Project 3b

Stateless, Passive Firewall (3a) → Stateful, Active Firewall (3b)
What stays...

• Same framework
• Same VM
• Same test harness
• Same tools
• Same basic firewall behavior
What’s new?

• Three new rules:

1. deny tcp <IP address> <port>
2. deny dns <domain name>
3. log http <host name>
Active!

- deny tcp <IP address> <port>
Even more active!

bulbapedia.bulbagarden.net has been blocked by your firewall. If you've found this site, then your firewall generates DNS responses correctly.

We apologize for the inconvenience. Have this picture of a kitten.

We apologize if we gave you a picture of too many kittens.
Stateful!

- log http <host name>

- Log HTTP transactions
  - Request/Response pair

log http *.berkeley.edu

www-inst.eecs.berkeley.edu GET ~/cs168/fa14/ HTTP/1.1 301 254
www-inst.eecs.berkeley.edu GET ~/cs168/fa14/ HTTP/1.1 200 273
www-inst.eecs.berkeley.edu GET /favicon.ico HTTP/1.1 200 0
...

Stateful!

• Handle:
  – segmented TCP packets
  – headers spanning multiple packets
  – packet drops/re-orderings
  – and more... (read project spec!)

• My advice?
  – Start early
What we won’t check…

• Firewall rules from 3a
• Country-based matching

Takeaway?

• Don’t worry too much if your solution for 3a wasn’t complete
  – But make sure the solution to this one is!
NO CHEATING

WE RUN COPY CHECKER
Logistics

• GSIs:
  – Anurag, Shoumik and Sangjin

• Additional OH:
  – Will be announced on Piazza

• Slides, specs (code framework same as 3a):
  – Online midnight today

• Due:
  – At noon on Dec 3rd
Datacenters (part 2)

CS 168, Fall 2014
Sylvia Ratnasamy

http://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs168/
What you need to know

• Characteristics of a datacenter environment
  – goals, constraints, workloads, etc.

• How and why DC networks are different (vs. WAN)
  – e.g., latency, geo, autonomy, ...

• How traditional solutions fare in this environment
  – E.g., IP, Ethernet, TCP, DHCP, ARP

• Specific design approaches
Recap: Last Lecture

• Key requirements
  – High “bisection bandwidth”
  – Low latency, even in the worst-case
  – Large scale
  – Low cost
Recap: High bisection BW topology

• E.g., `Clos’ topology
  – Multi-stage network
  – All switches have k ports
  – k/2 ports up, k/2 down
• All links have same speed
E.g., “Fat Tree” Topology [Sigcomm’08]
Questions for today

• L2/L3 design:
  – addressing / routing / forwarding in the Fat-Tree

• L4 design:
  – Transport protocol design (w/ Fat-Tree)
In the secondary tables are right-handed (i.e., than below, the routing table of any pod switch will contain no more by the fact that these tables are meant to be very small. As shown should ensure only a marginal penalty (see below). This is helped lookup latency, but the parallel nature of prefix search in hardware

An on-terminating prefix, then the longest-matching suffix in the secondary table is found and used.

Figure 4: Two-level table example. This is the table at switch.

Figure 3: Simple fat-tree topology. Using the two-level ro

A TCAM can store in hardware using Content-Addressable Memory (CAM) [9].

A TCAM stores address prefixes and suffixes, abit pattern. A CAM can perform parallel search among all terms, in contrast to algorithmic approaches [15, 29] for finding a match against CAMs are used in search-intensive applications and are faster in expensive per bit. However, in our architecture, routing tables can have rather low storage density, they are very power hungry, and such as the ones found in routing tables. On the downside, CAMs don't care.

This two-level structure will slightly increase the routing table entry with the numerically smallest matching address is output. This satisfies the semantics of our specific application of two-level entry with the numerically smaller addresses and right-handed (suffix) entries in hop and the output port. We store left-handed (prefix) entries in which in turn indexes a RAM that stores the IP address of the next lookup engine. A TCAM stores address prefixes and suffixes, each 32 bits wide).

Using multiple paths well
Questions for today

• L2/L3 design:
  – addressing / routing / forwarding in the Fat-Tree

• Goals:
  – Routing protocol must expose all available paths
  – Forwarding must spread traffic evenly over all paths
Extend DV / LS?

