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Network Functions (NFs)

- Examine and modify packets and flows in sophisticated ways
- Ensure security, improve performance, and providing other novel network functionality
- Examples of Network Functions: Firewall, Network Address Translators, Intrusion Detection Systems
Network Functions (NFs)

❖ Lie in the Critical Path between source and destination

❖ Should be capable of
  ➢ Handling packet bursts
  ➢ Failures
Lambda Architecture - Working

Upload your code to Lambda

Setup your code to trigger from other cloud services, HTTP endpoints or in-app activity

Lambda runs your code only when triggered, using only the compute resources needed

Pay just for the compute time used
Lambda Frameworks

- Lambda Frameworks are popular

- Public cloud lambda offerings
  - AWS Lambda
  - Azure Functions
  - Google Cloud Functions
Lambda Frameworks - Advantages

❖ Elimination of server management
❖ Continuous Scaling on demand
❖ High-availability
❖ Pay-as-you-go model
❖ Developer just writes event-handling logic
Does it make sense to implement network functions on lambda architectures?
Our Focus

- Investigate the performance of standalone NFs on Lambda architectures
- Implement and evaluate a locality-aware, event-based NF chaining system - LENS
Key Takeaways

- Naively implementing NFs on Lambda architecture leads to scalability at the cost of
  - High end-to-end latency
  - High overhead
- Porting standalone NFs onto Lambda architecture is not a viable option
- Lambda architectures are too restrictive - users cannot control the placement of lambda functions
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Standalone Network Functions

- Firewall
- NAT (Network address translation)
- PRADS (Passive Real-time Asset Detection System)
Standalone Network Functions - Firewall

- Monitors and controls the incoming and outgoing network traffic based on predetermined security rules

- Control Flow -
  i. Switch triggers Firewall
  ii. Fetch security rules
  iii. Block malicious packets
Standalone Network Functions - NAT

- Remaps IP addresses across private and public IP address space

- Control Flow -
  i. Switch triggers NAT
  ii. Extract IP address from packet
  iii. Lookup for IP from external store
  iv. Modify the IP address in packet
Standalone Network Functions - PRADS

- Gathers information on hosts/services

- Control Flow -
  i. Switch triggers PRADS
  ii. Extract relevant packet fields
  iii. Store to external store
Experimental Setup

- Experiments run on Cloudlab

- Synthetic Benchmarks -
  - Sequential Packet Benchmark
    - Analyse latency breakdown
  - Concurrent Packet Benchmark
    - Analyze latency with scale

- Lambda Region
  - AWS: us-east-1 region
Sequential Packet Benchmark Results - NAT

Sequential Packet Benchmark: End to End Latency
Sequential Packet Benchmark Results - NAT

Total Latency = Lambda Execution Time + Network Latency + AWS Overhead
Sequential Packet Benchmark Results - NAT

Lambda Execution Time = External Store Access Time + Pure Lambda Execution Time

Sequential Lambda Time Breakdown

![Sequential Lambda Time Breakdown Graph]
Concurrent Packet Benchmark Results - NAT

Network Functions Scale on Lambda Frameworks

Effect of Scale on Packet Processing Latency on a single machine

Concurrent Benchmark Average Latency
Concurrent Packet Benchmark Results - NAT

Average Time on Local vs Lambda

Time of Local (ms)

Concurrent Clients
DynamoDB vs Redis

Use of in-memory redis state operations provides much lower latencies
Middlebox Chaining Solution (Naive Approach)
LENS
Locality-aware, Event-based NF Chaining System
LENS Implementation Choice 1 - All In One

- Functionality of 3 middleboxes in single function
- Pros
  ➢ Locality Aware
- Cons
  ➢ One hot middlebox leads to unnecessary relaunch of all 3 middleboxes.
  ➢ One middlebox corruption renders other middleboxes on same lambda instance unusable
LENS Implementation Choice 2 - Step Functions

- Interpose each middlebox lambda onto a node in step function
- Pros
  - Easy to model complex workflows
- Cons
  - Overhead in Lambda States and Transitions
  - Can not enforce locality
Implementation Choice 3 - Simple Notification Service

- Simple Notification Service (SNS)
  - Fast
  - Flexible
  - Push Notification Service
  - Send individual messages
  - Fan-out messages
  - Publisher-Subscriber Model

