



# **Topology-Aware Placement** of Virtual Network Functions (**VNFs**) in **Autonomous** Response **Networks**

Leonardo Ochoa-Aday

Ph.D. Candidate, UPC Visiting Researcher within SNE Research Group, UvA

leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu





# **Topology options** for deploying **NFV**



"<u>NFV</u> aims to transform the way that network operators architect networks by evolving standard IT <u>virtualization</u> technology to consolidate many network equipment types onto industry-standard high-volume servers, switches and storage, which **could be located in data centers, network <u>nodes</u>, and in the end–user premises**.

According to ETSI – NFV (a priori solutions)

1. Centralized NFV Topology 2. Service Edge NFV Topology

### leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu





## **Advantages**

- OPEX (i.e. deployment and cooling costs) for implementing each virtual service is low, and re-use of resources is maximized.
- Compute and storage resources can easily be added to the centralized location.

## **Disadvantages**

- No support of services where particular functionality is needed at the service edge
  - e.g. the most effective DDoS defense scheme is to block attack traffic close to the source [1]
  - e.g. latency-sensitive applications, deploying 5G networks where network functions are the most sensitive to latency, thus they need to be located as close as possible to end---user devices

## **Centralized NFV Topology**



[1] T. Peng et al. - ACM Computing Surveys, Vol. 39, No. 1, Article 3, Publication date: April 2007

## leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 3/10





# Service Edge NFV Topology

### <u>Advantages</u>

- Enables services that are not possible to deploy in a centralized model
  - e.g. effective security defense schemes at the edge for DDoS
  - e.g. latency-sensitive applications

## **Disadvantages**

• Ability to add additional services or scale is limited by the installed resources - this limitation is overcome using a chained approach



#### SARNET overlay virtual topology

#### leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 4/10





# **Chained NFV Topology**

## Advantages

One advantage of the chained model over the service edge model ٠ is the ability to add virtualization resources without having to upgrade the service edge.

TT

UPC

The chained model can support all of the advanced applications ۲ that are available with the service edge model.



SARNET overlay virtual topology



## Disadvantages

Requires advanced orchestration to combine physical and virtual resources •





## **On going** research...

## Main <mark>Tasks</mark>

To design a topology-aware heuristic algorithm to efficiently allocate VNFs in a NFV/SDN environment

## **Specifics**

- 1. Modeling of the **network function placement and chaining problem** by means of an ILP model, taking into account the topology awareness (i.e. for a given infrastructure) for small networks size and service demands.
- 2. Designing an heuristic algorithm to efficiently place the VNFs for a specific scenario (i.e. DDoS, load balancing, etc).
- 3. Evaluating the results of the proposed solution with the results obtained using an optimal placement (i.e. ILP model).
- 4. Determining **network metrics and parameters** to compare the results of the heuristic algorithm against other topology option (i.e. centralized and service edge NFV topology).

### leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu





# Modeling network function placement and chaining problem (1/3)

<u>PHYSICAL NETWORKS</u> --> infrastructure

**\_P** is used to denote whether variables refers to physical resources.

**G** = (N, E) --> unidirectional network graph (cloud infrastructure, physical network, etc...)

N\_P [n]: network nodes

**E\_P** [i, j]: network links for (i, j) in E

**C\_P** [n]: CPU capacity in % of each node (n in N)

**B\_P** [i,j]: Bandwidth capacity of each (i,j) in E **D\_P** [i,j]: Delay of each (i,j) in E

## leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 7/10





## Modeling network function placement and chaining problem (2/3)

### **NETWORK FUNCTIONS**

**F** [f]: denote the set of possible VNFs that may be instantiated/placed in the infrastructure.

**U** [f]: denote the number of times that each network function can be instantiated, due to licensing purchases.

**F\_CPU** [f, inst]: each instance (inst in U) provides a limited amount of resources to process demands. This enables our model to represent instances of the same VNF with different capabilities.

**F**\_**DELAY** [f]: each function (f in F) has a processing delay associated to it.

## leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 8/10





## Modeling **network function placement** and **chaining problem** (3/3)

## SERVICE FUNCTION CHAININGS (SFCs) --> VNFs requests

**\_S** is used to denote whether variables refers to demand of services.

**S** [q]: denote the set of service functions chains (q in S).

**E\_S** [k,I]: virtual edge (k,I) between functions requested in the service chain k, represent the topology of the SFCs

**C\_S** [k, f]: CPU capacity required by function f in chain k

**B\_S** [k,l]: Bandwidth requested for each virtual edge (k,l) in E\_S **D\_S** [k,l]: Delay requested for each virtual edge (k,l) in E\_S

## leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 9/10







# **Topology-Aware Placement** of Virtual Network Functions (**VNFs**) in **Autonomous** Response **Networks**

Leonardo Ochoa-Aday

Ph.D. Candidate Visiting Researcher within SNE Research Group, UvA

## leonardo.ochoa@entel.upc.edu

## SARNET Alliance meeting – Jun 16th, 2017 10/10