing tiered memory systems and whether they achieve these goals.

TMTS [14] makes the case for tiered main memory system deployment at scale. TMTS showcases significant cost saving opportunities even when offloading only a fraction of cold data to a slow memory tier. It also demonstrates that lightweight tiered memory management mechanisms are necessary to achieve these benefits for tiered main memory. Focusing on applications with memory footprints that fit in the fast memory tier, TMTS describes the design of a distributed tiered memory management system that achieves these benefits by avoiding SLO impact for these applications versus baseline execution in the fast memory tier. However, to stay within strict performance bounds versus the fast memory tier, TMTS must be conservative, limiting slow tier capacity to 25% of the fast tier, as well as keeping any accessed data in the fast tier. This requires TMTS to use conservative page scanning techniques in addition to memory sampling, slowing memory management timescales to  $O(\text{minutes})$ . TMTS' focus on avoiding SLO impact versus the fast memory tier limits colocation and slow tier capacity scalability that are necessary to support Big Data applications.

Other existing systems, such as TPP [31], Optane two-level memory (2LM)<sup>2</sup> [1], Pond [27], AutoNUMA [2] with CPU-less NUMA nodes [25], and HeMem [33] are also designed for tiered main memory. However, they do not provide dynamic QoS. 2LM and AutoNUMA cannot differentiate between applications accessing tiered memory, leading to performance interference. HeMem is a per-process tiered memory library. To support multiple processes, fast and slow memory have to be statically partitioned and individually managed by separate HeMem instances. Pond [27] relies on offline working set estimation. Static partitioning can provide QoS when partitions can be sized according to application requirements and workloads do not change. In practice, workloads often vary dynamically and unpredictably. Dynamic QoS is hence necessary to enable dynamic Big Data application colocation. Without it, colocation opportunities are reduced to preallocated memory areas or time slots.

Some systems, like TMO [42] and Software-Defined Far Memory (SFM) [24] provide dynamic QoS, but are designed for swap-based slow memory (SSDs and compressed DRAM). Their policies and mechanisms rely on heavy-weight page

faults and IO to measure and manage application tiered memory access. These heavyweight mechanisms drastically reduce access performance to the slow memory tier, prohibiting its frequent use by Big Data applications.

### 3 MAXMEM DESIGN

MaxMem is a user-space tiered memory management system that can dynamically manage multiple processes with different QoS requirements. MaxMem has a number of design goals:

- **Simplicity.** Setting of tiered memory QoS goals should be simple and intuitive. In MaxMem, users/controllers configure a per-process target FMMR  $t_{miss} \in [0, 1]$ , representing how often that process accesses data from the slow memory tier as a fraction of all memory accesses. The FMMR is a direct way to specify per-process memory system QoS. It is easy to assess to what extent the goal is met by the system. It is therefore also a good target for higher-level resource-management systems because it directly and monotonically correlates with performance (e.g., [29]).
- **Scalability.** Tiered memory is expected to scale to terabytes and modern cloud servers are expected to multiplex tens of applications. MaxMem manages these memory sizes across processes by sampling memory accesses, binning pages into heat classes, and determining how to re-allocate memory across processes efficiently. Sampling overhead grows with memory bandwidth, scaling more slowly than memory capacity and core count.
- **Flexibility.** Tiered memory management is an evolving domain and it should be simple to extend and modify the management system. MaxMem is flexible by managing tiered memory at user-level. To do so, MaxMem consists of two main components: a *central manager* process and a library component (libMaxMem) that is dynamically linked into unmodified processes wishing to use tiered memory.

In this section, we describe the simple MaxMem policy (§3.1), lightweight mechanisms that scalably inform the policy (§3.2), as well as MaxMem's flexible user-space design (§3.3). Finally, we discuss how several tiered memory management issues may be handled by MaxMem (§3.4).

Figure 1 shows an overview of MaxMem's design as it relates to providing QoS for tiered memory. The figure illustrates in a concrete example, where two processes with target FMMR 0.9 and 0.1 are managed by MaxMem, the execution at the end of a MaxMem policy epoch (§3.1). The following sections refer to the figure, where appropriate.

<sup>2</sup>2LM is identical to "Memory Mode" (e.g., described in Section 2.4 in [33]) for Intel's Optane persistent memory, but it also supports CXL.




Figure 1: MaxMem QoS policy example.

### 3.1 Tiered Memory QoS Policy

How often a memory-intensive application accesses the slow tier has a direct effect on overall application performance [14]. The goal of MaxMem’s tiered memory QoS policy is thus to allocate the limited fast memory tier such that each process is able to meet its configured  $t_{miss}$ . Users configure a per-process target FMRR  $t_{miss} \in [0, 1]$ , representing how often that process accesses data from the slow memory tier as a fraction of all memory accesses. The FMRR is a direct way of specifying a per-process memory system QoS target. An FMRR of 1 implies no QoS and MaxMem may place the entire process working set into slow memory if necessary to provide QoS to other processes. To obtain an FMRR of 0, tiered memory should simply be disabled for that process.

To provide QoS, MaxMem samples per-process memory accesses to fast ( $a_{fast}$ ) and slow memory ( $a_{slow}$ ), as described in §3.2 and shown in step 1 of Figure 1. MaxMem then computes each process’s current FMRR  $a_{miss} = \frac{a_{slow}}{a_{slow} + a_{fast}} \in [0, 1]$ , as shown in step 2 of Figure 1. We assess  $a_{miss}$  as an exponentially moving average (EWMA) with  $\lambda = 0.5$  every second—the MaxMem policy epoch duration (cf. §5.3). If  $a_{slow} = a_{fast} = 0$ , we set  $a_{miss} := 0$  for that epoch. Hence, memory-inactive processes will eventually give up their fast memory allocation.

To meet FMRR targets, MaxMem needs to accomplish two goals. First, fast memory must be partitioned among processes such that each process has the fast memory it needs to meet its FMRR target. Second, since fast memory is a constrained resource in our system, where slow memory is many times larger than the fast memory, MaxMem must ensure that fast memory is optimally utilized by keeping each application’s hottest pages in fast memory. Both of these goals require MaxMem to migrate pages. We cap MaxMem’s migration rate to 4 GB per epoch. MaxMem allocates half of the migration rate to each goal.

