Architectures for the Future Networks and the Next Generation Internet

RAJ JAIN

Washington University in Saint Louis
Saint Louis, MO 63130
Jain@cse.wustl.edu
http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/

Tutorial at Globecom 2009, Hawaii, November 30, 2009

Overview

1. Why Next Gen?
2. Internet 3.0
3. Content Centric Networks
4. Delay/Disruption Tolerant Networks
5. Routing Architectures: Open Flow, ID-Locator Split Proposal
6. Green Networking
7. Next Generation Testbeds
8. Internet for Masses

Future Internet Projects

❑ In 2005 US National Science Foundation started a large research and infrastructure program on next generation Internet

❑ Q: How would you design Internet today? Clean slate design.

❑ "Future Internet Design" (FIND): 48+ projects
  ❑ Stanford, MIT, Berkeley, CMU, …
  ❑ "An Architecture for Diversified Internet" at WUSTL

❑ "Global Environment for Networking Innovations" (GENI): 29+ projects

❑ European Union: 7th Framework program

❑ Japan: AKARI (A small light in the dark pointing to the future)

❑ China, Korea, Australia, …20+ countries

Ref: [PAU09]

Future Internet: Areas of Research

1. **New architectures**
2. Security
3. **Content Delivery Mechanisms**
4. **Delay Tolerant Networking**
5. Management and Control Framework
6. Service Architectures
7. **Routing: New paradigms**
8. **Green Networking**
9. **Testbeds**

Key Problems with Current Internet

1. **Security**:
   Fundamental architecture design issue
   Control+Data are intermixed
   Security is just one of the policies.

2. No concept of **ownership**
   (except at infrastructure level)
   Difficult to represent organizational,
   administrative hierarchies and
   relationships. Perimeter based.

   $\Rightarrow$ Difficult to enforce organizational
   policies

   Trusted
   Un-trusted

   Realms

Problems (cont)

3. Identity and location in one
   (IP Address)
   Makes mobility complex.

4. Assumes live and awake end-systems
   Does not allow communication while
   sleeping.
   Many energy conscious systems today
   sleep.

5. No representation for real end system: the
   human.

Ref: [JAI06]

Names, IDs, Locators

Name: John Smith

ID: 012-34-5678

Locator:
1234 Main Street
Big City, MO 12345
USA

❑ Locator changes as you move, ID and Names remain the same.

❑ **Examples**:
  ➢ Names: Company names, DNS names (Microsoft.com)
  ➢ IDs: Cell phone numbers, 800-numbers, Ethernet addresses, Skype ID, VOIP Phone number
 ➢ Locators: Wired phone numbers, IP addresses

2. Internet 3.0

Overview

❑ Internet 3.0: Next Generation Internet

❑ Internet Generations

❑ Organizational Representation

❑ User- Host- and Data Centric Models

❑ Policy-Based Networking Architecture

❑ Multi-Tier Object-Oriented View

❑ Virtualization

Internet 3.0: Next Generation Internet

❑ Internet 3.0 is the name of the Washington University project on the next generation Internet

❑ Goal 1: Represent the commercial reality of distributed Internet ownership and organization

❑ Goal 2: Develop a *clean slate architecture* to overcome limitations of the current internet

❑ Goal 3: Develop an *incremental approach* to implement the architecture

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY

◈IEEE

Internet Generations

❑ **Internet 1.0** (1969 – 1989) – Research project
  ➢ RFC1 is dated April 1969.
  ➢ ARPA project started a few years earlier
  ➢ IP, TCP, UDP
  ➢ Mostly researchers
  ➢ Industry was busy with proprietary protocols: SNA, DECnet, AppleTalk, XNS

❑ **Internet 2.0** (1989 – Present) – Commerce $\Rightarrow$ new requirements
  ➢ Security RFC1108 in 1989
  ➢ NSFnet became commercial
  ➢ Inter-domain routing: BGP (Policy-based)
  ➢ Address Shortage IPv6
  ➢ Congestion Control, Quality of Service,…

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY

◈IEEE

Realms

- Object names and Ids are defined within a realm
- A realm is a **logical** grouping of objects under an administrative domain
- The Administrative domain may be based on Trust Relationships
- A realm represents an organization
  - Realm managers set policies for communications
  - Realm members can share services.
  - Objects are generally members of multiple realms
- Realm Boundaries: Organizational, Governmental, ISP, P2P,…

Realm = Administrative Group

Organizational Representation

Hosts = User Devices, Carrier equipment

Realm managers:

- Resolve current location for a given host-ID
- Enforce policies related to authentication, authorization, privacy
- Allow mobility, multi-homing, location privacy
- Different from several other ID-locator splitting proposals. Our Emphasis on organizational control.
- Ref: [PAN08]

User- Host- and Data Centric Models

- ❑ All discussion so far assumed host-centric communication
  - ➢ Host mobility and multihoming
  - ➢ Policies, services, and trust are related to hosts
- ❑ User Centric View:
  - ➢ Bob wants to watch a movie
  - ➢ Starts it on his media server
  - ➢ Continues on his iPhone during commute to work
  - ➢ Movie exists on many servers
  - ➢ Bob may get it from different servers at different times or multiple servers at the same time
- ❑ Can we just give IDs/locators to users and treat them as hosts? No! ⇒ Policy Oriented Naming Architecture (PONA)

Policy-Based Networking Architecture

```
   ┌──────────┐        ┌──────────┐
   │ User RM  │◄──────►│ Data RM  │
   └──────────┘        └──────────┘
┌──────┐                            ┌──────┐
│ User │                            │ Data │
└──────┘                            └──────┘
   ┌──────────┐        ┌──────────┐
   │ Host RM  │◄──────►│ Host RM  │
   └──────────┘        └──────────┘
┌──────┐                            ┌──────┐
│ Host │                            │ Host │
└──────┘                            └──────┘
   ┌────────────┐    ┌────────────┐
   │Location RM │◄──►│Location RM │
   └────────────┘    └────────────┘
┌──────────┐                    ┌──────────┐
│ Location │◄──────────────────►│ Location │
└──────────┘                    └──────────┘
         RM = Realm Manager
```

- ❑ Both Users and data need hosts for communication
- ❑ Data is easily replicable/divisible. All copies are equally good.
- ❑ Users, Hosts, Infrastructure, Data belong to different realms (organizations).
- ❑ Each object has to follow its organizational policies.

Multi-Tier Object-Oriented View

| User 1 | ●●● | User n | | Data 1 | ●●● | Data n |

Requirements
Services

| Host 1 | ●●● | Host n |

| Infrastructure 1 | ●●● | Infrastructure n |

❑ Objects provide services. Higher tiers specify the requirements
❑ Tier service broker (shown by dotted line) composes a service
  – can negotiate with multiple realms in that tier
❑ Higher tier may not/need not find details of lower tiers

Allows creating requirement specific networking context

Multi-Tier Issues

| User | ◄------------------► | Data | Data | Data |

| Host | | Host | | Host | | Host |

| IPoA | IPoA | IPoA | IPoA | IPoA | IPoA | IPoA | IPoA |

❑ **Multi-Tier Multi-homing**: Users are accessible via multiple
  hosts. Each host has multiple Infrastructure Point of
  Attachments (IPoAs)
❑ **Multi-Tier Mobility**: Users are constantly changing hosts.
  Hosts are changing their IPoAs.
❑ **Multi-Tier Virtualization**

Virtualizable Network Concept

Ref: T. Anderson, L. Peterson, S. Shenker, J. Turner, "Overcoming the Internet Impasse through Virtualization," Computer, April 2005, pp. 34 – 41.


Virtualization

❑ Allows multiple overlays on a single substrate

❑ Allows nodes to treat an overlay as a native network

❑ Provides isolation ⇒ multiple architectures, Partitioned Control

❑ Allow testing diverse routing protocols and service paradigms

❑ Better architectures will attract more users and become main line

❑ Allows diversified services while utilizing economies of scale in the substrate components

❑ Virtualization over IP networks
   ⇒ Not suitable for experiments at lower layers

Ref: T. Anderson, L. Peterson, S. Shenker, J. Turner, ``Overcoming the Internet Impasse through Virtualization," Computer, Volume 38, Issue 4, pp 34-41, April 2005.

