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The subsequent slides (not including this slide) contain draft material proposed for a planned IEEE 802 tutorial on CTF (see https://mentor.ieee.org/802.1/dcn/21/1-21-0015-04-lCne-ctf-study-item-planning-proposal.pdf):

• At the time this draft slide set is published, an IEEE 802 tutorial has not been approved!
• However, the contents of the following slides are designed to show content as it would like in a final version, including indications for such a tutorial, as it would look like if such a tutorial would be approved.
• All contents in this slide set are subject to discussion, change/correction, removal and addition. Nonetheless, this slide set is intended to give a preview of the merged individual contributions for the planned tutorial.

Discussions and contributions are welcome!
Tutorial:
Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF) in Bridges and Bridged Networks

Johannes Specht, Jordon Woods, Paul Congdon/Lily Lv, Henning Kaltheuner, <<TBD>>
Abstract

Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF) is a known method to improve the delay performance in Bridged Networks. In contrast to the store and forward operation of standardized switched Ethernet, CTF allows frame transmission in Bridges before reception is completed. Although not standardized in IEEE 802, CTF is already implemented in existing Bridge implementations. It is therefore technically feasible, but different implementations face interoperability problems that can be resolved by standardizing CTF in IEEE 802.1 and IEEE 802.3.

This tutorial introduces CTF on a technical level, explains application areas, markets and use-cases for CTF, and addresses technical and procedural aspects on integrating CTF into IEEE 802.1 and IEEE 802.3 Standards.
Disclaimer

This presentation should be considered as the personal views of the presenters not as a formal position, explanation, or interpretation of IEEE.

Per IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws, August 2020:

At lectures, symposia, seminars, or educational courses, an individual presenting information on IEEE standards shall make it clear that his or her views should be considered the personal views of that individual rather than the formal position of IEEE.
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Time-Sensitive Networking (TSN) Profiles (Selection and Use of TSN tools)

Audio Video Bridging [802.1BA]
Fronthaul [802.1CM/de]
Industrial Automation [IEC/IEEE 60802]
Automotive In-Vehicle [P802.1DG]
Service Provider [P802.1DF]
Aerospace [P802.1DP]

Time Synchronization:
Timing and Synchronization [802.1AS-2020]
(a profile of IEEE 1588)
Hot Standby [P802.1ASdm]
YANG [P802.1ASdn]

Bounded Low Latency:
Credit Based Shaper [802.1Qav]
Frame Preemption [802.1Qbu & 802.3br]
Scheduled Traffic [802.1Qbv]
Cyclic Queuing and Forwarding [802.1Qch]
Asynchronous Traffic Shaping [802.1Qcr]
QoS Provisions [P802.1DC]

TSN Components
(Tools of the TSN toolbox)

Synchronization
Reliability

Latency
Resource Management

High Availability / Ultra Reliability:
Frame Replication and Elimination [802.1CB]
Path Control and Reservation [802.1Qca]
Per-Stream Filtering and Policing [802.1Qci]
Reliability for Time Sync [802.1AS-2020]

Dedicated Resources & API:
Stream Reservation Protocol [802.1Qat]
Link-local Registration Protocol [802.1CS]
TSN Configuration [802.1Qcc]
Foundational Bridge YANG [802.1Qcp]
YANG for CFM [P802.1Qcx]
YANG for LLDP [P802.1ACb]
YANG for 802.1Qbv/Qbu/Qci [P802.1Qcw]
YANG & MIB for FRER [P802.1CBev]
Extended Stream Identification [P802.1CBdb]
Resource Allocation Protocol [P802.1Qdd]
TSN Configuration Enhancements [P802.1Qdj]
LLDPv2 for Multiframe Data Units [P802.1ABdh]
Multicast and Local Address Assignment [P802.1CQ]

Note: A ‘P’ in front of an ID indicates an ongoing Project.

