arXiv:cs/0411069v1 [cs.NI] 18 Nov 2004

CDN: Content Distribution Network*

Gang Peng
Department of Computer Science,
State University of New York at Stony Brook,
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4400.
gpeng@cs.sunysb.edu

October 22, 2018

Abstract

Internet evolves and operates largely without a central coordination, the lack of which was and is critically important to the rapid growth and evolution of Internet. However, the lack of management in turn makes it very difficult to guarantee proper performance and to deal systematically with performance problems. Meanwhile, the available network bandwidth and server capacity continue to be overwhelmed by the skyrocketing Internet utilization and the accelerating growth of bandwidth intensive content. As a result, Internet service quality perceived by customers is largely unpredictable and unsatisfactory. *Content Distribution Network* (CDN) is an effective approach to improve Internet service quality. CDN replicates the content from the place of origin to the replica servers scattered over the Internet and serves a request from a replica server close to where the request originates. In this paper, we first give an overview about CDN. We then present the critical issues involved in designing and implementing an effective CDN and survey the approaches proposed in literature to address these problems. An example of CDN is described to show how a real commercial CDN operates. After this, we present a scheme that provides fast service location for peer-to-peer systems, a special type of CDN with no infrastructure support. We conclude with a brief projection about CDN.

1 Introduction

Over the past several years, the Internet has effectuated serious changes in how we transact business. For most businesses, the performance of Web connections has a direct impact on their profitability. Although the time to load the content of key Internet sites has improved constantly over the last several years, overall Web content access latency is still in the range of a few seconds, which is several times the threshold believed to represent natural human reading/scanning speeds. One might think that the constant improvement in the bandwidth of Internet infrastructure, for example, the availability of high-speed "last mile" connection of the subscribers to the Internet and the backbone fibers, and the increasing capacity of the various servers would reduce or eliminate the access delay problem eventually. However, the reality is quite the opposite. Even with these improvements, users still suffer from very significant access delays.

*Technical Report TR-125 of Experimental Computer Systems Lab in Stony Brook University.

IPR2024-01311
SportsCastr Inc. EX-2021

The poor Internet service quality, typically represented as the long content delivery delay, is primarily due to two phenomena. The first is the lack of overall management for Internet. Although the fact that the Internet evolves and operates largely without central supervision was and is critically important to the rapid growth and change, the absence of overall administration in turn makes it very difficult to guarantee proper performance and deal systematically with performance problems. The second is that as the load on Internet and the richness of its content continue to soar, any increase in available network bandwidth and server capacity will continue to be overwhelmed. These two facts not only elevate the delay in accessing content on Internet, but also make the access latency unpredictable. With the emergence of new forms of Internet content, such as media streams, the Internet performance problem will become even worse because the fluctuation and irregularity of the access delay will have a serious impact on the quality of the streaming content that the customer perceives [GCR00].

The basic approach to address the performance problem is to move the content from the places of origin servers to the places at the edge of the Internet. Serving content from a local replica server typically has better performance (lower access latency, higher transfer rate) than from the origin server, and using multiple replica servers for servicing requests costs less than using only the data communications network does. CDN takes precisely this approach. In concrete, CDN replicates a very selective set of content to the replica servers and only sends those requests for the replicated content to a replica server. How to place replica servers and distribute content copies to replica servers and how to route the requests to the proper replica server having the desired content are the key challenges in designing an effective CDN, and are the major topics we will discuss.

The rest of the paper is organized as following: Section 2 gives an overview about CDN, including the general CDN architecture and the issues to be addressed in constructing a capable CDN. In Section 3, we describe the issues involved in replica placement in CDN and compare some representative strategies. We then proceed to Section 4, which discusses the problems we need to solve for request routing and survey effective approaches proposed in literature to resolve them. Section 5 describes how a commercial CDN works and Section 6 presents a request routing scheme for fast service location in large-scale peer-to-peer systems. We conclude in Section 6 with a brief projection about CDN.

2 Overview

CDN distributes the contents from the origin server to the replica servers close to the end clients. The replica servers in a CDN store a very selective set of content and only the requests for that set of content are served by the CDN so that the hit ratio can approach 100%. This fact implies that CDN can present short access delay and consume less network bandwidth. In addition, CDNs offer compelling benefits to content providers, including the popular Web sites [GCR00]. This is because a CDN can serve multiple content providers, and the shared resources offer economies of scale and allow the CDN to dynamically adjust content placement, request routing and capacity provisioning to respond to demand and network conditions [GCR00, CDD, DCTR01]. Moreover, the fact that many objects are not cacheable but replicable, which include dynamic objects with read-only access and personalized objects (e.g., "cookied" requests), makes CDN indispensable.



Figure 1: System Architecture Components of a CDN

2.1 A General Architecture of CDN

The general architecture of a CDN system is shown in Figure 1. It consists of seven components: *client*, *replica servers*, *origin server*, *billing organization*, *request routing system*, *distribution system* and *accounting system*. The relationships among these components are represented with the numbered lines in Figure 1 and are described as follows [GCTT00, DCTR01]:

1. The *origin server* delegates its URI name space for document objects to be distributed and delivered by the CDN to the *request routing system*.

2. The *origin server* publishes content that is to be distributed and delivered by the CDN into the *distribution system*.

3. The *distribution system* moves content to replica servers. In addition, this system interacts with the *request routing system* through feedback to assist in the *replica server* selection process for *client* requests.

4. The *client* requests documents from what it perceives to be the origin. However, due to URI name space delegation, the request is actually directed to the *request routing system*.

5. The *request routing system* routes the request to a suitable *replica server* in CDN.

6. The selected *replica server* delivers the requested content to the *client*. Additionally, the *replica server* sends accounting information for delivered content to the *accounting system*.

7. The *accounting system* aggregates and distills the accounting information into statistics and content detail records for use by the *origin server* and *billing organization*. Statistics are also used as feedback to the *request routing system*.

8. The *billing organization* uses the content detail records to settle with each of the parties involved in the content distribution and delivery process.

2.2 Distribution System

There are two dominating approaches to distribute content to replica servers: using the Internet, and using broadcast satellite. Internet distribution of content is simpler. In such an approach, a

CDN establishes and maintains a distribution tree or an overlay network over the existing Internet infrastructure and disseminates content from the origin server to the replica servers via the tree or overlay. How to establish and maintain the distribution overlay or tree is the major technical concern. This approach might suffer from the unpredictability and problematic performance of the Internet itself. Akamai Technologies and Sandpiper Networks use this model. Data satellite broadcast has the potential for remarkable cost savings, and it provides a high-quality, predictable performance path for sending critical content such as real-time streaming media. The content distribution schemes in CyberStar and Edgix utilize data satellite broadcast.

2.3 Replica Placement

Replica placement deals with how many replicas each object has and where in the network to place them. This problem can be further divided into two issues: replica server placement and object replica placement. Replica server placement deals with the problem of placing the replica servers on the Internet. Object replica placement is about on which replica server and how to place a particular object replica, e.g., a web page. Intuitively, replica servers should be placed in such a manner that they are *closer* to the clients, thereby reducing latency and bandwidth consumption. Also, object replicas should be placed to even the load of the replica servers in CDN, that is, trying to balance the load among replica servers [AR98].

Some theoretical approaches are proposed to model the replica server placement problem. These models are variations of or based on the *center placement problem*. Due to the computational complexity of these algorithms, heuristics have been developed. These suboptimal algorithms take into account the existing information from CDN, such as the workload pattern and the network topology. They provide sufficient solutions with less computation cost.

Object replica placement has been well studied in Web caching system. Korupolu et al. [KPR99, KD99] show that the cooperation between caching nodes can improve the overall performance significantly. For the object replica placement issue in CDN, Kangasharju et al. [KRR01] discussed a simple cost model and evaluated some heuristic approaches, and proposed an improved heuristic exploiting the coordination between replica servers. The essence of the work of Kangasharju et al. is similar to the idea that Korupolu et al. present.