Cloud Computing

User Organization 1 • • • User Organization n Data Organization 1 • • • Data Organization n

Host Provider 1 • • • Host Provider n

Infrastructure 1 Infrastructure 2 • • • Infrastructure n

❑ **Other Examples**:

➢ P2P: File sharing groups over hosts over infrastructure

➢ Distributed Services: Services over multi-homed hosts

➢ National Security: Infrastructure vs. national boundaries

Internet 1.0 vs. Internet 3.0: Design

|	Design Issue	Internet 1.0 Solution	Internet 3.0 Solution
1	Resource allocation	Algorithmic Optimization	Policy based
2	Intelligence	Manual/applications	In the network
3	Connections	Host-Host	User-Data (Hosts are intermediate systems)
4.	Ownership	Single=> Single Tier	Commercial Reality => Multi-Tier
5	Information	Complete knowledge of all tiers	Only service API's are disclosed
6	Mobility	Host mobility	Multi-tier mobility (User/data/host)
7	Multi-homing	Host multihoming	Multi-tier multihoming (User/Data/Host)
8	Virtualization	Network virtualization	Multi-Tier virtualization

3. Content Centric Networks

- ❑ Content-Centric Networks
- ❑ CCN Packets
- ❑ CCN Capable Routers Operation
- ❑ CCN Security

Content-Centric Networks

- ❑ IP cares about "**Where**": forward packets from A to B
- ❑ Users care about "**What**": Movie X
- ❑ Replace "packets" with "Data Objects" or "Interests" (requests)
- ❑ Replace "Addresses" with "Names of Objects"

[JAC09]

Ref: [JAC09] V. Jacobson, et al, "Networking Named Content," to appear in CoNEXT 2009, December 2009

CCN Packets

❑ Interest Packets: Request for Data

❑ Data Packets: Signed Data

❑ Longest prefix match is used as in IP addresses
http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/talks/ftp/in3_video matches
http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/talks/ftp/in3_video/V00/S00

Interest packet	Data packet
Content Name	Content Name
Selector (order preference, publisher filter, scope, ...)	Signature (digest algorithm, witness, ...)
Nonce	Signed Info (publisher ID, key locator, stale time, ...)
	Data

[JAC09]

CCN Capable Routers Operation

❑ **Content Store**: Local cache of data

❑ **Pending Interest Table (PIT):** Recent requests forwarded

❑ **Forwarding Information Base (FIB):** Known data locations

❑ **Faces**: Requesting processes and hardware interfaces

[JAC09]

Routers Operation (Cont)

❑ Applications send "Interest" in data X

❑ Router looks up in local store and sends if found

❑ Router looks up in PIT, if entry already exists (someone requested it recently) , adds the interest, face to the same entry

❑ Router looks up in FIB, if entry exists (data location is known), a PIT entry is made and the interest is multicasted to all faces in the FIB entry and the FIB entry is removed

❑ If there is no FIB entry, interest is discarded (router does not know how to get the data)

❑ When data arrives, Content Store match $\Rightarrow$ duplicate, discard
PIT match $\Rightarrow$ Forward to all faces
FIB match $\Rightarrow$ No PIT $\Rightarrow$ Unsolicited $\Rightarrow$ Discard

❑ Data providers register their data $\Rightarrow$ Creates FIB entries

CCN Security

❑ Data-Centric Security $\Rightarrow$ Protections travel with the data

❑ All data is signed

❑ Data can be replicated or moved

❑ All data is versioned and is immutable once in the system

❑ IP and CCN routers can coexist. Public domain code available.

4. Delay/Disruption Tolerant Networks

- Delay/Disruption Tolerant Net (DTN)
- Bundle Protocol
- Bundle Delivery Options
- DTN Security
- Known Issues with Bundle Protocol
- Licklider Transmission Protocol (LTP)

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY

◈IEEE

Delay/Disruption Tolerant Net (DTN)

- Intermittent Connectivity
- Long or variable delay
- Asymmetric data rates
- High Error Rates

Node →[Store] Forward→ Node →[Store] Forward→ Node →[Store] Forward→ Node [Store]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY

◈IEEE

Bundle Protocol

❑ End-to-end protocol for DTNs

❑ Runs between application and transport

❑ Ties together heterogeneous regions

❑ Bundles can be fragmented or reassembled on the way

DTN Host	Normal Router	DTN Router/Gateway		DTN Host
Application		Bundle		Application
Bundle				Bundle
Transport		Transport	Transport	Transport
Network	Network	Network	Network	Network
Datalink	Datalink	Datalink	Datalink	Datalink
Physical	Physical	Physical	Physical	Physical

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈IEEE

Bundle Protocol (Cont)

❑ Three Types of DTN Nodes: Hosts, Routers, Gateways (Convergence layer adapter)

❑ Custody transfer of bundles

❑ A node releases storage when someone else accepts custody

❑ End-to-End reliability can be achieved by requesting return receipt

❑ IPv6-like extension headers are used in bundle

Ref: [RFC4838, RFC 5050]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈IEEE

Bundle Delivery Options

1. Custody transfer requested
2. Source custody acceptance required
3. Report on bundle delivery
4. Ack by application requested
5. Report on bundle reception
6. Report on custody acceptance
7. Report on bundle forwarding
8. Reporting on bundle deletion
- Priority of Delivery: Bulk, normal, exped.
- Security: Confidentiality, Authentication, error detection
- Notifications can be to another reply-to-entity

1.

3,5,6.

4.

7.

DTN Security

- All nodes including hosts, routers, gateways are authenticated
- Sender information is authenticated for forwarding nodes
- Users and nodes have certificates and public/private keys
- Each forwarding node only verifies the identity of the previous forwarding node

Source A	Bundle →	Router or Gateway B	Bundle →	Router or Gateway C	Bundle →	Desti-nation
	A's Sign →		A's Sign →		A's Sign →	
			B's Sign →		C's Sign →	

Known Issues with Bundle Protocol

- Specification in Development. Not yet defined:
- Operations for forming bundle protocol addresses
- Means for key exchange and security associations
- QoS mechanisms
- How to bind IDs to addresses
- Multiple different convergence layers
  ⇒ Multiple naming schemes ⇒ How to map?
- How to exchange routing information among regions?

Ref: L. Wood, W. Eddy, P. Holliday, ``A Bundle of Problems,'' IEEE Aerospace conference, Big Sky, Montana, March 2009.

Licklider Transmission Protocol (LTP)

- Named after ARPA/Internet pioneer JCR Licklider
- Reliable transmission over long-delay frequent-interruptions links
- Interplanetary space: RTT between Earth and Europa (Jupiter's moon) is 66-100 minutes
- Communication possible only when in line-of-sight
  ⇒ Scheduled interruptions
- A reliable convergence layer over single-hop deep-space radio frequency links
- ARQ by soliciting Selective Acks
- Long delays ⇒ No negotiations or handshakes
- LTP connections are uni-directional (TCP is bi-directional)
  ⇒ Acks can't be piggybacked

LTP (Cont)

❑ RTT can vary significantly from segment to segment
  ⇒ No statistical averaging as in TCP

❑ Each Data=Red (acked and retransmitted)+Green(attempted but not assured)

❑ By varying red and green parts ⇒ LTP=TCP or LTP=UDP

❑ Red part is not higher priority. It needs reliability.

❑ No out-of-order caching

❑ Deterministic timers are used for retransmissions

❑ Checkpoint segments are sent to cause reception reports

❑ Session cancellation segment is queued to close a session

❑ Reciver closes the connection.
Refs: [RFC 5325, RFC 5326, RFC 5327]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY　◈IEEE

Overview

5. Routing Architectures

❑ OpenFlow

❑ ID-Locator Split

  ➢ Host Identity Protocol: HIP

  ➢ ID Locator Split via Core-Edge Separation

  ➢ LISP Protocol Details

  ➢ MILSA

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY　◈IEEE

OpenFlow

□ Allows researchers to run experimental protocols on production networks

□ Each router has a flow forwarding table

□ Forwarding table is prepared by a central controller

□ Vendors do not need to expose internal workings of their switches

□ No need to program switches. Just program the central controller.

Scope of OpenFlow Switch Specification

OpenFlow Switch

sw Secure Channel

hw Flow Table

OpenFlow Protocol SSL

Controller

PC

[MCK08]

Ref: [MCK08] ``OpenFlow: Enabling Innovation in Campus Networks,'' OpenFlow Whitepaper, March 2008

OpenFlow (Cont)

□ Three Components:
  ➢ Flow table: How to identify and process a flow
  ➢ Secure Channel: Between controller and the switch
  ➢ Open Flow Protocol: Standard way for a controller to communicate with a switch

□ Flow=TCP Connection, Same Source MAC,

□ Actions: Forward, encapsulate and forward, drop

□ Flow Table has 3 fields: Flow definition, action, statistics (# of packets and bytes)

□ Flow table for first generation switches:

In Port	VLAN ID	Ethernet			IP			TCP	
		SA	DA	Type	SA	DA	Proto	Src	Dst

OpenFlow (Cont)

- ❑ TCAMs are used to match the fields
- ❑ Controller forwards the packets correctly as the mobile clients move
- ❑ Can handle non-IP networks
- ❑ OpenFlow Consortium develops OpenFlow Switch Specification.
- ❑ Reference designs for Linux, Access points (OpenWRT), and NetFPGA (hardware)

Ref: [MCK08], OpenFlowSwitch.org

ID-Locator Split

FQDN→ID

3 and 4.
Host A gets host B's ID resolved to host B's locator through ID-locator mapping system

RANGI host

Legacy host

1 and 2
Host A obtains the identifier of host B from DNS.

