APPLE: Alias Pruning by Path Length Estimation

Alex Marder

UC San Diego / CAIDA



Overview

- 1. What is alias resolution and why do we need it?
- 2. Current state-of-the-art
- 3. APPLE methodology
 - A. Common successor groups
 - B. Prune with pings from many vantage points (VPs)
- 4. Results from two ground truth networks
- 5. Conclusion



- 1. What is alias resolution and why do we need it?
- 2. Current state-of-the-art
- 3. APPLE methodology
 - A. Common successor groups
 - B. Prune with pings from many vantage points (VPs)
- 4. Results from two ground truth networks
- 5. Conclusion

What is Alias Resolution?

Grouping addresses by their physical router



Why is Alias Resolution Important?

Traceroute provides interface addresses
No router identifiers

- Alias resolution helps provide router graph
 - More complete view of the network









Why is Alias Resolution Important?

Traceroute provides interface addresses
 No router identifiers

- Alias resolution helps provide router graph
 - More complete view of the network









Overview

- 1. What is alias resolution and why do we need it?
- 2. Current state-of-the-art
- 3. APPLE methodology
 - A. Common successor groups
 - B. Prune with pings
- 4. Results
- 5. Conclusion

Current State-of-the-Art: IP-ID Velocity

IPv4 Packet Header



Current State-of-the-Art: IP-ID Velocity



Current State-of-the-Art: hoiho Regex Learning [1]

• Uses IP-ID router groupings as training

• Automatically learn regexes for router IDs in hostnames

- ^[a-z]+-[^\.]+\..+\.([a-z\d]+\.net)\.internet2\.edu\$
 - et-9-1-0.4079.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil.net
 - et-11-0-0.103.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil.net
 - ae-3.4079.rtsw.dall3.net.internet2.edu -> dall3.net

[1] Luckie, M., Huffaker, B., et al.: Learning regexes to extract router names from hostnames. In: IMC (2019)

Current State-of-the-Art: hoiho Regex Learning [1]

Uses IP-ID router groupings as training

• Automatically learn regexes for router IDs in hostnames

- ^[a-z]+-[^\.]+\..+\.([a-z\d]+\.net)\.internet2\.edu\$
 - et-9-1-0.4079.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil.net
 - et-11-0-0.103.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil.net
 - ae-3.4079.rtsw.dall3.net.internet2.edu -> dall3.net

[1] Luckie, M., Huffaker, B., et al.: Learning regexes to extract router names from hostnames. In: IMC (2019)

Current State-of-the-Art: hoiho Regex Learning [1]

• Uses IP-ID router groupings as training

Automatically learn regexes for router IDs in hostnames

- ^[a-z]+-[^\.]+\..+\.([a-z\d])+\.net\.internet2\.edu\$
 - et-9-1-0.4079.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil
 - et-11-0-0.103.rtsw.phil.net.internet2.edu -> phil
 - ae-3.4079.rtsw.dall3.net.internet2.edu -> dall3

[1] Luckie, M., Huffaker, B., et al.: Learning regexes to extract router names from hostnames. In: IMC (2019)

- IP-ID techniques rely on specific IP implementations
 - IPv6 is even worse

- Cannot reverse lookup many addresses
 - Others lack router identifiers

- IP-ID techniques rely on specific IP implementations
 - IPv6 is even worse

- Cannot reverse lookup many addresses
 - Others lack router identifiers

IP-ID techniques rely on specific IP implementations
IPv6 is even worse

- Cannot reverse lookup many addresses
 - Others lack router identifiers

- IP-ID techniques rely on specific IP implementations
 - IPv6 is even worse

- Cannot reverse lookup many addresses
 - Others lack router identifiers

- IP-ID techniques rely on specific IP implementations
 - IPv6 is even worse

- Cannot reverse lookup many addresses
 - Others lack router identifiers

Overview

- 1. What is alias resolution and why do we need it?
- 2. Current state-of-the-art
- 3. APPLE methodology
 - A. Common successor groups
 - B. Prune with pings from many vantage points (VPs)
- 4. Results from two ground truth networks
- 5. Conclusion

