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On-path packet-level caching in ICN

- **Self-identified** (data) packets (= network transfer units)
- Receiver-driven transport
  - each (data) packet is *explicitly requested*
- Network storage
  - exploit router memory as **cache**
  - **store** incoming (data) packets (opportunistically)
  - respond immediately to received requests for (cached) packets
    - rather than forwarding the request
On-path caching in *Publish-Subscribe Internetworking* (PSI) with mmTP

- Multipath Multisource Transfer Protocol (mmTP) [1]
- Multiflow receiver-driven transfer protocol for PSI
- Slow path Rendezvous
  - Resolution system locates sources
  - Creates path(s) for each requestor-source pair (multi-source and multi-path)
- Fast-path Rendezvous
  - Requests sent directly to sources - Sequential order of requests
  - Algorithmic IDs: “<filename>/<packetNumber>”

Caching dimensions

1. Cache management – item replacement policy (micro)
   • for each (& every) cache
   • **When** to insert and evict a packet
     • LRU, FIFO, FILO...
2. Content placement – cache selection policy (macro)
   • **Where** (in the network) to store a packet
   • Everywhere (universal)
   • Betweenness Centrality [7], Probabilistic caching [8], ...

Cache selection policies use cache replacement policies
• e.g., Betweenness Centrality & Probabilistic caching: based on LRU

Extra caching dimension

Interplay between **objects** and **packets**
- most caches (proposed, studied...) operate at the **packet level**
- **packet**: main network and cache entity
- **object**: user-level entity
  - target for **popularity** statistics
- chunk...

**Sequential access** of packets from the start: important
- e.g., for video
  - > 50+% of the network traffic and growing

Main idea: combine
- **object**-oriented cache **lookups**
- with **packet**-oriented cache **replacement**
ICN router packet-cache design

- **Wire-speed** operation (... of large caches)
- Content store
  - **DRAM** - slow but cheap
- Index table to access the store [2]
  - **SRAM** - fast but expensive
- LRU: most commonly used replacement policy

Issues in ICN packet-caches

1. SRAM-DRAM size ratio leads to poor resource utilization
   • 1-to-1 mapping between SRAM-DRAM
   • 1 SRAM entry points to a 1 packet in DRAM
   • SRAM too small to index entire DRAM store

2. Large Object Poisoning
   • Object size outshines object popularity in LRU packet-caches and mitigates caching efficiency

3. Looped Replacement Effect
   • Sequential packet requests of partially stored objects does not work well with replacement policies that ignore (the existence/role of) objects, such as LRU, FIFO and FILO [3]

Issue #1: SRAM-DRAM size ratio

- 1-to-1 mapping of **SRAM-indexed, DRAM-stored** packets
  - 10 GB DRAM, 1500-byte data packets: ~7.1M packets [4] (!)
  - SRAM can index ~10% of stored packets
- ~90% of DRAM left un-indexed (= unused)

---

Issue #1 (SRAM/DRAM) : Possible solutions

• Increase (data) packet size
  • Impacts caching granularity → reduces gains [5]
  • Requires changing network's MTU to preserve the self-identification of network units
    • Even with jumbo Ethernet frames (9000 bytes), 20% of 10GB DRAM is still left unused (e.g., what about 40GB DRAM?).

• Split index between SRAM and DRAM
  • Induces false-positive accesses to DRAM during packet search
  • Accessing DRAM per packet – too slow! [2]

• Break 1-to-1 mapping of SRAM to DRAM entries
  • Object-oriented Packet Caching (OPC)

Issue #2: Looped replacement effect

- Sequential, ascending requests (from the start)
  - e.g., video streaming
- LRU
  - first packets are evicted before the last ones come...
  - first packets are evicted while other packets of the object are present, but are (basically) useless ...
- When 1st packet is evicted, hit prob. (from new streams) becomes zero
Issue #3: Large object poisoning

- Object-level (LRU) **popularity** criterion is outshined by **size**
  - New packets always enter at LRU’s head
  - Traverse the entire LRU chain before exiting

- **Large & unpopular** objects poison the cache
  - Occupy a great part of the cache
  - Do not provide any gain
Object-oriented Packet Caching (OPC)

- Two levels of management
  - L1. Object-level content indexing
  - L2. Packet-level content storage
- Assumptions
  - Clients request packets in sequential (ascending) order (e.g., video streaming)
  - Packet names indicate packet position in object
    - “<filename>/<packetNumber>”
- Advantages
  1. Addresses SRAM-DRAM size ratio
  2. Avoids looped replacement effect
  3. Reduces large object poisoning
- Does not require different hardware than (ordinary) LRU
OPC design

*Store the initial part of an object from the 1st to the n
th packet, with no gaps.*

- **SRAM** holds the index
  - **Key:** object, **Last:** Last packet ID, **Ptr:** @{last packet in DRAM}
  - Object-level LRU-‐> exploits object popularity
  - **1 entry per object** -> overcomes SRAM bottleneck

- **DRAM** holds the data packets
OPC: Lookups

- SRAM lookup, **avoid DRAM reads**
  - Example: request for packet <“file1/23”>
    
    IF (`file1` in `key` && `23` <= `Last`)
    
    packet is cached @ <follow `Ptr`>
    
    ELSE
    
    packet is not cached
    
    END_IF
  
- `Ptr` is the address of the object's last stored packet
OPC: Replacement policy

