Peer-to-Peer Systems and Distributed Hash Tables

COS 418: *Advanced Computer Systems*
Lecture 8

Mike Freedman

[Credit: Slides Adapted from Kyle Jamieson and Daniel Suo]

Today

1. **Peer-to-Peer Systems**
   – **Napster, Gnutella, BitTorrent, challenges**
2. Distributed Hash Tables
3. The Chord Lookup Service
4. Concluding thoughts on DHTs, P2P

2

What is a Peer-to-Peer (P2P) system?



- A **distributed** system architecture:
  – **No centralized control**
  – Nodes are **roughly symmetric** in function
- **Large** number of **unreliable** nodes

3

Why might P2P be a win?

- **High capacity for services** through parallelism:
  – Many disks
  – Many network connections
  – Many CPUs
- **Absence of a centralized server** may mean:
  – **Less chance** of service overload as load increases
  – Easier **deployment**
  – A single failure **won't wreck** the whole system
  – System as a whole is **harder to attack**

4

P2P adoption

Successful adoption in **some niche areas**

1. Client-to-client (legal, illegal) **file sharing**
2. **Digital currency:** no natural single owner (Bitcoin)
3. **Voice/video telephony:** user to user anyway
   – Issues: Privacy and control

5

Example: Classic BitTorrent

1. User clicks on download link
   – Gets ***torrent*** file with content hash, IP addr of ***tracker***
2. User's BitTorrent (BT) client talks to tracker
   – Tracker tells it **list of peers** who have file
3. User's BT client downloads file from peers
4. User's BT client tells tracker it has a copy now, too
5. User's BT client serves the file to others for a while

Provides huge download bandwidth, **without** expensive server or network links

6

The lookup problem



7

Centralized lookup (Napster)



8

Flooded queries (original Gnutella)



Routed DHT queries (Chord)



Today

1. Peer-to-Peer Systems

2. **Distributed Hash Tables**

3. The Chord Lookup Service

4. Concluding thoughts on DHTs, P2P

What is a DHT (and why)?

- Local hash table:
```
key = Hash(name)
put(key, value)
get(key) → value
```

- **Service:** Constant-time insertion and lookup

How can I do (roughly) this across millions of hosts on the Internet?
Distributed Hash Table (DHT)

What is a DHT (and why)?

- Distributed Hash Table:
  `key = hash(data)`
  `lookup(key)` → **`IP addr`** (Chord lookup service)
  `send-RPC(IP address, `**`put`**`, key, data)`
  `send-RPC(IP address, `**`get`**`, key)` → `data`

- **Partitioning data** in **large-scale distributed systems**
  – Tuples in a global database engine
  – Data blocks in a global file system
  – Files in a P2P file-sharing system

Cooperative storage with a DHT



- App may be **distributed** over many nodes
- DHT **distributes data storage** over many nodes

BitTorrent over DHT

- BitTorrent can use DHT instead of (or with) a tracker

- BitTorrent clients use DHT:
  – Key = **file content hash** ("infohash")
  – Value = **IP address of peer** willing to serve file
    - Can store multiple values (*i.e.* IP addresses) for a key

- Client does:
  – `get(infohash)` to find other clients willing to serve
  – `put(infohash, my-ipaddr)` to identify itself as willing

Why the put/get DHT interface?

- API supports a wide range of applications
  – DHT imposes no structure/meaning on keys

- Key/value pairs are persistent and global
  – Can store keys in other DHT values
  – And thus build complex data structures

Why might DHT design be hard?

- Decentralized: no central authority
- Scalable: low network traffic overhead
- Efficient: find items quickly (latency)
- Dynamic: nodes fail, new nodes join

Today

1. Peer-to-Peer Systems
2. Distributed Hash Tables
3. **The Chord Lookup Service**
   - **Basic design**
   - Integration with *DHash* DHT, performance

Chord lookup algorithm properties

- **Interface:** lookup(key) → IP address
- **Efficient:** O(log N) messages per lookup
  - N is the total number of servers
- **Scalable:** O(log N) state per node
- **Robust:** survives massive failures
- **Simple to analyze**

Chord identifiers

- **Key identifier** = SHA-1(key)
- **Node identifier** = SHA-1(IP address)
- SHA-1 distributes both uniformly
- ***How does Chord partition data?***
  - *i.e.*, map key IDs to node IDs

Consistent hashing [Karger '97]



