

FFTrainer: Fast Failover in Large-Language Model Training with Almost-Free State Management

Bohan Zhao[†]
Tsinghua University
zhaobh23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Yuanhong Wang[†]
Tsinghua University
yuanhong22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Chenglin Liu
Tsinghua University
liucl22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Jiaqi Pan
Tsinghua University
panjq22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Guang Yang
Tsinghua University
yangg22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Ruitao Liu
Tsinghua University
liurt23@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Tingrui Zhang
Tsinghua University
zhangtr22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Kai Luo
Tsinghua University
luok22@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Wei Xu^{*}
Tsinghua University
Weixu@tsinghua.edu.cn

Abstract

Recent developments in large language models (LLMs) have introduced new requirements for efficient and robust training. As LLM clusters scale, node failures, lengthy recoveries, and bulky checkpoints erode efficiency. Infrequent asynchronous checkpoints trigger costly rollbacks, yet higher frequencies add prohibitive overhead. To address these challenges, we propose FFTrainer, a system designed for robust LLM training. FFTrainer leverages surplus network capacity to quickly save and load states, thereby preventing rollbacks and accelerating recovery. Compared with prior checkpointing approaches, FFTrainer reduces recovery time by up to 98% and mitigates GPU utilization loss by up to 68% without hindering normal training.

1 Introduction

Large language models (LLMs) are widely used for tasks like question answering, content generation and coding assistance [15, 36], drawing significant attention from both academia and industry. Training these models requires large computation clusters involving substantial investments.

Unfortunately, these expensive clusters face frequent and lengthy downtime [21], leading to significant time and financial losses. For instance, a 16,384-GPU cluster used for training LLaMA3.1 405B reports a *mean time between failure (MTBF)* of about three hours. Even worse, *mean time to recover (MTTR)* from such failures can be tens of minutes [21], halting training progress. Studies show that failures can slow down training progress by up to 43% [26].

The training process design directly causes the short MTBF. Distributed LLM training relies on tightly coupled *workers* that communicate using MPI-style collective operations, which are not failure-tolerant. Thus, when any worker fails, the entire job must restart from a *checkpoint (CKPT)*. Even with GPUs that have an MTBF of around 80,000 hours (9

years), the MTBF for a cluster of 16,000 GPUs reduces to just three hours. While we can try to support Spark [51]-style partial recovery, managing the partial states would complicate the already-complex training process and add overhead during normal operation.

A more practical and economical approach is to tolerate the short MTBF by reducing the MTTR to seconds while introducing minimal overhead during normal execution. To do so, we first perform a comprehensive study to identify the main causes of the long MTTR. Most recovery time is spent recovering essential *states* on workers. These states include both training states like input data, model weights, and optimizer states, and network states. Unfortunately, in current training frameworks, neither kind recovers quickly.

The main challenge of recovery from a CKPT is the large *size* of the states. In state-of-the-art training libraries like DeepSpeed [28], each GPU needs to checkpoint tens of GBs of states. Loading them from/to storage not only delays recovery but also consumes significant disk, PCIe, and network bandwidth, further slowing down training. *Multi-level asynchronous checkpointing* is widely used in recent solutions like Gemini [48] and ByteCheckpoint [4], where states are first saved to main memory in a pipeline fashion before being written to remote disks by background threads. However, due to network and disk bandwidth limitations, completing a single CKPT can take several iterations. The background thread keeps consuming network and I/O resources, causing non-negligible slowdowns (see Section 3.1). These approaches do not fully exploit the redundancy in LLM CKPT, resulting in unnecessary overhead for saving training states.

In addition to the overhead that constrains CKPT frequency, state-of-the-art systems miss key recovery optimizations. Recovering network connection states involves multi-round communications to initialize communication groups and establish connections at various layers, such as PyTorch [38] agents

[†]Equal contribution.

^{*}Corresponding author.

Table 1. Data input and output per iteration of eight RTX 4090 when training with a 200 Gbps NIC.

Model	GPT-2	LLaMA3-8B	LLaMA2-13B	LLaMA3-70B
Per-iter time (s)	21	11	36	77
NIC capacity (GB)	525	275	900	1925
Data input (KB)	128	64	64	32
Data output (GB)	12	9.1	13	35

and NCCL [35] *ranks*, with the process requiring over 10 minutes on large clusters [21]. Additionally, there is an unnecessary dependency between network and training state recovery since worker IDs in the training framework reuse network ranks, causing delays when PyTorch assigns worker IDs after communication initialization, which can take over 1,000 seconds with 2,048 GPUs, thus delaying the recovery process. Moreover, training rarely saturates the network. Modern cluster designs provision ample fabric to absorb synchronous bursts (e.g., *all-to-all*, *allreduce*)[23], but links are largely idle otherwise. On an 8×4090 server with a single 200Gbps NIC, across four models (Table1), the average per-iteration utilization is only 1–3%.

Based on these observations, we present FFTrainer that eliminates the unnecessary bottlenecks in failover, reducing the MTTR to *tens of seconds*, and utilizing otherwise unused network bandwidth for CKPT and training data distribution with almost zero performance impact on normal training. Specifically, key ideas of FFTrainer include:

(1) **Only CKPT necessary information:** Many states are naturally redundant across workers (e.g., within the same data parallel group). Unlike existing solutions, FFTrainer only backs up unique states, enabling *instant checkpointing* (i.e., CKPT at *every* iteration).

(2) **Decouple training roles from network ranks:** FFTrainer decouples the *logical role* of a worker in the training job (`role = (id1, id2, id3)` in data/tensor/pipeline parallel groups) from its ranks in the NCCL layer. Therefore, training state recovery becomes independent of network state recovery, allowing us to overlap them.

(3) **Reduce network states to recover:** We observe that many network states (e.g., topologies and communication groups) in NCCL are unnecessary for LLM, slowing down initialization. Thus, we design a *lightweight collective communication library (LCCL)* to simplify the stack and speed up cross-node reconnections.

(4) **Leveraging unused network bandwidth for the free transfer of CKPTs and training data:** With the software control of LCCL, FFTrainer manages worker traffic without hardware QoS support, transferring CKPTs and training data only during communication idle periods, avoiding slowing down training. This also eliminates the need for a dedicated data network or pre-partitioning data onto local storage.

(5) **Compatible and easy integration into existing frameworks:** We integrated FFTrainer with the popular PyTorch framework and libraries like Megatron [31] and DeepSpeed.

FFTrainer only introduces dozens of lines of code changes (mainly changing the package names for CKPT and collective communication), enabling compatibility with off-the-shelf training code on existing models.

Compared to existing solutions, FFTrainer asynchronously manages state transfer and reduces state sizes by exploiting redundancy in the training framework. Experiments with four LLMs of different sizes on a 128-GPU cluster (16 servers) with a commodity network show that FFTrainer eliminates CKPT overhead, enables instant checkpointing, reduces job recovery time from about 1,000 seconds to 29 seconds, and removes the need for a dedicated storage network. Our analysis indicates these gains persist across a wide range of future compute and network infrastructures.

