

Cruise's Self-Driving Networking Journey

Bernard Van De Walle & Can "Jon" Yucel











Cruise

We're building the world's most advanced **self-driving** vehicles to safely connect people with the places, things, and experiences they care about.



Our Journey



4

Agenda

Network Connectivity

Ingress Traffic



Monitoring/Logging

Security

Hybrid DNS



Network Connectivity

- Isolate cluster from the public Internet
- A cluster connected to our internal network
- Repeatable configuration in multiple environments (dev, staging, prod)

• IP Range Design Decisions:

- Class A for the nodes (10.0.0/8)
- Class B for the pods (172.16.0.0/12)
- Class C for the services (192.168.0.0/16)

Network Connectivity

• Goal: Pod A can connect to Service B

- How to provide network connectivity?
 - Naive approach: VPN tunnels!



The Very First Problem!

 Challenge: Requests from
 Pod A to Srv B are all timing out!

• Root cause:

- No return route for Pod IP range
- Private GKE clusters
 come with IP MASQ
 agents
- IP MASQ agent doesn't source NAT a request
- Solution: Tweak IP MASQ configuration!



Lesson learned:

Masquerade all requests outside of the network

Default Config



VS.

Modified Config



Environmental and Regional Clusters

Clusters





Hybrid Networks

- Gotchas of VPN tunnels
 - n² tunnels
 - Static routes and route table management
 - Reduced performance



Hybrid Networks

- Interconnects solve n² tunnels problem.
 - Each network is connected through interconnects
 - \circ No IPSEC tunnels

• BGP routers dynamically advertises all the routes

 Physical dedicated interconnects between networks provide high bandwidth



Container Platform Networking - http://bit.ly/cruise-networking

Multiple clusters

• One subnet per cluster.

- Those IP ranges depend on:
 - Environment (dev, staging, prod)
 - Region
 - Cluster sizing





Constraints

- Node IPs globally unique
- Pod IPs locally unique per VPC (environment)
- Service IPs unique per VPC (environment)

Challenge: manual IP assignment process



Jerry: Constraint based IP range assignments

- 4 parameters:
- Environment
- Region
- Max pods per node
- Max nodes

Syncs and validates IP ranges with Netbox

Lesson learned: Meta Cluster visibility



Exposing services



Exposing services



Intra-cluster: Kubernetes services

- Cluster IP
- Node ports



Exposing services



Private L4 traffic

- Internal load balancer on VPC
- Self-service with annotations



Exposing services



Private L7 traffic

- 95% of traffic
- Use standard **Ingress** resource
- Nginx-ingress
- Started with standard **in-cluster** controllers
- Dedicated node pool to avoid noisy neighbour // ressource



Private L7 traffic

- **externalTrafficPolicy** to avoid extra hop
- Load balancer Healthchecks the nodes. Only those with a controller available will succeed.



Private L7 traffic

In-cluster **limitations**:

- Load Balancer healthcheck max. 250 nodes chosen randomly
- Decouple from Kubernetes management

- Private L7 traffic
- nginx-ingress
 out-of-cluster
- Managed in a separate instance group
- Watch Kube API outside the cluster
- Sends traffic directly to pods

Exposing services

Public L4 traffic

- Public Load balancer on environment VPC
- Exceptional cases only (requires review)
- Firewalled and mTLS (unmanaged by Kubernetes)

blic ad lancer
es ce IP
★
kend s

Exposing services

Public L7 traffic

- Started with L7 GLBC
- Evolved to **nginx-ingress**
- Same setup as private ingress
- Different nginx-ingress annotation

Lesson learned:

Support a small amount of options but support them well

Private ingress annotation:

apiVersion: extensions/v1
kind: Ingress
metadata:
annotations:
kubernetes.io/ingress
nginx.ingress.kuberne

Public ingress annotation:

apiVersion: extensions/v1
kind: Ingress
metadata:
annotations:
kubernetes.io/ingress
nginx.ingress.kuberne
nginx.ingress.kuberne

beta1

.class: nginx tes.io/affinity: cookie

lbeta1

.class: public tes.io/affinity: cookie tes.io/proxy-body-size: 20m

Hybrid DNS

• **Goal:** DNS that works in hybrid environment

• State:

- Domain records are stored in Route53
- DNS proxies used for forwarding internal queries to Route 53
- **First attempt:** Configure KubeDNS to forward cruise domains to DNS proxies via stub domains
- End result: High latency!

Hybrid DNS

- **Solution**: Use CoreDNS and enable Route53 backend
- Challenge: Route53 plugin only supports A records and fetches all records one-by-one.
 - Added support for batch requests and allowed fetching all record types.
 - Configured CoreDNS to periodically pull from Route53.

Hybrid DNS

- Challenge: Connecting to CoreDNS via stub domains only solve the problem for the Kubernetes clusters.
- **Solution:** Incorporate Cloud DNS and forwarding zones.

