

AN APPROACH FOR SYNTESIS OF NON-CONFLICT SCHEDULE WITH OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE OF SUB MATRICES IN A CROSSBAR SWITCHING NODE

K. Kolchakov, V.Monov

Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
kkolchakov@abv.bg, vmonov@iit.bas.bg

Abstract: In this paper, we present the synthesis of an optimal conflict-free schedule in terms of performance of the sub matrices in the connection matrix of a scheduling algorithm with diagonal activations of joint sub-switching matrices for a crossbar switch node. The algorithm was recently proved to be optimal with respect to the overall performance and necessary memory.

Key words: network nodes, node traffic, crossbar switch, conflict elimination, packet messages.

INTRODUCTION

The traffic via Crossbar switching nodes is casual and depends on the users. The formulation of a conflict issue during operation of the switching nodes is as follows. The dimensions of switches in the switching nodes are $N \times N$, where N sources of packet messages are connected to N receivers via the switches of the switching node. The traffic is random by nature and conflicts are available in the following two cases:

- When one source of message requests communication to two or more message receivers.
- When one message receiver receives communication requests from two or more message sources.

The evasion of conflicts is directly related to the switching node performance. The status of the switch of the switching node is represented with the so called connection matrix. For $N \times N$ dimensional switch the dimension of the connection matrix T is $N \times N$ also, where every element $T_{ij} = 1$ if the connection request from i - source to j - receiver exists. In the opposite case $T_{ij} = 0$.

A conflict situation arises if any row of the connection matrix has more than a single 1, which corresponds to the case when one source requests a connection with more than one receiver. The presence of more than a single 1 in any column of the matrix T also indicates a conflict situation, it means that two or more sources have requested a connection with the same receiver.[1,2,5,6,7]

The scheduling algorithm with diagonal activations of joint sub-switching matrices (ADAJS) was examined in [1] and proved to be optimal with respect to the overall performance

and necessary memory by means of analyzing and comparing fourteen different algorithms for design of a non-conflict schedule.

In this study, our aim is to synthesize a conflict-free schedule which is optimal with respect to the performance of the sub matrices entering into the connections matrix used in the algorithm ADAJS.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ALGORITHM

The connections matrix T with $N \times N$ size, where N is an integer being a degree of two, is divided into sub- matrices (S) with dimension $n \times n$, (n also is a degree of two), i.e:

$$T = [S_{ij}], \quad i = 1-n, j = 1-n$$

The sets of sub matrices located along the main diagonal are processed simultaneously in each of the diagonals. For sub matrices in diagonals parallel to the main one, the principle of reconciliation is used [2].

The idea of synthesis of the algorithm ADAJS is based on the knowledge that the diagonal sub matrices with requests for service in the matrix T are non-conflict in the diagonal where they are located. There are diagonals with sub matrices of requests that are non-conflict to one another. Figure 1 shows joint couples of non-conflict diagonals with sub matrices of requests for service and the main diagonal of sub matrices that can not be jointed with anyone else [2].




Figure 1. Diagonal activation of joint sub matrices.

The whole process of the implementation of ADAJS algorithm for obtaining a non-conflict schedule is divided into steps. The first step refers to the main diagonal sub matrices processed simultaneously and without conflict. The next steps are related to the reconciliation of the diagonals parallel to the main diagonal by pairs (Figure 1) [2].

The analytical description of the steps shown in Figure 1 is as follows:

- Step1: Activation of sub matrices $S_{11}, S_{22}, S_{33}, S_{44}$
- Step3: Activation of sub matrices $S_{21}, S_{32}, S_{43}, S_{14}$
- Step2: Activation of sub matrices $S_{41}, S_{12}, S_{23}, S_{34}$
- Step4: Activation of sub matrices $S_{31}, S_{42}, S_{13}, S_{24}$

$$T = [S_{ij}], \quad i = 1 - 4, j = 1 - 4$$

The size (n) of the sub matrix determines the number of steps (I) as follows

$$I = N/n \quad (1)$$

For $N = \text{const.}$, $I = f(n)$, where $1 < n \leq N/2$.

OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE ALGORITHM FOR NON-CONFLICT SCHEDULING IN SUB MATRICES

The optimal size of the sub matrices for different sizes N is determined by the minimum processing time. A clear minimum of the operating time (TW) is seen when $n = 4$ for $N = 128, 256, 512, 1024$ and 2048 . It can be concluded that

for size N up to 2048, the optimal sub matrix size is $n_{\text{opt}} = 4$ [3].

Two algorithms are used to obtain conflict-free schedule in the sub matrices in the ADAJS algorithm:

1. Algorithm with joint diagonals activations (AJDA) [4].
2. Algorithm by diagonal connectivity matrix activation (ADA) [6].

Typical for both algorithms is that they admit zero solutions, which reduces their performance.

In the new synthesized algorithm AOP (Algorithm for Optimal Performance) the joint diagonals are used again but with a periodical check is performed for depletion of requests. Furthermore, an initial check is done whether the sub matrix is not zero.

Another characteristic of the new algorithm is that it is checked for the presence of requests for service in the diagonal perpendicular to the main diagonal. Thus the check for requests includes joint diagonals parallel and perpendicular to the main one.

On Figure 2 we have illustrated the main diagonal, the perpendicular to the main diagonal and the jointed pairs of diagonals parallel to them.

The new algorithm AOP was implemented using the MATLAB software system. The software model SMAOP, describing the AOP algorithm in the MATLAB environment is given on Figure 4.




Figure2.

SOFTWARE MODELS PERFORMANCE

A software models performance (P) is defined as a ratio of the non- nil resolutions to the total number of the solutions. $R(v)$ is the set of the nil solutions, $R(w)$ is the set of the non-nil solutions, and R is a set of the all solutions[1].

$$R=R(v)+R(w) \quad (2)$$

$$P=(R(w)/R).100[\%] \quad (3)$$

From formula 3 it is seen that when the nil solutions $R(v)$ vanish to nil, then the performance P tends to 100% [1].

Figure 3 presents typical input matrices where for completeness we have added the zero and unit matrices.

Table 1 presents the results of studying the performance of three algorithms: the algorithm AJDA implemented by its software model SMAJDA, the algorithm ADA implemented by its software model SMADA and the algorithm AOP implemented by its software model SMAOP.

0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 1 0 0	0 0 1 1
0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 1 1 0	0 0 0 1
0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	0 1 1 1	1 0 0 0
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 1 1	1 1 0 0

1G	2G	3G	4G
----	----	----	----

0 1 1 0	1 1 1 1	1 1 1 1
1 0 1 1	0 1 1 1	1 1 1 1
0 1 0 1	0 0 1 1	1 1 1 1
1 1 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 1 1 1

5G	6G	7G
----	----	----

Figure3.

```

tic;T = randsrc(4,4,[0,1])
G = sparse(T)
%check for zero input sub matrix.
s = 0
for c = T
    s = s + sum(c)
end
if s ~= 0
M = eye(4)
N = sparse(M)
U = G.*N
T1 = T - U
% is there more requests for service.
s1 = 0
for c1 = T1
    s1 = s1 + sum(c1)
end
if s1 ~= 0 % if s1 is nonzero.
Y = [0 0 0 1; 0 0 1 0; 0 1 0 0; 1 0 0 0]
H = sparse(Y)
L = G.*H
T2 = T1 - L
% is there more requests for service.
s2 = 0
for c2 = T2
    s2 = s2 + sum(c2)
end
if s2 ~= 0 % if s2 is nonzero.
R1 = [0 1 0 0; 1 0 0 0; 0 0 0 1; 0 0 1 0]
R2 = [0 0 1 0; 0 0 0 1; 1 0 0 0; 0 1 0 0]
J = G.*R1
T3 = T2 - J
% is there more requests for service.
s3 = 0
for c3 = T3
    s3 = s3 + sum(c3)
end
if s3 ~= 0 % if s3 is nonzero.
K = G.*R2
end
end
end
end
toc

```

Figure 4. Software model SMAOP.

Table 1. Performance of algorithms SMAJDA, SMADA and SMAOP.

