arXiv:2611.15842v1 [cs.LG] 11 Nov 2026

Fewer Expert Transfers Without Changing Routing: Expert Eviction for MoE Offloading

Pierre-Luc Bacon
CarbonForge, Mila
Université de Montréal
pierreluc@carbonforge.ai

Diego Calanzone
Mila
Université de Montréal

Jean-Maxime Larouche
CarbonForge
jml@carbonforge.ai

Abstract

A mixture-of-experts (MoE) language model uses only a few experts per token, so a server can keep most expert weights in CPU memory and copy an expert to the GPU when the router requests it. Recent methods train the router to keep the same experts for several tokens, and treat fewer routing switches as a proxy for fewer copies. We measure the trade-off directly, in a harness that performs and times real CPU-to-GPU copies for OLMoE-1B-7B. On an L40S GPU, every tested policy that holds an expert set fixed and decodes faster than the least-recently-used (LRU) cache increases next-token loss by at least 0.067 nats. A change that leaves every routing decision intact does better: when the cache must evict an expert, evict the one whose next use lies farthest in the future. This rule copies $2.1\times$ fewer experts than LRU at no loss in quality and is within 3.5% of the fewest copies possible. It needs future requests; the next sixteen tokens of demand recover 96% of its reduction, whereas a rule based on counts of past requests recovers 27%.

1 Introduction

A mixture-of-experts layer activates only a few of its experts for each token. For example, OLMoE-1B-7B uses about 1B of its 7B parameters at a time [Muennighoff et al., 2025]. When the expert weights do not all fit on the GPU, the rest can stay in CPU memory while the GPU holds a smaller cache. When the router requests an expert that is not cached, the system copies its weights to the GPU and evicts another expert. The usual rule evicts the least recently used expert (LRU) [Eliseev and Mazur, 2023, Zhong et al., 2024], and an open vLLM pull request implements this design (PR #37190). Because LRU copies whatever the router asks for, the model computes exactly what it would with every expert on the GPU. The price is that each miss stalls decoding until its copy completes.

Serving systems shorten these stalls with prefetching, request traces, CPU/GPU scheduling, or periodic cache updates [Eliseev and Mazur, 2023, Yang et al., 2026, Xue et al., 2024, Yu et al., 2026, Kamahori et al., 2025, Kong et al., 2024]. They report results on different hardware with different measures of locality, and models differ in how well they tolerate a restricted expert set [Liang et al., 2026], so the published numbers do not say which policy gives the best trade-off between speed and quality.

A second line of work changes the router instead. It keeps the same expert set active for several tokens and learns when to replace it, which is called *temporally extended routing*. Shen and Henderson [2026] train an option-critic controller [Bacon et al., 2017] with a penalty on switching sets [Harb et al., 2018]. It lowers the fraction of tokens that switch sets from over 50% to under 5% while retaining up to 90% of the base model's accuracy. In that evaluation, however, every expert stays on the GPU: the router may choose only within the selected set, but no weights move. Other methods train the router to reuse experts [Zhu et al., 2026, Raje et al., 2026]. Both lines treat fewer switches as a proxy for lower serving cost.

40th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS 2026). Workshop: AXIOM 2026: Foundations of Efficient Deep Learning.




Figure 1: **Quality loss against decoding speed as expert copies become more expensive.** Left: measured L40S throughput for policies run in the harness; the farthest-future points combine their counted copies with the measured compute time. Middle and right: Equation (1) with copies $10\times$ and $50\times$ slower; among six policies checked by direct measurement, it picks the measured winner at both costs (§3.1). Points at $\Delta\text{NLL} = 0$ preserve every routing decision. At the native cost, no policy that holds an expert set fixed decodes faster than LRU without at least 0.067 nats of extra loss, while farthest-future eviction loses nothing and copies $2.1\times$ fewer experts.

Fewer switches need not mean fewer copies, even with a cache of two slots. The sequence $A, B, A, B, \ldots$ switches expert at every token but misses only twice, when A and B first enter the cache. The sequence $A, A, B, B, C, C, \ldots$ switches half as often, yet each switch requests an expert that is not cached. A switch is a change in the routing decision, whereas a copy happens only when the requested weights are absent. When copies block computation, decoding time is

$$\text{ms/token} = c + \rho \cdot \tau, \tag{1}$$

where c is compute time, ρ is the number of experts copied per token, and τ is the time to copy one expert. Holding an expert set fixed lowers ρ by restricting which experts the router may use, which can change the output. Changing which expert the cache evicts lowers ρ without changing any routing decision. The hardware sets τ, which varies fivefold across the GPUs in Table 1.

