What is P2P?

- “the sharing of computer resources and services by direct exchange of information”
What is P2P?

“P2P is a class of applications that take advantage of resources – storage, cycles, content, human presence – available at the edges of the Internet. Because accessing these decentralized resources means operating in an environment of unstable and unpredictable IP addresses P2P nodes must operate outside the DNS system and have significant, or total autonomy from central servers”

What is P2P?

“A distributed network architecture may be called a P2P network if the participants share a part of their own resources. These shared resources are necessary to provide the service offered by the network. The participants of such a network are both resource providers and resource consumers”

Absence of a centralized authority or server

Napster?
**What is P2P?**

- Various definitions seem to agree on
  - sharing of resources
  - direct communication between equals (peers)
  - no centralized control
  - Self-organization
  - Adaptation
  - Self-recovery
  - …

**Client/Server Architecture**

- Well known, powerful, reliable server is a data source
- Clients request data from server
- Very successful model
  - WWW (HTTP), FTP, Web services, etc.

* Figure from http://project-iris.net/talks/dht-toronto-03.ppt
Client/Server Limitations

- Scalability is hard to achieve
- Presents a single point of failure
- Requires administration
- Unused resources at the network edge
- Point of control (server)
  - Copyright and privacy limitations, censorship,
- P2P systems try to address these limitations

P2P Architecture

- All nodes are both clients and servers
  - Provide and consume data
  - Any node can initiate a connection
- No centralized data source
  - “The ultimate form of democracy on the Internet”
  - “The ultimate threat to copy-right protection on the Internet”

* Content from http://project-iris.net/talks/dht-toronto-03.ppt
P2P Network Characteristics

- **Clients** are also servers and routers
  - Nodes contribute content, storage, memory, CPU
- Nodes are **autonomous** (no administrative authority)
- Network is **dynamic**: nodes enter and leave the network “frequently”
- Nodes collaborate directly with each other (not through well-known servers)
- Nodes have widely **varying capabilities**

P2P Goals and Benefits

- Efficient use of resources
  - Unused bandwidth, storage, processing power at the “edge of the network”
- **Scalability**
  - No central information, communication and computation bottleneck
  - Aggregate resources grow naturally with utilization
- **Reliability**
  - Replicas
  - Geographic distribution
  - No single point of failure
- **Ease of administration**
  - Nodes self-organize
  - Built-in fault tolerance, replication, and load balancing
  - Increased autonomy
- **Anonymity – Privacy**
  - not easy in a centralized system
- **Dynamism**
  - highly dynamic environment
  - ad-hoc communication and collaboration
P2P Applications

- Are these P2P systems?
  - File sharing (Napster, Gnutella, Kazaa)
  - Multiplayer games (Unreal Tournament, DOOM)
  - Collaborative applications (ICQ, shared whiteboard)
  - Distributed computation (Seti@home)
  - Ad-hoc networks

- We will focus on information sharing P2P systems

Information sharing P2P systems

- The resource to be shared is information (e.g. files)
- The participants create an overlay network over a physical network (e.g. the Internet)
- P2P search problem: locate the requested information in the overlay network efficiently
  - small number of messages and hops
  - low latency
  - load balance
  - easy to update in a highly dynamic setting
Popular file sharing P2P Systems

- Napster, Gnutella, Kazaa, Freenet

- Large scale sharing of files.
  - User A makes files (music, video, etc.) on their computer available to others
  - User B connects to the network, searches for files and downloads files *directly* from user A

- Issues of copyright infringement

Architettura

- Unstructured: la posizione dei contenuti non dipende dalla topologia
  - Parzialmente centralizzata
  - Completamente distribuita
  - Ibrida

- Structured: relazione tra i contenuti (es. nome di un file) e la loro posizione
Unstructured/Napster

- program for sharing files over the Internet
- a “disruptive” application/technology?
- history:
  - 5/99: Shawn Fanning (freshman, Northeastern U.) founds Napster Online music service
  - 12/99: first lawsuit
  - 3/00: 25% UWisc traffic Napster
  - 2000: est. 60M users
  - 2/01: US Circuit Court of Appeals: Napster knew users violating copyright laws
- 7/01: # simultaneous online users: Napster 160K, Gnutella: 40K, Morpheus: 300K

