

Internet Research Task Force (IRTF)
Internet Draft
Category: Experimental

R. Krishnan
Dell
N. Figueira
Brocade
Dilip Krishnaswamy
IBM Research
D. R. Lopez
Telefonica I+D
Steven Wright
AT&T
Tim Hinrichs
Styra
Ruby Krishnaswamy
Orange
Arun Yerra
Dell

Expires: March 2016

March 2, 2016

**NFVIaaS Architectural Framework for Policy Based Resource Placement
and Scheduling**

[draft-krishnan-nfvrg-policy-based-rm-nfviaas-06](#)

Abstract

One of the goals of Network Functions Virtualization (NFV) is to offer the NFV infrastructure as a service to other SP customers - this is called NFVIaaS. Virtual Network Function (VNF) deployment in this paradigm will drive support for unique placement policies, given VNF's stringent service level specifications (SLS) required by customer SPs. Additionally, NFV DCs often have capacity, energy and other constraints - thus, optimizing the overall resource usage based on policy is an important part of the overall solution. The purpose of this document is to depict an architectural framework for policy based resource placement and scheduling in the context of NFVIaaS.

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted to IETF in full conformance with the provisions of [BCP 78](#) and [BCP 79](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that

other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire in March 2016.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (c) 2016 IETF Trust and the persons identified as the document authors. All rights reserved.

This document is subject to [BCP 78](#) and the IETF Trust's Legal Provisions Relating to IETF Documents (<http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info>) in effect on the date of publication of this document. Please review these documents carefully, as they describe your rights and restrictions with respect to this document.

Conventions used in this document

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	3
2.	NFVIaaS Architectural Framework for Policy Based Resource Placement and Scheduling.....	3
3.	System Analysis in a OpenStack Framework.....	5
3.1.	Compute Monitoring with OpenStack - Use Case and Example..	5
3.2.	Joint Network and Compute Awareness with OpenStack - Use Case.....	9
4.	Related Work.....	10
5.	Summary.....	10
6.	Future Work.....	10
7.	IANA Considerations.....	10
8.	Security Considerations.....	11
9.	Contributors.....	11
10.	Acknowledgements.....	11
11.	References.....	11

[11.1](#). Normative References.....[11](#)
[11.2](#). Informative References.....[11](#)
Authors' Addresses.....[12](#)

[1](#). Introduction

One of the goals of NFV [[ETSI-NFV-WHITE](#)] is to offer the NFV infrastructure as a service to other SP customers - this is called NFVIaaS [[ETSI-NFV-USE-CASES](#)]. In this context, it may be desirable for a Service Provider to run virtual network elements (e.g., virtual routers, virtual firewalls, and etc. - these are called Virtual Network Functions - VNF) as virtual machine instances inside the infrastructure of another Service Provider. In this document, we call the former a customer SP and the latter an NFVIaaS SP.

There are many reasons for a customer SP to require the services of an NFVIaaS SP, including: to meet performance requirements (e.g., latency or throughput) in locations where the customer SP does not have physical data center presence, to allow for expanded customer reach, regulatory requirements, and etc.

As VNFs are virtual machines, their deployment in such NFVIaaS SPs would share some of the same placement restrictions (i.e., placement policies) as those intended for Cloud Services. However, VNF deployment will drive support for unique placement policies, given VNF's stringent service level specifications (SLS) required/imposed by customer SPs. Additionally, NFV DCs or NFV PoPs [[ETSI-NFV-TERM](#)] often have capacity, energy and other constraints - thus, optimizing the overall resource usage based on policy is an important part of the overall solution.

The purpose of this document is to depict an architectural framework for policy based resource placement and scheduling in the context of NFVIaaS.

[2](#). NFVIaaS Architectural Framework for Policy Based Resource Placement and Scheduling

The policy engine performs policy-based resource placement and scheduling of Virtual Machines (VMs) in support for NFVIaaS. It determines optimized placement and scheduling choices based on the constraints specified in the policy. The NFVIaaS Architectural Framework for Policy Based resource placement and scheduling is based on the NFV policy architectural framework [[IRTF-NFV-POLICY-ARCH](#)].This is depicted in Figure 1.

In one instantiation of this architecture, the policy engine would interface with the Measurement Collector to periodically retrieve instantaneous per-server CPU utilization, which it would then use to compute a table of per-server average CPU utilization. In an alternative instantiation of this architecture, the measurement collector could itself compute per-server average CPU utilization. The latter approach reduces overhead, since it avoids too frequent pulling of stats from Ceilometer. The policy engine evaluates such policies based on an event trigger or a based on a programmable timer.

Other average utilization parameters such as VM CPU utilization, VM Memory utilization, VM disk read IOPS, Network utilization/latency etc. could be used by the policy engine to enforce other types of placement policies.




