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Application Sync Scenarios

- AppStore: server has millions of apps, each user’s phone has a (different) subset of apps
- Facebook: each user interested in a set of feeds
- Subscribe to New York Time news updates
- Twitter, Google+ and etc.
- How to achieve this synchronization efficiently?
Problem Definition

- Data in a data stream: `<prefix>/ <version>`
- Producer: N data streams, \( P = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_N\} \), \( p_i \) is a name prefix
- Consumer: M data streams, \( Q = \{q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_M\} \), \( q_i \) in \( P \) & \( M \leq N \), \( Q \) is Subscription List
  - Subscription list may change over time
- How to synchronize consumer with producer?
Challenges

• Producer:
  • large number of data streams
  • multiple producers, e.g., replicated repos

• Consumer:
  • any subset of producer’s data streams
  • large number of consumers
Naive Solutions

- Consumer sends a pending Interest for each prefix periodically
  - Problem: too many Interests if consumer has a large subscription list

- Consumer syncs all name prefixes the producer has similar to ChronoSync.
  - Two methods:
    - For each different consumer, generate a new sync group with all producers based on consumer’s dataset
    - Consumer learns whole dataset and keep all these information sync’ed
Our Solution

• Producer: finding out what has changed
  • Encodes its data streams’ status in Invertible Bloom Filter (IBF) and sends IBF in Sync Reply
    • Consumer sends back old IBF in Sync Interest
  • Get changes by calculating difference between current IBF and old IBF in Sync Interest

• Consumer: telling producer its subscription list
  • Encodes the subscribed prefixes in Bloom Filter (BF)
  • Sends BF in Sync Interest
    • Producer queries this BF and determines if an update should be sent to a consumer
Protocol design

- Case 1: Producer generates new data
  - Check each consumer’s sync interest and determine whether it is subscribed by them

- Case 2: Producer receives sync interest
  - Producer calculates changes = current IBF - old IBF
  - Sends sync reply if any change is in consumer’s subscription list (BF)
Experiment setup

- Topology: Sprint point of presence
  - 52 nodes, 84 links
  - 1 producer: node with the smallest maximum delay
  - 51 consumers: all nodes other than producer

- Different sizes of subscription listen for consumer: 10, 10000
- Different loss rate: 1%, 5% and 10% loss rate
- Platform: mini-ndn
Evaluation

• Comparison methodology
  • Naive approach: for each prefix in subscription list, consumer sends pending Interest to fetch data with next version in the data stream

• Metrics
  • Delay:
    • Delay to get update notification from producer
    • Delay to fetch new data (including notification delay)
  • Message overhead: Number of total interests in the network
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Related Work

- Chronosync[1]
  - Use digest tree to synchronize participants in a group
  - geared toward full synchronization: all nodes keep knowledge of the whole data streams
- CCNx Sync[2] and iSync[3,4]
  - pair-wise synchronization protocol
  - iSync uses IBF and has lower message overhead than CCNx Sync and ChronoSync
- Existing approaches are not as efficient as PartialSync for large number of subscribers with different and overlapping interest
  - either generate many different Sync groups
  - or sync all the data streams
Conclusion

• PartialSync has significantly lower message overhead than naive solution
• Size of subscription list has little impact on delay and processing overhead of PartialSync
• Under loss condition, PartialSync has similar delays as naive solution
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