Napster: how does it work

- Application-level, client-server protocol over point-to-point TCP
- Partially centralized/hybrid

Four steps:
- Connect to Napster server
- Upload your list of files (push) to server.
- Give server keywords to search the full list with.
- Select “best” of correct answers. (pings)
1. File list is uploaded

2. User requests search at server.
3. User pings hosts that apparently have data. Looks for best transfer rate.

4. User retrieves file
Unstructured/Napster

- Central Napster server
  - Can ensure correct results
  - Fast search
  - Bottleneck for scalability
  - Single point of failure
  - Susceptible to denial of service
    - Malicious users
    - Lawsuits, legislation

- Hybrid P2P system – “all peers are equal but some are more equal than others”
  - Search is centralized
  - File transfer is direct (peer-to-peer)

Unstructured decentralized - Gnutella

- Share any type of files (not just music)
- Completely decentralized method of searching for files
  - applications connect to peer applications

- each application instance (servent) serves to:
  - store selected files
  - route queries (file searches) from and to its neighboring peers
  - respond to queries (serve file) if file stored locally

- Gnutella history:
  - 3/14/00: release by AOL, almost immediately withdrawn
  - too late: 23K users on Gnutella at 8 am this AM
  - reverse engineered. many iterations to fix poor initial design
Unstructured/Gnutella

Searching by flooding:
- If you don’t have the file you want, query 7 of your neighbors.
- If they don’t have it, they contact 7 of their neighbors, for a maximum hop count of 10.
- Requests are flooded, but there is no tree structure.
- No looping but packets may be received twice.
- Reverse path forwarding

* Figure from http://computer.howstuffworks.com/file-sharing.htm
Unstructured/Gnutella

Aspetti implementativi

- Ogni messaggio ha un identificatore unico
- Ogni nodo mantiene una tabella che da’ l’associazione tra l’identificatore di una richiesta e il vicino da cui la richiesta è stata ricevuta
- Un messaggio con lo stesso identificatore di un ‘messaggio gia’ ricevuto e’ scartato
Gnutella: strengths and weaknesses

- **Pros:**
  - Flexibility in query processing
  - Complete decentralization
  - Simplicity
  - Fault tolerance/self-organization

- **Cons:**
  - Severe scalability problems
  - Susceptible to attacks

- Pure P2P system

Gnutella: initial problems and fixes

- 2000: avg size of reachable network only 400-800 hosts. Why so small?
  - **Modem users:** not enough bandwidth to provide search routing capabilities: routing black holes

- **Fix:** create peer hierarchy based on capabilities
  - Previously: all peers identical, most modem black holes
  - Preferential connection:
    - favors routing to well-connected peers
    - favors reply to clients that themselves serve large number of files: prevent freeloading
Kazaa (Fasttrack network)

- Hybrid of centralized Napster and decentralized Gnutella
  - hybrid P2P system

- Super-peers act as local search hubs
  - Each super-peer is similar to a Napster server for a small portion of the network
  - Super-peers are automatically chosen by the system based on their capacities (storage, bandwidth, etc.) and availability (connection time)

- Users upload their list of files to a super-peer
- Super-peers periodically exchange file lists
- You send queries to a super-peer for files of interest
- Proprietary system

Anonymity

- Napster, Gnutella, Kazaa don’t provide anonymity
  - Users know who they are downloading from
  - Others know who sent a query

- Freenet
  - Designed to provide anonymity among other features
Loosely Structured/Freenet

- Loosely structured
  - Only estimation of node storing a certain content is possible
- Keys are mapped to IDs
- Each node stores a cache of keys, and a routing table for some keys
  - routing table defines the overlay network
- Queries are routed to the node with the most similar key
- Data flows in reverse path of query
  - Impossible to know if a user is initiating or forwarding a query
  - Impossible to know if a user is consuming or forwarding data
  - Keys replicated in (some) of the nodes along the path
Inserts are performed similarly – they are unsuccessful queries
Freenet strengths and weaknesses

- **pros:**
  - complete decentralization
  - fault tolerance/self-organization
  - anonymity
  - scalability (to some degree)

- **cons:**
  - questionable efficiency & performance
  - rare keys disappear from the system
  - improvement of performance requires high overhead (maintenance of additional information for routing)

Unstructured vs Structured P2P

- The systems we described do not offer any guarantees about their performance (or even correctness)