In summary, our contributions include: (1) We diagnose design flaws and bottlenecks that slow checkpointing and recovery. (2) We introduce fast failure detection, near-zero-cost checkpointing, and efficient training data management that exploits otherwise unused network bandwidth. (3) We integrate FFTrainer into PyTorch, Megatron, and DeepSpeed bundles, requiring minimal changes to training code. (4) Real-cluster experiments show almost 10× faster recovery time with negligible overhead on normal training. *When the paper is published, we will open FFTrainer source code to the community.*

2 Background and Related Work

Distributed training (DT) and 3D parallelism. DT is crucial for modern NLP tasks, which rely on large transformer-based models [47] like LLaMA [12, 46], GPT-3 [5, 37], and BERT [11] for improved accuracy. DT is used to handle the growing size of models and data, with container orchestration systems like Kubernetes [13] managing *job* submission and software deployment on GPU servers. When a job is created, the scheduler selects physical nodes based on resource availability and constraints, assigning each to a *pod* that runs the job’s applications, libraries, and dependencies in a container. *3D parallelism* combines both data and model parallelism. In data parallelism, each worker processes a batch of training data on a single GPU, calculating local *gradients* at each iteration. Workers form a *parallel group* and synchronize their models by aggregating gradients using *parameter servers (PS)* [20, 24, 25] or *ring allreduce* [10, 39]. Model parallelism, including *pipeline parallelism* and *tensor parallelism* [17, 30, 31], divides models into smaller partitions to fit them into per-GPU memory.

Checkpointing and failover. Early deep learning training relies solely on data parallelism, and several techniques [29, 32, 42] were proposed to speed up checkpointing in this scenario. More recent systems like SWIFT [53], LightCheck [8], Gemini [48], TRANSOM [50], Dlover [1], DataStates-LLM [27], and ByteCheckpoint [4] target LLM training with 3D parallelism. They use asynchronous multi-level checkpointing

with various optimizations to saturate disk bandwidth and limit recovery region. However, these methods are still far from achieving instant checkpointing because they do not completely eliminate the overhead of checkpointing large and redundant states. An alternative, JIT-Checkpointing [16], triggers checkpointing reactively at failure time rather than periodically. While this reduces unnecessary I/O—saving model weights and optimizer states only when a failure is imminent—it can forfeit critical optimizer states because only shards present on healthy ranks can be restored.

Fault tolerance. Maintaining training under partial node failures is as important as saving and restoring state. Prior systems pursue elasticity or tolerance in different ways: Varuna leverages spot-instance elasticity [3]; Bamboo adds redundancy via duplicate computation [45]; Oobleck and Recycle use pipeline parallelism with heterogeneous templates to survive failures [14, 19]; the stateless parameter server continues with stale weights/gradients [7]; and nonuniform tensor parallelism resynchronizes parameters across differing TP degrees via gradient resharding [2]. These approaches often incur extra cost (e.g., Bamboo’s duplication, Recycle’s bubble time). FFTrainer is complementary: even with fault tolerance, newly joined nodes must recover state; accelerating failover shortens idle periods and sustains training efficiency.

State sharding. In data parallelism, all devices in the same parallel group hold the same model states, leading to wasted GPU memory. Techniques like ZeRO [43, 44] and FSDP [52] address this issue by state sharding, where optimizer states, gradients, and even model weights are distributed across devices based on user settings. While state sharding saves memory, it introduces challenges for state recovery, as unique states on each device can be lost if a node fails. FFTrainer overcomes this challenge and thus supports free state sharding in fast failover.

Communication and computation overlap. People have developed many techniques to overlap communication and computation during training. For example, we can execute *activation recomputation* [18, 22] or even forward/backward [21] during collective communication. The key to effective workload overlap is accurately estimating computation time. Given the number of parameters on each device (φ), the computation time of forward and backward is based on the number of floating-point operations on each parameter, batch size b , token length s , and the GPU FLOPS C : (1) forward computation time: $\frac{2sb\varphi}{C}$; and (2) backward computation time: $\frac{4sb\varphi}{C}$. To overlap communication within one iteration, the total transmission time must not exceed the computation time: $T_c = \frac{6sb\varphi}{C}$. For example, when saving complete CKPTs to remote storage, current CKPT engines must transfer and persist both weights and optimizer states. The CKPT time overhead is: $T_{ckpt} = \frac{16\varphi(V+I)}{VI}$ with disk/network bandwidth of I and V .

Table 2. Possibility of GPU failures on different cluster scales and corresponding MFU loss. P_x denotes the cumulative probability of clusters with x GPUs achieving a given MTBF.

MTBF(hours)	P_{16384}	P_{65536}	Relative MFU loss
3	0.46	0.91	0.19
6	0.71	0.99	0.10
9	0.84	0.99	0.06
12	0.91	0.99	0.05

3 FFTrainer Design Overview

3.1 Why LLM Training Recovers Slowly?

We elaborate the failover bottlenecks introduced in Section 1. **High CKPT overhead.** Despite various optimizations to improve CKPT throughput and meet disk bandwidth constraints, the CKPT frequency remains low (typically every 30 minutes, as reported in MegaScale [21] and Meta [12]). This low frequency is due to several factors: (1) Large CKPT size: LLM CKPTs are very large, making it challenging to store the entire CKPT in memory or write it to disk within one training iteration. For example, a complete CKPT of LLaMA2-70B exceeds 500 GB. (2) Data network bottleneck: When saving CKPTs from eight GPUs over a shared storage network to disks, the dedicated storage network (often with smaller bandwidth than the training network) can become a bottleneck. (3) Frequent GPU memory copies: Full CKPT involves copying extensive data from GPU memory, disrupting ongoing computations. Frequent CKPT, even if asynchronous, significantly lowers training efficiency. In our measurement, running asynchronous CKPT in a background thread increases the iteration length by $7\times$ due to the GPU-host bandwidth contention.

Small MTBF. The MTBF for most commodity GPUs is typically 80K ~ 100K hours [33], with some GPU models having even lower MTBFs [12]. Such MTBF values are adequate for small clusters but insufficient for large LLM training clusters. Table 2 shows failure probabilities at different MTBFs and cluster scales, along with the impact on GPU usage, measured by *model FLOPs utilization* (MFU). Given a CKPT overhead of T_{ckpt} and a CKPT interval of T_i , we can compute the relative MFU loss as the sum of losses from three resources: L_{ckpt} , $L_{recover}$, and $L_{rollback}$, where $L_{ckpt} = \frac{T_{ckpt}}{T_i + T_{ckpt}}$,

$$L_{recover} = \frac{MTTR}{MTBF + MTTR}, \text{ and } L_{rollback} = \frac{T_i/2}{MTBF + MTTR}.$$

Even considering GPU failures alone, a cluster with tens of thousands of GPUs is likely to experience a breakdown every 3 hours, with a 91% probability. Moreover, even with frequent CKPT (e.g., every 30 minutes) and no CKPT overhead, a 3-hour breakdown results in a 19% MFU loss. Network, host, and disk failures only further reduce MTBF. Therefore, without efficient failover solutions, large-scale LLM training faces substantial MFU loss.

High MTTR. We measure the overhead of each recovery step in Figure 1 and identify inefficiencies leading to high MTTR:




Figure 1. FFTrainer recovery timeline vs. PyTorch solutions.

Step ①: Slow failure detection. When failures occur during blocking collective communication, detecting them involves balancing accuracy with false positives from worker desynchrony. Processes must wait for a communication timeout to exit if peers fail. For instance, NCCL sets default timeout to ten minutes to avoid unnecessary restarts.

Step ② ③: Pod creation and dependency installation. Even with sufficient resources, this step incurs overhead from three tasks: pulling Docker images to the host (e.g., minutes for an NVIDIA PyTorch image); creating and launching the pod (seconds); and installing dependencies (minutes).