Traditional and Deterministic Services

— Traditional Service
  — Curves have long tail
  — Average latency is good
  — Lowering the latency means losing packets (or overprovisioning)

— Deterministic Service
  — Packet loss is at most due to equipment failure (zero congestion loss)
  — Bounded latency, no tails
  — The right packet at the right time

CTF is close to Preemption:

- Speed-up, most beneficial if combined with scheduled traffic
- Across IEEE WGs 802.1 and 802.3
Basic CTF Operation

CTF is an alternative forwarding method to Store & Forward (S&F) in Bridges

**Store & Forward**
IEEE Std 802.1Q-2018, IEEE Std 802.3-2018, and associated Standards

**Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF)**
Not standardized in IEEE 802.1 and IEEE 802.3

### Delay performance enhancements
- Reduced residence times of frames in Bridges (“speed-up“)
- Reduced frame length dependent jitter/delay variation

### (Main) Challenges
- Transmission of frames with errors discovered by FCS verification, and the associated consequences
- S&F operation “deeply” manifested in IEEE 802.1 and 802.3 Standards

**Cut-Through Forwarding (CTF) in Bridges and Bridged Networks – A Tutorial**
CTF Speed-up Analysis: Assumptions (1)

Purpose

• The following assumptions assemble a simplified model to focus on a simple speed-up analysis:
  • Some assumptions can be valid for some real systems, while being invalid for others.
  • The assumptions here are not intended as requirements or limitations for real systems with CTF.

Topology/Network

• Chain Network/Network segment
• Identical Link Speeds, Full-Duplex, negligible propagation delays
• CTF possible on all interconnections except from/to end stations (i.e., S&F at first and last hops)
• Strict Priority Transmission Selection Algorithm, optional with Enhancements for Scheduled Traffic

Errors

• Error free environment → no data corruption in frames
• However, errors, including late error handling, is addressed later in this tutorial
CTF Speed-up Analysis: Assumptions (2)

Traffic – Focus on Bounded Latency

• High Priority (HP): Focus of the Analysis
  • At most one stream sent by each end station, and each end station receives HP streams from at most one direction of the chain
  • Constant frame length\(^1\)
  • Periodic (same period for all streams)
  • Period < maximum end-to-end latency
  • Nominal transmission times at sending end stations

• Low Priority (LP): Background
  • Always Store & Forward
  • Interferes with CTF traffic
    • Without preemption: 1542 octets (max. LP frame\(^1,2\))
    • With preemption: 155 octets (max. non-preemptible LP frame\(^1,3\))

---

1) Includes all media-dependent overhead for IEEE 802.3 point-to-point full duplex media (Preamble, SFD, minimal Interpacket Gap).
2) Upper limit of 1500 octets payload in a tagged frame.
3) Defined upper limit for addFragSize=0 (cmp. 99.4.8 of IEEE Std 802.3ar-2016).
CTF Speed-up Analysis: Math

\[ d^\text{max}_{\text{SFF}} = (H + 2)(\max\{l_{HP}d_{Oct}, l_{Hdr}d_{Oct} + d_{LU}\} + d_Q) + \]
\[ (H + 1)l_{LP} + Hl_{HP}d_{Oct} \]

Maximum interference by crossing high priority traffic \(l_{HP}\) and crossing low priority traffic \(l_{LP}\). Dependent on the subsequently introduced communication schemes, either one or both types of interference exist or not (e.g., full TDM avoids both).

\[ d^\text{max}_{\text{CTF}} = 2(\max\{l_{HP}d_{Oct}, l_{Hdr}d_{Oct} + d_{LU}\} + d_Q) + \]
\[ H(l_{Hdr}d_{Oct} + d_{LU} + d_Q) + \]
\[ (H + 1)l_{LP} + Hl_{HP}d_{Oct} \]

Separates the \(H\) interconnections (CTF) from the first and last ones (S&F). Note that, if the lookup finishes after frame completion during reception, then CTF provides no lower delay than S&F. The other way around, if the lookup is “fast enough”, then CTF provides lower delays than S&F.

Symbols

- \(B_1, B_2, B_3, B_N\): Bridges
- \(E_1, E_2, E_3, E_N\): End Stations
- \(S&F\): Store & Forward
- \(CTF\): Cut-Through Forwarding
- \(l_{HP}\): Frame size of high priority traffic (i.e., the traffic that can be subject to CTF), including all media dependent overhead, in octets.
- \(l_{LP}\): Frame size of low priority traffic (always S&F), including all media dependent overhead, in octets.
- \(l_{Hdr}\): Header length required for destination port lookup in bridges, in octets.
- \(d_{Oct}\): Nominal duration of an octet reflecting the link speed, in \(\mu s\).
- \(d_{LU}\): Destination port lookup duration after \(l_{Hdr}\) octets were received, in \(\mu s\).
- \(d_Q\): Interference-independent queuing delay (MAC delay, PHY delay, etc.), in \(\mu s\).

