Network
OpenVSwitch: Requirements

• Support large and complex policies

• Support updates in such policies, e.g., VM migration, new customers, …

• Don’t take up too much resources (CPU must do useful work, not just policy processing)

• Process packets with high performance
  • High throughput and low delay
OVS design

Diagram showing the OVS design with VMs, Hypervisor, OVSDB, OpenFlow, Netlink, kernel module, Controller, and NICs.
First design: put OF tables in the kernel

Large policies: Low performance with 100+ lookups per packet
Merging policies is problematic: cross-product explosion
Complex logic in kernel: rules with wildcards require complex algorithms
Idea 1: Microflow cache

- Microflow: complete set of packet headers with action
  - Example: srcIP, dstIP, IP TTL, srcMAC, dstMAC
- Same insight as tuple space search; attempt to do one memory lookup per packet
  - Use a large hash table
  - Microflow cache in the kernel
  - Openflow table in user space
Problems with micro-flows

• Too many micro-flows: e.g., each TCP port
• Many micro-flows may be short lived
  • Poor cache-hit rate for memory lookup

• Can we cache the outcome of rule lookup directly?

• Naive approach: Cross-product explosion!
  • Example: Table 1 on source IP, table 2 on destination IP

• Recurring theme: avoid up-front (proactive) costs
Idea 2: Mega-flow cache

- Build the cache of rules **lazily** using just the **fields accessed**
  - Ex: contain just src/dst IP combinations that appeared in packets

Use tuple space search

Miss

Hit

Megaflow cache in the kernel

Openflow table in user space
Outlook: fast packet processing

- Get rid of needless software if you can
- Specialization to app can bring significant benefits
  - IDS (hyperscan), caching in switches & load balancers
  - Algorithms can be as important as the frameworks
- Software changes
  - Application-kernel interface: application must be modified
  - Device drivers must often be modified
- Multitenancy: think about implications to weakening fault isolation
- Can we get isolation with efficiency?
Going beyond one (software) box

- Safe & efficient composition of middleboxes
- Share or shard state
- Failover and migration
- Placement and routing
- Scaling and compaction
Distributed Control Planes
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In this example, a routing algorithm runs in each and every router and both forwarding and routing functions are contained within a router. As we'll see in Sections 5.3 and 5.4, the routing algorithm function in one router communicates with the routing algorithm function in other routers to compute the values for its forwarding table. How is this communication performed? By exchanging routing messages containing routing information according to a routing protocol! We'll cover routing algorithms and protocols in Sections 5.2 through 5.4.

The distinct and different purposes of the forwarding and routing functions can be further illustrated by considering the hypothetical (and unrealistic, but technically feasible) case of a network in which all forwarding tables are configured directly by human network operators physically present at the routers. In this case, no routing protocols would be required! Of course, the human operators would need to interact with each other to ensure that the forwarding tables were configured in such a way that packets reached their intended destinations. It's also likely that human configuration would be more error-prone and much slower to respond to changes in the network topology than a routing protocol. We're thus fortunate that all networks have both a forwarding and a routing function!
Routing protocols enable FT computation

• What does the protocol compute?
  • Spanning tree, shortest path, local policy, arbitrary end-to-end paths

• What algorithm does the protocol run?
  • Information exchange + computation
  • Spanning-tree construction, distance vector, link-state routing, path-vector routing, source routing, end-to-end signaling

• How do routers learn end-host locations?
  • Learning/flooding, injecting into the routing protocol, dissemination using a different protocol, and directory server
Goals of Routing Protocols #1

• Determine good paths from source to destination

• “Good” = least cost
  • Least propagation delay
  • Least cost per unit bandwidth (e.g., $ per Gbit/s)
  • Least congested (workload-driven)

• “Good” = policy compliant

• “Path” = a sequence of router ports (links)
Goals of Routing Protocols #2

• Make networks resilient to failures

• Routers & links can fail without taking down the entire network

• Entire subsets can be unreachable; rest still reachable

• Hence, the protocol must be distributed
What does the protocol compute?

