

Measuring Partial Reachability in the Public Internet

Guillermo Baltra
USC/ISI
Marina del Rey
California, USA
baltra@isi.edu

Tarang Saluja
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore
Pennsylvania, USA
tsaluja1@swarthmore.edu

Yuri Pradkin
USC/ISI
Marina del Rey
California, USA
yuri@isi.edu

John Heidemann
USC/ISI
Marina del Rey
California, USA
johnh@isi.edu

ABSTRACT

The Internet provides global connectivity by virtue of a public core—the routable public IP addresses that host services and to which cloud, enterprise, and home networks connect. Today the public core faces many challenges to uniform, global reachability: firewalls and access control lists, commercial disputes that stretch for days or years, and government-mandated sanctions. We define two algorithms to detect partial connectivity: *Taitao* detects *peninsulas* of persistent, partial connectivity, and *Chiloe* detects *islands*, when one or more computers are partitioned from the public core. These new algorithms apply to existing data collected by multiple long-lived measurement studies. We evaluate these algorithms with rigorous measurements from two platforms: Trinocular, where 6 locations observe 5M networks frequently, RIPE Atlas, where 10k locations scan the DNS root frequently, and validate adding a third: CAIDA Ark, where 171 locations traceroute to millions of networks daily. Root causes suggest that most peninsula events (45%) are routing transients, but most peninsula-time (90%) is due to long-lived events (7%). We show that the concept of *peninsulas and islands can improve existing measurement systems*. They identify measurement error and persistent problems in RIPE’s DNSmon that are 5× to 9.7× larger than the operationally important changes of interest. They explain previously contradictory results in several outage detection systems. *Peninsulas are at least as common as Internet outages*, posing new research direction.

1 INTRODUCTION

Internet users would like an Internet that either works or it doesn’t. They understand that the “Internet doesn’t work” when they are too far from the wifi access point, if their company’s router reboots, or when they lose power. However, most of the time they expect to be connected to the Internet and able to reach any public computer.

Unfortunately, the Internet is not so simple—this paper shows that *partial reachability is a fundamental part of the Internet and is surprisingly common*. While top-100 websites are hosted at many points-of-presence and are nearly always reachable, partial reachability is also common, where some destinations on the Internet can be reached from some sources, but not from others. In fact, we will show that in

IPv4 *partial reachability on the Internet is at least as common as an outage (complete Internet unreachability)* (§5.1).

Although partial reachability may seem unimportant (who needs to get to `obscure.example.com` when Youtube and Facebook beckon), we will show that partial reachability can obscure existing measurement systems, cluttering their basic results and hiding what is important. Reexamining widely used RIPE DNSmon in light of partial reachability (§6.2), we show that its observations of persistent high query loss (5–8% to the DNS Root [39]) are mostly measurement error and persistent partial connectivity. These factors are 5× and 9.7× (IPv4 and v6) larger than operationally important signals. Our analysis also helps resolve uncertainty in Internet outage detection (§6.1), clarifying “corner cases” due to conflicting observations [22, 34, 36, 41, 42].

Persistent partial unreachability can also occur because of policy choices. Firewalls protect one’s internal network from the Internet, and Access Control Lists sometimes serve as partial firewalls, preventing access from parts of the Internet while admitting others. Although some countries are well known for strict policies on international network access [3] particularly during unrest [12, 13, 20, 21, 24], our examination of global reachability shows that 95 U.S.-based ASes that have long-term blocks on international traffic to 429 /24 blocks (§3.3).

Partial reachability has been observed before [14], and several systems were designed to mitigate partial reachability by relaying through a third location [2, 25, 26]. While these prior systems reported the existence of partial reachability, we are the first to search for it Internet-wide and quantify how often and how long partial reachability exists in the general IPv4 Internet (§5).

The first contribution of our paper is to define two algorithms that detect partial connectivity (§3). *Taitao* detects peninsulas that often result from peering disputes or long-term firewalls. Our second algorithm, *Chiloe*, detects islands. We evaluate these algorithms using data from two different, long-running measurement systems. We look for partial outages in Trinocular, reexamining 3 quarters of data taken across 4 years from 6 Vantage Points (VPs) to 5M global networks. We also reexamine 3 years of RIPE Atlas data taken from about 10k VPs to 13 different locations.




Figure 1: A, B and C are the connected core, with B and C peninsulas; D and E islands; X is out.

Our second contribution is to validate these algorithms. We compare data from the above two systems with each other and against a third system, CAIDA Ark, where 171 VPs scan millions of networks, daily [8]. While each of these three systems have different numbers of VPs and destinations, we see very good recall (0.94) and reasonable precision (at least 0.42 when strictly interpreting different systems, or 0.82 with a broader interpretation) in §4.1. We also examine the consistence of our results when we reduce the number of observers. We find that combinations of any three independent VPs provide a result that is statistically indistinguishable from the asymptote (§5.1). Our algorithms provide consistent results and offer reproducible and useful estimates of Internet reachability and partial connectivity.

Our final contribution is to apply these algorithms to the Internet as a whole. We report on the frequency (§5.1), duration (§5.2), and location (§5.3) of peninsulas. We show that country-level peninsulas occur (§5.5), suggesting peninsulas occur as an organizational policy. We also report on island frequency (§5.6), duration (§5.7), and sizes (§5.8). Finally, we show that the concept of *peninsulas and islands can improve existing measurement systems*. We described early how measurement errors due to partial reachability hide legitimate problems in RIPE’s DNSmon (§6.2). They also explain previously contradictory results in several outage detection systems.

Artifacts and ethics: All of the data used (§3.1) and created [4] in this paper is available at no cost. Our work poses no ethical concerns for several reasons (see also §A): we collect no additional data, but instead reanalyze existing data with new algorithms. We have no data about individuals, and we do not have or use external information to map IP addresses to individuals. Our work was IRB reviewed and declared non-human subjects research (USC IRB IIR00001648).




Figure 2: Estimates reachable addresses for an island starting 2017-06-03t23:06Z and lasting 1 hour.




Figure 3: Estimates of reachable addresses for a peninsula starting 2017-10-23t22:02Z, lasting 3 hours.

2 PARTIAL REACHABILITY AND ITS OUTCOMES

We next define what we mean by operational reachability and how that results in outages, islands, and peninsulas.

2.1 An Operational Definition of Partial Reachability

Partial reachability has a simple operational definition: given observations from Vantage Points A and B of destination C (Figure 1, where reachability is shown by solid lines), partial reachability exists if A can reach C and B cannot.

This operational definition requires three caveats. First, problems near the VPs are not very interesting. (The Internet is not down because my laptop’s wifi is off!) We therefore typically consider partial reachability from multiple, independent observers.

This operational definition is tied to specific observers. Ideally we would like a conceptual definition that does not depend on specific observers.

Finally, reachability is defined between ASes, but we would like to consider reachability to *the Internet* as a whole. Here we consider reachability to the *Internet Core*; the public Internet informally defined as what is reachable from today’s Tier-1 ISPs.

We believe that addressing these caveats with a formal definition, independent of specific observers, is an important goal that can lead to a formal definition of the Internet Core. Exploring these questions in depth is outside the scope of this paper, but we provide some early results elsewhere [6]. Fortunately, the above operational definition of reachability and informal definition of Internet Core are sufficient to develop our algorithms here.

To understand different types of partial reachability, we next define outages, islands, and peninsulas. In Figure 1, in addition to solid lines showing current reachability, we also consider dotted lines showing previous reachability. Each white area is a strongly connected component. We assume all

locations use public Internet addresses and so are potentially part of the Internet.

2.2 Outages

In Figure 1, region *X* shows an *outage*, where all computers have failed.

A number of groups have examined Internet outages [22, 34, 36, 41]. These systems observe the public IPv4 Internet and identify networks that are no longer reachable—they have left the Internet. Often these systems define outages operationally (network *b* is out because none of our VPs can reach it). In this paper, we define an outage as when all computers in a block are off, perhaps due to power loss. We next define islands, when the computers are on but cannot reach the Internet core.

2.3 Islands: Isolated Networks

An *island* is a group of public IP addresses partitioned from the Internet, but still able to communicate among themselves. In Figure 1 *D* and *E* are islands, and *D* used to be reachable from elsewhere, while *E* has never been reachable.

Operationally, outages and islands are both unreachable from an external VP, but computers in an island are on and can reach each other.

Islands occur when an organization loses all connection to the Internet core. A single-office business with one ISP becomes an island when its router’s upstream connection fails, but computers in the office can still reach each other and in-office servers. An *address island* is when a computer can ping only itself. Externally, islands and outages appear identical.

An Example Island: Figure 2 shows an example of an island we have observed. Each line in this graph shows the number of active addresses that are estimated from one of 6 observers. Because Trinocular probes only a few addresses each round, these estimates lag the true value after an abrupt change in reachability.

The island starts at 2017-06-03t23:06Z and is indicated by the red bar in the middle of the graph. We see that VP *E* continues to see all addresses because it is inside the island. By contrast, the other 5 VPs eventually learn they cannot reach any addresses, then rediscover addresses after the island ends. We know this event is an island because we confirm VP *E* is active, but the other VPs could not reach it. Although this brief example is only one /24 block, we also see country-sized islands (§5.8.2).

2.4 Peninsulas: Partial Connectivity

Link and power failures create islands and outages, but *partial* connectivity is a more pernicious problem: when one can reach some destinations, but not others. We call a group of public IP addresses with partial connectivity to other parts of the Internet a *peninsula*. In Figure 1, *B* and *C* are on *peninsulas*

because they cannot directly route to each other, although they could relay through *A*. (Analogous to a geographic peninsula, where the mainland may be visible over water, but one must detour to reach it, so too Internet peninsulas *B* and *C* can only reach each other by relaying through *A*.)

Peninsulas occur when an AS peers with others, but lacks routes to parts of the network. Long-lasting peninsulas often occur due to peering disputes, where two ASes refuse to exchange routes [27], or when an AS purchases transit from a provider that is a peninsula. Peninsula existence has long been recognized, with overlay networks designed to route around them [2, 25, 26].

Examples in IPv6: An example of a persistent peninsula is the IPv6 peering dispute between Hurricane Electric (HE) and Cogent. These ISPs decline to peer in IPv6, nor are they willing to forward their IPv6 traffic through another party. This problem was noted in 2009 [27] and is visible as of November 2024 in DNSMon [37] (§6.2). We confirm unreachability between HE and Cogent users in IPv6 with traceroutes from looking glasses [11, 17] (HE at 2001:470:20::2 and Cogent at 2001:550:1:a::d). Neither can reach their neighbor’s server, but both reach their own. (Their IPv4 reachability is fine.)