Figure 1: NFVIaaS Architecture for Policy Based Resource Placement and Scheduling

In an ETSI NFV Architectural Framework [ETSI-NFV-ARCH][NFV-MANO-SPEC], Policy Engine is part of the Orchestrator and the Measurement Collector is part of the Virtual Infrastructure Manager (VIM).

3. System Analysis in a OpenStack Framework

3.1. Compute Monitoring with OpenStack - Use Case and Example

Consider an NFVIaaS SP that owns a multitude of mini NFV data centers managed by OpenStack [OPENSTACK] where,

- The Policy Engine function is performed by OpenStack Congress [OPENSTACK-CONGRESS-POLICY-ENGINE]
- The Measurement Collector function is performed by OpenStack Celimeter [OPENSTACK-CELIOMETER-MEASUREMENT]
- The Policy Engine has access to the OpenStack Nova database that stores records of mapping of virtual machines to physical servers.

Exemplary Mini NFV DC configuration:

An exemplary mini NFV DC configuration is depicted below.

- There are 210 physical servers in 2U rack server configuration spread over 10 racks.
- There are 4 types of physical servers each with a different system configuration and from a particular manufacturer. It is possible that the servers are from the same or different manufacturer. For the purpose of this example, server type 1 is described further. Server type 1 has 32 virtual CPUs and 128GB DRAM from manufacturer x. Assume 55 physical servers of type 1 per mini NFV DC.
- There are 2 types of instances large.2 and large.3, which are described in the table below. Each parameter has a minimum guarantee and a maximum usage limit.

Instance Type	Virtual CPU Units	Memory (GB)	Minimum/Maximum
Type	Minimum Guarantee	Minimum Guarantee	Physical Server
	/Maximum Usage	/Maximum Usage	Utilization (%)

----- ----- ----- -----
large.2 0/4 0/16 0/12.5
large.3 0/8 0/32 0/25
----- ----- ----- -----

Table 1: NFVIaaS Instance Types

For the purpose of this example, the Mini NFV DC topology is considered static -- the above topology, including the network interconnection, is available through a simple file-based interface.

Policy 1 (an exemplary NFV policy):

Policy 1 is an exemplary NFV policy. In a descriptive language, Policy 1 is as follows - "For physical servers of type 1, there can be at most only one active physical server with average overall utilization less than 50%."

The goal of this policy is to address the energy efficiency requirements described in the ETSI NFV Virtualization Requirements [[ETSI-NFV-REQ](#)].

Policy 1 is an example of reactive enforcement.

Policy 2 (another exemplary NFV policy):

Policy 2 is necessary to protect NFV servers from failures. In this example we consider failures of physical servers. Policy 2 is as follows - "Not more than one VM of the same HA group must be deployed on the same physical server".

Note: There may be conditions (according to current Mini DC usage and policies of type 2 that are currently active) when there may not be any placement solution respecting both policies. It may be better to reformulate Policy 1? For example, "Minimize the number of physical servers with average overall utilization less than 50%"

Policy 2 is an example of proactive and reactive enforcement.
Various Module Interactions for Policy 1:

The various module interactions with respect the architectural framework in Figure 1 for Policy 1 is described below.

The policy calls for the identification of servers by type. OpenStack Congress would need to support server type, average CPU utilization, and be able to support additional performance parameters (in the future) to support additional types of placement policies. OpenStack Congress would run the policy periodically or based on events such as deleting/adding VMs etc. Initially, we could use a periodic timer based approach. In case OpenStack Congress detects a violation, it determines optimized placement and scheduling choices so that the policy is not violated.

OpenStack Congress could interface with OpenStack Celiometer to periodically retrieve instantaneous per-server CPU utilization, which it would then use to compute a table of per-server average CPU utilization. Alternatively, OpenStack Celiometer could itself compute per-server average CPU utilization which could be used by OpenStack Congress.

The proposed module interactions in this NFVIaaS placement policy example are as depicted in the architectural framework in Figure 1.

A key goal of Policy 1 above is to ensure that servers are not kept under low utilization, since servers have a non-linear power profile and exhibit relatively higher power wastage at lower utilization. For example, in the active idle state as much as 30% of peak power is consumed. At the physical server level, instantaneous energy consumption can be accurately measured through IPMI standard. At a customer instance level, instantaneous energy consumption can be approximately measured using an overall utilization metric, which is a combination of CPU utilization, memory usage, I/O usage, and network usage. Hence, the policy is written in terms of overall utilization and not power usage.

The following example combines Policy 1 and Policy 2.

