

# UrDHT: A Unified Model for Distributed Hash Tables

Andrew Rosen

Brendan Benshoof

Robert W. Harrison

Anu G. Bourgeois

Department of Computer Science

Georgia State University

Atlanta, Georgia

rosen@cs.gsu.edu

bbenshoof@cs.gsu.edu

rharrison@cs.gsu.edu

anu@cs.gsu.edu

**Abstract**—UrDHT is an abstracted Distributed Hash Table (DHT) which maps the topologies of DHTs to the primal-dual problem of Voronoi Tessellation and Delaunay Triangulation. By completing a few simple functions, a developer can implement the topology of any DHT.

Current distributed systems suffer from fragmentation, high overhead, and an inability to scale due to difficulty of adoption. UrDHT is P2P system designed to improve the adaptability of P2P distributed serves.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Distributed Hash Tables (DHT) have been extensively researched for the past decade. Many different DHT protocols have developed over the years. Despite this, no one has created a cohesive formal specification for building a DHT.

UrDHT is our specification and implementation of an abstract DHT.

### *Motivation*

1) *Abstraction*: Distributed Hash Tables have been the catalyst for the creation of many P2P applications. Among these are Redis [1], Freenet [3], and, most notably, BitTorrent [4]. All DHTs use roughly the same protocol to perform lookup, storage, and retrieval operations. Despite this, no one has created a cohesive formal specification for building a DHT.

Our initial primary motivation for this project was to create an abstracted Distributed Hash Table based on observations we made during previous research [2]. We discovered that all DHTs can cleanly map to the primal-dual problems of Voronoi Tessellation and Delaunay Triangulation.

2) *Bootstrapping*: One issue in the adoption of new P2P applications is the bootstrapping problem. A node can only join the network if it knows another node *that is already a member of the network it is trying to join*.

The other motivation is making it easier for users to create distributed applications. What topology do you use? How do we want our program to communicate over the network?

UrDHT exists to simplify this process, minimizing the distributed application development time and making it easier to adopt by creating a network to bootstrap *other networks*.

3) *Embedding*: One of the other features shared by nearly every DHT is that routing works by minimizing the number of hops across the overlay network, with all hops treated as the same length. This is done because it is assumed that DHTs know nothing about the state of actual infrastructure the overlay is built upon.

However, this means that most DHTs will happily route a message from one continent to another and back. This is obviously undesirable, but is treated as the status quo in DHTs. Part of this is because nodes are typically assigned a point in the keyspace corresponding to the hash of some identifier or given a point randomly. This is done for purposes of load balancing and fault tolerance.

This motivated us to create a means of embedding latency into the DHT, while still maintaining the system's fault tolerance. Doing so would mean that the hops traversed to a destination are, in fact, the shortest path to the destination.

- We first discuss our motivation for creating UrDHT and *creating it the way we did* (Section I).
- We give a formal specification for what needs to be defined in order to create a functioning DHT. While there has long existed a well known protocol for distributed hash tables, these define what a DHT needs to be able to do. It does not describe what a DHT is. We define a set of simple functions that are needed to implement a DHT. We show that using these functions, DHTs cleanly map to the primal-dual problem of Delaunay triangulations and

Voronoi tessellations (Section II).

- We present UrDHT as an abstract DHT and show how a developer can tweak the functions we defined to create an arbitrary new DHT topology. We show how to reproduce the topology of Chord and Kademlia using UrDHT, which we call UrChord and UrKademlia.
- We conduct experiments showing that UrChord sufficiently approximates a correct implementation of Chord.

## II. WHAT DEFINES A DHT

A distributed hash table is usually defined by its protocol; in other words, what it can do. Nodes and data in a distributed hash table are assigned unique<sup>1</sup> keys via a consistent hashing algorithm. To make it easier to grok the context, we will call the key associated with a node its ID and refer to nodes and their IDs interchangeably.

A DHT can perform the `lookup(key)`, `get(key)`, and `store(key, value)` operations.<sup>2</sup> The `lookup` operation returns the node responsible for a queried key, `get` returns the value stored with that key with the `store` function.

However, this is what a DHT *does*, viewing the DHT as a black box, not what a DHT *is* and needs to be implemented. Here, we open that black box for the first time and present those components. We show that Distributed Hash Tables are just Voronoi tessellations and Delaunay triangulation.

### A. DHT Components

The following functions need to be defined in order for nodes to perform lookup operations and determine responsibility.

- **A distance function** - This measures distance in the overlay formed by the Distributed Hash Table. In most DHTs, the distance in the overlay has no correlation with real-world attributes. This is not necessarily the case with UrDHT (see Section III-B).
- **A midpoint function** - This calculates the minimally equidistant point between two given point. The midpoint is required for Delaunay triangulation calculation. In some spaces, such as Kademlia's XOR metric space, this can be tricky to calculate.

<sup>1</sup>Unique with astronomically high probability, given a large enough consistent hash algorithm.

<sup>2</sup>There is typically a `delete(key)` operation defined too, but it is not strictly necessary.

- **An responsibility definition** This defines the range of keys a node is responsible for. Not every DHT defines which node is responsible for particular keys in the same way. For example, nodes in Kademlia are responsible for the keys closest to themselves, while in Chord, nodes are responsible for the keys falling between themselves and the preceding node.

A DHT also needs a strategy to organize and maintain two lists of other nodes in the network: *short peers* and *long peers*. Short peers are the set of peers that define the topology of the network and guarantee that greedy routing works.

Long peers allow the DHT to achieve a better than linear lookup time, typically  $\log(n)$ , where  $n$  is the size of the network.

