Structured Peer-to-Peer Networks

- The P2P Scaling Problem
- Unstructured P2P Revisited
- Distributed Indexing
- Fundamentals of Distributed Hash Tables
- DHT Algorithms
  - Chord
  - Pastry
  - Can
- Programming a DHT

Graphics repeatedly taken from:
R.Steinmetz, K. Wehrle: *Peer-to-Peer Systems and Applications*, Springer LNCS 3485, 2005

Demands of P2P Systems

- Instant Deployment
  - Independent of infrastructural provisions
- Flexibility
  - Seamless adaptation to changing member requirements
- Reliability
  - Robustness against node or infrastructure failures
- Scalability
  - Resources per node do not (significantly) increase as the P2P network grows

The Challenge in Peer-to-Peer Systems



- Location of resources (data items) distributed among systems
  - Where shall the item be stored by the provider?
  - How does a requester find the actual location of an item?
- Scalability: limit the complexity for communication and storage
- Robustness and resilience in case of faults and frequent changes

Unstructured P2P Revisited

Basically two approaches:

- Centralized
  - Simple, flexible searches at server (O(1))
  - Single point of failure, O(N) node states at server
- Decentralized Flooding
  - Fault tolerant, O(1) node states
  - Communication overhead ≥ $O(N^2)$, search may fail

But:

  - No reference structure between nodes imposed

Unstructured P2P: Complexities



Idea: Distributed Indexing

- Initial ideas from distributed shared memories (1987 ff.)
- Nodes are structured according to some address space
- Data is mapped into the same address space
- Intermediate nodes maintain routing information to target nodes
  - Efficient forwarding to „destination“ (content – not location)
  - Definitive statement about existence of content



Scalability of Distributed Indexing

- Communication effort: O(log(N)) hops
- Node state: O(log(N)) routing entries



Distributed Indexing: Complexities



Fundamentals of Distributed Hash Tables

- Desired Characteristics:
  Flexibility, Reliability, Scalability
- Challenges for designing DHTs
  - Equal distribution of content among nodes
    - Crucial for efficient lookup of content
  - Permanent adaptation to faults, joins, exits of nodes
    - Assignment of responsibilities to new nodes
    - Re-assignment and re-distribution of responsibilities in case of node failure or departure
  - Maintenance of routing information

Distributed Management of Data

1. Mapping of nodes and data into same address space
   - Peers and content are addressed using flat identifiers (IDs)
   - Nodes are responsible for data in certain parts of the address space
   - Association of data to nodes may change since nodes may disappear
2. Storing / Looking up data in the DHT
   - Search for data = routing to the responsible node
     - Responsible node not necessarily known in advance
     - Deterministic statement about availability of data

Addressing in Distributed Hash Tables

Step 1: Mapping of content/nodes into linear space

- Usually: 0, …, 2^m-1 ≫ number of objects to be stored
- Mapping of data and nodes into an address space (with hash function)
  - E.g., Hash(*String*) mod 2^m: H(„*my data*“) → 2313
- Association of parts of address space to DHT nodes





Often, the address space is viewed as a circle.

Mapping Address Space to Nodes

Each node is responsible for part of the value range

- Often with redundancy (overlapping of parts)
- Continuous adaptation
- Real (underlay) and logical (overlay) topology so far uncorrelated

Node 3485 is responsible for data items in range 2907 to 3485
(in case of a Chord-DHT)

Logical view of the Distributed Hash Table



Mapping on the real topology



Routing to a Data Item

Step 2: Locating the data (content-based routing)

Goal: Small and scalable effort

- O(1) with centralized hash table
- Minimum overhead with distributed hash tables
  - O(log N): DHT hops to locate object
  - O(log N): number of keys and routing information per node (N = # nodes)

Routing to a Data Item (2)

- Routing to a Key-Value-pair
  - Start lookup at arbitrary node of DHT
  - Routing to requested data item (key) recursively according to node tables



Routing to a Data Item (3)

- Getting the content
  - K/V-pair is delivered to requester
  - Requester analyzes K/V-tuple
    (and downloads data from actual location – in case of indirect storage)



Data Storage

- Direct storage
  - Content is stored in responsible node for H("*my data*")

  → Inflexible for large content – o.k. for small data (<1KB)
- Indirect storage
  - Nodes in a DHT store tuples like (key,value)
    - Key = Hash(„*my data*") → 2313
    - Value is often real storage address of content: (IP, Port) = (134.2.11.140, 4711)