DNS

ID->Locator

ILM

Transport
Host ID
Locator
Link

Transport
Host ID
Locator
Link

Transport
Host ID
Locator
Link

Host A

Host B

6. Routing based on locator

5. Host A sends packets to B .

ID-Locator Split (Cont)

- ❑ Allows hosts to move
- ❑ Allows entire organizations to move
  Allows organizations to change providers
- ❑ No need to use "Provider Independent (PI)" addresses
- ❑ Provider Aggregatable (PA) addresses are preferred since they result in shorter BGP tables
  $\Rightarrow$ Scalable
- ❑ Several proposals for host-based ID-locator split:
  HIP, Shim6, I3, and HI3
- ❑ All hosts have ID and global locators
- ❑ Allow mobility, multihoming, renumbering

HIP

- ❑ Host Identity Protocol
- ❑ 128-bit Host ID tag (HIT)
- ❑ TCP is bound to HIT. HIT is bound to IP address in the kernel
- ❑ Uses flat cryptographic based identifier
- ❑ Two Methods:
  - ➢ Locator registered using Update packets to DNS
    $\Rightarrow$ Does not allow fast mobility
  - ➢ Use rendezvous servers
    $\Rightarrow$ Does not adhere to organizational boundary
- ❑ Requires changes to end hosts

Ref: R. Moskowitz, P. Nikander and P. Jokela, ``Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Architecture,'' IETF RFC4423, May 2006.

ID Locator Split via Core-Edge Separation

❑ Edge routing is based on ID.
  Core routing based on global locators
❑ Requires no changes to end hosts.
  Preferred solution for router vendors.
❑ Proposals: LISP, IVIP, DYNA, SIX/ONE, APT, TRRP
❑ LISP: Locator-ID Separation Protocol
❑ Uses IP-in-IP tunneling
❑ Edge routers translate IDs to routing locators and encapsulate
❑ No changes to core routers
❑ No centralized ID to locator mapping databases
❑ No support for host mobility, multihoming, traffic engineering

Refs: LIT09, MEY07, RRG08]

Locators	EID	IP Data

LISP Protocol Details

11.0.0.1 → 12.0.0.2
1.0.0.1 → 2.0.0.2

11.0.0.1 → 12.0.0.2
1.0.0.1 → 2.0.0.2

Core

Provider C
12.0.0.0/8

Provider A
10.0.0.0/8

Provider B
11.0.0.0/8

Provider D
13.0.0.0/8

10.0.0.1

Edge

A

Edge

B

12.0.0.2

13.0.0.2

11.0.0.1

1.0.0.1 → 2.0.0.2

1.0.0.1 → 2.0.0.2

EIDs: Green
Locators: Red

DNS: B→2.0.0.2

Mapping Entry:

EID-Prefix: 2.0.0.0/8
Locator Set:
12.0.0.2, priority 1, weight 50
13.0.0.2, priority 1, weight 50

Ref: *www.nanog.org/meetings/nanog41/presentations/*
***lisp**-nanog-abq.pdf*

MILSA

- Mobility and Multihoming Supporting ID-Locator Split Architecture
- New layer 3.5
- Distributed ID-locator mapping service
- New IDs = Secure Flat+Hierarchical
  $\Rightarrow$ No PI addresses in the global routing
- Proxy edge routers can translate IDs to locators
  $\Rightarrow$ Allows both router based and host based transition
- Incremental deployment

Refs: [PAN08, PAN09]

---

6. Green Networking

Overview

- Information and Communication Technology: Energy Stats
- Effect of Networking
- Network Component Design
- Performance and Sleep States
- Rate Adaptation
- Wireless Mobile Networking

Info and Comm Technology Energy Stats

1. ICT produces 2-3% of GHG mostly through consumption of electricity produced by coal powered generator
2. ICT emissions equal to entire aviation industry
3. ICT emissions are doubling every 4 years $\Rightarrow$ fastest sector
4. One small computer server = one SUV with 15 miles/gallon
5. Energy is 2nd highest data center costs (10% rising to 50%)
6. Cooling accounts for 20-50% of the total power consumption
7. Idle servers consume 50 to 80% of power at maximum load

❑Ref: An inefficient truth, http://www.globalactionplan.org.uk
❑Ref: HTTP://UCLUE.OM/INDEX.PHP?XQ=724
❑Ref: http://www.ee.unimelb.edu.au/people/rst/talks/files/Tucker_Green_Plenary.pdf
❑Ref: http://www.nanog.org/mtg-0802/levy.html
❑Ref: Http://esdc.pnl.gov/

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈IEEE

Effect of Networking

❑ Networking devices account for about 15% of a data center's total energy consumption
❑ Future Broadband Internet is expected to consume 5% of all electricity
❑ Networking uses 8W/port, 3 ports/server
  $\Rightarrow$ 75% servers, 15% storage, 10% network [EPA Aug 2007]

Printers (5%)
LAN and Office Telecoms (7%)
Mobile Telecoms (9%)
Fixed-Line Telecoms (15%)
PC and Monitors (41%)
Servers (23%)

Ref: N. Chilamkurti, et al, "Green Networking for Major Components of Information Communication Technology Systems," 25th September 2009, EURASIP Journal of Wireless Communications and Networks

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈IEEE

Networks: Green Enabler

- Use to reduce travel, Video Conference, Web meetings
- Allow remote working
  ⇒ Reduce desks, office space, commuting
- Use for remote sensing and energy control
- SOAK: Smart Operational Agriculture tool Kit
  ⇒ Weather forecast and sensors
  (ground moisture/temperature/wind/rainfall) to control
  irrigation)
- Distance learning courses rather than telecommuting

ICT's Enabling Effect

- ICT can help reduce 5 times its own footprint

Ref: SMART2020, "Enabling the low carbon economy in the information age," 2008

Network Component Design

- Energy efficient components
- Efficient power adapters
- Eliminate fans or adjust based on needs
- Auto hibernate unused ports, devices
- Adjust signal strength based on cable length
- Challenge: Power over Ethernet 15.4W/Port 384 port switch $\Rightarrow$ 5.9kW
- Increasing to 56W/Port $\Rightarrow$ Larger battery backup
- Can save 2/3 by turning of VOIP phones 16 hours/day

Performance and Sleep States

- Processors have multiple sleep states
  $\Rightarrow$ Power off different subcomponents
- Sleep states help when equipment is idle
- Disable ports, line cards, and switches when idle
- Ports are awakened when packets arrive
- A centralized power controller monitors the network and controls all ports
- Edge devices transmit packets in bursts
- Dynamically set the forwarding capacity of a port based on load: 1 Gbps, 100 Mbps, 10 Mbps, disabled
  $\Rightarrow$ Energy Efficient Ethernet (IEEE 802.3az standard)

Why Network Devices Cant Sleep?

❑ Broadcast packets: ARP. Continuous Hellos?
❑ 1 to 3 packets per second
❑ DHCP leases expires
❑ A proxy service (running in a middle box firewall, DSL router) can help handle many of these tasks
❑ Broadcast traffic in office:

ARP	NBNS	IPX	NBDGM	LLC	ANS	RPC	BOOTP	NTP	Other
46%	23%	10%	6%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	3%

❑ Multicast traffic in office:

HSRP	SSDP	PIM	IGMP	EIGRP	Other
60%	25%	6%	5%	2%	2%

Ref: S. Nedevschi, et al, "Skilled in the art of being idle: reducing energy waste in networked Systems," NSDI 2009.

