

# **CSE 5306 - Distributed Systems**

## **Programming Assignment 3**

### **Making Your Systems Fault Tolerant via 2PC & Raft**

#### **Team Information – Group 13**

##### **Student 1:**

Name: Srinivasa Sai Abhijit Challapalli

Student ID: 1002059486

Email: sxc9486@mavs.uta.edu

##### **Student 2:**

Name: Namburi Chaitanya Krishna

Student ID: 1002232417

Email: cxn2417@mavs.uta.edu

##### **GitHub Repository:**

<https://github.com/AbhijitChallapalli/CSE-5306-DS-PA3>

##### **Instructor:**

Dr. Jiayi Meng

# **Table of Contents:**

1. Test Cases and Results (Q5)
2. Project Overview
3. Two-Phase Commit Implementation (Q1, Q2)
4. Raft Implementation (Q3, Q4)
5. Technologies Used
6. Challenges and Solutions
7. Conclusion
8. References
9. Team Contributions

# 1. Test Cases and Results (Q5)

This section presents five comprehensive test cases designed for validating the Raft consensus implementation in the distributed polling system.

## Running Test Scenarios

In a separate terminal, run the comprehensive test suite:

Change directories:

```
cd CSE-5306-DS-PA3
```

```
cd RAFT_Voting_System
```

```
cd raft_integration
```

```
python3 test_raft_scenarios.py
```

## Test Case 1: Leader Discovery & Poll Creation via Any Node

### Objective

Validate that clients can contact any node in the cluster, and the system correctly forwards requests to the leader for write operations.

### Test Description

- A client sends a CreatePoll request to Node 1 (which is a follower)
- Node 1 should detect it is not the leader
- Node 1 should forward the request to the current leader (Node 5)
- The leader processes the request and replicates it to all followers
- The poll is successfully created and replicated across all nodes

### Expected Behavior

- Client contacts follower node
- Follower identifies current leader
- Follower forwards CreatePoll request to leader
- Leader appends entry to log and replicates via AppendEntries RPCs
- After majority acknowledgment, leader commits the entry
- Poll is successfully created with a UUID

### Test Output

```
TEST 1: Raft - Leader Discovery & Poll Creation via Any Node
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Trying Node 1 (CreatePoll)...
✓ SUCCESS on Node 1!
  Poll UUID: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
✓ TEST 1 PASSED
```

```
chaithu@MacBookAir raft_integration % python3 test_raft_scenarios.py

#####
#                                     #
#       Raft Scenario Tests for Polling System       #
#                                     #
#####

🕒 Waiting for cluster to stabilize (10 seconds)...

=====
TEST 1: Raft – Leader Discovery & Poll Creation via Any Node
=====

=====
Raft Scenario: Create Poll via Any Node (Leader or Follower)
=====

Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Options: ['Raft', 'Paxos', 'Zab', 'Viewstamped Replication']

Trying Node 1 (CreatePoll)...
✓ SUCCESS on Node 1!
Poll UUID: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
Status: open
Created: 2025-11-24 02:46:27

...

✓ TEST 1 PASSED: Poll created with UUID 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
```

## Test Case 2: Log Replication & Consistent Votes Across Nodes

### Objective

Verify that multiple write operations (votes) are correctly replicated across all nodes through the Raft log replication mechanism, ensuring consistency.

### Test Description

- Three different users cast votes on the same poll
- Each vote operation goes through Raft consensus
- Votes are replicated to all 5 nodes
- All nodes are queried to verify consistent vote counts
- Test validates that log replication produces identical state across the cluster

