

(Numerical) Investigations into Physical Power-law Models of Internet Traffic Using the Renormalization Group

IFORS Triennial Conference Honolulu, HI, July 11–15, 2005

Neil Gunther Performance Dynamics CompanySM Castro Valley, California www.perfdynamics.com



Possibly Perverse Packet History

Bellcore traces kicked off a "paper-mill" industry c.1994 Persistent burstiness: LRD pkt trains $\Rightarrow BIG$ queues

FUD: Queueing theory is dead, fractal traffic, power laws, non-Poisson arrivals, size-dependent service, ... \Rightarrow Internet (I & II) can't be modeled!

Multitudinous math: $M/G/\infty$, chaos thy, large devs, ...

Stop the tram! ...

- 1. Where is LRD being measured? (Rarely discussed) But see e.g., (Downey 2001)
- 2. Industry network engineers **don't** see it! (cf. SYN flooding)
- 3. How much should I care? (Never discussed) Only pkt level effects.



1-Pareto, 2-Pareto, ... ? (Fischer et al. 2004)

With four parameters I can fit an elephant, with five I can make his trunk wiggle. —J. von Neumann

Type	$ar{F}(x)$	f(x)	Domain	Parameters
3-P	$\left(rac{eta}{eta\!-\!k\!+\!x} ight)^lpha$	$\frac{lpha}{k}\left(rac{k}{eta-k+x} ight)^{1+lpha}$	$x \ge k$	$\alpha,\beta>0,k\geq 0$
2-P	$\left(\frac{k}{x}\right)^{lpha}$	$rac{lpha k^lpha}{x^{1+lpha}}$	$x \ge k$	$\alpha>0,\beta=k>0$
1 - P	$rac{1}{(1+x)^{lpha}}$	$rac{lpha}{(1+x)^{1+lpha}}$	$x \ge 0$	$\alpha>0,\beta=1,k=0$

With α (shape), β (scale), k(location). Conventional choice is 2-P:

$$F(k, \alpha, x) = 1 - \left(\frac{k}{x}\right)^{\alpha}$$
$$f(k, \alpha, x) = \frac{\alpha k^{\alpha}}{x^{1+\alpha}} \equiv dF(x)/dx$$
$$\bar{F}(k, \alpha, x) \equiv 1 - F(x) = \left(\frac{k}{x}\right)^{\alpha}$$



Motivations

Profs. Shortle and Gross are to blame for this talk \bigcirc

Is there a way to decide about n-P power law models?

Multi-parameter (unphysical) models are something I've seen before in computer/networking scalability analysis

Power laws and scaling arise from

Renormalization (semi-)group transformations

 \Rightarrow generalized homogeneous functions

If we try to apply RGT as a tool, what happens? (Not easy \Rightarrow numerical studies)



Computer Scalability





Computer Scaling Models I Have Known

(but not necessarily loved)

Scaling Model	Parameters	Genesis
$S_{\sigma}(p) = \frac{p}{1 + \sigma(p-1)}$	$0 \le \sigma < 1$	Gene (Amdahl 1967)
$S_{\phi}(p) = \frac{1 - \phi^p}{1 - \phi}$	$\phi \lesssim 1$	Unknown
$S_{\gamma}(p) = p - \gamma p(p-1)$	$0 \leq \gamma < 1$	Gunther 1991
$S_{\lambda}(p) = \frac{p}{1 + \sigma[(p-1) + \lambda p(p-1)]}$	$0\leq\sigma,\lambda<1,$	(Gunther 1993)
$S_{\alpha}(p) = p(1-\alpha)^{(p-1)}$	$0 \le \alpha < 1$	Amdahl Corp. 1999

- Shown that S_φ(p) is unphysical
 i.e., contradicts (Coxian) queueing theory (Gunther 2002)
- But S_σ(p) and S_λ(p) are physical
 i.e., consistent with queueing theory (Gunther 2004)



Parametric Scalability Models





Amdahl Meets the Repairman (Gunther 2004)



Repairman Model

$$S_{mva}(p) = \frac{p(D+Z)}{R(p)+Z}$$

where
$$S(p) = \frac{X(p)}{X(1)}$$

$$CPUs$$

$$Shared$$

$$memory bus$$

$$Multiprocessor Model$$

$$S_{sync}(p) = \frac{p(D+Z)}{pD+Z}$$

$$= \frac{p}{1+\sigma(p-1)}$$
where $\sigma = \frac{D}{D+Z}$



Load-Dependent Queues (Gunther 2005)





ALOHA Network Stability



Kleinrock, Metcalfe, Weiss, Nelson, Gunther, (Ganesh et al. 2004)



ALOHA as a Queue (Gunther 1990)



Internet routers did congest c.1986 \rightarrow TCP slow-start Critical behavior \rightarrow VM, ALOHA universality

Copyright © 2005 Performance Dynamics



Bellcore Ethernet Measurements

This case seems to have been forgotten! (since c.1989)



Figure 2.2.1. Network from which the August and October 1989 measurements were taken.

