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Abstract

Named Function Networking (NFN) extends the named-data approach: Interests typically carry more than one name, for example a function name and the names of the parameter data.

\[
\text{resolve}("/\text{some/data}") \Rightarrow \text{resolve}("/\text{some/fct ( /some/data )}")
\]

The question is whether NFN needs support from the NDN forwarder and the PIT, or whether NFN is just another application sitting on top of the named-data layer.

In this talk we sketch these two architectural paths and provide first insights based on simulation results.
From Named-Data to Named-Functions

- Raw data are more prevalent, but clients want cooked data (highly variable on-demand profile)

- Examples:
  
  `/downScale( /this/video )`
  `/getAverage( /sunShineHours/in/CA, 2014 )`
  `/geoFence( /my/heart/rate, /my/gps/location, 10ft )`

- The goal of Named Function Networking (NFN):
  - clients name the desired computation result, server-agnostically
  - network is in charge of finding execution places (servers)
  - network optimizes execution graph, caches the results
Three tasks: Locate data, fct and exec place; Run; Collect

REMOTE EVAL beats “download and process locally”: find a server close to the DB!

Network does not execute: NFN only orchestrates the computation by juggling around names and triggering exec, later returning the collected result.
Impact of NFN orchestration on the NDN Forwarder, PIT

- NFN intercepts requests, plans execution (∼ database query plan)
- NFN needs richer routing information:
  pick compute servers based on performance, load, data-proximity, ISA support, trust . . . → does not change forwarding per se, but
- NFN interferes with PIT/forwarding/caching mechanics:
  – forward a multi-name plan, not an interest, to select servers
  – trigger execution, wait for the server’s result
  – collect result, return as “content-matching-the-plan”
  – cache results

Can we avoid modifying the forwarder, PIT data structure?
NFN-over-NDN
(or: a desirable feature becoming a disadvantage)

- **NFN as an “app”:** NFN logic placed at client and compute nodes
  - intercept queries, maintain own PIT timeouts,
  - map multiple names to interest’s name field, same for plans
  - maintain a separate routing system (cpu locations, ISA).
  In principle doable (might need modifs of NDN PIT timeouts).

- **But:** How to get data base locations? NDN hides it!
  - conceptual mismatch when doing NFN-over-NDN
  - additional subtle problems: caching of results, effects of timeouts

Our current approach: embrace mix of plain NDN nodes and full NFN nodes (horizontal extension)
Other lessons (from simulations, for NDN-plus-NFN)

- Appropriate timeout values are crucial:
  A fixed PIT timeout leads to planning+exec to be placed close to client, instead of deep in the net.

- Computations can take a long time, fixed timeout not appropriate:
  NACKs should be generalized to “ETA – expected time of arrival” (with infinity meaning NACK), also needed for thunks.

- NACKs are mandatory for good performance of plan execution:
  Otherwise, NFN lacks “strategy triggers”, has to guess unavailability of resources.
Take home messages

1. Named functions as a “natural” extension of named-data

2. NFN-over-NDN problematic: must be able to learn location of data
   → mix plain-NDN, full-NFN nodes: resolution strategy matters
   → other mixes foreseeable: full-NFN, plain-NDN, new-CCN-style

3. Need a NACK, ETA discussion (useful also beyond NFN)

See Jeff Burke’s talk tomorrow: “Open mHealth”, NFN for data filters