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Agenda

1. Current Version: Changes with respect to draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-00
   - Splitting draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-background-00 and draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-01
   - Scope
   - New Definitions
   - New Sections

2. Next version: Future modifications
   - Comments from the email list
Current Version: Overview of Changes

draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-background-00
- General background informational on RLNC
- Symbol Representation as a standardization target

draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-01
- Symbol Representation Specification
- Definition of “Symbol Representation”
- New figures (32-bit template)

#ThanksVincent
Current Version: Symbol Representation

Spelling Out Assumed Definitions

draft-heide-nwcrг-rlnс-background-00

- “Symbol representation specifies the format of the symbol-carrying data unit that is to be coded, recoded, and decoded. In other words, symbol representation defines the format of the coding-layer data unit, including header format and symbol concatenation.”

draft-heide-nwcrг-rlnс-01

- “Symbol representation specifies the format of the symbol-carrying data unit that is to be used in network coding operations, including header format and symbol concatenation.”

```
Figure 1: A general symbol representation design.
```
Standardizing Symbol Representation

*Flexibility as an argument for standardization*

- Standardization is needed due to the flexibility of RLNC
- RLNC: dynamic structure, highly reconfigurable
  - Flexible coefficient location (Clustered, Indexed)
  - Dynamic number of coefficients / symbols
  - Flexible symbol size (Fragmentation, Padding, Encapsulation)
  - Flexible field (Coding complexity, Device capabilities)
Standardizing Symbol Representation

*Important for Network Operations*

Network operations may be affected by symbol representation

- Example: Fragmentation
- Known coefficients
  - Can recode fragments
- Unknown coefficients
  - (e.g., pre-coded or hidden)
  - Must use new coding layer

![Diagram of Code-aware and Conventional Fragmentation]

(a) Code-aware fragmentation

(b) Conventional fragmentation
Standardizing Symbol Representation

Important Standardization Target

- Architecture:
  Layered architecture, Coding architecture
  (e.g., Encapsulation, Routing)

- Topology:
  Logical (coding) topology
  (e.g., no recoding if coefficients are not explicit)

- Protocol
  (e.g., Generation vs sliding window)
Next Version: Overview of Suggested Changes

draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-background-00

- More definitions
- Correcting networking terminology
- Trade-offs related to coding parameters
- Security section

draft-heide-nwcrgrlnc-01

- Clarify definitions

#ThanksDave
#ThanksSalvatore
Next Version: Definitions

Clarifying Assumed Definitions

- Correcting networking terminology
  - “Connection”

- Clarify a number of terms:
  - “Field elements”: communication/information theoretic “symbols”
  - “Symbol”: array of field elements, “coding data unit”
  - “Raw data”: application data, “uncoded” / “systematic” / “raw” symbols
  - “Representation”: what goes on the wire
  - “Coding Layer”: new vs. current coding layer
  - “Coding Vector” (see next slide)
  - “Hidden” Coefficients (see Security notes below)

- Link / refer to taxonomy draft
Next Version: Coding Vector

**Spelling Out Assumed Definitions**

- **“Raw” Vector**
  - Mathematical/full vector of coefficients
  - “Yields coded symbol when multiplied with symbol matrix”
- **Different from representation**
  - (i.e., “what is sent on the wire”)
- **Representation requires**
  - Coefficient values
  - Symbol mapping
- **Examples of representations**
  - Raw vector (useful in dense coding)
  - Coefficient values + symbol indices (sparser codes)
  - Seed

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
c_1 & \cdots & c_S \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
c_{S1} & \cdots & c_{SN}
\end{bmatrix}
\times
\begin{bmatrix}
e_{11} & \cdots & e_{1N} \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
e_{S1} & \cdots & e_{SN}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
e_1 & \cdots & e_N
\end{bmatrix}
\]
Next Version: Protocol Trade-offs

*Emphasize fundamental trade-offs*

- Multiple trade-offs related to coding parameters
- Fundamental trade-offs
  - Field size: coding complexity, code diversity (linear dependence), required redundancy
  - Symbol size
  - Generation / window / block size: latency, throughput, redundancy granularity
- Application-related trade-offs (optional)
  - Block code vs. sliding window
  - Systematic vs. full coding
  - Sparse vs. dense coding
  - Feedback vs. no feedback
Next Version: Security

Updating Security Section

- Initial assumption: operating inside the “coding layer”
  - Focus on coding operations, erasure correction, performance enhancement
  - Security provided by other layers
- Network coding operates by allowing mixing of data
- What are the security consequences of such mixtures?
- Three aspects:
  - Data hiding
  - Byzantine or pollution attacks – detection and correction
  - Verification
Next Version: Other Suggestions

- Looking into incoming suggestions
  - Adding references
  - “Encoder Rank”
Thanks for the attention

Questions, Comments, Suggestions?
Content inaccessible without coefficients

Encrypt coefficients instead of payload

- Enforce selective access to broadcast data
- *e.g.*, protect multi-resolution video layers
Content distribution of large files

- Use network coding to increase the efficiency of content distribution in a P2P cooperative architecture.
  - Instead of storing pieces on servers, store random linear combination of the pieces on servers.
  - Clients also generate random linear combination of the pieces they have received to send out.
  - When a client has accumulated enough degrees of freedom, decode to obtain the whole file.
Detecting and Eliminating Pollution Attacks

Problem
- A malicious user can send packets with valid linear combination in the header, but garbage in the payload.
- The pollution of packets spreads quickly.

Solution
- Use homomorphic signature scheme
  - Compute file signature at source
  - Include in packets (use public key)
  - Verify that packet is valid linear combination (polynomial hash function)
- Intermediate nodes drop contaminated packets

Features
- No need to decode
- No need to contact source
- No need to retransmit contaminated data
- Low overhead
- Finding packet satisfying hash function is hard (= discrete logarithm)
- Packet- vs. block-level detection of pollution attacks