

Peer-to-Peer Networks 11 Past

Christian Schindelhauer Technical Faculty Computer-Networks and Telematics University of Freiburg

BURG

FREI



Pastary

PAST: A large-scale, persistent peer-to-peer storage utility

- by Peter D<u>rus</u>chel (Rice University, Houston now Max-Planck-Institut, Saarbrücken/Kaiserlautern)
- and Antony Rowstron (Microsoft Research)

Literature

- A. Rowstron and P. Druschel, "Storage management and caching in PAST, a large-scale, persistent peer-to-peer storage utility", 18th ACM SOSP'01, 2001.

all pictures from this paper

- P. Druschel and A. Rowstron, "PAST: A large-scale, persistent peer-to-peer storage utility", HotOS VIII, May 2001.

Oceanstore



- ZIP-roch thing aka. Plaxton-Routing - Ring & Relicble - magic sat M 310425 Random ->)

UNI FREIBURG





My Cloud

Peer-to-Peer based Internet Storage

- on top of Pastry
- Goals
 - File based storage
 - -/ High availability of data

Persistent storage

- Scalability

- Efficient usage of resources

network Storage





- Multiple, diverse nodes in the Internet can be used
 - safety by different locations
- No complicated backup
 - No additional backup devices
 - No mirroring
 - No RAID or SAN systems with special hardware
- Joint use of storage
 - for sharing files
 - for publishing documents
- Overcome local storage and data safety limitations





A Interface of PAST Freiburg

- Create: / fileId = Insert(name, owner-credentials, k, file)
 stores a file at a user-specified number k of divers nodes within the PAST network
 produces a 160 bit ID which identifies the file (via SHA-1)
 Lookup: file = Lookup(fileId)
 - reliably retrieves a copy of the file identified fileId
- Reclaim:

```
Reclaim(fileId, owner-credentials)
```

- reclaims the storage occupied by the k copies of the file identified by fileId





- Other operations do not exist:
 - No erase
 - to avoid complex agreement protocols
 - No write or rename
 - to avoid write conflicts
 - No group right management
 - to avoid user, group managements
 - No list files, file information, etc.
- Such operations must be provided by additional layer











Leafset:

- Neighbors on the ring
- Routing Table
 - Nodes for each prefix + 1 other letter
- Neighborhood set
 - set of nodes which have small TTL

Nodeld 10233102			
Leaf set	SMALLER	LARGER	
10233033	10233021	10233120	10233122
10233001	10233000	10233230	10233232
Routing table			
-0-2212102	1	-2-2301203	-3-1203203
0	1-1-301233	1-2-230203	1-3-021022
10-0-31203	10-1-32102	2	10-3-23302
102-0-0230	102-1-1302	102-2-2302	3
1023-0-322	1023-1-000	1023-2-121	3
10233-0-01	1	10233-2-32	
0		102331-2-0	
		2	
Neighborhood set			
13021022	10200230	11301233	31301233
02212102	22301203	31203203	33213321





- route(M, X):
 - route message M to node with nodeld numerically closest to <u>X</u>
- deliver(M):
 - deliver message M to application
- forwarding(M, X):
 - message M is being forwarded towards key X
- newLeaf(L):
 - report change in leaf set L to application









- Compute fileId by hashing
 - file name
 - public key of client
 - some random numbers, called salt
- Storage (k x filesize)
 - is debited against client's quota

File certificate

- is produced and signed with owner's private key
- contains fileID, SHA-1 hash of file's content, replciation factor k, the random salt, creation date, etc.





- File and certificate are routed via Pastry
 - to node responsible for <u>fileID</u>
- When it arrives in one node of the k nodes close to the fileId
 - the node checks the validity of the file
 - it is duplicated to all other k-1 nodes numerically close to fileId

حــــــ

- When all k nodes have accepted a copy
 - Each nodes sends store receipt is send to the owner
- If something goes wrong an error message is sent back
 - and nothing stored

DDDDD BB





- Client sends message with requested fileId into the Pastry network
- The first node storing the file answers
 - no further routing
- The node sends back the file
- Locality property of Pastry helps to send a closeby copy of a file





- Client's nodes sends reclaim certificate
 - allowing the storing nodes to check that the claim is authentificated
- Each node sends a reclaim receipt
- The client sends this recept to the retrieve the storage from the quota management



BURG



- Smartcard
 - for PAST users which want to store files
 - generates and verifies all certificates
 - maintain the storage quotas
 - ensure the integrity of nodeID and fileID assignment
- Users/nodes without smartcard
 - can read and serve as storage servers
- Randomized routing
 prevents intersection of messages
 - Malicious nodes only have local influence



