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SDN: Algorithms *with a fundamental twist*!
SDN: Algorithms with a fundamental twist!

Applications and Control Plane

... and regarding decoupling / interconnect!

Data Plane
SDN: Flexibilities and Constraints

Applications and Control Plane

SDN/OpenFlow is about **generality and flexibility:** in terms of how packets are matched (L2-L4 header fields and beyond), how flows are defined (fine vs coarse granular, proactive vs reactive), events can be handled **centrally vs in a distributed manner,** etc.

But there are also constraints and challenges: SDN is an inherently **asynchronous distributed system** (controller decoupled), switches are **simple devices** (not a Turing or even state machine!), IP-routing is prefix based, careful use of dynamic flexibilities: **don’t shoot in your foot!**
Applications: Algorithms with a twist!

- Let’s consider: Traffic Engineering
  - Circuit routing, call admission
  - Raghavan, Wolsey, Awerbuch, etc.

- SDN twist: more general/flexible!
  - Non-shortest paths and more
  - Enables complex network services: steer traffic through middleboxes i.e. waypoints (firewall, proxy etc.): paths may contain loops!
  - More than independent routing per segment: none-or-all segment admission control, joint optimization
  - E.g., LP relaxation (Raghavan et al.): how to randomly round and decompose complex requests?
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- Let's consider Traffic Engineering
- Classic routing, call admission
- Wolsey, Awerbuch, Plotkin, etc.
- SDN twist: more general/flexible!
- Non-shortest paths
- Enables complex network services: steer traffic through middleboxes, i.e. waypoints (firewall, proxy, etc.)
- Paths may contain loops!
- More than independent segment: none-or-all segment admission control, joint optimization
- E.g., LP relaxation (Raghavan et al.): how to randomly round and decompose complex requests?

Optionally NFV twist: where to place NFV (or hybrid SDN)? Facility location / capacitated dominating set, but: not distance to but distance via function(s) matters!

Control Programs

Online Admission Control and Embedding of Service Chains
Tamás Lukovszki and Stefan Schmid.
22nd International Colloquium on Structural Information and Communication Complexity (SIROCCO), Montserrat, Spain, July 2015.

An Approximation Algorithm for Path Computation and Function Placement in SDNs
Guy Even, Matthias Rost, and Stefan Schmid.

Service Chain and Virtual Network Embeddings: Approximations using Randomized Rounding
Matthias Rost and Stefan Schmid.
Applications: Algorithms with a twist!

- Let's consider Traffic Engineering.
- Classic routing, call admission, etc.
- SDN twist: more general/flexible!
- Non-shortest paths enable complex network services: steer traffic through middleboxes i.e. waypoints (firewall, proxy, etc.)
- Paths may contain loops!
- More than independent routing per segment: none-or-all segment admission control.
- E.g., LP relaxation (Raghavan et al.): how to randomly round and decompose complex requests?

Optionally NFV twist: where to place NFV (or hybrid SDN)? Facility location/capacitated dominating set, but: not distance to but distance via function(s) matters!

SDN:
- Non-shortest paths
- Enables complex network services: steer traffic through middleboxes i.e. waypoints (firewall, proxy, etc.)

Migration upon each new request undesirable: want incremental deployment! Related to submodular capacitated set cover and scheduling (Fleischer, Khuller), but end-to-end.

decompose complex requests?
Applications: Algorithms *with a twist*!

- Let’s consider:
  - Traffic Engineering
  - Classic routing, call admission
  - Wolsey, Awerbuch, Plotkin, etc.
  - SDN twist: more general/flexible!
  - Non-shortest paths
  - Enables complex network services: steer traffic through middleboxes i.e. waypoints (firewall, proxy, etc.)
    - paths may contain loops!
  - More than independent routing per segment: none- or all-segment admission control
    - E.g., LP relaxation (Raghavan et al.): how to randomly round and decompose complex requests?

Optionally *NFV twist*: where to place NFV (or hybrid SDN)?
Facility location / capacitated dominating set, *but*: not distance to but distance *via function(s)* matters!