(the outcome, not the computation)
Different ways to represent paths

• Trade-offs
  • State required to represent the paths
  • Efficiency of the resulting paths
  • Ability to support multiple paths
  • Complexity of computing the paths
  • Which nodes are “in charge”

• Applied in different settings
  • LAN, intra-domain, inter-domain
Spanning tree (Ethernet)

• One tree that reaches every node
  • Single path between each pair of nodes
  • No loops, so can support broadcast easily

• Disadvantages
  • Paths are sometimes long
  • Some links are not used at all
Shortest paths (OSPF/IS-IS)

- Shortest path(s) between each pair of nodes
  - Separate shortest-path tree rooted at each node
  - Minimum hop count or minimum sum of edge weights

- Disadvantages
  - All nodes need to agree on the link metrics
  - Multipath routing is limited to Equal cost multiPath
Local policy at each hop (BGP)

- Locally best path
  - Local policy: each node picks the path it likes best
  - … among the paths chosen by its neighbors

- Disadvantages
  - More complicated to configure and model
End-to-end path selection (IP src route)

• End-to-end path selection
  • Each node picks its own end to end paths
  • … independent of what other paths other nodes use

• Disadvantages
  • More state and complexity in the nodes
  • Hop-by-hop destination-based forwarding is not enough
How to compute paths?
Spanning tree algorithm (Ethernet)

- Elect a root
  - The switch with the smallest identifier
  - And form a tree from there

- Algorithm
  - Repeatedly talk to neighbors
    - “I think node Y is the root”
    - “My distance from Y is d”
  - Update information based on neighbors
    - Smaller id as the root
    - Smaller distance d+1
  - Don’t use interfaces not in the path
Spanning tree example: switch #4

• Switch #4 thinks it is the root
  • Sends (4, 0) message to 2 and 7
• Switch #4 hears from #2
  • Receives (2, 0) message from 2
  • … and thinks that #2 is the root
  • And realizes it is just one hop away
• Switch #4 hears from #7
  • Receives (2, 1) from 7
  • And realizes this is a longer path
  • So, prefers its own one-hop path
  • And removes 4-7 link from the tree
Shortest-path problem

• Compute: *path costs* to all nodes
  • From a given source $u$ to all other nodes
  • Cost of the path through each outgoing link
  • Next hop along the least-cost path to $s$
The graph abstraction

• Routing algorithms work over an abstract representation of a network: the graph abstraction

Ex: Rutgers campus

u: Computer Science
v: School of Engineering

• Each router is a node in a graph
• Each link is an edge in the graph
• Edges have weights (also called link metrics). Set by netadmin
The graph abstraction

• Routing algorithms work over an abstract representation of a network: the graph abstraction

Ex: Rutgers campus

u: Computer Science
v: School of Engineering

G = (N, E)
N = {u, v, w, x, y, z}
E = { (u,v), (u,x), (v,x), (v,w), (x,w), (x,y), (w,y), (w,z), (y,z) }
The graph abstraction

- Cost of an edge: $c(x, y)$
  - Examples: $c(u, v) = 2$, $c(u, w) = 5$
- Cost of a path = sum of edge costs
  - $c(\text{path } x \rightarrow w \rightarrow y \rightarrow z) = 3 + 1 + 2 = 6$

- **Outcome** of routing: each node should determine the **least cost path** to every other node

- Q1: What **information** should nodes exchange with each other to enable this computation?

- Q2: What **algorithm** should each node run to compute the least cost path to every node?
Q1: Information exchange

- **Link state flooding**: the process by which neighborhood information of each network router is transmitted to all other routers.
- Each router sends a **link state advertisement (LSA)** to each of its neighbors.
- LSA contains the router ID, the IP prefix owned by the router, the router’s neighbors, and link cost to those neighbors.
- Upon receiving an LSA, a router forwards it to each of its neighbors: *flooding*.
Q1: Information exchange

- Eventually, the entire network receives LSAs originated by each router
- LSAs put into a link state database
- LSAs occur periodically and whenever the graph changes
  - Example: if a link fails
  - Example: if a new link or router is added
- The routing algorithm running at each router can use the entire network’s graph to compute least cost paths
Q2: The algorithm

**Dijkstra’s algorithm**

- Given a network graph, the algorithm computes the least cost paths from one node (source) to all other nodes.
- This can then be used to compute the forwarding table at that node.
- Iterative algorithm: maintain estimates of least costs to reach every other node. After k iterations, each node definitively knows the least cost path to k destinations.