  → More flexible, but one step more to reach content

Dynamic of a DHT: Node Arrival

Bootstrapping/Joining of a new node

1. Calculation of node ID
2. New node contacts DHT via arbitrary node
3. Assignment of a particular hash range
4. Copying of K/V-pairs of hash range (usually with redundancy)
5. Binding into routing environment (of overlay)



Node Failure / Departure

- Failure of a node
  - Use of redundant K/V pairs (if a node fails)
  - Use of redundant / alternative routing paths
  - Key-value usually still retrievable if at least one copy remains
- Departure of a node
  - Partitioning of hash range to neighbor nodes
  - Copying of K/V pairs to corresponding nodes
  - Unbinding from routing environment

DHT Algorithms

- Lookup algorithm for nearby objects (Plaxton et al 1997)
  - Before P2P … later used in Tapestry
- Chord (Stoica et al 2001)
  - Straight forward 1-dim. DHT
- Pastry (Rowstron & Druschel 2001)
  - Proximity neighbour selection
- CAN (Ratnasamy et al 2001)
  - Route optimisation in a multidimensional identifier space
- Kademlia (Maymounkov & Mazières 2002) …

Chord: Overview

- Early and successful algorithm
- Simple & elegant
  - easy to understand and implement
  - many improvements and optimizations exist
- Main responsibilities:
  - Routing
    - Flat logical address space: l-bit identifiers instead of IPs
    - Efficient routing in large systems: log(N) hops, with N number of total nodes
  - Self-organization
    - Handle node arrival, departure, and failure

Chord: Topology

- Hash-table storage
  - put (key, value) inserts data into Chord
  - Value = get (key) retrieves data from Chord
- Identifiers from consistent hashing
  - Uses monotonic, load balancing hash function
    - E.g. SHA-1, 160-bit output → 0 <= identifier < 2^{160}
  - *Key* associated with data item
    - E.g. key = sha-1(value)
  - *ID* associated with host
    - E.g. id = sha-1 (IP address, port)

Chord: Topology

- Keys and IDs on ring, i.e., all arithmetic modulo 2^{160}
- (key, value) pairs managed by clockwise next node: successor



Chord: Topology

- Topology determined by links between nodes
  - Link: knowledge about another node
  - Stored in routing table on each node
- Simplest topology: circular linked list
  - Each node has link to clockwise next node



Routing on Ring ?

- Primitive routing:
  - Forward query for key x until successor(x) is found
  - Return result to source of query
- Pros:
  - Simple
  - Little node state
- Cons:
  - Poor lookup efficiency:
    O(1/2 * N) hops on average
    (with N nodes)
  - Node failure breaks circle



Improved Routing on Ring?

- Improved routing:
  - Store links to z next neighbors, Forward queries for k to farthest known predecessor of k
  - For z = N: fully meshed routing system
    - Lookup efficiency: O(1)
    - Per-node state: O(N)
  - Still poor scalability in linear routing progress
- Scalable routing:
  - Mix of short- and long-distance links required:
    - Accurate routing in node's vicinity
    - Fast routing progress over large distances
    - Bounded number of links per node

Chord: Routing

Chord's routing table: *finger table*

- Stores log(N) links per node
- Covers exponentially increasing distances:
  - Node n: entry i points to successor(n + 2^i) (*i-th finger*)



Chord: Routing

Chord's routing algorithm:

- Each node n forwards query for key k clockwise
  - To farthest finger preceding k
  - Until n = predecessor(k) and successor(n) = successor(k)
  - Return successor(n) to source of query



Chord: Self-Organization

- Handle changing network environment
  - Failure of nodes
  - Network failures
  - Arrival of new nodes
  - Departure of participating nodes
- Maintain consistent system state for routing
  - Keep routing information up to date
    - Routing correctness depends on correct successor information
    - Routing efficiency depends on correct finger tables
  - Failure tolerance required for all operations

Chord: Failure Tolerance in Storage

- Layered design
  - Chord DHT mainly responsible for routing
  - Data storage managed by application
    - persistence
    - consistency
- Chord soft-state approach:
  - Nodes delete (key, value) pairs after timeout
  - Applications need to refresh (key, value) pairs periodically
  - Worst case: data unavailable for refresh interval after node failure

