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Abstract—We propose a new heuristic ILP model for share backup path protection (SBPP) scheme of mesh networks, which used the sets of disjoint-joint primary-backup path candidates of using path-pair candidates. The solution of the model is near optimal and provides all the routing details of demands as well as the sharing information between backup paths, and also simplifies the wavelength assignment problem if the wavelength continuity is a consideration. The new entities are introduced into this model that allow to control the resource utilization as well as congestion level of the network for optimization purposes and the pre-processing of data offers more control in properties of the path candidates.

I. INTRODUCTION

Protecting Networks against the failures of physical components is a crucial task in network design and development. This is particularly important with networks employing wavelength division multiplexing (WDM), which offers terabit/second data channels over the fiber infrastructure. Survivable networks can be defined as networks that can continue functioning correctly in the presence of the failures of network components [1]. Optical mesh networks are becoming more widespread due to the facts that they use much less resource compared to ring networks, and can satisfy the growth in demand of data communication, by integrating new technologies into the networks that help reduce the response time gap between mesh and ring networks.

The survivability at optical layer in mesh networks is based on two paradigms: path protection/restoration and link protection/restoration. Protection and restoration are generally different in the timing of when the alternative paths are established, statically in design time for protection mechanism or dynamically after the failure has occurred for restoration. There are basically two types of resource allocation in network protection schemes: dedicated or shared. Studies of survivable mesh networks have shown that SBPP schemes offer the highest resource efficiency compared to others [1], [2], [3], [4]. However, due to the capacity sharing between backup paths, SBPP schemes generally have greater complexity in term of modeling and computation. Currently, there are three different approaches to the capacity allocation modeling for SBPP: non-joint SBPP, joint SBPP and joint SBPP design with wavelength assignment [5], [6]. In the first approach, the Non-Joint SBPP has to admit the possibility of the infeasibility in finding the backup routes for the given primary routes. The third approach involves wavelength assignment problem, thus the model is very complex and has a large number of variables/constraints, especially, due to the wavelength continuity requirements. Absence of wavelength converters, large number of wavelength channels may have to be installed. Therefore, this model can practically be applied only to networks with no more than 10 nodes [6].

In this paper, we propose a new alternative joint SBPP model, which employs a minimum set of disjoint-joint primary-backup paths set of demands. The solution of this model provides all the routing details for each connection in a given demands as well as sharing details between backup paths of demands. The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in Sec. II, we describe the general ILP model for link-path formulation; Sec. III, introduces the heuristic SBPP model based on minimum set of disjoint-joint primary-backup path pairs; simulation results are presented in Sec. IV; Sec. V summarizes some remarks and conclusion from our work.

II. BACKGROUND

An optical mesh network using a large number of wavelengths, usually includes Optical Cross Connects (OXC’s). Each OXC switches the optical signal coming from the input fiber link on a wavelength to an output fiber link with the same wavelength (or different wavelength if the OXC is equipped with a wavelength-converter). Thus an optical channel established over the network of OXCs is the lightpath, in some papers referred to as λ-channel, which may span over a number of纤维 links (physical hops). In the absence of wavelength converters, a lightpath is associated with the same wavelength on all hops that the light pass through (referred to as wavelength continuity constraint). If wavelength converters are used, different wavelengths may be used on each hop to create the lightpath. In this paper, we assume that the system either has enough wavelengths or wavelength converters are installed, hence wavelength continuity constraint is not considered.

A. General mathematical model for network’s traffic routing

There are two basic types of network routing models known as Link-Path formulation and Node-Link formulation [7], [8]. The Node-Link model usually has a larger number of variables and constraints than the Link-Path model, thus has a greater complexity. However, the Link-Path model requires preprocessing of data before being implemented, such as
computing sets of candidate paths for the traffic demands. More details about Link-Node model can be found in [8]. The new SBPP model introduced in this paper will be based on the above Link-Path formulation due to the following advantages it provides:

- The pre-processing data allows the properties of path candidates to be controlled, e.g., limited number of hops, path cost.
- The model can easily be extended further for dedicated protection, SBPP application.
- The size of the model is small in terms of variables and constraints.

