

WebCloud: Enabling more direct content exchange between web clients

Fangfei Zhou^{†§}

Motivation



The New York Times



Previously (pre-2005), web content -- in the form of web pages, images, audio, and video --- was primarily created by a small minority of Media and corporations, and was delivered to a large audience of web users.

Thus, network workload was

- From the "center" (media)
- To the "edge" (users)

Recent trends such as the rise in popularity of online social networking; the ease of content creation using digital devices like smart phones, cameras, and camcorders; and the ubiquity of Internet access have democratized content creation.





Today, Internet users are creating content that makes up a significant fraction of Internet traffic.

How is new content being delivered?

Traditional "centralized" architectures Akamai, Limelight Facebook serves most of its own content



Mismatch between infrastructure and workload

Workload is naturally decentralized Every Facebook upload goes via CA Works today with photos, but videos? facebook.

Can we move towards more decentralized web distribution architectures?

Liang Zhang^{†§}

Eric J. Franco^{†§}

^{*}Jandrell' Pearson & Revis Ltd [†]Northeastern University

Design

We propose WebCloud, a content distribution system designed to support the workloads present in existing online social networking websites.







facebook.



Key insight: leverage the local storage and bandwidth resources of the users themselves to help serve content to other users. (i.e., p2p content distribution for the web)

Saves bandwidth: due to the geographic locality that often exists between friends in online social networks, content exchanges often stays in the ISP Scalable: each additional user provides additional resources

Implementation

Goal: make it work with today's sites, browsers Idea: Introduce a middlebox to allow browsers to communicate

To build WebCloud, we need two components: Middlebox

Client-side changes

| Need to turn web browser into server | Add |
|--|---------|
| Implement WebCloud in JavaScript Add it to the site's pages | Li N |
| Use LocalStorage to store content : | Clie |
| Persistent cache, up to 5MB/site Easily programmatically accessed | Ir |
| Treated like LRU cache | Clie |

Use WebSockets/XHR to communicate :

Allow bidirectional communication Online client always connected to middlebox

Richard Revis⁺

Alan Mislove⁺

^sStudent

Evaluation

Implemented WebCloud to serve Facebook photos

Is there additional latency?

Accessed from

LAN

Cable modem

No, in fact, always faster than getting from Facebook All simulations ran in Boston, like deployment

What WebCloud hit rate can we expect?



Simulate using crawled Facebook data New Orleans Network, 65K users, 1.8M Links

1.1M comments on 816K photos

Does it work with today's browsers/sites?

Total of 2,060 photos viewed 26% serveed from WebCloud

Mobile Users

Implemented a prototype WebCloud app for iOS Tested with 3,513 requests when connected via 3G

iPhone's battery lasted an estimated 23 hours Even under the heaviest workload, the most-loaded user uploaded a total of 71.9MB, when the average user uploaded only 2.0MB



redirector proxies in each ISP:

ike Akamai, but stores no content laintains open connection to clients

nts connect to proxy:

nform of locally stored content

nt request content from proxy:

Proxy checks other local clients If Found:

fetches content from other client Otherwise:

fetches content from original site



Ravi Sundaram⁺

| | Served from | | |
|--|-------------|--------|-------------|
| | Facebook | LAN | Cable modem |
| | 668 ms | 63 ms | 398 ms |
| | 690 ms | 153 ms | 532 ms |

Number of Photos Uploaded per User

Simulated 1 week deployment Between 23% and 58% hit rate



Deployed WebCloud within Northeastern College of Computer Science 17 users for 10 days

> Works from Firefox, Safari, Chrome Average browser could store 56 photos

