Abstract

In-network computing can be conceived in many different ways – from active networking, data plane programmability, running virtualized functions, service chaining, to distributed computing.

This memo proposes a particular direction for Computing in the Networking (COIN) research and lists suggested research challenges.
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1. Introduction

Recent advances in platform virtualization, link layer technologies and data plane programmability have led to a growing set of use cases where computation near users or data consuming applications is needed – for example for addressing minimal latency requirements for compute-intensive interactive applications (networked Augmented Reality, AR), for addressing privacy sensitivity (avoiding raw data copies outside a perimeter by processing data locally), and for speeding up distributed computation by putting computation at convenient places in a network topology.

In-network computing has mainly been perceived in five variants so far: 1) Active Networking [ACTIVE], adapting the per-hop-behavior of network elements with respect to packets in flows, 2) Edge Computing as an extension of virtual-machine (VM) based platform-as-a-service, 3) programming the data plane of SDN switches (through powerful programmable CPUs and programming abstractions, such as P4 [SAPIO]), 4) application-layer data processing frameworks, and 5) Service Function Chaining (SFC).
Active Networking has not found much deployment in the past due to its problematic security properties and complexity.

Programmable data planes can be used in data centers with uniform infrastructure, good control over the infrastructure, and the feasibility of centralized control over function placement and scheduling. Due to the still limited, packet-based programmability model, most applications today are point solutions that can demonstrate benefits for particular optimizations, however often without addressing transport protocol services or data security that would be required for most applications running in shared infrastructure today.

Edge Computing (as traditional cloud computing) has a fairly coarse-grained (VM-based) computation-model and is hence typically deploying centralized positioning/scheduling through virtual infrastructure management (VIM) systems.

Microservices can be seen as a (light-weight) extension of the cloud computing model (application logic in containers and orchestrators for resource allocation and other management functions), leveraging more light-weight platforms and fine-grained functions. Compared to traditional VM-based systems, microservice platforms typically employ a "stateless" approach, where the service/application state is not tied to the compute platform, thus achieving fault tolerance with respect to compute platform/process failures.

Application-layer data processing such as Apache Flink \[FLINK\] provide attractive dataflow programming models for event-based stream processing and light-weight fault-tolerance mechanisms - however systems such as Flink are not designed for dynamic scheduling of compute functions.

Modern distributed applications frameworks such as Ray \[RAY\], Sparrow \[SPARROW\] or Canary \[CANARY\] are more flexible in this regard - but since they are conceived as application-layer frameworks, their scheduling logic can only operate with coarse-granular cost information. For example, application-layer frameworks in general, can only infer network performance, anomalies, optimization potential indirectly (through observed performance or failure), so most scheduling decisions are based on metrics such as platform load.

Service Function Chaining (SFC, \[RFC7665\]) is about establishing IP tunnels between processing functions that are expected to work on packets or flows - for applications such as inspection and classification - not for general Computing in the Network purposes.
2. Terminology

We are using the following terms in this memo:

Program: a set of computations requested by a user

Program Instance: one currently executing instance of a program

Function: a specific computation that can be invoked as part of a program

Execution Platform: a specific host platform that can run function code

Execution Environment: a class of target environments (execution platforms) for function execution, for example, a JVM-based execution environment that can run functions represented in JVM byte code

3. Computing in the Network vs Networked Computing vs Packet Processing

Many applications that might intuitively be characterized as "computing in the network" are actually either about connecting compute nodes/processes or about IP packet processing in fairly traditional ways.

Here, we try to contrast these existing and wildly successful systems (that probably do not require new research) with a more novel "computing in the network (COIN)" approach that revisits the function split between computing and networking.

3.1. Networked Computing

Networked Computing exists in various facets today (as described in the Introduction). Fundamentally, these systems make use of networking to connect compute instances - be it VMs, containers, processes or other forms of distributed computing instances.

There are established frameworks for connecting these instances, from general purpose Remote Method/Procedure Invocation to system-specific application-layer protocols. With that, these systems are not actually realizing "computing in the network" - they are just using the network (and taking connectivity as granted).

