

## An Empirical View on Consolidation of the Web

Technical University of Munich
University of Twente, NLnet Labs
Brandenburg University of Technology
CISPA, Technical University of Munich

Published in ACM Transactions on Internet Technology (TOIT) https://github.com/tv-doan/acm-toit-2022-web-consolidation

IETF 113 Vienna

IAB Open Meeting

March 24, 2022



### **Motivation**

Increasing demand and need for measurement studies on Internet centralization

Differing opinions about centralization

- Facilitates deployment of new protocols and extensions, streamlining services
- Risks for privacy, dependencies, concentration of control
- Difficult to define centralization and to assess extent and implications

Recent centralization studies on DNS, third-party dependencies, co-location, ...

→ In this paper: Web consolidation around Content Delivery Infrastructures (CDIs, i.e., CDN + cloud hosts)



# Longitudinal DNS Measurements

More than 160M landing Web pages of all .com/.net./.org domains



 $\rightarrow$  Increase of CDI penetration from 8% in 2015 to 15% in 2020



## **Popular Landing Pages**

Based on DNS measurements for Alexa Top 1M

Overall penetration of roughly 24% (IPv4) and 12% (IPv6), higher among more popular domains

Handful of CDIs are major contributors to overall penetration, particularly over IPv6





# Page Resources

Based on HTTP Archive data: Page loads for 4.3M websites, incl. 392M resources

#### Overall CDI penetration

- Landing Pages: 32.1%
- Page Resources: 56.6%

Google + Amazon: >50% of CDI-hosted resources

Especially high percentages for static resources

Case studies in paper:

High CDI penetration for ads/trackers, TLS 1.3, ...

	Provider	# Resources $(\downarrow)$	Share of CDI Resources	Share of All Resources
1)	Google	$76.6 \mathrm{M}$	34.5%	19.5%
2)	Amazon	$38.9 \mathrm{M}$	17.5%	9.9%
3)	Cloudflare	$27.5 \mathrm{M}$	12.4%	7.0%
4)	Facebook	$17.7 \mathrm{M}$	8.0%	4.5%
5)	Akamai	$15.7 \mathrm{M}$	7.1%	4.0%
6)	Fastly	$10.8 \mathrm{M}$	4.9%	2.7%
7)	WordPress	$4.1\mathrm{M}$	1.9%	1.1%
8)	Twitter	$4.0\mathrm{M}$	1.8%	1.0%
9)	Microsoft	$3.8\mathrm{M}$	1.7%	1.0%
10)	NetDNA	$3.6\mathrm{M}$	1.6%	0.9%

Resource Type	# CDI Resources	CDI Pen. of Type	# All Resources of Type	$\begin{array}{c} {\bf Share} \\ {\bf (All)} \ (\downarrow) \end{array}$
image	82,613,713	46.8%	$176,\!660,\!130$	45.0%
javascript	$64,\!223,\!345$	64.1%	100, 195, 949	25.5%
text	$21,\!676,\!628$	50.4%	43,017,071	11.0%
html	$19,\!590,\!470$	69.6%	28,148,091	7.2%
other	$11,\!864,\!834$	70.4%	$16,\!847,\!204$	4.3%
font	$14,\!245,\!056$	86.0%	$16,\!569,\!827$	4.2%
application	$6,\!303,\!607$	68.4%	9,220,762	2.4%
video	$1,\!135,\!211$	91.8%	1,236,756	0.3%
audio	$265,\!302$	62.2%	426,583	0.1%
Total	221,918,166	56.6%	392,322,373	100.0%



# Conclusion

Increasing consolidation of Web pages around CDIs

- → CDI penetration roughly doubled since 2015
- $\rightarrow$  Most of the resources delivered from a few selected CDIs

Some CDIs significantly contribute to the deployment/support of protocols

- → IPv6
- → TLS 1.3

Open questions for discussion (see [arch-d] mailing list):

- Motivation of users/customers?
- Natural evolution of ecosystem?
- Impact of/on IETF activities?