Strong Consistency & CAP Theorem

جامعة الملك عبدالله
للعلوم والتقنية
King Abdullah University of
Science and Technology

CS 240: Computing Systems and Concurrency
Lecture 15

Marco Canini

Credits: Michael Freedman and Kyle Jamieson developed much of the original material.

Consistency models

2PC / Consensus

Eventual consistency



Paxos / Raft

Dynamo

Consistency in Paxos/Raft



- Fault-tolerance / durability: Don't lose operations
- Consistency: Ordering between (visible) operations

Correct consistency model?



- Let's say A and B send an op.
- All readers see A → B ?
- All readers see B → A ?
- Some see A → B and others B → A ?

Paxos/RAFT has *strong consistency*

- Provide behavior of a single copy of object:
  - Read should return the most recent write
  - Subsequent reads should return same value, until next write

- Telephone intuition:
  1. Alice updates Facebook post
  2. Alice calls Bob on phone: “Check my Facebook post!”
  3. Bob read’s Alice’s wall, sees her post

Strong Consistency?



Phone call: Ensures *happens-before* relationship, even through "out-of-band" communication

Strong Consistency?



One cool trick: Delay responding to writes/ops until properly committed

Strong Consistency? This is buggy!



- Isn't sufficient to return value of third node:
  It doesn't know precisely when op is "globally" committed
- Instead: Need to actually *order* read operation

Strong Consistency!



Order all operations via (1) leader, (2) consensus

Strong consistency = linearizability

- Linearizability (Herlihy and Wang 1991)
  1. All servers execute all ops in *some* identical sequential order
  2. Global ordering preserves each client's own local ordering
  3. Global ordering preserves real-time guarantee
     - All ops receive global time-stamp using a sync'd clock
     - If $ts_{op1}(x) < ts_{op2}(y)$, OP1(x) precedes OP2(y) in sequence

- Once write completes, all later reads (by wall-clock start time) should return value of that write or value of later write.
- Once read returns particular value, all later reads should return that value or value of later write.

Intuition: Real-time ordering



- Once write completes, all later reads (by wall-clock start time) should return value of that write or value of later write.
- Once read returns particular value, all later reads should return that value or value of later write.

Weaker: Sequential consistency

- Sequential = Linearizability – real-time ordering
  1. All servers execute all ops in *some* identical sequential order
  2. Global ordering preserves each client's own local ordering

- With concurrent ops, "reordering" of ops (w.r.t. real-time ordering) acceptable, but all servers must see same order
  - e.g., linearizability cares about time
    sequential consistency cares about program order

Sequential Consistency



In example, system orders read(A) before write(A,1)

Valid Sequential Consistency?





- Why? Because P3 and P4 don't agree on order of ops. Doesn't matter when events took place on diff machine, as long as proc's AGREE on order.
- What if P1 did both W(x)a and W(x)b?
  - Neither valid, as (a) doesn't preserve local ordering

Tradeoffs are fundamental?

2PC / Consensus

Eventual consistency



Paxos / Raft

Dynamo

“CAP” Conjection for Distributed Systems

- From keynote lecture by Eric Brewer (2000)
  - History: Eric started Inktomi, early Internet search site based around “commodity” clusters of computers
  - Using CAP to justify “BASE” model: Basically Available, Soft-state services with Eventual consistency
- Popular interpretation: 2-out-of-3
  - Consistency (Linearizability)
  - Availability
  - Partition Tolerance: Arbitrary crash/network failures

CAP Theorem: Proof



Not consistent

Gilbert, Seth, and Nancy Lynch. "Brewer's conjecture and the feasibility of consistent, available, partition-tolerant web services." ACM SIGACT News 33.2 (2002): 51-59.

CAP Theorem: Proof



Gilbert, Seth, and Nancy Lynch. "Brewer's conjecture and the feasibility of consistent, available, partition-tolerant web services." ACM SIGACT News 33.2 (2002): 51-59.

CAP Theorem: Proof



Not partition tolerant

Gilbert, Seth, and Nancy Lynch. "Brewer's conjecture and the feasibility of consistent, available, partition-tolerant web services." ACM SIGACT News 33.2 (2002): 51-59.

CAP Theorem: AP or CP



Criticism: It's not 2-out-of-3

- Can't "choose" no partitions
- So: AP or CP

Not partition tolerant

More tradeoffs L vs. C

- Low-latency: Speak to fewer than quorum of nodes?
  - 2PC: write N, read 1
  - RAFT: write [N/2] + 1, read [N/2] + 1
  - General: |W| + |R| > N

- L and C are fundamentally at odds
  - “C” = linearizability, sequential, serializability (more later)

PACELC

- If there is a partition (P):
  - How does system tradeoff A and C?
- Else (no partition)
  - How does system tradeoff L and C?

- Is there a useful system that switches?
  - Dynamo: PA/EL
  - “ACID” dbs: PC/EC

http://dbmsmusings.blogspot.com/2010/04/problems-with-cap-and-yahoos-little.html

More linearizable replication algorithms

Chain replication



- Writes to head, which orders all writes
- When write reaches tail, implicitly committed rest of chain
- Reads to tail, which orders reads w.r.t. committed writes

Chain replication for read-heavy (CRAQ)



- Goal: If all replicas have same version, read from any one
- Challenge: They need to *know* they have correct version

Chain replication for read-heavy (CRAQ)



- Replicas maintain multiple versions of objects while “dirty”, i.e., contain uncommitted writes
- Commitment sent “up” chain after reaches tail

Chain replication for read-heavy (CRAQ)



- Read to dirty object must check with tail for proper version
- This orders read with respect to global order, regardless of replica that handles

Performance: CR vs. CRAQ



R. van Renesse and F. B. Schneider. Chain replication for supporting high throughput and availability. OSDI 2004.

J. Terrace and M. Freedman. Object Storage on CRAQ: High-throughput chain replication for read-mostly workloads. USENIX ATC 2009.

Wednesday lecture

Causal Consistency