- **Structured P2P**
  - Scalable guarantees on numbers of hops to answer a query
  - Maintain all other P2P properties (load balance, self-organization, dynamic nature)

- **Approach:** Distributed Hash Tables (DHT)
Distributed Hash Tables (DHT)

- Distributed version of a hash table data structure
- Stores (key, value) pairs
  - The key is like a filename
  - The value can be file contents, or pointer to location
- Goal: Efficiently insert/lookup/delete (key, value) pairs

- Each peer stores a subset of (key, value) pairs in the system
- Core operation: Find node responsible for a key
  - Map key to node
  - Efficiently route insert/lookup/delete request to this node
- Allow for frequent node arrivals/departures

Comportamento ideale

- \( H: K \rightarrow A \)
  - K: insieme delle chiavi (es. nomi dei file)
  - A: insieme degli identificatori dei nodi
- Comportamento ideale
  - \( H(x) \) assume ognuno dei possibili valori di I con la stessa probabilità 1/|A|
DHT Desirable Properties

- Keys should be mapped evenly to all nodes in the network (load balance)
- Each node should maintain information about only a few other nodes (scalability, low update cost)
- Messages should be routed to a node efficiently (small number of hops)
- Node arrival/departures should only affect a few nodes

DHT Routing Protocols

- DHT is a generic interface
- There are several implementations of this interface
  - Chord [MIT]
  - Pastry [Microsoft Research UK, Rice University]
  - Tapestry [UC Berkeley]
  - Content Addressable Network (CAN) [UC Berkeley]
  - SkipNet [Microsoft Research US, Univ. of Washington]
  - Kademlia [New York University]
  - Viceroy [Israel, UC Berkeley]
  - P-Grid [EPFL Switzerland]
  - Freenet [Ian Clarke]
**Basic Approach**

In all approaches:

- **keys** are associated with globally unique **IDs**
  - integers of size \( m \) (for large \( m \))
- **key ID space** (search space) is uniformly populated - mapping of keys to IDs using (consistent) hashing
- a node is responsible for indexing all the keys in a certain subspace (zone) of the **ID space**
- nodes have only partial knowledge of other node’s responsibilities

**Consistent Hashing**

- The main idea: map both **keys** and **nodes (node IPs)** to the same (metric) **ID space**
Consistent Hashing

- The main idea: map both keys and nodes (node IPs) to the same (metric) ID space

- Each key is assigned to the node with ID closest to the key ID
  - uniformly distributed
  - at most logarithmic number of keys assigned to each node

Problem: Starting from a node, how do we locate the node responsible for a key, while maintaining as little information about other nodes as possible
Basic Approach Differences

- Different P2P systems differ in:
  - the choice of the ID space
  - the structure of their network of nodes (i.e. how each node chooses its neighbors)

Chord

- Nodes organized in an identifier circle based on node identifiers
- Keys assigned to their successor node in the identifier circle
- Hash function ensures even distribution of nodes and keys on the circle

Consistent Hashing/cont.

- K keys, N nodes, m bits for ID space
- **Property 1:** every ID receives $K/2^m$ keys in the average
  - $O(1)$ if $m \geq \log_2 K$
- **Property 2:** every node is assigned $O(K/N)$ keys in the average
  - consequence of property 1
- **Property 3:** every node is assigned $O((K/N)\log_2 N)$ keys with high probability

**Problem:** Starting from a node, how do we locate the node responsible for a key, while maintaining as little information about other nodes as possible

Chord Finger Table

- $O(\log N)$ table size
- $i^{th}$ finger points to first node that succeeds $n$ by at least $2^{i-1}$
- maintain also pointers to predecessors (for correctness)
Chord Key Location

- Lookup in finger table the furthest node that precedes key

- Query homes in on target in $O(\log N)$ hops w.h.p.

Chord node insertion

Insert node N40:
- Locate node
- Add fingers
- Update successor pointers and other node’s fingers (max in-degree $O(\log^2 n)$ whp)

Time $O(\log^2 n)$
Stabilization protocol for refreshing links
Chord Properties

- In a system with N nodes and K keys, with high probability...
  - each node receives at most $O((K/N)\log_2 N)$ keys
  - each node maintains info. about $O(\log N)$ other nodes
  - lookups resolved with $O(\log N)$ hops
  - Insertions $O(\log^2 N)$

- In practice never stabilizes
- No consistency among replicas
- Hops have poor network locality

Network locality

- Nodes close on ring can be far in the network.