Figure 4.2.1 (b). Pox plot of R/S for sequence AUG89.MB. The plot tightly clusters around a straight line whose asymptotic slope clearly lies between the slopes 0.5 (lower dotted line) and 1.0 (upper dotted line) and is readily estimated (using the "brushed" points) to be about 0.79.

FUD has been how to model the Internet (Park & Willinger 2000)Fancy Internet models had better include Ethernet



Fast Switched Ethernet

Ethernet 802.3 (bus type) is not unstable in the sense of ALOHA

Nor is switched ethernet 802.3u (100Base-T) & 802.3a,b (1000Base-T)



(Harrison et al. 2004) measure pkts on 1000Base-T network Trace incoming/outgoing pkts near NIC of web server

- 1. Arrivals are **not Pareto** distributed
- 2. Packetization process is key (Cauchy-M/G/1)
- 3. LRD time correlations have 1/f power spectrum
- 4. Even with **Poisson** arrivals!



Ethernet Arrivals (Harrison et al. 2004)

Arrivals are **not** power law!





Ethernet Throughput (Harrison et al. 2004)





Flicker Noise

Studied by Schottky in **1918** for thermionic tubes, circuits, etc.



Power spectrum S(f) is Fourier transform of correlation function $C(\tau)$. If $C(\tau) \sim \tau^{\alpha-1}$ then $S(f) \sim 1/f^{\alpha}$ where $\alpha \to 0$: white noise $\alpha \to 1$: flicker noise $\alpha \to 2$: Brownian process

- Still no single (universal) model of 1/f noise (yet)
- Validity of "sandpile model" (Bak et al. 1987) now questioned



Power Law Impulse Filter



Simple sawtooth waveform





Impulse function $h(t) = 1/t^{\beta}$



S(f) output with cutoff



Power Law Queue



- Poisson arrivals with rate λ
- Service distribution $\sim t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ (file size-dept.) ((Harrison et al. 2004) use Cauchy size dsn. $\sim 1/x^2$)
- Output (network link) distribution $\sim 1/f^{\alpha}$ with ($\alpha = 1$)
- Seems to account for ethernet (Needs more investigation)
- That still leaves the Internet ...



Renormalization Group Therapy (for Recovering Physicists)

- RGT is mathematical group with no inverse Rescaling ⇒ averaging or filtering. Lose information Physics from group invariants e.g., rotational symmetry group → conservation of angular momentum
- RGT developed by physicists to study connection between local and global system dynamics. (cf. ALOHA)
 Connection occurs when system correlations go "critical"
 (Physics-speak for *fluctuations occur on all scales—length, time*)
 System characterization goes singular at critical point
 Singular behavior characterized by a power law (Stanley 1999)
- RGT produces power law solutions with the added capability of characterizing the singularity at **fixed point** of RGT (sometimes)



Site Percolation Models

Purely geometric arguments (Almost physics-free!) \bigcirc



Critical concentration p_c ?



Order parameter $|p - p_c|$



First conducting (porous) path



Correlation length $\xi \sim \frac{1}{|p-p_c|^{\nu}}$



Spatial Renormalization





Local transformation rules

Block re-scaling transformations

Local fluctuations averaged out under RGT (low-pass filter) Want fixed points of the re-scaling transformation Lattice geometry invariant at fixed point $p^* \Rightarrow LRD!$ Compute power law exponents near p^*



Example 1: Linear Geometry (d = 1)



R(p) is the RG transformation (from geometry) Fixed points p^* occur where R(p) intersects pIn this case, they're trivial: $p^* = 1$ (unstable), $p^* = 0$ (stable) U(p) is the control function (maxima and minima)



Example 2: \Box Lattice (d = 2)



Fixed points: 0, 0.618034, and 1 (numerically)

cf. ALOHA stability



Example 3: Δ Lattice (d = 2)



Fixed points $p^*: 0, 0.5, and 1$ (algebraically)

Use this ("simple") example to see how power law exponents for correlation length can be computed from RGT



Critical Exponents for Δ Lattice



Geometry of re-scaling to $b/\sqrt{3}$

RGT flows near $p^* = \frac{1}{2} \equiv p_c$

R(p) is *linear* in $(p - p_c)$ near critical pt. Taylor expand:

$$p' = p_c - 6p_c(p_c - 1)(p - p_c) + O(p - p_c)^2$$

where p' is the concentration on the rescaled lattice

Copyright © 2005 Performance Dynamics



Critical Exponent for Correlation Length

2nd term in p' contains Taylor series derivative:

$$\Lambda = \partial_p R(p) = 6(1-p)p \Big|_{p=\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{3}{2}$$

