Software-Defined Networking (SDN)

CS 168, Fall 2014

Scott Shenker (understudy to Sylvia Ratnasamy)

http://inst.eecs.berkeley.edu/~cs168/

A Desperate Plea

- I will be teaching CS168 for the next two years.
  - Fall semester….
- I need TAs.
- If you are interested in TAing, please email me.

Goal for Today

- Provide the “why” of software-defined networking
  - Some history
  - Some gossip
  - ***And an exercise in architectural thinking***

- Not much of the “what”
  - Enough that some of you will want to know more
  - Take 268, or do research

Caveats and Context

Caveats

- I cofounded a startup (Nicira) that worked on SDN
  - With Martín Casado and Nick McKeown
  - My views on SDN may therefore be biased
  - I have no financial interest in the outcome, just ego
- SDN is not a revolutionary technology…
  - …just a way of organizing network functionality
- But that's all the Internet architecture is….
  - The Internet architecture isn't clever, but it is deeply wise
  - *We know SDN isn't clever, but we hope it is wise….*

Context

- *Where did SDN come from?*
- *And what is the state of networking as a field?*
- **Keep context in mind as you learn about SDN…**
  - *It will clarify we think SDN is a big deal*
  - *And why it took us so long to wake up….*

C#1: Where did SDN come from?

- ~2004: Research on new management paradigms
  - RCP, 4D [Princeton, CMU,….]
  - SANE, Ethane [Stanford/Berkeley]
  - Industrial efforts with similar flavor (not published)
- 2008: Software-Defined Networking (SDN)
  - NOX Network Operating System [Nicira]
  - OpenFlow switch interface [Stanford/Nicira]
- 2011: Open Networking Foundation (ONF)
  - **Board**: Google,Yahoo,Verizon,DT,Msft, Fbook,NTT,GS
  - **Members**: Cisco, Juniper, HP, Dell, Broadcom, IBM,…..

Where did SDN really come from?

Martín Casado (from a Wired profile)

“Martin Casado is fucking amazing,” says Scott Shenker ….. “I’ve known a lot of smart people in my life, and on any dimension you care to mention, he’s off the scale.”

Current Status of SDN

- SDN widely accepted as "**future of networking**"
  - More than 120 members in ONF (almost "everyone")
  - Commercialized, in production use, >100M in revenue
    - E.g., controls Google's WAN; NTT has deployed
- An insane level of SDN hype, and backlash…
  - SDN doesn't work miracles, merely makes things easier
  - The fight isn't over whether SDN will be adopted, but which version of SDN will be adopted….
- But the real question is: *why the rapid adoption?*

How Long is Seven Years?

- A ***century*** in Internet application years
  - Commercial Internet only since 1994
- A ***nanosecond*** in Internet architecture years
  - Using same architecture 40 years after introduction
  - IPv6 in development since late 90's, still not deployed
  - And that only involves a few simple header changes!
- For you, seven years may seem like forever
  - For us in networking design and architecture…
  - *It is shockingly fast adoption, beyond our wildest dreams*

C#2: The Field of Networking…

- Research built a great artifact: Internet
  - Mostly unrelated to academic research which came later
- CS networking now largely the study of the Internet
- Also interesting research in wireless, optical
  - Much of it is EE research into underlying technologies
  - Some wireless research (such at Katabi at MIT) broader
- But we failed to create an academic discipline

Building an Artifact, Not a Discipline

- Other fields in “systems”: OS, DB, etc.
  - Teach basic principles
  - Are easily managed
  - Continue to evolve
- Networking:
  - Teach big bag of protocols
  - Notoriously difficult to manage
  - Evolves very slowly
- ***Networks are much more primitive and less understood than other computer systems***

We are left with two key questions

- *Why the rapid adoption of SDN?*
  - What problem is it solving?
- *Why is networking behind other fields in CS?*
  - What is missing in the field?
- The answers are related, but will unfold slowly

Network Management

What is Network Management?