Chord: Failure Tolerance in Routing

- Finger failures during routing
  - query cannot be forwarded to finger
  - forward to previous finger (do not overshoot destination node)
  - trigger repair mechanism: replace finger with its successor
- Active finger maintenance
  - periodically check fingers "`fix_fingers`"
  - replace with correct nodes on failures
  - trade-off: maintenance traffic vs. correctness & timeliness



Chord: Failure Tolerance in Routing

- Successor failure during routing
  - Last step of routing can return node failure to source of query
    -> all queries for successor fail
  - Store n successors in *successor list*
    - successor[0] fails -> use successor[1] etc.
    - routing fails only if n consecutive nodes fail simultaneously
- Active maintenance of successor list
  - periodic checks similar to finger table maintenance "`stabilize`" uses predecessor pointer
  - crucial for correct routing

Chord: Node Arrival

- New node picks ID
- Contact existing node
- Construct finger table via standard routing/lookup()
- Retrieve (key, value) pairs from successor



Chord: Node Arrival

- Examples for choosing new node IDs
  - random ID: equal distribution assumed but not guaranteed
  - hash IP address & port
  - external observables
- Retrieval of existing node IDs
  - Controlled flooding
  - DNS aliases
  - Published through web
  - etc.



Chord: Node Arrival

- Construction of finger table
  - iterate over finger table rows
  - for each row: query entry point for successor
  - standard Chord routing on entry point
- Construction of successor list
  - add immediate successor from finger table
  - request successor list from successor



Chord: Node Departure

- Deliberate node departure
  - clean shutdown instead of failure
- For simplicity: treat as failure
  - system already failure tolerant
  - soft state: automatic state restoration
  - state is lost briefly
  - invalid finger table entries: reduced routing efficiency
- For efficiency: handle explicitly
  - notification by departing node to
    - successor, predecessor, nodes at finger distances
  - copy (key, value) pairs before shutdown

Chord: Performance

- Impact of node failures on lookup failure rate
  - lookup failure rate roughly equivalent to node failure rate



Chord: Performance

Moderate impact of number of nodes on lookup latency





Consistent average path length

Chord: Performance

- Lookup latency (number of hops/messages):
  ~ 1/2 $\log_2(N)$
- Confirms theoretical estimation



Chord: Summary

- Complexity
  - Messages per lookup: O(log N)
  - Memory per node: O(log N)
  - Messages per management action (join/leave/fail): O(log² N)
- Advantages
  - Theoretical models and proofs about complexity
  - Simple & flexible
- Disadvantages
  - No notion of node proximity and proximity-based routing optimizations
  - Chord rings may become disjoint in realistic settings
- Many improvements published
  - e.g. proximity, bi-directional links, load balancing, etc.

Pastry: Overview

- Similar to Chord: Organises nodes & keys in a ring of flat hash IDs $0 \leq ID \leq 2^{128} - 1$
- Uses prefix-based routing:
  - Interprets identifiers as digit strings of base 2^{ℓ}, $\ell \approx 4$
  - Routing according to "longest prefix match"
  - Result: routing down a tree
- Routing table built according to proximity selection
  - enhanced routing efficiency due to locality

Pastry: Identifier Mapping

- Pastry views ℓ-bit identifiers as digit strings of base 2^b
- Example: $\ell = 4$, $b = 2$
- Keys (K..) are stored at closest node (N..) according to prefix metric
- In case of equal distance key is stored on both neighbouring nodes (K22)



Pastry Routing Table

- Contains ℓ/b rows ("the range of string lenths")
- 2^b -1 columns ("the digits", one represents the node)
- Cell position approximates pastry node v within overlay, using the index transformation ("·" concatenates):

$$T(i,j) = prefix(i-1, (hash(v)) \cdot j_b,$$

- Cell value maps to corresponding network address
- As there are several nodes with same prefix match: topologically closest selected for routing table

➔ Proximity Neighbour Selection (PSN)

Prefix-Match Routing Table

Node ID $v = 103220, \ell = 12, b = 2$

	0	1	2	3
0	031120	1	201303	312201
1	0	110003	120132	132012
2	100221	101203	102303	3
3	103031	103112	2	103302
4	103200	103210	2	103233
5	0	103221	103222	103223

Routing & Lookup Tables

Three tables:

