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Background

Low latency for a huge number of short query/response flows, especially the tail latency (e.g. 99-th)
Data centers use multi-stage Clos topologies

- Multiple equal-cost paths for a pair of hosts – How to load balance?
- Today’s practice: ECMP, local, random – lots of problems
Background

- Current data center transport is ill-fitted for the task

  RTT measurement in EC2 us-west-2c, 100K samples

  Mean RTT: 0.5ms

  99-th RTT: 17ms

- Corroborated by measurements from many existing papers
Background

- Culprit: ECMP is static and agnostic to congestion

- Tail latency is even worse with elephants colliding on the same path due to ECMP
Our quest

- How can we improve load balancing in data center networks?
  - Scalable enough to handle millions of mice flows traversing numerous links
  - Smart enough to avoid congestion in the network dynamically
Our answer

- Patch solution: RepNet
  - Application-layer transport that can be implemented today
  - INFOCOM 2014, under submission

- Fundamental solution: Expeditus
  - Distributed, congestion-aware load balancing protocol to replace ECMP
  - CoNEXT student workshop 2014 best paper, on-going work
Chapter I

RepNet
RepNet in a nutshell

- Replicate each mice flow to exploit multipath diversity

- No two paths are exactly the same – The power of two choices, M Mitzenmacher

- Clos based topologies provide many equal-cost paths
RepNet’s design

- Which flows?
  - Less than 100KB, consistent with many existing papers

- When?
  - Always! (We’ll come back about the overhead issue)

- How?
  - RepFlow: replicate each byte of the flow
  - RepSYN: only replicate SYN packets and choose the quicker connection
Is RepNet effective?
Simplified queueing analysis
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Packet-level NS-3 simulations

- Topology: 16-pod 1Gbps fat-tree, 1,024 hosts
- Traffic pattern: Poisson, random src/dst, 0.5s worth
- Flow size distribution:
  - Web search cluster from DCTCP paper
    - >95% bytes are from 30% flows large than 1MB
  - Data mining cluster from VL2 paper (not shown here)
    - >95% bytes are from 3.6% flows large than 35MB
Benchmarks

- TCP: TCP NewReno, initial window 12KB, DropTail queues with 100 packet buffer
- RepFlow
- DCTCP: source code from authors of D2TCP
- RepFlow-DCTCP: RepFlow on top of DCTCP
- pFabric: state-of-the-art, near-optimal FCT with priority queueing, source code obtained from authors
Results [1/4]

- Mean FCT, mice flows (<100KB)

![Graph showing FCT vs load for different protocols (TCP, RepFlow, DCTCP, RepFlow-DCTCP, pFabric). The graph indicates that pFabric has the lowest FCT across all loads, followed by RepFlow and DCTCP. TCP has the highest FCT. The graph highlights that pFabric maintains a consistently low FCT, particularly at higher loads, with an FCT of 40%-45%.](image-url)
Results [2/4]

- 99-th percentile FCT, mice flows (<100KB) >60%
Results [4/4]

- Mean FCT, elephant flows (>=100KB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>0.1</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.4</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.6</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>0.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>3.47%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replication overhead vs. load
Is RepNet *really* effective?
Implementation

- Based on node, a highly scalable platform for real-time server-side networked applications
  - Single-threaded, non-blocking socket, event driven
  - Widely used in industry for both front-end and back-end
Implementation

- A module `RepNet` based on `Net`, the standard library for non-blocking sockets
- Applications only need to change one line:
  - `require('net')` → `require('repnet')`
- `RepNet.Socket`: a single socket abstraction for applications while having two TCP sockets
- `RepNet.Server`: functions for listening for and managing both replicated and regular TCP connections
Testbed evaluation

- Pronto 3295 switches. 1Gbps links. Oversubscribed at 2:1
- Ping RTT 178us across racks
- Flow size distribution from the DCTCP paper
Testbed evaluation

- RepFlow and RepSYN significantly improve tail FCT when load is high in an oversubscribed network
- RepFlow is more beneficial
More results

- Application level performance using RepNet
- Mininet emulation with a 6-pod fat-tree
- All source code and experiment scripts are online
  - https://bitbucket.org/shuhaoliu/repnet
  - https://bitbucket.org/shuhaoliu/repnet_experiment
Recap

- Takeaway: RepNet is a practical and effective application layer low latency transport
- Open-source implementation and experimental evaluation
- Patch solution, short-term
Chapter II

Expeditus
How to build a distributed congestion-aware load balancing protocol, for a large-scale data center network?

- Naive solution: track congestion information for all possible paths
- This simply can’t scale
Per-path isn’t scalable

- $k^2/4$ paths between edge switches of distinct pods
- An edge switch talks to $k^2/2-k/2$ edge switches in distinct pods
- Each edge switch needs to track $O(k^4)$ paths!
Design

- One-hop congestion information collection
  - Each edge and aggr switch maintains congestion information for k ports in k-pod fat-tree
- Two-stage path selection
One-hop info collection

- Northbound congestion information can be obtained by polling buffer occupancy of egress ports
One-hop info collection

- Southbound congestion information needs to be transmitted by piggybacking in packets

Aggr switches collect congestion information coming from core switches

Edge switches collect congestion information coming from aggr switches
Two-stage path selection

- SYN packet carries congestion information at source edge switch to destination edge switch.
- Destination edge switch chooses the aggr switch with the least combined congestion at the first and last hop.
Two-stage path selection

- SYN-ACK packet carries congestion information at destination aggr switch to source aggr switch
- Source aggr switch chooses the core switch with the least combined congestion at the second and third hops
Two-stage path selection

- Assemble a complete path based on selected aggr and core switches, store in host’s flow routing table
- IP-in-IP encapsulation to enforce source routing
Preliminary evaluation

- NS-3 simulation with a 16-pod fat-tree (1,024 hosts), oversubscribed at 4:1, DCTCP flow size distribution

![Graphs showing mean and 99th percentile FCT](image)

- Mean FCT
- 99th percentile FCT
Implementation–on-going

- Click software router implementation (together with CONGA)
- Experiments on a fat-tree on Emulab
  - 20 PCs with 5 NICs as Expeditus switches
  - 16 PCs with 1 NICs as hosts
  - https://www.emulab.net/showproject.php3?pid=expeditus
Related work

- Reducing (tail) latency in data center networks is an important problem
  - Reduce queue length: DCTCP (2010), HULL (2012)
- They all require modifications to end-hosts and/or switches, making it difficult to deploy in reality
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