

Drafting Behind Akamai* (Travelocity-Based Detouring)

Ao-Jan Su
ajsu@cs.northwestern.edu
Aleksandar Kuzmanovic
akuzma@cs.northwestern.edu

David R. Choffnes
drchoffnes@cs.northwestern.edu
Fabián E. Bustamante
fabianb@cs.northwestern.edu

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
Northwestern University
Evanston, IL 60208, USA

ABSTRACT

To enhance web browsing experiences, content distribution networks (CDNs) move web content “closer” to clients by caching copies of web objects on thousands of servers worldwide. Additionally, to minimize client download times, such systems perform extensive network and server measurements, and use them to redirect clients to different servers over short time scales. In this paper, we explore techniques for inferring and exploiting network measurements performed by the largest CDN, Akamai; our objective is to locate and utilize quality Internet paths *without* performing extensive path probing or monitoring.

Our contributions are threefold. First, we conduct a broad measurement study of Akamai’s CDN. We probe Akamai’s network from 140 PlanetLab vantage points for two months. We find that Akamai redirection times, while slightly higher than advertised, are sufficiently low to be useful for network control. Second, we empirically show that Akamai redirections overwhelmingly correlate with *network* latencies on the paths between clients and the Akamai servers. Finally, we illustrate how large-scale overlay networks can exploit Akamai redirections to identify the best detouring nodes for one-hop source routing. Our research shows that in more than 50% of investigated scenarios, it is better to route through the nodes “recommended” by Akamai, than to use the direct paths. Because this is not the case for the rest of the scenarios, we develop low-overhead pruning algorithms that avoid Akamai-driven paths when they are not beneficial.

*Drafting is a technique commonly used by bikers and long-distance runners to reduce wind resistance by moving into the air pocket created behind the leader.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

SIGCOMM’06, September 11–15, 2006, Pisa, Italy.
Copyright 2006 ACM 1-59593-308-5/06/0009 ...\$5.00.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

C.2.2 [Computer-Communication Networks]: Internet
C.4 [Performance of Systems]: Measurement techniques

General Terms

Measurement, Performance, Experimentation

Keywords

Akamai, CDN, edge server, DNS, measurement reuse, one-hop source routing

1. INTRODUCTION

Content delivery networks (CDNs) attempt to improve web performance by delivering content to end users from multiple, geographically dispersed servers located at the edge of the network [4, 23, 27, 34]. Content providers contract with CDNs to host and distribute their content. Since most CDNs have servers in ISP points of presence, clients’ requests can be dynamically forwarded to topologically proximate replicas. DNS redirection and URL rewriting are two of the commonly used techniques for directing client requests to a particular server [18, 35].

Beyond static information such as geographic location and network connectivity, most CDNs rely on network measurement subsystems to incorporate dynamic network information on replica selection and determine high-speed Internet paths over which to transfer content within the network [7]. In this paper, *we explore techniques for inferring and exploiting the network measurements performed by CDNs for the purpose of locating and utilizing quality Internet paths without performing extensive path probing or monitoring.*

We focus our efforts on the Akamai CDN, which is perhaps the most extensive distribution network in the world – claiming over 15,000 servers operating in 69 countries and 1,000 networks [4]. Without Akamai’s CDN, highly popular web enterprises such as Yahoo, Amazon, or The New York Times would be unable to serve the gigabytes of data per second required by the images, Flash animations, and videos embedded in their web sites. Given the global nature of the Akamai network, it is clear that any viable information about network conditions collected by Akamai can be benefi-

cial to other applications; in this paper, we demonstrate how it can improve performance for routing in large-scale overlay networks.

1.1 Our Contributions

This paper explores (i) whether frequent client redirections generated by Akamai reveal *network* conditions over the paths between end-users and Akamai edge-servers, and (ii) how such information can be utilized by the broader Internet community. We expect the first hypothesis to hold true because Akamai utilizes extensive network and server measurements to minimize the latency perceived by end users [12]. Thus, if the load on Akamai edge servers were either low or uniform over long time scales (one of the main goals of CDNs in general), then Akamai client redirections would indeed imply viable network path-quality information.

For the second hypothesis, we consider the application of overlay routing. As long as an overlay network can map a subset of its nodes to Akamai edge servers, the clients of such an overlay could use Akamai redirections as viable indications regarding how to route their own traffic. Because the number of nodes in large-scale overlay networks is typically several orders of magnitude larger than the total number of Akamai servers, finding hosts that share networks with Akamai edge servers should not be difficult. Moreover, Akamai deploys its edge servers within ISPs' networks at no charge [1]. This greatly reduces ISPs' bandwidth expenses while increasing the number of potential overlay nodes that can map their positions to Akamai servers.

The incentive for a network to latch onto Akamai in the above way is to improve performance by using quality Internet paths *without* extensively monitoring, probing, or measuring the paths among the overlay nodes. In this work, we do *not* implement such an overlay network. Instead, we demonstrate the feasibility of this approach by performing a large-scale measurement study.

We conduct our study over a period of approximately two months, using a testbed consisting of 140 PlanetLab (PL) nodes. We initially measure the number of Akamai servers seen by each PL node over long time scales for a given Akamai customer (e.g., Yahoo). The surprising result is that nodes that are further away, in a networking sense, from the Akamai network are regularly served by *hundreds* of different servers on a daily basis. On the other hand, a moderate number of servers seen by a client (e.g., 2) reveals close proximity between the two. However, because different Akamai servers often host content for different customers, we show that the vast majority of investigated PL nodes see a large number of servers (and paths), e.g., over 50, for at least one of the Akamai customers.

We then measure the redirection dynamics for the Akamai CDN. While the updates are indeed frequent for the majority of the nodes, the inter-redirection times are much longer in certain parts of the world, e.g., as large as 6 minutes in South America. Our subsequent experiments indicate that such large time scales are not useful for network control; we show that even random or round-robin redirections over shorter time-scales would work better. Regardless, we discover that the redirection times for the vast majority of nodes are sufficient to reveal network conditions.

To show that network conditions are the primary determinant of Akamai's redirection behavior, we concurrently measure the performance of the ten best Akamai nodes seen by each of the PL nodes. By pinging, instead of fetching web objects from servers, we effectively decouple the network from the server latency. Our results show that Akamai redirections strongly correlate to network conditions. For example, more than 70% of paths chosen by Akamai are among approximately the best 10% of measured paths.

To explore the potential benefits of Akamai-driven one-hop source routing, we measure the best single-hop and direct path between

pairs of PL nodes. For a pair of PL nodes, we concurrently measure the ten best single-hop paths between the source and the destination, where the middle hop is a frequently updated Akamai edge server. Our results indicate that by following Akamai's updates, it is possible to avoid hot spots close to the source, thus significantly improving end-to-end performance. For example, in 25% of all investigated scenarios, Akamai-driven paths outperformed the direct paths. Moreover, 50% of the middle points *discovered* by Akamai show better performance than the direct path.

