



# CLOUD COMPUTING CONCEPTS

---

with Indranil Gupta (Indy)

## SNAPSHOTS

Lecture D

---

SAFETY AND LIVENESS

# "CORRECTNESS" IN DISTRIBUTED SYSTEMS

- Can be seen in two ways
- Liveness and Safety
- Often confused – it's important to distinguish from each other

# LIVENESS

- **Liveness** = guarantee that something **good** will happen, **eventually**
  - Eventually == does not imply a time bound, but if you let the system run long enough, then ...

# LIVENESS: EXAMPLES

- **Liveness** = guarantee that **something good will happen, eventually**
  - Eventually == does not imply a time bound, but if you let the system run long enough, then ...
- **Examples in Real World**
  - Guarantee that “at least one of the athletes in the 100m final will win gold” is liveness
  - A criminal will eventually be jailed
- **Examples in a Distributed System**
  - Distributed computation: Guarantee that it will terminate
  - “Completeness” in failure detectors: every failure is eventually detected by some non-faulty process
  - In Consensus: All processes eventually decide on a value

# SAFETY

- *Safety* = guarantee that something *bad* will *never* happen

# SAFETY: EXAMPLES

- **Safety** = guarantee that something **bad will never happen**
- **Examples in Real World**
  - A peace treaty between two nations provides safety
    - War will never happen
  - An innocent person will never be jailed
- **Examples in a Distributed System**
  - There is no deadlock in a distributed transaction system
  - No object is orphaned in a distributed object system
  - “Accuracy” in failure detectors
  - In Consensus: No two processes decide on different values

# CAN'T WE GUARANTEE BOTH?

- **Can be difficult to satisfy both liveness and safety in an asynchronous distributed system!**
  - Failure Detector: Completeness (Liveness) and Accuracy (Safety) cannot both be guaranteed by a failure detector in an asynchronous distributed system
  - Consensus: Decisions (Liveness) and correct decisions (Safety) cannot both be guaranteed by any consensus protocol in an asynchronous distributed system
  - Very difficult for legal systems (anywhere in the world) to guarantee that all criminals are jailed (Liveness) and no innocents are jailed (Safety)

# IN THE LANGUAGE OF GLOBAL STATES

- **Recall that a distributed system moves from one global state to another global state, via causal steps**
- **Liveness w.r.t. a property  $Pr$  in a given state  $S$  means**
  - $S$  satisfies  $Pr$ , or there is **some** causal path of global states from  $S$  to  $S'$  where  $S'$  satisfies  $Pr$
- **Safety w.r.t. a property  $Pr$  in a given state  $S$  means**
  - $S$  satisfies  $Pr$ , and **all** global states  $S'$  reachable from  $S$  also satisfy  $Pr$



# USING GLOBAL SNAPSHOT ALGORITHM

- **Chandy-Lamport algorithm can be used to detect global properties that are *stable***
  - Stable = once true, stays true forever afterwards
- **Stable Liveness examples**
  - Computation has terminated
- **Stable Non-Safety examples**
  - There is a deadlock
  - An object is orphaned (no pointers point to it)
- **All stable global properties can be detected using the Chandy-Lamport algorithm**
  - Due to its causal correctness

# 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)
- Can be used to detect stable global properties
- Safety vs. Liveness