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PFC's drawbacks

PFC is a coarse-grained mechanism. It will pause the whole traffic of a congested priority. This will result:
- Head-of-line blocking
- Congestion propagation
- Maybe reduction of the total throughput of the fabric
FFC: Flow-based Flow Control (1/4)

A dedicated buffer space called DVL (Dynamic Virtual Lane) is implemented to absorb the root flows of the congestion. It actually stores the addresses of packet descriptors rather than the real packet data. So it is low cost.

1) When a transmit queue exceeds a certain threshold, the root flow to congestion is picked out. A root flow is identified by 3-tuple: source IP, destination IP and QoS.
4) Get the root flow info in the BPF and assign a DVL to the root flow. The subsequent packets of the root flow will be put into the DVL. When the threshold is exceeded, a BPF (Back Pressure Frame) is sent to the upstream to suspend transmission of that flow.

2) One DVL will be assigned to that root flow. The subsequent packets of the root flow will be processed by the chip normally, but it will be put into the DVL, instead of the transmit queue.

3) When the threshold is exceeded, a BPF (Back Pressure Frame) is sent to the upstream to suspend transmission of that flow.
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FFC: Flow-based Flow Control (1/4)
Flow-based Flow Control (1/4)

5) When the congestion of transmit queue is gone, the packets of the root flow for that queue will be put into the transmit queue with pacer.

6) When the low threshold is exceeded, a CBPF (Cancel Back Pressure Frame) is sent to the upstream to cancel back pressure to that flow.

Flow-based, fine-grained, solve head-of-line blocking and congestion propagation problem

Isolate the congestion out the physical transmit queue, no influence of latency-sensitive small flows and no reduction of the total throughput of the fabric.
Flow-based Flow Control (4/4)

Indicate the station MAC address in the BPF.
Indicate the ethertype. If different flows use back pressure at the same time, transfer in one BPF.
Indicate the info of the root flow: 3-tuple (Src IP, Des IP, QoS). 5-tuple is better, but 3-tuple is enough.
XON or XOFF, just like traffic lights. Because we can’t calculate the exact pause time for one flow, so we just use the two state.
Simulator Environment

- **Platform**: OMNET++
- **Topology**: Fat-tree
- **Link capacity**: 40G
- **Link delay**: 200ns (40 meters)
Incast degree and FCT

With incast degree increasing, FCT for FFC remains almost unchanged. With an incast degree of 10:1, FFC is nearly 10X better than DCQCN with PFC.

The tail FCT for FFC also remains almost unchanged, and the improvement is more significant than median FCT.
Incast degree and FCT

Median flow completion times of incast flows (50% workload)

For incast flows, the FCT for FFC increases linearly, because without PFC no incast flow becomes an innocent flow.
When we scale out the network, we increase the count of incast proportionally, the FCT for DCQCN with PFC increases gradually, but FFC remains almost unchanged.

Same phenomenon appears in tail FCT. It implies that DCQCN with PFC has a scale bottleneck. When the FCT arrives at the limitation of application, there will be the upper limit of scale. While the FCT for FFC is not affected by the scale.
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