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Overview

- The Information Discovery Graph (IDG)
  - Scalable, robust, distributed information directory
  - Rendezvous data sources with clients
  - Low search time, low network overhead

The Plan

- Background
- Previous & Current Work
- Original IDG Design
- New IDG Design
- Current Status & Future Work

Goals for Good Information Discovery Tool

- Search or browse semantic content
- Handle short- and long-lived information resources
- Low search time
- Low network usage
- Robust
- Scalable

Background

- Amount of online information growing
- Locating relevant information difficult
- Current existing ad-hoc tools
  - Focus on specific niche
  - Low precision (low relevance)
  - Poor scalability
The Plan
- Background
- Previous & Current Work
- Original IDG Design
- New IDG Design
- Current Status & Future Work

Previous & Current Work
- Harvest
- Web search engines
- SAP and sdr
- Peer-based data sharing
- DNS

Harvest
- Early effort at information discovery
- Replicated system of indexed content
- Designed for relatively static content, not dynamic data
- Centrally built index database

Web Search Engines
- Central database of web pages
- URLs from manual registration, crawling
- Difficulty in relevance (page ranking)
  - Keyword counting
  - Hyperlink analysis
  - Manual evaluation

Web Search Engines, cont.
- Problems:
  - Central database inherently not scalable
  - Poor crawler coverage
  - Stale entries

SAP and sdr
- Locates MBone multicast sessions
- Sessions announce to single channel
  - Soft state announcement of all sessions
  - Info pushed to clients, no intermediaries
- Controlling overhead
  - Pre-configured bandwidth limit
  - Announcement frequency determined by number of total sessions
- Wait long enough, will hear everything
SAP and sdr, cont.

- Problems:
  - Long startup time
  - Unbounded location time if many announcements are missed
  - Searching only at local receiver
    - More overhead at receiver: memory, computation
  - Not suitable for short-lived sessions

Peer-based Data Sharing

- Peer-to-peer networked file system
- Napster: centralized search, registration
- Gnutella: arbitrary mesh, node-dependent searching
- Freenet: no search capability

DNS

- Distributed database
  - Provides mapping between host name and address
- Robustness and scalability
  - Caching and replication
- Designed for relatively static information
- Lookup engine only
  - No relevance rankings

The Information Discovery Graph (IDG)

- Addresses information discovery goals
- History:
  - Initially part of Semantic Multicast project
  - Two designs
    - Original design: reduce search time
    - New design: reduce network overhead

The Plan

- Background
- Previous & Current Work
- Original IDG Design
- New IDG Design
- Current Status & Future Work

Original IDG Design

- Hierarchical taxonomy
  - Semantic tree
  - Higher = broad topic, lower = specific
  - Use structure to speed up queries
IDG Design, cont.

- Components:
  - Client: users searching for content
  - Data sources: register the content
  - Manager: makes up the directory infrastructure
    - Organization of hierarchy
    - Registration of data sources
    - Handling queries from clients

Semantic Hierarchy

- A manager is responsible for a specific topic
- Related managers organized into a multicast group

Inter-Manager Messages

- Periodic messages between managers:
  - Semantic topic
  - Summary of registered data sources
- Purpose:
  - Share information for handling queries
  - Heartbeat

Data Source Registration

- Query for matching manager
- Register, receive acknowledgement
- Soft-state registration
  - Periodically re-register
  - Avoid stale entries
  - Robustness

Load-Balancing

- Adapt to topic popularity
  - If manager load above a threshold:
    - Split topic, assign to manager from pool of free managers
    - Pass matching data sources to new manager
  - Similarly if manager load below a threshold:
    - Merge the load with parent manager
    - Return the manager to the pool
- IDG hierarchy is fluid
Querying the IDG

- Clients: find the manager with the topic of interest
- Data sources: find the manager to register with
- Top-down search:
  - Start at top
  - Move downward until leaf or match

Querying Example

Caching

- As parts of hierarchy are learned, cache them
  - Upper levels relatively stable, easily cacheable
- Start searches lower in tree, closer to match
  - Keep queries out of top-most group
  - Reduce search time
- Minimize caching overhead
  - "Best-effort" consistency
  - Fall back to starting from the top if the cached structure changed

Caching Example

Robustness

- If a manager fails:
  - Other managers miss heartbeat
  - Another manager takes over failed manager’s topic
    - Topic is known from previous heartbeat
  - Data sources will notice and re-register
    - During periodic re-registration, will notice manager is gone
    - Randomized re-query to find new manager

Analysis of Original Design

- Compared against SAP
- Two metrics studied:
  - Search time
  - Multicast bandwidth overhead
### SAP Search Time
- SAP: time to hear all announcements
  - \( N = \text{number of announcements} \)
  - \( \text{interval} = \max(300, N \times \text{ad\_size})/\text{limit} \)
- \( ST_{\text{sap}} = N \times \text{interval} \)
- \( \text{linear in number of data sources} \)

### IDG Search Time
- IDG: time to find manager and get list
  - \( N = \text{number of total data sources} \)
  - \( B = \text{branching factor (\# of mgs per group)} \)
  - \( D = \text{depth of tree} = \log_6(N) \)
  - \( K = \text{\# of data sources per manager} \)
- \( ST_{\text{idg}} = B^D + K \)
- \( \text{logarithmic in number of data sources} \)

### Search Time Comparison

### SAP Multicast Bandwidth Usage
- Single global multicast channel
- Pre-configured bandwidth limit
  - SAPv0: default 200 bits/sec
  - SAPv2: default 4000 bits/sec
- \( \text{constant bound} \)

