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Abstract

Event-based communication is useful in many application domains, ranging from small, centralised applications to large, distributed systems. Many different event models have been developed to address the requirements of different application domains. One such model is the ECO model which was designed to support distributed virtual world applications. Like many other event models, ECO has event filtering capabilities meant to improve scalability by decreasing network traffic in a distributed implementation. Our recent work in event-based systems has included building a fully distributed version of the ECO model, including event filtering capabilities. This paper describes the results of our evaluation of filters as a means of achieving increased scalability in the ECO model. The evaluation is empirical and real data gathered from an actual event-based system is used. The findings show filters to be highly valuable in making distributed implementations of the model scale, that multicast contributes to the scalability and, perhaps most significantly, that multicast groups can be dynamically generated from filters using local (per node) rather global knowledge of the distributed application.

1. Introduction

Event-based communication is appropriate for many application domains, ranging from small, centralised applications such as GUIs to large, distributed systems such as telecommunications, network monitoring, and virtual world support systems. Many different event models have been put forward, some designed for small-scale systems and others for large-scale systems. One such model is the ECO model which was designed to support distributed virtual world applications in the Moonlight ([6]) project. Like many other event models ([9, 5]), ECO was designed to be scalable by including filtering capabilities that were intended to decrease network traffic in a distributed implementation.

Our recent work in event-based systems has included building a fully distributed version of the ECO model, including filtering capabilities. This paper describes the model and our implementation of it, as well as the experiments conducted to evaluate filtering as a means of increasing scalability. The experiments are based on empirical data from an actual event-based system. This data is used to perform three simulations of the original system to evaluate the performance implications of using filtering and the impact of using unicast or multicast communications. The results show that filtering coupled with multicast communications can substantially decrease network traffic and thus enhance scalability. Significantly, we also demonstrate that multicast groups can be constructed from filters without need for global knowledge about the distributed application, demonstrating a further programming level benefit from filters.

In the following, we describe the ECO model and its implementation thereafter we present our experiments and comparisons.
2. The ECO Model

As event models go, the ECO model is relatively simple. It has only three central concepts and its application programmer interface (API) contains only three operations. The intent of the model is that it is applied to a given host language and extends that language’s syntax and facilities as to support the ECO concepts. This section describes the ECO concepts and operations, paying special attention to notify constraints which are the model’s event filters.

As mentioned, the ECO model was originally designed for use in virtual world support systems. This is reflected in the terminology used to describe ECO. Thus, the term an ECO world means whatever collection of entities constitute the application in which the model is being used. For a detailed description of the model, please refer to [12, 7].

2.1. Concepts

The acronym ECO stands for events, constraints, and objects—the three central concepts in the event model:

**Objects** in the ECO model are much like objects in a standard object-oriented language. However, instead of invoking other objects for communication ECO objects communicate with other ECO objects via events and constraints as explained below. ECO objects are often implemented as programming language objects but not all programming language objects are necessarily ECO objects. In order to distinguish the two, ECO objects are often referred to as entities. Entities have identifiers that are unique within an ECO world and they may contain threads of control.

**Events** are the only means of communication in the model. Entities do not invoke each other’s methods directly but instead raise events which may, or may not, lead to other entities’ methods being invoked. Any entity can raise an event. Events are typed and have parameters, and they are propagated asynchronously and anonymously to the receiving entities in no particular order. The type of events is usually specified using the type system of the underlying language.

**Constraints** make it possible for entities to impose restrictions upon which events they actually receive. The ECO model specifies several types of constraints of which the central one is notify constraints. Notify constraints can be used by an entity to specify what events it is interested in receiving notification about. Notify constraints effectively constitute filters as they are known from other event models ([19, 5]). Other types of ECO constraints are pre, post, and synchronisation constraints. However, they are not interesting for event filtering and will not be discussed further in this paper.

The three concepts are shown in relation in figure 1 which depicts a simple scenario with two entities communicating. In the figure, entity A raises an event which may, or may not, reach entity B because of the constraint C. The constraint is imposed by entity B. The raising of an event can be thought of as an announcement to the rest of the ECO world that the event has occurred. A notify constraint can be thought of as a filter that decides whether or not a given entity is to receive the event, and receiving an event can be thought of as invoking an appropriate method (called an event handler) of an entity in response to the event. When an entity uses a notify constraint to enable it to receive certain events, we say that it subscribes to those events. An entity can subscribe multiple times to the same events using different constraints and handlers. It is also possible to subscribe without using a constraint, in which case no filtering is performed.