• Routing
  – Distance-Vector: Remember all next-hops that advertise equal cost to a destination
  – Link-State: Extend Dijkstra’s to compute all equal cost shortest paths to each destination

• Forwarding: how to spread traffic across next hops?
Forwarding

• Per-packet load balancing
Forwarding

• Per-packet load balancing
  + traffic well spread (even w/ elephant flows)
  − Interacts badly w/ TCP
TCP w/ per-packet load balancing

• Consider:
  – sender sends seq#: 1,2,3,4,5
  – receiver receives: 5,4,3,2,1
  – sender will enter fast retx, reduce CWND, retransmit #1, ...
  – repeatedly!

• Also: one RTT and timeout estimator for multiple paths
• Also: CWND halved when a packet is dropped on any path

• Multipath TCP (MP-TCP) is an ongoing effort to extend TCP to coexist with multipath routing
  – Value beyond datacenters (e.g., spread traffic across wifi and 4G access)
• Per-flow load balancing (*ECMP, “Equal Cost Multi Path”*)
  – E.g., based on HASH(source-addr, dst-addr, source-port, dst-port)
• Per-flow load balancing (*ECMP, “Equal Cost Multi Path”*)
  – E.g., based on HASH(source-addr, dst-addr, source-port, dst-port)
  – Pro: a flow follows a single path (TCP is happy)
  – Con: non optimal load-balancing; elephants are a problem
Extend DV / LS?

• How:
  – Simple extensions to DV/LS
  – ECMP for load balancing

• Benefits
  + Simple; reuses existing solutions

• Problem: scales poorly
  – With N destinations, \( O(N) \) routing entries and messages
  – N now in the millions!
You: design a **scalable** routing solution

- Design for this specific topology

```
\[ Image \]
```

- Take 5 minutes, then tell me:
  - #routing entries per switch your solution needs
  - many solutions possible; remember: you’re now free from backward compatibility (can redesign IP, routing algorithms, switch designs, etc.)
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing

10.0.*.* → 1
10.1.*.* → 2
10.2.*.* → 3
10.3.*.* → 4
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing

10.0.0.* → 1
10.0.1.* → 2
*.*.*.* → 3, 4
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing

10.0.0 * → 1
10.0.1 * → 2
** ** . ** . 0 → 3
** ** . ** . 1 → 4
**Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing**

10.0.0.0 → 1
10.0.0.1 → 2
*.*.*.0 → 3
*.*.*.1 → 4
Solution 1: Topology-aware addressing

- **Idea:** addresses embed location in regular topology

- **Maximum #entries/switch:** \( k ( = 4 \text{ in example}) \)
  - Constant, independent of #destinations!

- **No route computation / messages / protocols**
  - Topology is “hard coded”
  - (but still need localized link failure detection)

- **Problems?**
  - VM migration: ideally, VM keeps its IP address when it moves
  - Vulnerable to misconfiguration (in topology or addresses)
Solution 2: Centralize + Source Routes

• Centralized “controller” server knows topology and computes routes

• Controller hands server all paths to each destination
  – $O(#\text{destinations})$ state per server
  – But server memory cheap (e.g., 1M routes x 100B/route=100MB)

• Server inserts entire path vector into packet header (“source routing”)
  – E.g., header=[dst=D | index=0 | path={S5,S1,S2,S9}]

• Switch forwards based on packet header
  – index++; next-hop = path[index]
Solution 2: Centralize + Source Routes

- #entries per switch?
  - None!

- #routing messages?
  - akin to a broadcast from controller to all servers

- Pro:
  - switches very simple and scalable
  - flexibility: end-points (hence apps) control route selection

- Cons:
  - scalability / robustness of controller (SDN addresses this)
  - Clean-slate design of everything
Questions for today

• L2/L3 design:
  – addressing / routing / forwarding in the Fat-Tree

• L4 design:
  – Transport protocol design (w/ Fat-Tree)

Many slides courtesy of Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University
Workloads

- Partition/Aggregate (Query)
- Short messages [50KB-1MB] (Coordination, Control state)
- Large flows [1MB-50MB] (Data update)
## Tension Between Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Throughput</th>
<th>vs.</th>
<th>Low Latency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deep queues at switches:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shallow queues at switches:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Queuing delays increase latency</td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Bad for bursts &amp; throughput</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective:**

Low Queue Occupancy & High Throughput
Data Center TCP (DC-TCP)

• Proposal from Microsoft Research, 2010
  – Incremental fixes to TCP for DC environments
  – Deployed in Microsoft datacenters (~rumor)

