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Who am I?

• A real globetrotter :) Innsbruck ⇒ Linz ⇒ Innsbruck

• Ph.D. in Darmstadt (Max Mühlhäuser + Jon Crowcroft)
  - Defense passed with distinction November 2002
  - Published as Kluwer (now Springer) book “Scalable Performance Signalling and Congestion Avoidance”, August 2003
  - Received “Best Dissertation Award 2004” from German GI/ITG KuVS

• Network Congestion Control: Managing Internet Traffic
  - John Wiley & Sons, July 2005
  - The first introductory book on this topic

• Research notion: one-size-fits-all TCP + IP not optimal
  - Main interest: tailor network technology to work with
    • heterogeneous infrastructure (e.g. high-speed or noisy links, with mobility)
    • heterogeneous applications (e.g. streaming media, signaling, Grid)
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NSG activities

- **Research topics**: Grid = main focus
  - Tailored network technology in support of Grid applications
    - Congestion Control
    - Quality of Service (QoS)
    - Transport Protocols
    - Network Measurement and Prediction
    - Middleware Communication
  - Also other aspects of networking (e.g. multimedia communication)

- **Teaching**: we cover the networking courses at UIBK

- **Collaborations**: Grid related results are...
  - contributed to standards via GHPN-RG of Global Grid Forum (GGF)
  - embedded in the Workflow system developed by the DPS Group at UIBK
The DPS Grid Workflow Application

Execution Environment
Problem scope
Scope

- **Grid history**: parallel processing at a growing scale
  - Parallel CPU architectures
  - Multiprocessor machines
  - Clusters
  - ("Massively Distributed") computers on the Internet

- **Traditional goal**: processing power
  - Grid people = parallel people; thus, goal has not changed much

- **Broader definition** ("resource sharing")
  - reasonable - e.g., computers also have harddisks :-(
  - New research areas / buzzwords: Wireless Grid, DataGrid, Pervasive Grid, [this space reserved for your favorite research area] Grid
  - sometimes perhaps a little too broad, e.g., “P2P Working Group” is now part of the Global Grid Forum

Reasonable to focus on this.
Grid requirements

- Efficiency + ease of use!
  - Programmer should not worry about the Grid
  - Ideally, applications should automatically be distributed

- Underlying system has to deal with
  - Error management
  - Authentication, Authorization and Accounting (AAA)
  - Efficient Scheduling / Load Balancing
  - Resource finding and brokerage
  - Naming
  - Resource access and monitoring

- No problem: we do it all - in Middleware

- De facto standard: “Globus Toolkit”
  - Installation of GT3 in our high performance system: 1 1/2 hours or so...
  - Yes, it truly does it all :) 1000s of addons - GridFTP, MDS, NWS, GRAM, ..
Problem: How Grid folks see the Internet

- **Abstraction** - simply use what is available
  - still: performance = main goal

- **Existing transport system**
  (TCP/IP + Routing + ..) works well

- **QoS makes things better, the Grid needs it!**
  - we now have a chance for that, thanks to IPv6

- **Quote from a paper review:**
  "In fact, any solution that requires changing the TCP/IP protocol stack is practically unapplicable to real-world scenarios, (..)."

- **How to change this view: GGF GHPN-RG**
  - documents such as "net issues with grids", "overview of transport protocols"
  - also, some EU projects, workshops, ..
A time-to-market issue

Typical Grid project

Research begins

Real-life coding begins

Thesis writing

Real-life tests begin

Research begins

Typical Network project

(Simulation) coding begins

Ideal

Result: thesis + running code; tests in collaboration with different research areas

Result: thesis + simulation code; perhaps early real-life prototype (if students did well)
Grid-network peculiarities

- **Special behavior**
  - Predictable traffic pattern - this is totally new to the Internet!
    - Web: users create traffic
    - FTP download: starts ... ends
    - Streaming video: either CBR or depends on content! (head movement, ..)
  - Could be exploited by congestion control mechanisms
    - Distinction: Bulk data transfer (e.g. GridFTP) vs. control messages (e.g. SOAP)
    - File transfers are often “pushed” and not “pulled”

- **Special requirements**
  - Predictions
  - Latency bounds, bandwidth guarantees (“advance reservation”) => QoS

- **Distributed system, active for a certain duration**
  - Can use distributed overlay network strategies (done in P2P systems!)
    - Multicast
    - P2P paradigm: “do work for others to enhance the total system” (for your own good) - e.g. transcoding, act as a PEP, ..
  - Can exploit highly sophisticated network measurements!
    - some take a long time, some require a distributed infrastructure
Some issues: application interface...

