

# $v$ TNT: Unikernels for Efficient and Flexible Internet Probing

Maxime Letemple<sup>1</sup>, Gauthier Gain<sup>2</sup>, Sami Ben Mariem<sup>2</sup>, Laurent Mathy<sup>2</sup>, and Benoit Donnet<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut Polytechnique de Bordeaux, France*  
*mletemple@ipb.fr*

<sup>2</sup>*Université de Liège, Montefiore Institute, Belgium*  
*{firstname.name}@uliege.be*

**Abstract**—The last twenty years have seen the development and popularity of network measurement infrastructures. Internet measurement platforms have become common and have demonstrated their relevance in Internet understanding and security observation. However, despite their popularity, those platforms lack of flexibility and reactivity, as they are usually used for longitudinal measurements. As a consequence, they may miss detecting events that are security or Internet-related. During the same period, operating systems have evolved to virtual machines (VMs) as self-contained units for running applications, with the recent rise of unikernels, ultra-lightweight VMs tailored for specific applications, eliminating the need for a host OS.

In this paper, we advocate that measurement infrastructures could take advantage of unikernels to become more flexible and efficient. We propose  $v$ TNT, a proof-of-concept unikernel-based implementation of TNT, a `traceroute` extension able to reveal MPLS tunnels. This paper documents the full toolchain for porting TNT into a unikernel and evaluates  $v$ TNT performance with respect to more traditional approaches. The paper also discusses a use case in which  $v$ TNT could find a suitable usage.  $v$ TNT source code will be released upon paper acceptance.

## I. INTRODUCTION

For more than twenty years now, Internet measurement platforms have become common [1]. Most of them have been deployed by researchers and came with predefined measurement capacities [2], [3], [4], [5], [6]. Measurements are usually performed by platform owner and collected data set is often made available to the research community. Those platforms typically rely on dedicated hardware, located in well-known places or run by an army of volunteers. In parallel to those academic platforms, several measurement infrastructures [7], [8], [9] have been deployed following the SETI@home [10] model. That kind of infrastructure comes with the advantage of potentially increasing the probing sources, but at the cost of development difficulties (tools must support a variety of hardware, operating systems, and local configuration) and irregular data collection. Further, several consortiums [11], [12], [13] have also built distributed platforms on which researchers can possibly deploy their own network measurement experiences.

All those solutions require either dedicated hardware (e.g., RIPE Atlas [4], Archipelago [3], or even PlanetLab [11]), either an adaptation of tools to running operating system and libraries (e.g., PlanetLab [11] or Dimes [7]). More recent ones rely on Kubernetes and VM deployment (e.g., EdgeNet [12]).

Unfortunately, none of those solutions is flexible and easily deployable. As such, they are not built to quickly react to events, either related to security, network outages [14], [15], or even Internet topology dynamicity discovery [16]. By quickly, we mean it should be instantiated on-demand (loading time must be as quick as possible), should require the lowest memory footprint, and shutdown when the measurement is over.

In parallel to this, the last twenty years have seen the development of advanced operating systems. The advent of public clouds initially relied on hardware virtualization, using virtual machines (VMs) as self-contained units for running applications. While cost-effective, VMs were heavyweight, consuming substantial resources and storage due to their full OS image. This led to the adoption of containerization, with technologies like Docker [17] and LXC [18], which share the host OS kernel and reduce resource usage. However, containers have security concerns due to their large attack surface [19], [20]. To strike a balance between performance and isolation, a newer paradigm emerged: *unikernels* [21]. Unikernels are ultra-lightweight VMs tailored for specific applications, eliminating the need for a host OS. Including only essential OS components offers improved performance and a reduced attack surface, making them a promising alternative to VMs and containers [22], [23], [24], [25], [26].

The main challenge with unikernels is the need for manual porting of existing applications, involving intricate processes like component extraction, API compliance, and optimization. Fortunately, frameworks such as Unikraft [25] and its tools suite have been developed to make it easier to port existing applications to unikernels [27], [28]. The goal is to produce unikernels with small image sizes, quick boot times, and minimal memory usage, simplifying development and deployment.

This paper advocates that unikernels can be the foundation of new, flexible, and efficient measurement infrastructures. In particular, this paper introduces  $v$ TNT, a proof-of-concept unikernel-based implementation of TNT, a `traceroute` extension able to reveal MPLS tunnels and to provide hardware vendors pieces of information [29], [30]. Our paper makes the following contributions: (i) It describes the  $v$ TNT implementation, serving as a first example of the full toolchain for porting any network measurements software into a unikernel.

(ii) It evaluates  $vTNT$  performance, demonstrating that it is more flexible than traditional implementation as it consumes less CPU and memory. (iii) It discusses a use case in which the flexibility of unikernel based probing tool, such as  $vTNT$ , could find a suitable usage. We also evaluate its performance in such a context, compared to more traditional approaches.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Sec. II provides the required background for the paper; Sec. III discusses how we implemented  $vTNT$  and Sec. IV evaluates its performance; Sec. V introduces a use case in which  $vTNT$  would find a suitable usage; Sec. VI discusses the limits of our work; finally, Sec. VII concludes this paper by summarizing its main achievements.

## II. BACKGROUND

This section introduces the required background for this paper. In particular, Sec. II-A discusses unikernels in general. Sec. II-B presents *Unikraft*, a framework for porting applications on unikernels. Finally, Sec. II-C, gives an overview of memory deduplication, a technique for merging identical memory pages.