![Figure 1. The Three ECO Concepts in Relation](image)

2.2. Operations

The model’s API contains three operations which are used by entities to communicate:

- **Subscribe** is used by entities to register interest in events. An entity that subscribes to a certain type of event will receive an invocation of one of its methods when a matching event is raised. The event is delivered to the entity by being passed as a parameter to the handler. When an entity performs a subscription, it can also choose to specify a constraint. An event must be of the right type and must match the constraint (if any), in order to be delivered to a particular subscriber.

- **Raise** is used by an entity to announce the occurrence of an event. The event is delivered to all entities subscribing to events of that type, subject to filtering against their respective constraints.
Unsubscribe(event-type, event-handler) is used by an entity to cancel an existing subscription.

3. Scalability of Distributed ECO Implementations

The ECO model as such is neither centralised nor distributed but can be implemented in a centralised or distributed manner. A distributed implementation has the advantage that new nodes (typically in the form of physical machines) can be added in order to accommodate a larger number of entities. On the other hand, distributing the ECO implementation across a number of nodes means that entities on different nodes will need to exchange events as well as subscription and unsubscription information across machine boundaries. The amount of communication across node boundaries depends not on the number of entities but on the level of activity, i.e., on the number of subscriptions performed (and canceled) and the number of events raised.

3.1. Scalability

The term scalability has become something of a buzzword in the computer industry. There is no generally accepted scientific definition of what exactly scalability is, and people tend to rely on an intuitive understanding of the concept instead. Textbooks generally provide rather vague definitions and rely on examples to explain it. One of the more tangible definitions was made in connection with distributed garbage collection,

Scale is a relative concept that is hard to characterize precisely; rather we define scalability as a property related to an algorithm: it is scalable if its cost increases much slower than the number of spaces or of sites in the system. ([11])

Though somewhat specific to distributed garbage collection, the definition makes the important observation that scalability is an algorithmic issue. To make the definition more general, spaces and sites should be interpreted according to the underlying domain. In a distributed ECO context, the following parameters are considered when discussing scalability:

• number of entities (or objects)
• number of nodes (or machines)
• activity (communication)

These parameters are not mutually independent. As mentioned, for example, a common means of scaling (i.e., supporting a large number of) entities is to add more nodes to the system. This, however, causes more communication between nodes. Hence, improving scalability in one way may decrease it in another. This is a common dilemma in distributed systems; the greater the degree of distribution, the more communication. Therefore, any means of reducing unnecessary communication is valuable.

4. SECO - a Distributed ECO Implementation

The implementation was named SECO for Scalable ECO. It uses C++ as the host language. The ECO extensions take the form of a library with which an application using event communication is linked. There is also a series of header files which contain abstract C++ base classes for events, constraints, and entities, in addition to prototypes for the actual ECO operations. Two implementations are discussed: a unicast version (uSECO) and a multicast version (mSECO).

4.1. Overview

The architecture of the SECO implementation is based on the concept of Application Instances (AIs). An AI is implemented as a program running on a node in the network. It hosts a number of entities and relays events raised by them to other AIs. An AI also receives events from other AIs and delivers them to its own entities. A scenario with six entities hosted by three AIs running on two nodes is shown in figure 2.

In the uSECO implementation an Application Instance Register (AIR) is used to maintain authoritative information about the AIs that are active at any given time. A new AI joining an existing set of AIs obtains a list of its peers from the AIR. The current implementation of the AIR is centralised, but could readily be implemented in a distributed
fashion without further impact on the rest of the SECO im-
plementation.

In mSECO, since multicast communication does not re-
quire the sender to know the number of receivers, global
knowledge of the SECO entities is not necessary thus elimi-
nating the AIR. The number of event messages and manage-
ment (overhead) messages sent will be reduced. In uSECO,
an AI that raises an event propagates a copy of the event
to each subscriber, whereas in mSECO a single multicast
message is sent only. The same applies for management
messages. Instead of having to send a copy of a manage-
ment message to each AI, a single broadcast (implemented
as a well-known multicast group) message is sent.