- Pros
  - Simplifies Event based handling

- Cons
  - Locality unaware
LENS Implementation Choice 3 - Simple Notification Service (SNS)
LENS Evaluation Results

Middlebox Chaining : End to End Latency Results

Chaining Method

- All-In-One
- Naive
- Step-functions
- SNS

Time (s)
LENS Evaluation Results - Analysing Step Functions

Total Latency = Network Latency + Lambda Execution Time + AWS Step Function Overhead

- ~100ms to execute
- ~3ms for Lambda Execution
- High setup cost
- AWS Step Function Overhead represents:
  - State Transitions
  - Non-Task State time
LENS Evaluation Results - Analysing SNS Execution

- **SNS**
  - 92% overhead

- **Overhead includes**
  - Pub-Sub delay
  - Lambda Setup costs
Summary

- Implementing standalone NFs/middleboxes on Lambda is not a viable option
  - High latency and overhead

- Chaining middleboxes hides the high latency

- After exploring various chaining methods
  - Services provided by AWS lambda are
    - Very restrictive
    - Have high overhead
  - Chaining is most beneficial in the All-In-One case
    - Provides locality
    - High memory footprint
    - Only suitable when all NFs scale equally
Questions?
Graph 1

- Plot illustrating average NAT response time with concurrent clients
- Highlights the problem of scaling on a single machine
- Motivation for investigating a an implementation in a distributed setting
Graph 2

- NAT implementation on AWS lambda scales well
- AWS lambda: maximum parallel executions set to 100
- Latency is mostly unaffected
- High end to end latencies

![Concurrent Benchmark Average Latency](chart.png)
- Comparison between lambda and local NAT
- Very higher rate of change of local latency
- Lambda is unaffected
- Lambda addresses the scaling problem
  - At the cost of very high end-to-end latency
  - Further analysis
Distribution of NAT latencies for 100 sequential packets.

Need to breakdown the latency into known components:
- Network Latency
- Lambda Execution
- AWS overhead
Graph 5

- Distribution with the Lambda, Network and AWS overhead components
- High cost for launching lambda instances
Breakdown of Lambda Execution Time

State operations take higher fraction of time

DynamoDB Update operations are costly
  ➢ Provides High Consistency
Illustrating the scaling property provided by the lambda architecture

Similar trend observed for Firewall and PRADS middleboxes

Average latency remains mostly unaffected
Use of in-memory redis state operations provides much lower latencies

The state mapping will not be persistent

- Backup state in the DynamoDB
- Replication in Redis
Running the benchmarks from an EC2 instance

Avoids the Wide Area Network Latency by calling an internal API and Lambda trigger
- Lower Network Latency
- Lower AWS Overhead

Latency characteristics are comparable among the middleboxes
AWS chaining constructs have very high latency.

All-In-One illustrates low overhead
   ➢ 1 Lambda instance

Naive launches 3 lambdas

**Graph 10**

Middlebox Chaining: End to End Latency Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaining Method</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-In-One</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naive</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-functions</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNS</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- States executing lambdas
  - ~100ms to execute
  - ~3ms for Lambda execution
  - High setup cost

- Overhead represents
  - State Transitions
  - Non-Task State time

![Step Functions - Latency Breakdown](image-url)
Graph 12

- SNS
  - 92% overhead

- Overhead includes
  - Pub-Sub delay
  - Lambda Setup costs
Backup Slides
The term middlebox was coined in “1999” also now known as network functions.

Systems that examine and modify packets and flows

Ensure security & improve performance in enterprise and service provider networks.

Recent Trend: **Network Functions Virtualization (NFV)**
- Replace dedicated hardware appliances with software-based network functions running on generic compute resources.

Figure 1: Various Middleboxes
Lambda Architecture?

- Architecture for real-time & serverless computing
  - Execution of stateless functions

- Public cloud lambda offerings
  - AWS Lambda
  - Azure Functions
  - Google Cloud Functions

- Generic Advantages
  - Elimination of server management
  - Continuous Scaling on demand
  - High-availability
  - Event-based triggering mechanism
  - Developer just writes event-handling logic
Lambda Architecture

- How it works?

