

The Case for Transport-Level Encryption in Datacenter Networks

Tianyi Gao, Xinshu Ma, Suhas Narreddy, Eugenio Luo, Steven W. D. Chien, Michio Honda
University of Edinburgh

Abstract

Cloud applications need network data encryption to isolate from other tenants and protect their data from potential eavesdroppers in the network infrastructure. This paper presents SDP, a protocol design for emerging datacenter transport protocols, such as pHost, NDP, and Homa, to integrate data encryption with the use of existing NIC offloading of cryptographic operations designed for TLS over TCP. Therefore, SDP could enable a deployment path of new transport protocols in datacenters without giving up hardware offloading support, which would otherwise make encryption on those protocols even slower than TLS over TCP. SDP is based on Homa, and outperforms TLS over TCP by up to 29% in throughput. SDP currently supports two real-world applications, Redis, improving throughput by up to 24%, and in-kernel NVMe-oF, cutting P99 latency by up to 21%.

1 Introduction

Datacenter transport protocols have evolved for the last decade to achieve high throughput for bulk data transfer while maintaining low latency for small messages, pioneered by DCTCP [1]. The latest ones, including pHost [11], NDP [16] and Homa [30] are not extensions to TCP—they are receiver-driven, which schedule packet transmission at the receiver to achieve fine-grained network utilization. Although most of those are prototypes implemented in user space or simulator, since the Linux kernel implementation of Homa has been available in 2021 [34] and shown industry use [27], widespread use of receiver-driven transport protocols appears to be within reach.

However, what if the applications want data encryption to isolate from other tenants and protect from network infrastructure? Many cloud infrastructures accommodate multiple tenants [14]. Further, even hyperscalers do not build every datacenter component by themselves; they source many, such as switches, cables, and interface modules, from elsewhere, which might be found vulnerable or malicious at a later time. It is thus common for datacenter applications or tenants to wish to encrypt their network data, much like over the Internet.

There exists momentum to push the encryption into the lower-level functionality. One approach is integrating encryption inside the transport protocol design, as in QUIC [26] and TCPLS [42]. Although those protocols free applications from cryptographic operations and save handshake RTTs in the case of QUIC, their stream-oriented abstraction is unsuit-

able for datacenter applications [34, 50] and QUIC’s high software overheads prevent the applications from achieving high bandwidth, low latency transport [52]. Further, encrypted QUIC header fields, which are designed to survive middle-box interference and prevent protocol ossification [20], would be unnecessary or even unsuitable for datacenter networking that could proactively use in-network compute [44, 17, 56] or per-message load balancing [49]. A more datacenter-friendly approach is accelerating TLS over (DC)TCP by moving encryption to the kernel, thus called kTLS, for the use of NIC offloading of cryptographic operations together with TCP segmentation offload, which is available in Linux and FreeBSD. Facebook announced the use of kTLS over DCTCP in their datacenter in 2016 [18], and Netflix employs kTLS to push their video traffic [46].

Although the availability of receiver-driven transport protocols could enable operators and application designers to offer low latency services, the requirement of giving up hardware offloading of cryptographic operations available for TLS/TCP [37] would hinder their adoption. As we have seen that deploying a new transport protocol is extremely hard [9], we would take a conservative approach. In particular, we believe new transport protocols must be able to use NIC offloading features designed for TCP so they will not be slower than existing systems that employ hardware-accelerated TLS/TCP. Otherwise, a catch-22 situation would be created, motivating no hardware vendor to support the acceleration of the new transport protocol.

This paper presents Secure Datacenter transport Protocol (SDP), a protocol design that enables novel datacenter transport protocols to integrate transport-level encryption so that they can employ NIC offloading of cryptographic operations designed for TLS over TCP. We have implemented SDP based on Homa/Linux [34], because it is an actively-maintained receiver-driven transport protocol available for regular Linux with socket APIs, but we believe it is general enough to transform to another receiver-driven transport protocol that implements a different congestion control algorithm while sharing the vast majority of protocol format, software architecture, and abstractions.

The key insight that enables our approach is that TLS/TCP offloading works for packets whose network layer header indicates non-TCP in one of the most commodity NICs, NVIDIA ConnectX-6 and -7, based on our test. On the other hand, we show that it is rather inevitable to *integrate* encryption with

the transport protocol, unlike TLS *over* TCP, to utilize the offloading.

SDP adds up to 13% of processing overheads (mainly due to encryption and decryption) to Homa, whereas kTLS adds up to 35% of those to TCP. We also demonstrate that SDP improves throughput of a real-world application, Redis/TLS, by 5–24%. We also show SDP supports in-kernel applications, including NVMe-oF.

2 Design Space

There exist previous approaches that integrate or closely collocate encryption with a transport protocol. However, most of them are designed for Internet applications, sharing problems with hardware offloading or abstraction (§ 2.1). We then examine requirements in datacenter transport protocols (§ 2.2), and conclude that we need to integrate encryption with the datacenter transport protocol (§ 2.3).

2.1 Internet-Focused Approaches

The first is implementing both key exchange and data encryption inside the transport protocol, as with TcpCrypt [3]. It was designed for ubiquitous encryption for the Internet before today’s widespread adoption of TLS. TcpCrypt exchanges keys over TCP options during the handshake and payload of the first data packet that the client or server sends; the payload of subsequent data packets are encrypted. Unlike TLS/TCP, it authenticates TCP headers using a MAC, but excludes port numbers and checksum in validation, because those can be modified by a middlebox, such as NAT. TcpCrypt is unsuitable for datacenters, because it is based on TCP that provides stream abstraction, which makes message prioritization hard due to head-of-line blocking (HoLB), and does not preserve message boundaries [34, 50]. Further, it is not offload friendly.

The second option is QUIC, which is primarily designed for the web and runs in the user space on top of UDP. QUIC provides multiple streams within a single connection to avoid HoLB, and encrypts almost all the headers and payloads, except for the connection ID used by the load balancers. QUIC has a higher potential to avoid HoLB than TCP due to multiple independent streams. Further, since it operates on top of UDP, preserving message boundaries would also be trivial. However, QUIC’s complicated protocol design incurs high software overheads [52] and QUIC’s cryptographic operation cannot be offloaded to commodity NICs.

The third option is TCPLS [42], designed for better middlebox friendliness and more features than QUIC. It extends a TLS record type to cover not only application data but also encrypted control data to enable new transport functionality over TCP connection(s), such as connection migration, multipath data transfers and multiple data streams. TCPLS is implemented as a user-space library without TCP modification. In

addition to sharing the problems with other TCP-based approaches, TCPLS cannot utilize NIC offloads for TLS encryption, because it calculates nonce by a non-standard way [36].

2.2 Message-Based Transport

Datacenter transport protocols need message-based abstractions [49, 34, 18], because their applications transmit structured data in an RPC (i.e., request-response) manner, rather than file transfer or streaming. RPC is challenging on TCP, because TCP disregards message boundaries that the application would have indicated (e.g., with separate `write()`s) and RPCs can be highly concurrent [45]. As a result, the application must *serialize* multiple messages inside the in-order TCP bytestream, each of which is preceded by a framing header that indicates its message length so that the receiver app can reconstruct the messages out of the bytestream.

This, however, causes HoLB, triggered by a packet loss but even without. Since the host network stack load-balances egress and ingress processing between multiple CPU cores based on the flow 5-tuple, large messages would block smaller ones in the connection [34]. On packet transmission, the small message that is behind a large one waits as much as the transmission delay of the large one. On reception, the small message preceded by a large one needs to wait for complete delivery of the large one, because of the in-order delivery of TCP. The application would increase the concurrency using multiple TCP connections, but a large number of concurrent TCP connections incur high processing overheads in both the kernel (e.g., cache pollution [15, 22]) and application (e.g., scanning many sockets [57, 34]). The degree of concurrency is also limited by the port number space (65 K per server port).

To ease the message framing task of the applications, Facebook introduced kernel connection multiplexer (KCM) [23] as a part of their datacenter network stack [18]. It enables datagram APIs (e.g., `sendmmsg()`) over the TCP sockets. KCM frames receive TCP stream into the application-level messages inside the kernel using an application-specific eBPF program, but it incurs significant CPU overheads of locating the framing headers over the TCP payload at the receiver and leaves the HoL blocking unsolved.

