

INTERNET-DRAFT

Kommu BMWG S.
Internet-Draft
VMware Intended status: Informational J.
Rapp Expires: July 2018
VMware
2018 January 2,

Considerations for Benchmarking Network Virtualization Platforms
draft-skommu-bmwg-nvp-01.txt

Status of this Memo

This Internet-Draft is submitted 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.

documents Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other 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 on July 2, 2018.

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](http://trustee.ietf.org/license-info) 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. Code Components extracted from this document must include Simplified BSD License text as described in

Section 4.e of the [Trust Legal Provisions](#) and are provided without warranty as described in the Simplified BSD License.

Abstract

Current network benchmarking methodologies are focused on physical networking components and do not consider the actual application layer traffic patterns and hence do not reflect the traffic that virtual networking components work with. The purpose of this document is to distinguish and highlight benchmarking considerations when testing and evaluating virtual networking components in the data center.

Table of Contents

1	1. Introduction	
2		
2	2. Conventions used in this document	
3		
3	3. Definitions	
4		
4	3.1. System Under Test (SUT)	
4		
4	3.2. Network Virtualization Platform	
6	3.3. Micro-services	
7	4. Scope	
7		
7	4.1. Virtual Networking for Datacenter Applications	
8	4.2. Interaction with Physical Devices	
8	5. Interaction with Physical Devices	
11	5.1. Server Architecture Considerations	
14	6. Security Considerations	
14	7. IANA Considerations	
14	8. Conclusions	

<u>14</u>	<u>9.</u> References
<u>14</u>	<u>9.1.</u> Normative References
<u>15</u>	<u>9.2.</u> Informative References
<u>16</u>	<u>Appendix A.</u> Partial List of Parameters to Document
<u>16</u>	<u>A.1.</u> CPU
<u>16</u>	<u>A.2.</u> Memory
<u>16</u>	<u>A.3.</u> NIC
<u>17</u>	<u>A.4.</u> Hypervisor
<u>18</u>	<u>A.5.</u> Guest VM
<u>18</u>	<u>A.6.</u> Overlay Network Physical Fabric
<u>18</u>	<u>A.7.</u> Gateway Network Physical Fabric

1. Introduction

Datacenter virtualization that includes both compute and network virtualization is growing rapidly as the industry continues to

look

for ways to improve productivity, flexibility and at the same time

Kommu & Rapp

Expires July 2, 2018

[Page

2]

2018

cut costs. Network virtualization, is comparatively new and expected to grow tremendously similar to compute virtualization. There are multiple vendors and solutions out in the market, each with their own benchmarks to showcase why a particular solution is better than another. Hence, the need for a vendor and product agnostic way to benchmark multivendor solutions to help with comparison and make informed decisions when it comes to selecting the right network virtualization solution.

ACLs Applications traditionally have been segmented using VLANs and between the VLANs. This model does not scale because of the 4K scale limitations of VLANs. Overlays such as VXLAN were designed to address the limitations of VLANs

encapsulation With VXLAN, applications are segmented based on VXLAN (specifically the VNI field in the VXLAN header), which is similar to VLAN ID in the 802.1Q VLAN tag, however without the 4K scale limitations of VLANs. For a more detailed discussion on this subject please refer [RFC 7364](#) "Problem Statement: Overlays for Network Virtualization".

Geneve VXLAN is just one of several Network Virtualization Overlays(NVO). Some of the others include STT, Geneve and NVGRE. . STT and have expanded on the capabilities of VXLAN. Please refer IETF's nvo3 working group <<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/nvo3/documents/>> for more information.

going Modern application architectures, such as Micro-services, are beyond the three tier app models such as web, app and db. Benchmarks MUST consider whether the proposed solution is able to scale up to the demands of such applications and not just a three-tier architecture.

2. Conventions used in this document

NOT", The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL
this "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC 2119](#) [[RFC2119](#)].

In this document, these words will appear with that interpretation only when in ALL CAPS. Lower case uses of these words are not to

be

interpreted as carrying significance described in [RFC 2119](#).