Typical Link-Path model is as follows:

**Model 1:** General Link-Path model and Notations for ILPs.

- **Notation**
  - Network notation
    A network physical topology can be modeled as an undirected graph $G(V, E)$, where $V$ is a set of network nodes and $E$ is a set of physical links. $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N\}$, where $N$ is the number of network nodes. $E = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_M\}$, where $M$ is the number of network links.
  - Indices
    $d = 1, 2, \ldots, D$ demands
    $b = 1, 2, \ldots, P^d$ candidate paths pair between end nodes of demand $d$
    $e = 1, 2, \ldots, M$ links
  - Constants
    $\delta_{edp} = 1$ if link $e$ belongs to path $p$ of demand $d$; 0, otherwise
    $h_d$ volume of demand $d$
    $\xi_e$ unit cost of link $e$
    $c_e$ upper bound on the capacity of link $e$
  - Variables
    $x_{dp}$ flow variable allocated to path $p$ of demand $d$
    $y_e$ capacity on link $e$

- **ILP model**
  - Objective
    \[
    \text{Minimize : } \Sigma_e \xi_e y_e \hspace{1cm} (1)
    \]
  - Constraints
    \[
    \Sigma_p x_{dp} = h_d, \quad d = 1, 2, \ldots, D \hspace{1cm} (2)
    \]
    \[
    \Sigma_e \delta_{edp} x_{dp} \leq y_e, \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, E \hspace{1cm} (3)
    \]
    \[
    y_e \leq c_e, \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, E \hspace{1cm} (4)
    \]

Form the above model, the number of variables and constraints are as in Tab. I. Where $P$ is the average of candidate paths, $N' \times (N' - 1)$ is the demand $D$, with $N'$ is the number of nodes generating demand, $N$ is the network's nodes and $k$ is the average node degree.

---

![Table I](image)

**1. SBPP Modeling with K-Minimum Sets of Joint-Disjoint Paths**

**Definition 1:** Let $S(P, R)$ be the set of candidate path-pairs, where

$P = \{P_1, \ldots, P_D\}$ is the set of candidate primary paths.

$R = \{R_1, \ldots, R_D\}$ is the set of candidate backup paths.

$P_d = \{p_{d1}, p_{d2}, \ldots, p_{dK}\}$ is the set of $K$ candidate primary paths for connection $d$, where $p_{d1}^{th}$ denotes the $th$ primary path of connection $d$.

$R_d = \{r_{d1}, r_{d2}, \ldots, r_{dK}\}$ is the set of $K$ candidate backup paths for connection $d$, where $r_{d1}^{th}$ denotes the $th$ backup path of connection $d$ disjoint with $p_{d1}^{th}$.
The set of Joint-Disjoint path-pairs of group demands denote as $H = \{H^i_{d,g,k}\}$, where $H^i_{d,g,k}$ is the set of joint-disjoint path pairs of the $k^{th}$ candidate primary of demand $d$ in group demand $g$ at share level $i$, with: $H^i_{d,g,k} = \{S'|P'|,R'|\}S' \subseteq S(P,R)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- Variables

1. $\forall p_i', p_j' \in P\; \forall p_i' \cap p_j' = 0, i \neq j$: primary paths disjoint.
2. $\forall r_i', r_j' \in R\; r_i' \cap r_j' = \emptyset, i \neq j$: backup paths joint.
3. $\exists e_i, e \in E, \sum p\in P\; e_i = l$: shared level.

Model 2: Proposed new ILP model for Joint SBPP

- Notation

  - Network notation
    - Indices
      - $H$: set of disjoint-joint path-pair candidates
        - $d = 1, 2, \ldots, D$ demands
        - $e = 1, 2, \ldots, M$ links
        - $p = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ $p \in H$
      - Constants
        - $\delta_{ed} = 1$ if link $e$ belongs to path $b$ of demand $d$; 0, otherwise.
        - $\sigma_{egp} = \sum_{b \in P} \delta_{edb}$ if path-pair $b^{th}$ in $S$ uses link $e$ belongs to set $p$ of group demand $g = \{d_i\}$; 0, otherwise.
        - $h_d$: volume of demand $d$
        - $\xi_e$: unit cost of link $e$
        - $W$: upper bound on the amount of capacity of link $e$.
    - Variables

Algorithm 1: K disjoint-path pairs

**Input:** An indirected graph $G(V,E)$, a pair of source and destination nodes $(s,d)$, and the number of shortest disjoint-path pairs required.