### Test Output

```
=====
TEST 2: Raft – Log Replication & Consistent Votes Across Nodes
=====

=====
Casting Vote (Raft-backed write)
=====

Poll: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
User: userA
Option: Raft

Trying Node 1 (CastVote)...
Response: Vote Successfully!
✓ Vote cast successfully on Node 1!

=====
Casting Vote (Raft-backed write)
=====

Poll: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
User: userB
Option: Raft

Trying Node 1 (CastVote)...
Response: Vote Successfully!
✓ Vote cast successfully on Node 1!

=====
Casting Vote (Raft-backed write)
=====

Poll: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
User: userC
Option: Paxos

Trying Node 1 (CastVote)...
Response: Vote Successfully!
✓ Vote cast successfully on Node 1!

--- Consistency Check Attempt 1 ---
```

```

Poll: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f
User: userC
Option: Paxos

Trying Node 1 (CastVote)...
Response: Vote Successfully!
✓ Vote cast successfully on Node 1!

--- Consistency Check Attempt 1 ---

Querying Node 1 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0, 'Paxos': 1}

Querying Node 2 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 3 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 4 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 5 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Raft': 2, 'Zab': 0, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

✓ All nodes report consistent results matching expected counts.
✓ TEST 2 PASSED: Log replication produced consistent vote counts on all nodes.
```

## Test Case 3: Read Consistency from Every Node

### Objective

Validate that read operations return consistent results from any node in the cluster, demonstrating that committed entries are properly applied to all state machines.

### Test Output

```

=====
TEST 3: Raft – Read Consistency from Every Node
=====

Querying Node 1 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0, 'Paxos': 1}

Querying Node 2 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 3 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 4 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Zab': 0, 'Raft': 2, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

Querying Node 5 for results...
Question: What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?
Results: {'Raft': 2, 'Zab': 0, 'Paxos': 1, 'Viewstamped Replication': 0}

✓ TEST 3 PASSED: All nodes return identical, consistent results.
```

## Test Case 4: Replicated Poll Metadata via ListPolls

### Objective

Verify that poll metadata (poll listings) are correctly replicated across all nodes, ensuring that ListPolls returns consistent information cluster-wide.

### Test Output

```
TEST 4: Replicated Poll Metadata via ListPolls
All 5 nodes return 1 poll with matching UUID and status
✓ TEST 4 PASSED
```

```
=====
TEST 4: Raft - Replicated Poll Metadata via ListPolls
=====

Querying Node 1 for ListPolls...
Found 1 polls on Node 1:
  - 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f | open | What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?

Querying Node 2 for ListPolls...
Found 1 polls on Node 2:
  - 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f | open | What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?

Querying Node 3 for ListPolls...
Found 1 polls on Node 3:
  - 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f | open | What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?

Querying Node 4 for ListPolls...
Found 1 polls on Node 4:
  - 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f | open | What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?

Querying Node 5 for ListPolls...
Found 1 polls on Node 5:
  - 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f | open | What is your favorite distributed consensus algorithm?

✓ TEST 4 PASSED: Poll metadata is replicated to all nodes.
```

## Test Case 5: Leader-only ClosePoll & Client Retry Behavior

### Objective

Validate that write operations requiring leader processing work correctly with automatic forwarding, specifically testing the ClosePoll operation.

### Test Output

```
TEST 5: Leader-only ClosePoll & Client Retry Behavior
Trying Node 1 (ClosePoll)...
✓ Poll closed successfully!
✓ TEST 5 PASSED
```

```
=====
TEST 5: Raft - Leader-only ClosePoll & Client Retry Behavior
=====

Closing Poll via Any Node (Leader-only write)
=====
Poll UUID: 70f1c09d-355a-4d2c-a6d2-d1c2a20f7e1f

Trying Node 1 (ClosePoll)...
✓ Poll closed successfully on Node 1!
  Status: close

✓ TEST 5 PASSED: Poll closed successfully via some node (leader-only write).

=====
RAFT SCENARIO TEST SUMMARY
=====
All 5 Raft scenario tests completed successfully!

Scenarios demonstrated:
✓ Leader election & client writes via any node
✓ Log replication and commit before state update
✓ Read consistency from any node after commit
✓ Replication of poll metadata (ListPolls)
✓ Leader-only ClosePoll with client retry behavior

For logs, you can inspect e.g.:
docker logs raft_polling_node1
docker logs raft_polling_node2
docker logs raft_polling_node3
docker logs raft_polling_node4
docker logs raft_polling_node5
=====
```

## Test Summary

All five test cases were successfully executed, demonstrating:

- ✓ **Test 1: Leader discovery and request forwarding mechanism**
- ✓ **Test 2: Log replication ensures consistent state across all nodes**
- ✓ **Test 3: Read operations return consistent results from any node**
- ✓ **Test 4: Poll metadata is properly replicated cluster-wide**
- ✓ **Test 5: Leader-only operations work with automatic forwarding**

## 2. Project Overview

This project implements two fundamental distributed consensus algorithms:

### 2.1 Two-Phase Commit (2PC)

Applied to a distributed alarm system to ensure atomic commitment of 'Add Alarm' operations across multiple microservices.

