

Hermes: A General-Purpose Proxy-Enabled Networking Architecture

Behrooz Farkiani, Fan Liu, Ke Yang, John DeHart, Jyoti Parwatar, Patrick Crowley
 Washington University in St. Louis,
 1 Brookings Dr., St. Louis, MO, 63130, USA
 Emails: {b.farkiani, fan.liu, k.yang1, jdd, jp, pcrowley}@wustl.edu

Abstract—We introduce Hermes, a general-purpose networking architecture built on an overlay of reconfigurable proxies. Hermes delegates networking responsibilities from applications and services to the overlay proxies. It employs a range of proxying and tunneling techniques, utilizes HTTP as its core component, and incorporates assisting components to facilitate service delivery, enhance communication, and improve end-users’ experience. To substantiate these benefits, we prototyped Hermes and demonstrated its ability to efficiently address service and communication challenges. We showed that Hermes enables end-to-end solutions for compatibility with legacy applications and protocols and reliable delivery in highly disadvantaged networking conditions. Furthermore, Hermes demonstrated its ability to provide end-to-end, business-logic-driven handling of general IP traffic and to serve as a communication pipeline for Named Data Networking, facilitating the development and adoption of future networking architectures.

Index Terms—Overlay Networking, Proxy, HTTP, Architecture, Tunneling

I. INTRODUCTION

THE internet, as a general-purpose packet-switching network architecture, has been a remarkable engineering success. Its achievements are primarily due to the widespread adoption of its core protocol suite, which facilitates interconnection, and its end-to-end design principles. However, the internet architecture has notable flaws, including inadequate performance and security measures, as well as being ill-suited for content-oriented services. Despite these shortcomings, the internet’s success and global reach make large-scale changes to its architecture extremely challenging [1]–[4].

The need to improve these shortcomings led to two main research directions—first, a clean-slate design in projects like SCION [5]. The clean-slate designs of a new internet, despite their contributions and innovations, have not had a significant impact on the internet architecture, and it is widely believed that replacing the internet is an unrealistic approach [2]. The second direction has been to improve the functionality, security, and performance of the internet protocol suite by layering on top of it: that is, to use the current internet protocol stack and architecture as the foundation on which new protocols operate. Many innovations fall under this category, including the introduction of performance-enhancing proxies [6], and successful private or public overlay networks, such as Tor [7] and Akamai [8], which apply their own networking approach on top of the internet.

The end-to-end principle has historically guided the internet architecture by emphasizing that essential functions should be implemented at the endpoints, allowing for adaptable, reliable solutions across a shared network. In brief, many problems require end-to-end solutions. While this approach has enabled the internet to thrive, many current solutions focus primarily on the service domain, addressing challenges within provider infrastructure while leaving key issues unresolved on the end-user side. Additionally, end-user traffic routing and management often depend on external mechanisms like DNS and IP-based routing before reaching service infrastructure, limiting the control and reliability needed for true end-to-end solutions.

Observation 1 (Challenge): Today’s service providers face complex challenges that demand coordinated, end-to-end solutions to effectively manage traffic, privacy, and compatibility across the entire communication path, among other concerns. Service providers have developed numerous tools to control and manage traffic within their networks, yet certain challenges remain unresolved without coordinated action at the endpoints. One example of these challenges is traffic management: while providers can optimally steer incoming traffic within their infrastructure, they have limited control over input traffic before it reaches ingress points. This lack of early regulation often results in congestion that must be managed primarily by DNS and IP-based routing (including BGP), which lacks the ability to adjust dynamically to real-time user-side conditions.

Privacy is another complex issue. While TLS and Zero Trust frameworks enable secure connections from the user device to the provider’s edge, true end-to-end privacy requires a unified privacy model across all segments. This means maintaining consistent protections as data moves across each layer and intermediary. Once data reaches the provider’s infrastructure, privacy protections may vary, as data is often decrypted, stored, or processed in ways that differ from those applied between the end-user and the edge. These varied privacy models along the path can lead to gaps in data handling and exposure.

Backward compatibility also poses a continuous challenge. While service-side updates can help manage compatibility across evolving protocols, many end-user devices require costly updates, and users may resist them or lack the option for updates altogether. Some devices are limited by hardware constraints or locked firmware, restricting them to older

versions and creating a fragmented user base that relies on outdated protocols. These service-level challenges underscore the limitations of relying solely on centralized, provider-side solutions for problems that ultimately require end-to-end coordination.

Observation 2 (Challenge): There is a lack of an end-to-end, general-purpose communication layer that can adapt to the varied requirements of modern networks. The IP layer’s best-effort delivery model, while foundational to the internet’s success, has led to the development of various transport protocols over time, including TCP and its many variations with improved congestion control. However, limitations persist, particularly in end-to-end, business-logic-driven handling of traffic, efficient communication in high-latency or unstable environments, and the inherent internet limitation of address-based rather than content-based addressing. To address challenges in achieving efficient communication in unstable environments, other general-purpose protocols, such as QUIC and HTTP/3, have been introduced and demonstrate significant improvements in lossy networks [9]. However, the performance of these protocols depends heavily on network conditions and can sometimes be worse than TCP with HTTP/2 [10]. Additionally, specialized protocols like Delay Tolerant Networking (DTN) [11] are designed for highly disrupted environments but require a fundamental shift from traditional networking strategies, making them difficult to adopt as general-purpose solutions.

Inventions like Named Data Networking (NDN) [12] allows for content-based addressing, where data can be retrieved by content names rather than specific locations. Despite this innovative approach, NDN presents challenges for developers and users who must adopt new programming and conceptual models that diverge from traditional IP-based methods.

Businesses use VPNs to enforce core communication-layer policies, such as controlling and monitoring user access to internal networks, while also providing communication-level privacy. However, integrating traditional VPNs with broader business objectives is challenging due to inter-layer complexities. Business requirements, such as access control and policies designed to ensure user quality of service, typically operate at higher layers than the VPN itself, making it difficult to enforce these policies within a network-layer protocol. Additionally, the static nature of most traditional VPNs limits their flexibility, as they are not designed to adapt dynamically to business-driven policies.

Consequently, the communication layer continues to face limitations in delivering a universally adaptive, reliable, privacy- and policy-oriented approach. Meeting these requirements would facilitate the design of true end-to-end solutions across the entire communication path.

Observation 3 (Solution): A cross-layer solution that addresses both service and communication requirements has advantageous compared to using separate solutions for each layer, as a coordinated approach allows for adaptive optimization across layers. When designing each layer of a system, certain assumptions are often made about the behavior of the other layers. However, in uncontrolled environments like the internet, many of these assumptions may not hold.

For instance, a provider processing encrypted video streams might assume that the underlying network will handle packet recovery and, based on this, select a power-efficient encryption algorithm. However, if network conditions change and the transport protocol fails to recover packets, the encryption choices may impact performance [13], [14]. A cross-layer approach that dynamically adjusts itself according to networking conditions and service requirements offers superior service quality and communication efficiency compared to isolated, layer-specific solutions [15].

Observation 4 (Solution): HTTP is highly extensible, capable of implementing new semantics, and adaptable to carry virtually any type of traffic. Over 60% of internet traffic is HTTP(S) [16], [17], and more than 50% of web traffic now comes from mobile devices [18]. In [19] the authors predicted that HTTP would become the narrow waist of the internet—a prediction that has largely come true. With its flexible header structure, HTTP can easily support various semantics, adapting to the evolving demands of modern networks. Additionally, it can act as a unifying protocol for different traffic types: the CONNECT-UDP mechanism (RFC 9298 [20]), allows HTTP to encapsulate UDP traffic, CONNECT-IP (RFC 9484 [21]) supports IP packets, and CONNECT-ETHERNET [22] enables Ethernet frame encapsulation. These are all part of the MASQUE framework [23], which extends HTTP’s functionality and positions it as a versatile, general-purpose communication protocol well-suited for today’s heterogeneous traffic demands.

Observation 5 (Solution): Special-purpose proxies have been utilized to enhance internet communication and provide targeted benefits for service providers. Proxies are versatile tools that can be configured for various benefits, such as privacy, performance, and security enhancements. For example, Tor [7] uses proxies to create an anonymous overlay network that preserves privacy, while Cloudflare [24] employs reverse proxies to enhance internet security, performance, and reliability. Solutions like PEP-DNA [25] leverage proxies to translate between the internet and alternative architectures, and Apple’s private relay [26] focuses on protecting user privacy. In managed service environments, service meshes such as Istio [27], Consul [28], and Canal [29] use proxies to improve security, manageability, and observability [30]–[33]. However, these implementations are typically designed for a specific purpose. While some researchers have explored using service meshes as a new networking layer in managed service environments [34], proxies still lack a generalized, open-ended application across diverse environments. Expanding their role could help realize a more flexible, adaptive networking layer that meets broader communication and service needs.

A. Motivation

Given the service and communication challenges outlined, there is a well-motivated opportunity to propose a unified solution that addresses both layers in an effective and integrated manner. Our solution is centered on the use of proxies and the extensibility of the HTTP protocol. Dynamically reconfigurable proxies offer the capability to manage evolving service

and network conditions, while the flexibility and extensibility of the HTTP protocol, which can accommodate a wide range of traffic types, provide a robust and unifying foundation for our solution. In response to these challenges, we propose *Hermes*, a general-purpose architecture that expands the solution space to include end-users, enabling end-to-end solutions for service and communication challenges and improving the end-user experience.

B. Contributions

We propose a novel general-purpose networking architecture, Hermes, which constructs an overlay of dynamically configurable proxies extending from end-user devices to various locations, including across domains. Addressing the need for coordinated functionality at both endpoints, especially on the end-user side, which is currently unaddressed in existing solutions, Hermes focuses on end-user networking and enables end-to-end solutions for challenges faced by service and communication providers.

As a service facilitator, Hermes focuses on enhancing control and management of end-user traffic and its interaction with services. Furthermore, as a communication facilitator, Hermes establishes a robust and adaptable general-purpose communication pipeline that provides end-to-end control over the routing of IP packets. The Hermes architecture enables tailored handling of general IP packets and service-associated traffic, including policy-based routing, authentication, authorization, and reliability, among other benefits. More importantly, the architecture is not restricted to specific goals (such as solely providing privacy) as it is dynamically reconfigurable. It is not bound to specific tools or environments (such as Kubernetes) or limited to certain types of traffic (like east-west traffic in service mesh implementations). Instead, Hermes is general-purpose and designed to address service and communication provider challenges and improve end-user experience in a flexible and adaptable manner.

This paper makes three main contributions. First, it introduces the design and components of the Hermes, which are primarily based on four key concepts: 1) **delegation of networking responsibility** from applications or services to an overlay network of dynamically reconfigurable proxies; 2) **overlay tunneling** via UDP, TCP, or HTTP proxies to ensure compatibility with the internet; 3) **HTTP-based semantic processing and routing** at any node within the overlay network to provide extensibility; and 4) **utilizing assisting components** to implement additional logic or perform specific tasks, such as policy enforcement or advanced traffic manipulation.

Second, we develop a prototype implementation using commercially relevant open-source projects and our own custom software, including an overlay controller and Android and iOS smartphone applications¹.

Third, by evaluating the prototype developed in this work, we show that Hermes:

- can provide backward compatibility and reliable delivery in noisy environments (Section III-A);
- can securely transfer data in highly unstable networks (Section III-B);
- can provide end-to-end control for general IP packets (Section III-C);
- can dynamically adapt to network condition changes according to business policies (Section III-C);
- can act as a reliable underlying network for future networking architectures (Section III-D).

The rest of this paper investigates the details of the Hermes architecture. Section II describes Hermes features, components and challenges that each feature can address. Section III describes prototype implementations of Hermes overlays, and we evaluate their performance in solving various problems. After discussing all aspects of the Hermes architecture, Section IV explores the related work, and finally, Section V concludes this paper.

II. HERMES ARCHITECTURE

Hermes is a general-purpose networking architecture that is composed of an overlay network of dynamically reconfigurable proxies, managed by an overlay control plane. Proxies can assume two roles: dependent or standalone (see Section II-B for more details). Dependent proxies receive traffic directly from the source or destination and control the networking of the source or destination. Standalone proxies form the backbone of the overlay and act as software routers. Proxies can be accompanied by several assisting components that enhance proxy logic, implement additional features, or provide advanced traffic manipulation capabilities.

