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1. Introduction

- DDS needs discovery protocols: procedure to put in contact publishers and subscribers
- Discovery is a common problem in distributed networking
- Discovery can compromise the scalability of DDS
- The state of the art in discovery is important to review

New functional relationships and network topologies to consider: centralized, pure and hierarchical peer-to-peer

Optimization techniques: locality, cache and Bloom filters

- **Main goal**: to improve the scalability of DDS discovery protocols by using bloom filter technology and researches in peer-to-peer (P2P)
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2. The State of the Art in Discovery

• Reference Discovery procedures
  
  - *Chord*: a scalable peer-to-peer lookup protocol for internet applications.
  
  - *Pastry*: Scalable, Decentralized Object Location, and Routing for Large-Scale Peer-to-Peer Systems
  
  
  - *Directory Facilitator and Service Discovery Agent (DFSDA)*.
  
  - *Kademlia*: A Peer-to-Peer Information System Based on the XOR Metric.
  
  - LDAP directories.
  
  - *Peer-to-Peer* networks like ed2k or Gnutella

• Adopted terminology
  
  - Client ~ Node ~ Agent
  
  - Server ~ SuperNode ~ DirectoryFacilitator
2. The State of the Art in Discovery

• Discovery procedure issues
  − Functional relationship between the entities of the network
    • Client-Server
    • Centralized peer-to-peer (P2P)
    • Pure P2P
    • Hierarchical P2P
  − Network entities distribution
    • Unstructured topology (ed2k)
    • Ring in Distributed Hash Table (DHT) implementations (Chord, Pastry...)
    • Trees (LDAP Directories)
    • Hierarchical combination (OSDA, DFSDA)
  − Database and information representation and storing
    • DHT
    • Bloom filters
  − Learning, cache and local versus global discovery
2. The State of the Art in Discovery

• Pure P2P are theoretically scalable, but not in practice. For instances
  
  – *Chord* does not scale in scenarios with 2000 nodes
  
  – *Pastry* can turn out to be non-functional given the incurred management traffic overhead.


• Some hierarchical combination uses DHTs to maintain a structure for global discovery
2. The State of the Art in Discovery

- State of the art main conclusions:
  
  1. Pure P2P does not scale well in practice
  
  2. Network entities distribution
  
  3. To reduce network traffic and storage in Database and information representation

  - Hierarchical P2P
  - Hierarchical combination (OSDA)
  - Bloom filters
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3.1. Introduction to Bloom filters

- High Level Ideas
  - Because DDS entities lists can be long and unwieldy to manage
  - We move from: “Give me the list of what you have”
  - to the paradigm of: “Give me information so I can figure out what you have”
  - Bloom filters allow to achieve the new paradigm
- Given a set $S = \{x_1,x_2,x_3,...,x_n\}$ the problem is to answer queries of the form:
  
  Is element $y$ in the set $S$?

- Bloom filter (BF) technology provides answers in:
  - “Constant” time (time to hash).
  - Small amount of space.
  - But with some probability of being wrong (false positives).
3.1. Introduction to Bloom filters

Start with an $m$ bit array, filled with 0s.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Hash each item $x_j$ in $S$ $k$ times. If $H_i(x_j) = p$, set $V[p] = 1$.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

To check if $y$ is in $S$, check $V$ at $H_i(y)$. All $k$ values must be 1.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Possible to have a false positive; all $k$ values are 1, but $y$ is not in $S$.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
\]

Source: Michael Mitzenmacher, "Codes, Bloom Filters, and Overlay Networks"
3.1. Introduction to Bloom filters

- Given a
  - Vector $v$ of size $m$
  - $k$ hash functions, $H_i(x)$
  - A set $S$ with $n$ elements

The probability of a false positive can be expressed as

$$f = \left(1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right)^k\right)^n \approx \left(1 - e^{-kn/m}\right)^k$$
3.1. Introduction to Bloom filters

Some Bloom filters additional issues

• Bloom filters work better when they are not full
• Two design parameters must be tuned
  – $m$ the size of the filter
  – $k$ the number of hash functions
• It is needed to deal with false positives
• Note that to delete an item implies re-building the entire filter
• Depending on $m$ and the size of a key, the updates should be done in different ways:
  – To send the entire filter
  – To send just the updated information change
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3.2. BF practical uses

- **The first BF use was in Spell Check (~70s):**
  - The filter represents a list of valid words
- **Summary Cache** (Cache Digest in Squid)
  - Squid is a high-performance proxy caching server for web clients, supporting FTP, gopher, and HTTP data objects.
  - A **Cache Digest** is a summary of the contents of an Internet Object Caching Server. It contains, in a compact (i.e. compressed) format, an indication of whether or not particular URLs are in the cache.
- **OSDA** *(Open Service Discovery Architecture)*
  - Similar use to Cache Digest
  - Used to reduce network traffic in local and global discovery
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4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