Step ④: Network state recovery. Large jobs must rebuild massive communication groups that take long time to initialize. PyTorch uses a TCP-store to collect socket information and build connections with lock-based concurrency. NCCL bootstraps ranks and initializes groups, which becomes increasingly time-consuming with scale (reaching 1000 seconds with 2048 GPUs [21]).

Step ⑤ ⑥: Recovering and loading training states. New pods stage hundreds of GB per GPU (training data and CKPTs) to local disk/DRAM (minutes). During recovery, each process then loads its model partition from CKPTs (tens of seconds), but only *after* network state is restored in Step ④, creating a strict dependency chain.

3.2 What Can We Do About It

Guided by the analysis in §3.1, we design FFTrainer to manage state transfers for faster training recovery while minimizing network and storage costs. It targets two goals: (1) *instant checkpointing*—performing CKPT every iteration with no added overhead—to avoid rollbacks to stale checkpoints, and (2) reduced MTTR for faster recovery. We now introduce LLM-specific optimizations that realize these goals.

[Optimization 1] Reducing CKPT size and transferring them using idle network. Training progress is lost if the

CKPT interval exceeds one iteration. However, previous solutions cannot checkpoint every iteration due to bandwidth/storage limits and large CKPTs. FFTrainer enables instant (per-iteration) CKPT via: (1) *checkpoint razor*: eliminates redundant state data, compressing the CKPT size to one-tenth or less; (2) *neighboring redundancy*: backs up CKPTs in their neighbors’ memory using idle training network bandwidth from allreduce connections, avoiding data network and disk usage; (3) *lazy backup*: persists and transfers redundant states only during failure recovery.

[Optimization 2] Recovering network states with low latency. PyTorch+NCCL incurs slow communication initialization, often requiring thousands of seconds to derive network states for collectives. Yet LLM training under ring-style algorithms needs only *two* persistent peers per rank (one for PP, one for DP). LCCL streamlines initialization by discarding heavyweight abstractions and features, establishing minimal point-to-point channels with fast setup for failure recovery.

[Optimization 3] Coordinating multiple types of data transfers within the training network. FFTrainer coordinates TRAIN and STATE traffic, each with distinct optimization goals. TRAIN includes training output traffic, such as gradients and activations, while STATE involves saving/loading of LLM states like training data and CKPT. Without careful scheduling, the coexistence of TRAIN and STATE in the same network can slow down training, as GPU computation depends on inputs from TRAIN. To avoid this, FFTrainer prioritizes TRAIN to monopolize the network link and complete the transfer quickly, while STATE is allowed only when the network is idle.

[Optimization 4] Speeding up training job restart . Launching training jobs on a new pod involves several dependent steps: pod creation, dependency installation, network/training state recovery. Existing frameworks execute these steps sequentially, inflating restart latency. FFTrainer shortens the critical path via: (1) fully packaged Docker images pre-pulled to hosts, making pods training-ready within seconds; (2) LCCL-managed inter-node communication with lightweight initialization, reducing connection setup to *tens of seconds* even at scale; and (3) decoupling training roles from network ranks in LCCL, which lets FFTrainer overlap model loading with connection establishment. Figure 1 contrasts FFTrainer’s overlapped timeline with current serial flows.

Non-goals. FFTrainer is designed to complement existing DT libraries like Megatron and DeepSpeed, remaining transparent to GPU training frameworks and requiring minimal changes to user code. FFTrainer deliberately does not manage intra-host data paths; it delegates local communication to NCCL and focuses solely on node-level failover.

3.3 System Architecture

FFTrainer has four modules that jointly support three core functionalities: data management, CKPT, and recovery.




Figure 2. FFTrainer communication among workers with role $\{r_d, r_p, r_t\}$. Each iteration: workers send heartbeats to the controller (①) and backup their states on the neighbour in the data parallel group (③). The controller spreads data indexing to the rank 0 in each tensor parallel group (②). When pod 2 fails, the controller can detect failure via heartbeats and forward states from pod 1 to the substitute (④).

State controller. A dedicated process that coordinates data transfer and resource management. At init, it helps LCCL exchange addresses and establish connections. Each iteration, it assigns data indices to data loaders and collects worker heartbeats for liveness. On recovery, it retrieves redundant state from active workers and forwards it to newcomers. Although centralized, it avoids overload by handling only control plane messages.

CKPT engine. FFTrainer’s CKPT engine builds on asynchronous saving to alleviate interruptions during training. It provides interfaces for trainers to save CKPTs for neighboring redundancy or lazy backup.

Data loader. An extension of PyTorch’s loader that preloads training data *over the training network* using indices from the state controller, bypassing local disks and the host data network. It buffers data for future iterations. Each transfer is labeled by $TID = (role, iter)$, where *role* is the three-tuple in §1. The state controller manages all TID -to-data mappings, and LCCL uses TID to address states.

LCCL. API-compatible with `torch.distributed` to minimize code changes. For each collective, LCCL decides whether to use the network: host-agent handled if needed, otherwise offloaded to NCCL. It supports *asynchronous initialization* and *interruptible blocking communication* (§5), yielding faster startup and throughput on par with PyTorch.

Agents. FFTrainer adopts a three-layer runtime. Each node runs a pod that (i) launches a *worker agent* to spawn one per-GPU worker (e.g., via `torchrun`), monitor health, reap zombies, and restart workers on state-controller signals; and (ii) runs a *LCCL host agent* to handle all traffic in training network via a user-level stack (RDMA-backed).

4 Resource-Sensitive State Management

We require high bandwidth for exchanging gradients and activations, yet links are often underutilized outside bursty collectives. FFTrainer leverages this unused bandwidth to

enable two resource-intensive tasks in distributed training: training data and CKPT management. Figure 2 illustrates the communications involved in STATE during normal training and recovery. The key challenge is to support both tasks while maintaining high performance.

4.1 Training Data Management

To eliminate data loading stalls, we implement fine-grained data management that delivers training data just-in-time. Key functions include preloading, buffer management, and persistence, ensuring that the training process never waits for data or blocks GPU computation.

Each FFTrainer data loader maintains a buffer in CPU memory to hold data for the next k iterations (default $k = 10$). The buffer size is calculated as the smaller of the k input size and the amount of data that can be transferred in T_c : $B = \min(4sbk, \frac{6sbqV}{C})$ (about 40 MB for LLaMA-3 70B).

FFTrainer extends PyTorch’s data loader with two key functionalities: (1) preloading and buffering management: an asynchronous thread preloads training data and buffers it in a FIFO manner, evicting used data after each iteration and regulating preloading speed to prevent overflow; and (2) naming resolution: an overridden `get_item` method retrieves data using TID from the buffer.

In FFTrainer, workers do not store statically partitioned training data. Instead, the state controller computes and maintains indexing from data items to each TID , completing this at startup based on the number of GPUs without adding extra overhead. It also tracks how many workers are active and can dynamically adjust batch sizes and indexing.

With the state controller managing data partitions, FFTrainer allows training jobs to dynamically update sampling algorithms and rearrange data feed order, providing more opportunities to improve training quality.

The indexing information from the state controller decouples the training role from network ranks, allowing FFTrainer’s data loader to preload training data from a *data server* via the training network. The data server, running on globally shared storage or local disks, preloads data for faster response to preloading requests.

4.2 Checkpointing

FFTrainer tailors its CKPT engine to two objectives: (1) minimize interference with training compute, and (2) ensuring that all CKPT steps (both synchronous and asynchronous) are completed within a single iteration. We first introduce the checkpointing techniques and then explain how these techniques enable instant checkpointing. Figure 3 compares the FFTrainer’s CKPT process with existing frameworks.