Similar to [2], we define an architecture as the specification for the hop-by-hop handling of traffic between senders and receivers, including the protocols used. In our case, this specification is fully determined by the configurations of the overlay components, which includes both standalone and dependent proxies. Consequently, the Hermes qualifies as an architecture. Furthermore, since the Hermes can route general IP packets over an overlay network, it can be considered general-purpose. However, we constrain its primary function to that of a service and communication facilitator.

A. Core Concepts

The overlay constructed by Hermes incorporates the following ideas to serve as a general-purpose and adaptable communication medium:

- 1) To delegate networking responsibilities from applications or services to an overlay network of dynamically reconfigurable proxies. This allows applications and services to communicate only with their local dependent proxies, without concern for the complexities of the underlying network. Since the proxies are dynamically reconfigurable, they can adapt to changes in service and network conditions.
- 2) To act as UDP, TCP, or HTTP proxies to remain internet-compatible. Proxies are IP endpoints, listen to UDP and TCP ports, and should be able to process data at

¹The code for this paper is available at: <https://github.com/Bfarkiani/Hermes>.

least at the UDP, TCP, and HTTP layers, sending traffic encapsulated in UDP or TCP to the next destination.

- 3) To process and route traffic based on semantics defined in HTTP headers. Each proxy can append custom HTTP headers to the input traffic. These headers can be used to implement specific actions, perform distributed debugging, enrich input traffic with user-dependent information, and make routing decisions, among other uses.
- 4) To act as traffic processing points rather than simple forwarders. Proxies can utilize assisting components to enhance their capabilities, such as creating a tunnel device to redirect general IP packets to their UDP or TCP listening ports, perform local algorithms to better handle input traffic, advanced caching, and policy enforcement. All of these assisting components are managed by the control plane and communicate through the overlay proxies.

By utilizing these core concepts, Hermes can provide the following features, among others:

- **Simplifying applications and making them robust.** Proxies can dynamically adjust the protocols and parameters they use or select optimal paths in response to changes in service or network conditions. For example, if the application always connects through UDP to the proxy, the proxy can tunnel data over TCP or HTTP/2 to the destination. If network conditions deteriorate, the proxy can be updated to use QUIC/HTTP/3, which is more resilient to packet loss [9]. The key point is that the application only needs to connect to the local proxy, without concern for network conditions, as the overlay manages these complexities and updates proxies.
- **Providing dedicated address spaces.** A dedicated address space associates an address, in the format of a domain name or IP address, with a user. Since applications can pass domain names to proxies, developers can use specific names, such as "DEV," as hostnames. When a user provides "DEV" as the hostname to the local dependent proxy, it appears as an HTTP header to the proxy. Each proxy can be configured to either process the address locally or delegate it to another proxy. Thus, for two separate users, the hostname "DEV" might resolve to two different machines. Overlay nodes can process addresses with or without DNS intervention, eliminating the need for DNS resolution at end-hosts. For IP addresses, as shown in Section III-C, the network address can be added to the user's input traffic as an HTTP header.
- **Providing fine-grained end-to-end traffic control and observation.** Typically, organizations process user traffic and perform tasks such as authentication, authorization, and load balancing once the traffic reaches the organization's network edges. Deploying a proxy at the end-user device allows the organization to extend its control and processing capabilities to the user's device itself. This enables end-to-end control over user traffic from the moment it is generated, offering significant advantages. With early insights into user traffic, organizations can deploy local load balancing and endpoint selection algorithms as proxy-assisting components, leading to better traffic distribution directly from end-user devices. Additionally, the overlay can implement end-to-end policy enforcement and policy-based traffic management tailored to each user's identity across the internet and between domains. As we show in Section III-C, an organization can have full control over IP traffic and can enforce policies end-to-end. In addition, it can be shown that Hermes can implement Zero Trust APP and Host Access scenarios [35].
- **Providing legacy application and protocol compatibility.** Compatibility is a major challenge in developing and maintaining services. Every new internet-facing service must either ensure backward compatibility or require the organization to keep older endpoints active for an extended period until customers migrate to newer versions. In some cases, a few customers may encounter compatibility issues with current services, but redesigning a service is often too costly. Hermes addresses these challenges by enabling tunneling, as well as protocol and data format translation, at the end-user's local proxy. This means only the overlay proxies need to be modified. In Section III-A, we demonstrate how a UDP-based video streaming service can achieve reliable, lossless streaming in a noisy network by tunneling UDP over HTTP, without requiring any modifications to the client or server implementations.
- **Supporting communication in unstable networks.** Over the past decade, researchers have proposed protocols, mechanisms, and architectures to support communication in highly unstable networks [11], [36], [37]. However, these approaches often require modifying applications or using a translation gateway to convert the original connection to another protocol or architecture. The Hermes creates an adaptable overlay that can adjust to changes in network connectivity. For instance, proxies can be reconfigured to use QUIC instead of TCP, or they can employ local algorithms to fine-tune retry parameters of the current protocol in use. In Section III-B, we demonstrate that while direct communication over TCP is not feasible in highly unstable networks [38], overlay proxies parameters can be tuned to achieve 100% successful delivery.
- **Supporting experimental networking protocols and architectures.** For experimental protocols and architectures, encapsulating custom data formats as the payload of an internet protocol and decapsulating them at the destination is a feasible approach to achieving global reachability. However, traffic and network management over the internet remains complex, resulting in intricate service architectures. The Hermes overlay can serve as the underlying network for transferring data between architecture components, offering features such as name-based routing, traffic management, reliable delivery, and load balancing, among others, which simplify the design of protocols and architectures. In Section III-D, we demonstrate how the overlay can carry traffic between

NDN nodes while providing reliability and load balancing. Notably, even if future architectures do not support UDP or TCP encapsulation, as we explain in Section II-B, The Hermes is capable of running tunnel devices to capture IP packets and route them over the overlay.

The Hermes architecture simplifies end-user clients by shifting complexity to the overlay nodes. This approach eases the development, maintenance, and management of applications and services, as proxies handle traffic routing, network management, and compatibility issues.

B. Components and Roles

Hermes has two main components. The overlay proxies and the control plane.

1) **Proxies:** The overlay proxies are software components and IP endpoints that have associated TCP or UDP ports and IPv4 or IPv6 addresses, functioning as at least UDP, TCP, and HTTP proxying tools. To enable proxies to handle IP packet proxying, they may create tunnel devices to redirect IP packets to the TCP or UDP ports they are listening on. This can be accomplished either by the proxy itself or with the help of assisting components.

Proxies can add, remove, append, or modify both payload and header information of the received data. They can be configured to establish new HTTP tunnels and proxy TCP over HTTP using the CONNECT method [39], UDP over HTTP with the CONNECT-UDP method [20], and general IP packets over HTTP using the CONNECT-IP method [21] (i.e., the MASQUE framework [23]). Proxies can also perform TCP or UDP forwarding without tunneling through HTTP if desired. They have full control over traffic routing, can collect telemetry data, and can be dynamically configured by the control plane.

Hermes assumes two roles for proxies: dependent and standalone. Proxies can always be paired with assisting components to enhance their capabilities. These components should be configurable by the control plane and should only communicate through the proxy. As a core element of the architecture, end-user devices must connect to dependent proxies, while the inclusion of additional proxies is optional. Once traffic passes through the end-user's local dependent proxy, it can be routed to various destinations, such as the public internet, a networking architecture distinct from the internet, an organization with legacy applications and services, or a service mesh within a cloud environment, among others. Different configurations of dependent and standalone proxies are shown in Figure 1. The black box represents a physical machine, and dependent and standalone proxies are shown with **DP** and **SaP**, respectively.

Dependent proxies. Dependent proxies accept traffic from end hosts (which includes the end-user device, as the source, or the destination of the traffic) and act as communication gateways to one or more applications or services, according to Figures 1a to 1c. All relevant traffic entering the overlay or exiting to applications or services must pass through the dependent proxy. While these proxies may have little or no knowledge of the applications or services, they play a crucial role in ensuring smooth communication. This definition

pertains to the role of the proxy, not its physical location. Thus, dependent proxies might be a separate component or bundled with each application (Figure 1a), be shared between multiple applications (Figure 1b), or might not be physically collocated with the devices hosting the applications or services they serve as gateways for (Figure 1c); however, end-users can access them through their local network. The architecture mandates running at least one dependent proxy on the end-user side of communication.

Dependent proxies utilize HTTP headers to augment incoming traffic with overlay-specific information, which the overlay uses to determine subsequent actions. This information can include user identity, dedicated address space data, or tunneling details, among other examples. If the incoming traffic is not HTTP, dependent proxies can tunnel it through HTTP using the MASQUE framework, appending the relevant headers. However, proxies still need to associate incoming traffic with the appropriate headers. One approach is to link headers to the ports on which the proxy is listening. For instance, if only database-related traffic arrives on port 1000, database-specific headers will be appended to the proxied traffic. Since proxies can tunnel general IP packets, a split tunneling mechanism is required to associate each network address with a specific port, thus establishing an IP-based address space. For example, traffic destined for the 10.10.0.0/16 network could be directed to port 10000 UDP on the proxy, either via the tunnel device created by the proxy or through its assisting components. The proxy can then append an HTTP header corresponding to the network address and send the traffic to the overlay.

Standalone proxies. Standalone proxies function as software routers that route traffic between different sections of the overlay and they accept traffic from dependent proxies similar to Figure 1d. These proxies will likely employ policy enforcers and advanced traffic modification components as their assisting components. Additionally, standalone proxies can rely solely on TCP or UDP forwarding to enhance overlay performance or when HTTP processing is not necessary. For example, as shown in Section III-B, proxies can act as TCP forwarders to ensure an end-to-end secure TLS connection between the end-user and the destination, eliminating the need to trust the overlay proxies.

Please note that a proxy can have both roles of dependent and standalone proxies simultaneously. It may accept traffic on one of its ports from other proxies (acting as a standalone proxy) while also communicating with a local application on another port (acting as a dependent proxy).

2) **Control Plane:** The essential components of the control plane, a critical part of the system, include the overlay controller, infrastructure controller, configuration database, and observability and management tools. The control plane, as shown in Figure 2, consists of these four key components.

The overlay controller. The overlay controller is responsible for the placement of overlay proxies and their assisting components, configuring these proxies and components, and managing their life cycle. It ensures that the overlay remains healthy and efficient by implementing various resource allocation and network management solutions as needed.

The infrastructure controller. The infrastructure controller




Fig. 1: Different proxy configurations




Fig. 2: Control plane components

is responsible for managing the infrastructure and physical machines that host the proxies. It communicates directly with the overlay controller to start, stop, scale proxies, or manage other resources on the machines.

Configuration database. The configuration database stores the configurations of all overlay components that specifies how they process traffic. The overlay controller writes to the configuration database to update the overlay configuration, and, when necessary, pushes the latest configurations to the overlay components to ensure they stay up to date.

The Observability and Monitoring Component. The observability and monitoring component collects and stores data on overlay status, resource usage, and end-user telemetry, among other metrics. The overlay controller relies on this data to detect network and service issues and optimize the overlay’s efficiency.

Now that we have discussed the overlay components, we can define the users within the overlay.

End-user. The end-user is the source of traffic passing through the overlay. Traffic may originate from IoT devices, mobile devices, or other systems, and the overlay is agnostic

to the source. End-users should have control over the proxy, with the ability to start or stop it as needed.

Service and communication providers. These are organizations or individuals that use the overlay to improve end-user experience or enhance communication or service delivery.

Overlay operator. The overlay operator is the organization or individual who sets up the control plane and configures proxies. The overlay operator might not be the same as the service or communication provider and could be a third party. An overlay operator controls the proxies within its domain, but a Hermes overlay can span multiple domains, requiring multiple overlay operators, each responsible for their own domain.