Not all Akamai paths will lead to lower latency than the direct alternative. For example, a direct path between two nodes in Brazil will always outperform single-hop Akamai paths, simply because the detouring point is in the US. Thus, we develop low-overhead pruning algorithms that consistently choose the best path from available Akamai-driven and direct paths. The question then becomes, how often does a client need to "double-check" to ensure that Akamai-driven paths are indeed faster than direct paths. We show that these techniques always lead to better performance than using the direct path, regardless of frequency, and that the frequency can be as low as once every two hours before a client's performance significantly declines. Thus, we show that this Akamai-driven routing has the potential to offer significant performance gains with a very small amount of network measurement.

1.2 Roadmap

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses the details of the Akamai CDN relevant to this study. In Section 3, we describe our experimental setup and present summary results from our large-scale measurement-based study. Section 4 further analyzes the measured results to determine whether Akamai reveals network conditions through its edge-server selection. After showing that this is the case, we present and analyze a second measurement-based experiment designed to determine the effectiveness of Akamai-driven, one-hop source routing in Section 5. We discuss our results and describe related work in Section 6. Section 7 presents our conclusions.

2. HOW DOES AKAMAI WORK?

In this section, we provide the necessary background to understand the context for the ensuing experiments. In general, for a web client to retrieve content for a web page, the first step is to use DNS to resolve the server-name portion of the content's URL into the address of a machine hosting it. If the web site uses a CDN, the content will be replicated at several hosts across the Internet. A popular way to direct clients to those replicas dynamically is DNS redirection. With DNS redirection, a client's DNS request is redirected to an authoritative DNS name server that is controlled by the CDN, which then resolves the CDN server name to the IP address of one or more content servers [21]. DNS redirection can be used to deliver full or partial site content. With the former, all DNS requests for the origin server are redirected to the CDN. With partial site content delivery, the origin site modifies certain embedded URLs so that requests for only those URLs are redirected to the CDN. The Akamai CDN uses DNS redirection to deliver partial content.

Although Akamai's network measurement, path selection and cache distribution algorithms are proprietary and private, the mechanisms that enable Akamai to redirect clients' requests are public knowledge. Below, we provide a detailed explanation of these mechanisms, which is based on both publicly available sources [8, 9, 22, 24] and our own measurements.




Figure 1: Illustration of Akamai DNS translation.

2.1 DNS Translation

Akamai performs DNS redirection using a hierarchy of DNS servers that translate a web client’s request for content in an Akamai customer’s domain into the IP address of a nearby Akamai server, also called an edge server. At a high level, the DNS translation is performed as follows. First, the end user (e.g., a web browser) requests a domain name translation to fetch content from an Akamai customer. The customer’s DNS server uses a canonical name (CNAME) entry containing a domain name in the Akamai network. A CNAME entry serves as an alias, enabling a DNS server to redirect lookups to a new domain. Next, a hierarchy of Akamai DNS servers responds to the DNS name-translation request, using the local DNS server’s IP address (if the client issues DNS requests to its local DNS) or end user’s IP address (if the DNS request is issued directly), the name of the Akamai customer and the name of the requested content as a guide to determine the best two Akamai edge servers to return.

The remainder of this subsection provides a detailed example of Akamai DNS translation, using the home page for PCWorld.com as an example (Figure 1). At first, a web client issues a request for an embedded object that resides in the images.pcworld.com domain. It then queries its local DNS server (LDNS) for the IP address corresponding to images.pcworld.com (1); the LDNS then attempts a name translation on behalf of the client (2).

When the pcworld.com name server is contacted for a name translation, it begins the DNS redirection by returning a CNAME entry for images.pcworld.com, because content in the images.pcworld.com domain is served by Akamai. The value of the CNAME entry in this case is images.pcworld.com.edgesuite.net; edgesuite.net is a domain owned by Akamai. The LDNS once again performs a name translation, this time on the edgesuite.net domain. Two more DNS redirections are subsequently performed, first to the akam.net domain (e.g., adns1.akam.net), then to a1694.g.akamai.net, where 1694 is the customer number for PCWorld. In general, Akamai redirections include a customer number in the domain name.

In the final and most important stage of translation, the Akamai network uses a hierarchy of Akamai name servers to return to the LDNS the IP addresses of edge servers that should yield a fast download and are likely to be close to the web client that initiated the request. The LDNS is directed to the akamai.net name server (3), which begins the process of finding a nearby edge

server by forwarding the LDNS to a high-level Akamai DNS server, e.g., one named za.akamaitech.net as shown in (4).

A high-level Akamai DNS server is one of a small, global set of DNS servers that is responsible for delegating the DNS request to an appropriate low-level Akamai DNS server (5). Generally, the low-level Akamai DNS server is closer to the LDNS than the high-level one. Then, the low-level Akamai DNS server (currently named using the pattern n#g.akamai.net, where # is between 0 and 9) returns the IP addresses of two edge servers that it expects to offer high performance to the web client. Our measurements reveal that the machines that act as low-level Akamai DNS servers and as edge servers can be (and frequently are) one and the same. Finally, the IP address of the edge server is returned to the web client, which is unaware of any of the redirections that occurred (6).

2.2 System Dynamics

It is important to note that many of the steps explained above are normally bypassed thanks to LDNS caching. Unfortunately, this same caching can reduce a CDN’s ability to direct clients to optimal servers. To ensure that clients are updated on the appropriate server to use, Akamai’s DNS servers set relatively small timeout values (TTL) for their entries. For example, the TTL value for an edge server’s DNS entry is 20 seconds. This means that the LDNS should request a new translation from a low-level Akamai DNS server every 20 seconds.¹ While nothing requires a local DNS server to expire entries according to their given timeout values [29], we will show how this behavior does not impact the results of our work since we request DNS translation *directly*.

3. MEASURING AKAMAI


In this section, we present details of our large-scale measurements of the Akamai CDN. These measurements reveal important system parameters, such as the scale and dynamics of Akamai-driven redirections, which we exploit later in the paper. In particular, we answer the following questions: (i) What is the server diversity, i.e., how many Akamai edge servers does an arbitrary web client “see” over long time intervals? (ii) What is the impact of clients’ locations on server diversity? (iii) How does Akamai’s content (e.g., Yahoo vs. The New York Times) impact server diversity? (iv) What is the redirection frequency, i.e., how often are clients directed to a different set of edge servers?

For our measurements we relied on 140 PlanetLab (PL) nodes scattered around the world [3]. We deployed measurement programs on 50 PL nodes in the US and Canada, 35 in Europe, 18 in Asia, 8 in South America, 4 in Australia, and the other 25 were randomly selected among the remaining PL nodes. Every 20 seconds, each of the 140 nodes independently sends a DNS request for one of the Akamai customers (e.g., images.pcworld.com), and records the IP addresses of the edge servers returned by Akamai. The measurement results are then recorded in a database for further processing and analysis. The following results are derived from an experiment that ran continuously for 7 days. We measured 15 Akamai customers, including the following popular ones: Yahoo, CNN, Amazon, AOL, The New York Times, Apple, Monster, FOX News, MSN, and PCWorld.


