

Trimming the Multipath for Efficient Dynamic Routing

Adrian S.-W. Tam Kang Xi H. Jonathan Chao

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
Polytechnic Institute of New York University
Email: adriantam@nyu.edu, kxi@poly.edu, chao@poly.edu

Abstract—Multipath routing is a trivial way to exploit the path diversity to leverage the network throughput. Technologies such as OSPF ECMP use all the available paths in the network to forward traffic, however, we argue that is not necessary to do so to load balance the network. In this paper, we consider multipath routing with only a limited number of end-to-end paths for each source and destination, and found that this can still load balance the traffic. We devised an algorithm to select a few paths for each source-destination pair so that when all traffic are forwarded over these paths, we can achieve a balanced load in the sense that the maximum link utilization is comparable to that of ECMP forwarding. When the constraint of only shortest paths (i.e. equal paths) are relaxed, we can even outperform ECMP in certain cases. As a result, we can use a few end-to-end tunnels between each source and destination nodes to achieve the load balancing of traffic.

I. INTRODUCTION

The networks nowadays, in particular the data center networks, have a high degree of connectivity and redundancy. The traditional shortest path routing does not make use of them for a better performance. Such routing paradigm forward packets from its source to the destination on only one path. This may lead to imbalanced load and create ‘hot-spot’ links. Introducing multipath routing, such as OSPF [1] ECMP, is an easy way to leverage the overall throughput of the network as well as balancing the load on different links.

There are two categories of multipath routing mechanisms in the current literature: hop-by-hop routing or end-to-end tunnels. The former, OSPF ECMP as an example, is scalable as each intermediate router selects the next hop of a route independently, and the routing tables on the routers are built distributed. The latter mechanism is to build parallel end-to-end tunnels between a pair of end-points, such as using MPLS label switched paths [2]. Then the traffic between the two end-points are forwarded over these established tunnels. This mechanism allows the forwarding paths to be known explicitly. It also allows the network administrators to have more control on the traffic over the network. For example, we can build a particular tunnel to avoid traversing certain part of the network; also we can adjust the proportion of the traffic sending over different tunnels to precisely control the load on different links.

The controllability provided by the multipath routing using end-to-end tunnels are attractive to the network administrators

as it is easier to load-balance the networks. However, there are hard limitations on the number of tunnels you can built. For example, SPAIN [3] uses VLANs to separate the parallel forwarding paths, then the number of VLANs that it can use is subject to the size of VLAN ID space; MATE [4] builds upon MPLS, therefore it is subject to the limitation of MPLS label space. Moreover, on the same source-destination pair, the more the number of parallel paths, the higher the overhead in operation, such as the time and bandwidth spent on probing realtime path characteristics, and the computation resource on finding the optimal traffic splitting ratio among the paths.

In this paper, we consider a data center network built with modern switches such as OpenFlow switches [5], similar to the case in [6]. In order to have a higher network throughput and prevent congestion, we forward traffic on multipath routes. The multipath routes are prebuilt end-to-end connections for the flexibility in control. Because of the delay sensitivity in data center applications, shortest paths between the source and destination nodes are preferred. And because of the overhead in maintaining these connections, we would like to keep the number of parallel paths between a pair of nodes to be as small as possible, while allowing the network to be load-balanced and flows routed dynamically. In this setting, we devised an algorithm to prebuild the multipath for all possible connections with the objective to minimize the network congestion, namely, to minimize the maximum link load on the network. We do not exploit all the multipath possibility provided by the network, but use a subset of the multipath to forward traffic. The contributions of this paper are (1) providing a method to strategically select a few paths for multipath forwarding, and (2) showing that even the number of paths used is few, we can achieve a performance similar or even better than ECMP, which forward traffic over *all* equally shortest paths.

II. RELATED WORK

Multipath routing have been discussed since the early years of networking. A large body of literature is available addressing different issues of multipath routing. For example, [7], [8], [9], [10] describe the way to deduce loop-free multipath routes in a hop-by-hop basis. Some other, such as [11], [12], transform the multipath routing problem into constrained optimization to find the optimal way to forward traffic for highest throughput and lowest congestion. QoS routing is

addressed in [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], which is to perform multipath routing to satisfy QoS guarantees.

Multipath has the potential to allow dynamic load balancing without route change. There are proposals on splitting traffic to different paths adaptive to the current network conditions for a better load balance, such as the OSPF Optimized Multipath [18] and MPLS Optimized Multipath [19]. MATE [4] proposed an analytical model and algorithms to adjust the traffic ratio on the multipaths in order to reduce the network congestion. Similarly, in [20], the authors propose to use multipath routing adaptively by adjusting the traffic split ratio among different path according to regularly updated utilization information. The context of [20] is in QoS routing, i.e. bandwidth on the path is explicitly reserved for a flow. However, it also recognizes the need to reduce the number of paths being used due to overhead concern. An algorithm is proposed in [20] to find the *widest disjoint paths* for a source-destination pair, so that it provides the highest probability of satisfying the QoS guarantee upon a flow arrival. It share the same objective as our work but we are different in certain sense: Firstly, the multipath find in [20] depends on the current utilization information. Such statistics is volatile and the selection of the multipath is updated time to time. Our work, however, is based on an estimate of the traffic matrix to find the multipath. The multipath is stable amid the fluctuating utilization on the network. The insensitivity of our performance to the traffic matrix is evaluated in section V-C. Secondly, the multipath is selected individually on each sender node in [20]. This approach does not allow the coordinated multipath selection, therefore it may accidentally lead the concurrent flows to contention at certain links. Our approach is to do the multipath selection from a centralized view, so that by strategically selecting different paths for the traffic, the load-balancing objective is achieved.

