Lecture 33: Router Architecture, FIFO, RED, ECN

**Input Port Functions**

- Physical layer: bit-level reception
- Data link layer: e.g., CSMA/CD

Packet forwarding:
- given packet destination, lookup output port using forwarding table in input port memory
- goal: complete input port processing at “line speed”
- input queueing: if packets arrive faster than forwarding rate into switch fabric

**Input Port Queueing**

- Fabric slower than input ports taken together ⇒ queueing may occur at input queues

**Head-of-the-Line (HOL) blocking**: queued packet at the front of queue prevents others in queue from moving forward

Queueing delay and loss can happen at input port buffer

**Router Architecture Overview**

Two key router functions:
1. run routing algorithms/protocol (RIP, OSPF, BGP)
2. forward packets from incoming to outgoing link
Three Types of Switching Fabrics

Switching Via Memory
First generation routers:
- traditional computers, with switching under direct control of CPU
- packet copied into system’s memory
- speed limited by memory bandwidth
  (2 bus crossings per datagram)

Switching Via a Bus
Packet transferred from input port memory to output port memory via a shared bus

Bus contention: switching speed limited by bus bandwidth

1 Gbps bus (e.g., Cisco 1900): sufficient speed for access and enterprise routers (not regional or backbone)

Switching via Interconnect
Overcome bus bandwidth limitations

Banyan networks and other interconnection nets initially developed to connect processors in multiprocessor system

Advanced design: fragment datagrams into fixed length cells, switch cells through the fabric

E.g., Cisco 12000: switches Gbps through the interconnect
Output Ports

Output queueing: buffering required when packets arrive from fabric faster than the line transmission rate

Scheduling discipline chooses among queued packets for transmission

Queueing delay and loss can also happen at output port buffer

Four Sources of Packet Delay

1. Node processing/service time:
   • check bit errors
   • determine output link

2. Queueing delay
   • time waiting at output link for transmission
   • depends on congestion level at router

3. Transmission delay ($\mu$):
   • $R$ = link bandwidth (bps)
   • $L$ = packet length (bits)
   • transmission delay = $L/R$

4. Propagation delay ($\tau$):
   • $d$ = length of physical link
   • $s$ = propagation speed in medium (~$2 \times 10^8$ m/sec)
   • propagation delay (latency) = $d/s$

Note: $s$ and $R$ are very different quantities!

Per-Node Delay

\[ d_{\text{per-node}} = d_{\text{proc}} + d_{\text{queue}} + d_{\text{trans}} + d_{\text{prop}} \]

\[ d_{\text{proc}} = \text{processing delay} \]
   • typically a few $\mu$s or less

\[ d_{\text{queue}} = \text{queueing delay} \]
   • depends on congestion

\[ d_{\text{trans}} = \text{transmission delay} \]
   • = $L/R$, significant for low-speed links

\[ d_{\text{prop}} = \text{propagation delay} \]
   • a few $\mu$s to hundreds of ms

Packet Switching: Store and Forward

Transmission delay: it takes $L/R$ seconds to transmit packet of $L$ bits onto link of $R$ bps

Entire packet must arrive at a router before it can be transmitted onto the next link: store and forward

Total transmission delay = $3L/R$

Example:

• $L$ = 7.5 Mbits
• $R$ = 1.5 Mbps
• total transmission delay = 15 sec
**Queueing Delay**

\[ L = \text{packet length (bits)} \]

\[ a = \text{average packet arrival rate} \]

\[ R = \text{link bandwidth (bps)} \]

Traffic intensity \( I = \frac{L a}{R} \)

- \( I \approx 0 \): average queueing delay small
- \( I \approx 1 \): delays become large
- \( I > 1 \): more “work” arriving than can be serviced, average delay infinite!

