BUbiNG Massive Crawling for the Masses

Paolo Boldi, Andrea Marino, Massimo Santini, Sebastiano Vigna

> Dipartimento di Informatica Università degli Studi di Milano Italy

Once upon a time UbiCrawler

- UbiCrawler was a scalable, fault-tolerant and fully distributed web crawler (*Software: Practice & Experience*, 34(8):711-726, 2004)
- LAW (Laboratory for Web Algorithmics) used it many times in the mid-2000s, to download portions of the web (.it, .uk, .eu, Arabic countries...)
- Based on this experience, LAW decided to write a new crawler, **10 years later**!

BUbiNG

Why a new crawler?

• **OPEN SOURCE!**

- Not so many **open-source** crawlers
 - *Heritrix* (Internet Archive; used for ClueWeb12)
 - *Nutch* (used for ClueWeb09)
- Not suitable to collect really **big** datasets
- Not so easily **extensible**
- **Distributed**? (Heritrix is not distributed; Nutch uses Hadoop)

Challenges

- **Pushing hardware to the limit**: Use massive memory and multiple cores efficiently
- Fill bandwidth in spite of politeness (both at host and IP level) => coherent time frame
- Producing **big** datasets in spite of limited hardware
- Making crawling and analysis consistent

- Completely configurable
- Extensible will little eff
- Integrated with spam detection (Hungarian Academy of Sciences)

High Parallelism

- We use **massively** multiple (like 5000) **fetching** threads
- Every thread handles a request and is I/O bound
- Parallel threads parse and store pages
- Slow data structures are sandwiched between
 lock-free queues



Fully Distributed

- We use JGroups to set up a view on a set of agents
- We use JAI4J, a thin layer over JGroups that handles job assignment.
- Hosts are assigned to agent using consistent hashing
- URLs for which an agent is not responsible are quickly delivered to the right agent

Near-Duplicates

- We detect (presently) near-duplicates using a fingerprint of a stripped page (stored in a *Bloom filter*)
- The stripping includes eliminating almost all tag attributes and numbers from text



Highlight: The workbench

- A double priority queue of *visit states* (the state of visit of a host)
- Organized by next-fetch per host & per IP
- Works like a delay queue: wait until a host is ready to be visited

Highlight: the workbench virtualizer

- Visit states keep track of URLs that are to be visited for a given host (those already been output from the sieve)
- How to reconcile this with *constant memory*?
- Keeping only the tip of each queue and using on-disk refill queues for the rest...

Behavior on a slow connection



Front size



Average speed

Comparisons

	Machines	Speed/agent (MB/s)
Nutch (ClueWeb09)	100	0,1
Heritrix (ClueWeb12)	5	4
Heritrix (<i>in vitro</i>)	1	4,5
IRLBot	1	40
BUbiNG (in vivo)	1	154
BUbiNG (in vitro)	4	160

Fast?

- In vitro: >9000 pages/s average, peaks at 18000 pages/s
- In vivo (@iStella): >3500 pages/s average (single crawler), steady download speed of 1.2Gb/s
- ClueWeb09 (Nutch): 4.3 pages/s
- ClueWeb12 (Heritrix): 60 pages/s
- IRLbot: 1790 pages/s (unverifiable)

We broke down almost everything!

- Hardware broke down: €40,000 server development charge with a €60,000 server
 OS broke down: Linu openel's bug 862758
 JVM brobatance
 JVM brobatance
 Try opening 5000 random-access files

open-source projects, including the Jericho HTML parser, Apache Software Foundation's HTTP Client, etc.

Future works

- Download@http://law.di.unimi.it/
- Using other prioritizations for URL
- But first of all: making crawling technology more and more accessible to the masses

Thanks!