*Fast memory reallocation.* It is impossible to determine the ideal fast memory partition a priori, as it depends on future access patterns. Instead, MaxMem reallocates fast memory proportionally among processes, based on distance from  $t_{miss}$ . To do so, MaxMem first calculates the total scale of needed and surplus fast memory,  $F_{need}$  and  $F_{surplus}$  w.r.t.  $t_{miss}$  (as defined in Figure 1). These are dimensionless quantities, used to calculate a fractional migration bandwidth  $M_p$  for each process  $p$  in the epoch. Fast memory  $M_p = \frac{a_{miss}}{t_{miss}} \times \frac{R}{F_{need}}$  is given to processes  $p$  with  $a_{miss} > t_{miss}$ . Fast memory  $M_p = \frac{t_{miss}}{a_{miss}} \times \frac{R}{F_{surplus}}$  is taken from processes  $p$  with  $a_{miss} < t_{miss}$  if they have fast memory.  $R$  is the total migration bandwidth MaxMem uses for fast memory reallocations each epoch. If  $M_p$  is larger than the amount of fast memory available to  $p$ , then MaxMem simply takes all of its remaining fast memory. In this case, MaxMem may underutilize its migration rate within an epoch. When  $t_{miss} = a_{miss}$ , the process has the appropriate amount of fast memory and we maintain its allocation. In calculations, where  $a_{miss}$  is a 0 denominator, we substitute  $\infty$  for the result and we define  $\frac{\infty}{\infty} = 1$ . If there are multiple processes with  $a_{miss} = 0$ , MaxMem takes fast memory from only one per epoch.

It is possible for MaxMem to encounter an application mix where it is impossible to meet each application’s target FMRR due to not having enough fast memory available. In this case, MaxMem attempts to meet the target FMRR for as many applications as it can, on a first-come-first-served basis. MaxMem can flag the applications that cannot meet their target FMRRs so that a system administrator can decide whether to wait until more fast memory becomes available (due to, e.g., process exit) or to kill that application and move it to a machine with adequate fast memory. An alternative policy might attempt to provide fairness in these situations by allocating fast memory such that each application is equally close to their target. Note that fast memory reallocations entail data movement overheads and can affect application performance, particularly with bandwidth-constrained slow tiers. Thus, MaxMem minimizes fast memory reallocations in situations where it cannot meet all target FMRRs by stopping once it has met all the target FMRRs it can

*Page migration.* Once fast memory allocations are decided for each process, MaxMem fills the allocations by migrating hot pages to them, while colder pages previously residing in fast memory are migrated to slow memory. Note that this step occurs for each process regardless of whether its fast memory allocation changed. This ensures, even in the absence of fast memory reallocations, that each process’s hot data resides in fast memory, while cold data resides in slow memory.

To maximize the impact that migrations have on fast memory miss ratios, MaxMem migrates each process’s hottest

pages to fast memory and coldest pages to slow memory. To do so, MaxMem uses a memory heat gradient computed via per-process hotness bins. We describe this process in §3.2. Step 4 of Figure 1 shows the hottest pages  $x$ ,  $v$ , and  $w$  of process 2, as well as page  $b$  of process 1 are migrated to fast memory, while the coldest pages  $c$ ,  $d$ , and  $e$  of process 1, as well as page  $z$  of process 2 are migrated to slow memory. The figure only shows this subset of page migrations, while more pages would be migrated to fulfill the fast memory reallocation. As migration is carried out for all processes, process 1 migrates page  $b$  to fast memory, even though its fast memory allocation shrank.

*Memory allocation.* When physical memory is allocated to a process, either explicitly via `mmap` with the `MAP_POPULATE` flag, or implicitly via a page fault, MaxMem first attempts to allocate fast memory. If no fast memory is available to the process, then slow memory is allocated. If slow memory is also unavailable, then an error is returned (for `mmap`) or the process is killed (for page faults).

*Process exit.* When a process exits, MaxMem reclaims its memory and returns it to the free memory pool. If, at this point, processes exist with  $a_{miss} > t_{miss}$ , then memory is immediately allocated from the free memory pool.

### 3.2 Lightweight QoS Mechanisms

MaxMem relies on a number of mechanisms to inform its QoS policy (§3.1). The ability of any process to achieve a certain FMMR is determined primarily by how frequently memory is accessed. Many applications have non-uniform memory access patterns. Hence, MaxMem tracks per-page memory access frequencies of each process. MaxMem uses memory access sampling to track page access frequencies and then categorizes pages into different hotness bins, based on how frequently each page is being accessed.

*FMMR sampling.* MaxMem monitors per-process FMMR via light-weight sampling of memory access patterns (cf. HeMem [14, 33]). Two performance counters are configured to separately sample all cache misses served from fast and slow memory and record the virtual address target of each such instruction as well as the PID of the process the instruction is from (§4). This is shown in step 1 of Figure 1. MaxMem uses a sampling period of 100 load events (or 1% of loads), which provides adequate sampling fidelity [14]. Each epoch, MaxMem computes a current FMMR for each process it is managing, based on the samples from fast and slow memory during that epoch. Sampling is a scalable mechanism as it does not depend on memory capacity and its overhead scales with memory bandwidth, which is outpaced by overall performance and core-count scaling.

*Hotness bins.* MaxMem also uses the samples to determine access frequencies for each page of memory in each managed

process. Each epoch, after quantizing samples to huge page granularity, MaxMem accumulates accesses per observed page. MaxMem then categorizes each process’s pages into a configurable number of per-process *hotness bins*, based on accumulated accesses. Bins represent exponential access frequencies, relative to each other—a page in one bin has been accessed roughly twice as much as a page in its neighboring colder bin; the coldest bin represents pages that have not been recently accessed. Example hotness bins of processes 1 and 2 are shown in step 2 of Figure 1.

Once enough samples accumulate to a page, the page is promoted to its hotter neighbor bin. We configure 6 per-process hotness bins, which we empirically determined offer good fidelity for QoS policy decisions. Once a page reaches the threshold for promotion beyond the maximum of the configured bin (cf.  $2^5$  in our 6-bin configuration), MaxMem “cools” all pages by halving all sample counts, rounded down, redistributing each page to a one-cooler bin and leaving the hottest page (momentarily) alone in the hottest bin. Cooling happens at most once per epoch.

Our implementation of the hotness bins is simple and cheap. Each bin requires a single counter for the number of pages in that bin and two linked-list head pointers for associating pages in that bin from fast and slow memory. Victims for promotion to fast memory and demotion to slow memory can thus be quickly identified with low overhead. A counter is also stored per page for its accumulated accesses. This counter and the bins themselves are lazily updated when a page receives a sample or when it is considered for migration; this includes applying the accumulated cooling events since its previous counter update. While this allows essentially free scaling of the number of hotness bins, a larger number of bins increases the cooling interval and slows down the response to hot-set changes.

MaxMem uses the hotness bins to determine a *memory heat gradient* per process. The memory heat gradient allows MaxMem to quickly determine which pages have the greatest impact on a process’s FMMR. For each process, after determining its fast memory allocation for the epoch, MaxMem migrates pages to fast memory starting with the hottest bin. To make room, MaxMem evicts pages to slow memory starting with the coldest bin.

### 3.3 Userspace Tiered Memory Management

To manage tiered memory efficiently from user space, MaxMem is split into two components that each run at user-level: a library component (`libMaxMem`) that is linked into processes and a central manager that runs as a separate process. An overview of this design is given in Figure 2.

