# Simulation Analysis of Congestion Isolation (CI)

Kevin Shen

kevin.shenli@huawei.com

Sam Sun

sam.sunwenhao@huawei.com

IEEE 802.1 DCB, Chicago, March 2018

## **Objectives of the Analysis**

#### • Investigate the XON threshold impact

• Keep other configuration unchanged, and compare the performances under different XON threshold settings

#### • Find out the best combination of local CI, signaling and PFC

• Compare the performances under different combinations of local Cl, signaling and PFC

#### **Simulation Set-up**



- Platform: OMNET++
- 2 Tier CLOS: 100GbE interface with 200ns of link latency (about 40 meters)
- Scale: 1152 servers, 72 switches

### **Simulation Set-up**



#### • Traffic Pattern

- Data mining applications with different flow size distributions
- Randomly select 21 servers as a small cluster for many to many traffic, 50 that kind of small clusters in all.
- Randomly select 20:1 permanent many to one incast traffic,
  4 that kind of many to one incasts in all.



Many to one incast traffic

## **Compared Solutions for Objective 1**





- Solution "Without Cl" means PFC + ECN without Cl.
- Flows are mapped to one of the two queues by hash of destination IP.
- PFC and ECN are enabled on both queues.
- Queue setting:
  - Queue size: 1 MB;
  - PFC threshold: XOFF 750 KB;
  - ECN: Low 10 KB, High 300 KB, Max Probability 1%.

- Solution "CI" means PFC + ECN with CI.
- Flows go through the non-congested queue by default, and congested flows are dynamically isolated to the congested queue based on congestion.
- ECN is marked once a packet is isolated.
- Queue setting:
  - Queue size: 1 MB;
  - PFC threshold: XOFF 750 KB;
  - CI: Low 10 KB, High 300 KB, Max Probability 1%.

#### XON threshold impact





- For solution "Without CI", XON threshold is critical.
- But for CI, XON threshold is not so important, because PFC only impact the congested flow.
- Even at the best configuration of XON threshold, CI has a big performance improvement compared to "Without CI".

### XON threshold impact



**CNP** Count Received by Servers

• "CI" can reduce Pause frame count and CNP count significantly at all XON threshold setting.

### **Compared Solutions for Objective 2**

#### • Compared Solutions:

- "no Cl no PFC": Just ECN with neither Cl nor PFC.
- "Cl no Sig no PFC": Local CI with ECN, but no signaling to upstream to isolate the congested flow and no PFC.
- "CI no Sig PFC": Local CI with ECN and PFC, but no signaling to upstream to isolate the congested flow.
- "CI Sig no PFC": Intact CI with ECN but without PFC.
- "CI Sig PFC": Intact CI with ECN and PFC.

#### Packet Loss Rate Comparison

**Overall Packet Loss Rate(%)** 



• Without signaling or PFC, CI solutions cannot prevent packet loss, only intact CI with PFC can.

## FCT Comparison between Solutions with PFC











- We make "CI no sig with PFC" lossless (Pause the non-congested queue and pause both queue as last resort), but it performs even worse than "PFC no CI".
- Because under "CI no sig with PFC", it plays just like one queue model with PFC enabled, which involves more HOLB.

## Summary

#### Investigate the XON threshold impact

- There is a best XON threshold setting around 250KB.
- Compared with "Without CI", "CI" gets much less impacts from the XON threshold.
- Even at the best configuration of XON threshold, "CI" has a big performance improvement compared to "Without CI".

#### • Find out the best combination of local CI, signaling and PFC

• The intact "CI" with PFC has best performance.

#### Questions?