



↔ vs

Open vSwitch

December 10-11, 2019 | Westford, MA

DDlog in OVN
Current State and Future Challenges

Mark Michelson, Dumitru Ceara, Red Hat

What is DDlog? Why does OVN need it?

Differential Datalog (DDlog)

- ▶ *bottom-up, incremental, in-memory, typed Datalog engine* [1]
- ▶ automatic incremental behavior
- ▶ compiles into Rust
- ▶ uses Rust for utility functions and standard library

OVN (ovn-northd) processes NB/SB databases completely (with every change!)

- ▶ does this scale (lots of recomputation without changing outputs)?
- ▶ can we replace the DB processing with DDlog? Yes, we could [2]

[1] <https://github.com/vmware/differential-datalog>

[2] <https://github.com/ovn-org/ovn/tree/ddlog-dev-v2>

Dev story #1 – IP Multicast in ovn-northd-ddlog

The “good”:

- ▶ resulting code is more concise, the developer can focus on the functionality. Basic metric (LoC): ~650 LoC in DDlog vs ~1778 LoC in C
- ▶ (some) things are easier to implement: e.g., stable ID allocation for multicast groups
 - no need for IDL lookups and such.. it’s incremental, right?
- ▶ DDlog feature requests/bug reports get immediate attention from DDlog maintainers: e.g., debug options to dump intermediate relations, ovssdb2ddlog enhancements

The “bad”:

- ▶ new language, different programming paradigm. Good topic coverage in documentation [1]. Some hard-to-spot bottlenecks for DDlog beginners [2].
- ▶ debugging is mainly offline; analyzing DDlog relations (tables) dumps.

[1] <https://github.com/vmware/differential-datalog/blob/master/doc/tutorial/tutorial.md>

[2] https://github.com/ovn-org/ovn/pull/28#discussion_r348680499

Dev story #2 - Dynamic MAC for static IPv6

The "good":

- ▶ DDlog tutorials were enough to get the job done
- ▶ error messages for DDlog were clear and made it easy fix mistakes

The "bad":

- ▶ the feature implementation involved writing more Rust code vs DDlog.
- ▶ ended up not really getting to see the benefits of DDlog
- ▶ compilation takes long
- ▶ never managed to get the ovn-northd-cli to compile properly; a unit test still failing
- ▶ therefore, the change never got to be submitted for review

Highlights/Lowlights

The “good”:

- ▶ simple translation of input to output relations; focus is on the data itself
- ▶ automatic incremental updates
- ▶ stronger type system than C; safer memory usage
- ▶ ovn-northd-ddlog performs better than the C version [1] [2]

The “bad”:

- ▶ “unproven” new language
- ▶ tooling is minimal, especially for debugging (a live DDlog debugger would be great)
- ▶ standard library is ad-hoc and quite minimal
- ▶ no DDlog v1.0/stable release yet

[1] <https://mail.openvswitch.org/pipermail/ovs-dev/2019-July/360876.html>

[2] <https://mail.openvswitch.org/pipermail/ovs-dev/2019-July/360889.html>

Challenges for conversion to DDlog

- ▶ ovn-northd (C) is a moving target that often gets new features/patches; these should also be ported to ovn-northd-ddlog!
- ▶ who does the porting?
- ▶ the contributor must learn DDlog on top of understanding the rest of OVN code
- ▶ ovn-northd-ddlog uses a custom ovssdb client to push updates from DDlog to the NB/SB databases; code duplication and missed edge cases (e.g., transaction failure reporting). Should we use IDL instead?
- ▶ is ovn-northd the only bottleneck?
 - ovn-controller also has incremental processing (C)
 - maintain two incremental processing approaches or choose one?

Thanks!

