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Do IP networks manage themselves?

- In some sense, yes:
  - TCP senders send less traffic during congestion
  - Routing protocols adapt to topology changes
- But, does the network run efficiently?
  - Congested link when idle paths exist?
  - High-delay path when a low-delay path exists?
- How should routing adapt to the traffic?
  - Avoiding congested links in the network
  - Satisfying application requirements (e.g., delay)
- ... essential questions of traffic engineering
Traffic engineering

● What is traffic engineering?
  ● Control and optimization of routing, to steer traffic through the network in the most effective way

● Two fundamental approaches to adaptation
  ● Adaptive routing protocols
    ● Distribute traffic and performance measurements
    ● Compute paths based on load, and requirements
  ● Adaptive network-management system
    ● Collect measurements of traffic and topology
    ● Optimize the setting of the “static” parameters

● Big debates still today about the right answer
Outline: Three alternatives

- Load-sensitive routing at *packet* level
  - Routers receive feedback on load and delay
  - Routers re-compute their forwarding tables
  - Fundamental problems with oscillation

- Load-sensitive routing at *circuit* level
  - Routers receive feedback on load and delay
  - Router compute a path for the next circuit
  - Less oscillation, as long as circuits last for a while

- Traffic engineering as a *management problem*
  - Routers compute paths based on “static” values
  - Network management system sets the parameters
  - Acting on network-wide view of traffic and topology
Load-sensitive routing protocols: Pros and Cons

- **Advantages**
  - Efficient use of network resources
  - Satisfying the performance needs of end users
  - Self-managing network takes care of itself

- **Disadvantages**
  - Higher overhead on the routers
  - Long alternate paths consume extra resources
  - Instability from reacting to out-of-date information
Packet-based load-sensitive routing

- Packet-based routing
  - Forward packets based on forwarding table
- Load-sensitive
  - Compute table entries based on load or delay
- Questions
  - What link metrics to use?
  - How frequently to update the metrics?
  - How to propagate the metrics?
  - How to compute the paths based on metrics?
Original ARPANET algorithm (1969)

- Routing algorithm
  - Shortest-path routing based on link metrics
  - Instantaneous queue length plus a constant
  - Distributed shortest-path algorithm (Bellman-Ford)

![Diagram of network with labeled links and congestion](image-url)
Performance of original ARPANET algo

- **Light load**
  - Delay dominated by the constant part (transmission delay and propagation delay)

- **Medium load**
  - Queuing delay is no longer negligible
  - Moderate traffic shifts to avoid congestion

- **Heavy load**
  - Very high metrics on congested links
  - Busy links look bad to all of the routers
  - All routers avoid the busy links
  - Routers may send packets on longer paths
Second ARPANET algorithm (1979)

- Averaging of the link metric over time
  - Old: Instantaneous delay fluctuates a lot
  - New: Averaging reduces the fluctuations

- Link-state protocol
  - Old: Distributed path computation leads to loops
  - New: Better to flood metrics and have each router compute the shortest paths

- Reduce frequency of updates
  - Old: Sending updates on each change is too much
  - New: Send updates if change passes a threshold
Problem of long alternate paths

- Picking alternate paths
  - Long path chosen by one router consumes resource that other packets could have used
  - Leads other routers to pick other alternate paths

Solution: Limit path length
- Bound the value of the link metric
  - “This link is busy enough to go two extra hops”

- Extreme case
  - Limit path selection to shortest paths
  - Pick the least-loaded shortest path in the network
Problem of out-of-date information

- Routers make decisions based on old information
  - Propagation delay in flooding link metrics
  - Thresholds applied to limit number of updates
- Old information leads to bad decisions
  - All routers avoid the congested links
  - ... leading to congestion on other links
  - ... and the whole things repeats

“Backup at Lincoln” on radio triggers congestion at Holland
Avoiding oscillations from out-of-date info

- Send link metrics more often
  - But, leads to higher overhead
  - But, propagation delay is a fundamental limit