For an exemplary maximum usage scenario, 53 physical servers could be under peak utilization (100%), 1 server (server-a) could be under partial utilization (62.5%) with 2 instances of type large.3 and 1 instance of type large.2 (this instance is referred as large.2.X1), and 1 server (server-b) could be under partial utilization (37.5%) with 3 instances of type large.2. Call these three instances large.2.X2, large.2.Y and large.2.Z

One HA-group has been configured and two large.2 instances belong to this HA-group. To enforce Policy 2 large.2.X1 and large2.X2 that belong to the HA-group have been deployed in different physical servers, one in server-a and a second in server-b.

When one of the large.3 instances mapped to server-a is deleted from physical server type 1, Policy 1 will be violated, since the overall utilization of server-a falls to 37,5%, since two servers are underutilized (below 50%)

OpenStack Congress, on detecting the policy violation, uses various constraint based placement techniques to find the new placement(s) for physical server type 1 to address Policy 1 violation without breaking Policy 2. Constrained based placement will be explored in a convex optimization framework [[CONVEX-OPT](#)]; some of the algorithms which would be considered are linear programming [[LINEAR-PROGRAM](#)], branch and bound [[BRANCH-AND-BOUND](#)], interior point methods, equality constrained minimization, non-linear optimization etc.

Various new placement(s) are described below.

1) New placement 1: Move 2 of three instances of large.2 running on server-b to server-a. Overall utilization of server-a - 62,5%. Overall utilization of server-b - 25%. large.2.X2 must not be one of the migrated instances.

2) New placement 2: Move 1 instance of large.3 to server-b. Overall utilization of server-a - 12,5%. Overall utilization of server-b - 62.5%.

A third solution consisting of moving 3 large.2 instances to server-a cannot be adopted since this breaks Policy 2. Another policy minimizing the number of migrations could allow choosing between solution (1) and (2).

New placements 2 and 3 could be considered optimal, since they achieve maximal bin packing and open up the door for turning off server-a or server-b and maximizing energy efficiency.

To detect violations of Policy 1, an example of a classification rule is expressed below in Datalog, the policy language used by OpenStack Congress.

Database table exported by the Resource Placement and Scheduler for Policy 1 and Policy 2:

The database table exported by the Resource Placement and Scheduler for Policy 1 is below.

```
server_utilization (physical_server, overall_util)
```


- Each database entry has the physical server and the calculated average overall utilization.

```
vm_host_mapping(vm, server)
```

- Each database entry gives the physical server on which VM is deployed.

```
anti-affinity_group(vm, group)
```

- Each entry gives the anti-affinity group to which a VM belongs.

Policy 1 (in Datalog [[DATALOG](#)] policy language):

Policy 1 in a Datalog policy language is as follows.

```
error (physical_server) :-
```

```
nova [OPENSTACK-NOVA-COMPUTE]: node (physical_server, "type1"),
```

```
resource placement and scheduler: server_utilization  
(physical_server, overall_util < 50)
```

Policy 2 (in Datalog policy language):

```
error(vm) :-
```

```
anti-affinity_group(vm1, grp1),
```

```
anti-affinity_group(vm2, grp2),
```

```
grp1 != grp2,
```

```
nova: vm host mapping(vm1, server-1),
```

```
nova: vm host mapping(vm2, server-2),
```

```
server-1 == server-2
```

3.2. Joint Network and Compute Awareness with OpenStack - Use Case

There are several NFV DCs such as mobile base stations, small central offices, small branch office locations etc. Having an OpenStack Controller in each of these locations increases the management complexity and the DC capacity needs. The idea is to have the OpenStack compute and network nodes in these DC locations and manage them centrally through an OpenStack Controller node through a

larger central office location in the same metro area. The key considerations here are that the OpenStack management network extends over the metropolitan area network (MAN) and is an in-band network where the data and management traffic use the same physical pipe; typical MAN distances are within 100 miles but could have a geographic variation.

Across MAN, some of the key management network considerations are latency and bandwidth impacting various operations such as configuration, VM image transfer, monitoring data collection, backing up of logs etc. OpenStack Neutron can provide the hooks for reporting MAN bandwidth and latency which will be abstracted by the enhanced OpenStack Nova scheduler. The network connection between NFV DCs can be modelled as Neutron end-points. During the validation phase, the enhanced OpenStack Nova scheduler (part of the OpenStack Controller node) in the central DC can determine if the compute/network nodes in the small DC are manageable remotely based on the service SLA requirements specified by the Orchestrator; each of the small DCs could have different bandwidth/latency depending on the network topology. During runtime, the enhanced OpenStack Nova scheduler periodically monitors the MAN bandwidth and latency variations and reports any exceptions. The enhanced scheduler can measure the overall bandwidth usage across MAN so that it can determine the optimized time window(s) during the day for backing up logs, detailed monitoring data etc. The enhanced scheduler can also measure overall latency usage across MAN so that it can place the high availability instances across DCs meeting the service SLA requirements. Dynamic measurement of MAN bandwidth and latency can be implemented using a vendor specific OpenStack Neutron plugin which typically interfaces with an SDN Controller [[LAYERED-SDN](#)]. [[Y.1731-monitoring](#)] is typically used by switches for performance monitoring across physical/logical Ethernet network end points.

