

CS244


Advanced Topics in Networking

Lecture 6: Switching

Nick McKeown

“High-speed switch scheduling for local-area networks”

[Tom Anderson, Susan Owicki, James Saxe, Chuck Thacker. 1993]




Spring 2020

Context



Tom Anderson

At the time: DEC SRC (Palo Alto)
Professor of CS, University of Washington
Previously: UC Berkeley, EECS



Susan Owicki

At the time: DEC SRC (Palo Alto)
Before that: Prof of EE & CS, Stanford
Today: Marriage and Family Therapist, Palo Alto



James B. Saxe

At the time: DEC SRC (Palo Alto)
After that: Compaq and HP Labs



Chuck Thacker (d. 2017)

At the time: DEC SRC (Palo Alto)
Before that: Xerox PARC (“Alto”)
After that: Microsoft
2010 Turing Award Winner

At the time the paper was written...


- WWW was new, and Internet traffic was growing fast
- Fastest Ethernet networks ran at 100Mb/s
- Lots of interest in building faster switches and routers
- Lively debate about an alternative to the Internet, called “ATM”

But first...


A few words about packet queues...

R = line rate.


e.g. 100M bit/s, 10Gb/s




Q: For any “load” $\lambda \leq 1$, what arrival pattern leads to the most customers in the queue?



Observation: With one arrival “line” at the same rate, the queue is always empty (or at most one store-and-forward packet). The arrival process is “bounded” by R .




Q: For any “load” $\lambda \leq 1$, what arrival pattern leads to the most customers in the queue?



Observation: The arrival rate is “bounded” by R on average.


Different cases for $\lambda = 1$

1




Q: How big does the buffer need to be?

3



Q: How big does the buffer need to be?


2




Q: How big does the buffer need to be?

Observation: For a given arrival rate, in order to know the queueing delay, we need to know the pattern (or “process”) of arrivals.


Background



A switch, or router, with N “ports”.
Each port runs at rate R b/s.
We say the “switching capacity” is $N \times R$ b/s.



An output-queued (OQ) switch




Properties of an OQ switch

- All buffering takes place at the output.
- Output queues must be able to write packets at rate $N \times R$.

Consequences

- “Work conserving”: Whenever there is a packet in the system, its output is busy sending a packet. No unnecessary idling.
- Average delay is minimized.
- But memory bandwidth limits the switching capacity.

Traffic Matrix



Traffic matrix, $\Lambda = [\lambda_{i,j}]$

$\lambda_{i,j}$ is the fraction of traffic from input i to output j

For example:

$$\Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} 0.1 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.4 \\ 0.2 & 0.3 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ 1.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 \\ 0.1 & 0.4 & 0.3 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note that the row (input) sum: $\sum_j \lambda_{i,j} \leq 1, \forall i$

Non-oversubscribed TM:

Total traffic rate to each output is ≤ 1

$$\sum_i \lambda_{i,j} \leq 1, \forall j$$

and still: $\sum_j \lambda_{i,j} \leq 1, \forall i$

Uniform Traffic Matrix:

$$\Lambda = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

where: $\lambda \leq 1/N$

OQ Switches and “100% Throughput”

If we send traffic according to any non-over-subscribed traffic matrix to an OQ switch (*with infinite buffers*) then the output rates correspond to the column sums.


i.e. The traffic rate at output j $= R \sum_i \lambda_{i,j} \leq R$

Put another way, an OQ switch can “keep up” with any reasonable traffic matrix we throw at it.

We often say an OQ switch can “sustain 100% throughput”.

Q: What happens if the buffers are finite?

An input-queued (IQ) switch




Properties of an IQ switch

- All buffering takes place at the input.
- Input queues only need to be able to write packets at rate R (instead of $N \times R$).

Consequences

- Can build a switch N times faster.
- But, a packet can be held up by packet ahead destined to a different output.
- Hence an IQ switch is not “work conserving”. It can unnecessarily idle.
- May not achieve “100% throughput”.
- Average delay is not minimized.



Head of Line Blocking



Head of Line Blocking

IQ switch with uniform traffic matrix, $\lambda \leq 1$


Observation: HOL Blocking means we lose 42% of the switching capacity




Poisson arrivals:

$$E(d) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2 - \lambda}{1 - \lambda} \right)$$

What does the “58%” result mean?



Virtual Output Queues (VOQs)






Basic idea

With a VOQ, a packet cannot be held up by a packet in front of it, destined to a different output.

Q: With VOQs, does/can 58% become 100% throughput?



100% Throughput

Reminder: “100% throughput” is equivalent to


For a non over-subscribing traffic matrix, queues don't grow without bound.

i.e. $\mu \geq \lambda$ for every queue in the system.

