Distributed Systems

Peer-to-Peer Systems



Dynamic and Distributed Information Systems

Today's Agenda

- Historical Overview
- □ Define P2P
- □ What are the important issues
- Application Areas
- **D** Brief overview of File Sharing



Historical Overview



Dynamic and Distributed Information Systems

Peer-to-Peer Systems















Historical perspective

- 1970s 1980s: Birth of the Internet
 - Limited reach of the Internet
 - Email, FTP, Telnet
 - Share documents and resources between research centers
 - Central committee to organize and maintain it

1990s

- □ Tremendous expansion & diffusion
- □ Killer apps: WWW and e-Commerce
- Client/Server model

Late 1990s - today

- □ P2P: An alternative to Client/Server
- $\Box \quad \text{Passive clients} \rightarrow \text{active peers}$
- End-computers play a role, contribute, interact

How it all started

June 1999

- Napster is born / 1st generation of P2P
- Users not only download content but also provide content to others
- Users establish a virtual network, entirely independent of physical network and administrative authorities or restrictions
- Basis: UDP and TCP connections between the peers
- December 1999: RIAA files a lawsuit against Napster Inc.
 - TARGET: the central lookup server of Napster
 - ACHIEVEMENT: Napster popularity skyrocketed!
- □ February 2001: Peak operation
 - 26.4M users
 - 2.79 billion files / month
- □ July 2001: Judge orders Napster to pull the plug!
 - Napster network breaks down instantly





17/11/2008

How it continued

□ March 2000

- Nullsoft releases Gnutella as an open source project
- Fully decentralized
- Additionally to offering files, the peers also take over routing tasks
- No central lookup server \rightarrow no single point to attack

□ Later in 2000: Superpeer concept

- Hierarchical routing layer
- Significantly improves scalability and efficiency
- FastTrack (Morpheus, KaZaA)
- eDonkey2000

2001 - 2002

- KaZaA loses ground (many defected files due to weak hash keys to identify files)
- eDonkey and Gnutella regain popularity
- eDonkey becomes most popular file-sharing network: 2-3M *online* users
- Gnutella v0.6 adopts superpeer architecture (*ultrapeers* in Gnutella terminology)







P2P Traffic in 2001



How it took off!

2002

First version of BitTorrent released

2003

- BitTorrent causes majority of the observed traffic
- Downloads significantly faster, due to mechanism against free-riding
- □ Middle of 2003
 - New P2P concepts develop
 - Skype is born: a P2P Voice-over-IP application
- □ In the meantime: More P2P domains explored!
 - P2P Routing
 - Network Storage
 - P2P Multicasting
 - Data aggregation
 - P2P Streaming
 - etc.
- **D** Today:

(D)IS

 Major efforts are made to increase the reliability of P2P systems, to use P2P also in mobile networks, etc.





Internet Traffic



DIS

Define P2P



Dynamic and Distributed Information Systems

A simple definition













Telephones!



NAPSTER: Based on a centralized server!!!

What makes P2P interesting?

- End-nodes are promoted to active components!
 - previously they were just clients
- □ Nodes participate, interact, contribute to the services they use.
- Harness huge pools of resources accumulated in millions of end-nodes.



Is application XYZ P2P?

- Do nodes contribute to the system?
- Do nodes collectively carry out a service?
- □ Are variable connectivity and temporary network addresses the norm?
- Do nodes have significant autonomy?
- □ Can they (generally) be heterogeneous?
- □ Who owns the hardware?
 - Single-administered entity?
 - Distributed among participating users?

A better definition

P2P is a class of systems where:

- **Resources available at the edges of the Internet are utilized:**
 - Storage
 - CPU cycles
 - Bandwidth
 - Content

()IS

- Human presence
- Service is carried out collectively
 - Nodes share both benefits and duties
- **Irregularities** and **dynamicity** are treated as the norm

Dual nature: Client & Server



client



server



17/11/2008

Main advantages of P2P

- □ Inherently scalable:
 - higher demand \rightarrow higher contribution!
- □ Increased (massive) aggregate capacity
- Utilize otherwise wasted resources
- Distribute load and administration
- Designed to be fault tolerant
- Inherently handle dynamic conditions



