

BOEING

## INVENTION DISCLOSURE

Page 1 of 19

This form is to be used for disclosure to The Boeing Company of inventions, discoveries, improvements or innovations, whether or not considered patentable.  
See above for instructions.

TITLE OF INVENTION (Descriptive and Concise)								
A <u>SWAN: Small-World Wide Area Networking</u>								
INVENTOR INFORMATION (Use Additional Sheet If Necessary)								
INVENTOR NAME (FIRST, M.I., LAST) <b>1</b>		INVENTOR NAME (FIRST, M.I., LAST) <b>2</b>		INVENTOR NAME (FIRST, M.I., LAST) <b>3</b>		INVENTOR NAME (FIRST, M.I., LAST) <b>4</b>		
Virgil E. Bourassa		Fred B. Holt						
SOCIAL SECURITY NO.		SOCIAL SECURITY NO.						
ORG. NO.		ORG. NO.						
MAIL STOP		MAIL STOP						
PHONE		PHONE		PHONE		PHONE		
BOEING EMPLOYEE (ADD SUBSIDIARY)		BOEING EMPLOYEE (ADD SUBSIDIARY)		BOEING EMPLOYEE (ADD SUBSIDIARY)		BOEING EMPLOYEE (ADD SUBSIDIARY)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Boeing SSG <input type="checkbox"/> MDC <input type="checkbox"/> BNA		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Boeing SSG <input type="checkbox"/> MDC <input type="checkbox"/> BNA		<input type="checkbox"/> Boeing <input type="checkbox"/> MDC <input type="checkbox"/> BNA		<input type="checkbox"/> Boeing <input type="checkbox"/> MDC <input type="checkbox"/> BNA		
CONTRACT EMPLOYEE		CONTRACT EMPLOYEE		CONTRACT EMPLOYEE		CONTRACT EMPLOYEE		
OTHER (SPECIFY)		OTHER (SPECIFY)		OTHER (SPECIFY)		OTHER (SPECIFY)		
MANAGER'S NAME		MANAGER'S NAME		MANAGER'S NAME		MANAGER'S NAME		
Robert Abernethy		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		
PHONE		PHONE		PHONE		PHONE		
[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		
STATE OF DEVELOPMENT (See Remarks On Back)								
DATE CONCEIVED		CONCEPT ONLY		DATE BUILT		DATE SATISFACTORILY TESTED		
11/96		<input type="checkbox"/> PROVEN ANALYTICALLY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DESIGN COMPLETE		8/30/99		9/16/99		
						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROTOTYPE IN PRODUCTION 11/1/99 DATE		
APPLICATION OF THE INVENTION								
PRODUCT/PROGRAM				PRODUCTION RELEASE E.G. PRR NO.			DATE	
[Redacted]				[Redacted]			9/99	
POTENTIAL CUSTOMER(S) IN ADDITION TO BOEING								
[Redacted]								
DISCLOSURE OF INVENTION OUTSIDE BOEING								
[Redacted]						DATE(S)		
						4/8/99		
						12/9/99		
						12/9/99		
PUBLISHED		PUBLICATION NAME				DATE	VOLUME NO.	PAGE
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		[Redacted]						
DEVELOPMENT HISTORY								
1. WHAT BOEING ACCOUNT OR WORK ORDER WERE YOU CHARGING TO WHEN YOU MADE THIS INVENTION?								
ACCOUNT OR WORK ORDER NO. FOR EACH INVENTOR (16-DIGIT CHARGELINE) 1) [Redacted]								
[Redacted] 3) [Redacted] 4) [Redacted]								
2. CHECK AS APPLICABLE:								
<input type="checkbox"/> THIS INVENTION WAS CONCEIVED OR FIRST BUILT AND TESTED IN THE COURSE OF WORK UNDER A U.S. GOVERNMENT CONTRACT. CONTRACT NO. OR OTHER IDENTIFICATION _____								
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> THIS INVENTION WAS NEITHER CONCEIVED NOR FIRST BUILT AND TESTED IN THE COURSE OF WORK UNDER A U.S. GOVERNMENT CONTRACT.								
<input type="checkbox"/> THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL PARTIES MAY HAVE RIGHTS TO THIS INVENTION: <u>N/A</u>								
3. RELATED INVENTION DISCLOSURE NOS: _____								
DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE								
DISCLOSURE NO.		DATE RECEIVED		DISCLOSURE ASSIGNED TO:		PE		IP
[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]		[Redacted]

# SWAN: SMALL-WORLD WIDE AREA NETWORKING

## Introduction

The need has been increasing in large software projects, in collaborative workflow, and to facilitate enterprise-wide-engineering, for an effective means to allow scalable and reliable sharing of information across multiple processes. For example, the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has proven valuable in allowing collaborative design reviews to take place at geographically distant sites, such as between Everett, WA, and St. Louis, MO. To enhance the value of [REDACTED] and enable additional world-wide electronic collaboration applications, programmers need a software mechanism allowing dozens, hundreds, or perhaps thousands of participating computer processes to simultaneously share information easily, quickly, and reliably across the world.

