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Abstract—Data sets in e-science are increasing exponentially in size. To transfer these huge data sets we need to make efficient use of all available network capacity. This means using multiple paths when available. In this paper a prototype of such a multipath network is presented. Several emerging network technologies are integrated to achieve the goal of efficient high end-to-end throughput. Multipath TCP is used by the end hosts to distribute the traffic across multiple paths and OpenFlow is used within the network to do the wide area traffic engineering. Extensive monitoring is part of the demonstration. A website will show the actual topology (including link outages), the paths provisioned through the network and traffic statistics on all links and the end-to-end aggregate throughput.
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I. INTRODUCTION

An international consortium of researchers is investigating innovative technologies for supporting high performance computing (HPC) data flows using the capabilities of OpenFlow as well as enhancements to the TCP/IP stack. This consortium has created an experimental international OpenFlow testbed, which will be used for a series of complementary demonstrations at SuperComputing 2012 (SC12). These demonstrations will showcase several OpenFlow based services for e-science, including multipathing with multipath TCP (MPTCP), multi-domain automatic network topology discovery for integrated L2/L3 paths using tunneling techniques, and direct dynamic path provisioning using edge signaling and control. This paper focuses on multipathing with OpenFlow and MPTCP.

Multipathing can be done at L3 with Equal Cost Multipath (ECMP) routing or at L2 with protocols like TRILL (IETF RFC 5556) [1] or IEEE 802.1aq (Shortest Path Bridging -P802.1aq-2012 [3]). In all these cases load balancing across the paths is done based on flows by calculating a hash (based on e.g. Ethernet addresses, IP addresses and TCP/UDP port numbers) of the packets. Each packet of such a flow follows the same path through the network, which prevents out of order delivery within a flow. When the traffic has many different flows the traffic will be evenly spread across the various paths. But when there are only a few flows, which is typically the case in large data e-science applications, this is not the case. Another disadvantage of hashing is that all links get the same percentage of the hash values and therefore all the paths need to have the same capacity.

Multipath TCP is a new approach towards efficient load balancing. Instead of letting the network do the load balancing by using hashes and ECMP, MPTCP is doing the load balancing in the end nodes as part of the TCP process. Multipath TCP (MPTCP) is described in RFC 6182 [4] and the ‘TCP Extensions for Multipath Operation with Multiple Addresses’ internet draft [5]. MPTCP is an extension of the TCP/IP stack. The byte stream of the application is split across multiple subflows, one for each interface. MPTCP can handle paths of different bandwidth because there is a congestion control mechanism across the subflows. This congestion control mechanism takes care that traffic on a congested path is moved to a link with less congestion. So it adapts the load balancing according to the load of other traffic on the paths.

In this demonstration MPTCP will be used in combination with an OpenFlow based multipath network. Figure 1 shows
an example of such a network. The topology has multiple paths of various capacity between the servers. The four switches are controlled via the OpenFlow protocol by an OpenFlow application. This application automatically detects the topology by listening to LLDP (link Layer Discovery Protocol) packets (received via the OpenFlow protocol) and calculates link disjoint paths between the servers. The forwarding entries that are needed for the paths are then pushed to the switches. MPTCP on the servers can now use multiple paths simultaneously. The details are described in section III.

II. HOW DOES MULTIPATH TCP WORK?

Figure 2 shows how MPTCP works. In a MPTCP enabled

kernel the TCP component is split in a MPTCP component and TCP subflow components for each interface. The MPTCP component receives a byte stream from the application (MPTCP uses an unmodified socket API and TCP semantics northbound, so applications do not need to be

adapted). The MPTCP component splits the byte stream into multiple segments which are handed to the TCP subflow components. Each subflow behaves as a normal TCP flow to the network.

The MPTCP component implements several functions. It takes care of path management by detecting and using multiple paths to a destination. Packet scheduling splits the byte stream received from the application in multiple segments and transmits these segments on one of the available subflows. These segments are numbered, so that the receiving MPTCP component can put the segments in the correct order and reconstruct the original byte stream. Finally there is congestion control across the subflows. This function spreads the load over the subflows. When a subflow becomes congested, traffic is moved to a subflow that is less congested. This function also takes care of retransmissions on another subflow when one of the subflows fails.