- Routing – Prefix Match
- Leaf Set – Closest Nodes in Overlay
- Neighbourhood Set – Closest Nodes in phys. Network

according to given metric: RTT, Hops, …

Node 103220

Routing Table

0	031120	*1*	201303	312201
1	*0*	110003	120132	132012
2	100221	101203	102303	*3*
3		103112	*2*	103302
4		103210	*2*	
5	*0*			

Leaf Set

103123	103210	103302	103330

Neighborhood Set

031120	312201	120132	101203

Pastry Routing

Step 1: Check, if key k is within the range of the leaf set

➔ Request forwarded to closest node in leaf set

Step 2: For k not in the range of leaf set, lookup routing table

➔ Try to identify entry with longer common prefix

➔ If not available, route to entry closer to key

Note: Routing is loop-free, as forwarding is strictly done according to numerical closeness.

Pastry Routing Examples



Pastry: Node Arrival

- New node *n* picks Pastry ID and contacts a Pastry node *k* nearby w.r.t the proximity metric
- As *k* is nearby, its neighbourhood set is copied to *n*
- The leaf set is copied from the numerically closest overlay node *c*, which *n* reaches by a join message via *k*
- The join message is forwarded along nodes with increasingly longer prefixes common to *n* and will trigger routing updates from intermediate nodes to n
- Finally *n* sends its state to all nodes in its routing tables (active route propagation incl. time stamps)

Pastry: Node Failure

- Node failure arrives at contact failures of tabulated nodes
  - Lazy failure detection (reactive)
- Pastry provides several redundancies:
  - Routing tables may include several equivalent entries
  - Forwarding may take place to an adjacent entry
- Routing & neighbourhood table repair:
  - Query nodes neighbouring in table rows
  - If unsuccessful: query entries from previous rows
  - Lively routing tables are advertised from new nodes

Pastry: Hop Performance



Pastry: Delay Stretch



Pastry: Summary

- Complexity
  - Messages per lookup: O($\log_{2^b} N$)
  - Messages per mgmt. action (join/leave/fail): O($\log_{2^b} N$)/O($\log_b N$)
  - Memory per node: O(b · $\log_{2^b} N$)
- Advantages
  - Exploits proximity neighbouring
  - Robust & flexible
- Disadvantages
  - Complex, theoretical modelling & analysis more difficult
- Pastry admits constant delay stretch w.r.t. # of overlay nodes, but depends on network topology – Chord's delay stretch remains independent of topology, but depends on overlay size

CAN: Overview

- Maps node IDs to regions, which partition *d*-dimensional space
- Keys correspondingly are coordinate points in a *d*-dim. torus: $<k_1, \ldots, k_d>$
- Routing from neighbour to neighbour – neighbourhood enhanced in high dimensionality
- *d* tuning parameter of the system

CAN: Space Partitioning

- Keys mapped into $[0,1]^d$ (or other numerical interval)
- Node's regions always cover the entire torus
- Data is placed on node, who owns zone of its key
- Zone management is done by splitting / re-merging regions
- Dimensional ordering to retain spatial coherence



CAN Routing

- Each node maintains a coordinate neighbour set (Neighbours overlap in (*d-1*) dim. and abut in the remaining dim.)
- Routing is done from neighbour to neighbour along the straight line path from source to destination:
- Forwarding is done to that neighbour with coordinate zone closest to destination



1's coordinate neighbor set = {2,3,4,5}
7's coordinate neighbor set = { }

CAN Node Arrival

The new node

1. Picks a random coordinate
2. Contacts any CAN node and routes a join to the owner of the corresponding zone
3. Splits zone to acquire region of its picked point & learns neighbours from previous owner
4. Advertises its presence to neighbours



1's coordinate neighbor set = {2,3,4,7}
7's coordinate neighbor set = {1,2,4,5}

Node Failure / Departure

- Node failure detected by missing update messages
- Leaving gracefully, a node notifies neighbours and copies its content
- On node's disappearance zone needs re-occupation in a size-balancing approach:
  - Neighbours start timers invers. proportional to their zone size
  - On timeout a neighbour requests 'takeover', responded only by those nodes with smaller zone sizes

CAN Optimisations

- Redundancy:
  Multiple simultaneous coordinate spaces - Realities
- Expedited Routing: Cartesian Distance weighted by network-level measures
- Path-length reduction: Overloading coordinate zones
- Proximity neighbouring: Topologically sensitive construction of overlay (landmarking)
- ...