The components of the control plane are logically centralized. Each domain requires its own separate control plane, and the connection between controllers in autonomous domains can be established through custom interfaces or out-of-band communication. The next section illustrates an example of a multi-domain Hermes overlay deployment.

C. Deployment Example

An example of a multi-domain deployment is described below. In this example, we utilize all four design concepts introduced in Section II-A to demonstrate how Hermes can support the hypothetical networking architecture FutureNet in transferring data between autonomous domains. It is important to note that a multi-domain deployment requires multiple domains to be aware of the Hermes overlay and presents complexities that a typical single-domain deployment does not encounter.

FutureNet has its own transport protocol over IP and has already assigned unique address spaces to its customers (for example, 10.10.0.0/24). FutureNet users access resources and their dedicated address space through a dedicated client. While FutureNet could implement this use case using a traditional VPN client, as shown in Section III-C, the VPN approach




Fig. 3: Deployment example. Proxies are in green. FutureNet nodes are in black.

has many limitations in flexibility and policy enforcement. Additionally, if FutureNet relies on the VPN approach, it loses the benefits of transferring data over an overlay, such as improved traffic routing over the internet, which private overlays like Akamai [8] have leveraged for many years.

FutureNet advertises the public IP addresses of its ingress routers with the attributes “Experimental: true” and “ARCH: FutureNet,” which we assume are standardized headers, over the internet. Domain administrators who recognize the Hermes overlay use the advertised information to build a path to the FutureNet network. Each domain administrator can also aggregate the propagated paths over the Hermes architecture. For instance, a domain may aggregate based on the “Experimental” header and forward traffic according to the value of this specific header while ignoring the others. Consequently, the processing of the remaining headers will be deferred until the traffic reaches a proxy configured to handle them.

The administrator of FutureNet provides each user wishing to connect to their network with a proxy client capable of creating a tunnel device. The proxy is managed by the FutureNet network over the internet. Using the tunnel device, user traffic is directed to the dependent proxy’s local ports. The dependent proxy then encapsulates the traffic into HTTP and appends the Experimental, ARCH, and Encapsulation headers. The Encapsulation header specifies how to decapsulate the original payload. The dependent proxy then forwards the traffic to a standalone proxy that is close to the user. In this example, we assume the user’s local ISP supports Hermes and operates a standalone proxy.

The topology is shown in Figure 3. A user in Domain A utilizes a FutureNet client to access a service provided by a service node in Domain C. The user’s proxy client configures a tunnel to route traffic destined for the IP address range 10.10.0.0/24 (FutureNet assigned private IP range to this user) to the tunnel device managed by the proxy’s assisting component. The assisting component then encapsulates the data in UDP and delivers it to the appropriate proxy port. The remaining actions proceed as follows.

- 1) The dependent proxy receives FutureNet data units encapsulated in UDP on one of its UDP ports. It then tunnels UDP packets over HTTP to R1, adding at least three HTTP headers: Experimental, ARCH type, and Encapsulation headers. R1 is operated by the user’s local ISP as described above.
- 2) R1 processes the Experimental HTTP header. Its routing table is aggregated based on the Experimental header and is configured to forward all experimental traffic to the IP address of R3. R1 does not process the Encapsulation or ARCH headers.
- 3) Domain B has an agreement in place that permits the transfer of data between Domains A and C. Therefore, Domain B forwards the data to Domain C without processing the HTTP headers. Domain B is not aware of the Hermes overlay or the FutureNet.
- 4) Overlay node R3 processes ARCH HTTP header. It is already configured to route FutureNet architecture traffic to the overlay node R4, which is aware of more details.
- 5) R4 has direct access to the FutureNet ingress router. It then forwards traffic to the ingress router.
- 6) The dependent proxy on the FutureNet ingress router processes the Encapsulation header, decapsulates the payload, and delivers the original data units to the service node. It then encapsulates the response into UDP using the tunnel device its dependent proxy created. Since there is an already established HTTP path between the end-user’s dependent proxy and the ingress router’s dependent proxy, they can communicate directly.

In this example, the FutureNet client and ingress nodes delegated their networking tasks to their local proxies, communicating exclusively through them (Design Concept 1). We used UDP tunneling over HTTP to ensure compatibility and reachability over the internet (Design Concept 2). Since HTTP can be easily extended through its headers, additional headers can be added when more complex communication is required. The overlay nodes do not need to process all headers. In the example above, R1 processed the Experimental header, R3

and R4 processed the ARCH header, and the ingress node processed the Encapsulation header. This represents HTTP-based semantic processing and routing, with the processing of some headers deferred until the traffic reaches specific nodes (Design Concept 3). Finally, we used assisting components to encapsulate the IP packet in UDP and deliver it to the proxy ports (Design Concept 4).

Two important challenges in this multi-domain scenario are that domain controllers must first, have a way to discover, receive, and utilize the advertised information of overlay destinations, and second, agree on both the syntax and semantics of the HTTP headers if they intend to process them. However, if a domain functions solely as a transport domain, such as Domain B, it does not need to be aware of these details. Therefore, if only one domain uses the Hermes overlay and other domains serve as transport domains, these challenges do not need to be addressed, as demonstrated in the implementation section. In the following section, we will discuss the factors that need to be considered to build an efficient Hermes overlay.

D. Challenges and Considerations

Thus far, we have only discussed the features and components of the Hermes architecture. However, there are several additional aspects that must be considered before deploying the overlay. The challenges highlighted here represent the most significant obstacles to the wide-scale deployment of Hermes. As we continue to implement and use the architecture more extensively, new challenges will undoubtedly emerge.

1) *Motivations*: A key question to consider is: what motivates service or communication providers to operate the overlay on their infrastructure and bear its associated costs? We explore this question from two distinct perspectives and investigate specific use cases in the implementation section.

Service providers aim to deliver better service quality to their customers. When end-users interact with a service through an upgradable and configurable client provided by the service provider, many overlay features can be integrated directly into the client. However, delegating networking tasks to separate, reconfigurable proxy components and removing networking logic from the business logic of the client application can result in a simpler client, which can enhance feature development speed. Proxies can also enable backward compatibility, introduce additional service features without requiring client upgrades, and enhance service delivery under various network conditions. Since a proxy responsible for networking tasks is not as complex as a service client, if a functional client is not available for the end-user's specific environment, or if the existing client has limited functionality, the use of a proxy can provide significant benefits. While a dedicated client is tailored to a specific service, a dependent proxy requires little to no knowledge of the service itself, focusing primarily on traffic parameters. This makes proxies much easier to deploy and configure compared to dedicated clients. These factors contribute to improved service quality and increased financial profitability.

Communication providers aim to deliver reliable and efficient communication over the internet. Proxies act as connection endpoints and can be reconfigured to adapt to changing

network conditions, granting providers full control over traffic. A communication provider can leverage the overlay to bypass local ISP restrictions, ensure reliable delivery in disadvantaged networks, facilitate the operation of other networking architectures, and build a secure, authenticated network over untrusted infrastructure, among other advantages. A shared dependent proxy allows the communication provider to capture traffic from various applications and services that are permitted to pass through the overlay. Consequently, a communication provider can improve service quality for an aggregated set of services, making the operation of an overlay not only justifiable but also highly advantageous.

2) *Feasibility*: Each device can support a limited number of ports, and users may simultaneously utilize multiple services. Two key questions arise for end-users: 1) How many proxies are needed on their devices? 2) Are service providers required to migrate all their users and services to Hermes?

To address the first question, it is important to note that a dependent proxy can be deployed on a separate machine and can simultaneously serve multiple applications (Figures 1b and 1c). However, managing different proxies may become a tedious task for end-users, potentially hindering the adoption of the architecture. A potential solution is to treat proxies as services offered directly by the service or communication provider within the end-user's device. This shifts edge services from the provider's network to the user's device. Architectures like [4], which offer an integrated approach to accessing edge services, could provide a viable solution.

As for the second question, it is important to highlight that Hermes acts as a service or communication *facilitator*. Therefore, it is not necessary to migrate the entire user base to the Hermes architecture. For example, for a specific user, a service provider might selectively route the traffic of certain services through Hermes while allowing other services to bypass it. This selective capability is enabled by Hermes's use of proxies, allowing traffic to pass through Hermes only when needed. Consequently, Hermes can be deployed solely for users and services requiring special traffic handling, and it can coexist with any other already deployed solutions.

3) *Performance*: Does using Hermes increase or decrease performance? It depends. Performance measures must be defined in alignment with the system's goals. Using an overlay of proxies will inevitably increase processing time compared to operating without a proxy. Specifically, HTTP-layer processing is more resource-intensive than other layers, which motivated technologies like Ambient Mesh [30] to prioritize transport layer processing over HTTP processing. Hermes requires HTTP-layer processing at the end-user proxies to prepare user traffic for the overlay. However, other standalone proxies can use transport layer processing to reduce processing overhead. Therefore, if the primary objective of the service or network is low-latency communication over a reliable infrastructure, employing a proxy overlay may not be justified. However, the internet is not a reliable medium, and Hermes was specifically designed to operate in such environments.

Hermes can enhance system performance, as demonstrated in Sections III. For example, In Section III-A, the overlay prevented packet loss and improved the delivered video quality.

In Section III-B, we defined the performance metric as the success delivery ratio and the overlay successfully increased it from 0% to 100%. Proxies can also deliver significant system-level performance improvements when used as load balancers. Hermes provides end-to-end user traffic control, fast overlay reconfiguration, and detailed telemetry data, as proxies function as IP endpoints, among other roles. This enables the design of advanced resource management mechanisms to optimize overall system performance. As with any new technology, adopters must carefully evaluate performance gains, Capex and Opex, and potential disadvantages before implementation, and Hermes is no exception.

4) *Security and Privacy*: Another set of questions arises around security and privacy. How can a user trust that the overlay does not pose a threat to their security and privacy? Similarly, how can a service provider trust the overlay not to endanger its services? To address these questions, it's essential to consider the overlay operator, the entity responsible for managing the overlay.

If the service provider operates its own overlay, users can have greater confidence in the security of the overlay proxies. In this scenario, the service provider's edge effectively extends to the user's device, enabling more flexible service offerings. However, if the overlay is operated by a third party, users need assurance that the security of their end-to-end connections remains uncompromised. Hermes supports this scenario: the end-user client connects to the proxy using the CONNECT method, allowing proxies to process the Host header to determine subsequent actions. Hermes can also operate at the IP level, tunneling IP traffic directly to the service provider's network without breaking end-to-end security. These use cases are demonstrated in Section III.

Addressing the service provider's trust concerns is more complex. Each proxy handles part of the service provider's traffic processing logic. Proxies outside the provider's infrastructure are vulnerable to attacks and could be compromised, potentially generating malicious traffic toward other proxies. Given that proxy configurations are provided by a central controller, it is crucial for the controller and proxy to mutually authenticate. The controller can even validate the proxy's binary hash before distributing configurations. Proxy configurations and key distribution should adhere to the principle of least privilege, ensuring that proxies receive only the information necessary for their function. More importantly, proxies need to be continuously monitored by the control plane to detect malicious activities or performance issues. Since Hermes is reconfigurable, ill-functioning proxies can be swiftly replaced with substitutes, and overlay routing can quickly adapt to these changes. In the prototype implementation of Hermes, proxies and the controller mutually authenticate, and proxies are continuously monitored.

5) *Management*: Will using proxies improve network management tasks? Since proxies function as IP endpoints, they can generate extensive telemetry data. The integration of observability and monitoring features within the controller, along with reconfigurable proxies, is essential for creating an adaptable network that can quickly respond to service and network changes. This results in more efficient network

management, as service degradations can be swiftly detected, and reconfigurations can be completed faster with the help of reconfiguration capabilities. Additionally, proxies can be equipped with assisting components to implement failover algorithms in case of disconnection from the control plane, ensuring continued operation despite network disruptions.