### A. Unikernels

The concept of a unikernel represents a recent innovation where an application is tightly integrated with the underlying kernel. In simpler terms, software is compiled to include only the necessary OS functionality, such as required system calls and drivers, forming a single statically-compiled executable image. This single address space design means that unikernels do not maintain separate user and kernel address spaces, and all threads, as well as the kernel, share the same page table. The primary advantage of this approach lies in its capacity to minimize the potential attack surface and the exploitability of the operating system code. Unlike virtual machines and containers, which often come bundled with an excess of tools and libraries beyond what the running application truly needs, unikernels exclusively contain essential operating system functions. Fig. 1 gives a high-overview of the different paradigms between VMs, containers and unikernels.




Figure 1. Comparison of a virtual machine (VM), a container, and a unikernel.

In addition to enhancing security, unikernels also offer performance improvements. They utilize a single address space without distinguishing between kernel-space and user-space. Consequently, system calls are akin to regular function calls,

sidestepping the performance overhead associated with context switches and data transfers between user and kernel spaces.

Unikernels can be categorized into two primary types: (i) *POSIX-compliant unikernels*. These unikernels have the capability to execute both existing and legacy applications through the use of cross-compiling techniques. Typically, they are constructed around a customized kernel and exhibit a larger code base due to their increased resource requirements. Nonetheless, these platforms offer a straightforward approach to migrate traditional software, originally designed for virtual machines and containers, into the unikernel environment by simply requiring recompilation. Unikraft [25] is an example of this type of system. It is tailored to run unaltered Linux applications on the KVM (Kernel Virtual Machine [31]) hypervisor. Similarly, within this classification, Rumprun [23] provides reusable kernel-quality components that facilitate the creation of highly customized unikernel images with minimal overhead. (ii) *Language-based unikernels*. In contrast, this second category pertains to the development of minimalist operating systems with a custom API. Unlike the previous approach, this model does not aim to optimize existing code; instead, it concentrates on providing a set of tools for the rapid assembly of new components, eliminating the need to address underlying services such as memory allocators and drivers. However, this concept does have the drawback of generating a code base that is generally incompatible with existing applications. Consequently, it necessitates the rewriting of legacy code to conform to the defined platform’s API. MirageOS [21], developed using OCaml, represents an example of this architecture. It serves as a complete, ground-up set of protocol libraries designed for the construction of specialized unikernels that operate on the Xen hypervisor [32].

### B. Unikraft

While traditional OS development is typically divided between monolithic kernels, where all critical system functions like device drivers are closely integrated into a single kernel [33], [34], and modular micro-kernels that prioritize isolating OS components [35], [36], Unikraft stands out by adopting a unique approach. It combines the monolithic design (no protection between components) with the modularity provided by micro-kernels. Unikraft leverages modularity to enable specialization, dividing OS functionality into distinct components that only interact through well-defined API boundaries. Rather than compromising API boundaries for the sake of performance, Unikraft ensures performance through meticulous API design and static linking. To fulfill the overarching principle of modularity, Unikraft relies on two primary components.

(i) **Micro-libraries and pools:** Micro-libraries, (micro-libs for short), are software components which implement one of the core Unikraft APIs. Within a given pool of libraries, each of them adheres to the same API standard, making them fully interchangeable. Furthermore, micro-libraries can integrate functionality from external library projects such as OpenSSL [37], `musl` [38], Protobuf [39], and more. They can also incorporate features from applications like

SQLite [40], Nginx [41], or even adapt to different platforms like Solo5 [42], Firecracker [43], or Raspberry Pi 3 and architectures (e.g., x86, ARM, etc.). The size of micro-libraries can vary widely, ranging from extremely compact ones, such as those containing basic boot code (e.g., `ukboot` [44]), to substantial ones, like those providing comprehensive `libc` (e.g., `musl` [38]) or network support (e.g., `lwip` [45]). The Unikraft project maintains several micro-libraries available on Github [46], but users and developers can also create their own.




Figure 2. From a traditional full stack application to an optimized Unikraft-based unikernel. The application to be ported is shipped with the essential libraries and OS components into a unikernel.

(ii) **Buildsystem:** Unikraft provides a user-friendly menu based on `KConfig`<sup>1</sup>, allowing users to choose the micro-libraries they want to incorporate into their application during the build process. Users can also specify the platform(s) and CPU architectures to target and configure individual micro-libs if desired (i.e. memory allocators, network protocols support, etc). The build system efficiently handles the compilation and linking of all chosen micro-libs, resulting in the creation of one binary per selected platform and architecture. Fig. 2 shows how a unikernel can be built using Unikraft.

To port an existing application to Unikraft, developers need to provide three essential files: (i) A `Makefile` file designating the Unikraft repository’s location relative to the application’s repository, as well as any external library repositories. (ii) A `Makefile.uk` file which serves as the principal `Makefile` for specifying sources to build, including paths, flags, and application-specific targets. (iii) A `Config.uk` file, which populates Unikraft’s menu with application-specific configuration options. In most cases, porting an existing library or application to Unikraft requires few if any changes to the actual code: most of the work consists of creating a Unikraft makefile called `Makefile.uk` that Unikraft uses to compile the source code. When this step is done, some changes in the application code may be applied to avoid runtime errors (e.g., stubbing `fork`, `exec`, etc.).

<sup>1</sup>`Kconfig` is a configuration system providing a hierarchical menu-driven interface for enabling/disabling features.