Important Issues in P2P



Dynamic and Distributed Information Systems

Overlay Networks







| Unstructured P2P | Structured P2P |
|--|--|
| Any two nodes can establish a link Topology evolves at random Topology reflects desired properties of linked nodes | Topology strictly determined by node IDs |



| Unstructured P2P | | Structured P2P | |
|--|---|---|---|
| Centralized P2P | Pure P2P | Hybrid P2P | DHT-Based |
| Central entity necessary to manage the overlay | No central entities | Multiple & Dynamic central entities | No central entities |
| Central entity is some | Any node can be | Any node can be removed | Fixed links, determined by node IDs |
| kind of index/group database | removed without loss of functionality | without loss of functionality | Any node can be removed without loss of functionality |
| Example: Napster | Example: Gnutella v0.4, Freenet | Example: Gnutella v0.6, Freenet | Examples: Chord, Pastry, CAN |
| | | | $ \begin{array}{c} $ |

Overlay Maintenance

Bootstrapping

- how to join the system
- Continuous maintenance
 - how to handle changes, faults, etc.



Scalability

- Avoid central server!
- Distribute load on multiple peers
- □ Limit load per peer
 - **Computing**
 - □ Messaging
 - □ Storage
 - □ State



Fairness

Load balancing

- Distribute load among peers, but how?
 - Evenly?
 - Proportionally to node capacity?
 - …?
- User behavior!
 - users are selfish and independent (maximize own benefit)
 - give incentives for fair play
 - to maximize benefit \rightarrow abide by the rules!

Dynamicity and Adaptability

- Changing topology
 - nodes join and leave: node churn
 - network partitions
- Changing data
 - content is changed
 - files are added / deleted
- Changing profiles
 - users change interests
 - new semantic categories introduced
- **Change in load**

(D)IS

load rebalancing

Fault Tolerance

- **D** Robustness of the overlay
- **Resilience to failures**
- Resistance to node & link crashes
- Availability



Self-Organization

• Key for

- Overlay maintenance
- Adaptability
- Fault Tolerance
- Robustness

□ No one keeps full state: <u>nodes take local decisions</u>

- □ Globally smooth operation should emerge from local decisions!!
 - Self-Management
 - Self-Healing
 - □ repair problems encountered
 - Self-Configuration
 - Self-*

Performance

□ Efficiency

- in searching
- in routing steps
- in discovering relationships
- etc.
- Locality
 - reduce network latency



Privacy

- □ Anonymity
 - ...who downloaded a copyrighted movie?
 - ...who wrote the bad review about Spyros' course?
- **Reputation**
- **Resistance to censorship**



Security

- Defend against DDOS attacks
- Disseminate worm protection patches: Speed is crucial!
- Make P2P systems themselves secure



Legal issues

Copyright violation

- Direct infringement
 - e.g., download or upload copyrighted files
- Indirect infringement
 - e.g., someone offers the means for direct infringement



SIMPLICITY !

Things can easily get out of control with thousands of nodes under dynamic conditions!



Application Areas



Dynamic and Distributed Information Systems

P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



Sharing Content



Killer deployments

- □ Napster
- **Gnutella**
- □ KaZaA/FastTrack
- □ eDonkey2000
- BitTorrent

E.

Large distributed storageVery high variation of content

Ţ

Unstable availabilityNo guarantees

P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



Network Storage

OceanStore

PAST



Network Storage

OceanStore

PAST





P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



Contributing Bandwidth

- CDNs (Content Distribution Networks)
- BitTorrent
- □ File-sharing systems



Contributing Bandwidth



(d) IS

P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



Sharing CPU

- Increasing requirements for High Performance Computing
 - i.e., in the field of bio-informatics, logistics or the financial sector
- Available computing power of endpoints often unused
- □ Use P2P to bundle processor cycles:
 - Forming a cluster of independent, networked computers that are combined into a single logical computer
 - Achieve computing power which even the most expensive supercomputers can scarcely provide
 - "Grid Computing"



Sharing CPU --- Examples

□ Popular example: *SETI@home*

Calculations during the idle processor cycles of participating peers.

□ Successors:

- BOINC (Berkeley): http://boinc.berkeley.edu
- World Community Grid (IBM) : http://www.worldcommunitygrid.org
 - Biology and Medicine
 - Climate simulations
 - □ Math
 - □ Astronomy, Physics, Chemistry

NOTE:

The core of these systems is a classical Client/Server application

- Advanced vision of grid computing: *Globus Toolkit*
 - Standardized middleware for grid application.

