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The Point

There are two main ways to build software switch pipelines:

“code-driven”

and

“data-driven”

Usually, these are considered to be alternatives.

They can actually be complementary.
Irrelevancies

The distinction I am making is not about packet I/O methods like:

- Custom kernel module
- AF_PACKET sockets
- DPDK
- Netmap

Packet I/O is key to performance but not to switch pipelines.
Code-Driven Switch Pipeline

Executes series of code fragments ("stages") per packet.

- Obvious.
- Loose coupling.
Code-Driven Pipeline Stages

- Can do anything or nothing.
- Each stage increases per-packet latency.
- Near-zero fixed overhead.
- Therefore: null pipeline is very fast.

Packet Forwarding Latency versus Number of Stages
DPDK and Netmap Are Not Software Switches

DPDK and Netmap are packet I/O methods. Early publications compared them against software switches. This is unfair: compare them against other packet I/O methods instead.
Some Code-Driven Switches
in chronological order

1) Linux bridge + iptables + ebtables + …
2) Click
3) VMware VDS
4) VMware NSX Edge
5) VPP
6) BESS
Data-Driven Switch Pipeline

A single engine drives each packet through all the stages, each of which is a data table.

- Unnatural for programmers
- Limited by engine's capabilities
- Parsing is expensive
+ Parsing happens only once per pipeline
Data-Driven Pipeline Stages

N stages can be cross-producted into 1 stage (see NSDI 2015 paper):

\[
data \times \underbrace{\times \cdots \times}_{N \text{ stages}} \times data = data
\]

- High fixed cost.
- Adding stages adds little per-packet latency.
- Therefore: null pipeline is slow, complex pipeline is fast.
- Hardware classification offload is possible.
Some Data-Driven Switches

- Open vSwitch
- MidoNet
Crossover

Can we combine strengths of both approaches?

Code-driven:
  + Low fixed overhead.
  + Flexibility.

Data-driven:
  + Low per-stage overhead.
  + Common parser.

I don't have a complete answer but I have some thoughts.
Code-Driven Moving Toward Data-Driven

Are you skeptical?

“If a data-driven pipeline is faster than a code-driven one, for some application, then the code-driven pipeline code is badly written.”

But I have two data points:

1. VMware VDS
2. VMware NSX Edge
Data-Driven Moving Toward Code-Driven

Attack sources of fixed overhead:

- Cost of parsing, by parsing less.
- Cost of classification, by hardware offload (which is not just for high-priced specialized hardware).

Increase flexibility:

- Integrate arbitrary code, via eBPF/P4.
- Integrate external code, e.g. kernel conntrack, NAT.
Conclusion

Two seemingly different software switch pipelines, “code-driven” and “data-driven,” may ultimately move closer to one another than they started out out.