DNS configuration:

Each cluster publishes a DNS record for:

- Private Ingress endpoint
- Public Ingress endpoint

Tenants CNAME to the ingress endpoints

	C
	C
private.clusterX-w	est1-dev.rob
А	C
shared-network Inte Lo Bala Ingress instance group Ng	rnal ad incer
Bac Pod	kend s

Ingress logging

- Structured logs with Fluentd
- Easy to search and filter
- Example filter:

jsonPayload.ingress_name="ingress-example" jsonPayload.ingress namespace="paas-tools"

```
2019-11-19 09:37:08.000 PST GET 200 819 B 4 ms curl/7.58... /
    10.252.10.2 - "GET /" 200 819 "-" "curl/7.58.0"
   • {
      httpRequest: {...}
       insertId: "98nchae9hx58v5cki"
      • jsonPayload: {
          cluster: "paas-dev-us-west1"
          container id: "89031a874870f3b64263bf452e48c46f8925f6b40583489019d46ce4b0c07ccb"
          container name: "/nginx nginx 1"
          host: "ingress-example.robot.car"
          ingress name: "ingress-example"
          ingress namespace: "paas-tools"
        s", "referer": "-", "time": "19/Nov/2019:17:37:08 +0000"}"
          referer: "-"
          source: "stdout"
      blabels: {...}
       logName:
       receiveTimestamp: "2019-11-19T17:37:13.120505549Z"
      resource: {...}
       timestamp: "2019-11-19T17:37:08Z"
```

Expand all | Collapse all

log: "{"host": "ingress-example.robot.car", "httpRequest": {"latency": "0.004s", "referer": "-", "remoteI p": "10.252.10.2", "requestMethod": "GET", "requestSize": "38", "requestUrl": "/", "responseSize": "819", "st atus": "200", "userAgent": "curl/7.58.0"}, "ingress_name": "ingress-example", "ingress_namespace": "paas-tool

Monitoring

Ingress metrics

Filtered by:

- Cluster
- Namespace
- Ingress

Lesson learned:

Provide easy access to network logging and monitoring

uno	Example	👻 All Proje
Observ	ability	
Dashboards		Development
		Namespace Overview⊠
		Cluster Utilization
		Blackbox Monitoring⊠
		Private Ingress⊠
* Dashboard conter	nt might be empty if	there are no applications or ing
Logs		Development
		PaaS GKE12
		Private Ingress (Nginx)⊠
Incidents		Pager Duty 2

e	w
3	
9	Z

Staging

Namespace Overview☑ Cluster Utilization☑ Blackbox Monitoring☑ Private Ingress∅

s or ingresses configured in your GKE namespace.

Staging PaaS GKE

Private Ingress (Nginx)☑

Production

Namespace Overview⊠ Cluster Utilization☑ Blackbox Monitoring☑ Private Ingress⊠

Production PaaS GKE Private Ingress (Nginx)☑

Ingress Monitoring

- Motivation: Experiencing
 elevated MTTR for ingress
 failures
- Goals:
 - Automate blackbox
 monitoring for
 - Ingresses
 - Probe both
 private/public
 endpoints
 - Helps tenants identifyproblems early on

Ingress monitoring

- Toggle Runscope tests
- Enable Runscope agents
 via environments
- Set an interval to run the tests
- Define a prefix

api\	/ersion: extensions/v1beta1
kind	I: Ingress
meta	adata:
ar	nnotations:
	kubernetes.io/ingress.allow-
	kubernetes.io/ingress.class:
	runscope.getcruise.com/bucke
	runscope.getcruise.com/enabl
	runscope.getcruise.com/paren
111	1111-2222-3333-4444-55555555
	runscope.getcruise.com/path:
	runscope.getcruise.com/sched
	<pre>runscope.getcruise.com/test-</pre>


```
-http: "false"

: public-nginx

et-name: paas-system

le-api-tests: "true"

nt-environment-id:

55555

: /

dule: 1m

-prefix: '[P4]'
```

Lesson learned:

Requests directed to LoadBalancers created via services are still internal to the cluster

Better to have additional agents running outside of the cluster

Default network isolation

- AuthN//AuthZ for everything
- Full access to cluster node from inside the VPC
- No access from outside the VPC to cluster nodes (exceptions possible)
- TCP 80,443 from inside
 Cruise to Ingress
 Gateways
- Namespace isolation considered with
 NetworkPolicies

Pod network security:

K-Rail admission controller

https://github.com/cruise-automation/k-rail

- Host network pods forbidden
- Extra network capabilities forbidden
- Public ingress requires whitelisting

- User friendly output
- Add exemptions as required

\$ kubectl apply -f deploy/non-compliant-deployment.yaml

Error from server (k-rail): error when creating "deploy/non-compliant-deployment.yaml": admission webhook "k-rail.cruise-automation.github.com" denied the request:

Deployment bad-deployment had violation: No Host Network: Using the host network is forbidden Deployment bad-deployment had violation: No Privileged Container: Using privileged containers is forbidden Deployment bad-deployment had violation: No New Capabilities: Adding additional capabilities is forbidden

Current Challenges

Current challenges Multi cluster ingress

• Single "federated" endpoint for all clusters

Current challenges Improved Visibility and Metrics

 Identifying networking traffic characteristics on multi-tenant clusters

45

Current challenges

Network traffic engineering and QoS

DNS Enhancements

Load Testing Framework

Questions