The central manager is in charge of allocating memory to processes from fast and slow tiers, as well as migrating




Figure 2: MaxMem user-space design.

process memory between tiers based on patterns gathered from memory access samples. libMaxMem is responsible for intercepting application virtual memory allocation calls and registering the corresponding memory regions with the central manager for tiered memory management. To do so, libMaxMem registers regions with a user-level page fault handler (via userfaultfd [3]) executing in the central manager. Userfaultfd has negligible overhead for Big Data applications [33]. Processes do not control their tiered memory allocations.

*Central manager.* The central manager runs as a separate daemon process and listens on a UNIX domain socket for new libMaxMem connections. Tiered memory processes connect to the socket on startup via libMaxMem and send a userfaultfd file descriptor. A separate fault handling thread monitors these descriptors for page faults. Upon a page missing fault, the central manager allocates a page to the faulting process based on its policy (§3.1). Like HeMem [33], MaxMem write-protects pages as it migrates them. When a protection fault occurs on a page under migration, the central manager waits until the migration completes before un-protecting the page.

*PEBS thread.* The central manager uses Intel processor event based sampling (PEBS) [18] for light-weight sampling of per-process memory access patterns (cf. HeMem [33]). A separate PEBS thread monitors the PEBS buffer and updates page access information.

*Policy thread.* A policy thread implements the QoS policy and runs once every epoch. The policy thread uses  $t_{miss}$  and page access statistics from the PEBS thread to make decisions about which pages should be placed in which memory tier. When migrating pages, the policy thread first write protects each page to ensure correctness before copying the page’s data to its new location. The process may read from the page while it is migrating but any write results in a write-protection fault that is caught by the fault thread. When migration is finished, the policy thread resets page protection bits.

*libMaxMem.* libMaxMem is simple. Upon startup, libMaxMem opens a UNIX domain socket to the central manager. It then opens a userfaultfd file descriptor and sends it to the central manager. libMaxMem then intercepts the mmap memory allocation system call. Large (greater than 1 GB) allocations are registered with userfaultfd, allowing the central manager to manage the memory backing these allocations. Any page fault from the process on these regions is forwarded by userfaultfd to the central manager, which is responsible for allocating memory to handle the fault. When a process frees memory, libMaxMem removes the region from userfaultfd, which notifies the central manager of the freed memory.

### 3.4 Discussion

*Application weights.* As  $t_{miss}$  of an application is decreased, its share of fast memory and its performance increase. Different weights can thus be expressed as relative values of FMMRs. Resource-provisioning and QoS runtimes (e.g., [29]) can hence directly use  $t_{miss}$  because it is monotonic with performance. We argue that using relative miss ratios is preferable to directly provisioning fast memory because the application miss curves are not known a-priori.

*Application performance metrics.* MaxMem uses FMMR to gauge the effect of slow memory on application performance. Other such metrics have been proposed. SFM [24] defines a *promotion rate* at which pages are swapped in from the slow memory tier and seeks to keep the promotion rate for an application below a target 0.2% of the application’s working set per minute. In contrast, MaxMem’s FMRR can vary for each application and is measured over seconds, allowing MaxMem to provide different levels of QoS to applications and to react over shorter timescales. TMO [42] uses *pressure stall information (PSI)* to quantify lost work due to a shortage of resources—a holistic view of application QoS. PSI could be integrated with MaxMem to derive FMMRs if tiered memory is the main QoS factor.

*Fair sharing.* MaxMem’s fast memory allocation policy is best-effort based on application target FMMRs. MaxMem attempts to allocate enough fast memory to each application to allow it to meet its target. If more fast memory is still available at this point, then MaxMem allocates the remaining equally to all processes. Fast memory reallocations are done proportionally to how close or far each application is from its target. Applications substantially below their target FMMRs give up fast memory faster than applications slightly below their target FMMRs. Similarly, applications substantially above their target FMMRs are allocated fast memory faster than applications slightly above their target FMMRs.

*Containers and virtual machines (VMs).* MaxMem’s policies and mechanisms naturally extend to containers and VMs. Fast memory miss ratios and page access frequencies may

be specified and measured on a per-container and per-VM basis. Linux’s performance monitoring infrastructure, which MaxMem uses, supports monitoring containers based on control groups (cgroups) via the `PERF_FLAG_PID_CGROUP` flag. VMs may be identified simply via PIDs and host execution may be excluded from monitoring via the `exclude_host` flag.

*Security.* We have designed MaxMem for a standard OS threat model, where user-space processes can request service and OS processes, including the MaxMem central manager, are trusted to provide it globally. Hence, mechanisms and policies for memory allocation, measurement, and migration are implemented in the central manager, enabling realization of MaxMem’s QoS management policy without interference from user-space processes (with one implementation-specific caveat described in §4). As is typical of best-effort OS policies, it can be abused. For example, a malicious process can continually touch any unused memory ranges to cause MaxMem to migrate them to the fast memory tier and inflate the process’s level of service. To remedy abuse, the system administrator can explicitly limit memory allocation.

*Starvation.* Resource managers that can deprive tasks of a particular resource may prevent the task from making progress, also known as *starvation*. In MaxMem, it is possible that tasks are deprived of fast memory. In this case, the tasks are still able to access slow memory and make progress, so starvation is not an issue in MaxMem.

## 4 IMPLEMENTATION

We implement MaxMem in around 4,500 lines of code for the central manager process and around 750 lines for the libMaxMem component linked in each application. The MaxMem central manager reuses mechanisms from the HeMem [33] tiered memory management system. In particular, PEBS sampling, DMA migration, and `userfaultfd` page fault handling.

Our prototype expects slow and fast memory to be exposed as DAX files to user-space. For example, Intel Optane’s AppDirect mode exposes a DAX file for slow memory. We can expose direct-attached DRAM as a DAX for fast memory at boot via the Linux kernel `mmap` command-line argument. Dynamically sharing DRAM with the existing kernel memory manager is possible, for example via pinned anonymous mappings, but requires additional `userfaultfd` support for these mappings [33].

*Memory access sampling.* The central manager uses the `perf_event_open` system call to set up performance monitoring counters to monitor per-process memory access patterns with PEBS. The PEBS counters are set up to sample from all loads that are served from DRAM<sup>3</sup> and NVM.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>`MEM_LOAD_L3_MISS_RETIRED.LOCAL_DRAM`

<sup>4</sup>`MEM_LOAD_RETIRED.LOCAL_PMM`

MaxMem configures each core with its own set of PEBS counters configured to count any events occurring on that core. In addition to the virtual memory address target of the instruction, the PID of the process producing the sample is included so that MaxMem can distinguish samples from the different processes it is managing.