Figure 3 shows the initial connection setup and a subflow connection setup with server A as the initiator of both setups. MPTCP starts with an initial connection setup that is similar to a normal TCP connection setup with a SYN, SYN/ACK, ACK sequence. The only difference is that an MPTCP capable server adds the MP_CAPABLE TCP option. Server A sends a TCP SYN packet with the MP_CAPABLE TCP option. This option field also contains its authentication key and some additional flags to indicate whether checksums are required and the cryptographic algorithm to use. The 64-bit authentication key is used to authenticate the addition of future subflows to this MPTCP connection. When server B is MPTCP capable, it will respond with a SYN/ACK with the MP_CAPABLE TCP option. This option field also contains its authentication key and the flags. When server B is not MPTCP capable, it does not understand the MP_CAPABLE TCP option and it will respond with a SYN/ACK which does not contain the MP_CAPABLE TCP option. In that case server A will continue in normal TCP mode. However, if server B has signalled it is MPTCP capable, server A will respond with an ACK, the MP_CAPABLE TCP option with the authentication keys of both server A and

Fig. 2. Traditional TCP vs Multipath TCP
server B and the flags. This completes the initial MPTCP connection setup.

Additional subflow connections can be initiated by either side, but usually they are initiated by the server that did the initial connection setup. The existence of additional IPv4 and/or IPv6 addresses can be advertised to the other side with the ADD_ADDR TCP option.

In figure 3 the additional subflow is initiated by server A. Additional subflows are setup similar to a normal TCP connection setup with the exchange of SYN, SYN/ACK and ACK packets, but in the case of subflows these packets also contain the MP_JOIN TCP option. Server A starts with sending a SYN packet with the MP_JOIN TCP option with a token, a random number (nonce), an address ID and flags. The token is a cryptographic SHA-1 hash (truncated to the most significant 32 bits) of the receiver’s key. This token can be used by server B to identify the connection. The random number (nonce) is used to prevent replay attacks on the authentication method. The address ID identifies the source address (in this case B2) of this packet. The address ID allows address removal without needing to know what the source address at the receiver is, thus allowing address removal through NATs. The flags can be used by the sender to tell the other server to use this subflow only for backup when other paths have failed, or that the subflow should be used immediately.

When receiving a SYN packet with an MP_JOIN TCP option that contains a valid token for an existing MPTCP connection, the recipient responds with a SYN/ACK packet with an MP_JOIN TCP option containing a Message Authentication Code (MAC), a random number (nonce) and the address ID (in this case B2). Server B’s MAC is a SHA-1 hash of server B’s key followed by server A’s key and truncated to the leftmost 64 bits.

Server A responds with an ACK packet with the MP_JOIN TCP option which contains server A’s MAC. This is a SHA-1 hash of server A’s key followed by server B’s key and truncated to the leftmost 64 bits. This ACK packet needs to be sent reliably, since it is the only time server A’s MAC is sent. Therefore there is a fourth handshake in which server B sends an ACK packet to server A. Server A sets the connection to the ESTABLISHED state only after receiving this final ACK.

MPTCP is implemented on Ubuntu and Debian Linux [13] by the group of Olivier Bonaventure at the Institute of Information and Communication Technologies, Electronics and Applied Mathematics (ICTEAM) of the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL) in Belgium. This implementation will be used in our demonstration.

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE DEMONSTRATION

This demonstration is a joint effort of SARA, Caltech, SURFnet, StarLight and iCAIR. An international OpenFlow testbed will be used to transfer data from a server at the Caltech PoP at CERN in Geneva to a server at the Caltech booth at SC12. Each server has two 10GE interfaces and the servers are MPTCP capable. The servers use MPTCP to simultaneously transfer data over all available paths, spreading the load optimally across the paths. An OpenFlow application is responsible for calculating optimal paths and provisioning these on the OpenFlow switches. The OpenFlow application monitors the network continuously. Some links will be manually interrupted during the demonstration. This will generate a link down event, which is sent via the OpenFlow protocol to the application. The application updates its discovered topology and calculates new paths. New forwarding entries will then be pushed to the switches.

The links in the OpenFlow network are a mixture of 1GE and 10GE. A possible topology is shown in figure 4. The demonstration topology will use three transatlantic links: one provided by US LHCnet between CERN and StarLight, one provided by ACE between NetherLight and StarLight and one provided by SURFnet between NetherLight and MAN LAN. This SURFnet link carries two 1GE circuits or VLANs. The Dutch Research Consortium (DRC) booth has requested two 10GE circuits (D10-1 and D10-2 in figure 4). iCAIR has two 10GE circuits available (I10-1 and I10-2) and a 100GE circuit (I100-1). Finally, Caltech has two 10GE available (C10-1 and C10-2). The details depend on the availability of various links during SC12, although the usage of the transatlantic links is already confirmed by SURFnet and US LHCnet.