**Output:** A set of K-shortest disjoint-path pairs.

1. Take a shortest path between the source $s$ and destination $d$, using one of the shortest path algorithms, eg. modified Dijkstra or BFS [13], [8]. Denote this as $p$.
2. Define the direction of each link traversed in $p$ from $s$ toward $d$ as positive direction.
3. Remove all directed links on the shortest path $p$ and replace them with reverse direction and negative weight of each such link (eg. by multiplying the original link’s cost with $-1$).
4. Find K least cost paths from $s$ to $d$ in the modified graph using the algorithm in [17]. Denote these as the set of paths $S = \{s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_K\}$.
5. For each pair of paths $(p, s_i)$, remove any link of the original graph traversed by both $p$ and $s_i$. These are called interlacing links. Identify all path segments by the link removal from path $p$ and $s_i$. Such path-pairs form the K-disjoint path pairs ($P\text{pairs} = \{(w_1, r_1), (w_2, r_2), \ldots, (w_K, r_K)\}$).

$x_{dp}$ flow variable allocated to set $p$

$y_e$ capacity on link $e$

- **Objective**

  Minimize $\sum \xi_e y_e$ (5)

- **Constraints**

  \[ \sum_p x_{dp} = h_d, \quad d \in D \] (6)
  \[ \sum_d \sum_p \sigma_{egp} x_{dp} \leq \xi_e, \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, E \] (7)
  \[ y_e \leq \xi_e, \quad e = 1, 2, \ldots, E \] (8)

The number of variables and constraints that are introduced in the new SBPP model are given in Tab. II.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Variables</th>
<th>No. of Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$PN'(N' - 1) + \frac{3}{2} kN$</td>
<td>$N'(N' - 1) + \frac{3}{2} kN$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Routing cost vs. network congestion:

Optimization models for wavelength routing currently have objective functions aimed at reducing either the network congestion level (referred to as $CongMin$) or the total wavelength channels used (referred to as $CapMin$) [15]. The purpose of the $CongMin$ scheme is balancing the network load, thus lowering the number of wavelength channels needed and reducing the blocking probability for future connections. However, the total cost or capacities used by $CongMin$ is usually higher compared to the $CapMin$ scheme. In contrast, when the objective function has employed the $CapMin$ scheme, the total network capacities used may be reduced, but the utilized wavelength channels on some links in the network can reach their upper limit, thus no future demands can be served via those links.

By combining the above two schemes into the objective function of the ILP model, we can control and balance the capacity utilization and congestion level of the network. To do that, we need to introduce some new identities into the model as follows:

- **Constants**

  \[ f_p = \sum \sigma_{egp} \] total capacity used by set $p$

- **Variables**

  \[ \alpha \] max congestion of the network

  \[ \text{The modified ILP model: If we define } f_{\text{sum}} = \sum_p f_p \text{ and } f_{\text{max}} = k\alpha, \text{ where } k \text{ is the controlling factor, then:} \]

  - **Objective**

    Minimize $f_{\text{sum}} + f_{\text{max}}$ (9)

  - **Constraints**

    \[ \sum_p x_{dp} = h_d, \quad d \in D \] (10)
    \[ \sum_d \sum_p \sigma_{egp} x_{dp} \leq \alpha \] (11)
    \[ \alpha \leq W \] (12)
Algorithm 2 Finding Joint-Disjoint Primary-Backup paths
Input: An undirected graph $G(V, E)$, $T = \{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_D\}$ is the set of connection demands $D$ over the network, where $t_i$ denotes the connection between node pair $\{s_i, d_i\}$ required for each demand $d$. A set of candidate disjoint path-pairs $S = (P, R)$ as in Definition 1
Output: Set of Joint-Disjoint path pairs $H$ of demand $D$ at different share levels.
1: Finding primary disjoint path of $K$ shortest path-pair for each demand $d \in D$;
2: Generate $H$
3: $\alpha \leftarrow$ Sharefactor
4: for $d = 1 \rightarrow D$ do
5: for $i = 1 \rightarrow K$ do
6: for $j = 1 \rightarrow \alpha$ do
7: $N \leftarrow C_i(dP_d)$
8: if $\forall n \in N, \exists e \in E, \sum_b e_b = i$ then
9: $H_{(d)j} \leftarrow \{n\}$
10: end if
11: end for
12: end for
13: end for
14: end for

