

Generalized and Resource-Efficient VNet Embeddings with Migrations

Gregor Schaffrath, Stefan Schmid, Anja Feldmann
Telekom Innovation Labs & TU Berlin, Berlin, Germany
{grsch,stefan,anja}@net.t-labs.tu-berlin.de

Abstract—This paper attends to the problem of embedding flexibly specified CloudNets, virtual networks connecting cloud resources (such as storage or computation). We attend to a scenario where customers can request CloudNets at short notice, and an infrastructure provider (or a potential intermediate broker or reseller) first embeds the CloudNet fast (e.g., using a simple heuristic). Later, however, long-lived CloudNets embeddings are optimized by migrating them to more suitable locations, whose precise definition depends on a given objective function. For instance, such migrations can be useful to reduce the peak resource loads in the network by spreading CloudNets across the infrastructure, to save energy by moving CloudNets together and switching off unused components, or for maintenance purposes.

We present a very generic algorithm to compute optimal embeddings of CloudNets: It allows for different objective functions (such as load minimization or energy conservation), supports cost-aware migration, and can deal with all link types that arise in practice (e.g., full-duplex or even wireless or wired broadcast links with multiple endpoints). Our evaluation shows that such a rigorous optimization is even feasible in order to optimize a moderate-size CloudNet of full flexibility (e.g., a router site, a small physical infrastructure or virtual provider network).

I. INTRODUCTION

More and more of today’s infrastructure is being virtualized. Emerging link virtualization technologies such as OpenFlow allow us to realize the vision of CloudNets which provide an abstraction of *both nodes and links*, connecting (and providing access to) virtual cloud resources with virtual networking. Decoupling virtual networks from the physical constraints of the underlying infrastructure (the *substrate*), CloudNets can offer opportunities for customized network environments and can be flexibly *embedded*¹ at optimal (e.g., economical) locations and even migrated.

One of the central challenges arising from CloudNets concerns the strategies to leverage the resource allocation flexibility. While previous work focused on optimized initial embeddings of graph-like topologies [3], recent efforts aim at the improvement of the migration process [18] or the calculation of the most beneficial reconfigurations under constraints of additional network communication cost [13]. However, the question of how virtual network embedding costs are affected by the possibility of migration has received much less attention so far. While today’s network virtualization technology facilitates seamless migration (without session interruption), migration inevitably introduces costs (e.g., in

terms of computation, bandwidth, or even roaming fees in case of cross-provider migrations). Whether and where to migrate (parts of) virtual networks is hence a non-trivial problem.

Our work is based on (and incorporated in) our prototype virtualization architecture described in [15]. The architecture is motivated by both technical and business perspectives. It considers a scenario where participating entities focus on abstractions relevant to them and optimize towards their own goals: A customer requests a network with (possibly incomplete) requirement specifications, whereas every unspecified parameter is a degree of freedom to the providers. Brokers and resellers without holistic substrate topology knowledge split up the request and negotiate for partial resources with cloud providers, optimizing the embedding towards their own benefits. Cloud providers in turn optimize the embeddings inside their own substrate segment along their specific substrate management policies. We further assume that large cloud providers may substructure into sites, and introduce their own internal reseller or broker instances.

This scenario entails two important implications: First, the abstraction characteristic of virtualization and the given requirement specification allow providers on any level (cloud providers and resellers) to freely optimize embeddings for their own purposes. If agreed upon provisioning properties are met, changes may be assumed not to disrupt applications inside the CloudNet. Second, resource mapping—a computationally hard problem—needs to scale only to the scope of one role/player, as it happens in multiple steps.

The embedding strategies and objectives are likely to vary in size and heterogeneity of the available substrate, as well as the time available to find a solution. It is unlikely that one CloudNets embedding approach will fit all situations: Symmetries in data centers may allow for reasonable approximations e.g., by greedy virtual network placements or aggregation of similar resources. A backbone router site may be too diverse for such an approach, but allow for the computation of optimal solutions to its limited size. In scenarios with heavy-tailed CloudNet durations, short term placements may not even warrant the effort of optimization, but it is beneficial for a provider to optimize *long-lived* CloudNets into an efficiently managed segment of the network.

A. Our Contribution

This paper addresses the CloudNets embedding problem. We propose a generic embedding algorithm which *jointly*

¹In this paper, the terms embedding and mapping are treated as synonymous and used interchangeably.

optimizes node placements and link embeddings and exploits this flexibility to compute *optimal embeddings* (“realizations”) of the CloudNets, while *guaranteeing* the allocation and provisioning of the requested combination of resources. Our algorithm is the first one to integrate *cost-aware migrations*. We believe that as the type and arrival time of CloudNet requests is hard to predict, the possibility of reconfigurations and migration is crucial. Moreover, our algorithm does not rely on any particular “clean-slate” type of substrate topology [19].

In addition, our approach provides high flexibility, including all link types that occur in practice, such as half-duplex, full-duplex, or even broadcast links with multiple endpoints (as they appear in wireless networks but also in wired contexts with hubs), in the sense that any of these links can be mapped on any other. It supports embeddings across resources and resource types and exact solutions for the mapping of partial networks to single substrate nodes. It further supports provider-side placement policies as well as resource prioritization (e.g., prioritizing lucrative resource allocations). It also allows us to take into account node-based loads, e.g., as a function of the packet rate (shorter packets increase the computational load at the forwarding engine) etc.

Interestingly, despite this flexibility, our algorithm is a (linear) Mixed Integer Program (MIP) and can hence be solved by standard and optimized tools such as CPLEX. Another advantage of the mathematical programming approach is that it enables us to propose different objective functions which can be easily exchanged. For example, at some point a provider may choose to place the virtual networks on the “edge” of the physical network in order to avoid blocking bottleneck links and hence to maximize the likelihood that future CloudNet requests can be accepted. At another point it wants to spread the CloudNet embeddings as much as possible in order to minimize the load or congestion, or to collocate the CloudNets as much as possible in order to be able to switch off other parts of the network in order to save energy or for maintenance work.