Other IPv6 disputes are Cogent with Google [35], and Cloudflare with Hurricane Electric [19]. Disputes are often due to an inability to agree to settlement-free or paid peering.

An Example in IPv4: We next explore a real-world example of partial reachability to several Polish ISPs. Our algorithms found that on 2017-10-23, for a period of 3 hours starting at 22:02Z, five Polish Autonomous Systems (ASes) had 1716 /24 blocks that were unreachable from five VPs, but they remained reachable from a sixth VP.

Before the peninsula, all blocks that became partially unreachable received service through Multimedia Polska (AS21021, or *MP*), via Cogent (AS174), with an alternate path through Tata (AS6453). When the peninsula occurred, traffic continued through Cogent but was blackholed; it did not shift to Tata (see §D). One VP (*W*) could reach *MP* through Tata for the entire event, proving *MP* was connected. After 3 hours, we see a burst of BGP updates (more than 23k), making *MP* reachable again from all VPs.

To show how our algorithms detect this event (the shaded red region), Figure 3 shows how many addresses are estimated as reachable. In this case VP *W* always reaches the block (*W* has some green), but the others stay unreachable (their estimates fall to zero) for 3 hours.

We can confirm this peninsula with additional observations from traceroutes taken by CAIDA’s Archipelago [8] (Ark). During the event we see 94 unique Ark VPs attempted 345 traceroutes to the affected blocks. Of the 94 VPs, 21 VPs (22%) have their last responsive traceroute hop in the same AS as the target address, and 68 probes (73%) stopped before

reaching that AS. The remaining 5 VPs were able to reach the destination AS for some probes, while not for others. (Sample traceroutes are in §D.)

Although we do not have a root cause for this peninsula from network operators, large number of BGP Update messages suggests a routing problem. In §5.3 we show peninsulas are mostly due to policy choices.

3 DETECTING PARTIAL CONNECTIVITY

We use observations from multiple, independent VPs to detect partial outages and islands (from §2) with our new algorithms: *Taitao* detects peninsulas, and *Chiloe*, islands. (Algorithm names are from Patagonian geography.)

We use these algorithms to study the Internet in §5, showing that users see peninsulas as often as outages (§5.1). These algorithms and the results help clarify prior studies of Internet outages [22, 34, 36, 41, 42] in §6.1. We show that they also can improve network observation systems such as DNSmon by identifying misconfigurations and persistent problems that obscure more urgent, short-term changes (§6.2, with additional information in a preliminary study [40] and detection of Covid-work-from-home [43]).

3.1 Suitable Data Sources

We evaluate our algorithms with publicly available data from several systems: USC Trinocular [34], RIPE Atlas [38], and CAIDA’s Archipelago [9], and use Routeviews [29] for BGP. We list all datasets in Table 8 in §B.

We use data from Trinocular [34] to study both algorithms because it is available at no cost [46], provides data since 2014, and covers most of the responsive, public IPv4 Internet [5]. Briefly, Trinocular watches about 5M out of 5.9M responsive IPv4 /24 blocks. In each probing round of 11 minutes, it sends up to 15 ICMP echo-requests (pings), stopping early if it proves the block is reachable. It interprets the results using Bayesian inference, and merges the results from six geographically distributed VPs. VPs are in Los Angeles (W), Colorado (C), Tokyo (J), Athens (G), Washington, DC (E), and Amsterdam (N). In §4.4 we show they are topologically independent. Our algorithms should work with other active probing data as future work.

We use RIPE Atlas [38] to study islands (§3.4), and to see how our algorithms can improve monitoring (§6.2). Atlas consists of about 12k VPs (as of 2024), globally distributed across 3785 different IPv4 ASes. Atlas VPs carry out both researcher-directed measurements and periodic scans of DNS servers. We use Atlas scans of DNS root servers in our work.

We validate our results using CAIDA’s Ark [9]. CAIDA ark consisted of about 150 VPs; each taking traceroutes to many IPv4 /24 blocks.

We use BGP data from RouteViews [29] to confirm our data-plane observations.

We generally use recent data, but in some cases we chose older data to avoid known problems in measurement systems. Many of our findings are demonstrated over multiple years (§F). We use Trinocular measurements for 2017q4 because this time period had six active VPs, allowing us to make strong statements about multiple perspectives. It had fewer VPs in 2019 and early 2020, but verify and find quantitatively similar results in 2020 in §F. We use 2020q3 data in §5.3 because Ark observed a very large number of loops in 2017q4.

3.2 Taitao: a Peninsula Detector

Peninsulas occur when portions of the Internet are reachable from some locations and not others. They can be seen by two VPs disagreeing on reachability. With multiple VPs, non-unanimous observations suggest a peninsula.

Detecting peninsulas presents three challenges. First, we do not have VPs everywhere. If all VPs are on the same “side” of a peninsula (*A* and *C* in Figure 1), their reachability agrees even though VPs may disagree (like *B*). Second, observations are often asynchronous. In Trinocular they are spread over 11 minutes, and in Atlas 5 minutes, so each VP tests reachability at different times. Observations immediately before and after a network change disagree, but both were true when measured—the difference is from weak synchronization, not a peninsula. Third, connectivity problems near the observer (or when an observer is an island) should not reflect on the intended destination.

We identify peninsulas by detecting disagreements in block state by comparing valid VP observations that occur at about the same time. Since probing rounds occur every 11 minutes, we compare measurements within an 11-minute window. This approach will see peninsulas that last at least 11 minutes, but may miss briefer ones, or peninsulas where VPs are not on “both sides”.

Formally, $O_{i,b}$ is the set of observers with valid observations about block b at round i . We look for disagreements in $O_{i,b}$, defining $O_{i,b}^{up} \subset O_{i,b}$ as the set of observers that measure block b as up at round i . We detect a peninsula when:

$$0 < |O_{i,b}^{up}| < |O_{i,b}| \quad (1)$$

When only one VP reaches a block, that block can be either a peninsula or an island. We require more information to distinguish them, as we describe in §3.4.

3.3 Detecting Country-Level Peninsulas

Taitao detects peninsulas based on differences in observations. Long-lived peninsulas are likely intentional, from policy choices. One policy is filtering based on national boundaries, possibly to implement legal requirements about data sovereignty or economic boycotts.

We identify country-specific peninsulas as a special case of Taitao where a given destination block is reachable (or unreachable) from only one country, persistently for an extended period of time. (In practice, the ability to detect

country-level peninsulas is somewhat limited because the only country with multiple VPs in our data is the United States. However, we augment non-U.S. observers with data from other non-U.S. sites such as Ark or RIPE Atlas.)

A country level peninsula occurs when *all* available VPs from the same country as the target block successfully reach the target block and all available VPs from different countries fail. Formally, we say there is a country peninsula when the set of observers claiming block b is up at time i is equal to $O_{i,b}^c \subset O_{i,b}$ the set of all available observers with valid observations at country c .

$$O_{i,b}^{up} = O_{i,b}^c \quad (2)$$

3.4 Chiloe: an Island Detector

According §2.3, islands occur when the Internet core is partitioned, and the component with fewer than half the active addresses is the island. Typical islands are much smaller.

We can find islands by looking for networks that are only reachable from less than half of the Internet core. However, to classify such networks as an island and not merely a peninsula, we need to show that it is partitioned, which requires global knowledge. In addition, if islands are partitioned from all VPs, we cannot tell an island, with active but disconnected computers, from an outage, where they are off.

For these reasons, we must look for islands that include VPs in their partition. Because we know the VP is active and scanning we can determine how much of the Internet core is in its partition, ruling out an outage. We also can confirm the Internet core is not reachable, to rule out a peninsula.

Formally, we say that B is the set of blocks on the Internet core responding in the last week. $B_{i,o}^{up} \subseteq B$ are blocks reachable from observer o at round i , while $B_{i,o}^{dn} \subseteq B$ is its complement. We detect that observer o is in an island when it thinks half or more of the observable Internet core is down:

$$0 \leq |B_{i,o}^{up}| \leq |B_{i,o}^{dn}| \quad (3)$$

This method is independent of measurement systems, but is limited to detecting islands that contain VPs. We evaluate islands in Trinocular and Atlas across thousands of VPs in §5.6. Finally, because observations are not instantaneous, we must avoid confusing short-lived islands with long-lived peninsulas. For islands lasting longer than 11-minutes, we also require $|B_{i,o}^{up}| \rightarrow 0$. With $|B_{i,o}^{up}| = 0$, it is an address island.

4 VALIDATING OUR APPROACH

We validate our algorithms, comparing Taitao peninsulas and Chiloe islands to independent data (§4.1 and §4.3), and examining country-level peninsulas (§4.2).

4.1 Can Taitao Detect Peninsulas?

We compare Taitao detections from 6 VPs to independent observations taken from more than 100 VPs in CAIDA’s Ark [9]. This comparison is challenging, because both Taitao and Ark

are imperfect operational systems that differ in probing frequency, targets, and method. Neither defines perfect ground truth, but agreement suggests likely truth.

Although Ark probes targets much less frequently than Trinocular, Ark makes observations from 171 global locations, providing a diverse perspective. Ark traceroutes also allow us to assess *where* peninsulas begin. We expect to see a strong correlation between Taitao peninsulas and Ark observations. (We considered RIPE Atlas as another external dataset, but its coverage is sparse, while Ark covers all /24s.)

Identifying comparable blocks: We study 21 days of Ark observations from 2017-10-10 to -31. Ark covers all networks with two strategies. With team probing, a 40 VP “team” traceroutes to all routed /24 about once per day. For prefix probing, about 35 VPs each traceroute to .1 addresses of all routed /24s every day. We use both types of data: the three Ark teams and all available prefix probing VPs. We group results by /24 block of the traceroute’s target address.

Ark differs from Taitao’s Trinocular input in three ways: the target is a random address or the .1 address in each block; it uses traceroute, not ping; and it probes blocks daily, not every 11 minutes. Sometimes these differences cause Ark traceroutes to fail when a simple ping succeeds. First, Trinocular’s targets respond more often because it uses a curated hitlist [18] while Ark does not. Second, Ark’s traceroutes can terminate due to path *loops* or *gaps* in the path, (in addition to succeeding or reporting target unreachable). We do not consider results with gaps, so problems on the path do not bias results for endpoints reachable by direct pings.