We compare both approaches in a PyTorch harness that performs real, blocking CPU-to-GPU copies. Half of the frozen model's MoE layers keep 32 of their 64 experts on the GPU and the rest in CPU memory, and quality, copy counts and decoding time come from the same run. At the native L40S cost, every tested policy that decodes faster than LRU increases next-token negative log-likelihood (NLL) by at least 0.067 nats (Figure 1). Our contributions are:

- **Measured offloading.** We compare six cache policies, including a reimplementation of the learned controller, under real CPU-to-GPU copies. Equation (1), fed with measured compute and copy times, picks the fastest of them when copies are made $10\times$ and $50\times$ slower (§2–3.1).
- **A lossless alternative to LRU.** Evicting the expert whose next use lies farthest in the future copies $2.1\times$ fewer experts than LRU without changing the model's computation. Sixteen tokens of future demand recover 96% of this reduction (§3.2).
- **Fewer switches do not give fewer copies.** At four of six thresholds, a simpler schedule matches or beats the learned controller, and the other two lower traffic only with large losses in quality. A router fine-tuned for simulated cache hits copies as many experts as before (§3.3).

2 Measurement setup

We freeze OLMoE-1B-7B [Muennighoff et al., 2025] with a router trained to reuse experts, following Zhu et al. [2026]. Eight of its sixteen MoE layers are offloaded, chosen by restricting one layer at a time (Appendix A). In each offloaded layer, all 64 bf16 experts (12.6 MB each) stay in pinned CPU memory and the GPU holds C=32 of them. Every policy decodes the same sixteen held-out sequences of at most 384 tokens, teacher-forced with batch size one. We record next-token NLL, tokens per second and expert copies, leaving out the copies that first fill the cache. A policy that copies every requested expert produces the same outputs as a run with all 64 experts on the GPU, and

Table 1: **Left:** quality, speed and steady-state copies per token (ρ) on the L40S, where one expert copy takes $\tau = 0.51$ ms. The farthest-future throughput is computed from Equation (1); the others are measured. Shaded policies preserve every routing decision and match the NLL of the all-64-expert baseline. **Right:** copy time and bandwidth across GPUs; raw logs were kept only for the L40S.

	quality	serving cost	
Policy	ΔNLL	tok/s	ρ
All 64 experts cached	$+0.000$	49.0	0.0
LRU (lossless)	$+0.000$	38.3	9.6
Farthest-future eviction	$+0.000$	42.5	4.6
Dwell-16 (window $8\times$)	$+0.067$	42.2	4.5
Dwell-64 (window $1\times$)	$+0.085$	43.5	3.9
Static (64-token profile)	$+0.110$	44.0	3.4
Learned, thr. 0.5	$+0.076$	33.8	12.3
Learned, thr. 0.9	$+0.350$	43.6	0.9

	transfer cost	
GPU	τ (ms)	GiB/s
H100 / H200 (PCIe 5)	0.24	49.7
A100-SXM4	0.48	24.5
L40S	0.51	23.0
L4 (PCIe 4×8)	1.03	11.4
RTX 8000 (PCIe 3)	1.17	10.0

that run is within 5×10^{-3} NLL and 5% throughput of the model's own MoE block. Code, traces and raw results are at `github.com/carbonforgeAI/moe-expert-eviction`.

The model and router stay frozen, and the policies differ only in how they manage the 32 GPU slots. LRU copies each missing expert at once and evicts the least recently used expert that the current token does not need, so it preserves every routing decision. The other policies change the cache only at scheduled times. Between changes they copy nothing, and the router must choose among the cached experts, which can change the output.

Dwell-k holds the cache fixed for k tokens, then refills it with the experts requested most often in a recent window: $8k$ tokens for Dwell-16 and k tokens for Dwell-64 (Appendix A). *Static* fills the cache from the first 64 tokens and keeps it for the rest of the sequence. *Learned* is our implementation of Shen and Henderson [2026]. At each token, a termination head outputs a score β, and the cache is replaced when β exceeds a threshold, so higher thresholds replace it less often; a selection head (μ) chooses the new set. Training penalizes switches, changed experts and misses with hand-set weights rather than the measured τ, and both heads run inside the timed decoding step. The original trained heads are not available, so this tests our implementation of the method, not the published checkpoint.

Copies block computation in our harness, so copy time adds to compute time as in Equation (1). A system that overlaps copies with computation would instead approach $\max(c, \rho\tau)$, which shrinks the benefit of a better cache on fast links. The measured τ belongs to this pinned-memory copy path, not to the GPU in general.