Interestingly, despite the diversity of DHT topologies, all DHTs use the relatively the greedy routing algorithm (Algorithm 1):

---

#### Algorithm 1 The DHT Generic Routing algorithm

---

```

1: Given node  $n$  and a message being sent to  $key$ 
2: function  $n.lookup(key)$ 
3: if  $key \in n$ 's range of responsibility then
4:   return  $n$ 
5: end if
6: if One of  $n$ 's short peers are responsible for  $key$  then
7:   return the responsible node
8: end if
9:  $candidates = short\_peers + long\_peers$ 
10:  $next \leftarrow \min(n.distance(candidates, key))$ 
11: return  $next.lookup(key)$ 

```

---

If I, the node, am responsible for the key, I return myself. Otherwise, if I know who is responsible for this key, I return that node. Finally, if that is not the case, I forward this query to the node I know with shortest distance from the node to the desired key.<sup>3</sup>

Between individual DHTs, this algorithm might be implemented either recursively or iteratively. It will certainly have differences in how a node handles errors, such as how to handle connecting to a failed node which no longer exists. This algorithm may possibly be run in parallel, such as in Kademlia [5]. Despite this, the base greedy algorithm is always the same between implementations.

<sup>3</sup>This order matters, as Chord is unidirectional.

The final component is a consistent hashing function. This function must generate keys large enough to make the chances of a hash collision nigh impossible.

### B. DHTs, Delaunay Triangulation, and Voronoi Tessellation

With the following components of a DHT defined above we can now show the relationship between DHTs and the primal-dual problems of Delaunay Triangulation and Voronoi Tessellation.

We can map a given node's ID to a point in a space, the range of keys a node is responsible for to that node's Voronoi region, and the set of short peers to the Delaunay triangulation. Thus, if we can calculate the Delaunay triangulation between nodes in a DHT, we have a generalized means of created the overlay network.

So how do we efficiently calculate Delaunay Triangulations in a distributed system? We created an algorithm call the Distributed Greedy Voronoi Heuristic (DGVH), shown in Algorithm 2 and explained below [2].

---

#### Algorithm 2 Distributed Greedy Voronoi Heuristic

---

```

1: Given node  $n$  and its list of candidates.
2: Given the minimum table_size
3:  $short\_peers \leftarrow$  empty set that will contain  $n$ 's one-hop peers
4:  $long\_peers \leftarrow$  empty set that will contain  $n$ 's peers further than one hop.
5: Sort candidates in ascending order by each node's distance to  $n$ 
6: Remove the first member of candidates and add it to short_peers
7: for all  $c$  in candidates do
8:    $m \leftarrow \text{midpoint}(n, c)$ 
9:   if any node in short_peers is closer to  $m$  than  $n$  then
10:    Reject  $c$  as a peer
11:   else
12:    Remove  $c$  from candidates
13:    Add  $c$  to short_peers
14:   end if
15: end for
16: while  $|short\_peers| < table\_size$  and  $|candidates| > 0$  do
17:   Remove the first entry  $c$  from candidates
18:   Add  $c$  to short_peers
19: end while
20: Add candidates to the set of long_peers
21:  $\text{handleLongPeers}(long\_peers)$ 

```

---

DGVH uses the midpoint to gauge which other nodes to use as its Delaunay triangulation [2]. Every maintenance cycle, nodes exchange their peer lists with **a current neighbor and then recalculate their neighbors**. A node creates a list of candidates by combining their peer list with their neighbor's peer list. This list of peers is then sorted from closest to furthest distance. The node then initializes a new peer list with the closest candidate. For each of the remaining candidates, the node calculates the midpoint between itself and the candidate. If new peer list does not contain any nodes closer to the midpoint than the candidate, the candidate is added to the new peer list. Otherwise, the candidate is set aside.

## III. URDHT

### A. UrDHT Components (or maybe logic)

UrDHT is sectioned off into 3 components: database, network, and logic. Database handles file storage and network dictates the protocol for how nodes communicate.

The distance and midpoints functions are defined and discussed in detail in Section III-B

#### 1) Put and Poll:

### B. Hyperbolic Routing

### C. Okay, this is interesting, but why bother?

Hyperbolic spaces allow us to cleanly embed scale free graphs

### D. Wait, Nodes can move in DHTs??

Yes, they can. There's no rule against it. In fact, it helps.

### E. Implementing Chord and Ring-Based Topology

Ring topologies are fairly straightforward since they act as are one dimensional

### F. Implementing Kademlia and Other Tree Based Topologies

Trees are easy to embed in a hyperbolic space.

### G. ZHT

ZHT leads to an extremely trivial implementation in UrDHT.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTS

#### V. FUTURE WORK AND CONCLUSIONS

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Redis. <http://redis.io>.
- [2] Brendan Benschhoof, Andrew Rosen, Anu G. Bourgeois, and Robert W Harrison. A distributed greedy heuristic for computing voronoi tessellations with applications towards peer-to-peer networks. In *Dependable Parallel, Distributed and Network-Centric Systems, 20th IEEE Workshop on*.
- [3] Ian Clarke, Oskar Sandberg, Brandon Wiley, and Theodore W Hong. Freenet: A distributed anonymous information storage and retrieval system. In *Designing Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, pages 46–66. Springer, 2001.
- [4] Bram Cohen. Incentives build robustness in bittorrent. In *Workshop on Economics of Peer-to-Peer systems*, volume 6, pages 68–72, 2003.
- [5] Petar Maymounkov and David Mazières. Kademlia: A peer-to-peer information system based on the xor metric. In *Peer-to-Peer Systems*, pages 53–65. Springer, 2002.