Distributed Systems

CS425/ECE428

02/05/2020

Logistics

- Campus cluster access for MP0:
	- All requests sent by last Friday should have received access.
	- Other requests are getting processed.
	- If you have any specific concerns that have not yet been addressed, please see Prof. Borisov after class.
- Please reach out if you require any DRES related accommodations.

Today's agenda

- Wrap up logical clocks
	- Chapter 14.4
- Global states and snapshots
	- Chapter 14.5

Recap from last class: clock synchronization

- Cristian Algorithm
	- Synchronization between a client and a server.
	- Synchronization bound = $(T_{round} / 2)$ min $\leq T_{round} / 2$
- Berkeley Algorithm
	- Internal synchronization between clocks.
	- A central server picks the average time and disseminates offsets.
- Network Time Protocol
	- Hierarchical time synchronization over the Internet.
	- Symmetric mode synchronization for better accuracy.

Event Ordering

- A usecase of synchronized clocks:
	- Reasoning about order of events.
- Can we reason about order of events without synchronized clocks?

Event Ordering

- Easy to order events within a single process p_i , based on their time of occurrence.
- How do we reason about events across processes?
	- A message must be *sent* before it gets *received* at another process.
- These two notions help define *happened-before* (HB) relationship denoted by \rightarrow .
	- e → e' means e *happened before* e'.

Happened-Before Relationship

- *Happened-before* (HB) relationship denoted by →.
	- e → e' means e *happened before* e'.
	- **e** →_i e' means **e** happened before **e**', as observed by p_i .
- HB rules:
	- If $\exists p_i$, $e \rightarrow e'$ then $e \rightarrow e'$.
	- For any message m, send(m) \rightarrow receive(m)
	- If $e \rightarrow e'$ and $e' \rightarrow e''$ then $e \rightarrow e''$
- Also called *"potentially causal"* ordering.

Lamport's Logical Clock

- Logical timestamp for each event that captures the *happened-before* relationship.
- Algorithm: Each process p_i
	- 1. initializes local clock $L_i = 0$.
	- 2. increments L_i before timestamping each event.
	- 3. piggybacks L_i when sending a message.
	- 4. upon receiving a message with clock value t
		- sets $L_i = max(t, L_i)$
		- increments L_i (as per point 2).

Lamport's Logical Clock

- Logical timestamp for each event that captures the *happened-before* relationship.
- If $e \rightarrow e'$ then $L(e) < L(e')$
- What if $L(e) < L(e')$?
	- We cannot say that $e \rightarrow e'$
	- We can say: $e' \nrightarrow e$
	- Either $e \rightarrow e'$ or $e \mid\mid e'$

Logical Timestamps: Example

Vector Clocks

- Each event associated with a vector timestamp.
- Each process maintains vector of clocks V_i
	- V_i[j] is the clock for process p_j
- Algorithm: each process p_i : :
:
	- 1. initializes local clock $V_i[j] = 0$
	- 2. increments V_i[i] before timestamping each event.
	- 3. piggybacks V_i , when sending a message.
	- 4. upon receiving a message with clock value t
		- sets $V_i[j] = max(V_i[j], t[j])$ for all $j = 1...n$.
		- increments $V_i[i]$ (as per point 2).

Vector Timestamps: Example

Vector Timestamps: Example

Comparing Vector Timestamps

• Let
$$
V(e) = V
$$
 and $V(e') = V'$

- $V=V'$, iff $V[i] = V'[i]$, for all $i = 1, ..., n$
- $V \leq V$, iff $V[i] \leq V'[i]$, for all $i = 1, ..., n$
- $V < V'$, iff $V \leq V' \& V \neq V'$

iff $V \leq V' \& \exists j$ such that $(V[j] \leq V'[j])$

- $e \rightarrow e'$ iff $V \leq V'$
	- (V < V' implies $e \rightarrow e'$) and $(e \rightarrow e'$ implies V < V')
- e || e' iff ($V \le V'$ and $V' \le V$)

Vector Timestamps: Example

Vector Timestamps: Example

Timestamps Summary

- Comparing timestamps across events is useful.
	- Reconciling updates made to an object in a distributed datastore.
	- Rollback recovery during failures:

1. Checkpoint state of the system; 2. Log events (with timestamps); 3. Rollback to checkpoint and replay events in order if system crashes.

• How to compare timestamps across different processes?

- Physical timestamp: requires clock synchronization.
	- Google's Spanner Distributed Database uses "TrueTime".
- Lamport's timestamps: cannot fully differentiate between causal and concurrent ordering of events.
	- Oracle uses "System Change Numbers" based on Lamport's clock.
- Vector timestamps: larger message sizes.
	- Amazon's DynamoDB uses vector clocks.

Timestamps Summary

- Comparing timestamps across events is useful.
	- Reconciling updates made to an object in a distributed datastore.
	- Rollback recovery during failures:

1. Checkpoint state of the system; 2. Log events (with timestamps); 3. Rollback to checkpoint and replay events in order if system crashes.

