

Doctoral Dissertation Academic Year 2013

Analysis of Peer-to-Peer Operation in Content
Delivery

Keio University
Graduate School of Media and Governance

Mohamad Dikshie Fauzie

Summary

Live video streaming has long been projected as the killer application for Internet. In recent years with the deployment of increased bandwidth in the last mile, this promise finally turned into reality. There are competing technologies to deliver live video streaming: CDN (content delivery network) and P2P (peer-to-peer). CDNs provides end-users with the appearance of traditional client server approaches but enable content providers to handle much larger request volumes. At the same time, ISPs can also benefit from deploying CDN servers in their networks as it reduces the total amount of upstream and transit traffic. CDN provide excellent quality to end-users when the workload is within provisioning limits. P2P systems solve the scalability issue by leveraging the resources of the participating peers, while keeping the server requirement low. However, decentralized uncoordinated of P2P operation comes with undesirable side effects: unfairness in the face of heterogeneous peer resources, network unfriendliness, etc. On the other hand, the growth of video traffic is also contribute to increases of power consumption and it's need to be considered.

In this research, BitTorrent as one of the most popular and successful P2P applications in the current Internet is taken as example the study of uncoordinated P2P operation. First problem to be addressed in this research is how to reveal the topology of real BitTorrent swarms, how dynamic the topology is, and how it affects overall behavior. We study of BitTorrent networks, where real-world BitTorrent swarms were measured using a rigorous and simple method in order to

understand the BitTorrent network topology. We propose the usage the BitTorrent Peer Exchange (PEX) messages to infer the topology of BitTorrent swarms listed on a BitTorrent tracker claiming to be the largest BitTorrent network on the Internet, instead of building small BitTorrent networks on testbeds such as PlanetLab and OneLab as other researchers have done. We also performed simulations using the same approach to show the validity of the inferred topology resulted from the PEX messages by comparing it with the topology of the simulated network. Our result, verified using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness of fit test and the likelihood ratio test and confirmed via simulation, show that a power-law with exponential cutoff is a more plausible model than a pure power-law distribution. We also found that the average clustering coefficient is very low, implies the the BitTorrent swarms are close to random networks. BitTorrent swarms are far more dynamic than has been recognized previously, potentially impacting attempts to optimize the performance of the system as well as the accuracy of simulations and analyses.

In the current content delivery architecture, many CDN companies and ISPs adopt hybrid CDN-P2P because the advantage of P2P. In P2P side, peers are organized in a tree based overlay on a per substream basis for live streaming. This ensure that all peers contribute some upload bandwidth. Each CDN server keeps track of clients currently assigned to it to avoid undesirable side effects of P2P. Each client learns about other peers assigned to its designed CDN server. Since in hybrid CDN-P2P architecture some of workload or data delivery are done by peers, therefore CDN server foreseeing the potential power consumption reduction. Second problem to addressed in this research is what's the trade-off of hybrid CDN-P2P architecture compare to CDN. We solve this problem by proposing simple model of power consumption of CDN server and router including the cost of cooling that needed generated from power consumption of CDN server and router. Furthermore, this power reduction can be used for capacity planning of data center.

Finally, proposed methodology can contribute largely to further characterizing

P2P networks and promotion of relaxing capacity planning data center in term of energy consumption by hybrid CDN-P2P.

Keywords: P2P, BitTorrent, Power-Law, CDN, Energy.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the people, who always encourage my research. Prof.Jun Murai, my thesis supervisor who keeps giving the direction of my research and support me with insightful comments. Prof.Kusumoto who giving me the supports. Prof.Osamu Nakamura, who giving me sharp comments of my work. I extremely grateful to Dr.Kenjiro Cho for constructive suggestions. Associate Prof.Rodney Van Meter has been kindly advised me with various research supports. Dr.Achmad Husni Thamrin who supports my research life in SFC everyday. Dr.Shigeya Suzuki who supports me in various ways including some administrative stuffs. Prof.Keiko Okawa who supports me in SFC and gave me opportunity to join School on Internet (SOI) - Asia project and WIDE project.

I am also grateful to Prof.Jin Mitsugi, Prof.Keiji Takeda, Prof.Keisuke Uehara, Dr.Hitoshi Asaeda, Dr.Kotaro Kataoka, Dr.Kenji Saito, Mr.Ucu Maksudi, and Prof. Kilnam Chon. Thanks to all members of SOI-Asia group: Dr.Achmad Basuki, Dr.Shoko Mikawa, Mr.Haruhito Watanabe, Mr.Katsuhiro Hiroba, Mr.Noriatsu Kudo, and SOI-Asia group in Keio Media Design: Mr.Marcos Sadao Maekawa and Mr.Goki Miyakita.

I would also say thank my father, my mother, and my wife for understanding of my extra student time.

Contents

1	Introduction	12
1.1	Background	12
1.2	Challenges	15
1.3	Motivation	16
1.4	Approach	17
1.5	Contribution	19
2	P2P Content Delivery	20
2.1	Introduction	20
2.2	P2P Measurement	27
2.2.1	Measuring BitTorrent	28
2.3	Energy Aspect of P2P Network	32
2.4	Related Work	34
3	Characteristics of BitTorrent Swarms	39
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Measurement Methodology	41
3.2.1	Graph Sampling	42
3.2.2	Experimental Methodology	44
3.2.3	Data Analysis Background	44
3.3	Experimental Results	45
3.3.1	Power-law Distribution of Node Degree	46

CONTENTS 2

3.3.2	Alternative Distributions	47
3.3.3	Clustering Coefficient	53
3.4	Confirmation via Simulation	55
3.5	Summary	57
4	Peer-Assisted Content Delivery	59
4.1	Introduction	59
4.2	Estimating Internet VoD Popularity Phase	61
4.3	System Description	64
4.4	Evaluation	65
4.4.1	Simulation Design	66
4.4.2	Result and Discussion	68
4.5	Summary	76
5	Energy Savings in Peer-Assisted CDN	77
5.1	Motivation	77
5.2	System Description	78
5.2.1	Live Streaming	78
5.2.2	Peer-Assisted Online Storage	81
5.2.3	Energy Model	84
5.3	Result and Analysis	87
5.3.1	Numerical Parameters	87
5.3.2	Live Streaming Service	88
5.3.3	Online Storage	91
5.4	Summary	95
6	Conclusion and Future Work	97
6.1	Conclusion	97
6.2	Future Work	99

<i>CONTENTS</i>	3
Appendices	100
A Some Detail on BitTorrent Terminology	101
A.1 Torrent File	101
A.2 Handshake	102
A.3 HAVE	103
A.4 BITFIELD	103
A.5 PEX	103
B Likelihood Ratio Test	105

List of Figures

2.1	Building block of BitTorrent. L term refer to Leecher and S term refer to Seeder. In a very popular torrent swarm, it is very common that seeder can be more than 40000 seeders and leecher can be more than 50000. While 'get torrent' and 'fetch torrent file' only happen in the beginning of process when a peer join to BitTorrent swarm, the announce step will be repeated for every 30 minutes per BitTorrent specification.	21
2.2	P2P Technologies Building Block. This graph is adapted from [47] with modification.	23
2.3	Hierarchical P2P Network.	25
2.4	BitTorrent tracker crawling: The BitTorrent crawler fetch the torrent file from BitTorrent portals. Using information from torrent file, the BitTorrent crawler contacts the BitTorrent tracker by sending announce message. The BitTorrent tracker will reply by giving list of seeders and leechers. This process is repeated until obtain all the peers in the swarm.	29
2.5	Peer crawling: The initial process is same with the BitTorrent tracker crawling with additional steps for the BitTorrent crawler to contact all the peers in the swarm by sending handshake request. The contacted peers will reply by sending BITFIELD message and HAVE message.	31

2.6 Cascade effect: 1 watt energy saving in server component can reduce 2.8 watt energy in total facility level. This figure adapted from [29]	34
3.1 Simplified view of our approach. Left: At time t=1, the actor gets a PEX message from peer A and learns that peer A is connected to peer B and C. At t=2, the actor gets PEX messages from peers C and A. The actor learns that now peer A is connected to peer D. Thus the actor knows the properties of peer A at t=1 and t=2.	41
3.2 CDF plot of number of peers for the 50 swarms during measurement.	46
3.3 Node degree fit for snapshots of two torrents, with three fits shown in log scale.	48
3.4 CDF plot of p value of K-S statistics.	48
3.5 Scatter plot of p value vs ρ value. We divide this figure into three areas where the borders are vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ and horizontal line $p = 0.1$. p is goodness-fit of test for power-law model, if $p \geq 0.1$ power-law model is good model for data set. ρ is significance test for nested hypothesis. if $\rho \geq 0.1$ then there is no significant difference between the likelihood of the data under the two hypotheses being compared. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ there is significant difference between the likelihood of the data under the two hypotheses being compared. 52% of points lie in area 1, thus an alternative model may be plausible for these points.	49

- 3.6 Scatter plot of p value vs log-likelihood ratio (LR) for $\rho < 0.1$. We divide this figure into four areas where the borders are vertical line $LR = 0$ and horizontal line $p = 0.1$. p is goodness-fit of test for power-law model, if $p \geq 0.1$ power-law model is good model for data set. ρ is significance test for nested hypothesis. LR is the sign of likelihood ratio value. if LR is negative, there is a significant difference in the likelihoods and the alternative model is better. 58% of points lie in area 3 and 42% lie in area 4. Because area 3 and 4 are negative value of LR, the alternative model is better. 50
- 3.7 CDF plot of ρ value of log-likelihood ratio test for power-law v.s log-normal. We divide the figure into two areas with vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ as border. Under nested hypothesis, ρ value is significance value of observed sign of likelihood ratio. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ then the sign of log-likelihood ratio is a good indicator of which model is the better fit to the data. In this figure, only 13% of ρ values are less than 0.1. Since 87% of ρ values are more than 0.1, the sign of log-likelihood ratio is not good indicator and the test does not favor either model over the other. 52
- 3.8 Scatter plot p values v.s log-likelihood ratio (LR) for likelihood test for power-law vs log-normal. In this figure, we show the log-likelihood ratio (LR) values for $\rho \leq 0.1$. Since the LR values are negative, the alternative distribution (log-normal) is not better than power-law model. 53

3.9 CDF plot of ρ value of log-likelihood ratio test for power-law v.s exponential. We divide the figure into two areas with vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ as border. Under nested hypothesis, ρ value is significance value of observed sign of likelihood ratio. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ then the sign of log-likelihood ratio is a good indicator of which model is the better fit to the data. In this figure, only 5.5% of ρ values are less than 0.1. Since 94.5% of ρ values are more than 0.1, the sign of log-likelihood ratio is not good indicator and the test does not favor either model over the other.	54
3.10 Scatter plot p values v.s log-likelihood ratio (LR) for likelihood test for power-law vs exponential. In this figure, we show the log-likelihood ratio (LR) values for $\rho \leq 0.1$. Since the LR values are negative, the alternative distribution (exponential) is not better than power-law model.	55
3.11 CDF plot of the clustering coefficient for each torrent.	56
3.12 α estimation and p value for global topology and topology inferred from PEX where both done in our simulator.	57
4.1 Time to peak empirical distribution [7].	61
4.2 View rate distribution versus week relative to at-peak phase week for every video, where y-axis in log scale. Every point lies in negative x-axis mean view rate of every video in before-peak phase. Every point lies in x-axis= 0 mean view rate of every video at-peak phase. Every point lies in positive x-axis mean view rate of every video in after-peak phase.	61
4.3 Transformation of view rate distribution. We add week number and make it as x -axis, View rate as y -axis, and relative week to peak as z -axis.	62

4.4	2D visualization of view rate distribution after transformation where <i>x</i> -axis is week number, <i>y</i> -axis is view rate.	63
4.5	Peer interaction in simulator. When a peer requests a video, it always goes to a CDN server (step 1). The CDN provides the videos to the peer (step 2). If there is another peer request same video, that request will go to CDN (step 3). A CDN will check its record to see if there is some peers cache that requested video. If there is some peers cache that requested video, a CDN will reply with redirect message that asking a peer to download requested video from other peer (step 4). If there s no peers have requested video, a CDN will serve the video. A peer then can request the video to other peer and get the video (step 5 and step 6).	65
4.6	Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario A (<i>y</i> -axis in log-scale).	68
4.7	Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario B (<i>y</i> -axis in log-scale).	68
4.8	Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario C (<i>y</i> -axis in log-scale).	69
4.9	Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario A (<i>y</i> axis in log-scale).	69
4.10	Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario B (<i>y</i> axis in log-scale).	70
4.11	Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario C (<i>y</i> axis in log-scale). In model we found many zero replica when a peer requests a video. Because we use log-scale in this figure, the zero numbers can not be viewed.	70
4.12	Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario A.	71
4.13	Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario B.	71
4.14	Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario C.	72
4.15	Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario A.	72
4.16	Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario B.	73

4.17 Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario C	73
5.1 Example model of peer-assisted online storage architecture.	79
5.2 Example model of peer-assisted online storage architecture.	81
5.3 COP curve for the chilled water cooling units from HP Lab utility data center. As the target temperature of the air the cooling unit pumps into the floor plenum increases, the COP increases.	86
5.4 Simplified physical representation flow of data.	88
5.5 Power consumption for the server, router, peer, and total system for CDN architecture. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.	89
5.6 Power consumption for the server, router, peer and total system for peer-assisted CDN with $N_s^u = 0.75$. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.	90
5.7 Savings in power consumption between CDN architecture and peer- assisted CDN for server with $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$	91
5.8 Savings in power consumption between CDN architecture and peer- assisted CDN for total system with $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$	92
5.9 Power consumption for lower bound strategy. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.	93
5.10 Savings in power consumption between each bandwidth allocation and CDN architecture for total and server. Note that the server and router energy (data center) are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale. .	94

5.11 Power consumption for total (left axis) and router (right axis) under different server bandwidth allocation strategies when peer arrival rate of less popular varies. We use fixed server bandwidth $S = 50$ MBps.	95
---	----

List of Tables

2.1	Comparison of Measurement Techniques in BitTorrent.	28
4.1	Percentage of Cached events and Not-Cached events in Model and PROP	74
4.2	Percentage of Video Phase for Model in cached and not-cached events	75
5.1	Numerical Simulation Parameters.	87

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Background

Internet-based multimedia content delivery enables users to watch desired content from any location at any point of time. With the increasing capacities of end-user devices and faster Internet connections, the popularity of such services is growing steadily. Cisco VNI predicts that video streaming will significantly outweigh other types of consumer Internet traffic, such as file sharing, Web, Voice over IP (VoIP), and online gaming [9]. Contrary to file transfers, video streaming enables users to watch the video while downloading it, which imposes strict requirements on the delivery infrastructure. The users expect a performance similar to the traditional television with short startup delays and without performance degradations or playback stalling during watching. This is exacerbated by the growing requirements on video quality, such as higher resolutions and additional features (high-definition and 3D videos). The higher quality typically results in increased video bitrates that require higher download bandwidth. Contrary to file transfers, video streaming enables users to watch the video while downloading it, which imposes strict requirements on the delivery infrastructure. The users expect a performance similar to the traditional television with short startup delays and without performance degradations.

tions or play-back stalling during watching. This is exacerbated by the growing requirements on video quality, such as higher resolutions and additional features (high-definition and 3D videos). The higher quality typically results in increased video bitrates that require higher download bandwidth.

Today users are increasingly able to consume videos directly from their TV screens using Internet-enabled Set-top Boxes (STBs) such as digital video recorders, game consoles, or other entertainment devices. Questions arise as which delivery architecture is able to provide this vast amount of video content to end-user devices and which mechanisms are required to make this architecture scalable and cost-efficient. Common solutions are centralized and decentralized delivery architectures employing various mechanisms to deliver video streams to end-users. These delivery architectures build overlay networks on top of the underlying Internet infrastructure. The simplest architecture for video streaming is based on the centralized client-server model. Here (one or many) video servers send a separate video stream to each client, which results in high bandwidth costs for popular content and potential scalability issues for large numbers of concurrent users. The peer-to-peer (p2p) paradigm offers a promising alternative to pure server-based video distribution networks. Here, the users, called peers¹, not only consume but also provide services to other peers. The application of the p2p paradigm to video streaming uses peers resources, such as local storage, computational power, and bandwidth, to reduce the load and costs of content servers. In the extreme case of pure p2p streaming, there are no dedicated servers anymore and all services are provided by regular peers. If we consider a commercial streaming system, a pure p2p solution turns out to be insufficient because it lacks important properties such as service guarantees for users, security, and control by the content provider. In order to overcome these limitations, a peer-assisted architecture can combine content servers and peers intelligently.