• Goal: Reduce reliance on specific router implementations of IP

• Step 1: collect candidate router alias groups from traceroute

• Step 2: prune the groups using pings

Goal: Reduce reliance on specific implementations of IP

• Step 1: collect candidate router alias groups from traceroute

• Goal: Reduce reliance on specific router implementations of IP

• Step 1: collect candidate router alias groups from traceroute

• Goal: Reduce reliance on specific router implementations of IP

• Step 1: collect candidate router alias groups from traceroute

Traceroute Responses Provide Inbound Address



Common Successors Provide Alias Hints





Step 1: Build Common Successor Sets











b

 R_3



 R_3

• Goal: Reduce reliance on specific router implementations of IP

• Step 1: collect candidate router alias groups from traceroute

Step 2: Pruning

• Prune common successor groups using reply path length

IPv4 Packet Header

Version	IHL	DSCP	ECN	Length	
Identification (IP-ID)				Flags	Fragment Offset
	TTL Protocol			Checksum	
Source					
Destination					

Intuition: Destination-Based Forwarding



Intuition: Destination-Based Forwarding



Random Reply TTL Collisions

- Finite range of TTL values
 - 8-bit TTL field
 - 256 possible values



More VPs reduces chances of collision

Random Reply TTL Collisions

- Finite range of TTL values
 - 8-bit TTL field
 - 256 possible values



More VPs reduces chances of collision
Coverage vs False Aliases

- Tradeoff between including valid aliases and including false aliases
- Better to exclude invalid aliases alias resolution is transitive



Coverage vs False Aliases

- Tradeoff between including valid aliases and including false aliases
- Better to exclude invalid aliases alias resolution is transitive



APPLE Thresholds Control the Tradeoff

1. Minimum match threshold: minimum number of matches required to keep alias pair

2. Acceptance threshold: minimum ratio of matches to comparisons

APPLE Thresholds Control the Tradeoff

1. Minimum match threshold: minimum number of matches required to keep alias pair

2. Acceptance threshold: minimum ratio of matches to comparisons

APPLE Thresholds Control the Tradeoff

1. Minimum match threshold: minimum number of matches required to keep alias pair

2. Acceptance threshold: minimum ratio of matches to comparisons

Minimum Match Threshold: Birthday Problem

Probability that any 2 people in a group share a birthday

•
$$p(n,d) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-n(n-1)}{2d}\right)$$

- *n* number of people
- *d* number of days



Minimum Match Threshold: Birthday Problem

Probability that any 2 people in a group share a birthday

•
$$p(n,d) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-n(n-1)}{2d}\right)$$

- *n* number of people
- *d* number of days



$$p(n,d) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-n(n-1)}{2d}\right)$$

$$\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$$
: people pairs to compare

$$p(\boldsymbol{a},d) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-\boldsymbol{a}}{d}\right)$$

a: number of potential alias pairs

$$p(\mathbf{a}, d) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-\mathbf{a}}{\mathbf{d}}\right)$$

a: number of potential alias pairs*d*: number of days

$$p(a, r, v) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-a}{r^{v}}\right)$$

a: number of potential alias pairs *r*: number of possible reply TTL values *v*: number of vantage points

$$p(v) \approx 1 - \exp\left(\frac{-a}{r^v}\right) < \frac{1}{a}$$

v: number of vantage points

Set the minimum match to limit the probability of a random collision to < 1/a

• Order VPs by minimum RTT to potential alias pair addresses

• Order VPs by minimum RTT to potential alias pair addresses

• Order VPs by minimum RTT to potential alias pair addresses

• Order VPs by minimum RTT to potential alias pair addresses

Ping Each Address From Every VP



• Minimum match = 6

• Acceptance = 100%



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 1/6 = **16.7%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 2/6 = **33.3%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 3/6 = **50%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 4/6 = **66.7%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 5/6 = **83.3%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 6/6 = **100%**