**Symbol** | **Description**
--- | ---
\(d^\text{max}_{\text{SFF}}\) | Maximum end-to-end delay without CTF of HP frames, in \(\mu s\).
\(d^\text{max}_{\text{CTF}}\) | Maximum end-to-end delay with CTF of HP frames, in \(\mu s\).
\(H\) | Number of possible CTF interconnections (e.g., N-2 for the stream of \(E_1\)).
\(l_{HP}\) | Frame size of high priority traffic (i.e., the traffic that can be subject to CTF), including all media dependent overhead, in octets.
\(l_{LP}\) | Frame size of low priority traffic (always S&F), including all media dependent overhead, in octets. **Assumption:** 1542 octets without preemption, 155 octets with preemption.
\(l_{Hdr}\) | Header length required for destination port lookup in bridges, in octets. **Assumption:** 24 octets (preamble, start of frame delimiter, DA, SA, VLAN-Tag).
\(d_{Oct}\) | Nominal duration of an octet reflecting the link speed, in \(\mu s\).
\(d_{LU}\) | Destination port lookup duration after \(l_{Hdr}\) octets were received, in \(\mu s\). **Assumption:** 0.16 \(\mu s\) (e.g., 20 clock cycles @ 125 MHz).
\(d_Q\) | Interference-independent queuing delay (MAC delay, PHY delay, etc.), in \(\mu s\). **Assumption:** 0.32 \(\mu s\).
CTF Speed-up Analysis: Both Extremes

Interference by low priority and other high priority (CTF) traffic

Uncoordinated

Full Time Division Multiplexing
No Interference

SFF-to-CTF ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>$l_{HP}$</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>512</th>
<th>1024</th>
<th>1542</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>512</th>
<th>1024</th>
<th>1542</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H$</th>
<th>Link</th>
<th>$l_{HP}$</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>512</th>
<th>1024</th>
<th>1542</th>
<th>128</th>
<th>256</th>
<th>512</th>
<th>1024</th>
<th>1542</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>100 Mbps</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1 Gbps</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>2.5 Gbps</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower percent values indicate higher end to end delay performance improvements of CTF over S&F.
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Reasons for standardizing CTF in IEEE 802

Interoperable and deterministic data plane
(examples)

- Distinguish CTF Traffic from S&F Traffic
  - TAGs, Addresses, Ports?
- “Late” error handling
  - Shorten/truncate erroneous frames?
  - Mark erroneous frames?
  - Do nothing?
- Behavior of existing 802.1 Bridge mechanisms for CTF traffic
  - Flow Metering (e.g. Max. SDU size filters, MEF 10.3)?
  - Transmission selection algorithms?
  - Transmission gates?
  - Link speed transitions?¹

Unified Management

- Elements
  - Configuration Parameters (e.g., enable/disable CTF)
  - Device properties (e.g., timing)
  - Status Variables (e.g., erroneous CTF frame counters)

Application and limitations of CTF in Networks

- Quality of Service¹,²
  Limit circulating erroneous frames in topological loops; limit bandwidth loss by erroneous frames
  - Security ¹

Prevent exposure of frame contents (CTF and S&F) to untrusted network segments

Use-Cases: Industrial Automation

Jordon Woods
Networking Requirements: Principal Data Path (Control Loop)

Principle data path between the controller and a device:

- The entities which are involved into the guaranteed latency transmission for the control loop are depicted
- Latencies for link layer control, bus interface, MAC/PHY are incurred at the controller and the device
- Combined store & forward, bridge delay and PHY delay accumulate at each hop in the network.
Networking Requirements: Summary

Industrial applications, such as machine control, are typically connected in long line configurations. For these installations, to minimize wiring cost and complexity, typical installation uses “daisy chain” where each node has (2) external switched ports and an internal port that goes to the end-node.

A common application is motion control where fast loop times are required. 125 µs cycle rate is common for 100 Mbps. Even lower rates (62.5µs/31.25µs ) are desired for 1 Gbps. To support this, low latency for messages through the network is a high priority.

Even Gigabit data rates are not sufficient to solve this problem. Combined store & forward, bridge delay and PHY delay exceed timing budgets. For instance, in a line topology of 64 hops, accumulated latency would exceed a 100 µs control loop even at Gigabit speeds.


These industrial automation systems often have environmental constraints (power, space, radiated emissions, etc.) which make lower data rates desirable. There is a desire in some applications to support brown-field wiring. Often, these devices are resource, power and cost-constrained. For these applications 100Mb/s rates are desired.
Why Line Topologies?