* Figure from http://project-iris.net/talks/dht-toronto-03.ppt
Plaxton’s Mesh

- map the nodes and keys to $b$-ary numbers of $m$ digits
- assign each key to the node with which it shares the longest prefix
  - e.g. $b = 4$ and $m = 6$

\[ \begin{align*}
  321302 & \quad 321002 \\
  321333 & \quad 321333
\end{align*} \]

Plaxton’s Mesh – Routing Table

- for $b = 4$, $m = 6$, nodeID = 110223; routing table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>d = 0</th>
<th>d = 1</th>
<th>d = 2</th>
<th>d = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$p = 0$</td>
<td>032130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210231</td>
<td>303213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 1$</td>
<td>103002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123011</td>
<td>133233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 2$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111210</td>
<td>112301</td>
<td>113331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 3$</td>
<td>110031</td>
<td>110122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 4$</td>
<td>110200</td>
<td>110212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p = 5$</td>
<td>110220</td>
<td>110221</td>
<td>110222</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enforcing Network Locality

- For the \((i,j)\) entry of the table select the node that is geographically closer to the current node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>110223</th>
<th>(d = 0)</th>
<th>(d = 1)</th>
<th>(d = 2)</th>
<th>(d = 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(p = 0)</td>
<td>032130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210231</td>
<td>303213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = 1)</td>
<td>103002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123011</td>
<td>133233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = 2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111210</td>
<td>112301</td>
<td>113331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = 3)</td>
<td>110031</td>
<td>110122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = 4)</td>
<td>110200</td>
<td>110212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p = 5)</td>
<td>110220</td>
<td>110221</td>
<td>110222</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaxton Mesh Routing

- Routing done incrementally, digit by digit
  - In each step, message sent to node with address one digit closer to destination.
- Example - node 0325 sends Message to node 4598
  - Possible route:
    - 0325
    - B4F8
    - 9098
    - 7598
    - 4598
Plaxton Mesh Routing Tables

- Each node has a neighbor map
  - Used to find a node whose address has one more digit in common with the destination
- Size of the map: $B \times L$, where:
  - $B$ – base used for the digits of the address. Eg. 8 in octal base
  - $L$ – length of the addresses
- 4 digit addresses in octal base -> 8*4 tables.

Enforcing Network Locality

- Critical property
  - for larger row numbers the number of possible choices decreases exponentially
    - in row $i+1$ we have $1/b$ the choices we had in row $i$
  - for larger row numbers the distance to the nearest neighbor increases exponentially
  - the distance of the source to the target is approximately equal to the distance in the last step – as a result it is well approximated
Enforcing Network Locality

Plaxton algorithm: routing

Move closer to the target one digit at the time

locate 322210

110223

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p = 0</th>
<th>p = 1</th>
<th>p = 2</th>
<th>p = 3</th>
<th>p = 4</th>
<th>p = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d = 0</td>
<td>103002</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110031</td>
<td>110200</td>
<td>110220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 1</td>
<td>032130</td>
<td>103002</td>
<td>111210</td>
<td>110200</td>
<td>110220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112301</td>
<td>110122</td>
<td>110221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d = 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>113331</td>
<td>110212</td>
<td>110222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plaxton algorithm: routing

Move closer to the target one digit at the time

locate 322210

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>d = 0</th>
<th>d = 1</th>
<th>d = 2</th>
<th>d = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>032130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210231</td>
<td>303213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>103002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123011</td>
<td>133233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111210</td>
<td>112301</td>
<td>113331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>110031</td>
<td>110122</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>110200</td>
<td>110212</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>110220</td>
<td>110221</td>
<td>110222</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plaxton algorithm: routing

Move closer to the target one digit at the time

locate 322210

110223 303213 322001
Plaxton algorithm: routing

Move closer to the target one digit at the time

locate 322210

110223 303213 322001 322200

Plaxton algorithm: routing

Move closer to the target one digit at the time

locate 322210

110223 303213 322001 322200 322213
Pastry: Node Joins

- Node X finds the closest (in network proximity) node and makes a query with its own ID

![Diagram of network nodes and paths]

