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## Packet switches



- A packet switch consists of a routing engine (table look-up), a switch scheduler, and a switch fabric
- The routing engine looks-up the packet address in a routing table and determines which output port to send the packet
- Packet is tagged with port number
- The switch uses the tag to send the packet to the proper output port


## First Generation Switches



- Computer with multiple line cards
- CPU polls the line cards
- CPU processes the packets
- Simple, but performance is limited by processor speeds and bus speeds
- Examples: Ethernet bridges and low end routers


## Second Generation switches



- Most of the processing is now done in the line cards
- Route table look-up, etc.
- Line cards buffer the packets
- Line card send packets to proper output port
- Advantages: CPU and main Memory are no longer the bottleneck
- Disadvantage: Performance limited by bus speeds
- Bus BW must be $\mathbf{N}$ times LC speed ( $\mathbf{N}$ ports)
- Example: CISCO $\mathbf{7 5 0 0}$ series router


## Third generation switches



- Replace shared bus with a switch fabric
- Performance depends on the switch fabric, but potentially can alleviate the bus bottleneck


## Switch Architectures

- Distributed buffer
- Output buffer
- Input buffer


## Distributed buffer

- Modular Architecture

Basic module is a $\mathbf{2 x} 2$ switch, which can be either in the through or crossed position


- Switch buffers: None, at input, or at output of each module Switch fabric consists of many $2 \times 2$ modules



## Interconnection networks

- N input
- Log(N) stages with $\mathrm{N} / 2$ modules per stage

Example: Omega (shuffle exchange network)


- Notice the order of inputs into a stage is a shuffle of the outputs from the previous stage: (0,4,1,5,2,6,3,7)
- Easily extended to more stages
- Any output can be reached from any input by proper switch settings
- Not all routes can be done simultaneously
- Exactly one route between each SD pair
- Self-routing network


## Self Routing

- Use a tag: n bit sequence with one bit per stage of the network
$-\quad$ E.g., $\mathbf{T a g}=\mathbf{b}_{3} \mathbf{b}_{2} \mathbf{b}_{1}$
- Module at stage $i$ looks at bit $i$ of the $\operatorname{tag}\left(b_{i}\right)$, and sends the packet up if $b_{i}=0$ and down if $b_{i}=1$
- In omega network, for destination port with binary address abc the tag is cba
- Example: output $\mathbf{1 0 0} \Rightarrow \mathbf{t a g}=001$
- Notice that regardless of input port, tag 001 will get you to output 100


## Baseline network

- Another Example of a multi-stage interconnection network
- Built using the basic $\mathbf{2 x 2}$ switch module
- Recursive construction
- Construct an N by N switch using two $\mathrm{N} / 2$ by N/2 switches and a new stage of $\mathrm{N} / 2$ basic ( $2 \times 2$ ) modules
- $\quad \mathbf{N}$ by N switch has $\log _{2}(\mathrm{~N})$ stages each with $\mathrm{N} / 2$ basic ( $2 \times 2$ ) modules



## Contention

- Two packets may want to use the same link at the same time (same output port of a module)
- Hot spot effect
- Solution: Buffering


## Throughput analysis of interconnection networks

- Assume no buffering at the switches
- If two packets want to use the same port one of them is dropped
- Suppose switch has m stages
- Packet transmit time $=1$ slot (between stages)
- New packet arrival at the inputs, every slot
- Saturation analysis (for maximum throughput)
- Uniform destination distribution independent from packet to packet


## Interconnection Throughput, continued

- Let $\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{m})$ be the probability that a packet is transmitted on a stage $m$ link

- $\mathbf{P}(0)=1$
- $P(m+1)=1-P(n o$ packet on stage $m+1$ link (link $c))$
$=1-\mathbf{P}($ neither inputs to stage $\mathbf{m}+1$ chooses this output)
- Each input has a packet with probability $\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{m})$ and that packet will choose the link with probability $\mathbf{1 / 2}$. Hence,

$$
P(m+1)=1-\left(1-\frac{1}{2} P(m)\right)^{2}
$$

- We can now solve for $\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{m})$ recursively
- For an $m$ stage network, throughput (per output link) is $\mathbf{P ( m )}$, which is the probability that there is a packet at the output


## Interconnection Throughput, continued



- Throughput can be significantly improved by adding buffers at the stages
- Buffers increase delay
- Tradeoff between delay and throughput


## Advantages/Disadvantages of multi-stage architecture

- Advantages
- Modular
- Scalable
- Bus (links) only needs to be as fast as the line cards
- Disadvantages
- Delays for going through the stages

Cut-through possible when buffers empty

- Decreased throughput due to internal blocking
- Alternatives: Buffers that are external to the switch fabric
- Output buffers
- Input buffers


## Output buffer architecture



- As soon as a packet arrives, it is transferred to the appropriate output buffer
- Assume slotted system (cell switch)
- During each slot the switch fabric transfers one packet from each input (if available) to the appropriate output
- Must be able to transfer N packets per slot
- Bus speed must be $\mathbf{N}$ times the line rate
- No queueing at the inputs

Buffer at most one packet at the input for one slot

## Queueing Analysis

- If external arrivals to each input are Poisson (average rate $\bar{A}$ ), each output queue behaves as an $M / D / 1$ queue
- packet duration equaling one slot $\bar{X}=\overline{X^{2}}=1$
- The average number of packets at each output is given by (M/G/1 formula):

$$
N_{Q}=\frac{2 \bar{A}-(\bar{A})^{2}}{2(1-\bar{A})}
$$

- Note that the only delay is due to the queueing at the outputs and none is due to the switch fabric


