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Abstract—A challenge facing network device designers, besides increasing the speed of network gear, is improving its programmability in order to simplify the implementation of new applications (see for example, active networks, content networking, etc). This paper presents our work on designing and implementing a virtual network processor, called NetVM, which has an instruction set optimized for packet processing applications, i.e., for handling network traffic. Similarly to a Java Virtual Machine that virtualizes a CPU, a NetVM virtualizes a network processor. The NetVM is expected to provide a compatibility layer for networking tasks (e.g., packet filtering, packet counting, string matching) performed by various packet processing applications (firewalls, network monitors, intrusion detectors) so that they can be executed on any network device, ranging from expensive routers to small appliances (e.g. smart phones). Moreover, the NetVM will provide efficient mapping of the elementary functionalities used to realize the above mentioned networking tasks upon specific hardware functional units (e.g., ASICs, FPGAs, and network processing elements) included in special purpose hardware systems possibly deployed to implement network devices.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays networks demand ever increasing packet processing speeds. Additionally, more and more intelligence is requested to the network, making the old approach, entirely based on defining custom ASIC for packet processing, no longer feasible. For instance, ASICs guarantee extremely high packet rates, but they cannot be reprogrammed and the time needed to develop (and prototype) a new chip is increasingly high.

A solution that can guarantee high packet processing rates, a new form of programmability and short developing time can be found in Network Processors. These are programmable chips whose architecture is particularly targeted to network packet processing. Their performances are obtained by a mixture of several components. First, a RISC-based processing core (which is well-known being very fast) that includes a reduced set of instructions, i.e. the ones that are most significant in packet processing (e.g. while floating point instructions are not present, there are special instructions for bit manipulation). Second, they implement a high degree of parallelism since there may be several execution engines inside the core that are able to execute multiple fragments of code in parallel. Third, there are some specialized hardware modules that are able to perform some of the complex tasks usually required in packet processing (e.g. table lookup engines).

As a general purpose CPU can be used to process packets, a general purpose VM (such as CLR or JAVA) can be used for this task too. However, not being optimized for this, they will never match the performance of a specialized VM, in terms of speed, memory requirements, and processing time. This paper provides a first report of a project aiming at the definition of the architecture of a virtual machine optimized for network programming, which is called Network Virtual Machine (NetVM). This work has the potential to:

• Simplify and speedup the development of optimized packet processing applications, such as traffic monitors, routers, firewalls;
• Enable efficient mapping of the execution of software modules performing specific tasks onto optimized components of custom hardware architectures;
• Provide a unifying programming environment for various hardware architecture;
• Offer portability of packet processing applications across different hardware and software platforms;
• Provide a reference architecture for the implementation of hardware (integrated) networking systems;
• Provide a new tool for specification, fast prototyping, and implementation of hardware (integrated) networking systems targeted to a specific packet processing application.

The work presented in this paper is based on previous work partly funded by Telecom Italia Labs. This work has been carried out within the framework of the QUASAR project, funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research (MIUR) as part of the PRIN 2004 Funding Program.
Section II, that outlines the motivations to and the potential benefits stemming from this work, further elaborated on the above implications. Section III discusses related work that broadly touches three areas: code portability across heterogeneous platforms, virtual machines, and, specifically, network and packet processing related virtual machines. The proposed NetVM architecture is outlined in Section IV and performance issues are discussed in Section V. Section VI draws some conclusions and briefs current and future work.

II. MOTIVATIONS AND BENEFITS

The NetVM aims to be a portable but efficient platform for demanding networking applications. While when the NetVM is executed by a general purpose CPU a NetVM program may be less efficient than a natively coded one, the situation may be reversed when the NetVM is executed by a network processor or a system with custom hardware and architecture. In fact, NetVM network-specific instructions can be efficiently mapped onto custom functional units (e.g., ASICs and FPGAs) that have been designed to optimally execute their tasks.

One of the problems of network processors is their complexity from the programmability point of view. Each device offers its own programming environment that usually includes a C-like compiler, which is different not only from vendor to vendor, but even between different lines of products of a single vendor. However, higher level approaches like C programming are not the ideal solution, because C has been invented for general purpose programming: it lacks many features that could help network development and presents some features that are not needed. For instance, the provided high-level languages lack of some of the standard functions (the ones that should not be related to network processing), while new ones are available (some that are needed to be able to exploit some hardware characteristics of the chip at best); therefore there is no guarantee about portability.