- Recall the two “planes” of networking
- **Data plane**: forwarding packets
  - Based on local forwarding state
- **Control plane**: computing that forwarding state
  - Involves coordination with rest of system
- Broad definition of “network management”:
  - ***Everything having to do with the control plane***

Original goals for the control plane

- **Basic connectivity**: route packets to destination
  - Local state computed by routing protocols
  - Globally distributed algorithms
- **Interdomain policy**: find policy-compliant paths
  - Done by globally distributed BGP
- For long time, these were the only relevant goals!
  - *What other goals are there in running a network?*

Isolation

- L2 bcast protocols often used for discovery
  - Useful, unscalable, invasive
- Want multiple logical LANs on a physical network
  - Retain usefulness, cope with scaling, provide isolation
- Use VLANs (virtual LANs) tags in L2 headers
  - Controls where broadcast packets go
  - Gives support for logical L2 networks
  - Routers connect these logical L2 networks
- No universal method for setting VLAN state

Access Control

- Operators want to limit access to various hosts
  - “Don’t let laptops access backend database machines”
- This can be imposed by routers using ACLs
  - ACL: Access Control List
- Example entry in ACL: <header template; drop>
  - If not port 80, drop
  - If source address = X, drop

Traffic Engineering

- Want to avoid persistent overloads on links
- Choose routes to spread traffic load across links
- Two main methods:
  - Setting up MPLS tunnels *(MPLS is layer 2.5)*
  - Adjusting weights in OSPF
- Often done with centralized computation
  - Take snapshot of topology and load
  - Compute appropriate MPLS/OSPF state
  - Send to network

Net management has many goals

- Achieving these goals is job of the control plane…
- …which currently involves many mechanisms
- **Globally distributed:** routing algorithms
- **Manual/scripted configuration:** ACLs, VLANs
- **Centralized computation:** Traffic engineering

Bottom Line

- Many different control plane mechanisms
- Each designed from scratch for their intended goal
- Encompassing a wide variety of implementations
  - Distributed, manual, centralized,…
- And none of them particularly well designed
- **Network control plane is a complicated mess!**

How Did We Get Into This Mess?

How Have We Managed To Survive?

- Net. admins miraculously master this complexity
  - Understand all aspects of networks
  - Must keep myriad details in mind
- This ability to master complexity is both a blessing
  - **…and a curse!**

A Simple Story About Complexity...

- ~1985: Don Norman visits Xerox PARC
  - Talks about user interfaces and stick shifts



What Was His Point?

- The ability to **master complexity** is valuable
  - But not the same as the ability to **extract simplicity**
- Each has its role:
  - When first getting systems to work, *master complexity*
    - ***Stick shifts!***
  - When making system easy to use, *extract simplicity*
    - ***Automatic transmissions!***
- You will never succeed in extracting simplicity
  - ***If you don't recognize it is a different skill set than mastering complexity!***

What Is *My* Point?

- Networking has never made the distinction…
  - And therefore has never made the transition from mastering complexity to extracting simplicity
- Still focused on mastering complexity
  - Networking "experts" are those that know all the details
- *Extracting simplicity lays intellectual foundations*
  - *By providing elegant conceptual formulations*
- This is why networking has weak foundation
  - We are ***still*** building the artifact, not the discipline

Have answered one of our questions

- The reason networking is not a discipline is because it has not sought to extract simplicity
  - Other fields, such as OS, DB, etc, have
  - Those fields are more mature
- One reason for this difference
  - They can build their own artifacts, we are tied to Internet
- Extracting simplicity is also how you generalize to larger, more complicated systems
  - So it has practical advantages as well….

Forcing people to make the transition

- We are really good at mastering complexity
  - And it has worked for us for decades, why change?
- How do you make people change?
  - Make them cry!
- A personal story about algebra and complexity
  - School problems:

    $3x + 2y = 8$ $\qquad$ $x + y = 3$
  - My father's problems:

    $327x + 26y = 8757$ $\qquad$ $45x + 57y = 7776$

Making Network Operators Cry…

Step 1: Large datacenters

- 100,000s machines; 10,000s switches
- This is pushing the limits of what we can handle….

