

Chapter 16: Distributed Synchronization





Chapter 16 Distributed Synchronization

- Event Ordering
- Mutual Exclusion
- Atomicity
- Concurrency Control
- Deadlock Handling
- Election Algorithms
- Reaching Agreement





Chapter Objectives

- To describe various methods for achieving mutual exclusion in a distributed system
- To explain how atomic transactions can be implemented in a distributed system
- To show how some of the concurrency-control schemes discussed in Chapter 6 can be modified for use in a distributed environment
- To present schemes for handling deadlock prevention, deadlock avoidance, and deadlock detection in a distributed system






Event Ordering

- *Happened-before* relation (denoted by \rightarrow)
 - If A and B are events in the same process, and A was executed before B , then $A \rightarrow B$
 - If A is the event of sending a message by one process and B is the event of receiving that message by another process, then $A \rightarrow B$
 - If $A \rightarrow B$ and $B \rightarrow C$ then $A \rightarrow C$





Relative Time for Three Concurrent Processes





Implementation of \rightarrow

- Associate a timestamp with each system event
 - Require that for every pair of events A and B, if $A \rightarrow B$, then the timestamp of A is less than the timestamp of B
- Within each process P_i a **logical clock**, LC_i is associated
 - The logical clock can be implemented as a simple counter that is incremented between any two successive events executed within a process
 - ▶ Logical clock is **monotonically increasing**
- A process advances its logical clock when it receives a message whose timestamp is greater than the current value of its logical clock
- If the timestamps of two events A and B are the same, then the events are concurrent
 - We may use the process identity numbers to break ties and to create a total ordering





Distributed Mutual Exclusion (DME)

■ Assumptions

- The system consists of n processes; each process P_i resides at a different processor
- Each process has a critical section that requires mutual exclusion

■ Requirement

- If P_i is executing in its critical section, then no other process P_j is executing in its critical section

■ We present two algorithms to ensure the mutual exclusion execution of processes in their critical sections





DME: Centralized Approach

- One of the processes in the system is chosen to coordinate the entry to the critical section
- A process that wants to enter its critical section sends a request message to the coordinator
- The coordinator decides which process can enter the critical section next, and it sends that process a reply message
- When the process receives a reply message from the coordinator, it enters its critical section
- After exiting its critical section, the process sends a release message to the coordinator and proceeds with its execution
- This scheme requires three messages per critical-section entry:
 - request
 - reply
 - release





DME: Fully Distributed Approach

- When process P_i wants to enter its critical section, it generates a new timestamp, TS , and sends the message *request* (P_i , TS) to all other processes in the system
- When process P_j receives a *request* message, it may reply immediately or it may defer sending a reply back
- When process P_i receives a *reply* message from all other processes in the system, it can enter its critical section
- After exiting its critical section, the process sends *reply* messages to all its deferred requests





DME: Fully Distributed Approach (Cont.)

- The decision whether process P_j replies immediately to a $request(P_i, TS)$ message or defers its reply is based on three factors:
 - If P_j is in its critical section, then it defers its reply to P_i
 - If P_j does *not* want to enter its critical section, then it sends a *reply* immediately to P_i
 - If P_j wants to enter its critical section but has not yet entered it, then it compares its own request timestamp with the timestamp TS
 - ▶ If its own request timestamp is greater than TS , then it sends a *reply* immediately to P_i (P_i asked first)
 - ▶ Otherwise, the reply is deferred





Desirable Behavior of Fully Distributed Approach

- Freedom from Deadlock is ensured
- Freedom from starvation is ensured, since entry to the critical section is scheduled according to the timestamp ordering
 - The timestamp ordering ensures that processes are served in a first-come, first served order
- The number of messages per critical-section entry is

$$2 \times (n - 1)$$

This is the minimum number of required messages per critical-section entry when processes act independently and concurrently