### C. Memory Deduplication in Virtualized Environments

Running multiple VMs or unikernels can significantly inflate memory consumption because of the inherent isolation between instances. To mitigate excessive memory usage across various instances [22], [47], cloud providers may employ a memory deduplication scanner. This technology is particularly useful in virtualized environments where multiple VMs share the same physical hardware resources. Memory deduplication scanners analyze the contents of a system’s memory to detect identical memory pages<sup>2</sup> and merges them into a same single frame. For instance, the *Kernel Samepage Merging* (KSM [47]) is the default memory deduplication scanner available in the Linux Kernel. There exist also other scanners such as *UKSM* [48] or *KSM++*[49] which deliver better performance than KSM, but these are not integrated into the Linux kernel and require the use of custom kernels.

### III. *v*TNT

This section is dedicated to *v*TNT, the porting of TNT (a modified `traceroute` driver for `scamper`) into a unikernel using Unikraft. Sec. III-A gives an overview of `scamper` and TNT. Sec. III-B documents how *v*TNT has been implemented.

#### A. Overview

`scamper` [50] is a modern implementation of `traceroute` [51]. In addition to traditional `traceroute` (in both IPv4 and IPv6), `scamper` comes with multiple tools: `ping`, alias resolution [52], DNS probing, and load balancing discovery [53]. `scamper` has been designed to probe the Internet in parallel, at a specified packet-per-second rate. This paper considers an additional layer above `scamper`: TNT [29], [30]. TNT uses `traceroute`-like probing for revealing the presence of MPLS tunnels [54]. Further, TNT provides, for each collected IP interface, its fingerprint in order to identify the hardware vendor [55].

`Scamper` is based on two processes to operate: a listening server, which waits for a command, performs the measurements and sends back the results to the second process that saves the result into a file. Initiating `scamper` involves commencing with the primary ‘`scamper`’ program, which waits for measurement commands. Subsequently, in a distinct terminal, the designated command for the desired measurement should be executed. For example, to execute a standard `traceroute`, `sc_tracediff` is employed, while TNT is used for the modified `traceroute` (TNT).

#### B. Implementation

To transform TNT into a unikernel, denoted as *v*TNT, we used Unikraft [25] and one of its toolsets [27] tailored to streamline the porting process. We opted for the Unikraft framework as our unikernel framework for a variety of compelling reasons. Firstly, it boasts an extensive library and application collection, all are open-source and available on

<sup>2</sup>A page represents a uniform, fixed-size segment of virtual memory, and is characterized by a single entry within the page table. It is the smallest unit of data for memory management in a virtual memory operating system.

GitHub [46]. Secondly, it is actively maintained and continually evolving. Additionally, its POSIX compatibility eliminates the need to rewrite applications from scratch. Lastly, a range of tools is available for application porting. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that alternative unikernel frameworks like Nanos [56] and Rumprun [23] remain viable options.




Figure 3. High-level overview of the different steps to port an application into a unikernel. The Unikraft developers tool is used to perform micro-libraries matching and to generate the required configuration files. After this step, the application’s codebase has been patched to be compliant with Unikraft.

In Fig. 3, we outline the 3 general steps involved to port an application as unikernel: (1) Using a developer assisting tool to perform the libraries matching and generating the required configuration files for Unikraft. (2) Adapting the given application’s codebase to support Unikraft paradigm (e.g., single address space and single process). (3) Updating external libraries by modifying their codebase to be compliant with the ported application. These last two steps can either be skipped (no compilation or linking error) or be repeated several times until the application is successfully built using the Unikraft build system.

We ported Scamper+TNT according to these steps. During the first step, we used a developer tool [27], written by the Unikraft community, which analyses the application’s symbols, both in its binary and source files, endeavoring to match them with the symbols found in Unikraft’s micro-libraries. As a result, it automatically generates a fully configured `Makefile.uk` containing the necessary source files and a `Makefile` with the required micro-libraries. When applied to the `scamper` folder, the tool produced a `Makefile.uk` comprising 82 source files and a `Makefile` with only two external libraries: `musl` as the C library (`libc`) and `lwip` for the networking support. Please note that core libraries such as `uksched`, `ukboot`, etc., are also used but not listed in the `makefile`; only external libraries are included.

Throughout the second step, we undertook the task of combining `scamper` and `TNT` into Unikraft. Given that Unikraft exclusively supports single-process applications, we made some necessary code adaptations to remove the multi-process support. This adjustment involved two key steps: first, we modified the configuration file in `scamper` (`config.h`) to disable multi-process support by modifying some core variables. For instance, we disabled the privilege separation daemon, allowing to run two processes - one with and one

without privileges. Second, we updated the main file of `TNT` to launch two threads, one for `scamper` and another for `TNT`. Additionally, we converted the original socket-based communication between the two processes into multithreaded communication. Indeed, `scamper` originally used a specific sockets implementation for inter-process communication, which was incompatible with the Unikraft framework, which only supports a certain type of socket family, provided by the `lwip` network stack. To establish communication between `scamper` and `TNT` in this context, we made changes to the core code, specifically by adjusting some functions to enforce the use of `lwip`’s sockets while preserving the rest of the code unchanged. In addition, we also removed irrelevant code for Unikraft, such as the code related to user permission controls (e.g., `setgroups`, etc) and root directory management (e.g., `chroot`, etc.).

After that, we had to make a few minor adjustments to the `lwip` and `musl` libraries to ensure the proper functioning of `vTNT`. For instance, we modified some `lwip` functions to prevent the automatic inclusion of an IP header resulting in a conflict between `lwip` and `scamper`. Additionally, we also modified specific `lwip` options by updating the `lwip` configuration (e.g., respond to broadcast pings, enable IP forwarding, etc.) to be compliant with `scamper` behaviour. For `musl`, we updated the `Makefile` to include additional headers required by `scamper`. Once all these steps were completed, we were able to successfully compile and build `vTNT`.