CAN Path Length Evaluation



CAN Path Length Evaluation (2)



CAN: Summary

- Complexity
  - Messages per lookup: $O(N^{1/d})$
  - Messages per mgmt. action (join/leave/fail): $O(d/2\ N^{1/d})/O(2\ d)$
  - Memory per node: $O(d)$
- Advantages
  - Performance parametrisable through dimensionality
  - Simple basic principle, easy to analyse & improve
- Disadvantages
  - Lookup complexity is not logarithmically bound
- Due to its simple construction, CAN is open to many variants, improvements and customisations

Implementations / Deployment

- Many concepts & implementations …
  - Storage Systems
  - Indexing/Naming
  - Content Distribution
  - DB Query Processing, …
- Real Deployment:
  - Public DHT-Service: OpenDHT
  - Filesharing: Overnet (eDonkey), BitTorrent
  - Media Conferencing: P2PSIP
  - Music Indexing: freeDB
  - WebCaching: Coral
- Problems: Overload + Starvation, Need Fairness Balance

Programming a DHT

- Two communication interfaces:
  - One towards the application layer (user of the DHT)
  - One towards other nodes within the DHT
  - Functions similar
- Node-to-Node Interface must be network transparent, choice of:
    - Application layer protocol (using TCP or UDP sockets)
    - Remote procedure calls (RPCs)
    - Remote Method Invocation (RMI/Corba)
    - Web services …
- Application layer interface may be local or distributed

DHT Data Interfaces

- Generic interface of distributed hash tables
  - Provisioning of information
    - Publish(key,value)
  - Requesting of information (search for content)
    - Lookup(key)
    - Reply: value
- DHT approaches are interchangeable (with respect to interface)



DHT Self Organisation Interface

- Join(mykey): Retrieve ring successor & predecessor (neighbours), initiate key transfer
- Leave(): Transfer predecessor and keys to successor
- Maintain predecessor & successor (neighbour) list, e.g., stabilize in Chord
- Maintain routing table, e.g., fix_fingers in Chord

Dabek Model

- Layered approach towards a "unified overlay routing"
- Core idea: KBR layer (Tier 0) as a routing abstraction on (interchangeable) structured schemes
- Tier 1: General services
- Tier 2: Higher layer services and applications



Common KBR API

Tier	Message Routing
1-2	`forward(key↔K, msg↔M, nodehandle↔nextHopNode)` `deliver(key→K, msg→M)`
0	`route(key→K, msg→M, nodehandle→hint)`

Table 5.1: The KBR Message Routing API Calls Implemented on the Corresponding Layers

Tier	State Access
1-2	`update(nodehandle→n, bool→joined)`

0	`nodehandle [] local_lookup(key→K, int→num, boolean→safe)`
	`nodehandle [] neighborSet(int→num)`
	`nodehandle [] replicaSet(key→k, int→max_rank)`
	`boolean range(nodehandle→N, rank→r, key↔lkey,key←rkey)`

Table 5.2: The KBR State Access API Calls Implemented on the Corresponding Layers [

References

- C.Plaxton, R. Rajaraman, A. Richa: *Accessing Nearby Copies of Replicated Objects in a Distributed Environment*, Proc. of 9th ACM Sympos. on parallel Algor. and Arch. (SPAA), pp.311-330, June 1997.
- I. Stoica, R. Morris, D. Karger, F. Kaashoek, and H. Balakrishnan: *Chord: A Scalable Peer-to-Peer Lookup Service for Internet Applications.* Proc. of the 2001 ACM SigComm, pp. 149 – 160, ACM Press, 2001.
- A. Rowstron and P. Druschel: Pastry: Scalable, Distributed Object Location and Routing for Large-Scale Peer-to-Peer Systems. IFIP/ACM Intern. Conference on Distrib. Systems Platforms (Middleware), pp. 329-350, Springer, 2001.
- S. Ratnasamy, P. Francis, M. Handley, R. Karp: *A Scalable Content-Addressable Network.* Proc. of the 2001 ACM SigComm, pp. 161 – 172, ACM Press, 2001.
- F. Dabek et al.: *Towards a Common API for Structured Peer-to-Peer Overlays*, IPTPS 2003, LNCS, Vol 2735, pp. 33-44, Springer, 2003