Three Undesirable Consequences

- The processes need to know the identity of all other processes in the system, which makes the dynamic addition and removal of processes more complex
- If one of the processes fails, then the entire scheme collapses
 - This can be dealt with by continuously monitoring the state of all the processes in the system
- Processes that have not entered their critical section must pause frequently to assure other processes that they intend to enter the critical section
 - This protocol is therefore suited for small, stable sets of cooperating processes





Token-Passing Approach

- Circulate a token among processes in system
 - **Token** is special type of message
 - Possession of token entitles holder to enter critical section
- Processes *logically* organized in a **ring structure**
- Unidirectional ring guarantees freedom from starvation
- Two types of failures
 - Lost token – election must be called
 - Failed processes – new logical ring established





Atomicity

- Either all the operations associated with a program unit are executed to completion, or none are performed
- Ensuring **atomicity** in a distributed system requires a **transaction coordinator**, which is responsible for the following:
 - Starting the execution of the transaction
 - Breaking the transaction into a number of subtransactions, and distribution these subtransactions to the appropriate sites for execution
 - Coordinating the termination of the transaction, which may result in the transaction being committed at all sites or aborted at all sites





Two-Phase Commit Protocol (2PC)

- Assumes fail-stop model
- Execution of the protocol is initiated by the coordinator after the last step of the transaction has been reached
- When the protocol is initiated, the transaction may still be executing at some of the local sites
- The protocol involves all the local sites at which the transaction executed
- Example: Let T be a transaction initiated at site S_i and let the transaction coordinator at S_i be C_i





Phase 1: Obtaining a Decision

- C_i adds $\langle \text{prepare } T \rangle$ record to the log
- C_i sends $\langle \text{prepare } T \rangle$ message to all sites
- When a site receives a $\langle \text{prepare } T \rangle$ message, the transaction manager determines if it can commit the transaction
 - If no: add $\langle \text{no } T \rangle$ record to the log and respond to C_i with $\langle \text{abort } T \rangle$
 - If yes:
 - ▶ add $\langle \text{ready } T \rangle$ record to the log
 - ▶ force *all log records* for T onto stable storage
 - ▶ send $\langle \text{ready } T \rangle$ message to C_i





Phase 1 (Cont.)

- Coordinator collects responses
 - All respond “ready”,
decision is *commit*
 - At least one response is “abort”,
decision is *abort*
 - At least one participant fails to respond within time out period,
decision is *abort*





Phase 2: Recording Decision in the Database

- Coordinator adds a decision record
 $\langle \text{abort } T \rangle$ or $\langle \text{commit } T \rangle$
to its log and forces record onto stable storage
- Once that record reaches stable storage it is irrevocable (even if failures occur)
- Coordinator sends a message to each participant informing it of the decision (commit or abort)
- Participants take appropriate action locally





Failure Handling in 2PC – Site Failure

- The log contains a $\langle \text{commit } T \rangle$ record
 - In this case, the site executes **redo**(T)
- The log contains an $\langle \text{abort } T \rangle$ record
 - In this case, the site executes **undo**(T)
- The log contains a $\langle \text{ready } T \rangle$ record; consult C_i
 - If C_i is down, site sends **query-status** T message to the other sites
- The log contains no control records concerning T
 - In this case, the site executes **undo**(T)





Failure Handling in 2PC – Coordinator C_i Failure

- If an active site contains a $\langle \text{commit } T \rangle$ record in its log, the T must be committed
- If an active site contains an $\langle \text{abort } T \rangle$ record in its log, then T must be aborted
- If some active site does *not* contain the record $\langle \text{ready } T \rangle$ in its log then the failed coordinator C_i cannot have decided to commit T
 - Rather than wait for C_i to recover, it is preferable to abort T
- All active sites have a $\langle \text{ready } T \rangle$ record in their logs, but no additional control records
 - In this case we must wait for the coordinator to recover
 - Blocking problem – T is blocked pending the recovery of site S_i





Concurrency Control

- Modify the centralized concurrency schemes to accommodate the distribution of transactions
- Transaction manager coordinates execution of transactions (or subtransactions) that access data at local sites
- Local transaction only executes at that site
- Global transaction executes at several sites