Minion/ μ TCP [32] self-delimits the TCP bytestream using consistent overhead byte stuffing (COBS), reserving a single byte value (e.g., 0) as a delimiter and encoding the original data such that they do not include the delimiter at the expense of small extra data length. μ TCP then enables out-of-order delivery by modifying the socket API to retrieve the out-of-order data out of the received TCP buffer. μ TCP would solve the HoL problem caused by packet losses, but not the one caused by CPU load balancing. Further, μ TCP would introduce significant overheads that are non-negligible for datacenter applications to encode or decode the data, which needs to be done on CPUs.

	Delimiter	Frame decoding	HoLB (by loss)	HoLB (by CPU)	Wire format
KCM [23]	App-supplied eBPF prog.	Scan payload	✗	✗	TCP
μTCP [32]	Self-delimit by COBS	Scan & decode payload	✓	✗	TCP
Homa [34]	Framing header	Read first bytes in the payload	✓	✓	New protocol

Table 1: TSO-capable message transport abstractions.

Src port	Dst port	Msg ID	Msg len	Msg off	Payload

Figure 1: Generalized view of a message-based transport packet format based on MTP [49] and Homa [34]. Shaded parts are the same for all the packets that belong to the same message.

Homa [34, 30], a new transport protocol with its own protocol number, natively preserves message boundaries. It provides a reliable transport service with one-to-many style socket abstraction, similar to SCTP [51]. Homa solves HoLB on a packet loss by message-granularity delivery and retransmission. Further, it solves that on a CPU core by the shortest remaining processing time (SRPT) packet scheduling even within the same 5-tuple for ingress traffic, instead of always allocating the same core for a flow tuple. This minimizes the *hotspot* in the stack where multiple messages, regardless of their flow 5 tuple, contend for a CPU core.

Homa *overlays* a TCP header to use TCP Segmentation Offload (TSO), where the network stack creates a TSO segment, which is a TCP packet that exceeds the MTU size, but split by the NIC into sequential MTU-sized or smaller TCP packets to reduce the packetization costs; TSO works for packets whose network layer header indicates an undefined transport protocol [30, 33]. Homa embeds framing headers inside the TSO segment such that each of which is located at the beginning of the packet payload after TSO. This is necessary for the receiver to locate the offset of the packet within the TSO segment, because NICs do not generate contiguous sequence numbers over the resulting packets when the protocol number does not indicate TCP.

Figure 1 depicts a generalized packet format based on Homa and MTP [49], which also proposes a similar transport wire packet format for in-network computing and congestion control. Packets that belong to the same message have the same message ID and length (Homa locates those in the TCP Options space of the TSO segment, which is copied to all the resulting packets [20]), whereas each packet indicates its own offset within the message (Homa locates it at the beginning of the payload), as the message can exceed the MTU size. The packet length in the network layer header or the extra length field (not in the figure) can be used to compute the length of the message portion in the packet.

We believe Homa is the most practical basis for a message-based transport protocol for datacenters in terms of abstraction and packet format, summarizing in Table 1. We do not claim that Homa is the best in terms of in-network congestion

control, as different algorithms have different network requirements. However, Homa could be extended to implement other receiver-driven congestion control algorithms, such as NDP and dcPIM, as they have similar requirements in the host stack, such as packet scheduler to prioritize specific message types (e.g., *PULL* packets in NDP) and first-RTT data transfer. Further, Homa is well documented and actively maintained. We thus base our SDP design on Homa.

2.3 TCP as Substrate for Offloading

TCP has been considered as a substrate to survive interference of middleboxes, such as NATs, firewalls and transparent proxies [32], which would drop non-TCP packets. Many application-level framing methods, such as gRPC and ØMQ [58], use it, as well as transport-level extensions like Minion. For datacenters, the TCP-as-substrate philosophy still applies due to the prevalence of middleboxes like load balancers and network observability systems. However, the most pivotal aspect would be NIC offloading, which is essential to drive high-speed network fabrics and leave sufficient CPU cycles to the applications. Although many middleboxes exist inside the cloud, those would be less ossified or more evolvable than in the Internet, because those are directly implemented, often in software [5, 8, 29], and operated by the cloud operators.

Having considered a plausible basis for message-based datacenter transport protocols, we now discuss how to achieve encryption with it. The most crucial question is whether NIC offloading of cryptographic operations would work for a non-TCP protocol, including Homa, together with TSO. The Chelsio T6 NIC, released in 2016, implements TLS offloading, but it strips even TCP options provided by the stack because its TLS offload relies on the TCP full offload engine (TOE). T6 is thus unsuitable for not only new transport protocols but even TCP extensions, which was unfavored by Netflix, Microsoft, and other operators [37].

On the other hand, NVIDIA/Mellanox ConnectX-6 (CX6) and -7 (CX7), released in 2020 and 2023, respectively, employ a different hardware architecture, *autonomous* offloading, that enables the transport protocol to run in software and thus keep evolving, while allowing data processing in application-level protocols like TLS to be offloaded. This offloading architecture has been acknowledged by Linux and its software interface and hardware requirements for other vendors are documented [24]. Those NICs are widely used today. Although CX7 is difficult to source in a short period due to the chip shortage, CX6 is in stock at many suppliers. Further, the




Figure 2: The send path of a single app message over TLS/TCP and SDP. Unlike TCP, Homa, which SDP extends, inserts framing headers within the app message. The NIC treats the message that includes those headers as the TSO segment payload that is encrypted and *then* split by the NIC.

distinctive software interfaces of [24] allow us to infer the TLS offload architecture of other NICs based on their Linux drivers. Fungible/Microsoft and Netronome NICs appear to have that architecture; Intel and Broadcom appear to not.

We test CX6 and CX7 NICs by generating a TLS/TCP TSO segment using kTLS, which is required to use encryption offload. In the driver, we modified the protocol number field in the IP header right before the packet descriptor is linked to the hardware transmit queue; we weren’t able to do so with eBPF, because this action at the lowest level eBPF hook directed the packet to a different code path than TCP in the driver. Although we needed a small driver modification to adjust the offset to start the encryption, we confirmed that the resulting packets have encrypted payload while preserving the original TCP header structure with or without TSO. This observation opens up the pathway to designing a deployable new transport protocol that can benefit from *existing* hardware acceleration.

Now we are arriving at the reason why we need to integrate encryption with the transport layer. To utilize existing NIC offloading for cryptographic operations, it is unavoidable that the framing headers, which are a part of the transport protocol metadata, are covered by encryption (Figure 2 right); at the receiver, the transport protocol, not the application, must decrypt the packets to read those framing headers. This is a stark contrast to TLS over TCP, including kTLS, where the application and transport protocols are unaware of each other (Figure 2 left). We discuss message transmission and reassembly in § 3.2 in more detail.

3 SDP Design

Based on the discussion in the last section, we define three goals in our SDP design, which previous systems do not sup-

port. First, to avoid HoLB caused by packet losses or CPU load balancing, SDP must support message-oriented transport protocols that can send and receive multiple messages out-of-order within the same 5-tuple while preserving message boundaries, such as Homa. Second, it must support non-TCP protocol together with TLS hardware offloading. Although there have been attempt to repurpose TCP protocol number to utilize offloading in existing NICs (e.g., STT [7]), it is unclear such an approach would be widely accepted or general enough, because it confuses middleboxes, which are also prevalent in the cloud, and network management or monitoring systems. We believe enabling performant SDP without relying on the TCP protocol number largely improves applicability to various transport protocols.

Finally, we design SDP to secure communication based on the same threat model with TLS/TCP, protecting the endpoints from data breach, packet injection, and replay attacks while enabling high message-based communication performance by inheriting that of datacenter transport protocols like Homa and using the NIC offload engine designed for TLS/TCP so that the early adopters do not suffer from the performance drop in comparison to existing TLS/TCP with offloading.

We assume the host subsystem that executes the transport protocol, which is the OS kernel for our implementation, is trusted. Further, we assume the NIC is trusted, but we can extend this to not; in that case, TLS-offload needs to be disabled so that the NIC only sees the encrypted packets. Our assumption is the same as that of sRDMA (§ 6)¹

We must address two challenges. As in Figure 2 (right), it is unavoidable that we need to have the framing headers encrypted already but the receiver still needs to reconstruct the original message (§ 3.2). Further, since we are tunneling the messages into a byte stream in terms of TLS, we need careful management of the hardware state in the NIC (§ 3.3).

