

# **P51: High Performance Networking**

**Lecture 3: Low Latency Devices** 

Dr Noa Zilberman noa.zilberman@cl.cam.ac.uk

Lent 2017/18

Low Latency Switches



- Obvious option 1: Increase clock frequency
  - -E.g. change core clock frequency from 100MHz to 200MHz
  - -Half the time through the pipeline





- Obvious option 1: Increase clock frequency
- Limitations:
  - Frequency is often a property of manufacturing process
  - Some modules (e.g. PCS) must work at a specific frequency (multiplications)





- Obvious option 2: Reduce the number of pipeline stages
  - -Can you do the same in 150 pipeline stages instead of 200?
  - -Limitation: hard to achieve.





- Can we achieve ~0 latency switch?
  - -Is there a lower bound on switch latency?





Cut Through Switching



# **Cut Through Switch**

- Cut through switch  $\neq$  Low latency switch
  - A cut through switch can implement a very long pipeline...
- But:
  - For the smallest packet, the latency is ~same
  - As packet size grows, latency saving grows



- Kermani & Kleinrock, "Virtual cut-through: A new computer communication switching technique", 1976
- "when a message arrives in an intermediate node and its selected outgoing channel is free (just after the reception of the header), then, in contrast to message switching, the message is sent out to the adjacent node towards its destination before it is received completely at the node; only if the message is blocked due to a busy output channel is a message buffered in an intermediate node."





- Past (far back):
  - Networks were slow
  - Memory was fast
  - Writing packets to the DRAM took "negligible" time
- With time:
  - Networks become faster
  - Memory access time is no longer "negligible"



• Sundar, Kompella, and McKeown. "Designing packet buffers for router line cards." 2002.





- But what does a REAL silicon implementation looks like?
- Tip 1: search for patents on Google Scholar
- Tip 2: read carefully performance evaluation reports
  - We'll discuss some examples in the next lectures



Latency considerations within modules



#### **Network Interfaces**

- Data arrives at (up to) ~50Gbps per link.
- Let us ignore clock recovery, signal detection etc.
- Feasible clock rate is ~1GHz
- But if data rate is ×50 times faster...

• Observation: data bus width will be no less than incoming data rate and feasible clock rate



#### **Network Interfaces**

- Line coding often directs the bus widths:
  - E.g., 8b/10b coding led to bus widths of 16b (20b) or 64b (80b)
- A port is commonly an aggregation of multiple serial links
  - 10G XAUI = 4 × 3.125Gbps
  - 100G CAUI4 = 4 × 25Gbps
  - 400G PSM4 = 8 × 50Gbps
  - Need to take care of aligning the data arriving from multiple links on the same port.



#### **Network Interfaces**

- Role: check the validity of the packet (e.g., FCS)
- What to do if an error is detected?
  - Forward an error using a "fast path"
  - Mark the last cycle of the packet
    - E.g., to cause drop in the next hop
- Other roles need to be maintained too
  - Frame delimiting and recognition, flow control, enforcing IFG, ...



## **Packet Processing**

• A likely flow:



- Possible implementations:
  - The entire packet goes through the header processing unit
  - Just the header goes through the header processing unit
  - "Better" depends on your performance profile (what are the bottlenecks? Resource limitations?)



## **Packet Processing**

• A likely flow:



- Challenges:
  - A field may arrive over multiple clock cycles (e.g. 32b field, 16b on clock 2 and 16b on clock 3)
  - Memory access taking more than 1 clock cycle
    - E.g. request on clock 1, reply on clock 3
    - Some memories allow multiple concurrent accesses, some don't
    - The bigger the memory, the more time it takes



## **Packet Processing**

• A likely flow:



- Solutions:
  - Pipelining! Don't stall, add NOP stages in your pipe.
  - Reorder operations (where possible)
    - E.g. Lookup 1 → Action 1 → Lookup 2 → Action 2 turns: Lookup 1 → Lookup 2 → Action 1 → Action 2
    - Don't create hazards!



- Simple example:
  - Packets arriving from 4 ports
  - (approximately) same arrival time
  - Arbiter uses Round Robin
- Problem: arbitration on packet boundaries?



 No: interleaved packets within the pipeline Need to track which cycle belongs to which packet May require multiple concurrent header lookups Order is not guaranteed (e.g. P1-P2-P3-P1-P2-P2-...), due to NIF timing



- Simple example:
  - Packets arriving from 4 ports
  - (approximately) same arrival time
  - Arbiter uses Round Robin
- Problem: arbitration on packet boundaries?



 Yes: packets need to wait for previous packets to be handled before being admitted.
Worst case waiting with <N> inputs is <N-1>×Packet time



- Solutions to the previous problem:
  - Scheduled (or slotted) traffic
  - Multiple pipelines



. . .



Thursday, 26 September 13



M Grosvenor *et al* "The Resilient Realtime Data Delivery Network Architecture" (R2D2) 2013

- This example solves the arbitration problem entering the device
- Resource inefficient:
  - Pipeline overdesign
  - Inefficient use of memories
  - Concurrency issues
- One solution:
  - Shared memories / tables
  - Highly complex





## Switching

- The previous arbitration solution "pushed" the problem to the switching unit
- But now the problem is only when multiple packets compete over the same output that's fine!
- Assuming your switch can handle multiple packets per cycle
  - E.g. crossbar









# Switching

## Switching

- ... This is also queueing
- Challenge: SCALE
  - So you can do it with 4 ports
  - Can you do it with 32? 128? 256?
- Not just resource / area
  - Computation time being able to examine and choose between all available inputs
- Eventually: Packets must be sent out on packet boundaries do not interleave packets!