Upload your code to Lambda

Setup your code to trigger from other cloud services, HTTP endpoints or in-app activity

Lambda runs your code only when triggered, using only the compute resources needed

Pay just for the compute time used
Problem Statement and Motivation

- Evaluate the viability of implementing Network Middleboxes on the Lambda architecture based on:
  - Scale
  - Performance
  - Consistency
  - State Maintenance
- Implementing Middleboxes on a single machine does not scale well.
- Use the benefits of scaling and high availability provided by Lambda Architecture
- Obtain better performance characteristics for Middleboxes at scale
Motivation

- Performance degrades with the number of concurrent packets
- Natural way to handle scale is to launch more concurrent instances
- Network middleboxes are on the critical path
  - Handle low latency
  - Handle concurrent connections
- Each stage of processing in a middlebox chain must
  - Handle load
  - Handle hard/soft failures

Effect of Scale on Packet Processing Latency on a single machine
Solution Approach

- Model middleboxes as event-based lambda functions
  - Stateful middleboxes
    - Eg. NAT, Firewall
    - Fetching and updating state on every packet
    - Use external stores for maintaining state
      - Trade-off between latency and consistency of the state
    - Stateless operations performed in the lambda handler
  - Stateless middleboxes
    - Fits the lambda framework naturally
    - All the middlebox box handled in a function

- Investigate the idea of middlebox chaining
  - Reduce communication time between middleboxes
  - Current implementations lead to multiple hops on the network
Concise Result

- We would be presenting some results based on our Lambda Middlebox applications
  - Preliminary investigation among public clouds
  - Choice of storing the stateful information
  - Baseline performance characteristics for the middleboxes
    - NAT
    - Firewall
    - PRADS
  - Breakdown and analysis of the total client observed end-to-end latency
  - Overheads and effect of network latency
  - Effect of chaining the middleboxes using various techniques
    - Naive
    - All in one lambda
    - Use of a graph-based step functions topology
    - Notification based triggering mechanism
Design (Middleboxes)

- Network Address Translation (NAT)
  - Remaps IP addresses across private and public IP address space
  - Design a 2 way mapping to perform lookups
  - Lambda functions would
    - Extract IP address from packet
    - Lookup for IP to external store
    - Modify the IP address in packet
  - Mapping is stored externally
    - Database
    - In-Memory Cache
Design (Middleboxes)

- **Firewall**
  - Inspects the IP address/port
  - Mapping contains rules for filtering
  - Lambda functions would
    - Extract IP/port fields
    - Lookup for filtering rules
    - Block malicious packets

- **PRADS**
  - Gathers information on hosts/services
  - Mapping stores relevant fields
  - Lambda function would
    - Extract IP/port fields
    - Store host fields

**Generic workflow**
- Parse incoming packets
- Update/Retrieve state information
- Middlebox specific action
Baseline Latency Results

We pick AWS Lambda to implement the middleboxes discussed.

Trends for NAT implementation on AWS-Dynamo and Azure-SQL.

NAT End To End Latency Comparison

Concurrent Latency Distribution: Overheads
Breakdown of the Latency and Lambda Execution

- Execution of lambda functions is a small fraction of the latency
Concurrent Benchmark Behaviour

- The workload launched concurrent clients
- AWS lambda has a limit of maximum 100 parallel executions
- Small variation in the average time taken for 10 and 100 clients
- Illustrates the scaling achieved by lambda.
  - Contrasts with the single machine trend
Effect of External Store and Network Latency

- Dynamo DB persists the state to leading to higher overhead
- Storing state in memory leads to faster lookups and updates
- This is not persistent and is lost on redis-server crash
- Majority of the lambda execution time is spent in state lookups
Effect of Network Latency

- Sending requests from the EC2 datacenter avoids the link over Wide Area Network.
- Network latency is a major component of the remote request latency.
Design I (Lambda - Naive impln)
Design (Lambda - All In One)
Design (Step Fns)
Design (SNS - Pub/Sub model)

1. SWITCH
2. publish to SNS Topic 1
3. subscribe to SNS Topic 1
4. publish to SNS Topic 2
5. subscribe to SNS Topic 2
6. Switching between SNS Topic 1 and SNS Topic 2
Design (Lambda calling Lambda) - Future Work
Comparison between middlebox chaining
Summary
Conclusion