Migration upon each new request undesirable: want **incremental deployment**! Related to submodular capacitated set cover and scheduling (Fleischer, Khuller), *but* end-to-end.

*It's a Match! Near-Optimal and Incremental Middlebox Deployment*
Tamás Lukovszki, Matthias Rost, and Stefan Schmid.
Control Plane: Algorithms with a twist!

- Reduce **latency and overhead**: What can be computed locally?
  - Routing vs heavy-hitter detection?
  - LOCAL model! Insights apply: verification vs optimization

- **SDN twist: pre-processing!**
  - Hard in LOCAL: **symmetry breaking**! But unlike *ad-hoc networks*: no need to discover network from scratch
  - Topology events **less frequent** than flow related events
  - If **links fail**: subgraph! Find recomputed structures that are still useful in subgraph (e.g., **proof labelings**)
  - Precomputation known to help for relevant problems: **load-balancing / matching**
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**SDN twist: pre-processing?**
- Hard in LOCAL: **symmetry breaking**! But unlike ad-hoc networks: no need to discover network from scratch
- Topology events **less frequent** than flow related events
- If links fail: **subgraph**! Find recomputed structures that are still useful in subgraph (e.g., proof labelings)
- Precomputation known to help for relevant problems: load-balancing/matching

---

A Distributed and Robust SDN Control Plane for Transactional Network Updates
Marco Canini, Petr Kuznetsov, Dan Levin, and Stefan Schmid. 34th IEEE Conference on Computer Communications (INFOCOM), Hong Kong, April 2015.
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- How to make control plane robust? **Software transactional memory** problem: network configuration = shared memory, updates = **transactions**, but with a twist: flows are uncontrolled, real-time transactions: do not abort! (And not only read!)

- SDN twist: pre-processing?
  - Hard in LOCAL: **symmetry breaking**! But unlike **ad-hoc networks**: no need to discover network from scratch

Careful: independent flow spaces does not imply that controllers can **concurrently** update without conflict: e.g., due to **shared embedding**!

Atomic read-modify-write relevant problems: **load-balancing** / matching

---

**In-Band Synchronization for Distributed SDN Control Planes**
Liron Schiff, Petr Kuznetsov, and Stefan Schmid.
Even in SDN: Keep some functionality in the data plane!
- E.g., for performance: OpenFlow local fast failover: 1st line of defense

**SDN twist:** data plane algorithms operate under **simple conditions**
- Failover tables are **statically** (proactively) preconfigured, w/o multiple failures knowledge
- At runtime: **local view only** and **header space is scarce resource**
- W/ tagging: **graph exploration**
- W/o tagging: **combinatorial problem**
- Later: **consolidate this with controller!**
Data Plane: Algorithms with a twist!

- With **infinite header space** ideal robustness possible. But what about bounded header space? And resulting route lengths?
- **Without good algorithms, routing may disconnect way before physical network does!**
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Data Plane: Algorithms with a twist!

- With **infinite header space** ideal robustness possible. But what about bounded header space? And resulting route lengths?
- **Without good algorithms, routing may disconnect way before physical network does!**

- Failover tables are **statically** (proactively) preconfigured, w/o multiple failures knowledge.
- At runtime: **local view only** and header space is scarce resource.
- W/ tagging: graph exploration.
- W/o tagging: combinatorial problem.
- Later: **consolidate this with controller**!

---

**How (Not) to Shoot in Your Foot with SDN Local Fast Failover: A Load-Connectivity Tradeoff**
Michael Borokhovich and Stefan Schmid.

**Provable Data Plane Connectivity with Local Fast Failover: Introducing OpenFlow Graph Algorithms**
Michael Borokhovich, Liron Schiff, and Stefan Schmid.
Decoupling: Algorithms *with a twist*!

- Decoupling already challenging for a single switch!

- Network *Hello World* application: MAC learning

- MAC learning has *SDN twist*: MAC learning SDN controller is *decoupled*: may miss response and keep flooding!

- Need to *configure rules* s.t. controller stays informed when necessary!
Decoupling: Algorithms with a twist!