3.1 Overview

SDP extends Homa [34], because it provides datacenter friendly abstractions and could be extended to other receiver-driven transport protocol (§ 2.2). SDP inherits all the Homa features, providing one-to-many style socket abstraction where the sender application can send RPC messages to different receivers on the same socket, like UDP. Messages have unique IDs and can be sent or delivered out-of-order within the same 5 tuple.

SDP is activated via `setsockopt()` that registers the Initialization Vectors (IVs), session keys, and sequence IDs negotiated by the applications using the standard TLS handshake—same as kTLS. However, we also introduce faster key exchange methods in § 3.4. Once SDP is activated on the socket, a plaintext RPC written by the application is encrypted by

¹Although sRDMA [53] assumes compromised end systems since it would be vulnerable if the memory management subsystem was hijacked, we consider both SDP and sRDMA as vulnerable for compromised OS kernels.




Figure 3: SDP TSO segment format being split to 3 packets. Dark and light gray parts overlay TCP common header and options space, respectively, and are replicated over the packets by TSO. The NIC encrypts the dashed area. TLS record header is actually 13 B and the authentication tag is 16 B.

SDP. At the receiver, SDP decrypts the RPC and the application reads the plaintext one.

Homa Internals. TCP transmits packets in the `syscall` context (e.g., when a new data is written by the application and a sufficient window is available) or `receive-interrupt` (`softirq`) context (e.g., when an ack triggers new transmission in the send buffer), both of which are performed while locking the socket. In contrast, Homa takes finer-grained locking based on RPC-level without socket-level one for better concurrency between RPCs (that belong to the same socket). Further, Homa employs the *pacemaker* kernel thread that acts as a packet scheduler and ensures that the packet rate does not exceed the available bandwidth, so that packets are not queued in the NIC. Small RPCs are directly pushed in the `syscall` context, but later parts of large RPCs are pushed by the *pacemaker*. When the Homa sender receives a *Grant* packet, in which the receiver grants the sender transmission of new data, it sends data chunks in the `softirq` context. Concurrency between `syscall`, *pacemaker*, and `softirq` poses challenges (§ 3.3).

3.2 Message Transmission and Reassembling

When the application writes a plaintext message to the SDP socket, the transport layer frames the message (Figure 2 right).

When a message fits in the TSO size, SDP creates a TSO segment that is covered by one TLS record header; the figure shows this case. When the message is larger, multiple TSO segments are created, each covered by one TLS record header.

Figure 3 illustrates the SDP TSO segment format that results in three packets on the wire.

TSO segment and TLS record reassembly. When a receiver receives a series of packets, it must reassemble packet(s) into one or more TSO segments and then to the whole message. Although the common case is in-order packet arrival, we must handle packet reordering which happens for a number of reasons. To reassemble the TSO segment, we need a value incremented over packets originating from the same TSO segment. In the case of TCP, we can simply use the sequence number, but, unfortunately, when TSO is used for an undefined transport protocol, the NIC does not embed sequence numbers in the “TCP” header of those resulting packets.

We have two options. The first option, which we currently use in our implementation, is to use the 16-bit IPID value in the IPv4 header, which is incremented from 0 over TSO-ed packets. To identify the completion of reassembling the TSO segment, we can use the message ID and length that appear in all the packets. The other option is, less preferable, but to disable TSO but still employ TLS offload. However, the penalty of disabling TSO in SDP or Homa would not be as large as in TCP cases. This is because the advantage of TSO is divided into checksum offload and segmentation offload, and Homa only takes the latter. In other words, Homa does not guarantee message integrity, although SDP intrinsically does it (§ 5.1) based on message encryption and decryption. With this option, we can embed any ID in the transport protocol header field(s), including the ones we use for retransmission, as described next.

When the receiver reassembles a TSO segment, it does not have to wait for the first packet of the next TSO segment that has the initial ID (e.g., IPID 0), which even might not come. This is because SDP uses a per-TSO segment TLS record, as mentioned earlier, meaning that the record header in the first packet indicates the total length of the TSO segment. When the receiver has reassembled a complete TSO segment, it is handed off to the `recvmsg` `syscall` thread that performs decryption.

Message reassembly. After reconstructing the TSO segment, the receiver must find the offset of it inside the message, which can consist of multiple TSO segments. Since the Homa message size can be as large as 1 MB (and would be larger in theory) SDP embeds the *TSO offset* in the urgent pointer field (which we confirmed that the NIC keeps the original value over the packets when performing TSO as long as the urgent pointer flag is unset) plus a 4-bit extended field in the options space (TSO offset (cont.) in Figure 3) in the overlaid TCP header. We would just use *TSO ID*, but indicating the byte-granularity offset makes message reassembling more efficient because the sender might use different sizes between multiple

TSO segments. As a result, our current design supports up to 1 MB of messages.

We must handle two cases of retransmissions, one is based on the actual packet loss, and the other is spurious retransmission, which must be ignored by the receiver. Retransmissions need to have the original segment offset, but since we use IPID for that and retransmitted packets have different ones, we embed the original offset within the TSO segment in the unused space of “TCP” header (outside of the encrypted area).

3.3 Concurrency

We need careful concurrency control particularly to use the TLS hardware offloading designed for TCP. The main challenge is based on the different data transmission models between TCP and Homa. TCP serializes all the data transmissions, including ones pushed by the syscall context and those pushed by the softirq context, which includes ack-clocked ones. However, Homa parallelizes message transmissions within the same 5-tuple space because messages are independent of each other and thus those can be sent without locking the socket. We first review how it works for TCP, then we describe how we fit SDP’s message-based transmissions into a logical TLS byte stream.

3.3.1 TLS TX Offload

When TLS offload is used, the transport layer embeds the TLS record header and placeholder authentication tag in the TSO segment [37]. The cryptographic engine needs to have been initialized and installed in the device beforehand. Meanwhile, the device driver maintains a *flow context* that mirrors the hardware-internal state of the TLS stream associated with this engine. This flow context is referred to by the packet metadata that points to the egress TSO segment. The metadata points to the TLS record sequence number (maintained by the kTLS layer), because it cannot be obtained by the device by reading the TLS record header in TLS 1.3. When the TSO segment is pushed down to the NIC driver, the context has an *expected* TCP sequence number, and as long as the driver receives such a packet (TSO segment), it keeps passing the packet to the device, because the internal state of the hardware embeds a valid authentication tag by incrementing the internal state.

When a packet is retransmitted, the driver sees an unexpected sequence number against the flow context. Since it is clear that, if the underlying device generates an authentication tag based on its current internal state, the tag would be invalid, leading to decryption failure at the receiver. Therefore, the driver *resyncs* the record sequence number of the retransmitted packet and the flow context’s expected sequence number. To this end, the driver inserts a control packet descriptor in front of the descriptor pointing to the retransmitted packet in the packet transmission queue, so that the device can use the correct record sequence number to generate the




Figure 4: Race condition between TSO segments sent by different CPU cores. When the device reads Segment 4 after reading Resync 3, the NIC generates an invalid TLS authentication tag.

authentication tag. Retransmitted packets may be sent by a different CPU core than the original one and thus go to the different NIC queue, but it is not a problem for TCP, because the state is shared behind those queues. Since TCP locks a socket when transmitting or retransmitting packets, those packets are always serialized irrespective of the NIC queue selection. Therefore, the resync descriptor is read by the device immediately before the data descriptor that requires resync.

3.3.2 Challenges

However, the TLS offloading architecture poses challenges when used by message-based transport protocols like Homa, because the Homa socket can send multiple unordered messages by multiple threads without locking the socket (§ 3.1). Consider a message that consists of 4 TSO segments (and thus those segments are in the same 5 tuples). After the first two segments are sent by the pacer (§ 3.1), the host receives a grant packet. The softirq thread, which runs on a different CPU core than the pacer, pushes the next (third) TSO segment to the NIC over a different queue (due to the different CPU core). At the same time, the pacer pushes the next (fourth) TSO segment to the other queue.

This is where several patterns of race conditions can happen, as illustrated in Figure 4. First, for a number of reasons, the last segment sent by the softirq can arrive at the driver earlier than the preceding one sent by the pacer. In this case, the driver sees an unexpected record sequence number (SDP uses it instead of the TCP sequence number, which Homa does not have), and thus it inserts the resync descriptor in front of the descriptor for this segment. Slightly later, the pacer-pushed segment arrives at another queue, and the driver sees the unexpected sequence number (because it has already updated the state based on the softirq-pushed segment). Therefore, the driver inserts another resync descriptor in the queue. At this point, one queue has the fourth segment preceded by the resync descriptor, and another queue has the third segment preceded by another resync descriptor.