III. PROBLEM STATEMENT

The easiest way to run multipath routing in commodity switches and routers is to turn on the equal-cost multipath forwarding (ECMP). ECMP performs per-hop decision to evenly distribute traffic to all the next hops that are equally close to the destination. Because of its ubiquitous availability, ECMP forwarding is also proposed in data center networks to obtain a higher throughput. See VL2 [21] for example. This is a multipath routing using hop-by-hop decisions. Therefore, the forwarding paths of a flow according to ECMP may not be mutually disjoint, and the traffic may not be well balanced.

Fig. 1 shows an example that the parallel paths according to ECMP are not disjoint and the traffic is imbalanced. We assume each link in Fig. 1 has equal weight in the shortest path computation. The arrows between nodes denotes the shortest path tree toward T. When one unit of traffic is sent from S to T, the ECMP routing logic will split the traffic to each link as shown in the figure. Here we can see, the link CT is carrying three times more traffic than link DT, because at each node ECMP splits traffic equally among all the valid next hops. To solve this problem, optimized multipath [18] and adaptive




Fig. 1: ECMP forwarding one unit of traffic from S to T leads to imbalanced traffic load.

multipath [22] are proposed. They make use of the packet loss information to split the traffic among different paths. In essence, the traffic load on a path is adaptive to the level of congestion. However, we can see that, the same problem can be solved easily by removing the path S-B-C-T, i.e. not to use all the available multipaths but a subset of them.

How can we use a subset of available paths in multipath routing? An easy way is to build the multipath using tunnels, such as the MPLS label switched paths. As the OpenFlow architecture [5] getting popular, we can also make use of its flexibility to pin-point a path in OpenFlow switches or manipulating their forwarding table to achieve the same goal. Therefore, the remaining problem is that, how should we select the paths for multipath routing, so that we can have a better load-balancing or equivalently, minimize the congestion.

In this paper, we attempt to solve the following problem: Given a topology, and a set of flows, find the routes to deliver these flows with the constraint that no any flow, defined as a traffic demand between a unique source-destination pair, is routed over more than k paths. For simplicity, we assume the traffic of a flow is distributed evenly to all the viable paths. In other words, the traffic distribution is *not* adaptive to network congestions, so that we avoid the issues of route change and their consequence of packet reordering. The objective is to route efficiently, namely, to minimize the maximum link utilization on the network.

This is similar to the multi-commodity flow problem [23] but with additional constraints on splitting traffic evenly to all viable paths. Afterwards, we will remove the requirement of providing k as a parameter, and to find the optimal number of paths given the traffic matrix.

IV. THE ALGORITHM

A. Heuristic algorithm on path selection

As the complexity in solving the multi-commodity flow problem for the optimal solution is high, a heuristic algorithm is devised. The heuristic algorithm is to find the multipaths individually between a pair of nodes. Since our goal is to balance the network, i.e. minimize the maximum link utilization for the given traffic matrix, we introduce a cost function to measure how good are the paths. The outline of the algorithm is depicted in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Algorithm to place routes on a network

Data: Network topology $G = (V, E)$
Data: Source-destination flows $F \subset V^2$
Data: Estimated traffic matrix $\alpha_{st}, \forall (s, t) \in F$
Data: Maximum number of paths for a flow k

- 1 Initialize link load account $\lambda_e := 0, \forall e \in E$;
- 2 **foreach** $(s, t) \in F$ *in random order* **do**
 /* Find the candidate paths from s to t */
- 3 $M :=$ all valid paths joining s to t ;
 /* Select k paths */
- 4 **for** $i := 1$ *to* k **do**
- 5 $p :=$ the path among M with the lowest path cost;
- 6 λ_e increase by $\frac{1}{k}\alpha_{st}$ for all $e \in p$
- 7 **end**
- 8 **end**

The heuristic algorithm is a greedy algorithm that selects one path at a time, assuming that we can minimize the overall maximum link utilization by minimizing the path cost in every step. The algorithm takes a traffic matrix as the input to provide estimate of the relative size of traffic between different pairs of nodes. Whether the traffic matrix can be fulfilled in the network is not a concern, although it may have influence on the cost function, for example, a cost function that models the links as queues will find an unfulfillable traffic matrix to yield an infinite cost. The idea of the algorithm is as follows: We first initialize link load values λ_e to zero. They serve as the scoreboard for the amount of traffic assigned to the links. Then we examine each pair of nodes in a random order, to select the k best paths on the network that connect them. A cost function returns a cost for every path based on the current load on each link. The k best paths are selected so that they correspond to the lowest cost according to the current λ_e . Once the paths are selected, all the corresponding λ_e are increased by α_{st}/k , where α_{st} is the amount of traffic from s to t , to reflect that these links are carrying additional traffic. For simplicity, we assume an even distribution of load to these k paths. This can serve as the lower bound on the performance if adaptive multipath routing is being used. At the end of the algorithm, λ_e reflects the resulting utilization as the multipaths are selected accordingly.