3.1 Server Diversity

We first explore the number of unique Akamai edge servers that an arbitrary endpoint sees over long time scales. Such measure-

¹The TTL value for the entry pointing to the low-level Akamai DNS server is set to a value between 30 minutes and 1 hour; the value for a high-level Akamai DNS server is set to 48 hours.



(a) From Berkeley



(b) From Purdue

Figure 2: Server diversity from two characteristic PL nodes.

ments reveal important relationships between clients and servers: A moderate number of servers seen by a client (*e.g.*, 2) reveals close proximity between the client and servers. On the other hand, clients that are farther away from the Akamai network can see a large number (*e.g.*, hundreds) of distinct Akamai servers over longer time scales. In either case, by pointing to the best servers over shorter time scales, the Akamai CDN reveals valuable path-quality information, as we demonstrate in Section 4.

Figure 2 plots the *unique* Akamai edge-server IP identification numbers (IDs) seen by two clients requesting `a943.x.a.yimg.com`, which is a CNAME for Yahoo. The clients are hosted on the `berkeley.intel-research.net` and `cs.purdue.edu` networks, and the result is shown over a period of two days. We plot the Akamai server IDs on the y-axis in the order of appearance, *i.e.*, those showing up sooner have lower IDs. As indicated in the figure, low-level Akamai DNS servers always return the IP addresses of *two* edge servers for redundancy, as explained in the previous section. Thus, there are always two points in Figure 2 corresponding to each timestamp on the x-axis.

In addition to revealing the targeted number of unique Akamai server IDs, Figure 2 extracts valuable dynamic information. Indeed, both figures show strong time-of-day effects. During the evening, both clients are directed to the same set of edge servers; during the day, the redirections are much more pronounced. In the next section, we demonstrate that these redirections are driven by network conditions on the paths between clients and edge servers, which change more dramatically during the day. In general, the time-of-day effects are stronger in scenarios where both a client and its associated Akamai edge servers reside in the same time zone (*e.g.*, the Berkeley case); as the edge servers become scattered across a larger number of time zones (*e.g.*, the Purdue case), the effect becomes less pronounced.

The key insight from Figure 2 is the large discrepancy between the number of unique Akamai edge servers seen by the two hosts. The Berkeley node is served by fewer than 20 unique edge servers during the day, indicating that this node and its Akamai servers are nearby. On the other hand, the lack of Akamai caching servers near the Purdue PL node significantly impacts the number of servers seen by that node — more than 200 in under two days. The majority of the servers are from the Midwest or the East Coast (*e.g.*, Boston, Cambridge, Columbus, or Dover); however, when the paths from Purdue to these servers become congested, downloads from the West Coast (*e.g.*, San Francisco or Seattle) are not unusual.

Figure 3 summarizes the number of unique Akamai edge servers seen by all PL nodes from our experiments requesting the same CNAME for Yahoo. The number ranges from two (*e.g.*, `lbnl.`




Figure 3: Server diversity for all measured PL nodes.

`nodes.planet-lab.org`), to up to 340, which is the number of servers seen by `att.nodes.planet-lab.org`. As discussed above, PL nodes experiencing a low server diversity typically share the network with Akamai edge servers. From the perspective of an overlay network aiming to “draft behind” Akamai, such PL nodes would be good candidates for *mapping* to the corresponding Akamai servers. Other nodes show either moderate or large server diversity. In general, the larger the network distance between a node and its Akamai servers, the larger the number of edge servers and corresponding network paths. For example, nodes in Asia or South America regularly see a large number of servers (*e.g.*, above 50), the majority of which are located in the US; similarly, the US PL nodes (*e.g.*, Purdue U. or Columbia U.) that are not near Akamai “hot spots” also have a large server cardinality.

3.2 The Impact of Akamai Customers on Server Diversity

In the Akamai CDN, different edge servers may host content for different customers [24]. Such an arrangement alleviates the load placed on the servers, thus improving the speed of content delivery; at the same time, this approach provides a reasonable degree of server redundancy, which is necessary for resilience to server failures. Here, we explore how this technique impacts the PL nodes’ server diversity. In essence, we repeat the above experiment, but query multiple Akamai customers in addition to Yahoo.

Figure 4 depicts the server diversity for a set of five PL nodes and ten Akamai customers. For the reasons explained above, both Purdue and Columbia PL nodes show a large server diversity. While the actual number of observed servers certainly depends on the Akamai customer, the cardinality is generally always high for these two nodes. The exception is FEMA’s (Federal Emergency




Figure 4: Server diversity for multiple Akamai customers.

Management Agency) web site,² the content of which is modestly distributed on the Akamai network; we found only 43 out of over 15,000 Akamai edge servers [4] that host this web site.

Despite the fact that some of our PL nodes are placed on the same networks as Akamai edge servers, *all* PL nodes show a large server diversity for at least one of the Akamai customers. For example, Figure 4 indicates that querying Yahoo or The New York Times from the U. of Oregon reveals a large number of Akamai servers; likewise, querying Amazon from the UMass or LBNL PL nodes shows the same result. The bottom line is that because Akamai customers are hosted on different (possibly distinct) sets of servers, *all* clients, no matter how close they are to an Akamai edge server, can see a large number of servers. Most importantly, a large number of servers enables clients to reveal low-latency Internet paths, as we demonstrate in Section 4.

3.3 Redirection Dynamics

To ensure that clients are updated on the appropriate server to use, Akamai’s low-level DNS servers set small, 20-second timeouts for their entries. However, nothing requires a low-level Akamai DNS server to direct clients to a new set of edge servers after each timeout. Here, we measure the frequency with which low-level Akamai DNS servers actually change their entries. In the following experiments, the PL nodes query their low-level Akamai DNS servers by requesting `a943.x.a.yimg.com` (the CNAME for Yahoo) every 20 seconds. By comparing the subsequent responses from the DNS servers, we are able to detect when a DNS entry is updated and measure the inter-redirection times. Our primary goal is to verify that the updates are happening at sufficiently short time scales to capture changes in network conditions.




Figure 5: Redirection dynamics from three representative nodes.

²www.fema.gov

Figure 5 plots the cumulative distribution function (CDF), $F(x) = Pr[X \leq x]$, of inter-server redirection times for three PL nodes, located in Berkeley (the same node as in Figure 2(a)), South Korea, and Brazil. The CDF curve for the Berkeley node represents the inter-redirection dynamics for the vast majority of nodes in our PL set. Approximately 50% of the redirections are shorter than 40 seconds, while more than 80% of the redirections are shorter than 100 seconds. Nevertheless, very long inter-redirection times also occur, the majority of which are due to the time-of-day effects explained above.