We give an overview of our changes in Table I. To count the lines of code (LoC), we used `CLOC` [57] and considered only the C/C++ files with their associated header files (only code without any comment). The last column gives the percentage of changes compared to the original codebase. All the patches containing our changes can be found with our setup in our GitHub repository<sup>3</sup>.

Table I  
OVERVIEW OF THE CHANGES MADE TO THE DIFFERENT LIBRARIES.

Micro Libraries	# File(s) updated	# LoC updated	% of changes
core (ukboot, etc)	/	/	/
musl (libc)	1	5	<0.01%
lwip (network)	3	12	0.01%
scamper	5	110	0.2%
TNT	1	70	1.8%
<i>Total</i>	11	197	/

After successfully porting the application, the next step involves establishing an Internet connection to perform network measurements. To achieve this, we create and setup a network bridge, which is then linked to the `vTNT` via a configuration file.

#### IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In this section, we showcase the experimental results obtained through a comparison of `TNT` across three distinct

<sup>3</sup>URL redacted for anonymity.

architectures. These paradigms include: (i) Adapting TNT for use within a conventional Debian virtual machine (VM) with Vagrant for simplified management, (ii) Containerizing TNT through the use of a Docker container, and (iii) Porting TNT into a unikernel (i.e.,  $v$ TNT) by using Unikraft as codebase and Firecracker [43] as a hypervisor with KVM (Kernel Virtual Machine [31]) support. The primary objective of these experiments is to assess  $v$ TNT’s performance across various dimensions, such as memory usage, CPU utilization, file size, and total execution time across these distinct architectures.

### A. Methodology

To conduct an equitable comparison of the various architectures, we standardized the environment by employing identical versions of `scamper` and TNT across all three cases. In the case of the VM, we relied on the capabilities of Vagrant, a versatile and dynamic virtual machine management tool. We crafted a `Vagrantfile` that instantiated a minimal Debian server boasting 256 MB of memory and with `libvirt` [58] (a convenient way to manage VM and virtualized functionalities) as the provider. This Vagrant environment executed a shell script responsible for running `scamper` and TNT. For Docker, we employed the official Debian image and made adaptations to the underlying `Dockerfile` to enable the execution of `scamper` and TNT. Notably, in both setups, we set the same destination target (i.e., 1.1.1.1) and maintained consistent parameter settings for TNT.

All the following experiments were performed on a Debian GNU/Linux 11 (bullseye) with a Linux kernel 5.10.162. Firecracker version 1.2.1, Vagrant 2.2.14, and Docker 20.10.5 have been used. The host machine used for the experiments has 32 GB of RAM and an Intel (R) Xeon(R) CPU E5-2620v4 @2.10GHz with 16 cores. In addition, Unikraft Pandora 0.15.0 has been used for the following experiments.

Ultimately, we opted for KSM<sup>4</sup>, the default memory deduplication scanner in Linux, as it is directly integrated into the kernel. Using another deduplication scanner that necessitates a custom kernel appears less relevant, given the constraints related to underlying host kernels in cloud platforms [60], [61].

### B. Results

As depicted in Fig. 4, the  $v$ TNT unikernel has a tiny size, occupying less than 1 MB of space. This impressive size reduction can be attributed to Unikraft’s capability to execute *Dead Code Elimination* (DCE – i.e., an optimization that removes code which does not affect the program results) on the static underlying file, efficiently removing extraneous code and resulting in a minimal image containing only essential components. In stark contrast, the Docker image is 430 times larger than  $v$ TNT. Similarly, the Vagrant image proved even more substantial, with an image 1,170 times larger than  $v$ TNT.

After evaluating image sizes, our next step was to measure the memory utilization across each configuration. For each one, we measured the overall memory footprint (hypervisor




Figure 4. Size of a Docker image, a Vagrant image, and  $v$ TNT. Using unikernel considerably reduced disk usage.

and guest operating system for  $v$ TNT + Vagrant and Docker engine + container for Docker) of a single instance. In addition to the three fundamental setups, we introduced an additional one utilizing KSM, denoted as “(+KSM)”. Our initial comparison focused first on the three original configurations, excluding KSM. As depicted in Fig. 5, our observations reveal that  $v$ TNT consumes approximately 7.2 times less memory than Docker and 32 times less memory than the Vagrant configuration. It is worth noting that the Vagrant configuration is the most memory-intensive, given its requirement for a complete operating system to operate. In contrast, the Docker configuration is less memory-intensive than the VM configuration, leveraging the host operating system’s kernel. The  $v$ TNT configuration is the most memory-efficient due to its specialization.




Figure 5. Memory consumption of  $v$ TNT, compared to `scamper` and Vagrant. In addition, two additional configurations denoted “(+KSM)” are evaluated using a memory deduplication scanner to merge identical pages.

Next, we compared the configuration based on KSM. In this case,  $v$ TNT (+KSM) exhibited a striking reduction in memory consumption, being 17 times less than Docker and an 74 times less than the Vagrant configuration. This outcome aligns with our expectations, as KSM performs the merging of identical memory pages (after a certain period of time), effectively reducing the memory footprint of the unikernel. For Vagrant(+KSM), given its large memory consumption and the volatility of its pages, KSM only manages to merge a tiny amount of memory, which explains its low memory reduction.

We then proceeded to evaluate the overall time, encompassing the deployment and the execution time (creation, execution

<sup>4</sup>Configured with the default parameters [59].