Checkpoint razor and fast snapshot. When FFTrainer’s CKPT engine initializes, it parses the training configuration to identify unique states using a tool called the *checkpoint razor*. For LLM training, the checkpoint razor follows two rules: (1)




Figure 3. FFTrainer checkpointing approach vs. current solutions. FFTrainer introduces no blocking time between iterations but overlaps all checkpointing steps with computation.

if the data parallel degree is greater than one, model weights are redundant; (2) if the data parallel degree is greater than one and the distributed optimizer is not enabled (as in Zero-2 [44] and Megatron [31]), optimizer states are redundant. The checkpoint razor eliminates these redundant states, leaving only unique parts for backup. We save redundant states in healthy workers in CKPT only during job recovery.

The CKPT engine calculates the CPU memory buffer size needed to store unique states based on the optimizer type (e.g., $12\phi/d$ for the Adam optimizer, where ϕ is the number of parameters per device and d is the data parallel degree).

In each iteration, FFTrainer snapshots these unique states by device-to-host copies, stores them in a pre-allocated RDMA memory buffer ((A) in Figure 3), and streams them to the next worker’s buffer in the data parallel ring (i.e., neighboring redundancy, (B) in Figure 3). By avoiding disk writes and focusing only on unique states (typically small due to data parallelism), FFTrainer accelerates the snapshot process. It also avoids serializing states with `Pickle` [40], further reducing overhead. These optimizations allow FFTrainer to achieve instant checkpointing.

We model the relationship between a model’s computation overhead and the transfer overhead of its optimizer states, exploring the conditions required to overlap transfer with computation. The following inequality captures the condition:

$$T_c = \frac{6sb\phi}{C} \geq T'_{ckpt} = \frac{12\phi}{V}. \quad (1)$$

Using the checkpoint razor, we reduce the CKPT time from $T_{ckpt} = \frac{16\phi(V+I)}{VI}$ to $T'_{ckpt} = \frac{12\phi}{V}$, achieving over a 90% reduction. We also find that as long as the ratio of the model size and NIC bandwidth to GPU FLOPS is below a threshold (i.e.,

$\frac{sbV}{2C} \geq 1$), FFTrainer can fully hide the neighboring redundancy process within the computation. We call $\frac{sbV}{2C}$ the *free checkpointing ratio (FCR)*, a metric indicating whether CKPT overhead can be hidden within the computation, and we have the FCR condition:

$$T_c \geq T'_{ckpt} \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{FCR} = \frac{sbV}{2C} \geq 1. \quad (2)$$

In Section 7, we will show that this condition is satisfied in most real cases.

Lazy backup and checkpointing consistency. Recovery requires both unique and redundant state. FFTrainer adopts *lazy backup*: upon restart, healthy workers persist only the redundant state *before* exiting; to minimize duplication and ensure consistency, only `rank 0` in each DP group performs this backup. The backup runs in parallel with new-pod creation, adding negligible restart overhead and remaining compatible with future deployments.

Because FFTrainer does not enforce a fixed CKPT iteration, failures that stall collectives can leave groups at different versions (e.g., some checkpoints update in iteration n , others in $n + 1$). The state controller resolves this by choosing the earliest available iteration as the global CKPT and instructing survivors to roll back to that version for lazy backup. Model weights can be reconciled using the latest gradients, but optimizer state is harder; therefore, FFTrainer keeps two recent snapshots of optimizer state for version coordination—typically a few GB that fits in CPU memory.

Corner case handling for correctness. Two corner cases can invalidate CKPTS in FFTrainer: (1) all workers in a data parallel group fail, and (2) a worker fails along with its next rank. While increasing redundancy by saving states across more workers could address these issues, it is not worth the overhead to handle these rare cases (approximately 1.7% during recovery, as Table 2 shows). To avoid adding system complexity and overhead, FFTrainer employs multi-level insurance for these rare events: after a long training period (e.g., 500 iterations), FFTrainer triggers traditional asynchronous CKPT to save complete states, ensuring a fallback mechanism for basic recovery even if instant checkpointing fails.

4.3 Load Planning

Reducing workload of state controllers. FFTrainer employs a single controller per job—even at scale—and confines it to lightweight control-plane duties. To ensure scalability, it limits data I/O and message volume as follows. First, only the local `rank 0` on each pod reports per second, capping controller connections at 1/8 of total GPUs. States are updated in a lock-free array, enabling failure detection within one second even with tens of thousands of GPUs. Second, because workers in a model-parallel group share the same data, the controller sends indices only to that group’s `rank 0`; intra-node tensor-parallel links fan out the indices to peers. Even

at large scales, the controller transmits less than one GB per iteration, taking under a second using the training network.

Fast pod creation. FFTrainer employs additional operating techniques to reduce restart overhead. When the job first starts, FFTrainer pulls the required Docker image to all available hosts and maintains this list throughout the job’s runtime. This optimization ensures new pods created for recovery do not waste time pulling images. Additionally, FFTrainer pre-installs all training dependencies in a pod and commits it as a new Docker image before launching the job, avoiding repeated downloads and installations on each pod.

5 Latency-Sensitive State Management

FFTrainer uses LCCL to overcome NCCL’s high latency in network state recovery by several techniques. We describe these techniques in this section.

5.1 Fast Network State Recovery

The default DT setup incurs significant overhead from *connection building* and *communication group initialization*. In PyTorch, TCP-Store [41] exchanges network addresses and synchronizes communication group initialization on a single thread, causing the read-write overhead to grow linearly with the number of GPUs. Moreover, 3D parallelism requires multiple groups per worker, resulting in $O(N^2)$ initialization complexity due to global barriers. LCCL addresses these inefficiencies with two techniques:

Group-free collective communication. FFTrainer customizes collective communication for ring-based 3D parallelism. In distributed training, each worker needs at most four inter-node connections—two for DP and two for PP. With static participation, MPI-style membership management is unnecessary. Thus, FFTrainer eliminates cross-node communication groups in LCCL, bypassing costly group initialization. Workers simply send data through fixed connections.

Lock-free connection building. The state controller uses a lock-free array for asynchronous exchange of node addresses. Each node writes its rank and address and retrieves two target addresses for its receivers. By flagging each address upon completion, threads can verify readiness, allowing workers to build connections without barrier synchronization. This process is repeated during failover in FFTrainer, ensuring that a node with an LCCL agent can always track the mapping between its global role and rank, even after a failure occurs.

5.2 Overlapping Initialization with Model Loading

Model loading from disk to GPU is one of the most time-consuming steps in training initialization. However, existing frameworks typically execute the step sequentially after communication initialization because each device must identify its ranks to determine which model partition to load (Figure 1 in Section 3.1). Both steps are slow in LLM training, further delaying restarts. LCCL introduces an asynchronous

two-stage initialization to overlap these steps. First, it uses PyTorch interfaces to establish GPU connections within a single host via NCCL, which completes quickly (within hundreds of milliseconds) as it only involves 8 GPUs within a node. Meanwhile, the host agent can derive a set of roles from the state controller. Roles are then assigned to each worker according to their local ranks, allowing model loading to begin while LCCL builds cross-node connections simultaneously.

Thanks to the initialization speedups above, connection building usually completes faster than model loading. LCCL ensures that collective communication is delayed until all initialization is finished, guaranteeing correctness in rare cases.