In order to understand the relationships between entities in P2P-CDN ecosystem and to identify the possible tensions, we must understand their roles in the architec-

ture:

- Overlay providers contribute the initial content and host servers for content injection and indexing. In a pure commercial scenario the overlay provider also acts as a content provider, while in a scenario with user-generated content the content is contributed by users that upload it to content servers. Typically, an overlay provider receives certain payments for the hosted content, either directly from users (usage-dependent or subscription-based) or indirectly via advertisements.
- Users consume the streamed videos but also provide their resources to the system, such as upload bandwidth, local storage space, and online time. The users typically pay flat-rate fees for the Internet access, which explains why they allow an overlay provider to use their upload bandwidth.
- Network operators provide infrastructure for Internet access and receive flat-rate payments from the users for this service. Typical delivery overlays span several network domains controlled by different network operators. Therefore, network operators must manage both the internal and external traffic flows to avoid congestion and excessive payments for traffic transit.

A peer-assisted solution shifts the main load of content delivery from the overlay providers servers to users. However, the actual delivery costs are shifted from the overlay providers to the network operators. The reason is the widespread acceptance of flat-rate based pricing for the Internet access. These pricing schemes allow network operators to attract users and to sell high-speed Internet connections. But peer-assisted overlays can also lead to bottlenecks and link congestions, since the Internet architecture is built for the client-server traffic pattern where the traffic flows from content servers to the users. In the last years, the management of overlay traffic that crosses the boundaries of network operators domains has gained a lot of attention in the research community. Thereby, various traffic management meth-

ods have been proposed to relieve the tension between the overlays and network operators. However, most of them fail to satisfy the demands of both parties.

1.2 Challenges

In this section, we discuss the specific challenges of peer-assisted. Most of these challenges arise from the necessity to achieve quality of service (QoS) comparable to the current client-server systems, while using the limited resources of unreliable peers.

- Limited resources of an individual peer compared to a typical server mean that the resources of many peers must be combined to serve the same streaming request. This applies in particular to the upload bandwidth, which is typically much smaller than the download bandwidth.
- Heterogeneity of peers in terms of their resources and behavior. For example, the upload capacity is a resource that differs between the users and affects the systems performance significantly.
- Lack of service guarantees at peers makes it difficult to ensure a quality streaming experience to the users (comparable to well-dimensioned server-based sys- tems). In a commercial scenario, in contrast to pure p2p-based systems, all users should be able to receive the quality they paid for, which makes the coupling between the peers contribution of resources and received streaming quality undesirable.
- Missing or insufficient incentives for users to contribute their resources are a common issue for p2p-based systems. In a commercial scenario, it can be partially solved by offering rewards or discounts for contributed resources. For example, a peer might get certain credits for each megabyte of data up- loaded to other peers. However, this does not solve the issue of users that

should remain online in order to provide content availability.

- Energy consumption is becoming an important challenge for content delivery.
While various approaches were proposed to increase the energy efficiency of servers and routers in terms of reduced power consumption, the same issue applies for the users devices. One interesting aspect here is whether an idle peer should stay online to serve new requests or leave the system. While the first option would maximize the peers contribution to the system, the second option would save energy that might be wasted if the services of this peer are not required.
- Negative impact on the network infrastructure is another issue in peer-assisted and pure p2p delivery architectures. Most p2p and peer-assisted overlays apply their own application level routing mechanisms that might have undesired effects on the underlying network such as congested links or high costs for the transit traffic.

1.3 Motivation

P2P as in this case BitTorrent as the most popular filesharing applications dominated the Internet traffic and is still growing even though recent studies suggest that its growth slower than the growth of Internet traffic and its proportion to the Internet traffic is declining. This popularity reflects the robustness and efficiency of the BitTorrent protocol. These characteristics of BitTorrent come from its peer and piece selection strategies to distribute large files efficiently.

Many properties of BitTorrent such as upload, download performance, peer arrival and departure have been studied but only few research have assessed the topological properties of BitTorrent. The BitTorrent system is different from other P2P systems. The BitTorrent protocol does not offer peer traversal and the BitTorrent tracker also does not know about the relationship between peers since peers never

sending information to the tracker concerning their connectivity with other peer. While a crawler can be used in other P2P networks such as Gnutella, in BitTorrent we can not easily use a crawler to discover topology, making direct measurement of the topology very difficult and challenging. This BitTorrent swarm topologies reflects peer behavior. The peer relationship behavior is very important as a basis to design controllable P2P system that to be used together with other system for example peer assisted CDN or peer assisted cloud.

In the current modern content delivery, CDN providers tend to combine P2P with CDN in order to help the scaling the services, especially related to traffic or bandwidth saving. It has been done by for example: Akamai and Pando networks. The bigger issue is not traffic or bandwidth that relatively easy to fulfilled by adding network card into router or adding more servers, instead energy consumption by CDN provider itself inside data center. Since the Internet traffic grows, demand for scaling is also grow thus demand for energy is also grow. This growing is constrained by energy supply in data center. The usage of peer assisted CDN can be seen not only for helping scaling the services, but there is potential to reduce the energy consumption furthermore this reduction can relax energy budget inside data center.

1.4 Approach

The key factors in this research are: (1) characterization of peer dynamic in P2P systems, (2) simulation of peer-assisted CDN, and (3) energy consumption trade-off in the using of P2P to assist CDN server.

P2P Swarm Dynamics

The real-world BitTorrent swarms were measured using a rigorous and simple method in order to understand the BitTorrent topology. To our knowledge, our approach is the first to perform such a study on real-world the BitTorrent network topologies.

We used the BitTorrent peer exchange (PEX) messages to infer the topology of Bit-Torrent swarms listed on a BitTorrent tracker claiming to be the largest BitTorrent network on the Internet, instead of building small BitTorrent networks on testbed such as PlanetLab or OneLab as other researchers have done. We also performed simulations using the same approach to show the validity of the inferred topology resulted from the PEX messages by comparing it with the topology of the simulated network.

Peer-Assisted CDN

The goal of peer-assisted CDN is to help the delivery of content by peer-to-peer network. In this work, we did a simulation how peer-assisted CDN can deliver the content that involved 100000 peers and with a catalog that consists 10000 videos. Our model is an improvement from previous researcher [21]. We found that our peer-assisted CDN model can increase peer contribution while maintaining optimal number of replicas. Increasing of peer contributions will impact to the energy usage in CDN side. The CDN side can reduce the workload because some workload of content delivery done by peers.

Energy Consumption of peer assisted CDN

As intermediate step in merging between P2P and CDN, this research introduce energy consumption trade-off in peer-assisted CDN. We analyze the characteristics and the requirements of peer-assisted CDN for live streaming and peer-assisted CDN for online storage. Then we propose energy consumption model for both peer-assisted CDN architectures. To be able to validate the result, we use model from both architectures that currently running on the Internet which are LiveSky [72] and FS2you [14].

1.5 Contribution

This dissertation makes contributions for enabling analysis into integration of P2P services and CDN services.

- For P2P, we propose new and effective methodology to infer BitTorrent swarm topologies. We show that gathering BitTorrent swarm topologies is important as step to understand peer behavior.
- For Peer-assisted CDN, we show by a simulation that our model can increase peer contribution while maintaining optimum number of replicas compared to previous work by another researchers.
- For energy trade-off, we show that both peer-assisted CDN architecture have different in energy characteristics that can be used as considering model in the service integration between P2P and CDN, furthermore this model can use by CDN provider as basis for: capacity planning in data center and incentive planning to customer who will run peer-assisted mode in home gateway.

Chapter 2

P2P Content Delivery

2.1 Introduction

P2P applications such as Napster, Gnutella, FastTrack, BitTorrent, Skype and PPLive, have attracted the end users. According to the P2P paradigm, the P2P network is formed by peers that equally share the computing resources in a cooperative manner. Each peer contributes of its resources such as network bandwidth, storage, etc. As the nodes of P2P grows, the capacity of the network grows, too because many peers join to the network. This enables a P2P application is cheap and it can be used for content delivery.

We noted that the popular P2P file sharing applications are Gnutella, eDonkey, and BitTorrent. Gnutella is one of the earliest P2P file sharing applications in the Internet. Gnutella is pure P2P applications that do not use a centralized server. A Gnutella peer joins the network via at least one known peer. That known peer IP address is obtained via pre-configured addresses. From this initial Gnutella peer, we can discover new Gnutella peers. The Gnutella peer will send the search request to all connected peers. The recipient peer will answer the query if it knows anything. The recipient peer can forward the request to other peers if it does not know the answer. Thus, The query will propagate among the Gnutella network. Therefire




Figure 2.1: Building block of BitTorrent. L term refer to Leecher and S term refer to Seeder. In a very popular torrent swarm, it is very common that seeder can be more than 40000 seeders and leecher can be more than 50000. While 'get torrent' and 'fetch torrent file' only happen in the beginning of process when a peer join to BitTorrent swarm, the announce step will be repeated for every 30 minutes per BitTorrent specification.

Gnutella will floods the network for searching.

Other P2P applications is eDonkey. This applications is very popular in Europe.

The eDonkey network operates as a hybrid P2P and server. The eDonkey network consists number of clients and number of servers. IP address of server is usually pre-configured when user installing the applications for the first time. If users want to change the server, user can read on eDonkey web portal. The eDonkey server is working as a index files and for distributing IP addresses of other eDonkey peers to the eDonkey users.

BitTorrent was created in 2002 by Bram Cohen. It runs on an open protocol

specification thus there a lot of BitTorrent implementation. To share a file or a set of files through BitTorrent, a torrent file must be created for the first time. The torrent file contains the information of the content, which includes the information of the tracker and the hashes of the file blocks to be distributed. The torrent file is usually distributed via BitTorrent web portals. When a client wants to get a file that shared in BitTorrent web portals, it must obtain the torrent file from BitTorrent portals. The client then contacts the trackers listed in the torrent file to obtain a list of peers that are sharing the file at the same time. The announce step as shown in Fig.2.1 is also a tool for peer to get current state of tracker e.q list of seeders and leechers. BitTorrent specification defines minimum announce interval 30 minutes [52]. This process from initial phase to join BitTorrent swarm is shown in Fig.2.1 BitTorrent has generated great enthusiasm for P2P file sharing distribution due to simplicity. Many open source software projects use BitTorrent to distribute their applications which is quite big enough (equal or than CD disk space). Important terms in BitTorrent are a seeder is a client who has complete chunks/blockss and a leecher is a client who download the chunks/blocks.

Beside of P2P for filesharing, we also noted that P2P for streaming is also on the rise especially in China. The target of P2P streaming is to build a scalable P2P platform for TV/music delivery. More than a dozen companies are actively working in this area for example UUSe, PPLive, PPStream. Let's take PPLive as an example since it is the most popular P2P streaming service. According to [23] in 2007, the number of concurrent users for the most popular PPLive session raises to 1.5 million and aggregate bandwidth up to 100Gb/s. When the PPLive client is launched by users, it retrieves from a channel servers the metadata information of all channels. After users choose the channel, the PPLive client further talks to a tracker of that channel. Next the trackers will give a list of peers that are watching the same channel. After getting a list of peers, the PPLive client connects to a set of peers, and starts to exchange data. The challenge in P2P streaming is to provide




Figure 2.2: P2P Technologies Building Block. This graph is adapted from [47] with modification.

a sustained streaming bit rate to all peers joining the network. In P2P streaming available bandwidth is very important. Insufficient bandwidth can cause poor video quality.

Due to complexity of P2P, many building blocks of P2P technology that need to explore related to content delivery. Figure 2.2 shows the presentation of P2P technologies building block. The bottom level provides the basic networking abstractions, i.e., the P2P overlay networks. The middle level provides additional P2P services for delivery and management (including searching). Above them, we can see P2P applications which work on the top of previous blocks. Additional overlay abstractions can be exist in the middle to help delivery process. For examples: mesh structure and gossip service. Finally, security, trust and cooperation are seen as cross-layer issues including the mismatches between P2P applications cooperation and ISPs.

All P2P networks run on top of the Internet. We often consider the P2P network as an overlay network on the top of Internet. We can classify overlay to: structured, unstructured, and hierarchical. In structured overlays, the network is formed in a particular structure. The function of structured overlay is for storing and locating

objects based on defined virtual address space. The space is organized according to a given geometry which defines neighbourhood relationship between peers. For example Pastry [50], which organized peers in a logical ring and pastry's address is a position in the ring.

In unstructured systems, the unstructured overlay do not form any a fixed structure in the network. Unstructured overlay networks is typically close to random graphs. This is due to nature of every P2P applications that choose neighbors in random. In unstructured P2P networks, peers usually do have not the same role with other peers and a peer can choose any other peers as neighbor to the some degree of freedom. In hierarchical overlay network, the network is built in an unstructured architecture with superpeers. The superpeers is forming the top level and ordinary peers the bottom level. In hierarchical overlay network, peers are organized in different groups and each group can runs its own overlay. A top-level of overlay can be formed by one representative per group. This architecture will flexible than conventional unstructured with superpeers as a group can form a different overlay network either structured or unstructured. Figure 2.3 shows conceptual of hierarchical P2P network.

Searching for content in overlay network is one of the key services in P2P. Index is a keyword in searching inside P2P network. In P2P networks, indices can be centralized, localized, or distributed. In structured overlay network centralized indices typically rely on a unique entity. In unstructured overlay network localized indices is usually use for searching. Therefore, a query looking for a particular content must be propagated among peers. However, indexing does not solve content poisoning problem in P2P.

In structured overlay networks, due to fix structured form, this networks can provide the support for exact match queries. Let's take Distributed Hash Table (DHT) for example. It has key and address of available content therefore a search operation results is fast and efficient.




Figure 2.3: Hierarchical P2P Network.

Replication is tied with P2P networks. Let's take example in BitTorrent. If a user download content in BitTorrent, it means that user replicated the contents. The block of content that already downloaded replicated in his/her PC and that block can be downloaded by other peers that need. Consistency is important in BitTorrent, that's why BitTorrent provide hash for every block for checking the right block and reject bad block from fake content.

Gossiping is a simple and effective mechanism to spread the information. In P2P overlay networks, each peer participating in a gossiping process contacts of other peers in random and exchange the information between them. Gossiping can be in push or pull mode. Most of P2P applications working on both modes. In BitTorrent implementation gossiping is in push and pull mode and the set of peers to contact is chosen at random.

Another important aspect in security of P2P is related to trust, and particularly to establishment of reputation. Establishing reputation of peers requires collecting information about previous interactions. For example, BitTorrent tracker usually has log to record the peers behavior. If a peer has bad upload/download ratio, BitTorrent tracker can blacklist that peer to join the BitTorrent swarm since the tit-for-tat policy of BitTorrent is the basis of cooperation enforcement. We introduce private BitTorrent swarm term where user can join BitTorrent swarms by paying a membership. In private BitTorrent swarm, the trust is very important. Any member who can not fulfill the requirement (e.g minimum upload bandwidth, minimum uptime after finishing download) can be blocked from BitTorrent swarm.

We highlight an important aspect related to the impact of P2P technologies on ISP policies (cross layer issues). P2P solutions are network agnostic, in the sense that they do not take any consideration the layer 3 of the network paths. Having agnostic P2P solutions can cause problems at different levels to ISPs. It has been shown that blind selections of neighbors in P2P networks may result in unnecessary traversal of multiple links inside an ISP. Furthermore, it can significantly impact on the shape and amount of traffic among different ISPs, which may result being quite different from what foreseen in ISPs peering agreements. Although, many solution to this problem are exist, the implementations are still not deployed widely.

While algorithms and mechanism in P2P system has been analyzed by many researchers, measurement of P2P is other aspect that important to do. First example: in cross layer issue, P2P is often blind in selection of neighbors in P2P networks that affect underlying ISP's traffic engineering policies. This effect can only seen if we have good real measurement instead doing simulation. Second example: in BitTorrent economic model, researchers wants to understand the content publishing phenomena. The growing popularity of BitTorrent is primary due to the availability of valuable content without any cost for users. However, publishing valuable content has legal implications for the users who publish the content. This raise the

question that if content publisher behave in altruistic manner or financial incentives. This question can only be answered by doing measurement in real BitTorrent swarm.

Energy was another aspect that is quite separated from current P2P research but now that topic becomes to rise. While popularity of P2P is decline because users now the content to the cloud, in some region P2P filesharing (e.g. BitTorrent) applications is still popular. Even now content providers, CDN providers, and ISPs are actively exploring the use of peer-to-peer (P2P) technologies to distribute content to homes as a means of reducing both file download times and the energy consumption of data centers. This approach pushes the energy use out of the data centers and into the homes of content consumers including P2P based applications that run on mobile devices. With million house are connected to the Internet and million mobile devices are also connected to the Internet, it is very important to consider energy consumption in P2P network.

2.2 P2P Measurement

BitTorrent is the most successful Peer-to-Peer (P2P) application and was responsible for a major portion of Internet traffic in the past. This has attracted the interest of the research community to evaluate the performance and the demographic aspects of BitTorrent. Example current popular an application that use BitTorrent like protocol is Spotify which is a very popular streaming music application in Europe and US. BitTorrent has been largely studied using simulations, models and real measurements. Although simulations and modelling are easier to perform, they typically simplify the problems and they are likely to miss some of the effects which occur in real BitTorrent swarms. Several techniques have been used in order to measure different aspects of BitTorrent so far. Since many popular applications work based on BitTorrent like protocol these days, we will focus on it.