Not all PL nodes from our set show the above characteristics. Examples are `kaist.ac.kr` and `pop-ce.rnr.br`, which are also included in Figure 5. The median redirection time is around 4 minutes for the former, and as much as 6 minutes for the latter. Moreover, the steep changes in the CDF curves reveal the most probable (still quite long) redirection time scales. Longer redirection updates can prevent corresponding clients from achieving desirable performance, as we demonstrate below. Still, the summary statistics for the entire set of 140 PL nodes reveals satisfactory redirection intervals: the median redirection time is below 100 seconds.

4. DOES AKAMAI REVEAL QUALITY INTERNET PATHS?

Here, we answer one of the key questions relevant to our study: Do frequent Akamai redirections correlate with *network* conditions over the paths between a client and its servers? In an earlier study, Johnson *et al.* [16] demonstrated that Akamai generally picks servers that yield low client-perceived latencies. However, both network- and server-side effects impact the overall latency, and Akamai claims to perform and use both measurements to redirect clients to the closest server [4]. Thus, our goal is to *decouple* the network side from the server side to determine which one dominates performance. If the server component prevails, then only Akamai’s clients benefit from redirections. However, if the network component dominates, then redirections reveal network conditions on Internet paths – information valuable to the broader community of Internet users.

4.1 Methodology

Figure 6 illustrates our measurement methodology for determining whether Akamai redirections reveal quality Internet paths. As in the above experiments, each of the 140 nodes sends a DNS request for one of the Akamai customers every 20 seconds and records the IP addresses of the edge servers returned by Akamai. In addition, every 5 seconds, each PL node *pings* a set of the 10 best Akamai edge servers. That is, whenever a new server ID is returned by Akamai, it replaces the longest-RTT edge server in the current set. It is essential to understand that by pinging, instead of fetching parts of Akamai-hosted pages from servers as done in [16], we effectively avoid measuring *combined* network and server latencies, and isolate the network-side effects. Finally, the results of 7 days of measurements from all 140 nodes are collected and processed in a database.

4.2 Rank

The latency between a client and its servers varies depending on the client’s location. For example, the latencies for nodes located in the middle of Akamai “hot-spots” are on the order of few milliseconds; on the other hand, the RTTs of other nodes (*e.g.*, located in South America) to the closest Akamai server are on the order of several *hundreds* of milliseconds. To determine the relative quality of paths to edge servers selected by Akamai, we introduce the *rank* metric to represent the correlation of Akamai’s redirection decisions to network latencies. In each 20-second-long round of the




Figure 6: Measurement Methodology.

experiment, the 10 best Akamai paths are ranked by the RTTs measured from the client, in the order from 0 (the longest) to 9 (the shortest). Akamai returns IP addresses of two edge servers in each round; thus, we assign ranks r_1 and r_2 to the corresponding edge server. We define the total rank, r , as $r = r_1 + r_2 - 1$. If the paths returned by Akamai are the best two among all ten paths, the rank is 16; similarly, if the Akamai paths are the worst in the group, the rank equals zero.




Figure 7: Ranks for three characteristic PL nodes.

Figure 7 plots the rank of Internet paths measured from the sources indicated in the figure to the Akamai servers. A point in the figure with coordinates (x, y) means that the rank of the two paths returned by Akamai is better than or equal to the rank y during x percent of the duration of the 7-day experiment. Thus, the closer the curve is to the upper right corner, the better the corresponding paths selected by Akamai. Indeed, Figure 7 indicates that the Akamai redirections for `csail.mit.edu` and `cs.vu.nl` almost perfectly follow network conditions. On the other hand, because the average redirection interval is quite high in the Brazil case (6 minutes, as shown in Figure 5), we observe a relatively poor selection of servers in terms of path latency. Indeed, even a random or round-robin path selection over shorter time intervals would achieve a better result in this case. This is because Brazil's node performance is below average. Theoretically, random selection should achieve average performance.

Figure 8 depicts the average rank of the paths that Akamai returns to all 140 PL nodes. We plot the curves in Figure 8 in the increasing rank order. Hence, the order of PL node IDs on the x -axis, while similar, is not identical for different customers. To examine the effect of Akamai customer on this metric, we measure six dif-




Figure 8: Averaged rank for all PL nodes.

ferent Akamai customers as indicated in the figure. The key insight from the figure is that Akamai redirections overwhelmingly correlate with network conditions. For example, for the set of customers showing the best performance (e.g. Fox News), more than 97% of the paths chosen by Akamai (IDs 5-140 in Figure 8) are better than average (rank larger than 8); at the same time, more than 70% of Akamai paths are approximately among the best 10% of paths (rank larger than 14).

Figure 8 also reveals that Akamai offers different performance depending on the customer. As we previously explained, this occurs because different Akamai servers can, and often do, host a different set of customers. It is interesting, however, to find that CNN (CNAME `a1921.aol.akamai.net`) shows by far the worst result in our measurement. Further investigation showed that all of the edge servers we found for CNN are from the same region in the US; moreover, they are all from the same subnet. This finding seems to contradict Akamai's policy of using globally deployed edge servers to serve content. We later learned that none of CNN's servers are currently owned by Akamai. Therefore, it appears that CNN is no longer an Akamai customer, though they still have "akamai.net" as the postfix of their CNAME. For this reason, we removed CNN from all other figures in this study. Regardless, this finding provides evidence that CDN services that utilize network measurements and global server deployment are significantly better than traditional web content distribution using load-balancing server farms in a few data centers.

4.3 Latency

In this subsection, we measure the latency gains made possible by following the paths to edge servers returned by Akamai. Such measurements not only reveal the performance of the Akamai CDN, but also indicate the spectrum of potential latency gains achievable with Akamai-driven one-hop source routing, which we explore in the next section.

For each PL node, we collect the statistics for the RTTs on the paths between the client and the Akamai servers as follows. (i) Best delay, defined as the lowest RTT in each 20-second-long measurement round among the current ten best Akamai paths. (ii) Akamai's delay, defined as the average of RTTs on the paths to the two edge servers selected by Akamai in each measurement round. (iii) Average delay, defined as the average of the ten best Akamai-recommended paths. (iv) Worst delay, defined as the highest RTT in each measurement round among all ten paths.

Figure 9 plots the CDF curves for two PL nodes, `csmail.mit.edu` and `cs.vu.nl`, previously shown in Figure 7. Both figures confirm that Akamai indeed does a great job in these two scenarios; the Akamai path is almost identical to the best path in both cases. However, the key insight from the figure is that the




Figure 9: CDF of RTTs for Akamai paths for two PL nodes.

relative latency gain depends on the distance between the PL node and its Akamai edge servers. For example, the MIT node obviously operates in an Akamai hot-spot, since the difference between the medians (CDF = 0.5) of the best and the worst path is only 20 ms. On the contrary, the corresponding difference is as much as 100 ms in the Amsterdam case. Indeed, as the distance between the Akamai CDN and a PL node increases, both the number of servers (and paths) increases and the variance of path quality increases. Thus, following the Akamai redirections brings the largest latency gains for nodes that are distant from their edge servers.




