Module 6 - Synchronization
Synchronization Problem

- How processes cooperate and synchronize with one another in a distributed system
  - In single CPU systems, critical regions, mutual exclusion, and other synchronization problems are solved using methods such as semaphores.
  - These methods will not work in distributed systems because they implicitly rely on the existence of shared memory.
  - Examples:
    - Two processes interacting using a semaphore must both be able to access the semaphore. In a centralized system, the semaphore is stored in the kernel and accessed by the processes using system calls.
    - If two events occur in a distributed system, it is difficult to determine which event occurred first.

- How to decide on relative ordering of events
  - Does one event precede another event?
  - Difficult to determine if events occur on different machines.
What will we study

- Part 1 - Clocks
  - How to synchronize events based on actual time?
    → Clock synchronization
  - How to determine relative ordering?
    → Logical clocks

- Part 2 - Global State and Election
  - What is the “global state” of a distributed system?
  - How do we determine the “coordinator” of a distributed system?

- Part 3 - How do we synchronize for sharing
  - Mutual exclusion
  - Distributed transactions
Clock synchronization

- In a centralized system:
  - Time is unambiguous: A process gets the time by issuing a system call to the kernel. If process $A$ gets the time and latter process $B$ gets the time. The value $B$ gets is higher than (or possibly equal to) the value $A$ got
  - Example: UNIX make examines the times at which all the source and object files were last modified:
    - If time (input.c) > time(input.o) then recompile input.c
    - If time (input.c) < time(input.o) then no compilation is needed
Clock synchronization (2)

- In a distributed system:
  - Achieving agreement on time is not trivial!

- Is it possible to synchronize all the clocks in a distributed system?
Clocks

- A computer has a timer, not really a clock.
- Timer is a precisely machined quartz crystal oscillating at a frequency that depends on how the crystal was cut and the amount of tension.
- Two registers are associated with the crystal: counter & holding register.
  - Each oscillation of the crystal decrements the counter by one. When counter gets to zero, an interrupt is generated and the counter reloaded from holding register.
  - In this way, it is possible to program a timer to generate an interrupt 60 times a second, or any other desired frequency. Each interrupt is called a clock tick.
  - At each clock tick, the interrupt procedure adds 1 to the time stored in memory (this keeps the software clock up to date).
- On each of $n$ computers, the crystals will run at slightly different frequencies, causing the software clocks gradually to get out of sync (clock skew).
Logical vs Physical Clocks

- Clock synchronization need not be absolute! (due to Lamport, 1978):
  - If two processes do not interact, their clocks need not be synchronized.
  - What matters is not that all processes agree on exactly what time is it, but rather, that they agree on the order in which events occur.
  - We will discuss this later under “logical clock synchronization”.

- For algorithms where only internal consistency of clocks matters (not whether clocks are close to real time), we speak of logical clocks.

- For algorithms where clocks must not only be the same, but also must not deviate from real-time, we speak of physical clocks.
Physical Clocks

- Since the invention of mechanical clocks in the 17th century, time has been measured astronomically (mean solar day, mean solar second)

- With the invention of the atomic clock in 1948, it becomes possible to measure the time more accurately
  - Labs around the world have atomic clocks and each of them periodically tells the BIH (Bureau International de l’Heure) in Paris how many times its clock ticked.
  - The BIH averages these to produce the TAI (Temps Atomique International).
  - Originally the atomic time is computed to make the atomic second equal to the mean solar second
Universal Coordinated Time

- Because the mean solar day gets longer all the time, the BIH made necessary correction (by introducing leap seconds) called UTC (Universal Coordinated Time)

- UTC is provided to people who need precise time:
  - National Institute of Standard Time (NIST) operates a shortwave radio station with call letters WWV from Fort Collins, Colorado: ± 1 msec accurate.
  - From an earth station using GEOS: accurate to 0.5 msec
  - By telephone from NIST: cheaper but less accurate.
Physical Clock Synchronization

- Model of the system
  - Each machine timer causes an interrupt $H$ times a second (theoretically)
  - When timer goes off, the interrupt handler adds 1 to the software clock
  - When UTC is $t$, the value of the clock on machine $p$ is $C_p(t)$
  - In a perfect world, $C_p(t) = t$ for all $p$ and all $t$, i.e., $dC/dt = 1$
  - In practice, timers do not interrupt exactly $H$ times a second. The relative error obtainable with modern chips is $10^{-5}$
  - Timer is said to be working within its specification if:
    - $1 - \rho \leq dC/dt \leq 1 + \rho$, where constant $\rho$ is the maximum drift rate (specified by manufacturer)

- If after synchronization, 2 clocks are drifting from UTC in the opposite direction, they may be as much as $2\rho \Delta t$ apart at time $\Delta t$
- For clocks not to differ by more than $\delta$, they must be resynchronized every $\delta / 2\rho$ seconds
Cristian’s Algorithm

- One time server (WWV receiver); all other machines stay synchronized with the time server.
- Cannot set $T_1$ to $C_{UTC}$ because time must never run backwards. Changes are introduced gradually by adding more or less seconds for each interrupt.
- The propagation time is included in the change.
  - Estimated as: $(T_1 - T_0 - I)/2$ (can be improved by continuous probing & averaging)

