

Reflection, Rendezvous, and Relaying: Addressing the P2P Bootstrap Problem for Small Overlay Networks

Abstract—Peer-to-Peer (P2P) overlays provide a framework for building distributed applications consisting of few to many resources with features including self-configuration, scalability, and resilience to node failures. Such systems have been successfully adopted in large-scale Internet services such as content delivery networks, file sharing, and data storage. The bootstrap problem, finding an existing peer in the overlay, remains a challenge to enabling these services for small-scale P2P systems. In large networks, the bootstrap problem has been solved by dedicated services, though creating and maintaining these systems requires expertise and resources, which constrain their usefulness and make them unappealing for small-scale systems. Decentralized, P2P systems can be useful in small-scale systems for privacy concerns as well as supporting applications that lack dedicated, centralized bootstrap servers.

In this paper, we identify how existing services or overlays can be used to solve the bootstrap problem. The components of the framework are a method for reflection methods for obtaining a publicly reachable address, so remote peers can initiate sessions; rendezvous service for discovering remote peers, when the overlay lacks stable membership; and a communication relay to exchange connection information. We have implemented a prototype of this system using XMPP overlays, such as Google Talk and Live Journal Talk, and Brunet, a structured overlay based upon Symphony. We present a qualitative overview of our prototype, quantitative evaluation of the prototype using simulation, and experiences from deployment. Uniquely differentiating our approach from similar techniques, we have implemented this system and verified its usefulness by deploying it on PlanetLab.

I. INTRODUCTION

While P2P overlays provide a scalable, resilient, and self-configuring platform for distributed applications, their adoption rate for use across the Internet has been slow outside of large-scale systems, such as data distribution and communication. General use of decentralized, P2P applications targeting homes and small/medium businesses (SMBs) has been limited in large part due to difficulty in decentralized discovery of P2P systems, the bootstrap problem, further inhibited by constrained network conditions due to firewalls and NATs (network address translators). While these environments could benefit from P2P, many of these users lack the resources or expertise necessary to bootstrap private P2P overlays particularly when the member state is unsteady and across wide-area network environments where a significant amount of or all peers may be unable to initiate direct communication with each other due to firewalls and NATs.

Examples of large-scale P2P systems include Skype, BitTorrent, and Gnutella. Skype is a voice over P2P system, whereas BitTorrent and Gnutella are file sharing programs.

Bootstrapping in these system follows a common pattern: the overlay maintainers setup high availability systems for bootstrapping and bundle their connection information with the application for distribution. Upon starting the application, it queries these high availability peers and connects to other peers in the system. Alternatively, some services constantly crawl the network and place peer lists on dedicated web sites, a new peer wishing to join the network queries the web site and then attempts to connect to the peers on that list.

In smaller-scale systems, interest in P2P focuses more on the decentralized component. Users may desire to run an application at many distributed sites, but the application lacks dedicated central servers to provide discovery or rendezvous service for peers. Alternatively, dedicated, centralized P2P service providers, such as LogMeIn's Hamachi, a P2P VPN, may collect usage data, which the users may wish to remain private. Many applications fit into these roles, such as multiplayer games, especially those that never or no longer have dedicated online services; private data sharing; or even distributed file systems. Clearly, a small P2P system could be bootstrapped by one or more users of the system running on public IP addresses, exchanging those addresses through e-mail or phone, and then bootstrapping from there, but but these types of situations are an exception and not the norm. Instead, We focus on the components that can make decentralized bootstrapping transparent to the user, so that user interaction with the P2P component of the application is minimal and intuitive.

The basic bootstrapping process can be broken down into two components finding a remote peer and then successively connecting to more peers. When a node bootstraps into a P2P system, it contacts bootstrap servers, until it successfully connects with one. Upon connecting with a bootstrap server, the two exchange information. The bootstrap server may inquire into the overlay for the best set of peers for the new peer and respond with that information or it may respond with its existing neighbors. At which point, the peer attempts to connect with those peers. This process continues aggressively until the peer arrives at the location in the overlay, where they belong. Afterward, the P2P logic arrives at a steady state and only reacts based upon churn, that is new incoming peers or outgoing peers.