- Acceptance = 100%
 - 7/8 = **87.5%**



Load Balancing: Prune Valid Alias Pair



Load Balancing: Keep Invalid Alias Pair



Overview

- 1. What is alias resolution and why do we need it?
- 2. Current state-of-the-art
- 3. APPLE methodology
 - A. Common successor groups
 - B. Prune with pings from many vantage points (VPs)
- 4. Results from two ground truth networks
- 5. Conclusion



	ITDK	Pings Sent	Probed	Responses	Resp. %	Pairs
IPv4	201904	201904	366,469	292,141	79.7%	5,022,839
IPv6	201901	201905	76,098	59,778	78.6%	563,489

https://www.caida.org/data/internet-topology-data-kit/

	VPs	ASNs	Countries	Cities
IPv4	99	71	37	83
IPv6	78	61	29	63

https://www.caida.org/projects/ark/locations/

Ground Truth

• 2 ground truth networks: Internet2 & large US R&E network

	Routers		Alias Pairs		Probed		Responses	
	IPv4	IPv6	IPv4	IPv6	IPv4	IPv6	IPv4	IPv6
Internet2	42	41	2176	1095	719	616	646	536
R&E	25	16	1651	137	352	137	352	137
Total	67	57	3737	1232	1071	753	998	673

How Popular is the Most Popular Reply TTL?

• For each VP:

- Select most frequent reply TTL
- Compute % of all replies at that VP

VP ₁	VP ₂
56	59
56	58
57	61
54	58
	57
50%	40%

How Popular is the Most Popular Reply TTL?

• For each VP:

- Select most frequent reply TTL
- Compute % of all replies at that VP

VP ₁	VP ₂
56	59
56	58
57	61
54	58
	57
50%	40%

How Popular is the Most Popular Reply TTL?

• For each VP:

- Select most frequent reply TTL
- Compute % of all replies at that VP

VP ₁	VP ₂
56	59
56	58
57	61
54	58
	57
50%	40%

Maximum % of Individual Reply TTLs



- IPv4: most frequent reply TTL <10% of replies at any VP
 - Estimate 10 possible reply TTLs

- IPv6: most frequent reply TTL <20% of replies at any VP
 - Estimate 5 possible reply TTLs

Setting the Minimum Match Threshold

Input Parameters 1.0 **Brobability of Overlap** 0.6 - 0.0 - 0.2 -08 $\frac{1}{2}$ 5e7eIPv4 IPv6 \sim \mathfrak{n} \mathcal{C} \mathcal{C} 563 K **Alias Pairs** 5 M Pv4 p(14)Pv6 p(17)10 5 Reply TTLs IPv4 IPv6 0.0 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 3 5 8 9 6 2 74 $\left(\right)$ Number of VPs

Estimated Probability of Random Reply TTL Overlap

Setting the Minimum Match Threshold


Setting the Minimum Match Threshold

Estimated Probability of Random Reply TTL Overlap Input Parameters 1.0 **Brobability of Overlap** 0.6 - 0.0 - 0.2 -08 $\frac{10}{10}$ 5c76 IPv4 IPv6 \sim \bigcirc \mathbb{N} $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$ **Alias Pairs** 563 K 5 M Pv4 p(14)p(17)10 5 Reply TTLs IPv4 Pv6 IPv6 0.0 3 5 8 9 $10\ 11\ 12\ 13\ 14\ 15\ 16\ 17\ 18\ 19\ 20$ 2 6 74 $\left(\right)$ Number of VPs

Setting the Minimum Match Threshold













Combined

All











The number of VPs directly affects correctness and coverage





With more VPs we introduce errors but increase coverage





No more false aliases by 90 VPs



Conclusion and Future Work

- Similar TPR to Midar+iffinder
- Even better TPR for IPv6 than IPv4
- Combines well with existing alias resolution

- Future work
 - More ground truth use hoiho regexes as pseudo-ground truth
 - Improve pruning to decrease false alias pairs

Conclusion and Future Work

- Similar TPR to Midar+iffinder
- Even better TPR for IPv6 than IPv4
- Combines well with existing alias resolution

- Future work
 - More ground truth use hoiho regexes as pseudo-ground truth
 - Improve pruning to decrease false alias pairs