- **In-band control:** cheap but algorithmically challenging!
  - Distributed coordination algorithms to manage switches?
  - Powerful fault-tolerance concept: self-stabilization

- **SDN twist:** switches are simple!
  - Cannot actively participate in arbitrary self-stab spanning tree protocols
  - Controller needs to install tree rules
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- In-band control: cheap but algorithmically challenging!
  - Distributed coordination algorithms to manage switches?
  - Powerful fault-tolerance concept: self-stabilization

- **SDN twist**: switches are simple!
  - Cannot actively participate in arbitrary self-stab spanning tree protocols
  - Controller needs to install tree rules

---

**Ground Control to Major Faults: Towards a Fault Tolerant and Adaptive SDN Control Network**

Liron Schiff, Stefan Schmid, and Marco Canini.
IEEE/IFIP DSN Workshop on Dependability Issues on SDN and NFV (DISN), Toulouse, France, June 2016.
Decoupling: Algorithms with a twist!

- Researchers proposed to exploit SDN rule definition flexibilities to solve growing FIB size problem
  - OpenFlow-based IP router: caching and aggregation
  - Zipf law: many infrequent prefixes at controller
  - Extremely distributed control 😊

- Online paging with SDN twist
  - Forwarding semantic: largest common prefix forwarding, i.e., dependencies: only offload root-contiguous set in trie
  - Can do bypassing

ICDCS 2014
Researchers proposed to **exploit SDN** rule definition flexibilities to solve growing FIB size problem

- OpenFlow-based IP router: **caching and aggregation**
- **Zipf law**: many infrequent prefixes at controller
- Extremely distributed control 😊

**Online paging with SDN twist**

- Forwarding semantic: largest common prefix forwarding, dependencies: only off **contiguous** set in trie
- Can do **bypassing**

---

**Competitive FIB Aggregation without Update Churn**
Marcin Bienkowski, Nadi Sarrar, Stefan Schmid, and Steve Uhlig.
34th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (**ICDCS**), Madrid, Spain, June 2014.

**Online Tree Caching**
Marcin Bienkowski, Jan Marcinkowski, Maciej Pacut, Stefan Schmid, and Aleksandra Spyra.
Interconnect: Algorithms *with a twist*!

- Another challenge: asynchronous communication channel

He et al., ACM SOSR 2015: without network latency
Interconnect: Algorithms \textit{with a twist}!

- Another challenge: asynchronous communication channel

He et al., ACM SOSR 2015: without network latency

Not only because of network latency, but also data structures!
What can possibly go wrong?

Invariant: Traffic from untrusted hosts to trusted hosts via firewall!
What can possibly go wrong?

Invariant: Traffic from untrusted hosts to trusted hosts via firewall!
Example 1: Bypassed Waypoint

Controller Platform

insecure Internet

secure zone
Example 2: *Transient* Loop

Controller Platform

insecure Internet

secure zone
Tagging: A Universal Solution?

- Old route: red
- New route: blue

- 2-Phase Update:
  - Install blue flow rules internally
  - Flip tag at ingress ports
Tagging: A Universal Solution?

- Old route: red
- New route: blue

2-Phase Update:
- Install blue flow rules internally
- Flip tag at ingress ports

Where to tag?
Header space? Overhead?

Cost of extra rules?

Time till new link becomes available?
Alternative: Weaker Transient Consistency

Idea: Packet may take a mix of old and new path, as long as weaker consistencies are fulfilled transiently, e.g. Loop-Freedom (LF) and Waypoint Enforcement (WPE).

Schedule safe subsets in **multiple rounds**
The Spectrum of Consistency

per-packet consistency
Reitblatt et al., SIGCOMM 2012

correct network virtualization
Ghorbani and Godfrey, HotSDN 2014

weak, transient consistency
(loop-freedom, waypoint enforced)
Mahajan and Wattenhofer, HotNets 2014
Ludwig et al., HotNets 2014

Strong
Weak
Going Back to Our Examples: LF Update?

- insecure Internet
- secure zone

Diagram showing the flow from insecure Internet to a secure zone with a firewall in the middle.
Going Back to Our Examples: LF Update!

