Distributed Hash Tables

CS425 /ECE428 – DISTRIBUTED SYSTEMS – SPRING 2020

Material derived from slides by I. Gupta, M. Harandi, J. Hou, S. Mitra, K. Nahrstedt, N. Vaidya

Distributed System Organization

- Centralized
- Ring
- Clique
- How well do these work with 1M+ nodes?

Centralized

- Problems?
- Leader a bottleneck
  - O(N) load on leader
- Leader election expensive



Ring

- Problems?
- Fragile
  - O(1) failures tolerated
- Slow communication
  - O(N) messages



Clique

- Problems?
- High overhead
  - O(N) state at each node
  - O(N^2) messages for failure detection



Distributed Hash Tables

- Middle point between ring and clique
- Scalable *and* fault-tolerant
  - Maintain O(log N) state
  - Routing complexity O(log N)
  - Tolerate O(N) failures
- Other possibilities:
  - State: O(1), routing: O(log N)
  - State: O(log N), routing: O(log N / log log N)
  - State: O(√N), routing: O(1)

Distributed Hash Table

- A hash table allows you to insert, lookup and delete objects with keys
- A *distributed* hash table allows you to do the same in a distributed setting (objects=files)
- DHT also sometimes called a key-value store when used within a cloud
- Performance Concerns:
  - Load balancing
  - Fault-tolerance
  - Efficiency of lookups and inserts

Chord

- Intelligent choice of neighbors to reduce latency and message cost of routing (lookups/inserts)

- Uses *Consistent Hashing* on node's (peer's) address
  - (ip_address,port) →hashed id (*m* bits)
  - Called peer *id* (number between 0 and $2^m - 1$)
  - Not unique but id conflicts very unlikely
  - Can then map peers to one of 2^m logical points on a circle

Ring of peers

Say *m*=7

6 nodes



Peer pointers (1): *successors*



(similarly predecessors)

Peer pointers (2): *finger tables*

Say $m=7$

Finger Table at N80

i	$ft[i]$
0	96
1	96
2	96
3	96
4	96
5	112
6	16



ith entry at peer with id n is first peer with id >= $n + 2^i (\bmod 2^m)$

Mapping Values

- Key = hash(ident)
  - m bit string
- Value is stored at first peer with id greater than its key (mod 2^m)



Search

Say $m=7$



Search

At node *n*, send query for key *k* to largest successor/finger entry <= *k*
if none exist, send query to *successor(n)*

Say *m=7*



Search

At node *n*, send query for key *k* to largest successor/finger entry <= *k*
if none exist, send query to *successor(n)*

Say $m=7$



Analysis



Search takes *O(log(N))* time

Proof

- (intuition): *at each step, distance between query and peer-with-file reduces by a factor of at least 2* (why?)

  Takes at most *m* steps: 2^m is at most a constant multiplicative factor above *N,* lookup is *O(log(N))*

- (intuition): after *log(N)* forwardings, distance to key is at most $2^m / N$ (why?)

  Number of node identifiers in a range of $2^m / N$

  is *O(log(N))* with high probability (why?)

  So using *successor*s in that range will be ok

Analysis (contd.)

- *O(log(N))* search time holds for file insertions too (in general for *routing to any key*)
  - "Routing" can thus be used as a building block for
    - All operations: insert, lookup, delete
- *O(log(N))* time true only if finger and successor entries correct
- When might these entries be wrong?
  - When you have failures

Search under peer failures

Say m=7



Search under peer failures

One solution: maintain *r* multiple *successor* entries
In case of failure, use successor entries

Say $m=7$



Search under peer failures (2)



Search under peer failures (2)

One solution: replicate file/key at *r* successors and predecessors

Say m=7



Need to deal with dynamic changes

✓Peers fail
- New peers join
- Peers leave
  - P2P systems have a high rate of *churn* (node join, leave and failure)

→ Need to update *successor*s and *finger*s, and copy keys

New peers joining

Introducer directs N40 to N45 (and N32)
N32 updates successor to N40
N40 initializes successor to N45, and inits fingers from it

Say *m=7*



New peers joining

Introducer directs N40 to N45 (and N32)
N32 updates successor to N40
N40 initializes successor to N45, and inits fingers from it
N40 periodically talks to its neighbors to update finger table

Say $m=7$



Stabilization Protocol
(to allow for "continuous" churn, multiple changes)

New peers joining (2)

N40 may need to copy some files/keys from N45
(files with fileid between 32 and 40)

Say *m=7*



Lookups



log N, as expected

Chord Protocol: Summary

- *O(log(N))* memory and lookup costs
- Hashing to distribute filenames uniformly across key/address space
- Allows dynamic addition/deletion of nodes

DHT Deployment

- Many DHT designs
  - Chord, Pastry, Tapestry, Koorde, CAN, Viceroy, Kelips, Kademlia, …
- Slow adoption in real world
  - Most real-world P2P systems unstructured
    - No guarantees
    - Controlled flooding for routing
  - Kademlia slowly made inroads, now used in many file sharing networks