Rate Adaptation

❑ Processors have multiple performance States
⇒ Different frequencies
❑ Performance states help when the equipment is active
❑ Adapt rate of individual links by load
❑ 10G devices need more power than 1G than 100M
❑ Lower voltage and lower frequency
⇒ Change speed by queue sizes
❑ Reduce energy consumption by 50%

Component	100Mbps	1GBps
CPU	6W	6W
Interface	2W	12W
Other	9W	9W

Ref: [Ned08]

Ref: W. Feng, IPDPS 2009

Wireless Mobile Networking

- 57% of the operator's electricity use is in radio access
- Base stations use most of the energy during operation
- Subscriber devices use most of the energy in manufacturing

Ref: Tomas Edler, "Green Base Stations – How to Minimize CO2 Emission in Operator Networks," Ericsson, Bath Base Station Conference 2008

Wireless (Cont)

- Exponential Growth in Traffic $\Rightarrow$ Reduce energy per data bit $\Rightarrow$ lower power per cell
- Power consumption is a major issue in emerging markets
- Use renewable energy at base station
- Sleep techniques to allow power to scale with load
- Macro vs. Micro vs. Pico vs. Femto cells
  Energy is proportional to distance
  $\Rightarrow$ operating vs. manufacturing energy tradeoff

7. Next Generation Testbeds

- Past: PlanetLab, Emulab, VINI, OneLab
- Federation
- GENI, Requirements, Subsystems
- GENI Prototype Clusters
- Wireless Network Virtualization
- Supercharged PlanetLab Platform (SPP)
- FIRE, FEDERICA
- AKARI

PlanetLab

- Global networking research testbed
- 1055 nodes at 490 sites [Nov 2009]
- Researchers use it experiment with new ideas on distributed storage, network mapping, peer-to-peer systems, distributed hash tables, and query processing

Ref: http://www.planet-lab.org/

PlanetLab (Cont)

❑ Linux virtual server software on Interned nodes
❑ **Slivers** = Piece of a resource
❑ Node manager (**NM**) manages the node's virtual servers
❑ Planet Lab Control (**PLC**) interacts with NM
❑ Experimenters request a "**Slice**" = slivers in various sites

Emulab

❑ Networking research testbed at University of Utah
❑ Available for public use for research and education
❑ Software implemented at two dozen sites around the world
❑ Allows simulated links and nodes in slices
  ⇒Allows fault studies
❑ Provides repeatability

[emulab.net]

Ref: http://www.emulab.net/

VINI

- Testbed for Routing protocols
- Install User Model Linux (UML) on the slice
- Runs open source router code XORP on UML
- Flows through VINI routers also go over real routers ⇒ Not clean

Refs: [ON405, BAV06]

OneLab

- Federation of European PlanetLabs
- Enhanced monitoring infrastructure
- Wireless Testbeds
- IPv6 multihoming
- Emulation tools
- Deal with unstable connectivity

Ref: OneLab,http://www.onelab.eu

Federation

- Larger testbeds
- Testbeds for specialized resources such as access technologies
- Specialized research communities and cross-discipline
- Challenges:
  - Homogenization of diverse context
  - Interoperability of security protocols
  - Political or social-economic issues
  - Intellectual Property rights
  - Commercial and non-commercial interests

Ref: OneLab2 Whitepaper: ``On Federations…, January 2009,
http://www.onelab.eu/index.php/results/whitepapers/294-whitepaper-1-on-federations.html

---

GENI

- Global Environment for Network Innovations
- Dedicated shared substrate facility for large-scale experiments
- US National Science Foundation project
- Dedicated backbone links through LambdaRail and Internet2
- Diverse and extensible set of technologies

Refs: [GENI01, ON410]

GENI Requirements

- Sliceability: Sharing with isolation.
- Programmability: All components should be programmable
- Virtualization: Slicing via virtualization or space/time sharing.
- Federation: Combination of independently owned testbeds
- Observability: Allow specifiable measurement framework
- Security: Should not harm production Internet

Refs: [AND052, SHA05, CLA05, RAY05, BLU05, BELL05, KAA05]

GENI Subsystems

GENI Subsystems

❑ Component: A device that provides resources that are shared via virtualization.

❑ Aggregate: A set of components under a central control

❑ Clearinghouse: Centralized registry of principles, slices, and components

❑ Control Framework: Access control policies, trust/federation mechanisms

❑ Measurement Subsystem: Archival and retrieval of experimental data

❑ Administration and Operation: Incorporate new resources, identify mis-behaving resources

❑ Experimenter Tools and Services: Resource discovery, reservation, debugging, etc.

GENI Subsystems (Cont)

❑ GENI Generalized Control Framework

❑ Each component has a component manager.

❑ Each aggregate has an aggregate manager.

❑ Slice manager reserves slices for an experiment.

❑ Interfaces and messages between entities are defined.

Ref: GENI-SE-CF-RQ-01.3: GENI Control Framework Requirements, January 9, 2009, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/GeniControlFrameworkRequirements/ 010909b%20%20GENI-SE-CH-RQ-01.3.pdf

GENI Prototype Clusters

Five Clusters in Spiral 1:

1. Trial Integration Environment with DETER (TIAD): Emulab based security experiments testbed
2. PlanetLab: Federate all slice-based substrates PlanetLab, Emulab, VINI, and GENI
3. ProtoGENI: Federation of Emulab testbeds, Enhanced Emulab Control
4. Open Resource Control Architecture (ORCA): Resource manager runs under the host operating system Uses virtualization to allocate containers
5. Open Access Research Testbed (ORBIT): Wireless testbed with emulated and real nodes

Ref: GENI Spiral 1, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/SpiralOne

Wireless Network Virtualization

- Low bandwidth $\Rightarrow$ Can't share a link $\Rightarrow$ Partition the network for isolated experiments
- Coding, multiplexing are node specific
- Slicing via Space Division Multiple Access/FDMA/TDMA/combinations
- Can't overprovision the spectrum
- Nodes of different types cannot substitute (WiFi vs. WiMAX)
- Sharing Techniques: FDMA, TDMA, FDMA+TDMA, Freq Hopping, CDMA
- Slicing Techniques: SDMA, SDMA+TDMA, SDMA+FDMA, SDMA+TDMA+FDMA

Ref: S. Paul, S. Seshan, ``GDD-06-17: Technical Document on Wireless Virtualization,'' GENI Design Document 06-17, September 2006, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-06-17.pdf

Supercharged PlanetLab Platform (SPP)

- Allows multiple virtual routers w different stacks
- Fast path for line speed packet forwarding
- Slow path for application specific processing
- Multiple meta-networks (routers, links) on a substrate
- 3 Components: Line cards, switching fabric, control proc
- Virtualizing line cards is difficult
- Processing Pool Architecture:
  No processing in line cards
  Simply switch to proc engines

Refs: [TUR06, TUR107, TUR207]

Processing Engines

PE$_1$ PE$_2$ … PE$_m$

Switch Fabric

LC$_1$ LC$_2$ … LC$_n$

Line Card

FIRE

- Future Internet Research and Experimentation
- Federate multiple existing testbeds in Europe
  $\Rightarrow$ Provide a large multi-context research testbed

Information Society Technologies

Research Infrastructures

GEANT

EUQOS

RING

ANEMONE

ONELAB

OPENNET

PANLAB

VITAL

FIRE (Cont)

❑ GEANT connects 30 national res and education nets (NRENs)
  ➢ Onelab2: Develop economic incentive models for sharing
  ➢ Panlab II (PII): Pan European Laboratory –
    A consortium of telecom providers.
    Federate test labs and testbeds for large scale experiments
  ➢ VITAL++: P2P technology
  ➢ WISEBED: Wireless Sensor Networks Testbed
❑ Implements IPv6, IP with QoS, Multicasting, Prioritized IP
❑ Production network like NSFNet, LambdaRail, Internet3

Refs:[ON411, ON426, ONE09, ON427, ON404, ON428, ON429, ON430, ON431]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◆IEEE

FEDERICA

FEDERICA	VITAL++	WISEBED	Testbed
	PII		...
	ONELAB2		Testbed

❑ Goal: Test new paradigms at large scale
❑ End-to-end slice via virtualization like GENI
❑ Substrate is agnostic about protocol, services and applications
  Similar to Diversified Internet Architecture
❑ 12 PoPs of GEANT2 and NRENs connected via 1 Gbps
❑ 4 core + 8 on-core sites: Core connected via dedicated links
  Non-core connected via GEANT2 or NRENs or Internet
❑ Core allows BGP peering with Internet   **Refs**: [FED01, FED02]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◆IEEE

AKARI

(a) Isolated Virtual Networks

VN₁ VN₂ . . .

Real TestBed Network

(b) Transitive Virtual Networks

VN₁ → VN₂ . . .   Self-evolvable

Real Operational Network

(C) Overlaid Virtual Networks

VN₂

VN₁

Real Operational Network

❑ Use virtualization

❑ Isolated/transitive/overlaid virtual networks

Refs: [ON408, HAR08]

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈ IEEE

---

8. Internet for Masses

❑ Make it easy for naive users

❑ Function in infrastructure poor environments

❑ Intermittent power

❑ Device sharing

❑ Allow sneaker nets

❑ Long distance wireless CDMA450

Ref: E. Brewer, M. Demmer, B. Du, et al, "The Case for Technology in Developing Regions," June 2005

IEEE COMMUNICATIONS SOCIETY ◈ IEEE

Summary

1. NSF FIND program has funded a number of architectural component research programs.
2. GENI testbed consists of 5 clusters in Spiral 1
3. FIRE in Europe and AKARI in Japan are similar to GENI.
4. Internet 3.0 is an industry sponsored full architecture program

Top 10 Features of Next Generation Internet

1. Security
2. Mobility
3. User/Data-Centric: Network support of data objects
4. Easy to use: Self-organizing, better user control
5. Disruption Tolerant
6. Green: Proxy, Sleep Modes,
7. Services: Storage, Translation, Monitoring
8. Organizational Representation
9. Virtualizable to create Application Specific Context
10. Policy Enforcement