The candidate paths may subject to certain constraints. Obviously, it is reasonable to require these paths to be loop-free. Moreover, we may also limit the paths' length to avoid a significant disparity in propagation delay between different paths. These limitations are fulfilled in line 3. Obviously, if there are no more than k paths available, all of them would be chosen to route traffic between this pair of nodes. More detail on the candidate path selection process is presented in next subsection.

The cost function is the core of this heuristic algorithm. It quantizes the preference of a path over another. Because our objective is to minimize the maximum link utilization, we use

the following cost function in our paper:

$$\chi(p) = \max_{e \in p} \frac{\lambda_e + \alpha_{st}/k}{\mu_e}. \quad (1)$$

This function takes a path p as an argument, and find the maximum link utilization among all the links on this path. The fraction represents the resulting utilization if this path is chosen to carry traffic from s to t , namely, the total resulting traffic, $\lambda_e + \alpha_{st}/k$ divided by the link capacity μ_e .

We also tried different cost functions, such as sum of the utilization instead of maximum, so that it can prefer an overall shorter and less congested path, or evaluating the cost by a monotonically increasing convex function. However, according to our evaluation done in section V, the cost function (1) gives the best performance in terms of minimizing the maximum link utilization.

In line 5, we use the path length as the tie-breaker if there are several paths of the equal lowest cost. When these paths are of equal length, we randomly pick one among them.

B. Path finding algorithm

In line 3 of Algorithm 1, we enumerate the valid paths that joins s to t . A number of algorithms are available to find not only a single shortest path but multiple paths between two nodes, for example, [24], [25]. In our study, we use a modified Eppstein's algorithm [26] for simplicity reasons. Its pseudocode is listed as Algorithm 2. We describe the Eppstein's algorithm as follows.

Algorithm 2: Path finding algorithm

Data: Network topology $G = (V, E)$
Data: Length of links $w(e) \forall e \in E$

- 1 Run Bellman-Ford algorithm to find the shortest path from any node to t , let $d(v)$ denotes the shortest path distance found from v to t ;
- 2 $T :=$ the tree composed of the the shortest paths to t ;
- 3 $S :=$ the set of links not in T , a.k.a. sidetrack links;
- 4 **foreach** $e \in S$ **do**
 /* Assume e is a directed edge joining u to v */
- 5 $c(e) := d(v) - d(u) + w(e)$
- 6 **end**
- 7 Start with an empty priority queue Q ;
- 8 Q .push(\emptyset with priority 0);
- 9 **while** Q *not empty* **do**
- 10 $\sigma := Q$.pop();
- 11 Output the shortest path from s to t according to T and σ ;
- 12 **foreach** $e \in S - \sigma$ **do**
- 13 $\sigma' := \sigma \cup \{e\}$;
- 14 **if** σ' *represents a valid path* **then**
- 15 Q .push(σ' with priority $\sum_{e \in \sigma'} c(e)$);
- 16 **end**
- 17 **end**
- 18 **end**

The core of the Eppstein's algorithm is the shortest path tree T terminated at t as given by the Bellman-Ford algorithm. The tree is a directed graph such that each arc is pointed to t . We can find the shortest path from any node v to t by traversing along the arc in this tree. Any loop-free path other than the shortest path according to this tree T can be represented by a set of *sidetrack* edges. The sidetrack edges are directed edges. They are the edges that are traversed in a path that is not included in T . When a set of sidetrack edges are given, the path from s to t is constructed as follows: We start from node s on the network, and traverse the edges until we reach t . At every node, the edge to traverse is determined uniquely by first looking for any edge that is included in the set of sidetrack edges. If none is found, then we follow the edge on the shortest path tree T . Therefore, a well-formed set of sidetrack edges shall not contain more than one edge emerging from the same node. Moreover, the path constructed in this way shall exhaust all the provided sidetrack edges to make this set of sidetrack edges well-formed. Thus, for any loop-free path, there is a corresponding set of sidetrack edges, but not vice versa.

We use Fig. 1 to illustrate the idea of the Eppstein's algorithm. An empty set of sidetrack edges means we traverse along the shortest path tree. Therefore, for S to T, the path would be S-A-C-T. If the set of sidetrack edges is A-B and C-D, the path would be S-A-B-C-D-T. But if the set of sidetrack edges is B-A only, we cannot find a corresponding path since we can never reach node B from S along the shortest path tree.

