

Introduction

- We consider a network of nodes that construct paths via a routing protocol, e.g. BGP
- Routing through a node is characterized by a metric, e.g. latency or throughput
- Some nodes can adopt a new, incrementally deployable routing protocol

How does end-to-end routing performance change with incremental deployment of the new protocol?

Problem formulation

- We model a protocol via the amount and relevance of routing-metric information it provides to individual nodes
- Incumbent protocol:
 - Every node knows imprecisely the distributions of metric values for the other nodes
- New protocol:
 - Each of the adopting nodes almost surely knows the distributions of their metric values

Mathematical description

- Building on [1, 4], we formulate traffic routing as an optimization problem :

$$\begin{aligned} \min C(f) &= \sum_{e \in E} l_e(f_e) f_e \\ \text{s.t. } f_e &= \sum_{p \text{ such as } e \in P} f_p \quad \forall e \in E \\ \sum_{p \in P_i} f_p &= d_i \quad \forall i \in R \\ f_p &\geq 0 \quad \forall p \in P \end{aligned}$$

where $C(f)$ - cost function, f_p - flow through path p , f_e - flow through edge e , d_i - amount of traffic of flow i , l_e - Lipschitz edge penalty function, E - set of edges, P - set of paths, R - set of flows

- A solution is a matrix representing distribution of flows across paths.

$$|S(X) - S(Y)| \leq L \left(\sum_{i=1}^m d_i |\beta(\sigma_i, \sigma_i)| + 2 * \sum_{i=1}^m d_i |\beta(\sigma_i, x_i)| \right)$$

where $\beta(x, y) = x^T (D^T D) y$, σ_i - column of the difference matrix


D - mapping paths to edges matrix, L - Lipschitz constant, m - number of flows

- Dependence of the cost difference on the solution difference is less than or equal to quadratic
- Small changes in the routing cause small changes in the cost function
- Significant changes of the cost function imply substantial changes in the routing


Hypothesis

How do solutions depend on the available routing-metric information as the number of adopting nodes increasing?

- Smooth behavior




- Threshold behavior



Evaluation

- We use our own discrete-time event simulator
- Nodes are Internet Autonomous Systems
- The topology is scale-free [2]
- Metric is latency
- Distributions of traffic and latency are based on real data [3]

Results



- The improvement is smooth without a threshold
- Significant adoption is needed in order to yield a substantial fraction of the performance benefits

Reference

- [1] "How Bad Is Selfish Routing?" by Tim Roughgarden, Eva Tardos. Journal of the ACM, 2002
- [2] "On Power-Law Relationships of the Internet Topology" by Michalis Faloutsos, Petros Faloutsos, Christos Faloutsos. ACM SIGCOMM 1999
- [3] "An Empirical Evaluation of Internet Latency Expansion" by Hui Zhang, Ashish Goel, Ramesh Govindan. ASM SIGCOMM 2005
- [4] "Selfish Routing in Capacitated Networks" by Jose R. Correa, Andreas S. Schulz, Nicolas E. Stier Moses. Mathematics of Operations Research 2004