IV. SIMULATION AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we illustrate the performance of our proposed model through an example using a small randomly generated network. Note that our purpose is to demonstrate the abilities of the new ILP model, therefore a small number of traffic demands are used for the simulation. Fig. 1 shows the randomly generated network which has 7 nodes and 8 links, and has the link configuration and connection demands as shown in tables III, IV and V. In table III, each physical link of the network is assigned an index. For simplicity, all links have the same capacity and cost. In table V, each traffic is also assigned an index. By indexing the network links and demands, the implementation of the model is much easier and we can create the cross reference table for the translation of the solution from the ILP solver. Table IV contains information about the number of $k$ shortest path-pair candidates that the program generates and is used in the model, and the maximum allowable sharing per physical link in the network. Note that the number of candidates $k$ for each demand are not necessarily the same; they can have different values, eg. demand 1 of connection (1-4) may have the $k = 3$ candidate path-pairs due to the limits of the physical network, while demand 4 of connection (2-4) can have the $k = 5$ candidate path-pairs. The details of the solution given by the ILP solver are shown in tables VI and VII. Table VI contains the routing details of each demand for both primary path (indicated by letter P) and backup path (indicated by the letter B). The last column of the table gives the indices of the corresponding demands used for cross referencing with the ILP solver. Table IV

![Fig. 1. An arbitrary network](image-url)
table VII, which shows the sharing details between backup paths of demands. Assigning wavelength for paths selected, and placement of wavelength converters can simply be done by using the information provided in these two tables. From the routing details, the two demands with indices 4 and 5 have the same source and destination, and also have the same primary and backup paths assigned to them as in table VI. However, this is not always the case as the primary-backup paths can be different between such demands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Link used</th>
<th>Traffic index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 - 5) B</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 - 5) B</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 1 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 - 4) B</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 - 4) B</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 - 4) B</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ε1 ε2 ε3 ε4 ε5 ε6 ε7 ε8</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 - 5) B</td>
<td>1 1 1 0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE VII
SHARING DETAILS BETWEEN BACKUP PATHS OF TRAFFICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connection Sharing</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The limits of the conventional SBPP model compared to the heuristic one are that they can only give the optimal solution in capacity usages, congestion of the network. Further processing of results to get the sharing details.

If the network can support wavelength converters as needed at each node, then the model can be applied directly. At the other extreme is that placing wavelength converters is another objective of the optimization problem. Hence, wavelength assignment will be the next task if this model is employed. In contrast, the proposed model although having less advantages in terms of size of variables and requires data pre-processing, it provides all the routing details for each connection in the demands such as which path is selected for the corresponding connection and how the links are shared between backup paths. In addition, due to the candidates in Model 2 are sets of Disjoint-Joint primary-backup paths, hence assigning wavelengths for each path selected, and placing the wavelength converters at suitable nodes is just the matter of translate from the solution details and can be done via a simple program algorithm. However, Model 2 can only provide an heuristic solution because of the limit of candidates. Furthermore, this model can be extended to support multi-failure scenarios by the use of k disjoint paths for the candidates.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have reviewed the survivability of the optical networks with particular focus on the SBPP at the optical layer because of its resource efficiency due to the fact that the backup paths can share wavelength channels on links while their corresponding primary paths are link disjoint. We presented a new heuristic ILP model for SBPP problem based on the general link-path formulation and compared our model with the conventional models. The total number of constraints in the our model is larger than the conventional one, but has less constraints. The new SBPP model gives near optimal solution, assures 100% protection under single link failures, and gives full routing details for each connection sharing in the demand set, thus simplifying the wavelength assignment problem in the network design phase. In addition, the new model can be extended to solve SBPP with multiple link failures by using k-disjoint path candidates instead of path pair candidates.
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