Key is stored at its **successor:** node with next-higher ID

Chord: Successor pointers



Basic lookup



Simple lookup algorithm

```
Lookup(key-id)
  succ ← my successor
  if my-id < succ < key-id     // next hop
    call Lookup(key-id) on succ
  else                         // done
    return succ
```

Correctness depends only on **successors**

Improving performance

- **Problem:** Forwarding through successor is slow
- Data structure is a linked list: O(n)
- **Idea:** Can we make it more like a binary search?
  - Need to be able to halve distance at each step

"Finger table" allows log N-time lookups



Finger *i* Points to Successor of $n+2^i$



Implication of finger tables

- A **binary lookup tree** rooted at every node
  - Threaded through other nodes' finger tables
- Better than arranging nodes in a single tree
  - Every node acts as a root
    - So there's **no root hotspot**
    - **No single point** of failure
    - But a **lot more state** in total

Lookup with finger table

```
Lookup(key-id)
  look in local finger table for
    highest n: my-id < n < key-id
  if n exists
    call Lookup(key-id) on node n  //next hop
  else
    return my successor //done
```

29

Lookups Take O(log *N*) Hops



30

An aside: Is log(n) fast or slow?

- For a million nodes, it's 20 hops
- If each hop takes 50ms, lookups take **a second**
- If each hop has 10% chance of failure, it's a couple of timeouts
- So in practice log(n) is better than O(n) but **not great**

31

Joining: Linked list insert



32

Join (2)



33

Join (3)



34

Notify maintains predecessors



35

Stabilize message fixes successor



36

Joining: Summary



- Predecessor pointer allows link to new node
- Update finger pointers in the background
- Correct successors produce correct lookups

Failures may cause incorrect lookup



N80 does not know correct successor, so **incorrect lookup**

Successor lists

- Each node stores a **list** of its *r* immediate successors
  - After failure, will know first live successor
  - **Correct successors** guarantee **correct lookups**
    - Guarantee is with some probability

Today

1. Peer-to-Peer Systems
2. Distributed Hash Tables
3. **The Chord Lookup Service**
   - Basic design
   - **Integration with *DHash* DHT, performance**

The DHash DHT

- Builds key/value storage on Chord
- **Replicates** blocks for availability
  - Stores ***k* replicas** at the ***k* successors** after the block on the Chord ring
- **Caches** blocks for load balancing
  - **Client** sends **copy of block** to each server it contacted along **lookup path**
- **Authenticates** block contents

43

DHash data authentication

- Two types of DHash blocks:
  - **Content-hash:** key = SHA-1(data)
  - **Public-key:** Data signed by corresponding private key
- Chord File System example:



44

DHash replicates blocks at *r* successors



- **Replicas** are **easy to find** if successor fails
- Hashed node IDs ensure **independent failure**

45

Today

1. Peer-to-Peer Systems
2. Distributed Hash Tables
3. The Chord Lookup Service
   - Basic design
   - Integration with *DHash* DHT, performance
4. **Concluding thoughts on DHT, P2P**

50

DHTs: Impact

- Original DHTs (CAN, Chord, Kademlia, Pastry, Tapestry) proposed in 2001-02
- Next 5-6 years saw proliferation of DHT-based apps:
  - Filesystems (e.g., CFS, Ivy, OceanStore, Pond, PAST)
  - Naming systems (e.g., SFR, Beehive)
  - DB query processing [PIER, Wisc]
  - Content distribution systems (e.g., CoralCDN)
  - distributed databases (e.g., PIER)

Why don't all services use P2P?

1. **High latency and limited bandwidth** between peers (vs. intra/inter-datacenter)
2. User computers are **less reliable** than managed servers
3. **Lack of trust** in peers' correct behavior
   - Securing DHT routing hard, unsolved in practice

DHTs in retrospective

- Seem promising for finding data in large P2P systems
- Decentralization seems good for load, fault tolerance
- **But:** the **security problems** are difficult
- **But:** **churn** is a problem, particularly if log(n) is big
- **And:** cloud computing solved many economics reasons, as did rise of ad-based business models
- DHTs have not had the hoped-for impact

What DHTs got right

- **Consistent hashing**
  - Elegant way to divide a workload across machines
  - Very useful in clusters: actively used today in Amazon Dynamo and other systems
- **Replication** for high availability, efficient recovery
- **Incremental scalability**
- **Self-management:** minimal configuration
- **Unique trait:** no single server to shut down/monitor