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Scheduling not programmable
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- Programmable packet scheduling, HotNets’15, SIGCOMM’16
  - Many slides borrowed from Anirudh Sivaraman.

- Universal packet scheduling, HotNets’15, NSDI’16
The Push-In First-Out Queue

- Many algorithms determine transmission order at packet arrival
- Relative order of packet transmissions of packets in the queue doesn’t change with future arrivals
- Examples:
  - SJF: Order determined by flow size
  - FCFS: Order determined by arrival time
- Push-in first-out queues (PIFO) is a good abstraction to capture such algorithms.
  - packets are pushed into an arbitrary location based on a priority, and dequeued from the head
- First used as a proof construct by Chuang et. al.
The PIFO abstraction

• PIFO: A sorted array that let us insert an entry (packet or PIFO pointer) based on a programmable priority
  • Entries are always dequeued from the head
  • If an entry is a packet, dequeue and transmit it
  • If an entry is a PIFO, dequeue it, and continue recursively
A programmable scheduler
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Push-In-First-Out (PIFO) Queue
pFabric using PIFO

1. \( f = \text{flow}(p) \)
2. \( p.\text{prio} = f.\text{rem\_size} \)
Weighted Fair Queuing

1. \( f = \text{flow}(p) \)
2. \( p.\text{start} = T[f].\text{finish} \)
3. \( T[f].\text{finish} = p.\text{start} + \frac{p.\text{len}}{p.w} \)
4. \( p.\text{prio} = p.\text{start} \)
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Traffic Shaping

1. update tokens
2. $p\text{.send} = \text{now} + \left(\text{p.len} - \text{tokens}\right) / \text{rate};$
3. $p\text{.prio} = p\text{.send}$
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Push-In-First-Out (PIFO) Queue
Composing PIFOs

Hierarchical packet-fair queueing (HPFQ)

A (0.5)
\[ 1 (0.1) \quad 2 (0.9) \]
B (0.5)
\[ 3 (0.3) \quad 4 (0.7) \]

Composing PIFOs

PIFO-root
(WFQ on A and B)

PIFO-A
(WFQ on 1 and 2)

PIFO-B
(WFQ on 3 and 4)
PIFO in hardware

- Meets timing at 1 GHz on a 16 nm node
- 5% area overhead for 3-level hierarchy
- Challenges wisdom that sorting is hard
Programmable packet scheduling, SIGCOMM’16

Single array PIFO can be expensive (lots of comparator circuits required)

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>B40</td>
<td>A30</td>
<td>D25</td>
<td>B20</td>
<td>C9</td>
<td>C8</td>
<td>C7</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: 30, 5
B: 40, 20, 5, 3
C: 9, 8, 7
D: 50, 25

Flow scheduler (fewer comparator circuits required)
Key limitation of the PIFO abstraction

• When priority (relative ordering between two packets) changes after enqueuing them.

• …
Your opinions

• Pros:
  • PIFO and calendar queues are simple and powerful abstractions.
  • Idea of making scheduling programmable is useful and exciting.
  • Shows feasibility of implementation.
  • Can be used to implement composite scheduling algorithms.
Your opinions

• Cons:
  • Supports only a finite range of priorities.
  • How to handle multiple flows with different scheduling requirements?
  • No analysis of how expressive PIFO/calendar queues are.
  • In-switch computation of priority might be limited by switch capabilities.
  • How splitting of mini-PIFOs is handled is questionable.
Your opinions

- Ideas
  - How to use PIFOs?
  - Programming language and compiler for scheduling?
  - How will an operator interact with a programmable scheduler?
  - Anything else in the switch that could be made programmable?
  - Analyze the need for programmable scheduling.
  - Pros and cons compared to UPS.
Two complementary papers

- Programmable packet scheduling, HotNets’15, SIGCOMM’16
- Universal Packet Scheduling, HotNets’15, NSDI’16
Many Scheduling Algorithms

• Many different algorithms
  • FIFO, FQ, virtual clocks, priorities...

• Many different goals
  • fairness, small packet delay, small FCT...

• Many different contexts
  • WAN, datacenters, cellular...
Many Scheduling Algorithms

• Implemented in *router hardware*.

• *How do we support different scheduling algorithms for different requirements?*
  - Option 1: Change router hardware for each new algorithm
  - Option 2: Implement *all* scheduling algorithms in hardware
  - Option 3: Programmable scheduling hardware
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Many Scheduling Algorithms

- Implemented in *router hardware*.

- *How do we support different scheduling algorithms for different requirements?*
  - Option 1: Change router hardware for each new algorithm
  - Option 2: Implement *all* scheduling algorithms in hardware
  - Option 3: Programmable scheduling hardware
Is there a universal packet scheduling algorithm?

