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Abstract
The delivery of IP traffic through the internet depends on the complex interactions between thousands of autonomous systems (ASs) that exchange routing information using the Border Gateway Protocol (BGP). This paper investigates topological structure of the internet in terms of customer-provider and peer-peer relationship between AS's, as manifested in BGP routing policies. We describe a technique for inferring as relationships by exploring partial views of the AS graph available from different vantage points. Next we are apply the technique to a collection or ten BGP routing tables to infer the relationship between neighboring ASs .Based on these results, we analyze the hierarchical structure of the Internet and purpose a five-level classification of ASs. Our characterization differs from previous studies by focusing on commercial relationships between ASs rather than simply the connectivity between the nodes.

Keywords:
Computer Networks: Autonomous Systems from the view of multiple vantagepoints

Introduction:
TODAY’s internet is divided into more than 10,000 Autonomous systems (ASs) that interact to coordinate the delivery of IP traffic. An AS typically falls under the administrative control of single institution, such as university, company or internet service provider (ISP). Neighboring ASs use the Border gate way protocol (BGP) to exchange information about how to reach the individual blocks of destination IP address (prefixes).

AS relationships and the associated routing policies have a profound influence on how traffic leaves through the internet. An understanding the structure of the internet in terms of these relationships facilitates a wide range of important applications. For example, consider a content distribution network (CDN) that can place replicas of the web site in data centers hosted by different ASs. The company can identify the best locations for its replicas.

As another example, consider a new regional ISP that want to connect to a small number of upstream providers. An accurate view of the AS topology and the relationships can help the ISP determine which ASs would provide the best connectivity to and from the rest of the internet.

In this work, we propose a technique for combining data from multiple vantage points in the internet to construct a more complete view of the topology and the AS relationships. Each vantage points offer a partial view of the internet topology as viewed from one source node. Due to the presence of complex routing polices, these partial views are not necessarily shortest path trees and may, in fact, include cycles. We generate a directed AS level graph from each vantage point and assign a rank to each AS based on its position. Then, each AS is represented by the vector that contains its rank form each of routing table dumps.

We infer the relationship between two ASs by comparing their vectors. Based on these relationships, we construct a new directed AS graph and examine the AS level hierarchy of the internet. We present a five-level classification of ASs with the top most level that consists of a rich set of peer-peer relationships between 20 so called tire-1 providers.

The work we describe is novel in three ways. First, we analyze AS path seen from multiple locations to from a more complete views of the graph. Second, rather than simply combining the data from the various vantage points, we propose a methodology for exploiting the uniqueness of view to infer the relationships between AS pairs. Third we characterize the hierarchy of Ass based on the
commercial relationships, rather than simply the connectivity of the graph. We evaluate our technique on a collection of ten BGP routing tables and summarize characteristics of the AS relationships.

**Problem formulation:**

In this section, we present a brief overview of how AS relationships affect BGP export policies and formally define the type of relationship (ToR) problem. Then we discuss the practical challenges that arise in solving this problem and validating potential solutions.

A. **Type of Relationship problem:**

The relationships between ASs arise from contracts that define pricing model and the exchange of traffic between domains. ASs typically have a provider-customer or peer-peer relationship.

In a provider-customer relationship, the customer is typically a smaller AS that pays a larger AS for access to the rest of the interne. The provider may in turn be a customer of an even larger AS. In a peer-to-peer relationships of the two peers are typically of comparable size and find it mutually advantageous to exchange traffic between their respective customers. These relationships translate directly into policies for exporting route advertisements via BGP sessions with neighboring Ass.

a. Exporting to a provider: In exchanging routing information with a provider, an AS can export its routes learned from other providers or peers.

b. Exporting to a peer: In exchanging routing information with a peer, an AS can export its routes and routes of the customers, but cannot export routes learned from other providers or peers.

c. Exporting to customers: An AS can export its routes, routes of its customers, but routes learned from other-providers and peer to its customers.