*Memory migration.* The central manager migrates memory among tiers with a DMA engine [26] if available. We implement a Linux kernel driver that exposes a DMA API to user-space, which is used by the central manager. If a DMA engine is not available, the copy is performed by 4 parallel copy threads, as done in HeMem [33].

*Memory mapping.* The Linux kernel has only limited support for modifying another process’s virtual address space. While mapping memory in response to page faults is possible via `userfaultfd`, there is no support to remap another process’s mapped memory. Since remapping is necessary to support memory migration, our MaxMem prototype realizes memory remapping from within the process. We do so by remapping within `libMaxMem`, cooperatively, upon request from the central manager. The central manager sends a message to a process when serving a page fault or when migrating a page to inform the process where the page of memory should be mapped and `libMaxMem` carries out the mapping. While doing so is not safe for production deployment, it lets us avoid a potentially cumbersome implementation within the Linux kernel, without adverse effect on our performance results. `userfaultfd` could be extended to support this functionality.

## 5 EVALUATION

We first analyze the performance of MaxMem’s policies and mechanisms with a number of GUPS microbenchmarks (§5.1). We then evaluate a number of big data applications in a variety of different colocation configurations (§5.2). These big data applications include a key-value store, a graph processing system, and a parallel application benchmark. Experiments are repeated five times and we report the average. Timelines are from representative runs. There is negligible variance across runs.

- Our evaluation seeks to answer the following questions:
- What are the overheads of the various policies and mechanisms of MaxMem? Can MaxMem offer competitive performance to other tiered memory management systems with only a single application running? (§5.1.1)
  - How well does MaxMem perform under a number of different and changing colocation scenarios? Can MaxMem accurately recognize when an LS application needs more DRAM to achieve its performance goals? Can MaxMem

provide fair performance to applications in the same priority class? Can MaxMem adapt to dynamically changing access patterns and QoS requirements? (§5.1.2)

- How well does MaxMem meet the performance goals of an LS application in terms of tail latency and throughput? (§5.2)
- What is MaxMem’s performance sensitivity to its various measurement and migration parameters? (§5.3)

*Evaluation platform.* We run our evaluation on a single socket<sup>5</sup> of a dual-socket Intel Cascade Lake-SP system running at 2.2GHz with 24 cores per socket. Hyperthreads are disabled. Each socket has 192 GB of DDR4 DRAM and 768 GB of Intel Optane DC NVM. There are 6 DIMMs of DRAM and NVM per socket, fully leveraging all 6 memory channels. The machine runs Debian 10.9 with Linux kernel version 5.1.0rc4. We run each benchmark pinned to a single NUMA node. To avoid interference from CPU core contention, we do not run more application threads than available cores.

*State-of-the-art.* We compare MaxMem to a number of tiered memory management systems including Intel Optane DC 2LM [1] and Linux AutoNUMA [2] that do not provide QoS, and HeMem [33], where we statically partition tiered memory among applications and run a HeMem instance for each. Both HeMem and MaxMem use the I/OAT DMA engine for page migration. HeMem and MaxMem are configured to use 128 GB of DRAM and 768 GB of NVM as fast and slow memory tiers, respectively, via DAX files. To generalize our evaluation beyond Optane, we modify HeMem to use the same PEBS counters as MaxMem, eliminating any Optane-specific optimizations (e.g., read-write asymmetry) in HeMem. 2LM and AutoNUMA use all available DRAM and NVM as fast and slow memory tiers, respectively.

## 5.1 Microbenchmarks

We use the GUPS [5] microbenchmark to evaluate the overheads and performance of the various MaxMem policies and mechanisms. GUPS executes parallel read-modify-write operations to eight byte memory objects in a configurable sized memory region. Each thread does a configurable number of operations in either a random or skewed access pattern and measures the giga updates per second (GUPS) it performs.

*5.1.1 MaxMem Overheads (Single Process).* To understand the overheads of MaxMem’s architecture and the efficacy of the heat gradient mechanism, we first run a single GUPS process with 16 threads and report the average steady-state throughput in Figure 3. We configure GUPS with a hot set, accessed 60% of the time, a warm set, accessed 30% of the time, and a working set, accessed 10% of the time, as well

<sup>5</sup>NUMA effects of NVM are complex and have, in the context of storage, been analyzed before [8, 46]. They are beyond the scope of this work.




Figure 3: GUPS throughput.

as a fixed size ratio of 2× between hot and warm set and between warm and working set. We configure  $t_{miss} = 0.1$  to exercise MaxMem’s QoS policy mechanisms (MaxMem) and  $t_{miss} = 1$  (MaxMem non-QoS). This parameter has no effect in a single process scenario and serves only to break out QoS policy overheads.

While the working set fits in DRAM, all systems attain a high average GUPS throughput. In this case, GUPS performs at most 3% worse with MaxMem than with HeMem, indicating that the overhead for MaxMem’s mechanisms is at most 3%. There is no noticeable difference between MaxMem and MaxMem non-QoS, indicating that the QoS policy does not perturb single process results. With a working set of 256 GB, the hot set (64 GB) and the warm set (128 GB) cannot both fit in DRAM. MaxMem can prioritize the hot set for placement in DRAM due to its heat gradient tracking. HeMem uses a hotness threshold that cannot distinguish between hot and warm sets and suffers a lower average throughput, about 30% of MaxMem. This demonstrates the benefit of MaxMem’s heat gradient mechanism as the working set size expands.

*5.1.2 MaxMem QoS (Process Colocation).* We evaluate how well MaxMem provides QoS dynamically. To do so, we run six GUPS processes. Each process runs with 2 threads and accesses a 32 GB working set. The first process is best effort, with  $t_{miss} = 1$ . The next five processes each have an 16 GB hot set that is accessed 90% of the time and they are latency sensitive, each with  $t_{miss} = 0.1$ . The first five processes all start 10 seconds apart, while the last process starts 60 seconds after the previous process. We plot a timeline of the per-second GUPS throughput and the  $a_{miss}$  of each of the processes in Figure 4. We use this workload to evaluate MaxMem’s performance regarding three different dynamic QoS scenarios: (i) dynamically arriving applications, (ii) dynamically changing access patterns, and (iii) dynamically changing QoS requirements.

*Dynamically arriving applications.* MaxMem dynamically reallocates DRAM among applications according to QoS targets as applications arrive. The first four processes to start can all fit in fast memory, so they all attain a high throughput and low  $a_{miss}$ . Once the fifth process starts (①), fast memory is full, so this new process starts without fast memory. MaxMem observes that  $a_{miss} = 1 > 0.1 = t_{miss}$  for this fifth process. MaxMem reallocates fast memory by taking memory






Figure 4: Dynamic workload timeline with 6 GUPS processes.

from the other GUPS processes which all have  $t_{miss} > a_{miss}$ . As fast memory is reallocated from the other processes to the fifth process, the throughput of the fifth process increases while the throughput of the others decrease. Note that there is also a small drop in throughput of the second, third, and fourth processes during this time, even though these processes are not giving up any of their fast memory allocations. Their throughput is affected by MaxMem migrations causing shared memory bandwidth contention. However, the contention is limited due to MaxMem’s 1GB/s migration rate limit (§3.1).  $a_{miss} \leq t_{miss}$  always holds for these processes. At ②, the throughput and FMMRs stabilize and MaxMem provides QoS to all processes, according to their target FMMRs.

