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Last Time
- Evolution of peer-to-peer
  - Central directory (Napster)
  - Query flooding (Gnutella)
  - Hierarchical overlay (Kazaa, modern Gnutella)
- BitTorrent
  - Focuses on parallel download
  - Prevents free-riding

Today’s Question
- How do we organize the nodes in a distributed system?
  - Up to the 90’s
    - Prevalent architecture: client-server (or master-slave)
      - Unequal responsibilities
  - Now
    - Emerged architecture: peer-to-peer
      - Equal responsibilities
  - Today: studying peer-to-peer as a paradigm

What We Want
- Functionality: lookup-response
  - E.g., Gnutella

What We Don’t Want
- Cost (scalability) & no guarantee for lookup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Lookup Latency</th>
<th>#Messages for a lookup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Napster</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
<td>$O(1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($O(N@server)$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnutella</td>
<td>$O(N)$</td>
<td>$O(N)$</td>
<td>$O(N)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(worst case)</td>
<td>(worst case)</td>
<td>(worst case)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Napster: cost not balanced, too much for the server-side
- Gnutella: cost still not balanced, just too much, no guarantee for lookup

What We Want
- What data structure provides lookup-response?
- Hash table: data structure that associates keys with values
- Name-value pairs (or key-value pairs)
  - E.g., “http://www.cnn.com/foo.html” and the Web page
  - E.g., “BritneyHitMe.mp3” and “12.78.183.2”
Hashing Basics

- Hash function
  - Function that maps a large, possibly variable-sized datum into a small datum, often a single integer that serves to index an associative array
  - In short: maps n-bit datum into k buckets (k \ll 2^n)
  - Provides time- & space-saving data structure for lookup
- Main goals:
  - Low cost
  - Deterministic
  - Uniformity (load balanced)
- E.g., mod
  - k buckets (k \ll 2^n), data d (n-bit)
  - b = d mod k
  - Distributes load uniformly only when data is distributed uniformly

DHT: Goal

- Let’s build a distributed system with a hash table abstraction!

Where to Keep the Hash Table

- Server-side → Napster
- Client-local → Gnutella

  - What are the requirements (think Napster and Gnutella)?
    - Deterministic lookup
    - Low lookup time (shouldn’t grow linearly with the system size)
    - Should balance load even with node join/leave
- What we’ll do: partition the hash table and distribute them among the nodes in the system
- We need to choose the right hash function
  - We also need to somehow partition the table and distribute the partitions with minimal relocation of partitions in the presence of join/leave

Using Basic Hashing and Bucket Partitioning?

- Hashing: Suppose we use modulo hashing
  - Number servers 1..k
- Partitioning: Place X on server j = (X mod k)
  - Problem? Data may not be uniformly distributed

Using Basic Hashing and Bucket Partitioning?

- Place X on server i = hash (X) mod k
- Problem?
  - What happens if a server fails or joins (k \to k\pm1)?
  - Answer: (Almost) all entries get remapped to new nodes!
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Chord DHT

• A distributed hash table system using consistent hashing
• Organizes nodes in a ring
• Maintains neighbors for correctness and shortcuts for performance
• DHT in general
  – DHT systems are "structured" peer-to-peer as opposed to "unstructured" peer-to-peer such as Napster, Gnutella, etc.
  – Used as a base system for other systems, e.g., many "trackerless" BitTorrent clients, Amazon Dynamo, distributed repositories, distributed file systems, etc.
• It shows an example of principled design.

Chord Ring: Global Hash Table

• Represent the hash key space as a virtual ring
  – A ring representation instead of a table representation.
• Use a hash function that evenly distributes items over the hash space, e.g., SHA-1
• Map nodes (buckets) in the same ring
• Used in DHTs, memcached, etc.

Chord: Consistent Hashing

• Partitioning: Maps data items to its "successor" node
• Advantages
  – Even distribution
  – Few changes as nodes come and go...

Chord: When nodes come and go...

• Small changes when nodes come and go
  – Only affects mapping of keys mapped to the node that comes or goes

Chord: Node Organization

• Maintain a circularly linked list around the ring
  – Every node has a predecessor and successor
• Separate join and leave protocols
Chord: Basic Lookup

lookup (id):
if ( id > pred.id &&
id <= my.id )
return my.id;
else
return succ.lookup(id);

• Route hop by hop via successors
  - O(n) hops to find destination id

Chord: Efficient Lookup --- Fingers

• ith entry at peer with id n is first peer with:
  - id >= n + 2^i

Finger Table

Finger Table at N80

Chord: Efficient Lookup --- Fingers

lookup (id):
if ( id > pred.id &&
id <= my.id )
return my.id;
else
// fingers()
for finger in fingers():
if id >= finger.id:
return finger.lookup(id);
return succ.lookup(id);

• Route greedily via distant “finger” nodes
  - O(log n) hops to find destination id

Chord: Node Joins and Leaves

• When a node joins
  - Node does a lookup on its own id
  - And learns the node responsible for that id
  - This node becomes the new node’s successor
  - And the node can learn that node’s predecessor (which will become the new node’s predecessor)

• Monitor
  - If doesn’t respond for some time, find new

• Leave
  - Clean (planned) leave: notify the neighbors
  - Unclean leave (failure): need an extra mechanism to handle lost (key, value) pairs, e.g., as Dynamo does.

Summary

• DHT
  - Gives a hash table as an abstraction
  - Partitions the hash table and distributes them over the nodes
  - “Structured” peer-to-peer

• Chord DHT
  - Based on consistent hashing
  - Balances hash table partitions over the nodes
  - Basic lookup based on successors
  - Efficient lookup through fingers
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