B. **Practical challenges:**

Identifying the commercial relationships between Ass in challenging in practice. First, peer-peer relationships are difficult to classify. A pair may have different relationships for certain blocks of IP address. For example, an AS in Europe may be a customer of an AS in the US for some destinations and a peer for others. Router misconfiguration also causes violations in the export rules. For example, a customer may mistakenly export advertisements learned from one provider to another.

**AS Ranking:**

Our algorithm assigns a rank to each AS for each vantage point. Let X denote the source AS of a particular view of the AS graph and let P(X) denote the set of AS paths seen from X. Since each p ∈ P(X) consists of a sequence of notes starting with X, we construct a directed graph G routed at X from P(X). Let c(Gx) denote the set of all vertices in Gx and let levels (Gx) ∈ v(Gx) denote the leaves of the graph. We assign a ranking rank(u) to each vertex u ∈ v(Gx) by applying the reverse pruning algorithm in figure 1. At each edge the algorithm identifies the leaf node, assigns them a rank and remove these nodes (and their incident edges) from the graph. In the end of the remaining nodes (if any) form the connected component of the original graph G; these nodes are assigned the same (highest) rank.

\[
\begin{align*}
G &= G_x; \\
r &= 1; \\
\text{while} \ (\text{leaves}(G) = \emptyset) \ 
\{ \\
\quad \text{for all } u \in \text{leaves}(G) \\
\quad \quad \text{rank}(u) = r; \\
\quad \quad v = v(G) - \text{leaves}(G); \\
\quad \quad r = r + 1; \\
\quad G = G_v; \\
\} \\
\text{for all } u \in v(G) \\
\quad \text{set rank}(u) = r;
\end{align*}
\]

Fig1: Reverse pruning algorithm on Graph Gx

**Multiple vantage points:**

If we continuing the pruning in figure 2(a) the eventual leaf C will be inferred as a customer of D, even
though the two ASs have a peer-peer relationship. Identifying the boundary points the uphill and downhill portions of the path is tricky. The structure of partial view of the AS graph depends on the position of the AS in the internet hierarchy. In the figure 3, the boundary is between C and D (peer-peer relationship) not at E as suggested by this partial view in the figure 2(a). Now consider the view from AS B in figure 2(b). This view confirms that A is a customer of D and F is a customer of E, however, the graph contradicts the previous view in that d is a customer of C. Clearly D and C cannot be customers of each other. This contradiction suggests that the two ASs may have a peer-peer relationship.

Inference rules of the ToR problem:

1. Inferring peer-peer relationships:

We use equivalence rule below to identify the peer-peer edges that are visible from many views. An AS relationship may not be visible from same partial views because some ASs may assign to low preference to path that traverse in this edge. We use the probabilistic equivalence rule to find peering edges where the relationship between two ASs is not visible from many partial views.

- Equivalence two ASs i and j are said to be equivalent if e(i,j) > N/2. This rule considers two ASs that have the same rank in more than half the vantage points. In these ASs share an edge, they are likely to be peers.

- Probabilistic equivalence two ASs are probably close to 1. We use this rule to infer peering relationships between ASs when visibility is poor across the partial views.

2. Inferring provider-customer relationships:

We use the dominance rule to determine if an edge between two ASs is a provider customer relationship because one AS tends to have a higher rank than the other in many of the partial views. Typically, in the graphs from the vantage point of J or its customers, it is the probable that rank (j) > rank (i) even if is a provider of j. To avoid an incorrect inference in such cases, we use the probabilistic dominance rule.

- Dominance an AS i is said to be dominate AS j if 1(j,j) >= N/2 and 1(j,i)=0. If dominates j, then we can infer that i is the provider of j, if the two ASs share an edge.

- Probabilistic dominance If for the high value of then i probably dominates j, and thus i is a provider of j. δ₀ should be greater than δ₁. We use the value of 3 for δ₀ in our experiments.