Figure 10: Latency gains for all measured PL nodes.

Figure 10 plots the latency performance over all 140 PL nodes for different Akamai customers. For each node, we compute the average difference between (i) the RTT corresponding to the average of the ten best Akamai paths seen by the node, and (ii) the RTT corresponding to the Akamai path. The *y-axis* of Figure 10 plots the *absolute value* of the above average difference between the two paths. Thus, nodes on the left of the figure (e.g., 0-20) show the worst performance, *i.e.*, the path that Akamai selects is worse than the average of the current ten best Akamai paths. We found that this group is dominated by nodes that have a large server (and path) diversity and a small redirection frequency. Nodes with IDs in the range 20-30 are dominated by a small number of short-latency Akamai paths; in this case, although Akamai redirections correlate well with measured network latencies, the difference among the paths is negligible, e.g., less than 1 ms. Finally, the vast majority of nodes (IDs 30-140) are directed to better-than-average paths. For a large percentage of nodes (IDs 50-140), the gains are quite substantial, ranging from 10 ms to 170 ms.

To summarize, we demonstrated that Akamai redirections overwhelmingly reveal the *network* conditions over the paths between end-users and Akamai edge-servers. Thus, by querying low-level

Akamai DNS servers, an endpoint can reveal information about quality Internet paths *without* extensively probing and monitoring them. While this is potentially useful for many applications, in the next section, we necessarily focus on one such application.

5. AKAMAI-DRIVEN ONE-HOP SOURCE ROUTING

In this section, we examine the potential for performance improvement by using Akamai to drive an example network application: one-hop routing in a large-scale overlay network. Since Akamai redirections generally reveal low-latency paths between nodes and edge servers, such an overlay network can use these redirections to route its own traffic. Even if an application is not primarily interested in low latency, but rather strives for high-bandwidth, the Akamai-driven approach is still viable. Measurements from [26] indicate that the vast majority of TCP flows are limited by the receiver advertised window parameter. Similarly, a recent measurement study shows that as much as 85% of the KaZaA clients do not suffer any packet loss [15]. Hence, in such cases, lower latencies directly translate to larger throughputs [30].

The key prerequisite in this environment is for the overlay network to be able to map a subset of its nodes to Akamai edge servers. Fortunately, the number of nodes in large-scale peer-to-peer (P2P) networks (e.g., Kazaa [2]) is typically several orders of magnitude larger than the total number of Akamai servers; thus, finding hosts that share networks with Akamai edge servers should not be difficult. Moreover, Akamai deploys its edge servers within ISPs' networks at no charge [1]. This both greatly reduces ISPs' bandwidth expenses and improves the performance of Akamai's clients; likewise, it increases the number of potential overlay nodes that can map their positions to Akamai servers.

As a concrete example of how Akamai-driven, one-hop source routing works, consider two nodes in a large-scale overlay network. To find a high-quality path between them, the nodes perform a "race" to determine which path has the smallest latency: the direct path between the two nodes, or the one-hop path via a third node mapped to an Akamai server. In our scenario, the Akamai path consists of two parts. The first is the path from the source node to the (frequently updated) Akamai edge server; the second part is the path from the Akamai edge server to the destination. Thus, we perform no mapping between overlay nodes and Akamai edge server; rather, we simply "simulate" perfect matching. As such, the presented results should be understood as an upper bound of the actual performance. As we showed above, by selecting low-latency Internet paths, Akamai manages to successfully avoid network hot

spots; this can potentially improve the end-to-end (source — Akamai node — destination) path performance.

Of course, the Akamai path is not always better than the direct path. For example, consider two nodes in Brazil, a country poorly served by Akamai. In this case, the nodes should clearly use the direct path since the Akamai servers are likely to be located in the US. Despite the potential for performance degradation, we will show that it is possible to identify and use the better of the two types of paths – without a large measurement overhead.

5.1 Methodology




Figure 11: Illustration of the measurement methodology.

Figure 11 depicts the experimental setup for the measurements in this section. For each pair of nodes, one node is designated as the source and the other as the destination. Throughout the experiment, we measure the RTTs for 11 paths between the source and the destination. The first path is the direct one, which the source node measures by pinging the destination and recording the corresponding RTT. The other ten paths are “recommended” by Akamai, and we measure their RTTs as follows. *The source node* iteratively issues a DNS query for an Akamai customer. In Figure 11, it repeatedly requests `a943.x.a.yimg.com`, which is the CNAME for Yahoo.³ As in the previous experiment, the source node measures and records the RTTs to the 10 current, lowest-latency Akamai edge servers it witnessed. Additionally, the source node notifies the destination node of the IP addresses for those 10 Akamai edge servers. This enables the destination node to measure RTTs to the most recent edge servers that *the source node* has witnessed. Finally, by adding the corresponding RTTs measured from the source and the destination to the set of Akamai servers, we estimate the RTTs of the 10 distinct one-hop paths.

An important characteristic of the above measurement is its asymmetry. For the same pair of nodes, the results can be quite different depending on which node is assigned to be the source. This occurs because the Akamai servers witnessed by the source and destination nodes are generally different, particularly for geographically distant nodes. We explore such effects in more detail below.

³Our experiments show similar performance for other Akamai customers, including Travelocity, CNAME `a1450.x.akamai.net`.

5.2 A Case Study: Taiwan — UK

To demonstrate the potential of Akamai-driven one-hop source routing, and to show the effects of asymmetry, we initially present results for a pair of geographically distant PL nodes. The first is `iis.sinica.edu.tw`, located in Taiwan, and the second is `cambridge.intel-research.net`, located in the UK.

Figure 12 plots the CDF functions of the RTTs for the following paths. (i) Best path, defined as the path with the lowest RTT in each 20-second-long measurement round among the ten one-hop paths and the direct path; (ii) Akamai’s path, defined as the average of the two one-hop paths via the two edge servers selected (and frequently updated) by Akamai. (iii) Direct path, measured from the source to the destination; (iv) Worst path, defined as the path with the highest RTT in each measurement round among all eleven (ten one-hop and one direct) paths. In Figure 12(a), the Taiwan node is the source; in Figure 12(b), the UK node is the source.

The CDF curves from Figure 12 illustrate the gains that can be achieved by using Akamai’s one-hop paths. For example, Akamai’s path is nearly optimal in the Taiwan case, outpacing the direct path by nearly 20 ms. On the other hand, while the paths chosen using Akamai’s “recommendations” from the UK are suboptimal, they still generally beat the direct path. To shed more light on these results, we collected statistics for the Akamai servers seen by each node. For the Taiwan node, 80% of edge server “hits” are in Taiwan, 15% in Japan, and 5% in the US. For the UK’s node, 75% of the hits are in the UK, and 25% are in the US. The large number of servers close (in the same country) to the source nodes indicates that the gains over the direct path come from avoiding hot spots close to the sources. Moreover, whenever the “middle nodes” are not in the country of origin, they are still placed along a high quality path to the destination, thus improving the performance.

