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Logistics

• HW1 is due today!

• HW2 has been released.
  • you should be able to solve the first question already.
  • you should be able to solve Q2 and Q3 after today’s class (hopefully), and the remaining questions by the end of this week.

• Midterm 1 next week!
Today’s agenda

• Leader Election
  • Chapter 15.3

• Goal:
  • What is leader election in distributed systems?
  • How do we elect a leader?
  • To what extent can we handle failures when electing a leader?
Examples of leader election?

- The root server in a group of NTP servers.
- The master in Berkeley algorithm for clock synchronization.
- In the sequencer-based algorithm for total ordering of multicasts, the “sequencer” = leader.
- The central server in the “central server algorithm” for mutual exclusion.
- Other systems that need leader election: Apache Zookeeper, Google’s Chubby.
Why Election?

• Example: Your Bank account details are replicated at a few servers, but one of these servers is responsible for receiving all reads and writes, i.e., it is the leader among the replicas
  • What if servers disagree about who the leader is?
  • What if there are two leaders per customer?
  • What if the leader crashes?

  *Each of the above scenarios leads to inconsistency*
Leader Election Problem

• In a group of processes, elect a Leader to undertake special tasks
  • And let everyone know in the group about this Leader

• What happens when a leader fails (crashes)
  • Some process detects this (using a Failure Detector!)
  • Then what?

• Focus of this lecture: Election algorithm. Its goal:
  1. Elect one leader only among the non-faulty processes
  2. All non-faulty processes agree on who is the leader
Calling for an Election

- Any process can call for an election.
- A process can call for at most one election at a time.
- Multiple processes are allowed to call an election simultaneously.
  - All of them together must yield only a single leader
- The result of an election should not depend on which process calls for it.
Election Problem, Formally

- A run of the election algorithm must always guarantee:
  - **Safety**: For all non-faulty processes $p$:
    - $p$ has elected:
      - $(q$: a particular non-faulty process with the best attribute value$)$
      - or Null
  - **Liveness**: For all election runs:
    - election run terminates
    - & for all non-faulty processes $p$: $p$'s elected is not Null

- At the end of the election protocol, the non-faulty process with the best (highest) election attribute value is elected.
  - Common attribute: leader has highest id
  - Other attribute examples: leader has highest IP address, or fastest cpu, or most disk space, or most number of files, etc.
System Model

- $N$ processes.
- Messages are eventually delivered.
- Failures may occur during the election protocol.
- **Each process has a unique id.**
  - Each process has a unique attribute (based on which Leader is elected).
  - If two processes have the same attribute, combine the attribute with the process id to break ties.
Classical Election Algorithms

• Ring election algorithm

• Bully algorithm
Classical Election Algorithms

- Ring election algorithm
- Bully algorithm
Ring Election Algorithm

- $N$ processes are organized in a logical ring
- All messages are sent clockwise around the ring.
Ring Election Protocol (basic version)

• When Pi start election
  • send election message with Pi’s \(<\text{attr}_i, i>\) to ring successor.

• When Pj receives message (election, \(<\text{attr}_x, x>\)) from predecessor
  • If \((\text{attr}_x, x) > (\text{attr}_j, j)\):
    • forward message (election, \(<\text{attr}_x, x>\)) to successor
  • If \((\text{attr}_x, x) < (\text{attr}_j, j)\)
    • send (election, \(<\text{attr}_j, j>\)) to successor
  • If \((\text{attr}_x, x) = (\text{attr}_j, j)\): Pj is the elected leader (why?)
    • send elected message containing Pj’s id.