In contrast to various existing embedding heuristics for virtual networks (e.g., [7], [11], [12]), the focus of this paper is on an *integrated* approach which emphasizes the *quality* of the CloudNet embeddings. In particular, we focus on the optimal solutions, and investigate the feasibility of this approach to improve initially heuristically placed CloudNets; this is interesting for *long-lived* CloudNets where the resource investments for computing the optimizations may pay off in the future. We have three use-cases in mind: (1) a *VPN-like scenario* where the virtual node locations are given, (2) a *data center like scenario* where the virtual node placements are fully flexible, and (3) an *out-sourcing / cloud scenario* where some virtual nodes have a fixed location (location and access network of a company) and others do not (out-sourced services, to cloud). Clearly, the data center scenario is the most challenging for optimization, while the VPN scenario, without the possibility to optimize terminal mappings, boils down to a classic flow problem which can even be solved optimally in polynomial time. In our evaluation, we will hence focus on

the first two.

Note that our algorithm allows us to compute, e.g., the migration cost-benefit tradeoff: By computing the embedding that would result from migration together with the migration cost, it is left to the (potentially automated) administrator to decide whether the changes are worthwhile. For example, our algorithm allows to answer questions such as: Can we migrate CloudNets to a more compact form such that 20% of the currently used resources are freed up, and what would be the corresponding migration cost?

We have implemented all our algorithms in our CloudNets prototype architecture.

II. CHALLENGES

A distinguishing feature of CloudNets is the flexibility in terms of the specification and the combination of different resources, from bandwidth requirements along virtual cloud links to storage and computational capacities at the virtual cloud nodes. Indeed, we consider all kinds of real live constraints. This requires a generic and formal interface that allows a customer and a provider to agree on a certain service; within this specification, the provider is free to optimize and re-embed the allocation, e.g., in order to make optimal (re-)use of the given infrastructure, to provide the best service or to save energy by switching off unused resources. The specification of a CloudNet can include capacities, geographical constraints, specific versions of the operating system, or also non-topological requirements such as the binary compatibility (e.g., w.r.t. word size) of the architectures where two virtual nodes are mapped to.

There are also constraints on the physical infrastructure provider side. For example, not all possible link types are available, and hence a virtual broadcast link may be implemented with multiple asymmetric links. Moreover, a provider may have its own set of policies where to map certain components.

Efficient CloudNet embeddings are challenging and due to the large number of possible specifications, a very flexible algorithm is needed. An algorithm to compute a good embedding of a given static set of CloudNets is not satisfactory in practice, as CloudNet requests arrive over time and an optimal placement at some time t_0 may become suboptimal at some time $t > t_0$. For instance, if another virtual cloud network expires, resources are freed up and another CloudNet could be migrated there. Re-embeddings can also make sense for network management and maintenance, e.g., to move the traffic to different paths to upgrade the routers. Moreover, the demand for a certain service can be *dynamic*, due to daytime reasons, and also the origins of the request can change due to *user mobility* or *time-zone effects*, which means that CloudNets should be dynamically scaled up or down depending on the demand, and moved with the users to ensure a good latency of the access (Quality-of-Service/Quality-of-Experience parameters). An embedding algorithm must hence support cost-aware migrations in the sense that it trades off migration cost against the potential benefits.

A. Migration Cost

While migrations may yield more efficient embeddings, their costs depend on many factors. For instance, classic server migrations may entail service interruption costs that depend on the available bandwidth along the migration path, while live migration technology may provide a seamless service and only come at a cost of bulk data transfers. In this paper, we will group these factors into three categories:

Resource removal: These costs are independent of the migration destination. They either relate to the removal of old allocations, or to the fact that a migration is happening per se. A migration entails a management overhead C_{mgmt} . If, e.g., a virtual network provider triggers a cross-provider migration, the termination of provisioning contracts may entail penalties C_{contract} . Temporary redundant allocations of resources and reconfiguration based service outages during migration entail opportunistic costs C_{reconfig} . An example cause for the latter would be outages triggered by switchovers to and from transitional provisioning solutions.

Resource transferral: These costs may depend on the migration destination. They relate to the actual transfer and possible property changes. Bulk data transfers may entail both real and opportunistic transit costs C_{transit} . E.g., transfer of host state may require additional bandwidth to be leased from transit providers. It may interfere with provisioning of other CloudNets, if routed via the same substrate links. Furthermore, adaptations may impose overhead if crucial properties change (e.g., migrating a virtual host from Xen to KVM). We denote this cost factor by $C_{\text{adaptation}}$.

Resource reinstantiation: Establishment of new provisioning contracts or cost and benefit changes relate to the new placement and hence the future position. However, we model them in the context of placement preferences, as they are semantically equivalent to the factors influencing initial placement. This becomes clear considering that some resources (e.g., virtual links) may be migrated by reinstantiation rather than actual transfer.

Some of the mentioned costs may be zero and others approximated for practical reasons. As an example, consider the following two scenarios: The first comprises a live migration of a host inside of a (fully switched, homogeneous) rack belonging to the same provider, providing separate links for the data plane and migrations. Evidently, contract penalties do not apply, no adaptations are required, and transit costs may be approximated as destination independent in the scope. In the second, a virtual network provider live-migrates a host between providers. All cost factors may apply, but those of the second group may be included in C_{reconfig} , if the migration is provided as a service on behalf of the physical infrastructure providers.

B. Use Cases

We have three basic use cases in mind.

VPN: In the *VPN scenario*, the locations of the virtual nodes of a CloudNet are fully specified. In contrast to typical VPN networks however, resources are reserved along the paths

connecting the VPN terminals (admission control and traffic shaping to ensure QoS), which essentially boils down to a network flow problem; moreover, computational and storage resources can be specified at the terminals.

DC: The *data center scenario* describes the other extreme where the virtual cloud nodes have full placement flexibility and can be mapped to arbitrary locations.

OC: The so-called *out-sourcing/cloud scenario* is situated between the two extremes modeled by the static VPN and the fully flexible DC scenario. A CloudNet consists of some virtual nodes with fixed locations (e.g., branches of the company and access network) while other virtual nodes (providing, for example, storage or computation) are “out-sourced”, e.g., to a data center, and have a flexible location.