2.4 Request Routing System

Request routing system is used to select a suitable replica server that holds the copy of the requested content and direct the incoming requests to that server. Proximity between the client and the selected replica server and the replica server load are the two major criteria used to choose a proper replica server.

Server location The question of how to choose a suitable replica server within a CDN to service a given request involves the following issues:

- Determine the distance between the requesting client and a server. Hop counts and round-trip times are two often used metrics to measure the distance. "ping" and "traceroute" are the common tools to obtain these two parameters. However, neither of these two metrics is sufficient and accurate to indicate the proximity between the clients and the replica servers because the former does not account for the network traffic situation and the latter is highly variable.

- Determine the load of a replica server. The techniques widely used to determine the server load are *server push* and *client probe*. In the first technique, the replica servers propagate the load information to some agents. In the second approach, the agents probe the status of the servers of interest periodically. There is trade-off between the frequencies of probing for accurate measurement and the traffic incurred by probing.

Request routing Many techniques have been used to guide clients to use a particular server among a set of replica servers. In general, they can be classified into five categories.

- *Client multiplexing*: In this scheme, the client or a proxy server close to the client receives the addresses of a set of candidate replica servers and chooses one to send the request. Generally, this scheme imposes additional overhead in sending the set of candidate replica servers to the client when requesting some content. Also, due to lack of overall information, the client may choose a server with high load, which could result in overloading servers and hence larger access latency.

- *HTTP redirection*: This is simplest and probably the least efficient means of redirecting requests. In this scheme, requests for content make it all the way to the origin server, at which point the server re-directs the browser to a new URL at the HTTP protocol level. Because the origin server or server cluster is the only point responsible for redirecting requests, it could become a bottleneck and is quite error prone.

- *DNS indirection*: This scheme uses Domain Name System (DNS) modifications to return the IP address of one of a set of replica servers when the DNS server is queried by the client. Choosing a server may depend on the location of the client. This technique is transparent to the client. The quality of server selection can be improved by taking into account the server performance. Some commercial CDNs, such as Akamai, are taking this approach.

- *Anycasting*: Essentially, request routing in CDN can be viewed as an application of locating nearby copies of replicated Internet servers. Techniques such as anycasting developed for server location can be used for request routing in CDN. In this scheme, an *anycast address/domain name*, which can be an *IP anycast address* or *a URL of content*, is used to define a group of servers that provide the same service. A client desiring to communicate with only one of the servers sends packets with the anycast address in the destination address field. The packet is then routed via anycast-aware routers to at least one of the servers identified by the anycast address. This anycast-aware routing can be integrated into the existing Internet routing infrastructure, thereby providing request routing service to all the CDNs. In addition, this scheme has the potential to scale up well with the growth of the Internet.

- *Peer-to-Peer Routing*: Peer-to-peer systems are becoming widely deployed on the Internet to disseminate content. The participant nodes in a peer-to-peer system generally belong to different affiliations and themselves constitute an ad-hoc network. As the network is constantly changing, no nodes have the complete global information in time about the network. The problem of routing requests efficiently in a distributed manner without incurring high overhead of propagating the routing information is a major research concern.

3 Server Placement

In this section, we survey the approaches to server placement described in the literature along with their contributions and inadequacies. The issue here is to decide where on the Internet to place the servers, which store replicates of objects. The goal is to minimize the following two metrics: the average content access latency perceived by clients and the overall network bandwidth consumption for transferring replicated documents from servers to clients. These two are correlated in sense that optimizing one metric generally will lead to the minimization of another one.

3.1 Theoretical Approaches

The server placement problem can be modeled as a *center placement problem*. The center placement problem is defined as follows: for the placement of a given number of centers, one could consider the metric (P_{minK}) of minimizing the maximum distance between a node and the nearest center. This problem is also known as the *minimum K-center problem* [JJJ+00]. A problem similar to the minimum K-center problem is the *facility location problem*, where the total cost in terms of building facilities and servicing clients is a given constrain [QPV01]. Another theoretical approach to solve the center placement problem based on graph theory is the *k-hierarchically well-separated trees* (k-HST) [JJJ+00, Bar96]. We first define some notations and then describe the k-HST and the minimum K-center approaches.

Notations: We adopt the following notations in this section: the network is represented by a graph $G(V, E)$, where V is the set of nodes, and $E \subseteq V \times V$ is the set of links. We use $N = |V|$ to denote the number of nodes in G, and $\mathcal{T}$ to denote the number of centers we place in the graph. We denote the distance between nodes u and v in the graph G by $d_G(u, v)$; we will omit G when it can be deduced from the context.

3.1.1 *k*-HST

The k-HST algorithm consists of two phases. In the first phase, the graph is recursively partitioned as follows. A node is arbitrarily selected from the current (parent) partition, which is the complete graph at the beginning, and all the nodes that are within a random radius from this node form a new (child) partition. The value of the radius of the child partition is a factor of k smaller than the diameter of the parent partition. This process recurs for each partition, until each node is in a partition of its own. It then obtains a tree of partitions with the root node being the entire network and leaf nodes being individual nodes in the network. In the second phase, a virtual node is assigned to each of the partitions at each level. Each virtual node in a parent partition becomes the parent of the virtual nodes of the child partitions. The length of the links from a virtual node to its children is half of the partition diameter. Together, the virtual nodes also form a tree. Figure 2 gives an example of generating a 1-HST tree based on the algorithm described above from a graph. All the links on the graph have the length of one.

The randomization of a partition radius is done so that the probability of a short link being cut by partitioning decreases exponentially as one climbs the tree. Hence nodes close together are more likely to be partitioned lower down the tree. Taking advantage of this characteristics of the resulting k-HST tree, the following greedy algorithm can be devised to find the number of centers needed when the maximum center-node distance is bounded by $\mathcal{D}$.

Let node r be the root of the partition tree, $\mathcal{N}_i$ be the children of node i on the partition tree,



Figure 2: Example of Generating *1*-HST

and $\mathcal{L}$ be a list of partitions sorted in the decreasing order of the partition diameter at all times. $H_{\mathcal{L}}$ denotes the partition at the head of the list, and $diam(H_{\mathcal{L}})$ its diameter. The following shows the greedy algorithm on the k-HST tree.

$\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{N}_r$
`while(` $diam(H_{\mathcal{L}}) > \mathcal{D}$)
`begin`
  $h \leftarrow H_{\mathcal{L}}$
  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} - H_{\mathcal{L}}$
  $\mathcal{L} \leftarrow \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{N}_h$
`end`

The algorithm pushes the centers down the tree until it discovers a partition with diameter $\leq \mathcal{D}$. The number of partitions, $|\mathcal{L}|$, is the minimum number of centers required to satisfy the performance metric P_{diam}. To select the actual centers, it simply needs to set the virtual nodes of these partitions in $\mathcal{L}$ to be the centers. Using the example of Figure 2, if we set $\mathcal{D}$ as 2, we will get the partition of $\{\{C, E, F, G\}, \{A, B, D\}\}$ after running the above greedy algorithm. This result shows that if we need to ensure that the distance between any single node and the closest server to be no greater than two, we have to deploy two servers with each located within node set $\{C, E, F, G\}$ and $\{A, B, D\}$, respectively.

The k-HST-based greedy placement algorithm presented above can not only tell us the number of centers needed to satisfy the performance metric P_{diam}, but it can also be used to determine their placement for any given budget of centers. For example, to place K centers, it simply needs to change line 2 in the above algorithm with "while($|\mathcal{L}| < K$)". Obviously, the performance metric P_{diam} may no longer be satisfied for K below a certain number.

3.1.2 Minimum *K*-center

The minimum K-center problem is NP-complete [GJ79]. However, if we are willing to tolerate inaccuracies within a factor of 2, i.e., the maximum distance between a node and the nearest center being no worse than twice the maximum in the optimal case, the problem is solvable in $O(N|E|)$ [Vaz99] as follows.