• Leverages Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN)
Lec#14: Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN)

- Defined in RFC 3168 using ToS/DSCP bits in the IP header

- Single bit in packet header; set by congested routers
  - If data packet has bit set, then ACK has ECN bit set

- Routers typically set ECN bit based on average queue length

- Congestion semantics exactly like that of drop
  - I.e., sender reacts as though it saw a drop
Review: The TCP/ECN Control Loop

ECN = Explicit Congestion Notification

Sender 1
Sender 2
Receiver

ECN Mark (1 bit)
DC-TCP: key ideas

1. React early and quickly: use ECN
2. React in proportion to the \textit{extent} of congestion, not its \textit{presence}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECN Marks</th>
<th>TCP</th>
<th>DCTCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1</td>
<td>Cut window by 50%</td>
<td>Cut window by 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>Cut window by 50%</td>
<td>Cut window by 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Slide from Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University*
At the switch

– If Queue Length > K
  (note: queue length is instantaneous, not average)
  • Set ECN bit in packet
At the sender

- Maintain running average of the fraction of packets marked ($\alpha$).

  \[
  \text{each RTT: } F = \frac{\text{# of marked ACKs}}{\text{Total # of ACKs}} \Rightarrow \alpha \leftarrow (1 - g)\alpha + gF
  \]

- Window adapts based on $\alpha$:  
  \[
  W \leftarrow (1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})W
  \]

$\alpha$ equal to 1 (high congestion):  
  \[
  W \leftarrow \frac{W}{2} \quad \text{(same as TCP!)}
  \]
DCTCP in Action

Setup: Win 7, Broadcom 1Gbps Switch
Scenario: 2 long-lived flows, K = 30KB
DC-TCP: why it works

1. React early and quickly: use ECN
   → Avoid large buildup in queues → lower latency

2. React in proportion to the **extent** of congestion, not its **presence**
   → Maintain high throughput by not over-reacting to congestion
   → Reduces variance in sending rates, lowering queue buildups
Data Center TCP (DC-TCP)

• Proposal from Microsoft Research, 2010
  – Incremental fixes to TCP for DC environments
  – Deployed in Microsoft datacenters (~rumor)

• Leverages Explicit Congestion Notification (ECN)

• An improvement; but still far from “ideal”
What’s “ideal”? 

- What is the best measure of performance for a data center transport protocol?
  - When the flow is completely transferred?
  - Latency of each packet in the flow?
  - Number of packet drops?
  - Link utilization?
  - Average queue length at switches?
Flow Completion Time (FCT)

- Time from when flow started at the sender, to when all packets in the flow were received at the receiver
FCT with DCTCP

Slide from Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University
Recall: “Elephants” and “Mice”

- Web search, data mining (Microsoft) [Alizadeh 2010]
FCT with DCTCP

Problem: the mice are delayed by the elephants

Slide from Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University
Solution: use priorities!

\[pFabric, Sigcomm 2013\]

- **Packets carry a single priority number**
  - priority = remaining flow size (e.g., #bytes un-acked)

- **Switches**
  - very small queues (e.g., 10 packets)
  - send highest priority / drop lowest priority packet

- **Servers**
  - Transmit/retransmit aggressively (at full link rate)
  - Drop transmission rate only under extreme loss (timeouts)
Slide from Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University
Slide from Mohammad Alizadeh, Stanford University
Why does pFabric work?

• Consider problem of scheduling N jobs at a single queue/processor
  – $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_n$ with duration $T_1, T_2, \ldots T_n$ respectively
• “Shortest Job First” (SJF) scheduling minimizes average Job Completion Time
  – Pick job with minimum $T_i$; de-queue and run; repeat
  – I.e., job that requires minimum runtime has max priority
• Solution for a network of queues is NP-hard
• Setting priority=remaining flow size is a heuristic to approximate SJF
DIY exercise: why does SJF work?

• Consider 4 jobs with duration 1, 2, 4, 8
• Compute finish times w/ Round-Robin vs. SJF
• Assume scheduler:
  – Picks best job (as per scheduling policy)
  – Runs job for one time unit
  – Update job durations
  – repeat
• Job completion times:
  – With RR: 1, 5, 10, 15
  – With SJF: 1, 3, 7, 15
Summary

• Learn more:

• Next time: Guest lecture by Stephen Strowes, IPv6!