Step 2: Multiple tenancy

- Large datacenters can host many customers
- Each customer gets their own logical network
  - Customer should be able to set policies on this network
  - ACLs, VLANs, etc.
- If there are 1000 customers, that adds 3 oom
  - Where oom = orders of magnitude
- This goes *way* beyond what we can handle

Net Operators Are Now Weeping…

- They have been beaten by complexity
- The era of ad hoc control mechanisms is over
- We need a simpler, more systematic design
- ***So how do you "extract simplicity"?***

An Example Transition: Programming

- Machine languages: no abstractions
  - Had to deal with low-level details
  - Mastering complexity was crucial
- Higher-level languages: OS and other abstractions
  - File system, virtual memory, abstract data types, ...
- Modern languages: even more abstractions
  - Object orientation, garbage collection,...

Abstractions key to extracting simplicity

“The Power of Abstraction”

“Modularity based on abstraction is the way things get done”

– Barbara Liskov

Abstractions → Interfaces → Modularity

What About Network Abstractions?

- Consider the data and control planes separately
- Different tasks, so naturally different abstractions

Abstractions for Data Plane: Layers

Applications

…built on…

Reliable (or unreliable) transport

…built on…

Best-effort global packet delivery

…built on…

Best-effort local packet delivery

…built on…

Physical transfer of bits



The Importance of Layering

- Decomposed delivery into basic components
- Independent, compatible innovation at each layer
  - Clean “separation of concerns”
  - Leaving each layer to solve a tractable problem
- Responsible for the success of the Internet!
  - Rich ecosystem of independent innovation
- Think about it….
  - Original architecture has handled many oom changes in speed, size, scope, diversity

Control Plane Abstractions

Many Control Plane Mechanisms

- Variety of goals, no modularity:
  - **Routing:** distributed routing algorithms
  - **Isolation**: ACLs, VLANs, Firewalls,…
  - **Traffic engineering**: adjusting weights, MPLS,…

- **Control Plane: mechanism without abstraction**
  - ***Too many mechanisms, not enough functionality***

Finding Control Plane Abstractions

How do you find abstractions?

- You first decompose the problem….
- …and define abstractions for each subproblem
- **So what is the control plane problem?**

Task: Compute forwarding state:

- Consistent with low-level hardware/software
  - Which might depend on particular vendor
- Based on entire network topology
  - Because many control decisions depend on topology
- For all routers/switches in network
  - Every router/switch needs forwarding state

Our current approach

- Design one-off mechanisms that solve all three
- A sign of how much we love complexity
- No other field would deal with such a problem!
- They would define abstractions for each subtask
- …and so should we!

Separate Concerns with Abstractions

1. Be compatible with low-level hardware/software
   Need an abstraction for general **forwarding model**

2. Make decisions based on entire network
   Need an abstraction for **network state**

3. Compute configuration of each physical device
   Need an abstraction that **simplifies configuration**

Abs#1: Forwarding Abstraction

- Express intent independent of implementation
  - Don’t want to deal with proprietary HW and SW
- OpenFlow is current proposal for forwarding
  - Standardized interface to switch
  - Configuration in terms of flow entries: <header, action>
- Design details concern exact nature of:
  - Header matching
  - Allowed actions

Two Important Facets to OpenFlow

- Switches accept external control messages
  - Not closed, proprietary boxes
- Standardized flow entry format
  - So switches are interchangable

Separate Concerns with Abstractions

1. Be compatible with low-level hardware/software
   Need an abstraction for general **forwarding model**

2. **Make decisions based on entire network**
   Need an abstraction for network state

3. Compute configuration of each physical device
   Need an abstraction that simplifies configuration

Abs#2: Network State Abstraction

- Abstract away various distributed mechanisms
- Abstraction: **global network view**
  - Annotated network graph provided through an API
- Implementation: “Network Operating System”
  - Runs on servers in network (“controllers”)
  - Replicated for reliability
- Information flows both ways
  - Information *from* routers/switches to form “view”
  - Configurations *to* routers/switches to control forwarding

Network Operating System

- Think of it as a centralized link-state algorithm
- Switches send connectivity info to controller
- Controller computes forwarding state
  - Some control program that uses the topology as input
- Controller sends forwarding state to switches
- Controller is replicated for resilience
  - System is only “logically centralized”

Network Software Defined Network (SDN)

routing, access control, etc.