5.3 Aggregate Results

In this section, we study a much broader range of sources and destinations to determine the performance of Akamai-driven one-hop source routing. For this study, we assemble a list of PL nodes located in the US (6), Europe (3), Asia (3), and South America (2). We then pair all nodes with each other by randomly choosing the source and destination for each pair. Out of 91 attempted paths, 78 successfully completed 3-day-long experiments, while the rest failed (*e.g.*, due to a PL node rebooting).




Figure 13: Latency differences between one-hop routing and direct-path routing.

Figure 13 illustrates the difference between the latency using a direct path and the Akamai one-hop paths, all measured over short, 20-second-long, time scales. For each pair, we compute the best and the worst (out of ten) one-hop Akamai paths, and the average of the two one-hop paths returned by Akamai. A negative value means that the corresponding direct path is better for the pair; otherwise,




Figure 12: CDFs for path latencies between Taiwan and the UK. In each figure, the first country is designated as the source.

the Akamai-driven path is better. For example, the best, worst, and Akamai-selected paths are, on average, worse than the direct path for Pair ID 1. On the other hand, all one-hop Akamai paths outperform the direct path for pair ID 78.

The figure indicates that in approximately 25% of scenarios (IDs 60-78), Akamai-driven paths outperform the direct path, in the same manner as discussed for the Taiwan—UK example above. The majority of the paths are intercontinental, excluding South America, *e.g.*, Asia—US, US—Europe, Europe—Asia. The second group (path IDs 30-60) is dominated by the intra-Europe or intra-US paths for which the potential gains of detouring are smaller in general. Finally, the third group (path IDs 0-30) consists of two subgroups: (i) PL nodes that are close to each other and relatively far away from Akamai servers (*e.g.*, Korea—Japan) that have a better direct path and (ii) all paths sourced in South America see no gain from Akamai due to infrequent refreshing of the low-level Akamai DNS server’s tables.

Finally, an important point is that in approximately 50% of scenarios, the best measured Akamai one-hop path outperforms the direct path. While these paths are not “directly accessible” by following Akamai redirections (because Akamai optimizes only the source part of the one-hop path), this indicates both that detouring has a significant potential for improving performance, and that Akamai is successful in *locating* quality detouring points. These results encouraged us to investigate to what extent we can capture these performance improvements using a low-cost, deployable algorithm.

5.4 Path Pruning

Here, we discuss practical techniques for determining which of the following two paths to use for routing: the direct or the Akamai-recommended path. Thus, while the measurement overhead is already significantly reduced (to the above two paths), the question is whether it can be reduced even further. Our goal is to prune low-quality paths from the set of available paths. When making this decision, there are two issues: (i) how frequently to make a decision whether to use a one-hop route or simply use the direct path and (ii) if using one-hop routing, whether to use the first Akamai edge server that is returned or whether to perform a measurement to determine the better of the two.

To determine the effectiveness of using Akamai-driven one-hop routing, we must develop a low-cost algorithm that (i) enables nodes to reap any performance benefits of Akamai’s network measurements and (ii) quickly determines when Akamai cannot improve performance and, in this case, simply use the direct path between the source and destination. In short, we want to find the best path

among the direct path and Akamai-recommended paths, while minimizing the number of network measurements required to find that path. Thus, the algorithm must find a good trade-off between network performance and measurement overhead.

We evaluate four heuristics for determining routes. First, we consider how frequently the algorithm should reevaluate the decision to use the direct path or one-hop paths. This decision can be made (i) once for the duration of the experiment (static) or (ii) it can be reevaluated every y minutes (dynamic). In either case, if a one-hop path is selected, we explore the performance of two alternatives:

First Akamai Server (FAS). We query the Akamai DNS for an edge server approximately once per minute and use the first server returned by Akamai as our one hop.

Better of the Two Akamai Servers (BTAS). We query the Akamai DNS for an edge server approximately once per minute. We perform ping measurements to compare the quality of the paths along the two edge servers returned by DNS and use the lower-latency path.

For the static algorithms, we must include a bootstrap period that enables the Akamai network to “warm up,” *i.e.*, to determine which servers are best for our measurement nodes. For the following experiments, we use a bootstrap period of approximately 100 minutes.

To form a baseline for comparing the effectiveness of these algorithms, we first determine the maximum latency gain that can be achieved by pruning paths. For example, if the *best* Akamai path is 100 ms *faster* than the direct path, the maximum gain is 100 ms. Similarly, if the *worst* Akamai path is 100 ms *slower* than the direct path, then the maximum gain is again 100 ms. We aggregated the maximum latency gain over all 78 pairs of nodes and used the average value as our baseline. Figure 14 depicts the performance of our four algorithms relative to the maximum latency gain (100%) and to the case where the direct path is always used (*i.e.*, no routing decisions are made).

Figure 14 shows that using the direct path alone accounts for only about 78% of the performance gain seen in our experiments. This further shows that Akamai is good at locating nodes along high-quality paths. The figure also clearly shows that the dynamic versions of FAS and BTAS can lead to significant improvement over the direct path. In particular, the update frequency for BTAS and FAS can be as long as almost 2 hours before its performance more sharply declines. Even with update intervals on the order of a day, these algorithms outperform the direct path on average. It is also clear that BTAS outperforms FAS over shorter timer intervals (on the order of hours). As expected, choosing the better of the two Akamai paths is more resilient to changes in path quality than




Figure 14: Comparing pruning algorithms against best-case performance.

when simply picking the first of the two. Still, the difference is not dramatic.

We also note that the performance of the static versions of the pruning algorithms are nearly identical, and are slightly worse than using the direct path (by $\leq 1\%$) when averaged over all pairs of nodes. As discussed above, Akamai optimizes only the source part of the one-hop path, and thus may sometimes direct clients to edges that are along slower one-hop paths than the direct path. Since the static versions of these algorithms cannot “double-check” Akamai, they may suffer a performance hit by sticking with their original decision to always use one-hop paths.

6. DISCUSSION AND RELATED WORK

In this section, we discuss several issues relevant to our study and present work related to topics covered in this paper.

6.1 Discussion

Akarouting. Akamai has formed a private, proprietary network measurement system and overlay network. One goal of this system is to improve download speeds by using its network measurements to find “high-speed” Internet paths over which to transfer content *within* the network. In addition, Akamai applies one-hop source routing to transfer content from customer origin servers, e.g., `NYTimes.com` to edge-servers, a technique they call Akarouting [7]. The fundamental difference between Akarouting and our approach is the following: we are using Akamai’s client-to-server redirections to locate and utilize potentially high-quality detouring points in a *separate* overlay network.

Additionally, it is important to note that the Akamai-driven one-hop source routes in our experiments are *not* routed through the proprietary Akamai-owned network. Our ping and trace-route measurements confirm that the routes from PL nodes to Akamai edge-servers take “public” Internet paths available to everybody.