At ③, the sixth process starts and the process repeats. MaxMem reallocates fast memory from the other process to the sixth process. MaxMem takes more memory from the first process whose  $t_{miss} = 1$  than the other processes whose  $a_{miss}$  are closer to  $t_{miss}$  according to the method described in §3.1. As a result, the throughput of the first process degrades more than the throughput of the others as its fast memory allocation shrinks compared to the rest. At ④, the system stabilizes once again with MaxMem providing QoS to all processes.

*Dynamically changing access patterns.* At ⑤, we increase the hot set size of the fifth process by 50%. MaxMem’s FMMR mechanism immediately detects this dynamic access pattern change, as the FMMR of the fifth process spikes to almost 0.2. MaxMem now allocates more fast memory to this process. As the fifth process is allocated more fast memory, its FMMR decreases and its throughput increases, until all processes achieve their QoS requirements (⑥).

*Dynamically changing QoS requirements.* At ⑦, the target FMMR of the first process is updated from 1.0 to 0.1. The

adjustment causes MaxMem to migrate more of its hot set to fast memory as some of its hot data was accessed from NVM (seen by its  $a_{miss} > 0.1$ ) before this change. Fast memory is taken from the other processes. Their cold data, according to their heat gradients, is migrated to slow memory, minimizing the performance impact of this reallocation. Once the system stabilizes, each process exhibits an FMMR that is at or below their new target FMMRs, providing QoS.


## 5.2 Application Benchmarks

To demonstrate that dynamic QoS improves colocation performance, we evaluate the performance of colocated Big Data applications with tiered main memory management systems that embody different approaches to QoS. In particular, we evaluate the tail latency and throughput of FlexKVS [20], a high-performance key-value store, running as a high-priority LS application alongside each of three BE applications: GUPS [5], GapBS [10], and NAS BT [9]. We investigate both static workload configurations, as well as a dynamically changing workload mix. To minimize CPU interference, we pin each application to its own set of CPU cores. FlexKVS is run with 4 threads, while GUPS and GapBS are each run with 8 threads.


*Colocation performance without tiered memory.* We first run all applications in fast memory to establish baseline colocation performance without tiered memory. In this scenario, the working set size of each application is set to 64GB, such that the colocated applications fit. We find that there is negligible interference—FlexKVS 99%-ile latency is  $34\mu\text{s}$  at 0.15 MOPS in isolation and in colocation, and regardless of co-runner. We conclude that the baseline system configuration without tiered memory isolates these applications well. As configured, CPU scheduling also does not cause performance interference.

App	Workload	Workset
FlexKVS	32B keys, 16KB vals, 9:1 read:update, 23% hot	320 GB
GUPS	Uniform random memory update	256 GB
GapBS	Betweenness centrality graph algorithm	128 GB
NPB	Block Tri-diagonal solver (BT)	180 GB

**Table 1: Workloads and working sets in tiered memory.**




**Figure 5: FlexKVS 99%-ile latency under collocation.**



**Figure 6: FlexKVS throughput under collocation.**

*Static workload.* To measure how well each tiered memory system meets the performance requirements of LS applications, we compare 2LM (no QoS), AutoNUMA (no QoS), HeMem (static QoS), and MaxMem (dynamic QoS). For MaxMem, we configure FlexKVS with  $t_{miss} = 0.1$  and the BE tasks with  $t_{miss} = 1$ . HeMem’s static QoS approach is an upper bound for this experiment: we configure a fast memory partition of 128GB, fitting FlexKVS’s entire hot set. The results, in terms of FlexKVS tail latency and throughput, are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively. Figure 7 shows a latency CDF of FlexKVS under BT collocation. Our workloads (using Big Data configurations [33]) and their working set sizes in tiered memory are described in Table 1. We observe:

1. MaxMem provides tail latencies and throughput comparable to HeMem. Figure 7, in particular, shows that HeMem and MaxMem tails are nearly identical for BT collocation, which is the most memory intensive co-runner due to its use of vector instructions. MaxMem achieves this performance by automatically and dynamically providing enough fast memory to FlexKVS to achieve its target FMMR. Note that 99th percentile latency (shown in Figure 5) is dominated by slow memory accesses, but still affected by bandwidth contention on slow memory when not enough fast memory is allocated. MaxMem allocates the necessary amount of fast memory to attain target



**Figure 7: FlexKVS latency CDF under BT collocation.**

FMMRs, causing minimal slow memory bandwidth contention.

2. 2LM and AutoNUMA do not perform well. For all collocations, but in particular for the BT collocation, 2LM and AutoNUMA exert far higher tail latency and lower throughput. Figure 7 shows that AutoNUMA’s and 2LM’s latency deteriorates after the 80th percentile.

We conclude that, while DRAM provides good QoS among our collocated applications in this setting and does not need special QoS support, tiered memory systems that do not support QoS fail to isolate memory access performance. While HeMem’s static memory partitioning achieves QoS, it is only optimal when the workload is static and the partition is manually configured to match the hot set. MaxMem can achieve the performance of HeMem dynamically and automatically finds the appropriate fast memory allocation. In this experiment, MaxMem achieves HeMem’s performance while using on average 32% less fast memory than the manually configured HeMem partition.

*Dynamic workload.* Next, we measure how well MaxMem can react to dynamically changing workloads. We run FlexKVS as an LS application with a 320 GB working set and a 48 GB hot set. We collocate FlexKVS with GapBS with a graph with  $2^{28}$  vertices and with uniform GUPS with a working set size of 128 GB. For MaxMem, FlexKVS is given a target FMMR  $t_{miss} = 0.1$  while GapBS and GUPS are given target FMMRs  $t_{miss} = 1$ . For HeMem, we partition fast memory into three equal sections 42 GB in size. Both FlexKVS and GapBS start at the same time. We allow each system a warmup time of 100 seconds to identify a hot set and then measure the per-second throughput, 90th, and 99th percentile latencies, as well as  $a_{miss}$  of FlexKVS in Figure 8. FlexKVS accesses its hot set 90% of the time, so 90th percentile latencies show how well the hot set is isolated. 99th percentile latencies show how well the working set is isolated. Note that MaxMem attempts to provide QoS only for the hot set ( $t_{miss} = 0.1$ ). We continue running FlexKVS and GapBS for 75 seconds before starting GUPS. We then run for an additional 65 seconds, at which point FlexKVS increases its hot set size to 74 GB. We then run for another 240 seconds.