6) *Interoperability*: As a general-purpose architecture, a Hermes overlay can be constructed across multiple autonomous domains, as demonstrated in the example from Section II-C. A domain is controlled by an administrative entity and can range in size from a small organizational branch to an entire autonomous system. Each domain has a single control plane that manages all proxies within it. The advantages of using a multi-domain overlay, rather than relying solely on the internet for traffic delivery, can be summarized as follows: 1) similar to other overlay approaches like Akamai [8], it offers more efficient traffic routing than what the internet and BGP provide, and 2) by processing HTTP headers, the overlay can leverage custom address spaces and destinations, rather than being limited to DNS and public IP-based routing, among other benefits. But how can such an overlay be built?

To address this question, we need a method to distribute information about each destination, along with the custom headers associated with them, as demonstrated in the example of Section II-C. Proxies across different domains must also cooperate on the level of processing they perform (whether they act as HTTP forwarders or only process at the TCP or UDP level), the forwarding decisions they make, and the technical details they must agree on, such as protocol versions and headers. With the current level of Hermes deployment, an approach similar to the Tor [7] works well: using public directories combined with out-of-band communication between overlay proxies to distribute information and reach consensus. However, in the future, this concern raises the need for dedicated control-plane protocols and mechanisms.

7) *Standardization*: Two important questions to consider are: 1) Can we establish a standardized proxy configuration syntax? and 2) Can we develop a standardized HTTP header extension so that, when traffic passes between multiple domains, all domains have a shared understanding of the traffic semantics and know how to handle it appropriately?

The first question primarily relates to the integration issue discussed in the feasibility section. If a method exists to integrate all proxies running on end-user devices, a standardized configuration syntax for all proxies would be required, along with standardized interfaces between the controller and the proxies. However, if each communication or service provider operates its own proxy independently, such standardization may not be necessary.

The second question primarily concerns the inter-domain processing of overlay traffic, as discussed in the example from Section II-C. When traffic passes between different domains, administrators who agree to process HTTP headers must have a shared understanding of the headers' meaning and usage. While these agreements can be bilateral rather than standardized, a standardization effort could greatly facilitate the broader adoption of the Hermes architecture.

III. IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

This section demonstrates the capabilities of the Hermes architecture by prototyping and evaluating its performance in various use cases. As Hermes is a general-purpose architecture, its benefit can be illustrated through numerous use cases. Here, we handpicked four introductory use cases to corroborate the listed features in Section II-A. For each use case, we deploy an overlay topology over an underlying physical network. Dependent proxies and standalone proxies are abbreviated as *DP* and *SaP*, respectively. Configuration details are briefly discussed here, with further information provided in the appendix. As we continue to adopt and apply this architecture, we will expand the list of use cases and publish updates on GitHub.

1) *Infrastructure setup*: The hardware network testbed used in the experiments, except for the IP use case (Section III-C), is a remotely accessible resource for networking researchers and educators [40]. We utilized software routers and switches running on separate Ubuntu 20.04.6 machines with 1 Gbps Ethernet interfaces as the physical network components. Link bandwidth and packet drop rates were controlled using the Ubuntu `tc` utility [41], with bandwidth limited to 10 Mbps to facilitate easy comparison across different implementations. The end-user was a machine within the remote topology, also running Ubuntu 20.04.6 and Docker. For the IP use case, we used servers located in Warsaw and Chicago, with all systems running Ubuntu 22.04.4.

2) *Proxies*: There are many proxy implementations available, but we required a proxy that can process TCP, UDP, and HTTP headers, supports reconfiguration, and is capable of tunneling UDP, TCP, and IP packets over HTTP. Unfortunately, no single proxy implementation meets all of these requirements. Even advanced, production-grade proxies like Linkerd [42] and Envoy [43] lack some of the necessary features. Ultimately, we selected Envoy, as it supports UDP-over-HTTP tunneling, although this feature is still in development. Envoy is a high-performance proxy that provides both layer 4 and layer 7 filtering, load balancing, and comprehensive statistics, among other features [31]. Envoy can be configured to use a set of filters to process traffic and control routing. These filters can process HTTP headers, interact with external entities for authorization, create additional tunnels, and perform protocol translation. Envoy also supports custom plugins, which can act as assisting components in the architecture. If an assisting component is complex, such as an advanced cache, it can be deployed as a separate process that communicates through the proxy. For Ubuntu systems, we use the `envoy-dev` container image with digest `10d0784b9cdb` [44]. Additionally, we developed Android and iOS proxy clients (screenshots in Figures 8 and 9) using Envoy’s mobile library [45]. These clients, with limited HTTP filtering capabilities, accept traffic from other applications on the phone and route it over the overlay. All proxy instances, including the mobile proxies, use an initial configuration to boot up and then receive their full configuration from the controller.

3) *Control plane*: We developed an overlay controller using Envoy’s implementation of the data plane API in the Go programming language [46]. The controller connects to an

Apache CouchDB v3.3.3 [47] database, which stores the configuration of overlay proxies. It reads the configuration and periodically updates the overlay when configuration changes occur. The controller also supports on-demand update requests to modify specific nodes. Initial proxy configurations contain unique IDs, which are sent to the controller via the xDS API over gRPC [48], and the controller responds with the corresponding configuration. The connection between overlay proxies and the controller is TLS-encrypted, and proxies can be authenticated using passphrases. The controller can push new configurations to initiate a hot restart [49] in response to changes in network or service conditions. Although we also developed an infrastructure controller using Ansible [50] and other relevant packages, it was not used in the following use cases, as they can be managed entirely through the overlay controller.

4) *Assisting components*: For policy-based routing and authorization, we use Open Policy Agent (OPA) [51] and its Envoy plugin as assisting components. OPA provides a policy definition language that can define policies based on input data provided by a collocated Envoy instance. In our implementation, the OPA instance makes an allow/deny decision, returning it along with an HTTP header. We append this header to the allowed traffic and use it in policy-based routing decisions. To enable proxies to capture IP packets, we developed an assisting component capable of creating tunnel devices, performing UDP encapsulation and decapsulation, and supporting split tunneling to route traffic to the local dependent proxy’s UDP endpoints.

In the remainder of this section, we define specific problem instances and, through prototyping, demonstrate how the Hermes features can efficiently address these issues. Specifically, the first two use cases (Video and Intermittent) focus primarily on the Hermes as a service facilitator, while the last two use cases (IP and NDN) emphasize its capabilities as a communication facilitator.

A. Providing Legacy Application and Protocol Compatibility

In this section, we investigate a video streaming website that owns the video content and uses licensed proprietary streaming code that only supports UDP streaming. Some users experience degraded video quality, and the company is looking for a way to enhance the quality for customers without altering the client or server implementations, as they do not have control over them.

1) *Problem (Video Use Case)*: A customer uses a UDP-based video streaming service but is complaining about the video quality due to the lack of reliability in UDP. One solution is to update the service interface and client software to use a reliable protocol. However, this approach would require developing a new version, which is time-consuming, potentially expensive, and may be rejected by the customer who might not want to update their client. Additionally, in this case, the provider does not have control over the source code. Therefore, we need a solution that provides reliability with minimal or no changes to the client and server implementations.




Fig. 4: Video use case topology. Overlay is above.

TABLE I: Video use case results. #: average number of, *S.D.*: standard deviation.

Solutions	Macroblock errors		Processed frames	
	#	S.D.	#	S.D.
Overlay -1 min	0.00	0.00	1800.00	0.00
Overlay -2 min	0.00	0.00	3600.00	0.00
Direct -1 min	19.62	4.36	1773.13	5.49
Direct -2 min	40.00	6.55	3543.73	32.19

2) *Solution*: We deploy a dependent proxy on both the customer’s devices and servers. When the server starts streaming UDP, it sends the packets to the dependent proxy’s configured port. The dependent proxy then tunnels the UDP packets over an HTTP tunnel, sending them to the customer’s dependent proxy. The customer’s dependent proxy receives the HTTP packets, terminates the HTTP tunnel, decapsulates the UDP packets, and delivers them to the client. This process requires no changes to the client or server implementations. Since HTTP runs over TCP, it can recover from small transmission errors and packet losses. As shown in the next section, Hermes enables TCP to reliably deliver traffic even in severely disadvantaged networks.

3) *Implementation*: The video use case investigates on-demand video streaming over UDP. For this purpose, we used ffmpeg [52] as both client and server. We used the topology shown in Figure 4, and the software detail is shown in Table IX and Table X. We introduced a 1% loss along the path with Ubuntu tc to investigate the effect of packet loss on streaming. We developed a video server that accepts HTTP connections. It passes requests to its local ffmpeg application to stream the requested file back to the IP address of the client requested it over UDP.

The user sends requests in the format `http://VIDEO/filepath` with an authorization token to their local dependent proxy endpoint. The “VIDEO” portion is part of the user’s dedicated address space, and the proxies handle “VIDEO” to route traffic to the appropriate destination configured for that space. Therefore, two different users using “VIDEO” might see different

videos available to them because they are assigned to different address spaces. The dependent proxy tunnels the requests over an HTTP/2 TLS-encrypted link to the ingress proxy of the video provider’s network. Once received, the ingress proxy decrypts the requests, processes the HTTP headers, and forwards them to one of the distributor proxies. The distributor proxies then forward the request to the local OPA instance to verify the user’s access level.

The local OPA instance authorizes the user based on their authorization token and the configured policy. If the user is allowed access, the traffic is forwarded to the dependent proxy on the video server. The server’s dependent proxy delivers the request to the local video server running ffmpeg. The video server only sees the IP address of the local dependent proxy and instructs ffmpeg to stream back to it. The dependent proxy at the video server then tunnels the UDP packets over HTTP using CONNECT-UDP [53] and sends them along the same path back. When the tunneled data reaches the end-user’s dependent proxy, it decapsulates and delivers the UDP data to ffmpeg running on the user’s device, which has been configured to receive data from its local proxy.

We compare the overlay performance with direct requests to the video servers over UDP. The direct requests (Figure 4-bottom) followed the format `http://IP:Port/filepath`, along with a token that the video server ignored. The video server instructed ffmpeg to stream the video directly to the end-user over UDP. We used a video from NASA [54] with a duration of three minutes and extracted two MP4 videos of one and two minutes. We conducted 30 iterations of the experiment, where both files were requested in each run. After retrieving the files, we analyzed them using ffmpeg and counted the number of processed frames and macroblock errors as performance and quality measures. The results are shown in Table I.

The Hermes overlay uses HTTP tunneling, which benefits from the reliability of TCP. In contrast, the direct connection uses an unreliable UDP connection. As shown in Table I, with the overlay approach, the user received the video without any errors. However, with the direct connection, we observed an average loss of 26.87 and 56.27 frames, along with 19.62 and 40 macroblocks in error for the 1- and 2-minute video files, respectively.

4) *Discussion*: As discussed, using HTTP tunneling and the Hermes overlay mitigated noisy network conditions and improved the user experience. Additionally, the overlay provided features such as load balancing, authorization, encryption, and eliminating the need for users to know the video server address. Users only need to use “VIDEO” instead of a domain name, and the proxies handle routing to the appropriate destination. It should be noted that TCP cannot fully recover from severe disconnections, as shown in [38]. However, as we demonstrate in the next section, successful delivery can still be achieved with the Hermes overlay’s assistance.

B. Supporting Communication in Unstable Networks

This section investigates a use case where a group of mobile users fails to download a file due to unstable network links. We will demonstrate how the overlay control plane can adjust the proxy retry parameters to overcome this issue.

TABLE II: Download time (s). Data is in the format of value (standard deviation). Base average values are shown above.

Solutions	1MB (Base=1.02)		5MB (Base=4.85)	
	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Overlay	115.82 (36.18)	133.69 (57.42)	601.49 (110.21)	618.75 (101.46)
Overlay w/ CONN	101.67 (44.51)	86.96 (46.68)	567.3 (134.73)	498.28 (178.32)




Fig. 5: Intermittent use case topology. Overlay is above.

1) *Problem (Intermittent use case)*: A user wants to securely download a file from an HTTP web server over TCP. However, the network connecting the user and server is severely unstable. This issue might arise if nodes are mobile and there is no stable wireless coverage for all nodes. We have a special situation in which there are three unstable links along the path, with only one link is connected during each time slot. As a result, a direct TCP connection between the client and server fails because there is no consistent end-to-end path [38]. Clients can address this by using alternative network stacks, such as NDN or DTN [11]. However, using these stacks requires changes to client, server, or network node programs.