The latter half of the path finding algorithm is crucial to enumerate the paths in ascending order of path length. The quantity $c(e)$ represents the penalty of using a sidetrack edge e in terms of the length of resulted path, $c(e) \geq 0$ guaranteed. Therefore, for a well-formed set of sidetrack edges, $\sigma(p)$, the length of the corresponding path p is

$$\ell(p) = d(s) + \sum_{e \in \sigma(p)} c(e)$$

where $d(s)$ is the shortest path distance from s to t and the summation is the total additional length imposed by traversing the sidetracked edges. Therefore, for any set $\sigma(p')$ that is a superset of $\sigma(p)$, the corresponding path of the former must be no shorter than that of the latter. Making use of this property, the while-loop in the above algorithm use a priority queue to enumerate the paths in ascending order of lengths. And because of this, we can terminate the path-finding algorithm prematurely if we impose a constraint on the length of paths to be found. For example, we can limit to our search to only shortest paths (i.e. paths of the length equal to $d(s)$) by skipping the set of sidetrack edges $\sigma(p)$ whenever $\sum_{e \in \sigma(p)} c(e) > 0$ is found. In our evaluations, we set a threshold $\theta \geq 0$ to limit the path selection to

$$\frac{1}{d(s)} \sum_{e \in \sigma(p)} c(e) \leq \theta,$$

i.e. no path that is longer than the shortest path by a fraction θ will be selected.

C. Optimal number of paths

According to our evaluation, we find that having more path diversity does not necessarily decrease the maximum link utilization on the network. Indeed, the increase in k (the number of paths in a multipath set between a pair of nodes) exhibits the law of diminishing return. Therefore, it is interesting to ask, for a particular topology, at least how many paths we needed to enjoy the benefits of multipath routing.

Algorithm 3: Algorithm to place routes on a network

Data: Network topology $G = (V, E)$
Data: Source-destination flows $F \subset V^2$
Data: Estimated traffic matrix $\alpha_{st}, \forall (s, t) \in F$

- 1 Initialize link load account $\lambda_e := 0, \forall e \in E;$
- 2 Initialize multipath $\pi_{st} := \emptyset \quad \forall (s, t) \in F;$
- 3 **for** $i := 1$ to k **do**
- 4 **foreach** $(s, t) \in F$ in random order **do**
- 5 /* Find the candidate paths from s to t */
- 6 $M :=$ all valid paths joining s to t not in $\pi_{st};$
- 7 /* Select the i -th path */
- 8 $p :=$ the path among M with the lowest path cost;
- 9 **if** $(\pi_{st} \cup \{p\})$ is better than π_{st} **then**
- 10 **foreach** path $q \in \pi_{st}$ **do**
- 11 $\lambda_e := \lambda_e - \frac{1}{|\pi_{st}|} \alpha_{st} + \frac{1}{|\pi_{st}|+1} \alpha_{st} \quad \forall e \in q;$
- 12 **end**
- 13 $\lambda_e := \lambda_e + \frac{1}{|\pi_{st}|+1} \alpha_{st} \quad \forall e \in p;$
- 14 $\pi_{st} := \pi_{st} \cup \{p\};$
- 15 **end**

We slightly modified Algorithm 1 to detect the optimal number of paths to be used automatically, as outlined in Algorithm 3. The idea of finding the optimal number of paths is to compare if it is beneficial to have one more paths added to the set of multipaths. Since the offered load α_{st} between a pair (s, t) is given, if it is distributed to n paths, then each path will carry α_{st}/n . Obviously, each path will carry less traffic if n is larger. In other words, the existing links for (s, t) will benefit from having more path diversity. However, if the traffic is extended to a new path which involves a heavily loaded link, additional traffic will make the link even more heavily loaded. In line 7 of Algorithm 3, we check if extending the existing set π_{st} of paths for (s, t) to a new path p is worthwhile by verifying if the additional path can lower the maximum link load among the links in concern, i.e.

$$\max\{\lambda'_e : e \in q, q \in (\pi_{st} \cup \{p\})\} \leq \max\{\lambda_e : e \in q, q \in \pi_{st}\},$$

where the new link load λ'_e is computed according to the equation in line 9. If this condition holds, we include p into π_{st} and update the values of λ_e correspondingly.

We placed a limit k as the maximum number of paths for a pair of nodes (s, t) , as in line 3. In practice, we found that the number of parallel paths is mostly limited by the condition in line 7.

D. Limitations of the Algorithm

The algorithms to find the k paths for all the source-destination pairs is presented in the previous subsections. The algorithms do not try to find the global optimal but instead, they are heuristic algorithms to approximate the solution.