Locking Protocols

- Can use the two-phase locking protocol in a distributed environment by changing how the lock manager is implemented
- Nonreplicated scheme – each site maintains a local lock manager which administers lock and unlock requests for those data items that are stored in that site
 - Simple implementation involves two message transfers for handling lock requests, and one message transfer for handling unlock requests
 - Deadlock handling is more complex





Single-Coordinator Approach

- A single lock manager resides in a single chosen site, all lock and unlock requests are made at that site
- Simple implementation
- Simple deadlock handling
- Possibility of bottleneck
- Vulnerable to loss of concurrency controller if single site fails
- **Multiple-coordinator approach** distributes lock-manager function over several sites





Majority Protocol

- Avoids drawbacks of central control by dealing with replicated data in a decentralized manner
- More complicated to implement
- Deadlock-handling algorithms must be modified; possible for deadlock to occur in locking only one data item





Biased Protocol

- Similar to majority protocol, but requests for shared locks prioritized over requests for exclusive locks
- Less overhead on read operations than in majority protocol; but has additional overhead on writes
- Like majority protocol, deadlock handling is complex





Primary Copy

- One of the sites at which a replica resides is designated as the primary site
 - Request to lock a data item is made at the primary site of that data item
- Concurrency control for replicated data handled in a manner similar to that of unreplicated data
- Simple implementation, but if primary site fails, the data item is unavailable, even though other sites may have a replica





Timestamping


- Generate unique timestamps in distributed scheme:
 - Each site generates a unique local timestamp
 - The global unique timestamp is obtained by concatenation of the unique local timestamp with the unique site identifier
 - Use a *logical clock* defined within each site to ensure the fair generation of timestamps

- Timestamp-ordering scheme – combine the centralized concurrency control timestamp scheme with the 2PC protocol to obtain a protocol that ensures serializability with no cascading rollbacks





Generation of Unique Timestamps





Deadlock Prevention

- Resource-ordering deadlock-prevention – define a *global* ordering among the system resources
 - Assign a unique number to all system resources
 - A process may request a resource with unique number i only if it is not holding a resource with a unique number greater than i
 - Simple to implement; requires little overhead
- Banker's algorithm – designate one of the processes in the system as the process that maintains the information necessary to carry out the Banker's algorithm
 - Also implemented easily, but may require too much overhead





Timestamped Deadlock-Prevention Scheme

- Each process P_i is assigned a unique priority number
- Priority numbers are used to decide whether a process P_i should wait for a process P_j ; otherwise P_i is rolled back
- The scheme prevents deadlocks
 - For every edge $P_i \rightarrow P_j$ in the wait-for graph, P_i has a higher priority than P_j
 - Thus a cycle cannot exist





Wait-Die Scheme

- Based on a nonpreemptive technique
- If P_i requests a resource currently held by P_j , P_i is allowed to wait only if it has a smaller timestamp than does P_j (P_i is older than P_j)
 - Otherwise, P_i is rolled back (dies)
- Example: Suppose that processes P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 have timestamps 5, 10, and 15 respectively
 - if P_1 request a resource held by P_2 , then P_1 will wait
 - If P_3 requests a resource held by P_2 , then P_3 will be rolled back





Would-Wait Scheme

- Based on a preemptive technique; counterpart to the wait-die system
- If P_i requests a resource currently held by P_j , P_i is allowed to wait only if it has a larger timestamp than does P_j (P_i is younger than P_j). Otherwise P_j is rolled back (P_j is wounded by P_i)
- Example: Suppose that processes P_1 , P_2 , and P_3 have timestamps 5, 10, and 15 respectively
 - If P_1 requests a resource held by P_2 , then the resource will be preempted from P_2 and P_2 will be rolled back
 - If P_3 requests a resource held by P_2 , then P_3 will wait






Deadlock Detection

- Use **wait-for** graphs
 - **Local wait-for graphs at each local site.** The nodes of the graph correspond to all the processes that are currently either holding or requesting any of the resources local to that site
 - May also use a **global wait-for graph.** This graph is the union of all local wait-for graphs.