Most of the challenges here are related to compute resource allocation, i.e., orchestration methods for instantiating the right compute instance on a corresponding platform - for achieving fault tolerance, performance optimization and cost reduction.
Examples of successful applications of networked computing are typical overlay systems such as CDNs. As overlays they do not need to be "in the network" - they are effectively applications. (Note: we sometimes refer to CDN as an "in-network" service because of the mental model of HTTP requests that are being directed and potentially forwarded by CDN systems. However, none of this happens "in the network" - it is just a successful application of HTTP and underlying transport protocols.)

3.2. Packet Processing

Packet processing is a function "in the network" - in a sense that middleboxes reside in the network as transparent functions that apply processing functions (inspection, classification, filtering, load management etc.) - mostly _transparent_ to endpoints. Some middlebox functions (TCP split proxies, video optimizers) are more invasive in a sense that they do not only operate on IP flows but also try to impersonate transport endpoints (or interfere with their behavior).

Since these systems can have severe impacts on service availability, security/privacy, and performance they are typically not very _programmable_.

Active Networking can be characterized as an attempt to offer abstractions for programmable packet processing from an "endpoint perspective", i.e., by using data packets to specify intended behavior in the network with the mentioned security problems.

Programmable Data Plane approach such as P4 are providing abstractions of different types of network switch hardware (NPUs, CPUs, FPGA, PISA) from a switch/network programming perspective. Corresponding programs are constrained by the capabilities (instruction set, memory) of the target platform and typically operate on packets/flow abstractions (for example match-action-style processing).

Network Functions Virtualization (NFV) is essentially a "Networked Computing" approach (after all, Network Functions are just virtualized compute functions that get instantiated on compute platforms by an orchestrator). However, some VNFs happen do process/forward packets (e.g., gateways in provider networks, NATs or firewalls). Still that does not affect their fundamental properties as virtualized computing functions.
3.3. Computing in the Network

In some deployments, networked computing and packet processing go well together, for example when network virtualization (multiplexing physical infrastructure for multiple isolated subnetworks) is achieved through data-plane programming (SDN-style) to provide connectivity for VMs of a tenant system.

While such deployments are including both computing and networking, they are not really doing computing _in the network_. VM/containers are virtualized hosts/processes using the existing network, and packet processing/programmable networks is about packet-level manipulation. While it is possible to implement certain optimizations (for example, processing logic for data aggregation) - the applicability is limited especially for applications where application-data units do not map to packets and where additional transport protocols and security requirements have to be considered.

Distributed Computing (stream processing, edge computing) on the other side is an area where many application-layer frameworks exist that actually _could_ benefit from a better integration of computing and networking, i.e., from a new "computing in the network" approach.

For example, when running a distributed application that requires dynamic function/process instantiation, traditional frameworks typically deploy an orchestrator that keeps track of available host platforms and assigned functions/processes. The orchestrator typically has good visibility of the availability of and current load on host platforms, so it can pick suitable candidates for instantiating a new function.

However, it is typically agnostic of the network itself - as application layer overlays the function instances and orchestrators take the network as a given, assuming full connectivity between all hosts and functions. While some optimizations may still be feasible (for example co-locating interacting functions/processes on a single host platform), these systems cannot easily reason about

- shortest paths between function instances;
- function off-loading opportunities on topologically convenient next-hops; and
- availability of new, not yet utilized resources in the network.

While it is possible to perform optimizations like these in application layers overlays, it involves significant monitoring effort and would often duplicate information (topology, latency) that
is readily available inside the network. In addition to the associated overhead, such systems also operate at different time scales so that direct reaction in fine-grained computing environments is difficult to achieve.

When asking the question of how the network can support distributed computing better, it may be helpful to characterize this problem as a resource allocation optimization problem: Can we integrate computing and networking in a way that enables a joint optimization of computing and networking resource usage? Can we apply this approach to achieve certain optimization goals such as:

- low latency for certain function calls or compute threads;
- high throughput for a pipeline of data processing functions;
- high availability for an overall application/service;
- load management (balancing, concentration) according to performance/cost constraints; and
- consideration of security/privacy constraints with respect to platform selection and function execution?

Also: can we do this at the speed of network dynamics, which may be substantially higher than the rate at which distributed computing applications change?