### IDG Multicast Bandwidth Usage
- Many global multicast groups
  - \( N = \text{number of total data sources} \)
  - \( K = \text{\# of data sources per manager} = N/K \)
  - \( M = \text{number of managers} = N/K \)
  - \( B = \text{branching factor} \)
  - \( L = \text{per-group bandwidth limit} \)
- \( BW_{\text{idg}} = (M/B)^L \)
- \( \text{linear in number of data sources} \)

### Bandwidth Usage Comparison
Performance Summary

- Search time improved
- Too much multicast bandwidth overhead
- Motivation for new IDG design:
  - Reduce global multicast overhead
  - Retain good search time

The Plan

- Background
- Previous & Current Work
- Original IDG Design
  - New IDG Design
- Current Status & Future Work

New IDG Design

- Associate location with semantics
  - Each topic has a location
  - Hierarchy has both topic and location info
- Multicast can now be scoped

New IDG Hierarchy Example

Benefits of New Design

- Multicast messages are now limited to within local area only
  - Local heartbeats instead of global
  - Permits scoped access control
- Data sources configured as global or local scope

Design Issues of New Model

- Data source registration
- Searching the IDG
- Location of semantic subgroups
- Migration
Data Source Registration

- Globally-scoped data sources:
  - Ignore location
  - Register with semantic match
  - Use top-down search
    (same as original IDG design)

Globally-scoped Registration

Locally-scoped Registration

Data Source Registration, cont.

- Locally-scoped data sources:
  - Ignore topic
  - Register with smallest scope enclosing the data source

Locally-scoped Registration

Querying the New IDG

- Top-down
- Bottom-up

Top-down Searching

- Identical to original IDG design
- Ignores location
- Finds globally accessible data sources
Bottom-up Searching

- Query starts at client’s scope, moves upwards towards root
- Ignores semantic topic
- At each step, finds locally-scope data sources that match topic
- Enables scoped-based access control

Bottom-up Searching Example

Hybrid Approach

- Use top-down to get globally accessible information
- Use bottom-up to get locally scope-controlled data
- So, use both together to find both kinds of info for a topic

Forwarding Queries

- A query may take several steps to reach the manager(s) with the desired data
- Existing approaches
  - Forward: resend query, no acknowledgement to client (like IP Routing)
  - Redirect: respond to client with next step, client sends query to next hop (like DNS)
- IDG approach: when a manager gets a query:
  - forward query to next node
  - send acknowledgement to the client
- Helps client discover IDG hierarchy

Forwarding Queries Example

Location of Semantic Subgroups

- Child groups can be far away from the parent manager
- Maintain scoped multicast with proxy
  - Child manager multicasts to group via proxy
Proxy Message Handling
- Proxy acts as relay between remote manager and local multicast group
- Heartbeats:
  - Aggregate and forward to manager
- Queries:
  - Proxy responds for the manager
  - Queries do not need to be forwarded

Proxy Failure Recovery
- Proxy responsible if attached manager fails
  - Signaled by loss of unicast connection
  - Request new manager from remote group’s pool of free managers
  - Establish unicast connection with newly assigned manager
- Similarly, if proxy fails, attached manager requests a new proxy

Migration
- If many group members are proxies:
  - Move location of group to make managers local again
  - Side effect: move towards “hot spot” of data source popularity
  - Use free manager pool at destination

Analysis
- Search time
- Multicast bandwidth overhead

Search Time
- Top-down part: identical
  - Logarithmic in number of data sources
- Bottom-up part: time to walk path to root
  - Logarithmic in number of data sources
- Total search time: sum of top-down and bottom-up parts
  - Logarithmic in number of data sources

System Overhead
- Scalability affected by global multicast, not by local multicast
  - Only top-most group managers are globally distributed
  - So, only heartbeats among top-most managers contribute to global message overhead
  - Constant bound
New IDG Performance Summary
- Search time kept to logarithmic
- Global multicast reduced from linear to constant

Other Sources of Overhead
- Examine other sources of overhead
  - Data source registration overhead
  - Proxy overhead
  - Migration overhead
- Analyze impact on model

The Plan
- Background
- Previous & Current Work
- Original IDG Design
- New IDG Design
- Current Status & Future Work

Current Status & Future Work
- Now: implementing Parsec simulation
- Future:
  - Verify overhead estimates
  - Implement prototype
  - Anticipated issues
    - Differentiate scope and locality
    - Semantic organization of taxonomy
    - Deployment

Differentiating Scope and Locality
- Scope not always matched to physical locality
  - e.g., administrative scoping
- Can different kinds of scoping be used?

Semantic Organization of Taxonomy
- Information is not simple hierarchy
  - Many cross-references
  - Complex taxonomy
- Mesh structure more accurate
  - Multiple parents, multiple children
  - Fanout of queries
Deployment Issues
- Anticipate issues of deploying IDG
  - Who deploys managers for manager pool?
  - Who decides where topics will be assigned?

Manager Deployment
- Motivation to deploy IDG managers
  - Increase chance that popular topic is local
  - Reduce response time for local users
- Top-level managers may need governmental agency backing
  - Minimum deployment
  - Similar to DNS root server deployment

Topic/Location Pairings
- How will topics and locations be initially paired?
  - Doesn’t matter, rely on adaptive migration
  - Ensure migration scheme is efficient

Conclusion
- IDG provides information discovery
  - Search or browse by semantic categories
  - Low search time, low network overhead
  - Robust
  - Scalable
- Goal: develop and deploy IDG as the standard information discovery tool