Figure 6. Total time (deployment + execution) to run TNT, compared to Docker and Vagrant. Using *vTNT* gives the lower total time.

of TNT with specific parameters, instance destruction, and cleanup). Additionally, we measured the CPU consumption associated with each deployment. To avoid unnecessarily overloading the graphs for these two evaluations, we did not consider KSM configurations, given that KSM operates on a dedicated CPU core and has a negligible impact on the performance of an individual instance running on another core. In this experiment, we introduced a slight modification to the setup by incorporating a deployment phase. During this phase, we considered a sandboxed environment that necessitates initialization before deploying a specific instance. For example, with Docker, a `docker pull` operation is required to fetch the Docker image from a remote repository. In the case of Vagrant, a `vagrant up` command is necessary to launch the virtual machine. Lastly, for *vTNT*, it gets the underlying image from a remote server. Once the environment has been initiated, the image is executed, and the execution time is measured. To ensure the statistical validity of the results, this experiment was repeated 30 times. Results are shown in Fig. 6.

We start by examining the TNT execution time for each configuration. Notably, the one for *vTNT* and Docker is relatively similar, as *vTNT* involves initiating a unikernel from scratch, including to initialize essential components such as the memory, the scheduler, etc. In contrast, Vagrant’s execution time is quite huge compared to the two other configurations. This is explained by the necessity of booting a heavyweight virtual machine. Consequently, this discrepancy in execution time can significantly affect the TNT runtime, resulting in a duration that is up to 7.5 times longer than the one observed with *vTNT* and Docker.

The time it takes to deploy varies significantly based on the chosen configuration. Deploying *vTNT* is the fastest option, requiring the download of a small single-binary file (less than 1 MB), taking only a few milliseconds. Deploying with Docker is somewhat slower due to the need to download a larger image (a few hundred megabytes) from DockerHub [62]. Lastly, deploying with Vagrant is the most time-consuming, as it involves downloading a virtual machine image (a few gigabytes) from VagrantCloud [63]. All in all, deploying and executing *vTNT* allows to have a gain of 2.4 times compared to Docker and 13 times compared to Vagrant.

From this same setup, we conducted CPU usage measurements for each configuration. The findings, depicted in Fig. 7,




Figure 7. CPU consumption for *vTNT*, compared to scamper implementation as a virtual machine (VM) and Docker.

reveal that *vTNT* exhibits lower CPU utilization in comparison to Docker and Vagrant. This gap can be attributed to several factors, including its minimalist design, application-specific components, single-address space, effective I/O management, reduced attack surface, and the utilization of a lightweight hypervisor optimized for resource efficiency. In contrast, Docker operates containers with a complete operating system, which frequently leads to increased resource overhead. Vagrant is considerably more expensive than *vTNT* and Docker. This is primarily attributed to the fact that a full VM comes preloaded with a set of services (e.g., `systemd`, `cron`, etc.), collectively driving up CPU usage.

Concluding our study, we conducted two additional experiments in which we initiated multiple instances of *vTNT*, Docker, and Vagrant, each constrained by specific resource allocations: 1 GB of memory and a 25% CPU usage limit (4 cores). All these instances are started nearly simultaneously, with a 0.1-second gap between each instance. In order to prevent launching DOS attacks against the initial remote target, we slightly updated the configurations by executing a `traceroute` on the address of the network interface and introduce a 10-second delay to simulate a complete `traceroute`. We chose arbitrary values for the budget, which are representative of the resources that may be available in a system. Nevertheless, it is expected that the outcomes would be comparable even when different budget values are employed. Fig. 8 presents the outcomes of these experiments. In every scenario, a noteworthy observation emerges: *vTNT* consistently allows for a significantly greater number of instances to be launched within the specified resource constraints, outperforming both Docker and Vagrant.

Concerning the memory allocation, we employed Linux’s control groups to limit memory usage at 1 GB across all configurations. As before, we also considered configuration based on KSM. As can be seen in Fig. 8, using *vTNT* allows to obtain almost 5 times more instances than Docker and 53 times more instances than Vagrant. In this experiment, it is important to note that the use of KSM does not affect the number of instances. Indeed, given the substantial number of pages to scan (for both Vagrant and *vTNT*), KSM takes time to converge, making it difficult to reduce the initial memory peak. This effect can be observed in Fig. 8a.

For the CPU usage, we relied on the `isolcpu` and




Figure 8. Memory and CPU usage with a fixed budget. Using  $vTNT$  allows to run considerably more instances than Docker and Vagrant.

`taskset` commands to respectively isolate tasks and limit the CPU usage to 25% (4 cores) for the different configurations. In this experiment, we initiate multiple instances by pinning them to CPU cores and allocating an equivalent execution time to every configuration. When employing  $vTNT$ , this allows to launch almost 3 times more instances than Docker and 81 times more instances than Vagrant. The CPU evolution of the different configurations is depicted in Fig. 8b. In the context of Docker, we observe decreased CPU utilization when compared to both  $vTNT$  and Vagrant. This observation raises the possibility that Docker might be performing more I/O operations. In that case, the CPU may spend a significant amount of time waiting for I/O operations to complete, leading to lower CPU utilization.

## V. FLEXIBLE DEPLOYMENT

Our primary goal is to showcase the quick deployment of unikernels for network measurements anywhere on the Internet. To achieve this, we identify a relevant scenario: deploying unikernels on remote servers for immediate network measurement purposes, where the deployment process is orchestrated by a controller.