- Physical constraints make cabling for star topologies impractical.
- The construction of the application naturally lends itself to point-to-point connectivity.
- They are, after all, assembly “lines”.
Use Case 2 - Redundancy (ring topologies)

• Typical topology for redundancy in industrial networks is a ring:
  • Inherently different packet latency on the network along the different routes
  • Depending on the setup, packet latency on the two paths can have extreme deviation
  • Depending on the allowed reception window of redundancy mechanisms, ring size is limited
  • For instance, for a 300 byte packet and 100 us packet deviation:
    • At 100 Mbit/s: the max. tolerable difference in the path is consumed in 4 hops
    • At 1 Gbit/s: the max. tolerable difference in the path is consumed in 34 hops
Industrial Network Growth

Industrial automation market > $123B in 2019


Connectivity portion is growing

• Fieldbus (58%), 7% growth
• Ethernet (38%), 20% growth
• Limited wireless adoption

With the advent of a common layer 2 (TSN), Industrie 4.0, China 2025, etc., strong growth is expected.

• Global industrial Ethernet market valued at USD $24B in 2016
• Expected to grow to $58.98 billion by 2022
• CAGR of slightly above 16.20% (2017 and 2022)

Use-cases: Data Center Networks

Paul Congdon, Lily Lv
High Performance Computing (HPC), AI (Artificial Intelligence)/Big Data and Cloud Computing are hot growth areas.

The convergence of these 3 areas is currently a trend in the data center.

- HPC is available as a cloud service in many public offerings (AWS, Azure, Alibaba etc); growing 17.6% CAGR (Compound annual growth rate), 2.5 times faster than on-premise HPC.
- HPDA (High performance data analytics) and HPC-based AI are fast emerging markets, with 16% and 31% CAGR respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>CAGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPC cloud</td>
<td>$2,466</td>
<td>$3,910</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Premise HPC</td>
<td>$27,678</td>
<td>$23,981</td>
<td>$26,774</td>
<td>$31,872</td>
<td>$36,138</td>
<td>$38,214</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hyperion Research, November 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>CAGR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPC Server Revenues</td>
<td>$13,713</td>
<td>$11,846</td>
<td>$13,295</td>
<td>$15,817</td>
<td>$17,942</td>
<td>$19,044</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPDA Server Revenues</td>
<td>$3,598</td>
<td>$3,932</td>
<td>$4,737</td>
<td>$5,457</td>
<td>$6,480</td>
<td>$7,479</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPC-Based AI</td>
<td>$918</td>
<td>$1,094</td>
<td>$1,399</td>
<td>$1,810</td>
<td>$2,745</td>
<td>$3,555</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hyperion Research, November 2020
Latency is Critical in Data Center Networks (1)

High performance applications are driving change in data center, putting pressure on end-to-end latency.

- System scale is increasing significantly, with much more end points and a larger network.
- Synchronization in large parallel applications is critical to job completion time.
- New hardware architectures, such as server disaggregation, require extremely low-latency fabric.

![Parallel AI software diagram](image1)

![Server disaggregation diagram](image2)
Latency is Critical in Data Center Networks (2)

New technologies are emerging to reduce system latency.

- **RDMA (Remote Direct Memory Access)**
  - RDMA enables direct memory access from one server to another, bypassing the TCP/IP stack handling in OS.
  - RDMA runs over InfiniBand or Ethernet.
    - InfiniBand, like Ethernet, is a networking technology, but customized for high throughput and low latency.
  - RDMA improves message transfer time by 5x compared with TCP/IP.
Latency is Critical in Data Center Networks (3)

New technologies are emerging to reduce storage latency.

- **Faster storage media**
  - Persistent storage latencies are approaching memory latencies with the latest Storage Class Memory (SCM) technology.

- **NVMe (Non-Volatile Memory express)**
  - NVMe is a storage interface specification defining communication between host software and PCIe SSD.
  - “The NVMe specification was designed from the ground up for SSDs. It is a much more efficient interface, providing lower latency, and is more scalable for SSDs than legacy interfaces, like serial ATA (SATA).” ([https://nvmexpress.org/](https://nvmexpress.org/))
  - NVMeoF (NVMe over Fabrics) enables “networked” fast storage (SSD/SCM). However, without networking enhancements, the network becomes the largest part of end-to-end latency.

