Transactions 2PC Review

Chris Rossbach cs378h

Transactions

Core issue: multiple updates

Canonical examples:

Transactions

Core issue: multiple updates

Canonical examples:

- Modified data in memory/caches
- Even if in-memory data is durable, multiple disk updates

Transactions

Core issue: multiple updates

Canonical examples:

Problem: crash in the middle

- Modified data in memory/caches
- Even if in-memory data is durable, multiple disk updates

Key idea: turn multiple updates into a single one

- Key idea: turn multiple updates into a single one
- Many implementation Techniques
 - Two-phase locking
 - Timestamp ordering
 - Optimistic Concurrency Control
 - Journaling
 - 2,3-phase commit
 - Speculation-rollback
 - Single global lock
 - Compensating transactions

- Key idea: turn multiple updates into a single one
- Many implementation Techniques
 - Two-phase locking
 - Timestamp ordering
 - Optimistic Concurrency Control
 - Journaling
 - 2,3-phase commit
 - Speculation-rollback
 - Single global lock
 - Compensating transactions

Key problems:

- output commit
- synchronization

- Key idea: turn multiple updates into a single one
- Many implementation Techniques
 - Two-phase locking
 - Timestamp ordering
 - Optimistic Concurrency Control
 - Journaling
 - 2,3-phase commit
 - Speculation-rollback
 - Single global lock
 - Compensating transactions

Key problems:

- output commit
- synchronization



Two-phase commit

- N participants agree or don't (atomicity)
- Phase 1: everyone "prepares"
- Phase 2: Master decides and tells everyone to actually commit
- What if the master crashes in the middle?

2PC: Phase 1

- 1. Coordinator sends REQUEST to all participants
- 2. Participants receive request and
- 3. Execute locally
- 4. Write VOTE_COMMIT or VOTE_ABORT to local log
- 5. Send VOTE_COMMIT or VOTE_ABORT to coordinator

Example—move: $C \rightarrow S1$: delete foo from /, $C \rightarrow S2$: add foo to /

```
Failure case:

S1 writes rm /foo, VOTE_COMMIT to log
S1 sends VOTE_COMMIT
S2 decides permission problem
S2 writes/sends VOTE ABORT

Success case:
S1 writes rm /foo, VOTE_COMMIT to log
S1 sends VOTE_COMMIT
S2 writes add foo to /
S2 writes/sends VOTE COMMIT
```

2PC: Phase 2

- Case 1: receive VOTE_ABORT or timeout
 - Write GLOBAL_ABORT to log
 - send GLOBAL_ABORT to participants
- Case 2: receive VOTE_COMMIT from all
 - Write GLOBAL_COMMIT to log
 - send GLOBAL_COMMIT to participants
- Participants receive decision, write GLOBAL_* to log

2PC corner cases

Phase 1

- 1. Coordinator sends REQUEST to all participants
- 2. Participants receive request and
 - 3. Execute locally
 - 4. Write VOTE_COMMIT or VOTE_ABORT to local log
 - 5. Send VOTE COMMIT or VOTE ABORT to coordinator

Phase 2

- Case 1: receive VOTE_ABORT or timeout
 - Write GLOBAL_ABORT to log
 - send GLOBAL_ABORT to participants
 - Case 2: receive VOTE COMMIT from all
 - Write GLOBAL_COMMIT to log
 - send GLOBAL_COMMIT to participants
- Participants recv decision, write GLOBAL_* to log

- What if participant crashes at X?
- Coordinator crashes at Y?
- Participant crashes at Z?
- Coordinator crashes at W?

• Coordinator crashes at W, never wakes up

- Coordinator crashes at W, never wakes up
- All nodes block forever!

- Coordinator crashes at W, never wakes up
- All nodes block forever!
- Can participants ask each other what happened?

- Coordinator crashes at W, never wakes up
- All nodes block forever!
- Can participants ask each other what happened?
- 2PC: always has risk of indefinite blocking

- Coordinator crashes at W, never wakes up
- All nodes block forever!
- Can participants ask each other what happened?
- 2PC: always has risk of indefinite blocking
- Solution: (yes) 3 phase commit!
 - Reliable replacement of crashed "leader"
 - 2PC often good enough in practice

Questions?