Two Local Wait-For Graphs





Global Wait-For Graph





Deadlock Detection – Centralized Approach

- Each site keeps a local wait-for graph
- A global wait-for graph is maintained in a single coordination process.
- There are three different options (points in time) when the wait-for graph may be constructed:
 1. Whenever a new edge is inserted or removed in one of the local wait-for graphs
 2. Periodically, when a number of changes have occurred in a wait-for graph
 3. Whenever the coordinator needs to invoke the cycle-detection algorithm
- Unnecessary rollbacks may occur as a result of false cycles





Detection Algorithm Based on Option 3

- Append unique identifiers (timestamps) to requests from different sites
- When process P_i at site A , requests a resource from process P_j at site B , a request message with timestamp TS is sent
- The edge $P_i \rightarrow P_j$ with the label TS is inserted in the local wait-for of A . The edge is inserted in the local wait-for graph of B only if B has received the request message and cannot immediately grant the requested resource





The Algorithm


1. The controller sends an initiating message to each site in the system
2. On receiving this message, a site sends its local wait-for graph to the coordinator
3. When the controller has received a reply from each site, it constructs a graph as follows:
 - (a) The constructed graph contains a vertex for every process in the system
 - (b) The graph has an edge $P_i \rightarrow P_j$ if and only if
 - ✈ there is an edge $P_i \rightarrow P_j$ in one of the wait-for graphs, or
 - ✈ an edge $P_i \rightarrow P_j$ with some label TS appears in more than one wait-for graph

If the constructed graph contains a cycle \Rightarrow deadlock





Local and Global Wait-For Graphs






Fully Distributed Approach

- All controllers share equally the responsibility for detecting deadlock
- Every site constructs a wait-for graph that represents a part of the total graph
- We add one additional node P_{ex} to each local wait-for graph
- If a local wait-for graph contains a cycle that does not involve node P_{ex} , then the system is in a deadlock state
- A cycle involving P_{ex} implies the possibility of a deadlock
 - To ascertain whether a deadlock does exist, a distributed deadlock-detection algorithm must be invoked






Augmented Local Wait-For Graphs





Augmented Local Wait-For Graph in Site S_2





Election Algorithms

- Determine where a new copy of the coordinator should be restarted
- Assume that a unique priority number is associated with each active process in the system, and assume that the priority number of process P_i is i
- Assume a one-to-one correspondence between processes and sites
- The coordinator is always the process with the largest priority number. When a coordinator fails, the algorithm must elect that active process with the largest priority number
- Two algorithms, the bully algorithm and a ring algorithm, can be used to elect a new coordinator in case of failures





Bully Algorithm

- Applicable to systems where every process can send a message to every other process in the system
- If process P_i sends a request that is not answered by the coordinator within a time interval T , assume that the coordinator has failed; P_i tries to elect itself as the new coordinator
- P_i sends an election message to every process with a higher priority number, P_i then waits for any of these processes to answer within T





Bully Algorithm (Cont.)

- If no response within T , assume that all processes with numbers greater than i have failed; P_i elects itself the new coordinator
- If answer is received, P_i begins time interval T' , waiting to receive a message that a process with a higher priority number has been elected
- If no message is sent within T' , assume the process with a higher number has failed; P_i should restart the algorithm





Bully Algorithm (Cont.)

