6.5810: PicNIC

Adam Belay <abelay@mit.edu>



Logistics

- Next week: Draft project report is due
- Describes the motivation and design of your system
- Can be short, target 2-4 pages
- Implementation and evaluation will be in the final report

Motivation for PicNIC

- So far, the focus has been on raw net performance and efficiency
- But clouds have multiple tenants that share the network
- PicNIC focuses on providing performance isolation
- Unusual challenge: CPU is processing network packets for VMs
 - Authors observe contention inside the "host stack"
 - Usually, the host stack runs on a limited set of cores

Example

- One VM is experiencing a denial-of-service attack
- Host stack becomes congested, spends all cycles processing DOS attack packets
- All other VMs on the same machine experience high latency
- This is a breakage of performance isolation

Network virtualization?

- Key idea: Give cloud users the abstraction of their own private network on top of a physical network
- Host stack translates virtual IP addresses to real IP addresses via encapsulation



Figure 1: Overview of an on-host network virtualization stack.

Example incident (egress)



Figure 2: HoL blocking and isolation breakage at egress.

PicNIC's design principles

- 1. Host stack resources should be proportional to each VM's SLO
- 2. Under overload, apply backpressure, otherwise drop early

Defining predictability

Metric	Predictable vNIC SLO
Bandwidth Delay Loss rate	<i>min.</i> and <i>max.</i> envelope (hose model) Low; predictable distribution* No drops for cooperating traffic*
*for well-behaved traffic in bandwidth envelope	

Table 2: Abstraction: Predictable vNIC SLO metrics

Design overview



Figure 5: PicNIC architecture. Local constructs (ingress CWFQs and egress sender-side admission control) working in coherence with end-to-end receiverdriven congestion control to achieve the predictable vNIC abstraction.

Idea: Ingress CPU-Fair WFQs (CWFQs)

- Pull ingress (RX) packets from NIC as fast as possible
- Place packets in per-VM queues
- Calculate per-packet processing overhead in each queue
- Allocate CPU resources in a weighted but fair way across VMs

Idea: Congestion control

- Combination of rate limiters at sender
 - Set bandwidth per second limit to control bandwidth use
 - Set packets per second limit to minimize CPU use and delay
- Congestion control is left off for low load VMs
- High load VMs experience delays in their CFWFQs
- Use this delay as a signal to control transmit rate at sender

Idea: Egress admission control

- Traffic shapping: Controls the rate of packet transmissions
- PicNIC uses a timing wheel; a data structure that stores packets by their transmission timestamp
- Problem: VM guests can spam egress packets
- Solution #1: PicNIC places a limit on buffer use to avoid too many buffers waiting in the timing wheel
- Solution #2: PicNIC applies backpressure to VMs so they can voluntarily stop sending

Backpressure inside the guest OS

- Note: Guest OS is willing participant in this scheme; many modifications were made to Linux
- #1: PicNIC sends out-of-order completions when each packet leaves the wheel
- #2: TCP small queues (TSQs) limits the number of packets each flow can have in flight

Q: Why can PicNIC not use in-order completions?

• Note: In order completions are the normal approach used by NICs

Q: What happens if the buffer limit is hit?

Egress admission control design



Figure 6: PicNIC's sender-side admission control.

Back to the UDP flow overload problem



Figure 10: Predictable low latency with PicNIC.

Contribution of PicNIC's mechanisms



Discussion

- Could we put PicNIC in hardware? What parts?
- How does PicNIC compare to Ethernet PFC?
- Do RDMA NICs have the same problem of unpredictable packet processing work? Do packets consume resources? Does 1RMA?
- Are there any downsides to out-of-order completions or TCP small queues?

Deeper discussion

- Should VMs participate in congestion control at all?
- Why or why not?