R1:

insecure Internet → unsafe zone

R2:

insecure Internet → unsafe zone → secure zone

Going Back to Our Examples: LF Update!

R1:

insecure Internet → R1: LF ok! But: WPE violated in Round 1! → secure zone

R2:

insecure Internet → R2: LF ok! But: WPE violated in Round 1! → secure zone
Going Back to Our Examples: WPE Update?

insecure Internet → firewall (security) → secure zone
Going Back to Our Examples: WPE Update!

R1: insecure Internet

R2: insecure Internet
Going Back to Our Examples: WPE Update!

R1: ... ok but may violate LF in Round 1!
Going Back to Our Examples: Both WPE+LF?

insecure Internet

secure zone

---

I
nternet

secure zone
Going Back to Our Examples: WPE+LF!

R1:
- Insecure Internet
- Secure zone

R2:
- Insecure Internet
- Secure zone

R3:
- Insecure Internet
- Secure zone
Going Back to Our Examples: WPE+LF!

R1:

insecure Internet → secure zone

R2:

insecure Internet → secure zone

R3:

Is there always a WPE+LF schedule?
What about this one?
LF and WPE may conflict!

- Cannot update any forward edge in R1: WP
- Cannot update any backward edge in R1: LF

No schedule exists!
LF and WPE may conflict!

- Cannot update any **forward edge** in R1: WP
- Cannot update any **backward edge** in R1: LF

*Good Network Updates for Bad Packets: Waypoint Enforcement Beyond Destination-Based Routing Policies*

Arne Ludwig, Matthias Rost, Damien Foucard, and Stefan Schmid. 13th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HotNets), Los Angeles, California, USA, October 2014.
What about this one?
What about this one?

- Forward edge after the waypoint: safe!
- No loop, no WPE violation
What about this one?

☐ Now this backward is safe too!

☐ No loop because exit through 1
What about this one?

☑️ Now this is safe: 🟢 ready back to WP!
☑️ No waypoint violation
What about this one?

Ok: loop-free and also not on the path (exit via 1)
What about this one?

Ok: loop-free and also not on the path (exit via 1)
What about this one?
Back to the start: What if....
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Update any of the 2 backward edges? LF 😞
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☐ Update any of the 2 backward edges? LF 😞
Back to the start: What if.... also this one?!

☐ Update any of the 2 backward edges? LF 😞
Back to the start: What if.... also this one?!

- Update any of the 2 backward edges? LF 😞
- Update any of the 2 other forward edges? WPE 😞
- What about a combination? Nope...
Back to the start: What if.... also this one?!
Back to the start: What if… also this one?!

To update or not to update in the first round?
That is the question…
... which leads to NP-hardness!
Back to the start: What if…. also this one?!

To update or not to update in the first round? That is the question…
... which leads to NP-hardness!

Transiently Secure Network Updates
Arne Ludwig, Szymon Dudycz, Matthias Rost, and Stefan Schmid. 42nd ACM SIGMETRICS, Antibes Juan-les-Pins, France, June 2016.
Let us focus on **loop-freedom only**: always possible in \( n \) rounds! (How?) But how to minimize rounds?
Example: Optimal 2-Round Update Schedules
Example: Optimal 2-Round Update Schedules

Clear: in Round 1 (R1), I can only update „forward“ links!

What about last round? Observe: Update schedule read backward (i.e., updating from new to old policy), must also be legal! I.e., in last round (R2), I can do all „forward“ edges of old edges wrt to new ones! Symmetry!
Optimal Algorithm for 2-Round Instances: Leveraging Symmetry!

- Classify nodes/edges with 2-letter code:

- F●, B●: Does (dashed) new edge point forward or backward wrt (solid) old path?
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Optimal Algorithm for 2-Round Instances: Leveraging Symmetry!

- Classify nodes/edges with 2-letter code:
  - \( F \bullet, B \bullet \): Does (dashed) new edge point forward or backward wrt (solid) old path?
  - \( \bullet F, \bullet B \): Does the (solid) old edge point forward or backward wrt (dashed) new path?

Old policy from left to right!

New policy from left to right!
Optimal Algorithm for 2-Round Instances: Leveraging Symmetry!