2) *Solution*: We demonstrate that TCP can still successfully download files with the assistance of Hermes overlay proxies. Proxies, which act as IP endpoints, initiate and terminate TCP connections, allowing them to control the connections based on network conditions. We deploy an overlay along the path between the client and the web server. Proxies can retry connections if they fail, and the control plane can adjust their retry parameters. We also use wget [55] as the client program because of its retry options.

For end-to-end security, there are two options:

- Establish hop-by-hop secure connections, where each pair of connected proxies establishes a TLS connection. This allows for caching at each node since the TLS connection is between proxies. The downside is that the user must trust the overlay proxies.
- Use the HTTP CONNECT method to create an end-to-end secure connection to the website. In this method, one of the proxies along the path processes the CONNECT request, establishes a TCP tunnel to the website, and blindly forwards encrypted packets to ensure that the connection remains end-to-end secure between the end-

user and the web server.

3) *Implementation*: The topology is shown in Figure 5. The software configurations are shown in Table XII, and retry parameters are shown in Table XIII. The links between Proxies 2-5 were intermittent; each link was only connected for one second, and no two links were connected simultaneously. We used Ubuntu tc and increased packet drop to 100% to mimic the link disconnection.

We used wget with a timeout of 60s to download 1MB and 5MB files. Wget tried 10 times and continued from whatever was downloaded before. The web server configuration is shown in Table VIII. We compare four scenarios: 1) direct connection to servers with no intermittent link as the base measurement (Base), 2) direct connection to the servers in the presence of three intermittent links (Figure 5-bottom) (Base-Intermittent), 3) hop-by-hop TLS connection through overlay proxies in the presence of intermittent links with caching at all overlay nodes except the ingress (Overlay), and 4) No caching and using CONNECT at client that was processed at the Proxy 2 and after that in Proxies 3-5 we only used TCP listeners (Overlay w/CONN).

In the "Overlay" scenarios, client requests were in the form of `http://UNSTABLE/filepath`, and they were sent to the dependent proxy. The dependent proxy then encrypted and forwarded the requests to the ingress proxies. Proxies 2-5 were configured with an HTTP retry policy [56], as shown in Table XIII. In the "Overlay w/CONN" scenario, the client sent requests in the form of `https://UNSTABLE/filepath`. While Proxy 2 followed the same retry policy as in the Overlay scenario, Proxies 3-5 applied a retry policy with `max_connect_attempts=20` [57], as they were TCP forwarders. The ingress proxy processed "UNSTABLE" and then forwarded the data.

For the "Base" and "Base-Intermittent" scenarios, the client used wget with the same retry parameters and sent requests in the format `https://IP:PORT/unstable/filepath`, which were routed through Routers 2-5. The experiment consisted of 20 batches, each with two iterations. Each batch started with the intermittent pattern, and random sleep was often used to minimize the influence of the pattern stage on the experimental results. Performance was measured by the download time—the duration it took for wget to complete (measured using the `time` [58] command)—and the success ratio, calculated as the number of successful downloads divided by the total number of iterations.

The average success ratios for Base and Base-Intermittent are 100% and 0% for both files, respectively; the direct TCP connection (Base-Intermittent) always fails in the presence of three intermittent links. In contrast, for the Overlay scenario, we observed a success ratio of 100% for both files. The Overlay w/CONN success ratios for the 1MB and 5MB files are 80% and 32.5%, respectively. This lower success rate occurred because wget exited with the error "Unable to establish SSL connection" before completing its configured number of retries [59].

Table II shows the average download time. We excluded the data of Base-Intermittent. For the Overlay and Overlay w/CONNECT scenarios we averaged the first and second iter-

ations separately. As it is shown, both overlay implementations show a significant increase in download time. In addition, caches were rarely used in the Overlay scenario. This was mainly due to partial data being downloaded over multiple iterations.

4) *Discussion*: It is noteworthy to mention that wget and overlay proxies retry parameters (Table XIII) might look like to be fine-tuned for this particular example. Also, not all end-users use wget, and they might want to use their own clients. Therefore, a question might be raised about the applicability of this approach in general use cases. The point is that proxies can be coupled with assisting components, and one of these assisting components can be a program similar to wget that retries in case of failure and can be controlled by the control plane. Another assisting component can be an advanced caching mechanism to enhance caching since Envoy uses a simple HTTP cache implementation. The control plane can dynamically update assisting components and proxies retry parameters according to network conditions to handle severe link disconnections. Thus, the Hermes networking approach can offer a general solution. In the next section, we will explore how the control plane dynamically updates proxies to effectively manage changes in connectivity conditions.

C. Overcoming Network Degradation Through Adjusting Overlay Configuration

This section presents a solution that can replace traditional consumer VPN protocols. We explore how an overlay network of proxies can provide efficient IP tunneling, along with how quickly and easily the overlay can be dynamically reconfigured to mitigate increases in network latency. Additionally, we examine how the control plane can dynamically update a user's dedicated address space.

TABLE III: Initial latency results from User2. RTT is in ms and S.D. is standard deviation

Poland					
Latency		Latency w/ Tunnel & w/o Proxy		Latency w/ Tunnel & w/ Proxy	
RTT	S.D.	RTT	S.D.	RTT	S.D.
129.73	5.8	131.23	6.31	134.27	22.92
US					
Latency		Latency w/ Tunnel & w/o Proxy		Latency w/ Tunnel & w/ Proxy	
RTT	S.D.	RTT	S.D.	RTT	S.D.
21.71	37.85	21.45	7.55	24.05	23.9

1) *Problem (IP use case)*: An organization allows its employees to remotely connect to servers within the organization's internal network to perform their daily tasks and access remote services. The organization operates in two regions: one in Poland and the other in the US. Each remote developer has access to three IP address ranges: 10.0.0.1/32 for their personal server, 10.0.0.2/32 for a shared server (e.g., an internal mail server), and 128.252.0.0/16, which is accessed via the organization's servers. Each user is assigned a dedicated IP-based address space, meaning that two users can send traffic to the same IP address (e.g., 10.0.0.1), but the physical destinations of the traffic are different. Thus, the user-destination association is unique.

The organization requires a solution that enforces end-to-end policies and provides seamless updates to endpoints and address spaces. In this specific case, a user residing in Poland has moved to the US but is still connecting to an ingress address and a personal server located in Poland. The overlay controller and the user detected an increase in latency. The policy enforces that end-to-end latency should not exceed a certain threshold, and if this threshold is violated, the control plane can adjust overlay parameters to improve the end-user experience. In this scenario, the controller decides to relocate both the ingress point and the user's personal server (10.0.0.1) to the US to improve performance.

The organization can set up this use case by using WireGuard as the VPN client and server. As part of the server configuration, traffic from each user can be routed to a specific IP table to resolve the destination based on the user's assigned IP, providing dedicated IP-based address space. Additional configurations, such as source NAT, may also be required for a fully functional setup. However, this approach presents several challenges:

- WireGuard traffic is easily detectable and can be blocked by any ISP along the path.
- At the organization's ingress, there needs to be a VPN server to terminate the VPN tunnels and forward traffic to the final destination. As a result, the VPN tunnel is not truly end-to-end.
- Since the VPN tunnel is not end-to-end, certain policies cannot be enforced. For instance, a remotely connected CEO may require end-to-end encrypted access to personal servers, while this may not be necessary for a junior developer. The current implementation cannot satisfy this requirement.
- Updating this configuration is slow and burdensome. If the company changes the VPN server address, every user's VPN profile needs to be updated. Similarly, changing a user's destination server requires modifying numerous IP table rules within the VPN server. For example, if the company needs to route user traffic to different endpoints during working hours and after hours (e.g., changing the physical location of server 10.0.0.1 after working hours), technical challenges and the lack of a smooth update process may hinder the implementation of such features.
- With traditional VPN protocols, authentication, authorization, policy enforcement, and cryptographic aspects are limited to the VPN's specification and implementation. However, the company needs more control over the choices it can make. For example, it might decide that for some users there is no need for IP-level packet encryption since applications can use TLS. For other users, it might choose TLS encryption between overlay nodes to encrypt traffic. For another group of users, it might decide to use obfuscation to prevent ISP blocking. All of these options will be severely limited both in implementation and performance if the company chooses traditional VPN protocols.




Fig. 6: The overall overlay update process and performance evaluation.

2) *Solution*: This use case involves utilizing Hermes as a connectivity facilitator, where the organization acts as the communication provider, enabling remote users to connect with the internal network. The overlay will not be configured for a specific service but instead provide efficient IP-level connectivity. As previously discussed, proxies listen to UDP and TCP endpoints, and tunnel devices are needed to redirect general IP packets, such as ICMP, to proxy endpoints. To enable this scenario, two features are required:

- Encapsulation of IP traffic in TCP or UDP.
- Assigning each destination network (within the user’s dedicated address space) to a specific port of the user’s local proxy and sending encapsulated traffic to it (split tunneling).

Envoy proxy cannot perform these actions and needs to be assisted by other components. Therefore, we developed an assisting component to provide both IP-in-UDP encapsulation and split tunneling: we create tunnels at end-user devices and destinations, encapsulate IP traffic in UDP packets, and deliver the encapsulated packets to the end-user local proxy UDP endpoint based on the destination network address. The

local proxy encapsulate UDP in HTTP, appends user-related HTTP headers to associate destination addresses with the user’s identity, and forwards the traffic to the ingress, which acts as an HTTP proxy. The ingress performs HTTP-level parsing and determines the next destination based on the HTTP headers. As a result, there is no tunnel termination at the ingress, and the tunnel remains active until the traffic reaches its final destination, where the tunnel is terminated. The overlay can selectively enable TLS links between each proxy if it is configured, which enables encrypted end-to-end communication. Additionally, the overlay can perform policy-based routing and authorization using the HTTP headers.

3) *Implementation*: The network configuration is shown in Figure 6. All systems were running Ubuntu 22.04. In this example, the ingress proxy acts as a dependent proxy since it directly receives traffic from destination addresses. There are two users, each running a tunneling client that functions as an assisting component to their local proxy. User2 is located in the US, while User1, along with all ingress points and servers, is in Poland. The proxy configurations are shown in Table XI. This experiment was performed over the internet and not in a controlled network. Please note that we did not configure TLS-

encrypted links between overlay nodes since the experiment uses Ping to measure latency, and encryption is unnecessary.

The proxy assisting components were configured to send traffic destined for 10.0.0.1/32, 10.0.0.2/32, and 128.252.0.0/16 to three distinct UDP ports on the users' local proxies. The local proxy listens on these ports and encapsulates incoming UDP packets in HTTP using MASQUE. It also appends two HTTP headers: "user" and "IPaddress," which contain information about the user and the destination address. For example, a realization of these headers could be "user":"user2" and "IPaddress":"128.252.0.0." The "IPaddress" represents the destination network address, and the overlay uses the "user" and "IPaddress" headers to route traffic to the appropriate node.

The local proxy then sends the HTTP-encapsulated UDP packets to the ingress proxy. At the ingress, the HTTP headers are parsed to determine the next node, and the HTTP encapsulation is removed, leaving the UDP packet. The UDP packet is then forwarded to the appropriate tunnel endpoint based on the user and destination information in the HTTP headers. At the tunnel endpoint, the UDP packet is decapsulated to extract the original IP packet. The original IP packet is then routed to its final destination.

The update process consists of three steps. The initial step, shown in Figure 6a, depicts User2, who is located in the US, connecting to an ingress point and a personal server, both located in Poland. We initially have one ingress point and all users are connected to it. Since we want to move both the ingress point and the personal server (10.0.0.1) to the US, we first dynamically update the end-user proxy configuration to point to a new ingress point in the US. This allows us to migrate the personal server's content to the US. Therefore, in the first step shown in Figure 6b, the controller initiates the update by reconfiguring User2's proxy to send traffic to the new ingress point in the US. Once the new personal server is ready, in the second step shown in Figure 6c, the controller updates the new ingress server to route traffic destined for the personal server (10.0.0.1) to the newly migrated server in the US.