![Diagram of time synchronization]

Both $T_0$ and $T_1$ are measured with the same clock.
Berkeley Algorithm

- Suitable when no machine has a WWV receiver
- The time server (a time daemon) is active:
  - Time daemon polls every machine periodically to ask what time is there
  - Based on the answers, it computes an average time
  - Tells all other machines to advance their clocks to the new time or slow their clocks down until some specified reduction has been achieved
- The time daemon’s time is set manually by operator periodically

From Tanenbaum and van Steen, Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms
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Averaging Algorithm

- A decentralized algorithm:
  - Divide the time into fixed length resynchronization intervals
  - The $i$-th interval starts at $T_0 + iR$ and runs until $T_0 + (i+1)R$, where $T_0$ is an agreed upon moment in the past, and $R$ is a system parameter
  - At the beginning of each interval, each machine broadcasts the current time according to its own clock (broadcasts are not likely to happen simultaneously because the clocks on different machine do not run at exactly the same speed)
  - After a machine broadcasts its time, it starts a timer to collect all other broadcasts that arrive during some interval $S$
  - When all broadcasts arrive, an algorithm is run to compute the new time from them
    - Simplest algorithm: Average the values from all other machines
  - Variations: discard $m$ highest and $m$ lowest values and average the rest; Add to each message an estimate of the propagation time from source
The Internet Network Time Protocols (NTP)

- Layered client-server architecture, based on UDP message passing
- Synchronization at clients with higher strata number less accurate due to increased latency to strata 1 time server
- Failure robustness: if a strata 1 server fails, it may become a strata 2 server that is being synchronized though another strata 1 server
- Modes:
  - Multicast
    - One computer periodically transmits time
  - Procedure call
    - Similar to Cristian’s algorithm
  - Symmetric
    - To be used where high accuracy is needed
Use of Synchronized Clocks

- Hardware and Software for synchronizing clocks on a wide scale are available (e.g., over the entire Internet)
- It is possible to keep millions of clocks synchronized to within a few milliseconds of UTC
- Algorithms that utilize synchronized clocks appeared
- Two examples (Liskov, 1993)
  - At-Most-Once Message Delivery
  - Clock-Based Cache Consistency
At-Most-Once Message Delivery

- Enforce at-most-once message delivery to a server, even in the face of crashes

Algorithm:
- Every message carries a connection identifier and a timestamp
- For each connection, the server records in a table the most recent timestamp it has seen
- If an incoming message for a connection is lower than timestamp stored for that connection, the message is rejected as a duplicate
- Periodically the current time is written to disk.
- When server crashes and then reboots, it reloads the stored time value
  - Any message with a timestamp older than this time value is rejected as duplicate
- Consequence:
  - every message that might have been accepted before the crash is rejected.
  - Some new messages may be incorrectly rejected, but at-most-once semantics is always guaranteed.
Logical Clock Synchronization

- **Happens-before relation**
  - If $a$ and $b$ are events in the same process, and $a$ happens-before $b$, then $a \rightarrow b$ is true
  - If $a$ is the event of a message being sent by one process, and $b$ is the event of the same message being received by another process, then $a \rightarrow b$ is also true
  - If two events, $a$ and $b$, happen in different processes that do not exchange messages, then $a \rightarrow b$ is not true, but neither is $b \rightarrow a$. These events are said to be concurrent ($a \parallel b$).
  - happens-before is transitive: $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow c \Rightarrow a \rightarrow c$

Lamport’s Algorithm

- Capturing happens-before relation
- Each process $p_i$ has a local monotonically increasing counter, called its logical clock $L_i$
- Each event $e$ that occurs at process $p_i$ is assigned a Lamport timestamp $L_i(e)$
- Rules:
  - $L_i$ is incremented before event $e$ is issued at $p_i$: $L_i := L_i + 1$
  - When $p_i$ sends message $m$, it adds $t = L_i$: $(m, t)$ [this is event $send(m)$]
  - On receiving $(m, t)$, $p_j$ computes $L_j := \max(L_j, t)$; $L_j := L_j + 1$; timestamp event $receive(m)$
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Example

- a) Three processes, each with its own clock. The clocks run at different rates.
- b) Lamport's algorithm corrects the clocks.
- Lamport solution:
  - Between every two events, the clock must tick at least once.
  - No two events occur at exactly the same time. If two events happen in processes 1 and 2, both with time 40, the former becomes 40.1 and the latter becomes 40.2.
Lamport Timestamps

a) The updates have to be ordered the same way across the replicas.
b) This can be achieved by a totally ordered multicast algorithm.
c) Totally ordered multicasting can be achieved by means of Lamport clocks.
2 criteria before a node can commit a write:
• All write requests with a smaller timestamp has been committed.
• It has received a write-request acknowledgement from every node.
Can not commit \((x, 8)\) until \((y, 4)\) is committed as the nodes have already seen the \((y, 4)\) message.