3 Results

Three questions organize the results. Does holding an expert set fixed make decoding faster at matched quality (§3.1)? How many copies can a better eviction rule remove without changing any routing decision (§3.2)? Do the learned approaches reduce the copies actually made (§3.3)? An aggregate summary from a second text shard, whose raw logs were not kept, orders the policies the same way (Appendix F).

3.1 Quality and throughput across expert-transfer costs

On the L40S, LRU matches the NLL of the all-64-expert baseline but decodes at 38.3 instead of 49.0 tokens/s, about 22% slower. Policies that hold the cache fixed copy fewer experts and can decode faster, but every tested policy that beats LRU's speed raises next-token NLL by at least 0.067 nats. At this PCIe 4 copy cost, holding an expert set fixed buys speed with quality; it does not improve on LRU for free.

Which policy is fastest depends on the platform. The copy count ρ depends on the policy and the token sequence, whereas c and τ must be measured on each machine; given both, Equation (1) predicts the fastest policy. We test that prediction by repeating every copy 10 or 50 times for six policies, and the predicted winner is the measured winner at both costs. At $50\times$, the equation predicts that Dwell-16 and Dwell-64 decode 2.0–$2.5\times$ faster than LRU, and that threshold 0.9 is the fastest policy that restricts routing. Dwell-64 and threshold 0.9 were not among the six policies run at these costs, so the runs confirm which policy wins, not the accuracy of the predicted times in general. A deployment must measure c and τ itself and decide how much loss in quality it accepts.

3.2 A better eviction rule cuts transfers without changing routing

When the cache is full and a missing expert must come in, the only remaining choice is which cached expert to evict. That choice changes future misses but not the current token's computation. Belady's rule [Belady, 1966] evicts the expert whose next use lies farthest in the future. It needs the future requests, so we apply it offline to the requests recorded in the LRU run; because eviction never changes routing, these are exactly the requests the model makes under the new rule. Farthest-future eviction lowers copies from LRU's 9.6 per token to 4.6, a $2.1\times$ reduction, with every routing decision unchanged.

Belady's proof of optimality assumes one request at a time, whereas each MoE token requests eight experts at once, so the rule is not guaranteed optimal here. A lower bound of $14{,}587$ copies on our trace, against the rule's $15{,}087$, places it within 3.5% of the fewest possible (Appendix B).

A deployable rule must instead predict which cached expert will go unused for the longest. Knowing only the requests of the next sixteen tokens recovers 96% of the reduction from LRU to the full-lookahead rule. A rule that ranks experts by exponentially decayed counts of past requests recovers 27%, and a learned scorer that also sees router probabilities recovers 32–33% (Appendix C).

3.3 Learned routing does not improve the measured trade-off

Across six thresholds, the learned controller replaces its cache every 2.9 to 73 tokens on average. At thresholds 0.4 through 0.7, a simpler policy gives better quality at the same traffic or less traffic at the same quality. At threshold 0.5, for example, the controller and Dwell-16 raise NLL by similar amounts (0.076 and 0.067), but the controller copies $2.7\times$ as many experts, and that comparison leaves out the time spent running its two heads. Thresholds 0.8 and 0.9 lower traffic only by raising NLL 0.238 and 0.350 nats.

The selection head predicts well over short spans. When the controller picks a new set about every three tokens, NLL rises by only 0.030 nats; when it keeps each set for 73 tokens on average, NLL rises by 0.350, more than the 0.110 of a static cache chosen from the first 64 tokens. The selector therefore seems to predict near-term demand, while the termination head keeps each prediction too long. Retraining the controller with measured copy time in its objective does not reach the trade-off of the simple policies in a one-seed sweep. In an aggregate 5,000-question MMLU summary, all three learned seeds also score below Dwell-32 at the same switch rate, though the per-question outputs were not kept (Appendix D). The simple policies restart at each 384-token sequence and the controller does not, so longer sequences could narrow the gap.

The second learned approach changes the router itself. Following Calanzone et al. [2026], we fine-tune it with GRPO [Shao et al., 2024], a reinforcement-learning method, rewarding the hit rate of a simulated 16-slot LRU cache at one layer. The training logs report a higher simulated hit rate, but in the harness the fine-tuned model copies $32{,}050$ experts, against $31{,}915$ before fine-tuning. At the trained layer and cache size alone, the counts are $10{,}963$ and $10{,}954$. Adding a cache-size tag to the prompt increases traffic, and a supervised fine-tuning control stays close to the base model (Appendix E).