3. Definitions

3.1. System Under Test (SUT)

Traditional hardware based networking devices generally use the device under test (DUT) model of testing. In this model, apart from

any allowed configuration, the DUT is a black box from a testing perspective. This method works for hardware based networking devices since the device itself is not influenced by any other components outside the DUT.

Virtual networking components cannot leverage DUT model of testing as the DUT is not just the virtual device but includes the hardware

components that were used to host the virtual device

Hence SUT model MUST be used instead of the traditional device under test

With SUT model, the virtual networking component along with all software and hardware components that host the virtual networking component MUST be considered as part of the SUT.

Virtual networking components may also work with higher level TCP segments such as TS0. In contrast, all physical switches and routers, including the ones that act as initiators for NVOs, work with L2/L3 packets.

Please refer to [section 5](#) Figure 1 for a visual representation of System Under Test in the case of Intra-Host testing and [section 5](#) Figure 2 for System Under Test in the case of Inter-Host testing

3.2. Network Virtualization Platform

This document does not focus on Network Function Virtualization.

Network Function Virtualization (NFV) focuses on being independent of networking hardware while providing the same functionality. In the case of NFV, traditional benchmarking methodologies recommended

by IETF may be used. Considerations for Benchmarking Virtual Network Functions and Their Infrastructure IETF document addresses benchmarking NFVs.

Typical NFV implementations emulate in software, the characteristics

physical and features of physical switches. They are similar to any
L2/L3 switch from the perspective of the packet size, which is
typically enforced based on the maximum transmission unit used.

Network Virtualization platforms on the other hand, are closer to
the application layer and are able to work with not only L2/L3

Kommu & Rapp Expires July 2, 2018 [Page
4]

2018

packets but also segments that leverage TCP optimizations such as Large Segment Offload (LSO).

NVPs leverage TCP stack optimizations such as TCP Segmentation Offload (TSO) and Large Receive Offload (LRO) that enables NVPs to work with much larger payloads of up to 64K unlike their counterparts such as NFVs.

one
MTU

Because of the difference in the payload, which translates into operation per 64K of payload in NVP verses ~40 operations for the same amount of payload in NFV because of having to divide it to sized packets, results in considerable difference in performance between NFV and NVP.

Please refer to figure 1 for a pictorial representation of this primary difference between NPV and NFV for a 64K payload segment/packet running on network set to 1500 bytes MTU.

Note: Payload sizes in figure 1 are approximates.




Figure 1 Payload NPV vs NFV

Hence, normal benchmarking methods are not relevant to the NVPs.

Instead, newer methods that take into account the built in advantages of TCP provided optimizations MUST be used for testing Network Virtualization Platforms.

3.3. Micro-services

deployment

Traditional monolithic application architectures such as the three tier web, app and db architectures are hitting scale and

limits for the modern use cases.

Micro-services make use of classic unix style of small app with

single responsibility.

Kommu & Rapp

Expires July 2, 2018

[Page

6]

2018

These small apps are designed with the following characteristics:

Each application only does one thing - like unix tools

Small enough that you could rewrite instead of maintain

Embedded with a simple web container

Packaged as a single executable

Installed as daemons

Each of these applications are completely separate

Interact via uniform interface

REST (over HTTP/HTTPS) being the most common

With Micro-services architecture, a single web app of the three

tier

application model could now have 100s of smaller apps dedicated to do just one job.

These 100s of small one responsibility only services will MUST be secured into their own segment - hence pushing the scale

boundaries

of the overlay from both simple segmentation perspective and also from a security perspective

4. Scope

This document does not address Network Function Virtualization has been covered already by previous IETF documents

(https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-bmwg-virtual-net/?include_text=1) the focus of this document is Network Virtualization Platform where the network functions are an

intrinsic

part of the hypervisor's TCP stack, working closer to the application layer and leveraging performance optimizations such TSO/RSS provided by the TCP stack and the underlying hardware.