- Make the traffic last longer
  - Circuit switching: Phone network
    - Average phone call last 3 minutes
    - Plenty of time for feedback on link loads
  - Packet switching: Internet
    - Data packet is small (e.g., 1500 bytes or less)
    - But, feedback on link metrics also sent via packets
    - Better to make decisions on groups of packets
Quality-of-Service routing on circuits
Quality-of-Service routing with circuit switching

- Traffic performance requirement
  - Guaranteed bandwidth $b$ per connection

- Link resource reservation
  - Reserved bandwidth $r_i$ on link $I$
  - Capacity $c_i$ on link $i$

- Signaling: Admission control on path $P$
  - Reserve bandwidth $b$ on each link $i$ on path $P$
  - Block: if $(r_i + b > c_i)$ then reject (or try again)
  - Accept: else $r_i = r_i + b$

- Routing: Ingress router selects the path
Source-directed QoS routing

- New connection with $b = 3$
  - Routing: Select path with available resources
  - Signaling: Reserve bandwidth along the path ($r = r + 3$)
  - Forwarding: Forward data packets along the selected path
  - Teardown: Free the link bandwidth ($r = r - 3$)
QoS routing: Path selection

- Link-state advertisements
  - Advertise available bandwidth \((c_i - r_i)\) on link \(i\)
    - E.g., every \(T\) seconds, independent of changes
    - E.g., when metric changes beyond threshold
  - Each router constructs view of topology

- Path computation at each router
  - E.g., Shortest widest path
    - Consider paths with largest value of \(\min_i(c_i-r_i)\)
    - Tie-break on smallest number of hops
  - E.g., Widest shortest path
    - Consider only paths with minimum hops
    - Tie-break on largest value of \(\min_i(c_i-r_i)\) over paths
How to get IP packets on to circuits?

- Who initiates the circuit?
  - End system application or operating system?
  - Edge router?

- Edge router can infer the need for a circuit
  - Match on packet header bits
    - E.g., source, destination, port numbers, etc.
  - Apply policy for picking bandwidth parameters
    - E.g., Web connections get 10 Kbps, video gets 2 Mbps
  - Trigger establishment of circuit for the traffic
    - Select path based on load and requirements
    - Signal creation of the circuit
    - Tear down circuit after an idle period
Grouping IP packets into flows

- Group packets with the "same" end points
  - Application level: single TCP connection
  - Host level: single source-destination pair
  - Subnet level: single source prefix and dest prefix

- Group packets that are close together in time
  - E.g., 60-sec spacing between consecutive packets
But, staleness can still be a problem...

- **Link state updates**
  - High update rate leads to high overhead
  - Low update rate leads to oscillation

- **Connections are too short**
  - Average Web transfer is just 10 packets
  - Requires high update rates to ensure stability

- **Idea: QoS routing only for long transfers!**
  - Small fraction of transfers are very large
  - ... and these few transfers carry a lot of traffic
  - Forward most transfers on static routes
  - ... and compute dynamic routes for long transfers
Identifying the long transfers

- A nice property of transfer sizes
  - Most transfers are short, but a few are very long
  - Distribution of transfer sizes is “heavy tailed”

- A nice property of heavy tails
  - After you see 10 packets, it is likely a long transfer
  - Even the remainder of the transfer is long

- Routing policy
  - Forward initial packets on the static default route
  - After seeing 10 packets, try to signal a circuit
  - Forward the remaining packets on the circuit

- Avoids oscillation even for small update rates
Ongoing work on QoS routing

- **Standards activity**
  - Traffic-engineering extensions to the conventional routing protocols (e.g., OSPF and IS-IS)
  - Use of MPLS to establish the circuits over the links
  - New work on Path Computation Elements that compute the load-sensitive routes for the routers

- **Research activity**
  - Avoid propagating dynamic link-state information
  - Based decisions based on past success or failure
  - Essentially inferring the state of the links
Traffic engineering as a network-management problem
Using traditional routing protocols

