

# Cloud Design Patterns<sup>1</sup>

Mikael Svahnberg<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mikael.Svahnberg@bth.se School of Computing Blekinge Institute of Technology

May 7, 2015

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Creatively borrowed from B. Wilder, "Cloud Architecture Patterns", O'Reilly, 2012.



# Scalability

- (Flexible) Scalability is one of the core features of Cloud Computing
- Vertical Scaling (increase capacity per node)
- Horizontal Scaling (adding nodes)



# Measures of Scalability

#### A combination of:

- Concurrent Users
- Response Time
- Processed items / time unit
- Complexity of processing requests



# Issues that influence scalability

#### Scarce resources:

- Computing power
- RAM
- Storage space
- Network bandwidth



# Scaling Mindsets

- Cetain mindsets help in addressing Cloud Scaling
- These do not affect the architecture *per se*, but influences your choices of solutions.
  - Eventual Consistency
  - Multitenancy
  - Inevitable Failure
  - Network Latency



### **Eventual Consistency**

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



### **Eventual Consistency**

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



### **Eventual Consistency**

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
    - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



#### Eventual Consistency

- consistent, with somne small number of values still being updated"
- CAP theorem: {Consistency, Availability, Partition Tolerance}: Pick two!
- This implies:
- Data is always(?) available, although not always 100% correct

- Your system needs to robustely deal with this.
- Compare with RDBMS' ACID property.
- With a distributed database (using e.g. a NoSQL database), you instead have BASE:
  - Basically Available
  - Soft State
  - Eventually Consistent



# Multitenancy

- One company (host) operates the application for use by other companies (tenants)
- The tenants have the impression that they are alone in using the service
- Has implications on:
- data partitioning
- security
- performance management
- As much a concern for the cloud provider as for the cloud application provider.



#### Inevitable Failure

- The cloud provider is likely to use cheap commodity hardware
- Therefore, hardware failure is inevitable (although not necessarily frequent)
- This implies that your application need to be robust
- Focus shift from MTBF to MTTR



#### Network Latency

- Problem: You are *here*, your data are *there*, and your users are *yonder*
- ... And the servers running your applications are neither *here nor there*.
- Moving data between your servers and, eventually, to the users requires network bandwidth
- Strategies your application may take:
  - Data compression
  - Background processing
  - Predictive fetching
  - Moving your application closer to the users
  - Moving the data closer to the users
  - Moving data processing nodes closer together

www.bth.se 10/16



#### Scalability Patterns

- Generic Scalability:
  - Horizontally Scaling Compute Pattern
  - Queue-Centric Workflow Pattern
  - Auto-Scaling Pattern
- Eventual Consistency
  - MapReduce Pattern
  - Database Sharding Pattern
- Multitenancy and Inevitable Failure
  - Busy Signal Pattern
  - Node Failure Pattern
- Network Latency
  - Colocate Pattern
  - Valet Key Pattern
  - CDN Pattern
  - Multisite Deployment Pattern

www.bth.se 11/16



# Challenges with Horizontal Scaling

- Load Balancing
- Synchronisation between nodes
- Managing Session State
- Sticky sessions? (What happens if that node breaks?)
- Cookies (for small amounts of data)
- Cookies (as a key to the full db record)
- Capacity Planning (per time unit)
- Sizing the virtual machines

www.bth.se 12/16



#### Queue Centric Workflow

- Problem: Some jobs take longer time. This may impact the responsiveness of the application.
- Solution:
- Package the tasks to do in a job description and add it to a queue.
- Worker(s) in the service tier picks work from the job queue and processes them in due order.
- cf. Eventual Consistency
- Challenges:
- One worker picks a job but fails halfway through.
- Solutions: Invisibility window, idempotent processing (for repeat messages), handling of poison messages

www.bth.se 13/16



### MapReduce

- Map: execute function on each instance of the data
- Reduce: merge the results of a map into a combined and consistent data set again.
- Challenges:
  - moving big data takes time and is expensive.
- Solution: "bring the compute to the data"

www.bth.se 14/16



### Database Sharding

- Classic database division: Vertical
- For example: db{users}, db{orders}, db{warehouse}, ...
- Sharding divides the data horizontally.
- All db instances have the entire schema, and contains a subset of all the rows.
- One db row only exist in one db.
- Challenges:
- Deciding how to shard your data to be most efficient
- Cloudfronting (where should a particular row be?)
- Defining the shards to minimise database queries over several shards, or shards far away.

www.bth.se 15/16



#### Node Failure

Scenario	Warning	Impact
Sudden failure	no	local data is lost
Platform shutdown/restart	yes	local data may be available
Application shutdown/restart	yes	local data is available
Shutdown/destroy	yes	local data is lost

#### Advice:

- Treat all interruptions as node failures
- Maintain sufficient capacity for failure (N+1 rule)
- Load balancing to minimise interruption for user
- Combine with other patterns, e.g. queue-centric workflow pattern, busy signal pattern



#### Summary

- There are a few mindsets that influence your choices of solutions for a cloud application
  - Eventual Consistency
  - Multitenancy
  - Inevitable Failure
  - Network Latency
- Related to these mindsets, there are a number of design patterns for addressing them in a cloud setting.
- Some of these are mentioned in this lecture.
- Some of these are discussed in some further detail.
- As usual, when discussing architecture and design patterns, the details are not available until you design your specific application.