2.2.1 Measuring BitTorrent

In this sub section we describe the BitTorrent measurement techniques defined in the literature so far. We classify them into two main categories macroscopic and microscopic depending on the retrieved information. Table 2.1 shows the summary of different techniques on BitTorrent measurement.

Table 2.1: Comparison of Measurement Techniques in BitTorrent.

Property	Portal crawling	Tracker crawling	Peers crawler
Scope	macroscopic	macroscopic	microscopic
Information level	torrents level	demographics and general performance	peer level performance
Cost of crawler preparation	low	medium	high
Obtained result details	basic	medium	high
Peers population results	-	high	very high

Macroscopic Technique

The goal macroscopic technique is to understand the demographics of the BitTorrent ecosystem for example the type of published content, the popularity of the content, the distribution of BitTorrent users per country, etc. The macroscopic measurement allows us to get the performance information such as the ratio of between seeder to leechers, the session time of the BitTorrent users, the seedless state (period the torrent is without seeder) duration, etc. We can classify the macroscopic techniques into two categories: BitTorrent portals crawling and BitTorrent trackers crawling.

- BitTorrent portals crawling: The (major) BitTorrent portals index millions of torrents in a structured way. They provide detailed information about each indexed torrent on a specific torrent web page. Once we know the how BitTorrent portals indexing the torrents, we can crawl the BitTorrent portals using that index. If we want to analyze the demographics of BitTorrent, we need to crawl a large number of torrents. This is take time since millions of torrents exist in BitTorrent portals, every second a new torrent can be published




Figure 2.4: BitTorrent tracker crawling: The BitTorrent crawler fetch the torrent file from BitTorrent portals. Using information from torrent file, the BitTorrent crawler contacts the BitTorrent tracker by sending announce message. The BitTorrent tracker will reply by giving list of seeders and leechers. This process is repeated until obtain all the peers in the swarm.

to BitTorrent portals (including fake torrent). By processing the data from the BitTorrent crawling, we can get the information related to BitTorrent demographics. For example: content popularity distribution, distribution of published content, and publishing rate of new torrents. It's depends on BitTorrent web portals, some BitTorrent portals do not give detail information about the torrent information.

- BitTorrent trackers crawling: While crawling BitTorrent portals can give us information about the torrent type and torrent publisher and some number of seeders and leechers, that technique is not sufficient for more detail information such as distribution of users per country or performance relevant information such as peers arrival rate and peers session time. To get that

information, we need to collect IP address of seeders and leechers in the Bit-torrent swarms. This information can only get from BitTorrent tracker logs by asking to BitTorrent tracker owners or by crawling the BitTorrent tracker. Figure 2.4 shows the schematic of BitTorrent tracker crawling. First, a BitTorrent crawler needs to download torrent file from BitTorrent portal. Next, a BitTorrent crawler send announce message to BitTorrent tracker and BitTorrent tracker will reply by giving list of seeders IP address and list of leechers IP address. A BitTorrent crawler send announce message again to BitTorrent tracker. Since BitTorrent tracker has been recorded the IP address of the BitTorrent crawler, BitTorrent tracker will reply by giving list of leechers IP address only. This process repeat as many as possible to get list of leechers IP address. If a BitTorrent crawler send too many announce message, BitTorrent tracker will block the BitTorrent crawler. Hence, this technique must be done in friendly way for BitTorrent tracker. Another challenge is in BitTorrent the peers do not have a permanent peer-id. Everytime BitTorrent client is started a new random peer-id is generated thus it is very difficult to follow a peer using its peer-id. On the other since most of the BitTorrent client is home user which the IP address is assigned in a dynamic way by ISP, identifying peers by their IP address can introduce inaccuracies.

Microscopic Technique

While in macroscopic techniques we can get the peers IP level information, that information does not sufficient to infer more detail performance metrics at the peer level such as peers download and upload rate, and how peers can connect each other (graph of the network). To get this information, we need more sophisticated techniques that implement wire level BitTorrent protocol since the crawling techniques in this case means join directly to BitTorrent swarm. Figure 2.5 shows the schematic functionality of peer crawling. In this peer crawling technique, a BitTorrent crawler




Figure 2.5: Peer crawling: The initial process is same with the BitTorrent tracker crawling with additional steps for the BitTorrent crawler to contact all the peers in the swarm by sending handshake request. The contacted peers will reply by sending BITFIELD message and HAVE message.

get the IP address of peers participating in a swarm. The initial process is same with tracker crawling. Afterwards, the BitTorrent crawler contact each peer and performs the handshake procedure. Handshake message must be the first message sent by BitTorrent client to other peers. The contacted peers will reply by sending BITFIELD and HAVE message. From handshake response we can get information if the peers is using public IP address space or behind NAT. Basically if contacted peers response to the BitTorrent crawler then that peers is using public IP address space and if that peers silent then that peers are behind NAT. From BITFIELD message we can get information about peers type: seeder or leecher. By measuring the time between the reception of two consecutive HAVE messages from a peer, the BitTorrent crawler can calculate the time needed to download a chunk. Chunk size

information itself is always available in torrent file. Thus, dividing the size of the chunk by the time need to download two consecutive HAVE message, we can infer the instantaneous download rate of a peer. BITFIELD message contains information about chunks that already has in every peer in the swarms. Thus by comparing BITFIELD message for every peers in the swarm, we can infer the chunk distributions in the swarms. Challenges in this technique is the BitTorrent crawler can be blocked by a peer because it send many handshake message and receive many BITFIELD and HAVE message from a peer but the BitTorrent crawler does not upload any information to the peer.

2.3 Energy Aspect of P2P Network

Gupta and Singh [22] work on green networking has received a lot of attention. In recent years, many efforts have been pushed to reduced energy expenditure. Big companies and data center operator are trying new technologies to consume less energy. For example Google which is planning to operate its data centers with a zero carbon footprint by using hydropower, water-based chillers, external cold air, etc for cooling its data center. While energy is mostly concerned by companies that run hundred of server and hundred of networking devices inside data center, only a little attention have been made for home users. Remembering that P2P applications was the largest fraction of the Internet traffic in the past, although it is now decline due to the popularity of content sharing via cloud computing, we still have many popular P2P application that run based on P2P paradigm. For example, spotify. Spotify is fee based music streaming service for mobile and desktop. It is very popular in Europe and USA. Spotify works like BitTorrent though there are several difference. These figures shows that making P2P applications more energy efficient is important. These days ISPs have evolved from providing basic Internet connectivity to offering higher valued services such as Internet+TV+phone. In this value added

service, the STBs or home gateways play an increasingly important. This STBs is same powerfull as PC desktop while the shape quite small compared to desktop PC. However, the powerfull of STB means consume more power. Since broadband home Internet users are increasing, consideration to reduce energy consumption of STB is required.

Several approaches have been considered to reduce energy consumption. For example: Dynamic Voltage Scaling (DVS) and Dynamic Frequency Scaling (DFS) can be used to reduce energy consumption. With DVS the supply voltage is reduced when not needed, hence we can get slower operation of circuit. DFS can reduce the number of processor instructions, thus reducing performance. Another approach is designing new network architectures. For example: placing optical amplifiers at the most convenient locations and the task functions near renewable sources. Performing resource consolidation, capitalizing on available energy is also considered as a way to reduce energy consumption. This can be done via traffic engineering. Another way is by migrating computation or delegate the workload, typically using virtualization to move workloads transparently.

Due to the complexity of P2P networks, DVS and DFS can be implemented in hardware level. While in network level, migrating computation task is the another way to reduce energy consumption. For example in [15], Gianetti et al. propose the usage of BitTorrent proxy for delegating the BitTorrent client work. Delegating some work to BitTorrent proxy can save up to 25% of energy usage for PC desktop used for BitTorrent file sharing. Delegating or proxying workload is not new idea. Example more primitive idea of proxying is Wake on LAN technology that introduced almost two decades ago [28]. Wake on LAN technology allows computer to be awakened by *magic* packet.

Since energy flow to consumers is based on supply and demand. The saving of small energy in home can affect distribution side of energy. This is known as cascade effect. It not only happened in home and its distribution but it is also appear




Figure 2.6: Cascade effect: 1 watt energy saving in server component can reduce 2.8 watt energy in total facility level. This figure adapted from [29]

in data center and its distribution.

While most network architecture energy consumption has been explored, a little work is done in exploring energy consumption in hybrid network architecture fashion. For example: energy consumption in combination of P2P and data center (CDN or Cloud).

2.4 Related Work

Bittorrent protocol performance has been explored extensively [20] [36] [48] [60] [37] [73]. Although we know that the topology can have a large impact on perfor-

mance, to date only a few papers have addressed the issue. Urvoy *et al.* [61] used a discrete event simulator to show that the time to distribute a file in a BitTorrent swarm has a strong relation to the overlay topology. Al-Hamra *et al.* [2], also using a discrete event simulator, showed that BitTorrent creates a robust overlay topology and the overlay topology formed is not random. They also show that peer exchange (PEX) generates a chain-like overlay with a large diameter. Dale *et al.* [11], in an experimental study on PlanetLab, show that in the initial stage of BitTorrent a peer will get a random peer list from the tracker. They found that a network of peers that unchoked each other is scale-free and the node degree follows a power-law distribution with exponent approximately 2. Dale *et al.* [11] also showed that the path length formed in BitTorrent swarms averages four hops and BitTorrent swarms have low average clustering coefficient. However, little work has been done on confirming that such controlled experiments correspond to the system.

We emphasize that compared to Hoßfeld *et al.* [24], our work provides a completely different approach and goal. Hoßfeld *et al.* [24] discuss the AS (Autonomous System) level topology of BitTorrent swarm for optimizing overlay traffic across ASes, while our study focus on microscopic dynamic aspect which is BitTorrent swarms topology itself (peer level or IP address level). The closest work to ours is Kryczka *et al.* [34]. While our method is somewhat similar to theirs, they focus on clustering and locality while our focus is on node degree and clustering. They use PEX to discover peer relationship, unfortunately they do not explain in detail how to process the PEX data set. Because of differing PEX implementations between BitTorrent clients, we need to be careful with it in data processing. In our work, we describe PEX behavior and its limitation on two popular BitTorrent clients: Vuze and uTorrent, and we also explain how to treat PEX data from different BitTorrent clients. We also provide simulation result to confirm that our methods for inferring peer relationship with PEX is valid. They observed that BitTorrent swarms have slightly higher clustering coefficient compared to random graphs of the same size

and they observe neither BitTorrent swarm fulfills the properties of small world. The slightly difference in clustering come from the difference of PEX data processing. They assume that PEX is the same and complete for all BitTorrent clients, therefore they get slightly different results.

Our results agree with previous research [11] in some areas and disagree in others, perhaps for two reasons. First, power-law claims must be handled carefully. Many steps are required to confirm the power-law behavior, including alternative model checking, and we must be prepared for disappointment since other models may give a better fit. Second, our methodology relies on real work measurement combined with simulation for validation. This real-world measurement will reflect different types of clients connected to our swarm, and each client has a different behavior. We also face difficult-to-characterize network realities such as NAT and firewalls. Our ability to reproduce key aspects of the topology dynamics suggests that these factors have only limited impact on the topology, somewhat to our surprise.

Content delivery networks (CDN) is a large distributed system of servers deployed in multiple data center across the Internet. The objective of CDN is to serve content to end-users high availability and low latency manner as CDNs are distributed geographically. A CDN is owned, deployed, and maintained by a company that charges content providers or website owners for its services. CDN with peer assist have been successfully deployed on the Internet, such as Akamai [27] and LiveSky [72]. The authors of [27] conclude from two real world traces that hybrid CDN-P2P can significantly reduce the cost of content distribution and can scale to cope with the exponential growth of Internet video content. Yin et al. [72] described LiveSky as commercial operation of a peer-assisted CDN in China. LiveSky solved several challenges in the system design, such as dynamic resource scaling of P2P, low startup latency, ease of P2P integration with the existing CDN infrastructure, and network friendliness and upload fairness in the P2P operation. Measurement

from LiveSky showed that LiveSky can save bandwidth around 40% [72]. The author in [26] and [25] proposed mechanisms to minimize CDN server bandwidth to make the content distribution cheap. They designed different peer prefetching policies of video on demand system in surplus mode while ensuring user quality of experience. A similar analysis has been done in [70] for live video streaming system where the authors proposed different limited peer contribution policies to reduce CDN bandwidth requirement and eventually off the distribution process from CDN to P2P system. An ISP friendly rate allocation schemes for a hybrid CDN-P2P video on demand system in [67]. These technique try to minimize CDN server bandwidth while reducing ISP unfriendly traffic and maximizing peer prefetching. Load on CDN server has been shown to be reduced using this approach while reducing cross ISP traffic. Above studies were performed for video on demand or live video streaming. While video is the most popular content, the systems can be also for other type contents. Moreover while content based services are growing, energy consumption of a content distribution system has not been analyzed.

Related to CDN and energy usage, in a seminal work [49], the authors show that if costs are based on electricity usage and if the power prices vary in real-time, global load balancing decision can be made such that users are routed to locations with the cheapest power without significantly impacting user performance or bandwidth cost. In [46], the author proposed utilizing batteries for CDN for reducing total supplied power and total power costs. The authors in [46] also proposed battery provisioning algorithms based on workload of CDN server. The result shows that batteries can provide up to 14% power savings.

The idea that utilize ISP controlled home gateway to provide computing and storage services and adopts managed peer-to-peer model is presented in [64]. Valančius et al. [64] show that distributing computing platform in NaDa (Nano Data Center) save at least 20-30% energy compare to traditional data centers. The saving in NaDa comes from underutilizing home gateway, avoidance of cooling costs, and

the reduction of network energy consumption as a result of demand and service co-localization.

The comparison between CDN architecture and peer-to-peer architecture are discussed in [5] and [13]. Both authors in [5] and [13] agree that CDN architecture is more energy saving compare to peer-to-peer architecture. Another interesting study of energy efficient in content delivery architectures is presented by Guan et al. [18]. Guan et al. [18] compare energy efficient of CDN architecture and CCN architecture. CCN is a new architecture to deliver the contents in the Internet [31]. CCN uses data storage cache at each level of the network e.g routers to decrease the transmission traffic and also increase the speed of response. The authors in [18] conclude that CCN is more energy efficient in delivering popular content while the approach with optical bypass is more energy efficient in delivering infrequent accessed content.

To the best of our knowledge, the study of energy in that considering peer-to-peer in CDN architecture is presented in [40]. Mandal et al. [40] mentioned that hybrid CDN-P2P systems can reduce a significant amount energy in the optical core network around 20-40% less energy. The authors only considered energy consumption of hardware especially optical devices and does not include overhead inside data center, CDN server energy comsumption, and consumed power by peers. Our work is quite different, we take number of peers with static content and add overhead of data center which is power of cooling cause by temperature of hardware for different purpose which are live streaming and video on demand.

Chapter 3

Characteristics of BitTorrent Swarms

3.1 Introduction

BitTorrent is one of the most used application in the current Internet and is responsible for an important portion of the upstream and downstream traffic as revealed by recent reports. The significant footprint of BitTorrent in the Internet has motivated researchers and practitioners to dedicate an important amount of effort to understanding and improving BitTorrent. However, despite this effort, we still have little knowledge regarding the connectivity properties exhibited by real BitTorrent swarms at both swarm and peer level. Due to the difficulty in collecting the required information from real swarms, most of the existing works that analyze connectivity properties are based on simulations or experiments in controlled environments. As a result, they are likely to miss some of the effects affecting BitTorrent swarms in the wild. The analysis of the peer level connectivity in real BitTorrent swarms can reveal important information such as: (1) efficiency of a swarm to disseminate the content; (2) the resilience of the swarm, (3) checking the locality-bias. Urvoy Keller et al. [61] shows that number of connections from a peer maintains high en-

tropy of the BitTorrent system thus the BitTorrent works in optimal. Resilience of the swarm is very important for content provider who use BitTorrent like protocol to disseminate their contents. The result of the information about how peer connect each other can be used for doing network partition. For example, we want to know what's happened if high degree peers are removed randomly?; what's happened with peers are removed randomly? will the swarm collapse? or will it decrease download performance? Some ISPs have started to introduce a policy to minimize the impact of cross AS traffic caused by P2P. This effect of locality will be much better observed if we have peer connectivity level properties information by measuring real BitTorrent swarms topology.

In this Chapter, we first present a methodology to collect the connectivity information at both the swarm and the peer level for the entire lifespan of a real torrent. Specifically, we discover new torrents just after their birth by using the RSS service of the most important BitTorrent portal, namely the Pirate Bay. Afterwards, we exploit the Peer Exchange (PEX) extension of the BitTorrent protocol to gather the set of neighbors for each peer. PEX is a gossiping technique which main goal is to allow peers to exchange their list of neighbors so that they can learn about other participants in the swarm without contacting the tracker. Note, that PEX has been implemented by most of the existing BitTorrent clients and in particular by the most popular ones such as uTorrent or Vuze. The information collected from PEX (i.e., a peers neighborhood) is the connectivity information at the peer level. Furthermore, by aggregating the neighborhood information collected from every peer in a swarm we are able to build the overlay topology of that swarm (i.e., swarm level connectivity). We retrieve the information from each active peer every 3 minutes and then study the dynamic evolution of both: the overlay topology of the swarm and the composition of each peers neighborhood. We have applied the described methodology to collect the connectivity information of 50 real torrents, including more than 150 peers, since their birth during a period of 10 days.




