Communication Networks Spring 2019



Rüdiger Birkner

https://comm-net.ethz.ch/

ETH Zürich

March 7 2019



Don't hesitate to ask questions

also over Slack (email) after the session

Main contact persons:

Tobias	Eng. & Ger.
Alexander	Eng. & Ger.
Rüdiger	Eng. & Ger.
Hendrik	Eng. & Ger.
Eric	Eng. & Ger.

Communication Networks Exercise 2



Quick recap and task 2.4

Time for you to solve the tasks

More recap and discussion of task 2.2

Solutions will be published next week

routing

How do you guide IP packets from a source to destination?

Think of IP packets as envelopes



Like an envelope, packets have a header



Like an envelope, packets have a payload



The header contains the metadata needed to forward the packet















Let's zoom in on what is going on between two adjacent routers





Upon packet reception, routers locally look up their forwarding table to know where to send it next



Forwarding decisions necessarily depend on the destination, but can also depend on other criteria

Task 2.4: (Source-and)-Destination-Based Routing

- destination
- source

- Let's compare these two in terms of
 - required state
 - path diversity

With source- & destination-based routing, paths from different sources can differ



With destination-based routing,

paths from different source coincide once they overlap



While forwarding is a *local* process, routing is inherently a *global* process

How can a router know where to direct packets if it does not know what the network looks like?

Essentially, there are three ways to compute valid routing state

	Intuition	Example
#1	Use tree-like topologies	Spanning-tree
#2	Rely on a global network view	Link-State SDN
#3	Rely on distributed computation	Distance-Vector BGP

Communication Networks Exercise 2



Quick recap and task 2.4

Time for you to solve the tasks

More recap and discussion of task 2.2

Solutions will be published next week

Communication Networks Exercise 2



Quick recap and task 2.4

Time for you to solve the tasks

More recap and discussion of task 2.2

Solutions will be published next week

To build this global view

routers essentially solve a jigsaw puzzle

Initially, routers only know their ID and their neighbors



D only knows, it is connected to B and C

along with the weights to reach them (by configuration)

Each routers builds a message (known as Link-State) and floods it (reliably) in the entire network



D's Advertisement

edge (D,B); cost: 1 edge (D,C); cost: 4 At the end of the flooding process,

everybody share the exact same view of the network

required for correctness see exercise



Dijkstra will always converge to a unique stable state when run on *static* weights

cf. exercice session for the dynamic case

Task 2.4: Dynamic weights



Unlike before, weights are bidirectional and represent link load



The problem of oscillation is fundamental to congestion-based routing with local decisions

solution #1Use static weightsi.e. don't do congestion-aware routing

solution #2Use randomness to break self-synchronizationwait(random(0,50ms)); send(new_link_weight);

solution #3Have the routers agree on the paths to useessentially meaning to rely on circuit-switching

Communication Networks Exercise 2



Quick recap and task 2.4

Time for you to solve the tasks

More recap and discussion of task 2.2

Solutions will be published next week