As a consequence, the most affordable way to program these devices (and to get efficient programs out of them) is to use native assembly language, which is time-consuming and error-prone. This requires not only a deep knowledge of the target machine, but also a non-negligible amount of time to program the device. Additionally, porting a program from a platform to another (even belonging to the same manufacturer) is a nightmare.

The idea behind the NetVM (Network Virtual Machine) architecture is to keep the high performance guaranteed by network processors while adding a reasonable degree of programmability. First, the NetVM defines the architecture for a new network processor, which is a reference architecture that wants to accomplish the most common tasks in packet processing. Additionally, it defines a way to extend this architecture by means of some additional functions (e.g., some hardware-based dedicated processors) in order to permit customization. Second, it defines the assembly language needed to program this virtual device and a set of specifications related to the interaction between every block (e.g., memory, execution units, etc.) inside the NetVM. Third, it defines how an application can interact with these components, e.g., how to download the code, how to get the results, and more.

The main goal of the NetVM is to provide programmers with an architectural reference, so that they can concentrate on what to do on packets, instead of how to do that. Each vendor can define a target compiler that translates this code into device-specific code. This guarantees a high degree of portability of the code between different devices, while keeping the performance characteristics of the network processors.

Taking this a step further, the NetVM architecture could be implemented in hardware, i.e., the architecture of the virtual machine could be used as the (basis for the) design of a hardware architecture for network processing (e.g., a network processor).

Analogously, the NetVM code implementing a set of functionalities could be compiled in the hardware description of a (possibly integrated) system that implements such functionalities (e.g., an ASIC or an FPGA configuration). In other words, the NetVM could provide support to fast prototyping, specification, and implementation of network oriented hardware systems.

In Figure 1 there is an example of deployment of NetVM environment: the entire architecture is built around the processing element. As shown in the figure, each NetPE (similarly to a processing engine of a network processor) isolates a specific functionality and uses some specialized functional unit (coprocessor) and some shared memories to exchange data and packets among all virtual machine elements.

III. RELATED WORK

The most adopted approach to generate code portable among heterogeneous platforms is the one of retargetable compilers. Besides a bunch of alternatives [1][2][3], this is the approach adopted for Network Processor Units (NPUs) as well [4][5][6][7]. This methodology derives from the area of embedded systems, of which NPUs are considered evolutions.

A retargetable compiler is usually subdivided into two parts: a frontend and a backend. The frontend is in charge of source code analysis, generation of an intermediate representation, and machine-independent optimizations. The backend maps the machine-independent intermediate representation into machine-dependent assembly code. Such an approach is said to be retargetable since it is possible add one or more different target code generators to the backend.

From this point of view, a virtual machine can be considered an evolution of a retargetable compiler. In such a solution, the source language compiler is the frontend. It parses syntax, performs high-level optimizations and produces bytecode. The bytecode replaces the intermediate representation of a retargetable compiler, and the JIT compiler replaces the backend: it reads
intermediate language, validates it, performs machine
dependent optimizations and generates native code.

Compared to a retargetable compiler, a virtual machine
provides a better insulation among the modules: the fact
that the backend is a completely separate entity ensures
easier portability toward several targets, and the
possibility for the developer of an hardware platform to
support it without having to do with the compiler.
Moreover, taking place just before code deployment (or
even during code execution), the just in time compilation
process is able to exploit a better knowledge of the target
hardware and the application execution patterns, and as a
consequence can implement more aggressive optimizations.
Another advantage of using a virtual machine is that portability is provided at bytecode level: a
library of networking functions can be used on all the
supported platforms, without the need of recompiling or
modifying the source code.

The best known virtual machines, like University of
California P Machine [9], SUN JVM [8] or Microsoft
CLR [10], are generic, system-independent platforms that
run code generated by one or more languages. They are
general purpose stack machines, with simple but standard
instruction sets that provide instructions for load and store,
control transfer, arithmetic operations, stack management
and so on.

