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Overview

- Annotea
- Implementing Danno & Dannotate
- Lessons learned
- Scaling up
Annotea Basics

- Protocol for managing annotations on web resources
  - HTTP based, RESTful.
  - Annotations/Replies represented in RDF with simple/generic RDF schemas.
  - Simple queries to fetch annotations for resource, replies for annotation.
  - GET, POST, PUT and DELETE for CRUD.
  - Annotations are separate from resources.
Annotea History & Status

- Produced by W3C working group, circa 2000
- Documents are draft only.
  - Not endorsed standards.
  - Not standard track.
  - Objectively not “standard quality”.
- No current Annotea standardization effort.
- Implementations exist, but no major products / websites support Annotea.
Danno & Dannotate

- **Danno annotation server:**
  - Implements Annotea protocol + extensions.
  - Supports fine-grained access control, collection management, OAI-PMH harvest, etc.
  - Designed to be highly configurable, extensible.

- **Dannotate annotation client:**
  - Runs in multiple browser (not IE7 or earlier)
  - Not a browser plugin / addon – no user install step.
  - Text, image & map annotations.
  - Context sensitive annotation, annotation of data.
Danno Architecture

Tomcat Web Container

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotea</th>
<th>RSS</th>
<th>OAI-PMH (OAICAT)</th>
<th>Import + Collections</th>
<th>Web Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Query Handler</td>
<td>Update Handler</td>
<td>Collection Handler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena Adapter</td>
<td>Sesame Adapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jena libs</td>
<td>Sesame libs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary StorageAdapter Plugin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Triple Store

File System
Danno / Dannote in use

- Aus-e-lit project.
  - Uses Danno with custom annotation tool.
  - Free-text indexing of annotations.
- Atlas of Living Australia.
  - Uses Danno. Will use Dannoteate.
- 3-D model Annotation project.
  - Uses Danno with custom annotation tool.
- AAF-enable Annotation project.
  - Will use Danno + Dannoteate + ...
Lessons – Annotea issues

- **General:**
  - Failure to create a standard.
  - Too much “specification by example”.
  - Specifications should be based on real experience.

- **Specific:**
  - No specification of the annotation model.
  - Dubious handling of annotation “bodies”.
  - Sketchy RDF schemas. Poor separation.
  - Security / access control not addressed.
Is OAC the answer?

- Open Annotations Collaboration (OAC).
- Superior Annotation model:
  - Multiple annotation targets, contents.
  - Improved contexts: fragments, constrained targets.
  - Annotation versions, time-related annotations.
- Missing from OAC (so far):
  - Client-server protocol for annotation tools.
  - Framework for application-specific annotations.
  - Standards track.
Lessons - Danno

- No SPARQL equivalent for updating
- No standard Java APIs for RDF handling.
  - Sesame, Jena, etc all have different APIs.
  - Vendor tie-in or abstraction layer.
- Triple store performance issues.
  - Sesame, Jena are slow.
  - Proprietary implementations faster, but expensive.
  - Performance of closure operations.
  - Connection pool / transaction impl issues.
Lessons - Dannotate

- Avoiding browser plugin / extension requires significant server-side support.
  - Same source problem.
  - Page repeater approach is fragile.
- Cross-platform Javascript is hard.
- Map annotations are hard, Map API specific.
- Live updates are a scalability issue.
The Scaling Problem

- Danno handles 100 requests per second max*.
  - 300 users x 10 browser tabs with live-updates** ... 
  - ... “Huston, we have a problem”.

* Indicative only. This is from an old benchmark with no security, a small triplestore and no Dannotate.
** Assume live-updates poll once every 30 seconds.

- Scaling dimensions:
  - Number of annotated targets, annotations per target, replies per annotation
  - Number of concurrently active users
  - Annotation create/update/delete rates
Danno Performance

- Replace persistence abstraction layer.
  - Not RDF-centric. Not Annotea-centric.
- Use blob store to hold RDF/XML annotations:
  - Use triple store or multi-store implementations in deployments where inference is a requirement.
- Add custom SQL tables to support Annotea queries and access control:
  - Tables & indexes for supported queries.
  - Table for annotation metadata.
Danno Scaling

- Partition annotations across multiple Danno servers based on target URLs
  - Load balancer dispatches based on annotation URLs and query params (e.g. annotation target).
- Database / blob store for primary persistence.
- Further measures:
  - Replicate / mirror Danno's persistence backend.
  - Use in-memory caches for active locuses.
Scaled-up Danno

Direct request based on query params / annotation URL

Load Balancers

Danno Query

Danno Update

Database + Blob store

Triple store

…

Danno Query

Danno Update

Database + Blob store

Triple store
Dannotate Performance

- Reducing the number of interactions:
  - User's browser <-> Dannotate servlet
  - Dannotate servlet <-> Danno

- Adaptive live updates:
  - reduce polling rate when load is high.

- Use of COMET for live updates.
Dannotate Scaling

- Dannote / Dannotate servlet on different servers.
- Replicate servers running Dannotate servlet.
  - Load balancer dispatches to server based on client IP address.
- Use internal publish/subscribe network to eliminate live update load on Dannote servers:
  - Dannote servers publish update events for annotation / reply create, update and delete.
  - Dannotate servers subscribe to update events for relevant targets, annotations or replies.
Scaled-up Dannotate

Initially direct request based on web page URL

Load Balancer

Live Update

Dannotate Web API

Page Repeater

Update events via pub/sub

Danno server cluster

Annotea+ requests
Conclusions

- Only use a triple store if you need to.
  - Fixed queries + no inference => DB is faster.
- Annotea is problematic:
  - It is not a standard.
  - Specification incomplete + technical issues.
  - Nobody much implements it (see above)
- Open Annotation Collaboration
  - Shows considerable promise.
  - Needs to be standards tracked ... or else it will be ignored by industry. (My prediction!)