List of Abbreviations

4D	Data, Discovery, Dissemination and Decision
AKARI	"a small light in the dark pointing to the future" in Japanese
ANA	Autonomic Network Architecture
AS	Autonomous System
ASRG	Anti-Spam Research Group (of IRTF)
BGP	Border Gateway protocol
CABO	Concurrent Architectures are Better than One
CCN	Content Centric Networking
CDN	Content Distribution Network
CONMan	Complexity Oblivious Network Management
CTS	Clear-to-Send
DAN	Disaster day After Networks
DFT	Delay/Fault Tolerant
DNS	Domain Name System
DONA	Data Oriented Network Architecture
DTN	Delay/Disruption Tolerant Network
FEDERICA	Federated E-infrastructure Dedicated to European Researchers Innovating in Computing network Architectures
FIND	Future Internet Design
FIRE	Future Internet Research and Experimentation
FP6	6th Framework Program
FP7	7th Framework Program
GENI	Global Environment for Network Innovations
GROH	Greedy Routing on Hidden Metrics
HIP	Host Identity Protocol
HLP	Hybrid Link State Path-Vector Inter-Domain Routing
ID	Identifier
IIAS	Internet in a slice
INM	In-Network Management
IP	Internet Protocol
IRTF	Internet Research Task Force
ISP	Internet Service Provider
LISP	Locator ID Separation Protocol
MILSA	Mobility and Multihoming supporting Identifier Locator Split Architecture
NGI	Next Generation Internet
NGN	Next Generation Network
NSF	National Science Foundation
OMF	ORBIT cOntrol and Management Framework
ORBIT	Open-access Research Testbed
ORCA	Open Resource Control Architecture
PANLAB	Pan European Laboratory
PI	ProviderIndependent
PIP	Phoenix Interconnectivity Protocol
PLC	PlanetLab Control
PONA	Policy Oriented Networking Architecture
PTP	Phoenix Transport Protocol
RANGI	Routing Architecture for Next Generation

	Internet
RCP	Routing Control Platform
RTS	Ready-to-Send
SANE	Security Architecture for Networked Enterprises
SCN	Selectively Connected Networking
SLA	Service Level Agreement
SLA@SOI	Service Economy with SLA-aware Infrastructures
SMTP	Simple Mail Transfer Prototocol
SOA	Service Oriented Architecture
SOA4ALL	Service Oriented Architectures for All
SPP	Supercharged PlanetLab Platform
TIED	Trial Integration Environment with
UML	User Mode Linux
WISEBED	Wireless Sensor Network Testbeds

Future Networks and Next Generation Internet: References

- Survey Papers
- Organizations
- Project Web Pages
- Papers

Note: A periodically updated version of this list is kept on-line at http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/refs/ngi_refs.htm
Back to Raj Jain's Home Page

Survey Papers

- [PAU09] S. Paul, J. Pan, R. Jain, "Architectures for the Future Networks and the Next Generation Internet: A Survey," Washington University in Saint Louis, technical report 2009-69, October 2, 2009, 59 pp., http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/papers/i3survey.htm

Organizations

- [ON400] NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/
- [ON410] GENI: Global Environment for Network Innovations, http://www.geni.net
- [ON411] FIRE: Future Internet Research and Experimentation, http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/fire/
- [ON412] National LambdaRail, http://www.nlr.net/
- [ON413] Internet 2, http://www.Internet2.edu/

Projects Web Pages

- [ON401] University of Utah, the Emulab Project, 2002, http://www.emulab.net
- [ON402] University of Wisconsin. The Wisconsin Advanced Internet Laboratory, 2007, http://wail.cs.wisc.edu
- [ON403] PlanetLab,http://www.planet-lab.org
- [ON404] OneLab,http://www.onelab.eu
- [ON405] VINI, http://www.vini-veritas.net/?q=node/34
- [ON406] User Mode Linux, http://user-mode-linux.sourceforge.net
- [ON407] XORP: eXtensible Open Router Platform, http://www.xorp.org
- [ON408] AKARI Project, http://akari-project.nict.go.jp/eng/index2.htm
- [ON409] OpenFlow Project, http://www.openflowswitch.org/
- [ON414] GENI Spiral 1, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/SpiralOne
- [ON415] DETERlab Testbed, http://www.isi.edu/deter
- [ON416] TIED: Trial Integration Environment in DETER, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/TIED
- [ON417] DRAGON: Dynamic Resource Allocation via GMPLS Optical Networks, http://dragon.maxgigapop.net/twiki/bin/view/DRAGON/WebHome
- [ON418] ProtoGENI, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/ProtoGENI

- [ON419] ProtoGENI ClearingHouse, http://www.protogeni.net/trac/protogeni/wiki/ClearingHouseDesc
- [ON420] ORCA, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/ORCABEN
- [ON421] BEN: Breakable Experimental Network, https://geni-orca.renci.org/trac
- [ON422] ORBIT, http://groups.geni.net/geni/wiki/ORBIT
- [ON423] ORBIT-Lab, http://www.orbit-lab.org
- [ON424] OMF: cOntrol and Management Framework, http://omf.mytestbed.net
- [ON425] Milestone ORBIT: 1a Extend OMF to support multiple heterogeneous testbeds,\\ http://groups.geni.net/geni/milestone/ORBIT\%3A\%201a\%20Extend\%20OMF\%20to\%20support\%20multiple\%20heterogeneous\%20testbeds
- [ON426] GEANT, http://www.geant.net
- [ON427] FP6 Research Networking Testbeds, http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/fire/fp6-testbeds/_en.html
- [ON428] Panlab, http://www.panlab.net
- [ON429] Vital++, http://www.ict-vitalpp.upatras.gr
- [ON430] WISEBED: Wireless Sensor Network Testbeds, http://www.wisebed.eu
- [ON431] FEDERICA, http://www.fp7-federica.eu
- [ON432] GEANT2, http://www.geant2.net
- [ON433] ProtoGeni ClearingHouse, http://www.protogeni.net/trac/protogeni/attachment/wiki/ClearingHouseDesc/clearinghouse.png?format=raw
- [ON601] CacheLogic, Home Page: Advanced Solutions for P2P Networks Home Page, http://www.cachelogic.com
- [ON602] AKAMAI, AKAMAI to enable Web for DVD and HD video, August 31, 2007, http://www.akamai.com/dl/akamai/Akam_in_Online_Reporter.pdf
- [ON603] Napster Home Web Page, http://www.napster.com
- [ON604] Annual Global IP Traffic Will Exceed Two-Third of a Zettabyte in 4 Years, Jun 09, 2009, http://www.circleid.com/posts/global_ip_traffic_exceed_two_third_zettabyte_4_years.
- [ON605] BitTorrent, www.bittorrent.com
- [ON606] P4P working group, http://www.openp4p.net
- [ON607] P2PNext Project, http://www.p2p-next.org
- [ON608] KaZaa, KaZaa, http://www.kazaa.com
- [ON609] Gnutella, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gnutella
- [ON701] InterPlaNetary Internet Project, Internet Society IPN Special Interest Group, http://www.ipnsig.org/home.htm
- [ON702] Delay Tolerant Networking Research group, IRTF, http://irtf.org/charter?gtype=rg\&group=dtnrg
- [ON703] CENS: Center for Embedded Networked Sensing, http://research.cens.ucla.edu
- [ON704] SeNDT: Sensor Networking with Delay Tolerance, http://down.dsg.cs.tcd.ie/sendt
- [ON705] DTN/SN Project, Swedish Institute of Computer Science, http://www.sics.se/nes/Projects/DTNSN.html
- [ON801] The 4D Project: Clean Slate Architectures for Network Management, url{http://www.cs.cmu.edu/\~{}4D/}
- [ON802] IBM Corporation, Autonomic computing - a manifesto, www.research.ibm.com/autonomic, 2001.
- [ON803] Autonomic Network Architecture (ANA) Project, http://www.ana-project.org

Papers

- [AGG08] V. Aggarwal, O. Akonjang, A. Feldmann, ``Improving user and ISP experience through ISP-aided P2P locality,'' Proceedings of INFOCOM Workshops 2008, New York, April 13-18, 2008, pp 1-6.
- [ALL07] M. Allman, V. Paxson, K. Christensen, et al, ``Architectural Support for

Connected End Systems: Enabling an Energy-Efficient Future Internet," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/ArchtSupport.php