4 Limitations and conclusion

Evicting the expert needed farthest in the future copies $2.1\times$ fewer experts than LRU, comes within 3.5% of the fewest copies possible, and changes no routing decision. It needs future requests: sixteen tokens of lookahead recover 96% of the reduction, but the rules we built from past requests and router probabilities recover only 27–33%, and closing that gap is an open prediction problem. The approaches that change routing did not help. The learned controller does not improve the trade-off between speed and quality at thresholds 0.4 through 0.7, its two lower-traffic settings raise NLL by 0.238–0.350 nats, and a router trained for simulated cache hits copies as many experts as before. All results come from one model, batch-1 teacher forcing and copies that do not overlap computation; batching and asynchronous copies may shrink the gains. Within this setting, expert eviction is a better target for learning than routing.

References

Pierre-Luc Bacon, Jean Harb, and Doina Precup. The option-critic architecture. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 31, pages 1726–1734, 2017. doi:

10.1609/aaai.v31i1.10916.

Laszlo A. Belady. A study of replacement algorithms for a virtual-storage computer. *IBM Systems Journal*, 5(2):78–101, 1966. doi: 10.1147/sj.52.0078.

Diego Calanzone, Riyasat Ohib, and Pierre-Luc Bacon. Cache-aware routing: Towards efficient and stable MoEs with reinforcement learning on hardware features. In *NeurIPS 2026 Workshop on Foundations of LLM Post-Training in Changing Environments*, 2026. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=IuQwkUGjMa`.

Artyom Eliseev and Denis Mazur. Fast inference of mixture-of-experts language models with offloading. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.17238*, 2023.

Jean Harb, Pierre-Luc Bacon, Martin Klissarov, and Doina Precup. When waiting is not an option: Learning options with a deliberation cost. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v32i1.11831.

Akanksha Jain and Calvin Lin. Back to the future: Leveraging Belady's algorithm for improved cache replacement. In *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM/IEEE Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 78–89, 2016. doi: 10.1109/ISCA.2016.17.

Keisuke Kamahori, Tian Tang, Yile Gu, Kan Zhu, and Baris Kasikci. Fiddler: CPU-GPU orchestration for fast inference of mixture-of-experts models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.

Rui Kong, Yuanchun Li, Qingtian Feng, Weijun Wang, Xiaozhou Ye, Ye Ouyang, Linghe Kong, and Yunxin Liu. SwapMoE: Serving off-the-shelf MoE-based large language models with tunable memory budget. In *Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 6710–6720, 2024. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.acl-long.363.

Jingcong Liang, Siyuan Wang, Miren Tian, Yitong Li, Duyu Tang, and Zhongyu Wei. Not all models suit expert offloading: On local routing consistency of mixture-of-expert models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2026.

Evan Z. Liu, Milad Hashemi, Kevin Swersky, Parthasarathy Ranganathan, and Junwhan Ahn. An imitation learning approach for cache replacement. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6237–6247, 2020.

Richard L. Mattson, Jan Gecsei, Donald R. Slutz, and Irving L. Traiger. Evaluation techniques for storage hierarchies. *IBM Systems Journal*, 9(2):78–117, 1970. doi: 10.1147/sj.92.0078.

Niklas Muennighoff, Luca Soldaini, Dirk Groeneveld, Kyle Lo, Jacob Morrison, Sewon Min, Weijia Shi, Pete Walsh, Oyvind Tafjord, Nathan Lambert, Yuling Gu, Shane Arora, Akshita Bhagia, Dustin Schwenk, David Wadden, Alexander Wettig, Binyuan Hui, Tim Dettmers, Douwe Kiela, Ali Farhadi, Noah A. Smith, Pang Wei Koh, Amanpreet Singh, and Hannaneh Hajishirzi. OLMoE: Open mixture-of-experts language models. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2025.

Arian Raje, Anupam Nayak, and Gauri Joshi. MELINOE: Fine-tuning enables memory-efficient inference for mixture-of-experts models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.11192*, 2026.

Zhihong Shao, Peiyi Wang, Qihao Zhu, Runxin Xu, Junxiao Song, Xiao Bi, Haowei Zhang, Mingchuan Zhang, Y. K. Li, Y. Wu, and Daya Guo. DeepSeekMath: Pushing the limits of mathematical reasoning in open language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03300*, 2024.

Zeyu Shen and Peter Henderson. Temporally extended mixture-of-experts models. *Reinforcement Learning Journal*, 7, 2026.

