A Comparison of Network Processor Programming Environments

Niraj Shah
William Plishker
Kurt Keutzer

Outline

• Motivation
• Study
  - Overview
  - Performance measurement
  - Development Process
  - Resource Usage
• Conclusions
• Future Work
**Motivation**

- Electronic systems designers want silicon customization
- Application Specific IC design becoming increasingly risky
  - Costly
  - Unpredictable
- Fuels the rise of programmable devices or ASIPs (Application Specific Instruction Processors)
  - Networking
  - Multimedia
  - Graphics
- ASIPs
  - Architectures have been explored in great depth
  - Modest progress on programming environments
  - But, the success of users is dependent on their ability to program these effectively

**Existing ASIP Programming Environments**

- Macro assembler
- C language variants
  - Subset: no function pointers or recursion
  - Superset: language features for threads, processes, and data allocation
- Higher level programming environments
  - Application domain-specific, block based
The Study

- Focus on Networking*
- Use a representative network processor
- Implement two applications
- With two programming environments
- Compare
  - Achievable performance
  - Development process
  - Resource usage


Representative NP: Intel IXP1200
Applications Overview

- IP version 4 (IPv4) packet forwarding
  - Data plane of router
  - Baseline functionality for network equipment

- Differentiated Services (DiffServ)
  - Quality of service in IP
  - Provision network resources for categories of traffic

Programming Environment: IXP-C

- Subset of C
  - Loops, conditionals, function calls
  - Basic and abstract data types

- Explicit parallelism - each microengine programmed independently

- Explicit threading model

- User defined data allocation
Programming Environment: NP-Click

*Developed here*

- **Click** concepts
  - elements
  - communication via push and pull of packets

- Combined with salient features of underlying hardware
  - threads
  - data layout
  - arbitration of shared resources


Evaluation

- **IPv4 Performance Measurement**
  - 16x100Mbps IPv4 packet forwarder
  - 1000 entry route table
  - Maximum sustainable data rate on a variety of packet sizes as proxy for performance

- **DiffServ Performance Measurement**
  - 4x100Mbps DiffServ node
  - Ingress: a variety of packet classes (Assured Forwarding, Best Effort, Expedited Forwarding).
  - Measure egress data rate of constituent flows
IPv4 Forwarding Performance

Performance Summary

- **IPv4 Forwarding Performance**
  - IXP-C: 75-85% of line rate
  - NP-Click: 55-85% of line rate, 93% of IXP-C (IETF)
  - Assembler: Performs at 85-100% of line rate

- **DiffServ Performance**
  - Both implementations received packets at line rate and perform similarly
  - NP-Click within 10% of IXP-C for higher priority flows
Development Process Comparison

NP-Click

- Functional correctness in a few days
- Poor initial performance
- Most of time spent profiling/optimizing
  - Changing mapping to microengines
  - Element implementations
  - Arbitration schemes
- IPv4: 100 person hours
- DiffServ: additional 120 person hours

IXP-C

- Mostly spent reaching functional correctness
- High initial performance
- Isolating & fixing multi-threading bugs
- Profiling and optimizing difficult
  - Only incremental changes
- IPv4: 400 person hours
- DiffServ: additional 320 person hours

Development Process Summary
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Summary: IXP-C

- Principal advantages
  - Resource usage: smaller code size, fewer microengines
  - Performance edge: slightly higher data rate
- Drawbacks
  - Much longer development effort
  - Long time to reach functional correctness
  - Performance tuning difficult → only incremental changes
  - Final implementation largely dependent on initial implementation

Summary: NP-Click

- Primary advantages
  - Very short time to functional correctness
  - Explore design space of implementations
  - 2.6-4x shorter overall design effort
- Disadvantages
  - Resource usage: much larger code size
  - Small performance overhead
    - IPv4: 7% less than IXP-C for IETF traffic mix
    - DiffServ: within 10% for higher priority flows
- More effort using NP-Click spent can reduce performance gap and resource usage
Conclusions

- Embedded software development
  - Performance-focused
  - Effort bound
- Best use of IXP-C
  - Squeeze the most performance from chip
  - Tight resource constraints
- Best use of NP-Click
  - Effort bound projects
  - Little intuition about design space
- These results are applicable to current and newer network processors

Future Work

- Automation of mapping application to architecture
  - Task Allocation was recently done*
  - Memory and Communication are underway
- Perform similar study on newer, larger scale NP architectures
  - Will highlight NP-Click’s design space exploration
  - Even more difficult to program in IXP-C