Figure 3.1: Simplified view of our approach. Left: At time $t=1$, the actor gets a PEX message from peer A and learns that peer A is connected to peer B and C. At $t=2$, the actor gets PEX messages from peers C and A. The actor learns that now peer A is connected to peer D. Thus the actor knows the properties of peer A at $t=1$ and $t=2$.

3.2 Measurement Methodology

The difficulties in inferring topologies in BitTorrent swarms are caused by the BitTorrent mechanism itself. First, although a BitTorrent *peer* may offer some information about its peers, there is no mechanism for peer *discovery*. Second, a peer never sends information about its connections with other peers to the tracker, so we cannot infer overlay topologies by querying or hosting a tracker. Our other options inferring topologies are simulation or deploying BitTorrent nodes in a real network or in a laboratory, e.g., PlanetLab. Deploying hundreds to thousands of nodes in a real network or in the laboratory in a manner that accurately reflects the real world is a very challenging task.

We used PEX to collect information about peer neighbors (see Fig.3.1), and then we describe the network formed in terms of properties such as node degree and average clustering. Besides collecting data from real BitTorrent networks, we

ran simulations similar to these of Al-Hamra *et al.* [3]. In these simulations, we assumed that peer arrivals and departures (churn) follow an exponential distribution as explained by Guo *et al.* [20]. For simplification, we assumed that nodes are not behind a NAT. Since we are only interested in the construction of the overlay topology, we argue that our simulations are thorough enough to explain the overlay properties.

Temporal graphs have recently been proposed to study real dynamic graphs, with the intuition that the behaviour of dynamic networks can be more accurately captured by a sequence of snapshots of the network topology as it changes over time [17] [58]. In highly dynamic networks such as P2P, an instantaneous snapshot may capture only a few nodes and links. In this chapter, we study the network dynamics by continuously taking network snapshots over a short time interval Δ , and show them as a time series. A snapshot captures all participating peers and their connections within a particular time interval, from which a graph can be generated. The snapshot duration may have minor effects on analyzing slowly changing networks. However, in a P2P network, the characteristics of the network topology vary greatly with respect to the time scale of the snapshot duration [55]. We consider $\Delta = 3$ minutes to be a reasonable estimate of minimum session length in BitTorrent [53].

3.2.1 Graph Sampling

Due to the large and dynamic nature of BitTorrent networks, it is often very difficult or impossible to capture global properties. Facing this difficulty, sampling is a natural approach. However, collecting unbiased or representative sampling is also sometimes a challenging task.

Suppose that a BitTorrent overlay network is a graph $G(V, E)$ with the peers or nodes as vertices and connections between the peers as edges. If we observe the graph in a time series, i.e., we take samples of the graph, the time-indexed graph

is $G_t = G(V_t, E_t)$. From this set of graphs, we can define a measurement window $[t_0, t_0 + \Delta]$ and select peers uniformly at random from the set: $V_{t_0, t_0 + \Delta} = \bigcup_{t=t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta} V_t$. In that equation, we cannot distinguish properties of the same peer at different times, thus it focuses on sampling peers instead of peer properties. Stutzbach *et al.* [54] showed that equation is only appropriate for exponentially distributed peer session lengths but we know from existing measurement that BitTorrent networks peer session lengths have very high variation [20].

For example: suppose we want to measure number of files shared by peers in BitTorrent swarm. In this BitTorrent swarm, half of the peers are up all the time and have many files, while other peers remain around for one minute and are immediately replaced by new short-lived peers who have few files. The common method is to observe the system for a long time and sample the peers randomly. This method will incorrectly conclude that most of the peers in the system have very few files. The problem with this method is that it focuses on sampling the number of peers instead of peer properties. Our objective should not be to select a vertex $v_i \in \bigcup_{t=t_0}^{t_0 + \Delta} V_t$, but to sample the property of a vertex v_i at a particular instant time t . Therefore, we must distinguish the occurrences of the same peer at different times: samples $v_{i,t}$ and $v_{i,t'}$ gathered at different times $t \neq t'$ are viewed as different, even from the same peer. The key in this method is that we must be able to sample from the same peer more than once at different points in time. Thus we can formalize this into $v_{i,t} \in V_t, t \in [t_0, t_0 + \Delta]$ [54]. With that method, the sampling will not be biased because we track the peer's properties over time.

The number of peers in a swarm that is observed by our client is our population. The sampled peers set is the number of peers that exchange PEX messages with our client. Our sampled peers set through PEX messages exchange can observe about 70% of the peers in a population. This observation is consistent with [69].

3.2.2 Experimental Methodology

We joined the top 50 TV series torrents from the piratebay, which claims to be the biggest torrent tracker on the Internet. Almost all of these torrents were in steady-state phase, which is more dominant than the bootstrapping and decay phases of a torrent’s lifetime. We used a modified rasterbar libtorrent [44] client that is connection greedy, where the client tries to connect to all peers it knows without a limit on the number of connections, and the client logs PEX messages received from other clients. PEX messages from old versions of Vuze Bittorrent clients contain all of peers they connected to in the past, hence these clients should be removed from the data. Removal of some peers in data processing is valid in terms of sampling with dynamics, see Sect.(3.2.1). In terms of connectivity, two popular Bittorrent clients (uTorrent and Vuze), by default try to connect to peer candidates randomly without any preference, thus we have random data sets. This implies that our data set is independent of measurement location and the number of measurement locations.

3.2.3 Data Analysis Background

Many realistic networks exhibit the scale-free property [10], though we note that “scale-free” is not a complete description of a network topology [12] [38]. It has been suggested that Bittorrent networks also might have scale-free characteristics [11]. In this chapter, we test this hypothesis. Besides testing this hypothesis, we also study the clustering property of Bittorrent swarms.

In a scale-free network, the degree distribution follows a power-law distribution. A power-law distribution is quite a natural model and can be generated from simple generative processes [41], and power-law models appear in many areas of science [10] [41].

A power-law distribution can be described as:

$$Pr[X \geq x] \propto cx^{-\alpha}. \quad (3.1)$$

where x is the quantity of distribution and α is commonly called the scaling parameter. The scaling parameter usually lies in the range $1.8 < \alpha < 3.5$. In discrete form, the above formula can be expressed as:

$$p(x) = Pr(X = x) = Cx^{-\alpha}. \quad (3.2)$$

This distribution diverges on zero, therefore there must be a lower bound of x , called $x_{min} > 0$, that holds for the sample to be fitted by a power-law. If we want to estimate a good power-law scaling parameter then we must also have a good x_{min} estimation.

Normalizing (3.2) we get

$$p(x) = \frac{x^{-\alpha}}{\zeta(\alpha, x_{min})}. \quad (3.3)$$

The most common way to fit empirical data to a power-law is to take the logarithm of Eq.(3.1) and draw a straight line on a logarithmic plot [41]. We use maximum likelihood to estimate the scaling parameter α of power-law [10]. This approach is accurate to estimate the scaling parameter in the limit of large sample size. For the detailed calculations of both x_{min} and α , see Appendix B in [10].

3.3 Experimental Results

Our time samples for the size of swarms are plotted as the CDF of the number of peers for every swarm during measurement with 104 to 1400 time samples for each torrent, as shown in Fig.3.2. It is clear that the number of peers has high variability due to churn in BitTorrent networks.




Figure 3.2: CDF plot of number of peers for the 50 swarms during measurement.

3.3.1 Power-law Distribution of Node Degree

The degree of a node in a network is the number of edges connected to that node. If we define p_k as the fraction of nodes in the network that have degree k , then p_k is the probability that a node chosen uniformly at random has degree k . We show node degree data in cumulative distribution function (CDF) plot, which can be expressed as

$$P_k = \sum_{k'=k}^{\infty} p_{k'}. \quad (3.4)$$

We want to know the power-law distribution of the measured BitTorrent networks, and we do not know *a priori* if our data are power-law distributed. To test the applicability of a power-law distribution, we use the goodness-of-fit test as described by Clauset *et al.* [10]. First, we fit data to the power-law model and calculate the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistic for this fit. Second, we generate power-law synthetic data sets based on the scaling parameter α estimation and the lower bound

of x_{min} . We fit the synthetic data to a power-law model and calculate the KS statistics, then count what fraction of the resulting statistics is larger than the value for the measured data set. This fraction is called the p value. If $p \geq 0.1$ then a power-law model is a good model for the data set, and if $p < 0.1$ then power-law is not a good model.

As mentioned before, a good estimation for x_{min} is important to get a overall good fit. Too small an x_{min} will cause a fit only to the body of the distribution. Too high an x_{min} will cause a fit only to the tail of the distribution. Figure 3.3 illustrates the fit for snapshots of *torrent1* and *torrent3*. For *torrent1*, setting $x_{min} = 2$ leads to $\alpha = 2.11$, while $x_{min} = 1$ gives $\alpha = 2.9$. For *torrent1*, $x_{min} = 1$ visually does not give a good fit, while for *torrent3*, setting $x_{min} = 1$ leads to a visually good fit.

Figure 3.4 shows the CDF for p values for all data sets. This figure shows that from the K-S statistics point of view, around 45% of the time a power-law distribution is not a good fit for the data. The inset figure in Fig.3.4 shows the CDF plot p value for each torrent. The dash line on p value = 0.1 is the threshold.

However, these data sets must be interpreted with care. The usage of the maximum likelihood estimators for parameter estimation in power-law is guaranteed to be unbiased only in the asymptotic limit of large sample size, and some of our data sets fall below the rule of thumb for sample size, $n = 50$ [10]. In the goodness-of-fit test, a large p value does not mean the power-law is the correct distribution for data sets, because there may be other distributions that match the data sets and there is always a possibility that even with small value of p the distribution will follow a power-law [10]. We address these concerns next.

3.3.2 Alternative Distributions

Even if we have estimated the power-law parameter properly and the fit is decent, it does not mean the power-law model is good. It is always possible that non-power-law models are better than the power-law model. There are several methods for di-




Figure 3.3: Node degree fit for snapshots of two torrents, with three fits shown in log scale.




Figure 3.4: CDF plot of p value of K-S statistics.

rect comparison of two distributions such as *likelihood ratio test* [66], *Bayesian test*, and *Minimum description length*. The likelihood ratio test idea is to compute the




Figure 3.5: Scatter plot of p value vs ρ value. We divide this figure into three areas where the borders are vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ and horizontal line $p = 0.1$. p is goodness-fit of test for power-law model, if $p \geq 0.1$ power-law model is good model for data set. ρ is significance test for nested hypothesis. if $\rho \geq 0.1$ then there is no significant difference between the likelihood of the data under the two hypotheses being compared. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ there is significant difference between the likelihood of the data under the two hypotheses being compared. 52% of points lie in area 1, thus an alternative model may be plausible for these points.

likelihood of the data sets under two distributions. The one with the higher likelihood is the better fit. We use the likelihood ratio test to see whether other distributions can give better parameter estimation.

Nested Case

We now hypothesize that the smaller family of power-law distributions may give a better fit to our data sets. We only consider a power-law model and a power-law with exponential cut-off model as examples to show model selection. Model selection for power-law model and power-law with exponential cut-off is a kind of nested model selection problem. In a nested model selection, there is always the possibility that a bigger family (power-law) can provide as good a fit as the




Figure 3.6: Scatter plot of p value vs log-likelihood ratio (LR) for $\rho < 0.1$. We divide this figure into four areas where the borders are vertical line $LR = 0$ and horizontal line $p = 0.1$. p is goodness-fit of test for power-law model, if $p \geq 0.1$ power-law model is good model for data set. ρ is significance test for nested hypothesis. LR is the sign of likelihood ratio value. if LR is negative, there is a significant difference in the likelihoods and the alternative model is better. 58% of points lie in area 3 and 42% lie in area 4. Because area 3 and 4 are negative value of LR, the alternative model is better.

smaller family (power-law with exponential cut-off). In a likelihood ratio test, we must provide the significance value (ρ value). Under the likelihood ratio test, we compare the pure power-law model to power-law with exponential cut-off, and the ρ value here helps us establish which of three possibilities occurs: (i) $\rho > 0.1$ means there is no significant difference between the likelihood of the data under the two hypotheses being compared and thus neither is favored over the other; if we already rejected the pure power-law model, then this does not necessarily tell us that we also can reject the alternative model; (ii) $\rho < 0.1$ and the sign of likelihood ratio (LR) = negative means that there is a significant difference in the likelihoods and that the alternative model is better; if we have already rejected the pure power-law model, then this case simply tells us that the alternative model is better than the

bad model we rejected; (iii) if $\rho < 0.1$ and the sign of LR = positive means that there is a significant difference and that the pure power-law model is better than the alternative; if we have already rejected the pure power-law model, then this case tells us the alternative is even worse than the bad model we already rejected.

Figure 3.5 shows a p value vs ρ value scatter plot, divided into three areas. Area 1: $\rho < 0.1$ and $p > 0$. Area 2: $\rho > 0.1$ and $p < 0.1$. Area 3: $\rho > 0.1$ and $p > 0.1$. This figure shows that 52% of the samples lie in area 1, thus an alternative model may be plausible for these samples.

Now we plot p value vs LR as shown in Fig.3.6 for $\rho < 0.1$. We divide the figure into four areas: area 1, area 2, area 3, and area 4 with green lines as borders to see how sparse the points are in each area. Area 1: LR=positive sign and $p < 0.1$. Area 2: LR=positive sign and $p > 0.1$. Area 3: LR=negative sign and $p < 0.1$. Area 4: LR=negative sign and $p > 0.1$. In this figure, 58% of the samples lie in area 3 and 42% lie in area 4, while there are no samples in areas 1 and 2, which means that the alternative model is better. Although in the case $p < 0.1$ we reject power-law as the plausible model, the alternative model is still better than the power-law model. We believe that these results are caused by peers that are not willing to maintain large numbers of concurrent connections (high node degree). These observations clearly demonstrate that comparing models is a very complex task in highly dynamic networks.

Non-Nested Case

In the non-nested case, we compare power-law distribution with log-normal distribution and exponential distribution. We calculate the ratio of two likelihood distributions or the logarithm of the ratio, which is positive or negative depending on which distribution is better. The positive or negative sign of log-likelihood ratio does not definitively indicate which model is the better fit. Vuong's [66] method gives a ρ value that can tell us whether the observed sign of likelihood ratio is sta-




Figure 3.7: CDF plot of ρ value of log-likelihood ratio test for power-law v.s log-normal. We divide the figure into two areas with vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ as border. Under nested hypothesis, ρ value is significance value of observed sign of likelihood ratio. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ then the sign of log-likelihood ratio is a good indicator of which model is the better fit to the data. In this figure, only 13% of ρ values are less than 0.1. Since 87% of ρ values are more than 0.1, the sign of log-likelihood ratio is not good indicator and the test does not favor either model over the other.

tistically significant. If this ρ value is small ($\rho < 0.1$) then the sign of log-likelihood ratio is a reliable indicator of which model is the better fit to the data. If the ρ value is large the sign of log-likelihood ratio is not reliable and the test does not favor either model over the other.

Figure 3.7 and Fig.3.9 show the CDF of the ρ value for the log-likelihood ratio between power-law and log-normal distributions and the log-likelihood ratio between power-law and exponential distributions. Both alternative distributions only show very small number of data points that have $\rho < 0.1$, each at around 13% and 5.5%. The log-likelihood ratio of these data points have negative signs as shown in Fig.3.8 and Fig.3.10, therefore the alternative distributions are not better than power-law. With the vast majority of the values for ρ being larger than 0.1, the results of the log-likelihood ratio test are ambiguous. Therefore, it is important to look at the-




Figure 3.8: Scatter plot p values v.s log-likelihood ratio (LR) for likelihood test for power-law vs log-normal. In this figure, we show the log-likelihood ratio (LR) values for $\rho \leq 0.1$. Since the LR values are negative, the alternative distribution (log-normal) is not better than power-law model.

oretical factors or design factors behind the systems to make a sensible judgment. For example: a leecher in a BitTorrent swarm is design to prefer the fastest seeders or leechers instead of high degree seeders or leechers. With this design factor information, we can make a sensible judgment which distributional form is more reasonable.