Figure 8: FlexKVS throughput, tail latencies, and  $a_{miss}$ .

For the first 75 seconds after the warmup phase, MaxMem exhibits 4% better throughput than HeMem. Tail latencies show a similar behavior. HeMem’s fast memory partition of 42 GB is not large enough to hold the initial hot set of FlexKVS, so its throughput suffers due to the portion of hot key accesses that are served from slow memory. Due to the static partitioning, HeMem cannot make use of the portion of fast memory reserved for GUPS, even though GUPS is not running. MaxMem dynamically determines the fast memory partition that allows FlexKVS to keep its hot set in fast memory and meet its target FMMRs. AutoNUMA does not allocate enough fast memory to FlexKVS, resulting in up to 13% lower throughput and latency spikes of up to 3× higher 99% latency than the other systems in this phase.

At ①, we start GUPS. HeMem and AutoNUMA exhibit a slight drop in throughput as FlexKVS contends with GUPS over slow memory bandwidth. FlexKVS throughput and tail latencies remain steady with both MaxMem after GUPS starts. In fact, GUPS ( $t_{miss} = 1$ ) is allocated no fast memory with MaxMem when it starts up because GapBS and FlexKVS are using the entire fast memory. As GUPS continues to run, AutoNUMA exhibits worse throughput and tail latency as more fast memory is allocated to GUPS, resulting in interference with FlexKVS. FlexKVS with MaxMem exhibits 8% and 14% better throughput than HeMem and AutoNUMA,




Figure 9: FlexKVS FMMR varying migration rate.

respectively, and up to 27% and 70% lower 99% latencies than HeMem and AutoNUMA, respectively during this phase.

At ② we increase the hot set of FlexKVS from 42 GB to 74 GB. HeMem’s static partition of fast memory is not large enough to fit the enlarged hot set of FlexKVS and HeMem exhibits a 8.6% drop in FlexKVS throughput as some of its hot accesses are now served from slow memory. Similarly, AutoNUMA exhibits a 10% drop in throughput at this point.

MaxMem reacts to the increase in FlexKVS’s FMMR and allocates more fast memory to it. Throughput and latency of FlexKVS are temporarily degraded while this occurs. By ③, MaxMem has restored FlexKVS throughput. No other system restores FlexKVS throughput and latency. AutoNUMA exhibits substantial performance interference between ③ and ④, resulting in up to 86% decrease in throughput compared to MaxMem and up to 10× higher tail latency, respectively. HeMem also exhibits a brief period of performance interference during this phase, resulting in an up to 56% drop in throughput and a 3× increase in 99% latency. By the end of the benchmark, MaxMem achieves 11% and 38% better throughput than HeMem and AutoNUMA, respectively.

### 5.3 MaxMem Parameter Sensitivity

We evaluate how MaxMem’s performance is affected by its various memory measurement and migration parameters. We conduct this study using FlexKVS as an LS and GapBS as a BE application. In particular, we run FlexKVS for 30 seconds with a hot set that fits in fast memory. Then, we double the size of FlexKVS’s hot set and observe how quickly MaxMem restores FlexKVS’s FMMR, as well as how FlexKVS’s operation tail latency is affected by MaxMem migration.

*Memory migration rate.* We analyze a variety of memory migration rate caps. Figure 9 shows that 1 GB/s restores FlexKVS’s FMMR the quickest. 100 MB/s is migrating memory too slowly, while 10 GB/s is requesting a higher migration rate than available migration bandwidth. This stalls MaxMem’s policy thread during migration, as is evident from the resulting step function, causing MaxMem to take longer to converge. Figure 10 shows a CDF of FlexKVS operation latency. We can see that migration affects 95th percentile




Figure 10: FlexKVS latency CDF varying migration rate.

and higher latencies. Higher migration rates have a larger effect, as expected. Nevertheless, MaxMem’s migration rate used in this paper is 10 GB/s, in line with HeMem’s [33].

*Migration epoch duration.* We analyze a range of migration epoch durations—100ms, 500ms, 1s, and 2s, while fixing migration rate at 1 GB/s. We find that 1s provides the best FMMR convergence time and reaction time. FlexKVS tail latencies are negligibly affected by epoch duration. Short migration epochs migrate too few pages at a time, limiting migration performance. Long migration epochs increase reaction times, prolonging time to convergence.

## 6 RELATED WORK

*Tiered memory systems.* Further tiered memory systems [6, 7, 13, 15, 19, 22, 33, 34, 41, 43, 44] do not maximize server utilization or provide QoS for Big Data applications. These systems propose a variety of techniques to determine which tier to use for application data. To be lightweight, MaxMem builds on HeMem [33] and uses PEBS for this task.

*QoS in other contexts.* QoS is a full-stack concern and is thus addressed across the hardware/software stack. For example, distributed caching engines for web applications provide QoS among tenants via partitioning [11], with coarse-grained input via SLAs and cache utilization telemetry. As with static tiered memory partitioning in HeMem [33], these techniques often result in underutilization of cache partitions due to bursty workloads. Quantitative methods, including cache miss ratio, have been studied but usually discarded due to space overheads. OSCA [45] is a recent block storage cache that tackles space overheads by using re-access ratio to obtain the cache requirements, using total hit traffic as the optimization target, and searching for an optimal cache partition using dynamic programming. Memshare [12] is a multi-tenant KV cache that dynamically repartitions memory among tenants via a segmented in-memory log. Pisces [38] provides performance isolation and max-min fairness in multi-tenant cloud storage via smart placement and weighting of storage partitions. MaxMem has to be lighter-weight than these approaches, while supporting multi-processing.

MaxMem thus samples FMMRs via a trusted central manager process.

Intel introduced cache allocation technology (CAT) [32] into recent CPUs to provide CPU cache QoS. CAT allows system administrators to group processes and VMs into service classes that are allocated a partition of last-level cache (LLC). Partitions may be altered at run time. However, the OS is responsible for implementing appropriate partitioning policies and measurements. MaxMem provides such policies and measurements and it is conceivable that the LLC may be integrated as an additional memory tier.

Virtual machines implement memory capacity sharing via ballooning and employ share-based memory allocation to VMs [40]. These mechanisms consider only a single tier of memory and are thus focused on the working set of VMs, rather than memory heat gradients.

*User-space OS services.* MaxMem’s user-space design takes inspiration from recent user-space OS service proposals, including ghOst [17], a user-space Linux CPU scheduler, Snap [30] and TAS [21], user-space networking stacks, and Strata [23] and Assise [8], user-space (distributed) file systems. User-space development is fast and flexible, unlike error-prone kernel-space development, but user-space performance overheads may be larger and specific techniques have to be adopted to stay efficient. Each system developed its own techniques, specific to each task, to do so. MaxMem leverages a split library and central manager design, as well as batched samples in shared memory buffers via PEBS, asynchronous relay of page faults to user-space via userfaultfd, as well as batched migration via DMA offload, to make user-space management of tiered memory efficient.