Node \(B\) will always send the \((y, 4)\) message before sending an acknowledgement for \((x, 8)\).
Can now commit \((y, 4)\) and \((x, 8)\) in that order.
Vector Timestamp

- With Lamport timestamps:
  - e -> f then timestamp(e) < timestamp(f)
  - But timestamp(e) < timestamp(f) does not imply that e -> f
  - Does not capture causality

- Vector timestamp:
  - All hosts use a vector of logical clocks, where the i-th element is the clock value for the i-th host
  - Timestamp elements for other hosts are initially set to zero
Vector Timestamp

- For every non-communication event on host $i$
  - Increment the $i$-th element in the vector
- Send message sends the entire vector
- On receiving a message from host $j$ (on host $i$), update vector $j$ by:
  - Incrementing the $i$-th element
  - For the remaining elements, take the max value between vector $i$ and $j$
Vector Timestamp

- Two timestamps are equal iff all elements are equal
  - VT1[i] = VT2[i], i = 1, ..., n
- VT1 <= VT2
  - iff VT1[i] <= VT2[i], i = 1, ..., n
- VT1 < VT2
  - iff VT1 <= VT2 and VT1 != VT2
- Otherwise, VT1 is concurrent with VT2
  - We can’t tell from by the message communication pattern whether one happened before the other.
Part 2
Global State & Election Algorithms
Global State

- Sometimes it is useful to know the global state of a distributed system
  - Garbage collection
  - Deadlocks
  - Termination

- Global state = local state of each process + msg’s in transit
  - Local state depends on the process

Distributed Snapshot

- Represents a state in which the distributed system might have been.
  - Consistent global state: If A sends a message to B and the system records B receiving the message, it should also record A sending it.

- Cut of the system’s execution: subset of its global history identifying set of events e
  - Cut C is consistent iff $\forall e \in C, f \rightarrow e \Rightarrow f \in C$
Distributed Snapshot Algorithm

a) Organization of a process and channels for a distributed snapshot
b) Process Q receives a marker for the first time and records its local state
c) Q records all incoming message
d) Q receives a marker for its incoming channel and finishes recording the state of the incoming channel
Initiates distributed snapshot. Process A saves its local state and sends a marker to B and C.
On receiving a marker, process B saves its local state, saves the channel A→B as being empty, and sends the marker to A and C.
Other messages may have arrived at this point.
When a node that has already recorded a local snapshot receives a marker on a channel, it records the state of the channel as having all messages that have arrived since the local snapshot. For example, channel B->A contains message x.
This line represents the distributed snapshot. Additional, channel B->A contains message x and channel C->B contains message y.
Election Problem

- Many algorithms require 1 process to act as a coordinator
  → Example: Coordinator in the centralized mutual exclusion algorithm
- In general, it does not matter which process takes on this special responsibility, but one has to do it.
- How to elect a coordinator?
General Approach

Assumptions:
- Each process has a unique number (e.g., its network address) to distinguish them and hence to select one
- One process per machine: For simplicity
- Every process knows the process number of every other process
- Processes do not know which processes are currently up and which ones are currently down

Approach:
- Locate the process with the highest process number and designate it as coordinator.
- Election algorithms differ in the way they do the location
The Bully Algorithm

- When a process, P, notices that the coordinator is no longer responding to requests, it initiates an election:
  - P sends an ELECTION message to all processes with higher numbers
  - If no one responds, P wins the election and becomes coordinator
  - If one of the higher-ups answers, it takes over. P’s job is done

- When a process gets an ELECTION message from one of its lower-numbered colleagues:
  - Receiver sends an OK message back to the sender to indicate that he is alive and will take over
  - Receiver holds an election, unless it is already holding one
  - Eventually, all processes give up but one, and that one is the new coordinator.
  - New coordinator announce its victory by sending all processes a message telling them that starting immediately it is the new coordinator

- If a process that was previously down comes back:
  - It holds an election. If it happens to be the highest process currently running, it will win the election and take over the coordinator’s job

- The biggest guy in town always wins!
Example

From Tanenbaum and van Steen, Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms
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A Ring Algorithm

- Use a ring (processes are physically or logically ordered, so that each process knows who its successor is). No token is used.

- Algorithm:
  - When any process notices that coordinator is not functioning:
    - Builds an ELECTION message (containing its own process number)
    - Sends the message to its successor (if successor is down, sender skips over it and goes to next member along the ring, or the one after that, until a running process is located)
    - At each step, sender adds its own process number to the list in the message
  - When the message gets back to the process that started it all:
    - Process recognizes the message containing its own process number
    - Changes message type to COORDINATOR
    - Circulates message once again to inform everyone else: Who the new coordinator is (list member with highest number); Who the members of the new ring are
    - When message has circulated once, it is removed
Example

Previous coordinator has crashed

No response

Election message

From Tanenbaum and van Steen, Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms © Prentice-Hall, Inc. 2002
Leader Election in a DHT

- Rather than select the highest ID node as the leader, select the node closest to a pre-determined ID in the ID space (such as 0).
- Resilient DHT routing should deliver requests to the closest node even with node failures.
Part 3
Sharing in Distributed Systems
Mutual Exclusion Problem