Because the heuristic algorithms search the paths in a greedy manner, there are three limitations:

- As the paths for each source-destination pair is computed individually, there is no coordination to strategically use different paths for different source-destination pairs to avoid contention. The algorithms use only the cost function as the means to avoid such contention, which is not guaranteed to success.
- The way to find k paths for a particular source-destination pair is to find the paths one by one according to the updated path cost. In this way, similarly, we cannot coordinate the selection between these k paths.
- Particular to Algorithm 1, it finds k paths for a source-destination pair whenever it is possible. However, for the objective of minimizing the maximum link load, the best solution may not be utilizing all the k paths.

To partially deal with the limitation of the greedy algorithm and improve the output, we can fine-tune the path selections after the main algorithm as follows: Firstly, find the links of the maximum load. This is the set of hot links in the current configuration. Then, for each path that traverses any hot links, try to look for a substitute path such that, if replaced, we can lower the load on one existing hot link but not creating a new hot link. This algorithm is outlined in Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 4: Fine-tuning path selection

```

Data: Path set  $P$ 
1 repeat
  /* Find all paths that traverses a hot link */
2    $\hat{E} := \arg \max_e \lambda_e$  ;
3    $\hat{P} := \{p : p \in P \text{ such that } e \in p \exists e \in \hat{E}\}$ ;
4   foreach  $p \in \hat{P}$  do
    /* Find a candidate substitution path */
5      $(s, t) :=$  Source-destination pair of  $p$ ;
6      $\Pi :=$  all valid paths joining  $s$  to  $t$  that (a) not in
       $P$ , and (b) not traversing  $\hat{E}$ , and (c) can alleviate
      a hot link without creating a new one;
7     if  $\Pi \neq \emptyset$  then
8       Replace  $p$  with any path in  $\Pi$ ;
9       Update  $P$ 
10    end
11  end
12 until no more change in the path selection is possible;

```

Moreover, the algorithm is based on the assumptions that we can use any arbitrary loop-free paths to forward traffic and the traffic demand is known a priori. The former assumption can be readily achieved by setting up end-to-end paths, such as MPLS LSP. If only hop-by-hop forwarding is allowed, the

selection of paths (Algorithm 2) would be more restricted. The latter assumption is also a reasonable one as we can merely estimate the traffic matrix by statistics of historical usage data.

V. EVALUATIONS

Evaluations are done on the heuristic algorithm in section IV, to compare its performance against the standard ECMP. The first evaluation is to compare the traffic load on each links as a result of even distribution according to ECMP, against using the paths found by the algorithm (section V-A). Subsequently, we investigate the effect of adjusting different parameters in the algorithm (sections V-B and V-D) and its sensitivity to traffic matrix (section V-C). Finally, we use flow-based simulation to verify our statements on the performance of the algorithm (section V-E).

A. ECMP vs Subset of shortest paths

We first assume the traffic demand provided is fluid demand, such that, we can split the traffic evenly across a number of paths. The traffic distribution as depicted in Fig. 1 is the result of fluid traffic splitting according to ECMP. We compare the load distribution according to ECMP against the case of $k = 4$ paths being found by our algorithm with $\theta = 0$, i.e. the paths found are restricted to shortest paths.

Fig. 2 shows the relative link load in different topologies. It plots the load of links in a topology in ascending order. The horizontal axes numbers the links; the magnitude of the vertical axes are unimportant, hence omitted. The plots demonstrate how balanced is the load when different flow placement strategies are used. Here we assume a uniform traffic demand, i.e. each distinct pair of hosts in the network sends one unit of traffic to each other. In irregular topologies (Fig. 2a and 2b), any node can send traffic, but in fat tree topologies (Fig. 2c and 2d), the hosts that can send or receive traffic are attached to the edge switches.

Consider ECMP in Fig. 2, we see that regular topologies such as fat tree can benefit greatly from ECMP, as their links are highly balanced (their curves are narrow and flat). Irregular topologies, on the contrary, has a significant disparity between the heavily loaded and lightly loaded links. Those heavily loaded links are ‘hot links’ of the network that are more popular, thus carried more load than others.

When we use our heuristic algorithm to find the multiple shortest paths to replace ECMP, we found its performance is close to that of ECMP in terms of the maximum link load in the topology. These two curves are even almost coincide in irregular topologies and closely approximate to each other in fat trees. The difference between them is due to the heuristic nature of the algorithm, namely, it does not coordinate the path selection between different pairs. Even the two curves are not identical, they are close at the right end. This means using only a few shortest paths to forward traffic is similar to that of using all shortest paths in ECMP, but without sacrificing the balance of load.

This claim is valid on another traffic demand as well. Fig. 3 shows the same plots with a random traffic demand, i.e. each




Fig. 2: Relative load of links in (a) irregular topology 1, (b) irregular topology 2, (c) fat tree XGFT(2;3,6;3,3), and (d) fat tree XGFT(2;5,10;5,5)




Fig. 3: Relative load of links in (a) irregular topology 1, (b) irregular topology 2, (c) fat tree XGFT(2;3,6;3,3), and (d) fat tree XGFT(2;5,10;5,5). Random traffic demand.

distinct pair of hosts sends traffic to each other with a random rate between 0 and 1. We still see a flat curve for ECMP in fat tree topologies, and with $k = 4$ shortest paths gives a performance close to that of ECMP.