- **Insertions**
  - Always start with the 1\textsuperscript{st} packet of a file
  - n\textsuperscript{th} packet only if (n-1)\textsuperscript{th} is already cached

- **Evictions**
  - If SRAM is full: all packets of the LRU object are evicted (remove one entry from the index)
  - If DRAM is full: remove the last packet of the LRU object
OPC: DRAM organization

- **DRAM Entry:** Pointer (8 bytes) + (Data) Packet (1500 bytes)
- 1 single linked-list per object
  - pointers start from tail and point backwards
  - O(1) insertions at the back
- 1 linked-list of available/free slots via $Ptr_{free}$

- On insertion
  - Packet is stored @ $Ptr_{free}$ and is linked to the appropriate object list
  - $Ptr_{free}$ points to the next free slot

- On eviction
  - Object eviction: all object’s packets are linked to the *free-list*
  - Packet eviction: packet is linked to the *free-list* and object’s $Ptr$ (SRAM) points to previous packet
DRAM overhead

• DRAM reads
  • Packet insertion or eviction: 1 access
  • Object eviction: \(n\) accesses, where \(n = (#\text{stored packets})\)
  • Packet fetch: \(m\) accesses, where \(m = n - \text{packet\_Number}\)

• Minimize cost for packet-insertion

• Cost of packet fetch (hit) to be compared to cost of miss
  = delay to get packet upstream (>>)

Looped replacement effect in OPC

At all times, **OPC keeps in the cache the initial part of an object, from the first to the n-th packet, with no gaps**

- In OPC potential hits decrease gradually
  1. \( T=t \), cache is full and last packet \((t-1)\) is evicted, remaining pcks: \([1, t-2]\)
  2. LRU would remove the 1\(^{st}\) packet, remaining packets: \([2, t-1]\)
  3. \( T=t+1 \), a second object request would get \(t-2\) hits
  4. LRU would get ZERO

- **OPC** (theoretically) can provide **200% better hit-ratio** by only addressing this issue
Large object (not) poisoning OPC

- Incoming packets placed at “LRU” position of the object
  - In ordinary LRU each incoming packet is placed at the head

- Cached objects get at LRU’s head only in case of cache hit
- Packets of unpopular objects are placed closer to the exit

Entering packets:
- are placed at LRU’s head

Entering packets:
- objects’ 1st packets are placed at LRU’s head
- other are placed at object’s position in LRU
Evaluation setup

CCN/NDN implementation in NS-3

• “Realistic” workload by GlobeTraff (traffic generator)[6]
Topology

• 10 synthetic ‘scale-free’ topologies 50-100 nodes
• 25 receivers placed at access nodes share a workload served by 1 sender (at a random access node)

Network nodes
• Cache-enabled
• 50-100 in each topology

User nodes
• 25 subscribers per access node
• 1 publisher at a random access node
Evaluation setup (details)

- **Network**
  - Link delay: 5ms
  - Link capacity: 50Mb/s
  - CCN/NDN implementation
    - PIT, FIB, content store impl.
  - **No losses** or damaged packets
    - Links are **not congested** or stressed
- **Cache**
  - SRAM latency: 0.45ns
  - DRAM latency: 55ns
- **Workload**
  - Web traffic
    - Zipf with $a=0.9$
  - Video
    - Weibull, $k=0.513$, $\lambda=6010$
- **Application**
  - Congest. Control: **stop-and-wait**
  - Receivers start simultaneously
  - request packets in ascending order
  - request next object when last chunk of previous is received
Evaluation parameters

- fast memory (SRAM) size:
  - 0.0001% to 1% of the distinct items in the workload
- Cache placement/selection policy:
  - Universal caching: all routers
  - Edge caching: only routers at access nodes
  - Betweenness Centrality [7]: the most central router on the path
- Metrics:
  - Server load, network load, cache hit-ratio, DRAM accesses, transfer completion time
- The results are illustrated **normalized to LRU**
  - to properly highlight OPC offered gains

---

Performance assessment

Normalized to LRU

- Substantial improvement (200%-500%) in many cases
  - Roughly no gains when memory size is 0.0001%
  - Large (1%) SRAM size: 120%-160% reduction
  - Gains are \(~\text{inversely proportional to the ratio } SRAM\_size/Traffic\_load~\)
Performance assessment (cont.)

- DRAM accesses
  - OPC accesses DRAM less than LRU for cache sizes < 0.1%
- Completion time
  - DRAM overhead is not noticeable
  - Completion time is mostly dependent on network load
SRAM-to-DRAM ratio

- **1-to-5**: Almost reached maximum gains
  - Most popular items in the workload consist of less than 10 packets (Web traffic)
- **1-to-1**: **OPC** offers 14%-40% better cache-hit ratio
  - By avoiding large object poisoning
  - By addressing looped replacement effect

SRAM size: 0.1%
Conclusions

• **Object-oriented Packet Caching** (OPC) design for ICN
  • object-oriented cache **lookups** (LRU decisions)
  • packet-oriented cache **replacement** (item operations)

• OPC
  • substantially increases resource utilization of caches (with typical parameters)
  • addresses issues associated with packet caches
    • large object poisoning
    • looped replacement effect
  • does not require additional/different hardware
  • performance compared to (simple) LRU
    • up to 4x further reduction of network and server load
    • up to about 3x higher hit-ratio
Thank you!
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