The problem is that hardware processing between those descriptors is not atomic. The device may read the resync descriptor for the fourth segment and then read that for the third segment, before reading the fourth segment. In this case, the device generates the authentication tag for the fourth packet based on the resync-ed record sequence number for

the third packet, which is invalid for the fourth packet. It should be noted that, even if the segments arrive at the driver in-order, the device may read those segments, located in different queues, out-of-order. In the above example, the NIC would generate the authentication tag based on its internal state that expects the record sequence number 3, which is invalid.

One option to solve this problem is to enforce all the TSO segments with the same 5 tuple to go to the same NIC queue. However, it would create a hot spot of lock contention on the queue. On the other hand, unless we pin the pacer and softirq threads on specific CPU cores, which we do not wish for CPU load balancing, those threads can run on any CPU cores.

Therefore, we allocate a flow context for each message, which lasts for the lifetime of the RPC. The context is recycled over non-overlapping RPCs in the same 5 tuples, to minimize the NIC resource usage. In addition, to mitigate lock contention hotspots, we select the NIC queue associated with the context in a round-robin fashion, meaning that the message segments in the same 5 tuples can be sent to different queues. This enables RPCs in the same 5 tuple to be balanced to multiple queues, avoiding head-of-line blocking within the same 5 tuple. In other words, in comparison to assigning the queue based on 5 tuples, our design enables finer-grained queue balancing, which would reduce the tail latency.

3.4 Key Exchange

Key exchange is crucial for cloud applications to start data transfer as soon as possible. Although the default option reuses the standard TLS handshake (§ 3.1) and the application reuses the same shared key over the same source-destination 4 tuple for a while, it would be useful if the application could achieve fast key exchange, as new clients and servers keep arriving and departing. In this section we introduce methods to enable faster key exchange methods that rely on internal DNS resolvers, which the application provider would have access.

3.4.1 Key Management and Encryption Algorithms

Key exchange methods widely used in the Internet would be expensive in datacenters, indicating the need for alternative methods. Table 2 shows the latency breakdown of the standard TLS 1.3 handshake with 2048-bit RSA and 256-bit ECDSA obtained by timestamping the `picotls` library.

Key pre-generation. To save S2.1 and C1.1, the server and client would maintain a list of stand-by key pairs created prior to a handshake. This would be feasible in datacenters, which often centralize administrative control such that a choice of security parameters is made upfront and can be relied on.

ECDSA authentication. To save S2.5, C5.1 and C5.2, we should use ECDSA for authentication because of better computational efficiency than RSA; a server would cut hundreds

Server	ID	Operation	Overhead (μs)
Handle CHLO	S1	Process CHLO	1.8
	S2.1	Key Gen	67.9
	S2.2	ECDH Exchange	265.0
	S2.3	SHLO Gen	75.2
	S2.4	EE & Cert Encode	13.6
	S2.5	CertVerify Gen	137.6* / 1344.0+
Handle Finished	S2.6	Secret Derive	48.6
	S3	Process Finished	44.4
Client			
Generate CHLO	C1.1	Key Gen	61.3
	C1.2	Others Gen	5.5
Handle SHLO	C2.1	Process SHLO	2.6
	C2.2	ECDH Exchange	88.7
	C2.3	Secret Derive	48.8
Verify Cert	C4.1	Decode Cert	0.1
	C4.2	Verify Cert	483.4
Verify CertVerify	C5.1	Build Sign Data	1.4
	C5.2	Verify CertVerify	196.3* / 67.1+
Handle Finished	C6	Process Finished	42.6

Table 2: Server-side (top) and Client-side (bottom) TLS handshake overheads (* with ECDSA and + with RSA).

of μs in CertVerify Gen. This is more true for when mutual authentication is needed, because the main cost on the server side is $1 \times \text{Sign}$ and $2 \times \text{Verify}$.

Short certificate chain. To save C4.2, we should setup short certificate chain and specify CA verification key among all endpoints. Our experiment shows that Verify Cert is about 52% faster with the verification key specified in a short chain as it avoids search for the right CA certificate and long chain verification. Given the internal CA issuing certificates within a datacenter, we could omit backward compatibility features.

3.4.2 0-RTT Data and Key Exchange

Datacenter transport protocols, such as Homa and NDP, send an RPC already on the first RTT without transport-level handshake. 0-RTT data could be based on the TLS 1.3 handshake with the aid of DNS records to distribute a *short-lived* ECDH public key share of the server² to remove 1 RTT from the initial handshake. Servers reuse the short-lived key pair across multiple connections and regenerate the key pair periodically.

Unlike the Internet, the datacenter or cloud provider could operate its own root CA that also acts as the internal DNS resolver. We assume SDP servers upload key information to the resolver as the *SDP-ticket* that contains: (i) the server’s short-lived ECDH key; (ii) cryptographic parameters such as key exchange algorithm, cipher suite, and signature scheme; (iii) maximum size of the early data; (iv) certificate that authenticates the server; (v) server’s signature of the SDP-data using the private key from the certificate.

We could design two variants of key exchange over 0-RTT data—with and without the forward secrecy property of data

²Inspired by Encrypted Client Hello [41].

on the second and later RTTs. Either way the SDP client obtains the *SDP-ticket* via a DNS query and authenticates the ticket, which can be done way before the handshake. It then sends the ClientHello (CHLO) with the ticket identity, forward secrecy requirement and the early (0-RTT) data that is encrypted by *sdp-key* derived from the client’s ephemeral key and server’s short-lived key via a ECDH exchange. When the ticket authentication fails (e.g., expired ticket or failed signature verification), the client should perform the standard TLS initial handshake.

We would configure SDP servers to manage multiple SDP-tickets whose validity period overlaps with others for seamless ticket transitions. Those tickets should have different DH groups; otherwise the usage of short-lived key share would force clients connecting to the same server to rely on a single DH group, which undermines the key exchange security.

Upon receipt of CHLO, if forward secrecy is requested, the server generates the server ephemeral key and computes the *fs-key* using the client ephemeral key. The server then sends back ServerHello (SHLO) that carries 0-RTT reply data encrypted by the *fs-key* if forward secrecy is used, otherwise *sdp-key*. SHLO does not contain the server certificate, because it is embedded in the SDP-ticket. The handshake completes with exchanging Finished messages. When forward secrecy is enabled, the client computes a *fs-key* from the server ephemeral key obtained from SHLO.

Client 0-RTT data is not forward secure, like that in the resumed handshake in TLS 1.3. We can control the level of the risk by limiting the valid period of the SDP-ticket. Like TLS session tickets, we suggest the SDP-ticket be valid for less than one hour based on the industry practice³ for 0-RTT data. To mitigate replay attack, despite limiting the ticket lifetime, another countermeasure is to record the random number in CHLO at the server side as stated in TLS 1.3 [40].

SDP session resumption follows the standard TLS 1.3 procedure [40], which already enables 0-RTT data. Similar to the initial handshake, one ECDH exchange is omitted when forward secrecy is disabled.

3.5 Implementation

Current SDP implementation support Linux kernel 6.2. It consists of approximately 2800 LoC patch to Homa/Linux and 300 LoC patch to Nvidia/Mellanox `mlx5` driver.

For key exchange, we extend `picotls` library. We add a new extension type of `psk_sdp_ticket` to indicate the use of SDP-ticket. We reuse the extension field of `pre_shared_key` to specify the identity of SDP-ticket being used in the current handshake. Like session resumption, we use `psk_key_exchange_modes` extension to request an additional key exchange for forward secrecy.

³CloudFlare rotates session ticket keys hourly [55]




Figure 5: Unloaded RTTs of various sized RPCs. Standard deviations are 2–12 %.

4 Evaluation

We measure the performance of SDP in comparison to TLS/TCP and other systems.

HW & OS. We use two identical machines connected back-to-back. Each machine is equipped with two Silver 4314 CPUs and NVIDIA/Mellanox ConnectX-7 DX 100 Gb/s NIC. Both machines enable Turbo Boost and disable Hyper-threading. They run Linux kernel 6.2. We configure RX interrupts go to one CPU core based on Homa’s recommendation, because Homa does its own load balancing without relying on RSS. All the threads and softirqs run on the same NUMA node as the NIC. Unless otherwise stated, the network MTU size is 1.5 K B.