4.1. Virtual Networking for Datacenter Applications

While virtualization is growing beyond the datacenter, this

document

focuses on the virtual networking for east-west traffic within the

datacenter applications only. For example, in a three tier app
such web, app and db, this document focuses on the east-west traffic
between web and app. It does not address north-south web traffic
accessed from outside the datacenter. A future document would
address north-south traffic flows.

Kommu & Rapp

Expires July 2, 2018

[Page

7]

2018

This document addresses scale requirements for modern application architectures such as Micro-services to consider whether the proposed solution is able to scale up to the demands of micro-services application models that basically have 100s of small services communicating on some standard ports such as http/https using protocols such as REST

4.2. Interaction with Physical Devices

Virtual network components cannot be tested independent of other components within the system. Example, unlike a physical router

or

a firewall, where the tests can be focused directly solely on the device, when testing a virtual router or firewall, multiple other devices may become part of the system under test. Hence the characteristics of these other traditional networking switches and routers, LB, FW etc. MUST be considered.

- ! Hashing method used
- ! Over-subscription rate
- ! Throughput available
- ! Latency characteristics

5. Interaction with Physical Devices

In virtual environments, System Under Test (SUT) may often share resources and reside on the same Physical hardware with other components involved in the tests. Hence SUT MUST be clearly defined. In this tests, a single hypervisor may host multiple servers, switches, routers, firewalls etc.,

number

Intra host testing: Intra host testing helps in reducing the of components involved in a test. For example, intra host testing would help focus on the System Under Test, logical switch and the hardware that is running the hypervisor that hosts the logical switch, and eliminate other components. Because of the nature of virtual infrastructures and multiple elements being hosted on the same physical infrastructure, influence from other components

cannot

be completely ruled out. For example, unlike in physical infrastructures, logical routing or distributed firewall MUST NOT

be

benchmarked independent of logical switching. System Under Test definition MUST include all components involved with that

particular
test.

8] Kommu & Rapp Expires July 2, 2018 [Page

2018




Figure 2 Intra-Host System Under Test

Inter host testing: Inter host testing helps in profiling the underlying network interconnect performance. For example, when testing Logical Switching, inter host testing would not only test the logical switch component but also any other devices that are part of the physical data center fabric that connects the two hypervisors. System Under Test MUST be well defined to help with repeatability of tests. System Under Test definition in the case

of

inter host testing, MUST include all components, including the underlying network fabric.

Figure 2 is a visual representation of system under test for

inter-

host testing

2018




Figure 3 Inter-Host System Under Test

Virtual components have a direct dependency on the physical infrastructure that is hosting these resources. Hardware characteristics of the physical host impact the performance of the virtual components. The components that are being tested and the impact of the other hardware components within the hypervisor on

the

performance of the SUT MUST be documented. Virtual component
performance is influenced by the physical hardware components
within
the hypervisor. Access to various offloads such as TCP
segmentation

2018

offload, may have significant impact on performance. Firmware and driver differences may also significantly impact results based on whether the specific driver leverages any hardware level offloads offered. Hence, all physical components of the physical server running the hypervisor that hosts the virtual components MUST be documented along with the firmware and driver versions of all the components used to help ensure repeatability of test results. For example, BIOS configuration of the server MUST be documented as

some

of those changes are designed to improve performance. Please

refer

to [Appendix A](#) for a partial list of parameters to document.

5.1. Server Architecture Considerations

When testing physical networking components, the approach taken is to consider the device as a black-box. With virtual

infrastructure,

this approach would no longer help as the virtual networking components are an intrinsic part of the hypervisor they are

running

on and are directly impacted by the server architecture used. Server hardware components define the capabilities of the virtual networking components. Hence, server architecture MUST be documented in detail to help with repeatability of tests. And the entire hardware and software components become the SUT.