• How to compare timestamps across different processes?

- Physical timestamp: requires clock synchronization.
	- Google's Spanner Distributed Database uses "TrueTime".
- Lamport's timestamps: cannot fully differentiate between causal and concurrent ordering of events.
	- Oracle uses "System Change Numbers" based on Lamport's clock.
- Vector timestamps: larger message sizes.
	- Amazon's DynamoDB uses vector clocks.

Process, state, events

- Consider a system with **n** processes: $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$.
- Each process p_i is associated with *state* s_i .
	- State includes values of all local variables, affected files, etc.
- Each channel can also be associated with a state.
	- Which messages are currently *pending* on the channel.
	- Can be computed from process' state:
		- Record when a process sends and receives messages.
		- if p_i sends a message that p_i has not yet received, it is pending on the channel.
- State of a process (or a channel) gets transformed when an *event* occurs. 3 types of events:
	- local computation, sending a message, receiving a message.

- State of each process (and each channel) in the system at a given instant of time.
- Example:

Capturing a global snapshot

- Useful to capture a global snapshot of the system:
	- *Checkpointing* the system state.
	- Reasoning about unreferenced objects (for garbage collection).
	- Deadlock detection.
	- Distributed debugging.

Capturing a global snapshot

- Difficult to capture a global snapshot of the system.
- Global state or global snapshot is state of each process (and each channel) in the system at a given *instant of time*.
- Strawman:
	- Each process records its state at 3:15pm.
	- We get the global state of the system at 3:15pm.
	- *But precise clock synchronization is difficult to achieve.*
- How do we capture global snapshots without precise time synchronization across processes?

- Consider a system with **n** processes: $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$.
- Each process p_i is associated with *state* s_i .
	- State includes values of all local variables, affected files, etc.
- Each channel can also be associated with a state.
	- Which messages are currently *pending* on the channel.
	- Can be computed from process' state:
		- Record when a process sends and receives messages.
		- if p_i sends a message that p_i has not yet received, it is pending on the channel.
- State of a process (or a channel) gets transformed when an *event* occurs. 3 types of events:
	- local computation, sending a message, receiving a message.

- Consider a system with **n** processes: $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$.
- Each process p_i is associated with *state* s_i .
	- State includes values of all local variables, affected files, etc.
- Each channel can also be associated with a state.
	- Which messages are currently *pending* on the channel.
	- Can be computed from process' state:
		- Record when a process sends and receives messages.
		- if p_i sends a message that p_i has not yet received, it is pending on the channel.
- State of a process (or a channel) gets transformed when an *event* occurs. e_i^j is the jth event at p_i . 3 types of events:
	- local computation, sending a message, receiving a message.

• For a process \mathbf{p}_i , where events \mathbf{e}_i^0 , \mathbf{e}_i^1 , ... occur: history(p_i) = $h_i = \langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ... \rangle$ prefix history(p_i^k) = h_i^k = $\langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ..., e_i^k \rangle$ s_i^k : p_i 's state immediately after k^{th} event. ' • For a set of processes $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$: global history: $H = \cup_i (h_i)$ global state: $S = \cup_i (s_i)$

• For a process \mathbf{p}_i , where events \mathbf{e}_i^0 , \mathbf{e}_i^1 , ... occur: history(p_i) = $h_i = \langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ... \rangle$ prefix history(p_i^k) = h_i^k = $\langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ..., e_i^k \rangle$ s_i^k : p_i^s state immediately after k^{th} event. • For a set of processes $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$: global history: $H = \cup_i (h_i)$ global state: $S = \cup_i (s_i)$ *But state at what time instant?*

• For a process \mathbf{p}_i , where events \mathbf{e}_i^0 , \mathbf{e}_i^1 , ... occur: history(p_i) = $h_i = \langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ... \rangle$ prefix history(p_i^k) = h_i^k = $\langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ..., e_i^k \rangle$ s_i^k : p_i 's state immediately after k^{th} event. • For a set of processes $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$: global history: $H = \cup_i (h_i)$ global state: $S = \cup_i (s_i^k i)$ a cut $C \subseteq H = h_1^c \cup h_2^c \cup ... \cup h_n^c$ the frontier of $C = \{e_i^{c_i}, i = 1, 2, ... n\}$ global state S that corresponds to cut $C = \cup_i (s_i^c)$

Example: Cut

• For a process \mathbf{p}_i , where events \mathbf{e}_i^0 , \mathbf{e}_i^1 , ... occur: history(p_i) = $h_i = \langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ... \rangle$ prefix history(p_i^k) = h_i^k = $\langle e_i^0, e_i^1, ..., e_i^k \rangle$ s_i^k : p_i 's state immediately after k^{th} event. • For a set of processes $\langle p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n \rangle$: global history: $H = \cup_i (h_i)$ global state: $S = \cup_i (s_i^k i)$ a cut $C \subseteq H = h_1^c \cup h_2^c \cup ... \cup h_n^c$ the frontier of $C = \{e_i^{c_i}, i = 1, 2, ... n\}$ global state S that corresponds to cut $C = \cup_i (s_i^c)$

