

SNAP: Stateful Network-Wide Abstractions for Packet Processing

Mina Tahmasbi Arashloo¹, Yaron Koral¹, Michael Greenberg², Jennifer Rexford¹, and David Walker¹

¹ Princeton University, ² Pomona College

Software Defined Networks (SDN) -Centralized Control



Software Defined Networks (SDN) -Centralized Control



Program your network from a central logical point!



OpenFlow - Abstractions for SDN

Each Rule can

- Match on header fields
- modify/forward/drop packets

Prio	match	action
1 2	dstip = 10.0.0.1 dstip = 10.0.0.2	outport ← 1 drop
	• • •	





Is OpenFlow Enough?

- OpenFlow rules are "stateless"
 - Rule tables process each packet independently from the rest
- Algorithms almost always need "stateful" processing
 - i.e., decide what to do with the packet based on packets seen so far!

Option #1 - All the state on the controller



Centralized control **but** not efficient!

- Switches process packets at **ns** scale
- Going through the controller, each update could take from ms to a few seconds



Option #2 - Middleboxes (MBs)

Efficient **but** we lose centralized control!

- MBs are ad-hoc blackboxes
- They make it hard to reason about network's behavior



Our Goal

Stateful packet processing

with centralized control

without compromising on **efficiency**

Insight

- New switches offer more sophisticated stateful packet processing functionality
 - The switch has local state
 - Rules can match on/modify local state

Let's push stateful processing to switches!



SNAP - Language and Compiler Overview



- The stateful program is written on top of one big switch
- The actual network has collections of switches
- How should we realize the program collectively on the network of switches?

SNAP - Language and Compiler Overview



SNAP - Language



Packets!



Programming Model

• SNAP's expressions are **functions**



updated state

set of packets

Reads/Modifies state Reads/Duplicate/Modifies packet

Running Example - Detecting Malicious Domains

 Domains that change TTL frequently are suspected to be malicious



```
if dstip = CS_ip & srcport = DNS then
   if ~seen[dns.domain] then
       seen[dns.domain] \leftarrow True;
       last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
      ttl_change[dns.domain] \leftarrow 0
   else
      if dns.ttl = last_ttl[dns.domain] then
          id
      else
          last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
          ttl_change[dns.domain]++
else id
```

```
if dstip = CS_ip & srcport = DNS then
   if ~seen[dns.domain] then
       seen[dns.domain] \leftarrow True;
       last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
       ttl_change[dns.domain] \leftarrow 0
   else
       if dns.ttl = last_ttl[dns.domain] then
          id
      else
          last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
          ttl_change[dns.domain]++
else id
```

```
if dstip = CS_ip & srcport = DNS then
   if ~seen[dns.domain] then
      seen[dns.domain] ← True;
      last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
      ttl_change[dns.domain] \leftarrow 0
   else
      if dns.ttl = last_ttl[dns.domain] then
          id
      else
          last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
          ttl_change[dns.domain]++
else id
```

State variable is a key-value dictionary

```
if dstip = CS_ip & srcport = DNS then
   if ~seen[dns.domain] then
      last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
      ttl_change[dns.domain] \leftarrow 0
   else
      if dns.ttl = last_ttl[dns.domain] then
         id
      else
         last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
         ttl_change[dns.domain]++
else id
```

```
if dstip = CS_ip & srcport = DNS then
   if ~seen[dns.domain] then
       seen[dns.domain] \leftarrow True;
       last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
       ttl_change[dns.domain] \leftarrow 0
   else
       if dns.ttl = last_ttl[dns.domain] then
          id
      else
          last_ttl[dns.domain] \leftarrow dns.ttl;
          ttl_change[dns.domain]++
else id
```

Adding Forwarding

 Operator wants to specify where packets should be forwarded to

```
forwarding = if dstip = CS_ip then outport ← CS
    else if dstip = EE_ip then outport ← EE
    else if dstip = ISP1_ip then outport ← ISP1
    else if dstip = ISP2_ip then outport ← ISP2
    else drop
```

Forwarding is composed with TTL change tracking

ttl_change ; forwarding

Identify State Dependencies

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

Identify State Dependencies

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

?

?

?

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

?

?

?

- Efficient
 - in terms of number of generated rules
 - for extraction of mapping from packets to state variables (next phase)

- Generalization of binary decision diagrams [1]
- Intermediate node : test on header fields and state
- Leaf : set of action sequences



[1] Fast NetKAT Compiler, Smolka et.al, SIGPLAN 2015

- Three types of tests
 - field = value
 - $field_1 = field_2$
 - $state_var[e_1] = e_2$



- Three types of tests
 - field = value
 - $field_1 = field_2$
 - $state_var[e_1] = e_2$



- Three types of tests
 - field = value
 - $field_1 = field_2$
 - $state_var[e_1] = e_2$



- Three types of tests
 - field = value
 - $field_1 = field_2$
 - $state_var[e_1] = e_2$



- Three types of tests
 - field = value
 - $field_1 = field_2$
 - state_var[e₁] = e₂



SNAP Expression to FDD



SNAP Expression to FDD



Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

?

?

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

/

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

flows to CS need all three state variables

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

/

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

flows to CS need all three state variables

Optimal Distribution of the FDD



Optimal Distribution of the FDD



Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

/

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

flows to CS need all three state variables

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

/

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

flows to CS need all three state variables

Identify State Dependencies

ttl_change → last_ttl → seen

Translate to Intermediate Representation (FDD)

/

Identify mapping from packets to state variables

Optimally distribute the FDD

Generate rules per switch

flows to CS need all three state variables









Evaluation

- Evaluated on three campus networks and four ASs
 - 25-160 switches
 - 100-650 links
- Cold-start compilation takes 35-600 seconds
 - most of the time goes for optimally distributing the FDD
- Re-compilation time can be reduced to under one minute by **fixing** state placement

Related Work

- NetKAT
 - inspired basic language constructs
- Fast NetKAT Compiler
 - stateless FDDs
- Stateful NetKAT (largely concurrent with SNAP)
 - simple registers (vs general dictionaries)
 - formal definition and proof of correctness for updates
 - Different optimization goal (rule space)

Questions?