Internet Compact Routing: The Results

James I. Madeley Supervisors Iain Phillips & Posco Tso Examiners Colin Perkins & Lars Nagel





Revisiting Emulated Network Orchestration and Visualisation

2023

Compact Routing the AS Graph

2024

Towards Measuring Content Locality





CIDR-Report, Geoff Huston, 2025

3



CIDR-Report, Geoff Huston, 2025

Table Size Matters

Increased Storage Requirements Growing Router Costs Slower Lookup Times



Compact Routing



What Does Compact Mean?

Sub-Linear Routing Table Growth



#InspiringWinners since 1909

7

How Does Compact Routing Work?

Establish a hierarchy

Select networks as landmarks

Associate networks with landmarks

Forward traffic via landmarks



How Does Compact Routing Work? - cont.

All nodes store all landmarks

Landmark nodes store associated nodes

Sender performs landmark lookup







Table Reduction vs Path Length Increase



Simulations

CAIDA AS Relationships Dataset (IPv6, 2015 - 2025)

No routing policy Compared to shortest path









Results – 2025 Graph

Mean Table Reduction: 98%

Average Path Length Increase: 11% Paths Unaffected: 65%

Affected Paths: 31% Increase





Alternative Landmark Selection









Compact routing protocol algorithms

Evaluations on realistic network topologies

Considerations on protocol security and landmark selection criteria





Prove algorithmic convergence

Evaluate using routing policy

Standardise the protocol





Excessive routing table growth causes problems

Compact routing achieves a 98% table reduction with only 11% path length increase

Compact routing can also support alternative routing goals



Additional Slides





Landmark Selection: 14x combined reduction

Stretch w/out shortcuts is 12% (37% paths affected)

209 standard landmarks selected

Average landmark distance 1.4 hops









Loughborough