Consistent cuts and snapshots

• A cut C is **consistent** if and only if $\forall e \in C$ (if $f \rightarrow e$ then $f \in C$)

Example: Cut

$$
C_{A}: < e_{1}^{0}, e_{2}^{0} > \quad \text{Frontier of } C_{A}: \{e_{1}^{0}, e_{2}^{0}\} \quad \text{Inconsistent cut.}
$$

 C_B : $\le e_1^0$, e_1^1 , e_1^2 , e_2^0 , e_2^1 e_2^2 > Frontier of C_B : { e_1^2 , e_2^2 } Consistent cut.

Consistent cuts and snapshots

- A cut C is **consistent** if and only if $\forall e \in C$ (if $f \rightarrow e$ then $f \in C$)
	- A global state S is consistent if and only if it corresponds to a consistent cut.

Example: Cut

$$
C_{A}: < e_{1}^{0}, e_{2}^{0} > \quad \text{Frontier of } C_{A}: \{e_{1}^{0}, e_{2}^{0}\} \quad \text{Inconsistent cut.}
$$

 C_B : $\le e_1^0$, e_1^1 , e_1^2 , e_2^0 , e_2^1 e_2^2 > Frontier of C_B : { e_1^2 , e_2^2 } Consistent cut.

Consistent cuts and snapshots

- A cut C is **consistent** if and only if $\forall e \in C$ (if $f \rightarrow e$ then $f \in C$)
	- A global state S is consistent if and only if it corresponds to a consistent cut.
	- *How do we find consistent global states?*

- Goal:
	- Record a global snapshot
		- Set of process state (and channel state) for a set of processes.
	- The recorded global state is consistent.
- Identifies a consistent cut.
- Records corresponding state locally at each process.

- *System model and assumptions:*
	- System of **n** processes: $\leq p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$.
	- There are two uni-directional communication channels between each ordered process pair : p_i to p_i and p_i to p_i . .
	- Communication channels are FIFO-ordered (first in first out).
	- All messages arrive intact, and are not duplicated.
	- No failures: neither channel nor processes fail.
- *Requirements:*
	- Snapshot should not interfere with normal application actions, and it should not require application to stop sending messages.
	- Any process may initiate algorithm.

- First, initiator p_i : :
:
	- records its own state.
	- creates a special **marker** message.
	- sends the **marker** to all other process.

- When a process receives a marker.
	- records its own state.

- First, initiator p_i : :
:
	- records its own state.
	- creates a special **marker** message.
	- sends the **marker** to all other process.
	- start recording messages received on other channels.
- When a process receives a marker.
	- records its own state.

Cut frontier: $\{e_1^2, e_2^2\}$

Cut frontier: $\{e_1^2, e_2^2\}$

- First, initiator p_i : :
:
	- records its own state.
	- creates a special **marker** message.
	- sends the **marker** to all other process.
	- start recording messages received on other channels.
		- until a marker is received on a channel.
- When a process receives a marker.
	- If marker is received for the first time.
		- records its own state.
		- sends marker on all other channels.
		- start recording messages received on other channels.
			- until a marker is received on a channel.

- First, initiator p_i : :
:
	- records its own state.
	- creates a special **marker** message.
	- for *j=1 to n* except *i*
		- **p**_i sends a marker message on outgoing channel c_{ij}
		- starts recording the incoming messages on each of the incoming channels at $\mathbf{p}_i : \mathbf{c}_{ii}$ (for $j=1$ to *n* except *i*).

Whenever a process \mathbf{p}_i receives a **marker** message on an incoming channel c_{ki}

- if (this is the first **marker** p_i is seeing)
	- p_i records its own state first
	- marks the state of channel c_{ki} as "empty"
	- \bullet for $|=1$ to n except i
		- p_i sends out a marker message on outgoing channel c_{ii}
	- starts recording the incoming messages on each of the incoming channels at \mathbf{p}_i : \mathbf{c}_{ij} (for $j=1$ to *n* except *i* and *k*).
- else // already seen a marker message
	- mark the state of channel c_{ki} as all the messages that have arrived on it since recording was turned on for c_{ki}

The algorithm terminates when

- All processes have received a marker
	- To record their own state
- All processes have received a marker on all the (*n-1*) incoming channels
	- To record the state of all channels

Summary

- The ability to calculate global snapshots in a distributed system is very important.
- But don't want to interrupt running distributed application.
- Chandy-Lamport algorithm calculates global snapshot.
- Obeys causality (creates a consistent cut).