To correct for differences in target addresses, we must avoid misinterpreting a block as unreachable when the block is online but Ark’s target address is not, we discard traces sent to never-active addresses (those not observed in 3 years of complete IPv4 scans), and blocks for which Ark did not get a single successful response. Since dynamic addressing [33] means Ark often fails with an unreachable last hop, we see conflicting observations in Ark, implying false peninsulas. We therefore trust Ark confirmation of outages and full reachability, but question Ark-only peninsulas.

To correct for Ark’s less frequent probing, we compare *long-lived* Trinocular down-events (5 hours or more). Ark measurements are infrequent (once every 24 hours) compared to Trinocular’s 11-minute reports, so short Trinocular events are often unobserved by Ark. To confirm agreements or conflicting reports from Ark, we require at least 3 Ark observations within the peninsula’s span of time.

We filter out blocks with frequent transient changes or signs of network-level filtering. We define the “reliable” blocks suitable for comparison as those responsive for at least 85% of the quarter from each of the 6 Trinocular VPs. (This threshold avoids diurnal blocks or blocks with long outages; values of 90% or less have similar results.) We also discard flaky

		Ark		
		Sites Up	Conflicting	All Down
Trinocular Conflicting	1	20	6	15
	2	13	5	11
	3	13	1	5
	4	26	4	19
	5	83	13	201
Trinocular Agree	0	6	97	6
	6	491,120	90	1,485,394

Table 1: Trinocular and Ark agreement table. Dataset A30, 2017q4.

		Ark		
		Peninsula	Non Peninsula	
Taitao	Peninsula	184	251 (<i>strict</i>)	40 (<i>loose</i>)
	Non Peninsula	12	1,976,701	

Table 2: Taitao confusion matrix. Dataset: A30, 2017q4.

		Ark			Total
		U.S. VPs	Domestic Only	≤ 5 Foreign	
Trinocular	WCE	211	171	47	429
	WcE	0	5	1	6
	WeE	0	1	0	1
	wCE	0	0	0	0
	Wce	3	40	11	54
	wcE	0	4	5	9
	wCe	0	1	1	2
Marginal distr.		214	222	65	501

Table 3: Trinocular U.S.-only blocks. Dataset: A30, 2017q4.

blocks whose responses are frequently inconsistent across VPs. (We consider more than 10 combinations of VP as frequently inconsistent.) For the 21 days, we find 4M unique Trinocular /24 blocks, and 11M Ark /24 blocks, making 2M blocks in both available for study.

Results: Table 1 provides details and Table 2 summarizes our interpretation, treating Taitao as prediction and Ark as truth. Here dark green indicates true positives (TP): when (a) either both Taitao and Ark show mixed results, both indicating a peninsula, or when (b) Taitao indicates a peninsula (1 to 5 sites up but at least one down), Ark shows all-down during the event and up before and after. We treat Ark in case (b) as positive because the infrequency of Ark probing (one probe per team every 24 hours) means we cannot guarantee VPs in the peninsula will probe responsive targets in time. Since peninsulas are not common, so too are true positives, but we see 184 TPs.

We show *true negatives* as light green and neither bold nor italic. In almost all of these cases (1.4M) both Taitao and Ark reach the block, agreeing. The vast majority of these are an artifact of our use of Ark as “ground truth”, when it is not designed to accurately measure partitions. The challenge an Ark claim of peninsula is that about 5/6ths of Ark probes fail in the last hop because it probes a single random address (see [34] figure 6). As a result, while positive Ark results support non-partitions, negative Ark results are most likely a missed target and not an unreachable block. We therefore treat this second most-common result (491k cases) as a true negative. While this is likely true 5/6ths of the time, it is also likely that the 150 VPs in Ark can see some peninsulas that our 6 VPs miss—thus our results may *underestimate* the severity of the problem of partial connectivity. Our validation therefore demonstrates a strong *lower bound* on the number of peninsulas, hopefully prompting a tighter bound in future work. We expand on this analysis and its interpretation in §C.

For the same reason, we include the small number (97) of cases where both Ark and Taitao report all-down as true negatives, assuming Ark terminates at an empty address. We include in this category the 90 events where Ark is all-down and Trinocular is all-up. We attribute Ark’s failure to reach its targets to infrequent probing.

We mark *false negatives* as red and bold. For these few cases (only 12), all Trinocular VPs are down, but Ark reports all or some responding. We believe these cases indicate blocks that have chosen to drop Trinocular traffic.

Finally, yellow italics shows when Taitao’s peninsulas are *false positives*, since all Ark probes reached the target block. This case occurs when either traffic from some Trinocular VPs is filtered, or all Ark VPs are “inside” the peninsula. Light yellow (*strict*) shows all the 251 cases that Taitao detects. For most of these cases (201), five Trinocular VPs responding and one does not, suggesting network problems are near one of the Trinocular VPs (since five of six independent VPs have working paths). Discarding these cases we get 40 (*orange*); still conservative but a *looser* estimate.

The strict scenario sees precision 0.42, recall 0.94, and F_1 score 0.58, and in the loose scenario, precision improves to 0.82 and F_1 score to 0.88. We consider these results a strong lower bound on the size of problem, and confirmation that the peninsulas detected by Taitao are correct. We hope our results will prompt future work to tighten our bound on size.

4.2 Detecting Country-Level Peninsulas

Next, we verify detection of country-level peninsulas (§3.3). We expect that legal requirements sometimes result in long-term network unreachability. For example, blocking access from Europe is a crude way to comply with the EU’s GDPR [44].

Identifying country-level peninsulas requires multiple VPs in the same country. Unfortunately the source data we use only has multiple VPs for the United States. We therefore look for U.S.-specific peninsulas where only these VPs can reach the target and the non-U.S.-VPs cannot, or vice versa.

We first consider the 501 cases where Taitao reports that only U.S. VPs can see the target, and compare to how Ark VPs respond. For Ark, we follow §4.1, except retaining blocks with less than 85% uptime. We only consider Ark VPs that are able to reach the destination (that halt with “success”). We note blocks that can only be reached by Ark VPs within the same country as domestic, and blocks that can be reached from VPs located in other countries as foreign.

In Table 3 we show the number of blocks that uniquely responded to all U.S. VP combinations during the quarter. We contrast these results against Ark reachability.

True positives are when Taitao shows a peninsula responsive only to U.S. VPs and nearly all Ark VPs confirm this result. We see 211 targets are U.S.-only, and another 171 are available to only a few non-U.S. countries. The specific combinations vary: sometimes allowing access from the U.K., or Mexico and Canada. Together these make 382 true positives, most of the 501 cases. Comparing all positive cases, we see a very high precision of 0.99 (382 green of 385 green and red reports)—our predictions are nearly all confirmed by Ark.

In yellow italics we show 47 cases of false positives where more than five non-U.S. countries are allowed access. In many cases these include many European countries. Our recall is therefore 0.89 (382 green of 429 green and yellow true country peninsulas).

In light green we show true negatives. Here we include blocks that filter one or more U.S. VPs, and are reachable from Ark VPs in multiple countries, amounting to a total of 69 blocks. There are other categories involving non-U.S. sites, along with other millions of true negatives, however, we only concentrate in these few.

In red and bold we show three false negatives. These three blocks seem to have strict filtering policies, since they were reachable only from one U.S. site (W) and not the others (C and E) in the 21 days period.

4.3 Can Chiloe Detect Islands?

Chiloe (§3.4) detects islands when a VP within the island can reach less than half the rest of the world. When less than 50% of the network replies, it means that the VP is either in an island (for brief events, or when replies drop near zero) or a peninsula (long-lived partial replies).

To validate Chiloe’s correctness, we compare when a single VP believes to be in an island, against what the rest of the world believes about that VP.

Islands are unreachable, like D in Figure 1. We measure blocks, so if any address in block D can reach another, it is an island. If no external VPs can reach D ’s block, Chiloe confirms an island, but some VP reaching D ’s block implies a peninsula. In §4.4 we show that Trinocular VPs are independent, and therefore no two VPs live within the same island. We believe this definition is the best possible ground truth, since perfect classification requires instant, global knowledge and cannot be measured in practice.

We take 3 years worth of data from all six Trinocular VPs. From Trinocular’s pacing, we analyze 11-minute bins.

In Table 4a we show that Chiloe detects 23 islands across three years. In 2 of these events, the block is unreachable from other VPs, confirming the island with our validation methodology. Manual inspection confirms that the remaining 19 events are islands too, but at the address level—the VP was unable to reach anything but did not lose power, and other addresses in its block were reachable from VPs at other

		Chiloe		Sites	Events	Per Year
		Island	Peninsula			
Trinocular	Blk Island	2	0	W	5	1.67
	Addr Island	19	8	C	11	3.67
				J	1	0.33
	Peninsula	2	566	G	1	0.33
				E	3	1.00
				N	2	0.67
				All (norm.)	23	7.67 (1.28)

(a) Chiloe confusion matrix

(b) Detected islands

Table 4: (a) Chiloe confusion matrix, events between 2017-01-04 and 2020-03-31, datasets A28 through A39. (b) Islands detected from 2017q2 to 2020q1.

locations. These observations suggest a VP-specific problem making it an island. Finally, for 2 events, the prober’s block was reachable during the event by every site including the prober itself which suggests partial connectivity (a peninsula), and therefore a false positive.

In the 566 non-island events (true negatives), a single VP cannot reach more than 5% but less than 50% of the Internet core. In each of these cases, one or more other VPs were able to reach the affected VP’s block, showing they were not an island (although perhaps a peninsula). The table omits the frequent events when less than 5% of the network is unavailable from the VP, although they too are true negatives.

Bold red shows 8 false negatives. These are events that last about 2 Trinocular rounds or less (22 min), often not enough time for Trinocular to change its belief on block state.

4.4 Are the Sites Independent?

Our evaluation assumes VPs do not share common network paths. Two VPs in the same location would share the same local outages, but those in different physical locations will often use different network paths, particularly with today’s “flatter” Internet [28]. We next quantify this similarity to validate our assumption.