Network latency becomes the bottleneck!
Latency is Critical in Data Center Networks (4)

Types of latency in data center networks: dynamic and static

Dynamic latency = queuing delay + retransmission delay

- Mainly caused by congestion
  - In-cast congestion from parallel applications.
  - In-network congestion from ineffective load balancing.

Static latency = switch forwarding + packet processing + link latency

- Impacted by forwarding table lookup delay, frame reception delay (if store and forwarding) and switching delay
- Impacted by header processing and packet modification
- Propagation delay impacted by distance and speed

- Mainly caused by packet loss due to congestion
  - Priority-based Flow Control (PFC) guarantees no loss
  - PFC has deployment challenges: configuration, deadlocks, head-of-line blocking, congestion spreading

Dynamic latency is the major component and attracts a lot of the industry’s attention: See

- 802 Nendica - The Lossless Network for Data Centers - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.1/dcn/18/1-18-0042-00-ICne.pdf
- 802 Nendica - Intelligent Lossless Data Center Networks - https://mentor.ieee.org/802.1/dcn/20/1-21-0004-00.pdf

However, Static latency becomes significant in high performance scenarios, such as HPC.
Benefits of Cut-Through Forwarding in the HPC Networks

HPC network operates at the nanosecond level

- E2E network latency is only several micro-seconds.
- Per hop latency is required as low as possible, hundreds of nano seconds, or even lower.

CTF is applicable in the HPC network

- Traffic loads can be predictable, leading to congestion avoidance techniques in switches.
- Data center topologies are well structured with similar type of switches.

Regular Topologies: Two typical HPC networks

- **Fat Tree**: is a rearrangeably non-blocking structure, which provides an oversubscription ratio of 1:1 to all servers.

- **Dragonfly**: is a well-balanced network with no oversubscription.
InfiniBand is the ‘first-choice’ in HPC Today (1)

Although 51% of the TOP500 supercomputers use Ethernet fabrics, InfiniBand is the dominant interconnect in TOP100.

Choice of Interconnect

- Infiniband
- Ethernet
- Omnipath
- Other

Top 100: 60% Infiniband, 20% Ethernet, 18% Omnipath, 2% Other
Top 200: 46% Infiniband, 16% Ethernet, 15% Omnipath, 2% Other
Top 300: 38% Infiniband, 13% Ethernet, 12% Omnipath, 15% Other
Top 400: 49% Infiniband, 10% Ethernet, 10% Omnipath, 4% Other
Top 500: 51% Infiniband, 9% Ethernet, 9% Omnipath, 31% Other
InfiniBand is the ‘first-choice’ in HPC Today (2)

InfiniBand switch per hop latency is much lower than Ethernet

- Ethernet switching chipset latency can be greater than 100s of ns.
- Latency increases with frame size using store-and-forward.
- InfiniBand switching chipset latency can be less than 100ns.
- Cut-through is an important feature for InfiniBand to keep per hop latency low.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethernet (non-CT)</th>
<th>BRCM THK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>128*25G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One 25GbE Port to One 25GbE Port Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frame Size(Bytes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency(ns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IB (with CT)</th>
<th>MLNX Switch-IB</th>
<th>MLNX Switch-IB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port</td>
<td>144*25G</td>
<td>144*25G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency</td>
<td>90ns</td>
<td>90ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tolly, February 2016

Ethernet needs CTF to further penetrate HPC

Ethernet has great opportunity to become more competitive in HPC market.

- TOP 500 shows Ethernet Interconnects already takes the largest share (51%)
- Ethernet has its own advantages
  - Ethernet is ubiquitous technology.
    - Cost-effective solution
    - Relatively easy to deploy and manage
    - Leading technology development
  - Ethernet provides large bandwidth connectivity
    - up to 400G, 100G for single lane
    - towards 800G, 200G for single lane

The obvious gap of Ethernet is latency
- Per hop latency gap is significant compared with InfiniBand
- CTF is a good method to improve per hop latency
Use-Cases: Professional Audio/Video

Henning Kaltheuner
Possible integration into IEEE 802.1: General

Johannes Specht
Location in IEEE 802.1 Standards

Dedicated IEEE 802.1 Standard for CTF

• Not one or more amendment[s] to existing IEEE 802.1 Standards.

