## Low-latency Network Monitoring via Oversubscribed Port Mirroring



Jeff Rasley, Brent Stephens, Colin Dixon, Eric Rozner, Wes Felter, Kanak Agarwal, John Carter, Rodrigo Fonseca

### Research





## Self-Tuning Networks

### **Control Loop Examples**

- Traffic Engineering
- Failure Detection

#### How fast can we do this?

#### Measurement

### Control

#### Decisior



### **Control Loop Examples**

- Traffic Engineering
- Failure Detection

#### How fast can we do this?



### 100 ms — 1 sec+ Measurement







### **Control Loop Examples**

- Traffic Engineering
- Failure Detection

#### How fast can we do this?



### 100 ms — 1 sec+ Measurement

~100 µs



### **Control Loop Examples**

- Traffic Engineering
- Failure Detection

#### How fast can we do this?



### 100 ms — 1 sec+ Measurement

~10 ms Control

~100 µs



## Self-Tuning Networks

### **Control Loop Examples**

- Traffic Engineering
- Failure Detection

#### How fast can we do this?

### 100 ms — 1 sec+ Measurement

**~10 ms** Control

# **~100 μs**Decision



## Motivation for Faster Control Loops

100

80

60

40

20

0

0

% of flows shorter than x

#### This gets much worse as you go from 1 Gbps -> 10 Gbps

Background TCP flows, Microsoft data center DCTCP, Alizadeh et al. Sigcomm '10



 100
 200
 300
 400
 500
 600

 Flow Duration at 1Gbps (ms)



## Motivation for Faster Control Loops

100

80

60

40

20

0

0

% of flows shorter than x

#### This gets much worse as you go from 1 Gbps -> 10 Gbps

Background TCP flows, Microsoft data center DCTCP, Alizadeh et al. Sigcomm '10



100 200 300 400 500 600 Flow Duration at 1Gbps (ms)



## Motivation for Faster Control Loops

100

80

60

40

20

0

0

% of flows shorter than x

#### This gets much worse as you go from 1 Gbps -> 10 Gbps

Background TCP flows, Microsoft data center DCTCP, Alizadeh et al. Sigcomm '10



Flow Duration at 1Gbps (ms)



## Why is Measurement Slow?

- \* Traditionally, this didn't need to be fast
- \* Control plane CPUs are typically slow
  - Sampling or port counter polling
- \* Is this likely to get better? Maybe
- \* Faster control plane CPUs could help, still a big gap between CPUs and ASICs









## Our Solution: Abuse Port Mirroring

- Modern switches support port-mirroring
  - \* Copies all packets e.g. going out a port to a designated mirror port
- \* We abuse port mirroring to radically increase the number of samples/sec we get from a switch
- \* We mirror all ports to a single mirror port
  - \* Oversubscription approximates sampling (in the data plane) at much higher rates





## Our Solution: Abuse Port Mirroring

- Modern switches support port-mirroring
  - \* Copies all packets e.g. going out a port to a designated mirror port
- \* We abuse port mirroring to radically increase the number of samples/sec we get from a switch
- \* We mirror all ports to a single mirror port
  - Oversubscription approximates sampling (in the data plane) at much higher rates



## Our Solution: Abuse Port Mirroring

- \* Modern switches support port-mirroring
  - \* Copies all packets e.g. going out a port to a designated mirror port
- \* We abuse port mirroring to radically increase the number of samples/sec we get from a switch
- \* We mirror all ports to a single mirror port
  - \* Oversubscription approximates sampling (in the data plane) at much higher rates



## Architecture

- \* A set of collectors receives a stream of samples from mirror ports
  - Netmap or Intel DPDK for fast processing
- \* Reconstruct flow information across all flows in the network
  - \* e.g. flow throughput and port congestion
- \* Collectors can interact with an SDN controller to implement various applications
  - e.g. traffic engineering





# What Can Go Wrong?

- \* Lose input/output port information from packets
  - \* Recover meta-data about packets by sharing topology state from the controller
- \* When mirror port fills, its drop policy is unknown thus making it hard to calculate throughout
  - \* Rate estimation via TCP sequence numbers
- \* Oversubscribed port may occupy switch buffer space, taking away from production traffic
  - \* Indeed, buffers were reduced. Latency of production traffic decreased. Negligible increase in packet loss (~0.1%).





## What Can Go Wrong?

- \* Lose input/output port information
  - \* Recover met state
- \* When m making it
  - \* Rate est
- Oversubscri taking away

(~0.1%).

\* Indeed, buffers were reduced. Latency of production traffic decreased. Negligible increase in packet loss

uction traffic





# What Can Go Wrong?

- \* Lose input/output port information from packets
  - \* Recover meta-data about packets by sharing topology state from the controller
- \* When mirror port fills, its drop policy is unknown thus making it hard to calculate throughout
  - \* Rate estimation via TCP sequence numbers
- \* Oversubscribed port may occupy switch buffer space, taking away from production traffic
  - \* Indeed, buffers were reduced. Latency of production traffic decreased. Negligible increase in packet loss (~0.1%).





## Results: Sample Latency (high congestion)



Latency =  $t_2 - t_1$ 

Low Congestion Sample Latency: 75–150 μs 0.9 0.8 0.7 0.6 0.5 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1

CDF

IBM G8264 (10Gb) - Pronto 3290 (1Gb) -



1 2 3 4 5 Measurement Latency (ms)



6

## What Can You Do With This? TE!

#### <u>Setup</u>

- 16 hosts
- k=4 Fat Tree

#### Stride(8)

Permutation of hosts, such that each flow traverses the core



#### IBM G8264 (10 Gb) Hardware

#### Stride(8) 100 MiB Workload CDF of Flow Throughput



## What Can You Do With This? TE!

#### <u>Setup</u>

- 16 hosts
- k=4 Fat Tree

#### Stride(8)

CDF

Permutation of hosts, such that each flow traverses the core



#### IBM G8264 (10 Gb) Hardware

### Stride(8) 100 MiB Workload CDF of Flow Throughput



## What Can You Do With This? TE!

2

				Stı
				С
<u>Setup</u>				
16 hosts		' [		
k=4 Fat Tree		0.8		ECN
		0.0	-	Poll 1(
		0.6		Our
Stride(8)	G	0.4		0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Permutation of hosts,				0 0 0 0
such that each flow		0.2		•
traverses the core		0		

#### IBM G8264 (10 Gb) Hardware

### ride(8) 100 MiB Workload CDF of Flow Throughput





## Conclusion

- \* Using oversubscribed port mirroring we get ~1 million samples / sec.
- - 1 sec+

\* We get sampling latencies between **100 μs – 6ms** on real hardware, today. \* We improve this by 3–4 orders of magnitude, the state of the art is 100 ms –



## Questions? Thank you!



## Production Traffic Throughput







**Congested Output Ports** 

## Production Traffic Latency



## Production Traffic Packet Loss



**Congested Output Ports** 



## Flow Rate Estimation



Time (s)



## Rate Estimation Error



**Oversubscription Factor** 