P2P Application Areas

High-level grouping of P2P apps based on shared resource



Presence Information

Presence Information

information about which peers and which resources are available

- Example: Instant Messaging Systems
 - P2P application which essentially uses presence information
 - Peers pass on information via the network, whether or not they are available for communication





Document Collaboration

Usually centrally organized

- But
 - In many cases, documents distributed across desktop PCs
 - no central repository having any knowledge of their existence

Solution

- P2P networks which create a connected repository from the local data on the individual peers.
- Indexing and categorization of data by each peer on the basis of individually selected criteria.
- Self organized aggregation of information from areas of knowledge.

http://www.nextpage.com/





Collaboration

Collaboration

- synchronous communication
- online meetings
- edit shared documents.
- □ Groupware
 - offers functions like IM, file sharing, notification, co-browsing, whiteboards, voice conferences and databases with real time synchronization.
 - Client/Server groupware has to be set up and administered for each working group

■ P2P Groupware

- avoid additional administrative task and central data management:
- All of the data created is stored on each peer and is synchronized automatically.
- Users can set up shared working environment for virtual teams (so-called shared spaces).
- Users can invite other users to work in these teams.

| ie Ear Dew Opcous Belo Co | workspaces . An Back . My Forwar | | | | | T BICODE A |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Files | | | | | | Workspace Members |
| 🖓 Add Files 🔛 Save Files 🗈 | 16 16 16 19 18 🗉 | Start Sessi | 00 | | | ③ In Workspace |
| Folders | Name | Size | Туре | Modified Date | Modifie | Adam Bradley / HC |
| B Image: Server Image: Server Image: Support Image: Support Image: Support Image: Segment Material Image: Segment Material | Dold Decurity_faq Decurity_whitepaper | 96KB 589KB | File Folder Microsoft Word Document Microsoft Word Document | 6/29/2004 9:26:06 PM 6/30/2004 5:07:04 PM 6/29/2004 9:25:48 PM | James Kelly Fi James | Betty Champman / H Betty Champman / H Bob Robert Garb April Adams / HC Bob Roberts / HC Chadre West |
| Folder: Files (Root Folder)/Product Ma | berial/Platform/v3.0/PCS | | | | 180 | |
| cryptographic protection, information must be available on demand. | | | | ^ | Control Contro | |
| Security | Enhances Collaboratio | n | | | | Greg Jones / HC Offline ACK Printing Deb Quinn |
| Security Organizations resources que demand, and places, know workspace. 6 administratur servers for ce | Enhances Collaboratio using Grown benefit from its abilit kly and securely among those who whose burdensome administratory as workspaces. Instantaneously, it do gon the workspace, as they d rooms <i>Reveall transparency</i> uses sta to open special ports in the firewar ritratized management and control | n y to facilitat need it — 4 a interventio hey can inv fynamically andard web II. In addito over Groove | to the sharing of data an anywhare, anytime, any in, users can create ad- hite members from across introduce data and tools protocols to avoid requir no, crganizations can dig e usage. | d computational way. On- oc collaborative the asle or to the ing notwork loy Groove | | Goreg Jones / Inc. Goreg Jones / Inc. Goreg Jones / Inc. Goreg Jones / HC. Goreg Jones / HC. Goreg Jones / HC. Andrew, you busy? Andrew, you busy? |
| Security Organizations resources due alonand, and places, know administrator servers for ce Groove securi est u are est are es | Enhances Collaboratio using Groove benefit from its abilit sky and sourcely among those who without burdensome administrative as workspaces. Instantaneously, it to gene greated anapatement and control to gene greated parts in the free frailing of the state and control to gene greated anapatement and control by features enhance collaboration in re enables secures, cross firenal a velve of alternative existing, and a velve of alternative existing, and a powered to collaborate through th this manner, Groove is enabling to happen in an insecure manner, pe | n y to facilitat interventic hue can inv yrnamically interventic | te the sharing of data an anywhere, anytime, anyy in, users can create ad- intermember from across introduce data and tools protocols to avoid reque or grancations can dig u sage. Ing Ways: titon - Until now, allowin inization mean enlisting ed, shared web site. We curely, with no extra eff that would either not ha gh email. | d computational way, on- oc callaborative to the asle or to the ing notwork aloy Groove g users to IT resources to h Groove, users or required by oppen at all, or | | Correg Jones / HC Correg Jones / HC E Offline E ACK Printing E Deb Cuinn E Frank Bonis / HC E Jann Thomas Maty Yee Correg Jones / HC - Kollet Acdems, you busy? Acdems, you busy? Acdems, you busy? Acdems, you busy? Acdems, you busy? Correg Jones / ACC, Achieved Type here: Correg Jones / ACC, Achieved Correg Jones / Achieved Cor |



