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Why tunnels?

- Manage overlapping addresses between multiple tenants
- Decouple virtual **topology** provided by tunnels from physical network topology
- Decouple virtual **network service** from physical network (e.g. provide an L2 service over an L3 fabric)
- Support VM mobility independent of the physical network
- Support larger numbers of virtual networks (vs. VLANs for example)
- Reduce state requirements for physical network (e.g. MAC addresses)
- Because all CS problems can be solved with another level of indirection
Performance for SW

- Tunnels for Network Virtualization often originate in the hypervisor
- Lots of NICs support TSO/LRO (TCP Segmentation Offload/Large Receive Offload)
- Most NICs won’t do TSO with any existing tunneling encaps ➔ significant performance loss when tunneling
- STT uses a header that can be generated by today’s NICs when performing TSO
- A few other details in the draft to improve SW performance
Backwards Compatibility

- NICs
- Routers and switches
  - Source Port chosen to be constant per microflow, randomized for ECMP
- WAN services
  - They carry IP or Ethernet
- Middleboxes
  - Some work required (often true for tunnels)
  - Many also use SW implementation, reap TSO benefits
Flexible Control Plane

- Control plane should not be specified as part of tunnel encaps
  - Allow control plane to evolve

- Even putting “Virtual Network Instance ID” in data plane starts to constrain the control plane
  - Note that MPLS VPNs have a much more rich notion of VPN membership than a single VPN-ID can offer
Context Identification

- As packets exit from tunnels, need to deliver them to the right “context”
  - A context may be simply a “tenant” or “virtual network instance”, but they are special cases
  - Can also use it for other metadata (state versioning, distributed lookup, etc.)
  - An opaque context ID with control-plane defined semantics also supports control-plane independence goal
STT Encapsulation

Original data frame is encapsulated with STT Header

STT Frame is segmented and transmitted as a set of TCP segments (MAC headers not shown)
### STT Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Flags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4 Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Max. Segment Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Context ID (64 bits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15</td>
<td>Padding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-63</td>
<td>data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Up to 64kB, transmitted as a series of STT Segments
SEQ and ACK are repurposed to support reassembly of STT Frames
Open Issues

- Clearly this will confuse devices that expect a complete TCP state machine to exist
  - Most common result would be drop the packets
- Well-known port to be requested from IANA
- When middle boxes are in the path, need to
  A. Teach them at least to pass the packets, or
  B. Enable them to reassemble Frames for further processing
Next Steps

- Everything that is in STT could be done without “repurposing” the TCP header
  - We’d like to see the STT requirements considered in NVO3
  - See you in a few years when the NIC vendors build this

- Meanwhile, would be good to get more implementations (e.g. middleboxes)

- Not clear if any IETF WG is chartered to work on this yet, but L2VPN is closest fit