Although rich and thoroughly validated, these solutions
are by their nature very generic, because they virtualize a
general purpose CPU, therefore they often do not fit
efficiently to application-specific tasks. Considering for
example network processing, programs are organized in a
way that is different from the one of desktop applications;
furthermore, they make use of different primitives.

NetVM aims at providing specific support to network
processing rather than to desktop applications: as seen in
the previous paragraph, its architecture virtualises a NPU
rather than a general-purpose processor. As a
consequence, NetVM will never be better than Java or
CLR in traditional tasks, however in the domain of
network processing it provides advantages in terms of
development time, portability and performance, both on
traditional PC architectures and on programmable network
devices.

Note that some virtual processors for network-related
tasks already exist. The Berkeley Packet Filter (BPF) [11],
described in section 2.2, is a well known filtering
processor that supports packet capture; it is included in
several Unix kernels, in the NPF driver [14] and in the
pcap library [15]. SNAP [12] is a stack-based active
networking language derived from PLAN, designed to be
carried inside network packets and executed by the
network nodes. SNAP was born to be interpreted, but it
includes for example the switching element), with very
few concessions to other kind of processing. Moreover,
actual modularity is remarkably less pronounced than in
Click. All in all, VERA privileges architectural hierarchy
and pure performance rather than modularity portability.

Another approach consists in subdividing a program
into small pieces, each of which performs a single
independent functionality; these pieces cooperate to create
the overall application. Modularity in network processing
applications has been investigated by a number of
previous works, and is widely accepted nowadays.

[16] provides results that demonstrate the advantages of
structuring applications for network processors in a
modular way, and describes a system, called NEPAL, able
to extract modules from an existing sequential network
processing program. The simulations of this system with a
series of applications, shows that modularization is an
effective method to improve performance of network
processing. Modularization, on the other hand, allows
utilizing efficiently not only the strongly parallel NPU
architectures, but also the widespread SMP desktop
workstations.

Many existing systems make use of modularity; among
them we can cite NetFilter[17], VERA [18] and
Click [19]. Particularly, Click is a well-known software
router, which introduced most of the concepts behind
modular network processing, and which is used as a base
and as a term of comparison by several following tools.
NetVM too draws some concepts from its architecture. A
Click router is made up of packet processing modules
called elements. Elements implement specific functions
like packet classification, queuing, scheduling, and
interfacing with network devices. A router configuration
is built connecting elements in a directed graph, which
represents the flow of the packets inside the router. A
Click element is written in C++, and is a subclass of the
virtual class Element. It communicates with the external
world sending or receiving packets by means of two kinds
of connections: push or pull. In a push connection packet
transfer is initiated by the source endpoint, while in a pull
connection packet transfer is initiated by the destination
endpoint. Variants of click have been proposed to address
the issues of parallelism [20] and portability to network
processors [21], and demonstrated the goodness and the
feasibility of the modular approach under different
hardware configurations.

VERA, another modular router, is a step forward for
some of these issues: it has an architecture that includes a
hardware abstraction, and it considers the issue of
portability toward different processors (including NPUs).
However, the overall architecture is strictly oriented to
routing (starting from the hardware abstraction, that
includes for example the switching element), with very
few concessions to other kind of processing. Moreover,
actual modularity is remarkably less pronounced than in
Click. All in all, VERA privileges architectural hierarchy
and pure performance rather than modularity portability.

IV. NetVM ARCHITECTURE

The main goals of the NetVM are flexibility, simplicity
and efficiency. These objectives and the experiences
maturated in the field of Network Processor architecture,
determine the most important architectural choices of
the project.

Packet processing, as well known, is suitable for a
multi-stage pipeline or even for an array of processors: in
fact processing can be easily divided across several
processing units of moderate speed. Consequently, the
NetVM has a modular architecture built around the
The concept of a Network Processor (NetPE), which virtualizes (or, it could be said, is inspired to) the actual micro-engine of a Network Processor.

