Networking Named Content

Xinghong Fang (xf214)

The Problems

- Networking abstraction
  - Host-to-host
- Availability
  - Pre-planned mechanism
  - Extra bandwidth cost
- Security
  - Untrustworthy location
- Location-dependence
  - Complicated mapping configuration

Related Works

- DONA
  - Name and content are not bond securely
  - Content must be published or registered
  - Resolution handler: large forwarding table
- DHT-based System
  - Require explicit content publishing
  - No guarantee to retrieve the closest copy
- PSIRP
  - Unsecure directory service
- TRIAD
  - Relies on trusted directory to authenticate

Key Idea of CCN

- New networking abstraction
  - "named host" -> "named data"
  - No notion of host
  - Address names content
- Plus TCP/IP design decision
  - makes it simple, robust and scalable
  - e.g. FIB, longest-prefix match

Main Contributions of CCN

- Decoupling location from
  - identity, security and access
- Scalability, security and performance
- Layer over anything
- Strategy
  - Take advantage of multiple connectivities
  - Operate under changing conditions
- Security
  - Secure content itself

CCN Node Model

- Two packet types
  - Interest and Data
- Basic pattern
  - Consumer broadcasting interest
  - Node with data respond on hearing interest
- ContentName
  - Hierarchical: prefix match
  - Allow dynamic generation
  - Can be context-dependent

CCN Node Model - Data Structures

- Forward Information Base (FIB)
  - Forward interest to potential data holders
  - Allow multiple interface, parallel query
- ContentStore
  - Remember data packet
  - Reducing upstream bandwidth demand
  - Minimising downstream delay
- Pending Interest Table (PIT)
  - Keep track of interest source
  - Timeout & re-express interest

Strength of the model

- Consumer driven
  - Screen unsolicited data
- ContentStore
  - Transparent caching
  - Sharing by multicasting
- Multipoint data retrieval
  - Maintain communication in highly dynamic environment
  - DTN: works in isolated location

Weakness of the model

- Stateful vs Stateless
  - Install states in every nodes
  - Complicated forwarding node implementation
- ContentStore
  - Require extra cache memory
  - Needs explicit version control

Transport

- On top of unreliable packet delivery service
  - Retransmission (strategy layer)
  - Discard duplicated packets
    - Packet network
    - Multipoint distribution
- Flow control
  - No need for congestion control over a path
- Rich connectivity
  - No bind between IP address to MAC address
  - Strategy layer

Routing

- Reuse routing schemes for IP
- Prefix annoncement
  - IP: need spanning tree, traffics go through a single node
  - CCN: interests forwarded to all the nodes to annonce the prefix

Security

- Content-based security
- Digital signature, encryption
  - publicly authenticatable
  - a set of algorithms: fit performance requirement
  - individually verifiable
- Content validated by receiver
  - IP: must retrieve from original source to trust it
- Authenticate binds
  - Names, contents and supporting data
- User/application-meaningful names
  - Instead of self-certifying name
  - No need for indirection infrastructure

Security (cont.)

- Trust depends on the purpose of use
  - more flexible and easier
- Allowing content to securely link to others
  - allow content to certify other content
- Tackling traditional key management problems
  - keys accessible via simple naming conventions
  - Trust relationship ("key + name" signed by key)
- Evidence-based security
  - delegation, secure reference
- No trusted server required
  - only authorised user can decrypt

Security - Attack Protection

- Hard to attack a specific target
  - no notion of host
- Hard to perform DDoS
  - Flow balance between Interests and Data
  - Consumer driven (rate controlled by consumer)
  - Multiple request to same data will be combined
    - Upstream bandwidth not affected

Strength of Security

- Flexibility in algorithm and packet authentication
- No need for secured connection
- Secure reference to other content
- Chain of trust
- Attack protection

Weakness of Security

- Encryption/Decryption overhead
- Consumer's discretion of trust
- Risk of root key leaks
- Unsecure referenced content

Issues in Evalution

- Bulk data transfer
  - 6MB, is the size too small?
  - 5x pipelining than TCP (store-and-forward)
- Content distribution
  - strength: little increase of total download time when clients increases
- VoIP
  - Capability to use multiple connectivity

Conclusion

- Named data
- Inherited from TCP/IP design decision
- Consumer driven
- Attack protection
- Encryption overhead
- Issues of content reference

Questions?