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$ and all its edges arranged in non-decreasing order by edge cost, $c : c(e_1) \leq c(e_2) \leq ... \leq c(e_m)$, let $G_i = (V, E_i)$, where $E_i = \{e_1, e_2, ...e_i\}$. A *square graph* of G, G^2 is the graph containing V and edge (u, v) wherever there is a path between u and v in G of at most two hops, $u \neq v$ — hence some edges in G^2 are pseudo edges, in that they do not exist in G. An *independent set* of a graph $G = (V, E)$ is a subset $V' \subseteq V$ such that, for all $u, v \in V'$, the edge (u, v) is *not* in E. An independent set of G^2 is thus a set of nodes in G that are at least three hops

apart in G. We also define a *maximal* independent set M as an independent set V' such that all nodes in $V - V'$ are at most one hop away from nodes in V'.

The outline of the minimum K-center algorithm from [Vaz99] is shown as follows:

1. Construct G_1^2, G_2^2, ... ,G_m^2
2. Compute M_i for each G_i^2
3. Find smallest i such that $|M_i| \leq K$, say j
4. M_j is the set of K center.

The basic observation is that the cost of the optimal solution to the K-center problem is the cost of e_i, where i is the smallest index such that G_i has a dominating set[1] of size at most K. This is true since the set of center nodes is a dominating set, and if G_i has a dominating set of size K, then choosing this set to be the centers guarantees that the distance from a node to the nearest center is bounded by e_i. The second observation is that a star topology in G_i transfers into a clique (full-mesh) in G_i^2. Thus, a maximal independent set of size K in G_i^2 implies that there exists a set of K stars in G, such that the cost of each edge in it is bounded by $2e_i$: the smaller the i, the larger the K. The solution to the minimum K-center problem is the G_i^2 with K stars. Note that this approximation does not always yield a unique solution.

The 2-approximation minimum K-center algorithm can also be used to determine the number of centers needed to satisfy the performance metric P_{diam} by picking an index k such that $c(e_k) \leq \mathcal{D}/2$. The maximum distance between a node and the nearest center in G_k is then at most $\mathcal{D}$, and the number of centers needed is $|M_k|$.

3.2 Heuristic Solutions

The theoretical solutions described above are either computationally expensive or do not consider the characteristics of the network and workload. Thereby, they are very difficult to apply in practice [RGE01] and may not be suitable for the real CDN systems. Some heuristic or suboptimal algorithms were proposed, which leverage some existing information from CDNs, such as the work load pattern and the network topology [KRS00, QPV01, JJR+01, RGE01], and offer adequate solution with much lower computation complexity.

3.2.1 Greedy Algorithm

A greedy algorithm was proposed by P. Krishnan et al. [KRS00] for the cache location problem. Qiu et al. [QPV01] adapted this algorithm for the server placement problem in CDN.

The basic idea of the greedy algorithm is as follows. Suppose it needs to choose M servers among N potential sites. It chooses one site at a time. In the first iteration, it evaluates each of the N potential sites individually to determine its suitability for hosting a server. It computes the cost associated with each site under the assumption that accesses from all clients converge at that site, and picks the site that yields the lowest cost, e.g., the bandwidth consumption. In the second iteration, it searches for a second site that, in conjunction with the site already picked, yields the lowest cost. In general, in computing the cost, the algorithm assumes that clients direct

[1] A dominating set is a set of $\mathcal{D}$ nodes such that every $v \in V$ is either in $\mathcal{D}$ or has a neighbor in $\mathcal{D}$.

their accesses to the nearest server, i.e., one that can be reached with the lowest cost. The iteration continues until M servers have been chosen.

Jamin et al. [JJR+01] discussed a more general algorithm: ℓ-backtracking greedy algorithm. It differs from the basic one as follows: in each iteration, the ℓ-backtracking greedy algorithm checks all the possible combinations achievable by removing l of the already placed servers and replacing them with $\ell + 1$ new servers. Thus, the basic greedy algorithm is 0-backtracking greedy algorithm.

In evaluating the relative performance of the greedy replica placement strategy to that of the optimal ones, Qiu et al. [QPV01] extracted the client locations from the workload traces from MSNBC, ClarkNet and NASA Kennedy and reduced the number of the locations to the scale of thousands by clustering the clients that are topologically close together. They utilized two types of network topologies: one by simulating the network as random graph and another one by deriving the real topology from BGP routing table. Under this experimental configuration, the greedy algorithm performs remarkably well (within a factor of 1.1-1.5) compared to the computationally expensive optimal solution and the computation needed is several magnitudes less. Also, the greedy algorithm is relatively insensitive to imperfect input data. Unfortunately, this greedy placement requires knowledge of the client locations in the network and all pairwise inter-node distances. This information in many cases may not be available.

3.2.2 Topology-informed Placement Strategy

A topology-informed placement strategy, called "Transit Node", was first discussed by Jamin et al. [JJR+01]. It works as follows. Assuming that nodes with the highest outdegrees[2] can reach more nodes with smaller latency, we place servers on candidate hosts in descending order of outdegrees. This is called *Transit Node* heuristic under the assumption that nodes in the core of the Internet transit points will have the highest outdegrees. Due to the lack of more detailed network topology, it uses only Autonomous Systems (AS) topologies where each node represents a single AS, and node link corresponds to AS-level BGP peering. An improved topology-informed placement strategy is proposed by Radoslavov et al [RGE01]. They leverage the router-level Internet topology, instead of only AS-level topology. In this strategy, each LAN associated with a router is a potential site to place a server, rather than each AS being a site.

In the experiments of both strategies, the network topology is extracted from the Internet and the set of client locations is derived from some Web site trace log. The result shows that the transit node heuristic can perform almost as well as the greedy placement, and that using router-level topology information results in better performance than that achieved by only exploiting AS-level topology knowledge. Also, they found that the performance improvement diminishes when increasing the number of the servers and only explored the performance of up to tens of servers.

In practice, due to the capacity limit of a single site, a CDN may consist of much more servers, e.g., Akamai deploys around 13,000 servers in 64 countries [Aka]. To the best of our knowledge, the problem of optimizing the placement of such a large number of servers on the Internet is not well explored.

[2] The outdegree of a node is the number of other nodes it is connected to.



Figure 3: Server Location Techniques

4 Request Service

Two steps of operations are involved in servicing a request in a CDN: locating a suitable server holding the replicates of the requested object, which we name as *server location*, and redirecting the request to the selected server, which is called *request routing*. In a totally distributed request routing system, such as anycasting, the request is forwarded directly to the proper servers via anycast-aware routers, in which these two operations are combined together indeed. In this section, we first investigate these two issues and then explore the known anycasting schemes in depth. As one special type of CDN with no infrastructure support, peer-to-peer systems have been shed spotlight, either from academic or industry. We will also discuss the request routing problem in these systems in the last subsection.

4.1 Server Location

There are a number of possible ways to locate a nearby or suitable server in an internetwork environment, as summarized in Figure 3 [GS95]. The first choice about server location strategy is whether server location information is gathered in *reaction* to client requests for nearby servers, e.g., using a multicast scheme, or whether this information is gathered *proactively*. The next choice is whether support should be provided by the routing layer. Such support can reduce gathering costs, but given the practical difficulties of implementing widespread router changes, we also consider techniques to gather server location information in the application layer. Finally, we compare the cost of polling routing table against gathering information via network probes.

Reactive vs. proactive gathering Broadcast and multicast are two typical reactive approaches to locate suitable servers. Boggs [Bog83] proposed an *expanding ring* broadcast mechanism that iteratively enlarges concentric rings around the broadcasting host. More recent approaches have considered various forms of multicast routing. That is, given a multicast group joined by all instances of a particular type of server, one can choose the server that responds most quickly to a group multicast message. Since each time a client wants to locate a server providing a particular service, a message has to be multicasted to the entire group of servers, this approach wastes the precious network bandwidth. In contrast, in a proactive scheme, some agents, such as routers or dedicated applications, gather the network and server information by sending probe messages to the candidate servers or collect load information dispatched by servers, and maintain the server location or load database. Clients that request some service can locate a proper server providing

the desired service by only sending a query to the agents. This way, the unnecessary message transmission can be avoided.