- If P_i is not the coordinator, then, at any time during execution, P_i may receive one of the following two messages from process P_j
 - P_j is the new coordinator ($j > i$). P_i in turn, records this information
 - P_j started an election ($j > i$). P_i sends a response to P_j and begins its own election algorithm, provided that P_i has not already initiated such an election
- After a failed process recovers, it immediately begins execution of the same algorithm
- If there are no active processes with higher numbers, the recovered process forces all processes with lower number to let it become the coordinator process, even if there is a currently active coordinator with a lower number





Ring Algorithm

- Applicable to systems organized as a ring (logically or physically)
- Assumes that the links are unidirectional, and that processes send their messages to their right neighbors
- Each process maintains an active list, consisting of all the priority numbers of all active processes in the system when the algorithm ends
- If process P_i detects a coordinator failure, it creates a new active list that is initially empty. It then sends a message $elect(i)$ to its right neighbor, and adds the number i to its active list





Ring Algorithm (Cont.)

- If P_i receives a message $elect(j)$ from the process on the left, it must respond in one of three ways:
 - 👉 If this is the first *elect* message it has seen or sent, P_i creates a new active list with the numbers i and j
 - ◆ It then sends the message $elect(i)$, followed by the message $elect(j)$
 - 👉 If $i \neq j$, then the active list for P_i now contains the numbers of all the active processes in the system
 - ◆ P_i can now determine the largest number in the active list to identify the new coordinator process
 - 👉 If $i = j$, then P_i receives the message $elect(i)$
 - ◆ The active list for P_i contains all the active processes in the system
 - ◆ P_i can now determine the new coordinator process.





Reaching Agreement

- There are applications where a set of processes wish to agree on a common “value”
- Such agreement may not take place due to:
 - Faulty communication medium
 - Faulty processes
 - ▶ Processes may send garbled or incorrect messages to other processes
 - ▶ A subset of the processes may collaborate with each other in an attempt to defeat the scheme





Faulty Communications

- Process P_i at site A , has sent a message to process P_j at site B ; to proceed, P_i needs to know if P_j has received the message
- Detect failures using a time-out scheme
 - When P_i sends out a message, it also specifies a time interval during which it is willing to wait for an acknowledgment message from P_j
 - When P_j receives the message, it immediately sends an acknowledgment to P_i
 - If P_i receives the acknowledgment message within the specified time interval, it concludes that P_j has received its message
 - ▶ If a time-out occurs, P_i needs to retransmit its message and wait for an acknowledgment
 - Continue until P_i either receives an acknowledgment, or is notified by the system that B is down





Faulty Communications (Cont.)

- Suppose that P_j also needs to know that P_i has received its acknowledgment message, in order to decide on how to proceed
 - In the presence of failure, it is not possible to accomplish this task
 - It is not possible in a distributed environment for processes P_i and P_j to agree completely on their respective states





Faulty Processes (Byzantine Generals Problem)

- Communication medium is reliable, but processes can fail in unpredictable ways
- Consider a system of n processes, of which no more than m are faulty
 - Suppose that each process P_i has some private value of V_i
- Devise an algorithm that allows each nonfaulty P_i to construct a vector $X_i = (A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, \dots, A_{i,n})$ such that:
 - If P_j is a nonfaulty process, then $A_{ij} = V_j$.
 - If P_i and P_j are both nonfaulty processes, then $X_i = X_j$.
- Solutions share the following properties
 - A correct algorithm can be devised only if $n \geq 3 \times m + 1$
 - The worst-case delay for reaching agreement is proportionate to $m + 1$ message-passing delays





Faulty Processes (Cont.)

- An algorithm for the case where $m = 1$ and $n = 4$ requires two rounds of information exchange:
 - Each process sends its private value to the other 3 processes
 - Each process sends the information it has obtained in the first round to all other processes
- If a faulty process refuses to send messages, a nonfaulty process can choose an arbitrary value and pretend that that value was sent by that process
- After the two rounds are completed, a nonfaulty process P_i can construct its vector $X_i = (A_{i,1}, A_{i,2}, A_{i,3}, A_{i,4})$ as follows:
 - $A_{i,j} = V_j$
 - For $j \neq i$, if at least two of the three values reported for process P_j agree, then the majority value is used to set the value of A_{ij}
 - ▶ Otherwise, a default value (*nil*) is used



End of Chapter 18