- Systems involving multiple processes are often programmed using critical regions.
- When a process has to read or update certain shared data structure, it first enters a critical region to achieve mutual exclusion, i.e., ensure that no other process will use the shared data structure at the same time.
- In single-processor systems, critical regions are protected using semaphores, and monitors or similar constructs. How to accomplish the same in distributed systems?
  - We assume, for now, that transactions are not supported by the system.
Protocols & Requirements

- Application-level protocol
  
  `enter()`  // enter critical section - block if necessary
  `resourceAccesses()`  // access shared resources in critical section
  `exit()`  // leave critical section - other processes may enter

- Requirements
  1. At most one process may execute in the critical section (safety)
  2. Requests to enter and exit the critical section eventually succeed (liveness)
  3. If one request to enter the critical section happened-before another, then entry to the critical section is granted in that order (→ order)
A Centralized Algorithm (Central Server Algorithm)

One process is elected as the coordinator:

a) Process 1 asks the coordinator for permission to enter a critical region. Permission is granted.

b) Process 2 then asks permission to enter the same critical region. The coordinator does not reply.

c) When process 1 exits the critical region, it tells the coordinator, when then replies to 2
A Centralized Algorithm (2)

- **Advantages**
  - Obviously it guarantees mutual exclusion
  - It is fair (requests are granted in the order in which they are received)
  - No starvation (no process ever waits forever)
  - Easy to implement (only 3 messages: request, grant and release)

- **Shortcomings**
  - Coordinator: A single point of failure; A performance bottleneck
  - If processes normally block after making a request, they cannot distinguish a dead coordinator from “permission denied”
A Distributed Algorithm

- Based on a total ordering of events in a system (happens-before relation)

- Algorithm:
  - When a process wants to enter a critical region:
    - Builds a message: {name of critical region; process number; current time}
    - Sends the message to all other processes (assuming reliable transfer)
  - When a process receives a request message from another process:
    - If the receiver is not in the critical region and does not want to enter it, it sends back an OK message to the sender
    - If the receiver is already in the critical region, it does not reply. Instead it queues the request
    - If the receiver wants to enter the critical region but has not yet done so, it compares the timestamp with the one contained in the message it has sent everyone: If the incoming message is lower, the receiver sends back an OK message; otherwise the receiver queues the request and sends nothing
Example

a) Two processes want to enter the same critical region at the same moment.

b) Process 0 has the lowest timestamp, so it wins.

c) When process 0 is done, it sends an OK also, so 2 can now enter the critical region.
Problems

- The single point of failure has been replaced by $n$ points of failure: if any process crashes, it will fail to respond to requests. This silence will be interpreted (incorrectly) as denial of permission, thus blocking all subsequent attempts by all processes to enter all critical regions.

- If reliable multicasting is not available, each process must maintain the group membership list itself, including processes entering the group, leaving the group, and crashing.

  ⇒ Slower, more complicated, more expensive, and less robust than centralized algorithm!
A Token Ring Algorithm

Token holder may enter critical region or pass the token
A Token Ring Algorithm (2)

- **Pros:**
  - Guarantees mutual exclusion (only 1 process has the token at any instant)
  - No starvation (token circulates among processes in a well-defined order)

- **Cons:**
  - Regeneration of the token if it is ever lost: Detecting that the token is lost is difficult, since the amount of time between successive appearances of the token on the network is unbounded
  - Recovery if a process crashes: It is easier than in other cases though. If we require a process receiving the token to acknowledge receipt. A dead process is detected when its neighbor tries to give the token and fails. Dead process is then removed and the token handed to the next process down the line.
Comparison of the 3 Algorithms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Messages per entry/exit</th>
<th>Delay before entry (in message times)</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Coordinator crash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>2 ( (n-1) )</td>
<td>2 ( (n-1) )</td>
<td>Crash of any process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Token ring</td>
<td>1 to ( \infty )</td>
<td>0 to ( n-1 )</td>
<td>Lost token, process crash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Centralized Algorithm**: Simplest and most efficient. A request and a grant to enter, and a release to exit. Only 2 message times to enter.
- **Decentralized Algorithm**: Requires \( n-1 \) request messages, one to each of the other processes, and an additional \( n-1 \) grant messages. Entry takes \( 2(n-1) \) message times assuming that messages are passed sequentially over a LAN.
- **Token Ring Algorithm**: If every process constantly wants to enter a critical region (each token pass will result in one entry). The token may sometimes circulate for hours without anyone being interested in it (number of messages per entry is unbounded). Entry delay varies from 0 (token just arrived) to \( n-1 \) (token just departed).
Transaction

A transaction is a collection of actions that make consistent transformations of system states while preserving system consistency.