Leyang Xue, Yao Fu, Zhan Lu, Luo Mai, and Mahesh Marina. MoE-Infinity: Efficient MoE inference on personal machines with sparsity-aware expert cache. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14361*, 2024.

Shuo Yang, Xiaoze Fan, Melissa Pan, Haocheng Xi, Zhe Wang, Shanlin Sun, Kurt Keutzer, Song Han, Matei Zaharia, Chenfeng Xu, and Ion Stoica. FreeToken: Efficient edge-native MoE serving with bandwidth-adaptive execution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2608.16157*, 2026.

Hanfei Yu, Xingqi Cui, Hong Zhang, Hao Wang, and Hao Wang. Taming latency-memory trade-off in MoE-based LLM serving via fine-grained expert offloading. In *Proceedings of the 21st European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)*, pages 176–191, 2026. doi: 10.1145/3767295.3769319.

Shuzhang Zhong, Ling Liang, Yuan Wang, Runsheng Wang, Ru Huang, and Meng Li. AdapMoE: Adaptive sensitivity-based expert gating and management for efficient MoE inference. In *Proceedings of the 43rd IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*, pages 1–9, 2024. doi: 10.1145/3676536.3676741.

Xiongwei Zhu, Xiaojian Liao, Tianyang Jiang, Yusen Zhang, Liang Wang, and Limin Xiao. ReMoE: Boosting expert reuse through router fine-tuning in memory-constrained MoE LLM inference. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2026.

A Harness details

A.1 Weight layout and copies

For each restricted layer, the gate, up and down projections of all 64 experts are packed into three pinned host tensors. The GPU pool holds C slots per projection and a map from expert id to slot. A refresh copies only the experts that are not already resident, $|R_{\text{new}} \setminus R_{\text{old}}|$. Copies that fill a sequence's empty pool are counted separately from steady-state transfers for every policy; a pool counts as filling until it has been full once. Copy time is measured by device events placed around each group of copies, and it is part of the step time. Each sequence's first token and a global warm-up are excluded from steady-state timing. In the $10\times$ and $50\times$ runs, the summed copy events and the end-to-end step events cover different warm-up periods, so a compute time derived as their difference can be negative. We therefore use those runs to rank policies, not to split time into compute and copies.

A.2 Eviction

Evicting an expert moves no data. The host keeps an ordered map from expert id to GPU slot, in order of last use; evicting an expert removes its entry, and the incoming expert's copy overwrites the freed slot. Copies and expert matrix multiplications are queued on the same CUDA stream, so the multiplications always see the new weights. A different eviction rule, such as decayed frequency or a learned score, therefore changes only the function that picks the victim. More implementation notes are in the repository's README.

A.3 Copy bandwidth

On the L40S, the per-expert copy loop reaches 23.0 GiB/s at this expert size. We treat τ as a property of this pinned host-to-device copy path, not as a constant of the GPU.

A.4 Warm start and window length

Dwell policies refresh every token until their demand window first fills. Without this warm start, the first pool is filled by tie-breaking on expert ids and then frozen, which in an earlier version of the harness inflated dwell's quality penalty by up to half. The window length matters: at dwell 8, a window $8\times$ longer than the dwell lowers ΔNLL from $+0.150$ to $+0.073$ and the transfer rate from 10.9 to 4.8 experts per token, compared with a window equal to the dwell.

A.5 Exactness checks

In every run, the harness checks that LRU, dwell-1 with a one-token window, and the pool path at $C{=}64$ match the base model's NLL within 5×10^{-3}. The base NLL itself matches an independent batched evaluation of the same protocol within 4×10^{-4}.

A.6 Restricted layers

The eight offloaded layers are $\{4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13\}$. A probe that restricted one layer at a time selected them, and the set was then fixed to match the layers on which the learned controller had been trained, so all baselines use the same set. The probe's raw outputs were not kept, and we make no quantitative claim about how layers differ.

A.7 Choosing a policy

Given the measured $(c_i, \rho_i, \Delta L_i)$ of each policy and a tolerated quality loss ε, the fastest admissible policy is $\arg\min_{\Delta L_i \le \varepsilon}\ c_i + \rho_i \tau$. Each policy's cost is linear in τ, so the winner can change only where two of these lines cross, at $\tau_{ij} = (c_j - c_i)/(\rho_i - \rho_j)$. This is why one measurement of c and τ at startup is enough to pick the policy at any copy cost.