The switches marked with ‘OF’ in figure 4 are OpenFlow switches. All OpenFlow switches are controlled by one controller and one application. The OpenFlow application connects via the controller to the OpenFlow switches and
TABLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VLAN ASSIGNMENTS TO THE SERVER INTERFACES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>server B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eth1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500, 501, 502, 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>server A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eth1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504, 505, 506, 507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

automatically discovers the topology via the LLDP (Link Layer Discovery Protocol - IEEE 802.1AB-2009 [2]) protocol. The application then calculates all available paths between the servers and maps MPTCP subflows on these paths. This results in a set of paths to be provisioned. The application then pushes the forwarding entries for each of the paths to the switches using the OpenFlow protocol.

Normally, MPTCP is used in a routed infrastructure and the routing table at the server determines which outgoing interface needs to be used to reach an address of the peer server. So each address on a MPTCP capable server can communicate to any of the addresses of the peer MPTCP capable server. However, our network does not use routing so only interfaces that are on the same subnet (or VLAN) can communicate. That is why we decided to configure two VLANs on each interface of the servers. Table I shows the VLANs that will be configured on the server interfaces. The result is that there are 8 MPTCP subflows (on VLAN 500 to VLAN 507) between the servers. IPv6 Unique Local Addresses (ULA) [16] will be used on those VLANs. These 8 subflows will be mapped by the OpenFlow application onto paths through the OpenFlow network.

Figure 5 shows an example of paths provisioned in the network. In this example there are two fiber cuts (causing an outage on the SL1 and ACE links). The path finding algorithm in the application may find three paths in this situation:

- A 10GE path via US LHCnet, SL2 and the iCAIR booth
- A 1GE path via NetherLight, MAN LAN, ML1 and the iCAIR booth.
- A 1GE path via NetherLight, MAN LAN, ML2 and the DRC and iCAIR booths.

The OpenFlow application maps the 8 MPTCP subflows on these three paths. MPTCP should be able to fill these paths with up to 12 Gbps of traffic end-to-end.

Investigating various path finding algorithms in this topology is part of the work being done. We will start with a simple algorithm, most likely the Edmonds-Karp [19] or another maximum flow algorithm. Figure 6 shows such an algorithm in pseudo code. It finds a set of paths with maximum flow capacity between points A and B. The 8 MPTCP subflows are mapped on these paths. Subflows between the same set of interfaces are preferably mapped on different paths. When there is no path between two sets of interfaces, the two subflows of between those interfaces cannot communicate and the MPTCP congestion algorithm will detect this and will move traffic to other subflows.

The network will be monitored using Ethernet OAM (IEEE 802.1ag-2007, which is part of 802.1Q-2011 [6]), the traffic statistics counters on the OpenFlow switches and LLDP. The monitoring application will connect to all OpenFlow switches and monitors the reception of LLDP packets on interfaces and also the link down events when an interface goes down. This provides a view of the actual physical topology that is always up to date.

In addition, the flow entries on the switches are monitored in order to detect the paths that are provisioned in the network and to collect statistics about these paths. The traffic and error counters on all the interfaces of each path are retrieved and are shown on a website in a weather map style. The IEEE 802.1ag Ethernet OAM protocol is used to monitor end to end connectivity. CCM (Continuity Check Messages) will
TABLE II
VLAN CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE THREE BOOTHs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C10-1</th>
<th>C10-2</th>
<th>I10-1</th>
<th>I10-2</th>
<th>D10-1</th>
<th>D10-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C10-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10-1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10-2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

be used to monitor reachability. LBM (Loopback Message) and LTR (Link Trace Message) will be used on the end hosts to L2 ping Ethernet interfaces along the paths and to run L2 traces to detect the paths along the network.

IV. NETWORK REQUIREMENTS

One of the servers (A) is located at CERN. It has two 10GE interfaces, each of which is connected to an OpenFlow switch. There are two 10GE circuits between CERN and NetherLight over the dark fiber of SURFnet. There is also a 10GE connection provided by US LHCnet between CERN and the Caltech PoP at StarLight. The two 10GE circuits between CERN and NetherLight are passed through to two OpenFlow switches at SARA. One of these OpenFlow switches has a transatlantic 10GE circuit to StarLight provided by ACE. Both OpenFlow switches at SARA have a 1GE circuit to MAN LAN provided by SURFnet.