- concurrency transparency
- failure transparency
Example Transaction

begin
  input(flight_no, date, customer_name);
  Begin_transaction Reservation
  begin
    Write(flight(date).stsold++);
    Write(flight(date).cname, customer_name);
    Commit
  end. {Reservation}
  output(“reservation completed”)
  ...
  end
Example Transaction (2)

What if there are no free seats?

begin
    input(flight_no, date, customer_name);
    Begin_transaction Reservation
    begin
        temp ← Read(flight_no(date).stsold);
        if temp = flight(date).cap then
            begin
                cond ← Abort;
                Abort
            end
        else begin
            Write(flight(date).stsold, temp + 1);
            Write(flight(date).cname, customer_name);
            cond ← Commit;
            Commit
        end
    end {Reservation}
    if cond=Abort then output(“no free seats”)
    else output(“reservation completed”);
Characterization

- **Read set (RS)**
  - The set of objects that are read by a transaction

- **Write set (WS)**
  - The set of objects whose values are changed by this transaction

- **Base set (BS)**
  - $\text{RS} \cup \text{WS}$
Transaction Primitives

- Special primitives required for programming using transactions
  - Supplied by the operating system or by the language runtime system

- Examples of transaction primitives:
  - **BEGIN_TRANSACTION**: Mark the start of a transaction
  - **END_TRANSACTION (EOT)**: Terminate the transaction and try to commit (there may or may not be a separate **COMMIT** command)
  - **ABORT_TRANSACTION**: Kill the transaction and restore the old values
  - **READ**: Read data from a file (or other object)
  - **WRITE**: Write data to a file (or other object)
Centralized Transaction Execution

User Application

Begin_Transaction, Read, Write, Abort, EOT

Transaction Manager (TM)

Read, Write, Abort, EOT

Scheduler (SC)

Scheduled Operations

Recovery Manager (RM)

Results

Results & User Notifications
Distributed Transaction Execution

Begin_transaction, Read, Write, EOT, Abort

Results & User notifications

User application

TM

SC

RM

Distributed Transaction Execution Model

Replica Control Protocol

Distributed Concurrency Control Protocol

Local Recovery Protocol

Read, Write, EOT, Abort
Properties of Transactions

**ATOMICITY**
- All or nothing
- Multiple operations combined as an atomic transaction

**CONSISTENCY**
- No violation of integrity constraints
  - System specific rules. In a distributed database, the index should always reflect the data, foreign key constraints are not violated, triggers are issued, replicas have the same value, etc.
- Transactions are correct programs

**ISOLATION** ← Our focus in this module
- Concurrent changes invisible → serializable

**DURABILITY**
- Committed updates persist
- Database recovery
Transactions Provide…

- Atomic and reliable execution in the presence of failures
- Correct execution in the presence of multiple user accesses
- Correct management of replicas (if they support it)
Isolation

- Isolation is based on execution histories (sequences).
- Consider the following two transactions:

  \[ T_1: \text{Read}(x) \quad T_2: \text{Read}(x) \]
  \[ x \leftarrow x+1 \quad x \leftarrow x+1 \]
  \[ \text{Write}(x) \quad \text{Write}(x) \]
  \[ \text{Commit} \quad \text{Commit} \]

- Possible execution sequences:

  \[ T_1: \text{Read}(x) \quad T_1: \text{Read}(x) \]
  \[ T_1: x \leftarrow x+1 \quad T_1: x \leftarrow x+1 \]
  \[ T_1: \text{Write}(x) \quad T_2: \text{Read}(x) \]
  \[ T_1: \text{Commit} \quad T_1: \text{Write}(x) \]
  \[ T_2: \text{Read}(x) \quad T_2: x \leftarrow x+1 \]
  \[ T_2: x \leftarrow x+1 \quad T_2: \text{Write}(x) \]
  \[ T_2: \text{Write}(x) \quad T_1: \text{Commit} \]
  \[ T_2: \text{Commit} \quad T_2: \text{Commit} \]
Isolation Problems

- **Serializability**
  - If several transactions are executed concurrently, the results must be the same as if they were executed serially in some order.

- **Incomplete results**
  - An incomplete transaction cannot reveal its results to other transactions before its commitment.
  - Necessary to avoid cascading aborts.
  - Anomalies:
    - **Lost updates**
      - The effects of some transactions are not reflected on the database.
    - **Inconsistent retrievals**
      - E.g. a transaction, if it reads the same object more than once, should always read the same value.
## Lost Update Problem

Initial values: A=100, B=200, C=300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $T$:</th>
<th>Transaction $U$:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance();$</td>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance();$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1);$</td>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1);$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
<td>$c.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance();$</td>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance();$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200$</td>
<td>$200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1);$</td>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1);$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$220$</td>
<td>$220$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
<td>$c.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80$</td>
<td>$280$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Inconsistent Retrievals Problem

Initial values: A=200, B=200

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction V:</th>
<th>Transaction W:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.withdraw(100)</td>
<td>aBranch.branchTotal()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.deposit(100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.withdraw(100);</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total = a.getBalance() $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total = total+b.getBalance() $300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.deposit(100)</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total = total+c.getBalance()</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Execution Schedule (or History)

- An order in which the operations of a set of transactions are executed.
- A schedule (history) can be defined as a partial order over the operations of a set of transactions.

\[ H_1 = \{ W_2(x), R_1(x), R_3(x), W_1(x), C_1, W_2(y), R_3(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_3(z), C_3 \} \]
Serial History

