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Today

• End-host optimizations:
  – NUMA-aware networking
  – Kernel-bypass
  – Remote Direct Memory Access (RDMA)
Trends

• Networks get faster
  – 10Gb/s → 40Gb/s → 100Gb/s
  – Latency decreases (≈ 1μs)

• CPUs do not
  – But there are more of them
  – Latency is increasingly a software factor

• Moore's law continues
  – More transistors on a NIC
Key challenges

• Scaling
  – One fast network, lots of cores

• Latency
  – Dominated by software processing cost
  – Multiplied by multi-tier server architectures

• CPU load
  – Packet processing and data copying cost can be high
# Delay numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network switch</td>
<td>10-30 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network adaptor</td>
<td>2.5-32 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS network stack</td>
<td>15 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed of light (in fibre)</td>
<td>5 ns/m ⇒ 0.05-0.5 µs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- OS overhead per packet exchanged between two hosts attached to the same switch:
  \[
  \frac{(2\times15)}{(2\times2.5+2\times15+10)}=66\% \ (\!)
  \]
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Receiving a packet

3. Application scheduling (context switch), copy packet to user space application process context, adds latency.

can be CPU intensive at high data rates
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1. System call, copy from user space to socket buffer, TCP processing

can be CPU intensive at high data rates
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2. S/W Interrupt, remaining TCP/IP processing (multiplexing)

Can be CPU intensive at high data rates
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What does the hardware do?
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Overruns

• Device has no buffers for received packets \(\Rightarrow\) starts discarding packets
  – Not as bad as it sounds
  – Signals that it’s lost some in a status register

• CPU has no more slots to send packets \(\Rightarrow\) must wait
  – Can spin polling, but inefficient
  – Signals device to interrupt it when a packet has been sent
    i.e. a buffer slot is now free
Receive-Side Scaling (RSS)
Scaling with cores

- Use multiple queues (descriptor rings)
  - One queue per core $\Rightarrow$ better scaling
  - Per-queue interrupts $\Rightarrow$ direct to core
- Key question: which Rx queue gets a packet?

![Diagram](image)
RSS

- Queues serviced by different cores
- Each queue can trigger interrupt (MSI)
- Interrupt steered to core
More sophisticated filters

- Wildcard matches on 5-tuples
- VLAN matching
- SYN filter
  - Direct connection setups to a different queue
- Filters based on other protocols
- etc.
What about transmit?

- Multiple transmit queues:
  - Better scaling: each core has a tx queue
  - No locks or synchronization between cores
- Performance isolation:
  - NIC can schedule different tx queues
  - CPU scheduler not involved
Example:
Intel 82599EB 10Gb NIC

- 128 Send queues
- 128 Receive queues
- RSS filters
- 256 5-tuple filters
- Large number of "Flow Director" filters
- SYN filter
- etc.
What this buys you...

• Scaling with cores
• Reduced CPU load
  – Synchronization
  – Multiplexing
  – Scheduling
• Performance isolation
  – Receive: livelock

*If the OS is designed accordingly*
What it doesn't

• CPU load:
  – Demultiplexing on a queue
  – Protocol processing
  – Connection setup/teardown

• Context switches
  – Must still switch to receiving process
  – Enter/leave kernel
TCP Offload
TCP Offload

• Moving IP and TCP processing to the Network Interface (NIC)
• Main justification:
  – Reduction of host CPU cycles for protocol header processing, checksumming
  – Fewer CPU interrupts
  – Fewer bytes copied over the memory bus
  – Potential to offload expensive features such as encryption
TCP Offload Engines (TOEs)
Why TCP offload never worked

• Moore’s Law worked against “smart” NICs
  – CPU's used to be fast enough
• TCP/IP headers don’t take many CPU cycles
  – $\approx 30$ instructions if done with care.
• TOEs impose complex interfaces
  – TOE $\leftrightarrow$ CPU protocol can be worse than TCP!
• Connection management overhead
  – For short connections, overwhelms any savings
• OS can't control protocol implementation
  – Bug fixes
  – Protocol evolution (DCTCP, D2TCP, etc.)
Why TOEs sometimes help

- Now many cores, cores don't get faster
  - Network processing is hard to parallelize
- Sweet spot might be apps with:
  - Very high bandwidth
  - Relatively low end-to-end latency network paths
  - Long connection durations
  - Relatively few connections
- For example:
  - Storage-server access
  - Cluster interconnects
User-level networking
User-level Networking

- TCP offloading is not enough:
  - System call overhead
  - Context switches
  - Memory copies

- User-level networking key idea: remove overhead
  - Map individual queues to application
  - Allow applications to poll
  - OS-byapss (OS still needed for interrupts)