4. Related Work

A related proof of concept in ETSI NFV on placement and scheduling is [[ETSI-NFV-POC-PLACEMENT](#)].

5. Summary

6. Future Work

TBD

7. IANA Considerations

This draft does not have any IANA considerations.

8. Security Considerations

9. Contributors

Hesham ElBakoury

Huawei

Hesham.ElBakoury@huawei.com

10. Acknowledgements

The authors would like thank Prabhakar Kudva and Gokul Kandiraju for the proof of concept effort.

11. References

11.1. Normative References

11.2. Informative References

[ETSI-NFV-WHITE] "ETSI NFV White Paper,"
http://portal.etsi.org/NFV/NFV_White_Paper.pdf

[ETSI-NFV-USE-CASES] "ETSI NFV Use Cases,"
http://www.etsi.org/deliver/etsi_gs/NFV/001_099/001/01.01.01_60/gs_NFV001v010101p.pdf

[ETSI-NFV-REQ] "ETSI NFV Virtualization Requirements,"
http://www.etsi.org/deliver/etsi_gs/NFV/001_099/004/01.01.01_60/gs_NFV004v010101p.pdf

[ETSI-NFV-ARCH] "ETSI NFV Architectural Framework,"
http://www.etsi.org/deliver/etsi_gs/NFV/001_099/002/01.01.01_60/gs_NFV002v010101p.pdf

[ETSI-NFV-TERM] "ETSI NFV: Terminology for main concepts in NFV,"
http://www.etsi.org/deliver/etsi_gs/NFV/001_099/003/01.02.01_60/gs_NFV003v010201p.pdf

[OPENSTACK] "OpenStack Open Source Software,"
<https://www.openstack.org/>

[OPENSTACK-CONGRESS-POLICY-ENGINE] "A policy as a service open source project in OpenStack,"
<https://wiki.openstack.org/wiki/Congress>

[OPENSTACK-CELIOMETER-MEASUREMENT] "OpenStack Celiometer,"
<http://docs.openstack.org/developer/ceilometer/measurements.html>

[OPENSTACK-NOVA-COMPUTE] "OpenStack Nova,"
<https://wiki.openstack.org/wiki/Nova>

[LINEAR-PROGRAM] Dimitris Alevras and Manfred W. Padberg, "Linear Optimization and Extensions: Problems and Solutions," Universitext, Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[BRANCH-AND-BOUND] "Fundamentals of Algorithmics," G. Brassard and P. Bratley.

[NFV-MANO-SPEC] "NFV Management and Orchestration Framework Specification,"
http://docbox.etsi.org/ISG/NFV/Open/Latest_Drafts/NFV-MAN001v061-%20management%20and%20orchestration.pdf

[CONVEX-OPT] "Convex Optimization,"
https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/cvxbook/bv_cvxbook.pdf

[ETSI-NFV-POC-PLACEMENT] "ETSI NFV Proof of Concept on Placement and Scheduling,"
http://nfvwiki.etsi.org/index.php?title=Constraint_based_Placement_and_Scheduling_for_NFV/Cloud_Systems

[DATALOG] Ceri, S. et al., "What you always wanted to know about Datalog (and never dared to ask)," Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on (Volume:1 , Issue: 1)

[IRTF-NFV-POLICY-ARCH] Figueira, N. et al., "Policy Architecture and Framework for NFV and Cloud Services,"

[Y.1731-monitoring] "OAM functions and mechanisms for Ethernet-based networks," <https://www.itu.int/rec/T-REC-Y.1731/en>

[LAYERED-SDN] "Cooperating Layered Architecture for SDN,"
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-contreras-sdnrg-layered-sdn/>

Authors' Addresses

Ram (Ramki) Krishnan
Dell Inc.
ramkri123@gmail.com

Norival Figueira
Brocade Communications

nfigueir@Brocade.com

Dilip Krishnaswamy
IBM Research
dilikris@in.ibm.com

Diego Lopez
Telefonica I+D
Don Ramon de la Cruz, 82
Madrid, 28006, Spain
+34 913 129 041
diego.r.lopez@telefonica.com

Steven Wright
AT&T
sw3588@att.com

Tim Hinrichs
Styra
tim@styra.com

Ruby Krishnaswamy
Orange
ruby.krishnaswamy@orange.com

Arun Yerra
Dell Inc.
arun.yerra@dell.com