Overlays with support for constrained peers, those behind NATs and firewalls, require a few more components. Before that, let us investigate why a peer may want to connect to a

peer behind a NAT rather than communicate across the overlay. The user may be hosting a desirable file or a component of one. It may be the destination of a voice over P2P call. If nothing else, then for privacy, so that overlay peers cannot easily profile your communication habits. There are many forms of NAT traversal, but many require a third party to assist in notifying both peers to simultaneously communicate with each other. Thus the overlay must have some means of relaying communication between peers. In some cases, peers will not be able to form direct connections, in which case, the overlay will need to provide relaying of arbitrary data in order for the peers to communicate.

Thus to instantiate a private version of these large-scale P2P systems would require the use of overlay-centric dedicated components and rely on out of band mechanisms to relay this information to others, such as an e-mail or a phone call. Even if this is feasible, this sort of interaction is undesirable, P2P systems should be self-discovering so that users need to do minimal amount of work to take advantage of them and adhoc systems stress this point. In addition, these approaches rely on centralized components, thus if they become unavailable, which is very likely since most users lack the expertise in configuring highly available systems, the system will not be accessible.

To address this, we propose the use of existing public overlays as a means to bootstrap into private overlays. There are many existing wide-spread systems with high availability, such as Skype, Gnutella, XMPP, and BitTorrent; by leveraging these systems, system integrators can easily enable users to seamlessly bootstrap their own private P2P systems. In the preceding paragraphs, we identified the components necessary for bootstrapping in a homogeneous system, now we expand them for environments to support the bootstrapping of a private overlay from a public overlay with consideration for network constrained peers. The public overlay must support the following mechanisms:

- 1) **Reflection** - Constrained peers must have some method of determining their Internet connection information, to share with other constrained peers to enable direct connectivity.
- 2) **Rendezvous** - Peers seeking members of a private overlay in a public overlay must be able to identify each other.
- 3) **Relaying** - Peers must be able to exchange arbitrary data to share connection information and to enable direct links across NATs when possible or, otherwise, as a relay.

This work motivates from the belief that what prevents use of P2P systems is due to lack the resources, technical knowledge, or desire to create and manage high availability bootstrap services. A public overlay can be used to transparently bootstrap a private overlay with minimal user interaction.

These requirements will be presented and verified in the context of two prototype implementations: a XMPP (Jabber) [1] and Brunet [2]. XMPP or Extensible Messaging and Presence Protocol based overlays are commonly used as chat

portals, for example, GoogleTalk and Facebook Chat use the protocol. XMPP also supports a P2P overlay amongst servers forming a XMPP Federation allowing inter-domain communication amongst chat peers, so that users from one XMPP server can communicate with those using another. Brunet provides generic P2P abstractions as well as an implementation of the Symphony structured overlay. We present the architecture for these systems, the lessons learned in constructing and evaluating them, as well as provide quantitative analysis of peer connectivity to a private Brunet overlay.

The organization of this paper follows. Section II presents common P2P overlay technologies, unstructured and structured P2P systems, NAT challenges in P2P systems, and then an overview of existing bootstrapping techniques. In Section III, we present our contribution and describe its relation to various existing public overlays. Various applications that can be enabled by this architecture are described in Section IV. Finally, we conclude the paper with Section VI.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Common P2P Systems

Large-scale P2P systems typically come in two flavors: unstructured and structured. Unstructured systems [3], [4] are generally constructed by peers attempting to maintain a certain amount of connections to other peers in the P2P system, whereas structured systems organize into well-defined topologies, such as 2-D rings or hypercubes. Though unstructured systems are typically simpler to bootstrap and maintain, they rely on global knowledge, flooding, or stochastic techniques to search for information in an overlay and thus creating potential scalability constraints. Alternatively, structured systems [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. have guaranteed search time typically with a lower bound of $O(\log N)$, though recent research has shown that these systems can be constructed to support $O(1)$ search time [10].