- [ALL08] M. Allman, M. Rabinovich, N. Weaver, ``Relationship-Oriented Networking," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Relationship.php
- [AND04] S. Androutsellis-Theotokis, D. Spinellis, ``A survey of peer-to-peer content distribution technologies," ACM Computing Surveys, Vol 36, Issue 4, December 2004.
- [AND051] T. Anderson, L. Peterson, S. Shenker, J. Turner, ``Overcoming the Internet Impasse through Virtualization," Computer, Volume 38, Issue 4, pp 34-41, April 2005.
- [AND052] T. Anderson, L. Peterson, S. Shenker, et al, ``GDD-05-02: Report of NSF Workshop on Overcoming Barriers to Disruptive Innovation in Networking," GENI Design Document 05-02, January 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-05-02.pdf
- [ANT09] Anti-spam techniques wiki webpage, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-spam/techniques
- [ASR09] ASRG: Anti-Spam Research Group, Internet Research Task Force (IRTF) working group, http://asrg.sp.am
- [AVA09] AVANTSSAR: Automated Validation of Trust and Security of Service-oriented Architecture, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.avantssar.eu
- [AWE07] B. Awerbuch, B. Haberman, ``Algorithmic foundations for Internet Architecture: Clean Slate Approach," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Algorithmic.php
- [AWI09] AWISSENET: Ad-hoc personal area network \& WIreless Sensor SEcure NETwork, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.awissenet.eu
- [BAN07] E. Bangeman, ``P2P responsible for as much as 90 percent of all `Net traffic," ars Technical, September 3rd, 2007, \\ http://arstechnica.com/old/content/2007/09/p2p-responsible-for-as-much-as-90-percent-of-all-net-traffic.ars
- [BAV06] A. Bavier, N. Feamster, M. Huang, et al, ``In VINI veritas: realistic and controlled network experimentation," Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2006, Pisa, Italy, September 11-15, 2006, pp 3-14.
- [BELL05] S. M. Bellovin, D. D. Clark, A. Perrig, et al, ``GDD-05-05:Report of NSF Workshop on A Clean-Slate Design for the Next-Generation Secure Internet," GENI Design Document 05-05, July 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/ OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-05-05.pdf
- [BEN06] T. Benzel, R. Braden, D. Kim, et al, ``Experience with DETER: A Testbed for Security Research, Proceedings of Tridentcom," International Conference on Testbeds and Research Infrastructures for the Development of Networks \& Communities, Barcelona, Spain, March 1-3, 2006.
- [BLU05] D. J. Blumenthal, J. E. Bowers, C. Partridge, ``GDD-05-03: Report of NSF Workshop on Mapping a Future for Optical Networking and Communications," GENI Design Document 05-03, July 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-05-03.pdf
- [BON07] D. Boneh, D. Mazieres, M. Rosenblum, et al, ``Designing Secure Networks from the Ground-Up," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/DesigningSecure.php
- [BUC08] M. Buchanan, ``10 Percent of Broadband Subscribers Suck up 80 Percent of Bandwidth But P2P No Longer To Blame," Gizmodo, 22 April, http://gizmodo.com/382691/10-percent-of-broadband-subscriber-suck-up-80-percent-of/linebreak-bandwidth-but-p2p-no-longer-to-blame
- [BUR08] S. Burleigh, M. Ramadas, S. Farrell, et al, ``Licklider Transmission Protocol - Motivation," IETF RFC 5325, September 2008.
- [CAE05] M. Caesar, D. Caldwell, N. Feamster, et al., ``Design and implementation of a routing control platform," Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Symposium on Networked Systems Design \& Implementation (NSDI 2005), Berkeley, CA, May 02 - 04, 2005, Volume 2, pp. 15-28.
- [CAN07] R. Canonico, S. D'Antonio, M. Barone, et al, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4B.1 - UMTS Node, September 2007, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/d4b.1.pdf
- [CAN08] R. Canonico, A. Botta, G. Di Stasi, et al, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4B.2 - UMTS Gateway, February 2008, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/d4b.2.pdf
- [CAR08] M. Carbone, L. Rizzo, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4E.3 - Emulation Component, February 2008, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/d4e.3.pdf

- [CER07] V. Cerf, S. Burleigh, A. Hooke, et al, ``Delay-Tolerant Network Architecture,'' IETF RFC 4838, April 2007.
- [CHA07] J. Chase, L. Grit, D. Irwin, et al, ``Beyond Virtual Data Centers: Toward an Open Resource Control Architecture,'' Proceedings of the International Conference on the Virtual Computing Initiative (ICVCI 2007), Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, May 2007.
- [CLA05] K. Claffy, M. Crovella, T. Friedman, et al, ``GDD-06-40: Community-Oriented Network Measurement Infrastructure (CONMI) Workship Report,'' GENI Design Document 06-40, December 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-06-40.pdf
- [COR09] CORDIS website, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/programme/challenge1_en.html
- [DON08] B. Donnet, L. Iannone, O. Bonaventure, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4A.1 - WiMAX component, August 2008, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/onelab14a1.pdf
- [DUD09] D. Dudkowski, M. Brunner, G.Nunzi, et al, ``Architectural Principles and Elements of In-Network Management,'' Mini-conference at IFIP/IEEE Integrated Management symposium, New York, USA, 2009.
- [DYK06] (Book) Jeff Dyke, ``User Mode Linux,'' Prentice Hall, April 2006.
- [ECR07] European Network of Excellence in Cryptology II, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.ecrypt.eu.org
- [EUG07] T. S. Eugene Ng, A. L. Cox, ``Maestro: An Architecture for Network Control Management,'' NSF NeTS-FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Maestro.php
- [FAL03] K. Fall, ``A Delay-Tolerant Network Architecture for Challenged Internets,'' Proceedings of SIGCOMM 2003, Karlsruhe, Germany, Auguest 25-29, 2003, pp 27-34.
- [FAL08] K. Fall, S. Farrell, ``DTN: An Architectural Retrospective,'' IEEE Journal on Select Areas in Communications, Vol 26, No 5, June 2008, pp 828-836.
- [FAR08] S. Farrell, M. Ramadas, S. Burleigh, ``Licklider Transmission Protocol - Security Extensions,'' IETF RFC 5327, September 2008.
- [FAB07] T. Faber, J. Wroclawski, K. Lahey, ``A DETER Federation Architecture,'' Proceedings of the DETER Community Workshop on Cyber Security Experimentation and Test, August 2007.
- [FEA04] N. Feamster, H. Balakrishnan, J. Rexford, et al, ``The Case for Separating Routing from Routers,'' ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Future Directions in Network Architecture (FDNA), Portland, September, 2004, pp 5-12.
- [FEA07] N. Feamster, L. Gao and J. Rexford, ``CABO: Concurrent Architectures are Better Than One,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Cabo.php
- [FED01] P. Szegedi, Deliverable JRA2.1: Architectures for virtual infrastructures,new Internet paradigms and business models, Version 1.6, FEDERICA project, European Union 7th framwork, October, 2008.
- [FED02] Deliverable DSA1.1: FEDERICA Infrastructure, Version 7.0, FEDERICA project, European Union 7th framwork, October 2008.
- [FOL08] C. Foley, S. Balasubramaniam, E. Power, et al, ``A Framework for In-Network Management in Heterogeneous Future Communication Networks,'' Proceedings of the MACE 2008, Samos Island, Greece, September 22-26, 2008, Vol. 5276, pp 14-25.
- [FRA07] P. Francis and J. Lepreau, ``Towards Complexity-Oblivious Network Management,'' NSF NeTS-FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/TowardsComplexity.php
- [FU03] Y. Fu, J. Chase, B. Chun, et al, ``SHARP: an architecture for secure resource peering,'' SIGOPS Operation System Review, Vol 37, Issue 5, pp 133-148, December 2003.
- [GENI01] GENI-SE-SY-RQ-01.9: GENI Systems Requirements, Prepared by GENI Project Office, BBN Technologies, January 16, 2009, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/SysReqDoc/GENI-SE-SY-RQ-02.0.pdf
- [GENI02] GENI-SE-CF-RQ-01.3: GENI Control Framework Requirements, Prepared by GENI Project Office, BBN Technologies, January 9, 2009, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/GeniControlFrameworkRequirements/010909b%20%20GENI-SE-CH-RQ-01.3.pdf