Routing layer vs. application layer Partridge et al. [PMM93] proposed an *anycasting* mechanism, particularly in IP layer, which attempts to deliver a request to one nearby server. Anycasting is appealing because it can avoid burdening links with repeated requests to gather server distance information. However, a downside is that IP anycasting assumes that all servers provide equal service[3]. It therefore cannot handle server quality differences without programming policy constraints into routers. In contrast to IP anycasting, an application-level location service could include server quality into the selection criterion, after a handful of nearby servers have been selected from the database. As an additional practical advantage, an application-level service could be implemented without routing support, albeit at higher network cost. The main disadvantage of building the server location database at the application-level is that doing so requires periodic updating. At the routing layer the location database can be constructed incrementally by monitoring routing update traffic and group join/leave requests. Some approaches were proposed which aim to enjoy the benefits of both. Wood et al. [WCS93] built an application-level location service that constructs the server location database by monitoring the routing-layer traffic. Fei et al. [FBZA98] proposed an application-level anycasting mechanism to provide server location service. In their system, only when the load on a server changes *significantly*, the server pushes the changed status to the agents and then triggers updating the database so as to cut down the updating operation cost.

Polling routing table vs. network probing By polling routing tables, we can build a connectivity graph from a measurement beacon to one server by retrieving the local routing table, determining the next hop along the path, retrieving the routing table for that router, and so on, until we reach the destination. We can extend this algorithm to discover routes to all servers by iterating over the servers, taking care not to retrieve a routing table that has already been retrieved. In network probing approach, some measurement servers are responsible to explore the route to each of the replica servers by probing the servers. When a client asks one of the measurement servers for a list of nearby replica servers, a measurement server explores the route back to the client and adds that information to its connectivity database. It then searches the databases for servers near the client.

4.2 Request Routing

The request routing schemes proposed so far fall into the five categories: *client multiplexing*, *DNS indirection*, *HTTP redirection*, *anycasting* and *peer-to-peer routing*. We will discuss the former three in the remaining part of this subsection and the latter two in the other two subsections.

4.2.1 Client Multiplexing

In this approach, the client (Web browser or a proxy server) obtains the addresses of a set of physical replica servers and chooses one to send its request to. Three main mechanisms belong in this category.

[3]Partridge et al. [PMM93] specifies that a single server is selected in response to an anycast request, and that any of the servers in the anycast group are equally usable.

The first one is that the DNS server of the service provider returns the IP addresses of servers holding a replica of the object. The client's DNS resolver chooses a server among these. To decide, the resolver may issue probes to the servers and choose based on response times to these probes, or it may collect reports from the clients on performance of past accesses to these servers. This approach is used by Bhattacharjee et al. [BAZF97] and by Beck and Moore [BM98]. Its advantage is that no extra communication is added to the critical path of request processing. There are also several shortcomings. First, the approach relies on clients using a customized DNS resolver. If this resolver relies on client performance reports, then the client (i.e., browser or proxy) software must be modified as well. Second, the DNS infrastructure relies heavily on DNS response caching to cope with its load. Therefore, replica server sets cannot be changed frequently without the danger of resolvers using stale replica server sets. At the same time, reducing the caching time may incur DNS queries more frequently and hence just moves the stability bottleneck to the DNS infrastructure, provided enough clients adopt the approach.

The second approach relies on Java applets to perform replica server selection on the client [YCE+97]. The URL of an object actually points to a Java applet, which embeds the knowledge about the current replica server set and the procedure for replica server selection. This approach requires no changes to clients. However, unlike the previous approach, it involves an extra TCP communication to download the applet.

The third approach, proposed by [BBM+97], propagates information about replica server sets in HTTP headers. It requires changes to both Web servers and clients (proxy servers in this case) to process extra headers. Clients must also be modified to implement replica server selection.

4.2.2 DNS Indirection

Several domain name server implementations allow the Web site's DNS server to map a host domain name to a set of IP addresses and choose one of them for every client query, based on such factors as the query origin and the load of replica servers. The difference with DNS-based client multiplexing is that choosing a replica server occurs at the Web site or the DNS infrastructure, not at the client's DNS resolver. Unfortunately, DNS response caching by clients complicates changing replica server sets and controlling request distribution among replica servers. At the same time, reducing the lifetime of cached DNS responses may shift the performance bottleneck to the DNS infrastructure. In general, DNS system was designed for mostly an append-only database of existing mappings between a host name and an IP address that rarely ever changes.

4.2.3 HTTP Redirection

HTTP protocols allow a Web server to respond to a client request with a special message that tells the client to re-submit its request to another server. This mechanism can be used to build a special Web server which accepts client requests, chooses replica servers for them and redirects clients to these servers. Commercially, Cisco Distributed Director [Cis] and WindDance Web Challenger [Winb] implemented this functionality.

An advantage of HTTP-level redirection is that replication can be managed at fine granularity, down to individual Web pages, whereas other mechanisms postulate the entire Web site as the granule. A disadvantage is that this mechanism is quite heavyweight. Not only does it introduce an extra message round-trip into request processing, but also this round-trip is done over HTTP, which uses the expensive TCP protocol as the transport layer.



Figure 4: Illustration of IP Anycast



Figure 5: Anycast Group Classification at An Edge Domain

4.3 Anycasting

As defined [PMM93], anycasting provides: "a stateless best effort delivery of an anycast packet to at least one host, and preferably only one host, which serves the anycast address". The anycasting schemes proposed in literature so far can be classified into two classes: IP anycasting and application-level anycasting.

4.3.1 IP Anycasting

IP anycasting was proposed by Partridge et al. [PMM93]. Such service assumes that the same IP address is assigned to a set of hosts, and each IP router has in its routing table a path to the host that is the closest[4] to this router. Thus, different IP routers have paths to different hosts with the same IP address. Figure 4 illustrates IP anycasting.

The traditional approach routes IP anycast addresses using the unicast routing protocols, a design decision that makes IP anycast unscalable. The anycast group topology may not be hierarchical or comply with the unicast topology and thereby routing anycast packets using the unicast routing protocols requires advertising each global anycast address separately. This requirement causes the routing tables to grow proportionally to the number of all global anycast groups in the entire Internet, and hence does not scale.

Katabi et al. [KW00] proposed a framework for scalable global IP anycast (GIA). The framework scales by capturing the special characteristics of the anycast service in its inter-domain routing protocol, which generates two types of routes: default inexpensive routes that consume no bandwidth or storage space, and enhanced shortest path routes that are customized according to the beneficiary domain's interests. Figure 5 shows the anycast group classification at an edge domain.

[4]'closest' is defined according to the routing system's measure of distance.

For routing internal anycast groups, GIA uses the unicast intra-domain routing protocol, either based on the distance-vector algorithm, e.g., RIP, or on the link-state algorithm, such as OSPF. This approach stays scalable because the number of internal group is controllable by the domain itself. To route an unpopular anycast group, GIA uses a default route. A default route is determined by the unicast prefix of the home domain, which is part of the anycast address, and does not consume any bandwidth to be generated and does not need any storage space in the routing tables. A router that receives an anycast packet addressed to an unpopular anycast group forwards the packet to the group member in the home domain. For popular anycast groups, GIA generates shortest path routes and forwards the packet address to a popular anycast group via the shortest path route.

Although IP anycast is suitable for request routing and service location, it has the following limitations:

- Some part of the IP address space must be allocated to anycast address.
- Anycast addresses requires router support.
- The selection of the server to which an anycast packet is sent is made entirely within the network with no option for user selection or input.
- Consistent with the stateless nature of IP, the destination is determined on a per-packet basis.

4.3.2 Application-Level Anycasting

Since the network layer is able to effectively determine the shortest path, it is well suited for the IP anycasting service that selects the closest server based upon a shortest path metric such as hop count. On the other hand, an application layer approach is better suited at handling a variety of other metrics such as server throughput. Here we survey some typical systems in this field, which we call content routing network.