- Routers flood information to learn topology
  - Determine “next hop” to reach other routers...
  - Compute shortest paths based on link weights
- Link weights configured by network operator
**Approaches for setting the link weights**

- **Conventional static heuristics**
  - Proportional to physical distance
    - Cross-country links have higher weights
    - Minimizes end-to-end propagation delay
  - Inversely proportional to link capacity
    - Smaller weights for higher-bandwidth links
    - Attracts more traffic to links with more capacity

- **Tune the weights based on the offered traffic**
  - Network-wide optimization of the link weights
  - Directly minimizes metrics like max link utilization
Measure, model, and control
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Traffic engineering in ISP backbone

- **Topology**
  - Connectivity and capacity of routers and links

- **Traffic matrix**
  - Offered load between points in the network

- **Link weights**
  - Configurable parameters for routing protocol

- **Performance objective**
  - Balanced load, low latency, service level agreements ...

- **Question:** Given the *topology* and *traffic matrix*, which *link weights* should be used?
Key ingredients of the approach

- **Instrumentation**
  - Topology: monitoring of the routing protocols
  - Traffic matrix: fine-grained traffic measurement

- **Network-wide models**
  - Representations of topology and traffic
  - “What-if” models of shortest-path routing

- **Network optimization**
  - Efficient algorithms to find good configurations
  - Operational experience to identify key constraints
Formalizing the optimization problem

- **Input:** graph $G(R, L)$
  - $R$ is the set of routers
  - $L$ is the set of unidirectional links
  - $c_l$ is the capacity of link $l$

- **Input:** traffic matrix
  - $M_{i,j}$ is traffic load from router $i$ to $j$

- **Output:** setting of the link weights
  - $w_l$ is weight on unidirectional link $l$
  - $P_{i,j,l}$ is fraction of traffic from $i$ to $j$ traversing link $l$
Multiple shortest paths with even splitting

Values of $P_{i,j,l}$
Complexity of optimization problem

- NP-complete optimization problem
  - No efficient algorithm to find the link weights
  - Even for simple objective functions
- What are the implications?
  - Have to resort to *searching* through weight settings
Optimization based on local search

- Start with an initial setting of the link weights
  - E.g., same integer weight on every link
  - E.g., weights inversely proportional to capacity
  - E.g., existing weights in the operational network

- Compute the objective function
  - Compute the all-pairs shortest paths to get $P_{i,j,l}$
  - Apply the traffic matrix $M_{i,j}$ to get link loads $u_l$
  - Evaluate the objective function from the $u_l/c_l$

- Generate a new setting of the link weights
  repeat
Making the search efficient

- Avoid repeating the same weight setting
  - Keep track of past values of the weight setting
  - ... or keep a small signature of past values
  - Do not evaluate setting if signatures match

- Avoid computing shortest paths from scratch
  - Explore settings that changes just one weight
  - Apply fast incremental shortest-path algorithms

- Limit number of unique values of link weights
  - Do not explore $2^{16}$ possible values for each weight

- Stop early, before exploring all settings
Incorporating operational realities

- Minimize number of changes to the network
  - Changing just 1 or 2 link weights is often enough
- Tolerate failure of network equipment
  - Weights settings usually remain good after failure
  - ... or can be fixed by changing one or two weights
- Limit dependence on measurement accuracy
  - Good weights remain good, despite random noise
- Limit frequency of changes to the weights
  - Joint optimization for day & night traffic matrices
Application to AT&T’s backbone

- Performance of the optimized weights
  - Search finds a good solution within a few minutes
  - Much better than link capacity or physical distance
  - Competitive with multi-commodity flow solution

- How AT&T changes the link weights
  - Maintenance every night from midnight to 6am
  - Predict effects of removing link(s) from network
  - Reoptimize the link weights to avoid congestion
  - Configure new weights before disabling equipment