We next measure similarity of observations between pairs of VPs. We examine only cases where one of the pair disagrees with some other VP, since when all agree, we have no new information. If the pair agrees with each other, but not with the majority, the pair shows similarity. If they disagree with each other, they are dissimilar. We quantify similarity S_P for a pair of sites P as $S_P = (P_1 + P_0) / (P_1 + P_0 + D_*)$, where P_s indicates the pair agrees on the network having state s of up (1) or down (0) and disagrees with the others, and for D_* , the pair disagrees with each other. S_P ranges from 1, where the pair always agrees, to 0, where they always disagree.

Table 5 shows similarities for each pair of the 6 Trinocular VPs (as half of the symmetric matrix). No two sites have a similarity more than 0.14, and most pairs are under 0.08. This result shows that no two sites are particularly correlated.

5 INTERNET ISLANDS AND PENINSULAS

We now examine islands and peninsulas in the Internet core.

	C	J	G	E	N
W	0.017	0.031	0.019	0.035	0.020
C		0.077	0.143	0.067	0.049
J			0.044	0.036	0.046
G				0.050	0.100
E					0.058

Table 5: Similarities all VPs. Dataset: A30, 2017q4.

Sites Up	Target AS		Target Prefix	
	At	Before	At	Before
0	21,765	32,489	1,775	52,479
1	587	1,197	113	1,671
2	2,981	4,199	316	6,864
3	12,709	11,802	2,454	22,057
4	117,377	62,881	31,211	149,047
5	101,516	53,649	27,298	127,867
1-5	235,170	133,728	61,392	307,506
6	967,888	812,430	238,182	1,542,136

Table 6: Halt location of failed traceroutes for peninsulas longer than 5 hours. Dataset A41, 2020q3.

Industry	ASes	Blocks
ISP	23	138
Education	21	167
Communications	14	44
Healthcare	8	18
Government	7	31
Datacenter	6	11
IT Services	6	8
Finance	4	6
Other (6 types)	6	(1 per type)

Table 7: U.S. only blocks. Dataset A30, 2017q4

5.1 How Common Are Peninsulas?

We estimate how often peninsulas occur in the Internet core in three ways. First, we directly measure the visibility of peninsulas by summing the duration of peninsulas as seen from six VPs. Second, we confirm the accuracy of this estimate by evaluating its convergence as we vary the number of VPs—more VPs show more peninsula-time, but a result that converges suggests it is approaching the limit. Third, we compare peninsula-time to outage-time, showing that, in the limit, observers see both for about the same duration. Outages correspond to service downtime [48], and are a recognized problem in academia and industry. Our results show that *peninsulas are as common as outages*, suggesting peninsulas are an important new problem deserving attention.

Peninsula-time: We estimate the duration an observer can see a peninsula by considering three types of events: *all up*, *all down*, and *disagreement* between six VPs. Disagreement, the last case, suggests a peninsula, while agreement (all up or down), suggests no problem or an outage. We compute peninsula-time by summing the time each target /24 has disagreeing observations from Trinocular VPs.

We have computed peninsula-time by evaluating Taitao over Trinocular data for 2017q4 [46]. Figure 4 shows the distribution of peninsulas measured as a fraction of block-time for an increasing number of sites. We consider all possible combinations of the six sites.

First we examine the data with all 6 VPs—the rightmost point on each graph. We see that peninsulas (the middle, disagreement graph) are visible about 0.00075 of the time. This data suggests *peninsulas regularly occur, appearing at least 0.1% of the time*. Fortunately, large peninsulas are rare from many locations—our 6 VPs almost always see the same targets.

Convergence: With more VPs we get a better view of the Internet core’s overall state. As more reporting sites are added, more peninsulas are discovered. That is previously inferred outages (all unreachable) should have been peninsulas, with partial reachability. All-down (left) decreases from an average of 0.00082 with 2 VPs to 0.00074 for 6 VPs. All-up (right) goes down a relative 47% from 0.9988 to 0.9984,

while disagreements (center) increase from 0.0029 to 0.00045. Outages (left) converge after 3 sites, as shown by the fitted curve and decreasing variance. Peninsulas and all-up converge more slowly. We conclude that *a few, independent sites (3 or 4) converge on a good estimate of true islands and peninsulas*.

We support this claim by comparing all non-overlapping combinations of 3 sites. If all combinations are equivalent, then a fourth site will not add new information. Six VPs yield 10 possible sets of 3 sites; we examine those combinations for each of 21 quarters, from 2017q2 to 2020q1. When we compare the one-sample Student *t*-test to evaluate if the difference of each pair of combinations of those 21 quarters is greater than zero. None of the combinations are rejected at confidence level 99.75%, suggesting that any combination of three sites is statistically equivalent and confirm our claim that a few sites are sufficient for estimation.

Relative impact: Finally, comparing outages (the left graph) with peninsulas (the middle graph), we see both occur about the same fraction of time (around 0.00075). This comparison shows that *peninsulas are about as common as outages*, suggesting they deserve more attention.

Generalizing: We confirm that each of these results holds in a subsequent year in \$F, suggesting the result is not unique to this quarter. While we reach a slightly different limit (in that case, peninsulas and outages appear about in 0.002 of data), we still see good convergence after 4 VPs.

5.2 How Long Do Peninsulas Last?

Peninsulas have multiple root causes: some are short-lived routing misconfigurations while others reflect long-term disagreements in routing policy. In this section we study the distribution of peninsulas in terms of their duration to determine the prevalence of persistent peninsulas. We will show that there are millions of brief peninsulas, likely due to transient routing problems, but that 90% of peninsula-time is in long-lived events (5 h or more, following §4.1).

We use Taitao to see peninsula duration for all detected in 2017q4: some 23.6M peninsulas affecting 3.8M unique blocks. If instead we look at *long-lived* peninsulas (at least 5 h), we see 4.5M peninsulas in 338k unique blocks.




Figure 4: Distribution of block-time fraction: all-down (left), disagreement (center), and all-up (right), events ≥ 1 hour. Data: 3.7M blocks, 2017-10-06 to -11-16, A30.

Figure 11 examines peninsula duration in three ways: a cumulative distribution (CDF) counting all peninsula events (left, solid, purple line), the CDF of the number of peninsulas for VP-down events longer than 5 hours (middle, solid green line), and the cumulative size of peninsulas for VP down events longer than 5 hours (right, green dashes).

We see that there are many very brief peninsulas (purple line): about 65% last only 20–60 minutes (~ 2 –6 observations). With two or more observations, these events are not just one-off measurement loss. These results suggest that while the Internet core is robust, there are many small connectivity glitches (7.8M events). Events that are two rounds (20 minutes) or shorter may be due to transient BGP blackholes [7].

The number of day-long or multi-day peninsulas is small, only 1.7M events (2%, the purple line). However, about 57% of all peninsula-time is in such longer-lived events (the right, dashed line), and 20% of time is in events lasting 10 days or more, even when longer than 5 hours events are less numerous (compare the middle, green line to the left, purple line). Events lasting a day last long enough that they can be debugged by human network operators, and events lasting longer than a week suggest potential policy disputes and *intentional* unreachability. Together, these long-lived events suggest that there is benefit to identifying non-transient peninsulas and addressing the underlying routing problem.

5.3 Where Do Peninsulas Occur?

Firewalls, link failures, and routing problems cause peninsulas on the Internet. These can either occur inside a given AS, or in upstream providers.

To detect where the Internet breaks into peninsulas, we look at traceroutes that failed to reach their target address, either due to a loop or an ICMP unreachable message. Then, we find where these traces halt, and take note whether halting occurs *at* the target AS and target prefix, or *before* the target AS and target prefix.

For our experiment we run Taitao to detect peninsulas at target blocks over Trinocular VPs, we use Ark’s traceroutes [10] to find last IP address before halt, and we get target and halting ASNs and prefixes using RouteViews.

In Table 6 we show how many traces halt *at* or *before* the target network. The center, gray rows show peninsulas (disagreement between VPs) with their total sum in bold. For all peninsulas (the bold row), more traceroutes halt at or inside the target AS (235k vs. 134k, the left columns), but they more often terminate before reaching the target prefix (308k vs. 61k, the right columns). This difference suggests policy is implemented at or inside ASes, but not at routable prefixes. By contrast, outages (agreement with 0 sites up) more often terminate before reaching the target AS. Because peninsulas are more often at or in an AS, while outages occur in many places, it suggests that peninsulas are policy choices.

5.4 What Sizes Are Peninsulas?

When network issues cause connectivity problems like peninsulas, the *size* of those problems may vary, from country-size (see §5.5), to AS-size, and also for routable prefixes or fractions of prefixes. We next examine peninsula sizes.

We begin with Taitao peninsula detection at a /24 block level. We match peninsulas across blocks within the same prefix by start time and duration, both measured in one hour timebins. This match implies that the Trinocular VPs observing the blocks as up are also the same.

We compare peninsulas to routable prefixes from Routeviews [29], using longest prefix matches with /24 blocks.

Routable prefixes consist of many blocks, some of which may not be measurable. We therefore define the *peninsula-prefix fraction* for each routed prefix as fraction of blocks in the peninsula that are Trinocular-measurable blocks. To reduce noise provided by single block peninsulas, we only consider peninsulas covering 2 or more blocks in a prefix.

Figure 5a shows the number of peninsulas for different prefix lengths and the fraction of the prefix affected by the peninsula as a heat-map, where we group them into bins.

We see that about 10% of peninsulas are likely due to routing problems or policies, since 40k peninsulas affect the whole routable prefix. However, a third of peninsulas (101k, at the bottom of the plot) affect only a very small fraction of the prefix. These low prefix-fraction peninsulas suggest that they happen *inside* an ISP and are not due to interdomain routing.




Figure 5: Peninsulas measured with per-site down events longer than 5 hours. Dataset A30, 2017q4.

Finally, we show that *longer-lived peninsulas are likely due to routing or policy choices*. Figure 5b shows the same data source, but weighted by fraction of time each peninsula contributes to the total peninsula time during 2017q4. Here the larger fraction of weight are peninsulas covering full routable prefixes—20% of all peninsula time during the quarter (see left margin).

5.5 Country-Level Peninsulas

Country-specific filtering is a routing policy made by networks to restrict traffic they receive. We next look into what type of organizations actively block overseas traffic. For example, good candidates to restrain who can reach them for security purposes are government related organizations.

We test for country-specific filtering (§3.3) over 2017q4 and find 429 unique U.S.-only blocks in 95 distinct ASes. We then manually verify each AS categorized by industry in Table 7. It is surprising how many universities filter by country. While not common, country specific blocks do occur.

