Bowman: A Node OS for Active Networks

S. Merugu S. Bhattacharjee E. Zegura K. Calvert

College of Computing; Georgia Tech Department of Computer Science; U. of Maryland Department of Computer Science, U. of Kentucky

Infocom 2000, Tel Aviv, Israel

Outline

- Background Active Networking
- Bowman System Design
- Performance Measurements
- Configuration for Active Networking
- Concluding Remarks

Active Networking: What

- Programmable user-network interface(s)
- Control via:
 - mobile code in packets (capsules)
 - mobile code fetched from code repositories, based on packet header values
 - programmable signaling protocols
 - selection from set of fixed behaviors
 - → Multiple *execution environments*

Active Networking: Why

- Faster deployment of new protocols and services
- Platform for research
- Services that exploit app and network knowledge
 - reliable multicast
 - application-specific congestion control, e.g., MPEG
 - network caching
 - network monitoring

 \rightarrow High performance, access to low-level resources

DARPA Node Architecture



Bowman (and CANEs)



Bowman Design Goals

- Support per-flow processing
- Provide a fast path
- Enable a network-wide architecture
- Maintain reasonable performance
- Provide modularity and extensibility
- Leverage existing Host OS

Primary Bowman Abstractions

- Channels
 - communication endpoints
 - include protocol processing
- A-flows
 - computation
- State store
 - indexed by a unique key
 - includes named registries for data sharing between a-flows



Additional Components

- Dynamic extension mechanism
- Efficient packet classifier
 - match arbitrary number of header fields
 - returns first, all, or best match (with costs associated with each field)
 - dynamically extensible to different protocols
- Timers
- Network architecture via abstract topologies

Packet Processing Path



Bowman Network Architecture



- Configure abstract links: endpoints plus protocol processing over physical topology (ALP)
- Select set of abstract links for virtual topology (ATP)

Performance Testing



Compare to:

- Solaris kernel forwarding
- C gateway -- socket read/write of UDP segments

Forwarding Performance



Saturates 100 Mbps Ethernet for packets over 1400 bytes

Packet Processing Overheads



Bowman overhead relatively constant (~25 usec) System read and write calls dominate processing time

Effect of Real-time Scheduling



Comparison of time-sharing (TS) to real-time (RT) mode Three kernel threads: input, a-flow, output

Configuration for AN

- Monolithic approach
 - E creates exactly one a-flow that subscribes to all packets addressed to EE
 - EE manages own resources
- Multi-a-flow approach (CANEs)
 - E creates one control a-flow used for EE signaling and management
 - New a-flow for each user's packets
 - Bowman schedules user computation

Selected Related Work

- Router plug-ins (WashU)
 - integrated EE (customizable IP) and NodeOS
 - NetBSD kernel modifications
- Janos (Utah)
 - Java-based NodeOS
- Extensible routers (Princeton)
 - Scout-based NodeOS

Future Work

- Security mechanism
- Resource management
- More complex output queueing disciplines
- Scalable topology instantiation
- EE-developers toolkit to run over DARPA NodeOS implementations?