The orthogonal equivalence and the dominance rules infer peer-peer and provider customer relationships with a high degree of confidence. We apply those rules first in our inference algorithm, followed by the two probabilistic rules. Those AS relationships which are not infer using these have the values of max(1(j,i)), 1(i,j) δ₁ between δ₀.
Experimental Results:

This section evaluates our inference techniques on a collection to ten publicly available BGP Routing tables. We classify our relationships between ASs and identify a small number of AS paths that of inconsistent with a relationship agreement. The most common anomalies seem to stem from recent acquisitions and mergers, suggest that some AS pairs have a sibling relationship.

Internet hierarchy:

In addition to relationship between AS pairs it is useful to identify the position of each AS in the internet hierarchy. Previous work has classified ASs based on the node degree: ASs with a large number of neighbors are placed above ASs with small node degree. However, a simple degree based approach may not capture the essence of the tiers in the hierarchy. Instead, we classify ASs based on the commercial relationships. Typically, a customer should be at a low level in the hierarchy than provider(s) we represent the AS topology as directed graph, where the direction of an edge indicates the type of relationship between two ASs. In our graph a provider-customer relationship between A and B is represented by a directed edge from A to B and a peering relationship between A and B is represented by two directed edges, one from A to B and other from B to A. In such a graph representation has also been independently proposed. An important difference between our approaches is the procedure used for determining the internet hierarchy. The work in maps the internet topology in to a strict hierarchy based on provider-customer edges while our classification also uses the distribution of peering links as identify the top levels of the hierarchy.

1. Customer and small regional ISPs

Customers are the easiest class of ASs that can be classified from these directed graph structure of AS topology. Customers are those sub networks which are origin and sinks of traffic and which do not carry any transit traffic. From the very definition of the direction of the edges in our graph we can infer the customer ASs to be the leaves of the directed graph. In a directed graph, a leaf is a node with out-degree 0. Since undirected graph makes no distinction between out-degree and in-degree, customers with multiple providers would have a degree more than 1 and hence would not appear as leaves of the graph.

Modeling the topology as a directed graph provides a more precise characterization of the bottom-most level in the AS hierarchy, in the directed graph constructed from the BGP dumps, 8898 of the 10915 ASs are leaf nodes. The rest of the graph contains just 18.5% of the ASs.

2. Dense core:

i. Identifying the dense core:

First we order vertices based on “greedy” notation on connectivity, following the heuristic in figure 4. Let G represents the directed graph representation of the core let p(G) and E(G) represents the vertices and the edges of the graph G. Let d(x,y) for x ∈ v(G) denote the number of the edges of the form(x,y) where z ∈ Y. Connectivity from a node to a given set of nodes refer to the number of directed edges from the node to any of the nodes in the set. Assume that k of the N nodes are already ordered, for each of the remaining N-k nodes, we determine the connectivity to the k node and the pick the node with maximum connectivity as the(k+1). When multiple nodes have the same connectivity, with higher outer degree. In figure 4, pos(x) denotes the position of the node X in the final ordering.

```
compute z ∈ v(G) with maximum out-degree;
X = {z};
pos(z) = 1; r = 1;
while (X = v(G)) {
    compute y ∈ v(G) − X with max
    d(y, X)
    (selecting the y with the max
    out-degree)
    X = X ∪ {y};
    maxindegree(r) = d(y, X);
    r = r + 1;
pos(y) = r;
}
```

Fig 4
ii). Transit core:

After removing the dense core, we notice the presence of other large national providers and hosting companies that have peering relationships with many of the ASs in the dense core. To identify these ASs, we define the notation of a transit core. Nodes in the transit core peer with each other and with ASs in the dense core, but they do not tend to peer with many out ASs. In our directed graph representation, these peering links are essentially the incoming directed edges from vertices outside this set to vertices within the set. We define such a set of edges to be in-way cutoff graph indicated by the given set of vertices. Using the property, we define the transit core as a smallest set of ASs containing the dense core which indicates a weak in-way cut. That is one having small number of edges compared to the total number of ASs in the transit core.