5.6 How Common Are Islands?

Multiple groups have shown that there are many network outages in the Internet [22, 34, 36, 41, 42]. We have described (§2) two kinds of outages: full outages where all computers at a site are down (perhaps due to a loss of power), and islands, where the site is cut off from the Internet core, but computers at the site can talk between themselves. We next use Chiloe to determine how often islands occur. We study islands in two systems with 6 VPs for 3 years and 13k VPs for 3 months.

Trinocular: We first consider three years of Trinocular data (described in §3.1), from 2017-04-01 to 2020-04-01. We run Chiloe across each VP for this period.

Table 4b shows the number of islands per VP over this period. Over the 3 years, all six VPs see from 1 to 5 islands. In addition, we report as islands some cases even though not the *entire* Internet core is unreachable. This apparent discrepancy from our definition reflects the limitations of our necessarily non-instantaneous measurement of the Internet. We expect such cases, and perhaps other 12 non-islands where 20% to 50% is inaccessible, are *short-lived* true islands,




Figure 6: Unreachable blocks over time. Large spikes are unreachability to Chinese-allocated IPv4 addresses. Dataset: A29, 2017q3.

that are incompletely measured because the island recovers before we complete an 11 minute-long evaluation of all 5M networks for a full Internet scan (see §E.2 for details).

RIPE Atlas: For broader coverage we next consider RIPE Atlas’ 13k VPs for all of 2021q3 [31]. While Atlas does not scan the whole Internet core, they do scan most root DNS servers every 240 s. Chiloe would like to observe the whole Internet core, and while Trinocular scans 5M /24s, it does so with only 6 VPs. To use RIPE Atlas’ VPs, we approximate a full scan with probes to 12 of the DNS root server systems (G-Root was unavailable in 2021q3). Although far fewer than 5M networks, these targets provide a very sparse sample of usually independent destinations since each is independently operated. Thus we have complementary datasets with sparse VPs and dense probing, and many VPs but sparse probing. In other words, to get many VP locations we relax our conceptual definition by decreasing our target list.

Figure 7a shows the CDF of the number of islands detected per RIPE Atlas VP during 2021q3. During this period, 55% of VPs observed one or no islands (solid line). To compare to Trinocular, we consider events longer than 660 s with the dashed line. In the figure, 60% of VPs saw no islands, 19% see one, and the remainder see more. The annualized island rate of just the most stable VPs (those that see 2 or less islands) is 1.75 islands per year (a lower bound, since we exclude less stable VPs), compared to 1.28 for Trinocular (Table 4b). We see islands are more common in Atlas, perhaps because it includes many VPs at home.

We conclude that islands *do* happen, but they are rare, and at irregular times. This finding is consistent with importance of the Internet at the locations where we run VPs.

5.7 How Long Do Islands Last?

Islands are caused by both brief connectivity loss and long-term policy differences, so we next evaluate island duration.

We compare the distributions of island durations observed from RIPE Atlas (the left line) and Trinocular (right) in Figure 7b. Since Atlas’ frequent polling means it detects islands lasting seconds, while Trinocular sees only islands of 660 s or longer, we split out Atlas events lasting at least 660 s (middle




Figure 7: CDF of islands detected by Chiloe for data from Trinocular (3 years, Datasets A28-A39) and Atlas (2021q3).

line). All measurements follow a similar S-shaped curve, but for Trinocular, the curve is truncated at 660 s. With only 6 VPs, Trinocular sees far fewer events (23 in 3 years compared to 235k in a yearly quarter with Atlas), so the Trinocular data is quantized. In both cases, about 70% of islands are between 1000 and 6000 s. This graph shows that Trinocular’s curve is similar in shape to Atlas-660 s, but about 2× longer. All Trinocular observers are in datacenters, while Atlas devices are often at homes, so this difference may indicate that data-center islands are rarer, but harder to resolve.

5.8 What Sizes Are Islands?

In §2.3 we described different sizes of islands starting from as small as an address island, as opposed to LAN- or AS-sized islands, to country-sized islands potentially capable of partitioning the Internet core. Here we examine island sizes two ways: first by examining traceroutes, and then by considering several large events.

5.8.1 Island Size via Traceroute. First we evaluate island sizes by counting the number of hops in a traceroute sent towards a target outside the island before the traceroute fails.

We use traceroutes from RIPE Atlas VPs sent to 12 root DNS servers for 2021q3 [32]. In Figure 7c in green the distribution of the number of hops when traceroute reach their target. In purple, we plot the distribution of the number of hops of traceroutes that failed to reach the target for VPs in islands detected in §5.6.

We find most islands are small, with 70% at 0 or 1 hop. Huge islands (10 or more hops) seen in traceroutes are likely false positives.

5.8.2 Country-sized Islands. We also have some evidence of country-sized islands.

In 2017q3 we observed 8 events when it appears that most or all of China stopped responding to external pings. Figure 6 shows the number of /24 blocks that were down over time, each spike more than 200k /24s, between two to eight hours long. We found no problem reports on network operator mailing lists, so we believe these outages were ICMP-specific

and likely did not affect web traffic. Since there were no public reports, we assume the millions of computers inside China continued to operate and these events were islands and not outages.

We consider these cases examples of China becoming an *ICMP-island*. We have not seen such large islands since 2017.

6 APPLYING THESE TOOLS

6.1 Outages Given Partial Reachability

We next re-evaluate reports from existing outage detection systems, considering how to resolve conflicting information in light of our new algorithms. We compare findings to external information in traceroutes from CAIDA Ark.

Figure 8 compares Trinocular with 21 days of Ark topology data, from 2017-10-10 to -31 from all 3 probing teams. For each Trinocular outage we classify the Ark result as success or three types of failure: unreachable, loop, or gap.

Trinocular’s 6-site-up case suggests a working network, and we consider this case as typical. However, we see that about 25% of Ark traceroutes are “gap”, where several hops fail to reply. We also see about 2% of traceroutes are unreachable (after we discard traceroutes to never reachable addresses). Ark probes a random address in each block; many addresses are non-responsive, explaining these.

With 1 to 11 sites up, Trinocular is reporting disagreement. We see that the number of Ark success cases (the green, lower portion of each bar) falls roughly linearly with the number of successful observers. This consistency suggests that Trinocular and Ark are seeing similar behavior, and that there is partial reachability—these events with only partial Trinocular positive results are peninsulas.

Since 5 sites give the same results as all 6, single-VP failures likely represent problems local to that VP. This data suggests that all-but-one voting will track true outages.

With only partial reachability, with 1 to 4 VPs (of 6), we see likely peninsulas. These cases confirm that partial connectivity is common: while there are 1M traceroutes sent




Figure 8: Ark traceroutes sent to targets under partial outages (2017-10-10 to -31). Dataset A30.

to outages where no VP can see the target (the number of events is shown on the 0 bar), there are 1.6M traceroutes sent to partial outages (bars 1 to 5), and 850k traceroutes sent to definite peninsulas (bars 1 to 4). This result is consistent with the convergence we see in Figure 4.

6.2 Improving DNSmon Sensitivity

DNSmon [1] monitors the Root Server System [39] from the RIPE Atlas distributed platform [38]. For years, DNSmon has often reported IPv6 loss rates of 4-10%. Since the DNS root is well provisioned and distributed, we expect minimal congestion or loss and find these values surprisingly high.

RIPE Atlas operators are aware of problems with some Atlas VPs. Some VPs support IPv6 on their LAN, but not to the global IPv6 Internet—such VPs are IPv6 islands. Atlas periodically tags and culls these VPs from DNSmon. However, our study of DNSmon for islands and peninsulas improves their results. Using concepts pioneered here (§2 and §3), we give full analysis in a workshop paper [40]; Here we add new data showing these results persist for 1 year (Figure 9).

Groups of bars in Figure 10 show query loss for each of the 13 root service identifiers, as observed from all available Atlas VPs (10,082 IPv4, and 5,173 IPv6) on 2022-07-23. (We are similar to DNSmon, but it uses only about 100 well-connected “anchors”, so our analysis is wider.) The first two groups show loss rates for IPv4 (light blue, left most) and IPv6 (light red), showing IPv4 losses around 2%, and IPv6 from 9 to 13%.

We apply Chiloe to these VPs, detecting as islands those VPs that cannot see *any* of the 13 root identifiers over 24 hours. (This definition is stricter than regular Chiloe because these VPs attempt only 13 targets, and we apply it over a full day to consider only long-term trends.) The middle two groups of bars show IPv4 and IPv6 loss rates after removing VPs that are islands. Without island VPs, IPv4 loss rates drop to 0.005 from 0.01, and IPv6 to about 0.01 from 0.06. These rates represent a more meaningful estimate of DNS reliability. Users of VPs that are IPv6 islands will not expect global IPv6, and such VPs should not be used for IPv6 in DNSmon.

The third bar in each red cluster of IPv6 is an outlier: that root identifier shows 13% IPv6 loss with all VPs, and 6% loss after islands are removed. This result is explained by




Figure 9: Fraction of VPs observing islands and peninsulas for IPv4 and IPv6 during 2022.




Figure 10: Atlas queries from all available VPs to 13 Root Servers for IPv4 and IPv6 on 2022-07-23.

persistent routing disputes between Cogent (the operator of C-Root) and Hurricane Electric [30]. Omitting islands (the middle bars) makes this difference much clearer.

Finally we apply Taitao to detect peninsulas. Peninsulas suggest persistent routing problems; they deserve attention from ISPs and root operators. The darker, rightmost two groups show loss from VPs that are neither islands nor peninsulas, representing loss if routing problems were addressed. With this correction C-Root is similar to others, confirming that routing disputes account for its different response rates.

This example shows how *understanding partial reachability can improve the sensitivity of existing measurement systems*. Removing islands makes it easy to identify persistent routing problems. Removing peninsulas makes transient changes (perhaps from failure, DDoS, routing) more visible. Each layer of these problems can be interesting, but considering each separately, the interesting “signal” of routing changes (appearing in the right two groups in Figure 10), is hidden under the 5× or 9.7× times larger peninsulas and islands (the left two groups). Improved sensitivity also *shows a need to improve IPv6 provisioning*, since IPv6 loss is statistically higher than IPv4 loss (compare the right blue and red groups), even accounting for known problems. After sharing the results with root operators and RIPE Atlas, two operators adopted them in regular operation.