5.3 Guaranteeing Communication Performance

LCCL offloads intra-node communication to NCCL, utilizing its high-performance implementation on PCIe/NVlink [34]. For multi-node allreduce operations, LCCL performs an intra-node reduce followed by a ring allreduce among host agents to compute the final results. After cross-node communication, the results are broadcast within the host via NCCL. This approach achieves performance on par with PyTorch using NCCL, benefiting from high intra-node bandwidth.

To ensure consistent user interfaces, LCCL uses *faked groups*. For instance, when users create a faked group $[0, 4, 8, 12]$ across two hosts, LCCL internally builds two local process groups, $[0, 4]$ and $[8, 12]$, in NCCL and only manages the data exchange across groups.

To optimize network usage, LCCL allows TRAIN to monopolize the network, with STATE occurring only when no gradient or activation transfers are in progress. This is achieved by maintaining separate queues for TRAIN and STATE. Specifically, data loaders preload training data only when buffer space is available and the downlink is idle, ensuring data preloading does not block training. The checkpoint engine follows a similar approach: checkpoint threads back up in-memory states to neighboring workers only when there are no ongoing activation or gradient transfers.

As noted in Table 1 in Section 1, training data bandwidth requirements typically remain below one megabyte per iteration for most models, leaving sufficient spare bandwidth for all workers, even on hosts with eight GPUs and a single NIC.

6 Fast Failure Detection and Failover

FFTrainer assumes the fail-stop model commonly adopted in large-scale training. In this section, we discuss how FFTrainer detect and recover from these failures.

6.1 Cross-layer Worker Failure Detection

Blocking collective communication is essential for training, as workers rely on it to synchronize their steps, adding *barrier* semantics beyond simple data exchange. As we discuss in Section 3.1, tolerating the collective communication timeout to exit normally is time-consuming. Prior solutions use a

Table 3. FFTrainer interacts with external modules in different cases during failover.

	External			Internal
	Operator	Pod	Agent	FFTrainer
Normal launch	create pods	create an agent	create workers	N/A
Healthy node restart	N/A	N/A	restart workers	failure detection; lazy backup
Software failure	N/A	N/A	failure detection; restart workers	recover CKPT
Hardware failure	reschedule failure pods	create an agent	create workers	recover CKPT

worker agent to detect failures and forcefully terminate workers. However, this approach results in the loss of all active states in healthy pods, violating the lazy checkpointing policy and leading to a longer detection period.

To address this issue, FFTrainer employs a cross-layer signal to implement blocking communication in a non-blocking manner. When a collective communication operation is invoked, FFTrainer first submits the request to the host agent and then waits for signals from either communication completion or interruption. Upon completion, the host agent receives the data and notifies all waiting workers to proceed.

If a failure occurs during the communication, the state controller detects missing application-level heartbeats and triggers a breakdown notification to host agents, prompting a job recovery. Host agents wake up waiting workers and allow worker agents to restart unresponsive processes. This method is much faster than waiting for communication timeouts, as heartbeats are sent frequently (by default, every second). It is also more accurate than external heartbeats because the training process itself reports real-time aliveness via LCCL.

The hybrid signal design for communication interruption has two key benefits in implementation: (1) waiting threads can release the *global interpreter lock (GIL)* of Python, allowing other threads to receive messages from the state controller, and (2) the main training thread can exit normally, enabling lazy backup before the restart.

6.2 Failover

FFTrainer uses the above mechanisms to handle different failure cases. Table 3 enumerates all roles and their actions on different training recovery cases: (a) Normal launch: the operator creates a pod on each node; the launch command of each pod creates a worker agent; the agent then creates a worker for each GPU; (b) Healthy node restart: workers receive notifications from the state controller for lazy backup and then exit normally; the agent creates new workers; (c) Software failure: the worker agent receives notifications from the state controller to restart some workers and then workers recover from CKPTs; (d) Hardware failure: the operator kills

the original pod and repeats (a) on a new node, and workers additionally recover states from other nodes. Different cases share the same steps in Section 3.1 after workers restart.

We analyze the recovery probability of FFTrainer under a common failure assumption where, in a cluster of N machines, exactly k machines fail. The recovery probability from the CKPT in main memory is given by

$$\begin{cases} P_r(N, k) = 1, & \text{if } k = 1, \\ P_r(N, k) = \frac{\binom{N-k}{k} + \binom{N-k-1}{k-1}}{\binom{N}{k}}, & \text{if } k > 1. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

For $k > 1$, the probability is the fraction of ways to choose k failed servers that include at least one pair of adjacent servers (which causes backup loss) out of all possible ways to pick k failed servers. We also consider the probability of such k -node failures. Given the MTBF of a single GPU T_b , the probability that a host with eight GPUs fails within H hours is $1 - e^{-\frac{8H}{T_b}}$. Thus, the probability of k -node failures in a cluster with N machines is

$$P_f(N, k, H) = \binom{N}{k} (1 - e^{-\mu H})^k (e^{-\mu H})^{N-K}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mu = \frac{8}{T_b}$. The overall probability of successful recovery is

$$P(N, H) = \sum_{k=0}^N P_r(N, k) \times P_f(N, k, H). \quad (5)$$

$P(N, H)$ is large enough for most training scenarios (higher than 99% within 12 hours even when $N \geq 10,000$).

As noted in Section 4.2, all workers must restart from the same iteration; if some are ahead, we roll them back to the most recent globally consistent iteration. This rollback does not reduce training progress because we checkpoint the optimizer state immediately after each update (i.e., before the start of the next iteration). Consequently, once all workers have completed the weight update and entered the next iteration, a complete optimizer-state CKPT exists, and training can safely resume from that iteration.

7 Evaluation


We evaluate FFTrainer to answer three questions: (1) its overhead and MTTR improvements on real clusters; (2) the source of these improvements; and (3) its scalability to larger scale and future faster clusters. We answer the first two using experiments on a real cluster and the third with analysis.

7.1 Experiment Setup

Testbed. We run FFTrainer on a testbed of 128 GPUs on 16 servers connected via 200 Gbps Infiniband. Each worker node has a single 200 Gbps Mellanox ConnectX-6 NIC, 2×56 -core 2.00GHz CPUs, 192 GB RAM, and $8 \times$ NVIDIA GeForce RTX 4090 GPUs. All nodes use NVIDIA driver 550.76 with CUDA 12.4, Mellanox OFED 5.8-3.0.7.0, and Ubuntu 20.04.

Table 4. Default training configurations and models used in experiments.

	GPT-2 2.7B	LLaMA3-8B	LLaMA2-13B	LLaMA3-70B
d	16	4	4	2
p	2	8	8	8
t	4	4	4	8
Batch size	512	256	256	128

**Figure 4.** Checkpointing overhead for each system. The hollow part represents the difference of training time with/without CKPT, i.e., overhead of asynchronous checkpointing.

Prototype implementation. We integrate FFTrainer with PyTorch, DeepSpeed, and Megatron as four modules: two plugins that implement interfaces to LCCL and the CKPT engines on PyTorch, each with 1K lines of Python; LCCL with 4K lines of C++; and a state controller with 1K lines of Python and 1K lines of C++.

Workloads. We use four LLMs with various sizes: GPT-2 2.7B, LLaMA3-8B, LLaMA2-13B, and LLaMA3-70B. We perform pre-training using the Common Crawl dataset [9]. We train the models without quantization using fp16. We choose the tensor/pipeline parallel parameter t and p so the training fits the GPU memory, then we fully utilize all 128 GPUs by setting the correct data parallel degree d . Table 4 summarizes the configurations.