- Requires hardware which:
  - Can validate queue entries
  - Demultiplex messages to applications
User-space networking (2)

- Traditional networking
  - All communication through kernel
- User-level networking
  - Applications access NIC directly
  - Kernel involved only during connection setup/teardown
- “U-Net: a user-level network interface for parallel and distributed computing”
  - Eicken, Basu, Buch, Vogels, Cornell University, 1995
U-Net Data Structures & API

- Data structures:
  - Communication segment: application's handle
  - Buffers: hold data for sending and receiving
  - Message queues: hold descriptors to buffers

- Programming U-Net
  - Sending: compose data in buffer, post descriptor to send queue
  - Receiving: post descriptor to receive queue, poll status

- Messages contain TAG identifying source or destination queue
RDMA
Message passing exchange

- So far: messages between processes
Message passing exchange

- So far: messages between processes

Client

1. Packet arrives
2. DMA transfer to host memory
3. IRQ; schedule processor
4. Thread reads result
5. Copies into buffer in main memory
6. DMA request from main memory
7. Packet leaves

Server

Time

Block (rx)

send
Message passing exchange

- So far: messages between processes
- What about removing the server software entirely?
Remote Direct Memory Access (RDMA)

- Only the "client" actively involved in transfer
  - "One-sided" operation
- RDMA Write specifies:
  - where the data should be taken from locally
  - where it is to be placed remotely
- RDMA Read:
  - where the data should be taken from remotely
  - Where it is to be placed locally
- Require buffer advertisement prior to data exchange
**RDMA Read**
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**RDMA Read**

1. Req packet arrives
2. *DMA* request from main memory
3. Resp packet leaves
RDMA Write
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RDMA Write

1. Data packet arrives
2. DMA request to main memory
3. Optional [ACK packet leaves]
RDMA implementations

- Infiniband
  - Compaq, HP, IBM, Intel Microsoft and Sun Microsystems, 2000
  - New network from ground up (see Lecture Flow Control)
- IWARP (Internet Wide Area RDMA Protocol)
  - RDMA semantics over offloaded TCP/IP
  - Requires custom Ethernet NICs
- RoCE
  - RDMA semantics directly over Ethernet

- All implementations provide both:
  - Classical message passing (send/recv similar to U-Net)
  - RDMA operations (RDMA read/write)
Open Fabrics Enterprise Distribution (OFED)

- Unified RDMA stack different OS and hardware
  - Linux/Windows
  - Infiniband, iWARP, RoCE

- Vendors write their own device drivers and user library
  - Device driver implements allocation of message queues on device
  - User driver provides access to message queues from user user space

- Stack provides common application interface calls “verbs” interface
"Verbs" Data Structures & API

- Applications use 'verbs' interface to
  - Register application memory:
    - Operating system will make sure the memory is pinned and accessible by DMA
  - Create a queue pair (QP)
    - send/recv queue
  - Create a completion queue (CQ)
    - RNIC puts a new completion-queue element into the CQ after an operation has completed
  - Send/Receive/Read/Write data
    - Place a work-request element (WQE) into the send or recv queue
    - WQE points to user buffer and defines the type of the operation (e.g., send, recv, read, write)
RDMA vs TCP-Sockets

Throughput

Latency
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Typical CPU loads for three network stack implementations
Large RDMA Design Space

Operations
- READ
- WRITE
- ATOMIC
- SEND, RECV
  - Remote bypass (one-sided)
  - Two-sided

Transports
- Reliable
- Unreliable
- Connected
- Datagram

Optimizations
- Inlined
- Unsigned
- Doorbell batching
- WQE shrinking
- 0B-RECVs
How to Design a Sequencer Service

Sequencer Throughput

- Put multiple messages on the queue before notifying the NIC
- One QP per core
- Inline data with descriptor

- Use unreliable transport (avoid ACK), Use unsighaled Ops

Graph showing throughputs for different configurations:
- Atomics: 2.2
- RPC (1 C): 7
- +4 Queues, Dbell batching: 27.4
- +6 cores: 97.2
- +Header-only: 122

50x improvement shown.
Summary & Open Questions

• NICs getting faster, CPUs are not
  – Multiple tx/rx queues
  – Sophisticated mux/demux filters
  – Offload engines
  – Kernel bypass

• Open questions:
  – How to program closely-coupled set of RDMA devices? Requires a new way to think about software construction.
    • See Crail: www.crail.io
  – How to manage the sheer complexity and diversity of NICs?
  – What new architectures are required as bottlenecks move from NIC to PCI? (e.g., Intel OmniPath, Direct Cache Access, etc)