7 RELATED WORK

Several systems mitigate partial outages. RON provides alternate-path routing around failures for a mesh of sites [2]. Hubble monitors in real-time reachability problems when working physical paths exist [25]. LIFEGUARD, remediates route failures by rerouting traffic using BGP to select a working path [26]. While addressing the problem of partial outages, these systems do not quantify their duration or scope.

Prior work studied partial reachability, showing it is a common transient occurrence during routing convergence [7]. They reproduced partial connectivity with controlled experiments; we study it from Internet-wide VPs.

Internet scanners have examined bias by location [23], more recently looking for policy-based filtering [47]. We

measure policies with our country specific algorithm, and we extend those ideas to defining the Internet core.

Active outage detection systems have encountered partial outages. Thunderping recognizes a “hosed” state with mixed replies, but its study is future work [41]. Trinocular discards partial outages by reporting the target block “up” if any VP can reach it [34]. To the best of our knowledge, prior outage detection systems do not consistently report partial outages in the Internet core, nor do they study their extent.

Recent groups have studied the policy issues around Internet fragmentation [15, 16], but do not define it. We hope our definition can fill that need.

8 CONCLUSIONS

This paper identified partial connectivity as a fundamental challenge in the Internet today. We developed the algorithm Taitao, to find peninsulas of partial connectivity, and Chiloe, to find islands. We showed that partial connectivity events as common as simple outages, and use them to clarify implications of Internet sovereignty and to improve outage and DNSmon measurement systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank John Wroclawski, Wes Hardaker, Ramakrishna Padmanabhan, Ramesh Govindan, Eddie Kohler, Alberto Dainotti, and the Internet Architecture Board for their input on an early version of this paper.

The work is supported in part by the National Science Foundation, CISE Directorate, award CNS-2007106 and NSF-2028279. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon.

REFERENCES

- [1] Christopher Amin, Massimo Cándela, Daniel Karrenberg, Robert Kisteleki, and Andreas Strikos. 2015. Visualization and Monitoring for the Identification and Analysis of DNS Issues. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Internet Monitoring and Protection*. Brussels, Belgium. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Massimo-Candela/publication/279516870_Visualization_and_Monitoring_for_the_Identification_and_Analysis_of_DNS_Issues/links/559468c808ae793d13798901/Visualization-and-Monitoring-for-the-Identification-and-Analysis-of-DNS-Issues.pdf
- [2] David G. Andersen, Hari Balakrishnan, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Robert Morris. 2001. Resilient Overlay Networks. In *Proceedings of the Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. ACM, Chateau Lake Louise, Alberta, Canada, 131–145. <http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/sosp01/papers/andersen.pdf>
- [3] Anonymous. 2012. The collateral damage of Internet censorship by DNS injection. *ACM Computer Communication Review* 42, 3 (July 2012), 21–27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2317307.2317311>
- [4] ANT Project. 2022. ANT IPv4 Island and Peninsula Data. https://ant.isi.edu/datasets/ipv4_partial/. https://ant.isi.edu/datasets/ipv4_partial/
- [5] Guillermo Baltra and John Heidemann. 2020. Improving Coverage of Internet Outage Detection in Sparse Blocks. In *Proceedings of the Passive and Active Measurement Workshop*. Springer, Eugene, Oregon, USA.
- [6] Guillermo Baltra, Xiao Song, and John Heidemann. 2024. Ebb and Flow: Implications of ISP Address Dynamics. In *Proceedings of the Passive and Active Measurement Conference*. Springer, Virtual Location. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-56252-5_7
- [7] Randy Bush, Olaf Maennel, Matthew Roughan, and Steve Uhlig. 2009. Internet optometry: assessing the broken glasses in Internet reachability. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement*. ACM, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 242–253. <http://www.maennel.net/2009/imc099-bush.pdf>
- [8] CAIDA. 2007. Archipelago (Ark) Measurement Infrastructure. website <https://www.caida.org/projects/ark/>
- [9] CAIDA. 2017. The CAIDA UCSD IPv4 Routed /24 Topology Dataset - 2017-10-10 to -31. https://www.caida.org/data/active/ipv4_routed_24_topology_dataset.xml.
- [10] CAIDA. 2020. The CAIDA UCSD IPv4 Routed /24 Topology Dataset - 2020-09-01 to -31. https://www.caida.org/data/active/ipv4_routed_24_topology_dataset.xml.
- [11] Cogent. 2021. Looking Glass. <https://cogentco.com/en/looking-glass>.
- [12] Abdi Latif Dahir. 2018. Ethiopia has resorted to its old habit of blocking the Internet to quell internal unrest. News website Quartz Africa. <https://qz.com/africa/1351277/ethiopia-internet-shutdown-in-eastern-somali-region/>
- [13] Alberto Dainotti, Claudio Squarcella, Emile Aben, Marco Chiesa, Kimberly C. Claffy, Michele Russo, and Antonio Pescapé. 2011. Analysis of Country-wide Internet Outages Caused by Censorship. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Berlin, Germany, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2068816.2068818>
- [14] Amogh Dhamdhare, David D. Clark, Alexander Gamero-Garrido, Matthew Luckie, Ricky K. P. Mok, Gautam Akiwate, Kabir Gogia, Vaibhav Bajpai, Alex C. Snoeren, and kc claffy. 2018. Inferring Persistent Interdomain Congestion. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*. ACM, Budapest, Hungary, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3230543.3230549>
- [15] William J. Drake, Vinton G. Cerf, and Wolfgang Kleinwächter. 2016. *Internet Fragmentation: An Overview*. Technical Report. World Economic Forum. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_FII_Internet_Fragmentation_An_Overview_2016.pdf
- [16] William J. Drake (moderator). 2022. Internet Fragmentation, Reconsidered. CITI Seminar on Global Digital Governance at IETF 115. <https://www8.gsb.columbia.edu/citi/GlobalDigitalGovernance>
- [17] Hurricane Electric. 2021. Looking Glass. <http://lg.he.net/>.
- [18] Xun Fan and John Heidemann. 2010. Selecting Representative IP Addresses for Internet Topology Studies. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Melbourne, Australia, 411–423. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1879141.1879195>
- [19] HE forums. 2017. Cloudflare Blocked on Free Tunnels now? <https://forums.he.net/index.php?topic=3805.0>.
- [20] Phillipa Gill, Masashi Crete-Nishihata, Jakub Dalek, Sharon Goldberg, Adam Senft, and Greg Wiseman. 2015. Characterizing Web Censorship Worldwide: Another Look at the OpenNet Initiative Data. *ACM Transactions on the Web* 9, 1 (Jan. 2015). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2700339>
- [21] James Griffiths. 2019. Democratic Republic of Congo internet shutdown shows how Chinese censorship tactics are spreading. *CNN* (Jan. 2 2019). <https://edition.cnn.com/2019/01/02/africa/congo-internet-shutdown-china-intl/index.html>
- [22] Andreas Guillot, Romain Fontugne, Philipp Winter, Pascal Merindol, Alistair King, Alberto Dainotti, and Cristel Pelsler. 2019. Chocolate: Outage Detection for Internet Background Radiation. In *Proceedings of the IFIP International Workshop on Traffic Monitoring and Analysis*. IFIP, Paris, France, 8 pages. <https://clarinet.u-strasbg.fr/~pelsler/publications/Guillot-chocolatine-TMA2019.pdf>

- [23] John Heidemann, Yuri Pradkin, Ramesh Govindan, Christos Papadopoulos, Genevieve Bartlett, and Joseph Bannister. 2008. Census and Survey of the Visible Internet. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Vouliagmeni, Greece, 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1452520.1452542>
- [24] Sam Jahan and Sudipto Ganguly. 2024. Bangladesh shuts offices, imposes curfew to curb deadly job quota protests. *Reuters* (July 20 2024). <https://www.reuters.com/world/asia-pacific/bangladesh-army-enforces-curfew-student-led-protests-spiral-2024-07-20/>
- [25] Ethan Katz-Bassett, Harsha V Madhyastha, John P John, Arvind Krishnamurthy, David Wetherall, and Thomas E Anderson. 2008. Studying Black Holes in the Internet with Hubble. In *Proceedings of the USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*. ACM, San Francisco, CA, 247–262.
- [26] Ethan Katz-Bassett, Colin Scott, David R. Choffnes, Ítalo Cunha, Vytautas Valancius, Nick Feamster, Harsha V. Madhyastha, Tom Anderson, and Arvind Krishnamurthy. 2012. LIFEGUARD: Practical Repair of Persistent Route Failures. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*. ACM, Helsinki, Finland, 395–406. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2377677.2377756>
- [27] DataCenter Knowledge. 2009. Peering Disputes Migrate to IPv6. <https://www.datacenterknowledge.com/archives/2009/10/22/peering-disputes-migrate-to-ipv6>.
- [28] Craig Labovitz, Scott Iekel-Johnson, Danny McPherson, Jon Oberheide, and Farnam Jahanian. 2010. Internet Inter-Domain Traffic. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*. ACM, New Delhi, India, 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1851182.1851194>
- [29] D. Meyer. 2018. University of Oregon Routeviews. <http://www.routeviews.org>.
- [30] Rich Miller. 2009. Peering Disputes Migrate to IPv6. website <https://www.datacenterknowledge.com/archives/2009/10/22/peering-disputes-migrate-to-ipv6>. <https://www.datacenterknowledge.com/archives/2009/10/22/peering-disputes-migrate-to-ipv6>
- [31] RIPE NCC. 2021q3. RIPE Atlas IP echo measurements in IPv4. [https://atlas.ripe.net/measurements/\[1001,1004,1005,1006,1008,1009,1010,1011,1012,1013,1014,1015,1016\]/](https://atlas.ripe.net/measurements/[1001,1004,1005,1006,1008,1009,1010,1011,1012,1013,1014,1015,1016]/).
- [32] RIPE NCC. 2021q3. RIPE Atlas IP traceroute measurements in IPv4. [https://atlas.ripe.net/measurements/\[5001,5004,5005,5006,5008,5009,5010,5011,5012,5013,5014,5015,5016\]/](https://atlas.ripe.net/measurements/[5001,5004,5005,5006,5008,5009,5010,5011,5012,5013,5014,5015,5016]/).
- [33] Ramakrishna Padmanabhan, Amogh Dhamdhere, Emile Aben, kc claffy, and Neil Spring. 2016. Reasons Dynamic Addresses Change. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Santa Monica, CA, USA, 183–198. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2987443.2987461>
- [34] Lin Quan, John Heidemann, and Yuri Pradkin. 2013. Trinocular: Understanding Internet Reliability Through Adaptive Probing. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM Conference*. ACM, Hong Kong, China, 255–266. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2486001.2486017>
- [35] Dan Rayburn. 2016. Google Blocking IPv6 Adoption With Cogent, Impacting Transit Customers. <https://seekingalpha.com/article/3948876-google-blocking-ipv6-adoption-cogent-impacting-transit-customers>.
- [36] Philipp Richter, Ramakrishna Padmanabhan, Neil Spring, Arthur Berger, and David Clark. 2018. Advancing the Art of Internet Edge Outage Detection. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Boston, Massachusetts, USA, 350–363. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3278532.3278563>
- [37] RIPE NCC. 2020. DNSMON. <https://atlas.ripe.net/dnsmon>.
- [38] RIPE NCC Staff. 2015. RIPE Atlas: A Global Internet Measurement Network. *The Internet Protocol Journal* 18, 3 (Sept. 2015), 2–26.
- [39] Root Operators. 2016. <http://www.root-servers.org>.
- [40] Tarang Saluja, John Heidemann, and Yuri Pradkin. 2022. Differences in Monitoring the DNS Root Over IPv4 and IPv6. In *Proceedings of the National Symposium for NSF REU Research in Data Science, Systems, and Security*. IEEE, Portland, OR, USA, to appear.
- [41] Aaron Schulman and Neil Spring. 2011. Pingin’ in the Rain. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Berlin, Germany, 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2068816.2068819>
- [42] Anant Shah, Romain Fontugne, Emile Aben, Cristel Pelsser, and Randy Bush. 2017. Disco: Fast, Good, and Cheap Outage Detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Traffic Monitoring and Analysis*. Springer, Dublin, Ireland, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.23919/TMA.2017.8002902>
- [43] Xiao Song, Guillermo Baltra, and John Heidemann. 2023. Inferring Changes in Daily Human Activity from Internet Response. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Montreal, QC, Canada, to appear. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3618257.3624796>
- [44] European Union. 2021. Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>.
- [45] USC/ISI ANT project. 2017. <https://ant.isi.edu/datasets/all.html>. Accessed: 2019-01-08.
- [46] USC/LANDER Project. 2014. Internet Outage Measurements. listed on web page <https://ant.isi.edu/datasets/outage/>.
- [47] Gerry Wan, Liz Izhikevich, David Adrian, Katsunari Yoshioka, Ralph Holz, Christian Rossow, and Zakir Durumeric. 2020. On the Origin of Scanning: The Impact of Location on Internet-Wide Scans. In *Proceedings of the ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. ACM, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 662–679. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419394.3424214>
- [48] Samuel Woodhams and Simon Migliano. 2021. The Global Cost of Internet Shutdowns in 2020. <https://www.top10vpn.com/cost-of-internet-shutdowns/>.

A DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH ETHICS

Our work poses no ethical concerns as described in §1. We elaborate here.

First, we collect no additional data, but instead reanalyze data from several existing sources listed in §B. Our work therefore poses no additional load on the Internet, nor any new risk from data collection.

Our analysis poses no risk to individuals because our subject is network topology and connectivity. There is a slight risk to individuals in that we examine responsiveness of individual IP addresses. With external information, IP addresses can sometimes be traced to individuals, particularly when combined with external data sources like DHCP logs. We avoid this risk in three ways. First, we do not have DHCP logs for any networks (and in fact, most are unavailable outside of specific ISPs). Second, we commit, as research policy, to not combine IP addresses with external data sources that might de-anonymize them to individuals. Finally, except for analysis of specific cases as part of validation, all of our analysis is done in bulk over the whole dataset.

We do observe data about organizations such as ISPs, and about the geolocation of blocks of IP addresses. Because we do not map IP addresses to individuals, this analysis poses no individual privacy risk.

Finally, we suggest that while our work poses minimal privacy risks to individuals, it also provides substantial benefit to the community and to individuals. For reasons given in the introduction it is important to improve network reliability and understand how networks fail. Our work contributes to that goal.

Our work was reviewed by the Institutional Review Board at our university and because it poses no risk to individual privacy, it was identified as non-human subjects research (USC IRB IIR00001648).

B DATA SOURCES AND KEY CLAIMS

Table 8 provides a full list of datasets used in this paper and where they may be obtained.

Table 9 summarizes the key observations this paper makes about the Internet, and what datasets support each. The paper body provides all of our key claims and validates them with multiple data sources and broad, Internet-wide data as observed from 6 (Trinocular), about 150 (Ark), and about 10k (RIPE Atlas) locations. We emphasize that *all* our key results use data from multiple data sources. Some graphs emphasize data source from Trinocular, since it provides very broad coverage, all key validation and observational results are supported with data from either Ark or RIPE Atlas. All of our trends are verified with Trinocular data from 6 sites scanning millions of networks, and confirmed by data from many sites scanning less frequently (Ark, with 150 sites scanning millions of networks daily) or less completely (RIPE Atlas, with 10k sites scanning 13 destinations).

Our core quantitative results use Trinocular data, because it is the only currently available data source that provides very broad coverage (5M IPv4 blocks) with sufficient frequency (updates every 11 minutes) to approach an Internet wide view. However, we emphasize that we have validated these conclusions as described in §4 against other Ark data. These results strongly confirm that Taitao and Chiloe true positives and true negatives are correct, and suggest there are relatively few true positives. 2024-06-06 Trinocular’s observations from 6 VPs many underrepresent peninsulas (Taitao likely has an unknown number of false negatives), Finally, in many cases, we validate observations with multiple quarters of Trinocular data to show that the results are consistent over time.

The utility of core results are also strongly confirmed by applying Taitao and Chiloe to DNSmon in §6.2. DNSmon provides observations from about 10k VPs, although they contact 13 sites (the DNS root servers) and therefore require a relaxed version of the algorithms. These results show peninsulas and islands have profound effects on DNSmon reports about root-server-system reliability, confirming the Trinocular Internet-wide data.

C ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS OF POTENTIAL MISSED PENINSULAS

In §4.1 we suggest that it is difficult to use Ark to predict a peninsula because its methodology causes it to usually probe a non-responsive address. This result follows from Ark’s design as a topology discovery system, not partition detection—as a result, the majority of Ark probes fail to reach a target, even for a block that is reachable. (We do not mean this statement as a negative comment about Ark. It is well suited for topology discovery and building router-level network topologies. This problem occurs when we do our best to reuse Ark data to validate network partitions.)

Comparing Ark and Trinocular data: We reuse Ark to validate network partitions for two reasons: first, each traceroute targets one address (prefix probing, the .1, and team probing a random address), not multiple addresses. Second, Ark visits each block on average every 36 minutes, compared to Trinocular’s observation every 2 minutes (6 observers every 11 minutes).

The biggest challenge is that Ark probes either only one destination address. By contrast, Trinocular probes up to 15 addresses, stopping on success, and those addresses are drawn from addresses that have previously responded. Predicted addresses respond 49% of the time, while a random address responds in less than 1% of blocks ([18], Figure 7). Probing 15 addresses is successful more than 90% of time for 5/6ths of responsive blocks ([34], Figure 6), while probing .1 is responsive only in 1/6th of responsive blocks, and other addresses respond even less frequently. As a result, we expect 4/6ths of Ark targets to be non-responsive, even when the block is reachable. While this choice does not limit Ark for building router-level topologies, prediction of peninsulas from multiple Ark attempts with mixed results, *almost always reflects Ark targeting a non-responsive address, not an actual peninsula.*

Ark’s less frequent probing is a second factor. In aggregate, Ark probes a target block every 36 minutes (40 teams, each trying each block once per day), while Trinocular probes 18x more frequently (6 observers, each probing every block every 11 minutes). As a result, combinations of Ark observations are often from different times, blurring outages and peninsulas.

A “positive” is Taitao detecting a peninsula that Ark confirms, and a negative is Taitao not detecting a peninsula (showing all positive or all negative) that Ark has mixed results about. However, since 90% of Ark results are negative because it chooses a target address that doesn’t respond, *most* Ark results are mixed and are false indications of peninsulas. For this reason, we consider Ark reports about false negatives untrustworthy, and we discount Ark’s evaluation of metrics that depend on the false negative rate (such as recall,

Dataset Name	Source	Start Date	Duration	Where Used
internet_outage_adaptive_a28w-20170403	Trinocular [45]	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$2.3, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28c-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28j-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28g-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28e-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$2.3, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28n-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	90 days	
Polish peninsula subset		2017-06-03	12 hours	\$2.3, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a28all-20170403	Trinocular	2017-04-03	89 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a29all-20170702	Trinocular	2017-07-02	94 days	\$2.3, \$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a30w-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$2.4, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30c-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30j-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30g-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30e-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$2.4, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30n-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	
Site E Island		2017-10-23	36 hours	\$2.4, \$D
internet_outage_adaptive_a30all-20171006	Trinocular	2017-10-06	85 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$4.4, \$E.2
Oct. Nov. subset		2017-10-06	40 days	\$4.2, \$5.2, \$5.4
Oct. subset		2017-10-10	21 days	\$4.1, \$6.1
internet_outage_adaptive_a31all-20180101	Trinocular	2018-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a32all-20180401	Trinocular	2018-04-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a33all-20180701	Trinocular	2018-07-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a34all-20181001	Trinocular	2018-10-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$F.1, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a35all-20190101	Trinocular	2019-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a36all-20190401	Trinocular	2019-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a37all-20190701	Trinocular	2019-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a38all-20191001	Trinocular	2019-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a39all-20200101	Trinocular	2020-01-01	90 days	\$4.3, \$5.6, \$5.7, \$E.2
internet_outage_adaptive_a41all-20200701	Trinocular	2020-07-01	90 days	\$5.3
prefix-probing	Ark [8]			
Oct. 2017 subset		2017-10-10	21 days	\$4.1, \$6.1
2020q3 subset		2020-07-01	90 days	\$5.3
probe-data	Ark			
Oct 2017 subset		2017-10-10	21 days	\$4.1, \$6.1
2020q3 subset		2020-07-01	90 days	\$5.3
routeviews.org/bgpdata	Routeviews [29]	2017-10-06	40 days	\$4.2, \$D
Atlas Recurring Root Pings (id: 1001 to 1016)	Atlas [31]	2021-07-01	90 days	\$5.1, \$5.7

Table 8: All datasets used in this paper.

but not precision). In other words, Ark can confirm what Taitao finds, but it is insufficient to evaluate what Taitao misses.

