

# **Supporting Mobility in Global Scale**

Lixia Zhang

UCLA Computer Science Department

AsiaFI 2009 Winter School on Wireless Mobile Networks

---

# Setting Up the Stage

As networking researchers, exactly how do we get our job done?

- ◆ Physicists: interpret the given-world
  - No dispute over whether the design was right or wrong
- ◆ Networking research
  - God did not build the Internet; we did
  - We designed all the rules (protocols)
  - We create artifacts through (informed) trials and errors: define problem  $\Rightarrow$  design  $\Rightarrow$  implement  $\Rightarrow$  experiment  $\Rightarrow$  learn lessons  $\Rightarrow$  revise/next design (hopefully better)

**This talk is ~~an attempt to~~  
an attempted start to**

- ◆ Define the problem,
  - ◆ explore the design space, and
  - ◆ identify open issues
- 
- ◆ What are the Fundamental Challenges?
  - ◆ What are the Fundamental Principles to guide our mobility deployment effort in next few years?

# Why Mobility Support in Global Scale?

- ◆ Cellphone providers already have it
- ◆ Need Internet mobility support in global scale
- ◆ Why? Why now?

**From Dr. Wakikawa's presentation on Monday:**

**Mobiles are no longer minority**

Internet Population Changes to Mobiles

- Automobiles (800,000,000), Cell phones (1,500,000,000)  
People (???)

## “Mobility Support” = ??

- ◆ Being able to reach nodes that may have moved / may be moving (host mobility)
- ◆ Being able to reach a group of nodes that may be moving together (network mobility)
- ◆ Being able to reach moving entities through forwarding nodes that may be moving themselves (ad hoc network)

## A Side Note: ID vs IP Address

A topic that has triggered lots and lots discussions lately ...

- ◆ IP address is for data delivery == IP address is topologically-dependent
- ◆ To identify a mobile node or a multihomed node: need a node identifier
- ◆ What to use for that node-ID?
  - An engineering design decision

## “Global Scale” = ??

- ◆ Measured by geographic distance
- ◆ Measured by size
  - Number of nodes in the overall system
- ◆ Measured by the degrees of heterogeneity in technologies
- ◆ Measured by the number of autonomous parties in the game
  - Each with different interest

# Mobility Support: Some Other Variables

- ◆ Slow movement, fast movement
- ◆ Short distance movement, long distance movement
- ◆ Movement across different network boundaries
  - Networks of different owners, networks of different technologies
- ◆ Mobile nodes with multiple interfaces
  - Both a challenge and an opportunity
- ◆ Multiple mobility supports by different networks, at different levels
- ◆ Bigger factors:
  - Different parties with different interests
  - Technology trends and progressing speed
    - Much unknown lying ahead in the future

# Taking a Look at the Design Space

- ◆ How many different ways to get data to a mobile node?
- ◆ I can see three
  - Flooding
  - Continuously distributing current mobile location through network routing
  - One level of indirection: find the mobile location through a stationary entity
    - Various solutions as elaborations of this
      - ▲ Cellphone network: home provider
      - ▲ Mobile IP
      - ▲ Dynamic DNS

# Now, How do we cook all these together

- ◆ And get a "Global Scale" = ??

- ◆ Measured by geographic distance
- ◆ Measured by size
  - Number of nodes in the overall network
- ◆ Measured by the degree of connectivity
  - Networks of different types

**Mobility Support: Some Other Variables**

- ◆ Slow movement, fast movement
- ◆ Short distance movement, long distance movement
- ◆ Mobile nodes
  - Both a

## Taking a Look at the Design Space

- ◆ Measure the game
  - Each
- ◆ How many different ways to get data to a mobile node?
  - ◆ I thought of three
    - Flooding
    - Continuously distributing current mobile location through network routing
    - One level of indirection: find the mobile location through a stationary entity

# Setting Up the Stage

As networking researchers, exactly how do we get our job done?

- ◆ Physicists: interpret the given-world
  - No dispute over whether the design was right or wrong
- ◆ Networking research
  - God did not build the Internet; we did
  - We designed all the rules (protocols)
  - **We create artifacts through (informed) trials and errors:** define problem  $\Rightarrow$  design  $\Rightarrow$  implement  $\Rightarrow$  experiment  $\Rightarrow$  learn lessons  $\Rightarrow$  revise/next design (hopefully better)

# Look over the fence

- ◆ The wired Internet:
  - Measured by size: a global-scale system
    - The largest cohesive system ever by human?
  - The degrees of heterogeneity in technologies: high
  - Interconnecting very large numbers of autonomous parties, each with different interest
  - Driven by
    - ↪ technology advances → system growth → new users and new applications
- ◆ What can we learn from 30 years of Internet experience?

# Some principles/lessons from Internet

(an incomplete and unordered list)

- ◆ Reachability is number one
- ◆ Distributed, not centralized
  - The design must allow one to take care its own business, not affected by others
- ◆ Be prepared for things to go wrong
  - Reliability through redundancy
- ◆ Keep local changes local
  - Locality: measured by topological relations, geographic distance, network scope, ...
- ◆ Keep it simple
- ◆ Make it scalable
- ◆ Market chooses; end users have the final say
  - God seems unwilling to grant any particular party's wishes

# Example: DNS

- ◆ Reachability is number one
- ◆ Distributed, not centralized
  - Individual domain owners set up their own name servers, manage their own policies
  - Great division of responsibility
- ◆ Be prepared for things to go wrong
  - Redundant DNS servers, in distributed locations
- ◆ Keep local changes local
  - Name mapping changes at local domain only; DNS server changes propagate one-level up
- ◆ Keep it simple
  - The Resource Record design; the simple caching design
- ◆ Make it scale
  - There is a relation between the size and frequency of change
  - DNS servers: very large in numbers, infrequent changes

# Another Example: the Basic Mobile IP design

- ◆ Reachability is number one
- ◆ Distributed, not centralized
  - individual mobiles arrange their own home agents
  - Your HA may be failed, mine still working
- ◆ Be prepared for things to go wrong?
- ◆ Keep local changes local
  - mobile reports back to its own home agent
    - May not be local by topological or geographic distance
- ◆ Keep it simple
- ◆ Make it scalable
  - By keeping mobile dynamics outside routing infrastructure

# Is Mobile IP design a patch-on?

- ◆ It *was* added on later
- ◆ If we were to start again from scratch, would it have been done differently?
  - Distributed control
  - It scales well as far as distribution of mobility update is concerned
  - Performance is important, but below any of the above consideration
- ➔ Keeping mobile state at home agent
  - Keep the matter in your own hand
  - Simplest design?
  - Not giving highest possible performance: Non-local mobility updates as measured by topological or geographic distance → considered sub-optimal under rapid movement

# How to Improve the performance

- ◆ Must not sacrificing scalability
- ◆ Identify network scope?
- ◆ Identify boundary?
- ◆ Optimization within scope/boundary
  - Flooding?
  - Via routing?
  - Rapid binding?

# What to take away

- ◆ Keep the global picture in mind
- ◆ Learn from the past!
  - A rich set of lessons
  - A rich set of working solutions
- ◆ Understand where we came
  - May help us better understand where we are going
- ◆ Technology moving forward at an accelerating speed
- ◆ Successful designs → facilitating technology advances → potential change of the playground

# One more quick departing note

- ◆ Yes we can learn a lot from the past
  - What applies?
  - What doesn't?
- ◆ “one must think through everything on his own. One must not blindly accept others opinions; one must not worship ‘the principles’ ”

# Thank you!

## Questions?

*lixia@cs.ucla.edu*