Baselines. We compare FFTrainer with the original checkpoint engines from Megatron [31], DeepSpeed [28], and PyTorch [42]. In addition, we evaluate state-of-the-art failover solutions such as MegaScale [21], which focuses on fast recovery, and Gemini [48], which emphasizes rapid CKPT.

7.2 Key performance results

FFTrainer achieves instant checkpointing with minimal impact on training performance. We measure the per-iteration time of different models using various CKPT engines, and show the performance comparison in Figure 4. The CKPT overhead is calculated by running the training with/without CKPT, and taking the difference (shown as the hollow part of the bars). While FFTrainer does CKPT every iteration, other engines fail to support this high frequency, and thus we only

Table 5. Breakdown of failover overhead (seconds) when training LLaMA2-13B.

	Gemini		FFTrainer		Time Reduction
GPU num	16	128	16	128	
Failure detection	15	15	6	6	60%
Pod creation	392	392	7	7	98%
Dependency install	421	421	0	0	100%
State recovery & loading	71	166	13	16	82-91%
Total	899	994	26	29	97%

do CKPT every five iterations on vanilla DeepSpeed and Megatron. Gemini does CKPT every minute as in its evaluation.

We observe that: (1) Despite lower CKPT frequency, DeepSpeed and Megatron increase training time by 23% to 110% due to CKPT traffic, which can last several iterations (Section 3.1). (2) As model size grows, the CKPT overhead increases for baselines due to the larger CKPT size. (3) In contrast, FFTrainer maintains an overhead of less than 3% in all cases, demonstrating the benefits of the checkpoint razor and neighboring redundancy (Section 4). (4) Although both FFTrainer and Gemini incur minimal CKPT overhead during training, FFTrainer checkpoints every iteration while Gemini checkpoints every minute (about 1 to 6 iterations), allowing FFTrainer to achieve a higher CKPT frequency.

FFTrainer reduces MTTR at every step of the recovery. Referring to the six steps illustrated in Figure 1 (Section 3.2), we measure the time spent on each step, using LLaMA2-13B as an example. Note that these numbers only depend on per-worker state size but not the total model size, and thus all models provide similar results. Table 5 summarizes the results, and our observations are as follows: (1) By avoiding collective communication timeout, FFTrainer reduces detection time to 6 seconds. (2) Pre-installing and pre-loading all pod images allows FFTrainer to start pods within 7 seconds. (3) Decoupling network and training initialization enables both steps, including network/training state recovery and training state loading, to be completed within 16 seconds. (4) When increasing from 16 to 128 GPUs, connection building time increases by only 27% with FFTrainer, compared to an increase of 2.3× with the off-the-shelf PyTorch implementation. In summary, FFTrainer can reduce the MTTR by 97%.

Combining frequent CKPT with reduced MTTR significantly improves GPU utilization. We use MFU as the effectiveness metric for failover mechanisms in log scale. Using the measurement results from FFTrainer, Megatron, Gemini, and MegaScale, Figure 5 plots the MFU loss with the cluster MTBF ranging from 2 to 6 hours. The CKPT intervals for the four systems are per-iteration, per-minute, per-half-hour, and per-hour, as suggested in their respective papers.

We observe the following: (1) For Megatron, too frequent CKPT leads to significant checkpoint loss (solid bars), while




Figure 5. Relative MFU loss for failures at different MTBF.

Table 6. The probability that FFTrainer can recover failures from CKPTs stored in main memory ($P(N, H)$).

number of hosts (8 GPUs each)	FFTrainer H=3	FFTrainer H=12	Gemini m=2, H=3,	Gemini m=2, H=12
800	99.98%	99.74%	100.00%	99.94%
1200	99.97%	99.65%	99.99%	99.91%
1600	99.96%	99.57%	99.99%	99.88%
2000	99.96%	99.50%	99.99%	99.86%

infrequent checkpoints cause substantial progress loss due to rollback to previous CKPT (semitransparent bars). (2) Although Gemini reduces CKPT overhead, it still suffers from rollback (about 1%) and recovery (about 5%) overhead in short-MTBF cases without fast failover optimizations. (3) MegaScale speeds up recovery but is limited by its CKPT frequencies and lacks checkpoint optimizations, resulting in 12% rollback loss (semitransparent bars). (4) FFTrainer reduces MFU loss to nearly zero (no more than 0.27%) by combining frequent, efficient CKPT with reduced MTTR. (5) Since MTTR is constant, when MTBF is small, the MFU loss due to recovery becomes more significant (hollow bars).

7.3 Deeper look into each component

Overall recovery probability. To validate the effectiveness of FFTrainer’s CKPT strategy, we compare its CPU-memory recovery probability with Gemini (Section 6.2). Table 6 plots the recovery probability for both systems as a function of the number of machines. Even in a cluster with 2,000 servers (16,000 GPUs), FFTrainer’s lightweight CKPT strategy achieves a success probability nearly identical to Gemini, with less than a 0.5% difference over 12 hours. In recovery failure cases, both systems load CKPTs from remote storage, incurring higher latency. These results validate that a single CKPT suffices to guarantee high recovery success while reducing bandwidth and main memory overhead.

FFTrainer works well in different parallel configurations. We measure the extra cost caused by different CKPT engines at different parallel configurations in Table 7. In this experiment,

Table 7. Impact of FFTrainer on training efficiency with different parallel degrees when training GPT-2 2.7B.

	(2,4,2)	(4,4,2)	(8,4,2)	(16,4,2)
Per-iter time (s)	7.7	11	12	21
FFTrainer slowdown	1.3%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%
Megatron slowdown	18%	21%	31%	44%




Figure 6. Main memory overhead for checkpointing when training different models.

we fix the model partition size and batch size on each GPU to keep computation and copy overhead unchanged. We can see that (1) a larger data parallel degree can further increase CKPT overhead: Megatron CKPT engine spends up to $6.6\times$ more time gathering distributed optimizer states (if enabled) when $d = 16$; (2) FFTrainer introduces little overhead in all cases even with a large data parallel degree.

FFTrainer consumes acceptable main memory. A key trade-off in FFTrainer’s design is the use of extra main memory to store CKPTs for subsequent recovery. We measure the main memory overhead of different systems during training, as shown in Figure 6. For Gemini, we set $m = 2$ as in its evaluation. FFTrainer consumes the least main memory compared to all baselines, using 38% of Megatron and 19% of Gemini when training LLaMA3-8B. Thanks to the state sharding techniques discussed in Section 2, the optimizer state size decreases as the data parallel degree grows, giving FFTrainer a greater advantage in large-scale training. This benefit is primarily due to FFTrainer’s checkpoint razor optimization, which eliminates redundant training states. Note that the bandwidth consumption on both the network and disk is also equivalent to this overhead, as systems must eventually store CKPTs on remote storage.

LCCL can complete cross-node collective communication efficiently. We measure the time overhead of allreduce operations between two physical nodes with increasing data length when using different backends in Figure 7. We can observe that LCCL can provide similar efficiency to NCCL, e.g., 89% of NCCL on 2 GB data. Considering that the tensor length of gradients in data parallelism is around 2 GB, LCCL can effectively replace NCCL for cross-node communication with negligible cost, thereby directly benefiting training recovery.




Figure 7. Allreduce time overhead: LCCL vs. NCCL for different data lengths.




Figure 8. Network initialization overhead: LCCL vs. MegaScale for different scales.

LCCL outperforms MegaScale in network state recovery.