Note that the use cases are related, and the VPN problem is often a subproblem of the OC problem. An OC problem can also generate a DC problem in the sense that once an appropriate data center is found, a DC problem needs to be solved within the data center.

III. EMBEDDING: KEY CONCEPTS

The main objective of our algorithm is to embed CloudNet requests that arrive over time by mapping them onto the given substrate network resources in such a way that the specification is fulfilled (i.e., all specified resources are allocated to the CloudNet); or to reject the request otherwise. For instance, a virtual node may require a 1GHz CPU and may only be mapped onto Linux nodes in the US. Similarly, CloudNet links may need a minimum of 10 MBit/s. The resources offered by the substrate nodes and links can be shared among the virtual networks.

The algorithm should be flexible in terms of the objective function to be optimized for the CloudNet placement, and the arrival of a new CloudNet should cause minimal changes to the existing embedding of prior CloudNets (i.e., since CloudNet migration cost is non-zero there is a tradeoff between migration cost and a superior embedding).

In the following, we introduce the main ideas of our embedding algorithm. We pursue a mathematical programming approach and present a (linear) *Mixed Integer Program (MIP)* which has the advantage that standard software tools such as CPLEX or `lpsolve` can be used to perform the computations. (Although we focus on optimal embeddings, these tools also offer different heuristics for faster but approximate solutions; all these heuristics are directly applicable to our program as well.)

A MIP consists of a (linear) *objective function* expressed using a set of variables, plus a set of (linear) constraints on these variables that ensure “valid” solutions. If a problem can be specified in this form (what we do in this paper for the CloudNet embedding problem), state-of-the-art optimized algorithms can be used for evaluation. This section serves to introduce the reader to our approach and the different variables and constants used in our program. The complete formal program description appears in Figure 1.

A. Graph Representation

Shared communication channels, i.e., links with several end points (both in the virtual and the substrate network) constitute a first challenge for such a generic mapping approach. To describe virtual and substrate networks as classic graphs $G = (V, E)$ consisting of vertices V that are connected pairwise by edges E , we introduce the notion of *network elements* (NEs): network elements represent both *nodes* (set NE_N) and *links* (set NE_L). Network elements are connected by interfaces, which form the edges of the graph.

We distinguish between virtual network elements of the CloudNet (set $NE_V = NE_{VN} \cup NE_{VL}$ of virtual nodes and virtual links) and substrate network elements of the substrate network (set $NE_S = NE_{SN} \cup NE_{SL}$). In principle, any virtual node can be mapped onto any substrate node, depending on the requirements. A virtual link can be embedded onto a substrate node, a substrate link, or onto a set of paths in the substrate network (resulting in a multi-flow embedding).

The purpose of the embedding algorithm is to find a mapping of the virtual networks and their elements to the network elements of the substrate. To handle links with several endpoints, we replace each link with a vertex and add graph edges accordingly.

B. Placement Policies and Suitability

We use the binary matrix $new(u, v)$ to denote whether a virtual cloud network element $u \in NE_V$ is mapped to a substrate network element $v \in NE_S$ ($new(u, v) = 1$) or not ($new(u, v) = 0$).

A substrate element allocates resources for all virtual elements it hosts. To describe these allocations, we introduce the variables $alloc_{r_V}(u, v)$ which captures the amount of virtual resource r_V of u hosted on v and $alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V)$ describing the substrate resources r_S used to allocate it. The resources r_V requested for u are represented by the constant matrix $req(u, r_V, s)$, where $s \in VT$ refers to the value type of request (e.g., minimum, maximum, ...). To ensure that the sum of the allocated resources never exceeds substrate capacities of substrate we use the constant capacity matrices $cap_{r_S}(v)$, $cap_{r_S}(v, w)$, and $cap(r_S)$. The first two hold individual capacities of substrate components v and substrate interfaces interconnecting v and w with respect to r_S . The last represents the capacity of a resource r_S itself. All three are required to correctly model various possible shared resources assignments in the substrate.

It is not always possible to map a virtual network element to any arbitrary substrate element. For example, a virtual cloud node may be restricted to substrate elements within the US. The constant binary matrix $suit(u, v)$ specifies whether v is suitable to host network element u ($suit(u, v) = 1$) or not.

Our mathematical program considers placement restrictions: a provider may want to bias or fix a mapping for a specific CloudNet according to internal placement policies or cost factors. We thus use a constant weight matrix $weight(u, v)$ to introduce a cost for each node placement. These weights

can also be used as policy support to prioritize certain resource allocations over others in the objective function.

C. Link Types and Resources

Next, we discuss how we handle the different link types: If the bandwidth in both directions is the same we call a link *symmetric*, otherwise it is called *asymmetric*. A *full-duplex* link supports traffic in both directions *independently*. A full-duplex link can be regarded as two independent *unidirectional* links. A shared (wireless, or non-switched, hub-like) channel is referred as *half-duplex* link. Note that half-duplex links are symmetric by nature.

We explicitly distinguish between two classes of resources $R = R_V \cup R_S$, namely virtual resources $r_V \in R_V$ and substrate resources $r_S \in R_S$. To handle the different link types, virtual half-duplex links are associated to an r_V of attribute `'/link/symmetric/bandwidth'` whereas substrate full-duplex links receive two r_S with `'/link/upstream/bandwidth'` and `'/link/downstream/bandwidth'` respectively. In our embedding program, we assume a proportional relationship between r_V and r_S , that is, we consider a proportional factor $prop(r_V, r_S)$. As different relation functions are possible (e.g., involving constant instantiation overhead), the respective constraints should be considered exemplary.

Interestingly, differentiating between r_V and r_S in both CloudNet specification and MIP is not only useful for handling different link types but also for mapping nodes: It enables us to map and even split resources of arbitrary resource types onto arbitrary other resource types.

To handle shared communication channels we decompose its multiple endpoints into a *set of flows*. In particular, for each link u , we introduce a set $Fl(u)$ that describes the set of possible source-sink pairs for u .