A key component of most structured overlays is support for decentralized storage / retrieval of information by mapping keys to specific node IDs in an overlay called a distributed hash table (DHT). At a minimum, the data is stored at the node ID either smaller or larger to the data's node ID and for fault tolerance the data can be stored at other nodes. DHTs can be used by peers of systems to coordinate allocation and discovery of resources, making them attractive for self-configuration in decentralized collaborative environments. DHTs provide the building blocks to form more complex distributed data stores as presented in Past [11] and Kosha [12]. While most publications of structured overlays focus on their ability to scale from thousands to millions of nodes, practical applications have employed them in the order of 10s to 100s of nodes. For example, Amazon's shopping cart runs on Dynamo [13] using a "couple of hundred of nodes" or less. Facebook provides an inbox search system using Cassandra [14] running on "600+ cores". As mentioned in the publications, this is due to the high availability and autonomic features provided by dedicated structured overlays.

Another subset found in various scale environments are “P2P” systems that are not fully decentralized, such as “P2P VPNs” like Hamachi [15], older systems like the original Napster, and tracker-based BitTorrent. These types of systems provide a rendezvous services for peers to discover each other to form direct, or P2P, connections with each other for the purpose of network connectivity or data sharing. BitTorrent differentiates itself by using the trackers as a gateway into the overlay, once inside, peers exchange connection information with each other directly relegating the tracker as a fall back. This approach has enabled BitTorrent to be modified to support trackerless torrents through using a DHT.

B. Network Address Translation Hampering P2P Systems

As of 2010, the majority of the Internet is connected via Internet Protocol (IP) version 4. A limitation in this protocol is that there are only 2^{32} addresses (approximately 4 billion) available. With the Earth’s population of over 8 billion and each individual potentially having multiple devices that have Internet connectivity, the IPv4 limitation is becoming more and more apparent. To address this issue there have been two approaches: 1) the use of network address translation (NAT) to enable many machines and devices to share a single IP address but preventing bidirectional connection initiation, and 2) IPv6 which supports 2^{128} addresses. The use of NATs complicates the bootstrapping of P2P systems as it prevents peers from simply exchanging addresses with each other to form connections, as the addresses may not be public. In addition, firewalls may prevent peers from receiving incoming connections. Thus while the eventual widespread use IPv6 will cause the demise of NATs, though this is not guaranteed, it does not deal with the issue of firewalls preventing P2P applications from communicating.

When a machine, *A*, behind a typical NAT, *B*, sends out a packet to an Internet host, *C*, the NAT device translates the packet so that it appears it is coming from the NAT device making the NAT device a router. When the the packet is sent from *A* to *C*, the source and destination are listed as $IP : port$ pairs, where the source and destination are $IP_A : Port_A$ and $IP_C : Port_C$, respectively. *A* forwards the packet to *B* who transforms the source from $IP_A : Port_A$ to $IP_B : Port_B$, where $Port_A$ may or may not be equal to $Port_B$. This creates a NAT mapping so that incoming packets from $IP_C : Port_C$ to $IP_B : Port_B$ are translated and forwarded to $IP_A : Port_A$.

There are a handful of recognized NAT devices as presented in [16], [17]. The following list focuses on the more prevalent types:

- **Full cone** - All requests from the same internal IP and port are mapped to a static external IP and port, thus any external host can communicate with the internal host once a mapping has been made.
- **Restricted cone** - Like a full cone, but it requires that the internal host has sent a message to the external host before the NAT will pass the packets.
- **Port restricted cone** - Like a restricted cone, but it requires that the internal host has sent the packet to the

external hosts specific port, before the NAT will pass packets.

- **Symmetric** - Each source and destination pair have no relation, thus only a machine receiving a message from an internal host can send a message back.