Considering computing and networking resource holistically could be the key for achieving these optimization goals (without considerable overhead through telemetry, management and orchestration systems). If we are able to dissolve the layer boundaries between the networking domain (that is typically concerned with routing, forwarding, packet/flow-level load balancing) and the distributed computing domain (that is typically concerned with 'processor' allocation, scaling, reaction to failure for functions/processes), we might get a handle to achieve a joint resource optimization and enable the distributed computing layer to leverage network-provided mechanisms directly.

For example, if distributing information about available/suitable compute platform could be a routing function, we might be able to obtain and utilize this information in a distributed fashion. If instantiating a new function (or offloading some piece of computation) could consider live performance data obtained from an in-network forwarding/offloading service (similar to IP packet forwarding in traditional IP networks), the "next-hop" decision could be based both on network performance and node load/availability).
Integrating computing and networking in this manner would not rule out highly optimized systems leveraging sophisticated orchestrators. Instead, it would provide a (possibly somewhat uniform) framework that could allow several operating and optimization modes, including totally distributed modes, centralized orchestration, or hybrid forms, where policies or intents are injected into the distributed decision-making layer, i.e., as parameters for resource allocation and forwarding decisions.

3.4. Elements for Computing in the Network

In-network computing requires computing resources (CPU, possibly GPUs, memory, ...), physical or virtualized to some extent by a suitable platform. These computing resources may be available in a number of places, as partly already discussed above, including:

- They may be found on dedicated machines co-locating with the routing infrastructure, e.g., having a set of servers next to each router as one may find in access network concentrators. This would come closest to today’s principles of edge computing.
- They may be integrated with routers or other network operations infrastructure and thus be tightly integrated within the same physical device.
- They may be integrated within switches, similar to the (limited) P4 compute capabilities offered today.
- They may be located on NICs (in hosts) or line cards (routers) and be able to proactively perform some application functions, in the sense of a generalized variant of "offloading" that protocol stacks perform to reduce main CPU load.
- They might add novel types of dedicated hardware to execute certain functions more efficiently, e.g., GPU nodes for (distributed) analytics.
- They may also encompass additional resources at the edge of the network, such as sensor nodes. Associated sensors could be physical (as in IoT) or logical (as in MIB data about a network device).
- Even user devices along the lines of crowd computing \cite{crowd-computing} or mist computing \cite{mist-computing} may contribute compute resources and dynamically become part of the network.

Depending on the type of execution platform, as already alluded to above, a suitable execution framework must be put in place: from
lambda functions to threads to processes or process VMs to unikernels to containers to full-blown VMs. This should support mutual isolation and, depending on the service in question, a set of security features (e.g., authentication, trustworthy execution, accountability). Further, it may be desirable to be able to compose the executable units, e.g., by chaining lambda functions or allowing unikernels to provide services to each other - both within a local execution platform and between remote platform instances across the network.

The code to be executed may be pre-installed (as firmware, as microcode, as operating system functions, as libraries, as *aaS offering, among others) or may be dynamically supplied. While the former is governed by the entity operating the execution device or supplying it (the vendor), the code to be executed may have different origins. Fundamentally, we can distinguish between two cases:

1. The code may be "centrally" provisioned, originating from an application or other service provider inside the network. This is analogous to CDNs, in which an application provider contracts a CDN provider to host content and service logic on its behalf. The deployment is usually long-term, even if instantiations of the code may vary. The code thus originates from rather few - known - sources. In this setting, applications only invoke this code and pass on their parameters, context, data, etc.

2. The code may be "decentrally" provided from a user device or other service that requires a certain function or service to be carried out. At the coarse granularity of entire application images, this has been explored as "code offloading"; recent approaches have moved towards finer granularities of offloading (sets of) functions, for which also some frameworks for smartphones were developed, leading to finer granularities down to individual functions. In this setting, application transfer mobile code - along with suitable parameters, etc. - into the network that is executed by suitable execution platforms. This code is naturally expected to be less trusted as it may come from an arbitrary source.

Obviously, 1. and 2. may be combined as mobile code may make use of other in-network functions and services, allowing for flexible application decomposition. Essentially, in-network computing may support everything from full application offloading to decomposing an application into small snippets of code (e.g., at class, objects, or function granularity) that are fully distributed inside the network and executed in a distributed fashion according to the control flow of the application. This may lead to iterative or recursive calling
from application code on the initiating host to mobile code to pre-
provisioned code.