• elected message forwarded along the ring until it reaches the leader.
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader
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Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Initiates the election

Election: 32
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Election: 32

Initiates the election

N12
N6
N80
N3
N32
N5
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Election: 80

Initiates the election
Ring Election: Example

Election: 80
Initiates the election

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader
Ring Election: Example

Initiates the election

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Elected: 80

Initiates the election
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Initiates the election

N12 —> N3 —> N6 —> N32 —> N80 —> N5

N6

N3

N32

N80

N5

N12

Elected: 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

Initiates the election

N6 —> N3 —> N32 —> N80 —> N5 —> N12
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

Initiates the election

N12

N32

N6

N80

N3

N5

elected = 80

Elected: 80
Ring Election: Example

Goal: Elect highest id process as leader

N12
N3
N6
N80
N32
N5

Initiates the election

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80

elected = 80
Ring Election Protocol (basic version)

- When Pi starts election
  - send **election** message with Pi’s `<attr_i, i>` to ring successor.
- When Pj receives message (**election**, `<attr_x, x>`) from predecessor
  - If `(attr_x, x) > (attr_j, j)`:
    - forward message (**election**, `<attr_x, x>`) to successor
  - If `(attr_x, x) < (attr_j, j)`
    - send (**election**, `<attr_j, j>`) to successor
  - If `(attr_x, x) = (attr_j, j)`: Pj is the elected leader (why?)
    - send **elected** message containing Pj’s id.
- **elected** message forwarded along the ring until it reaches the leader.

What happens when multiple processes call for an election?
Ring Election: Example

Election: 80 sent twice.
Elected: 80 also sent twice.
Ring Election Protocol [Chang & Roberts’79]

- When Pi start election
  - send `election` message with Pi’s `<attr_i, i>` to ring successor.
  - set state to participating
- When Pj receives message `(election, <attr_x, x>)` from predecessor
  - If `(attr_x, x) > (attr_j, j)`:  
    - forward message `(election, <attr_x, x>)` to successor
    - set state to participating
  - If `(attr_x, x) < (attr_j, j)`
    - If (not participating):
      - send `(election, <attr_j, j>)` to successor
      - set state to participating
  - If `(attr_x, x) = (attr_j, j)`: Pj is the elected leader (why?)
    - send `elected` message containing Pj’s id.
- `elected` message forwarded along the ring until it reaches the leader.
  - Set state to `not participating` when an elected message is received.
Ring Election: Example

Election: 80 and Elected: 80
sent only once.
Performance Analysis

- Let’s assume no failures occur during the election protocol itself, and there are $N$ processes.
- Let’s also assume that only one process initiates the algorithm.
- **Bandwidth usage:** Total number of messages sent.
- **Turnaround time:** The number of serialized message transmission times between the initiation and termination of a single run of the algorithm.
Worst-case

Initiates the election

When the initiator is the ring successor of the would-be leader.
Worst-case

- (N-1) messages for Election message to get from N6 to N80.
- N messages for Election message to circulate around ring without message being changed.
- N messages for Elected message to circulate around the ring
- No. of messages: (3N-1)
- Turnaround time: (3N-1) message transmission times
Best-case

Initiates the election

When the initiator is the would-be leader.
Best-case

When the initiator is the would-be leader.

No. of messages: $2N$

Turnaround time: $2N$ message transmission times
Performance Analysis

• Let’s assume no failures occur during the election protocol itself, and there are $N$ processes.
• Let’s also assume that only one process initiates the algorithm
• Bandwidth usage (total number of messages)
  • $O(N)$: Worst case = $3N - 1$; Best case = $2N$.
• $O(N)$ turnaround time.
Performance Analysis

- Let's assume no failures occur during the election protocol itself, and there are $N$ processes.
- When each process initiates the algorithm?
  - $O(N)$ messages in best-case.

  - $N$ election messages generated at the start of the algorithm.
  - Only one survives, and completes a full round.
    - $N-1$ more messages.
  - One round for the elected message
    - $N$ messages.
  - Total: $3N-1$ messages
Performance Analysis

- Let’s assume no failures occur during the election protocol itself, and there are $N$ processes.
- When each process initiates the algorithm?
  - $O(N)$ messages in best-case.
  - $O(N^2)$ in worst-case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>N3</th>
<th>N4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- $N$ election messages generates at the starts of algorithm.
- $N - 1$ survive the next time step.
- $N - 2$ survive the next time step.
- ....
Performance Analysis

- Let’s assume no failures occur during the election protocol itself, and there are \( N \) processes.
- When each process initiates the algorithm?
  - \( O(N) \) messages in best-case.
  - \( O(N^2) \) messages in worst-case.
  - \( O(N) \) turnaround time.
Correctness

• Assuming no process fails.

• Safety:
  • Process with highest attribute elected by all nodes.