3.3.3 Clustering Coefficient

Networks show a tendency for link formation between neighboring vertices called *clustering* that reflects the topology robustness. The clustering around a vertex i is quantified by the clustering coefficient C_i , defined as the number of triangles in which vertex i participates normalized by the maximum possible number of such




Figure 3.9: CDF plot of ρ value of log-likelihood ratio test for power-law v.s exponential. We divide the figure into two areas with vertical line $\rho = 0.1$ as border. Under nested hypothesis, ρ value is significance value of observed sign of likelihood ratio. if $\rho \leq 0.1$ then the sign of log-likelihood ratio is a good indicator of which model is the better fit to the data. In this figure, only 5.5% of ρ values are less than 0.1. Since 94.5% of ρ values are more than 0.1, the sign of log-likelihood ratio is not good indicator and the test does not favor either model over the other.

triangles,

$$c_i = \frac{2t_i}{k_i(k_i - 1)} \quad (3.5)$$

where t_i denotes the number of triangles around i and k_i denotes vertex degree. For the whole graph, the clustering coefficient is

$$C = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in G} c_i. \quad (3.6)$$

A larger clustering coefficient represents more clustering at nodes in the graph, therefore the clustering coefficient expresses the local robustness of the network. The distinction between a random and a non-random graph can be measured by




Figure 3.10: Scatter plot p values v.s log-likelihood ratio (LR) for likelihood test for power-law vs exponential. In this figure, we show the log-likelihood ratio (LR) values for $\rho \leq 0.1$. Since the LR values are negative, the alternative distribution (exponential) is not better than power-law model.

clustering-coefficient metrics [68]. A network that has a high clustering coefficient and a small average path length is called a *small-world* model [68]. In BitTorrent systems, a previous study [35] mentioned the possibility that BitTorrent's efficiency partly comes from the clustering of peers. Figure 3.11 shows the CDF clustering coefficient value of our data sets. Only one torrent exhibits clustering coefficient less than 0.1 for about 40% of the snapshots, while for the other torrents, more than 70% are less than 0.1. This low clustering coefficient observation is the same as that observed by Dale *et al.* [11]. Considering only the low clustering coefficient, the BitTorrent topologies seem to be close to random graphs.

3.4 Confirmation via Simulation

We use simulations to compare the overlay topology properties based on our real-world experiments. We set the maximum peer set size to 80, the minimum number




Figure 3.11: CDF plot of the clustering coefficient for each torrent.

of neighbors to 20, and the maximum number of outgoing connections to 80. In our simulation, the results are quite easy to get since we are on a controlled system; we can directly read the global topology properties from our results. We also have the simulated PEX messages. We compare the global overlay topology properties as the final result from the simulator with the overlay topology that we get from PEX on the same simulator. Figure 3.12 shows the α estimate Eq.(3.1) and p Eq.(3.1) value both for the global result and the PEX result from our simulator. It clearly shows that both the global result and the PEX result from the simulator produce very low p values. We calculate the Spearman correlation for both α values from the global result and the PEX result. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient is a non-parametric correlation measure that assesses the relationship between two variables without making any assumptions of a monotonic function. The Spearman rank correlation test gives $0.38 \leq \rho \leq 0.5$, which we consider to be moderately well correlated. Therefore, the simulator confirms that the PEX method can be used to estimate α .




Figure 3.12: α estimation and p value for global topology and topology inferred from PEX where both done in our simulator.

3.5 Summary

We have investigated the properties of BitTorrent overlay topologies from the point of view of the peer exchange protocol using real swarms from an operational BitTorrent tracker on the Internet.

We find that the node degree of the graph formed in a BitTorrent swarm can be described by a power law with exponential cut-off and the observation of a low clustering coefficient implies BitTorrent networks are close to random networks. From the BitTorrent protocol point of view, the reason that a BitTorrent swarm can be described by a power-law with exponential cut-off is: leechers in a BitTorrent swarm prefer a few good seeders or neighbors that can give high data rates to exchange the data and seeders have rich connections to leechers as seeders have complete chunks or pieces. That behavior explains why seeders have rich connections while leechers only have a few neighbors. We argue that there are two reasons for the cut-off phenomenon. First, most BitTorrent clients configure the maximum number of

global connection between 200 – 300, however the maximum connection per torrent (swarm) is set between 50 – 90 by default [51] [63]. Some BitTorrent forums suggest decreasing the maximum connection for torrent (swarm) to between 30 – 40 [62]. Second, most of the BitTorrent users are home users where their home gateway device cannot give high concurrent connections and BitTorrent is not the main online activity. We argue that the BitTorrent swarm closes to random that we infer from clustering coefficient is caused by BitTorrent mechanism itself that always choose random peers from its neighbors in the choking-unchoking algorithm, optimistic choking algorithm, and optimistic connect algorithm as we explained previously. Our approach can infer BitTorrent swarms topology and the result confirmed by simulation.

Chapter 4

Peer-Assisted Content Delivery

4.1 Introduction

Streaming content, especially video, represents a significant fraction of the traffic volume on the Internet, and it has become a standard practice to deliver this type of content using Content Delivery Networks (CDNs) such as Akamai and Limelight for better scaling and quality of experience for the end users. For example, YouTube uses Google cache and MTV uses Akamai in their operations.

With the spread of broadband Internet access at a reasonable flat monthly rate, users are connected to the Internet 24 hours a day and they can download and share multimedia content. P2P (peer to peer) applications are also widely deployed. In China, P2P is very popular; we see many P2P applications from China such as PPStream, UUSe, Xunlei, etc. [65]. Some news broadcasters also rely on P2P technology to deliver popular live events. For example, CNN uses the Octoshape [45] solution that enables their broadcast to scale and offer good video quality as the number of users increases.

From the Internet provider point of view, the presence of so many always-on users suggests that it is possible to delegate a portion of computing, storage and networking tasks to the users, thus creating P2P networks where users can share

files and multimedia content. Starting from file sharing protocols, P2P architectures have evolved toward video on demand and support for live events.

Alternatively, video contents can be efficiently distributed on services offered by managed network architectures and CDN companies. The major issues of CDN are high deployment cost and good but not unlimited scalability in the long term. Given the complementary features of P2P and CDN, in recent years some hybrid solutions have been proposed and applied to the operational of CDN [27, 32, 71] to take the best of both approaches. In Peer assisted CDN, users can download content from CDN nodes from or other users or peers. A user may cache the content after download to serve requests from other users. Due to the complexity of the behavior of peers, the process should be done in the home gateway user where the ISP can control it.

In this work, we will revisit Guo et al., [21] work's PROP as basis to evaluate of the peer-assisted CDN and propose an improvement the model for the PROP. Internet video on demand (VoD) is on rising todays e.g. Youtube. We will take Youtube as an example of Internet VoD service model. In Youtube service model, we can get data such as (1) the time when a video is uploaded and (2) number of access or number of view. In a seminal work, Borghol et al., [7] use above information to estimate when a video become very popular. Moreover, Borghol et al., [7] classify a video popularity become three phases: before-peak phase, at-peak phase, and after-peak phase. We will use estimation of a video popularity phases for helping PROP. We will explain about video popularity in sect.4.2. A twofold of our contributions as follows: (1) We use the idea of VoD view popularity model to aid the PROP model. To our knowledge, the combination of PROP model and VoD view popularity model is the first. (2) From simulation-based experiments, we find that peer contributions in our model are almost same with PROP while the numbers of replicas are lower than PROP.




Figure 4.1: Time to peak empirical distribution [7].




Figure 4.2: View rate distribution versus week relative to at-peak phase week for every video, where y-axis in log scale. Every point lies in negative x-axis mean view rate of every video in before-peak phase. Every point lies in x-axis= 0 mean view rate of every video at-peak phase. Every point lies in positive x-axis mean view rate of every video in after-peak phase.

4.2 Estimating Internet VoD Popularity Phase

As we mentioned earlier, we will use Youtube service model as an example of Internet VoD. The objective of estimating Internet VoD popularity phase is to get popularity state of a requested video whether a video is before-peak popularity phase or at peak popularity phase, or after-peak popularity phase. We use Youtube as an example of VoD service where we get Youtube content popularity datasets from

view rate	1	1	1	10	1	1	1
relative week to peak	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3
<hr/>							
week #	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Figure 4.3: Transformation of view rate distribution. We add week number and make it as x -axis, View rate as y -axis, and relative week to peak as z -axis.

Borghol et al., [7]. The datasets consists the measurement of 29000 videos view count and the time when videos are uploaded during 36 weeks. Borghol et al., [7] classify three phases of a video popularity: before-peak, at-peak, and after-peak. The authors define time-to-peak for a video as its age (time since upload) at which its weekly viewing rate is the highest during measurement (from the first week until end of measurement). The time-to-peak distribution is shown in fig.4.1. Figure 4.1 shows Borghol et al., [7] work that around three-quarters of a large fraction videos peak within the first six weeks since their upload and beyond six weeks we have uniform distribution thus the time-to-peak is exponentially distributed mixture with uniform distribution. To estimate the rate parameter of exponential part of time-to-peak distribution, we use Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) [10]. Using MLE method, we can get exponential parameter $\lambda = 0.59$. Because we know the peak time (at-peak phase) of every video, we can also know before-peak phase and after-phase of every video. For detail we refer the readers to [7].

To reveal data distribution of view rate for every video, we plot view rate versus week where we shift week of view rate at-peak phase to zero. Therefore we can get view rate distribution relative to at-peak week as shown in fig. 4.2

How we estimate the video popularity phase is shown in fig.4.3 and 4.4. In fig. 4.3 we have view rate (y-axis) and relative week to peak (x-axis) which is view rate distribution versus week relative to at-peak phase. We transform these numbers by adding week number and make it as x-axis, view rate as y-axis, and relative




Figure 4.4: 2D visualization of view rate distribution after transformation where x -axis is week number, y -axis is view rate.

week to peak as z-axis fig. 4.3. This transformation is shown in fig. 4.4 denote as box points. Assume there is a peer requests a video, we want to estimate what is the phase of that video. Is the video in at-peak phase, before-phase, or after phase. We can estimate that video phase by averaging relative week to peak numbers (the points at z-axis) of the nearest point from datasets. If the average value less than 0 we estimate the video is at before-peak phase, if the average value equal to 0 we estimate the video is at at-peak phase, and if the average value more than 0 we estimate the video is at after-peak phase.

For example: there is a peer that requests a video where the position of video is in fourth week with the last week view rate $vr = 2$ (we can get as this data from CDN) shown in fig. 4.4 denote as circle. In this case, the nearest points are the point at third week $(2, 1, -1)$ and the point at fifth week $(4, 1, 1)$. By averaging the points at z-axis of the nearest points $(-1 + 1)/2 = 0$, we can get estimate that video is in at-peak phase.

4.3 System Description

In our work, we use Youtube VoD view model to aid our work that based from PROP. The Youtube VoD view model will be used in peer-caching strategy side to exploits the video popularity while caching strategy in CDN side is out of scope.

Since we can estimate before-peak phase, at-peak phase, and after-peak phase of video, we modified the original utility function from PROP by adding a $z(t)$ factor as follows:

$$u = \frac{(f(p) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p))}{r^{\alpha+\beta}} + z(t) \quad (4.1)$$

$\frac{(f(p) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p))}{r^{\alpha+\beta}}$ is the utility function from PROP and $z(t)$ is the z factor from our model. $z(t)$ is a function from current time in simulation.

$$z(t) = \begin{cases} 0.15 & \text{if phase estimation is before-peak} \\ 0.47 & \text{if phase estimation is at-peak} \\ 0.38 & \text{if phase estimation is after-peak} \end{cases}$$

Following [21], we can calculate p as follows:

$$p = \min\left(\frac{n_i^r}{t_i^r - t_a^i}, \frac{1}{t_{cur} - t_i^r}\right) \quad (4.2)$$

Where n_i^r is number of requested video, t_i^r is last time the video is requested, t_a^i is the uploaded time of the video, and t_{cur} is the current time. $z(t)$ is proportion of view count that we get from Youtube datasets. To able to track the simulation, we use default value from PROP thus we refer the readers to [21]. We choose the video with the smallest u value as the candidate to be replaced when a peer's cache capacity is full. In PROP's utility function, the difference between very popular videos and unpopular video is very difficult to differentiate. For unpopular video




Figure 4.5: Peer interaction in simulator. When a peer requests a video, it always goes to a CDN server (step 1). The CDN provides the videos to the peer (step 2). If there is another peer request same video, that request will go to CDN (step 3). A CDN will check its record to see if there is some peers cache that requested video. If there is some peers cache that requested video, a CDN will reply with redirect message that asking a peer to download requested video from other peer (step 4). If there s no peers have requested video, a CDN will serve the video. A peer then can request the video to other peer and get the video (step 5 and step 6).

$f(p)$ will be very close to $f(p_{min})$ thus $f(p) - f(p_{min})$ will be very close to 0 then utility function become very small. For very popular video $f(p)$ will be very close to $f(p_{max})$ thus $f(p_{max}) - f(p)$ will be very close to 0 then utility function become very small. Linear addition of $z(t)$ factor can help to differentiate the value of utility function.

4.4 Evaluation

In order to evaluate the proposed peer-caching strategy using estimation of before-peak, at-peak, and after-peak information from Youtube VoD view model, we have to compare our model to PROP model. We evaluate three metrics, which are peer contribution to delivery contents during simulation, access frequency of cache dur-

ing simulation, and number of replicas. Peer contribution metric related to byte-hit-ratio. Byte-hit-ratio is defined as the total bytes contents served by peers normalized by the total bytes of video all peers and CDN consume. It means more peer contributions, more byte-hit-ratio because peer can get content from another peers. Access frequency of cache reflects the storage utilization. More access means more peer storage utilization. Number of replicas is also related to peer storage utilization. However, too many replicas will waste the storage resources. To evaluate these metrics, we developed a peer-assisted CDN simulator.

4.4.1 Simulation Design

An event driven simulator is developed using Python for this purpose. In fig.4.5, we describe the process of a peer that requests a video in simulator, which derived from PROP. A peer and a CDN are implemented in object oriented-model inside the simulator. In short, a peer always requests to CDN then CDN will decided if a requested video is available in other peers or not. If a requested video is available in other peers, CDN will redirect the request to other peers. If a requested video is not available CDN will serve the request.

Catalog Generator

The goal for catalog generator is to create a catalog video that consist video-id, time when a video is uploaded, a video size, view count terminus, and progress of videos popularity like Youtube service model. We assume that a video is uploaded to server following Poisson process with mean rate $\lambda = 1$ thus we can get the time when a video is uploaded. The view count terminus for every video is assigned randomly uniform from Youtube datasets and video size for every video is assigned randomly uniform between 1 and 200MB. Because very weak relationship between file size and popularity [1] and our work much focus on popularity aspect impact to utility function rather than storage utilization, we believe that assigned random uniform

file size from Youtube datasets is fine. Finally, we have a catalog that consists of: video-id, time when a video is uploaded, view count terminus, and video size.

Peer Request Generator

In catalog generator, we assume peer request a video to CDN following Poisson process with a mean rate $\lambda = 1$ [74]. There are three scenarios for peer request (named as scenario A, B, and C): In scenario A, a peer chooses a video that has popularity following Youtube. The objective of the first scenario, we want to see the peer requests effect to peer-assisted CDN when the request following Youtube popularity. In scenario B, a peer chooses a video that has popularity following Youtube but we shift the request four weeks later. The objective of the second scenario, we want to see the peer requests effect to peer-assisted CDN when the request from peers are lag four weeks after popular in Youtube. In scenario C, a peer chooses a video that has popularity following zipf distribution with rate= 0.9 [19] thus a peer choose a video that its popularity does not follow Youtube popularity. The objective of the third scenario, we want to see the peer request effect to peer-assisted CDN when the requests from peers are totally different from Youtube's videos popularity.

Simulation Parameters and Scenarios

The simulation parameters are follows:

- Length: 360 days.
- Video size: uniform random between 1MB and 200MB.
- Peer capacity: 500MB.
- CDN capacity: 10000MB.
- Number of peers: 100000.




Figure 4.6: Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario A (y -axis in log-scale).




Figure 4.7: Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario B (y -axis in log-scale).

- Number of videos: 10000.

Finally, we compare our results to original PROP [21] implementation.

4.4.2 Result and Discussion

Figure 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8 show the absolute peer contribution to deliver videos compared between model and prop. Figure 4.6 and fig.4.7 show same pattern. The peers give more contribution in the tail while in the third scenario the peer contribution is mostly same between model and PROP. A peers can give more contribution




Figure 4.8: Absolute of contribution of peer for scenario C (y -axis in log-scale).




Figure 4.9: Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario A (y axis in log-scale).

because a video has longer duration than other videos in a peer's cache thus other peer's requests are served by the peer. A video has longer duration than other videos in peer's cache because that a video has bigger utility function than other videos for example a video that will enter the cache.

Figure 4.9, 4.10, and 4.9 show the number of videos replicas available in system




Figure 4.10: Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario B (y axis in log-scale).




Figure 4.11: Number of a video replicas when a peer request a video for scenario C (y axis in log-scale). In model we found many zero replica when a peer requests a video. Because we use log-scale in this figure, the zero numbers can not be viewed.




Figure 4.12: Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario A.




Figure 4.13: Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario B.

when a peer requests a video. As we can see from all figures, the model gives us lower number of replicas than PROP. The model gives lower number of replicas than PROP because when a peer requests a video, that peer is not cached the video.




Figure 4.14: Frequency a video stays in peers for scenario C.




Figure 4.15: Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario A.