4.1 Unloaded RTT

We first measure RTT of a single RPC without concurrent RPCs, using our custom app. This experiment highlights software overheads of the network stack, including the transport protocol, without the effect of queuing or app-level processing delays. Figure 5 shows the results.

SDP outperforms kTLS by 13–32 % with TLS offload and 10–35 % without it. Since Homa is faster than TCP by 5–35 %, SDP does not diminish the advantage of Homa over TCP. The margin is smallest with 65 KB RPCs, because the Homa receiver waits for the arrival of the entire RPC (that consists of multiple packets) before delivering (copying) data to the app, whereas TCP overlaps packet reception and app-data delivery due to its streaming abstraction. This is not a fundamental limitation of Homa and there exists work to remedy this issue [27, 35], and once it is merged into Homa, we expect that Homa and SDP outperform TCP variants by larger margins.

The benefit of hardware offloading is small (up to 7 % in SDP) in this experiment. For small messages, this is due to low encryption overheads and per-TSO segment cost incurred to populate offloading metadata (§ 3.3.1). For large messages, the bottleneck is not encryption but data copy. To confirm the

similar characteristics of larger message, we experimented with 500 K B RPCs (not plotted); it exhibited little (1 %) latency benefit of hardware offloading. In the next experiments where CPU cores are more loaded due to concurrent RPCs (§ 4.2) or complex app-level processing (§ 4.3), we observe a larger benefit of hardware offloading.

4.2 Throughput

Next, we measure the performance of SDP in the presence of concurrent RPCs and multiple application threads. We generate concurrent RPCs using 4 and 15 threads at the server and client, respectively, to stress the server.

Figure 6 shows the throughput over different numbers of concurrent RPCs for three RPC sizes. It should be noted that the maximum RPC rate of the current Homa implementation is limited to approximately 700 K RPCs/s, because it employs a single receive-interrupt processing (softirq) thread. Therefore, Homa is slower than TCP in 64 B and 1 K B RPC cases. However, in 1 K B RPC cases, since kTLS cannot achieve 700 K RPCs/s, SDP outperforms kTLS by up to 3–20 % with TLS offload and 15–27 % without it. Since the throughput of SDP is constrained by the maximum Homa RPC rate, not the cryptographic operations, TLS offload does not increase the throughput significantly in SDP.

In 8 K B cases (right in the figure) where the RPC rates are lower, SDP almost always outperforms kTLS, up to 23 % with TLS offload and up to 10 % without it. Further, since the rate is not constrained by Homa, SDP largely benefits from TLS offload, improving the throughput by 5–20 %. Finally, although Homa exhibits lower throughput than TCP, SDP outperforms kTLS, showing the locality advantage of integrating encryption with the transport protocol.

Overall, we observed SDP preserves the property of Homa. SDP’s overheads over Homa are up to 13 % with TLS offload and up to 27 % without it, whereas those of kTLS over TCP are up to 35 % with the offload and up to 51 % without it.

Impact of a larger MTU. We ran the same tests as Figure 6 right (1–150 concurrent 8KB RPCs) with 9 K B MTU (thus one message fits into a single packet). Compared to 1.5 K B MTU cases, SDP exhibited 7–37% and 7–38% higher throughput with and without TLS offload, respectively, because of the reduced number of packets per message. Its impact is larger for Homa, which is optimized for small RPCs (i.e., less packets), than TCP; kTLS improved its throughput by 6–22 % with TLS offload and 8–19 % without it. As a result, SDP outperformed kTLS by a larger margin than 1.5 K B MTU cases, up to 36% with TLS offload and up to 29% without it.

4.3 Redis

What does using SDP in a real-world application look like? To answer this question, we report our experience of adding support for SDP in Redis, a widely used key-value store. The

vast majority of effort was supporting vanilla Homa; once it is done, support for SDP was trivial, because it integrates encryption within the transport protocol.

Redis adopts a single-threaded design and monitors concurrent clients, each connects to the server over a TCP connection, using an `epoll`-based event loop, similar to event-driven web servers like `nginx`. Since Homa’s socket abstraction is one-to-many style and thus can communicate with multiple clients, Redis/SDP could directly block on `recvmsg`. However, to enable support for both TCP and SDP, we register the SDP socket (for multiple clients) to the `epoll` socket. Since TCP provides bytestream abstraction, the Redis server frames messages received from the client by locating the headers in the bytestream; in case of a partial read, Redis maintains the current offset of the message already received so far. On the other hand, since Homa preserves message boundaries, Redis/SDP does not need to maintain the partially-received request state. Once Homa support is done, it is trivial to support SDP. It simply adds `setsockopt` to the socket to register the key, which has been negotiated using an ordinary TLS library, such as OpenSSL. This key registration procedure is the same with kTLS.

Our modification to support a new feature (i.e., Homa and SDP) in Redis is straightforward, because the Redis instance can monitor both TCP and SDP clients in the same event loop. Although SDP file descriptors can be registered to the `epoll` event file descriptor as discussed earlier, this is not the case for supporting a kernel-bypass TCP stack as done in `mTCP` [31], `Demikernel` [59] and `Paste` [19]. Those stacks need to replace the entire event loop of Redis, disallowing the clients to access the same database over the regular kernel TCP stack, which is much more feature-rich. The same goes for `TCPLS`. It uses its own event loop based on `select` to manage the underlying TCP connections. Therefore, `TCPLS`’s descriptor on which the application performs I/O cannot be registered to the standard event loop based on the OS abstraction.

Results. Figure 7 shows throughput measured by `YCSB-C` [39], a C variant of `YCSB` [6], which generates workloads based on real-world key-value store systems. We extended `YCSB-C` to support Homa and SDP. Its default value size is 1 K B, but to see the impact of different value sizes, we also test with smaller (64 B) or larger (4 K B) values. To saturate the server, we use multiple threads and cores at the client, each opens its own socket to send requests to the server in parallel.

We compare SDP with or without TLS offload against TCP and TLS/TCP. The native Redis implementation uses user-space TLS that does not support hardware offload (TLS in the figure), but we added support for kTLS to make fair comparison to SDP.

SDP outperforms Redis/TLS in all the `YCSB` workloads and value sizes. SDP without TLS offload outperforms user-space TLS by 5–24% and kTLS without offload by 8–22%. When TLS offload is enabled, SDP outperforms kTLS by




Figure 6: Concurrent RPC throughput.




Figure 7: Redis throughput on YCSB. A: Update-heavy, B: Read-mostly, C: Read-only, D: Read-latest, E: Short ranges.

5–18%. Recall that the throughput of Homa and SDP was constrained to around 700 K RPCs/s by the softirq thread in § 4.2 (Figure 6). Since Redis has a considerable amount of app-level processing overheads (e.g., request parsing and database manipulation), the overall rates are below that rate, and thus Homa and SDP always outperformed the TCP counterparts.

TCP (without TLS) performs slightly better than Homa with 4 KB items, because it is optimized for large transfers. However, SDP, even without TLS offload, always outperforms TLS. Similar to 8 KB RPC cases in Figure 6, this highlights the better processing locality achieved by transport-level integration of cryptographic operations.

4.4 In-Kernel Client: NVMe-oF

In addition to user-space network applications like Redis, there exist in-kernel applications, such as NVMe-oF and NFS, that directly use the kernel TCP/IP suite. To show the applicability of SDP, we added experimental support for it in

NVMe-oF implemented in the Linux kernel. NVMe-oF is a remote block storage service to efficiently connect fast NVMe-based SSD devices and network clients. It is implemented in the kernel to avoid overheads of moving the data to the user space out of the kernel block layer and then moving the data back into the kernel to send it over TCP for read requests.

Similar to Redis, the most effort was about supporting Homa, and once it was done, SDP support was trivial. However, supporting Homa was harder than Redis due to the lack of Homa APIs for kernel clients whereas such APIs are available in TCP. We needed to implement the kernel-version of Homa APIs, but it was still trivial because most of the work was replacing the user-kernel crossing memory copy calls (e.g., `copy_from_user`) into in-kernel ones (`memcpy`).

We needed to modify the NVMe-over-TCP implementation, because it expects stream abstraction of the data for networking, whereas SDP inherits Homa’s RPC abstraction. Our NVMe-over-Homa/SDP works as following. When a client issues a write request, the server replies with *right-to-transmit* capsule which is the same as TCP. The client then




Figure 8: P50 and P99 latency of NVMe-oF.

sends a data payload as a request, and in response, the server replies with another right-to-transmit capsule. With TCP, the client would continuously send data payloads after getting the first right-to-transmit, which can be in multiple TCP packets. Finally, once all the expected data has been sent, the server replies to the last data payload with an *end* capsule, as in the TCP case. Reads are handled in a similar way. Since the NVMe stack is implemented inside the Linux kernel block layer, we can use unmodified client applications on top of it.