Peers on cone NATs can easily be traversed so long as a third-party assists in determining the port allocated by the NAT and as a medium for the peers to exchange this information, this method is referred to as STUN [18]. Peers behind symmetric NATs cannot easily communicate with each other, since there is no relation between remote hosts and ports and local ports. Further complicating the matter is that there are various types of symmetric NATs, having behaviors similar to full, restricted, and port restricted cone NATs. [19] describes methods to traverse these NATs so long as there is a predictable pattern to port selection. The approaches that attempt to form direct connections between peers, hole punching, generally use UDP. UDP, unlike TCP, lacks state, thus traversal attempts do not need to be concerned with potentially replaying message or handling potential reject methods that may occur when attempting to perform TCP hole punching, though there is reasonable amount of work describing TCP NAT traversal such as [20]. TCP NAT traversal is complicated by stateful firewalls, or those that watch connections and connection attempts preventing messages from closed TCP channels from passing through the NAT. For situations in which both peers are behind NATs and firewalls that prevent in bound communication inhibiting NAT traversal, a third-party can act as a relay between the two, known as triangulation or TURN [21] (traversal using relay NAT).

These NAT traversal services in themselves only deal with a small portion of the bootstrap problem, reflection. That is, peers are able to obtain a public address for receiving incoming connections. These services provide no means for users to exchange these addresses with each other and cannot make any guarantees on how long the mappings will be valid. Thus a peer using an address that was not exchanged recently may find that there is no peer or a completely different service is now listening on the remote end. To address this issue many systems incorporate these NAT traversal libraries and use intermediaries to exchange addresses. In order for peers to form direct connectoins, peers still need a mechanism to discover each other or rendezvous and then a relay pathway to exchange their network information.

An example of an application that uses these types of services combines with rendezvous and relay is Teredo [22]. Teredo enables all peers to have a globally identifiable IPv6 address. The IPv6 address maps to a specific Teredo gateway, client pair. When two peers using Teredo attempt to connect with each other, the Teredo servers exchange the clients IP information obtained using a STUN-like procedue. While this gives users a public address, it does not do so in a scalable or fault tolerant way. If the Teredo gateway goes offline or becomes saturated, the peers outgoing and incoming requests may be ignored.

C. Bootstrapping P2P Systems

As described in the introduction, the simple case of bootstrapping is limited to one peer attempting to find an active peer in the overlay in order for itself to become a member. The large-scale providers have resources not readily available to small-scale overlays. This section presents the existing techniques and those being developed and describes their application to small-scale systems.

When using dedicated bootstraps, a service provider hosts one or more bootstrap resources. Peers desiring to join the overlay query the bootstrap nodes, until a successful connection is made to one. The bootstrap server will then assist in connecting to other nodes in the P2P system. The bootstrap nodes are either packaged with the application at distribution time or through a meta data file, such as in BitTorrent. In small, ad hoc pools, this approaches draw backs are that the server would have to be used every time to bootstrap the system or users would have to reconfigure their software to connect to the appropriate bootstrap server. A bootstrap server creates a single point of failure, especially when not being deployed using high availability techniques. This approach requires at least one peer to have a publicly accessible address.

Another commonly used approach for large-scale systems is the use of a host cache [23]. Clients post current connection information to dedicated web services, a host cache, that cache the connection information and URLs to other host caches. For small, ad hoc networks, a host cache acts no differently than a centralized rendezvous point, requiring that at least one peer has a publicly accessible address.

Research has shown that peers using locality properties of IP addresses, a peer can use intelligent random probing [24], [25] are able to find an online peer in “Gnutella-sized” overlays. The results show for networks in the order of tens of thousands that a peer can find an active peer node within 2,000 guesses. The application of this approach to small, ad hoc groups is challenging. If peers are behind NATs, the port mapping may change randomly or not be the same for multiple peers, further more, if peers are widely distributed and very small, this approach may have to query the majority of the IP address range to find a peer.

Rather than distribute an IP address, which points explicitly to some location in the Internet, a small P2P network can apply a name abstraction around one peer in the overlay using Dynamic DNS [26]. In this approach, peers share a common DNS entry, providing a common means to bootstrap the overlay. When the peers detect that the IP directed to by the host is offline, they use a random time back off algorithm to replace it. The application of this approach to small, ad hoc groups is actually quite nice, as the service could be distributed across multiple Dynamic DNS registrations. The significant drawback to the approach is that the dynamic DNS server could be attacked, since the login information must be shared amongst all peers in the overlay. Also the approach requires that at least one peer be publicly addressable and know that it is, if a non-publicly addressable peer updates the cache,

it could delay or permanently prevent peers from creating a P2P system. The results were simulation based and did not determine how well a dynamic DNS would cope with active constant changing of the name to IP mapping.