“Free riding” on Akamai. It is very possible that Akamai, or any other CDN, might not be excited by the fact that third parties are exploiting the CDNs’ measurements for their own purposes. However, it is important to realize that the load placed on the Akamai DNS infrastructure by our proposed technique, even in the case of larger-scale deployment by overlay networks, will probably be negligible compared to the load that this infrastructure is already experiencing from its “regular” clients. This is because the Akamai CDN hosts some of the most popular web enterprises and keeps small TTL values for an edge server’s DNS entries. Thus, the “regular” load placed on low-level Akamai DNS servers is already very high. The implication is that the proposed technique should not jeopardize Akamai’s performance. Moreover, we believe that any attempt to detect the “free-riding” nodes might face

non-negligible false negatives and positives, thus unnecessarily degrading the “regular” clients’ performance. Finally, it is important to understand that the proposed techniques do not require the Akamai edge servers to reply to *pings*. Although we indeed used pings to *verify* the correlation between network latencies and Akamai redirections, they are not required for conducting Akamai-driven source routing.

The implications of widespread adoption. Finally, one concern is that if the approach is successful and widely followed, then this might affect the performance of the network paths that Akamai identifies as “good.” For example, if *all* clients from a particular domain use Akamai’s recommendations in precisely the same way, previously uncongested paths may become congested within a short time period. However, we do not expect this to be the common case, since different overlay nodes can choose to query Akamai’s DNS servers for any of the large number of hosted web sites (e.g., *The New York Times* vs. *Amazon*). As explained in Section 3.2, different edge servers typically host different web sites. As a result, overlay nodes from the same domain will have different “views” of the network, which naturally helps to spread the traffic load along different network paths.

6.2 Related Work

There have been a number of studies on the use, effectiveness and impact of content distribution networks. In an early work, Gadde *et al.* [11] analyze the effectiveness of interior web caches and CDNs based on an analytical model of caching behavior. Two recent studies confirm that CDNs reduce average download response times, but that DNS redirection techniques add noticeable overhead due to DNS latency [19, 21]. In [20] the authors examined how content distribution servers improved latency when compared to throughput from the origin servers. Johnson *et al.* [16] assessed the degree to which two different CDNs optimally redirect requests among their mirrors, and argue that these CDNs appeared to use the DNS mechanisms not necessarily to select optimal servers, but to avoid selecting bad ones. Krishnamurthy *et al.* [21] do an extensive study on the use of CDNs and propose a methodology to study client-perceived performance. Saroiu *et al.* [31] characterize four content delivery systems, including Akamai, based on traces collected at a university’s borders routers. In their study Akamai appears as the smallest bandwidth consumer (0.2%), with Gnutella, Kazaa and WWW traffic consuming near 60% of the remaining bandwidth. In addition to revealing and understanding CDN behavior, our research enables clients of *other* networks to reuse the measurements made by CDNs for their own purposes.

Some previous work has addressed other issues with DNS-based control, particularly in the context of server selection in CDNs. Shaikh *et al.* [35] evaluate the impact of DNS-based server selection on DNS; the authors find that extremely low TTL values (on the order of seconds) can adversely affect latency. In a related work, Jung *et al.* [17] show that the most common values for TTL should not greatly increase DNS-related wide-area network traffic. Studies by Shaikh *et al.* [35] and Mao *et al.* [25] found that clients are often not close in network topology to the name servers they use, questioning the accuracy of server selection based on IP address. No such problem exists with our scheme because clients request DNS translation *directly*, and not via a local DNS server.

CDN-driven detouring is based on, and related to overlay routing systems that attempt to improve a client’s reliability and performance. Our work is the first one to propose relying on CDNs’ measurements to locate and utilize quality Internet paths without performing extensive path probing or monitoring. The Detour study [33] suggested that this could be accomplished by routing via in-

intermediate end systems. The Resilient Overlay Network (RON) project demonstrated this to be the case in a small-scale overlay [5]. This, however, required background monitoring that is not scalable and therefore limits the approach to communication among a relatively small set of nodes. The solution proposed in [36] relies on end-to-end probing of the overlay paths and the inference of the loss probabilities on the underlying physical path segments, which suffers from similar scalability limitations.

In order to limit the resource requirement for overlays, more recent studies have focused on reducing the end-to-end measurement needed to select overlay paths. In [28], the authors propose a routing underlay dedicated to topology probing. With the help of this underlay, one can use inferred AS path information to construct disjoint paths between communicating nodes. The potential problem of this method is the accuracy of AS path inference. For instance, [25] showed that AS path inference can often be much less accurate than expected. Gummadi *et al.* [13] select relay nodes by randomly choosing k overlay nodes (random- k) and selecting the one with the best performance. With a small k , there is clearly the risk that random selection, while avoiding outages, will discard a good relay node. Indeed, the key difference between the random- k and Akamai-driven one-hop source routing is the former is intended to improve system's *reliability* by avoiding network outages, while the goal of our scheme is to improve clients' *performance* by selecting and hopping over quality (low-latency) paths as recommended by Akamai.

MONET looks to increase web site availability by taking advantage of redundant client-to-web-server paths whose failure modes are expected to be largely independent. Clients contact web sites via a local MONET proxy that is multi-home with multiple local interfaces. MONET increases the number of alternative paths through an overlay network of peer proxies that can probe a given origin server using a TCP SYN by request [6]. Undoubtedly, CDN-driven detouring has the potential to improve the performance of the above systems; not only by more efficiently avoiding network outages and hot spots, but by eliminating the need to probe a number of Internet paths, thus reducing the TCP SYN stress placed on web servers.

In another closely related work, Fei *et al.* [10] use AS-level path information inferred from `traceroute` to reduce the size of the candidate set for one-hop routing. The goal is to limit the overhead in selecting middle hops by examining only nodes along paths between the origin and destination that diverge in the AS-level path as early as possible. While able to avoid performance degradation over direct paths, it is unclear how the proposed technique could be extended to *online, dynamic* selection of middle nodes. In addition, the proposed heuristic normally yields a large number of potential middle nodes (up to 50) which, due to the coarse resolution of AS-level path disjointness, may not include good candidates. CDN-driven detouring typically results in a very small number of candidates selected based on measurements performed by the CDN as part of its normal operation.

Finally, our work is inspired by tools like Sting [32], T-BIT [26], and King [14], which use existing protocols "in unanticipated ways to obtain results that were previously intractable [14]."

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we performed an extensive measurement study of the Akamai CDN; the goal was to determine how one can *infer* and *utilize* quality, short time-scale information regarding network conditions without the cost of extensive network measurement. By concurrently measuring network paths and monitoring the frequently refreshed low-level Akamai DNS server tables, we

showed that: (i) Akamai-server redirections strongly correlate with network conditions on the paths between clients and servers; more than 70% of paths chosen by Akamai are among the best 10% of the measured network paths. (ii) For a given client, the correlation level predominantly depends on the inter-redirection frequency of the corresponding low-level Akamai DNS server. (iii) Due to low redirection frequencies, clients from South America experience correlation levels that are *below* that achievable by a random or round-robin path selection. (iv) Because Akamai customers are heterogeneously hosted on the edge servers, all investigated clients see a large number of servers (paths) for at least one of the customers. (v) CDN services that utilize network measurements and global server deployment can significantly outperform traditional web content distribution that use load-balancing server farms in a few data centers.