We evaluate performance by measuring the Round-Trip Time (RTT) of ICMP ECHO packets (Ping). The initial latencies are shown in Tables III. Table III shows the RTT values when we ran Ping to send packets every second. The latency column measures how far the servers were from User2, who, as previously mentioned, resides in the US. The "Latency with tunnel" columns describe the latency when only IP-in-UDP encapsulation is used, and traffic is sent directly to the destination tunnel's UDP endpoint. As shown, IP-in-UDP encapsulation introduces a subtle performance penalty, but as seen in the last column, encapsulating UDP in HTTP and routing traffic over the overlay adds more to the latency. This is because, before sending the very first ICMP packet, proxies need to establish a TCP connection, which adds to the latency. However, as shown in Table III, overlay routing adds up to 5 ms to the latency, which is still negligible.

To better measure the effectiveness of the updates, we sent ICMP packets every 10 seconds and waited up to 3 seconds for a response. Due to the timeout configuration of 3

seconds, as listed in Table XI, each ping required a new TCP connection, resulting in higher latency compared to the base measurements. We also updated User 2's Envoy proxy version to 1.32.0 [60] and set the `max_stream_duration` to 3 seconds to prevent Envoy crashes. The update events are shown in Figures 6d along with the corresponding RTT values. Initially, the average latency was 382.33 ms. After the first update, latency dropped to 206.33 ms as the ingress point was moved closer to the user. Following the second update, the average RTT further decreased to 79.68 ms, as both the ingress point and the personal server were now closer to the user. Please note that the results in Table III were measured by sending PING packets every second, while the results in Figure 6d were measured by sending PING packets every 10 seconds. There were no dropped packets, and the entire update process for each proxy was completed in less than 10 seconds from initiating the update, including a five-second sleep cycle for the controller to check for configuration changes.

4) *Discussion:* As shown, the overlay proxy can route IP packets with the help of assisting components, demonstrating that the Hermes architecture can handle general IP routing and serve a variety of use cases. It's important to note that using the architecture only requires split tunneling and the encapsulation of IP packets in either UDP or TCP. Other solutions, such as proxying IP over HTTP (MASQUE [23] and RFC 9484), can be used to send IP packets directly to an HTTP endpoint, which would significantly reduce the overhead associated with the UDP tunneling approach used here. However, the current implementation of MASQUE is still in its early stages [61], preventing us from using it for this scenario. Additionally, we still require split tunneling to associate each destination network with a specific port on the local proxy. A WireGuard client and server can also be used as assisting components if they are configured to send traffic to local proxies. However, as mentioned above, this approach adds unnecessary encryption and increases the complexity of the solution. If there is a need for encrypted end-to-end communication, the solution presented here can be modified to use TLS-encrypted links between proxies.

Although we observed a 5 ms increase in latency between the user and the US server when connected through the proxy, we also noted the architecture's notable performance in facilitating communication. The architecture was able to easily update each user's address space, a task that might be very complex with other implementations.

In addition, we gained complete control over IP packet routing by utilizing HTTP headers added at the end-user proxies, rather than relying solely on IP-level data. This allowed us to enforce policies at the IP level and perform IP routing based on user identity, not just IP destinations. Indeed, Hermes enabled dedicated address spaces where the IP address 10.0.0.1 could route to different physical machines for different users.

Finally, both updates took less than 10 seconds from the time the configuration database was updated until the proxies finished hot restarting, including a five-second sleep cycle for the controller to check configuration changes. This allowed us to quickly respond to network condition changes and adapt

new end-to-end routes for User2 in under 10 seconds. It should be noted that there was no change in IP table rules and the only change was in the overlay configuration.

D. Supporting Experimental Network Architectures

So far, we have demonstrated how Hermes can improve service delivery and act as a communication facilitator. Now, we explore a use case where a multi-domain Hermes overlay is used as the communication pipeline between NDN components, showing that it can provide NDN namespace load balancing without the need to configure NDN nodes directly.

TABLE IV: NDN use case results. D: average transfer time (s), S.D.: standard deviation of transfer time.

File	Direct		Overlay	
	D	S.D.	D	S.D.
0KB	0.002	1.12E-04	0.004	1.55E-04
1MB	0.905	1.97E-04	1.012	6.45E-04
26MB	21.787	2.39E-04	24.181	3.26E-02
49MB	41.523	2.97E-04	46.066	6.38E-02




Fig. 7: NDN use case topology. Overlay is above.

1) *Problem (NDN Use Case):* An organization has decided to adopt the NDN architecture [12] for some of its branches worldwide. NDN nodes use Faces [62] to connect to other nodes over the internet. Faces are responsible for encapsulating and decapsulating NDN data over TCP or UDP, which makes the data routable over the internet. The organization has opted to use UDP Faces, which requires specifying the addresses of nodes in other branches to enable communication.

The organization aims to provide two namespaces, "DEV" and "TEST," with load balancing between the servers hosting each namespace. Since this is an experimental architecture, the organization does not want to expose these UDP ports to the

internet. Additionally, the organization has a limited pool of dynamic IP addresses and no static IP addresses, complicating network configuration and maintenance. In this use case, we assume the existence of a multi-domain overlay of standalone proxies, which are already functional. These proxies have been configured to process "service" and "namespace" HTTP headers. For this use case, the "service" equals "NDN," and the "namespace" can be either "DEV" or "TEST."

2) *Solution:* Hermes can directly map each NDN namespace to a dedicated address space. To implement this, NDN Forwarding Daemons (NFD) should send requests for each namespace to a specific port on the local dependent proxy. The organization must then configure end-users' dependent proxies to map the NDN namespaces to the overlay address spaces by appending the appropriate HTTP headers. Autonomous domains will process these HTTP headers to route the traffic to its final destination.

The overlay proxies can use DNS to locate the next destination, with only HTTP ports being exposed, reducing the risk of exposing UDP ports. The organization simply needs to configure its dependent proxies and add agreed-upon headers between domains. This enables the organization to leverage the benefits of the multi-domain overlay for load balancing and routing.

3) *Implementation:* The network configuration is shown in Figure 7. The end-user used ndncatchunks [63] to request content from the DEV and TEST namespaces, while content was published on servers using ndnputchunks [63]. As depicted in Figure 7, apart from the end-user and servers, no other nodes used NFDs. The end-user's NFD was configured to send interests for each namespace to distinct ports of its local dependent proxy, which was running on a separate machine. This decision—to run the end-user's dependent proxy on another machine—was made to help regulate NDN's outgoing traffic.

Once the local proxy received the UDP packets, it tunneled them over HTTP and appended two headers: "service: NDN" and a namespace header, either "namespace: DEV" or "namespace: TEST," depending on the port through which it received the data. In this way, an NDN namespaces is mapped to an overlay address space. The data was then forwarded to the Domain 1 ingress proxy, which processed only the "service: NDN" header. It subsequently forwarded the traffic to the Domain 2 proxy, which parses the "namespace" header. Domain 2's proxy then distributed the traffic between the internet-facing organization's HTTP proxies. When the traffic reached the organization's HTTP proxies, they terminated the HTTP tunnel and delivered the UDP traffic to the local NFDs. Since all NFDs only communicated with their respective local proxies, their configurations remained simple, and there was no need to configure them to balance the load between available servers.

In the direct NDN connection (Figure 7-bottom), the client knew the addresses of the servers, and its NFD was configured with those addresses. We published three files with approximate sizes of 1MB, 26MB, and 49MB, and measured the Transfer Time, which is the total time it takes for ndncatchunks to receive the requested file. Additionally, we published a 0KB

file to measure latency. `ndncatchunks` was configured to always request fresh content and used a fixed interest pipeline size of 20, except for the 0KB file, where the pipeline size was set to 1.

We repeated the experiments at least 20 times, requesting both namespaces twice in each iteration. The average results for both namespaces are reported in Table IV. Although the Hermes approach is up to 12% slower than the direct approach, and its latency is slightly higher, it provides global reachability and load balancing, facilitating the development and usage of the NDN architecture while maintaining reliability, even when NDN uses UDP faces.

4) *Discussion:* As demonstrated, Hermes can serve as the underlying communication network for other experimental protocols and architectures. These systems need only to deliver their data units to their local proxy, after which Hermes manages reliability, load balancing, namespace routing, and other concerns. In the multi-domain overlay, no node has knowledge of the full network topology, and data is delivered through hop-by-hop HTTP processing. This approach greatly simplifies NDN network configuration and management.

Moreover, more complex traffic patterns, such as multicast, can also be supported by the overlay, as proxies function as IP endpoints with complete control over traffic. Additionally, proxies can leverage assisting components to generate more advanced traffic patterns, further enhancing network capabilities. Please note that the overlay creates a one-to-one mapping between NDN namespaces and Hermes address spaces, treating each namespace as a separate address space. This allows NDN developers to focus on the development of their applications with confidence, knowing that Hermes can efficiently handle the NDN networking aspects.

IV. DISCUSSION AND RELATED WORK

TABLE V: Comparison with Service Mesh

Aspect	Architecture	
	Service Mesh	The Hermes
Goal	Improve traffic management, observability, and security, in service to service communication [30]	Improve end-user experience by enhancing communication and service delivery
Target environments	Managed service environments	End-user's devices, multi-domain, general purpose
Proxy locations	Between services	Mandatory at end-user devices, optionally everywhere
Traffic type	Mostly TCP and HTTP [64] [65]	TCP, UDP, HTTP, and IP

So far, we have discussed how Hermes can facilitate service delivery and communication over the internet by providing an overlay of reconfigurable proxies, delegating network responsibilities to them, utilizing HTTP tunneling along with HTTP semantic-based processing, and incorporating assisting components. In this section, we will compare Hermes with other related architectures and solutions.

Hermes is comparable to architectures that use an overlay of proxies. Although Hermes is designed as a general-purpose

architecture, we have chosen to compare it with service mesh architectures, which are specialized for managing services. This comparison is particularly relevant because both rely on an overlay of proxies, and Envoy, the proxy we used to prototype Hermes, is also commonly used in service mesh implementations like Istio [27]. The comparison is primarily based on Istio and Linkerd [42] implementations and is summarized in Table V. As shown, the Hermes and service mesh architectures are inherently different. A service mesh, as its name suggests, provides an overlay specifically for service components within a controlled environment. In contrast, the Hermes creates an overlay that extends from end-user devices and may terminate at service components, the public internet, or other networking architectures. Because of these differences in scope, their goals and consequently the features they provide are different. For example, a Hermes overlay cannot be deployed using a service mesh, as end-users (the traffic sources) are external to the service environment. In a service mesh, the infrastructure is typically fully controlled and runs in a managed environment. However, the Hermes operates over the internet, where there is often no control over the entire end-to-end path due to the nature of how internet routing works. More importantly, a service mesh is usually designed to handle and process TCP and HTTP traffic, whereas the Hermes is built to carry general IP packets and encapsulated traffic from various other architectures. These fundamental differences result in distinct concepts, features, and use cases for each architecture. Please note that, since Hermes is a general-purpose architecture, one of its applications can be extending a service mesh to end-user devices, thereby enabling end-to-end service provisioning and improving resource allocation by incorporating real-time end-user statistics.

Although there has been some research on using service meshes in edge systems [66] and as a networking layer [34] in cloud-native environments, these applications still align with the comparison made in Table V, as they were not used for general-purpose networking. Instead, they focused on specific use cases within managed or controlled environments, further highlighting the distinct goals and capabilities of Hermes compared to service mesh architectures.

A more relevant comparison would be between Hermes and performance-enhancing proxies (PEP) as well as other general-purpose overlay approaches. A PEP can improve the performance of internet protocols at the transport and application layers. The effectiveness of PEPs in reducing end-to-end delay and packet loss in satellite communication and cellular environments has been demonstrated in studies such as [67]–[70]. Additionally, the authors of [25] showed how PEPs can be used to connect the internet to other clean-slate architectures, such as Content-Centric Networking (CCN) [71] and Recursive internetwork Architecture (RINA) [72]. Their approach involves breaking the end-to-end TCP logic and translating TCP packets into new architecture formats using a proxy.