We measure the time overhead of network state recovery at different scales using various communication libraries, as shown in Figure 8. LCCL completes recovery steps, such as connection building and group initialization, faster than MegaScale, which requires extra time to convert model tensors into DTensors [6]. For example, in 128-GPU clusters, LCCL takes only 17% of the time required by MegaScale. Additionally, since FFTrainer overlaps network state recovery with other steps like model loading, the current overhead is hidden without impacting failover.

7.4 Scalability and Future-proofing

FFTrainer can work on future models and devices. A critical assumption of FFTrainer is that we can complete all state management within a single iteration. The key question is whether the assumption still holds on future models and computation platforms.

We investigate the relationship between FCR (Section 4) and the training parameters (batch sizes and token length) and network/computation resources (per GPU network bandwidth and per-GPU FLOPS). We sample a variety of combinations of these parameters, and use *parallel coordinate plot* [49] to illustrate them in Figure 9. Specifically, the orange line represents combinations that satisfy FFTrainer’s assumption




Figure 9. Factors influencing FCR. The orange lines represent factor combinations satisfying $\text{FCR} \geq 1$ (free CKPT) while the blue lines represent $\text{FCR} < 1$ (paid CKPT). The dashed lines show real cases of training LLaMA3 using 4090 and H100 GPUs in a batch size of 256.

($\text{FCR} \geq 1$), while the blue line represents the cases where $\text{FCR} < 1$. The two thick lines indicate typical settings for the H100 and 4090 GPUs, respectively.

We observe that the orange lines across many different settings, while blue lines are all clustered at small regions with small token lengths, very small bandwidth (less than 25Gbps), and fast GPUs (about 4× higher than 4090s, or closer to H100). These blue lines represent impractical settings where small models are trained on very fast GPUs interconnected by low-bandwidth networks.

With the increasing scale of LLMs and computation power, the $\text{FCR} \geq 1$ assumption will become even stronger in the future: (1) Maximum token lengths will increase, raising FCR; (2) Larger GPU memory will allow for increased batch sizes, further boosting FCR; (3) While higher GPU FLOPS reduce FCR due to shorter network idle times, increasing network bandwidth will compensate for this. Even if GPUs become 82× faster than H100, existing 400 Gbps NICs can still guarantee $\text{FCR} \geq 1$. In summary, future technology trends will only favor the FCR assumption of FFTrainer.

FFTrainer scales to 30k+ GPUs. As we analyze in Section 4.3, the only scalability bottleneck is the centralized state controller. To stress-test the controller and ensure it does not become an actual bottleneck, we create 32,768 workers on our testbed without using GPUs, each sending heartbeats and attempting to establish connections with the controller, and measure processing time on the controller.

Figure 10 reveals the following conclusions: (1) It takes 11 seconds for a single worker to build connections (in order to register the RDMA buffer, etc.), and when we increase the number of workers to 32,768, it takes only 14 seconds in




Figure 10. Time overhead of processing heartbeats and connection building by the state controller at different scales.

total (yellow line/axis); (2) Processing heartbeats from 32,768 workers only uses 19 ms of CPU time (blue line/axis); (3) Both times grow close to linearly with number of workers. Thus, the central controller is unlikely to become a bottleneck.

8 Conclusion and Future Work

Despite substantial engineering to prevent failures, distributed LLM training systems are not failover-efficient; they rely on costly checkpointing that yields long recovery times. FF-Trainer shifts focus from increasing MTBF to minimizing MTTR, cutting 98% recovery time so frequent faults become tolerable. It delivers instant checkpointing by minimizing saved state (preventing rollbacks) and accelerates recovery via fast, asynchronous cross-node communication initialization and lightweight failure detection with LCCL. By routing and prioritizing state transfers on the training network, FFTrainer overlaps checkpointing with the transmission of training data, requiring no extra data network. FFTrainer remains effective on larger, faster future systems. As future work, we will explore checkpoint compression to further reduce overhead and mitigate FCR limitations.

References

- [1] AntGroup. 2024. Dlover. <https://github.com/intelligent-machine-learning/dlover/tree/master>.
- [2] Daiyaan Arfeen, Dheevatsa Mudigere, Ankit More, Bhargava Gopireddy, Ahmet Inci, and Gregory R. Ganger. 2025. Nonuniform-Tensor-Parallelism: Mitigating GPU failure impact for Scaled-up LLM Training. *arXiv:2504.06095 [cs.DC]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/2504.06095>
- [3] Sanjith Athlur, Nitika Saran, Muthian Sivathanu, Ramachandran Ramjee, and Nipun Kwatra. 2022. Varuna: scalable, low-cost training of massive deep learning models. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 472–487.
- [4] Wan Borui, Han Mingji, Sheng Yiyao, Peng Yanghua, Lin Haibin, Zhang Mofan, Lai Zhichao, Yu Menghan, Zhang Junda, Song Zuquan, Liu Xin, and Wu Chuan. 2024. ByteCheckpoint: A Unified Checkpointing System for Large Foundation Model Development. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.20143* (2024).
- [5] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. 2020. Language models are few-shot

- learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 1877–1901.
- [6] ByteDance. 2024. A PyTorch Native LLM Training Framework. <https://github.com/volcengine/veScale/tree/main>.
- [7] Ray Cao, Sherry Luo, Steve Gan, and Sujeeth Jinesh. 2024. Training Through Failure: Effects of Data Consistency in Parallel Machine Learning Training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.05546* (2024).
- [8] Menglei Chen, Yu Hua, Rong Bai, and Jianming Huang. 2023. A Cost-Efficient Failure-Tolerant Scheme for Distributed DNN Training. In *2023 IEEE 41st International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD)*. IEEE, 150–157.
- [9] Common Crawl. 2024. The Common Crawl corpus contains petabytes of data, regularly collected since 2008. <http://commoncrawl.org/the-data/>.
- [10] Jeffrey Dean, Greg S Corrado, Rajat Monga, Kai Chen, Matthieu Devin, Quoc V Le, Mark Z Mao, Marc’ Aurelio Ranzato, Andrew Senior, Paul Tucker, et al. 2012. Large scale distributed deep networks. (2012).
- [11] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805* (2018).
- [12] Abhimanyu Dubey, Abhinav Jauhri, Abhinav Pandey, Abhishek Kadian, Ahmad Al-Dahle, Aiesha Letman, Akhil Mathur, Alan Schelten, Amy Yang, Angela Fan, et al. 2024. The llama 3 herd of models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.21783* (2024).
- [13] Cloud Native Computing Foundation. 2024. Kubernetes, also known as K8s, is an open source system for automating deployment, scaling, and management of containerized applications. <https://kubernetes.io/>.
- [14] Swapnil Gandhi, Mark Zhao, Athinagoras Skiadopoulos, and Christos Kozyrakis. 2024. ReCycle: Resilient Training of Large DNNs using Pipeline Adaptation. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 30th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 211–228.
- [15] Github. 2023. Copilot. <https://copilot.github.com/>.
- [16] Tanmay Gupta, Sanjeev Krishnan, Rituraj Kumar, Abhishek Vijeev, Bhargav Gulavani, Nipun Kwatra, Ramachandran Ramjee, and Muthian Sivathanu. 2024. Just-In-Time Checkpointing: Low Cost Error Recovery from Deep Learning Training Failures. In *EuroSys ’24: Proceedings of the Nineteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*. 1110–1125.
- [17] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, Hyoungho Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, et al. 2019. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [18] Paras Jain, Ajay Jain, Aniruddha Nrusimha, Amir Gholami, Pieter Abbeel, Joseph Gonzalez, Kurt Keutzer, and Ion Stoica. 2020. Checkmate: Breaking the memory wall with optimal tensor rematerialization. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 2 (2020), 497–511.
- [19] Insu Jang, Zhenning Yang, Zhen Zhang, Xin Jin, and Mosharaf Chowdhury. 2023. Oobleck: Resilient distributed training of large models using pipeline templates. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 382–395.
- [20] Yimin Jiang, Yibo Zhu, Chang Lan, Bairen Yi, Yong Cui, and Chuanxiong Guo. 2020. A unified architecture for accelerating distributed DNN training in heterogeneous GPU/CPU clusters. In *14th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 20)*. 463–479.
- [21] Ziheng Jiang, Haibin Lin, Yinmin Zhong, Qi Huang, Yangrui Chen, Zhi Zhang, Yanghua Peng, Xiang Li, Cong Xie, Shibiao Nong, et al. 2024. MegaScale: Scaling large language model training to more than 10,000 GPUs. In *21st USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 24)*. 745–760.
- [22] Vijay Anand Korthikanti, Jared Casper, Sangkug Lym, Lawrence McAfee, Michael Andersch, Mohammad Shoyebi, and Bryan Catanzaro. 2023. Reducing activation recomputation in large transformer