How do we support different scheduling algorithms for different requirements?
A single scheduling algorithm that can imitate the network-wide output produced by any other algorithm.
How can a single algorithm imitate all others?
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Network Model

Goal: Minimize Mean FCT
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Goal: Fairness
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Network Model

Goal: Weighted Fairness
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How do we formally define and evaluate a UPS?
Defining a UPS

**Theoretical Viewpoint:**
Can it replay a given schedule?

**Practical Viewpoint:**
Can it achieve a given objective?
Theoretical Viewpoint

Can it replay a given schedule?
Original Schedule

Only requirement from original schedule: 
**Output Times are viable**
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Output Times 
\( o(p) \) for a packet \( p \)

EGRESS
Replaying the Schedule, given $o(p)$

For every packet $p$, $o'(p) \leq o(p)$
Pragmatic Constraints on a UPS
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We call this Blackbox Initialization

**Limited State:** Scheduling can use only header state and static information

**Obliviousness:** For initializing p’s header, use only o(p) and path(p)
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Basic Existence and Non-existence Results

There exists a UPS under *Omniscient Initialization* when scheduling time at every hop is known.

No UPS exists under *Blackbox Initialization* when only the final output time is known.

See NSDI’16 paper for proofs.
How close can we get to a UPS?
Key Result: Depends on congestion points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Congestion Points per Packet</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See NSDI’16 paper for proofs.
Can we achieve this upper bound?
Can we achieve this upper bound?
Yes, LSTF!
Least Slack Time First

- Packet header initialized with a slack value
  - slack = maximum tolerable queuing delay

- At the routers
  - Schedule packet with least slack time first
  - Update the slack by subtracting the wait time
### Key Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Congestion Points per Packet</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>LSTF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See NSDI’16 paper for proofs.
Not all algorithms achieve upper bound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Congestion Points per Packet</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>LSTF</th>
<th>Priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See NSDI’16 paper for proofs.
How well does LSTF perform empirically?
Empirically, LSTF is (almost) universal

- ns-2 simulation results on realistic network settings
  - Less than 3% packets missed their output times
  - Less than 0.1% packets are late by more than one transmission time
Summarizing the theoretical viewpoint

- Evaluate the ability to replay a schedule, given its final output times

- Analytical Results:
  - No UPS exists
  - LSTF comes as close to a UPS as possible

- Empirical Results: LSTF is *almost* universal!
Practical Viewpoint

Can it achieve a given objective?
Achieving various network objectives

- Slack assignment based on heuristics
- Comparison with state-of-the-art
- Three objective functions
  - Tail packet delays
  - Mean Flow Completion Time
  - Fairness
Tail Packet Delays

Slack Assignment: Same slack for all packets

State-of-the-art: FIFO, FIFO+

Results:
• Identical to FIFO+.
• Smaller tail packet delays compared to FIFO.
Mean Flow Completion Time

Slack Assignment: Proportional to flow size

State-of-the-art: SJF, SRPT

Results:
• Mean FCTs comparable to both SJF and SRPT.
Fairness

Slack Assignment: Inspired by Virtual Clocks

\[ \text{slack}(p_0) = 0 \]
\[ \text{slack}(p_i) = \max(0, \text{slack}(p_{i-1}) + (1/\text{rest}) - (i(p_i) - i(p_{i-1}))) \]

\[ \text{rest} = \text{Estimate of fair share rate} \]

State-of-the-art: Fair Queuing (FQ)

Results:

• Eventual convergence to fairness for long-lived flows.
• FCTs roughly comparable to FQ for short-lived flows.
  • Higher sensitivity to fair share rate estimate (\text{rest})
Results Summary

• Theoretical results show that
  – There is no UPS under blackbox initialization
  – LSTF comes as close to a UPS as possible
  – Empirically, LSTF is very close

• LSTF can be used in practice to achieve a variety of network-wide objectives.
Implication

• Less need for many different scheduling algorithms.

• Can just use LSTF, with varying initializations.
Limitations

• Policies for which the required information is not available during header initialization at the ingress.
• When relative ordering between two packets changes after enqueuing them.
• Class-based weighted fairness.
Your opinions

- **Pros:**
  - Good/intriguing motivation.
  - Understanding universality in terms of congestion points is useful.
  - Both theoretical and empirical results.
  - Concrete use cases.
Your opinions

• Cons:
  • No. of congestion points can be high in practice.
  • No discussion of implementation overhead.
  • A systematic framework for how to use LSTF/UPS.
  • What happens when there are more than one objectives/goals?
  • Is the theoretical model reasonable?
  • Lack of real internet-wide implementation.
Your opinions

• Ideas
  • Use LSTF for a broader range of scheduling algorithms.
  • Under what (relaxed) conditions is universality feasible?
  • Universal AQM scheme?
  • Are results valid only within data center or AS, or across the Internet (multiple ASes)?
  • What are the difficulties of implementing LSTF?
  • Better way to estimate o(p).
Recent work along similar lines…

• Most switches have only 8-16 queues. What’s the best we can do with existing switch hardware?
  • SP-PIFO (NSDI’20)

• A packet’s priority may change after it has been enqueued at a particular priority level. How to handle that?
  • Programmable Calendar Queues (NSDI’20)