Entities hosted by an AI invoke the SECO operations
to make and cancel subscriptions and to raise events. The
SECO library relays subscriptions, unsubscriptions, and
events to remote AIs as appropriate (e.g., subject to filter-
ing constraints) and delivers events obtained from remote
as well as local entities to the entities that it hosts by in-
voking their handlers. The SECO library uses a com-
munications package called KANGA ([2]) to communi-
cate with other AIs over the network. KANGA imple-
ments a convenient class-oriented front-end to the transport
layer (TCP/IP) based on connection endpoints rather than
hostnames and ports. Unlike TCP, KANGA is message-
oriented and includes marshalling operations for all stan-
dard C++ types. Figure 3 shows how the components in
a SECO application communicate. Note that, for reasons
stated above, the AIR is not needed in the mSECO imple-
mentation.

The SECO implementation performs not only the task it
is explicitly built for—in this case implementing the ECO
model—but also the task of keeping track of itself as a
distributed application. With regards to implementing the
ECO operations (propagating subscriptions, unsubscriptions,
and events) the implementation is fully distributed.
Messages pass directly from peer to peer; there is no cen-
tralised “event server” and therefore no single point of fail-
ure. With regards to distribution management, it should be
noted that the current version of the AIR is centralised and
therefore a single point of failure. However, it is used only
for maintaining the set of currently active AIs. In particular,
it has no influence on event flow or filtering and is therefore
of no interest to the findings described in this paper.

4.2. Latecomers

When an entity joins an ECO world that already exists,
there may be subscriptions in place that the new entity does
not know about. ECO semantics specify that old subscrip-
tions should apply for new entities, and therefore new enti-
ties need to obtain information about the subscriptions cur-
rently in effect. The solution adopted in the SECO imple-
mentation is to let the AIs holding entities with active sub-
scriptions resend the subscriptions to new AIs.

4.3. Implementation and management of the multi-
cast communication

mSECO’s multicast layer is implemented based on IP
multicast, providing a means of one-to-many group com-
mutation. IP multicast uses UDP as its transport layer
and thus is a connectionless best-effort (unreliable) service.
A reliable transport layer can be build on top of IP multi-
cast. mSECO uses a hash algorithm to generate multicast
groups. The hash operation is invoked on the consumer side
for each subscription sent and on the raising side for each
subscription received. The IP group address is calculated by
the hash function on the event type and the event filter (i.e.,
the notify constraint). This enables entities to manage their
group memberships based on a local decision, avoiding a
centralised component, and hence a single point of failure.

The success of this approach depends on the efficiency of
the chosen hash algorithm and on the size of the available
multicast group address space. The hash algorithm used in
mSECO is an adaptation of one proposed in [10, p.212]
which generates a unique key from a sequence of charac-
ters of arbitrary length and spreads the keys evenly into the
multicast group address space. The exact efficiency of vari-
ous hash algorithms is beyond the scope of this paper, but
the algorithm may easily be replaced by another. The cur-
cently available IP multicast address space consists of up to
28 bit address and a 16 bit port number. Although the IP
multicast address space may have to be shared with other
applications, the rather large number of available multicast
group addresses ensures that our approach suffices even in
large-scale systems that include many different event types
and notify constraints.

5. Simulating a Real-time System

Our experiments consist of running simulations on data
from an actual real-time event-based system found at the
University of Cambridge. The experiments and conclusions
presented in this paper are based on empirical event data ob-
tained from the Cambridge system. This section describes
the system and our simulation of it.

5.1. Active Badge System

The Cambridge system is an active badge system. It
is based on a number of infrared sensors (called stations)
which are placed in some university laboratories and pick
up signals emitted by battery-driven badges worn by per-
sonnel in the labs. When a station detects the presence of a
badge, it raises a so-called sighting event to announce that
this particular badge has been seen in that particular location. Stations are grouped into networks, each being a part of a particular laboratory. In addition, users can also be detected when they log into the campus computer network, e.g., via an X-terminal. Each badge carries a unique badge identifier which is picked up by the sensors. Certain kinds of equipment, such as workstations, X-terminals, and some network devices, also have badge identifiers associated with them and can cause sighting events to be raised.