Queue (buffer) preceding a link has finite capacity
- when packet arrives at full queue, packet is dropped (lost)
- lost packet may be retransmitted by the previous node, by the source, or not at all

**Queue Management**

Design issues:
- scheduling discipline:
  - choose next packet to send on link
  - e.g., FIFO, priority queue, fair queue
  - fairness issue
  - delay bound
- drop policy:
  - drop tail: drop newly arriving packet
  - drop head: long queued packet may no longer be of use to receiver
  - priority drop: drop on a priority basis
  - random drop: either on overflow or early drop
- cost of operation

Traditionally: FIFO with drop tail

**First In First Out (FIFO)**

- queued packets sent in order of arrival
- low cost
- not fair
- no delay bound

**Problems with Drop-Tail**

Traditionally, FIFO with drop tail, however:
- TCP uses packet drop as congestion signal
- congestion signal is time delayed in reaching sender
- problems:
  - drop-tail queuing leads to bursty losses
  - when a link becomes congested many arriving packets encounter a full queue
  - as a result, many flows divide sending rate in half and, many individual flows lose multiple packets
  - growth of cwnd’s across flows can become synchronized
  - unfair to long-RTT connections
**Slow Feedback from Drop Tail**

Feedback is given only when buffer is completely full
- even though the buffer has been filling up for a while

Plus, the filling buffer is increasing RTT
- and RTT variance

May be better to give **early feedback**
- get 1-2 largest flows to slow down, not all of them
- get these flows to slow down before buffer overflows

---

**Early Drop**

**Early drop:**
- watch the queue and start dropping before the queue is full
- give time for congestion signal to propagate back to source
- operate queue at knee capacity, prevent overflow

**Goals:**
- operate router at “knee” capacity: low delay, high throughput
- keep average queue size low
- but allow for fluctuations in actual queue size to accommodate **bursty traffic** and **transient congestion**

---

**Random Drop**

Random drop:
- observe: flows with more packets in queue have a higher probability of being dropped
- drop packet randomly if **average queue length** is above threshold
  - high **instantaneous** queue length could simply mean transient congestion
  - high **average** queue length indicates persistent congestion
- what would be a good way to measure average queue length?

---

**Random Early Drop**

Random Early Drop:
- router notices that the queue is getting backlogged
- and randomly drops packets to signal congestion early
  - drop probability increases as queue length increases
  - if buffer is below some level, don’t drop anything
  - otherwise, set drop probability as function of queue

**Implementation:**
- define a minimum (min_th) and a maximum (max_th) queue occupancy thresholds
- monitor average queue length (aqlen)

---

*Peterson & Davie*
Random Early Drop

- monitor average queue length:
  \[ aqlen \leftarrow (1-w) \text{aqlen} + wq, \]
  where:
  - aqlen: average queue length
  - w: weight
  - q: instantaneous queue length

- provide congestion avoidance by controlling average queue length
  - aqlen < min_th, no packet is dropped
  - aqlen > max_th, all packets are dropped
  - between the two thresholds, each packet has some probability \( P() \leq \text{MaxP} \) to be dropped, depending on size and duration of queue occupancy

Properties of RED

- Drops packets \text{before queue is full}
  - in the hope of reducing the rates of some flows

- Drops packet \text{in proportion to each flow’s rate}
  - high-rate flows have more packets in queue
  - hence, a higher chance of being selected

- Drops are spaced out in time
  - should help \text{desynchronize the TCP senders}

- Tolerant of burstiness in the traffic
  - by basing the decisions on \text{average queue length}

- But, hard to get tunable parameters just right
  - when parameters are not right, RED doesn’t help
  - as a result, implemented and deployed but not used

Approaches Towards Congestion Control

End-end congestion control:
- approach taken by TCP
- no explicit feedback from network
- congestion inferred from end-system observed loss, delay

Network-assisted congestion control:
- routers provide feedback to end systems
  - single bit indicating congestion, or
  - specific sending rate

Explicit Congestion Notification

- Early dropping of packets
  - good: gives early feedback
  - bad: has to drop the packet to give the feedback

- Explicit Congestion Notification
  - router marks the packet with an ECN bit
  - receiver reflects ECN to sender
  - sender interprets it as a sign of congestion and reduce rate
Explicit Congestion Notification

Implementation issues:

• must be supported by both end hosts and routers
• requires 2 bits in the IP header for forward (router to receiver) direction
  • one for the ECN mark; the other to indicate ECN capability
  • solution: borrow 2 Type-Of-Service bits in IPv4 header
• requires another 2 bits in TCP header for receiver to signal sender (reverse direction)