Distributed Systems

CS425/ECE428

April 7 2022

Instructor: Radhika Mittal

Acknowledgements for the materials: Indy Gupta, Nikita Borisov, Spanner authors

Logistics

- MP3 has been released

Distributed Transactions

- Transaction processing can be *distributed* across multiple servers.
  - Different objects can be stored on different servers.
  - An object may be replicated across multiple servers.
- Case study: Google's Spanner System
  - Our focus today

Spanner: Google's Globally-Distributed Database

- First three lines from the paper:
  - Spanner is a scalable, globally-distributed database designed, built, and deployed at Google.
  - At the highest level of abstraction, it is a database that shards data across many sets of Paxos state machines in datacenters spread all over the world.
  - Replication is used for global availability and geographic locality; clients automatically failover between replicas.

Spanner: Google's Globally-Distributed Database

Wilson Hsieh

representing a host of authors

OSDI 2012

Google™

What is Spanner?

- Distributed multiversion database
  - General-purpose transactions (ACID)
  - SQL query language
  - Schematized tables
  - Semi-relational data model
- Running in production
  - Storage for Google's ad data
  - Replaced a sharded MySQL database

Example: Social Network



Overview

- Feature: Lock-free distributed read transactions
- Property: External consistency of distributed transactions
  - First system at global scale
- Implementation: Integration of concurrency control, replication, and 2PC
  - Correctness and performance
- Enabling technology: TrueTime
  - Interval-based global time

Read Transactions

- Generate a page of friends' recent posts
  - Consistent view of friend list and their posts

Why consistency matters

1. Remove untrustworthy person X as friend
2. Post P: "My government is repressive…"

Single Machine



Multiple Machines



Multiple Datacenters



Version Management

- Transactions that write use strict 2PL
  - Each transaction *T* is assigned a timestamp *s*
  - Data written by *T* is timestamped with *s*

Time	<8	8	15
My friends	[X]	[]	
My posts			[P]
X's friends	[me]	[]	

Synchronizing Snapshots

Global wall-clock time

==

External Consistency:

Commit order respects global wall-time order

==

Timestamp order respects global wall-time order

given

timestamp order == commit order

Timestamps, Global Clock

- Strict two-phase locking for write transactions
- Assign timestamp while locks are held



Timestamp Invariants

- Timestamp order == commit order



- Timestamp order respects global wall-time order



TrueTime

- "Global wall-clock time" with bounded uncertainty



Timestamps and TrueTime



Commit Wait and Replication



Commit Wait and 2-Phase Commit



Example



Time	<8	8	15
My friends	[X]	[]	
My posts			[P]
X's friends	[me]	[]	

What Have We Covered?

- Lock-free read transactions across datacenters
- External consistency
- Timestamp assignment
- TrueTime
  - Uncertainty in time can be waited out

What Haven't We Covered?

- How to read at the present time
- Atomic schema changes
  - Mostly non-blocking
  - Commit in the future
- Non-blocking reads in the past
  - At any sufficiently up-to-date replica

TrueTime Architecture



Compute reference [earliest, latest] = now ± ε

TrueTime implementation

now = reference now + local-clock offset

ε = reference ε + worst-case local-clock drift



What If a Clock Goes Rogue?

- Timestamp assignment would violate external consistency
- Empirically unlikely based on 1 year of data
  - Bad CPUs 6 times more likely than bad clocks

Network-Induced Uncertainty



What's in the Literature

- External consistency/linearizability
- Distributed databases
- Concurrency control
- Replication
- Time (NTP, Marzullo)

Future Work

- Improving TrueTime
  - Lower $\varepsilon < 1$ ms
- Building out database features
  - Finish implementing basic features
  - Efficiently support rich query patterns

Conclusions

- Reify clock uncertainty in time APIs
  - Known unknowns are better than unknown unknowns
  - Rethink algorithms to make use of uncertainty
- Stronger semantics are achievable
  - Greater scale != weaker semantics

Thanks

- To the Spanner team and customers
- To our shepherd and reviewers
- To lots of Googlers for feedback
- To you for listening!

- Questions?

MP3: Distributed Transactions

- https://courses.grainger.illinois.edu/ece428/sp2022/mps/mp3.html
- Lead TA: Jiangran Wang

- Task:
  - Build a distributed transaction system that satisfies ACI properties (you do not need to handle Durability).

- Objective:
  - Think through and implement algorithms for achieving atomicity and consistency with distributed transactions (two-phase commit), concurrency control (two-phase locking / timestamped ordering), deadlock detection.

MP3: Distributed Transactions



sample config_file

```
A sp21-cs425-g01-01.cs.illinois.edu 1234
B sp21-cs425-g01-02.cs.illinois.edu 1234
C sp21-cs425-g01-03.cs.illinois.edu 1234
D sp21-cs425-g01-04.cs.illinois.edu 1234
E sp21-cs425-g01-05.cs.illinois.edu 1234
```

Use this information to establish communication across servers.

MP3: Distributed Transactions



sample config_file

```
A sp21-cs425-g01-01.cs.illinois.edu 1234
B sp21-cs425-g01-02.cs.illinois.edu 1234
C sp21-cs425-g01-03.cs.illinois.edu 1234
D sp21-cs425-g01-04.cs.illinois.edu 1234
E sp21-cs425-g01-05.cs.illinois.edu 1234
```



MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

< BEGIN //start a new transaction

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

For each transaction, client randomly chooses a server to act as coordinator. Only communicates with the coordinator

< BEGIN //start a new transaction
> OK
< DEPOSIT A.foo 10 //deposit 10 units in account foo at branch A

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

```
< BEGIN //start a new transaction
> OK
< DEPOSIT A.foo 10 //deposit 10 units in account foo at branch A
> OK
```

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

```
< BEGIN //start a new transaction
> OK
< DEPOSIT A.foo 10 //deposit 10 units in account foo at branch A
> OK
```

Other possible commands: WITHDRAW and BALANCE (only applicable if the account exists)

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

User enters COMMIT or ABORT to end the transaction.

A server may also choose to ABORT a transaction (e.g. if consistency violated, or if needed for concurrency control).

Changes made by one transaction visible to others only after it successful commits.

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

Required properties:

- Atomicity:
  - all servers commit the entire transaction, or all rollback the entire transaction.
- Consistency:
  - cannot withdraw from or read balance of a non-existent account.
  - a transaction cannot result in a negative account balance.

MP3: Distributed Transactions



Receives user input (command) from stdin.
Prints output of the command to stdout.

Required properties:

- Isolation:
  - multiple clients may concurrently issue commands on the object.
  - Must provide serial equivalence.
- Deadlock avoidance.

MP3: Distributed Transactions

- Due on Thursday, April 28th.
  - Allowed to submit up to 50 hours late, but with 2% penalty for every late hour (rounded up).
- Read the specification fully and carefully.
  - Required semantics discussed more completely there.
- Start early!