We can see the proportion of cached and not-cached event in table 4.1. We also present detail of the video phase breakdown in table 4.2. In model, not-cached events take around 65% from all events and majority of video phase is after-peak




Figure 4.16: Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario B.




Figure 4.17: Cache duration of a video in peers for scenario C.

for both cached events and not-cached events. Because the majority of video phase is after-peak for both cached events and not-cached events, In PROP, cached events take around 52% from all events for the first scenario and the second scenario, while

Table 4.1: Percentage of Cached events and Not-Cached events in Model and PROP

Scenario	Type	Cached	Not-Cached
Scenario 1	Model	33.5%	66.5%
	PROP	52%	48%
Scenario 2	Model	34.8%	65.2%
	PROP	52.6%	47.4%
Scenario 3	Model	32.4%	67.6%
	PROP	67.7%	32.3%

for the third scenario is 67.7%. In model not-cached events are bigger than PROP, means peers do not cached the videos thus we get lower replicas number than PROP.

Denote u_{dl} is the minimum utility function for a video inside the cache and u_{ms} is utility function for a video that will enter the cache, p_{dl} is the popularity for a video inside the cache and p_{ms} is the popularity for a video that will enter the cache. In order a requested video is cached by a peer, the utility function for u_{dl} must be lower than the utility function for u_{ms} .

$$u_{dl} < u_{ms} \quad (4.3)$$

$$\frac{(f(p_{dl}) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p_{dl}))}{r_{dl}^{\alpha+\beta}} + z_{dl} < \frac{(f(p_{ms}) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p_{ms}))}{r_{ms}^{\alpha+\beta}} + z_{ms} \quad (4.4)$$

We assume that numbers of replicas are same, thus:

$$(f(p_{dl}) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p_{dl})) - (f(p_{ms}) - f(p_{min}))(f(p_{max}) - f(p_{ms})) < z_{ms} - z_{dl} \quad (4.5)$$

Table 4.2: Percentage of Video Phase for Model in cached and not-cached events

Scenario	Type/Events	Before-Peak	At-Peak	After-Peak
Scenario 1	Model-Cached	8.2%	1.2%	24.1%
	Model-Not-Cached	11.2%	0.8%	54.5%
Scenario 2	Model-Cached	6.2%	1.2%	29.8%
	Model-Not-Cached	5.2%	0.8%	56.8%
Scenario 3	Model-Cached	8.0%	1.8%	22.7%
	Model-Not-Cached	15.1%	0.8%	51.6%

Since p_{min} and p_{max} are same for u_{dl} and u_{ms} , we can arrange the equation become:

$$f(p_{ms}) - f(p_{dl}) > z_{dl} - z_{ms} \quad (4.6)$$

As we know from table.4.2 that the majority of a requested video is after-peak phase and a requested video phase that is at-peak phase is very small portion, then we can see that $z_{dl} - z_{ms}$ term will be in negative term if z_{dl} is before-peak phase or 0 if z_{dl} is after-peak phase. If $z_{dl} - z_{ms} = 0$ then it is same with PROP. Since the not-cached events happen in when a requested video phase after-peak phase, we can get that $f(p_{ms}) - f(p_{dl}) < 0$. For the same situation and we compare to the PROP, the probability of u_{ms} less than u_{dl} in the model is less than PROP. Therefore, we can see in the model that the events when a peer does not cache a video are more often than PROP.

Figure 4.12, 4.13, and 4.14 show the frequency of a video stay in peers compared between model and PROP. As all figure show the model has higher frequency than PROP to stay in peers except for the beginning rank of data where the model has same frequency with prop in first and second scenario. In the third scenario, in the beginning rank of data the model has lower frequency than PROP, then around rank 1000 the model has higher frequency than prop until the end of data. The frequency a video stay in a video can also be viewed in fig 4.15, 4.16, and 4.17, where in the model some videos have longer cache duration than PROP, while others have

shorter cache duration than PROP. Thus, we can see the relationship between cache duration and frequency a video stays in peers.

4.5 Summary

This chapter presents a scheme for peer-to-peer network can help CDN to deliver the content over the Internet. We show that by introducing z factor to utility function we can maintain same peer contribution while reducing number of replicas. We found that there are no much different between the first scenario, the second scenario and the third scenario in peer contribution to deliver a video. We found that in the all scenarios, the model gives lower replicas than PROP. This is because in the model, we found that not-cached events are higher than cached events, more specifically, the probability of utility function a requested video in model is lower than PROP. Therefore, in the model the numbers of available replicas are lower than PROP. We also did the significance test to the number of replicas using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic on two samples and we find that for all scenarios the p -values are less than 1% thus the results are significant.

Some areas of improvement that we have identified for future are: The energy trade off this peer-assisted CDN architecture in order to know how much energy saving by ISP and how much increase of energy at users home gateway side in this architecture since we have higher peer contribution. More numerical experiments for other zipf shape parameters.

Chapter 5

Energy Savings in Peer-Assisted CDN

5.1 Motivation

We discussed peer-assisted CDN in previous chapter. One of the implication is the possibility to delegate workload from CDN servers to peers. As we mentioned earlier, CDN servers are placed in data centers globally in order to serve clients as fast as possible and as low latency as possible. On the other hand, the data center where the CDN server is placed faces costs for powering the data center. The Uptime Institute, a global data center authority, surveyed 1100 data center owners and operators in 2012 and reported that 55% of organizations will increase their financial budget 10% over 2011 [30]. 30% of organizations were expected run out of data center capacity (power, cooling, space, and network) by the end of 2012 [30]. More than 50% of the organizations surveyed reported that saving energy ¹ is a major priority. Even in the data centers using the state of art cooling technologies heat dissipation accounts for at least 20% and as much as 50% of the total power consumption [16]. The increases in energy cost and the demand due to growth of traffic urges the data center operators and owners to look for ways to reduce energy usage in the years to come. Although reducing energy consumption can effectively

¹As we are discussing steady-state operation, energy and power are in direct correspondence so we use the terms interchangeably.

reduce overall cost, this will limit the capacity for growth and scalability of the service provisioning. For example: routers and servers spend most of their energy on the baseline activities such as running the fans, spinning disk, powering the backplane, and powering the memory. Even in an idle state, modern systems can be consuming anything from 50% to 80% of the power consumed under maximum load [6, 8].

Alternatively, the data center can be revamped by relocating some services to end-host computers or peers. Peers contribute their communication, storage, and computation resources to exchange data and provide services while the data center performs central administration and authentication as well as backend processing. A P2P network formed by peers offers flexibility and scalability in service delivery.

We study the energy consumption of hybrid CDN-P2P in two use cases: live streaming and online storage services. It has been shown that CDN energy consumption is better than P2P architecture [5, 13]. The questions are: with the opportunity to offload the CDNs workload to the peers, how much energy saving can the CDN server get and how large is the difference compared to a pure CDN architecture. If we can estimate the difference between a CDN architecture and a peer-assisted CDN combined with an estimate of peer power consumption, we can use this difference as a basis calculation for giving an incentive to users since peer assisted relies heavily on the users uptime and upload rate. Furthermore, since the power consumption is reduced, the power requirement inside the data center can be reduced thus relaxing capacity planning.

5.2 System Description

5.2.1 Live Streaming

Figure 5.1 shows an example model of a peer-assisted CDN for live streaming adapted from [72]. CDN servers deliver video contents from the content provider




Figure 5.1: Example model of peer-assisted online storage architecture.

to end-users. The CDN usually is organized into several tiers usually to cope with the scale demand. Edge CDN servers are directly responsible for serving end users. The goal of the server side peer is for efficient data distribution with some measures to guard against some node failures and network delay.

The CDN overlay is largely tree-based. To provide greater reliability, a CDN node may allow retrieving the content either from other nodes. Edge CDN servers are responsible for serving end users

For this system, we introduce the concepts of seeder and leecher. A peer that is served by an edge CDN server is called a seeder while a peer that is served by seeders is called a leecher.

A peer obtains the URL from a content source. The global server load balancer finds a suitable edge CDN node for this peer. The peer is then redirected to the

nearest edge CDN. The edge CDNs has decision logic that decides if a new peer should be served directly by the edge CDN or if it should be redirected to the P2P overlay.

In the P2P overlay, the stream is separated into several substreams according the stream id and peers are organized in a tree-based overlay. A working peer-assisted CDN live streaming system is defined by parameters such as: (1) video bitrate, (2) the total number of peers, (3) the edge CDN servers bandwidth, and (4) peer upload bandwidth capacity and churn rates.

The maximum number of seeders is bounded by the CDN's capacity, while the maximum number of leechers is bounded by the number of seeders with a certain upload rate. Let us denote the number of the seeders by n_s , the number of leechers by n_l , the maximum bitrate supplied by seeders to leechers by ρ , and the video bitrate by r . The number of leechers that can be supported by seeders is:

$$\lfloor n_l \rfloor = n_s \cdot \rho \quad (5.1)$$

The number of seeders that support or upload content to leechers is:

$$n_s^u = n_l \cdot \frac{r}{\rho} \quad (5.2)$$

In peer-assisted live streaming, we introduce the utilization policy where the CDN server admits peers as seeders as long as the CDN utilization does not exceed 50%, which we defined as 50% of the capacity of a Gigabit Ethernet. When the utilization hits 50%, incoming peers are admitted as leechers, hence they receive the contents from seeders. When more peers join the system and the upload capacity of the seeders is exceeded, the policy raises the utilization cap and the server admits the newly joined peers as seeders. We consider this policy to be better than adding




Figure 5.2: Example model of peer-assisted online storage architecture.

a new server from the point of view of energy consumption.

5.2.2 Peer-Assisted Online Storage

Figure 5.2 illustrates the architecture of peer-assisted online storage for a file hosting system (one-click hosting service with peer-assistance) and interactions among the main components [57]. In this system, each file provided by users is treated as a swarm. Each end user is treated as a peer.

In Fig.5.2, arrows 1, 2, and 3 denote the interaction between a participating peer and tracking server and replication servers for uploading a new file. Arrows 4, 5, and 6 denote the interaction between peers and the tracking server to maintain the peer topology. Arrow 7 denotes the sharing of the file and exchange of availability data among peers. Arrows 8 and 9 represent peer requests and server response.

The tracking servers function is to maintain swarm information and bootstraps

peers. Replication servers working as dedicated content servers have a function for maintaining the availability of swarms when peers do not actively serve them alone.

We choose this peer-assisted online storage model because this model has been implemented widely in China, e.g. FS2You [14], and because one-click file hosting services are very popular right now [39]. Such services rely heavily on server farms inside the data center, thus energy cost becomes important [4]. In this model, since the server holds an important role in this system, we present a simple mathematical model of server bandwidth allocation strategies as a basis for energy calculations [56, 59], as follows:

- Type-1 represents less popular files and type-2 represents popular files.
- S_{t1} represents server bandwidth allocated to a type-1 file and S_{t2} represents server bandwidth allocated to a type-2 file.
- S is the total server bandwidth.
- S_{max1} is the maximum amount of server bandwidth that can be assigned to a file of type-1 and S_{max2} is the maximum amount of server bandwidth that can be assigned to a file of type-2.
- M_{t1} is the number of type-1 files and M_{t2} is the number of type-2 files.
- μ is upload rate of a peer.
- α_{t1} is the arrival rate of new peers in type-1 file and α_{t2} is the arrival rate of new peers in type-2 file.
- $\alpha = M_{t1}\alpha_{t1} + M_{t2}\alpha_{t2}$
- $M = M_{t1} + M_{t2}$
- η_{t1} is the file sharing effectiveness. It is the fraction of the upload capacity of peers that is being utilized for type-1 file.

- η_{t2} is the file sharing effectiveness. It is the fraction of the upload capacity of peers that is being utilized for type-2 file.
- T_d is the average downloading time.
- x_i is the average number of peers.

There are three server bandwidth allocation strategies: (1) lower bound of the average downloading time; (2) request driven strategy; (3) water leveling strategy. In the lower bound strategy, the server uses the bandwidth for type-1 files until S_{t1} reaches its maximum value, then the residual server bandwidth can be assigned to type-2 files. In the request driven strategy, the server serves every request from peers. The server bandwidth is equally divided among all the peers. Lets assume that the number of requests for a file to the server is proportional to the peer arrival rate of the file. Lets also assume that when the amount of server bandwidth assigned to one of the two types of files has reached its maximum value, the residual server bandwidth will be assigned to the other type of file. In the water leveling strategy, the server bandwidth is equalized across all the files by taking file popularity into consideration. The server serves the requests from peers according to a certain probability, which is inversely proportional to the peer arrival rate of the file. Lets assume that the number of requests for a file to the server is proportional to the peer arrival rate of the file, the server will serve the same number of requests for different files and therefore the server bandwidth is equally allocated across all the files. In order to be able to calculate our power consumption, we need to get the number of peers in the system that can be expressed as [56]:

$$\sum x_i = T_d \cdot \sum \lambda_i \quad (5.3)$$

Furthermore, we can calculate T_d :

$$T_d = \frac{1}{M_{t1} \cdot \lambda_{t1} + M_{t2} \cdot \lambda_{t2}} \left(\frac{M_{t1} \cdot f_{t1} \cdot \lambda_{t1} \cdot \eta_{t2} + M_{t2} \cdot f_{t2} \cdot \lambda_{t2} \cdot \eta_{t1}}{\mu \cdot \eta_{t1} \cdot \eta_{t2}} - \frac{S_{t1}(M_{t1} \cdot \eta_{t2} - M_{t2} \cdot \eta_{t1}) + S \cdot M_{t2} \cdot \eta_{t1}}{\mu \cdot \eta_{t1} \cdot \eta_{t2}} \right) \quad (5.4)$$

5.2.3 Energy Model

Our goal is to provide a general view and fair comparison of the energy consumed by a pure CDN and a hybrid CDN-P2P architecture. To do so, we designed a series of models and performed an analysis. Our energy model is similar to the models used in [43]. The differences with [43] are, firstly, our baseline energy is not a function of bitrate flow. Our baseline energy is based on the minimum energy required to turn on the device without any traffic flowing through the device. Secondly, our overhead ratio is based on the Coefficient of Performance (COP) of the cooling cycle in data center, which we will explain at the end of this section.

Let E_s , E_r , and E_p denote the energy consumption of a single request at each a CDN server, router, and peer respectively. Next, we define baseline energy consumption as the energy consumed to keep the device on, even when there is no traffic. Let E_{s-base} , E_{r-base} , and E_{p-base} denote the baseline energy consumption for CDN server, router, and peer respectively; and E_{s-max} , E_{r-max} , E_{p-max} denote the power consumption of server, router, and peer when operating at the maximum capacity.

Next, we introduce work-induced energy as the energy consume per bit transferred. Let δ_s , δ_r , and δ_p denote the work-induced energy consumed per additional bit transferred by each CDN server, router, and peer,

$$\delta_s = \frac{(E_{s-max} - E_{s-base})}{M_s} \quad (5.5)$$

$$\delta_r = \frac{(E_{r-\max} - E_{r-\text{base}})}{M_r} \quad (5.6)$$

$$\delta_p = \frac{(E_{p-\max} - E_{p-\text{base}})}{M_p} \quad (5.7)$$

Furthermore, we can get:

$$E_s = \delta_s B + E_{s-\text{base}} \quad (5.8)$$

$$E_r = d\delta_r B + E_{r-\text{base}} \quad (5.9)$$

$$E_p = \delta_p B + E_{p-\text{base}} \quad (5.10)$$

where d is the number of hops and B is the size of file to be transferred in bits.

We now introduce the overhead for the server and routers. The only overhead that we will consider here is cooling power. Since servers and routers are placed in the data center, the data center needs to be provisioned with adequate cooling. This cooling overhead in the data center is quantified by the coefficient of performance (COP). The COP value itself has been empirically determined to be [42]:

$$COP(T) = 0.0068.T^2 + 0.0008.T + 0.458 \quad (5.11)$$




Figure 5.3: COP curve for the chilled water cooling units from HP Lab utility data center. As the target temperature of the air the cooling unit pumps into the floor plenum increases, the COP increases.

Where T is the temperature supplied by the cooling unit in Celsius. Figure 5.3 shows the $COP(T)$ value for every T . Finally, the cooling cost can be calculated as [42]:

$$C = \frac{Q}{COP(T)} \quad (5.12)$$

Where Q is the amount of power consumed by the servers and hardware. We assume a uniform T at each cooling unit. Taking into account the cooling energy overhead, the total energy consumption is as follows:

$$E_t = E_s \left(1 + \frac{1}{COP(T)} \right) + E_r \left(1 + \frac{1}{COP(T)} \right) \quad (5.13)$$

We do not include the cooling overhead in the peer energy consumption because most of the peers in homes do not need a separate cooling supply.

5.3 Result and Analysis

5.3.1 Numerical Parameters

The parameters used in this analysis were adapted from [5, 43, 56, 64]. The parameters values are shown in Table 5.1. We choose the numerical parameters from [5, 43, 56, 64] because these parameters were gathered from empirical measurements.