Fei et al. [FBZA98] observed the shortcomings of IP anycast and proposed a framework for application-level anycasting service. In their design, the service consists of a set of *anycast resolvers*, which performs the *anycast domain names* (ADN) to IP address mapping. Clients interact with the anycast resolvers by generating an anycast query. The resolver processes the query and replies with an anycast response. A key feature of the system is the presence of a metric database, associated with each anycast resolver, containing performance data about replica servers. The performance data can be used in the selection of a server from a group, based on user-specified performance criteria. It estimates the server performance with manageable overhead by combining server pushes with client probes. However, deploying such a system requires the changes to the servers as well as the clients, which is prohibitively costly considering the possibly huge number of servers and clients.

Adjie-Winoto et al. [AWSBL99] proposed an intentional naming system (INS), which is designed as a resource discovery and service location system for dynamic and mobile networks of devices and computers. INS applications may be *services* or *clients*: services provide functionality or data and clients request and access these. *Intentional Name Resolvers (INRs)* form an application-level overlay network to exchange services descriptions, construct a local cache based on these advertisements and route client requests to the appropriate services. INS uses a simple language based on attributes and values for its names, which enable the service to be specified precisely. In addition, INS implements a late binding mechanism that integrates name resolution and message routing,



Figure 6: Content Layer Routing

enabling clients to continue communicating with end-nodes even if the name-to-address mappings change while a session is in progress. However, INS is not designed to provide global reachability information, and the attribute-based naming is less scalable than a hierarchical namespace provided by URL. Also, INS's late binding, where every message packet contains a name, is too expensive to use for content distribution.

Gritter et al. [GC01] designed a framework for content routing support in the Internet. Replica servers can be viewed as offering alternate routes to access the content that the client requests, as depicted in Figure 6. Network-integrated content routing provides support in the core of the Internet to distribute, maintain and make use of information about content reachability. This is performed by routers that are extended to support naming. They designed the *Name-Based Routing Protocol (NBRP)*, which performs routing by name with a structure similar to BGP. Like BGP, NBRP is a distance-vector routing algorithm with path information: an NBRP routing advertisement contains the path of content routers toward a content server. An *Internet Name Resolution Protocol (INRP)* is developed to perform efficient lookup on the distributed integrated name-based routing system.

Clients that desire some content initiate content request by contacting a local content router. Each content router maintains a set of name-to-next-hop mappings, just as an IP router maps address prefixes to next hops. When an INRP request arrives, the desired name is looked up in the name routing table, and the next hop is chosen based on the information associated with the known routes. The content router forwards the request to the next content router, and in this way the request proceeds toward the "best" content server, as shown in Figure 7 (The routing information kept for a name is typically just the path of content routers to the content server, although it may be augmented with load information or metrics directly measured by a content router). When an INRP request reaches the content router adjacent to the "best" content server, that router sends back a response message containing the address of the preferred server. This response is sent back along the same path of content routers. If no response appears, intermediate content routers can select alternate routes and retry the name lookup. In this fashion, client requests are routed over the best path to the desired content. INRP thus provides an "anycast" capability at the content level.

4.4 Peer-to-Peer Systems

Peer-to-peer systems build the information retrieval network on the members themselves instead of relying on a dedicated infrastructure like the traditional CDNs do. As a result, peer-to-peer systems are more fault-tolerant than the common CDNs. Also, peer-to-peer systems are more suitable for



Figure 7: Internet Name Resolution Protocol

content producers who are individuals, who may not be able to access or afford the common CDNs, most of which are commercial ones.

Ian Clarke et al. [CSWH00] designed Freenet, a distributed adaptive peer-to-peer system that enables the storage and retrieval of data while maintaining the anonymity of readers and authors. Freenet operates as a peer-to-peer system where nodes request a file store or retrieve service to their immediate neighbors using a location-independent naming key. Requests are forwarded hop-by-hop, a way similar to IP routing, and have a limited hops-to-live as well as a unique random id number to avoid loops in routing. Each node has a data store to which it must allow network access, as well as a dynamic routing table with keys associated with node addresses. File keys are generated using hash functions. Each file has a random public/private key pair to serve as a namespace called signed-subspace key (SSK) and a keyword-signed key (KSK) generated by a short descriptive text. A user publishes his descriptive string and subspace public key, and keeps his private key secret so that no other ones can add files to his subspace. A content-hash key is useful for updating and splitting files since the old version of the file remains temporarily available while a new version is being added to the system. There is more than one solutions proposed to search for keys, including insertion of indirect files by users with pointer to the real files, and publicizing public key compilations by users. Once the file key is known, a user will ask its node to retrieve the file. This node will check its own data store, and use its routing table to forward the request to a neighboring node if it does not have a copy of the file. Requests propagate as a steepest-ascent hill-climbing search with backtracking until the file is found or the request times out. A similar search is performed to insert new files. Similar keys are located and success is returned if the hops-to-live is reached without any collisions. Essentially, a trend will form where nodes become experts on similar keys located on the same node, and caching brings copies of file closer to the requester. When the system starts running out storage, the least recently used files are replaced. The system achieves security by enforcing anonymous requesters and senders, as well as employing a cryptographic protocol to add new nodes to the system. Freenet does not assign responsibility for documents to specific servers; instead, its lookups take the form of searches for cached copies. This allows Freenet to provide a degree of anonymity, but prevents it from guaranteeing retrieval of existing documents or from providing low bounds on retrieval costs.

Ion Stoica et al. [SMK+01] presented the Chord protocol that is designed to map a key onto a node in a distributed, peer-to-peer network whose size and composition change intermittently. Chord is proposed to meet the challenges faced by large-scale peer-to-peer network, namely, load balance, decentralization, scalability, availability and flexible naming. The Chord protocol employs



Figure 8: An identifier circle consisting of the three nodes 0, 1, and 3. In this example, key 1 is located at node 1, key 2 at node 3, and key 6 at node 0.

the consistent hashing function to acquire two m-bit identifiers for the node and the key, respectively. The identifiers are ordered in an identifier circle modulo 2^m (m is in the range of $O(logN)$ and N is the number of nodes in the network), using which the keys may be assigned to the nodes with the successor node technique, as shown in Figure 8. Consistent hashing is designed to let nodes enter and leave the network with minimal disruption. Further more, it is proven that each node is responsible for at most $(1+\epsilon)K/N$ keys, where K is the total number of keys. Each node, n, maintains a routing table with (at most) m entries, called the *finger table*. The ith entry in the table at node n contains the identity of the *first* node, s, that succeeds n by at least 2^{i-1} on the identifier circle, i.e., $s = successor(n + 2^{i-1})$, where $1 \leq i \leq m$. When a node n looks for the node holding key k, it searches its finger table for the node j whose ID most immediately precedes k, and asks j for the node it knows whose ID is closest to k. By repeating this process, n learns about nodes with IDs closer and closer to k. Eventually, node n finds the node holding k in $O(logN)$ steps. Also, Chord is designed to ease the additions and withdrawals of nodes, and the main idea for achieving this is to find the new predecessor and successor nodes on the identifier circle after addition/withdrawal of nodes in the network. When multiple nodes join or fail, a stabilizing routine is executed in the Chord in order to remap keys to the nodes so that the integrity of the identifier circle is maintained. In a word, Chord features simplicity, provable correctness and provable performance even in the face of concurrent node arrivals and departures. However, Chord needs specific mechanism to heal partitioned rings and security mechanism to tackle safety issues, e.g., malicious or buggy set of participants, which may present an incorrect view of the Chord ring. Also, anonymity of participant is not taken into account in Chord.