• Liveness:
  • Election completes within $3N - 1$ message transmission times.
Handling Failures
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Crash
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Handling failures

• Use the failure detector.

• A process can detect failure of N80 via its own local failure detector:
  • Repair the ring.
  • Stop forwarding Election:80 message.
  • Start a new run of leader election.
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Handling failures

• Use the failure detector.
• A process can detect failure of N80 via its own local failure detector:
  • Repair the ring.
  • Stop forwarding Election:80 message.
  • Start a new run of leader election.
• But failure detectors cannot be both complete and accurate.
  • Incomplete FD => N80’s failure might be missed.
What happens if a process failure is undetected?

Initiates the election

Election: 80

Crash
What happens if a process failure is undetected?

No "elected" message generated.

Crash

Election: 80

Initiates the election

Algorithm does not terminate.

Liveness violated.
Handling failures

• Use the failure detector.

• A process can detect failure of N80 via its own local failure detector:
  • Repair the ring.
  • Stop forwarding Election:80 message.
  • Start a new run of leader election.

• But failure detectors cannot be both complete and accurate.
  • Incomplete FD => N80’s failure might be missed
    • violation of liveness.
  • Inaccurate FD => N80 mistakenly detected as failed
What can happen if an alive process is detected as failed?
What can happen if an alive process is detected as failed?
What can happen if an alive process is detected as failed?
What can happen if an alive process is detected as failed?
What can happen if an alive process is detected as failed?

Safety has been violated.
Fixing for failures

• Use the failure detector.

• A process can detect failure of N80 via its own local failure detector:
  • Repair the ring.
  • Stop forwarding Election:80 message.
  • Start a new run of leader election.

• But failure detectors cannot be both complete and accurate.
  • Incomplete FD => N80’s failure might be missed
    • violation of liveness.
  • Inaccurate FD => N80 mistakenly detected as failed
    • new ring will be constructed without N80.
    • a process with lower attribute will be selected.
    • violation of safety.
Classical Election Algorithms

• Ring election algorithm

• Bully algorithm
Bully algorithm

• Faster turnaround time than ring election.

• Explicitly build in the notion of timeouts into the algorithm.

• Let’s assume (for simplicity of exposition) that the attribute based on which leader is elected is the process id.

• Before discussing Bully algorithm, let’s first discuss a simpler (related) algorithm…..
Multicast-based algorithm

• Start an election
  • Multicast <election, my ID> to all processes
  • If receive <agree> from all processes, then elected
    • Multicast <coordinator, my ID>
  • If receive <disagree> from any process
    • Give up election

• Receive <election, ID> from process p
  • If ID > my ID
    • Send <agree> to p (unicast)
  • If ID < my ID
    • Send <disagree> to p
    • Start election (if not already running)

• What about failures?
Multicast-based algorithm

- Start an election
  - Multicast <election, my ID> to all processes
  - If receive <agree> from all processes or timeout, then elected
    - Multicast <coordinator, my ID>
  - If receive <disagree> from any process
    - Give up election

- Receive <election, ID> from process p
  - If ID > my ID
    - Send <agree> to p (unicast)
  - If ID < my ID
    - Send <disagree> to p
    - Start election (if not already running)

- Can we improve on this?
Multicast-based algorithm

• Start an election
  • Multicast <election, my ID> to all processes
  • If receive <agree> from all processes or timeout, then elected
    • Multicast <coordinator, my ID>
  • If receive <disagree> from any process
    • Give up election

• Receive <election, ID> from process p
  • If ID > my ID
    • Send <agree> to p (unicast)
  • If ID < my ID
    • Send <disagree> to p
    • Start election (if not already running)

• Can we improve on this?
Bully Algorithm

- All processes know other process’ ids.
- Do not need to multicast election to all processes.
- Only to processes with higher id.
Bully Algorithm

• When a process wants to initiate an election
  • if it knows its id is the highest
    • it elects itself as coordinator, then sends a Coordinator message to all processes with lower identifiers. Election is completed.
  • else
    • it initiates an election by sending an Election message
    • (contd.)
Bully Algorithm (2)

• **else** it initiates an election by sending an `Election` message
  • Sends it to only processes that have a higher id than itself.
  • **if** receives no answer within timeout, calls itself leader and sends `Coordinator` message to all lower id processes. Election completed.
  • **if** an answer received however, then there is some non-faulty higher process => so, wait for coordinator message. If none received after another timeout, start a new election run.

