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IX
Outline

- OS Network Performance
- IX as a case study
Intel VT-x

- Makes x86 hardware “classically virtualizable” (as defined by Popek and Goldberg)
- **Goal**: *Direct execution* of most privileged instructions
- Introduces two CPU modes:
  - VMX root mode: for running VMM
  - VMX non-root mode: for running VMs (guest)
  - Each mode has its own rings (CPL0-CPL3)
- **In-memory structure called VM Control Structure (VMCS)** stores privileged register state and control flags
Linux network software structure

In kernel:
- Access to NIC hardware
- De-multiplex incoming packets (e.g., ARP/TCP)
- Prevent one app from messing with another app's connections
- Lots of locks and inter-core sharing:
  - Queues
  - TCP Connection state
  - …

Network Interface Card (NIC)

Kernel

TCP processing

Sockets (and queue)

read/write;
socket/accept/connect…
High-performance network servers

- For example, memcached (in-memory key/value storage server)
  - High request rate
  - Short requests/responses
  - Lots of clients, lots of potential parallelism
  - Want high throughput under high load (request per second)
  - Want low latency under low/modest load (seconds per request)
  - Want low tail of latency distribution
What are the relevant HW limits?

- 10 Gb Ethernet: 15 million tiny packets/sec.
- 40 Gb Ethernet: 60 million tiny packets/sec.
- RAM: a few gigabytes/sec.
- Interrupts: 1 million/sec.
- System calls: a few million/sec.
- Contended locks: 1 million/sec.
- Inter-core data movement: a few million/sec.

So:

- If limited by Ethernet and RAM: XX million/sec.
- If limited by interrupts, locks, etc.: Y million/sec.
Latency ingredients

• Latency important for e.g., web page with hundreds of items

• Low load: sum of a sequence of steps:
  • Network speed-of-light and switch round-trip time
  • Interrupt
  • queue operations
  • sleep/wakeup
  • system calls
  • inter-core data movement
  • RAM fetches
Latency ingredients

- Latency important for e.g., web page with hundreds of items
- High load: sum of a sequence of steps:
  - Latency is largely determined by wait time: queueing
  - Efficiency (high throughput) reduces queueing time
  - Bursty arrivals increase queue time
  - Bursty service times increase queue time
  - Structural problems can increase queue time
    - Load imbalance, or nobody servicing a queue

- Latency is hard to reason about: hard to improve
IX: a design for a high-performance network stack

- Built on top of Linux (with Dune kernel module)
- Different syscall API for networking (doesn’t preserve Linux API)
- Different TCP/IP stack architecture (doesn’t use Linux TCP/IP stack code or design)
Linux network software structure

Queues are actually in IX Kernel memory.
IX Notes

- IX runs in VMX non-root (guest) mode using Dune
- IX Kernel at CPL 0
- IX App at CPL 3
- Linux kernel gives dedicated NIC queues and dedicated cores
  - After that, Linux isn’t involved with networking
- IX application makes system call to IX kernel
  - To send and receive packets
- Packet buffers are in memory shared between IX kernel and IX application (and NIC)
  - So, packet data isn’t copied (unlike Linux)
Idea: batching system call interface

• The problem: System call overhead is big if messages are small
  • Want to send/recv more packets/sec than available syscalls/sec
• The solution: run_io()
  • `run_io()` argument contains one or more syscalls:
    - send to a TCP connection
    - done with a recv buffer
    - close/connect/accept
  • `run_io()` return contains:
    - Result of each of syscall, plus
      - recv on a connection
      - send completed
    - connection opened, connection terminated, …
Idea: batching system call interface

- Each user/kernel crossing does lots of work
  - Amortizes syscall cost across lots of packets

```python
while True:
    run_io(in, out)
    for msg in in:
        process msg
        out.append(reply)
```

pseudo-code for IX app thread
Idea: run to completion

(b) Interleaving of protocol processing and application execution.
Idea: run to completion

● **The problem:**
  ● Linux uses CPU time moving packets through stages and queues
  ● Queues:
    - Good if application is doing something else
    - Bad for network performance (locks, core-to-core, cache eviction)

● **What is run-to-completion?**
Idea: run to completion

- **What is run to completion?**
  - Complete the processing of one batch of inputs before starting on the next batch
  - Really complete: driver, TCP, application, enqueue reply
- **How?**
  - `run_io()` calls down to driver, returns packet all the way to app
  - app’s next call to `run_io()` has reply message
- **Why?**
  - Single thread carries batch of packets thru all steps
  - Avoids queues, sleep/wakeup, context switch, core-to-core transfers
  - Keeps packet batch in CPU data cache
  - No problem balancing processing rate in each stage
Idea: polling rather than interrupts

• The problem:
  • Interrupts are expensive
  • Interrupts are redundant if input is always likely waiting

• What is polling?
  • Periodically check NIC DMA queues for new input

• Why hard?
  • Where to put the checks? In what loop?
  • Might check too often—waste CPU
  • Might check too rarely—high latency, queue overflow
Idea: polling rather than interrupts

- **IX’s solution:**
  - Each application thread has a dedicated core:
    - `run_io` polls NIC DMA queues
    - No waste: if no input, nothing for the core to do anyway
    - If input, grabs a batch and returns it to the application
      - Never waits for a batch; just grabs what’s there
    - Automatically polls more often with low load, less at high load
      - Paper calls this *adaptive polling*

```python
while True:
    run_io(in, out)
    for msg in in:
        process msg
    out.append(reply)
```
What about multi-core parallelism?