Rescaled correlation length: $\xi' = \xi(p') = \xi(p)/b$ ξ is a **homogeneous function** of $(p - p_c)$:

$$\xi(\Lambda \times |p - p_c|) = \xi(|p - p_c|)/b$$

satisfied by **power law** $\xi = |p - p_c|^{-\nu}$. Hence:

$$\Lambda^{-\nu} |p - p_c|^{-\nu} = |p - p_c|^{-\nu} / b$$

and solving for the **exponent** ν with $b = \sqrt{3}$:

$$\nu = \frac{\ln(\sqrt{3})}{\ln(3/2)} = 1.35476$$

Empirical value is $\nu = \frac{4}{3} = 1.3333$



RG Theory of FARIMA Systems

Conventional ARIMA(0, 1, 0) \rightarrow random walk process ARIMA(0, d, 0) with **fractional difference** $d \in (0, \frac{1}{2}]$ Fractional ARIMA $\rightarrow S(f) \sim f^{-2d}$ (Hosking 1981)





RGT and Pareto

(Back to the future)

From: Dr. Neil Gunther
Sent: Monday, May 24, 2004 11:08 PM
To: Fischer, Martin J.
Subject: FW: CORS follow up to MC25.2

Dear Dr. Fischer,

I enjoyed your presentation MC25.2 at CORS ... I may have something to offer regarding your question about the reduction of variance in the 2-Pareto model.

Fischer et al.	NJG Conjecture	
If X is 1-P distributed r.v., then	$X \to Z$ is an affine transformation	
$Z = \beta X + k$ is a 3-P distributed r.v.	Affine group $> RG$	
"Stretched" by β	β : dilatation transf. (RG invariant)	
"Shifted" by k	k: is a translation (not RG invariant)	
Stretching does not change the CoV	RGT preserves ratio $CoV = \sigma^2/\mu^2$	
Given α , can get any μ and σ^2	Not from RGT. Only 1-P satisfies RGT	



Conclusions (my unfunded research)

- Has Internet LRD phenomenon been oversold? (Ethernet?)
- $RTG \rightarrow physical power laws (from critical dynamics)$
- Unstable ALOHA from load-dept. queueing **fixed points**
- Poisson input Ethernet **packetization** $\rightarrow 1/f$ LRD
- RGT for FARIMA models of 1/f LRD → fixed points May explain lack of observable Internet impact (critical dynamics) Very localized on Internet (not backbones or WANs)
- Which Pareto is physical?
 cf. unphysical multi-parametric scalability models
 1-P (F
 (x) ~ 1/x^α) is RGT invariant (cf. S(f) ~ 1/f^α)
- Plenty of cleanup to do ...



References

- [Amdahl 1967] G. Amdahl, "Validity of the Single Processor Approach to Achieving Large Scale Computing Capabilities", Proc. AFIPS Conf., 30, 483-485, Apr. 18-20, Atlantic City, New Jersey, 1967
- [Bak et al. 1987] P. Bak, C. Tang and K. Wiesenfeld, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59 381 (1987)
- [Downey 2001] A. B. Downey. "Evidence for Long-tailed Distributions in the Internet", ACM SIGCOM Internet Measurement Workshop, Nov. 2001
- [Harrison et al. 2004] T. Field, U. Harder and P. Harrison, "Measurement and Modeling of Self-Similar Traffic in Computer Networks", Imperial College London, 2004
- [Fischer et al. 2004] M. J. Fischer, D. M. Bevilacqua Masi, D. Gross and J. Shortle "One-Parameter, Two-Parameter, Three-Parameter Pareto: Is There a Modeling Difference?", CORS/INFORMS Joint Conference, Session MC-25, Banff, Canada, 2004
- [Ganesh et al. 2004] A. Ganesh, N. O'Connell and D. Wischik, *Big Queues*, Springer LNM #1838, 2004
- [Gunther 1990] N. J. Gunther and J. G. Shaw, "Path Integral Evaluation of ALOHA Network Transients", Information Processing Letters, **33(6)**, 289–295, 1990
- [Gunther 1993] N. J. Gunther, "A Simple Capacity Model for Massively Parallel Transaction Systems", Proc. CMG Conf., San Diego, California, pp. 1035–1044, 1993
- [Gunther 2002] N. J. Gunther, "A New Interpretation of Amdahl's Law and Geometric Scalability", xxx.lanl.gov/abs/cs.DC/0210017, Oct 17, 2002
- [Gunther 2004] N. J. Gunther, "On the Connection Between Scaling Laws in Parallel Computers and Manufacturing Systems", CORS/INFORMS Joint Conference, Session SC-16, Banff, Canada, 2004
- [Gunther 2005] N. J. Gunther, Analyzing Computer System Performance Using Perl::PDQ, Springer-Verlag, 2005
- [Hosking 1981] J. Hosking, "Fractional Differencing", Biometrika, 68(1), 165–176, 1981
- [Park & Willinger 2000] K. Park and W. Willinger, Self-Similar Network Traffic and Performance Evaluation, Wiley, 2000
- [Stanley 1999] H. E. Stanley, "Scaling, Universality, and Renormalization: Three Pillars of Modern Critical Phenomena", Reviews of Modern Physics, 71, No. 2, S358-S366, 1999