Designing a translator for every new architecture may not be a practical solution. Instead, encapsulation and decapsulation can be used as alternatives to translation: data units are encapsulated within a transport protocol that the internet

TABLE VI: Comparison with Related Work

Solution	Type	Goal	Technique
PEP-DNA	PEP	Enabling TCP/IP to communicate with other architectures	Using a proxy that translates from TCP/IP
COIN	PEP	Providing interoperability between TCP/IP and ICNs	Using a proxy gateway that translates between ICNs and TCP/IP
Akamai	Overlay	Private overlay that improves communication performance	Using DNS to direct traffic to the nearest edge server
I-3	Overlay	Decoupling senders from receivers	Associate packets with IDs, using Chord to store IDs and routing
Trotsky	Overlay	Easing the deployment of new architectures	Adding a layer over layer 3 for interdomain communication
Hermes	PEP and Overlay	Improving end-user experience by enhancing service and communication delivery	Using an overlay of proxies Using proxying and tunneling Using deferred name resolution Decoupling communication knowledge from application

supports, delivered across the internet, and decapsulated at the destination. This approach allows new architectures to be designed as overlay networks that leverage the internet’s best-effort delivery service. Some notable examples of such overlay networks include the Tor network as an anonymous communication network, Akamai as a performance-enhancing overlay network, and I-3 [73] as a general-purpose networking architecture. Among these, both Tor and I-3 use their own specific data formats but rely on the internet to carry data between overlay nodes. In recent research, the authors of [2] introduced Trotsky, an architectural framework aimed at making the internet more extensible. Trotsky decouples interdomain routing from intradomain routing and establishing an overlay layer 3.5 between the internet domains.

We can summarize the comparison of the Hermes with PEPs and general-purpose overlay approaches in Table VI. Both PEP-DNA and COIN [74] rely on translating between architectures. Supporting multiple architectures with this method requires numerous translation gateways, which is burdensome and prone to errors or incomplete translations. A more efficient approach is to encapsulate custom data formats within the payload of UDP, TCP, or HTTP packets and deliver them to the local proxy, as we did with NDN faces in Section III-D. The overlay will then manage reliable end-to-end data delivery and routing.

Akamai uses multiple layers of DNS resolvers to redirect traffic to one of its edge servers, requiring it to publish DNS resolution information and update it globally. In contrast, the Hermes relies on proxies to handle name and address resolution based on their configuration. Proxies can either resolve a name locally or forward the request to another proxy. This approach eliminates the need for global DNS updates, as name resolution can be performed at specific overlay proxies, streamlining the process and reducing the need for global-scale DNS management.

I-3 decouples senders and receivers by associating packets with IDs, making it one of the first attempts to separate networking knowledge from applications. Similarly, in Hermes, senders and receivers are not directly coupled and communicate only with their nearest dependent proxies. However, the Hermes approach is more general, allowing for complete decoupling of networking knowledge and even enabling protocol translation without the sender or receiver’s awareness. While I-3 introduces a new packet format, Hermes uses the TCP/IP protocol suite, and its functionality can be extended

by implementing HTTP-based semantics.

Trotsky is not a complete architecture; it is an architectural framework that primarily enforces logical pipes between layer 3.5 components and provides a host bootstrapping mechanism. Essential features of a layer 3.5 implementation, such as naming, addressing, security, and interlayer mapping, are left to be defined by specific layer 3.5 designs. In contrast, the Hermes is a fully defined architecture that specifies the complete treatment of packets from start to finish using the TCP/IP protocol suite, with mechanisms and behavior determined by the overlay configuration.

As shown, Hermes is fundamentally different from other related research. The concepts used in its design make Hermes the first overlay of proxies that can be applied to general-purpose use cases.

V. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper proposed Hermes, a general-purpose networking architecture that creates an overlay of reconfigurable dependent and standalone proxies, managed through a control plane. We explored its core concepts and features, showing how Hermes enhances end-to-end control over service delivery and communication by delegating networking responsibilities to the overlay, utilizing TCP, UDP, and HTTP proxying, relying on HTTP processing for routing and implementing new functionalities, and incorporating assisting components. Through prototyping, we demonstrated Hermes’ applicability across various use cases. We showed that Hermes can provide backward compatibility, support reliable delivery in unstable networking conditions, enable end-to-end policy-aware IP traffic control, and act as a communication pipeline between components of future networking architectures and protocols.

In future work, we plan to explore the capabilities of the Hermes overlay in addressing various policy-based traffic management and routing use cases. Additionally, we will examine how efficient end-to-end resource allocation can be achieved using Hermes architecture.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Clark, B. Lehr, S. Bauer, P. Faratin, R. Sami, and J. Wroclawski, "Overlay Networks and the Future of the Internet," *Communications and Strategies*, vol. 63, p. 109, 2006, publisher: Citeseer.
- [2] J. McCauley, Y. Harchol, A. Panda, B. Raghavan, and S. Shenker, "Enabling a permanent revolution in internet architecture," in *Proceedings of the ACM Special Interest Group on Data Communication*, ser. SIGCOMM '19. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Aug. 2019, pp. 1–14. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3341302.3342075>
- [3] H. Balakrishnan, S. Banerjee, I. Cidon, D. Culler, D. Estrin, E. Katz-Bassett, A. Krishnamurthy, M. McCauley, N. McKeown, A. Panda, S. Ratnasamy, J. Rexford, M. Schapira, S. Shenker, I. Stoica, D. Tennenhouse, A. Vahdat, and E. Zegura, "Revitalizing the public internet by making it extensible," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 18–24, May 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3464994.3464998>
- [4] L. Brown, E. Marx, D. Bali, E. Amaro, D. Sur, E. Kissel, I. Monga, E. Katz-Bassett, A. Krishnamurthy, J. McCauley, T. Narechania, A. Panda, and S. Shenker, "An Architecture For Edge Networking Services," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2024 Conference*, ser. ACM SIGCOMM '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Aug. 2024, pp. 645–660. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3651890.3672261>
- [5] A. Perrig, P. Szalachowski, R. M. Reischuk, and L. Chuat, *SCION: A Secure Internet Architecture*, ser. Information Security and Cryptography. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-67080-5>
- [6] J. Griner, J. Border, M. Kojo, Z. D. Shelby, and G. Montenegro, "Performance Enhancing Proxies Intended to Mitigate Link-Related Degradations," Internet Engineering Task Force, Request for Comments RFC 3135, Jun. 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc3135>
- [7] R. Dingleline, N. Mathewson, and P. Syverson, "Tor: the second-generation onion router," in *Proceedings of the 13th conference on USENIX Security Symposium - Volume 13*, ser. SSYM'04. USA: USENIX Association, Aug. 2004, p. 21.
- [8] E. Nygren, R. K. Sitaraman, and J. Sun, "The Akamai network: a platform for high-performance internet applications," *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 2–19, Aug. 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1842733.1842736>
- [9] B. V. Da Cunha, X. Li, W. Wilson, and K. Harfoush, "Performance Benchmarking of the QUIC Transport Protocol," in *2023 IEEE 20th Consumer Communications & Networking Conference (CCNC)*, Jan. 2023, pp. 206–212, iSSN: 2331-9860. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10060785>
- [10] X. Zhang, S. Jin, Y. He, A. Hassan, Z. M. Mao, F. Qian, and Z.-L. Zhang, "QUIC is not Quick Enough over Fast Internet," in *Proceedings of the ACM on Web Conference 2024*, ser. WWW '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2024, pp. 2713–2722.
- [11] Z. Zhang, "Routing in intermittently connected mobile ad hoc networks and delay tolerant networks: overview and challenges," *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutorials*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 24–37, 2006. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4116780/>
- [12] L. Zhang, A. Afanasyev, J. Burke, V. Jacobson, k. claffy, P. Crowley, C. Papadopoulos, L. Wang, and B. Zhang, "Named data networking," *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 66–73, Jul. 2014. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2656877.2656887>
- [13] O. Sadio, I. Ngom, and C. Lishou, "Lightweight Security Scheme for MQTT/MQTT-SN Protocol," in *2019 Sixth International Conference on Internet of Things: Systems, Management and Security (IOTSMS)*, Oct. 2019, pp. 119–123. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8939177>
- [14] C. Chen, X. Wang, G. Liu, and G. Huang, "A Robust Selective Encryption Scheme for H.265/HEVC Video," *IEEE Access*, vol. 11, pp. 17 252–17 264, 2023, conference Name: IEEE Access. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9903590>
- [15] V. Srivastava and M. Motani, "Cross-layer design: a survey and the road ahead," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 43, no. 12, pp. 112–119, Dec. 2005, conference Name: IEEE Communications Magazine. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1561928>
- [16] L. Schumann, T. V. Doan, T. Shreedhar, R. Mok, and V. Bajpai. (2022, Jan.) Impact of Evolving Protocols and COVID-19 on Internet Traffic Shares. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.00142>
- [17] I. Tsareva, T. V. Doan, and V. Bajpai, "A Decade Long View of Internet Traffic Composition in Japan," in *2023 IFIP Networking Conference (IFIP Networking)*, Jun. 2023, pp. 1–9, iSSN: 1861-2288. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/10186393>
- [18] (2024) Cloudflare Radar. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://radar.cloudflare.com/traffic?dateStart=2023-01-01&dateEnd=2023-12-31>
- [19] L. Popa, A. Ghodsi, and I. Stoica, "HTTP as the narrow waist of the future internet," in *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks*, ser. Hotnets-IX. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2010, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1868447.1868453>
- [20] D. Schinazi, "Proxying UDP in HTTP," Internet Engineering Task Force, Request for Comments RFC 9298, Aug. 2022, num Pages: 16. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc9298>
- [21] T. Pauly, D. Schinazi, A. Chernyakhovsky, M. Kühlewind, and M. Westerlund, "Proxying IP in HTTP," Internet Engineering Task Force, Request for Comments RFC 9484, Oct. 2023, num Pages: 37. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc9484>
- [22] A. Sedeño, "Proxying Ethernet in HTTP," Internet Engineering Task Force, Internet Draft draft-ietf-masque-connect-ethernet-04, Jul. 2024, num Pages: 16. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-ietf-masque-connect-ethernet-04>
- [23] D. Schinazi, "The MASQUE Proxy," Internet Engineering Task Force, Internet Draft draft-schinazi-masque-proxy-04, Aug. 2024, num Pages: 7. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/draft-schinazi-masque-proxy>
- [24] (2024) How Cloudflare works | Cloudflare Fundamentals docs. Accessed: 2024-08-21. [Online]. Available: <https://developers.cloudflare.com/fundamentals/concepts/how-cloudflare-works/>
- [25] K. Ciko, M. Welzl, and P. Teymoori, "PEP-DNA: A Performance Enhancing Proxy for Deploying Network Architectures," in *2021 IEEE 29th International Conference on Network Protocols (ICNP)*, Nov. 2021, pp. 1–6, iSSN: 2643-3303. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9651953>
- [26] "iCloud Private Relay Overview," Apple, Tech. Rep., Dec. 2021, num Pages: 11. [Online]. Available: https://www.apple.com/icloud/docs/iCloud_Private_Relay_Overview_Dec2021.pdf
- [27] (2024) Istio documentation. Accessed: 2024-09-24. [Online]. Available: <https://istio.io/latest/docs/>
- [28] (2024) Service Mesh on Consul | Consul | HashiCorp Developer. Accessed: 2024-08-21. [Online]. Available: <https://developer.hashicorp.com/consul/docs/connect>
- [29] E. Song, Y. Song, C. Lu, T. Pan, S. Zhang, J. Lu, J. Zhao, X. Wang, X. Wu, M. Gao, Z. Li, Z. Fang, B. Lyu, P. Zhang, R. Wen, L. Yi, Z. Zong, and S. Zhu, "Canal Mesh: A Cloud-Scale Sidecar-Free Multi-Tenant Service Mesh Architecture," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2024 Conference*, ser. ACM SIGCOMM '24. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Aug. 2024, pp. 860–875. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3651890.3672221>
- [30] J. Howard, E. J. Jackson, Y. Kohavi, I. Levine, J. Pettit, and L. Sun. (2024) Introducing Ambient Mesh. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://istio.io/latest/blog/2022/introducing-ambient-mesh/>
- [31] B. Farkiani and R. Jain, "Service Mesh: Architectures, Applications, and Implementations," Tech. Rep., May 2024, arXiv:2405.13333 [cs]. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2405.13333>
- [32] B. Burns and D. Oppenheimer, "Design Patterns for Container-based Distributed Systems," in *8th USENIX Workshop on Hot Topics in Cloud Computing (HotCloud 16)*. Denver, CO: USENIX Association, Jun. 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://www.usenix.org/conference/hotcloud16/workshop-program/presentation/burns>
- [33] W. Li, Y. Lemieux, J. Gao, Z. Zhao, and Y. Han, "Service Mesh: Challenges, State of the Art, and Future Research Opportunities," in *2019 IEEE International Conference on Service-Oriented System Engineering (SOSE)*, Apr. 2019, pp. 122–1225, iSSN: 2642-6587. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/8705911>
- [34] S. Ashok, P. B. Godfrey, and R. Mittal, "Leveraging Service Meshes as a New Network Layer," in *Proceedings of the 20th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks*, ser. HotNets '21. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Nov. 2021, pp. 229–236. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3484266.3487379>
- [35] (2024) Your First Service | OpenZiti. Accessed: 2024-09-11. [Online]. Available: <https://openziti.io/docs/learn/core-concepts/zero-trust-models/overview>
- [36] C.-A. Sarros, V. Demiroglou, and V. Tsaoussidis, "Intermittently-connected IoT devices: Experiments with an NDN-DTN architecture,"