### A. Scenario

In this experiment, we leveraged the OVH cloud infrastructure [64] to provision five remote servers situated in diverse locations, including Singapore, Canada, Australia, France, and Poland. Each node has the same environment and hardware. As before to prevent launching DOS attacks against the initial remote target, we slightly updated the configurations by executing `TNT` on the address of the network interface. The objective of the experiment is not to assess the network measurement but the responsiveness and flexibility of different solutions. As before, we repeated this experiment 30 times, to ensure the statistical validity of the results.

We then developed a Python script to simulate a controller responsible for deploying specific instances on remote servers for measurement purposes. This script is executed on our local server, which has the same hardware and configuration as previously described in Sec. IV-A. To manage parallel deployments, we relied on a multi-threaded architecture. As illustrated on Fig. 9, the controller operates as follows: (1)




Figure 9. High-level overview of the controller. The controller deploys the configuration on a free node ( $node1$  being busy, processing a previous deployment).

It reads a configuration file with remote node details.(2) Reads a list of events for deployment timings (e.g., one deployment per second for 60 seconds). (3) Based on the list of events, the controller triggers the deployment of the desired configuration (either  $vTNT$ , Docker, or Vagrant) on the remote nodes. To accomplish this, the controller sends a script. (4) When the script is received, the remote node initializes its environment and then executes the specified instance. (5) Remote node transmits execution results back to the controller. The controller records cumulative time for each node, and can adapt to high request scenarios with two distinct behaviours: (i) either it waits for a node to become available, (ii) it ignores and discards the request.

Note that our approach is agnostic to the cloud provider and can be used with other cloud providers such as Google Cloud [60], AWS [61], etc.

### B. Results

We begin by discussing the total time (deployment + execution) of various configurations. For this experiment, we

focused on the first controller’s behaviour, where it waits for a node to become available without discarding the request. As depicted in Fig. 10, the  $vTNT$  configuration exhibits the fastest performance, followed by Docker and Vagrant. Using  $vTNT$  results in a deployment that is 5 times faster than Docker and 65 times faster than Vagrant. This speed advantage can be attributed to the fact that  $vTNT$  requires a shorter deployment time compared to Docker and Vagrant, which are mainly hampered by the size of the underlying image. The higher standard deviation observed with Vagrant is likely attributed to the download of a relatively large image which can vary according to the network and the node location.




Figure 10. Average time to deploy and execute a specific configuration.  $vTNT$  is 5 times faster than Docker and 65 times faster than Vagrant.

Subsequently, we relied on the second controller’s behaviour, which involved ignoring and discarding a new deployment if none of the nodes was available. We can observe the outcomes of this experiment in Fig. 11. With this approach, the controller accomplishes 90% of  $vTNT$  deployments, 28% of Docker deployments, and 8% of Vagrant deployments. Just as previously noted,  $vTNT$  exhibits superior performance, followed by Docker, while Vagrant demonstrates poor scalability.




Figure 11. Number of successful deployments (+execution) per configuration.  $vTNT$  can achieve 3 times more deployments than Docker and 11 times more than Vagrant.

## VI. DISCUSSION

### A. Porting to Unikraft

For porting TNT to Unikraft, we have chosen a manual approach, which involves building the application from its source code. We made this decision because the `scamper` + TNT codebase is not overly complex, with few shared libraries and required primitives. Porting another open-source

measurement application would require following the same steps and involve a similar porting effort as ours.

If an application is closed-source or exhibits complexity, such as having numerous libraries, Unikraft offers an alternative approach centered around binary compatibility. This means that unmodified Linux Executable and Linkable Formats (ELFs) can be executed within Unikraft. While this approach eliminates the need for manual porting work, it does come with an initial cost of mapping system calls to the underlying OS functions. However, there are two significant drawbacks: the overhead resulting from multiple levels of indirection due to system call compliance and the possibility of runtime crashes caused by slight incompatibilities between the application’s expected ABI<sup>5</sup> and the one provided by the underlying OS.

The choice between these two approaches ultimately lies with the developer and maintainer.

### B. Cloud Deployment

In this paper, we have demonstrated that measurement infrastructures could take advantage of unikernels to become more flexible and efficient. However, in our evaluations, we only considered one platform (KVM) and architecture (x86\_64). Unikernel frameworks come with a set of supported platforms and architectures [25], [56]. For instance, Unikraft can also be deployed on a Xen server [32] or be compiled to run on an ARM architecture. We expect similar performance results on these platforms.

## VII. CONCLUSION

The last twenty years have seen the rise and development of measurement infrastructures and efficient probing tools while, at the same time, operating systems have evolved from monolithic architecture to virtualization and specialization with unikernels. This paper embraced those developments to introduce  $vTNT$ , a proof-of-concept of porting a network probing tool (i.e., TNT running over `scamper`) in a unikernel.

In this paper, we provided the complete toolchain when transforming TNT into  $vTNT$ . We believe this toolchain could be a very first step towards the generalisation of unikernels in network infrastructures. Indeed, this paper has demonstrated the supremacy of  $vTNT$  over more traditional approaches. Further, this paper also discussed a case study in which the flexibility and responsiveness of  $vTNT$  could find a suitable usage, compared again to more traditional approaches.

### SOFTWARE ARTIFACTS & ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All the code described and discussed in this paper ( $vTNT$ , performance measurement, controller script, deployment over cloud provider) is available on Gitlab [65].

This is supported by the CyberExcellence project funded by the Walloon Region, under number 2110186, and the Feder CyberGalaxia project.