## Problem Solved By This Invention

SWAN provides general world-wide ("wide-area") peer-to-peer communications among computer processes. It achieves this with high reliability and low latency, scaling from a single process to thousands of participating processes. The system is completely distributed among the participants, which may join, depart, or even fail, at any time and in any order.

The implementation doesn't require special hardware, or the intervention of system administrators. All computers can participate, without requiring root access, daemons, kernel modifications, or the addition of "well-known" port numbers.

Though openly accessible, SWAN does have rudimentary security. Joining a session is restricted to those processes sharing the SWAN code base and aware of the correct channel designation.




## Background

There are four categories of computer network communication systems that might be applied to the problem of wide-area simultaneous sharing of information for the purpose of collaborative processing. These are: 1) point-to-point networking protocols, 2) client-server middleware, 3) multicast networking protocols, and 4) peer-to-peer middleware.

## Point-To-Point Networking Protocols

A number of point-to-point networking protocols exist to allow direct one- or two-way communication between two computer processes. Examples include UNIX pipes, TCP/IP, UDP, IBM's SNA, and Xerox' XNS. Of these, only TCP/IP and UDP are universally available for communication between computers connected via the Internet or on the Boeing Intranet.

Using point-to-point connections directly does not scale easily as the number of participating processes grows. A process is limited in the number of such connections that can be made (roughly 60), and managing even a single connection is a complex task for programmers. Coordinating a communication session involving even a modest number of connections exacerbates the program complexity enormously. For all of these reasons, direct use of a point-

WITNESS SIGNATURE		THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY		PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
		PRINT	Robert M Abernol	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		PHONE	[REDACTED]	DATE	ORGN #	M/S	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]		12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE		DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE		DATE		
		12/23/99			23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)							

to-point networking protocol is not a feasible mechanism for sharing information across a medium- to large-scale collaboration across a wide-area network.

### Client-Server Middleware

To alleviate the complexity of programming directly at the network protocol level, client-server middleware is available to provide an easier programming abstraction. In client-server middleware, a number of "client" processes find or instantiate a single "server" process, forming a direct network connection between them. The client may then request services from the server, which often is given central authority over a resource, such as a database. Examples include database servers, remote procedure calls (RPC), and CORBA.

The client-server paradigm provided by this middleware, while providing a mechanism for sequenced resource sharing, is not feasible for collaborative information sharing. One client may be able to convey information directly to the server, but the other clients are unaware that the server has new information, forcing them to poll the server for possible new information. This creates a performance bottleneck as the number of participants increases, adds undue latency in disseminating the information, and wastes processing time as client processes continue to check for new information.

Some client-server middleware packages, such as CORBA, allow clients to register "callbacks," functions to be invoked when an event occurs. While this facility may make collaborative information sharing less onerous, for medium- to large-scale applications the single server is still a performance bottleneck.





Furthermore, the reliability of a collaborative application relying on a single server is poor, as loss of the server or difficulty in its instantiation completely destroys the integrity of the collaborative session.

### Multicast Networking Protocols

Multicast networking protocols allow selective broadcast of messages to multiple recipients. It retains the complexity of direct network communication mentioned above, but is a natural choice for collaborative sharing. Currently, multicast is available for UDP messages, but virtually all UDP multicast traffic is limited to a single local-area network or, at most, a small set of connected local-area networks. UDP multicast, in its current implementation, could easily swamp the Internet otherwise, as it would have to saturate the Internet with each message to find all possible participants.

Several wide-area multicast networking protocols have been proposed, and some, such as IP Multicast, are in limited commercial and/or research deployment. These solutions require special router hardware and/or software to achieve data sharing without overwhelming the participating networks. Even if a standard solution were selected today, it would take years, or possibly decades, before the entire Internet infrastructure could be completely retrofitted with the new technology.

Additionally, the solutions proposed in this area, in an attempt to conserve bandwidth, are not constructed with reliability as a concern. By using minimum spanning trees among the routers

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		

involved, any router failure can partition the collaborative session.

### Peer-To-Peer Middleware

Peer-to-peer middleware provides the programmer with a software library that is intended to provide an easy-to-use abstraction, such as "publish-and-subscribe" or "shared objects," for immediately sharing information among a set of collaborating processes. Hidden from the programmer is how the actual communication takes place.