- models. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 5 (2023).
- [23] Lambda. 2022. Hyperplane 8-A100. <https://lambdalabs.com>.
- [24] 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 *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 14)*. 583–598.
- [25] Mu Li, Li Zhou, Zichao Yang, Aaron Li, Fei Xia, David G Andersen, and Alexander Smola. 2013. Parameter server for distributed machine learning. In *Big Learning NIPS Workshop*, Vol. 6. 2.
- [26] Kiwan Maeng, Shivam Bharuka, Isabel Gao, Mark Jeffrey, Vikram Saraph, Bor-Yiing Su, Caroline Trippel, Jiyang Yang, Mike Rabbat, Brandon Lucia, et al. 2021. Understanding and improving failure tolerant training for deep learning recommendation with partial recovery. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 3 (2021), 637–651.
- [27] Avinash Maurya, Robert Underwood, M Mustafa Rafique, Franck Cappello, and Bogdan Nicolae. 2024. Datastates-llm: Lazy asynchronous checkpointing for large language models. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Symposium on High-Performance Parallel and Distributed Computing*. 227–239.
- [28] Microsoft. 2024. DeepSpeed. <https://github.com/microsoft/DeepSpeed>.
- [29] Jayashree Mohan, Amar Phanishayee, and Vijay Chidambaram. 2021. CheckFreq: Frequent, Fine-Grained DNN Checkpointing. In *19th USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies (FAST 21)*. 203–216.
- [30] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R Devanur, Gregory R Ganger, Phillip B Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. 2019. PipeDream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for DNN training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 1–15.
- [31] Deepak Narayanan, Mohammad Shoeybi, Jared Casper, Patrick LeGresley, Mostofa Patwary, Vijay Korthikanti, Dmitri Vainbrand, Prithvi Kashinkunti, Julie Bernauer, Bryan Catanzaro, et al. 2021. Efficient large-scale language model training on gpu clusters using megatron-lm. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. 1–15.
- [32] Bogdan Nicolae, Jiali Li, Justin M Wozniak, George Bosilca, Matthieu Dorier, and Franck Cappello. 2020. Deepfreeze: Towards scalable asynchronous checkpointing of deep learning models. In *2020 20th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Internet Computing (CCGRID)*. IEEE, 172–181.
- [33] Nvidia. 2020. NVIDIA Ampere Architecture In-Depth. <https://devblogs.nvidia.com/nvidia-ampere-architecture-in-depth/>.
- [34] Nvidia. 2020. NVLink and NVSwitch. <https://www.nvidia.com/engsg/data-center/nvlink>.
- [35] NVIDIA. 2024. NVIDIA Collective Communications Library (NCCL). <https://github.com/NVIDIA/nccl>.
- [36] OpenAI. 2023. ChatGPT application. <https://chat.openai.com/>.
- [37] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. 2022. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35 (2022), 27730–27744.
- [38] Adam Paszke, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, Zeming Lin, Natalia Gimelshein, Luca Antiga, Alban Desmaison, Andreas Kopf, Edward Yang, Zachary DeVito, Martin Raison, Alykhan Tejani, Sasank Chilamkurthy, Benoit Steiner, Lu Fang, Junjie Bai, and Soumith Chintala. 2019. PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 8024–8035. <http://papers.neurips.cc/paper/9015-pytorch-an-imperative-style-high-performance-deep-learning-library.pdf>
- [39] Pitch Patarasuk and Xin Yuan. 2009. Bandwidth optimal all-reduce algorithms for clusters of workstations. *J. Parallel and Distrib. Comput.* 69, 2 (2009), 117–124.
- [40] Python. 2024. pickle — Python object serialization. <https://docs.python.org/3/library/pickle.html>.
- [41] PyTorch. 2024. Introduction to Libuv TCPStore Backend. https://pytorch.org/tutorials/intermediate/TCPStore_libuv_backend.html.
- [42] Pytorch. 2024. Welcome to the TorchSnapshot documentation! <https://pytorch.org/torchsnapshot/stable/>.
- [43] Samyam Rajbhandari, Jeff Rasley, Olatunji Ruwase, and Yuxiong He. 2020. Zero: Memory optimizations toward training trillion parameter models. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. IEEE, 1–16.
- [44] Jie Ren, Samyam Rajbhandari, Reza Yazdani Aminabadi, Olatunji Ruwase, Shuangyan Yang, Minjia Zhang, Dong Li, and Yuxiong He. 2021. ZeRO-Offload : Democratizing Billion-Scale model training. In *2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 21)*. 551–564.
- [45] John Thorpe, Pengzhan Zhao, Jonathan Eyolfson, Yifan Qiao, Zhihao Jia, Minjia Zhang, Ravi Netravali, and Guoqing Harry Xu. 2023. Bamboo: Making preemptible instances resilient for affordable training of large {DNNs}. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*. 497–513.
- [46] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. 2023. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971* (2023).
- [47] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [48] Zhuang Wang, Zhen Jia, Shuai Zheng, Zhen Zhang, Xinwei Fu, TS Eugene Ng, and Yida Wang. 2023. Gemini: Fast failure recovery in distributed training with in-memory checkpoints. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 364–381.
- [49] Wikipedia. 2024. Parallel coordinates. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Parallel_coordinates.
- [50] Baodong Wu, Lei Xia, Qingping Li, Kangyu Li, Xu Chen, Yongqiang Guo, Tiejiao Xiang, Yuheng Chen, and Shigang Li. 2023. TRANSOM: An efficient fault-tolerant system for training LLMs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.10046* (2023).
- [51] Matei Zaharia, Mosharaf Chowdhury, Michael J Franklin, Scott Shenker, and Ion Stoica. 2010. Spark: Cluster computing with working sets. In *2nd USENIX workshop on hot topics in cloud computing (HotCloud 10)*.
- [52] Yanli Zhao, Andrew Gu, Rohan Varma, Liang Luo, Chien-Chin Huang, Min Xu, Less Wright, Hamid Shojanazeri, Myle Ott, Sam Shleifer, et al. 2023. Pytorch FSDP: experiences on scaling fully sharded data parallel. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.11277* (2023).
- [53] Yuchen Zhong, Guangming Sheng, Juncheng Liu, Jinhui Yuan, and Chuan Wu. 2023. Swift: Expedited Failure Recovery for Large-Scale DNN Training. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGPLAN Annual Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*. 447–449.