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Internet Architecture
Internet Routing Inefficiencies

- The default route is not always the best, in terms of latency or reliability
- Peering agreements and policy based routing can result in suboptimal routing decisions
- A route that passes through a “detour” may be better

---

1Savage et al. “Detour: Informed Internet routing and transport”. 1999
Access Link Underutilization

- Residential bandwidth constantly improves
- However, residential bandwidth is not fully utilized
  - Short-lived TCP sessions?
  - Anemic send buffers?
  - Network core can’t support bandwidth?
- Using alternative routes can improve performance
- Aggregating multiple routes can perform even better

---

2 Sargent and Allman. “Performance within a fiber-to-the-home network”. 2014
Concept
Contributions

**Problem:** Unmodified applications cannot use detour routing to circumvent Internet routing inefficiencies.

**Solution:** An OS-level detour routing system that leverages Multipath TCP (MPTCP).

**Contributions:**

- A method for performing detour routing with unmodified applications
- A prototype implementation in the Linux kernel
- An evaluation of this mechanism on emulated networks and the Internet
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Multipath TCP

- Multi-homed devices are becoming more common
  - Smartphones
  - Datacenters
  - Laptops
- TCP still views a connection as a five-tuple: (TCP, Source IP, Source port, Destination IP, Destination Port)
- Multi-homed devices are forced to choose a network interface
- Multipath TCP is an extension to TCP, allowing hosts to use multiple addresses in the same connection
Design Goals

- Remain compatible with TCP applications and the Internet
  - *Present the same socket API to applications*
  - Remain similar to TCP on the wire, to remain compatible with Internet middleboxes

- Improve performance and reliability over current TCP, by aggregating paths created by multiple interfaces.

- Do no harm to single-path TCP, by taking no more bandwidth over shared bottlenecks than standard TCP would
Architecture
Path Management

- Subflows are established with a three way handshake
- First subflow uses MP_CAPABLE option
- Subsequent subflows use MP_JOIN option
- Additional addresses may be advertised using ADD_ADDR at any time
- Either side may create new subflows at any time
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Related Work
Resilient Overlay Networks

- Rather than use only one detour, create an overlay network
- Overlay nodes use the Internet as their “link layer”
- Routing performed at each node using measured link characteristics
- Several studies based on RON:
  - Redundant multipath routing
  - “Biologically inspired” multipath routing
  - mTCP

3 Andersen, Snoeren, and Balakrishnan. “Best-path vs. multi-path overlay routing”. 2003
6 Andersen et al. Resilient overlay networks. 2001
Application Layer

- **Gnutella**
  - Requests forwarded via overlay network
  - Content exchanged via single path

- **BitTorrent**
  - Pieces of content exchanged between many pairs of peers
  - Multiple paths simulate detour routing

- **HTTP Range Requests**
  - Range requests allow requesting byte ranges of a file
  - Request from different network interfaces or to different endpoints to create alternative paths

---

7 Adar and Huberman. “Free riding on Gnutella”. 2000
8 Cohen. “Incentives build robustness in BitTorrent”. 2003
9 Kaspar et al. “Enhancing video-on-demand playout over multiple heterogeneous access networks”. 2010
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Ingredients

- Multipath TCP Linux Implementation v0.91
- Custom path manager
- OpenVPN
- Netfilter / IPTables frameworks
Strategies for Detours

- **OpenVPN Approach**
  - Establish an OpenVPN connection with detour
  - Send packets as normal through the virtual interface
  - Packets encapsulated via OpenVPN protocol

- **NAT Approach**
  - Address packets directly to detour
  - Detour alters source and destination address, forwards packet
  - Address information must be arranged ahead of time
OpenVPN Approach

- OpenVPN typically provides encryption and authentication
- Configure to only provide authentication on startup, no encryption or message signatures
- Use UDP as transport, to avoid “TCP Meltdown”
- VPN appears as network device to the kernel
- No per-MPTCP-connection signalling, but has per-packet overhead
NAT Approach

Custom protocol for arranging NAT detours
Once a MPTCP connection is established, path manager is informed

Path manager runs in a background thread

Requests detours from client daemon

Adds up to $N$ additional subflows, where $N$ is configurable. By default $N = 2$

Whenever a new detour becomes available, runs again
Client Daemon

- Userspace daemon required for tasks which are not well-suited for the kernel:
  - Starting processes
  - Using UDP sockets
- Daemon reads configuration file containing NAT and VPN detours.
- VPN instances are started up first and reported to kernel
- Wait for detour requests from kernel, send UDP requests, report replies to kernel
- All communication over Generic Netlink
Putting it Together (NAT)