- All the actions of a transaction occur consecutively.
- No interleaving of transaction operations.
- If each transaction is consistent (obeys integrity rules), then the database is guaranteed to be consistent at the end of executing a serial history.

\[
T_1: \begin{align*}
&\text{Read}(x) \\
&\text{Write}(x) \\
&\text{Commit}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
T_2: \begin{align*}
&\text{Write}(x) \\
&\text{Write}(y) \\
&\text{Read}(z) \\
&\text{Commit}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
T_3: \begin{align*}
&\text{Read}(x) \\
&\text{Read}(y) \\
&\text{Read}(z) \\
&\text{Commit}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
H_s = \{ W_2(x), W_2(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_1(x), W_1(x), C_1, R_3(x), R_3(y), R_3(z), C_3 \}
\]
Serializable History

- Transactions execute concurrently, but the net effect of the resulting history upon the database is equivalent to some serial history.

- Equivalent with respect to what?
  - Conflict equivalence: the relative order of execution of the conflicting operations belonging to non-aborted transactions in two histories are the same.
  - Conflicting operations: two incompatible operations (e.g., Read and Write) conflict if they both access the same object.
    - Incompatible operations of each transaction is assumed to conflict; do not change their execution orders.
    - If two operations from two different transactions conflict, the corresponding transactions are also said to conflict.
## Conflict Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations of different transactions</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>read</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>write</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Serializable History

\[
T_1: \quad \text{Read}(x) \quad \text{Write}(x) \quad \text{Commit} \\
T_2: \quad \text{Write}(x) \quad \text{Write}(y) \quad \text{Read}(y) \quad \text{Commit} \\
T_3: \quad \text{Read}(x) \quad \text{Read}(z) \quad \text{Commit}
\]

The following are not conflict equivalent (but \(H_1\) is serializable)

\[
H_s = \{ W_2(x), W_2(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_1(x), W_1(x), C_1, R_3(x), R_3(y), R_3(z), C_3 \}
\]

\[
H_1 = \{ W_2(x), R_1(x), R_3(x), W_1(x), C_1, W_2(y), R_3(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_3(z), C_3 \}
\]

\(H_2\) is not conflict equivalent to \(H_s\) and not serializable

\[
H_2 = \{ W_2(x), R_1(x), R_3(x), W_1(x), C_1, R_3(y), W_2(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_3(z), C_3 \}
\]

\(H_3\) is conflict equivalent to \(H_s\) and, therefore, is serializable.

\[
H_3 = \{ W_2(x), R_1(x), W_1(x), C_1, R_3(x), W_2(y), R_3(y), R_2(z), C_2, R_3(z), C_3 \}
\]
## Resolving Lost Update Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $T$:</th>
<th>Transaction $U$:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$</td>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$</td>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
<td>$c.withdraw(balance/10)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$ $200$</td>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$ $220$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$ $220$</td>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$ $242$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.withdraw(balance/10)$ $200$</td>
<td>$c.withdraw(balance/10)$ $278$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$ $200$</td>
<td>$balance = b.getBalance()$ $220$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$ $220$</td>
<td>$b.setBalance(balance*1.1)$ $242$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.withdraw(balance/10)$ $80$</td>
<td>$c.withdraw(balance/10)$ $278$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resolving Inconsistent Retrieval Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $V$:</th>
<th>Transaction $W$:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a$.withdraw(100); $b$.deposit(100)</td>
<td>$aBranch$.branchTotal()</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a$.withdraw(100); $b$.deposit(100)</td>
<td>$\text{total} = a.getBalance()$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{total} = \text{total} + b.getBalance()$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{total} = \text{total} + c.getBalance()$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $a$.withdraw(100) = $100$
- $b$.deposit(100) = $300$
- $\text{total} = 100 + 300 = 400$
- $\text{total} = \text{total} + b.getBalance() = 400 + 400 = 800$
- $\text{total} = \text{total} + c.getBalance()$
Distributed Transaction Serializability

- Somewhat more involved. Two histories have to be considered:
  - local histories
  - global history
- For global transactions (i.e., global history) to be serializable, two conditions are necessary:
  - Each local history should be serializable.
  - Two conflicting operations should be in the same relative order in all of the local histories where they appear together.
Global Non-serializability

\[ T_1: \quad \text{Read}(x) \]
\[ x \leftarrow x + 5 \]
\[ \text{Write}(x) \]
\[ \text{Commit} \]

\[ T_2: \quad \text{Read}(x) \]
\[ x \leftarrow x \times 15 \]
\[ \text{Write}(x) \]
\[ \text{Commit} \]

The following two local histories are individually serializable (in fact serial), but the two transactions are not globally serializable.

\[ LH_1 = \{ R_1(x), W_1(x), C_1, R_2(x), W_2(x), C_2 \} \]

\[ LH_2 = \{ R_2(x), W_2(x), C_2, R_1(x), W_1(x), C_1 \} \]
Concurency Control

- The problem of synchronizing concurrent transactions such that the consistency of the database is maintained while, at the same time, maximum degree of concurrency is achieved.