Implications in comparing Ark and Taitao: We observe that it is quite challenging to compare Taitao and Ark. We would like to take Ark as “ground truth” from more VPs (150, not just 6), but it is designed for topology discovery,

not peninsula detection, makes it an imperfect tool for this application.

However, we suggest it does provide useful validation for true positives, true negatives, and false positives, as we describe next.

Implications of potential false negatives: While we cannot trust Ark’s judgment of false negatives, it is likely that

	claim	support
examples	IPv4 islands exist (§2.3)	example Trinocular/2017q2
	IPv6 peninsulas exist (§2.4)	public news [19, 27, 35], DNSmon [37], looking glass [11, 17]
	IPv4 peninsulas exist (§2.4)	example Trinocular/2017q4, Ark [8], traceroutes and routeviews (§D)
validation	Taitao correctness (§4.1)	Trinocular/2017q4, validated with Ark
	Chiloe correctness (§4.3)	Trinocular/2017q1 to 2020q1
	6 Trinocular sites are independent (§4.4)	Trinocular/2017q4
observations	Peninsulas are common (§5.1)	Trinocular/2017q1, 2018q4, 2020q3
	Some peninsulas are long-lived (§5.2)	Trinocular/2017q3 to 2020q1 and RIPE Atlas (2021q3)
	Islands are common (§5.6)	Trinocular/2017q3 to 2020q1 and RIPE Atlas (2021q3)
	Most islands are hours or less (§5.7)	Trinocular/2017q3 to 2020q1 and RIPE Atlas (2021q3)
	Most islands are small (§5.8)	RIPE Atlas/2021q3
applications	peninsulas can clarify outages (§6.1)	Trinocular/2017q4 with Ark (21 days)
	DNSmon sensitivity can improve (§6.2)	DNSmon/2022 (uses RIPE Atlas)

Table 9: Key observations made in the paper and which datasets support each.




Figure 11: Cumulative peninsulas and peninsula duration. Dataset A30, 2017q4.

some are correct—Ark likely sees some partitions that Taitao misses when using only Trinocular as a data source. We expect that there are many very small peninsulas (micro-peninsulas), and that adding more VPs will increase the number of these micro-peninsulas. As a thought experiment, every computer that can route to a LAN using public IP addresses, but lacks a global route, is a peninsula.

We align our claims with this potential: we claim there are many peninsulas, at least more than there are outages, as supported by Figure 4. Although we think there are not many large peninsulas, we recognize there are many, and some are long-lasting (Figure 11). If some or many of the false negatives suggested by Ark are actual peninsulas, implies that understanding peninsulas is even more important than we predict.

Implications of true positives, true negatives, and false positives: While care must be taken when using Ark as

“ground truth” to judge false negatives (peninsulas missed by Taitao), it is much more promising to test other conditions.

True positives are peninsulas identified by Taitao because it sees conflicting VPs. For these cases, presence of conflicting Ark data is consistent with Taitao. Even if Ark has excessive last-hop failures, its large number of observers suggest that some may be correctly unreachable, and the presence of reachability from some Ark VPs confirms partial reachability.

True negatives last a long time, so in these cases all Taitao VPs reach the target, and the long duration of “all Taitao VPs reach” makes it very likely some Ark VP reaches the target.

Finally, the very small number when Taitao reports all down but Ark shows reachability (6 cases) confirms that in a few cases, 6 sites are not enough to see all peninsulas.

D VALIDATION OF THE POLISH PENINSULA

We define peninsulas in §2.4 and present a example peninsula we discovered through our algorithms. That example illustrates the concept, but here we expand on that example to providing additional data from BGP that support our interpretation of the event.

On 2017-10-23, for a period of 3 hours starting at 22:02Z, five Polish ASes had 1716 blocks that were unreachable from five VPs while the same blocks remained reachable from a sixth VP.

Figure 12 shows the AS-level relationships at the time of the peninsula. Multimedia Polska (AS21021, or *MP*) provides service to the other 4 ISPs. MP has two Tier-1 providers: Cogent (AS174) and Tata (AS6453). Before the peninsula, our VPs see MP through Cogent.

At event start, we observe many BGP updates (20,275) announcing and withdrawing routes to the affected blocks (see Figure 13). These updates correspond to Tata announcing MP’s prefixes. Perhaps MP changed its peering to prefer Tata over Cogent, or the MP-Cogent link failed.




Figure 12: AS level topology during the Polish peninsula.




Figure 13: BGP update messages sent for affected Polish blocks starting 2017-10-23t20:00Z. Data source: RouteViews.

Initially, traffic from most VPs continued through Cogent and was lost; it did not shift to Tata. One VP (W) could reach MP through Tata for the entire event, proving MP was connected. After 3 hours, we see another burst of BGP updates (23,487 this time), making MP reachable again from all VPs.

In Figure 14 we provide data from our 6 external VPs, where W is uniquely capable of reaching the target block, thus living in the same peninsula.

We further verify this event by looking at traceroutes. During the event we see 94 unique Ark VPs attempted 345 traceroutes to the affected blocks. Of the 94 VPs, 21 VPs (22%) have their last responsive traceroute hop in the same AS as the target address, and 68 probes (73%) stopped before reaching that AS. Table 10 shows traceroute data from a single CAIDA Ark VP before and during the peninsula described in §2.4 and Figure 3. This data confirms the block was reachable from some locations and not others. During the event, this trace breaks at the last hop within the source AS.




Figure 14: A block (80.245.176.0/24) showing a 3-hour peninsula accessible only from VP W (top bar) and not from the other five VPs. Dataset: A30.




Figure 15: A block showing a 1-hour island for this block and VP E, while other five VPs cannot reach it.

E ADDITIONAL DETAILS ABOUT ISLANDS

We define islands and give examples in §2.3. Here we supplement those results with examples of country-sided islands (§5.8.2), and details about a specific island around one of our VPs (§E.1). We also show the raw data we use to justify our choice of 50% unreachability to define islands in Trinocular (§E.2).

E.1 Validation of the Sample Island

In §2.3 we reported an island affecting a /24 block where VP E lives. During the time of the event, E was able to successfully probe addresses within the same block, however, unable to reach external addresses. This event started at 2017-06-03t23:06Z, and can be observed in Figure 16.

Furthermore, no other VP was able to reach the affected block for the time of the island as shown in Figure 15.

E.2 Longitudinal View Of Islands

We first consider three years of Trinocular data (described in §3.1), from 2017-04-01 to 2020-04-01. Figure 16 shows the fraction of the Internet that is reachable as a dotted line at

src block	dst block	time	traces
c85eb700	50f5b000	1508630032	q, 148.245.170.161, 189.209.17.197, 189.209.17.197, 38.104.245.9, 154.24.19.41, 154.54.47.33, 154.54.28.69, 154.54.7.157, 154.54.40.105, 154.54.40.61, 154.54.43.17, 154.54.44.161, 154.54.77.245, 154.54.38.206, 154.54.60.254, 154.54.59.38, 149.6.71.162, 89.228.6.33, 89.228.2.32, 176.221.98.194
c85eb700	50f5b000	1508802877	q, 148.245.170.161, 200.38.245.45, 148.240.221.29

Table 10: Traces from the same Ark VPs (mty-mx) to the same destination before and during the event block




Figure 16: Islands detected across 3 years using six VPs. Datasets A28-A39.

the 50% threshold that Chiloe uses to detect an island (§3.4). We run Chiloe across each VP for this period.

F STABILITY OF RESULTS OVER TIME

Our paper body uses Trinocular measurements for 2017q4 because this time period had six active VPs, allowing us to make strong statements about how multiple perspectives help. Those three months of data provide evidence of result stability, but those observations are now several years old. Because IP address allocation and partial reachability are associated with organizational policy (of ICANN and the Regional Internet Registries (RIRs)) and business practices of thousands of ISPs, we expect them to change relatively slowly. Here we verify this assumption, showing our results from 2017 hold in 2018 and 2020. They do—we find quantitatively similar results between 2017 for number and sizes of peninsulas in §F.1, and duration in 2020q3 in §F.2, confirming these results in §5 hold.

F.1 Additional Confirmation of the Number of Peninsulas

In §5.1 we quantify how common peninsulas are. Here we confirm we see qualitatively similar results, but in Trinocular from 2018q4 data.

In Figure 17 we confirm, that with more VPs more peninsulas are discovered, providing a better view of the Internet’s overall state.

Outages (left) converge after 3 sites, as shown by the fitted curve and decreasing variance. Peninsulas and all-up converge more slowly.

At six VPs, here we find an even higher difference between all down and disagreements. Confirming that peninsulas are a more pervasive problem than outages.

F.2 Additional Confirmation of Peninsula Duration

In §5.2 we characterize peninsula duration for 2017q4, to determine peninsula root causes. To confirm our results, we repeat the analysis, but with 2020q3 data.

As Figure 18a shows, similarly, as in our 2017q4 results, we see that there are many very brief peninsulas (from 20 to 60 minutes). These results suggest that while the Internet is robust, there are many small connectivity glitches.

Events shorter than two rounds (22 minutes), may represent BGP transients or failures due to random packet loss.

The number of multi-day peninsulas is small. However, these represent about 90% of all peninsula-time. Events lasting a day are long-enough that can be debugged by human network operators, and events lasting longer than a week are long-enough that they may represent policy disputes. Together, these long-lived events suggest that there is benefit to identifying non-transient peninsulas and addressing the underlying routing problem.

F.3 Additional Confirmation of Size

In §5.4 we discussed the size of peninsulas measured as a fraction of the affected routable prefix. In the latter section, we use 2017q4 data. Here we use 2020q3 to confirm our results.

Figure 18b shows the peninsulas per prefix fraction, and Figure 18c. Similarly, we find that while small prefix fraction peninsulas are more in numbers, most of the peninsula time




Figure 17: Distribution of block-time fraction over sites reporting all down (left), disagreement (center), and all up (right), for events longer than five hour. Dataset A34, 2018q4.




Figure 18: Peninsulas measured with per-site down events longer than 5 hours during 2020q3. Dataset A41. is spent in peninsulas covering the whole prefix. This result is consistent with long lived peninsulas being caused by policy choices.