1. Application creates MPTCP connection to MPTCP supporting server
2. Once 3WHS completes, path manager requests a detour from client daemon
3. Client daemon receives request and sends UDP request to every detour listed in configuration file
4. Detour daemon sets up detour, sends reply
5. Client daemon forwards reply to kernel
6. The path manager restarts the MPTCP connection’s thread, which creates a new subflow via this detour
Putting it Together (VPN)

1. At startup, client daemon connects to VPN and reports VPN to kernel.
2. Application creates MPTCP connection to MPTCP supporting server.
3. Once 3WHS completes, path manager requests a detour from client daemon.
4. Meanwhile, it uses the VPN already available and establishes a subflow.
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Types of Experiments

- Previous work has established that there do exist common scenarios where detour routing can improve path characteristics.
- We simply attempt to show the mechanism works as expected.
- Answer the following:
  - Can we achieve throughput of best available path?
  - When bandwidth aggregation is possible, can we aggregate path bandwidth?
  - What overheads exist in this mechanism?
  - Can this mechanism be used across the Internet at higher throughput?
Mininet Experiments

- Mininet allows you to create arbitrary network topologies
- Uses host networking stack rather than alternative or simulation
- Uses namespaces (foundation of containerization) rather than virtualization
Scenarios

- Two types of network:
  - **Symmetric**: every link has 10Mbps bandwidth
  - **Core-limited**: core links have 10Mbps, access links have 20Mbps

- Three variations:
  - **Normal**: no loss
  - **Lossy**: 1% packet loss on Link 2
  - **Delayed**: 100ms delay on Link 2

- Workload: send as much data as possible from client to server
Mechanisms

- **1-Subflow**: MPTCP with no available detours
- **NAT**: Using NAT detour
- **VPN**: Using VPN detour
- **TCP**: TCP over default route
- **TCP(NAT)**: TCP via the NAT tunnel
- **TCP(VPN)**: TCP via the VPN tunnel
Results
Results

- MPTCP has 140kbps, or about 1.5% overhead
- VPN approach has overhead of about 6.6%
- Mechanism performs well even when no aggregation benefit possible
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Results

- MPTCP has 140kbps, or about 1.5% overhead
- VPN approach has overhead of about 6.6%
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- Mechanism performs similarly to TCP over best path when the default path has loss
- Mechanism can effectively aggregate bandwidth when the network has the potential
Throughput Comparison: Core-limited with Loss

Throughput (Mbps)

1 Subflow  NAT  VPN  TCP  TCP (NAT)  TCP (VPN)
Results

- MPTCP has 140kbps, or about 1.5% overhead
- VPN approach has overhead of about 6.6%
- Mechanism performs well even when no aggregation benefit possible
- Mechanism performs similarly to TCP over best path when the default path has loss
- Mechanism can effectively aggregate bandwidth when the network has the potential, even in the presence of loss
Throughput Comparison: Core-limited with High Latency
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Results

- MPTCP has 140kbps, or about 1.5% overhead
- VPN approach has overhead of about 6.6%
- Mechanism performs well even when no aggregation benefit possible
- Mechanism performs similarly to TCP over best path when the default path has loss
- Mechanism can effectively aggregate bandwidth when the network has the potential, even in the presence of loss or high latency
Results

- MPTCP has 140kbps, or about 1.5% overhead
- VPN approach has overhead of about 6.6%
- Mechanism performs well even when no aggregation benefit possible
- Mechanism performs similarly to TCP over best path when the default path has loss
- Mechanism can effectively aggregate bandwidth when the network has the potential, even in the presence of loss or high latency
- NAT consistently outperforms VPN both in MPTCP and TCP, but by a small amount.
AWS Experiments

- Deployed client, server, and detour implementations to different AWS regions
- Ran similar throughput measurements for MPTCP
- Performed at much higher level, but didn’t show similar improvements
- OpenVPN cannot sustain above 60Mbps in our setup
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Summary

- Created a system for adding detour routes to MPTCP connections between single-homed devices.
- Like MPTCP, this system works with unmodified applications.
- System is capable of achieving similar performance to the best available path when no aggregation is possible.
- System is capable of aggregating throughput when possible.
Future Work

- Deployment scenarios
- Dynamic subflow addition and removal
- Data scheduling
- 0-RTT NAT establishment
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