- Classify nodes/edges with 2-letter code:
  - F●, B●: Does (dashed) new edge point forward or backward wrt (solid) old path?
  - ●F, ●B: Does the (solid) old edge point forward or backward wrt (dashed) new path?

Old policy from left to right!

New policy from left to right!
Insight 1: In the 1st round, I can safely update all forwarding (F•) edges! For sure loopfree.

- F•, B•: Does (dashed) new edge point forward or backward wrt (solid) old path?

- •F, •B: Does the (solid) old edge point forward or backward wrt (dashed) new path?
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Optimal Algorithm for 2-Round Instances: Leveraging Symmetry!

**Insight 1:** In the 1st round, I can safely update all forwarding (F•) edges! For sure loopfree.

**Insight 2:** Valid schedules are reversible! A valid schedule from old to new read backward is a valid schedule for new to old!

**Insight 3:** Hence in the last round, I can safely update all forwarding (•F) edges! For sure loopfree.

**2-Round Schedule:** If and only if there are no BB edges! Then I can update F• edges in first round and •F edges in second round!
**Optimal Algorithm for 2-Round Instances:**

**Leveraging Symmetry!**

1. **Insight 1:** In the 1st round, I can safely update all forwarding (F•) edges! For sure loopfree.

2. **Insight 2:** Valid schedules are reversible! A valid schedule from old to new read backward is a valid schedule for new to old!

3. **Insight 3:** Hence in the last round, I can safely update all forwarding (•F) edges! For sure loopfree.

**2-Round Schedule:** If and only if there are no BB edges! Then I can update F• edges in first round and •F edges in second round!

That is, FB must be in first round, BF must be in second round, and FF are flexible!
Intuition Why 3 Rounds Are Hard

Structure of a 3-round schedule:

Round 1

F edges: FF, FB

Round 2

all edges: FF, FB, BF, BB

Round 3

F edges: FF, BF

WLOG

W.l.o.g., can do FB in R1 and BF in R3.

Boils down to:

? FF ?
Intuition Why 3 Rounds Are Hard

Structure of a 3-round schedule:

- **Round 1**
  - FF, FB

- **Round 2**
  - FF, FB, BF, BB

- **Round 3**

Moving forward edges does not introduce loops, nor does making the graph sparser.

W.l.o.g., can do FB in R1 and BF in R3.

Boils down to:

- FF
Intuition Why 3 Rounds Are Hard

A hard decision problem: when to update FF?

- We know: BB node $v_6$ can only be updated in R2
- When to update FF nodes to make enable update BB in R2?
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Intuition Why 3 Rounds Are Hard

A hard decision problem: when to update FF?

- We know: BB node $v_6$ can only be updated in R2.
- When to update FF nodes to make enable update BB in R2.
- E.g., updating FF-node $v_4$ in R1 allows to update BB $v_6$ in R2.
- But only if FF-node $v_3$ is not updated as well in R1: potential loop.
- Smells like a gadget: which FF nodes to update when is hard!
Intuition Why 3 Rounds Are Hard

A hard decision problem:

We know: FF node $v_6$ can only be updated in R2

When to update **FF nodes** to make enable update BB in R2

E.g, updating FF-node $v_4$ in R1 allows to update BB $v_6$ in R2

But only if FF-node $v_3$ is not updated as well in R1: potential loop

Smells like a gadget: which FF nodes to update when is hard!

Devil lies in details: original paths must also be valid! I.e., to prove that such a configuration can be reached.

Being greedy is bad! Don’t update all FF!

- Don’t update all FF! Being greedy is bad!
- Devil lies in details: original paths must also be valid! I.e., to prove that such a configuration can be reached.
It’s Good to Relax: How to update LF?
LF Updates Can Take Many Rounds!

Invariant: need to update $v_2$ before $v_3$!
LF Updates Can Take Many Rounds!

Invariant: need to update $v_3$ before $v_4$!
LF Updates Can Take Many Rounds!

Induction: need to update $v_{i-1}$ before $v_i$ (before $v_{i+1}$ etc.)!