<sup>5</sup>Application Binary Interface (ABI) is a set of rules defining how software components interact at the binary level, ensuring compatibility and interoperability between different programs and systems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] V. Bajpai and J. Schonwalder, "A survey on Internet performance measurement platforms and related standardization efforts," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 1313–1341, April 2015.
- [2] B. Huffaker, D. Plummer, D. Moore, and k. claffy, "Topology discovery by active probing," in *Proc. Symposium on Applications and the Internet (SAINT)*, January 2002.
- [3] k. claffy, Y. Hyun, K. Keys, M. Fomenkov, and D. Krioukov, "Internet mapping: from art to science," in *Proc. IEEE Cybersecurity Application and Technologies Conference for Homeland Security (CATCH)*, March 2009.
- [4] RIPE Network Coordination Center, "Atlas," 2010, see <https://atlas.ripe.net>.
- [5] P. Gill, C. Diot, L. Y. Ohlsen, M. Mathis, and S. Soltesz, "M-lab: User initiated internet data for the research community," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 1, no. 52, January 2022.
- [6] H. V. Madhyastha, T. Isdal, M. Piatek, C. Dixon, T. Anderson, A. Krishnamurthy, and A. Venkataramani, "iPlane: An information plane for distributed services," in *Proc. USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI)*, November 2006.
- [7] Y. Shavitt and E. Shir, "DIMES: Let the internet measure itself," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 35, no. 5, 2005.
- [8] C. . Simpson and G. F. Riley, "NETI@home: A distributed approach to collecting end-to-end network performance measurements," in *Proc. Passive and Active Measurement Workshop (PAM)*, April 2004.
- [9] Z. Wen, S. Triukose, and M. Rabinovich, "Facilitating focused internet measurements," in *Proc. ACM SIGMETRICS*, June 2007.
- [10] D. P. Anderson, J. Cobb, E. Korpela, M. Lebofsky, and D. Werthimer, "SETI@home: An experiment in public-resource computing," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 45, no. 11, pp. 56–61, November 2002.
- [11] PlanetLab Consortium, "PlanetLab project," 2002, see <http://www.planet-lab.org>.
- [12] B. C. Senel, M. Mouchet, J. Cappos, O. Fourmaux, T. Friedman, and R. McGeer, "EdgeNet: A multi-tenant and multi-provider edge cloud," in *Proc. International Workshop on Edge Systems, Analytics and Networking*, April 2021.
- [13] N. Spring, D. Wetherall, and T. Anderson, "Scriptroute: A public Internet measurement facility," in *Proc. USENIX Symposium on Internet Technologies and Systems (USITS)*, March 2002, see <http://www.cs.washington.edu/research/networking/scriptroute/>.
- [14] G. Aceto, A. Boita, P. Marchetta, V. Persico, and A. Pescapé, "A comprehensive survey on Internet outages," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 113, pp. 36–63, July 2018.
- [15] M. Safaei Pour, C. Nader, K. Friday, and E. Bou-Harb, "A comprehensive survey of recent internet measurement techniques for cyber security," *Computers & Security*, vol. 128, May 2023.
- [16] B. Donnet, "Incentives for BGP guided IP-level topology discovery," in *Proc. Traffic and Measurement Analysis Workshop (TMA)*, May 2009.
- [17] Hykes, S. et al, "Docker," <https://docker.com/>, 2018, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [18] Lezcano D., Hallyn S., Graber S., "Linux Containers," <https://linuxcontainers.org>, 2008, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [19] E. Kovacs, "Docker fixes vulnerabilities, shares plans for making platform safer," <http://www.securityweek.com/docker-fixes-vulnerabilities-shares-plans-making-platform-safer>, 2014, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [20] A. Grattafiori, "Understanding and hardening linux containers," <https://research.nccgroup.com/2016/05/05/understanding-and-hardening-linux-containers/>, 2016, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [21] A. Madhavapeddy and D. J. Scott, "Unikernels: The rise of the virtual library operating systems," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 57, no. 1, pp. 61–69, January 2014.
- [22] G. Gain, C. Soldani, F. Huici, and L. Mathy, "Want more unikernels? inflate them!" in *Proc. Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC)*, November 2022.
- [23] A. Kantee, "Flexible operating systems internals: The design and implementation of the anykernel and rump kernels," Ph.D. dissertation, Aalto University, 2012.
- [24] A. Kivity, D. Laor, G. Costa, P. Enberg, N. Har'El, D. Marti, and Z. V., "OSv—optimizing the operating system for virtual machines," in *Proc. USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, June 2014.
- [25] S. Kuenzer, V.-A. Badoiu, H. Lefevre, S. Santhanam, A. Jung, G. Gain, C. Soldani, C. Lupu, S. Teodorescu, C. Raducanu, C. Banu, L. Mathy, R. Deaconescu, C. Raiciu, and F. Huici, "Unikraft: Fast, specialized unikernels the easy way," ser. In: *Proc. European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)*, April 2021.
- [26] H.-C. Kuo, D. Williams, R. Koller, and S. Mohan, "A Linux in unikernel clothing," in *Proc. European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)*, April 2020.
- [27] G. Gain, "Unikraft Tools," 2019, [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/gaulthiergain/tools>
- [28] H. Lefevre, G. Gain, V.-A. Bădoiu, D. Dinca, V.-R. Schiller, C. Raiciu, F. Huici, and P. Olivier, "Loupe: Driving the development of OS compatibility layers," in *Proc. ACM Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, May 2024.
- [29] Y. Vanaubel, J.-R. Luttringer, P. Mérindol, J.-J. Pansiot, and B. Donnet, "TNT, watch me explode: A light in the dark for revealing MPLS tunnels," in *Proc. IFIP Network Traffic Measurement and Analysis Conference (TMA)*, June 2019.
- [30] J.-R. Luttringer, Y. Vanaubel, P. Mérindol, J.-J. Pansiot, and B. Donnet, "Let there be light: Revealing hidden MPLS tunnels with TNT," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management (TNSM)*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 1239–1253, June 2020.
- [31] Red Hat, "Kernel virtual machine," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: [https://linux-kvm.org/page/Main\\_Page](https://linux-kvm.org/page/Main_Page)
- [32] P. Barham, B. Dragovic, K. Fraser, S. Hand, T. Harris, A. Ho, R. Neugebauer, I. Pratt, and A. Warfield, "Xen and the art of virtualization," in *Proc. ACM symposium on Operating systems principles (SOSP)*, October 2003.
- [33] C. Jacobsen, M. Khole, S. Spall, S. Bauer, and A. Burtsev, "Lightweight capability domains: Towards decomposing the linux kernel," in *Proc. Workshop on Programming Languages and Operating Systems (PLOS)*, October 2015.
- [34] L. Torvalds, "The Linux Kernel Archives," 2019, [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kernel.org>
- [35] H. Hartig, M. Hohmuth, J. Liedtke, S. Schonberg, and J. Wolter, "The performance of  $\mu$ -kernel-based systems," in *Proc. ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, October 1997.
- [36] D. Du, Z. Hua, Y. Xia, B. Zang, and H. Chen, "Xpc: Architectural support for secure and efficient cross process call," in *Proc. ACM/IEEE Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, June 2019.
- [37] OpenSSL, "Cryptography and SSL/TLS toolkit," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://www.openssl.org>
- [38] Felker, R. et al., "musl," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://musl.libc.org>
- [39] Google, "Protocol buffers," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://protobuf.dev>
- [40] D. Richard Hipp, "sqlite," [Last Accessed: October 30th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://sqlite.com>
- [41] NGINX, Inc, "Advanced load balancer, web server, & reverse proxy - nginx," [Last Accessed: October 30th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://www.nginx.com>
- [42] Williams, D. et al., "Solo5: A sandboxed execution environment," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/Solo5/solo5>
- [43] A. Agache, M. Brooker, A. Iordache, A. Liguori, R. Neugebauer, P. Piwonka, and D.-M. Popa, "Firecracker: Lightweight virtualization for serverless applications," in *Proc. USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI)*, February 2020.
- [44] Unikraft, "ukboot: Unikraft bootstrapping," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/unikraft/unikraft/tree/staging/lib/ukboot>
- [45] Dunkels, A. et al., "lwip: Lightweight IP," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://savannah.nongnu.org/projects/lwip/>
- [46] unikraft, "unikraft," <https://github.com/unikraft>, n.d, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [47] A. Arcangeli, I. Eidus, and C. Wright, "Increasing memory density by using KSM," in *Proc. Linux Symposium*, January 2009.
- [48] N. Xia, C. Tian, Y. Luo, H. Liu, and X. Wang, "UKSM: Swift memory deduplication via hierarchical and adaptive memory region distilling," in *Proc. USENIX Conference on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, February 2018.