5 An Example of CDN – Akamai

Akamai [Aka] is one of the successful commercial CDNs, which hosts some very popular websites, like Yahoo and Monster.com, and websites of many big companies, like IBM and FedEx. By July 2002, Akamai has deployed more than 9,700 replica servers across 56 countries. These replica servers store the replication of the content for the websites Akamai hosts. To achieve network diversity and proximity to users, these replica servers sit in data centers and Points of Presence (POPs) of major Internet and communication carriers. Akamai also built its own DNS network. This Akamai DNS network ensures fast delivery of the requested content by resolving the host name of the URL for the requested content to the IP address of the Akamai replica server that will

deliver the desired content to the user most quickly. Based on some white papers and published papers, we describe our conjectures on two major processes involved in the operation of Akamai: one is how to direct Internet traffic to the Akamai server network, another is how to direct requests to the suitable Akamai replica servers.

5.1 ARLs and Akamaizer

Akamaizer is the tool that tags embedded Web objects for delivery via the Akamai network, transforming ("akamaizing") their URLs into Akamai Resource Locators (ARLs). ARLs contain a number of fields that aid in the content delivery process. Their format is described in the following example.

A typical embedded object URL such as *http://www.foo.com/a.gif* would be transformed into the following ARL:

$$http://a\overbrace{836}^{\text{Serial \#}}.\overbrace{g.akamaitech.net}^{\text{Akamai Domain}}/\overbrace{7}^{\text{Type}}/\overbrace{836}^{\text{Serial \#}}/\overbrace{123}^{\text{Provider Code}}/\overbrace{e358f5db0045}^{\text{Object Data}}/\overbrace{www.foo.com/a.gif}^{\text{absoluteURL}}$$

The *serial number* identifies a virtual "bucket" of content – a group of akamaized objects that will always be served from the same set of Akamai replica servers. The *Akamai domain* ensures that requests for akamaized content travel directly from the user to the Akamai network, completely avoiding the object's origin site. The *type* field aids in interpreting an ARL. The *provider code* uniquely identifies an Akamai customer. The *object data* is used to guarantee object freshness. Depending on the type in use, this field contains either the object's expiration time, or a string that uniquely identifies a particular version of the object, e.g., the MD5 hash value of the object content. In the latter case, when the object is modified, its object data field changes, so its ARL changes as well. The last field *absolute URL* is used by Akamai replica servers to retrieve the object from the content provider's origin site the first time the object is requested.

5.2 The Akamai DNS System

All user requests for ARLs are directed to the Akamai network by the server domain field (set to *g.akamai.net*) in each ARL. Then, the Akamai DNS system chooses the Akamai replica server that will deliver the content to the user most quickly and resolve the **.g.akamai.net* server name using this server's IP address. Unlike the conventional DNS name resolution, this resolution relies not only on the server name, but also on the source address of the DNS query, current network condition and replica servers status.

The Akamai DNS system is implemented as a 2-level hierarchy of DNS servers: by April 2000, 50 *high-level .akamai.net servers* (HLDNS) and 2000 *low-level .g.akamai.net servers* (LLDNS). Each HLDNS server is responsible for directing each DNS query it receives to a LLDNS server that is close to the requesting client. The LLDNS servers perform the final resolution of server name to IP address, directing each client to the Akamai replica server that is optimally located to serve the client's requests. As Akamai continuously monitors network condition as well as the status of replica servers, it can respond to network events within a matter of seconds.

When a browser makes a request for an ARL, whose server name is *a9.g.akamai.net* for example, it first contacts its local DNS server, asking it to resolve the server name. In the absence of a cached response, the local DNS server resolves the server name by using iterative DNS queries. It first contacts a *.net* root server, which responds with a list of Akamai HLDNS servers. When the local

DNS server contacts one of these HLDNS servers, it receives a list of LLDNS servers that are close to it. It then contacts one of the LLDNS servers, which returns the IP address of the optimal replica server for this request. Eventually, the local DNS server returns this IP address to the requesting browser, which then fetches the content from that server.

The Akamai DNS system enables caching of DNS responses, just as in conventional DNS name resolution, so as to avoid every request incurring the delay of three levels of DNS queries. The Time-to-Live (TTL) of the DNS responses are set in such a way as to balance the benefits of caching with the chief goal of the Akamai DNS system: keeping the client-to-server mapping up to date with current network condition as well as replica servers status. As the responses obtained from the root *.net* servers do not vary with network conditions, they have a TTL of two days. The responses returned by HLDNS servers are based on a network map that is recomputed every 7-10 minutes, so these responses have a TTL of 20 minutes. Since LLDNS servers generate name resolution based on maps that are updated every 2-10 seconds, the TTL in the responses from LLDNS servers is set to 20 seconds.

6 Iridium: A Fast Content Location Service for Large-Scale Peer-to-Peer Systems

6.1 Related Work

The present routing protocols or services in peer-to-peer systems can be roughly classified into three categories according to the number of nodes performing the routing operation.

- The first category relies on a central node for servicing all the routing requests in the system. Napster [Nap] and Audiogalaxy [Aud] are the instances. Obviously, this centralized structure can not scale well for large system and is error prone. A more significant demerit of this structure is that the system using this routing structure can be easily censored. The suspension of Napster shows this defect.

- Some peer-to-peer systems choose a small set of "superpeers" or "supernodes" by consensus to service the routing requests in the system rather than replying on a central node for routing. Kazaa/Fasttrack [Kaz], WinMx [Wina] and edonkey2000 [edo] take this approach. Gnutella [Gnu] also has a slightly structured network for routing requests but delivers requests in an expanding search, which incurs enormous amount of search traffic. Fast content location generally is not an explicit concern in these systems.

- Tapestry [ZKJ01], CAN [RFH+01], Chord [SMK+01] and Pastry [RD01] constitute the peer-to-peer system in a completely distributed structure where each node participates in the routing procedure. They distribute the routing information on each node. Each node maintains information only about $O(logN)$ [5] other nodes, and a request requires $O(logN)$ overlay hops to complete. These systems achieve the excellent scalability at the cost of large lookup latency. This issue becomes worse in practice as each overlay hop could take very long time, especially when the physical path between the source and the sink of a hop is congested. Brocade [ZDH+02] improves over Tapestry on this issue by shortcutting the lookup messages through some selected "supernodes" which have high bandwidth and fast access to the wide-area network. However, it will still take $O(logN)$ overlay hops to finish a request.

[5] N is the total number of nodes in the system.

To address the large lookup latency issue of Tapestry etc. have, the proposed system in Iridium constructs a routing fabric consisting of a set of "supernodes". The system is divided into multiple partitions each consisting of a supernode and a set of regular nodes. Using consistent hashing [KLL+97], the routing fabric takes constant time to find out which partition stores the key being requested and service the request. In the meanwhile, the routing system in Iridium scales well as the routing operations are conducted in a distributed manner.

6.2 System Structure

Essentially, Iridium provides distributed computation of a hash function mapping keys to nodes responsible for them within constant time. It uses consistent hashing [KLL+97], which has several good properties. With high probability the hash function balances load. Also with high probability, when an Nth node joins (or leaves) the network, only an $O(1/N)$ fraction of the keys are moved to a different location.

The consistent hash function assigns each node and key an m-bit $identifier$ using a base hash function such as SHA-1 [sha95]. A node's identifier is chosen by hashing the node's IP address, while a key identifier is calculated by hashing the key. We will use the term "key" to refer to both the original key and its identifier. Similarly, the term "node" will refer to both the node and its identifier under the hash function.

There are two types of nodes in Iridium: *supernode* and *regular node*.

- Regular nodes store the keys. The keys are assigned by using the consistent hashing as follows: All the identifiers are ordered in an *identifier circle* modulo 2^m. Key k is assigned to the first regular node whose identifier is equal to or follows k in the identifier space. This regular node is called the *successor node* of key k.

- Supernodes store the node identifiers assigned by consistent hashing. A node n is assigned to the first supernode whose identifier is equal to or follows n in the supernode identifier space. This supernode is called the *associated supernode* of node n. Correspondingly, we call the regular nodes that are associated with supernode s the *bound set* of s, denoted as $b(s)$. A supernode performs the functionality of regular nodes as well.