From StarLight there will be three 10GE circuits (SL1, SL2 and SL3) towards SC12. SL1 connects to an OpenFlow switch at the Caltech booth, SL2 connects to an OpenFlow switch at the iCAIR booth and SL3 connects to an OpenFlow switch at the Dutch Research Consortium booth. Two of the three 10GE circuits may share capacity with each other. All circuits may share capacity with other demos, but the total transatlantic capacity available for this demonstration should preferable be 20 Gbps when there is no other traffic.

From MAN LAN there will be two 1GE circuits (ML1 and ML2) towards SC12. ML1 connects to an OpenFlow switch at the iCAIR booth. ML2 connects to an OpenFlow switch at the Dutch Research Consortium booth. ML1 and ML2 may share capacity with each other.

The Dutch Research Consortium booth has two 10GE interfaces available for this demonstration (D10-1 and D10-2). ML2 connects to D10-1, SL3 connects to D10-2.

The iCAIR booth has two 10GE interfaces available (I10-1 and I10-2) and also a 100GE interface (I100-1). SL2 connects to I100-1 and ML1 connects to I10-1.

The Caltech booth has two 10GE interfaces available for this demonstration (C10-1 and C10-2). SL1 connects to C10-2.

There will also be a couple of 10GE VLANs between the three booths. Table II shows which VLANs need to be provisioned.

V. DESIRED OUTCOMES

We expect to build a prototype that shows how several emerging technologies combined can provide an efficient high performance wide area network. A big advantage of the chosen technologies is that it does not need any changes to the application. MPTCP on the end node looks like a normal TCP/IP API to the application and it makes sure of spreading the load across multiple paths. Costin Raicu of University College London has done MPTCP performance testing in a datacenter network and got quite good results [12].

OpenFlow will do the wide area traffic engineering. By centralising the network state information and path calculation we expect fast and optimal path selections. The monitoring that will be an integrated part of the prototype is expected to show both overall and detailed performance and information what is going on in the network.

VI. RELEVANCE TO THE HPC COMMUNITY

One potential large scale application of the multipath approach at Layer 2 is the data processing environment for the LHC experiments. The infrastructure used for this purpose, organised through the World-wide LHC Computing Grid (WLCG), is based on a large set of computing sites located on each of the continents1. 11 Tier1 sites in the WLCG are interconnected through a dedicated Layer 2 network, the LHC Optical Private Network (LHCOPN). Tier 2 and Tier 3 sites typically are using the General Purpose R&E Networking infrastructures available in their respective region or country. The computing and data models of the LHC experiments are currently undergoing a change towards less hierarchical, more dynamical modes of operation. This change blurs the distinction between the roles of the sites, and will have an impact on the future data movement schemes. While the data distribution between the LHC computing sites used to be determined by pre-placement strategies based on expected dataset usage, data transfers will be more demand-driven, i.e. less predictable in the future. The LHC Open Network Environment (LHCONE) is an attempt to organise the network services for the LHC, by all national, regional and inter-regional R&E networks supporting LHC-related data movements. One particular challenge faced by LHCONE is the need to interconnect different administrative domains in different regions, while providing a flexible possibility of traffic engineering the networks. Typically, there are several interconnecting links between the domains, and efficient use of these (often expensive, as e.g. in the case of transoceanic circuits) is important. There are two aspects of this demonstration of particular interest to LHCONE:

- the possibility of global, centralised traffic engineering, which is intrinsically impossible at Layer 3 today
- The spread of traffic load across multiple paths between source and destination in an efficient and flexible way.

Also, data sets in e-science are increasing exponentially in size. E.g., the cost of genome sequencing has gone down

1With the exception of Antarctica
dramatically the last few years (figure 7) [18]. This has resulted

in an exponential growth of the number of genome sequencing projects stored in the Genomes Online Database (GOLD) [17] (figure 8). Other sciences are showing similar trends.

To transfer such huge data sets we need to make efficient use of all available network capacity. This means using multiple paths when available. Currently, these data sets are transferred via one or a few big flows over multiple paths by using traditional hash based load balancing. However, hash based load balancing does not work well when there are only a few flows. Therefore, this demonstration shows how MPTCP and multipathing in an OpenFlow enabled network can do a much better job. The advantage of using MPTCP is that applications do not need to be adapted.

