

DAAD Summerschool Curitiba 2011

Aspects of Large Scale High Speed Computing Building Blocks of a Cloud Storage Networks

3: Distributed Hash Tables - Virtualization without Index

Database

Christian Schindelhauer

Technical Faculty

Computer-Networks and Telematics

University of Freiburg





Concept of Virtualization

Principle

- A virtual storage constitutes handles all application accesses to the file system
- The virtual disk partitions files and stores blocks over several (physical) hard disks
- Control mechanisms allow redundancy and failure repair

Control

- Virtualization server assigns data, e.g. blocks of files to hard disks (address space remapping)
- Controls replication and redundancy strategy
- Adds and removes storage devices





Distributed Wide Area Storage Networks

- Distributed Hash Tables
 - Relieving hot spots in the Internet
 - Caching strategies for web servers
- Peer-to-Peer Networks
 - Distributed file lookup and download in Overlay networks
 - Most (or the best) of them use: DHT



- Web surfing:
 - Web servers offer web pages
 - Web clients request web pages
- Most of the time these requests are independent
- Requests use resources of the web servers
 - bandwidth
 - computation time



Load CoNe Freiburg

- Some web servers have always high load
 - for permanent high loads servers must be sufficiently powerful

Some suffer under high fluctuations

- e.g. special events:
 - jpl.nasa.gov (Mars mission)
 - cnn.com (terrorist attack)
- Server extension for worst case not reasonable
- Serving the requests is desired

www.google.com



A Load Balancing in the WWW

- Fluctuations target some servers
- (Commercial) solution
 - Service providers offer exchange servers an
 - Many requests will be distributed among these servers
- But how?





• Leighton, Lewin, et al. STOC 97

- Consistent Hashing and Random Trees: Distributed Caching Protocols for Relieving Hot Spots on the World Wide Web
- Used by Akamai (founded 1997)





Start Situation

- Without load balancing
- Advantage
 - simple
- Disadvantage
 - servers must be designed for worst case situations





- The whole web-site is copied to different web caches
- Browsers request at web server
- Web server redirects requests to Web-Cache
- Web-Cache delivers Web pages
- Advantage:
 - good load balancing
- Disadvantage:
 - bottleneck: redirect
 - large overhead for complete web-site replication





- Each web page is distributed to a few web-caches
- Only first request is sent to web server
- Links reference to pages in the webcache
- Then, web clients surfs in the webcache
- Advantage:
 - No bottleneck
- Disadvantages:
 - Load balancing only implicit
 - High requirements for placements





Balance

fair balancing of web pages



Dynamics

Efficient insert and delete of webcache-servers and files



Views

Web-Clients "see" different set of web-caches



IBURG

N





Set of Items: \mathcal{I}

Set of Buckets: ${\cal B}$

Example:
$$f(i) = ai + b mod n$$

12

UNI FREIBURG

A Ranged Hash-Funktionen

Given:

- Items $\mathcal I$, Number $\ I:=|\mathcal I|$
- Caches (Buckets), Bucket set: \mathcal{B}
- Views $\mathcal{V} \subseteq 2^{\mathcal{B}}$
- Ranged Hash-Funktion:
 - $f: 2^{\mathcal{B}} \times \mathcal{I} \to \mathcal{B}$
 - Prerequisite: for alle views $f_{\mathcal{V}}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$





- Algorithm:
 - Choose Hash funktion, e.g.

 $f(i) = ai + b \mod n$ n: number of Cache servers

- Balance:
 - very good
- Dynamics
 - Insert or remove of a single cache server
 - New hash functions and total rehashing
 - Very expensive!!