IP supports multicasting to groups interested in a common service. In the case of bootstrapping a P2P system [5], [25], all peers would be members of a specific group. When a new peer comes online, it would query this group for connection information and then connect to those that respond. The drawback to this approach is that it only works in environments connected by IP multicast, typically local area networks only, thus for a wide-area, distributed P2P system, this approach will most likely not work.

A large-scale structured overlay [27], [28] could enable peers to publish their information into a dedicated location for their service or application and then query that list to obtain a list of online peers. Peers could then come online, search for peers in their overlay, and then connect with them using their connection information. Since the service would be a large-scale system, it could easily be bootstrapped by a dedicated bootstrap or host caches. As it stands, the described works were position papers and the systems have not been fully fleshed out. The primary challenge in relationship to small, ad hoc networks is that it lacks details bootstrapping of peers behind NATs into overlays as it provides only a means for rendezvous and no reflection nor relaying.

III. BOOTSTRAPPING PRIVATE OVERLAYS

As presented in the preceding sections, a solution to bootstrapping small P2P overlays must address several challenges, namely reflection, rendezvous, and relaying. In this section, we present a generic solution to this problem. At the basis of our solution is the use of a publicly available free-to-join public overlay. In order to support these features the public overlay must have mechanisms for peers to determine their network identity and maintain these mappings, reflection; search for other peers that are bootstrapping the same P2P service, rendezvous; and send messages to peers through the overlay, relaying.

These are the minimum requirements to bootstrap a decentralized, P2P system when all peers are behind NATs. Without a reflection utility, two peers would be unable to communicate directly with each other, when they exchange connection information, they would only be able to share local networking information. If they are not on the same network, the information will be useless. Furthermore, if they are on the same network, then an approach using multicast would be sufficient. Thus assuming that the other two capabilities are available, rendezvous and relaying, peers would only be able to communicate through the overlay, which may introduce significant latency and bandwidth overheads.

A system, lacking the ability to exchange messages via the overlay or relaying, could limit the types of NATs peers could traverse. Assuming reflection and rendezvous, a peer could obtain connection information for another peer through an entry in the DHT, much like Tracker-less torrents, and

connect to it so long as the peer is either on a public address, behind a cone NAT, or have a TURN connection, though a TURN connection would violate the expectation of the overlay lacking relay capabilities. In other all other NAT cases, a peer must initiate simultaneous connection attempts in order to form a direct connection. Furthermore, while TURN may provide relaying, it is not very scalable unless the features is built decentrally into the overlay.

Without rendezvous, peers would have no mechanisms to discover each other, in this case, random probing would be the only mechanism for peers to discover each other. If the peers are behind NATs, not even random probing would be sufficient for them to form connections with each other. Thus rendezvous is the most important component without it, peers would be unable to find each other.

Table I reviews various overlays, the majority of which are public free-to-join overlays, though some research only overlays are included. The overlays were chosen based upon their scale and availability. From this the most attractive two services are Brunet and XMPP. Brunet provides traditional P2P infrastructure, though lacks the large-scale and high availability features due to being rooted in an academic project. XMPP, on the other hand, is a non-traditional overlay and limits private overlays to being bootstrapped through friendship connections. While most users seeking a private overlay will do so with friends, this may not always be the case, consider video game players searching for people to play with online. On the other hand, XMPP is built on top of production systems thus has more applicability to real world usage.

A. Bootstrapping Private Overlays Using Brunet

B. Bootstrapping Private Overlays Using XMPP

IV. APPLICATIONS

In this section, we present applications and potential ways to configure them to use a private overlay. The applications we investigate include chat rooms, social networks, VPNs, and multicast. The key to all these applications is that users can easily host their own services and be discovered through the use of a free-to-join public overlay.