To provide a sample application, we studied the potential for utilizing Akamai redirections to drive one-hop source routes (*i.e.*, detours) in a large-scale overlay network. By concurrently measuring and comparing Akamai-driven one-hop with direct paths between nodes scattered around the globe, we show that (i) in more than 50% of investigated scenarios, it is better to route through the nodes "discovered" by Akamai than to use direct paths. (ii) in 25% of investigated scenarios, a better-than-direct path can be utilized by always following Akamai redirections at the source. (iii) The vast majority of Akamai-driven paths between Asia and Europe belong to the above category; in addition to avoiding local hot spots, they exploit rich Akamai "proxy" infrastructure placed in between the two — *e.g.*, in the US. (iv) Other nodes can apply simple, low-overhead techniques to decide whether to stick with the direct path, or to draft behind Akamai. We conclude by noting that Akamai is only one of many CDNs; such networks are a great resource that can be exploited to obtain "a global Internet weather-report service" for little to no cost.

8. REFERENCES

- [1] Akamai and loral cyberstar alliance. <http://www.akamai.com/en/html/about/press/press123.html>.
- [2] Kazaa. <http://www.kazaa.com/>.
- [3] Planetlab. <http://www.planet-lab.org/>.
- [4] Akamai. Akamai CDN. <http://www.akamai.com>.
- [5] D. Andersen, H. Balakrishnan, F. Kaashoek, and R. Morris. Resilient overlay networks. In *ACM SOSP*, Alberta, Canada, October 2001.
- [6] D. Andersen, H. Balakrishnan, F. Kaashoek, and R. Rao. Improving web availability for clients with MONET. In *NSDI*, Boston, MA, May 2005.
- [7] C. Bornstein, T. Canfield, and G. Miller. Overlay routing networks (Akarouting), 2002. <http://www-math.mit.edu/steng/18.996/lecture9.ps>.
- [8] C. Bornstein, T. Canfield, G. Miller, and S. Rao. Optimal route selection in a content delivery network. US Patent Application 20020163882.
- [9] J. Dille, B. Maggs, J. Parikh, H. Prokop, and R. Sitaraman. Globally distributed content delivery. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 6(5):50–58, September 2002.
- [10] T. Fei, S. Tao, L. Gao, and R. Guerin. How to select a good alternate path in large peer-to-peer systems? In *IEEE INFOCOM*, Barcelona, Spain, April 2006.
- [11] S. Gadde, J. Chase, and M. Rabinovich. Web caching and content distribution: a view from the interior. In *WCW*, Boston, MA, June 2000.

- [12] P. Gilmore. OARtech, 2001.
<http://www.osc.edu/oarnet/oartech/presents/oarnet/11apr2001.ppt>.
- [13] K. Gummadi, H. Madhyastha, S. Gribble, H. Levy, and D. Wetherall. Improving the reliability of Internet paths with one-hop source routing. In *USENIX OSDI*, San Francisco, CA, December 2004.
- [14] K. Gummadi, S. Saroiu, and S. Gribble. King: Estimating latency between arbitrary Internet end hosts. In *ACM IMW*, Marseille, France, November 2002.
- [15] A. Habib and J. Chuang. A measurement-based analysis of residential multihoming. In *IEEE INFOCOM, poster session*, Miami, FL, March 2005.
- [16] K. Johnson, J. Carr, M. Day, and M. Kaashoek. The measured performance of content distribution networks. In *WCW*, Lisbon, Portugal, May 2000.
- [17] J. Jung, E. Sit, H. Balakrishnan, and R. Morris. DNS performance and the effectiveness of caching. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 10(5):589–603, October 2002.
- [18] J. Kangasharju, K. Ross, and J. Roberts. Performance evaluation of redirection schemes in content distribution networks. *Computer Communications*, 24(2):207–214, February 2001.
- [19] M. Koletsou and G. Voelker. The Medusa proxy: A tool for exploring user-perceived web performance. In *WCW*, Boston, MA, June 2001.
- [20] B. Krishnamurthy and C. Wills. Analyzing factors that influence end-to-end web performance. In *WCW*, Amsterdam, Netherlands, April 2000.
- [21] B. Krishnamurthy, C. Wills, and Y. Zhang. On the use and performance of content distribution networks. In *ACM IMW*, San Francisco, CA, November 2001.
- [22] F. Leighton and D. Lewin. Global hosting system. US Patent No. 6,108,703.
- [23] LimeLight Networks. Limelight networks CDN.
<http://www.limelightnetworks.com>.
- [24] R. Mahajan. How Akamai works? <http://www.cs.washington.edu/homes/ratul/akamai.html>.
- [25] Z. Mao, C. Cranor, F. Douglis, M. Rabinovich, O. Spatscheck, and J. Wang. A precise and efficient evaluation of the proximity between web clients and their local DNS servers. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, Monterey, CA, June 2002.
- [26] A. Medina, M. Allman, and S. Floyd. Measuring the evolution of transport protocols in the Internet. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, 35(2):37–52, April 2005.
- [27] Mirror Image. Mirror image CDN.
<http://www.mirror-image.net>.
- [28] A. Nakao, L. Peterson, and A. Bavier. A routing underlay for overlay networks. In *ACM SIGCOMM*, Karlsruhe, Germany, August 2003.
- [29] North American Network Operators' Group. NANOG mailing list.
<http://www.nanog.org/maillinglist.html>, 1999,2000.
- [30] J. Padhye, V. Firoiu, D. Towsley, and J. Kurose. Modeling TCP Reno performance: A simple model and its empirical validation. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 8(2):133–145, April 2000.
- [31] S. Saroiu, K. Gummadi, R. Dunn, S. Gribble, and H. Levy. An analysis of Internet content delivery systems. In *USENIX OSDI*, Boston, MA, December 2002.
- [32] S. Savage. Sting: a TCP-based measurement tool. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, Boulder, CO, October 1999.
- [33] S. Savage, A. Collins, E. Hoffman, J. Snell, and T. Anderson. The end-to-end effects of Internet path selection. In *ACM SIGCOMM*, Vancouver, British Columbia, September 1999.
- [34] SAVVIS. Digital island CDN.
<http://www.savvis.net>.
- [35] A. Shaikh, R. Tewari, and M. Agrawal. On the effectiveness of DNS-based server selection. In *IEEE INFOCOM*, Anchorage, AK, April 2001.
- [36] C. Tang and P. K. McKinley. A distributed multipath computation framework for overlay network applications. Technical Report MSU-CSE-04-18, Michigan State University, May 2004.