Monotony

- After adding or removing new caches (buckets) no pages (items) should be moved
- Balance
 - All caches should have the same load
- Spread
 - A page should be distributed to a bounded number of caches
- Load
 - No Cache should not have substantially more load than the average



- After adding or removing new caches (buckets) no pages (items) should be moved
- Formally: For all $V_1 \subseteq V_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ $f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i) \in \mathcal{V}_1 \implies f_{\mathcal{V}_1}(i) = f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i)$



UNI FREIBURG



• For every view V the is the $f_V(i)$ balanced For a constant c and all $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$:

$$\Pr\left[f_{\mathcal{V}}(i)=b\right] \le \frac{c}{|\mathcal{V}|}$$





• The spread $\sigma(i)$ of a page i is the overall number of all necessary copies (over all views)

$$\sigma(i) := |\{f_{\mathcal{V}_1}(i), f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i), \dots, f_{\mathcal{V}_V}(i)\}|$$





• The load $\lambda(b)$ of a cache b is the over-all number of all copies (over all views) $\lambda(b) := |\{ \bigcup_{\mathcal{V}} H_{\mathcal{V}}(b) \}|,$

wher $H_{\mathcal{V}}(b) :=$ set of all pages assigned to bucket b in View V





Distributed Hash Tables

Theorem

- There exists a family of hash function with the following properties
 - Each function f∈F is **monotone**
 - Balance: For every view
 - Spread: For each page i $\sigma(i) = \mathcal{O}(t \log C)$

with probability
$$1-rac{1}{C^{\Omega(1)}}$$

Load: For each cache b
$$\lambda(b) = \mathcal{O}(t \log C)$$
 with probability $1 - rac{1}{C^{\Omega(1)}}$

C number of caches (Buckets) C/t minimum number of caches per View V/C = constant (#Views / #Caches)

I = C (# pages = # Caches)

 $\Pr\left[f_{\mathcal{V}}(i)=b\right] \le \frac{c}{|\mathcal{V}|}$

20







• $f_{\mathcal{V}}(i) := \text{Cache } b \in \mathcal{V}$ which minimizes $|r_{\mathcal{B}}(b) - r_{\mathcal{I}}(i)|$ For all $\mathcal{V}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{V}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}$:

$$f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i) \in \mathcal{V}_1 \implies f_{\mathcal{V}_1}(i) = f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i)$$

Observe: blue interval in V_2 and in V_1 empty!





Balance: For all views
$$\Pr[f_{\mathcal{V}}(i) = b] \leq \frac{c}{|\mathcal{V}|}$$

- Choose fixed view and a web page i
- Apply hash functions $r_{\mathcal{B}}(b)$ and $r_{\mathcal{I}}(i)$
- Under the assumption that the mapping is random
 - every cache is chosen with the same probability



3. Spread CoNe Freiburg

$\sigma(i)$ = number of all necessary copies (over all views)

$$\sigma(i) := |\{f_{\mathcal{V}_1}(i), f_{\mathcal{V}_2}(i), \dots, f_{\mathcal{V}_V}(i)\}|$$

C number of caches (Buckets) C/t minimum number of caches per View V/C = constant (#Views / #Caches) I = C (# pages = # Caches)

ever user knows at least a fraction of 1/t over the caches

For every page i
$$\sigma(i) = \mathcal{O}(t \log C)$$
 with prob. $1 - rac{1}{C^{\Omega(1)}}$

Proof sketch:

• Every view has a cache in an interval of length t/C (with high probability)

• The number of caches gives an upper bound for the spread





• Last (load): $\lambda(b) =$ Number of copies over all views

$$\lambda(b) := |\{ \bigcup_{\mathcal{V}} H_{\mathcal{V}}(b) \}|,$$

where $H_{\mathcal{V}}(b)$:= set of pages assigned to bucket b under view V

• For every cache be we observe $\lambda(b) = \mathcal{O}(t \log C)$

with probability
$$1 - \frac{1}{C^{\Omega(1)}}$$

Proof sketch: Consider intervals of length t/C

• With high probability a cache of every view falls into one of these intervals

• The number of items in the interval gives an upper bound for the load





- Distributed Hash Table
 - is a distributed data structure for virtualization
 - with fair balance
 - provides dynamic behavior
- Standard data structure for dynamic distributed storages

UNI FREIBURG



DAAD Summerschool Curitiba 2011

Aspects of Large Scale High Speed Computing Building Blocks of a Cloud Storage Networks

3: Distributed Hash Tables - Virtualization without Index

Database

Christian Schindelhauer

Technical Faculty

Computer-Networks and Telematics

University of Freiburg