- Algorithms:
  - Two-Phase Locking-based (2PL)
    - Centralized (primary site) 2PL
    - Distributed 2PL
  - Timestamp Ordering (TO)
    - Basic TO
    - Multiversion TO
Locking-Based Algorithms

- Transactions indicate their intentions by requesting locks from the scheduler (called lock manager).
- Locks are either read lock ($rl$) [also called shared lock] or write lock ($wl$) [also called exclusive lock]
- Read locks and write locks conflict (because Read and Write operations are incompatible)
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$rl$</th>
<th>$wl$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$rl$</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$wl$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Locking works nicely to allow concurrent processing of transactions.
Two-Phase Locking (2PL)

- A transaction locks an object before using it.
- When an object is locked by another transaction, the requesting transaction must wait.
- When a transaction releases a lock, it may not request another lock.

![Diagram of Two-Phase Locking]
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Locking Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $T$:</th>
<th>Transaction $U$:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{balance} = b.\text{getBalance()}$</td>
<td>$\text{balance} = b.\text{getBalance()}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.\text{setBalance}(\text{bal} \times 1.1)$</td>
<td>$b.\text{setBalance}(\text{bal} \times 1.1)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.\text{withdraw}(\text{bal}/10)$</td>
<td>$c.\text{withdraw}(\text{bal}/10)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{openTransaction}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{openTransaction}$</td>
<td>waits for $T$’s lock on $B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{bal} = b.\text{getBalance()}$</td>
<td>write lock $B$</td>
<td>$\text{bal} = b.\text{getBalance()}$</td>
<td>write lock $B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.\text{setBalance}(\text{bal} \times 1.1)$</td>
<td>write lock $A$</td>
<td>$b.\text{setBalance}(\text{bal} \times 1.1)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.\text{withdraw}(\text{bal}/10)$</td>
<td>unlock $A$, $B$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{closeTransaction}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$c.\text{withdraw}(\text{bal}/10)$</td>
<td>write lock $C$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\text{closeTransaction}$</td>
<td>unlock $B$, $C$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locking Actions

1. When an operation accesses an object within a transaction:
   (a) If the object is not already locked, it is locked and the operation proceeds.
   (b) If the object has a conflicting lock set by another transaction, the transaction must wait until it is unlocked.
   (c) If the object has a non-conflicting lock set by another transaction, the lock is shared and the operation proceeds.
   (d) If the object has already been locked in the same transaction, the lock will be promoted if necessary and the operation proceeds. (Where promotion is prevented by a conflicting lock, rule (b) is used.)

2. When a transaction is committed or aborted, the server unlocks all objects it locked for the transaction.
Centralized 2PL

- There is only one 2PL scheduler in the distributed system.
- Lock requests are issued to the central scheduler.

Data Processors at participating sites  Coordinating TM  Central Site LM

Operation

End of Operation

Lock Request

Lock Granted

Release Locks
Distributed 2PL

- 2PL schedulers are placed at each site. Each scheduler handles lock requests for objects at that site.

Coordinating TM  Participating LMs  Participating DPs

Lock Request  Operation  End of Operation

Release Locks
Deadlock

- A transaction is deadlocked if it is blocked and will remain blocked until there is intervention.
- Locking-based CC algorithms may cause deadlocks.
- Wait-for graph
  - If transaction $T_i$ waits for another transaction $T_j$ to release a lock on an entity, then $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ in WFG.
# Deadlock Due To Locking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $T$</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
<th>Transaction $U$</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a.deposit(100)$</td>
<td>write lock $A$</td>
<td>$b.deposit(200)$</td>
<td>write lock $B$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.withdraw(100)$</td>
<td>waits for $U$’s lock on $B$</td>
<td>$a.withdraw(200)$;</td>
<td>waits for $T$’s lock on $A$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td>…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wait-for Graph (WFG)**

[Diagram showing the wait-for graph with transactions $T$ and $U$ and locks $A$ and $B$.]

## Resolution of Deadlock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $T$</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$a.$deposit(100);</td>
<td>write lock $A$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b.$withdraw(100)</td>
<td>waits for $U$’s</td>
<td>lock on $B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>(timeout elapses)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>$T$’s lock on $A$ becomes vulnerable,</td>
<td>unlock $A$, abort $T$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction $U$</th>
<th>Operations</th>
<th>Locks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b.$deposit(200)</td>
<td>write lock $B$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.$withdraw(200);</td>
<td>waits for $T$’s</td>
<td>lock on $A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$a.$withdraw(200)</td>
<td>write locks $A$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>unlock $A$, $B$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local versus Global WFG

Assume $T_1$ and $T_2$ run at site 1, $T_3$ and $T_4$ run at site 2. Also assume $T_3$ waits for a lock held by $T_4$ which waits for a lock held by $T_1$ which waits for a lock held by $T_2$ which, in turn, waits for a lock held by $T_3$.