A. Chat Rooms

Chat rooms provide a platform for individuals with a common interest to find each other, group discussion, private chat, and data exchange. One of the most popular chat systems for the Internet is Internet Relay Chat (IRC). As described in [32], IRC supports a distributed tree system, where clients connect to a server, and servers use a mixture of unicast and multicast to distribute messages. The issues with IRC are documented by [33], namely, scalability due to all servers needing global knowledge, reliability due to connectivity issues between servers, and lack of privacy. Private overlays could be extended to support the features of IRC and potentially deal with these inherent issues. Each chat room would be mapped to a private overlay and the public overlay would be used as a directory to learn about available chat rooms and request access. Structured overlays do not require global knowledge and can be

configured to handle connectivity issues. Additionally, IRC by default uses clear text messaging and even if security is used a server will be aware of the content of the message, two issues resolved by using PtP security in a private overlay chat room.

B. Social Networks

Social networks such as Facebook and MySpace provide an opportunity for users to indirectly share information with friends, family, and peers via a profile containing personal information, status updates, and pictures. Most social network structures rely on hosted systems, where they become the keepers of user data, which creates privacy and trust concerns. Private overlays can remove this third party, making users the only owner of their data. For this model, we propose that each user's profile be represented by a private overlay and that each of their friends become members of this overlay. The overlay will consist of a secured DHT, where only writes made by the overlay owner are valid and only members of the overlay have access to the content stored in it. In addition to bootstrapping the private overlays, the public overlay would be used as a directory for users to find and befriend each other. For fault tolerance and scalability, each user provides a copy of their profile locally, which will be distributed amongst the private overlay in a read-only DHT, therefore, allowing the user's profile to be visible whether they are offline or online. Each user's social network would then consist of the accumulation of the individual private overlays and the public overlay.

C. P2P VPNs

Private overlays enable P2P VPNs. The most common type of VPNs are centralized VPNs like OpenVPN, which requires that a centralized set of resources handle session initialization and communication. Another approach taken by Hamachi and many others is to maintain a central server for session initialization but allow communication to occur directly between peers and providing a central relay when NAT traversal fails. Using a structured private overlay allows users to host their own VPNs, where each VPN end points is responsible for its own session initialization and communication. The private overlay also provides mechanisms for handling failed NAT traversal attempts via relaying.

D. Multicast

The topic of secure multicast has been a focus of much research. Using an approach similar to CAN [34], a virtual private overlay forms a ring where all nodes are members of the multicast group with the additional feature that you can trust that your audience is limited to those in the overlay. The main advantage of such multicasting technologies would be for wide-area, distributed multicast. Examples of such services include light weight multicast DNS / DNS-SD (service discovery), as well as audio and video streaming.

V. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS AND EVALUATION

In this section, we describe our prototype implementation of a secure, private overlay followed by evaluation to quantify network overheads.