Control Program

Distributed algorithm running between neighbors

Global Network View

Complicated task-specific distributed algorithm

Network OS



Major Change in Paradigm

- Control program: **Configuration = Function(view)**
- Control mechanism now program using NOS API
- Not a distributed protocol, just a graph algorithm

Separate Concerns with Abstractions

1. Be compatible with low-level hardware/software
   Need an abstraction for general forwarding model

2. Make decisions based on entire network
   Need an abstraction for network state

3. **Compute configuration of each physical device**
   Need an abstraction that simplifies configuration

Abs#3: Specification Abstraction

- Control mechanism expresses desired behavior
  - Whether it be isolation, access control, or QoS
- It should not be responsible for ***implementing*** that behavior on physical network infrastructure
  - Requires configuring the forwarding tables in each switch
- Proposed abstraction: **abstract view** of network
  - Abstract view models only enough detail to *specify goals*
  - Will depend on task semantics

Simple Example: Access Control



Abstract Network View



Global Network View

Software Defined Network



Clean Separation of Concerns

- **Control program:** express goals on abstract view
  - Driven by **Operator Requirements**
- **Virt. Layer:** abstract view ←→ global view
  - Driven by **Specification Abstraction** for particular task
- **NOS:** global view ←→ physical switches
  - API: driven by **Network State Abstraction**
  - Switch interface: driven by **Forwarding Abstraction**

SDN: *Layers* for the Control Plane



Another Separation

- SDN separates control and data planes
  - SDN platform does control plane
  - Switches/routers do data plane
- Today's switches/routers do both
  - Requiring standardized control planes
  - Or vendor lock-in
- Better off separating control and data planes
  - So that one can reason globally about control plane
  - And have independent data plane implementations

Abstrns Don't Remove Complexity

- NOS, Virtualization are complicated pieces of code
- SDN merely localizes the complexity:
  - Simplifies interface for control program (user-specific)
  - Pushes complexity into ***reusable*** code (SDN platform)
- This is the big payoff of SDN: modularity!
  - The core distribution mechanisms can be reused
  - Control programs only deal with their specific function
- But SDN is "logically centralized"
  - How can that possibly scale?

Why Does SDN Scale?



What This Really Means

Routing Application

- Look at graph of network
- Compute routes
- Give to SDN platform, which passes on to switches
- *Graph algorithm, not distributed protocol*

Access Control Application

- Control program decides who can talk to who
- Pass this information to SDN platform
- Appropriate ACL flow entries are added to network
  - In the right places (based on the topology)
- *The control program that decides who can talk to whom doesn't care what the network looks like!*

Common Questions about SDN

Common Questions about SDN?

- Is SDN less scalable, secure, resilient,…?
- Is SDN incrementally deployable?
- Can SDN be extended to the WAN?
- Can you troubleshoot an SDN network?
- Is OpenFlow the right fwding abstraction?

Common Questions about SDN?

- Is SDN less scalable, secure, resilient,…? **No**
- Is SDN incrementally deployable? **Yes**
- Can SDN be extended to the WAN? **Yes**
- Can you troubleshoot an SDN network? **Yes**
- Is OpenFlow the right fwding abstraction? **No**

Why Is SDN Important?

- As a design:
  - It is more modular, enabling faster innovation
- As an academic endeavor:
  - Provides abstractions that enables systematic reasoning
- As a change in the ecosystem:
  - Open switch interfaces reduce vendor lock-in
  - Massive change, which some vendors are resisting

What Is the Killer App for SDN?

- Net. virtualization in multitenant datacenters (MTDs)
- Enable each client to specify an abstract network
  - That abstract network describes policies it wants enforced
- MTD operator uses SDN to enforce these policies
  - Driven by 1000s of tenants, acting independently
  - Cannot involve any manual intervention
- This is what made network operators cry
  - And SDN researchers smile….

What Did We Get Wrong?

- We forgot two things:
  - The edge and the core are different
  - There are as many middleboxes as routers

- We (Berkeley) are pushing SDNv2 which focuses on
  - General processing at the edge (middleboxes)
  - Very simple processing in the core
  - Support for third-party services (using mboxes)

Questions?