- DDS SDP (*Simple Discovery Protocol*)
- DDS uses **DDS publication** for discovery purposes (different ports are used)
- Two consecutive process:
  - First: **Participant discovery protocol**
  - Secondly: **Endpoint discovery protocol**
- Use of special (Built-in) *Topics* and *DataReader/DataWriter* to advertise participants/publications
- The Discovery process can be tuned with specific *QoS policies*
- Discovered participants/publications are stored in a **local database**
- The discovery process is started from a list of known host
4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

Figure: The Discovery Process phases. Source: DDS-RTPS Interoperability Wire Protocol" document ptc/2006-08-02

4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

- The Participant Discovery Protocol (PDP) (1st discovery stage)
  - PDP is restricted to discover participants in the same *domain*
  - PDP is based on best-effort communications
  - PDP uses `DCPSParticipant` built-in topic to exchange information about participants
  
  - Participant DATA are sent to known peers when a `DomainParticipant` is created/deleted. The remote participant stores the information in an *internal database*.

  - When new Participants DATA are received, the own Participants DATA are sent
4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

- Endpoint Discovery Protocol (EDP) (2\textsuperscript{nd} Discovery Stage)
  - When a new participant is discovered, its EndPoints must be matched
  - **Built-In Topics:** DCPSPublication, DCPSSubscription
  - Two pairs of Built-In Endpoints for:
    - Advertising local Endpoints
    - Discovering remote Endpoints
  - Uses ACK-NACK mechanism for reliability
  - Use of piggybacked Heartbeat to determine liveliness of endpoints
4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

4.1. Discovery Process in DDS

Main problem: **Scalability**

- Storage necessities
- Network traffic

Every node knows every node information

2nd optimization: hierarchical P2P and Bloom filters

1st optimization: Bloom filters

- Summarize the size of information representation
- Every node know a summary of others information

Nodes know a set of others information

- Global and local discovery
- Local cache
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4.2. SDP-Bloom Overview

- In DDS, mostly for those scenarios with a big number of Endpoints in each Participant, we identify two problems to be solved:
  - Memory requirements in nodes.
  - Network traffic.

- We call SDP-Bloom our new SDP variant, which is based on Bloom filter technology.

- Caused by interchanging and storing the complete remote list of Endpoints: “give me all information you have”

- In SDP-Bloom each Participant will send its own Bloom filter which encodes its Endpoint set: “give me the information to know what you have”
4.2.SDP-Bloom Overview

- In SPD-Bloom each Participant stores information of all entities but with significantly smaller size.
- Similarly, network traffic is also reduced.
- However, new problems must be solved:
  - False positives
  - EndPoint Updates
  - CPU cost for building the BF
- When BFs should be sent to the other Participants?
  - First approach: to include the filter in Participant DATA messages of the PDP, and to use EDP to deal with updates and false positives
  - Second approach: to sent the BF in the EDP (seems to be closer to the DDS standard)
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4.3. SDP-Bloom algorithm description

1) Just before enabling the new Participant, a BF is created for representing the Endpoints set.

2) Each time a new local Endpoint is created and enabled, it is added to the filter.

3) The Participant starts discovering remote Participants by using Simple Participant Discovery Protocol.

4) The Participant asserts all new discovered Participants and applies the Endpoint Discovery Protocol.

5) For each remote Participant, it sends its BFs instead of the complete set of local Endpoints. In the same way, it will receive the remote Participant filters and will proceed to match its Endpoints with each filter.
4.4. SDP-Bloom design decisions

- Design decisions: the $m/n$ ratio in our Bloom filter
  - The larger the $m/n$ ratio, the lower error rate
  - While the lower the $m/n$ ratio, the lower BW and memory requirements
  - The relation $n$ (Endpoints/Participant) is the number of keys to include in the filter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Rate</th>
<th>N (Keys)</th>
<th>M (Required Size)</th>
<th>BF (Bytes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5262</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>10215</td>
<td>1277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Note the Error Rate ($f$) is the probability of obtaining a false positive Endpoint in a given Participant.
4.4. SDP-Bloom design decisions

- Design decisions: information updates

  - Participants discovery still working like SDP (soft-state)
  
  - Endpoints are updated publishing changes on-demand:
    
    - Initially, we consider that the Endpoints/Participant relation is so small that is “cheaper” to send the new filter each time.
    
    - Deleting imply to rebuild the filter.
      
      - Counting BF supports deletion, but it probably use too much space
      
      - At the moment we consider to use original Bloom filters
4.4. SDP-Bloom design decisions

• Design decisions: managing false positives
  
  - The matching process consist in test if a Topic bellows to a filter.
  
  - For each desired Endpoint which matches with a filter we can assert the desired remote Endpoint and try to connect with it.
  