Another dimension beyond where the code comes from is how tightly the
code and the data are coupled. At one extreme approaches like Active
Messages combine the data and the code that operates (only) on that
data into transmission units, while at the other extreme approaches
like Network Function Virtualization are only concerned with the
instantiation of the code in the network. The underlying
architectural question is whether the goal is to enable the network
to perform computations on the data passing through it, or whether
the goal is to enable distributed computational processes to be built
in the network.

With these different existing and possibly emerging platforms and
execution environments and different ways to provision functions in
the network, it does not seem useful to assume any particular
platform and any particular "mobile code" representation as _the_
"computing in the network" environment. Instead, it seems more
promising to reason about properties that are relevant with respect
to distributed program semantics and protocols/interfaces that would
be used to integrate functions on heterogeneous platforms into one
application context. We discuss these ideas and associated
challenges in the following section.

4. Research Challenges

Conceiving computing in the network as a joint resource optimization
problem as described above incurs a set of interesting, novel
research challenges that are particularly relevant from an Internet
Research perspective.

4.1. Categorization of Different Use Cases for Computing in the Network

There are different applications but also different configuration
classes of Computing in the Network systems. For example, a data
processing pipeline might be different from a distributed application
employing some stateful actor components. It is worthwhile analyzing
different typical use cases and identify commonalities (for example,
fundamental protocol elements etc.) and differences.

4.2. Networking and Remote-Method-Invocation Abstractions

In distributed systems, there are different classes of functions that
can be distinguished, for example:

1. Strictly stateless functions that do not keep any context state
   beyond their activation time
2. Stateful functions/modules/programs that can be instantiated, invoked and eventually destroyed that do keep state over a series of function invocations

Modern frameworks such as Ray are offering a clear separation of stateless functions and stateful actors and offer corresponding abstractions in their programming environment. The aforementioned analysis of use cases should provide a diverse set of use cases for deriving a minimal yet sufficient set of function classes.

Beyond this fundamental categorization of functions/actors, there is the question of interfaces and protocols mechanisms - as building blocks to utilize functions in programs. For example, stateful functions are typically invoked through some Remote Method Invocation (RMI) protocol that identifies functions, allows for specifying/transferring parameters and function results etc. Stateful actors could provide class-like interfaces that offer a set of functions (some of which might manipulate actor state).

Another aspect is about identity (and naming) of functions and actors. For actors that are typically used to achieve real-world effects or to enable multiple invocations of functions manipulating actor state over time, it is obvious that there needs to be a concept of specific instances. Invoking an actor function would then require specifying some actor instance identifier.

Stateless functions may be different: an invoking instance may be oblivious function identify and locus (on an execution platform) and might just want to leave it to the network to find the "best" instance or locus for a new instantiation. Some fine-granular functions might just be instantiated for one invocation. On the other hand, a function might be tied to a particular execution platform, for example an GPU-supported host system. The naming and identity framework must allow for specifying such a function (or at least equivalence classes) accordingly.

Stateful functions may share state within the same program context, i.e., across multiple invocations by the same application (as, e.g., holds for web services that preserve context - locally or on the client side). But stateful functions may also hold state across applications and possibly across different instantiations of a function on different compute nodes. Such will require data synchronization mechanisms and the implementation of suitable data structure to achieve a certain degree of consistency. The targeted degree of consistency may vary depending on the function and so may the mechanisms used to achieve the desired consistency.
Finally, execution platforms will require efficient resource management techniques to operate with different types of stateless and stateful functions and their associated resources, as well as for dynamically instantiated mobile code. Besides the aforementioned location of suitable compute platforms and scheduling (possibly queuing) functions and function invocations, this also includes resource recovery ("garbage collection").

4.3. Transport Abstractions

When implementing Computing in the Network and building blocks such as function invocation it seems that IP packet processing is not the right abstraction. First of all, carrying the context for some function invocation might require many IP packets - possibly something like Application Data Units (ADUs). But even if such ADUs could be fit into network layer packets, other problems still need to be addressed, for example message formats, reliability mechanisms, flow and congestion control etc.

It could be argued that today’s distributed computing overlays solve that by using TCP and corresponding application layer formats (such as HTTP) - however this bears the question whether a fine-granular distributed computing system, aiming to leverage the network for certain tasks, is best served by a TCP/IP-based approach that entails issues such as

- need for additional resolution/mapping system to find IP addresses for functions;
- possible overhead for establishing TCP connections for fine-granular function invocation; and
- mismatch between TCP end-to-end semantics and the intention to defer next-hop selection etc. to the network.