**Notation:**

- \( c(x,y) \): link cost from node x to y; \( = \infty \) if not direct neighbors.
- \( D(v) \): current estimate of cost of path from source to destination v.
- \( p(v) \): (predecessor node) the last node before v on the path from source to v.
- \( N' \): set of nodes whose least cost path is definitively known.
Dijsktra's Algorithm

1. **Initialization:**
   2. \( N' = \{u\} \)
   3. for all nodes \( v \)
   4. if \( v \) adjacent to \( u \)
   5. then \( D(v) = c(u,v) \)
   6. else \( D(v) = \infty \)

8. **Loop**
   9. find \( w \) not in \( N' \) such that \( D(w) \) is a minimum
   10. add \( w \) to \( N' \)
   11. update \( D(v) \) for all \( v \) adjacent to \( w \) and not in \( N' \):
   12. \( D(v) = \min( D(v), D(w) + c(w,v) ) \)

/* new cost to \( v \) is either old cost to \( v \) or known shortest path cost to \( w \) plus cost from \( w \) to \( v \) */

15. until all nodes in \( N' \)

Initial estimates of distances are just the link costs of neighbors.

Least cost node among all estimates. This cost cannot decrease further.

Relaxation
Visualization

\[ N' \]

nodes whose least cost paths from \( u \) are definitively known

\( W \) should move to \( N' \).

\[ \min \text{ cost in } N \setminus N' \]

\[ c(w, v) \]

\( v \)

\( v' \)

\( v'' \)

\[ D(w) \]

\[ D(v) \]

\( W \) should move to \( N' \).

Relaxation: for each \( v \) in \( N \setminus N' \), is the cost of the path via \( w \) smaller than known least cost path to \( v \)?

If so, update \( D(v) \).

Predecessor of \( v \) is \( w \).

Cost of path via \( w \): \( D(w) + c(w, v) \)

Cost of known best path: \( D(v) \)
### Dijkstra’s algorithm: example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>N'</th>
<th>D(v),p(v)</th>
<th>D(w),p(w)</th>
<th>D(x),p(x)</th>
<th>D(y),p(y)</th>
<th>D(z),p(z)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>2,u</td>
<td>5,u</td>
<td>1,u</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ux</td>
<td>2,u</td>
<td>4,x</td>
<td>2,x</td>
<td>∞</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>uxy</td>
<td>2,u</td>
<td>3,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>uxyv</td>
<td>2,u</td>
<td>3,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
<td>4,y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>uxyvw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>uxyvwz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph diagram](image-url)
Constructing the forwarding table

• To find the router port to use for a given destination (router), find the *predecessor* of the node *iteratively* until reaching an immediate neighbor of the source $u$

• The port connecting $u$ to this neighbor is the output port for this destination
Constructing the forwarding table

- Suppose we want forwarding entry for \( z \).

Forwarding table at \( u \):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>destination</th>
<th>link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( z )</td>
<td>( (u,x) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( z: p(z) = y \)
\( y: p(y) = x \)
\( x: p(x) = u \)

\( x \) is an immediate neighbor of \( u \)
**Link-state: Shortest-path tree**

- Shortest-path tree from $u$
- Forwarding table at $u$

---

**Counter-intuitive:** Operators may set the link metric to achieve certain shortest-path trees with the protocol.
Path-vector routing (BGP)

• Key idea: advertise the entire path
• Distance vector: send *distance metric* per dest d
• Path vector: send the *entire path* for each dest d