Goals

- Utilization of all storage
- Storage balancing
- Providing k file replicas
- Methods
 - Replica diversion
 - exception to storing replicas nodes in the leafset
 - File diversion
 - if the local nodes are full all replicas are stored at different locations





A Causes of Storage Load Imbalance

- Statistical variation
 - birthday paradoxon (on a weaker scale)
- High variance of the size distribution
 - Typical heavy-tail distribution, e.g. Pareto distribution
- Different storage capacity of PAST nodes





- Discrete Pareto Distribution for $x \in \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$
 - with constant factor $\zeta(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^{\alpha}}$
- Heavy tail
 - only for small k moments E[Xk] are defined
 - Expectation is defined only if α >2
 - Variance and E[X²] only exist if α >3
 - $E[X^k]$ is defined ony if $\alpha > k+1$
- Often observed:
 - Distribution of wealth, sizes of towns, frequency of molecules, ...,
 - file length, WWW documents
 - Heavy-Tailed Probability Distributions in the World Wide Web, Crovella et al. 1996

$$\mathbf{P}[X=x] = \frac{1}{\zeta(\alpha) \cdot x^{\alpha}}$$





- Assumption:
 - Storage of nodes differ by at most a factor of 100
- Large scale storage
 - must be inserted as multiple PAST nodes
- Storage control:
 - if a node storage is too large it is asked to split and rejoin
 - if a node storage is too small it is rejected





- The first node close to the fileId checks whether it can store the file
 - if yes, it does and sends the store receipt

Cumulative ratio of replica diversions

0

20

- If a node A cannot store the file, it tries replica diversion
 - A chooses a node B in its leaf set which is not among the k closest asks B to store the copy
 - If B accepts, A stores a pointer to B and sends a store receipt
- When A or B fails then the replica is inaccessible
 - failure probability is doubled



Figure 5: Cumulative ratio of replica diversions versus storage utilization, when $t_{pri} = 0.1$ and $t_{div} = 0.05$.

Utilization (%)

40



80

100

A Policies for Replica Diversion

- Acceptance of replicas at a node
 - If (size of a file)/(remaining free space) > t then reject the file
 - for different t`s for close nodes (t_{pri}) and far nodes (t_{div}), where $t_{pri} > t_{div}$
 - discriminates large files and far storage
- Selecting a node to store a diverted replica
 - in the leaf set and
 - not in the k nodes closest to the fileId
 - do not hold a diverted replica of the same file
- Deciding when to divert a file to different part of the Pastry ring
 - If one of the k nodes does not find a proxy node
 - then it sends a reject message
 - and all nodes for the replicas discard the file



- If k nodes close to the chosen filed
 - cannot store the file
 - nor divert the replicas locally in the leafset
- then an error message is sent to the client
- The client generates a new <u>fileId</u> using different salt
 - and repeats the insert operation up to 3 times
 - then the operation is aborted and a failure is reported to the application
- Possibly the application retries with small fragments of the file



Figure 7: File insertion failures versus storage utilization for the filesystem workload, when $t_{pri} = 0.1$, $t_{div} = 0.05$.



Figure 4: Ratio of file diversions and cumulative insertion failures versus storage utilization, $t_{pri} = 0.1$ and $t_{div} = 0.05$.



- Pastry protocols checks leaf set periodically
- Node failure has been recognized
 - if a node is unresponsive for some certain time
 - Pastry triggers adjustment of the leaf set
 - PAST redistributes replicas
 - if the new neighbor is too full, then other nodes in the nodes will be uses via replica diversion
- When a new node arrives
 - files are not moved, but pointers adjusted (replica diversion)
 - because of ratio of storage to bandwidth





- k replicas is not the best redundancy strategy
- Using a Reed-Solomon encoding
 - with m additional check sum blocks to n original data blocks
 - reduces the storage overhead to (m+n)/n times the file size
 - if all m+n shares are distributed over different nodes
 - possibly speeds upt the access spee
- PAST
 - does NOT use any such encoding techniques





- Goal:
 - Minimize fetch distance
 - Maximize query throughput
 - Balance the query load
- Replicas provide these features
 - Highly popular files may demand many more replicas
 - this is provided by cache management
- PAST nodes use "unused" portion to cache files
 - cached copies can be erased at any time
 - e.g. for storing primary of redirected replicas
- When a file is routed through a node during lookup or insert it is inserted into the local cache
- Cache replacement policy: GreedyDual-Size
 - considers aging, file size and costs of a file



- PAST provides a distributed storage system
 - which allows full storage usage and locality features
- Storage management
 - based ond Smartcard system
 - provides a hardware restriction
 - utilization moderately increases failure rates and time behavior





Peer-to-Peer Networks 11 Past

Christian Schindelhauer Technical Faculty Computer-Networks and Telematics University of Freiburg

BURG

FREI