To enhance the reliability, a key k is stored in its successor node and the $p-1$ regular nodes that follow key k's successor node immediately. These p regular nodes together we call them the key k's *successor node set*. Similarly, a node n is assigned to its associated supernode and the $q-1$ supernodes that follow node n's associated supernode immediately. We name these q supernodes the node n's *associated supernode set*. Here p and q are tunable system parameters. Supposing the total number of nodes in the system is N, we denote the number of supernodes as $f(N)$ and the average number of nodes each supernode stores as $B(N)$, where $B(N)$ is equal to $q * N/f(N)$.

When a node i is looking for a key k, it first randomly selects one supernode, say I, from its associated supernode set to send a query to asking for the location of key k. Supernode I checks which supernode is the clockwise closest supernode to key k in the identifier space and forwards the query to that supernode, say J. Supernode J then looks up which regular nodes in its bound set are holding k and randomly chooses one, say j, to deliver the query to. After finding the desired key, the result will be sent back from j to J, then I and eventually i. In total, each key lookup involves only constant number of hops. For example, in Figure 9, when node 2 looks up for key 6, it first sends a query to its associated supernode 4. Supernode 4 then sends this query to supernode



Figure 9: An identifier circle consisting of the six nodes 0, 2, 4, 8, 10 and 11. In them, node 2, 8 and 12 are regular nodes and node 0, 4 and 10 are supernodes. Regular node 12 is assigned to supernode 0, 2 to 4 and 8 to 10. Key 1 is assigned to node 2, key 6 to node 8, key 9 to node 10 and key 11 to node 12.

10, which is the clockwise closest supernode to key 6 in the identifier space. Supernode 10 furthers the query to regular node 8, which is the successor node of key 6 and stores the key 6. Eventually, node 8 sends the result through node 10, 4 back to the requesting node 2.

6.3 System Maintenance

6.3.1 Node Joins

When a node wants to join the peer-to-peer system, it needs to find out its associated supernode first. It does this by flooding or broadcasting request looking for a supernode to its topological neighbors. Once it gets the location of a supernode, it queries the supernode for its associated supernode set. After that, it registers itself to its associated supernode set by sending information to these supernodes including its identifier and address.

6.3.2 Supernode Selection

When the number of nodes in the system exceeds certain threshold or the routing core consisting of the supernodes is overloaded, we need to select new supernodes out of the regular nodes to shed the workload.

First we determine the supernode from whose bound set to choose a supernode candidate. The supernode could be the most loaded one or the one having the largest bound set. We then select a supernode candidate from the bound set. We account the computation resources, including memory and CPU, and the average up time when choosing a candidate. The time complexity of selecting candidate is $B(N)$ if we search the bound set linearly as each supernode will hold around $B(N)$ regular nodes. It could be optimized to constant time if each supernode keeps its bound set sorted. After a new supernode is selected, its previous associated supernode migrates the regular nodes whose closest successor supernode becomes the new supernode to the newly selected supernode. The next operation is to propagate the existence of this new supernode to other supernodes. The simplest way to do this is to do broadcasting, which requires $f(N)$ messages for each supernode birth. This work could be optimized by using lazy update. If a supernode needs to lookup some keys which are held by certain regular nodes which are in the bound set of the new supernode, it queries

the old associated supernode of the new supernode first. Besides forwarding the query to the new supernode, the old associated supernode of the new supernode will sends back response including the information about the new supernode to the requesting supernode so that the information about the new supernode is delivered to the interested supernodes gradually.

6.3.3 Node Leaves

Iridium handles the node leaving or death for supernodes and regular nodes in different ways. Normally, a regular node updates its identifier and address stored in its associated supernode set either by explicitly sending message to its associated supernode set periodically or attaching these information into the query messages. The supernode simply cache these information constructing the bound set. When a regular node leaves, it notifies its associated supernode set its exit so that the supernodes can update their bound set. It also needs to migrate the keys it stores to its successor node. When a regular node dies, its associated supernode set will detect its death by the timeout of the corresponding regular node information.

It is more sophisticated to handle the leaving of supernodes as more information need to be migrated or updated when a supernode leaves or dies compared to what we do in case of regular node leaving. Basically, when a supernode leaves, it will migrate its bound set to its living successor supernode. Also, it has to tell the regular nodes to add one more successor supernode to their associated supernode set to keep the size of the set constant. To avoid the possible high instant traffic due to this operation, each regular node in the bound set of the leaving supernode waits for a random short period before executing this operation.

When a supernode dies, other nodes could not notice this event right at that moment. One straightforward approach to help the living nodes detect the death of a supernode is to let each supernode broadcasts its own identifier and address to other nodes periodically. Obviously, this will incur too much traffic over the Internet. For this reason, we take a lazy update approach to help detect the death of a supernode but avoid the unnecessary message transmission. This approach works as follows. After a supernode dies, as the living supernodes do not know about its death, they will forward the requests for the key held by the bound set of the dead supernode to the dead supernode as if it was alive. These requests will eventually timeout and as a result, the living supernodes forwarding the requests will find out that one supernode is down and update their supernode information accordingly. The same approach can be used by the regular nodes in the bound set of the dead supernode to update their own associated supernode sets. They send requests to the dead supernode as usual but detect the death of their associated supernode by timeout. Once they are aware of the death of their previous associated supernode, they add one more successor supernode to their associated supernode sets. In this approach, broadcasting the information of supernodes is avoided and also we do not need to send the information about a supernode to the nodes that are not interested.

6.4 Some Issues

Reliability When a regular node dies, the keys held by this node will lose. Similarly, if a supernode dies, we lose information about the bound set of this supernode. As a result of these information losing, the query will be disrupted. To guarantee the success of queries, we replicate information needed for forwarding queries. In concrete, each key is replicated in p regular nodes. The queries for a key are almost equally shared by the regular nodes holding the key. Similarly,

each regular node is associated with q supernodes and anyone of these supernodes has the same probability to forward the query to or from the regular node. To determine which values p and q should be so as to achieving an appropriate trade-off between reliability and scalability, a simulation study is necessary.

Scalability Unlike Tapestry etc., where each node participates in routing operation, in Iridium, the routing work is taken by a limited set of supernodes. As a result, Iridium may not scale as well as Tapestry etc. do. One possible reason for this is the space each supernode has is limited. However, to be a first approximation, supposing N is 10^7, $f(N)$ chosen as $N^{1/2}$, q as 10 and each node information needs 12 bytes (6 bytes for IP address and 6 for identifier), each supernode needs only about 760 KB to store the whole bound set as well as the information about all the supernodes. This amount of resource is negligible in practice. Another issue which could possibly prevent Iridium from scaling in practice is the amount of extra traffic supernodes may incur, which includes the messages for routing and for maintenance of the system. To answer this question, we need to perform extensive simulation study under different functions of $f(N)$. On the other hand, regular routing load is reduced heavily helping scalability.

6.5 Summary

In summary, Iridium is designed to provide fast content location service for large-scale peer-to-peer systems. As the design shows, the routing work is taken by a set of supernodes leveraging consistent hashing and a lookup can be done within constant time. We need to perform extensive simulation experiments to study the scalability and reliability of Iridium under various setups and scenarios.

7 Summary

With the increasing use of the Internet for content distribution, caching and replication techniques are receiving more and more attention. These are effective approaches to alleviate congestion on the Internet and to make the Internet more responsive. With many unique features, CDN renders appreciable benefits to the content providers, e.g., the popular web sites. In this report, we studied the core challenging issues involved in designing and building efficient CDNs, especially the content distribution and request routing problems. A scheme for fast service location in peer-to-peer systems is proposed.

Nowadays, new forms of Internet content and services, such as video-on-demand, which requires intensive bandwidth and predictable data transmission delay, are emerging. Meanwhile, the number of content providers turning to CDNs to better service their customers is growing rapidly. These two facts open several new issues to the design and architecture of CDNs in the future, such as support for streaming content or real-time events, scalability, built-in security mechanism, and so forth. The research on these issues are still undergoing and we believe that the successful solutions to these problems will make the next-generation CDNs fly.

