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draft status

- Network Performance Isolation in Data Centres using ConEx draft-briscoe-conex-data-centre-00.txt
- new individual draft Jul 2012, requested by w-g Mar 2012
- one of a (growing) set of ConEx deployment arrangement drafts
- largely complete (31pp)
  - another rev to fill a few ToDo’s
  - technical ideas complete, but 2 works in progress:
    - detail design of tunnelling alternative for guest OSs that may not support ConEx or ECN
    - parameter setting section
- purpose of this talk
  - generate more interest in readers & reviewers
audience

- data centre (private or cloud) people, not ConEx
- not written as a way to deploy ConEx
- rather two ways to solve the isolation problem
  1. ConEx: better (warrants “using ConEx” in title)
  2. tunnelling: works for non-ConEx guest OSs, but inferior

- audience assumed sceptical
  - how it works is simple
  - why it works is outside people’s comfort zones
    - isolate tenants with no per-tenant config on the switches?
document structure
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7. Incremental Deployment
8. Related Approaches
• Tailpieces (Security, Conclusions, Acks)
Features of Solution

• Network performance isolation between tenants
• No loss of LAN-like multiplexing benefits
  • work-conserving
• Zero (tenant-related) switch configuration
• No change to existing switch implementations
  • if ECN-capable
• Weighted performance differentiation
• Simplest possible contract
  • per-tenant network-wide allowance
  • tenant can freely move VMs around without changing allowance
  • sender constraint, but with transferable allowance
• Transport-Agnostic
• Extensible to wide-area and inter-data-centre interconnection
Outline Design

- Edge policing like Diffserv
  - but congestion policing
- Hose model
- Flow policing unnecessary, but optional

- intra-class isolation in FIFO queues
- ECN marking
performance isolation intuition

- congestion policer enforces bit-rate, $x = \frac{w}{p}$, where
  - $w$ is a constant for that tenant (the policy)
  - $p$ is % congestion
- similar to a so-called ‘scalable congestion control’
  - but for aggregate (hose) from source, made up of flows
  - TCP is evolving towards this (Compound, Cubic, DCTCP etc)
- property easy-to-say but hard to grasp:
  - same rate of congestion per tenant, however many other tenants capacity is shared with
  - congestion-bit-rate in one flow is the same
  - but under contention it goes on for longer

\[
\begin{align*}
0.02\% \text{ congestion} \times 100\text{Mb/s} &= 20\text{kb/s congestion} \\
0.04\% \text{ congestion} \times 50\text{Mb/s} &= 20\text{kb/s congestion}
\end{align*}
\]
intuition built-up as follows

- 'scalable congestion control' as boundary case (previous slide)
- single link
  - long running flows, single link
    - similar to (weighted) round-robin
    - on-off flows
      - congestion-volume accounts for how often a tenant is not 'on'
  - weighted on-off flows
    - longer flows shift away
- network of links
  - congestion-volume allows for how many links tenant is 'on' in
- transients
work in progress & innovations
incremental deployment

- Can deploy all infrastructure under control of one administration
- ConEx & ECN depend on sender and receiver in guest OS
  - trusted feedback tunnel back to policer
  - without ConEx or ECN in guest OS
  - under control of DC operator
  - concrete example builds on NV-GRE
- Hybrid
  - non-ConEx packets: feedback tunnel
  - non-ECN packets: feedback tunnel
  - ConEx packets: no feedback tunnel
- tunnel egress, if not-ECT on inner header
  - feedback CE to ingress
  - drops any ECN-marked packets
- tunnelling inferior:
  - less isolation (congestion knowledge delayed by RTT)
  - more complicated (tunnel feedback set-up)
  - less efficient (duplicates TCP feedback)
- reward ConEx at policer for being more efficient?
work in progress & innovations

interconnection

- DC operator buys WAN pipe
  - between data centres
  - to enterprise customers’ (uncontended) LANs
- within pipe tenants share as within DC
  - based on loss or ECN at ingress to pipe
  - just another internal link
plans

- intent: working group item
- present in other working groups at next IETF (e.g. NVO3)

working group input

- could the “intuition” section (16pp) be a stand-alone draft?
  - already well-summarised in the introduction
- review please
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