B. Non-shortest paths

If we relax our constraint so that all loop free paths can be chosen instead of just the shortest paths, we found an improvement on irregular topologies. Consider the curves labelled with $\theta = \infty$ in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, we observe a lowered maximum link load in those two irregular topologies. This is because, in irregular topologies, there may not be a large number of parallel shortest paths. Hence we cannot achieve a well-balanced link load even if we forward traffic using ECMP, or k shortest paths are used. However, if we relax the constraint of shortest paths, we may use a longer path to bypass a hot link, hence the network is better balanced. This explains curves of $\theta = \infty$ in Fig. 2a–b and 3a–b having their right end lowered. Anyhow, these further shows that ECMP is not always optimal in load balancing traffic.

Nevertheless, allowing any loop free paths is not without disadvantages. Besides using a very long path is sometimes not welcomed, consider the fat tree topologies in Fig. 2 and 3, it is obvious that using non-shortest path make the network more imbalanced. This is because in the heuristic algorithm, a path is selected according to a cost function. Therefore, in the early phase of the algorithm, it is very likely that a long path is chosen due to a slightly lower load, resulting in a larger sum of loads across all the links. This is less significant in irregular network because of the limited path diversity. Thus a

longer path is more likely to content with other traffic, which makes it less likely to be chosen. We found that in irregular networks, the longer paths are chosen in the later phase of the algorithm, in contrast to what is done in regular topologies.

We found that using $\theta = 25\%$ can combine the advantages. This allows a slightly longer path, in case the shortest path is too congested, but do not allow a overly long one. On one hand, this allows a detour around congested links in irregular network, and on the other hand, enforced shortest path to be used in fat trees, since the alternative paths is usually doubly long. In Fig. 2-3, we see the curve of $\theta = 25\%$ overlaps with that of $\theta = 0$ in fat tree topologies and overlaps with that of $\theta = \infty$ in irregular topologies at the right ends. We justify this value of θ by the fact that in data center networks, the usual hop count in a paths is a handful. Thus allowing 25% longer essentially means to have one or two more hops beyond the shortest path, which have limited impact on the end to end latencies.

C. Robustness to traffic matrix

Our heuristic algorithm takes a traffic matrix as input. A major criticism on this approach is the accuracy of the traffic matrix. Not only it is difficult to measure the traffic matrix, but also it is varying quickly with time. The algorithm relies on the traffic matrix to select a path. If the paths provided by the algorithm is very sensitive to the accuracy of the traffic matrix, it may not be very useful.

We evaluated the algorithm's sensitivity to traffic matrix by applying a varied traffic matrix to the paths found by the algorithm. We varied the traffic matrix by multiplying each




Fig. 4: Varied traffic matrix applied to (a) irregular topology 1 and (2) fat tree XGFT(2;5,10;5,5)




Fig. 5: Maximum link load vs k under random traffic in (a) irregular topology and (b) XGFT(2;5,10;5,5)

entry by a random value between 0.5 and 1.5, then feed in this traffic matrix to the paths found by the heuristic algorithm with $k = 4$ and $\theta = 25\%$. The variation is large, but according to Fig. 4, the link load does not change in scale. Especially in the irregular network (Fig. 4a), the maximum link load is increased by about 3%, since the hot link in the irregular network is used by a lot of source-destination pairs, which the variation between different pairs are canceling out each other. The fat tree network in Fig. 4b shows around 15% variation in the maximum link load. This is because the high degree of path diversity make the variation in traffic intensity less easy to cancel out. However, the increase in the maximum link load is still less than the variation in the traffic intensity. For reference purposes, we include in Fig. 4 the link load according to ECMP when the varied traffic matrix is applied.

D. Effect on the number of paths used

The number of paths k is a parameter to the algorithm. A natural question is the optimal value of k to be used. In the algorithm, k specifies the maximum number of paths to be used, which in certain cases, we may not be able to find k distinct paths for a particular source-destination pair, especially when the topology does not provide enough path diversity for a particular pair of nodes. Therefore, we should understand k as the parameter on the *maximum* number of paths between two nodes.

Fig. 5 shows the maximum link load in a topology against k under random traffic. The traffic matrix is the same as the one used in Fig. 3, and we fix $\theta = 25\%$ in the heuristic algorithm. In Fig. 5b, it is obvious that we can lower the maximum link load with a larger k . While it is trivial that a larger k can provide more paths to spread out the traffic and hence lower




Fig. 6: Maximum link load vs k under skewed traffic in (a) irregular topology and (b) XGFT(2;5,10;5,5)

the maximum load, it is interesting to see that the curve levels off at a small value of $k = 2$. This can be explained by the fact that the k paths provided for a pair of nodes may not be mutually disjoint. Thus further increasing k cannot reduce the load on those shared links by multipath routing.