Local WFG

Site 1

- $T_1$
- $T_2$

Site 2

- $T_4$
- $T_3$

Global WFG

- $T_1$ (connected to $T_4$)
- $T_2$ (connected to $T_3$)
Distributed Deadlock Example

Site 1 stores object A, Site 2 stores object B, Site 3 stores objects C, D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transaction U</th>
<th>Transaction V</th>
<th>Transaction W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d.deposit(10) lock D@S3</td>
<td>b.deposit(10) lock B@S2</td>
<td>c.deposit(30) lock C@S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.deposit(20) lock A@S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.withdraw(30) wait at S2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.withdraw(20) wait at S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a.withdraw(20) wait at S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distributed Deadlock Example (2)

Deadlock Management

- **Prevention**
  - Guaranteeing that deadlocks can never occur in the first place. Check transaction when it is initiated. Requires no run time support.
  - All resources which may be needed by a transaction must be predeclared

- **Avoidance**
  - Detecting potential deadlocks in advance and taking action to insure that deadlock will not occur. Requires run time support.
  - Order either the objects or the sites and always request locks in that order.

- **Detection and Recovery**
  - Allowing deadlocks to form and then finding and breaking them. As in the avoidance scheme, this requires run time support.
  - Centralized
  - Hierarchical
  - Distributed
Distributed Deadlock Detection

- Sites cooperate in detection of deadlocks.
- One example:
  - The local WFGs are formed at each site and passed on to other sites. Each local WFG is modified as follows:
    - Since each site receives the potential deadlock cycles from other sites, these edges are added to the local WFGs.
    - The edges in the local WFG which show that local transactions are waiting for transactions at other sites are joined with edges in the local WFGs which show that remote transactions are waiting for local ones.
  - Each local deadlock detector:
    - looks for a cycle that does not involve the external edge. If it exists, there is a local deadlock which can be handled locally.
    - looks for a cycle involving the external edge. If it exists, it indicates a potential global deadlock. Pass on the information to the next site.
Probing

W → U → V → W

Deadlock detected

Site 3

Waits for

W → U → V

Site 1

Initiation

Waits for
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Waits for

Timestamp Ordering

Transaction \( T_i \) is assigned a globally unique timestamp \( ts(T_i) \).
- Transaction manager attaches the timestamp to all operations issued by the transaction.
- Each object is assigned a write timestamp \( wts(x) \) and a read timestamp \( rts(x) \):
  - \( rts(x) = \) largest timestamp of any read on \( x \)
  - \( wts(x) = \) largest timestamp of any write on \( x \)

Conflicting operations are resolved by timestamp order.

Basic T/O:

for \( R_i(x) \)
  if \( ts(T_i) < wts(x) \)
    then reject \( R_i(x) \)
  else \{ accept \( R_i(x) \) \\
       \( rts(x) \leftarrow ts(T_i) \} \}

for \( W_i(x) \)
  if \( ts(T_i) < rts(x) \) or \( ts(T_i) < wts(x) \)
    then reject \( W_i(x) \)
  else \{ accept \( W_i(x) \) \\
       \( wts(x) \leftarrow ts(T_i) \} \}
## Conflicts in Timestamp Ordering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>$T_c$</th>
<th>$T_i$</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. write read</td>
<td>$T_c$ must not write an object that has been read by any $T_i$ where $T_i &gt; T_c$</td>
<td>this requires that $T_c \geq$ the maximum read timestamp of the object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. write write</td>
<td>$T_c$ must not write an object that has been written by any $T_i$ where $T_i &gt; T_c$</td>
<td>this requires that $T_c &gt;$ write timestamp of the committed object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. read write</td>
<td>$T_c$ must not read an object that has been written by any $T_i$ where $T_i &gt; T_c$</td>
<td>this requires that $T_c &gt;$ write timestamp of the committed object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

- Do not modify the values in the database, create new rules
  - Each data item \( x \) has a sequence of version \( <x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m> \)
- \( \text{wts}(x_k) \): timestamp of the transaction that created \( x_k \)
- \( \text{rts}(x_k) \): largest timestamp of a transaction that successfully read \( x_k \)
- When a new \( x_k \) is created by \( T_i \), the \( \text{wts}(x_k) \) is initialize to the timestamp of \( T_i \)
- \( \text{rts}(x_k) \) updated whenever a transaction with a bigger timestamp reads it.
Multiversion Timestamp Ordering

- If transaction $T_i$ issues a read($x$), then the system returns the $x_k$ with largest write timestamp amongst those with write timestamps that are less than or equal to $TS(T_i)$.
- If transaction $T_i$ issues a write($x$) and if $TS(T_i) < rts(x_k)$, then abort. Otherwise, create a new version of $x$.

- Reads always succeed!
- Writes by $T_i$ is rejected if some other transaction $T_j$ that should read $T_i$’s write had already read an older version.
Atomic Commit Protocols

- Atomicity property:
  - Either all operations must be carried out, or none of the operations

- For distributed transactions, this involves multiple servers

- Simple solution is have the transaction coordinator broadcast the commit/abort message
  - Why is this inadequate?
    - It prevents individual servers from making unilateral decision to abort a transaction
    - For example, if we are using locking, a server cannot abort a transaction to resolve a deadlock
    - Server might have crashed without the coordinator knowing.
# Two-Phase Commit Protocol

- Trying to reach consensus on whether to commit the transaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>canCommit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Prepared to commit (uncertain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Committed</td>
<td>doCommit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>haveCommitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>