The empirical data that we have obtained from the system consists of 35,811 sighting events collected over period of almost 21 hours by 118 stations distributed over 12 networks. For each sighting, the following information is available:

**Station Identifier** identifying the network (by a symbolic name) and the station (by an integer) within that network.

**Badge Identifier** identifying the sighted person or equipment (by a sequence of six eight-bit hexadecimal numbers separated by dashes).

**Time stamp** identifying the moment when the sighting was made in seconds and microseconds, since 00:00:00 UTC, January 1, 1970.\(^1\)

The experimental strategy is to replay these sightings in a simulation. We represent each station as an ECO entity that raises the sighting events recorded in the Cambridge data at the appropriate times, as measured by the local system clock.\(^2\) The simulation and its configuration are described in the following sections.

### 5.2. Hardware Configuration

Our testbed consists of five PCs with a minimum of 16 megabytes of memory, running FreeBSD and connected with a standard 10 Mbit/s Ethernet. Because we measured bandwidth usage on a per message basis (as opposed to, e.g., roundtrip times) the experiments were run in multiuser mode. Also, the machines were on a network segment with traffic not related to the experiments. The native compiler, GCC 2.6.3, was used to compile the programs.

### 5.3. Software Configuration

In the simulation, each of the twelve networks in the real badge system is represented by one AI as shown in figure 4 located on a single node (hogthrob). Four of the five nodes (janis, zoot, statler, and down) are used to run AIs which act as event consumers.

To measure network traffic as a function of the number of AIs, some of our experiments (2 and 3) are run in four configurations. Configuration A uses only one consumer node, configuration B uses two, and so on. This is illustrated in figure 4 where the four consumer AIs are marked with the configurations in which they are active.

All configurations of all experiments have two characteristics,

1. Event subscribers and consumers are held on disjoint AIs.
2. All AIs hosting event-generating entities outlive those with subscribing entities.

Given knowledge of the implementation, this configuration makes it relatively easy to calculate administration overhead caused by distribution and filtering. Whereas the latter is extremely relevant for the evaluation of filtering as a means of scalability, the former can be assumed to be equivalent to a distributed ECO implementation without filtering and is therefore of little concern for this paper. A discussion can be found in [3].

Filtering overhead is caused by making and cancelling subscriptions. This means that, given that \(n\) is the number of AIs and \(m\) the number of subscriptions performed

\[\text{Filtering Overhead} = n \times m\]

\[\text{Administration Overhead} = \text{Distribution Overhead} + \text{Filtering Overhead}\]

\[\text{Total Overhead} = \text{Administration Overhead} + \text{Network Latency}\]

---

\(^1\)As returned by `time(3)`.

\(^2\)Recall that the ECO model makes no requirements to event ordering, and we can therefore disregard clock variations between nodes.
during the application’s lifetime, the total number of extra messages due to filtering for unicast $N_{u-\text{filtering}}$ and for multicast $N_{m-\text{filtering}}$ can be written as,

$$N_{u-\text{filtering}}(m,n) = m \times N_{\text{subscription}}(n)$$

$$N_{m-\text{filtering}}(m,n) = m \times \text{Subscription}$$

where $N_{\text{subscription}}$ is the number of extra messages sent for a single subscription and in $N_{m-\text{filtering}}$, Subscription is the number of messages generated by a subscription and is independant of $n$.

To derive $N_{u-\text{filtering}}$ in the given configuration, all subscribing entities are hosted by a single AI. Subscriptions will be sent to all other instances and the total number of messages transmitted over the network for any particular subscription can be computed easily. If $n_s$ is the number of AIs at subscription time, the number of subscription messages (and replies) sent is,

$$2(n_s - 1)$$

At unsubscribe time, the number of AIs may have changed. Assuming it is called $n_u$ and that there is an unsubscribe for each subscription, the total number of subscribe/unsubscribe messages is,

$$2(n_s - 1) + 2(n_u - 1)$$

In the configuration used in our experiments, the AIs with event-generating entities always outlive the one with the subscriber, so for this particular case we have $n_s = n_u$. Setting $n = n_s = n_u$ the total number of subscribe/unsubscribe messages is,

$$N_{\text{subscription}}(n) = 2(n_s - 1) + 2(n_u - 1) = 4(n - 1)$$

Insertion into the earlier formula for $N_{u-\text{filtering}}$ gives us,

$$N_{u-\text{filtering}}(m,n) = m \times N_{\text{subscription}}(n) = 4m(n - 1)$$