B Farthest-future eviction is close to optimal

B.1 Setup

Consider one restricted layer with N experts, pool capacity C and k experts requested per token ($k \le C$; here N=64, C=32, k=8). Teacher-forced decoding of a fixed text produces a demand stream $S_1, \ldots, S_T$, where S_t is the set of k experts that the router selects at token t. A schedule is a sequence of resident sets $R_0 = \emptyset, R_1, \ldots, R_T$ with $|R_t| \le C$. It is *lossless* when $S_t \subseteq R_t$ for every t: every requested expert is resident when the token is computed, so the output equals the output with all experts resident. Let $\widetilde{B}(R) = \sum_t |R_t \setminus R_{t-1}|$ count all insertions. Steady traffic is $B(R) = \widetilde{B}(R) - C$, because the first C insertions fill the empty cache and every recorded stream reaches capacity. Layers have separate streams and pools, so totals are sums over layers, and the reported rate divides by the $T_{\text{eval}} = 3{,}296$ timed tokens. The harness counts the whole group of copies at the filling boundary as initial ($4{,}263$ LRU fills rather than the replay's $4{,}096$); both count $35{,}872$ LRU insertions in total, and Table 1 uses each artifact's own steady count.

Because the router is never restricted in a lossless schedule, the demand stream does not depend on the schedule. The minimum steady traffic

$$B^*(C) \;=\; \min\{\, B(R) \;:\; |R_t| \le C,\ S_t \subseteq R_t \text{ for all } t \,\}$$

is therefore a function of one recorded trace, and any lossless scheme, causal or clairvoyant, with or without prefetching, can be compared on it.

Proposition. *Let B_{greedy} be the steady traffic of the schedule that fetches only on demand and, when the cache overflows, evicts the resident expert that is not requested at the current token and whose next request lies farthest in the future (an expert never requested again counts as farthest). Let B_{flat} be the optimum of the classical MIN problem on the stream that lists each token's k experts as consecutive single requests. Then*

$$B_{\text{flat}} \;\le\; B^*(C) \;\le\; B_{\text{greedy}}.$$

Proof. The upper bound holds because the greedy schedule is lossless and feasible. For the lower bound, first note that prefetching never reduces the number of insertions. Suppose that expert e is inserted at time s although $e \notin S_s$, and let $u > s$ be its next request. If there is no such u, or if e is evicted before u, delete that residency interval and its insertion. Otherwise, remove e from $R_s, \ldots, R_{u-1}$, which delays the same insertion to u; the schedule stays feasible and uses no more capacity. Each step strictly decreases $\sum_t |R_t|$ and never adds an insertion, so repeating it ends at a schedule that fetches only on demand. Every recorded stream requests at least C distinct experts, so subtracting the common first C insertions preserves the order between schedules. Finally, any lossless schedule serves the flattened stream at the same cost, so B^* is at least the MIN optimum of that stream [Belady, 1966, Mattson et al., 1970]. □

The lower bound is not tight in general: MIN on the flattened stream may evict an expert right after its request within a token, which a lossless schedule may not do. Whether the greedy schedule always attains B^* is therefore open. Exact dynamic programming over all schedules, prefetching included, found greedy optimal on every one of 4.2×10^4 random instances (uniform, Zipf-distributed and bursty demand, including the served ratio $k/C = 0.25$–0.33).

B.2 Bounds on the recorded trace

Choosing the order of requests within each token that gives the tightest bound for each stream, $B_{\text{flat}} = 14{,}587$ and $B_{\text{greedy}} = 15{,}087$ (4,810 and 4,985 on the held-out sequences). The farthest-future count reported throughout is thus within 3.5% of the optimum. The two bounds coincide on 14% of the 128 (layer, sequence) streams, where greedy is exactly optimal, and the median gap per stream is 2.9%. Because B_{greedy} is an upper bound on B^*, the $2.1\times$ reduction of §3.2 is conservative; the exact ratio lies in $[2.1, 2.2]$.

The proposition bounds the minimum number of copies for every lossless policy. Prefetching cannot lower that minimum, although a poor prefetcher can add copies. Overlapping copies with computation changes when the necessary copies block execution, so latency can move from $c + \rho\tau$ toward $\max(c, \rho\tau)$ without changing how many copies are needed.