Our current implementation is in early stage and still expensive, including one extra data copy compared to TCP and lack of support for multiple I/O queues.

Results. We use *fio*, a widely-used storage benchmark tool, to generate random read requests to the remote SSD node over TCP, kTLS, Homa or SDP. We use the default NVMe block size, 4 KB, and force the data to be read from the NVMe SSD, not from the page cache.

Figure 8 plots the P50 and P99 request latency over varying iodepth, the number of requests sent without waiting for the response to the previous requests. Although we were not able to observe the advantage of Homa or SDP when iodepth is 1–4 at P50 or 1–2 at P99, we saw up to 7% (with TLS offload) or 15% (without it) of P50 latency reduction, and up to 16% (with TLS offload) or 21% (without it) of P99 latency reduction.

Unlike Redis cases, we were not able to observe clear advantage of hardware TLS offloading, likely because the benefit was masked by other NVMe device or stack overheads that increase the end-to-end latency. We leave further analysis and improvement of NVMe-oF/SDP as future work.

4.5 Comparison with TCPLS

TCPLS integrates a transport protocol (TCP) with TLS (§ 2.1). It reports that it outperforms all the QUIC implementations they tested, including Quicly (the fastest one), Msquic and mvfst, by at least $2.4\times$ [42].

We therefore compare SDP with TCPLS. Figure 9 plots unloaded latency to highlight software overheads. Note that TCPLS cannot use TLS NIC offloading, because it calculates

the TLS record nonce by a non-standard way [36]. SDP without TLS offload exhibits 5–18% lower latency than TCPLS. SDP with TLS offload achieves 12–18% lower latency than TCPLS (which cannot use offload).

4.6 Key Exchange Performance

We implemented the handshake methods that support 0-RTT data with and without forward secrecy (§ 3.4). Figure 11 plots RTT of initial handshake and resumption with each method, plus the baseline that performs the standard TLS 1.3 handshake over Homa (no pre key generation or short certificate chain). We use ECDH key exchange based on *secp256r1*, cipher suite of *aes128gcmsha256*, and ECDSA associated with *secp256r1* signature algorithm.

SDP initial handshake (Init-FS) is faster than the standard TLS (Init-1RTT) by 37–44% when forward secrecy is enabled, otherwise (Init) 52–55%. Speedup with Init-FS over Init-1RTT is 794–946 μ s. In addition to RTT saving, it removes C1.1 in Table 2 (by key pre-generation), C4.1, C4.2, C5.1, C5.2 (by verifying the certificate and signature obtained from SDP-ticket beforehand) at the client side and removes S2.1 (by pre-generated ephemeral key share) and S2.5 (already in the SDP-ticket) at the server side.

Compromising forward secrecy (Init) saves an additional ECDH exchange for fs-key calculation at both ends (S2.2 and C2.2) compared to Init-FS, further increasing the margin over Init-1RTT to 1120–1171 μ s. The margin between Init-FS and Init is 214–334 μ s.

For resumption, our implementation also uses pre-generated key at both ends. The margin between Rsmf-FS and Rsmf (no forward secrecy) is 338–387 μ s; it is reasonable, because the additional costs of S2.2 and C2.2 are similar.

5 Discussion

5.1 Transport-Level Integrity

Homa does not guarantee message integrity, because it does not employ checksum, likely due to segmentation offload does not embed correct checksum in the overlaid TCP header field for non-TCP packets. Therefore, when the application wishes message integrity to be guaranteed, it must checksum and verify the data by itself.

SDP intrinsically obviates this effort in its encryption/decryption and authentication process, because encrypting and decrypting the message with TLS means integrity is checked. Further, the cryptographic operation can be offloaded to the NIC hardware.

5.2 Better Message Reassembly

Our implementation currently uses the IPID to sort the packets in the TSO segment (§ 3.2). Unfortunately, IPv6 does not




Figure 9: TCPLS comparison.




Figure 10: Effect of TSO.




Figure 11: Key exchange latency.

have an equivalent field. Although we could be optimistic that the NIC vendor would enable sequence number embedding for non-TCP packets as it would not require significant NIC architecture change, we should also be conservative or be prepared for the case when it does not happen.

One approach is the use of TLS offload without TSO but with Generic Segmentation Offload (GSO). GSO is a software variant of TSO that executes at the bottom of the network stack. The benefits of TSO are two-folds: checksum offload and segmentation offload. Although Homa employs TSO, it only exploits the latter, as it does not employ checksum-based data integrity. Since packets split by GSO, unlike those split by TSO, can have the sequence numbers embedded in the “TCP” header fields, the receiver can simply reassemble the GSO segment based on those.

We experimentally validate the impact of the absence of TSO. For simplicity of prototyping, in this experiment we even do not use GSO, creating MTU-sized segments in the transport layer. Figure 10 plots RTTs of various-sized messages with and without TSO. TLS offload is enabled in both cases. When the number of packets in the message is just two (2048 B cases), the overheads are negligible. When the message spans across 6 packets (8192 B cases), those overheads go up to 12%. We do not consider the performance penalty as negligible, but given that our results are rather conservative estimation, as even GSO is not used, we still conclude that the use of SDP for IPv6 networks could be feasible.

5.3 Soft Offloading

An alternative crypto offloading method is the use of a DPU, such as NVIDIA/Mellanox BlueField3. General-purpose CPU cores on DPUs would be used for encryption, and DPUs would execute decryption tasks, which is hard with ASIC NIC engines. Since DPU itself introduces some latency, we would also run the transmit-side packet scheduler in DPUs.

We also found that when the message size or the number of application threads is large, the pacer thread often becomes a bottleneck. Although it is not specific to SDP, the pacer being a bottleneck also means diminishing the benefit of NIC-based encryption. DPUs would be a good option to offload the

packet scheduling task. Modern DPUs, including BlueField2 and BlueField3, support TLS offloading.

5.4 Receive-Side Offload

Receiver-side cryptographic NIC offload is challenging because the NIC does not direct the incoming non-TCP packets into its cryptographic engine. It would not be a great effort for the vendors to enable directing the non-TCP packets to the crypto offload engine; for example, Pensando Elba has a P4-based ingress packet processing engine [2] behind the cryptographic offload engine. Although we confirmed that the sender-side NIC-offloaded encryption accelerates the RPC throughput by up to 20%, receive-side offload would accelerate it further.

One option to enable it is to use the TCP protocol number and reserves a portion of the port number space. This method, however, has a problem with confusing middleboxes, which are also prevalent in the cloud infrastructure [29]. In fact reusing the TCP header and protocol number for TSO and Large Receive Offload (LRO) has been proposed by Stateless Transport Tunneling (STT) [7], but not been standardized. If this approach is widely accepted, SDP would reassemble the packets based on the TCP sequence numbers instead of IPID. Sender-side challenges discussed in § 3.3 remain unchanged.

5.5 Limitation

SDP supports almost the same threat model as TLS/TCP, but there is one possibility where its privacy-preserving property would be weaker than TLS/TCP. Ford [10] outlines the “weak” attackers that infer the activity in the traffic by reading unencrypted TLS metadata over the TCP traffic [47]. The relevant one is that, if the packet boundaries are aligned with the TLS record headers, it would ease locating an unencrypted TLS record header.

In TCP, when the application continually writes back-to-back messages each preceded by a TLS record header and the stack immediately sends every message, those record headers always appear at the beginning of the packet payload. This can happen more likely when the TCP_NODELAY option has

been set to the socket, but even without—when the stack sees a `write` smaller than the MTU, it often sends the data without waiting for the next one. However, if multiple messages *together* form TSO segment(s) (since the NIC splits those into MTU-sized packets), the record header positions are unlikely aligned with the beginning of the packet payload except for the first one. In other words, TCP could obfuscate record boundaries inside the bytestream.

SDP currently places TLS record headers aligned with message boundaries, always creating a similar case to the former scenario. A possible mitigation is, as suggested in [10], to encrypt the TLS metadata including the record headers. We leave the exploration of this direction as future work.

6 Related work

We already discussed transport-level encryption in § 2.1 message-based transport methods in § 2.2; we discuss the rest in this section.