- [GENI03] GENI-FAC-PRO-S1-OV-1.12: GENI Spiral 1 Overview, Prepared by GENI Project Office, BBN Technologies, September 2008, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/SpiralOne/GENIS1Ovrvw092908.pdf
- [GON09] A. G. Prieto, D. Dudkowski, C. Meirosu, et al, ``Decentralized In-Network Management for the Future Internet,'' Proceedings of IEEE ICC'09 International Workshop on the Network of the Future, Dresden, Germany, 2009.
- [GR102] T. Griffin, F.B. Shepherd, G. Wilfong, ``The stable paths problem and interdomain routing,'' IEEE/ACM Transaction on Networking, Vol 10, Issue 1, pp 232-243.
- [GR202] T.G. Griffin, G. Wilfong, ``On the correctness of IBGP configuration,'' ACM SIGCOMM 2002, Pittsburgh, PA, August 19-23, 2002.
- [GRE105] A. Greenberg, G. Hjalmtysson, D. A. Maltz,et al, ``A Clean Slate 4D Approach to Network Control and Management,'' ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, Volume 35, Issue 5, October 2005.
- [GRE205] A. Greenberg, G. Hjalmtysson, D. A. Maltz, et al, ``Refactoring Network Control and Management: A Case for the 4D Architecture,'' CMU CS Technical Report CMU-CS-05-117, September 2005.
- [GUA90] J. Guare, ``Six Degrees of Separation: A Play,'' New York: Vintage Books, 1990, 120 pages.
- [HAR08] Hiroaki Harai, AKARI Architecture Design Project in Japan, August 2008, http://akari-project.nict.go.jp/eng/document/asiafi-seminar-harai-080826.pdf
- [HIP06] R. Moskowitz, P. Nikander and P. Jokela, ``Host Identity Protocol (HIP) Architecture,'' IETF RFC4423, May 2006.
- [HO04] M. Ho, K. Fall, ``Poster: Delay Tolerant Networking for Sensor Networks,'' Proceedings of the First IEEE Conference on Sensor and Ad Hoc Communications and Networks (SECON 2004), October 2004.
- [INT09] INTERSECTION: INfrastructure for heTErogeneous, Resilient, SEcure, Complex, Tightly Inter-Operating Networks, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.intersection-project.eu/
- [IRW06] D. Irwin, J. Chase, L. Grit, et al, ``Sharing Networked Resources with Brokered Leases,'' Proceedings of USENIX Technical Conference, Boston, Massachusetts, June 2006.
- [JAC07] V. Jacobson, ``Content Centric Networking,'' Presentation at DARPA Assurable Global Networking, January 30, 2007.
- [JAC09] V. jacobson, D. Smetters, J. D. Thronton, M. F. Plass, et al, "Networking Named Content," To appear in CoNEXT 2009, December 2009, Rome, Italy, http://www.parc.com/content/attachments/networking-named-content-preprint2.pdf
- [JAI04] S. Jain, K. Fall, R. Patra, ``Routing in Delay Tolerant Network,'' Proceedings of SIGCOMM 2004, Oregon, USA, August 2004.
- [JAI06] R. Jain, ``Internet 3.0: Ten Problems with Current Internet Architecture and Solutions for the Next Generation,'' Proceedings of Military Communications Conference (MILCOM 2006), Washington, DC, October 23-25, 2006
- [KOP07] T. Koponen, M. Chawla, B. chun, et al, ``A data-oriented (and beyond) network architecture,'' ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, Volume 37, Issue 4, pp 181-192, October 2007.
- [KAA05] F. Kaashoek, B. Liskov, D. Andersen, et al, ``GDD-05-06: Report of the NSF Workshop on Research Challenges in Distributed Computer Systems,'' GENI Design Document 05-06, December 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-05-06.pdf
- [KIM08] C. Kim, M. Caesar, J. Rexford, ``Floodless in seattle: a scalable ethernet architecture for large enterprises,'' Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2008 Conference on Data Communication (Seattle, WA, USA), August 17-22, 2008.
- [KRI07] D. Krioukov, K. Claffy, K. Fall, ``Greedy Routing on Hidden Metric Spaces as a Foundation of Scalable Routing Architectures without Topology Updates,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Greedy.php

- [LAB101] C. Labovitz, A. Ahuja, A. Bose, F. Jahanian, ``Delayed Internet routing convergence,'' IEEE/ACM Transaction on Networking Vol 9, Issue 3, pp 293-306, June 2001.
- [LAB299] C. Labovitz, A. Ahuja, F. Jahanian, ``Experimental study of Internet stability and wide-area network failures,'' Proceedings of the International Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing, 1999.
- [LAB399]C. Labovitz, R. Malan, and F. Jahanian, ``Origins of Internet routing instability,'' Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM, New York, NY, March 1999.
- [LAH08] K. Lahey, R. Braden and K. Sklower, ``Experiment Isolation in a Secure Cluster Testbed,'' Proceedings of the CyberSecurity Experimentation and Test (CSET) Workshop, July 2008.
- [LEI08] T. Leighton, ``Improving performance in the Internet,'' ACM Queue, Volume 6, Issue 6, pp 20-29, October 2008.
- [LIS07] D. Farinacci, V. Fuller, et al, ``Internet Draft: Locator/ID Separation Protocol (LISP), draft-farinacci-LISP-03, August 13, 2007.
- [LIT07] T. Li, ``Internet Draft: Design Goals for Scalable Internet Routing,'' IRTF draft-irtf-rrg-design-goals-01 (work in progress), July 2007.
- [LIT09] T. Li, ``Internet Draft: Preliminary Recommendation for a Routing Architecture,'' IRTF draft-irtf-rrg-recommendation-00, February 2009.
- [LUO07] H. Luo, R. Kravets, T. Abdelzaher, ``The-Day-After Networks: A First-Response Edge-Network Architecture for Disaster Relief,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/DayAfterNet.php
- [MAO02] Z. M. Mao, R. Govindan, G. Varghese, R. Katz, ``Route flap damping exacerbates Internet routing convergence,'' Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM, Pittsburgh, PA, August 19-23, 2002.
- [MAS07] D. Massey, L. Wang, B. Zhang, L. Zhang, ``Enabling Future Internet innovations through Transitwire (eFIT),'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/eFIT.php
- [MAS09] MASTER: Managing Assurance, Security and Trust for sERvices, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.master-fp7.eu
- [MAT05] M. Caesar, D. Caldwell, N. Feamster, et al, ``Design and Implementation of a Routing Control Platform,'' Second Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'05), April 2005.
- [MAT07] B. Mathieu, D. Meddour, F. Jan, et al, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4D1 -- OneLab wireless mesh multi-hop network, August 2007, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/d4d.1.pdf
- [MCK08] N. McKeown, T. Anderson, H. Balakrishnan, et al, ``OpenFlow: Enabling Innovation in Campus Networks,'' OpenFlow Whitepaper, March 2008, http://www.openflowswitch.org/documents/openflow-wp-latest.pdf
- [MEY07] D. Meyer, L. Zhang, K.Fall, ``Report from IAB workshop on routing and addressing,'' IETF RFC 4984, September 2007.
- [MIL67] S. Milgram, ``The small world problem,'' Psychology Today, Vol. 1, pp.61--67, 1967.
- [MOB09] MOBIO: Mobile Biometry, Secured and Trusted Access to Mobile Services, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.mobioproject.org
- [NES06] Networked European Software and Services Initiative, a~European Technology Platform~on Software Architectures and Services Infrastructures, http://www.nessi-europe.eu/Nessi/
- [NET08] H. Schulzrinne, S. Seetharaman, V. Hilt, ``NetSerV - Architecture of a Service-Virtualized Internet,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Netserv.php
- [NIK04] P. Nikander, et al, Host Identity Indirection Infrastructure (Hi3), Proceedings of The Second Swedish National Computer Networking Workshop 2004 (SNCNW2004), Karlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden, Nov 23-24, 2004.
- [OLI107] A. de la Oliva, B. Donnet, I. Soto, et al, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4C.1 - Multihoming Architecture Document, February 2007, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables/d4c.1.pdf
- [OLI207] A. de la Oliva, B. Donnet, I. Soto, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D4C.2 - Multihoming Mechanisms Document, August 2007, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Deliverables