Processing Elements (both hardware and software ones) have to deal with only few tasks, but they have to perform them in a challenging way: they have to process data at wire speed and in real time, they have to process variable size data (e.g. IP payload) or/and fragmented data (e.g. the IP payload fragmented over several ATM cells). Consequently, a Processing Element must have advanced memory management and performing scheduling algorithms for the units that access memory directly. In addition, it should execute specific tasks, such as binary searches in complex tree structures and CRC (Cyclic Redundancy Code) calculation with stringent time constraints.

Multithreading is an expected feature of a Network Processor, hence an objective of our architectural design: in fact packets are quite independent from each other and suitable to be processed independently. For example, one of the first Network Processors — the Intel IXP1200 — is composed of six processing elements called Packet Engines. The larger the number of Processing Elements, the higher is the achievable degree of parallelism, since independent packets could be distributed to these units.

In our NetVM’s architecture, a NetPE is a virtual CPU (with a proper set of instructions, and a local memory) that executes an assembly program that performs an individual function inside the NetVM and maintains private state. A NetVM application is assembled from several NetPEs (for example, Figure 1 shows an application made of two NetPEs), each of which implements a single functionality; complex structures can be built by connecting different NetPEs together. This modular view derives from the observation that many packet processing applications can be decomposed in simple blocks that can be connected in complex structures. These structures can exploit parallelism or sequentiality to achieve better performance. The modular approach is not new: other software solutions, like Netfilter [17] or Click [19] have demonstrated its goodness, and the parallel architecture (based on many simple microengines) of many network processors follows the same direction.

Figure 2 shows how NetPEs can be connected to build more complex structures, either pipelined or parallel. In the first case the packets emitted by the output interface of an instance are received by the input interface of the following one. In the second case the packets coming from a single source are processed in parallel by two or more NetPEs.

### Table I

**Example of some instructions present in NetPE assembly.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initialization</td>
<td>Used to initialize the execution of a NetPE program</td>
<td>set.share</td>
<td>Set the size of the shared memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transfer</td>
<td>Transfer data within memory</td>
<td>dcopy</td>
<td>Copy a memory buffer from a portion of the memory to another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern matching</td>
<td>Used to compare a value in a memory buffer against the top of the stack</td>
<td>field.eq.8</td>
<td>Compare the top of the stack with an 8bit field in memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Control</td>
<td>Used to control the execution flow</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>Unconditional branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stack management</td>
<td>Used to manage the stack</td>
<td>swap</td>
<td>Swaps the two top elements of the stack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetics and Logic</td>
<td>Used to compute simple expressions</td>
<td>nor</td>
<td>Rotates right the value at the top of the stack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table II

**Example of network-specific opcodes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>find.bit</td>
<td>Find bit set. Returns the position of the first bit inside the top of the stack.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mfind.bit</td>
<td>Find masked bit set. Return position of the first set bit in the top value of the stack, with mask.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clz</td>
<td>Count leading zeroes. Counts the number of consecutive zeroes from the MSB of the top of the stack.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the NetVM may be potentially mapped on embedded systems and network processors, the use of high-level memory management systems like garbage collectors does not sound feasible. Therefore, the bytecode has a low-level, direct view of the memory. Furthermore, the memory is statically allocated during the initialization phase: the program itself, by means of appropriate opcodes, specifies the amount of memory it needs for being able to work properly. Obviously, these instructions can fail if not enough physical memory is present.

The flexibility lost with this approach is balanced by the gained efficiency: the program can access the memory without intermediation thanks to ad-hoc load and store instructions. Specific instructions for buffer copies (a recurrent operation in network processing; some platform have even ad-hoc hardware units) are provided as well, either inside the same memory or between different ones. Moreover, knowing the position and the amount of memory before program execution allows very fast accesses when a JIT compiler is used because memory offsets can be pre-computed.

Packets are stored in specific buffers, called exchange buffers, which are shared by two NetPE that are on the same processing path in order to minimize racing conditions when exchanging data. In order to optimise packet handling as fast as possible, network-specific instructions (e.g. string search) and coprocessors may have direct access to exchange buffers. Instructions for data transfer to and from, or internal to exchange buffers) are provided as well.