### 2.2 Raft Consensus Algorithm

Applied to a distributed polling/voting system to achieve fault-tolerant consensus through leader election, log replication, and consistent state management.

**Both implementations use:**

- **gRPC** for inter-process communication
- **Protocol Buffers** for message serialization
- **Docker Compose** for containerization and orchestration

## 3. Two-Phase Commit Implementation (Q1, Q2)

### 3.1 Architecture

The 2PC implementation consists of six microservices:

- **API Gateway** (Python, FastAPI) - Port 8080, Web UI for alarm management
- **Coordinator** (Python, gRPC) - Port 60050, Orchestrates 2PC protocol
- **Scheduler** (Python + Node.js) - Ports 60052, 61052, Validates and schedules alarms
- **Accounts** (Python + Node.js) - Ports 60053, 61053, Account validations
- **Storage** (Python, gRPC) - Port 50051, Persistent alarm storage
- **Notification** (Python, gRPC) - Handles alarm notifications

### 3.2 Q1: Voting Phase Implementation

#### Protocol Flow

- Client submits AddAlarm request to API Gateway
- API Gateway calls coordinator's AddAlarm2PC RPC
- Coordinator broadcasts VoteOnAddAlarm to all participants
- Each participant validates, prepares, and responds with VOTE\_COMMIT or VOTE\_ABORT

#### Logging Format (Q2 Requirement)

```
Phase Voting of Node coordinator sends RPC VoteOnAddAlarm to Phase Voting of Node scheduler
```

```
Phase Voting of Node coordinator sends RPC VoteOnAddAlarm to Phase Voting of Node accounts
```

### 3.3 Q2: Decision Phase Implementation

#### Protocol Flow

- Coordinator makes global decision based on votes
- Coordinator sends DecideOnAddAlarm to all participants
- Each participant commits or aborts prepared state
- Participants send acknowledgment back to coordinator



## 4. Raft Implementation (Q3, Q4)

### 4.1 Architecture

#### Cluster Configuration

- **5-node Raft cluster**
- **Heartbeat timeout:** 1 second
- **Election timeout:** Randomized between 1.5-3.0 seconds
- **Ports:** 50051-50055 (one per node)

#### Node States

- **FOLLOWER:** Default state, responds to RPCs from leader and candidates
- **CANDIDATE:** Initiates leader election when election timeout expires
- **LEADER:** Handles client requests, sends heartbeats, replicates log entries

### 4.2 Q3: Leader Election Implementation

#### Election Process

- All nodes start as FOLLOWERS with randomized election timeout
- Follower transitions to CANDIDATE when election timeout expires
- Candidate increments term, votes for itself, sends RequestVote RPCs
- Each node votes once per term (first-come-first-served)
- Candidate becomes leader if it receives majority votes
- New leader sends AppendEntries (heartbeat) to all followers

#### Logging Format (Q3 Requirement)

```
Node 1 sends RPC RequestVote to Node 2
Node 2 runs RPC RequestVote called by Node 1
```

### 4.3 Q4: Log Replication Implementation

#### Replication Process

- Client sends request to any node; follower forwards to leader
- Leader appends entry to log and sends AppendEntries RPC to followers
- Follower copies entries to log and sends ACK to leader
- Leader waits for majority acknowledgments and updates commit index
- Leader applies committed entries to state machine
- Followers receive commit index in next AppendEntries and apply entries

#### Logging Format (Q4 Requirement)

```
[Node 1] Q4 STEP 4: Follower copied 1 entries to log
[Node 1] Q4 STEP 5: Updated commit index c: 0 → 1
[Node 1] Q4 EXECUTE: Applied entry 1: CREATE_POLL
```

## 5. Technologies Used

### Programming Languages

- **Python 3.x:** Main implementation language for both 2PC and Raft
- **Node.js:** Decision phase implementation in 2PC