Transport multiplexing. Aquila [12] and EQDS [33] allow all the host traffic, such as TCP, RDMA, and their native transport, share the same network fabric. EQDS sits between the stack and NIC as *edge functions* and schedules all the traffic throughout the fabric using an NDP-derived low-latency, high-utilization control loop over UDP. Aquila attaches an integrated ToR-in-NIC (TiN) chip to the host, and delivers all the traffic between TiNs over hardware-based transport (GNet). SDP could be multiplexed in those while providing the abstraction and encryption to the application, or depending on the underlying network, SDP would be used between edge functions.

RDMA network security. ReDMArK [43] demonstrates packet injection attacks based on impersonation and unauthorized memory access in RDMA networks and then argues the necessity of encryption, using techniques like IPsec or sRDMA [53]; those attacks are mitigated in SDP. sRDMA employs symmetric cryptography for authentication and encryption, and extends the RDMA packet header to embed MAC. The application establishes RDMA connections (QPs) with the agent in the local SmartNIC whose CPUs perform authentication and encryption jobs, attaching or removing outer headers. [48] proposes encrypting RDMA packets with DTLS using hardware acceleration, but SDP does not opt for DTLS, because we also wish to use TSO.

Host stack improvements. Kernel bypass networking is a common way to implement a fast user-space TCP stack [22, 28]. It is also used in production systems to accelerate the continual engineering cycle in large operators like Google [29] and Alibaba [60]. SDP could be implemented in user-space, as it does not prohibit the use of relevant offloads. Kernel stack improvements are complementary to the SDP implementation, such as batching [15], zero copy [57], and fine-grained core allocation [4], although TCP-specific ones, such as congestion control [1] and handshake improvements [38], are irrelevant.

Homa improvements. ByteDance has reported their effort of improving Homa for their RPC traffic [27], improving large send performance with pipelining, congestion control with better RTT measurement, loss detection, and buffer estimation to coexist with TCP traffic. Those techniques are transparently applicable to SDP; they report Homa’s throughput is lower than TCP when the message size is larger than 50 KB, which we also observe similar in § 4. ByteDance reports the pipelining improves Homa throughput by 14%.

Encryption protocols. PSP [13] is an encryption protocol introduced by Google to encrypt intra- and inter-datacenter traffic. It encapsulates the original TCP/UDP packet in a PSP header. PSP is intended to be hardware-offload friendly for Google’s proprietary NIC. Our SDP design would support PSP in addition to TLS if PSP becomes widely available. However, we still need transport-level integration of encryption unless the NIC supports the SDP packet format, because encryption would happen per TSO segment that includes framing headers and PSP uses a single encryption offset.

Key exchange acceleration. SSLShader [21] and Smart-TLS [25] accelerate TLS handshake using GPU and SmartNIC CPU cores, respectively. Those can be used for SDP if key exchange is performed based on TLS, although we explored lightweight methods based on symmetric keys (§ 3.4).

Support for a new threat model. ERIM [54] enables the protection of sensitive data based on Intel MPK instructions and demonstrates protecting `nginx` session keys. This system would allow the applications on SDP to untrust the OS kernel; in that case, SDP needs to be implemented in the user space, perhaps extending the user-space implementation of Homa, which is already available [30].

7 Conclusion

This paper explored a rather conservative approach towards deployable secure datacenter transport protocols, extending the kernel implementation of Homa and enabling the use of existing in-NIC cryptographic offload engine designed for TCP. SDP enabled low short message latency and high throughput while benefiting from hardware offload, as well as easy use by existing applications, including Redis and NVMe-oF.

Current SDP implementation inherits performance issues from Homa [27], but we expect those will be mitigated due to its active development, and DPUs would also accelerate the software overheads, pushing the bottleneck to cryptographic operations, which SDP mitigates.

References

- [1] M. Alizadeh, A. Greenberg, D. A. Maltz, J. Padhye, P. Patel, B. Prabhakar, S. Sengupta, and M. Sridharan. “Data Center TCP (DCTCP)”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2010.

- [2] D. Bansal, G. DeGrace, R. Tewari, M. Zygmunt, J. Grantham, S. Gai, M. Baldi, K. Doddapaneni, A. Selvarajan, A. Arumugam, et al. “Disaggregating Stateful Network Functions”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2023.
- [3] A. Bittau, M. Hamburg, M. Handley, D. Mazieres, and D. Boneh. “The Case for Ubiquitous {Transport-Level} Encryption”. *USENIX Security*. 2010.
- [4] Q. Cai, M. Vuppalapati, J. Hwang, C. Kozyrakis, and R. Agarwal. “Towards μ s tail latency and terabit ethernet: disaggregating the host network stack”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2022.
- [5] Cilium. *eBPF-based Networking, Security, and Observability*. <https://github.com/cilium/cilium>.
- [6] B. F. Cooper, A. Silberstein, E. Tam, R. Ramakrishnan, and R. Sears. “Benchmarking cloud serving systems with YCSB”. *Proceedings of the 1st ACM symposium on Cloud computing*. 2010.
- [7] B. Davie and J. Gross. *A Stateless Transport Tunneling Protocol for Network Virtualization (STT)*. Internet-Draft draft-davie-stt-05. Mar. 2014.
- [8] D. E. Eisenbud, C. Yi, C. Contavalli, C. Smith, R. Kononov, E. Mann-Hielscher, A. Cilingiroglu, B. Cheyney, W. Shang, and J. D. Hosein. “Maglev: A fast and reliable software network load balancer”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2016.
- [9] B. Ford and J. R. Iyengar. “Breaking Up the Transport Logjam.” *HotNets*. 2008.
- [10] B. A. Ford. “Metadata Protection Considerations for TLS Present and Future”. *TLS 1.3 Ready or Not (TRON) Workshop*. 2016.
- [11] P. X. Gao, A. Narayan, G. Kumar, R. Agarwal, S. Ratnasamy, and S. Shenker. “PHost: Distributed near-Optimal Datacenter Transport over Commodity Network Fabric”. *ACM CoNEXT*. 2015.
- [12] D. Gibson, H. Hariharan, E. Lance, M. McLaren, B. Montazeri, A. Singh, S. Wang, H. M. G. Wassel, Z. Wu, S. Yoo, R. Balasubramanian, P. Chandra, M. Cutforth, P. Cuy, D. Decotigny, R. Gautam, A. Iriza, M. M. K. Martin, R. Roy, Z. Shen, M. Tan, Y. Tang, M. Wong-Chan, J. Zbiciak, and A. Vahdat. “Aquila: A unified, low-latency fabric for datacenter networks”. *USENIX NSDI*. Apr. 2022.
- [13] Google. *Announcing PSP’s cryptographic hardware offload at scale is now open source*. <https://cloud.google.com/blog/products/identity-security/announcing-ssp-security-protocol-is-now-open-source>.
- [14] Google. *Encryption in transit*. <https://cloud.google.com/docs/security/encryption-in-transit>. 2022.
- [15] S. Han, S. Marshall, B.-G. Chun, and S. Ratnasamy. “MegaPipe: A New Programming Interface for Scalable Network I/O”. *USENIX OSDI*. 2012.
- [16] M. Handley, C. Raiciu, A. Agache, A. Voinescu, A. W. Moore, G. Antichi, and M. Wójcik. “Re-Architecting Datacenter Networks and Stacks for Low Latency and High Performance”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2017.
- [17] Y. Hayakawa, M. Honda, D. Santry, and L. Eggert. “Prism: Proxies without the Pain”. *USENIX NSDI*. Apr. 2021.
- [18] T. Herbert. *Data center networking stack*. The Technical Conference on Linux Networking (Netdev 1.2), <https://legacy.netdevconf.info/1.2/session.html?tom-herbert/>. 2016.
- [19] M. Honda, G. Lettieri, L. Eggert, and D. Santry. “PASTE: A Network Programming Interface for Non-Volatile Main Memory”. *USENIX NSDI*. Apr. 2018.
- [20] M. Honda, Y. Nishida, C. Raiciu, A. Greenhalgh, M. Handley, and H. Tokuda. “Is It Still Possible to Extend TCP?”. *ACM IMC*. 2011.
- [21] K. Jang, S. Han, S. Han, S. Moon, and K. Park. “{SSLShader}: Cheap {SSL} Acceleration with Commodity Processors”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2011.
- [22] E. Y. Jeong, S. Woo, M. Jamshed, H. Jeong, S. Ihm, D. Han, and K. Park. “mTCP: A Highly Scalable User-level TCP Stack for Multicore Systems”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2014.
- [23] *Kernel Connection Multiplexer*. <https://www.kernel.org/doc/Documentation/networking/kcm.txt>.
- [24] *Kernel TLS offload*. <https://www.kernel.org/doc/html/latest/networking/tls-offload.html>.
- [25] D. Kim, S. Lee, and K. Park. “A case for smartnic-accelerated private communication”. *4th Asia-Pacific Workshop on Networking*. 2020.
- [26] A. Langley, A. Riddoch, A. Wilk, A. Vicente, C. Krasic, D. Zhang, F. Yang, F. Kouranov, I. Swett, J. Iyengar, J. Bailey, J. Dorfman, J. Roskind, J. Kulik, P. Westin, R. Tenneti, R. Shade, R. Hamilton, V. Vasiliev, W.-T. Chang, and Z. Shi. “The QUIC Transport Protocol: Design and Internet-Scale Deployment”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2017.
- [27] X. Lu and zijian Zhang. *Leveraging Homa: Enhancing Datacenter RPC Transport Protocols*. The Technical Conference on Linux Networking (Netdev 0x17), <https://netdevconf.info/0x17/docs/netdev-0x17-paper36-talk-paper.pdf>. 2023.
- [28] I. Marinos, R. N. Watson, M. Handley, and R. R. Stewart. “Diskl Cryptl Net: rethinking the stack for high-performance video streaming”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2017.
- [29] M. Marty, M. de Kruijf, J. Adriaens, C. Alfeld, S. Bauer, C. Contavalli, M. Dalton, N. Dukkupati, W. C. Evans, S. Gribble, et al. “Snap: A microkernel approach to host networking”. *ACM SOSP*. 2019.