- [49] K. Miller, F. Franz, T. Groening, M. Rittinghaus, M. Hillenbrand, and F. Bellosa, "KSM++: Using I/O-based hints to make memory-deduplication scanners more efficient," in *Proc. ASPLOS Workshop on Runtime Environments, Systems, Layering and Virtualized Environments (RESOLVE)*, March 2012.
- [50] M. Luckie, "Scamper: a scalable and extensible packet prober for active measurement of the Internet," in *Proc. ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, November 2010.
- [51] V. Jacobson et al., "traceroute," UNIX, man page, 1989, see source code: <ftp://ftp.ee.lbl.gov/traceroute.tar.gz>.
- [52] K. Keys, "Internet-scale IP alias resolution techniques," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 50–55, January 2010.
- [53] B. Augustin, R. Teixeira, and T. Friedman, "Measuring load-balanced paths in the Internet," in *Proc. ACM/USENIX Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, November 2007.
- [54] Y. Vanaubel, P. Mérindol, J.-J. Pansiot, and B. Donnet, "Through the wormhole: Tracking invisible MPLS tunnels," in *Proc. ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, November 2017.
- [55] Y. Vanaubel, J.-J. Pansiot, P. Mérindol, and B. Donnet, "Network fingerprinting: TTL-based router signature," in *Proc. ACM Internet Measurement Conference (IMC)*, October 2013.
- [56] The Nanos developers, "Nanos," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://nanos.org>
- [57] Al Daniai, "cloc: Count lines of code," [Last Accessed: October 30th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/AlDanial/cloc>
- [58] Ubuntu, "Libvirt," <https://ubuntu.com/server/docs/virtualization-libvirt>, n.d, [Last Accessed: October 26th, 2023].
- [59] Linux, "Kernel samepage merging," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://docs.kernel.org/admin-guide/mm/ksm.html>
- [60] Google, "Google cloud platform," <https://cloud.google.com/>, [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023].
- [61] Amazon, "Aws," <https://aws.amazon.com/>, [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023].
- [62] Docker, "Dockerhub: Build and ship any application anywhere," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://hub.docker.com>
- [63] Vagrant, "Vagrant cloud," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://app.vagrantup.com/boxes/search>
- [64] OVH, "Global cloud service provider | ovhcloud," [Last Accessed: October 24th, 2023]. [Online]. Available: <https://us.ovhcloud.com>
- [65] G. Gain, "utnt," [Last Accessed: May 6th, 2024]. [Online]. Available: <https://gitlab.uliege.be/Gauthier.Gain/utnt>