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Concurrency

• Multiple things happening at the same time

• Primary benefit is better performance
  • Do more work in the same amount of time
  • Complete fixed amount work in less time
  • Better utilize resources

• Primary cost is complexity
  • Hard to reason about
  • Hard to get right
  • (Systems deal with it, not applications, ... to some extent)
Concurrency Examples

• Run a computation on all cores in a machine
  • Run a computation on all cores on 100K machine!

• Allow an application to have multiple outstanding writes to disk
  • Allow many applications to write to disks

• Many devices use wireless bandwidth
  • Millions of TCP connections use internet backbone links
Distributed Systems, What?

1) Multiple computers
2) Connected by a network
3) Doing something together

Concurrency is Inevitable!
Motivation: Multi-site database replication

- A New York-based bank wants to make its transaction ledger database resilient to whole-site failures

- **Replicate** the database, keep one copy in sf, one in nyc
The consequences of concurrent updates

- **Replicate** the database, keep one copy in sf, one in nyc
  - Client sends query to the nearest copy
  - Client sends update to both copies

**Inconsistent replicas!**
Updates should have been performed in the same order at each copy

- Deposit $100
- Pay 1% interest

$1,000 $1,000 $1,100 $1,111 $1,010 $1,110
RFC 677 “The Maintenance of Duplicate Databases” (1975)

• “To the extent that the communication paths can be made reliable, and the clocks used by the processes kept close to synchrony, the probability of seemingly strange behavior can be made very small. However, the distributed nature of the system dictates that this probability can never be zero.”
Idea: Logical clocks

- Landmark 1978 paper by Leslie Lamport
- Insight: only the events themselves matter

Idea: Disregard the precise clock time
Instead, capture just a “happens before” relationship between a pair of events
Defining “happens-before” (→)

• Consider three processes: P1, P2, and P3

• Notation: Event a happens before event b (a → b)
Defining “happens-before” (→)

• Can observe event order at a single process
Defining “happens-before” (→)

1. If *same process* and a occurs before b, then a → b
Defining “happens-before” (⇒)

1. If same process and a occurs before b, then a ⇒ b

2. Can observe ordering when processes communicate

![Diagram showing processes P1, P2, and P3 with events a, b, and c in different order and a physical time line.](image)
Defining “happens-before” ($\rightarrow$)

1. If *same process* and *a* occurs before *b*, then $a \rightarrow b$

2. If *c* is a message receipt of *b*, then $b \rightarrow c$

![Diagram showing process order and physical time](image)
Defining “happens-before” ($\rightarrow$)

1. If **same process** and $a$ occurs before $b$, then $a \rightarrow b$

2. If $c$ is a message receipt of $b$, then $b \rightarrow c$

3. Can observe ordering transitively

![Diagram showing the sequence of events with nodes P1, P2, and P3, and arrows indicating the order of events.](image-url)
Defining “happens-before” (→)

1. If *same process* and a occurs before b, then a → b

2. If c is a message receipt of b, then b → c

3. If a → b and b → c, then a → c

*Physical time ↓*
Concurrent events

• Not all events are related by $\rightarrow$

• $a, d$ not related by $\rightarrow$ so concurrent, written as $a \ || \ d$
Lamport clocks: Objective

• We seek a clock time $C(a)$ for every event $a$

Plan: Tag events with clock times; use clock times to make distributed system correct

• Clock condition: If $a \rightarrow b$, then $C(a) < C(b)$
The Lamport Clock algorithm

- Each process $P_i$ maintains a local clock $C_i$

1. Before executing an event, $C_i \leftarrow C_i + 1$
1. Before executing an event a, \( C_i \leftarrow C_i + 1 \):

   - Set event time \( C(a) \leftarrow C_i \)

The Lamport Clock algorithm

P1 \( C_1 = 1 \)

P2 \( C_2 = 0 \)

P3 \( C_3 = 0 \)

Physical time ↓
The Lamport Clock algorithm

1. Before executing an event b, $C_i \leftarrow C_i + 1$:

   - Set event time $C(b) \leftarrow C_i$
The Lamport Clock algorithm

1. Before executing an event $b$, $C_i \leftarrow C_i + 1$

2. Send the local clock in the message $m$

Physical time ↓
The Lamport Clock algorithm

3. On process $P_j$ receiving a message $m$:

- Set $C_j$ and receive event time $C(c) \leftarrow 1 + \max\{ C_j, C(m) \}$

![Diagram showing the Lamport Clock algorithm with processes P1, P2, and P3, and a message m being received by P3. The clocks C(a), C(b), C(m), and C(c) are updated accordingly.]
Lamport Timestamps: Ordering all events

• **Break ties** by appending the process number to each event:

  1. Process $P_i$ timestamps event $e$ with $C_i(e).i$

  2. $C(a).i < C(b).j$ when:
     • $C(a) < C(b)$, or $C(a) = C(b)$ and $i < j$

• Now, for any two events $a$ and $b$, $C(a) < C(b)$ or $C(b) < C(a)$
  • This is called a total ordering of events
Order all these events

Physical time ↓
Totally-Ordered Multicast

Goal: All sites apply updates in (same) Lamport clock order

- Client sends update to one replica site $j$
  - Replica assigns it Lamport timestamp $C_j$. $j$

- Key idea: Place events into a sorted local queue
  - Sorted by increasing Lamport timestamps

Example: P1’s local queue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rightarrow$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. On receiving an update from client, broadcast to others (including yourself)

2. On receiving an update from replica:
   a) Add it to your local queue
   b) Broadcast an *acknowledgement message* to every replica (including yourself)

3. On receiving an acknowledgement:
   • Mark corresponding update *acknowledged* in your queue

4. Remove and process updates *everyone* has ack’ed from head of queue
Totally-Ordered Multicast (Almost correct)

- P1 queues $, P2 queues %
- P1 queues and ack’s %
  - P1 marks % fully ack’ed
- P2 marks % fully ack’ed

$ P2 processes %$
Totally-Ordered Multicast (Correct version)

1. On receiving an update from client, broadcast to others (including yourself)

2. On receiving or processing an update:
   a) Add it to your local queue, if received update
   b) Broadcast an acknowledgement message to every replica (including yourself) only from head of queue

3. On receiving an acknowledgement:
   • Mark corresponding update acknowledged in your queue

4. Remove and process updates everyone has ack’ed from head of queue
Totally-Ordered Multicast (Correct version)
So, are we done?

• Does totally-ordered multicast solve the problem of multi-site replication in general?

• Not by a long shot!

1. Our protocol assumed:
   • No node failures
   • No message loss
   • No message corruption

2. All to all communication does not scale

3. Waits forever for message delays (performance?)
Take-away points: Lamport clocks

• Can totally-order events in a distributed system: that’s useful!
  • We saw an application of Lamport clocks for totally-ordered multicast

• But: while by construction, \( a \rightarrow b \) implies \( C(a) < C(b) \),
  • The converse is not necessarily true:
    • \( C(a) < C(b) \) does not imply \( a \rightarrow b \) (possibly, \( a \perp \perp b \))

\textbf{Can’t use Lamport clock timestamps to infer causal relationships between events}
Intro to Concurrency Conclusion

• Concurrency is great for performance, hard to reason about, and often unavoidable in systems

• Replicated DB example
  • Concurrent updates can lead to inconsistency between replicas
  • Lamport clocks can order events in a distributed system
  • Lamport clocks + careful protocol = correct replication

• What is “correct”?