- How to specify properties and requirements
  - Should be simple and flexible - use QoS specification languages?
  - Should applications be aware of this?
  ⇒ Trade-off between service granularity and transparency!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional method</th>
<th>Our approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications old new</td>
<td>Applications old new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSG API</td>
<td>Socket- Interface Extras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socket- Interface</td>
<td>NSG API</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... and peer awareness

(a) Traditional PEP

(b) NSG PEP
Proposed solutions
Example 1: Network Measurement
Measuring the network

- When you measure, you measure the past
  - predictions / estimations with a ?? % chance of success

- When you measure, you change the system
  - e.g., high-rate-UDP vs. TCP: non-intrusiveness really important

- Measurements yield no guarantees
  - Internet traffic = result of user behavior!

- Research often carried out in controllable, isolated environments
  - Here, measurements are different from measurements in the ’net
  - Field trials are a necessary extra when you know that something works
NWS: The Network Weather Service

- Distributed system consisting of
  - Name Server (boring)
  - Sensor - actual measurement instance, regularly stores values in......
  - Persistent State
  - Forecaster (calculations based on data in Persistent State)

- Interesting parts:
  - Sensor
    Measured resources: availableCpu, bandwidthTcp, connectTimeTcp, currentCpu, freeDisk, freeMemory, latencyTcp
  - Forecaster
    Apply different models for prediction, compare with actual measurement data, choose best match

- Duration of a long TCP transfer
- RTT of a small message
NWS critique

- **Architecture** (splitting between sensors, forecaster etc.) seems reasonable; open source ⇒ consider integrating new work in NWS

- **Sensor**
  - active measurements even though non-intrusiveness was an important design goal
  - does not passively monitor TCP (i.e. ignores available data!)
  - strange methodology: (Large message throughput) "Empirically, we have observed that a message size of 64K bytes (...) yields meaningful results"
  - ignores packet size (= measurement granularity! ) and path characteristics
  - trivial method - much more sophisticated methods available (e.g. packet pair - later!)
  - point-to-point measurements: distributed infrastructure not taken into account

- **Forecaster**
  - relies on these weird measurements, where we don’t know much about the distribution (but we do know some things about other measurement methods!)
  - uses quite trivial models (but they may in fact suffice...)
Exploiting the Distributed Infrastructure

- Example problem:
  - C allocates tasks to A and B (CPU, memory available); both send results to C
  - B hinders A - task of B should have been kept at C!
- Path changes are rare - thus, possible to detect potential problem in advance
  - generate test messages from A, B to C - identify signature from B in A’s traffic
- Another issue in this scenario: how valid is a prediction that A obtains if the measurement / prediction system does not know about the shared bottleneck?
Exploiting longevity

- Time scale of traffic fluctuations < time scale of path changes
  ⇒ knowledge of link capacities may be more useful than traffic estimate

- Underlying technique: packet pair
  - send two packets $p_1$ and $p_2$ in a row; high probability that $p_2$ is enqueued exactly behind $p_1$ at bottleneck
  - at receiver: calculate bottleneck bandwidth via time between $p_1$ and $p_2$
  - minimize error via multiple probes
  - TCP with “Delayed ACK” receiver automatically sends packet pairs
    ⇒ passive TCP receiver monitoring is quite good!
Traffic prediction by monitoring TCP

- TCP propagates bottleneck self-similarity to end systems! ("samples bandwidth")
- Automatic prediction? Complex, but possible, I think - e.g.:

Results from measuring TCP throughput at equidistant intervals

Available bandwidth

TCP sending rate

Results from proper TCP monitoring (loss as a congestion indicator)
Example 2: QoS / High Performance Communication

QoS (reservation of network connections), high performance communication for the Grid
QoS: the state-of-the-art :-(

Papers from SIGCOMM’03 RIPQOS Workshop: “Why do we care, what have we learned?”