$\Omega(n)$ rounds?! In principle, yes...: Need a path back out before updating backward edge!
It is good to relax!

But: If s has been updated, nodes not on (s,d)-path!
It is good to relax!

But: If $s$ has been updated, nodes not on $(s,d)$-path!

Could be updated simultaneously!
It is good to relax!

But: If s has been updated, nodes not on (s,d)-path!

Could be updated simultaneously!

Finally put back on path!
It is good to relax!

Finally put back on path!

But: If s has been updated, nodes not on (s,d)-path!

Could be updated simultaneously!

3 rounds only!
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock* in Action
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock* in Action

Greedily choose far-reaching (independent) forward edges.
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock in Action*

R1 generated many nodes in branches which can be updated simultaneously!
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock* in Action

 Shortcut  Prune  Shortcut  Prune

round: 1  round: 2  round: 3  round: 4

Line re-established! (all merged with a node on the s-d-path)
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock in Action*

Peacock orders nodes wrt to distance: edge of length $x$ **can block** at most 2 edges of length $x$, so distance $2x$. 

Prune
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock* in Action

At least 1/3 of nodes merged in each round pair (shorter s-d path): logarithmic runtime!
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock* in Action

**Shortcut**

**Prune**

**Shortcut**

**Prune**
A log(n)-time Algorithm: *Peacock in Action*

**Shortcut**

**Prune**

**Shortcut**

**Prune**

*Scheduling Loop-free Network Updates: It's Good to Relax!*

Arne Ludwig, Jan Marcinkowski, and Stefan Schmid.
Remark on the Model

Easy to update new nodes which do not appear in old policy. And just keep nodes which are not on new path!
Loop-Freedom: Summary of Results

- Minimizing the number of rounds
  - For 2-round instances: polynomial time
  - For 3-round instances: NP-hard, no approximation known

- Relaxed notion of loop-freedom: $O(\log n)$ rounds
  - No approximation known

- Maximizing the number of updated edges per round: NP-hard
  - (dual feedback arc set) and bad (large number of rounds)
  - dFASP on simple graphs (out-degree 2 and originates from paths!)
  - Even hard on bounded treewidth?
  - Resulting number of rounds up to $\Omega(n)$ although $O(1)$ possible

- Multiple policies: aggregate updates to given switch!
  - Related to Shortest Common Supersequence Problem
Loop-Freedom: Summary of Results

- Minimizing the **number of rounds**
  - For 2-round instances: polynomial time
  - For 3-round instances: NP-hard, **no approximation known**

- Relaxed notion of loop-freedom: **O(log n)** rounds
  - No approximation known

- Maximizing the **number of updated edges** per round: NP-hard (dual feedback arc set) and bad (large number of rounds)
  - dFASP on simple graphs (out-degree 2 and originates from paths!)
  - Even hard on bounded treewidth?
  - Resulting number of rounds up to $\Omega(n)$ although $O(1)$ possible

- Multiple policies: aggregate updates to given switch!
  - Related to **Shortest Common Supersequence Problem**
Extension: Multiple Policies

At least one node needs to be **touched** twice: otherwise at least one flow will have a temporary loop:

Worst case: $k$ policies require $k$ touches!
Extension: Multiple Policies

At least one node needs to be touched twice: otherwise at least one flow will have a temporary loop:

On the positive side: given individual transiently consistent schedules, can optimally combine them using dynamic programming! Independently of the consistency property.

Worst case: k policies require k touches!
Extension: Multiple Policies
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On the positive side: given individual transiently consistent schedules, can optimally combine them using dynamic programming! Independently of the consistency property.

Worst case: k policies require k touches!

Can't Touch This: Consistent Network Updates for Multiple Policies
Szymon Dudycz, Arne Ludwig, and Stefan Schmid.
46th IEEE/IFIP International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN), Toulouse, France, June 2016.
Conclusion

Applications and Control Programs

E.g., distributed control but also MAC learning (Jen@Dagstuhl)!

... and regarding inter-connect!

E.g., robust failover.

Ctrl

E.g., admission control and routing with waypoints.

E.g., network updates or self-stabilizing in-band control network.
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