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A Typical Use Case

Cloud computing multi-tenancy

Open vSwitch: v2.7.0
DPDK: 17.02
GCC/GLIBC: 6.2.1/2.23
Linux: 4.7.5-200.fc24.x86_64
CPU: Xeon E5-2699 v3 @ 2.30GHz
NIC: 82599ES 10-Gigabit
Traffic: Round-robin DST IP
OvS-DPDK Scalability AS IS

Throughput drops significantly as the number of guests increases

Performance doesn’t scale by increasing the number of CPUs

Lack of clear guidelines for customer deployment

* Test and System Configurations: Estimates are based on internal Intel analysis using Intel® Server Board S2600WT, Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2689 v3 @ 2.30GHz, Intel® 82599ES 10 Gigabit Ethernet Controller
Datapath Abstraction

PVP (North-South)

```
while (true) {
    foreach rxq {
        recv packets;
        table lookup;
    }
    foreach txq {
        send packets;
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}
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Analysis

Cache efficiency
CPU efficiency
CPU utilization

Work hard
Work smart
Multitasking

Good hardware work ethic

So-called optimization
Cache Efficiency: Maximize Burst Size

Vhost Tx Fragmentation: 1 burst for multiple guests

How does it impact? Poor cache efficiency!

The solution: Tx-Buffering

Side effects: Increase of latency

Narrow the gap

- For throughput peaks only
- Timeout settings tuning

* Test and System Configurations: Estimates are based on internal Intel analysis using Intel® Server Board S2600WT, Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2699 v3 @ 2.30GHz, Intel® 82599ES 10 Gigabit Ethernet Controller
CPU Efficiency: Minimize Empty Polling

Allocate CPU based on expected traffic model

- NIC cycle per 64B packet: ~30
- Vhost cycle per 64B packet: ~70 + memory latency
- NIC Rx + Vhost Tx ~= Vhost Rx + NIC Tx

```bash
[root]# ./ovs-appctl dpif-netdev/pmd-rxq-show
pmd thread numa_id 0 core_id 13:
  isolated : false
  port: Vhost-user1 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user2 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user4 queue-id: 0
pmd thread numa_id 0 core_id 12:
  isolated : false
  port: dpdk0 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user3 queue-id: 0
```

1:1 core allocation for NIC and Vhost if 1:1 north vs. south traffic

```bash
[root]# ./ovs-appctl dpif-netdev/pmd-rxq-show
pmd thread numa_id 0 core_id 13:
  isolated : true
  port: Vhost-user1 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user2 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user3 queue-id: 0
  port: Vhost-user4 queue-id: 0
pmd thread numa_id 0 core_id 12:
  isolated : true
  port: dpdk0 queue-id: 0
```

The default core mapping doesn’t fit for all
How Did We Do?

Not bad

Test based on a POC patch, OvS formal patch WIP

* Test and System Configurations: Estimates are based on internal Intel analysis using Intel® Server Board S2600WT, Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2699 v3 @ 2.30GHz, Intel® 82599ES 10 Gigabit Ethernet Controller
CPU Utilization: Enable Hyper-Threading

Does Hyper-Threading help? Yes!
- Hiding memory access latency
- Squeezing execution units

But don’t spoil it!
- Keep spinlocks inside one CPU

Side effects: Again, increase of latency

2 threads for NIC and 2 for Vhost, (NN, VV) or (NV, NV)?
Hyper-Threading Gain

OVS-DPDK PVP throughput scaling with VM number
* 2 NICs, 2 CPUs 4 HT PMDs
* Linux IPV4 forwarding

Keep Txq spinlocks inside one CPU

30% HT gain

* Test and System Configurations: Estimates are based on internal Intel analysis using Intel® Server Board S2600WT, Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2699 v3 @ 2.30GHz, Intel® 82599ES 10 Gigabit Ethernet Controller
Finally, With All Due Optimization

About 3x the throughput

3.5x the throughput!!!

2.9x the throughput!!!

IMIX: Uniform distribution random [64, 1518]

* Test and System Configurations: Estimates are based on internal Intel analysis using Intel® Server Board S2600WT, Intel(R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2699 v3 @ 2.30GHz, Intel® 82599ES 10 Gigabit Ethernet Controller
Latency Is The Price To Pay

Latency is increased due to

- Extra overhead of buffering mechanism
- Lower frequency due to Hyper-Threading

Latency is decided by

- Guests per PMD core (Round-Robin)
- Traffic pattern (How fragmented?)
- Tx-Buffering timeout settings

No silver bullet, only tradeoffs and priorities
Deployment Guideline

Enable Vhost Tx-Buffering for throughput
- Enable for throughput peaks dynamically
- Evaluate timeout settings carefully

Allocate CPU based on expected traffic model

Utilize Hyper-Threading for PMDs
- For 1 CPU, 1 HT for NIC, 1 HT for Vhost
- For 2 CPUs, 2 HTs on 1 CPU for NIC, 2 HTs on another for Vhost
  - For more than 2 CPUs, per case tuning is required