http://www.groove.net/

Basics in File-Sharing



Napster: Centralized P2P

Peer-to-peer

- relies on a central index
- but files don't reside on a central server

■ Four steps:

- Connect to Napster server
- Upload your list of files (push) to server
- Give server keywords to search the full list
- Select "best" of correct answers (based on pings)





Napster: Clever Design

Centralized user and song database

- Quick searching
 - □ Faster/better than Gnutella
- Users come and go
 - User/search database continually updated
- Automatic file sharing
 - □ Easy to use file server

D But...

- Single server to bring down
- This centralization is ultimately its downfall



Gnutella: Pure P2P

■ Focus: decentralized method of searching

- harder to "pull the plug"
- Search by flooding

(D)IS

- If you don't have the file you want, query 7 of your partners (neighbors)
- If they don't have it, they contact 7 of their neighbors, for a maximum hop count of 10
- Requests are flooded may lead to scalability problems
- No looping but packets may be received twice
- Querying node is sent responses with list of matching files and IP addresses
- □ File transfer is direct (no anonymity)



Gnutella: Overlay Maintenance

□ Plug-in to a host and send a *broadcast ping*

- Can be any host (hosts transmitted through word-of-mouth or host-caches)
- Host broadcasts ping message with TTL of 7
- Hosts that are not overloaded respond with a *routed pong*
 - Gnutella caches IP addresses of replying nodes



Gnutella: Problems

■ 24 hour survey showed:

- 70% of people shared no files
- 50% of search responses from top 1% of hosts
- Reverting to client/server
 - Suddenly not so hard to shut down!
- Verified hypotheses
 - □ H1: A significant portion of Gnutella peers are free riders
 - □ H2: Free riders are distributed evenly across domains
 - □ H3: Often hosts share files nobody is interested in
- Non-standard implementation
 - People implement their own Gnutella clients
 - Some clients are dodgier than others



□ Software

- Proprietary
- Files and control data encrypted
- Everything in HTTP request and response messages

Architecture

- Hierarchical
- Cross between Napster and Gnutella



KaZaA: Architecture

- Each peer is either a supernode or is assigned to a supernode
 - Nodes with more bandwidth and that are more available are designated as supernodes
 - Each supernode knows about many other supernodes (almost mesh overlay)
 - Supernodes act as mini-Napster hubs tracking the content and IP addresses of their descendants
 - Guess: ~10,000 supernodes with 200-500 descendants each
 - Dedicated user authentication server and supernode list server



KaZaA: Queries

- Node first sends query to supernode
 - Supernode responds with matches
 - If *x* matches found, done
- Otherwise, supernode forwards query to subset of supernodes
 - If total of *x* matches found, done
- Otherwise, query further forwarded
 - Probably by original supernode rather than recursively



KaZaA: Overlay Maintenance

- List of potential supernodes included within software download
- New peer goes through list until it finds operational supernode
 - Connects, obtains more up-to-date list
 - Node then pings 5 nodes on list and connects with the one with smallest RTT
- If supernode goes down, node obtains updated list and chooses new supernode



KaZaA: Corporate Structure

- Software developed by FastTrack in Amsterdam
- FastTrack also deploys KaZaA service
- FastTrack licenses software to Music City (Morpheus) & Grokster
- Later, FastTrack terminates license, leaves only KaZaA with killer service

- International "cat-and-mouse" game
- Summer 2001, Sharman networks, founded in Vanuatu (small island in Pacific), acquires FastTrack
 - Board of directors, investors: secret
- Employees spread around, hard to locate
- **Code in Estonia**