Evaluating the Effectiveness of Happy Eyeballs

Vaibhav Bajpai and Jürgen Schönwälder

RIPE66, Dublin

Computer Networks and Distributed Systems
Jacobs University Bremen
Bremen, Germany

May 2013

overview

- motivation
- metric and implementation
- measurement trials
- data analysis insights
- conclusion

motivation

- getaddrinfo(...) behavior:
  - returns list of endpoints in an order that prioritizes IPv6 upgrade path
  - order is dictated by [RFC 6724] and /etc/gai.conf
  - if IPv6 is broken, application is unresponsive in order of seconds

- happy eyeballs algorithm [RFC 6555]:
  - initiate a TCP connect(...) with the first endpoint, give it 300ms
  - switch over with a TCP connect(...) to a different address family otherwise
  - the competition runs fair after 300ms

- does the algorithm help improve the user experience?

metric and implementation

- developed a simple TCP happy eyeballs [RFC 6555] probing tool



  - uses `getaddrinfo(...)` to resolve service names to endpoints
  - uses non-blocking `connect(...)` to connect to all endpoints of a service
  - uses a short-delay between connection attempts to avoid SYN floods
  - the service name resolution time is not accounted in the output
  - can produce either human-readable or machine-readable output
  - file locking capability

```
>> ./happy -q 1 -m www.google.com www.facebook.com
HAPPY.0;1360681039;OK;www.google.com;80;173.194.69.105;8626
HAPPY.0;1360681039;OK;www.google.com;80;2a00:1450:4008:c01::69;8884
HAPPY.0;1360681039;OK;www.facebook.com;80;2a03:2880:10:6f01:face:b00c::8;170855
HAPPY.0;1360681039;OK;www.facebook.com;80;31.13.72.39;26665
```

measurement trials

- dual-stacked web service name list:
  - HE.net maintains a list of top 100 dual-stacked service names
    - they use 1M service names from Alexa Top Sites
    - some domains we expect are missing from the list
    - some services only provide a IPv6 endpoint on prepending a www
    - HE.net does not follow CNAMEs (for e.g. wikipedia.org)
  - amazon has made 1M service name list public
    - we use it and script it ourselves to explicitly follow CNAMEs
- measurement agents:
  - native IPv6, 6in4, Teredo, IPv6 tunnel broker endpoints, native IPv4
  - located at Bremen, Amsterdam, Braunschweig
- measurement cycle length:
  - 1 week

how does IPv6 compare in performance to IPv4?

connection times (mean/std)





do a major portion of services centralize on CDNs?

IPv4 aggregation cloud



IPv6 aggregation cloud



to what extent is IPv6 preferred when connecting to a dual-stacked service?

IPv6 preference %

Native IPv6



IPv6 teredo tunnel



how slow is a happy eyeballed winner to that of a loser?

winner slowness to loser

Native IPv6 [Bremen]



Native IPv6 [Braunschweig]



conclusion

- higher connection times and variations over IPv6
- will never use Teredo IPv6 unless IPv4 connectivity is broken
- 300ms advantage leaves 1% chance to prefer IPv4 (even though faster)
- IPv6 happy eyeballed winner is rarely faster than IPv4 route

- future work:
  - provision happy on a large-scale measurement platform
  - cluster web services using announced BGP prefixes or path similarity