- QoS’s Downfall: At the bottom, or not at all! Jon Crowcroft, Steven Hand, Richard Mortier, Timothy Roscoe, Andrew Warfield
- Failure to Thrive: QoS and the Culture of Operational Networking Gregory Bell
- Deployment Experience with Differentiated Services Bruce Davie
- Quality of Service and Denial of Service Stanislav Shalunov, Benjamin Teitelbaum
- What QoS Research Hasn’t Understood About Risk Ben Teitelbaum, Stanislav Shalunov
- Internet Service Differentiation using Transport Options: the case for policy-aware congestion control Panos Gevros
Key reasons for QoS failure

- Required participation of end users and all intermediate ISPs
  - "normal" Internet users want Internet-wide QoS, or no QoS at all
  - In a Grid, a "virtual team" wants QoS between its nodes
  - Members of the team share the same ISPs - flow of $$$ is possible

- Technical inability to provision individual (per-flow) QoS
  - "normal" Internet users
    - unlimited number of flows come and go at any time
    - heterogeneous traffic mix
  - Grid users
    - number of members in a "virtual team" may be limited
    - clear distinction between bulk data transfer and SOAP messages
    - appearance of flows controlled by machines, not humans

⇒ QoS could work for the Grid!
High Performance Communication

- Often, large files are transmitted in Grids, and large capacity links are bought. Thus, two goals:
  - efficient capacity usage: desirable to achieve 1 gbit/s across 1 gbit/s link
  - fairness: if 10 flows share a link, all 10 flows should get their share
    = efficiency: e.g., GridFTP should not block SOAP messages

- Standard since 1980’s: Transmission Control Protocol (TCP)
  - roughly: additively increase rate until bottleneck queue grows, packet drop occurs (congestion caused!), then halve rate ⇒ sawtooth
  - works poorly in today’s environments: high speed links, “long fat pipes”, noisy (wireless) links, ..
  - gradual (small + downward compatible) improvements standardized

- Many alternatives proposed, often in Grid context - but hard to deploy because of TCP-friendliness
QoS + congestion control = solution!

- Idea: use traditional coarse-grain QoS mechanism (DiffServ) to differentiate between high-performance bulk data transfer and everything else (= SOAP etc. over TCP)

- Isolated long-living data transfer = requirements for CADPC/PTP
  - This is the best congestion control mechanism
  - because I developed it for my Ph.D. thesis :-)

- Some properties:
  - low loss, high throughput
  - predictable and stable rate, only depends on capacity and number of flows

- Disadvantage: requires router support
  - may be realistic in a Grid!
CADPC vs. 3 TCP(+ECN) flavors

Throughput (bytes):

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

No. of flows:

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

Loss (bytes):

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

No. of flows:

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

Average queue length:

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

No. of flows:

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas

Fairness Index:

- CADPC
- TCP Reno
- TCP Sack
- TCP Vegas
NSG Grid QoS architecture

- Mandate CADPC/PTP usage for bulk data transfer

- Resource reservation via admission control
  - Bandwidth broker decides what enters the network
  - Flow differentiation: simply allow a flow to act like \( n \) flows!
Conclusion

- Grid applications show special requirements and properties from a network perspective
  - and it is reasonable to develop tailored network technology for them.

- There is another class of such applications...
  
  - Multimedia.

- For multimedia applications, an immense number of network enhancements (even IETF standards) exist.

- For the Grid, there is nothing.

- This is a research gap; let’s fill it together!
Thank you!

Questions?
So they want efficiency...

- It’s a large stack: Globus/SOAP/HTTP/TCP/IP

- "Hello World" Grid Service call (including service creation) with GT3 (no security features etc.)
  - 60 packets exchanged, at least 6 RTTs (mainly TCP connection handling)
  - each additional call: another 14 packets (at least 2 RTTs)
  - MPI is better (keeps connections open), but is hardly used outside clusters

- Data transmission: 2 "clean" methods in GT3
  1. Parameters of a Grid Service call: SOAP/HTTP encoding :
  2. GridFTP: common choice for "bulk data transfer"
     - like FTP++ … multiple TCP connections, remote FTP invocation
     - but yes, it moves files only! Thus, data go mem-file-net-file-mem!

Room for enhancements!
How to use the Network Transport System

- Specify communication structure (map) + requirements
- Obtain good measurements
- Utilize efficient communication service (*no guarantees for now!*)

Temporary “solutions“:

- **nothing**
- **NWS**
- **TCP**

NOT a GRID Service! (*like file access*)
Adaptation Layer: architecture

Applications

Adaptation Layer

Transport / Network Layer

QoS requirements
Traffic specification

Control of network resources

QoS feedback

Performance measurements