/d4c.2.pdf

- [ONE09] OneLab2 Whitepaper: ``On Federations\dots, January 2009,\\ http://www.onelab.eu/index.php/results/whitepapers/294-whitepaper-1-on-federations.html
- [PAN07] P. Antoniadis, T. Friedman, X. Cuvellier, ``Resource Provision and Allocation in Shared Network Testbed Infrastructures," ROADS 2007, Warsaw, Poland, July 11-12, 2007.
- [PAN08] J. Pan, S. Paul, R. Jain, et al, ``MILSA: A Mobility and Multihoming Supporting Identifier Locator Split Architecture for Next Generation Internet," Proceedings of IEEE GLOBECOM 2008, New Orleans, LA, December 2008, http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/papers/milsa.htm
- [PAN09] J. Pan, S. Paul, R. Jain, et al, ``Enhanced MILSA Architecture for Naming, Addressing, Routing and Security Issues in the Next Generation Internet," Proceedings of IEEE ICC 2009, Dresden, Germany, June 2009, http://www.cse.wustl.edu/~jain/papers/emilsa.htm
- [PAU06] S. Paul, S. Seshan, ``GDD-06-17: Technical Document on Wireless Virtualization," GENI Design Document 06-17, September 2006, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-06-17.pdf
- [PAU08] S. Paul, R. Jain, J. Pan, et al, ``A Vision of the Next Generation Internet: A Policy Oriented View," Proceedings of British Computer Society conference on Visions of Computer Science, pp 1-14, September 2008.
- [PET06] L. Peterson, A. Bavier, M. E. Fiuczynski, et al, ``Experiences building planetlab," in Proceedings of the 7th symposium on Operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 2006), pp. 351-366, Berkeley, CA, 2006.
- [PET109] L. Peterson, S. Sevinc, J. Lepreau, et al, ``Slice-Based Facility Architecture, Draft Version 1.04," April 7, 2009, http://svn.planet-lab.org/attachment/wiki/GeniWrapper/sfa.pdf
- [PET209] L. Peterson, S. Sevinc, S. Baker, et al, ``PlanetLab Implementation of the Slice-Based Facility Architecture, Draft Version 0.05," June 23, 2009, http://www.cs.princeton.edu/geniwrapper.pdf
- [PPT401] (Presentation) Panayotis Antoniadis et al., ``The Onlab2 Project and research on federations," Kassel, March 2009, http://www.onelab.eu/images/PDFs/Presentations/onelab_pa_kivs09.pdf
- [RAM07] R. Ramanathan, R. Hansen, P. Basu, et al, ``Prioritized Epidemic Routing for Opportunistic Networks," Proceedings of ACM MobiSys workshop on Mobile Opportunistic Networking (MobiOpp 2007), San Juan, Puerto Rico, USA, June 11, 2007.
- [RAM08] M. Ramadas, S. Burleigh, S. Farrell, ``Licklider Transmission Protocol - Specification," IETF RFC 5326, September 2008.
- [RAY05] D. Raychaudhuri, M. Gerla, ``GDD-05-04: Report of NSF Workshop on New Architectures and Disruptive Technologies for the Future Internet: The Wireless, Mobile and Sensor Network Perspective," GENI Design Document 05-04, August 2005, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-05-04.pdf
- [REK06] Y. Rekhter, T. Li, S. Hares, ``A Border Gateway Protocol 4 (BGP-4)," IETF RFC 4271, January 2006
- [REX02] J. Rexford, J. Wang, Z. Xiao, et al, ``BGP routing stability of popular destinations," Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Internet Measurement, Marseille, France, November 6-8, 2002.
- [REX04] J. Rexford, A. Greenberg, G. Hjalmtysson, et al, ``Network-Wide Decision Making: Toward A Wafer-Thin Control Plane," Proceedings of HotNets III. November, 2004.
- [ROB08] M. Robuck, ``Survey: P2P sucking up 44\% of bandwidth," CED Magazine, 25 June 2008, http://www.cedmagazine.com/P2P-44-percent-bandwidth.aspx
- [SAN08] J. Sanjuas, G. Iannaccone, L. Peluso, et al, European ONELAB project: Deliverable D3A.2 Prototype Passive Monitoring Component, January 2008, http://www.onelab.eu/index.php/results/deliverables/252-d3a2-passive-monitoring-component.html
- [RRG08] Internet Research Task Force Routing Research Group Wiki page, 2008, http://trac.tools.ietf.org/group/irtf/trac/wiki/RoutingResearchGroup
- [SCH07] S. Schwab, B. Wilson, C. Ko, et al, ``SEER: A Security Experimentation EnviRonment for

DETER,'' Proceedings of the DETER Community Workshop on Cyber Security Experimentation and Test, August 2007.

- [SCO07] K. Scott, S. Burleigh, ``Bundle Protocol Specification,'' IETF RFC 5050, November 2007.
- [SER08] T. Wolf, ``Service-Centric End-to-End Abstractions for Network Architecture,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/ServiceCentric.php
- [SES08] S. Seshan, D. Wetherall, T. Kohno, ``Protecting User Privacy in a Network with Ubiquitous Computing Devices,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Protecting.php
- [SHA05] L. Sha, A. Agrawala, T. Abdelzaher, et al ``GDD-06-32: Report of NSF Workshop on Distributed Real-time and Embedded Systems Research in the Context of GENI,'' GENI Design Document 06-32, September 2006, http://groups.geni.net/geni/attachment /wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-06-32.pdf
- [SHE07] N. Shenoy, ``Victor Perotti, Switched Internet Architecture,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/SWA.php
- [SHI07] E. Nordmark, M. Bagnulo, ``Internet Draft: Shim6: level 3 multihoming Shim protocol for IPv6,'' IETF RFC 5533, June, 2009
- [SHI09] SHIELDS: Detecting known security vulnerabilities from within design and development tools, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.shieldsproject.eu
- [SIL08] G. Rouskas, R. Dutta, I. Baldine, et al, ``The SILO Architecture for Services Integration, Control, and Optimization for the Future Internet,'' NSF NeTS-FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Silo.php
- [SLA07] Empowering the Service Economy with SLA-aware Infrastructures, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://sla-at-soi.eu
- [SNO08] A. C. Snoeren, Y. Kohno, S. Savage, et al, ``Enabling Defense and Deterrence through Private Attribution,'' NSF NeTS-FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded /EnablingDefense.php
- [SOA08] Service Oriented Architectures for ALL, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.soa4all.eu
- [STO02] I. Stoica, D. Adkins, et al, ``Internet Indirection Infrastructure,'' Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2002, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA, 2002
- [SUB05] L. Subramanian, M. Caesar, C. T. Ee, et al, ``HLP: a next generation inter-domain routing protocol,'' Proceedings of SIGCOMM 2005, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 22-26, 2005.
- [SWI09] SWIFT: Secure Widespread Identities for Federated Telecommunications, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.ist-swift.org
- [TAS09] TAS3: Trusted Architecture for Securely Shared Services, European Union 7th Framework Program, http://www.tas3.eu
- [TEC09] TECOM: Trusted Embedded Computing, Information Technology for European Advanced (ITEA2) programme, http://www.tecom-itea.org
- [THO05] C. Thompson, ``The BitTorrent Effect,'' WIRED, Issue 13.01, January 2005.
- [TUR06] J. Turner, ``GDD-06-09:A Proposed Architcture for the GENI Backbone Platform,'' Washington University Technical Report WUCSE-2006-14, March 2006, http://groups.geni.net /geni/attachment/wiki/OldGPGDesignDocuments/GDD-06-09.pdf
- [TUR107] J. Turner, P. Crowley, J. DeHart, et al, ``Supercharging PlanetLab - a High Performance, Multi-Application, Overlay Network Platform Multi-Application, Overlay Network Platform,'' Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM, Kyoto, Japan, August 2007.
- [TUR207] J. Turner, P. Crowley, S. Gorinsky, et al, ``An Architecture for a Diversified Internet,'' NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/DiversifiedInternet.php
- [VAR00] K. Varadhan, R. Govindan, D. Estrin, ``Persistent route oscillations in inter-domain routing,'' Computer Networks, Vol 32, Issue 1, pp 1-16, 2000.
- [VEN07] A. Venkataramani and D. Towsley, ``A Swarming Architecture for Internet data transfer,'' NSF NeTS-FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/Swarming.php
- [WAN07] Y. Wang and H. Wu, ``Delay/Fault-Tolerant Mobile Sensor Network (DFT-MSN): A New

Paradigm for Pervasive Information Gathering," IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing, Vol 6, No 9, pp 1021-1034, 2007.

- [WAN08] Y. wang, H. Wu, F. Lin, et al, ``Cross-Layer Protocol Design and Optimization for Delay/Fault-tolerant Mobile Sensor Networks(DFT-MSN's)," IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Communications, Vol 26, No 5, pp 809-819, June 2008.
- [WAT05] J. W. Han, F. D. Jahanian, ``Topology aware overlay networks," Proceeding of IEEE INFOCOM, Vol 4, pp 2554-2565, March 13-17, 2005.
- [WIS08] WISEBED: Grant Agreement, Deliverable D1.1, 2.1 \& 3.1: Design of the Hardware Infrastructure, Architecture of the Software Infrastructure \& Design of Library of Algorithms, Seventh Framework Programme Theme 3, November 30, 2008, http://www.wisebed.eu/images/stories /deliverables/d1.1-d3.1.pdf
- [WOO09] L. Wood, W. Eddy, P. Holliday, ``A Bundle of Problems," IEEE Aerospace conference, Big Sky, Montana, March 2009.
- [XU09] X. Xu, R. Jain, Routing Architecture for the Next Generation Internet (RANGI), Internet draft, March, 2009, http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-xu-rangi-00
- [YAN07] H. Yan, D. A. Maltz, T. S. Eugene Ng, et al, ``Tesseract: A 4D Network Control Plane," Proceedings of USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI '07), April 2007.
- [YAT07] R. Yates, D. Raychaudhuri, S. Paul, et al, ``Postcards from the Edge: A Cache-and-Forward Architecture for the Future Internet," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded /Postcards.php
- [YANG07] X. Yang, ``An Internet Architecture for User-Controlled Routes," NSF NeTS FIND Initiative, http://www.nets-find.net/Funded/InternetArchitecture.php
- [ZHA06] Z. Zhang, ``Routing in Intermittently Connected Mobile Ad Hoc Networks and Delay tolerant Networks: Overview and Challenges," IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2006.
- [ZIE00] J. Zien, ``The Technology Behind Napster," About, 2000, http://Internet.about.com/library /weekly/2000/aa052800b.htm

---

SHARE   Back to Raj Jain's Home Page