5.1.1. Frame format/sizes within the Hypervisor

Maximum Transmission Unit (MTU) limits physical network

component's

frame sizes. The most common max supported MTU for physical

devices

is 9000. However, 1500 MTU is the standard. Physical network testing and NFV uses these MTU sizes for testing. However, the virtual networking components that live inside a hypervisor, may work with much larger segments because of the availability of hardware and software based offloads. Hence, the normal smaller packets based testing is not relevant for performance testing of virtual networking components. All the TCP related configuration such as TSO size, number of RSS queues MUST be documented along

with

any other physical NIC related configuration.

Virtual network components work closer to the application layer

then

the physical networking components. Hence virtual network

components work with type and size of segments that are often not the same type and size that the physical network works with.

Hence,

testing virtual network components MUST be done with application layer segments instead of the physical network layer packets.

5.1.2. Baseline testing with Logical Switch

Logical switch is often an intrinsic component of the test system along with any other hardware and software components used for

Kommu & Rapp

Expires July 2, 2018

[Page

2018

testing. Also, other logical components cannot be tested independent of the Logical Switch.

5.1.3. Repeatability

To ensure repeatability of the results, in the physical network component testing, much care is taken to ensure the tests are conducted with exactly the same parameters. Parameters such as

MAC

addresses used etc.,

When testing NPV components with an application layer test tool, there may be a number of components within the system that may not be available to tune or to ensure they maintain a desired state. Example: housekeeping functions of the underlying Operating

System.

Hence, tests MUST be repeated a number of times and each test case MUST be run for at least 2 minutes if test tool provides such an option. Results SHOULD be derived from multiple test runs.

Variance

between the tests SHOULD be documented.

5.1.4. Tunnel encap/decap outside the hypervisor

Logical network components may also have performance impact based

on

the functionality available within the physical fabric. Physical fabric that supports NVO encap/decap is one such case that has considerable impact on the performance. Any such functionality

that

exists on the physical fabric MUST be part of the test result documentation to ensure repeatability of tests. In this case SUT MUST include the physical fabric

5.1.5. SUT Hypervisor Profile

Physical networking equipment has well defined physical resource characteristics such as type and number of ASICs/SoCs used, amount of memory, type and number of processors etc., Virtual networking components performance is dependent on the physical hardware that hosts the hypervisor. Hence the physical hardware usage, which is part of SUT, for a given test MUST be documented. Example, CPU usage when running logical router.

the

CPU usage changes based on the type of hardware available within physical server. For example, TCP Segmentation Offload greatly

NIC reduces CPU usage by offloading the segmentation process to the
card on the sender side. Receive side scaling offers similar
benefit on the receive side. Hence, availability and status of
such hardware MUST be documented along with actual CPU/Memory usage
when the virtual networking components have access to such offload
capable hardware.

2018

Following is a partial list of components that MUST be documented both in terms of what is available and also what is used by the

SUT

- * CPU - type, speed, available instruction sets (e.g. AES-NI)
- * Memory - type, amount
- * Storage - type, amount
- * NIC Cards - type, number of ports, offloads available/used, drivers, firmware (if applicable), HW revision
- * Libraries such as DPDK if available and used
- * Number and type of VMs used for testing and
 - o vCPUs
 - o RAM
 - o Storage
 - o Network Driver
 - o Any prioritization of VM resources
 - o Operating System type, version and kernel if
- * Test tool
 - o Workload type
 - o Protocol being tested
 - o Number of threads
 - o Version of tool
- * For inter-hypervisor tests,
 - o Physical network devices that are part of the test

applicable

! Note: For inter-hypervisor tests, system

under test

is being

the

13]

Kommu & Rapp

is no longer only the virtual component that
tested but the entire fabric that connects

Expires July 2, 2018

[Page

under virtual components become part of the system
test.

6. Security Considerations

Test Benchmarking activities as described in this memo are limited to
with technology characterization of a Device Under Test/System Under
(DUT/SUT) using controlled stimuli in a laboratory environment,
dedicated address space and the constraints specified in the
sections above.

setup The benchmarking network topology will be an independent test
and MUST NOT be connected to devices that may forward the test
traffic into a production network, or misroute traffic to the test
management network.