- Routing table of X
  - the i-th row of the routing table is the i-th row of the i-th node along the search path for X

Network Proximity

- The starting node A is the closest one to node X, so by triangular inequality the neighbors in first row of the starting node A will also be close to X

- For the remaining entries of the table the same argument applies as before: the distance of the intermediate node Y to its neighbors dominates the distance from X to the intermediate node Y
- Search space: $d$-dimensional coordinate space (on a $d$-torus)
- Each node owns a distinct zone in the space
- Each node keeps links to the nodes responsible for zones adjacent to its zone (in the search space) – $\sim 2d$ on avg
- Each key hashes to a point in the space

*Figure from "A Scalable Content-Addressable Network", S. Ratnasamy et al., In Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM 2001.

---

**CAN Lookup**

Node $x$ wants to lookup key $K$

$K \rightarrow (a,b)$

Move along neighbors to the zone of the key each time moving closer to the key

expected time $O(dn^{1/d})$

can we do it in $O(\log n)$?
**CAN node insertion**

Node y needs to be inserted. It has knowledge of node x.

- Choose point at random: IP of y -> (c,d)
- Assume zone belongs to z
- Split z’s zone
- y’s routing table contains IP addresses of neighbours
- Neighbours of split zone are notified

**Kleinberg’s small world**

- Consider a 2-dimensional grid
- For each node u add edge (u,v) to a vertex v selected with pb proportional to [d(u,v)]^{-r}
- Simple Greedy routing
  - If r=2, expected lookup time is $O(\log^2 n)$
  - If r≠2, expected lookup time is $\Omega(n^\varepsilon)$, $\varepsilon>0$ depends on r
- The theorem generalizes in d-dimensions for r=d
Routing in the Small World

- $\log n$ regions of exponentially increasing size
- The routing algorithm spends $\log n$ expected time in each region → $\log^2 n$ expected routing time
- If $\log n$ long-range links are added, the expected time in each region becomes constant → $\log n$ expected routing time

Symphony

- Map the nodes and keys to the ring
  - Uniformly at random
- Link every node with its successor and predecessor
- Add $k$ random links with probability proportional to $1/(d \log n)$, where $d$ is the distance on the ring
- Lookup time $O(\log^2 n)$
- If $k = \log n$ lookup time $O(\log n)$
- Easy to insert and remove nodes (perform periodical refreshes for the links)
Emulating the butterfly network
- Emulating the butterfly network

![Diagram of a butterfly network]
Viceroy

- Emulating the butterfly network

Viceroy

- Emulating the butterfly network
Emulating the *butterfly* network

![Butterfly Network Diagram]
**Viceroy**

- Emulating the butterfly network

![Diagram of the butterfly network with levels 1 to 4]

- Logarithmic path lengths between any two nodes in the network

---

**Viceroy network**

- Arrange nodes and keys on a ring, like in Chord.

![Diagram of a ring network]
Assign to each node a level value, chosen uniformly from the set \( \{1, \ldots, \log n\} \).

- estimate \( n \) by taking the inverse of the distance of the node with its successor
- easy to update

Create a ring of nodes within the same level
Butterfly links

- Each node $x$ at level $i$ has two **downward** links to level $i+1$
  - a **left link** to the first node of level $i+1$ after position $x$ on the ring
  - a **right link** to the first node of level $i+1$ after position $x + (_i^i)$

Downward links
Upward links

- Each node $x$ at level $i$ has an upward link to the next node on the ring at level $i-1$
Lookup

- Lookup is performed in a similar fashion like the butterfly
  - expected time $O(\log n)$

- Viceroy was the first network with constant number of links and logarithmic lookup time

P2P Review

- Two key functions of P2P systems
  - Sharing content
  - Finding content

- Sharing content
  - Direct transfer between peers
    - All systems do this
  - Structured vs. unstructured placement of data
  - Automatic replication of data

- Finding content
  - Centralized (Napster)
  - Decentralized (Gnutella)
  - Probabilistic guarantees (DHTs)
Issues with P2P

- Free Riding (Free Loading)
  - Two types of free riding
    - Downloading but not sharing any data
    - Not sharing any interesting data
  - On Gnutella
    - 15% of users contribute 94% of content
    - 63% of users never responded to a query
      - Didn’t have “interesting” data

- No ranking: what is a trusted source?
  - “spoofing”
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