Table 5.1: Numerical Simulation Parameters.

Symbol	Description	Values
δ_s	Work induced at server per bit transferred	$5.2 \cdot 10^{-8}$ (J/b)
δ_r	Work induced at router per bit transferred	$8.0 \cdot 10^{-9}$ (J/b)
δ_p	Work induced at peer per bit transferred	$16 \cdot 10^{-9}$ (J.b)
E_{r-base}	Router baseline power consumption	750 watt
E_{s-base}	Server baseline power consumption	290 watt
E_{p-base}	Peer baseline power consumption	13.5 watt
r	Video bitrate in live streaming	1Mbps
d	Number of hops	1
N_s^u	Upload rate of peers in live streaming	[0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1] Mbps
N	Number of peers in live streaming	[100,..,1000]
δ_{t1}	Type-1 peer arrival rate to less popular files in online storage (Poisson process)	0.1
δ_{t2}	Type-2 peer arrival rate to less popular files in online storage (Poisson process)	1
η_{t1}	File type-1 sharing effectiveness. The fraction of the upload capacity of peers that is being utilized in online storage	0.5
η_{t2}	File type-2 sharing effectiveness. The fraction of the upload capacity of peers that is being utilized in online storage	1
M_{t1}	Number of files in type-1 files or less popular files	10
M_{t2}	Number of files in type-2 files or less popular files	1
$f_{t1} = f_{t2}$	File size in online storage	100 MB
μ	Upload rate of peers in online storage	0.5Mbps
c	Downloading rate of peers in online storage	1Mbps
T	Air temperature supplied form cooling unit in data center	[20, 25] correspond to COP value [3.194, 4.728]




Figure 5.4: Simplified physical representation flow of data.

5.3.2 Live Streaming Service

In the live streaming case, each video stream flows from the CDN node to the network, in this case a router, and then arrives at the seeders. If seeders need to upload data to leechers it will flow through the router then arrive at the leechers. We show the logical network architecture of peer-assisted CDN for live streaming in Fig.5.1. Fig.5.4 shows a simplified physical representation of the network. While in a logical network the peer can communicate directly with another peer, in a real physical world the communication between peers always passes through a router inside the data center.




Figure 5.5: Power consumption for the server, router, peer, and total system for CDN architecture. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.

Figure 5.5 shows energy usage for CDN server, router, and the total energy consumption for the CDN scenario (without peer assist). We plot the energy consumption for CDN server, router, clients, and total energy for two COP coefficient values (T). All energy consumption components increase in value as the number of peers increases; and peers consume most of the energy. The effect of variations in T on total energy is small

Figure 5.6 shows the energy consumption of all components for the CDN-P2P scenario. We use the peer upload rate $N_s^u = 0.75$ in Fig.5.6. We observe that there is almost no change in peers power consumption compared to the pure CDN. The router consumes more power with a higher rate of increase because in CDN-P2P peers the traffic originated from the seeders passes through the router twice. The CDN server power consumption has small increases between $N = 100$ and $N = 500$, while there are sections with no power increase at $N > 500$, which is where the seeders are uploading contents to the leechers. The server power consumption




Figure 5.6: Power consumption for the server, router, peer and total system for peer-assisted CDN with $N_s^u = 0.75$. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.

remains flat as long as the upload rate does not exceed the defined peer upload rate.

Figure 5.7 shows the energy savings of CDN-P2P compared to CDN architecture for CDN server with the utilization policy as explained in Sec.5.2 for $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$.

Lets take $N_s^u = 0.75$ as an example. The first 500 nodes are served directly by the CDN server since the utilization of the CDN server is 50% or less. We consider 500 nodes to be 50% utilization because a video-rate of 1 Mbps will result in total network traffic of 0.5 Gbps, which is half of a Gigabit Ethernet interface. When more peers join the system, these peers will be treated as leechers as long as the upload ratio condition is fulfilled. The number of leechers that can be supported by seeders is 375. Therefore from $N = 500$ to $N = 875$, the CDN server does not need to increase utilization because the leechers can be supported by seeders, thus we see that the CDN server saves energy. In this phase, compared to CDN architecture, CDN-P2P energy saving is around 7.8%. Next, we have 875 total peers in the




Figure 5.7: Savings in power consumption between CDN architecture and peer-assisted CDN for server with $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$.

system, is apportioned into 500 peers as seeders and 375 as leechers. Since more peers joining the system, the CDN increases the utilization from 50% to 87.5% so all current 875 peers become seeders. In this phase, 875 seeders can support an additional 656 leechers. Therefore, from $N = 875$ to $N = 1531$ the CDN utilization is flat at 87.5% because 875 seeders can support 656 leechers thus we have energy savings around 11% compared to CDN architecture. Other values of N_s^u have same pattern as shown in Fig.5.7.

Figure 5.8 shows the total energy savings of CDN-P2P compared to CDN architecture for $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$. As the savings only occurs in the CDN server, we see the same patterns as in Fig 5.7 but with a much lower percentage of energy savings, which is 1%.

5.3.3 Online Storage

To calculate the energy consumption in peer-assisted online storage, we must be able to determine the number of peers in the system. We get average downloading




Figure 5.8: Savings in power consumption between CDN architecture and peer-assisted CDN for total system with $N_s^u = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1]$.

time (T_d) values by varying server bandwidth values (S) from 0 to 150 MBps using Eq 5.4. After getting the average downloading time, we can get the average number of peers using Eq 5.3. We found that the number of peers is inversely related to the server bandwidth. The number of peers is the horizontal axis in Fig 5.9 and Fig 5.10. The figures cover more number of peers compared to the live streaming service and we can look at the comparable number of peers in both cases when we want to do comparisons.

Figure 5.9 shows the power consumption for the lower-bound strategy for the server, router, peers, and the total system. We found that increasing the number of peers decreases CDN server power consumption because the bandwidth usage of the CDN server decreases. The router power consumption is flat at around 1000J/s because the server bandwidth reduction is offset by the increasing number of peers. We also found that the other strategies, request driven and water leveling, have the same pattern as the power consumption of the lower-bound strategy.

Figure 5.10 shows a comparison of the energy consumption between the request




Figure 5.9: Power consumption for lower bound strategy. Note that the server and router energy are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.

driven and the lower bound strategy, and between the water-leveling strategy and the lower bound strategy for different numbers of peers. Compared to the water-leveling strategy, the request driven strategy required more energy because the request driven strategy equalizes the server bandwidth across all the peers. The water-leveling strategy equalizes server bandwidth across all the files by taking file popularity into consideration, thus minimizing downloading time. We mentioned before that the number of peers is inversely related to the server bandwidth, therefore for the same server bandwidth, we get different numbers of peers for each strategy. This implies that for the same number of peers, we get different server bandwidth. That is the reason for $1000 < N < 2500$ the power consumption diverges. In very limited server bandwidth (less than 45MBps) and sufficient server bandwidth (more than 120MBps) each strategy has the same downloading performance. That is the reason for $N < 1000$ and $N > 2500$ we have the same the number of peers for same bandwidth. As shown in Fig 5.10, for $N < 1000$ and $N > 2500$ the savings for each




Figure 5.10: Savings in power consumption between each bandwidth allocation and CDN architecture for total and server. Note that the server and router energy (data center) are plotted using the right hand scale, and the peer and total energy are plotted using the left hand scale.

strategy is relatively the same.

File popularity has a strong correlation with downloading performance. We examine popularity by varying the peer arrival rate of less popular files while the server has fixed bandwidth. Specifically, we increase the type-1 files popularity from 0.1 to 1 and we choose a fixed server bandwidth $S = 50$ MBps which is similar to FS2You. Figure 5.11 shows the difference in total power consumption (left axis) and router power consumption (right axis) of that case. Since the server bandwidth is fixed, we only show the power consumption changes in the routers and the total. When the arrival rate is less than 0.5, the request driven strategy has worse downloading performance compared to the water leveling strategy. This implies more peers exist in the request driven strategy than the water leveling strategy. Therefore, the energy consumption of the request driven strategy is higher than the water leveling strategy. Generally for each strategy, increasing the peer arrival rates to less popular file makes the total energy consumption and router energy consumption increase




Figure 5.11: Power consumption for total (left axis) and router (right axis) under different server bandwidth allocation strategies when peer arrival rate of less popular varies. We use fixed server bandwidth $S = 50$ MBps.

because more peers are present in the system. Increasing the peer arrival rates to the less popular file makes both the request driven and the water leveling strategy energy consumption converge to a lower bound. This is because more peers in the system improve P2P content availability, thus improving downloading performance that converges to the lower bound strategy.

5.4 Summary

We compared the energy consumption between peer-assisted CDN and pure CDN for live streaming and online storage services both at the data center as well as in total. Employing peer-to-peer capability to assist a CDN is thought to lower the energy requirements at data centers, and we found that the maximum savings at the data centers are 11% and 21%, respectively for the live streaming and online storage services. These savings may change depending on the COP values used and should

be better if a new generation of power proportional server were used. One thing to note is that as the number of peers increases, the servers energy consumption increases for the live streaming and decreases for the online storage service due to the differences in the ways both services handle peers. However, the servers energy consumption is swamped by the peers energy consumption. Despite this difference in behavior in the two cases, when comparing Peer Assisted CDN to pure CDN, we found the total energy savings of less than 1%. Nevertheless, the total energy consumption is large, so that even a small percentage improvement results in valuable net reduction. Several areas that we identified as the future work are: 1. The effect of peers uptime variations; 2. More realistic file popularity models for the online storage service; and 3. How CDN providers or ISPs give incentives to the peers based on the understanding of the energy consumptions.

Chapter 6

Conclusion and Future Work

6.1 Conclusion

We have investigated the properties of BitTorrent overlay topologies from the point of view of the peer exchange protocol using real swarms from an operational BitTorrent tracker on the Internet.

Our results agree in some particulars and disagree in others with prior published work on isolated testbed experiments, suggesting that more work is required to fully model the behavior of real-world BitTorrent networks.

We find that the node degree of the graph formed in a BitTorrent swarm can be described by a power law with exponential cut-off and the observation of a low clustering coefficient implies BitTorrent networks are close to random networks. From the BitTorrent protocol point of view, the reason that a BitTorrent swarm can be described by a power-law with exponential cut-off is: leechers in a BitTorrent swarm prefer a few good seeders or neighbors that can give high data rates to exchange the data and seeders have rich connections to leechers as seeders have complete chunks or pieces. That behavior explains why seeders have rich connections while leechers only have a few neighbors. We argue that there are two reasons for the cut-off phenomenon. First, most BitTorrent clients configure the maximum number of

global connection between 200 – 300, however the maximum connection per torrent (swarm) is set between 50 – 90 by default [51] [63]. Some BitTorrent forums suggest decreasing the maximum connection for torrent (swarm) to between 30 – 40 [62]. Second, most of the BitTorrent users are home users where their home gateway device cannot give high concurrent connections and BitTorrent is not the main online activity. We argue that the BitTorrent swarm closes to random that we infer from clustering coefficient is caused by BitTorrent mechanism itself that always choose random peers from its neighbors in the choking-unchoking algorithm, optimistic choking algorithm, and optimistic connect algorithm as we explained previously.

In peer-assisted CDN, We show that by introducing the z factor to utility function we can increase the peer contribution to deliver the content while decreasing required replicas. We found that there are no much different between the first scenario and the second scenario in peer contribution to deliver a video. We found that in the first scenario and the second scenario, the model gives lower replica in the body of distribution than prop, while the third scenario gives lower replica in the tail of distribution than prop. Implication of higher peer contribution means CDN can reduce workload because some workload are delegate to peer-to-peer network.

Integrating peer to peer capability to assist the existing CDN has a potential to save energy consumption. In this study, we show that even without explicitly considering energy consumption while assigning content, the peer assisted CDN can save energy consumption. Although the energy savings depend on number of request (number of clients), number of router and its configuration, for total system energy saving is around 0.5 to 1.2. If we break per component, the CDN server is the part that can be pushed to save energy up to 11% and can be more if new generation of power proportional server is used [33]. We agree with [8], Router component in the other side is quite difficult for energy saving, because different chassis size, different network interface type slot, and different configuration has different energy consumption. Several areas that we have been identified for future work are: more

correlation analysis of time period to peer energy usage pattern in live streaming, continued characterization of different peer energy usage based on flash memory storage, and comparing energy model with different file popularity models.

6.2 Future Work

Some areas of improvement that we have identified for future work are: more correlation analysis of the number of peers with α and p value, continued characterization with NATed peers, wider likelihood ratio test with other models and comparing the results with simulation for global graph properties such as distance distribution. We hope to incorporate these properties into a complete dK series for the evolution of a real-world BitTorrent overlay as it evolves over time [38]. We conclude that further work throughout the community is necessary to continue to improve the agreement of simulation and controlled experiment with the real world, and that such work will impact our understanding of BitTorrent performance and its effects on the Internet. Several areas that we have been identified for future work in energy comsumption of peer-assisted CDN: more correlation analysis of time period to peer energy usage pattern in live streaming, continued characterization of different peer energy usage based on flash memory storage, and comparing energy model with different file popularity models.

Appendices

Appendix A

Some Detail on BitTorrent Terminology

In this appendix, we will give more detail explanation some BitTorrent terminology based on BitTorrent specification.

A.1 Torrent File

Torrent file or metainfo file has always ending in ".torrent". This file is a bencoded dictionary, containing structure as follows:

- info: a dictionary described the file of the torrent.
- announce: the announce URL of the tracker.
- creation date: the creation time of the torrent in standard UNIX epoch format.
- comment: free text contain comments from the author.
- created by: name and version of the application used to create this torrent file or metainfo file.
- encoding: the string encoding format used to generate the pieces/chunks/blocks of the info dictionary in torrent file.

info itself has structure as follows:

- piece length: the length of a piece/chunk/block in bytes. it is usually in power of 2. Common size for piece length is 256KB.
- pieces: concatenation of all 20 byte SHA1 hash value each pieces/chunks/blocks.
- private: this optional to denote private torrent.

A.2 Handshake

. Handshake is the first message that must sent by BitTorrent client when contacting other peers. Handshake message format as follows:

handshake: <pstrlen><pstr><reserved><info_hash><peer_id>

The details as follows:

- pstrlen is string length of |pstr|.
- pstr is string identifier of the protocol.
- reserved is reverse bit for changing the behavior of protocol.
- info_hash is 20 byte SHA1 hash of the info key in torrent file.
- peer_id is 20 byte string used as a unique ID for the client.
- name: the file name of content.
- length: length of the file in bytes.
- md5sum: hexadecimal string correponding to the MD5 sum of the file.

A.3 HAVE

HAVE message is the message that sent by a peer to other peers. The purpose of this message to let other peers know the pieces/chunks that has just downloaded. The format of HAVE message as follows:

```
have: <len=0005><id=4><piece index>
```

piece index is the index of a piece that has just successfully downloaded and verified by the hash.

A.4 BITFIELD

BITFIELD message is the message that sent by peer to other peers. The purpose of this message to let other peers know total pieces/chunks that a peer have. The format of BITFIELD message as follows:

```
bitfield: <len=0001+X><id=5><bitfield>
```

The BITFIELD message has variable length because its depend on number of information of pieces/chunks that have been downloaded.

A.5 PEX

There are two PEX implementation which are Azareus and Libtorrent (UT_PEX). We will use the UT_PEX as reference. Since PEX is extension, to be able to use that extension, the reserved field in handshake message must be filled. In this case, the 5th bit of the 6th byte of the reserved. Next, the handshake message informs other peers which extended messages are supported and what's the extended id will be used.

The payload of a peer exchange message is a bencoded dictionary with the following keys:

- added: contains list of peers in the compact tracker format since the last peer exchange message.
- added.f: one byte of flags for each peer in the above added string. This contains information about other supported things for UT_PEX. for example in UT_PEX, byte 1 is for encryption thus the peer support encryption.
- dropped: contains list of peers that dropped since the last peer exchange message.

Appendix B

Likelihood Ratio Test

Assume we have two different distributions with PDFs $p_1(x)$ and $p_2(s)$. The likelihood of a given data set within two distributions are

$$L_1 = \prod_{i=1}^n p_1(x_i) \quad L_2 = \prod_{i=1}^n p_2(x_i) \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and the likelihood is:

$$R = \frac{L_1}{L_2} = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{p_1(x_i)}{p_2(x_i)} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

taking log, the log likelihood ratio is:

$$\mathcal{R} = \sum_{i=1}^n [\ln p_1(x_i) - \ln p_2(x_i)] = \sum_{i=1}^n [\ell_i^{(1)} - \ell_i^{(2)}] \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where $\ell_i^{(j)}$ is the log-likelihood in distribution j . As we assume that x_i are independent, thus $\ell_i^{(1)} - \ell_i^{(2)}$ is also independent. By the central limit theorem, their sum \mathcal{R} will be in normal distribution as n grows. Expected variance can be estimate as:

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [(\ell_i^{(1)} - \ell_i^{(2)}) - (\bar{\ell}_i^{(1)} - \bar{\ell}_i^{(2)})]^2 \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where

$$\bar{\ell}^1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i^{(1)} \quad \bar{\ell}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_i^{(2)} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

The probability that the measured of log-likelihood ratio has magnitude as large as or larger than observed value $|\mathcal{R}|$ is:

$$p = \operatorname{erfc}\left(\frac{|\mathcal{R}|}{\sqrt{2n}\sigma}\right) \quad (\text{B.6})$$

and

$$\operatorname{erfc}(z) = 1 - \operatorname{erf}(z) \quad (\text{B.7})$$

is the complementary Gaussian error function which is available widely in scientific computing library. This p value is also call significance value for log-likelihood test. In nested hypothesis where we compare two distributions under same family, if p -value is small, the smaller family is better than larger family. if not then we can not say no evidence that larger family is needed, while the smaller family gives better fit.