P[%]	1G	2G	3G	4G	5G	6G	7G
SMAJDA	0	6,66	20	80	80	53,3	100
SMADA	0	6,66	20	80	80	100	100
SMAOP	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

From Table 1 it is seen that for zero input matrix (1G) SMAOP has 100% performance and this is because the zero input is not processed. At the same time all the solutions of SMAJDA and SMADA are zero. Also, the results in Table 1 indicate that only SMAOP has 100% performance for all seven input matrices. Thus the algorithm AOP, applied as a processing algorithm of the sub matrices of ADAJS, substantially increases its performance.

CONCLUSION

The main conclusion of this study is that the synthesized algorithm AOP which is optimal related to the sub matrices in the connection matrix with respect to the performance. AOP meets the requirement for 100% performance, irrespectively of the type of input sub matrices.

REFERENCES

1. Kolchakov K., V. Monov. Comparative Analysis of a Class of Algorithms for Traffic Management in a Crossbar Commutator with Respect to Complex Performance, Speed and Memory, Problems of Engineering Cybernetics and Robotics, Vol.66, pp.53- 62 ,Sofia, 2015, ISSN 0204-9848. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
2. Kolchakov K., V. Monov. A Comparison Study of an Algorithm for Non Conflict Schedule with Diagonal Activation of Joint Sub Matrices in a Large Scale Switching Matrix. Information Technologies and Control, No. 2 pp.31-35, Printed in Nov. 2015. ISSN1312-2622, On-line ISSN 2367-5357.
3. Kolchakov K., V.Monov. Hiearchical two layers control commutator for implementation of fully non- conflict schedule. IJ IMA Vol.3, No 2, 2014 pp.175-181, ISSN 1314-6416(printed), ISSN 1314-6432(on line).
<http://www.foibg.com/ijima/vol03/ijima-fv3-vol03.htm>
<http://www.foibg.com/ijima/vol03/ijima03-02-p08.pdf>
4. Kolchakov K., T.Tashev, An Algorithm of Non-conflict Schedule with Joint Diagonals Activation of Connectivity Matrix, Proceedings of the International Conference on Computer Systems – CompSysTech'12, 22-23 June 2012, Ruse, Bulgaria, ACM PRESS, ICPS, VOL.630, pp.245-250, ISBN 978-1-4503-1193-9.
5. Kolchakov K., Examination on Algorithms for Non Conflict Schedule with Diagonal Activation in Case of a Large Size Switching Matrix. International Conference Automatics and Informatics '12 03-05.10.2012 Sofia, Bulgaria. Proceedings CD: ISSN 1313 – 1869. pp.341-344.
6. Kolchakov K., An Algorithm Synthesis of Non-Conflict Schedule by Diagonal Connectivity Matrix Activation, Proceedings of the International Conference AUTOMATICS AND INFORMATICS'11, John Atanasoff Society of Automatics and Informatics, Bulgaria, Sofia 03.10-07.10.2011., pp. B-247 – B251, Proceedings ISSN 1313-1850, CD ISSN 1313-1869
7. Kolchakov K., Synthesis of an Optimized Non-conflict Schedule Accounting the Direction of Messages Transfer in a Communication Node. Cybernetics and Information Technologies, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Vol. 4, No 2, 2004, pp. 88-95, Sofia.
8. Wanjari P., A. Chonhari, Implementation of 4x4 crossbar switch for Network Processor, International Journal of Emerging Technology and Advanced Engineering, Website: www.ijetae.com (ISSN 2250 – 2459, Volume 1, Issue 2, December 2011).
9. Kim D., K. Lee and H. Yoo, A Reconfigurable Crossbar Switch with Adaptive Bandwidth Control for Networks-on-Chip, IEEE International Symposium on Circuits and Systems, 2005.
10. Serpanos D., P. Antoniadis:”FIRM: A Class of Distributed Scheduling Algorithms for High-Speed ATM Switches with Multiple Input Queues”, *IEEE Infocom 2000 Conference*, Tel Aviv, Israel, March 2000.
11. Schaller M., K. Svozil, “Automaton Logic”, International Journal of Theoretical Physics, Vol.35, No. 5, pp. 911-940, 1996, Plenum Publishing Corporation-Springer.