Reference Usage

• Select/import and adjust existing protocols and protocol procedures from other IEEE 802.1 Standards:
  1. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx
  2. IEEE Std 802.1CB-20xx
  3. IEEE Std 802.1AC-20xx

Some Implications

• At least some of the implications:
  1. No distribution of CTF across multiple IEEE 802.1 Standards documents
  2. Existing protocols and protocol procedures not addressed are basically “beyond specification”
  3. A simple way for inclusion without adjustment is basically “as specified in x.y.z of IEEE Std 802.1A.B.C”
Main Contents

CTF in Networks
- Structure and elements (e.g., “CTF Bridge”)
- QoS Maintenance/Requirements
- Usage/Performance aspects

CTF in Bridges
- Bridge data plane behavior and managed objects (YANG)
  - MAC Relay Entity/Forwarding Process
  - Bridge Port Transmit and Receive

Requirements for CTF in Bridges

“Features” for QoS Maintenance and usage

---

1) Issues introduced by CTF (cmp. 6.5 of IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx)
2) See earlier slides in this slide set
3) To the extent possible in IEEE 802.1
Possible integration into IEEE 802.1: CTF in Bridges

Johannes Specht
CTF in Bridges: Feature Set

• Required:
  1. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: “Basic” VLAN/MAC Bridge Operations
  2. New for CTF: Fallbacks from CTF to S&F (i.e., to behavior from existing IEEE 802.1 Standards)
  3. New for CTF: Late error handling

• Options/within specification:
  1. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: Per-Stream Filtering and Policing (PSFP)
  2. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: Congestion Isolation (CI)
  3. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: Enhancements for Scheduled Traffic (EST)
  4. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: Enhanced Transmission Selection (ETS)
  5. IEEE Std 802.1CB-20xx: Frame Replication and Elimination for Reliability (FRER)
  6. IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx: Preemption

• For later discussion in IEEE WG 802.1:
  1. New for CTF: Header check sequences

---

1) Not necessarily required - header check sequences imply several challenges (interoperability with non-CTF bridges, loose definition of headers, etc.). This topic can be considered thoroughly during a IEEE 802.1 standards development project.
CTF in Bridges: Basic path of Frames through Bridges

1. Reception: Initial Identification/separation from S&F Traffic
   Reception on a Port for which CTF has been enabled
   AND (Priority decoded from VLAN-TAG (6.9 and 6.20 of IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx)
   OR Stream Identification (IEEE Std 802.1CB-20xx),
   used by stream filters followed by stream gates for Internal Priority Value assignments
   (IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx))

2. Queuing
   Queuing in traffic classes (8.6.6 of IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx) for which CTF is supported AND enabled

3. Transmission
   • Strict priority transmission selection algorithm OR enhanced transmission section algorithm (if supported),
   • followed by transmission gates (if supported)
   • Late error handling, in case of late errors

---
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---

New Management Parameter(s)
- CTFReceiveEnable
  (Boolean, RW, default False)
- Per-Port

New Management Parameter(s)
- CTFTransmitEnable
  (Boolean, RW, default False)
- CTFTransmitSupported
  (Boolean, RO)
- Per-Port per traffic class

---

1) The Mask-and-Match stream identification, as currently under development in IEEE P802.1CBd, effectively enables a priority to be determined by at least the Destination Address. As one result, there are different (potentially co-existing) perceptions of a “header”.
CTF in Bridges: Late Errors

1. Causes
   1. Errors discovered by FCS verification
   2. Maximum SDU size filtering limit reached during reception
   3. Stream gates transition to closed state\(^1\)
   4. Color of flow meters (MEF 10.3) transitions to red
   5. The per traffic class maximum SDU size of transmission gates is exceeded

2. Handling
   1. Treat the frame end by PSFP’s maximum SDU size filtering, stream gates and flow meters (MEF 10.3)
   2. Remove the frame from all queues
   3. Shorten the end of frame by an implementation-specific amount
   4. Erroneous frame marking (end of frame)

---

\(\text{1)}\) In contrast to stream gates, it is not intended to involve late error handling if EST transmission gates transition to a closed state during transmission for compatibility (see 8.6.8.4 of IEEE Std 802.1Q-20xx).