The underlying communication infrastructure may make use of a multicast network protocol, or a graph of point-to-point network protocols, or a combination of the two. The infrastructure in commercial use today, in products such as IBM's Sametime, Data Connection's DC-Share, and Microsoft's NetMeeting, is the T.120 Internet standard. That used in the current [REDACTED] infrastructure is called the [REDACTED]. Both have the user (*not* the programmer), assemble a point-to-point graph of connections. For this reason, and others, neither is suitable for the needs of medium- to large-scale collaboration.

### T.120 Internet Standard




Figure 1. T.120 connection tree.

An example of a T.120 communication session is depicted in Figure 1. When first connecting to a session on a given host computer, a proxy process (depicted in gray and black in the figure), called an MCU, is instantiated by a daemon process (a resident process that listens for such requests, not depicted). This MCU forms a direct connection to the MCU of another host designated by the application user, or is designated as the *root* of the session (the black dot). The requesting process

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
<i>Robert M. Abernethy</i>	Robert M. Abernethy	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/31/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
<i>David B. Hays</i>	12/23/99	<i>David B. Hays</i>	2:3 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		

and all additional processes on the host wishing to join the session form a direct connection to the MCU process on that host. To share information, a process sends a message to its MCU, which is sent up the tree of MCUs to the root, then down the tree of MCUs and disseminated among their attached processes.

This scheme fails to solve the problem of medium- to large-scale collaboration for a number of reasons. First, the responsibility of determining the topology of the connection graph is foisted off on the application users, which, in addition to being a nuisance to the users, is not likely to result in an efficient structure for performance. The most common kind of connection scheme seen in practice is for all host MCUs to connect directly to the root MCU.

Second, the MCUs are performance, reliability, and scalability bottlenecks. All messages must be serialized through each MCU to a potentially large number of processes on the host. Loss of an MCU not only removes all of the processes on the host, but also prunes the subtree attached to it from the session. Furthermore, given operating system limitations, each MCU can accommodate, at most, about 60 client processes.

Third, the need to coordinate all messages through the root MCU not only makes that process a performance bottleneck, and a single point of failure for the session, but also causes the speed of communication to be limited by the slowest host and/or communication link in the tree. For example, NetMeeting's performance is reported to be intolerable with about 20 participants.


Finally, the T.120 daemon must be installed on each host participating in a session. This requires additional administration and maintenance, and limits the set of hosts that can join in a session. It also requires an additional "well-known" port number, which must be coordinated globally among all computers on the Internet.

[REDACTED]

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. A. Carbone	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)				DATE	



## Invention Description



SWAN is a communications library that allows any number of computer processes to share information across a wide-area network using generally available point-to-point network communication protocols. The SWAN solution supports peer-to-peer middleware by weaving together a fabric of point-to-point TCP/IP connections into a 4-regular graph with high connectivity and minimal latency (see Figure 2). It avoids synchronization difficulties by making use of the "small-world effect," namely, using only local knowledge to achieve global properties of effectiveness.

Several innovations are made in SWAN to support easy, quick, and reliable large-scale information sharing around the globe. By using existing Internet protocols in non-invasive ways,




THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY


WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
<i>Rahman</i>	Robert M. Aberkaneh	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
<i>[Signature]</i>	12/23/99	<i>[Signature]</i>	23 Dec 99		

DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)

[REDACTED]

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY

WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)					



1. [REDACTED]

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY

WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
<i>[Signature]</i>	Robert M. Albarbanel	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
<i>[Signature]</i>	12/23/99	<i>[Signature]</i>	23 Dec 99		

DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)



[illegible][illegible]

**INVENTOR SIGNATURE**  
*Viggo ...*

**DATE**  
12/23/99

**WITNESS SIGNATURE**  
*Robert M. Abarbanel*

**DATE**  
6-6-92

**INVENTOR SIGNATURE**  
*[Signature]*


**DATE**  
12/23/99

**WITNESS SIGNATURE**  
*[Signature]*


**DATE**  
23 Dec 99









**DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)**


**DATE**



THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)				DATE	












THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)				DATE	




THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
<i>Rahman</i>	Robert M. Albrecht	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
<i>[Signature]</i>	12/23/99	<i>[Signature]</i>	23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)					
DATE					

(A)




THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)					
DATE					











THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY


WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		






THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY









WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Albarbanel		12/15/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		




THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY

WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		



THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY					
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abankanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE 1	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)				DATE	














THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY

WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Albarbanel	[REDACTED]	12/13/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	12/23/99	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)			DATE		

[illegible]

THE FOREGOING WAS EXPLAINED TO AND UNDERSTOOD BY

WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
	Robert M. Abarbanel		12/23/99		
WITNESS SIGNATURE	PRINT	PHONE	DATE	ORGN #	M/S
			12/23/99		
INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE	INVENTOR SIGNATURE	DATE		
	12/23/99		23 Dec 99		
DISCLOSURE NO. (ASSIGNED BY PATENT STAFF)		DATE			