Further, benchmarking is performed on a "black-box" basis, relying
solely on measurements observable external to the DUT/SUT.

Special capabilities SHOULD NOT exist in the DUT/SUT specifically
for benchmarking purposes. Any implications for network security
arising from the DUT/SUT SHOULD be identical in the lab and in
production networks.

7. IANA Considerations

No IANA Action is requested at this time.

8. Conclusions

the Network Virtualization Platforms, because of their proximity to
application layer and since they can take advantage of TCP stack
optimizations, do not function on packets/sec basis. Hence,
traditional benchmarking methods, while still relevant for Network
Function Virtualization, are not designed to test Network
Virtualization Platforms. Also, advances in application
architectures such as micro-services, bring new challenges and
need benchmarking not just around throughput and latency but also
around scale. New benchmarking methods that are designed to take
advantage of the TCP optimizations or needed to accurately benchmark

9. References

9.1. Normative References

[RFC7364] T. Narten, E. Gray, D. Black, L. Fang, L. Kreeger, M. Napierala, "Problem Statement: Overlays for Network Virtualization",
[RFC 7364](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc7364/), October 2014, <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc7364/>
[Kommur](#) & Rapp Expires July 2, 2018 [Page

[nv03] IETF, WG, Network Virtualization Overlays, <
<https://datatracker.ietf.org/wg/nvo3/documents/>>

9.2. Informative References

- Network
- [1] A. Morton " Considerations for Benchmarking Virtual
Functions and Their Infrastructure", [draft-ietf-bmwg-
virtual-
net-03](#), < [https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-bmwg-
virtual-net/?include_text=1](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-bmwg-virtual-net/?include_text=1)>

[Appendix A](#). Partial List of Parameters to Document

A.1. CPU

CPU Vendor

CPU Number

CPU Architecture

of Sockets (CPUs)

of Cores

Clock Speed (GHz)

Max Turbo Freq. (GHz)

Cache per CPU (MB)

of Memory Channels

Chipset

Hyperthreading (BIOS Setting)

Power Management (BIOS Setting)

VT-d

A.2. Memory

Memory Speed (MHz)

DIMM Capacity (GB)

of DIMMs

DIMM configuration

Total DRAM (GB)

A.3. NIC

Vendor

Model

Port Speed (Gbps)

Ports

PCIe Version

PCIe Lanes

Bonded

Bonding Driver

Kernel Module Name

Driver Version

VXLAN TSO Capable

VXLAN RSS Capable

Ring Buffer Size RX

Ring Buffer Size TX

A.4. Hypervisor

Hypervisor Name

Version/Build

Based on

Hotfixes/Patches

OVS Version/Build

IRQ balancing

vCPUs per VM

Modifications to HV

Modifications to HV TCP stack

Number of VMs

IP MTU

Flow control TX (send pause)

Flow control RX (honor pause)

Encapsulation Type

A.5. Guest VM

Guest OS & Version

Modifications to VM

IP MTU Guest VM (Bytes)

Test tool used

Number of NetPerf Instances

Total Number of Streams

Guest RAM (GB)

A.6. Overlay Network Physical Fabric

Vendor

Model

and Type of Ports

Software Release

Interface Configuration

Interface/Ethernet MTU (Bytes)

Flow control TX (send pause)

Flow control RX (honor pause)

A.7. Gateway Network Physical Fabric

Vendor

Model

and Type of Ports

Software Release

Interface Configuration

Interface/Ethernet MTU (Bytes)

2018

Internet-Draft

NVP Benchmarking Considerations

January

Flow control TX (send pause)

Flow control RX (honor pause)

2018

Internet-Draft

NVP Benchmarking Considerations

January

Author's Addresses

Samuel Kommu
VMware
3401 Hillview Ave
Palo Alto, CA, 94304

Email: skommu@vmware.com

Jacob Rapp
VMware
3401 Hillview Ave
Palo Alto, CA, 94304

Email: jrapp@vmware.com