- in *2021 IEEE 18th Annual Consumer Communications & Networking Conference (CCNC)*. Las Vegas, NV, USA: IEEE, Jan. 2021, pp. 1–9.
- [37] T. Li, Z. Kong, and L. Zhang, “Supporting Delay Tolerant Networking: A Comparative Study of Epidemic Routing and NDN,” in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications Workshops (ICC Workshops)*. Dublin, Ireland: IEEE, Jun. 2020, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9145301/>
- [38] B. Farkiani, J. DeHart, J. Parwatikar, and P. Crowley, “Mitigating Intermittent Links With Name-Based Networking,” in *Proceedings of the 10th ACM Conference on Information-Centric Networking*, ser. ACM ICN '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Oct. 2023, pp. 121–123. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3623565.3623756>
- [39] R. T. Fielding, M. Nottingham, and J. Reschke, “HTTP Semantics,” Internet Engineering Task Force, Request for Comments RFC 9110, Jun. 2022, num Pages: 194. [Online]. Available: <https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/rfc9110>
- [40] C. Wiseman, J. Turner, M. Becchi, P. Crowley, J. DeHart, M. Haitjema, S. James, F. Kuhns, J. Lu, J. Parwatikar, R. Patney, M. Wilson, K. Wong, and D. Zar, “A remotely accessible network processor-based router for network experimentation,” in *Proceedings of the 4th ACM/IEEE Symposium on Architectures for Networking and Communications Systems*, ser. ANCS '08. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Nov. 2008, pp. 20–29. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1477942.1477946>
- [41] (2024) Ubuntu Manpage: tc. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/focal/man8/tc.8.html>
- [42] (2024, Sep.) linkerd/linkerd2-proxy. Accessed: 2024-09-19. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/linkerd/linkerd2-proxy>
- [43] (2024) Envoy proxy - home. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://www.envoyproxy.io/>
- [44] (2024) envoy-dev. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/48MPeol>
- [45] (2024) Envoy mobile. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/envoyproxy/envoy-mobile>
- [46] (2024, Jan.) envoyproxy/go-control-plane. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/envoyproxy/go-control-plane>
- [47] (2024) Apache CouchDB. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://couchdb.apache.org/>
- [48] (2024) xDS configuration API overview. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: https://www.envoyproxy.io/docs/envoy/latest/intro/arch_overview/operations/dynamic_configuration
- [49] (2024) Hot restart — envoy 1.32.0-dev-cfb1b7 documentation. Accessed: 2024-09-23. [Online]. Available: https://www.envoyproxy.io/docs/envoy/latest/intro/arch_overview/operations/hot_restart
- [50] (2024) Homepage | Ansible Collaborative. Accessed: 2024-09-19. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ansible.com/>
- [51] (2024) Open Policy Agent. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://www.openpolicyagent.org/>
- [52] (2024) FFmpeg. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://ffmpeg.org/>
- [53] (2024) Tunneling UDP over HTTP. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: https://www.envoyproxy.io/docs/envoy/latest/intro/arch_overview/http/upgrades#tunneling-udp-over-http
- [54] (2024) NASA Image and Video Library. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://images.nasa.gov/details/JPL-20231227-M2020f-0001-Perseverance%20Rover%20Zooms%20in%20on%20Ancient%20Mars%20River>
- [55] (2024) Ubuntu Manpage: Wget - The non-interactive network downloader. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/trusty/man1/wget.1.html>
- [56] (2024) HTTP route components (proto). Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: https://www.envoyproxy.io/docs/envoy/latest/api-v3/config/route/v3/route_components.proto#envoy-v3-api-msg-config-route-v3-retrypolicy
- [57] (2024) TCP Proxy (proto). Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: https://www.envoyproxy.io/docs/envoy/latest/api-v3/extensions/filters/network/tcp_proxy/v3/tcp_proxy.proto
- [58] (2024) time(1) - Linux manual page. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://man7.org/linux/man-pages/man1/time.1.html>
- [59] (2024) [Bug-wget] retry when unable to establish SSL connection? Accessed: 2024-11-15. [Online]. Available: <https://lists.gnu.org/archive/html/bug-wget/2019-08/msg00006.html>
- [60] (2024) Image Layer Details - envoyproxy/envoy:v1.32.0. Accessed: 2024-10-24. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/4fd07Cc>
- [61] (2024) masque connect-ip failure · Issue #73 · google/quiche. Accessed: 2024-09-23. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/google/quiche/issues/73>
- [62] J. Shi. (2021, Feb.) What is a “Face” in Named Data Networking? [Online]. Available: <https://yoursunny.com/t/2021/NDN-face/>
- [63] (2024) ndncatchchunks and ndputchunks. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/named-data/ndn-tools/blob/master/tools/chunks/README.md>
- [64] (2024) Protocol Selection. Accessed: 2024-09-24. [Online]. Available: <https://istio.io/latest/docs/ops/configuration/traffic-management/protocol-selection/>
- [65] “HTTP3 / QUIC support · Issue #4723 · linkerd/linkerd2,” 2024, accessed: 2024-09-24. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/linkerd/linkerd2/issues/4723>
- [66] Y. Elkhatib and J. P. Poyato, “An Evaluation of Service Mesh Frameworks for Edge Systems,” in *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Edge Systems, Analytics and Networking*, ser. EdgeSys '23. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, May 2023, pp. 19–24. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3578354.3592867>
- [67] N. Ehsan, M. Liu, and R. J. Ragland, “Evaluation of performance enhancing proxies in internet over satellite,” *International Journal of Communication Systems*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 513–534, 2003. [Online]. Available: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/dac.593>
- [68] C. Caini, R. Firrincieli, and D. Lacamera, “PEPsal: a Performance Enhancing Proxy designed for TCP satellite connections,” in *2006 IEEE 63rd Vehicular Technology Conference*, vol. 6, May 2006, pp. 2607–2611, iSSN: 1550-2252. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1683339/authors#authors>
- [69] A. Abdelsalam, M. Luglio, M. Quadrini, C. Roseti, and F. Zampognaro, “QUIC-proxy based architecture for satellite communication to enhance a 5G scenario,” in *2019 International Symposium on Networks, Computers and Communications (ISNCC)*, Jun. 2019, pp. 1–6. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8909181>
- [70] M. Ivanovich, P. W. Bickerdike, and J. C. Li, “On TCP performance enhancing proxies in a wireless environment,” *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 46, no. 9, pp. 76–83, Sep. 2008, conference Name: IEEE Communications Magazine. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/4623710/>
- [71] V. Jacobson, D. K. Smetters, J. D. Thornton, M. F. Plass, N. H. Briggs, and R. L. Braynard, “Networking named content,” in *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on Emerging networking experiments and technologies*, ser. CoNEXT '09. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, Dec. 2009, pp. 1–12. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1658939.1658941>
- [72] E. Trouva, E. Grasa, J. Day, I. Matta, L. T. Chitkushev, S. Bunch, M. P. de Leon, P. Phelan, and X. Hesselbach-Serra, “Transport over Heterogeneous Networks Using the RINA Architecture,” in *Wired/Wireless Internet Communications*, X. Masip-Bruin, D. Verchere, V. Tsaoussidis, and M. Yannuzzi, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 297–308.
- [73] I. Stoica, D. Adkins, S. Zhuang, S. Shenker, and S. Surana, “Internet indirection infrastructure,” *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 73–86, Aug. 2002. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/964725.633033>
- [74] M. Jahanian, J. Chen, and K. K. Ramakrishnan, “Managing the Evolution to Future Internet Architectures and Seamless Interoperation,” in *2020 29th International Conference on Computer Communications and Networks (ICCCN)*, Aug. 2020, pp. 1–11, iSSN: 2637-9430. [Online]. Available: <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/9209599>
- [75] (2024) Project Gutenberg. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://www.gutenberg.org/>
- [76] (2024) Ubuntu Manpage: curl - transfer a URL. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://manpages.ubuntu.com/manpages/trusty/man1/curl.1.html>
- [77] (2024) OPAv0.60.0. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/486HrjW>
- [78] (2024) patrikjuvonen/docker-nginx-http3:2.1.4. Accessed: 2024-01-01. [Online]. Available: <https://bit.ly/4bm0AAS>

APPENDIX

A. Research Reproducibility

All prototype implementations and use cases we presented in this paper are available at address <https://github.com/Bfarkiani/Hermes>.

B. Additional Information and configuration details

This section includes additional information.




Fig. 8: The Hermes Android mobile client.




Fig. 9: The Hermes iOS mobile client.

TABLE VII: File sizes used in the experiments

Use case	File name	Size of the downloaded files on disk (bytes)
Video	1 minute [54]	5736233
	2 minutes [54]	11688214
Intermittent	1 MB [75]	1090352
	5 MB [75]	5497060
NDN	0KB	0
	1MB [75]	1090352
	26MB [75]	26236224
	49MB	50000000

TABLE VIII: Nginx Configuration

Configuration	Value
Cache-control	Public, max-age=300
Sendfile	On
Send_file_max_chunk	1k
Keepalive_timeout	0
If_modified_since	Off

TABLE IX: Video use case node configuration

Node	Configuration
End-user	Linux Ubuntu v20.04.6 ffmpeg v4.2.7 [52] Envoy dev [44] curl v7.81.0 [76]
Ingress	Envoy dev [44]
Dist 1 and 2	Envoy dev [44] OPA [77]
Server	Envoy dev [44] Video server (Python) ffmpeg [52]

TABLE X: Video use case ffmpeg configuration

Video server	
read rate	30fps
codec	libx264
format	mpegts
bufsize	3968k
End-user	
time out	90s (1min video), 150s (2mins video)
flags	ignore_error
rtbufsize	40M
buffer_size	26214400
fifo_size	500000

TABLE XI: IP use case proxy configuration

Parameter	Value
drain-time-s	5
parent-shutdown-time-s	10
drain-strategy	immediate
timeout	3s
idle_timeout	3s
connect_timeout	5s
close_connections_on_host_set_change	TRUE

TABLE XII: Intermittent use case node configuration

Node	Configuration
End-user	Linux Ubuntu v20.04.6 Envoy dev [44] wget v1.21.2 [55]
Ingress, Proxies 2-4	Envoy dev [44]
Server, Proxy 5	Envoy dev [44] Nginx [78]

TABLE XIII: Intermittent use case retry parameters

Software	Parameter
Wget	tries=10
	waitretry=20
	timeout=60
	continue retry-connrefused retry-on-http-error=503
Envoy HTTP listener	retry_on: 5xx, refused-stream, connect-failure, gateway-error, reset
	per_try_timeout =25s
	num_retries =2