1. Identifying the transit core: given $X \subseteq v(G)$, let $\text{cut}_{\text{in}}(X)$ denote the set of all edges of the form $(y,z)$. We define a cut $X$ of the vertex set $v(G)$ to be a weak cut in $|\text{cut}_{\text{in}}(X)| > X/2$. The problem of finding weak cuts in the graph is NP-complete and no good approximation algorithms are known for that problem. Given the transit core is a superset of the dense core and that the dense core is derived by the greedy ordering, we apply some ordering to find the transit core as was used to find the dense core. A natural way of using this ordering to find the transit core is to find the smallest value of $k$ such that $|\text{cut}_{\text{in}}(X_k)|<k/2$. Surprisingly we find that the value of $k$ at which $|\text{cut in}(X_k)|< k/2$ also satisfy the property that $\text{conn}(k+1)=1$. This means that no two edges in the $\text{cut}_{\text{in}}(X_k)$ have the same source. A weak cut also means that more than 50% of the ASs in $X_k$ do not have any peering relationship with any of the ASs in $v(G)-X_k$. Hence by this definition, $X_k$ should intended contain all the transit providers.

2. Properties of the transit core: Applying the in-way cut algorithm to our graph, we discover a transit core consisting of 129 ASs. These 129 ASs have 183 peering links with the ASs in the dense core. We found many of the top providers in Europe and Asia to be present in our transit core.

iii). Outer core:

We classify all the remaining ASs in the core as the outer core. The members of the outer core typically represent regional ISPs which have a few customer ASs and a few peering relationships with other such regional ISPs. The outer core consists of 897 ASs that have 29 peering sessions with ASs in the dense core and 145 peering sessions with ASs in the transit core. We observed that many members of our outer core are regional ISPs.

iv). Summary:

Table 1, shows summarized number of ASs at each level in the hierarchy dense core(level 0), transit core(level 1), outer core(level 2), small regional ISPs(level 3) and customer (level 4). Table 2, summarizes the connectivity between various levels in the AS hierarchy. each number in the table is the total number of edges from level 0 to level 1. The table shows several key properties of the internet topology.

- The ASs in dense core are very well connected.
- As we move from the dense core towards customer, the inter-level and intra-level connectivity graphs significantly.
- The large number of customers ASs have their providers distributed across levels is not strictly hierarchal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th># of Ass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dense core(0)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit core(1)</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer core(2)</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small regional ISPs</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customers</td>
<td>8898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASs in the different groups communicates via ASs in the dense core and transit core.

Distribution of ASs in the Hierarchy(Table1)

Interconnectivity Across levels(Table2)

The graph in figure 5, explores the relationship between node degree and the levels in the hierarchy. We define node degree as number of neighboring ASs without regard to the relationships. The graph plats the cumulative distribution of node degree as a logarithmic scale. In general level 0 and 1 ASs have high degree, and level 3 and level 4 ASs tends to have low degree. However, this is not universally true. Some customers at level 4 have a large number of upstream providers, and some ASs in the dense core at level 0 have a relatively small number of neighbours. A hierarchy based solely on degree distribution would not be able to make this distribution.

Summary:

The relationships between ASs has a significant impact on the flow of traffic through the internet. Our work makes two important contribution toward understanding the structure of the internet in terms of these relationships:

- An algorithm for inferring AS relationships from partial views of the AS graph from different vantage points.
- A mechanism for dividing the Internet hierarchy into levels based on AS relationships and node connectivity.

The complete structure of the internet is unknown and difficult if not impossible to obtain. Our approach is comprised of many heuristics with certain limitations.

- We draw our inferences based on only ten vantage points available. Ideally we would have a larger collection of routing tables from more diverse vantage points, including small customers.

- We treat the route views routing tables as a view from a single AS.

Future work:

We plan to extend our methodology to incorporate more complex routing policies that are captured by the traditional customer-provider and peer-peer relationship.

Despite of these limitations, we have shown that our approach provides a detailed view of the Internet topology in terms of the relationships between ASs. The complete structure of the internet is unknown and difficult if not impossible to obtain. Our approach is comprised of many heuristics with certain limitations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>6732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>3373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>3752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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