- **The problem:**
  - One core often can’t deliver enough throughput
  - Will leave most of a 10Gb Ethernet idle

- **Opportunity**
  - Lots of clients
  - Work for each client is often independent
  - All modern machines have multiple cores

- **The dangers**
  - Lock contention is expensive
  - Data movement (between cores) is expensive
What about multi-core parallelism?

- **To avoid data movement and lock contention:**
  - All actions for a client, TCP, and packet should be on the same core
  - No data should be used on more than one core
- **Examples of potentially shared data:**
  - packet content
  - NIC queues
  - packet free lists
  - TCP data structures
  - Application data (e.g., memcached’s in-memory DB)
Idea: multiple NIC queues for parallelism

- Modern NICs support many independent DMA queues
  - NIC uses filters and hashing to pick the queue
- Linux sets up a separate set of NIC queues for each IX application
  - One queue per core for each IX application
  - Linux tells NIC a filter for each IX application
Idea: multiple NIC queues for parallelism

- NIC hashes client IP addr/port to pick the queue for each incoming packet
  - “flow-consistent hashing” or “receive-side scaling” (RSS)
- NIC gives all packets for a given TCP connection to the same core
- No need to share TCP connection state among all cores
- No need to move packet data between cores
- `run_io` looks at NIC DMA queue for just its own core
- A new connection is given to the core determined by the NIC’s hash
  - Hopefully uniform and results in a balanced load
Idea: zero copy

- How to avoid IX/user and user/IX copies of packet data?
  - Across the CPL 0/CPL 3 boundary (like user/kernel)
  - 40 Gb/sec may stress RAM throughput
- IX uses page table to map packet buffers into both IX and application
  - NIC DMAs to/from this memory
  - `run_io` carries pointers into this memory
- App/IX cooperate to note when received/sent buffer is free
  - Freed buffers reported via `run_io`
IX design limitations

- Assumes many parallel clients making small requests
  - You’d want something else for a single 40-Mb/sec transfer
- Assumes good load balancing across cores
  - Clients and requests evenly distributed across cores
  - Requests all take about the same amount of time
  - Could reassign flows to NIC queues?
  - Could steal work from other cores?
- Assumes non-blocking request handling
  - Service code computes and then replies
  - Does not: read the disk, send an RPC and wait, etc.
  - Blocking would cause an idle core and expanding queue
  - Could shift blocked requests to a dedicated thread/core?
Evaluation

• What should we look for?
  • High throughput under high load—especially for small messages
  • Low latency under light load
  • Throughput proportional to number of cores
Evaluation

- **Low latency test**
  - Single message ping-ponged between two servers on a 10Gb connection
  - Latency for a 64 byte message:
    - Between two IX servers: 5.7\(\mu\)s
    - Between two Linux servers: 24\(\mu\)s

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goodput: app-level throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why increases?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortizes fixed costs over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger amounts of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited by 10Gb Ethernet - minus headers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: NetPIPE performance for varying message sizes and system software configurations.
Evaluation

• Low latency test with small packets
  • Why does IX beat Linux on goodput?
    - Latency-limited
    - IX polling sees the message sooner
    - IX has no interrupt/queueing/sleep/wakeup
    - Fewer user/kernel crossings
Evaluation

- Multi-core scalability

(a) Multi-core scalability (n=1, s=64B)
Summary: IX makes many big architectural decisions differently

- **Per-application network stack**
  - Rather than single shared stack
  - Allows packet buffers to be shared: zero copy

- **Dedicated cores to application threads**
  - Rather than shared cores multiplexed by kernel
  - Allows polling and run to completion
  - Helps make the software more efficient, and simpler
  - Requires plentiful cores

- **Dedicated NIC queues to application threads**
  - Rather than shared queues, multiplexed by kernel
  - More direct access for better efficiency
  - Requires plentiful NIC queues
Questions

• What is adaptive batching?
  • Never wait for packets
  • Upper bound on size of batch
• Could a single app disable reception for all other apps by acquiring all the buffers?
• What is zero-copy?
• When would one not necessarily want high throughput and low latency?
• What is a data plane?
  • The code responsible for manipulating the packets
• What is the hardware/OS mismatch?
  • Hardware should support high throughput/low latency
  • Most OSes are not designed to use the hardware well
Questions

- **What are tradeoffs of using IX (other than only being able to run one app)?**
  - Different API
  - Possibly-wasted/underutilized cores
  - Actually, can run ≥1 app

- **What is RDMA?**
  - User-level reads/writes of remote memory
  - Fast because goes directly from local NIC to remote NIC to registered memory, bypassing the remote OS

- **Are elastic threads some type of sthread?**
  - No, just thread with its own CPU and NIC queue