---
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CTF in Bridges: Fallbacks to S&F

1. On the main relay path
   1. CTF reception is disabled on a Bridge Port
   2. CTF is disabled/unsupported by a traffic class on a Bridge Port
   3. No matching filtering entry in the FDB (i.e., flooding)
   4. Association of a frame under reception with a FRER recovery function
   5. Different link speed between reception-transmission port pairs
   6. Frame length changes (e.g., TAG removal)

2. Leaving the relay path
   1. To Higher Layer Entities
   2. FDB for learning

3. Implicit
   1. Interfering frames during transmission
Possible integration into IEEE 802.1: CTF in Networks
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CTF in Networks: Circulating frames (1)

Problem Description

- Erroneous frame under reception by CTF Bridge are classified for CTF, and are transmitted by unintended Bridge Ports before FCS verification.
- The issue affects networks/network segments with topological loops, in which such frames can circulate for “a while”.

Observation

- It does not matter whether erroneous frames were intended for CTF or S&F.
  1. Frames intended for S&F can be misclassified by the receiving CTF Bridge as CTF frames.
  2. Frames intended for CTF can remain classified for CTF, but match a wrong FDB entry (i.e., wrong port map).
  3. Frames misclassified as S&F frames are no issue (i.e., FCS verification prior to transmission).

Goal Definition

Frame removal after at most one round, if FCS verification can discover the error.
CTF in Networks: Circulating frames (2)

Network Requirements

• **Default**
  At least one S&F-only hop in each topological loop.

• **Potential Alternative**
  Only explicit FDB filtering entries for all traffic in all CTF Bridges in a loop
  AND
  the probability of errors affecting the same frame on two or more different links is negligible low.

• **Potential Alternative**
  The topological loop contains sufficient links(hops),
  AND
  all Bridges in the loop limit frame lengths of CTF traffic,
  AND
  the sum of the minimum frame shorting in all Bridges in the loop is greater than the frame length limit.
Problem Description

• Erroneous frame under reception by CTF Bridge are classified for CTF, and transmitted before FCS verification by
  • unintended Bridge Ports AND/OR
  • in the wrong traffic class.

• Such frames in the affected traffic class in Bridge transmission Ports can cause unplanned interferences in this traffic class or any higher priority traffic classes (oversized frames) and reduce the bandwidth available for lower priority traffic classes.

• The issue affects every traffic class in Bridge transmission Ports if CTF reception in at least one other Bridge Port is enabled.
CTF in Networks: Bandwidth loss (2)

Network Recommendations

• Plan for additional interference/bandwidth usage
• If applicable\(^1\), use disjoint redundant paths via FRER
• If applicable\(^2\), use PSFP
  • Max. SDU size filtering can limit the effect of oversized frames
  • Proper usage of flow meters and/or stream gates depends on the traffic characteristics - for example\(^3\):
    • Flow meters (MEF 10.3) can limit the bandwidth of uncoordinated traffic
    • Stream gates can be used for TDM traffic

Implicit, but still present

• Frame shorting (limits the propagation/impact)

\(^1\) Disjoint paths are unacceptable for some systems (e.g., due to cost reasons).
\(^2\) The planning required to properly configure PSFP can be unacceptable for some systems.
\(^3\) See the introduction of this slide set.
Problem Statements
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Problem Statements: Introduction

Background
• It is intended to standardize CTF for Bridges and Bridged Networks in IEEE WG 802.1. A proposal on how this can be done has been outlined before.
• The lower layers in this proposal were intentionally left out. In particular, details on the interface between IEEE 802.1 Bridges and IEEE 802.3 MACs were omitted: The MAC Service Interface.

Problem Summary
• The standardized MAC Service Interface treats frame transfers between MAC and Bridge as atomic operations that transfer entire frames (from destination address to frame check sequence) as a whole:
  • `MA_DATA.request` (frame transmission)
  • `MA_DATA.indication` (frame reception)
• Due to the atomic property of these operations, the MAC Service Interface cannot support CTF.
• IEEE WG 802.1 and IEEE WG 802.3 are asked to collaborate on a solution that allows CTF in Bridges.

Refinement
• The subsequent content details the problem further.
• Remarks:
  • None of the subsequent contents shall imply a requirement to change the standardized MAC Service Interface!
  • It is not intended to shift present and potential future functions from IEEE 802.3 to IEEE 802.1 or vice versa!
Questions & Answers
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Call for Actions

Proposal for IEEE 802.1

Authorize IEEE 802.1 to craft PAR/CSD for an IEEE 802.1 Standard for CTF in Bridges and Bridged Networks

• CTF is technically feasible
• Market Potential for CTF exists
• A way to integrate CTF into the 802.1 Standards environment has been shown
• How QoS challenges can be addressed has been shown
Thank you for your Attention!

Questions, Opinions, Ideas?