B. Coprocessors

Like hardware network processors, that add specific capabilities to a general-purpose processor in a single chip, the NetVM adds specific functionalities for network processing to a standard stack-based instruction set. We call these specific functionalities coprocessors. The advantage of providing this is twofold. First, they can be mapped on features (where present) of real network processors, exploiting the advanced hardware and the coprocessors that often equip them. This allows to greatly increasing the efficiency of the programs when the target platform provides the proper hardware. For example, a program using the CRC32 functionality of a CRC coprocessor will be very efficient and simple on a platform with CRC hardware. Second, on general purpose systems they make use of optimized algorithms. They share code and data structures among different modules and thus grant good resource usage. For example, in a configuration with several NetPEs that call the CRC32 functionality, the same coprocessor can be used by all these NetPEs. Furthermore, if the efficiency of the CRC32 is improved with a better algorithm, every NetPE that uses it becomes faster, therefore the whole configuration (an not only a module) is enhanced. Finally, tasks like string search or classification can share data structures and tables among different modules for even better efficiency and resource usage. An example is the Aho-Corasick string-matching algorithm, which can build a single automaton to search multiple strings.

NetPEs communicate with coprocessors by means of a well-defined interface. Figure 1 shows (at the bottom) some coprocessors that may be present in the NetVM reference design.

V. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Although the current implementation of the NetVM is still in the early stages, we can figure out some numbers in order to evaluate the goodness of the proposed architecture.

This preliminary performance evaluation is carried out against the BPF, probably the most known virtual machine in network processing arena. Figure 3 shows a very short program in BPF assembly language that, given an Ethernet frame, it checks if the frame contains an IP packet. Figure 4 contains a similar program coded according to the NetVM language.

A first comparison shows that the NetVM assembly is definitely richer than the BPF one, which gives an insight about the possibility of the NetVM assembly. However the resulting program is far less compact (the "core" is six instructions against tree in BPF). This shows one of the most important characteristics of the NetVM architecture: the stack-based virtual machine is less efficient of a competing register-based VM (such as the PBF is) because it cannot rely on a set of general-purpose registers. Hence, the raw performance obtained by NetVM cannot directly compete against the ones obtained by the BPF.
TABLE III shows the time needed to execute the programs reported in Figure 3 and Figure 4: as expected, the BPF outperforms the NetVM. For instance NetVM is penalized not only due to the additional instructions, but also due to the fact that BPF code is translated into native x86 assembly, while NetVM instructions are interpreted at run-time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virtual Machine</th>
<th>Time for executing the “IPv4” filter (clock cycles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NetVM</td>
<td>2236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPF</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, a NetVM is intended as a reference design and its code is not expected to be executed as it is. In order to achieve better performance, NetVM code must be translated into native code (thorough a recompilation at execution-time) according to the characteristics of the target platform. This justifies the choice of a stack-based machine, which is intrinsically slower, but its instructions are much simpler to be translated into native code. Performances are expected to be much better after a dynamic recompilation. The implementation of a just in time (JIT) compiler is part of our future work in the NetVM.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This paper presents the architecture Network Virtual Machine (NetVM), a virtual machine optimized for network programming. The paper discusses the motivations behind the definition of such architecture and the benefits stemming from its deployment on several hardware platforms. These include simplifying and speeding up the development of performing packet processing applications whose execution can be efficiently delegated to specialized components of customized hardware architectures. Moreover, the NetVM provides a unifying programming environment for various hardware architecture, thus offering portability of packet processing applications across different hardware and software platforms. Further, the proposed architecture can be used as reference architecture for the implementation of hardware (integrated) networking systems. Finally, the NetVM can be used as a novel tool for specification, fast prototyping, and implementation of hardware (integrated) networking systems.

Some preliminary results on the performance of a simple NetVM program shows that other simpler virtual machines targeted to networking applications outperform the NetVM that, in turn, provides higher flexibility. Ongoing work on the implementation of a Just In Time compiler (JITTER) for NetVM code aims at reversing or at least reducing this performance discrepancy.

Since writing NetVM native code (bytecode) is not practical, work is being done towards the definition of a high level programming language and the implementation of the corresponding compiler into NetVM bytecode.

Finally, in order to fully demonstrate the benefits, also in terms of performance, brought by the NetVM, further work includes the implementation of the virtual machine and its JITTER for a commercial network processor.
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