Each flow $f \in Fl(u)$ inherits the requirements of u . Analogously to the $alloc$ matrices, $flow_{r_V}(f, v, w)$ and $flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V)$ reflect tentative resource allocations on substrate interfaces, and $new(f, v)$ denotes corresponding tentative flow mappings. Resources of these flows $f \in Fl(u)$ form the set $R_f \subset R_V$.

D. The Flow Problem

While we consider virtual nodes atomic in the context of our MIP, virtual links can be realized either as single path or multiple paths within the substrate network. The aggregated resources of the paths must satisfy the requirements of the virtual link while not exceeding the capacity limits of the substrate elements. For instance, the sum of the bandwidths of the different paths must equal the link's bandwidth demand. This constitutes a *flow problem*. However, since we tackle placement and embedding at the same time this corresponds to a multi-commodity flow problem with a twist: The endpoints are not fixed, but candidate locations overlap.

Our mathematical program ensures that the allocated flows are connected, consistent with the requirements and capacities. We enforce a *flow preservation invariant*, that is, we guarantee

that the amount of flow arriving at a node equals the amount of flow leaving the node. However, we must exempt the source and the sink of the flow from this invariant: We ensure that the traffic leaving the source equals the demand of the virtual link. The link's sink simply consumes the incoming flows. This is implemented via selector variables that render the constraint trivially true for endpoints (a tautology).

E. Migration Support

As mentioned, CloudNet requests typically arrive over time and the provider faces the problem of how to embed a new CloudNet given the existing allocations of other requests. Clearly, a complete re-embedding of all requests is out-of-question, as this potentially comes at a high cost and with long outage times. However, small local reconfigurations may reduce the overall resource overhead and improve the overall embedding substantially, or even make the embedding possible at all.

To this end, we introduce matrices and constraints that allow the specification of reconfiguration costs and enable the solver to weight them against the respective benefits. Analogue to $new(u, v)$, we use the constant binary matrix $old(u, v)$ to describe existing mappings, and specify whether a virtual network element u is currently mapped to a substrate element v ($old(u, v) = 1$) or not ($old(u, v) = 0$).

We account for the cost of migration in two respects: destination independent cost factors are reflected in the constant penalty matrix $penalty(u) = C_{contract}(u) + C_{mgmt}(u) + C_{reconfig}(u)$. Destination dependent $C_{transit}$ and $C_{adaptation}$ cost factors to migrate virtual network element u from its current position to substrate element v are summed up in the constant matrix $transit(u, v)$.

Node migration is typically more expensive relative to link migration, as links do not involve state or bulk data transfers but are rather re-instantiated. As long as at least one end point of a modified link remains in place (i.e., the connected virtual node did not migrate), connectivity can be guaranteed by temporary redundant resource allocations. Costs can be reflected by the link's $transit(u, v)$ variables. If all endpoints migrate simultaneously, at least one interconnecting segment or tunnel is required to allow for live-migrations. As a simplification, we consider a scenario where every migrating host receives a temporary tunnel, as proposed in VROOM [17], and where costs are added to the respective host's $transit(u, v)$ values. Furthermore, we do not consider contract penalties for removed link segments, or migration-maximizing objective functions in this step. We thus assume $penalty(u) = \epsilon$ for $\forall u \in NE_{VL}$ and an arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$, unless stated otherwise.

IV. THE EMBEDDING PROGRAM

Based on the above ideas we next describe the MIP in details, see Tables I(sets), II(constants), III(variables) for a summary. While we introduced most sets, variables, and constants above we will describe the remaining ones in support of

specific objective functions, and proceed with an explanation of the constraints.

A. Objective Function

How is an optimal embedding of a CloudNet on a set of resources in the substrate network characterized? The answer depends on the goals of the mapping entity, and also relies crucially on the predictability of future resource requests. Even with good predictions, an optimal solution found at time t_0 may be suboptimal upon the arrival of the next request at some time $t > t_0$.

We hence do not propose any specific objective functions here (recall that one advantage of our mathematical programming approach is the ease of exchanging different objective functions with only limited implementation effort) but just consider two canonical examples: minimizing resource usage (to ensure localizing embeddings) and load balancing (by spreading the embeddings as much as possible).

The minimization of the amount of substrate resources used for CloudNet allocations is a natural objective that maximizes the chances to be able to embed also future requests, to save energy by switching off unused hardware, or to perform maintenance work. The objective function also used for our experiments hence balances resource usage and migration cost:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u \in NE_V} \sum_{v \in NE_S} \sum_{r_S \in R_S} weight(u, v) \cdot alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) \\ & + \sum_{u \in NE_V} \left(penalty(u) \cdot mig(u) + \sum_{v \in NE_S} transit(u, v) \cdot new(u, v) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, in our prototype, we also employ an objective function that seeks to distribute the load equally among all network elements to minimize peak loads and congestion. Such an objective function may make sense, if requests are likely to involve placement constraints, or if resource guarantees allow for usage spikes:

$$\begin{aligned} & c \cdot max_load + \sum_{r_S \in R_S} load(r_S) \\ & + \sum_{u \in NE_V} \left(penalty(u) \cdot mig(u) + \sum_{v \in NE_S} transit(u, v) \cdot new(u, v) \right) \end{aligned}$$

To this end, we extend the program by the $load(r_S)$ matrix capturing the individual substrate resource loads (needed in the objective function for efficient allocation). max_load denotes the maximal load over all resources and is defined in the constraints of the MIP. This dual load approach is required to compensate for variation in availability of different resources: minimizing only max_load would optimize only the scarcest resource and hence leave overly high slack in other resource allocations. Minimizing individual $load(r_S)$ avoids unnecessary resource allocations, but (again numerically) overrules max_load as a prime factor. Therefore, the constant factor c is required to balance between overall and individual load.