| | Description | Reflection | Rendezvous | Relay |
|--------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| BitTorrent | Basic BitTorrent systems rely on a centralized tracker to provide the initial bootstrapping. At which point, the peers no longer require use of the tracker, but it can be used to monitor the state of the file distribution and ensure good distribution of file providers, seeds. BitTorrent specifies a protocol, though each client may support additional features not covered by the protocol. | In general, the current specification does not support NAT traversal, though future versions may potentially use UDP NAT traversal. At which point, BitTorrent may support a reflection service. | | |
| Gnutella | Gnutella is a large-scale unstructured overlay, consisting of over a million active peers. Gnutella's is primarily used for file sharing. Skypes general make up consists of a couple thousand super, ultra, peers to provide reliability to the overlay. Gnutella is free-to-join and requires no registration to use. | Work in progress. Peers attempt to connect to a sharers resource, though a "Push" notification reverses this behavior. Thus a peer behind a NAT can share with a peer on a public address. | Peers can perform broadcast searches with TTL up to 2, when networks consist of millions of peers, small overlays will most likely not be able to discover each other. | Not explicitly, could potentially utilize ping messages to exchange messages. |
| Skype | Skype is a large-scale unstructured overlay, consisting of over a million active peers. Skype is primarily used for voice over P2P communication. Skype, like Gnutella, also has super peers, though the owners of Skype provides authentication and bootstrap servers. Though Skype is free-to-join, it requires registration to use. | Skype APIs provide no means for reflection. | Skype allows extensions through applications. It is possible for peers to broadcast queries to each other, transparently from the user, to determine if a given user has an application installed. Thus Skype does support rendezvous. | Skype applications are allowed to route messages via the Skype overlay, but because Skype lacks reflection, all communication must traverse the Skype overlay. |
| XMPP | XMPP consists of a federation of distributed servers. Peers must register an account with server, though registration can be done through XMPP APIs without user interaction. XMPP is not a traditional P2P system, though it has some P2P features. XMPP servers allow peers on distinct XMPP servers to communicate with each other. The links between servers are created based upon client demand. The links are trusted due to a certificate provided, when the server joins the XMPP federation. | While not provided by all XMPP servers, there exist extensions for NAT traversal. GoogleTalk, for example, provides both STUN and TURN servers. | Similar to Skype, XMPP friends can broadcast queries to each other to find other peers using the same P2P service. Thus XMPP supports rendezvous. | The XMPP specification allows peers to exchange arbitrary out of band communication with each other. Most servers support this behavior, even when sent across the federation. Thus XMPP supports relaying. |
| Kademlia [8] | There exists two popular Kademlia systems, one used by many BitTorrent systems and the other used by Gnutella, called Mojito. Kademlia implements an iterative structured overlays, where peers query each other directly when searching the overlay. Thus all resources of a Kademlia overlay must be publicly addressable. | Existing implementations of Kademlia does not support mechanisms for peers to determine their network identity. | Peers can use the DHT as a rendezvous service, storing their connectivity information in the DHT at key location: $hash(SERVICE)$. | An iterative structured overlay has no support for relaying messages. |
| OpenDHT [29] | OpenDHT was until recently a freely available DHT running on PlanetLab, though it was recently decommissioned. OpenDHT is built using Bamboo, a Pastry-like protocol [5]. Pastry implements recursive routing, where peers in the overlay forward messages for each other from source to destination. | Existing implementations of Bamboo and Pastry do not support mechanisms for peers to determine their network identity. Though this is ongoing work. | Peers can use the DHT as a rendezvous service, storing their connectivity information in the DHT at key location: $hash(SERVICE)$. | Because Pastry uses recursive routing, it can be used as a relay. Furthermore, extensions to Pastry have enabled explicit relays called virtual connections [30]. |
| Brunet [2] | Brunet like OpenDHT is a freely available DHT running on PlanetLab, though still in active development. Brunet creates a Symphony [7] overlay using recursive routing. | Brunet supports inherent reflection services, when a peer forms a connection with a remote peer, the peers exchange their view of the relationship. | Peers can use the DHT as a rendezvous service, storing their connectivity information in the DHT at key location: $hash(SERVICE)$. | Like Pastry, Brunet supports recursive routing and even supports explicit relays called tunnels [31]. |

TABLE I

VI. CONCLUSION

REFERENCES

- [1]
- [2] P. O. Boykin and et al., "A symphony conducted by brunet," <http://arxiv.org/abs/0709.4048>, 2007.
- [3]
- [4]
- [5] A. Rowstron and P. Druschel, "Pastry: Scalable, decentralized object location and routing for large-scale peer-to-peer systems," in *IFIP/ACM International Conference on Distributed Systems Platforms (Middleware)*, November 2001.
- [6] I. Stoica and et al., "Chord: A scalable Peer-To-Peer lookup service for internet applications," in *SIGCOMM*, 2001.
- [7] G. S. Manku, M. Bawa, and P. Raghavan, "Symphony: distributed hashing in a small world," in *USITS*, 2003.
- [8] P. Maymounkov and D. Mazières, "Kademlia: A peer-to-peer information system based on the XOR metric," in *IPTPS '02*, 2002.
- [9] S. Ratnasamy, P. Francis, S. Shenker, and M. Handley, "A scalable content-addressable network," in *In Proceedings of ACM SIGCOMM*,

2001.