• A process that receives an `Election` message replies with `disagree` message, and starts its own leader election protocol (unless it has already done so).
Bully Algorithm: Example

P2 initiates election after detecting P5's failure.

1. P2 initiates election

2. P2 receives "replies

3. P3 & P4 initiate election

4. P3 receives reply

5. P4 receives no reply

5. P4 announces itself

What if P4 fails after step 3?
Bully Algorithm: Example

P2 initiates election after detecting P5’s failure.

1. P2 initiates election
2. P2 receives "replies"
3. P3 & P4 initiate election
4. P3 receives reply
5. P4 receives no reply
5. P4 announces itself

What if P4 fails after step 4?
• **else** it initiates an election by sending an *Election* message
  • Sends it to only processes that have a *higher id than itself*.
  • **if** receives no answer within *timeout*, calls itself leader and sends *Coordinator* message to all lower id processes. Election completed.
  • **if** an answer received however, then there is some non-faulty higher process => so, wait for coordinator message. If none received after another *timeout*, start a new election run.

• A process that receives an *Election* message replies with *disagree* message, and starts its own leader election protocol (unless it has already done so).
Timeout values

• Assume the one-way message transmission time (T) is known.

• First timeout value (when the process that has initiated election waits for the first response)
  • Must be set as accurately as possible.
    • If it is too small, a lower id process can declare itself to be the coordinator even when a higher id process is alive.
  • What should be the first timeout value be, given the above assumption?
    • $2T + \text{(processing time)} \approx 2T$

• When the second timeout happens (after ‘disagree’ message), election is re-started.
  • A very small value will lead to extra “Election” messages.
  • A suitable option is to use the worst-case turnaround time.
Performance Analysis

• Best-case
  • Second-highest id detects leader failure
    • Highest remaining id initiates election.
  • Sends \((N-2)\) Coordinator messages
  • Turnaround time: 1 message transmission time \(T\)

• Worst-case: For simplicity, assume no failures after a process calls for election.
  • Turnaround time: 4 message transmission times \((4T)\)
    • if any lower id process detects failure and starts election.
Bully Algorithm: Example

1. P2 initiates election

2. P2 receives "replies"

3. P3 & P4 initiate election

4. P3 receives reply

5. P4 receives no reply

5. P4 announces itself

P4 waits for T more time after P2 receives its "disagree" message.

P2 initiates election after detecting P5’s failure.
Analysis

• Best-case
  • Second-highest id detects leader failure
    • Highest remaining id initiates election.
  • Sends (N-2) Coordinator messages
  • Turnaround time: 1 message transmission time

• Worst-case: For simplicity, assume no failures after a process calls for election.
  • Turnaround time: 4 message transmission times
    • if any lower id process detects failure and starts election.
  • Election + (disagree & Election) + (Timeout – T) + Coordinator
  • When the process with the lowest id in the system detects failure.
    • (N-1) processes altogether begin elections, each sending messages to processes with higher ids.
    • i-th highest id process sends (i-1) election messages
    • Number of Election messages
      \[= N-1 + N-2 + … + 1 = (N-1)\times\frac{N}{2} = O(N^2)\]
Correctness

• In synchronous system model:
  • Set timeout accurately using known bounds on network delays and processing times.
  • Satisfies safety and liveness.

• In asynchronous system model:
  • Failure detectors cannot be both accurate and complete.
  • Either liveness and safety is violated.
Why is Election so hard?

• Because it is related to the consensus problem!

• If we could solve election, then we could solve consensus!
  • Elect a process, use its id’s last bit as the consensus decision.

• But (as we will see in next class) consensus is impossible in asynchronous systems, so is election!
Summary

• Leader election is an important problem in distributed system.
  • Crucial for implementing any centralized algorithm.

• Two classical algorithms:
  • Ring election algorithm and Bully algorithm

• Hard to guarantee correctness in an asynchronous system with failures.