NitroSketch: Robust and General Sketch-based Monitoring in Software Switches

Alan (Zaoxing) Liu

Joint work with Ran Ben-Basat, Gil Einziger, Yaron Kassner, Vladimir Braverman, Roy Friedman, and Vyas Sekar











Need for network telemetry in software switches

Where: Virtual switches, White-box switches, DPDK, FD.io,...



Need for network telemetry in software switches

Where: Virtual switches, White-box switches, DPDK, FD.io





"Entropy", "Traffic Changes"





Requirements: Performance, Accuracy

Sketches appear to be a promising alternative



- Require small memory with bounded error rates.
- Guaranteed fidelity with arbitrary workloads.

Reality: Sketches in software switches not performant!



- Single core 100% CPU.
- Cannot meet high line-rates: < 10Gbps

Existing proposals to speed up sketches?

• SketchVisor [SIGCOMM'17]:

Performance increase (still < 10 Mpps) X Not robust on arbitrary workloads.

• Elastic Sketch [SIGCOMM'18]:

Performance increase (> 14.8 Mpps)

X Not robust on arbitrary workloads.

• R-HHH [SIGCOMM'17]:

Performance increase (up to 14.8 Mpps)

X Not general towards many tasks.

NitroSketch in a nutshell

A software-switch based sketching framework that simultaneously has:

Performance: line-rate (40G) with minimal CPU and memory.

Generality: support a variety of measurement tasks.

Robustness: accuracy guarantees for any workload.

NitroSketch Approach

- Systematically analyze the performance bottlenecks.
- Learn key insights from strawman solutions (sampling, one-level hash).
- Reformulate sketching for software from first principles
 - Tradeoff slight memory increase, Novel counter sampling rather than packet.

Outline for this talk

- Motivation
- Understanding bottlenecks
- Design Insights
 - Strawman ideas
 - Our proposals
- \cdot Evaluation
- Conclusions and future work

Outline for this talk

- Motivation
- Understanding bottlenecks
- Design Insights
 - Strawman ideas
 - Our proposals
- Evaluation
- Conclusions and future work

Bottleneck Analysis

- Performance benchmarks using Intel VTune Amplifier.
- Hotspots for UnivMon [SIGCOMM'16].

Func/Call Stack	Description	CPU Time
xxhash32	hash computations	37.29%
memcpy	memcpy and counter update	15.91%
heap_find	heap operation	10.71%

Bottleneck B1: Many hash computations per packet



B1: Many (independent) hash computations per packet (~37% CPU)

Bottleneck B2: Many counter updates per packet



B2: Many counter updates (~15% CPU)

Bottleneck B3: Tracking keys is also expensive



B3: Expensive flow key data structure operations (e.g., heap (~10% CPU))

Outline for this talk

- Motivation
- Understanding bottlenecks
- Design Insights
 - Strawman ideas
 - Our proposals
- \cdot Evaluation
- Conclusions and future work

Outline for this talk

- Motivation
- Understanding bottlenecks
- Design Insights
 - Strawman ideas
 - Our proposals
- Evaluation
- Conclusions and future work



Pros: Simple idea to reduce hash computations.

Cons:

- Memory increase may cause cache misses.
- Even one lightweight hash per packet may be high!

Strawman 2: Reduce updates by packet sampling?



Pros: Simple idea to reduce hash/counter updates.

Cons:

- Memory increase may cause cache misses.
- Even one coin flip per packet may be high!
- Incurs accuracy-convergence tradeoff.

Key lessons from strawman solutions

Can tradeoff memory for CPU reduction
But need to ensure cache residency

• Sampling is promising But need to manage per-packet ops and convergence

How do we tackle this?

• We trade memory for CPU reduction while ensuring cache residency

• Sampling is promising But need to manage per-packet ops and convergence

Key Idea: Sample counter updates not packets!



Key Idea: Sample counter updates not packets!

Multiple independent hashes key for memory efficiency



- Per-packet hash/counter updates can be reduced to less than one.
- Memory increase by O(1/p): Much better than uniform packet sampling.

How do we tackle this?

• Can tradeoff memory for CPU reduction But need to ensure still cache resident

• Sampling works!

but need to manage per-packet ops and convergence



Trick: Geometric sampling to reduce per-packet ops



Trick: Adapt sampling rate to manage convergence

- Sampling-based approach needs to receive enough packets before becoming accurate (need convergence).
- □ When packet rate isn't high,
 - \Box we can sample more packets \Rightarrow faster converge



Datarate Adaptive

Adaptively adjusting sampling rate:

Packet rate: 1Mpps, sample with 1/1

Packet rate: 8Mpps, sample with 1/8

Packet rate: 64Mpps, sample with 1/64

NitroSketch: Putting it together



NitroSketch is theoretically robust!

• NitroSketch offers accuracy guarantees for a variety of measurement tasks.

Our theoretical analysis holds after receiving enough packets.

• In practice, we need ~2-4 Mil packets to converge.

Check out our paper for more details!

NitroSketch Inline Implementation



• Other versions: FD.io-VPP, BESS

NitroSketch achieves 40G on software switches

- Two threads with OVS-DPDK, VPP and BESS on Intel XL710 NIC.
- NitroSketch uses no extra cores.



NitroSketch can achieve higher throughput

- In-memory single thread (Intel E5 2620 v4 CPU)
- Algorithms use 5~10 independent hash functions



Guaranteed accuracy after convergence

• After received 2~4 Mil packets, Sketches achieve comparable (or better) accuracy as the original sketches.



NitroSketch outforms other solutions

• NitroSketch achieves higher accuracy when converged.



Conclusions

- Sketching is a promising alternative for software switch based telemetry.
- Performance of sketches is far from optimal.
- Existing efforts missing in performance, robustness, or generality.
- NitroSketch key ideas:

Tradeoff small memory increase, Sample counters not packets, Geometric sampling to reduce packet ops, Adaptive sampling

• NitroSketch improves the performance of sketches by 1~2 orders of magnitude while retaining the robustness and generality

https://github.com/zaoxing/NitroSketch