- [10]
- [11] A. Rowstron and P. Druschel, "Storage management and caching in PAST, a large-scale, persistent peer-to-peer storage utility," in *18th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP'01)*, October 2001.
- [12] A. R. Butt, T. A. Johnson, Y. Zheng, and Y. C. Hu, "Kosha: A peer-to-peer enhancement for the network file system," in *IEEE/ACM Supercomputing*, 2004.
- [13] G. DeCandia, D. Hastorun, M. Jampani, G. Kakulapati, A. Lakshman, A. Pilchin, S. Sivasubramanian, P. Voshall, and W. Vogels, "Dynamo: amazon's highly available key-value store," in *SOSP '07: Proceedings of twenty-first ACM SIGOPS symposium on Operating systems principles*. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2007, pp. 205–220.
- [14]
- [15] LogMeIn. (2009) Hamachi. <https://secure.logmein.com/products/hamachi2/>.
- [16] J. Rosenberg, J. Weinberger, C. Huitema, and R. Mahy. (2003) Stun - simple traversal of user datagram protocol (udp) through network address translators (nats).
- [17] P. Srisuresh, B. Ford, and D. Kegel, *RFC 5128 State of Peer-to-Peer (P2P) Communication across Network Address Translators (NATs)*, March 2008.
- [18]
- [19] J. Rosenberg, "Interactive connectivity establishment (ICE): A protocol for network address translator (NAT) traversal for offer/answer protocols," <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-mmusic-ice-19>, October 2008.
- [20] S. Guha and P. Francis, "Characterization and measurement of tcp traversal through nats and firewalls," in *IMC '05: Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet Measurement*. Berkeley, CA, USA: USENIX Association, 2005, pp. 18–18.
- [21] J. Rosenberg, R. Mahy, and P. Matthews. (2009) "traversal using relays around nat (turn)". <http://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-behave-turn-16>.
- [22]
- [23] H. Damfling. (2003) Gnutella web caching system. <http://www.gnucleus.com/gwebcache/specs.html>.
- [24] C. GauthierDickey and C. Grothoff, "Bootstrapping of peer-to-peer networks," 2008.
- [25] C. Cramer, K. Kutzner, and T. Fuhrmann, "Bootstrapping locality-aware p2p networks," in *in: The IEEE International Conference on Networks (ICON)*, 2004.
- [26] M. Knoll, A. Wacker, G. Schiele, and T. Weis, "Bootstrapping in peer-to-peer systems," 2008.
- [27] M. Castro, P. Druschel, A.-M. Kermarrec, and A. Rowstron, "One ring to rule them all: Service discover and binding in structured peer-to-peer overlay networks," in *SIGOPS European Workshop*, Sep. 2002.
- [28] M. Conrad and H.-J. Hof, "A generic, self-organizing, and distributed bootstrap service for peer-to-peer networks," in *International Workshop on Self-Organizing Systems (IWSOS)*, 2007.
- [29] S. Rhea, B. Godfrey, B. Karp, J. Kubiatowicz, S. Ratnasamy, S. Shenker, I. Stoica, and H. Yu, "Opendht: a public dht service and its uses," in *SIGCOMM '05: Proceedings of the 2005 conference on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications*, 2005.
- [30] A. Mislove, A. Post, A. Haeberlen, and P. Druschel, "Experiences in building and operating epost, a reliable peer-to-peer application," in *EuroSys '06: Proceedings of the 1st ACM SIGOPS/EuroSys European Conference on Computer Systems 2006*, 2006.
- [31] A. Ganguly and et al., "Improving peer connectivity in wide-area overlays of virtual workstations," in *HPDC*, 6 2008.
- [32] J. Oikarinen and D. Reed. (1993, May) RFC 1459 internet relay chat protocol.
- [33] C. Kalt. (2000, April) RFC 2810 internet relay chat: Architecture.
- [34] S. Ratnasamy, M. Handley, R. M. Karp, and S. Shenker, "Application-level multicast using content-addressable networks," in *NGC '01: Proceedings of the Third International COST264 Workshop on Networked Group Communication*, 2001.