Sets	
NE_V	Virtual Network Elements
NE_{VN}	Virtual Nodes
NE_{VL}	Virtual Links
NE_S	Substrate Network Elements
NE_{SN}	Substrate Nodes
NE_{SL}	Substrate Links
R_V	Set of Virtual Resource
R_S	Set of Substrate Resource
$R_f : R_f \subset R_V$	Set of Virtual Flow Resources
VT	Value Types
$Fl(u)$	Flows ((source,sink)-Tuples)

TABLE I
SET DEFINITIONS

Table 2: Constants		Range	
$weight(u, v)$	Resource Weight	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$	$\in [0, 1]$
$penalty(u)$	Migration Cost	$\forall u \in NE_V$	> 0
$transit(u, v)$	Costs transferring u resources to v	$transit(u, v), \forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$	≥ 0
$old(u, v)$	Old Mapping	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$	$\in \{0, 1\}$
$suit(u, v)$	Suitable Mapping	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$	$\in \{0, 1\}$
$cap_{r_S}(v)$	Capacity of v w.r.t. r_S	$\forall v \in NE_S, r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
$cap_{r_S}(v, w)$	Connection Capacity	$\forall (v, w) \in NE_S^2, r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
$cap(r_S)$	Resource r_S Capacity	$\forall r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
$req(u, r_V, s)$	Resource Request	$\forall u \in NE_V, r_V \in R_V, s \in VT$	≥ 0
$prop(r_V, r_S)$	Scaling Factor	$\forall r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
$weight_{r_S}$	Load Weight Factor	$\forall r_S \in R_S$	$\in [0, 1]$
c	sum,max Load Priority Factor		$\geq \sum_{r_S \in R_S} weight_{r_S}$
$min_alloc_{r_V}$	Min. r_V allocation unit	$\forall r_V \in R_V$	≥ 0

TABLE II
CONSTANT DEFINITIONS

Table 3: Variables		Range	
$alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V)$	Allocated Resources	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S, \forall r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
$alloc_{r_V}(u, v)$	Hosted Resources	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S, \forall r_V \in R_V$	≥ 0
$new(u, v)$	Mapping Matrix for Elements	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$	$\in \{0, 1\}$
$new(f, v)$	Mapping Matrix for Flows	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$	$\in \{0, 1\}$
$mig(u)$	Migration Selector	$\forall u \in NE_V$	$\in \{0, 1\}$
$flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V)$	Allocated Resources for Flow	$\forall (v, w) \in NE_S^2,$ $\forall f \in Fl(u), r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$	≥ 0
$flow_{r_V}(f, v, w)$	Hosted Resources for Flow	$\forall (v, w) \in NE_S^2,$ $\forall f \in Fl(u), r_V \in R_V, u \in NE_{VL}$	≥ 0
$load(r_S)$	Load on Resource r_S	$\forall r_S \in R_S$	≥ 0
max_load	Max Load over All r_S		≥ 0

TABLE III
VARIABLE DEFINITIONS

B. Constraints

The embedding must fulfill various type, capacity, and other consistency constraints, see Figure 1 for a complete and formal constraint list.

Nodes: This constraints category is used to ensure that each CloudNet node is mapped to an appropriate substrate node. In contrast to links, we do not map nodes to multiple substrate elements, and hence Constraint `map_node` is necessary to guarantee a unique mapping location. At the location where the node is mapped (and only there!), resource requirements must be fulfilled (Constraint `set_new`). Depending on the substrate resource type (minimum, maximum, or constant), the resource constraints are imposed in a different manner (Constraints `req_min`, `req_max`, `req_con`).

Mapping: The mapping constraints ensure that the substrate element has sufficient capacity (Constraint `ne_capacity`) allocated. If resources are shared amongst substrate elements, we need to check against the capacity of the resource itself (Constraint `capacity`). In order to limit link splitups, we set a minimal resource allocation unit (Constraint `relate_V`). Moreover, virtual elements hosted must be of the correct type (Constraint `allowed`). Constraint `load` and Constraint `max_load` define the load of a resource (i.e. the fraction of its capacity used) and the maximum of all individual resource loads, respectively.

Resource-Variable Relation: This set of constraints deals with the relation between the resource types r_S that host resources of type r_V . In our mathematical

Nodes:

map_node:	$\sum_{v \in NE_S} new(u, v) = 1$	$\forall u \in NE_{VN}$
set_new:	$alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) \leq cap_{r_S}(v) new(u, v)$	$\forall u \in NE_{VN}, v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S$
req_min:	$alloc_{r_V}(u, v) \geq new(u, v) req(u, r_V, s)$	$\forall u \in NE_{VN}, r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S, s = \text{minimum}$
req_max:	$alloc_{r_V}(u, v) \leq new(u, v) req(u, r_V, s)$	$\forall u \in NE_{VN}, r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S, s = \text{maximum}$
req_con:	$alloc_{r_V}(u, v) = new(u, v) req(u, r_V, s)$	$\forall u \in NE_{VN}, r_V \in R_V, r_S \in R_S, s = \text{constant}$

Mapping:

relate_V:	$alloc_{r_V}(u, v) \geq min_alloc_{r_V} \cdot new(u, v)$	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_V$
allowed:	$suit(u, v) \geq new(u, v)$	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$
ne_capacity:	$\sum_{u \in NE_V} \sum_{r_V \in R_V} alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) \leq cap_{r_S}(v)$	$\forall v \in NE_S, r_S \in R_S$
capacity:	$\sum_{v \in NE_S} \sum_{u \in NE_V} \sum_{r_V \in R_V} alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) \leq cap(r_S)$	$\forall r_S \in R_S$
load:	$weight_{r_S} / cap(r_S) \cdot \sum_{v \in NE_S} \sum_{u \in NE_V} \sum_{r_V \in R_V} alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) \leq load(r_S)$	$\forall r_S \in R_S$
max_load:	$load(r_S) \leq max_load$	$\forall r_S \in R_S$

Resource-Variable Relation:

resource:	$\sum_{r_S \in R_S} prop(r_V, r_S) alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V) = alloc_{r_V}(u, v)$	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_V$
flow_res:	$\sum_{r_S \in R_S} prop(r_V, r_S) flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V) = flow_{r_V}(f, v, w)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), (v, w) \in NE_S^2, r_V \in R_f, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$

