MQP Meeting minutes

Date and Time	Tuesday 26, November 2013 at 2:00 pm
Venue	Craig's Office
Participants	Curtis, Craig, Krishna, Dan

Item	Notes and Discussion
Notes on the Demo	• Could this be extended to dispatch entire HTTP requests to peer routers to speed up load times for typical web pages (Krishna). • Try to devise a more eloquent way to determine when to aggregate (perhaps a conditional GET on content length) • Monitor performance using tshark or tcpdump. (Throughput,)
Trust Calc (Pt. 3)	• Running trust calculation with a bit vector. Penalize recent activity more then past actions. • Good action adds a 1 to the front of the vector, bad actions add a 0. Divide by $2^{number-of-actions}$. Produces a trust value. • Highly reactionary. 1 sample (leading bit) will always determine 50% of the value. • Might work better for averaging past transactions, or for computing reliability. • What does trust mean? Accuracy, Timeliness (next to godliness), willingness, reliability. We're better of having a Pure Quality metric which lumps all of these metrics together.
Determining when a response is false	• End of the day, the response is either good data or bad data. How can we truly know? Zero Knowledge proof only works on static content. • HTTP headers (last modified date) might allow us to conclude when the server has responded with cached or out of date data. • A server is more likely to mess up with a response then the peer. Verifying data is a very difficult problem. • There will be many cases in which we can't verify the data. The heavier the analysis, the more overhead is introduced. • An accusation of lying will require a lot of work (Craig) • This was scoped more towards static content like movie files, we shouldn't have to worry to much about dealing with dynamic content.
For next week	• Excel timeline for upcoming work. • Revision of paper for Craig on Sunday (read it!)