Bibliography

- [1] ABHARI, A., AND SORAYA, M. Workload generation for youtube. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 46, 1 (2010), 91–118.
- [2] AL HAMRA, A., LEGOUT, A., AND BARAKAT, C. Understanding the properties of the bittorrent overlay. *CoRR abs/0707.1820* (2007).
- [3] AL-HAMRA, A., LIOGKAS, N., LEGOUT, A., AND BARAKAT, C. Swarming overlay construction strategies. In *Computer Communications and Networks, 2009. ICCCN 2009. Proceedings of 18th International Conference on* (2009), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [4] ARSTECHNICA. Megaupload data cost. <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2012/03/isp-storing-25-petabytes-of-megaupload-data-costs-us-9000-a-day/>.
- [5] BALIGA, J., HINTON, K., AND TUCKER, R. S. Energy consumption of the internet. In *Optical Internet, 2007 and the 2007 32nd Australian Conference on Optical Fibre Technology. COIN-ACOFT 2007. Joint International Conference on* (2007), IEEE, pp. 1–3.
- [6] BARROSO, L., AND HOLZLE, U. The case for energy-proportional computing. *Computer* 40, 12 (2007), 33–37.

- [7] BORGHOL, Y., MITRA, S., ARDON, S., CARLSSON, N., EAGER, D., AND MAHANTI, A. Characterizing and modelling popularity of user-generated videos. *Perform. Eval.* 68, 11 (Nov. 2011), 1037–1055.
- [8] CHABAREK, J., SOMMERS, J., BARFORD, P., ESTAN, C., TSIANG, D., AND WRIGHT, S. Power awareness in network design and routing. In *INFOCOM 2008. The 27th Conference on Computer Communications. IEEE* (2008), pp. 457–465.
- [9] Cisco. Cisco visual networking index. http://www.cisco.com/en/US/netsol/ns827/networking_solutions_sub_solution.html.
- [10] CLAUSET, A., SHALIZI, C., AND NEWMAN, M. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM review* 51, 4 (2009), 661–703.
- [11] DALE, C., LIU, J., PETERS, J., AND LI, B. Evolution and enhancement of bittorrent network topologies. In *Quality of Service, 2008. IWQoS 2008. 16th International Workshop on* (2008), IEEE, pp. 1–10.
- [12] DOYLE, J., ALDERSON, D., LI, L., LOW, S., ROUGHAN, M., SHALUNOV, S., TANAKA, R., AND WILLINGER, W. The robust yet fragile nature of the internet. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 102, 41 (2005), 14497.
- [13] FELDMANN, A., GLADISCH, A., KIND, M., LANGE, C., SMARAGDAKIS, G., AND WESTPHAL, F.-J. Energy trade-offs among content delivery architectures. In *Telecommunications Internet and Media Techno Economics (CTTE), 2010 9th Conference on* (2010), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [14] FS2You. Fs2you. <http://www.rayfile.com/en/>.
- [15] GIANNETTI, I., ANASTASI, G., AND CONTI, M. Energy-efficient p2p file sharing for residential bittorrent users. In *Computers and Communications (ISCC), 2012 IEEE Symposium on* (2012), pp. 000524–000529.

- [16] GOOGLE. Google data center power usage. Available on <http://www.google.com/corporate/datacenters/measuring.html>.
- [17] GRINDROD, P., AND HIGHAM, D. J. Evolving graphs: dynamical models, inverse problems and propagation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Science* 466, 2115 (Mar. 2010), 753–770.
- [18] GUAN, K., ATKINSON, G., KILPER, D., AND GULSEN, E. On the energy efficiency of content delivery architectures. In *Communications Workshops (ICC), 2011 IEEE International Conference on* (2011), pp. 1–6.
- [19] GUILLEMIN, F., HOUDOIN, T., AND MOTEAU, S. Volatility of youtube content in orange networks and consequences. In *Communications (ICC), 2013 IEEE International Conference on* (June 2013), pp. 2381–2385.
- [20] GUO, L., CHEN, S., XIAO, Z., TAN, E., DING, X., AND ZHANG, X. Measurements, analysis, and modeling of bittorrent-like systems. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet Measurement* (2005), USENIX Association, p. 4.
- [21] GUO, L., CHEN, S., AND ZHANG, X. Design and evaluation of a scalable and reliable p2p assisted proxy for on-demand streaming media delivery. *Knowledge and Data Engineering, IEEE Transactions on* 18, 5 (May 2006), 669–682.
- [22] GUPTA, M., AND SINGH, S. Greening of the internet. In *Proceedings of the 2003 conference on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications* (New York, NY, USA, 2003), SIGCOMM ’03, ACM, pp. 19–26.
- [23] HEI, X., LIANG, C., LIANG, J., LIU, Y., AND ROSS, K. A measurement study of a large-scale p2p iptv system. *Multimedia, IEEE Transactions on* 9, 8 (2007), 1672–1687.

- [24] HOSSFELD, T., HOCK, D., OECHSNER, S., LEHRIEDER, F., DESPOTOVIC, Z., KELLERER, W., AND MICHEL, M. Measurement of bittorrent swarms and their as topologies. Technical Report 464, University of Wurzburg, November 2009.
- [25] HUANG, C., LI, J., AND ROSS, K. Peer-assisted vod: Making internet video distribution cheap. In *Proc. of IPTPS* (2007), vol. 7.
- [26] HUANG, C., LI, J., AND ROSS, K. W. Can internet video-on-demand be profitable? *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 37, 4 (Aug. 2007), 133–144.
- [27] HUANG, C., WANG, A., LI, J., AND ROSS, K. W. Understanding hybrid cdn-p2p: why limelight needs its own red swoosh. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Workshop on Network and Operating Systems Support for Digital Audio and Video* (New York, NY, USA, 2008), NOSSDAV ’08, ACM, pp. 75–80.
- [28] INC., A. Available on http://support.amd.com/us/Embedded_TechDocs/20213.pdf.
- [29] INC., C. Available on http://www.cisco.com/web/partners/downloads/765/other/Energy_Logic Reducing_Data_Center_Energy_Consumption.pdf.
- [30] INSTITUTE, U. the 2012 uptime institute data center industry survey. Available on <http://uptimeinstitute.com/2012-survey-results>.
- [31] JACOBSON, V., SMETTERS, D. K., THORNTON, J. D., PLASS, M. F., BRIGGS, N. H., AND BRAYNARD, R. L. Networking named content. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Emerging Networking Experiments and Technologies* (New York, NY, USA, 2009), CoNEXT ’09, ACM, pp. 1–12.
- [32] JIANG, H., LI, J., LI, Z., AND LIU, J. Efficient hierarchical content distribution using p2p technology. In *Networks, 2008. ICON 2008. 16th IEEE International Conference on* (dec. 2008), pp. 1 –6.

- [33] KRIOUKOV, A., MOHAN, P., ALSPAUGH, S., KEYS, L., CULLER, D., AND KATZ, R. Napsac: design and implementation of a power-proportional web cluster. *SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.* 41, 1 (Jan. 2011), 102–108.
- [34] KRYCZKA, M., CUEVAS, R., GUERRERO, C., AND AZCORRA, A. Unrevealing the structure of live bittorrent swarms: Methodology and analysis. In *Proc. IEEE Int Peer-to-Peer Computing (P2P) Conf* (2011), pp. 230–239.
- [35] LEGOUT, A., LIOKAS, N., KOHLER, E., AND ZHANG, L. Clustering and sharing incentives in bittorrent systems. In *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM SIGMETRICS international conference on Measurement and modeling of computer systems* (2007), ACM, pp. 301–312.
- [36] LEGOUT, A., URVOY-KELLER, G., AND MICHIARDI, P. Rarest first and choke algorithms are enough. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement* (2006), ACM, pp. 203–216.
- [37] LI, Z., GOYAL, A., CHEN, Y., AND KUZMANOVIC, A. Measurement and diagnosis of address misconfigured p2p traffic. In *INFOCOM, 2010 Proceedings IEEE* (2010), IEEE, pp. 1–9.
- [38] MAHADEVAN, P., KRIOUKOV, D., FALL, K., AND VAHDAT, A. Systematic topology analysis and generation using degree correlations. In *Proceedings of the 2006 conference on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications* (2006), ACM, pp. 135–146.
- [39] MAHANTI, A. Measurement and analysis of cyberlocker services. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference companion on World wide web* (New York, NY, USA, 2011), WWW ’11, ACM, pp. 373–378.
- [40] MANDAL, U., LANGE, C., GLADISCH, A., AND MUKHERJEE, B. Should isps adopt hybrid cdn-p2p in ip-over-wdm networks: An energy-efficiency perspective?

- In *Advanced Networks and Telecommunications Systems (ANTS), 2012 IEEE International Conference on* (2012), pp. 6–11.
- [41] MITZENMACHER, M. A brief history of generative models for power law and lognormal distributions. *Internet mathematics* 1, 2 (2004), 226–251.
- [42] MOORE, J., CHASE, J., RANGANATHAN, P., AND SHARMA, R. Making scheduling” cool”: temperature-aware workload placement in data centers. In *Proceedings of the annual conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (2005), pp. 5–5.
- [43] NEDEVSCHI, S., RATNASAMY, S., AND PADHYE, J. Hot data centers vs. cool peers. In *Proceedings of the 2008 conference on Power aware computing and systems* (Berkeley, CA, USA, 2008), HotPower’08, USENIX Association, pp. 8–8.
- [44] NORDBERG, A. Rasterbar libtorrent. <http://www.rasterbar.com/products/libtorrent>.
- [45] OCTOSHAPE. Cnn uses octoshape. Available on <http://octoshape.com/cnn-com-using-octoshapes-p2p-for-live-feed/>.
- [46] PALASAMUDRAM, D. S., SITARAMAN, R. K., URGAONKAR, B., AND URGAONKAR, R. Using batteries to reduce the power costs of internet-scale distributed networks. In *Proceedings of the Third ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing* (New York, NY, USA, 2012), SoCC ’12, ACM, pp. 11:1–11:14.
- [47] PASSARELLA, A. A survey on content-centric technologies for the current internet: Cdn and p2p solutions. *Computer Communications* 35, 1 (2012), 1 – 32.
- [48] POUWELSE, J., GARBACKI, P., EPEMA, D., AND SIPS, H. A measurement study of the bittorrent peer-to-peer file-sharing system. *Delft University of Technology*

- Parallel and Distributed Systems Report Series, Tech. Rep. Technical Report PDS-2004-007* (2004).
- [49] QURESHI, A., WEBER, R., BALAKRISHNAN, H., GUTTAG, J., AND MAGGS, B. Cutting the electric bill for internet-scale systems. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 39, 4 (2009), 123–134.
- [50] ROWSTRON, A. I. T., AND DRUSCHEL, P. Pastry: Scalable, decentralized object location, and routing for large-scale peer-to-peer systems. In *Proceedings of the IFIP/ACM International Conference on Distributed Systems Platforms Heidelberg* (London, UK, UK, 2001), Middleware ’01, Springer-Verlag, pp. 329–350.
- [51] SETTING, V. B. C. G. Available on http://wiki.vuze.com/w/Good_settings.
- [52] SPECIFICATION, B. Available on <https://wiki.theory.org/BitTorrentSpecification>.
- [53] STUTZBACH, D., AND REJAIE, R. Understanding churn in peer-to-peer networks. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement* (2006), ACM, pp. 189–202.
- [54] STUTZBACH, D., REJAIE, R., DUFFIELD, N., SEN, S., AND WILLINGER, W. Sampling techniques for large, dynamic graphs. In *INFOCOM 2006. 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications. Proceedings* (2007), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [55] STUTZBACH, D., REJAIE, R., AND SEN, S. Characterizing unstructured overlay topologies in modern p2p file-sharing systems. *Networking, IEEE/ACM Transactions on* 16, 2 (2008), 267–280.

- [56] SUN, Y., LIU, F., LI, B., AND LI, B. Peer-assisted online storage and distribution: modeling and server strategies. In *Proceedings of the 18th international workshop on Network and operating systems support for digital audio and video* (New York, NY, USA, 2009), NOSSDAV '09, ACM, pp. 13–18.
- [57] SUN, Y., LIU, F., LI, B., LI, B., AND ZHANG, X. Fs2you: Peer-assisted semi-persistent online storage at a large scale. In *INFOCOM 2009, IEEE* (2009), pp. 873–881.
- [58] TANG, J., MUSOLESI, M., MASCOLO, C., AND LATOURA, V. Temporal distance metrics for social network analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM workshop on Online social networks* (New York, NY, USA, 2009), WOSN '09, ACM, pp. 31–36.
- [59] TEWARI, S., AND KLEINROCK, L. Analytical model for bittorrent-based live video streaming. In *Consumer Communications and Networking Conference, 2007. CCNC 2007. 4th IEEE* (jan. 2007), pp. 976 –980.
- [60] TIAN, Y., WU, D., AND NG, K. Modeling, analysis and improvement for bittorrent-like file sharing networks. In *INFOCOM 2006. 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications. Proceedings* (2007), IEEE, pp. 1–11.
- [61] URVOY-KELLER, G., AND MICHIARDI, P. Impact of inner parameters and overlay structure on the performance of bittorrent. In *INFOCOM 2006. 25th IEEE International Conference on Computer Communications. Proceedings* (2007), IEEE, pp. 1–6.
- [62] uTORRENT BITTORRENT CLIENT’s FORUM. Available on <http://forum.utorrent.com/viewtopic.php?id=47523>.
- [63] uTORRENT BITTORRENT CLIENT’s GOOD SETTING. Available on <http://forum.utorrent.com/viewtopic.php?id=58404>.

- [64] VALANCIUS, V., LAOUTARIS, N., MASSOULIÉ, L., DIOT, C., AND RODRIGUEZ, P. Greening the internet with nano data centers. In *Proceedings of the 5th international conference on Emerging networking experiments and technologies* (2009), ACM, pp. 37–48.
- [65] VU, L., GUPTA, I., NAHRSTEDT, K., AND LIANG, J. Understanding overlay characteristics of a large-scale peer-to-peer iptv system. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.* 6, 4 (Nov. 2010), 31:1–31:24.
- [66] VUONG, Q. Likelihood ratio tests for model selection and non-nested hypotheses. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society* 57, 2 (1989), 307–333.
- [67] WANG, J., HUANG, C., AND LI, J. On isp-friendly rate allocation for peer-assisted vod. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM international conference on Multimedia* (New York, NY, USA, 2008), MM ’08, ACM, pp. 279–288.
- [68] WATTS, D., AND STROGATZ, S. Collective dynamics of small-world networks. *Nature* 393, 6684 (1998), 440–442.
- [69] WU, D., DHUNGEL, P., HEI, X., ZHANG, C., AND ROSS, K. Understanding peer exchange in bittorrent systems. In *Peer-to-Peer Computing (P2P), 2010 IEEE Tenth International Conference on* (2010), IEEE, pp. 1–8.
- [70] Xu, D., KULKARNI, S. S., ROSENBERG, C., AND CHAI, H.-K. Analysis of a cdn-p2p hybrid architecture for cost-effective streaming media distribution. *Multimedia Systems* 11, 4 (2006), 383–399.
- [71] YIN, H., LIU, X., ZHAN, T., SEKAR, V., QIU, F., LIN, C., ZHANG, H., AND LI, B. Design and deployment of a hybrid cdn-p2p system for live video streaming: experiences with livesky. In *Proceedings of the 17th ACM international conference on Multimedia* (New York, NY, USA, 2009), MM ’09, ACM, pp. 25–34.

- [72] YIN, H., LIU, X., ZHAN, T., SEKAR, V., QIU, F., LIN, C., ZHANG, H., AND LI, B. Livesky: Enhancing cdn with p2p. *ACM Trans. Multimedia Comput. Commun. Appl.* 6, 3 (Aug. 2010), 16:1–16:19.
- [73] ZHANG, C., DHUNGEL, P., LIU, Z., AND ROSS, K. BitTorrent darknets. In *INFO-COM, 2010 Proceedings IEEE* (2010), IEEE, pp. 1–9.
- [74] ZINK, M., SUH, K., GU, Y., AND KUROSE, J. Characteristics of youtube network traffic at a campus network - measurements, models, and implications. *Comput. Netw.* 53, 4 (Mar. 2009), 501–514.