Links:

map_link:	$\sum_{v \in NE_S} new(u, v) \geq 1$	$\forall u \in NE_{VL}$
map_src:	$new(u, v) \geq new(q_f, v)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, q_f \text{ source of } f; \forall u \in NE_{VL}$
map_sink:	$new(u, v) \geq new(d_f, v)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, d_f \text{ sink of } f; \forall u \in NE_{VL}$
req_fmin:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} (flow_{r_V}(f, v, w) - flow_{r_V}(f, w, v)) \geq new(q_f, v) req(u, r_V, s) - new(d_f, v) \infty$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f; \forall u \in NE_{VL}, s = \text{minimum}$
req_fmax:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} (flow_{r_V}(f, v, w) - flow_{r_V}(f, w, v)) \leq new(q_f, v) req(u, r_V, s) + new(d_f, v) \infty$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f; \forall u \in NE_{VL}, s = \text{maximum}$
req_fconst:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} (flow_{r_V}(f, v, w) - flow_{r_V}(f, w, v)) = new(q_f, v) req(u, r_V, s) - new(d_f, v) req(u, r_V, s)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f; \forall u \in NE_{VL}, s = \text{constant}$

Link Allocation:

exp_out:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V) \leq alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f, r_S \in R_S, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$
exp_in:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} flow_{r_S}(f, w, v, r_V) \leq alloc_{r_S}(u, v, r_V)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f, r_S \in R_S, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$
direction:	$flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V) \leq new(u, v) cap_{r_S}(v, w)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), (v, w) \in NE_S^2, r_V \in R_f, r_S \in R_S, \forall u \in NE_{VL}$
relate_f:	$\sum_{w \in NE_S} flow_{r_S}(f, v, w, r_V) + flow_{r_S}(f, w, v, r_V) \geq new(u, v)$	$\forall f \in Fl(u), \forall u \in NE_{VL}, v \in NE_S, r_V \in R_f, r_S \in R_S$

Migration:

new:	$\sum_{v \in NE_S} old(u, v) \geq mig(u)$	$\forall u \in NE_V$
migrated:	$old(u, v) - new(u, v) \leq mig(u)$	$\forall u \in NE_V, v \in NE_S$

Fig. 1. Embedding constraints for linear Mixed Integer Program. Explanations are given in the text.

program, we assume a linear relation, which is given by the constant factor $prop(r_V, r_S)$ (Constraints resource and flow_res).

Links: Mapping links is similar to mapping nodes, and hence, several constraints apply also to links. However, in contrast to nodes, links may be mapped to more than one substrate element (as one or several paths). Shared communication channels need to allocate resources to satisfy their requirements with respect to every virtual node pair connected. In order to calculate allocations in this case, links are expanded into a set of flows, as described earlier. Clearly, each virtual link must be mapped to at least one substrate element (Constraint map_link). Sources and sinks of the expanded flows definitely are part of this mapping (Constraints map_src and map_sink). Note that this allows to find a valid mapping even for pure local links, i.e. if all virtual nodes are mapped to a single substrate node.

As a simplification, we assume that pure local links require only nominal resources, considering only resource allocation corresponding to $min_alloc_{r_V}^2$. The multi-path propagation of each flow f must satisfy flow preservation, except for the source and sink element. The constraint depends on the value type (minimum, maximum, or constant): In case of a minimum type, the net flow of a given resource type must be at least the requested resources at the source and preserved otherwise. If the substrate element is the sink, the flow preservation invariant is suspended and the constraint becomes fulfilled trivially. To implement a corresponding selector, multiplication by a sufficiently large number (e.g., slightly larger than the maximal amount of involved resources, here simply represented by ∞) is used in the subtra-

²This can be extended trivially by adding a variant of constraints req_* for links u , where $new(u, v)$ is replaced by $new(u', v)$ for all virtual nodes u' connected to u

hend. This yields the desired tautology (see Constraint `req_fmin`). The Constraints `req_fmax` and `req_fconst` are defined analogously. Note however that it is not possible to mathematically strictly ensure maximum or constant bandwidth in combination with half-duplex links.

Link Allocation: The r_S allocated for a virtual u on a substrate element v is the maximum of the r_S required for every single of u 's flows. Constraints `exp_out` and `exp_in` ensure that these resources are allocated on sources and destinations of the respective flows. Constraint `direction` enforces direction specific capacity constraints on full-duplex substrate resources.

Migration: Our program allows us to migrate already embedded cloud network elements to new locations, if the reconfiguration costs are amortized by the more efficient embedding. The migration constraints set the migration flag $mig(u)$ if³ the mapped element is not new (Constraint `new`) and was previously embedded at a different location, where it was removed (Constraint `migrated`).

V. EXPERIMENTS

This section reports on our experience with the prototype implementation. We conducted experiments for the out-sourcing/cloud (OC) and the data center (DC) scenarios; the virtual private networks (VPN) use case is studied under the out-sourcing scenario by setting the placement freedom to zero (i.e., all virtual cloud nodes have a fixed location).

In order to model the physical substrate network, we extracted *Rocketfuel topologies* [16]. Connected subsets of these graphs are also used to describe the topology of the CloudNet requests. For the OC use case, the virtual cloud nodes of the CloudNets are partitioned into freely allocatable cloud resources (CR) and fixed access points (AP) (e.g., connection points to corporate subnets of the requesting entity); in the DC use case all virtual cloud nodes exhibit full placement flexibility. Unless stated otherwise, substrate network elements feature capacity for fifteen virtual network elements, no placement preferences are given (with destination independent migration penalties for all node pairs and with unit weights) and the embeddings are optimized with the maximal load minimization objective function. As a solver, IBM's standard CPLEX software is used in deterministic mode with a limit of six concurrent threads on a 8-core Xeon server running at 2.5GHz.