Moreover, for $N_{m-\text{filtering}}$ we simply argue that there is a message due to subscribe and a message due to unsubscribe for each subscription, giving us 2 messages per subscription and hence:

$$N_{m-\text{filtering}}(m,n) = 2m$$

These formulae are used in the next section to compute the number of overhead messages. Note a multiplier, which is the number of subscriber AIs, must be applied depending on which configuration is being used.
6. Three Experiments

In practice, the complete event flow through an active badge system is large and difficult to comprehend. Subscribers with well-chosen notify constraints can be used to provide meaningful views of this event flow by dynamically extracting events according to certain patterns, and in this way make it easier for humans to monitor the system at runtime. The three experiments presented in this chapter were designed to present such meaningful views of the event flow and would be likely candidates for implementation in a real (non-simulation) badge system. Each experiment features one type of subscriber. Some experiments feature a subscriber which can be given parameters and which filter events according to their values. Such subscribers were run with all possible sets of parameters. For each experiment we list the number of event messages sent in the absence of filtering, the number of event messages actually sent, and the number of overhead messages caused by subscriptions (calculated according to the formulae 3 from the previous section). Finally, the total number of messages actually sent (including overhead messages) is listed, along with the relative decrease in number of messages sent due to event filtering.

6.1. Experiment 1: God

The God entity sees all and hence receives all events. In a real badge system, such a subscriber could be useful for logging purposes. Here it is also used to measure filtering overhead by implementing a filter without effect. Table 1 shows the results from the experiment.

The reduction in number of messages is negative, meaning that using this filter (not suprisingly) introduced a slight overhead. However, in the experiments it was as low as 0.01%. It is important to look at the scenario in which this result was obtained. Overhead in the form of extra network messages is generated at subscription and unsubscription time but not while the subscription is in effect. In experiment 1, there was only one subscription involved and it was in effect for a very long time (time enough to raise 35,811 events). Consequently, the relative cost decreased as more and more bandwidth was used for other purposes. We conclude that long-lasting subscriptions have a relatively low overhead. No significant difference was noted between uSECO and mSECO in this experiment.

6.2. Experiment 2: CCTV

A number of CCTV entities subscribe to all events generated in a particular network. In a real system, it could be used to monitor a specific (and therefore more manageable) area of the entire system. This experiment was run with twelve subscribers in parallel, one for each network. The results are displayed in tables 2, 3, 4, and 5.

As can be seen, the reduction in number of transmitted messages is quite high: above 90% on average. Had events simply been broadcast instead of filtered, approximately ten times as many messages would have been transmitted across the network. Even the most busy camera only received 20% of the messages it would have received if filters had not been used. As in experiment 1, these subscriptions were in effect for a long period of time, and the fixed administration overhead of 24 messages in uSECO and 2 messages (per camera) in mSECO gradually became less and less significant as more events were raised.

6.3. Experiment 3: Private Eye

The Private Eye entity subscribes to all events generated by a particular badge. In a real system, this subscriber could be used to trace the movement patterns of a particular badge owner. This experiment was run with at least 12 (out of a possible) 162 subscribers in parallel, one for each badge present in the event data. An extract of the results (twelve private eye entities) is shown in tables 6, 7, 8, and 9. For the remaining data, please refer to [3].

The data shows substantial savings, averaging just above 99.0% reduction in the number of messages transmitted across the network. The private eye entities in this experiment collectively get all sightings of registered badges. The busiest of the badge-wearers caused 658 sightings and still received only 2% of the messages it would have received if filters had not been used.

6.4. Overall Conclusion

Figure 5 shows the average number of event messages sent depending on the number of subscribing AIs, according to the data found in experiment 2. A similar graph could be depicted based on the data that resulted from experiment 3. For the uSECO experiment, the number of event messages sent increases linearly to the number of subscribing AIs. Whereas, the mSECO experiment found that the number of event messages sent is independent to the number of subscribing AIs. Furthermore, the graph shows that the number of overhead messages, although reduced in the mSECO experiment, do not contribute significantly towards the number of event messages sent.

