Lecture 25: Interconnection Networks

- Topics: communication latency, centralized and decentralized switches, routing, deadlocks (Appendix E)
- Review session, Wednesday Dec 1st, 10-12, LCR (MEB 3147)
- Final exam reminders
 - Come early, 10:35 12:15
 - Same rules as first midterm, open books/notes/...,
 - Can use calculators and laptops (no search or internet)
 - 20% from first midterm material; remaining 80% from caches, multiprocs, TM
 - 20% new problems
 - Attempt every question

Topologies

- Internet topologies are not very regular they grew incrementally
- Supercomputers have regular interconnect topologies and trade off cost for high bandwidth
- Nodes can be connected with
 - centralized switch: all nodes have input and output wires going to a centralized chip that internally handles all routing
 - decentralized switch: each node is connected to a switch that routes data to one of a few neighbors

Centralized Crossbar Switch



Centralized Crossbar Switch



- Assuming each node has one input and one output, a crossbar can provide maximum bandwidth: N messages can be sent as long as there are N unique sources and N unique destinations
- Maximum overhead: WN² internal switches, where W is data width and N is number of nodes
- To reduce overhead, use smaller switches as building blocks – trade off overhead for lower effective bandwidth

Switch with Omega Network



Omega Network Properties

- The switch complexity is now O(N log N)
- Contention increases: P0 \rightarrow P5 and P1 \rightarrow P7 cannot happen concurrently (this was possible in a crossbar)
- To deal with contention, can increase the number of levels (redundant paths) – by mirroring the network, we can route from P0 to P5 via N intermediate nodes, while increasing complexity by a factor of 2

Tree Network

- Complexity is O(N)
- Can yield low latencies when communicating with neighbors
- Can build a fat tree by having multiple incoming and outgoing links



- Split N nodes into two groups of N/2 nodes such that the bandwidth between these two groups is minimum: that is the bisection bandwidth
- Why is it relevant: if traffic is completely random, the probability of a message going across the two halves is 1/2 – if all nodes send a message, the bisection bandwidth will have to be N/2
- The concept of bisection bandwidth confirms that the tree network is not suited for random traffic patterns, but for localized traffic patterns

Distributed Switches: Ring

- Each node is connected to a 3x3 switch that routes messages between the node and its two neighbors
- Effectively a repeated bus: multiple messages in transit
- Disadvantage: bisection bandwidth of 2 and N/2 hops on average



- Performance can be increased by throwing more hardware at the problem: fully-connected switches: every switch is connected to every other switch: N² wiring complexity, N² /4 bisection bandwidth
- Most commercial designs adopt a point between the two extremes (ring and fully-connected):
 - > Grid: each node connects with its N, E, W, S neighbors
 - > Torus: connections wrap around
 - Hypercube: links between nodes whose binary names differ in a single bit

Topology Examples







Hypercube

12

Torus

Criteria	Bus	Ring	2Dtorus	6-cube	Fully connected
Performance Bisection bandwidth					
Cost					
Total links					

Topology Examples







Hypercube

Torus

Criteria	Bus	Ring	2Dtorus	6-cube	Fully connected
Performance Bisection bandwidth	1	2	16	32	1024
Cost					
Ports/switch		3	5	7	64
Total links	1	128	192	256	2080

13



- Consider a k-ary d-cube: a d-dimension array with k elements in each dimension, there are links between elements that differ in one dimension by 1 (mod k)
- Number of nodes $N = k^d$

Number of switches	ŝ		
Switch degree			
Number of links			
Pins per node	ł		

Avg. routing distance:DiameterBisection bandwidthSwitch complexity

Should we minimize or maximize dimension?

- Consider a k-ary d-cube: a d-dimension array with k elements in each dimension, there are links between elements that differ in one dimension by 1 (mod k)
- Number of nodes $N = k^d$

Number of switches :NSwitch degree:2d + 1Number of links:NdPins per node:2wd

Avg. routing distance:d(k-1)/2Diameter:d(k-1)Bisection bandwidth: $2wk^{d-1}$ Switch complexity:(2d + 1)^2

d(k-1)/2 d(k-1) 2wk^{d-1} (2d + 1)²

(with no wraparound)

Should we minimize or maximize dimension?



- Deterministic routing: given the source and destination, there exists a unique route
- Adaptive routing: a switch may alter the route in order to deal with unexpected events (faults, congestion) – more complexity in the router vs. potentially better performance
- Example of deterministic routing: dimension order routing: send packet along first dimension until destination co-ord (in that dimension) is reached, then next dimension, etc.



 Deadlock happens when there is a cycle of resource dependencies – a process holds on to a resource (A) and attempts to acquire another resource (B) – A is not relinquished until B is acquired

Deadlock Example



Each message is attempting to make a left turn – it must acquire an output port, while still holding on to a series of input and output ports

- Number edges and show that all routes will traverse edges in increasing (or decreasing) order therefore, it will be impossible to have cyclic dependencies
- Example: k-ary 2-d array with dimension routing: first route along x-dimension, then along y



- The earlier proof does not apply to tori because of wraparound edges
- Partition resources across multiple virtual channels
- If a wraparound edge must be used in a torus, travel on virtual channel 1, else travel on virtual channel 0

- Consider the eight possible turns in a 2-d array (note that turns lead to cycles)
- By preventing just two turns, cycles can be eliminated
- Dimension-order routing disallows four turns
- Helps avoid deadlock even in adaptive routing





Bullet