A. Out-sourcing Scenario

In the out-sourcing scenario, the virtual cloud nodes fall into two categories: a set of fixed APs, and a set of freely placeable CRs. Concretely, for each CloudNet we chose (uniformly at random) between one and three flexible cloud nodes and between one and seven fixed access nodes. We refer to the

³and only if, whenever migration costs are relevant - i.e., > 0 , and minimized in the objective function




Fig. 3. Run time (log scale) per embedded CloudNet with and without migration (sample run).

percentage of flexible nodes in the CloudNet by the variable $freedom \in [0, 1]$; note that $freedom = 0$ is our VPN scenario. For our experiments, we use a substrate network of twenty-five nodes, and we iteratively place incoming CloudNet requests. Evaluations are repeated ten times, and all CloudNet requests are accepted as long as resources are available. We study scenarios with and without migration.

Figure 2 shows the runtime (real time, in seconds) required to embed CloudNets iteratively (one after the other, sorted on the x-axis) in a scenario without migrations. There are several takeaways from these experiments: First, we observe that the embedding times are small (never exceeding 14 seconds). Moreover, depending on the load on the substrate network (the number of already embedded CloudNets), the runtime increases slightly. The data also exhibits a relatively high variance, which can be explained by the randomized nature of the to be embedded CloudNets (in terms of size and nature).

The run times generally increase if we enable the option to migrate, see Figure 3, although there are instances where the results are comparable. This is to be expected as migration increases flexibility and therefore the complexity of the MIP. An interesting feature of integrating migration support is that we can at any time check if a subset of the resources, e.g., half of the network is sufficient to fulfill the demand. In the above cases such a run takes on average 2.73 seconds with a standard deviation of 0.42 seconds.

As the above experiment suggests, the main parameter that determines the time complexity of the embeddings is the freedom of the node placement. We conducted on a series of experiments where the CloudNet size and the proportion of CRs, i.e., the variable $freedom$, varies. The findings are summarized in Figure 4 which confirms this dependency. Interestingly, despite the flexibility of the CloudNets and the existing load on the substrate, the run times are still in the range of several minutes.

We can conclude that although the option to migrate and the placement flexibility effect the execution times, optimal solutions for relatively large problems are feasible and can be computed in reasonable time. Moreover, as the run times





Fig. 2. Run time per embedded CloudNet without migration for multiple runs (left: time series, right: boxplot).





Fig. 4. Run time (log scale) per embedded CloudNet for different degrees of freedom (sample runs). CPLEX is used in deterministic mode yielding constant run times.

Fig. 5. Run time (log scale) vs. substrate size for full degrees of freedom—optimal solution vs. feasible solution (sample runs).

without migration support are lower than their counterparts, hybrid designs, where incoming CloudNets are first placed ad-hoc, and persisting ones are optimized regularly (by an offline, background process) are attractive.

B. Data Centers

The data center use case exhibits the highest flexibility and hence constitutes, in some sense, the “worst case” scenario (in terms of embedding complexity). In order to quantify the impact of the substrate network size, we calculated mappings for a single twenty-five CR CloudNet on substrates of different sizes. (The complexity is similar to experiments with multiple CloudNets using the same amount of resources.) In one set of experiments, we calculated the optimum, in another we emphasized feasibility. For the latter experiments, we turned off the multi-threading and parallelization features of CPLEX.

Figure 5 studies the price of optimality: the comparison of the run times for optimal and feasible (i.e., first possible) CloudNet embeddings shows that while the performance of both depends on the substrate size, optimal solutions may result in an order of magnitude higher run times. For a substrate network of around twenty nodes, we can still expect an optimal solution within hours. Recall, this is a worst case scenario as it offers full flexibility.




Fig. 6. Run time (log scale) vs. CloudNetsize (log scale) for different substrate size (sample runs).

Finally, we examine feasibility in detail and report on an experiment studying the run times as a function of the CloudNet size (cf Figure 6): the loglog plot indicates that the runtime grows linearly for larger network sizes. Even CloudNets with thousands of elements can be embedded within minutes in a substrate of almost one hundred nodes.

As a final remark, note that although our run times for the data center embeddings are higher than in the out-sourcing

use case, the conclusion that CloudNet optimizations are time-consuming in data centers may be wrong. Our experiments are overly conservative in the sense that in reality, we expect that CloudNet requests for real data centers to be homogeneous, and are issued to, e.g., computing grid environments which are typically likely to be homogeneous as well. This homogeneity facilitates a range of optimizations, e.g., by aggregating entities into larger meta-nodes; this reduces the number of elements (i.e., variables) in the problem.

VI. RELATED WORK

There has been a significant interest in virtual networks over the last years. The reader is referred to the recent surveys [4] and [8]. The work described here is conducted in the context of our network virtualization project where we develop a prototype implementation.

Network embedding problems have already been studied in various settings (even in the context of circuit-design, which is however quite different and not discussed further here). Note that the virtual network embedding problem is different from classic *VPN embedding* or *multi-flow* problems in the sense that the node placement is not given but subject to optimization as well. This additional degree of freedom renders the problem more complex. Indeed, many variants already of much simpler virtual network embedding problems are computationally hard: Even if all virtual network requests are given in advance, the offline optimization problem with constraints on virtual nodes and virtual links can be reduced to the NP-hard *multi-way separator problem* (e.g., see [1] for a survey). Thus, there is a large body of literature on *heuristic solutions*: For example, Fan and Ammar [7] study dynamic re-configurable topologies to accommodate communication requirements that vary over time, Zhu and Ammar [20] consider virtual network assignment problems with and without reconfiguration but only for bandwidth constraints, Ricci et al. [14] pursue a simulated annealing approach, and Lu and Turner [12] seek to find the best topology in a family of backbone-star topologies. Many approaches in the literature fail to exploit the flexibility to embed virtual nodes and links simultaneously and solve the two mappings sequentially (e.g., [11]), which entails a loss of efficiency [5]. To deal with the computational hardness, Yu et al. [19] advocate to rethink the design of the substrate network to simplify the embedding, e.g., by allowing to split a virtual link over multiple paths and perform periodic path migrations. The focus of the work by Butt et al. [2] is on re-optimization mechanisms that ameliorate the performance of the previous virtual network embedding algorithms in terms of acceptance ratio and load balancing; their algorithm is able to prioritize resources and is evaluated by simulations. Virtual network embeddings have also been studied from a distributed computing point-of-view [9].