References

[Aka] Akamai Technologies, Inc. *A Distributed Infrastructure for e-Business — Real Benefits, Measurable Returns.*

[AR98] Amit Aggarwal and Michael Rabinovich. Performance of dynamic replication schemes for an internet hosting service. Technical Report HPL-2001-8, AT&T Labs, October 1998.

[Aud] Audiogalaxy. http://www.audiogalaxy.com/.

[AWSBL99] William Adjie-Winoto, Elliot Schwartz, Hari Balakrishnan, and Jeremy Lilley. The design and implementation of an intentional naming system. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM Symposium on Operating System Principals*, December 1999.

[Bar96] Yair Bartal. Probabilistic approximation of metric space and its algorithmic applications. In *37th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, October 1996.

[BAZF97] S. Bhattacharjee, M. Ammar, E. Zegura, and Z. Fei. Application-layer anycasting. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'97*, 1997.

[BBM+97] M. Baentsch, L. Baum, G. Molter, S. Rothkugel, and P. Sturm. Enhancing the web infrastructure - from caching to replication. *IEEE Internet Computing*, pages 18–27, Mar-Apr 1997.

[BM98] Micah Beck and Terry Moore. The internet-2 distributed storage infrastructure project: An architecture for internet content channels. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International WWW Caching Workshop*, Manchester, UK, June 1998.

[Bog83] David R. Boggs. Internet broadcasting. Ph.D. Thesis, available as Technical Report CSL-83-3, Xerox Palo Alto Research Center, October 1983.

[CDD] Cdd101: An introduction to content distribution and delivery. http://www.cddcenter.com/101/.

[Cis] Cisco Systems, Inc. *DistributedDirector. White paper.* `http://www.cisco.com/warp/public/734/distdir/dd_wp.htm`.

[CSWH00] Ian Clarke, Oskar Sandberg, Brandon Wiley, and Theodore W. Hong. Freenet: A distributed anonymous information storage and retrieval system. In *Workshop on Design Issues in Anonymity and Unobservability*, pages 46–66, 2000.

[DCTR01] M. Day, B. Cain, G. Tomlinson, and P. Rzewski. A model for content internetworking. Internet-Draft, March 2001.

[edo] edonkey2000. http://www.edonkey2000.com/.

[FBZA98] Zongming Fei, Samrat Bhattacharjee, Ellen W. Zegura, and Mostafa H. Ammar. A novel server selection technique for improving the response time of a replicated service. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM'98*, San Francisco, California USA, March 1998.

[GC01] Mark Gritter and David R. Cheriton. An architecture for content routing support in the internet. In *Proceedings of the 3rd USENIX Symposium on Internet Technologies and Systems(USITS'01)*, San Francisco, CA, USA, March 2001.

[GCR00] Syam Gadde, Jeff Chase, and Michael Rabinovich. Web caching and content distribution: A view from the interior. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Web Caching and Content Delivery Workshop*, Lisbon, Portugal, May 2000.

[GCTT00] M. Green, B. Cain, G. Tomlinson, and S. Thomas. Cdn peering architectural overview. Internet-Draft, November 2000.

[GJ79] Michael R. Garey and David S. Johnson. Computers and intractability. NY, NY:W.H.Freeman and Co., 1979.

[Gnu] Gnutelliums. http://www.gnutelliums.com/.

[GS95] James D. Guyton and Michael F. Schwartz. Locating nearby copies of replicated internet servers. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM'95*, pages 288–298, Cambridge, MA, August 1995.

[JJJ+00] Sugih Jamin, Cheng Jin, Yixin Jin, Danny Raz, Yuval Shavitt, and Lixia Zhang. On the placement of internet instrumentation. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM 2000 Conference*, pages 295–304, Tel-Aviv, Israel, March 2000.

[JJR+01] Sugih Jamin, Cheng Jin, Anthony R.Kure, Danny Raz, and Yuval Shavitt. Contrained mirror placement on the internet. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM 2001 Conference*, Anchorage, Alaska USA, April 2001.

[Kaz] Kazaa. http://www.kazaa.com/.

[KD99] M. Korupolu and M. Dahlin. Coordinated placement and replacement for large-scale distributed caches. In *Proceedings of the 1999 IEEE Workshop on Internet Applications*, June 1999.

[KLL+97] David Karger, Eric Lehman, Tom Leighton, Mathhew Levine, Daniel Lewin, and Rina Panigrahy. Consistent hashing and random trees: Distributed caching protocols for relieving hot spots on the world wide web. In *ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 654–663, May 1997.

[KPR99] M. Korupolu, G. Plaxton, and R. Rajaraman. Placement algorithms for hierarchical cooperative caching. In *Proceedings of 10th ACM-SIAM SODA*, 1999.

[KRR01] Jussi Kangasharju, James Roberts, and Keith W. Ross. Object replication strategies in content distribution network. In *Proceedings of Sixth International Workshop on Web Caching and Content Distribution*, Boston, Massachusetts, June 2001.

[KRS00] P. Krishnan, Danny Raz, and Yuval Shavitt. The cache location problem. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 8(5), 2000.

[KW00] Dina Katabi and John Wroclawski. A framework for scalable global ip-anycast(gia). In *Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2000*, pages 3–15, Stockholm, Sweden, August 2000.

[Nap] Napster. http://www.napster.com/.

[PMM93] Craig Partridge, Trevor Mendez, and Walter Milliken. Host anycasting service. IETF RFC 1546, November 1993.

[QPV01] Lili Qiu, Venkata N. Padmanabhan, and Geoffrey M. Voelker. On the placement of web server replicas. In *Proceedings of IEEE INFOCOM 2001 Conference*, Anchorage, Alaska USA, April 2001.

[RD01] Antony Rowstron and Peter Druschel. Pastry: Scalable, decentralized object location, and routing for large-scale peer-to-peer systems. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2218:329–??, 2001.

[RFH+01] Sylvia Ratnasamy, Paul Francis, Mark Handley, Richard Karp, and Scott Shenker. A scalable content addressable network. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2001*, 2001.

[RGE01] Pavlin Radoslavov, Ramesh Govindan, and Deborah Estrin. Topology-informed internet replica placement. In *Proceedings of Sixth International Workshop on Web Caching and Content Distribution*, Boston, Massachusetts, June 2001.

[sha95] Fips 180-1. secure hash standard. U.S. Department of Commerce/NIST, National Technical Information Service, 1995.

[SMK+01] I. Stoica, R. Morris, D. Karger, M.F. Kasshoek, and H. Balakrishnan. Chord: A scalable peer-to-peer lookup service for internet applications. In *Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM'01*, San Diego, CA, September 2001.

[Vaz99] Vijay Vazirani. Approximation methods. Springer-Verlag, 1999.

[WCS93] David C. M. Wood, Sean S. Coleman, and Michael F. Schwartz. Fremont: A system for discovering network characteristics and problems. In *Proceedings of the USENIX Winder Conference*, pages 335–348, January 1993.

[Wina] Winmx. http://www.winmx.com/.

[Winb] WindDance Networks Corp. *Webchallenger*. `http://www.winddancenet.com/webchallenger/product`

[YCE+97] Chad Yoshikawa, Brent Chun, Paul Eastham, Amin Vahdat, Thomas Anderson, and David Culler. Using smart clients to build scalable services. In *Proceedings of the USENIX 1997 Annual Technical Conference*, Anaheim, California USA, January 1997.

[ZDH+02] B. Zhao, Y. Duan, L. Huang, A. Joseph, and J. Kubiatowicz. Brocade: Landmark routing on overlay networks, 2002.

[ZKJ01] B. Y. Zhao, J. D. Kubiatowicz, and A. D. Joseph. Tapestry: An infrastructure for fault-tolerant wide-area location and routing. Technical Report UCB/CSD-01-1141, UC Berkeley, April 2001.