The experiments presented in this section shows that filtering was generally worthwhile in the example simulation. Notify constraints caused a reduction of between 99.9% and 80.0% for all entities used in the experiments, except the God entity where notify constraints caused a slight increase.

3 Apply appropriate multiplier as per previous observation.
To what extent these findings can be expected to hold for other applications of course depends on the applications in question. The application in this scenario used subscriptions which were in effect for a fairly long time. Applications with frequent subscriptions (and cancelling of subscriptions) will benefit less from using notify constraints, but for the active badge system constraints were extremely useful. The next section discusses three other event models, two of which contain filters and one of which does not.

7. Related Work

In this section, we look closer at three state-of-the-art event models. Two of them are from industry and one is a research model. They are targeted for different application domains and therefore have different characteristics. A more detailed discussion of the three models, in particular in the context of ECO, can be found in [3].

7.1. JavaBeans

Java is an object-oriented programming language, reminiscent of C++, which has become increasingly popular since it was launched by Sun in the mid 1990s. JavaBeans is a component model for Java also developed by Sun, and version 1.01 of the JavaBeans specification ([13]) defines an event model. The model is designed with small centralised systems (e.g., window toolkits) in mind but can be used in a distributed fashion by using the Java Remote Method Invocation (RMI) system.

The model has no inherent filtering support. The event source and receiver are tightly coupled, compared to other models, and must maintain detailed knowledge about each other. The model specifies that the source of an event should invoke receivers in sequence, passing its thread of control to each receiver. These semantics mean that implementations of the model cannot benefit from network level multicast. In its current form, the model will not scale to be used in any distributed environment of substantial size.

7.2. CORBA Services

The Common Object Request Broker Architecture (CORBA) is a middleware architecture specified by the Object Management Group (OMG). The architecture is based on the idea of using Object Request Brokers (ORBs) as a common way for different systems to perform remote procedure calls (RPCs). In addition to ORB functionality, the CORBA 2.0 specification ([8]) describes a number of general-purpose services, one of which is the CORBA Event Service. Applications using this service can communicate using events in addition to the normal RPCs provided by the bare ORB. Moreover, work is currently ongoing within the OMG to define a Notification Service to extend the event service with event filtering capabilities.4

The CORBA Event and Notification Services have been designed to be usable in virtually any setting where event-based communication is required. The pending Notification Service proposal, effectively a superset of the Event

4The OMG Technical Committee initiated the adoption vote on November 13, 1998.
Service, constitutes an extremely general event model with powerful filtering capabilities based on filters expressed in an interpreted language. It is difficult to imagine a distributed event-based application that could not fit into this model. However, the generality is paid for by an increase in complexity—understanding and using the CORBA event model is difficult, and a correspondingly high development cost can be expected for applications using it.

7.3. Cambridge Event Model

The event model described in [1, 4] was developed at the University of Cambridge Computer Laboratory. Like the CORBA model, it has filters which are expressed in an interpreted language. The Cambridge model is architecturally much simpler than the CORBA model, but has a feature not present in the other, namely that of event composition. The idea is that subscribers can register interest in the occurrence of events, subject to restrictions on the order in which they occur. For example, it is possible to register interest in an event, only if it has been (or explicitly has not been) preceded by another. The composite event language is reminiscent of regular expressions and can be used to form very complex filter expressions.

In general, the Cambridge model is less flexible than the CORBA service but also a lot less complex. Its principal strength is that it has native support for composite event filters, a powerful feature which has yet to be discovered by industry. Like the CORBA model, but unlike the JavaBeans model, it is designed for large-scale systems.

7.4. Summary

The three event models discussed here are different in many respects. The CORBA and Cambridge models share some similarities in that both are designed for large-scale systems and both have excellent filtering support. In comparison, the JavaBeans model is well suited for centralised or small-scale distributed applications but has no inherent support for filtering.

8. Conclusion

The initial discussion about scalability identified three parameters in the ECO model, one of which (number of entities) could be scaled by scaling the second (number of nodes) at the cost of decreased scalability of the third (activity). In any large-scale distributed event system, activity is probably the parameter which is most difficult to scale. New nodes can be added practically ad infinitum but they all have to exchange events over the same network. Reducing network traffic is therefore an important way of scaling activity in any such system.

