

NS_PCOM7E January 2023 A

Group 2: Nisa, Nomusa, Prannoy, Xue Ling

The Future of the Internet

Introduction

- Internet: an integral part of our lives
 - Digital communication, work, interaction

- Technology, information & knowledge sharing
 - Peer-to-peer (P2P)

Definition

- Decentralised network architecture: mesh-like
- Direct communication between computers (as both client & server)
- P2P overlay-based networking protocols
 - BitTorrent
 - TOR
 - Freenet
 - KAD

Advantages

- Decentralisation: Highly distributed networks
 - Functional without any central servers
 - High fault-tolerance
- Lower (running) costs
 - Less need for expensive infrastructure
- High scalability potential
 - Ideal architecture for the future of the Internet
- Privacy: Anonymous

BitTorrent

BitTorrent

- Popular file distribution system
 - Divide large files into smaller pieces
 - Each peer downloads & uploads pieces to other peers
- Sharing information stored in a distributed host system
 - Redistribute load
- Saves cost
 - Data saved on different host machines - exchange data

TOR

TOR

- Specialised web browser
- Onion routing
 - Route traffic through multiple nodes in TOR network
 - Session key generated in each hop gets deleted
 - Difficult to trace traffic source
- Anonymous
 - More data privacy than standard web browser (i.e. Chrome)
 - Chrome browser: Network goes through ISP servers

Freenet

Freenet

- Privacy & availability
- Share & communicate
 anonymously: publish, replicate,
 retrieve data
- Location-independent
 - High availability
 - Scales with number of users
 - Distribute data across network:
 difficult to censor/block content

KAD

KAD

- eMule file-sharing app
- Distributed Hash Table (DHT): index files & network locations
 - Quick & easy to find consistent format
 - Peers locate & download files from other peers
 - Distributed nature: Grow/shrink system without significant operational impact

Limitations of Other Technologies & Conclusion

Limitations of

Content Centric Networking (CCN) and/or NDN or COAST

Why It May Not Be the Best Solution for the Future of the Internet

- Some advantages over traditional IP network
- Scalability challenges:
 Significant infrastructure & app changes
- Limited support for real-time apps
- Security & privacy concerns
- P2P Overlay may be better suited for the future of the Internet

Limitations of MobilityFirst Architecture

Why It May Not Be the Best Solution for the Future of the Internet

- High implementation cost
- Limited compatibility with existing networks
- Complexity
 - Specialised skills & knowledge
- Still in research phase
- Not suitable for all use cases

Limitations of Adoption of IPv6 and Associated Security Measures

Why It May Not Be the Best Solution for the Future of the Internet

- Some advantages: improved address space & security
- Limits & challenges
 - Compatibility issues with older devices, systems
- IPv6
 - Costly & time-consuming
 - Requires significant infrastructure upgrades
 - Risk of fragmentation & incompatibility if IPv6 adoption is not universal
- Combination of different approaches & solutions
 - o DNSSEC, HTTP/3, IPsec

Conclusion

- Promising technology: device and user growth
- Protect privacy: Anonymous platform
- Cost saving: spread across users
- Improved security: data not concentrated in central servers
 = no single point of failure
 - Difficult for attackers to target and steal data
- Security concern: No central entity management

Clarke, I., Sandberg, O., Wiley, B. and Hong, T.W., 2001, March. Freenet: A distributed anonymous information storage and retrieval system. In Designing privacy enhancing technologies: international workshop on design issues in anonymity and unobservability Berkeley, CA, USA, July 25–26, 2000 Proceedings (pp. 46-66). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Cohen, B., 2003, June. Incentives build robustness in BitTorrent. In Workshop on Economics of Peer-to-Peer systems (Vol. 6, pp. 68-72).

Dingledine, R., Mathewson, N. and Syverson, P., 2004. Tor: The second-generation onion router. Naval Research Lab Washington DC.

Fuchs, C., 2007. Internet and society: Social theory in the information age. Routledge.

Lua, E.K., Crowcroft, J., Pias, M., Sharma, R. and Lim, S., 2005. A survey and comparison of peer-to-peer overlay network schemes. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 7(2), pp.72-93.

Raychaudhuri, D., Seskar, I., Ganu, S., Kolenkiewicz, M., & Venkataramani, A. (2012). MobilityFirst: a mobility-centric and trustworthy internet architecture. Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM workshop on Future human-centric multimedia networking, 1-6.

Steiner, M., En-Najjary, T. and Biersack, E.W., 2007. Exploiting KAD: possible uses and misuses. ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, 37(5), pp.65-70.

Stoica, I., Morris, R., Karger, D., Kaashoek, M. F., & Balakrishnan, H. (2001). Chord: A scalable peer-to-peer lookup service for internet applications. ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review, 31(4), 149-160.

Wang, Y., Zhang, D., & Xu, C. Z. (2012). A comparative study of content-centric networking and traditional IP networking. IEEE Communications Magazine, 50(7), 106-113.

Yang, S.J. and Chen, I.Y., 2008. A social network-based system for supporting interactive collaboration in knowledge sharing over peer-to-peer network. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 66(1), pp.36-50.

Yang, Y., Liu, J., & Zhang, J. (2015). A survey of peer-to-peer overlay network architectures. IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, 17(1), 69-93.

Zhang, J., Hu, J., & Wang, X. (2012). Peer-to-peer overlay-based network and its applications. Journal of Computer Science and Technology, 27(5), 923-937.