## 7 CONCLUSION

We present MaxMem, a tiered main memory management system that maximizes Big Data application colocation and performance. MaxMem uses an application-agnostic and lightweight memory occupancy control mechanism based on FMMRs to provide application QoS under increasing colocation. By relying on memory access sampling and binning to quickly identify per-process memory heat gradients, MaxMem maximizes performance for many applications sharing tiered main memory simultaneously. MaxMem is designed as a user-space memory manager to be easily modifiable and extensible, without complex kernel code development. Our evaluation confirms that MaxMem provides up to 76% and 80% lower 90th and 99th percentile tail latency, while providing 11% better throughput for a Big Data key-value store in consolidated workload mixes than the next best solution.

## REFERENCES

- [1] 2017. Intel Optane Memory. <http://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/architecture-and-technology/optane-memory.html>.
- [2] 2020. autonuma: Optimize memory placement for memory tiering system. <https://lwn.net/Articles/835402/>.
- [3] 2020. userfaultfd(2). <http://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man2/userfaultfd.2.html>.
- [4] 2021. The Graph500 Benchmark. <http://www.graph500.org/>.
- [5] 2021. GUPS (Giga Updates Per Second). <http://icl.cs.utk.edu/projectsfiles/hpcc/RandomAccess/>.
- [6] Neha Agarwal and Thomas F. Wenisch. 2017. Thermostat: Application-Transparent Page Management for Two-Tiered Main Memory. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3037697.3037706>
- [7] Emmanuel Amaro, Christopher Branner-Augmon, Zhihong Luo, Amy Ousterhout, Marcos K. Aguilera, Aurojit Panda, Sylvia Ratnasamy, and Scott Shenker. 2020. Can Far Memory Improve Job Throughput?. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387522>
- [8] Thomas E. Anderson, Marco Canini, Jongyul Kim, Dejan Kostic, Youngjin Kwon, Simon Peter, Waleed Reda, Henry N. Schuh, and Emmett Witchel. 2020. Assise: Performance and Availability via Client-local NVM in a Distributed File System. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'20)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/anderson>
- [9] D.H. Bailey, E. Barszcz, J.T. Barton, D.S. Browning, R.L. Carter, L. Dagum, R.A. Fatoohi, P.O. Frederickson, T.A. Lasinski, R.S. Schreiber, H.D. Simon, V. Venkatakrisnan, and S.K. Weeratunga. 1991. The NAS Parallel Benchmarks. *The International Journal of Supercomputing Applications* 5, 3 (1991), 63–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/109434209100500306>
- [10] Scott Beamer, Krste Asanovic, and David A. Patterson. 2015. The GAP Benchmark Suite. *CoRR abs/1508.03619* (2015). [arXiv:1508.03619](http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03619) <http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.03619>
- [11] Benjamin Berg, Daniel S. Berger, Sara McAllister, Isaac Grosf, Sathya Gunasekar, Jimmy Lu, Michael Uhlar, Jim Carrig, Nathan Beckmann, Mor Harchol-Balter, and Gregory R. Ganger. 2020. The CacheLib Caching Engine: Design and Experiences at Scale. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'20)*. USENIX Association, USA, Article 44, 18 pages.
- [12] Asaf Cidon, Daniel Rushton, Stephen M. Rumble, and Ryan Stutsman. 2017. Memshare: A Dynamic Multi-Tenant Key-Value Cache. In *Proceedings of the 2017 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference* (Santa Clara, CA, USA) (*USENIX ATC '17*). USENIX Association, USA, 321–334.
- [13] Subramanya R. Dullloor, Amitabha Roy, Zheguang Zhao, Narayanan Sundaram, Nadathur Satish, Rajesh Sankaran, Jeff Jackson, and Karsten Schwan. 2016. Data Tiering in Heterogeneous Memory Systems. In *Proceedings of the Eleventh European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2901318.2901344>
- [14] Padmapriya Duraisamy, Wei Xu, Scott Hare, Ravi Rajwar, David Culler, Zhiyi Xu, Jianing Fan, Christopher Kennelly, Bill McCloskey, Danijela Mijailovic, Brian Morris, Chiranjit Mukherjee, Jingliang Ren, Greg Thelen, Paul Turner, Carlos Villavieja, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Amin Vahdat. 2023. Towards an Adaptable Systems Architecture for Memory Tiering at Warehouse-Scale. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3* (Vancouver, BC, Canada) (*ASPLOS 2023*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 727–741. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3582016.3582031>
- [15] Zhiyuan Guo, Yizhou Shan, Xuhao Luo, Yutong Huang, and Yiyang Zhang. 2022. Clio: A Hardware-Software Co-Designed Disaggregated Memory System. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507762>
- [16] Qi Huang, Ken Birman, Robbert van Renesse, Wyatt Lloyd, Sanjeev Kumar, and Harry C. Li. 2013. An Analysis of Facebook Photo Caching. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2517349.2522722>
- [17] Jack Tigar Humphries, Neel Natu, Ashwin Chaugule, Ofir Weisse, Barret Rhoden, Josh Don, Luigi Rizzo, Oleg Rombakh, Paul Turner, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2021. GhOST: Fast & Flexible User-Space Delegation of Linux Scheduling. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483542>
- [18] Intel Corporation. 2022. *Intel® 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer's Manual Volume 3: System Programming Guide*. Intel Corporation. Chapter 19.9.
- [19] Sudarsun Kannan, Ada Gavrilovska, Vishal Gupta, and Karsten Schwan. 2017. HeteroOS: OS Design for Heterogeneous Memory Management in Datacenter. In *Proceedings of the 44th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3079856.3080245>
- [20] Antoine Kaufmann, Simon Peter, Naveen Kr. Sharma, Thomas Anderson, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2016. High Performance Packet Processing with FlexNIC. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2872362.2872367>
- [21] Antoine Kaufmann, Tim Stamler, Simon Peter, Naveen Kr. Sharma, Arvind Krishnamurthy, and Thomas Anderson. 2019. TAS: TCP Acceleration as an OS Service. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth EuroSys Conference 2019 (EuroSys '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3302424.3303985>
- [22] Jonghyeon Kim, Wonkyo Choe, and Jeongseob Ahn. 2021. Exploring the Design Space of Page Management for Multi-Tiered Memory Systems. In *2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATC '21)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc21/presentation/kim-jonghyeon>
- [23] Youngjin Kwon, Henrique Fingler, Tyler Hunt, Simon Peter, Emmett Witchel, and Thomas Anderson. 2017. Strata: A Cross Media File System. In *Proceedings of the 26th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP 17)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3132747.3132770>