In Fig. 5a, however, k does not show any effect on the maximum link load. It is partially due to the topology does not provide enough path diversity, but also because of the traffic between nodes are even. We repeated the evaluation with a skewed traffic matrix, i.e. among the nodes in the topology, we randomly select some of them as hot sender and some as hot receivers. The cardinality of the set of hot senders and hot receivers are both 20% of total number of nodes. The traffic from hot senders to hot receivers comprises 80% of total traffic across the network. The result is depicted in Fig. 6. Here we see a magnified effect of k to the maximum link load, but it levels off eventually at a larger value of k . An even more skewed traffic matrix can be constructed. An extreme would be to have only one flow between two nodes in the network. Then we can expect it can enjoy a larger k until the paths found have some overlap. But such traffic model may not be realistic in practice.

From these figures, we see that a small number of k (e.g. $k = 4$) is enough to load balance traffic. Taking the fat tree topology XGFT(2;5,10,5,5) as an example, there are 25 distinct shortest paths between any two nodes. But Fig. 5-6 shows that we need no more than 4 paths from the heuristic algorithm. This is an encouraging result as it means that a small number of paths is sufficient in practice to achieve a good load balancing, as a result, the management overhead is limited.

E. Dynamic traffic distribution

The above traffic distribution is assuming a fluid traffic that we can perfectly split across the multiple paths provided. However, usually we do not want to split a *flow* across different paths to avoid the problems of packet reordering. Usually a *flow* here is defined as a *five-tuple flow*, namely, the one identified by the set of source and destination addresses, protocol, and source and destination port number. Therefore, we devised a discrete event simulation to verify the results above is valid in this setting.

This evaluation is performed as follows: Assume we have the topology and traffic matrix as before, we can then find the forwarding paths for different source-destination pairs




Fig. 7: Maximum link load vs time under random flows in (a) irregular topology and (b) XGFT(2;5,10;5,5)

according to the algorithm. Then, we read the flow descriptions and place them into the network on one of the those paths found by the algorithm. The description of one flow provides the information about the flow's source and destination node, the size (in term of traffic rate of data), the time of arrival, and its holding time. We assume it is a CBR flows of predetermined holding time for simplicity. A flow is placed into the network one at a time. Each flow uses one path, even if the network provided enough path diversity, as a means to avoid packet reordering. The path selection for a particular flow is random. Adaptive placement of flows according to the real-time load can be a future extension, whereas the random placement can be regarded as the baseline performance. When a flow is placed to a path, all the links correspond to this path would have their load increased. Their load will be decreased when this flow expires. We keep track on the load of each link at any time.

Fig. 7 shows the result from the evaluation using dynamic traffic. The traffic matrix is same as the one used in Fig. 3. We convert the traffic matrix into a series of flows with Poisson arrival and exponential holding time, so that their average load corresponds to the entry in the traffic matrix. The arrival of flows lasts from time 0 to 100. The maximum link load in the topology against time is plotted as a continuous curve.

The curve labelled as k-path correspond to the multipath routing according to the paths given by the algorithm with $k = 4$ and $\theta = 25\%$. Fig. 7b shows that the curves of k-path and ECMP are overlapping in fat tree topology. This means the former is as good as the latter. Similarly, Fig. 7a shows the two curves in an irregular topology. We can see an observable improvement of the k-path algorithm over ECMP, in the sense that the former has a lower maximum link load than the latter. This conclusion is consistent with that of Fig. 3. For tidiness, we do not show the curves with $\theta = 0$ and $\theta = \infty$ in Fig. 7, but we confirmed that their flow-based evaluation is consistent with the abovementioned.

In summary, although we do not consider a flow can be split in this evaluation, we see the conclusion the same here as in sections V-A and V-B, namely, the paths from the algorithm with $\theta = 0$ is as good as ECMP is all scenarios tested, and $\theta = \infty$ can perform better in irregular topologies where there are a few hot-spot links, or perform worse in highly regular topologies such as fat-tree. Therefore, $\theta = 25\%$ is suggested to enjoy the benefit in both topologies.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we devised a heuristic algorithm to find a subset of loop free paths between two nodes in a topology, so that we can approximately minimize the maximum link load. The heuristic algorithm takes a traffic matrix as the input to provide estimated measure on the relative traffic intensity between different pairs of nodes. This algorithm tries to use only a few paths to forward traffics between different nodes so that contention is minimized. The output of the algorithm, namely, the set of paths between every pair of nodes, can be implemented in the network as end-to-end tunnels such as MPLS LSP, to forward traffic at a later time. The benefit of doing so is to allow the controllability on the routing of traffic and limit the operation overhead by limiting the number of paths involved.