Another important aspect of this prototype is that it introduces multipathing as a basic network feature. This will become increasingly important in the next years now that we are reaching the fiber capacity limit. Modern modulation techniques like DP-QPSK (used for 100G in a 50 GHz ITU channel) and DP-16QAM (used for 200G in a 50 GHz ITU channel and 400G in a 80 GHz superchannel) approach the Shannon limit and we are faced with tradeoffs between reach, bandwidth and spectral efficiency (see figure 9). Higher bandwidth means either lower reach or a wider channel. In order to continue be able to transfer the ever increasing e-sciene data sets we need to make use of multiple paths in the network. This parallelism is similar to what happened with RAID in storage, multi-core in computing and combining servers into clusters, grids and clouds.

VII. PREVIOUS WORK

In the SCInet Research Sandbox of 2011 SARA, iCair and CRC showed Ethernet monitoring with Ethernet OAM enabled OpenFlow Controllers [7]. In this demonstration we showed how an Ethernet network with OpenFlow switches could be monitored using Ethernet OAM. We integrated an open source implementation of of the IEEE 802.1ag protocol (the dot1ag-utils [8]) with the NOX [9] OpenFlow controller. Continuity Check Messages were used to monitor the reachability of switches in an international OpenFlow testbed between Europe and the USA. The results were shown on a website (see figure 10).

VIII. RELATED WORK

There have been many proposals for efficient network use in highly meshed networks. Much work has been done in
datacenters with fat tree and clos topologies [10]. Forwarding is such highly meshed networks is a challenge. When using a flat L2 topology the spanning tree protocol will prune many paths from the network to end up with a single tree topology. IETF TRILL [1] and IEEE 802.1aq [3] try to solve this limitation by supporting the simultaneous use of multiple paths. TRILL uses Equal Cost Multipath (ECMP) to spread the traffic across multiple paths. 802.1aq uses multiple VLANs to distinguish the paths. It is expected that end stations use ECMP to simultaneously forward on all VLANs. A big disadvantage of ECMP is that it only works well for a large number of flows (thousands of flows). Unfortunately, transfers in e-science usually consist of only a few very large flows.

Instead of treating the whole network as one flat L2 topology the network can be divided into multiple L2 subnets with routing between them. But this increases the configuration and operational complexity and also make it much harder to migrate Virtual Machines from one server to another when these servers are in different IP subnets. Routing also does not solve the load balancing problem when transferring a few large data flows.

Another possibility is to use flow scheduling. The group of Amin Vehdat at UCSD has done much work in this area with the Hedera flow scheduling system in the Portland testbed [11]. OpenFlow was used to setup flow entries in the switches.

SCTP, the Stream Control Transmission Protocol (RFC 4960) [14] is a transport protocol that uses multiple sub-streams. It supports multipathing, but only one path is used for data transport. The other paths are used as backup when the primary path has failed. Work is going on to make the simultaneous use of all working paths possible [15]. SCTP has several disadvantages. It uses its own protocol number (132) instead of UDP (17) or TCP (6). The result is that SCTP is often dropped by middle boxes like NATs and firewalls. This also means that applications need to be adapted to support SCTP. In the socket() calls the IPPROTO_SCTP protocol identifier needs to be passed instead of e.g. IPPROTO_TCP.

IX. GLOSSARY

1GE 1 Gigabit per second Ethernet
10GE 10 Gigabit per second Ethernet
Caltech California Institute of Technology
CCM Continuity Check Message
CERN The European Organization for Nuclear Research
CRC Communications Research Centre Canada
DRC Dutch Research Consortium
DP-16QAM Dual-Polarization Quadrature Amplitude Modulation
DP-QPSK Dual-Polarization Quadrature Phase Shift Keying
ECMP Equal Cost Multipath (routing)
GOLD Genomes OnLine Database
HPC High Performance Computing
iCAIR International Center for Advanced Internet Research
IEEE Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
IETF Internet Engineering Task Force
ITU International Telecommunication Union
L2 Layer two (of the OSI stack)
L3 Layer three (of the OSI stack)
LBM Loopback Message
LLDP Link Layer Discovery Protocol
LTM Link Trace Message
MAC Message Authentication Code
MPTCP Multipath TCP
NAT Network Address Translation
NHGRI National Human Genome Research Institute
OAM Operations, Administration and Maintenance
OSI Open Systems Interconnection
PS-QPSK Polarization-Switched Quadrature Phase Shift Keying
RAID Redundant Array of Independent Disks
SPB Shortest Path Bridging
SCTP Stream Control Transmission Protocol
TCP Transmission Control Protocol
TRILL Transparent Interconnect of Lots of Links
UCSD University of California, San Diego
UDP User Datagram Protocol
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