- [30] B. Montazeri, Y. Li, M. Alizadeh, and J. Ousterhout. “Homa: A Receiver-Driven Low-Latency Transport Protocol Using Network Priorities”. *ACM SIGCOMM*. 2018.
- [31] Y. Moon, S. Lee, M. A. Jamshed, and K. Park. “{AccelTCP}: Accelerating network applications with stateful {TCP} offloading”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2020.
- [32] M. F. Nowlan, N. Tiwari, J. Iyengar, S. O. Amin, and B. Ford. “Fitting Square Pegs Through Round Pipes: Unordered Delivery {Wire-Compatible} with {TCP} and {TLS}”. *USENIX NSDI*. 2012.
- [33] V. Olteanu, H. Eran, D. Dumitrescu, A. Popa, C. Baciuc, M. Silberstein, G. Nikolaidis, M. Handley, and C. Raiciu. “An edge-queued datagram service for all datacenter traffic”. *USENIX NSDI*. Apr. 2022.
- [34] J. Ousterhout. “A Linux Kernel Implementation of the Homa Transport Protocol”. *USENIX ATC*. Jul. 2021.
- [35] J. Ousterhout. *Kernel-Managed User Buffers in Homa*. The Technical Conference on Linux Networking (Netdev 0x17), <https://netdevconf.info/0x17/docs/netdev-0x17-paper38-talk-slides/HomaBuffersNetDev.pdf>. 2023.
- [36] M. Piraux, O. Bonaventure, and F. Rochet. *TCPLS: Modern Transport Services with TCP and TLS*. Internet-Draft draft-piraux-tcps-00. Oct. 2021.
- [37] B. Pismenny, H. Eran, A. Yehezkel, L. Liss, A. Morrison, and D. Tsafir. “Autonomous NIC offloads”. *ACM ASPLOS*. 2021.
- [38] S. Radhakrishnan, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Jain, and B. Raghavan. “TCP fast open”. *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies*. 2011.
- [39] J. Ren. *YCSB-C*. <https://github.com/basicthinker/YCSB-C>.
- [40] E. Rescorla. *The Transport Layer Security (TLS) Protocol Version 1.3*. RFC 8446. Aug. 2018. URL: <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc8446>.
- [41] E. Rescorla, K. Oku, N. Sullivan, and C. A. Wood. *TLS Encrypted Client Hello*. Internet-Draft draft-ietf-tls-esni-17. Oct. 2023.
- [42] F. Rochet, E. Assogba, M. Piraux, K. Edeline, B. Donnet, and O. Bonaventure. “TCPLS: Modern Transport Services with TCP and TLS”. *ACM CoNEXT*. 2021.
- [43] B. Rothenberger, K. Taranov, A. Perrig, and T. Hoefler. “ReDMark: Bypassing RDMA Security Mechanisms”. *USENIX Security*. Aug. 2021.
- [44] A. Sapio, M. Canini, C.-Y. Ho, J. Nelson, P. Kalnis, C. Kim, A. Krishnamurthy, M. Moshref, D. Ports, and P. Richtarik. “Scaling Distributed Machine Learning with In-Network Aggregation”. *USENIX NSDI*. Apr. 2021.
- [45] K. Seemakhupt, B. E. Stephens, S. Khan, S. Liu, H. Wassel, S. H. Yeganeh, A. C. Snoeren, A. Krishnamurthy, D. E. Culler, and H. M. Levy. “A Cloud-Scale Characterization of Remote Procedure Calls”. *ACM SOSP*. 2023.
- [46] *Serving Netflix Video Traffic at 400Gb/s and Beyond*.
- [47] S. Siby, M. Juarez, C. Diaz, N. Vallina-Rodriguez, and C. Troncoso. “Encrypted DNS→ Privacy? A traffic analysis perspective”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.09682* (2019).
- [48] A. K. Simpson, A. Szekeres, J. Nelson, and I. Zhang. “Securing {RDMA} for {High-Performance} Datacenter Storage Systems”. *12th USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 20)*. 2020.
- [49] B. E. Stephens, D. Grassi, H. Almasi, T. Ji, B. Vamanan, and A. Akella. “TCP is Harmful to In-Network Computing: Designing a Message Transport Protocol (MTP)”. *ACM HotNets*. 2021.
- [50] B. E. Stephens, D. Grassi, H. Almasi, T. Ji, B. Vamanan, and A. Akella. “TCP is Harmful to In-Network Computing: Designing a Message Transport Protocol (MTP)”. *ACM HotNets*. 2021.
- [51] R. R. Stewart, M. Tüxen, and Karen Nielsen. *Stream Control Transmission Protocol*. RFC 9260. Jun. 2022. URL: <https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc9260>.
- [52] L. Tan, W. Su, Y. Liu, X. Gao, and W. Zhang. “DC-QUIC: Flexible and Reliable Software-defined Data Center Transport”. *IEEE Infocom*. 2021.
- [53] K. Taranov, B. Rothenberger, A. Perrig, and T. Hoefler. “{sRDMA}-Efficient {NIC-based} Authentication and Encryption for Remote Direct Memory Access”. *USENIX ATC*. 2020.
- [54] A. Vahldiek-Oberwagner, E. Elnikety, N. O. Duarte, M. Sammler, P. Druschel, and D. Garg. “{ERIM}: Secure, Efficient In-process Isolation with Protection Keys ({{{MPK}}})”. *USENIX Security*. 2019.
- [55] F. Valsorda. *An overview of TLS 1.3 and Q&A*. <https://blog.cloudflare.com/tls-1-3-overview-and-q-and-a>. 2016.
- [56] Q. Wang, Y. Lu, E. Xu, J. Li, Y. Chen, and J. Shu. “Concordia: Distributed Shared Memory with In-Network Cache Coherence”. *USENIX FAST*. Feb. 2021.
- [57] K. Yasukata, M. Honda, D. Santry, and L. Eggert. “StackMap: Low-Latency Networking with the OS Stack and Dedicated NICs”. *USENIX ATC*. 2016.

- [58] *ZeroMQ: The intelligent transport layer*. <https://zeromq.org/>.
- [59] I. Zhang, A. Raybuck, P. Patel, K. Olynyk, J. Nelson, O. S. N. Leija, A. Martinez, J. Liu, A. K. Simpson, S. Jayakar, et al. “The demikernel datapath os architecture for microsecond-scale datacenter systems”. *ACM SOSP*. 2021.
- [60] L. Zhu, Y. Shen, E. Xu, B. Shi, T. Fu, S. Ma, S. Chen, Z. Wang, H. Wu, X. Liao, et al. “Deploying User-space {TCP} at Cloud Scale with {LUNA}”. *USENIX ATC*. 2023.