In contrast to the literature reviewed above, our work seeks to combine virtual networks with storage and computation to enable virtual cloud networks, and puts an emphasis on *generality* and *quality* of the embeddings. (Of course, our mathematical program can also be solved heuristically, e.g.,

for ad-hoc placements.) We believe that the mathematical programming approach we pursued has many advantages, as it allows for a simple replacement of the objective function, and as state-of-the-art and optimized solvers can be used to find not only optimal but also approximate or heuristic solutions. (There is no need to reinvent, e.g., new pruning heuristics for each embedding problem variant; often such heuristics are also unlikely to be faster than the sophisticated algorithms incorporated into CPLEX or lpsolve.) We are only aware of two embedding problems related to virtual networks for which a mathematical program exists: Kumar et al. [10] describe an approach to solve a Virtual Private Network tree computation problem for bandwidth provisioning; flexible virtual node placements are not possible. Chowdhury et al. [3] present an integer embedding program and pursue a relaxation strategy, applying randomized and deterministic rounding to find approximate solutions. The presented graph extension approach supports exact solutions for placements where interconnected virtual nodes do not share candidate substrate nodes, as it would add bogus resources otherwise. Hajjat et al. [13] calculate reconfigurations in the context of enterprise applications under the constraint of communication costs after migration. Costs of the migration itself are not considered.

To the best of our knowledge, there is no algorithm to embed CloudNet like networks in a manner whose generality and flexibility is close to ours. In particular, none of the solutions above can handle all the heterogeneous links occurring in practice and map, e.g., a (wireless) broadcast link onto a set of asymmetric and full-duplex links; besides the virtual links, also the expressiveness of the node mapping is restricted, and we are not aware of any algorithm which e.g., allows to capture loads induced due to packet rates of the flows in a CloudNet; finally, we believe that the support of cost-aware migration is crucial, as the dynamical aspects lie at the heart of network virtualization.

VII. CONCLUSION

We have proposed an integrative and flexible approach to realize CloudNets by jointly considering node and link placement on heterogeneous resources. Moreover, our algorithm considers “the use of migration” as an important primitive and thus allows the operator to study, i.e., the trade-off between the gains (e.g., in terms of resource savings or QoS) that can be obtained from migrating existing CloudNets to different locations, and the corresponding migration cost. We find that joint optimal embeddings of long-lived CloudNets are feasible for moderate size networks, especially in a hierarchical management hierarchy as we envision it in our federated prototype architecture and implementation [15]. Moreover, we believe that the computations can be further sped up by optimizing the solver. In future work, we plan to continue the study of the quality of our embeddings over time, i.e., to devise online algorithms that (in contrast to VPN embedding approaches [6]) exploit the placement flexibility in a competitive manner.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Andersen. Theoretical approaches to node assignment. In *CS CMU Report*, 2002.
- [2] N. F. Butt, M. Chowdhury, and R. Boutaba. Topology-awareness and reoptimization mechanism for virtual network embedding. In *Proc. IFIP/TC6 NETWORKING*, 2010.
- [3] K. Chowdhury, M. R. Rahman, and R. Boutaba. Virtual network embedding with coordinated node and link mapping. In *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2009.
- [4] M. K. Chowdhury and R. Boutaba. A survey of network virtualization. *Elsevier Computer Networks*, 54(5), 2010.
- [5] L. P. Cordella, P. Foggia, C. Sansone, and M. Vento. An improved algorithm for matching large graphs. In *Proc. Workshop on Graph-based Representations in Pattern Recognition*, 2001.
- [6] G. Even, M. Medina, G. Schaffrath, and S. Schmid. Competitive and deterministic embeddings of virtual networks. In *Proc. 13th International Conference on Distributed Computing and Networking (ICDCN)*, 2012.
- [7] J. Fan and M. H. Ammar. Dynamic topology configuration in service overlay networks: A study of reconfiguration policies. In *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2006.
- [8] A. Haider, R. Potter, and A. Nakao. Challenges in resource allocation in network virtualization. In *Proc. ITC Specialist Seminar on Network Virtualization*, 2009.
- [9] I. Houidi, W. Louati, and D. Zeghlache. A distributed virtual network mapping algorithm. 2008.
- [10] A. Kumar, R. Rastogi, A. Silberschatz, and B. Yener. Algorithms for provisioning virtual private networks in the hose model. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 10(4), 2002.
- [11] J. Lischka and H. Karl. A virtual network mapping algorithm based on subgraph isomorphism detection. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM VISA*, 2009.
- [12] J. Lu and J. Turner. Efficient mapping of virtual networks onto a shared substrate. In *WUCSE-2006-35, Washington University*, 2006.
- [13] Y.-W. E. S. D. M. S. R. K. S. M. T. M. Hajjat, X. Sun. Cloudward bound: Planning for beneficial migration of enterprise applications to the cloud. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, 2011.
- [14] R. Ricci, C. Alfeld, and J. Lepreau. A solver for the network testbed mapping problem. *ACM SIGCOMM CCR*, 33(2), 2003.
- [15] G. Schaffrath, C. Werle, P. Papadimitriou, A. Feldmann, R. Bless, A. Greenhalgh, A. Wundsam, M. Kind, O. Maennel, and L. Mathy. Network virtualization architecture: Proposal and initial prototype. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM VISA*, pages 63–72, 2009.
- [16] N. Spring, R. Mahajan, D. Wetherall, and T. Anderson. Measuring isp topologies with rocketfuel. *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, 12(1):2–16, 2004.
- [17] Y. Wang. VROOM: Virtual routers on the move. In *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM HotNets Workshop*, 2007.
- [18] T. Wood, P. Shenoy, K. Ramakrishnan, and J. V. der Merwe. Cloudnet: Dynamic pooling of cloud resources by live wan migration of virtual machines. In *Proc. ACM VEE*, 2011.
- [19] M. Yu, Y. Yi, J. Rexford, and M. Chiang. Rethinking virtual network embedding: substrate support for path splitting and migration. *ACM SIGCOMM CCR*, 38(2), 2008.
- [20] Y. Zhu and M. H. Ammar. Algorithms for assigning substrate network resources to virtual network components. In *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2006.