C Learned eviction

C.1 Hand-built rules

The farthest-future rule can be computed offline on the recorded demand trace (eight restricted layers, sixteen sequences of different lengths; counts sum over layers). Replaying the trace therefore gives an exact label for every eviction decision. Hawkeye [Jain and Lin, 2016] and Parrot [Liu et al., 2020] learn processor cache replacement from the same kind of labels; our setting has 64 candidates per set, a frozen model, and router probabilities that forecast the next request. Evicting the expert with the lowest exponentially decayed use count recovers 26.9% of the gap between LRU and the oracle with no learning at all (31,776 steady transfers for LRU, 27,285 for decayed frequency and 15,087 for the oracle). Evicting by predicted time to next use, estimated from each expert's mean interval between requests, is 17.5% worse than LRU: demand comes in bursts, so an expert used recently is likely to be used again soon. An aggregate summary of a closed-loop run in the harness agrees with the replay: decayed-frequency eviction moves 27,118 experts against LRU's 31,609 (27% of the oracle gap, within 0.6% of the replay) at the same checked NLL. The same summary reports that evicting the expert with the lowest current router logit moves 46,079 experts, 46% more than LRU, because it evicts experts that were just used.

C.2 Imitation from past use

A small scoring model (linear, or a two-layer MLP) scores every resident expert at each eviction, and the expert with the highest score is evicted. It is trained to reproduce the oracle's choice, and its inputs summarize only the expert's past use: time since last use, use counts decayed at several rates, and the spacing of past uses. Trained on twelve of the sixteen sequences and run closed-loop on the other four, the MLP recovers 25% of the gap (9,231 transfers against 10,635 for LRU and 4,985 for the oracle). The same MLP trained on shuffled labels is far worse than LRU (-136%), so the gain comes from the oracle's labels. The linear model puts nearly all of its weight on the frequency features and evicts rarely used experts; on the same four sequences the hand-built decayed-frequency rule scores 28.7%. From past use alone, imitation rediscovers frequency-based eviction.

C.3 Limited foresight

We give the oracle only k tokens of foresight: residents whose next request lies beyond k tokens are treated as equal, and the least recently used of them is evicted. Figure 2 shows the result. One token of foresight recovers 17% of the gap, two tokens 31%, four 51%, eight 76% and sixteen 96%, and the curve saturates at thirty-two tokens (99.7%; held-out sequences, with all sixteen sequences within about two points). Nearly all of the oracle's advantage comes from requests in the next few dozen tokens. The curve shows how far ahead a causal policy would need to predict; it does not show that such a prediction is possible from the signals that the server has.

C.4 Adding router probabilities

We retrained the scoring model with router features: each candidate's current probability under the full softmax, its decayed averages, its trend and its recent maxima. Training used a separate trace




Figure 2: Share of the gap between LRU and the oracle that the oracle recovers when it sees only the next k tokens of requests. The dotted lines are the causal rules, which correspond to about two tokens of foresight.

of 48 sequences ($3.4\times$ as many eviction events), so all sixteen evaluation sequences are unseen. On the four held-out sequences, past use alone recovers 26% of the gap, router probabilities alone 25%, and both together 32% with the same two-layer model and 33% with a small recurrent model (GRU) per candidate. Validation loss on the training trace selected the two-layer model; we report the GRU but did not select it. Both beat the decayed-frequency rule (29%) on these four sequences, but on all sixteen sequences the learned and hand-built rules tie at 25–27%. The shuffled-label control again does worse than LRU (-34%). Measured against the foresight curve, the combined model is worth about two tokens of foresight, far from the sixteen that would close most of the gap.

D The learned controller

D.1 Training objectives

The termination head (β) and selection head (μ) are trained on top of the frozen language model with one of two objectives. The differentiable objective backpropagates next-token NLL through the soft mixture $(1-\beta)$ keep $+\,\beta$ refresh and adds penalties for refreshes, changed experts, expected cache misses and undecided values of β, together with a KL term that keeps the routing close to the original router. The policy-gradient objective applies REINFORCE to the same decisions, with a reward that combines language-model loss, refresh rate, rate of changed experts and cache cost, and an entropy bonus. Both objectives therefore count switches, changed experts and misses, but with hand-set weights rather than the measured copy time τ.

D.2 Objective priced by measured copy time

We retrained the heads with the traffic penalty set to $e \cdot \tau$, using the measured τ and otherwise the original configuration, and swept the exchange rate e between quality and time (one seed, same data and number of steps). At $e = 0$ the controller refreshes almost every token and moves 73 experts per token at full quality. At $e = 0.005$ it stays close to that up to threshold 0.8; at threshold 0.9 it lowers traffic from 65.8 to 41.5 experts per token for $+0.071$ nats. At $e = 0.02$, the inference threshold becomes a smooth control from 62 down to 4.8 experts per token, and $e = 0.08$ nearly reproduces the curve of the original heads, whose hand-set weight of 0.05 per changed expert corresponds to $e \approx 0.1$. No price reaches the frontier of the simple policies: at 4.0 experts per token the retrained controller loses 0.16 nats, while Dwell-64 loses 0.085 at 3.9 and farthest-future eviction loses nothing at 4.6. Pricing the objective moves the controller along its own curve but does not close the gap to the frontier.