Moreover, some Computing in the Network applications such as Big Data processing (Hadoop-style etc.) can benefit significantly from data-oriented concepts such as

- in-network caching (of data objects that represent function parameters or results);
- reasoning about the tradeoffs between moving data to function vs. moving code to data assets; and
- sharing data (e.g., function results) between sets of consuming entities.
RMI systems such as RICE [RICE] enable Remote Method Invocation of ICN (data-oriented network/transport). Research questions include investigating how such approaches can be used to design general-purpose distributed computing systems. More specifically, this would involve questions such as:

- What is the role of network elements in forwarding RMI requests?
- What visibility into load, performance and other properties should endpoints and the network have to make forwarding/offloading decisions?
- What is the notion of transport services in this concept and how intertwined is traditional transport with RMI invocation?
- What kind of feedback mechanisms would be desirable for supporting corresponding transport services?

### 4.4. Programming Abstractions

When creating SDKs and programming environments (as opposed to individual point solutions) questions arise such as:

- How to use concepts such as stateless functions, actor models and RMI in actual programs, i.e., what are minimal/ideal bindings or extensions to programming languages so that programmers can take advantage of Computing in the Network?
- Are there additional, potentially higher-layer, abstractions that are needed/useful, for example data set synchronization, data types for distributed computing such as CRDTs?

In addition to programming languages, bindings, and data types, there is the question of execution environments and mobile code representation. With the vast amount of different platforms (CPUs, GPUs, FPGAs etc.) it does not seem useful to assume exactly one environment. Instead, interesting applications might actually benefit from running one particular function on a highly optimized platform but are agnostic with respect to platforms for other, less performance-critical functions. Being able to support a heterogenous, evolving set of execution environments brings about questions such as:

- How to discover available platforms (and understand their properties)?
- How to specify application needs and map them to available platforms?
Can a certain function/application service be provided with different fidelity levels, e.g., can an application leverage a GPU platform if available and fall back to a reduced feature set in case such a platform is not available?

In this context, updates and versioning could entail another dimension of variability for Computing in the Network:

- How to manage coexistence of multiple versions of functions and services, also for service routing and request forwarding?
- Is there potential for fallback and version negotiation if needed (considering the risk of "bidding downs" attacks?)
- How to retire old versions?
- How to securely and reliably deal with function updates and corresponding maintenance tasks?

### 4.5. Security, Privacy, Trust Model

Computing in the Network has interesting security-related challenges, including:

- How can a caller trust that a remove function works as expected? This entails several questions such as
  - How to securely bind "function names" to actual function code?
  - How to trust the execution platform (in its entirety)?
  - How to trust the network that is forwards requests (and result messages) reliably and securely?
- What levels of authentication are needed for callers (assuming that not everybody can invoke any function)?
- How to authenticate and achieve confidentiality for requests, their parameters and result data (especially when considering sharing of results)?

Many of these questions are related to other design decisions such as

- What kind of session concept do we assume, i.e., is there a concept of distributed application session that represents a trust domain for its members?
Where is trust anchored? Can the system enable decentralized operation?

All of these questions are not new, but conceiving networking and computing holistically seems to revisit distributed systems and network security - because some established concepts and technologies may not be directly applicable (such as transport layer security and corresponding web PKI).

4.6. Failure Handling, Debugging, Management

Distributed computing naturally provides different types of failures and exceptions. In fine-granular distributed computing, some failures may be more tolerable (think microservices), i.e., platform crash or function abort due to isolated problems could be handled by just re-starting/re-running a particular function. Similarly, "message loss" or incorrect routing information may be repairable by the system itself (after time).

When failure cannot be repaired (or just tolerated) by the distributed computing framework, this raises questions such as:

- What are strategies for retrying vs aborting function invocation?
- How to signal exceptions and enable robust response to failures?

Failure handling and debugging also has a management aspect that leads to questions such as:

- What monitoring and instrumentation interfaces are needed?
- How can we represent, visualize, and understand the (dynamically changing) properties of Computing in the Network infrastructure as well as of the currently running/instantiated entities?
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