We evaluated the algorithm by different traffic models. In the evaluations, we found that forwarding traffic to all the possible paths is not optimal as the paths may partially overlap, and thus the link load is imbalanced. Hence this justifies our approach on using a subset of paths instead of ECMP in term of load balancing. Furthermore, we found that allowing the traffic to route over slightly longer paths can improve load balancing in some topologies. If there are hot links in such topologies, enforcing shortest path routing rules out the possibility of using a detour to bypass those hot links. Using non-shortest path is not easy to guarantee the paths are loop free when routing is done hop-by-hop, but it is trivial when end-to-end tunnels are used. We also found that the number of paths per pair of nodes is small to achieve a good level of load balancing. These supports our proposal of using a few tunnels between pairs of nodes for better control and better load balancing.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Moy, "OSPF version 2," IETF STD 54, RFC 2328, Apr. 1998.
- [2] E. C. Rosen, A. Viswanathan, and R. Callon, "Multiprotocol label switching architecture," IETF RFC 3031, Jan. 2001.
- [3] J. Mudigonda, P. Yalagandula, M. Al-Fares, and J. C. Mogul, "SPAIN: COTS data-center Ethernet for multipathing over arbitrary topologies," in *Proc. 7th USENIX NSDI*, San Jose, CA, Apr. 2010.
- [4] A. Elwalid, C. Jin, S. Low, and I. Widjaja, "MATE: MPLS adaptive traffic engineering," in *Proc. INFOCOM*, 2001.
- [5] N. McKeown, T. Anderson, H. Balakrishnan, G. Prulkar, L. Peterson, J. Rexford, S. Shenker, and J. Turner, "OpenFlow: Enabling innovation in campus networks," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 69–74, Apr. 2008.
- [6] T. Benson, A. Anand, A. Akella, and M. Zhang, "The case for fine-grained traffic engineering in data-centers," in *Proc. INM/WREN*, San Jose, CA, Apr. 2010.
- [7] P. Narvaez and K. Y. Siu, "Efficient algorithms for multi-path link state routing," in *Proc. ISCOM*, 1999.
- [8] S. Vutukurya and J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves, "MPATH: a loop-free multipath routing algorithm," *Microprocessors and Microsystems*, vol. 24, pp. 319–327, 2000.
- [9] S. Vutukury and J. J. Garcia-Luna-Aceves, "MDVA: A distance-vector multipath routing protocol," in *Proc. INFOCOM*, 2001.
- [10] P. Mérindol, J.-J. Pansiot, and S. Cateloin, "Improving load balancing with multipath routing," in *Proc. ICCCN*, 2008, pp. 1–8.
- [11] B. Fortz and M. Thorup, "Internet traffic engineering by optimizing OSPF weights," in *Proc. INFOCOM*, 2000, pp. 519–528.
- [12] R. Banner and A. Orda, "Multipath routing algorithms for congestion minimization," *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 413–424, Apr. 2007.

- [13] Z. Wang and J. Crowcroft, "Quality-of-service routing for supporting multimedia applications," *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 1228–1234, 1996.
- [14] Q. Ma and P. Steenkiste, "On path selection for traffic with bandwidth guarantees," in *Proc. ICNP*, Oct. 1997.
- [15] R. Guerin, S. Kamat, A. Orda, T. Przygienda, and D. Williams, "Qos routing mechanisms and ospf extensions," IETF RFC 2386, Aug. 1998.
- [16] S. Chen and K. Nahrstedt, "An overview of quality-of-service routing for the next generation high-speed networks: Problems and solutions," *IEEE Network Magazine*, vol. 12, no. 6, pp. 64–79, 1998.
- [17] Y. Jia, I. Nikolaidis, and P. Gburzynski, "Multiple path QoS routing," in *Proc. ICC*, 2001, pp. 2583–2587.
- [18] C. Villamizar, "OSPF optimized multipath (OSPF-OMP)," IETF Internet Draft, Feb. 1999, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-ospf-omp-02>.
- [19] —, "MPLS optimized multipath (MPLS-OMP)," IETF Internet Draft, Feb. 1999, <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-villamizar-mpls-omp-01>.
- [20] S. Nelakuditi, Z.-L. Zhang, and D. H. Du, "On selection of candidate paths for proportional routing," *Computer Networks*, vol. 44, pp. 79–102, 2004.
- [21] A. Greenberg, N. Jain, S. Kandula, C. Kim, P. Lahiri, D. A. Maltz, P. Patel, and S. Sengupta, "VL2: A scalable and flexible data center network," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Data Communication*, Aug. 2009.
- [22] I. Gojmerac, T. Ziegler, F. Ricciato, and P. Reichl, "Adaptive multipath routing for dynamic traffic engineering," in *Proc. GLOBECOM*, Nov. 2003.
- [23] M. Pióro and D. Medhi, *Routing, Flow, and Capacity Design in Communication and Computer Networks*. San Francisco, CA: Morgan Kaufmann, 2004.
- [24] J. Y. Yen, "Finding the k shortest loopless paths in a network," *Management Science*, vol. 17, no. 11, pp. 712–716, Jul. 1971.
- [25] E. Minieka, *Optimization algorithms for networks and graphs*. New York: Marcel Dekker, 1978.
- [26] D. Eppstein, "Finding the k shortest paths," *SIAM J. Computing*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 652–673, 1998.