  - Normally, we do not have problems, but if it fails we can:
    
    • Obtain the complete remote Endpoint list for this Participant, as Endpoint Discovery Protocol does.
    
    • Ask the remote Participant about this Endpoint.
    
    • **Deduce that we got a false positive and do no assert the Endpoint.**
4.5. SDP-Bloom nodes dialog

start

Build or update the BF

Send BF to the discovered Participants

Match local Endpoint with remote BF

Try to Subscribe

yes

no (fail)

Assert remote Endpoint

Deduce false positive

Wait a refresh time

Local changes

New remote information

End?
- We omit PDP information.
- The BF is sent in a refresh period defined as a QoS parameter.
- The light blue shows the suppressed traffic.

**SDP-Bloom**

Node A

- Participant A DATA
- DataWriter A1 created
- DataWriter A2 created
- DataWriter A3 created
- DataWriter An created

Node B

- Participant B DATA
- Participant A Bloom filter
- Participant C DATA

Node C

- Participant A BF
- Participant A Bloom filter

**Storage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node B</th>
<th>SDP</th>
<th>SDP-Bloom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QoS parameter**

On-demand update

**BF Refresh period**
- Participant A wishes to inform about its Endpoints
- Participant B wishes to match A2, A4 and F
- We omit PDP information

SDP-Bloom

- Participant A creates DataWriter A1
- Participant A creates DataWriter A2
- Participant A creates DataWriter A3
- Participant A creates DataWriter An

B can match A1-N topics, topic F is a false positive
B matches A2, A4, F and tries to subscribe A2, A4, F
B deduces it was a false positive and annotates it
B can match A1, A2, A4, N topics

- SDP
  - SDP-Bloom

Node A

Node B

BF Refresh period
4.6. SDP-Bloom Scalability Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario name</th>
<th>Participants (P)</th>
<th>Topics (T)</th>
<th>Endpoints (E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small System</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium System</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large System</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9100</td>
<td>200000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Motivation and overview

• Pure P2P: DHTs and overlay P2P networks provide replication, fault tolerance and scalability up to 2000 nodes

• Hierarchical P2P
  – **Global discovery.** Global information stored in a DHT.
    • SuperNodes do global discovery according to Nodes petitions
  – **Local discovery.** Each SuperNode “adopts” a set of Nodes
    • The adoption depends of the key assigned in the DHT
    • SuperNodes and Nodes do local discovery in a Domain

• Scalability of Hierarchical P2P:
  – Participants with a short life time should not be included in DHT
  – Only a subset of nodes will be selected in the DHT, then the DHT works better in terms of the cost of maintaining the self structure.
  – Local discovery allows using local cache in each group
5. Hierarchical P2P in DDS Discovery

The Distributed Hash Table in Pure P2P

- Each peer stores a subset of (key, value) pairs in the system
- Core operation: Find node responsible for a key
  - Map key to node
  - Efficiently route insert/lookup/delete request to this node
- Overlay P2P networks: Key Based Routing (KBR) networks
5. Hierarchical P2P in DDS Discovery

The Distributed Hash Table in Hierarchical P2P and DDS:

- The **nodes** in DHT will be the **SuperNodes** in discovery.
- The **resources Key** will be a **Topic**.
- The **value** will be the list of Participants which are interested in a Topic.
- DHT (key, value) = (Topic, Participant list).
- A SuperNode *adopts* a set of Participants interested in the Topics which the SN manages.
- The **replication** and **fault tolerance** of SuperNodes is delegated to the DHT implementation.
5. Hierarchical P2P in DDS Discovery

All the Participants interested in SN p's Topics will receive discovery information via DCPS built-in Topics

SNs replication and fault tolerance is delegated on the DHT

Lookup (T, Participants) in the DHT is $O(\log N)$, where $N =$ number of SuperNodes
5. Hierarchical P2P in DDS Discovery

Discovery Process example:

SuperNode SN1:
- Adopts TopicFoo and manages TopicFoo discovery issues

New Participant interested in TopicFoo:
- The hashed TopicFoo involve been adopted by SN1
- Creates DCPS_TopicFoo built-in endpoints for discovery relation with SN1
- SN1 add the Participant to the (TopicFoo,Participant list) and notifies existing Participants

New Participant interested in TopicBar:
- The hashed TopicBar involve been adopted by SN4
- Created DCPS_TopicBar built-in endpoints for discovery relation with SN4
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6. Conclusions

- In this work we propose to use Bloom filters in DDS discovery.

- While in SDP the consumed traffic depends on the number of topics, by adopting our solution this dependence is relaxed.

- The improvement will be better as the number of topics grows.

- BFs can reduce network traffic and storage requirements

- We have shown preliminarily that hierarchical P2P can be used in DDS discovery.

- We provides replication, better fault tolerance and balanced load.
  - Therefore, it promises even better scalability
Thank you very much
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