D.3 MMLU accuracy

Table 2 reports aggregate run summaries on $5{,}000$ questions, scored by the answer letter, at a matched switch rate of 3.1% (dwell 32); base accuracy is 48.4%. Per-question outputs and the trained heads were not kept. At threshold 0.5 (higher switch rates, 12 to 16 transfers per token), the three seeds

retain 89.6%, 86.5% and 86.8%. Earlier evaluations on 500 questions spread seed-level retention over 82–96%, consistent with their ±4.7-point 95% intervals.

Table 2: MMLU accuracy at a matched 3.1% switch rate (n=5,000; aggregate summaries). The ±1.3 is one standard error across three training seeds.

Policy	Accuracy	Retention
Free routing	0.484	100.0%
Fixed set, oracle selection	0.481	99.5%
Fixed set, chosen from recent use	0.430	88.9%
Learned $\beta\mu$, seed 0	0.422	87.3%
Learned $\beta\mu$, seed 1	0.415	85.7%
Learned $\beta\mu$, seed 2	0.401	82.8%
Learned $\beta\mu$, mean of 3 seeds	0.413	$85.2\% \pm 1.3$

E A router fine-tuned for cache hits

E.1 Method

Starting from the public OLMoE-1B-7B-0125-Instruct checkpoint, the router is fine-tuned with GRPO [Shao et al., 2024] following Calanzone et al. [2026]. During training, a 16-slot LRU cache of experts is simulated at one middle layer over the model's own generations, and the reward at each token is that cache's hit rate. One variant adds a prompt tag `[CACHE_SIZE=`c`]` so that the cache size can be chosen at inference time. LoRA adapters on the router, expert and attention projections are merged into the base weights before measurement. The control is a model fine-tuned on the same data by supervised learning (SFT) without the cache reward. An aggregate training summary reports a higher simulated hit rate at the trained layer; the simulator's raw output was not kept.

E.2 Protocol

We use the main protocol of Appendix A: the same sixteen teacher-forced sequences on the same GPU. Serving uses lossless LRU, which keeps each model's selected experts, so steady transfers are the whole comparison. We measure two operating points: the main one (8 restricted layers, C=32) and the method's own training setting (the trained layer only, C=16). The tagged variant's NLL is not comparable to the others, because the tag tokens are also scored.

Table 3: Steady expert transfers (lower is better) for routers fine-tuned for cache hits, under lossless LRU serving, under lossless serving with decayed-frequency (LFU) eviction, and at the method's training setting.

Objective	Base NLL	LRU	LRU+LFU eviction	Trained layer (C=16)
Base (untuned)	1.382	31,915	27,275	**10,954**
SFT control	1.350	**31,686**	**27,107**	—
Cache-hit reward	1.397	32,050	27,355	10,963
+ cache-size tag	—	33,101	29,063	11,223

E.3 Results

The SFT control moves 0.7% fewer experts than the untuned base, so fine-tuning alone changes little. The reward-trained variants do not reduce traffic (+0.4%, and +0.1% at the trained layer and cache size), and the cache-size tag increases it by 2.5–3.7%. Decayed-frequency eviction, by contrast, removes 12–15% of the transfers of every variant without changing the selected experts. Two differences between the instruments could explain why the simulated gains do not appear in the measured counts: the reward and its reported gains come from the same simulator of a single layer, and they were computed on the model's own generations, while our measurement uses teacher forcing on fixed text.

F Replication and uncertainty

Aggregate summaries of a second, disjoint text shard (a different offset in the same corpus, same protocol; base NLL 0.9297) report the same orderings. Dwell with a longer window beats dwell with a window equal to the dwell and the static profile ($+0.075$ to $+0.092$ nats against $+0.115$ to $+0.142$). The learned controller at threshold 0.5 matches the heuristics' quality with about $2.7\times$ as many transfers, threshold 0.9 again gives low traffic at a high quality cost, and LRU remains lossless. The raw logs of this shard were not kept. On the main shard, per-sequence NLLs are logged for every policy. The points of Figure 1 are token-weighted aggregate ΔNLL, while the per-sequence spread weights every sequence equally, so it is not an uncertainty estimate for those points; we show no error bars and make no claim of statistical significance. Transfer counts are deterministic given the trace.