- [24] Andres Lagar-Cavilla, Junwhan Ahn, Suleiman Souhlal, Neha Agarwal, Radoslaw Burny, Shakeel Butt, Jichuan Chang, Ashwin Chaugule, Nan Deng, Junaid Shahid, Greg Thelen, Kamil Adam Yurtsever, Yu Zhao, and Parthasarathy Ranganathan. 2019. Software-Defined Far Memory in Warehouse-Scale Computers. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304053>
- [25] Christopher Lameter. 2019. Flavors of Memory supported by Linux, Their Use and Benefit. <https://events19.linuxfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/The-Flavors-of-Memory-Supported-by-Linux-their-Use-and-Benefit-Christopher-Lameter-Jump-Trading-LLC.pdf>.
- [26] Thai Le, Jonathan Stern, and Stephen Briscoe. 2017. Fast memcopy with SPDK and Intel I/OAT DMA Engine. <https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/fast-memcopy-using-spdk-and-ioat-dma-engine>.
- [27] Huaicheng Li, Daniel S. Berger, Stanko Novakovic, Lisa Hsu, Dan Ernst, Pantea Zardoshti, Monish Shah, Samir Rajadnya, Scott Lee, Ishwar Agarwal, Mark D. Hill, Marcus Fontoura, and Ricardo Bianchini. 2022. Pond: CXL-Based Memory Pooling Systems for Cloud Platforms. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.00241>
- [28] Mu Li, David G. Andersen, Jun Woo Park, Alexander J. Smola, Amr Ahmed, Vanja Josifovski, James Long, Eugene J. Shekita, and Bor-Yiing Su. 2014. Scaling Distributed Machine Learning with the Parameter Server. In *Proceedings of the 11th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI '14)*. USENIX Association. [https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/li\\_mu](https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi14/technical-sessions/presentation/li_mu)
- [29] David Lo, Liquun 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 (ISCA '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2749469.2749475>
- [30] Michael Marty, Marc de Kruijf, Jacob Adriaens, Christopher Alfeld, Sean Bauer, Carlo Contavalli, Michael Dalton, Nandita Dukkipati, William C. Evans, Steve Gribble, Nicholas Kidd, Roman Kononov, Gautam Kumar, Carl Mauer, Emily Musick, Lena Olson, Erik Rubow, Michael Ryan, Kevin Springborn, Paul Turner, Valas Valancius, Xi Wang, and Amin Vahdat. 2019. Snap: A Microkernel Approach to Host Networking. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3341301.3359657>
- [31] Hasan Al Maruf, Hao Wang, Abhishek Dhanotia, Johannes Weiner, Niket Agarwal, Pallab Bhattacharya, Chris Petersen, Mosharaf Chowdhury, Shobhit Kanaujia, and Prakash Chauhan. 2022. TPP: Transparent Page Placement for CXL-Enabled Tiered Memory. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2206.02878>
- [32] Khang T Nguyen. 2016. Introduction to Cache Allocation Technology in the Intel® Xeon® Processor E5 v4 Family. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/developer/articles/technical/introduction-to-cache-allocation-technology.html>.
- [33] Amanda Raybuck, Tim Stamler, Wei Zhang, Mattan Erez, and Simon Peter. 2021. HeMem: Scalable Tiered Memory Management for Big Data Applications and Real NVM. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '21)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3477132.3483550>
- [34] Zhenyuan Ruan, Malte Schwarzkopf, Marcos K. Aguilera, and Adam Belay. 2020. AIFM: High-Performance, Application-Integrated Far Memory. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'20)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi20/presentation/ruan>
- [35] Krzysztof Rzdca, Pawel Findeisen, Jacek Swiderski, Przemyslaw Zych, Przemyslaw Broniek, Jarek Kusmierek, Pawel 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 (EuroSys '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387524>
- [36] Samsung Electronics, Inc. 2022. Samsung Electronics Introduces Industry's First 512GB CXL Memory Module. <https://news.samsung.com/global/samsung-electronics-introduces-industrys-first-512gb-cxl-memory-module>.
- [37] Debendra Das Sharma. 2022. Compute Express Link®: An open industry-standard interconnect enabling heterogeneous data-centric computing. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on High-Performance Interconnects (HOTI)*. 5–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HOTI55740.2022.00017>
- [38] David Shue, Michael J. Freedman, and Anees Shaikh. 2012. Performance Isolation and Fairness for Multi-Tenant Cloud Storage. In *10th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 12)*. USENIX Association, Hollywood, CA, 349–362. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi12/technical-sessions/presentation/shue>
- [39] Muhammad Tirmazi, Adam Barker, Nan Deng, Md E. Haque, Zhi-jing Gene Qin, Steven Hand, Mor Harchol-Balter, and John Wilkes. 2020. Borg: the Next Generation. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3342195.3387517>
- [40] Carl A. Waldspurger. 2002. Memory Resource Management in VMware ESX Server. In *5th Symposium on Operating System Design and Implementation (OSDI 2002)*, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, December 9-11, 2002, David E. Culler and Peter Druschel (Eds.). USENIX Association. <http://www.usenix.org/events/osdi02/tech/waldspurger.html>
- [41] Wei Wei, Dejun Jiang, Sally A. McKee, Jin Xiong, and Mingyu Chen. 2015. Exploiting Program Semantics to Place Data in Hybrid Memory. In *Proceedings of the 2015 International Conference on Parallel Architecture and Compilation (PACT '15)*. IEEE Computer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PACT.2015.10>
- [42] Johannes Weiner, Niket Agarwal, Dan Schatzberg, Leon Yang, Hao Wang, Blaise Sanouillet, Bikash Sharma, Tejun Heo, Mayank Jain, Chunqiang Tang, and Dimitrios Skarlatos. 2022. TMO: Transparent Memory Offloading in Datacenters. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3503222.3507731>
- [43] Kai Wu, Yingchao Huang, and Dong Li. 2017. Unimem: Runtime Data Management on Non-Volatile Memory-Based Heterogeneous Main Memory. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3126908.3126923>
- [44] Zi Yan, Daniel Lustig, David Nellans, and Abhishek Bhattacharjee. 2019. Nimble Page Management for Tiered Memory Systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3297858.3304024>
- [45] Yu Zhang, Ping Huang, Ke Zhou, Hua Wang, Jianying Hu, Yongguang Ji, and Bin Cheng. 2020. OSCA: An Online-Model Based Cache Allocation Scheme in Cloud Block Storage Systems. In *Proceedings of the 2020 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC'20)*. USENIX Association, USA, Article 54, 14 pages.

- [46] Diyu Zhou, Yuchen Qian, Vishal Gupta, Zhifei Yang, Changwoo Min, and Sanidhya Kashyap. 2022. ODINFS: Scaling PM Performance with Opportunistic Delegation. In *16th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 22)*. USENIX Association, Carlsbad, CA, 179–193. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi22/presentation/zhou-diyu>