### Frameworks and Libraries

- **gRPC:** Remote procedure call framework
- **Protocol Buffers:** Interface definition and serialization

- **FastAPI:** Web framework for API Gateway (2PC)
- **Uvicorn:** ASGI server for FastAPI

## Containerization

- **Docker:** Container runtime
- **Docker Compose:** Multi-container orchestration

## 6. Challenges and Solutions

### 6.1 2PC Implementation Challenges

#### Challenge 1: Cross-Language Communication

**Problem:** Vote phase (Python) and Decision phase (Node.js) on same node

**Solution:** Used gRPC for intra-node communication with shared proto definitions

#### Challenge 2: Prepared State Management

**Problem:** Maintaining prepared state between voting and decision

**Solution:** Implemented in-memory prepared state storage with transaction IDs

### 6.2 Raft Implementation Challenges

#### Challenge 1: Split Vote Prevention

**Problem:** Multiple candidates could split votes indefinitely

**Solution:** Implemented randomized election timeouts (1.5-3.0s)

#### Challenge 2: Log Consistency

**Problem:** Ensuring all nodes apply entries in same order

**Solution:** Strict index-based log replication with term checking

#### Challenge 3: Request Forwarding

**Problem:** Clients contacting followers instead of leader

**Solution:** Implemented automatic forwarding from follower to current leader

## 7. Conclusion

This project successfully demonstrates the implementation of two fundamental distributed consensus algorithms.

### 7.1 Two-Phase Commit (2PC) Achievements

- ✓ Implemented complete voting and decision phases
- ✓ Demonstrated both global commit and global abort scenarios
- ✓ Successfully coordinated transactions across multiple microservices
- ✓ Proper logging format for all RPC calls
- ✓ Web UI for easy demonstration

## 7.2 Raft Consensus Achievements

- ✓ Implemented leader election with randomized timeouts
- ✓ Implemented log replication with majority consensus
- ✓ Demonstrated request forwarding from followers to leader
- ✓ Achieved consistent state across 5-node cluster
- ✓ Comprehensive test suite with 5 different scenarios
- ✓ Proper logging format for all RPC calls

## 7.3 Key Takeaways

- **Consensus is Hard:** Both algorithms require careful handling of edge cases
- **Testing is Critical:** Comprehensive test cases are essential for validation
- **Logging is Essential:** Detailed logging helps understand system behavior
- **gRPC Simplifies Communication:** Clean abstraction for distributed communication
- **Docker Enables Easy Deployment:** Makes multi-node clusters easy to run locally

# 8. References

## Base Implementations

1. Distributed Alarm System  
<https://github.com/hoaihdinh/Distributed-Alarm-System/>
2. Distributed Voting System  
<https://github.com/CSE-5306-004-DISTRIBUTED-SYSTEMS/Project2>

## Technical Documentation

3. Raft Consensus Algorithm  
Website: <https://raft.github.io/>  
  
Paper: <https://raft.github.io/raft.pdf>
4. gRPC Documentation  
<https://grpc.io/docs/>
5. Protocol Buffers Documentation  
<https://developers.google.com/protocol-buffers>
6. Docker Compose Documentation  
<https://docs.docker.com/compose/>

## Academic Resources

7. Andrew S. Tanenbaum and Maarten Van Steen  
*Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms* (4th Edition)  
Chapter: Two-Phase Commit Protocol
8. Diego Ongaro and John Ousterhout  
*In Search of an Understandable Consensus Algorithm*  
Stanford University, 2014
9. Wikipedia - Two-Phase Commit Protocol  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-phase\\_commit\\_protocol](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Two-phase_commit_protocol)
10. Wikipedia - Raft (Algorithm)  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raft\\_\(algorithm\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Raft_(algorithm))

## 9. Team Contributions

Srinivasa Sai Abhijit Challapalli - 1002059486

- Implemented complete 2PC algorithm (Q1, Q2)
- Voting phase and decision phase implementation
- Microservice architecture design
- 2PC documentation and testing

Namburi Chaitanya Krishna - 1002232417

- Implemented complete Raft algorithm (Q3, Q4, Q5)
- Leader election and log replication
- Comprehensive test suite (5 scenarios)
- Raft documentation and testing