Observations:


1. Burstiness of arrivals does not affect throughput
2. For a uniform Traffic Matrix, solution is trivial!

An input-queued (IQ) switch with VOQs and a crossbar







bipartite
request
graph



bipartite
match








e.g. “maximum size match”





Crossbar schedule

Fixed cycle of permutations:



$\lambda \leq 1$, therefore
arrival rate \leq departure rate.
True for all VOQs, therefore
100% throughput for uniform TM




100% throughput for uniform traffic

Four (trivial) algorithms for a uniform traffic matrix:

1. Cycle through permutations in “round-robin” (i.e. previous slide).
2. Each time, randomly pick one of the permutations in (1).
3. Each time, pick a permutation uniformly and at random from all possible $N!$ permutations.
4. Wait until all VOQs are non-empty, then pick any algorithm above.

Quick recap so far

An input-queued (IQ) switch



Properties of an IQ switch

- All buffering takes place at the input.
- Input queues only need to be able to write packets at rate R (instead of $N \times R$).


Consequences

- Can build a switch N times faster.
- HOL Blocking: a packet can be held up by packet ahead destined to a different output.
- Hence an IQ switch is not “work conserving”. It can unnecessarily idle.
- May not achieve “100% throughput”.
- Average delay is not minimized.

Head of Line Blocking

IQ switch with uniform traffic matrix, $\lambda \leq 1$

Observation: HOL Blocking means we lose 42% of the switching capacity



100% throughput easy for uniform traffic

Four (trivial) algorithms for a uniform traffic matrix:

1. Cycle through permutations in “round-robin”.
2. Each time, randomly pick one of the permutations in (1).
3. Each time, pick a permutation uniformly and at random from all possible $N!$ permutations.
4. Wait until all VOQs are non-empty, then pick any algorithm above.

Q: So why did the authors need Parallel Iterative Matching (PIM)?

Because in practice, arrivals are not uniform.

(If know the matrix, we can still create a cycle of permutations to serve every VOQ at the rate in the traffic matrix).


In practice we don't know the traffic matrix.

Hence, PIM....

Parallel Iterative Matching


A maximal bipartite match

Iteration 1:



Q: Are we done?
Q: Is a larger match possible?

Iteration 2:



⋮


PIM Properties

1. Inputs and outputs make decisions independently and in parallel.
2. Guaranteed to find a maximal match in at most N iterations.
3. Typically completes in much fewer than N iterations.

Q: How large is a maximal match compared to a maximum match?


A maximal match is guaranteed to be at least half the cardinality (size) of a maximum match.

Parallel Iterative Matching




Simulation
16-port switch
Uniform traffic matrix

Parallel Iterative Matching



Simulation
16-port switch
Uniform traffic matrix

Parallel Iterative Matching



PIM with
four iterations


Simulation
16-port switch
Uniform traffic matrix

How many PIM iterations should be run?

Parallel Iterative Matching

Number of iterations

Consider the n requests to output j



$$w.p. \begin{cases} \frac{k}{n}, & \text{all requests to } j \text{ are resolved} \\ 1 - \frac{k}{n}, & \text{at most } k \text{ remain unresolved} \end{cases}$$

$$E[\text{Num unresolved requests}] \leq \frac{k}{n} \cdot 0 + \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) \cdot k$$

$$\leq \frac{n}{4}, \text{ because } (1 - a) \cdot a \leq \frac{1}{4}, \text{ when } a < 1$$

Therefore, 3/4 of all requests are resolved each iteration.

(It follows that the number of iterations $\leq \log_2 N + \frac{4}{3}$)

Known methods for non-uniform traffic


1. 100% throughput is now known to be theoretically possible with:
 - IQ switch, with VOQs, and
 - An arbiter to pick a permutation to maximize the total matching weight (e.g. weight is VOQ occupancy)



$L_{i,j} = 3$




bipartite
request
graph




Choose matching M
that maximizes $\sum_{i,j \in M} L_{i,j}$

bipartite
match



“maximum WEIGHT match”



Observation: give preference to longer VOQs
Leads to 100% throughput for any traffic matrix.

Known methods for non-uniform traffic

2. It is practically possible with:

- IQ switch, VOQs, all running *twice as fast* (i.e. choose and transfer two cells per cell time)
- An arbiter running a *maximal* match (e.g. PIM)


Intuition: Because maximal match is at least half the size of a maximum match, running twice as fast compensates for it.

Known methods for non-uniform traffic


3. 2 switch stages with a fixed schedule of permutations!

A 2-stage Load-balancing switch

Fixed cycle of permutations




Fixed cycle of permutations



Intuition: If uniform traffic is so easy, can I make non-uniform traffic “sufficiently uniform”?

A 2-stage Load-balancing switch



End.