## Advantages/Disadvantages of Output buffer architecture

- Advantages: No delay or blocking inside switch
- Disadvantages:
- Bus speed must be $\mathbf{N}$ times line speed

Imposes practical limit on size and capacity of switch

- Shared output buffers: output buffers are implemented in shared memory using a linked list
- Requires less memory (due to statistical multiplexing)
- Memory must be fast


## Input buffer architecture

- Packets buffered at input rather than output
- Switch fabric does not need to be as fast

- During each slot, the scheduler established the crossbar connections to transfer packets from the input to the outputs
- Maximum of one packet from each input
- Maximum of one packet to each output
- Head of line (HOL) blocking - when the packet at the head of two or more input queues is destined to the same output, only one can be transferred and the other is blocked


## Throughput analysis of input queued switches

- HOL blocking limits throughput because some inputs (consequently outputs) are kept idle during a slot even when they have other packet to send in their queue
- Consider an NxN switch and again assume that inputs are saturated (always have a packet to send)
- Uniform traffic $\Rightarrow$ each packet is destined to each output with equal probability (1/N)
- Now, consider only those packets at the head of their queues (there are $\mathbf{N}$ of them!)


## Throughput analysis, continued

- Let $Q_{m}^{i}$ be the number of HOL packets destined to node $i$ at the end of the $\mathbf{m}^{\text {th }}$ slot

$$
Q_{m}^{i}=\max \left(0, Q_{m-1}^{i}+A_{m}^{i}-1\right)
$$

- Where
$A_{m}^{i}=$ number of new HOL messages addressed to node ithat arrive to the HOL during slot m . Now,

$$
P\left(A_{m}^{i}=l\right)=\binom{C_{m-1}}{l}(1 / N)^{l}(1-1 / N)^{C_{m-1}-l}
$$

- Where
$C_{m-1}=$ number of HOL messages that departed during the $\mathbf{m - 1}$ slot $=$ number of new HOL arrivals
- As $\mathbf{N}$ approaches infinity, $A_{m}^{i}$ becomes Poisson of rate $\mathbf{C} / \mathbf{N}$ where $\mathbf{C}$ is the average number of departures per slot


## Throughput analysis, continued

- In steady-state, $\mathbf{Q}^{i}$ behaves as an $M / D / 1$ of rate $\bar{A}$ and, as before,

$$
\overline{Q^{i}}=\frac{2 \bar{A}-(\bar{A})^{2}}{2(1-\bar{A})}
$$

- Notice however that the total number of packets addressed to the outputs is $\mathbf{N}$ (number of HOL packets). Hence,

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{N} Q^{i}=N \quad \Rightarrow \quad \overline{Q^{i}}=\frac{2 \bar{A}-(\bar{A})^{2}}{2(1-\bar{A})}=1
$$

- We can now solve, using the quadratic equation to obtain:

$$
\bar{A}=\text { utilization }=2-\sqrt{2} \approx 0.58
$$

## Summary of input queued switches

- The maximum throughput of an input queued switch, is limited by HOL blocking to $58 \%$ ( for large N )
- Assuming uniform traffic and FCFS service
- Advantages of input queues:
- Simple
- Bus rate = line rate
- Disadvantages: Throughput limitation


## Overcoming HOL blocking

- If inputs are allowed to transfer packets that are not at the head of their queues, throughput can be substantially improved (not FCFS)

Example:


- How does the scheduler decide which input to transfer to which output?


## Backlog matrix



- Each entery in the backlog matrix represent the number of packets in input i's queue that are destined to output $j$
- During each slot the scheduler can transfer at most one packet from each input to each output
- The scheduler must choose one packet (at most) from each row, and column of the backlog matrix
- This can be done by solving a bi-partite graph matching algorithm
- The bi-partite graph consists of $\mathbf{N}$ nodes representing the inputs and $\mathbf{N}$ nodes representing the outputs


## Bi-partite graph representation

- There is an edge in the graph from an input to an output if there is a packet in the backlog matrix to be transferred from that input to that output
- For previous backlog matrix, the bi-partite graph is:

- Definition: A matching is a set of edges, such that no two edges share a node
- Finding a matching in the bi-partite graph is equivalent to finding a set of packets such that no two packets share a row or column in the backlog matrix
- Definition: A maximum matching is a matching with the maximum possible number of edges
- Finding a maximum matching is equivalent to finding the largest set of packets that can be transferred simultaneously


## Maximum Matchings

- Algorithms for finding maximum matching exist
- The best known algorithms takes $\mathbf{O}\left(\mathbf{N}^{2.5}\right)$ operations
- Too long for large $\mathbf{N}$
- Alternatives
- Sub-optimal solutions
- Maximal matching: A matching that cannot be made any larger for a given backlog matrix
- For previous example:
( $1-1,3-3$ ) is maximal
(2-1,1-2,3-3) is maximum
- Fact: The number of edges in a maximal matching $\geq \mathbf{1 / 2}$ the number of edges in a maximum matching


## Achieving 100\% throughput in an input queued switch

- Finding a maximum matching during each time slot does not eliminate the effects of HOL blocking
- Must look beyond one slot at a time in making scheduling decisions
- Definition: A weighted bi-partite graph is a bi-partite graph with costs associated with the edges
- Definition: A maximum weighted matching is a matching with the maximum edge weights
- Theorem: A scheduler that chooses during each time slot the maximum weighted matching where the weight of link ( $\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}$ ) is equal to the length of queue $(\mathbf{i}, \mathrm{j})$ achieves full utilization ( $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ throughput)
- Proof: see "Achieving 100\% throughput in an input queued switch" by N. McKeown, et. al., IEEE Transactions on Communications, Aug. 1999.