Our work has shown filtering to be an extremely powerful means to save network bandwidth in an event-based system as demonstrated in the results obtained over unicast, and consequently a feasible way to dramatically increase scalability. We have also shown that the introduction of multicast communications produces a further improvement in scalability from the network traffic perspective.

Of at least equal significance is our demonstration that a high level description of constraints can be used to generate multicast groups. In doing this we are masking out lower level network decisions from the designer.

Furthermore, because the experiments were conducted with data from a real event-based system, we claim the results to have practical relevance and expect them to hold for similar event-based systems outside the laboratory. Indeed, a sign that the industry is becoming aware of the importance of event filtering is the OMG’s initiative to augment their event service with filtering capabilities. ([9]).
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### Table 1. Experiment 1: God (Configuration A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Camera</th>
<th>Unfiltered event msgs</th>
<th>Multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual event msgs</th>
<th>Actual multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Unicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Multicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Total unicast msgs</th>
<th>Total multicast msgs</th>
<th>Relative decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupExt0#</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupMain0#</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Home#0</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net1</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net2</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net3</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>6,932</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net4</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net5</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net6</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net7</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>1,809</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#8</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#9</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Experiment 2: CCTV (Configuration A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Camera</th>
<th>Unfiltered event msgs</th>
<th>Multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual event msgs</th>
<th>Actual multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Unicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Multicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Total unicast msgs</th>
<th>Total multicast msgs</th>
<th>Relative decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupExt0#</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupMain0#</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Home#0</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net1</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net2</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>11,406</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net3</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>13,864</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net4</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>5,164</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net5</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>10,046</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net6</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net7</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>3,798</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#8</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>14,288</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#9</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>71,622</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>5,969</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3. Experiment 2: CCTV (Configuration B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Camera</th>
<th>Unfiltered event msgs</th>
<th>Multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual event msgs</th>
<th>Actual multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Unicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Multicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Total unicast msgs</th>
<th>Total multicast msgs</th>
<th>Relative decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupExt0#</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArupMain0#</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Home#0</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net0#</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>6375</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net1</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>17109</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net2</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>20796</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net3</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>7746</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net4</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>15069</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net5</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>6225</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net6</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>5697</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#8</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>21432</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#9</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>6741</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>107,433</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>8,953</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Experiment 2: CCTV (Configuration C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Camera</th>
<th>Unfiltered unicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual unicast msg</th>
<th>Multicast unicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual multicast msg</th>
<th>Unicast overhead</th>
<th>Multicast overhead</th>
<th>Total unicast msgs</th>
<th>Total multicast msgs</th>
<th>Relative unicast decrease</th>
<th>Relative multicast decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArpMain#1</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 35,811</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL-ArpMain#2</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 35,811</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Home#5</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#0</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 8,500</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,956</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#1</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 22,812</td>
<td>5,703</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22,908</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#2</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 27,728</td>
<td>6,932</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27,824</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#4</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 10,328</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10,424</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#5</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 20,092</td>
<td>5,033</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20,188</td>
<td>5,031</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#6</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 8,300</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,396</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Net#7</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 7,596</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7,692</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#8</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 28,576</td>
<td>7,144</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28,672</td>
<td>7,152</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORL-Three#9</td>
<td>143,244 35,811 8,988</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9,084</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 143,244 35,811 11,931 2,964 96 8 12,033 2,902 91.0% 91.6%

Table 5. Experiment 2: CCTV (Configuration D)

Table 6. Experiment 3: Private Eye (Configuration A)

Table 7. Experiment 3: Private Eye (Configuration B)

Table 8. Experiment 3: Private Eye (Configuration C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Camera</th>
<th>Unfiltered unicast event msgs</th>
<th>Unfiltered multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual unicast event msgs</th>
<th>Actual multicast event msgs</th>
<th>Unicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Multicast overhead msgs</th>
<th>Total unicast msgs</th>
<th>Total multicast msgs</th>
<th>Relative unicast decrease (%)</th>
<th>Relative multicast decrease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-10-1</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,604</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-13-e</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>98.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-42b</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-79-0</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-81-2</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,508</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-81-5</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-82-5</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>1,328</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-83-2</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-83-4</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-83-9</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-0-0-0-e-e9</td>
<td>143,244</td>
<td>35,811</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Experiment 3: Private Eye (Configuration D)