#### Programming at Scale: Dataflow and Consistency

cs378h



Questions?

Administrivia

- Rust lab due today!
- Project Proposal Due Thursday!

Agenda:

- Dataflow Wrapup
- Concurrency & Consistency at Scale

```
public void kmeans() {
  while(...) {
    for each point
      find_nearest_center(point);
    for each center
      compute_new_center(center)
  }
```

```
public void kmeans() {
    while(...) {
    for each point
        find_nearest_center(point);
        for each center
            compute_new_center(center)
        }
```

```
public void kmeans() {
    while(...) {
    map for each point
        find_nearest_center(point);
    reduce for each center
        compute_new_center(center)
    }
```

```
public void kmeans() {
     while(...) {
      for each point
 map
         find nearest center(point);
       for each center
reduce
         compute new center(center)
```















### How Does Parallelization Work?











# Task Granularity And Pipelining

|map tasks| >> |machines| -- why?

# Task Granularity And Pipelining

|map tasks| >> |machines| -- why?
Minimize fault recovery time
Pipeline map with other tasks
Easier to load balance dynamically

#### MapReduce: A major step backwards | The Database Column

http://databasecolumn.vertica.com/database-innovation/mapreduce-a-major-step-backwards/

September 6, 201

on Jan 17 in Database architecture, Database history, Database innovation posted by DeWitt

[Note: Although the system attributes this post to a single author, it was written by David J. DeWitt and Michael Stonebraker]

On January 8, a Database Column reader asked for our views on new distributed database research efforts, and we'll begin here with our views on <u>MapReduce</u>. This is a good time to discuss it, since the recent trade press has been filled with news of the revolution of so-called "cloud computing." This paradigm entails harnessing large numbers of (low-end) processors working in parallel to solve a computing problem. In effect, this suggests constructing a data center by lining up a large number of "jelly beans" rather than utilizing a much smaller number of high-end servers.

For example, IBM and Google have announced plans to make a 1,000 processor cluster available to a few select universities to teach students how to program such clusters using a software tool called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.

As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, data-intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:

abase		
September 6, 2011		
n by David J. DeWitt		
ted database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ita center by lining up gh-end servers. sor cluster available	l	
ng a software tool called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.		
As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, data-intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:		
1. A giant step backward in the programming paradigm for large-scale data intensive applications		

abase		
September 6, 2011		
n by David J. DeWitt		
ted database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ita center by lining up gh-end servers. sor cluster available	l	
ng a software tool called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.		
As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, data-intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:		
1. A giant step backward in the programming paradigm for large-scale data intensive applications		

Backwards step in programming paradigm	abase
	September 6, 2011
,	n by David J. DeWitt
	ted database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ata center by lining up gh-end servers.
	sor cluster available
called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their free program using the MapReduce framework.	eshman how to
As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapRe have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of sc intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain type computations, but to the database community, it is:	educe proponents calable, data- es of general-purpose
<ol> <li>A giant step backward in the programming paradigm for large-scale data applications</li> </ol>	a intensive

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing

abase

September 6, 201

n by David J. DeWitt

ted database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ta center by lining up gh-end servers.

sor cluster available ng a software tool

called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.

As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, dataintensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine

abase

eptember 6, 201

n by David J. DeWitt

ed database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ita center by lining up gh-end servers.

sor cluster available ng a software tool

called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.

As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, data-intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ...

abase

eptember 6, 201

n by David J. DeWitt

ted database good time to discuss -called "cloud essors working in ta center by lining up gh-end servers.

sor cluster available ng a software tool

called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.

As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, dataintensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ... Incompatible with most DBMS tools

sor cluster available

n by David J. DeWitt

aood time to discuss

essors working in ita center by lining up gh-end servers.

ted database

called "cloud

abase

called MapReduce [1]. Berkeley has gone so far as to plan on teaching their freshman how to program using the MapReduce framework.

As both educators and researchers, we are amazed at the hype that the MapReduce proponents have spread about how it represents a paradigm shift in the development of scalable, data-intensive applications. MapReduce may be a good idea for writing certain types of general-purpose computations, but to the database community, it is:

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ... Incompatible with most DBMS tools

> sor cluster available og a software tool on teaching their freshman how to

abase

n by David J. DeWitt

aood time to discuss

ta center by lining up gh-end servers.

ted database

called "cloud essors working in

#### So why is it such a big success?

type that the MapReduce proponents development of scalable, datawriting certain types of general-purpose

Backwards step in programming paradigm

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ...

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ... Incompatible with most DBMS tools

Backwards step in programming paradigm Sub-optimal: brute force, no indexing Not novel: 25 year-old ideas from DBMS lit It's just a group-by aggregate engine Missing most DBMS features Schema, foreign keys, ... Incompatible with most DBMS tools

#### So why is it such a big success?

# MapReduce and Dataflow

# MapReduce and Dataflow

• MR is a *dataflow* engine

# MapReduce and Dataflow

• MR is a *dataflow* engine


### MapReduce and Dataflow

- MR is a *dataflow* engine
- Lots of others
  - Dryad
  - DryadLINQ
  - Dandelion
  - CIEL
  - GraphChi/Pregel
  - Spark



### MapReduce and Dataflow

- MR is a *dataflow* engine
- Lots of others
  - Dryad
  - DryadLINQ
  - Dandelion
  - CIEL
  - GraphChi/Pregel
  - Spark





### MapReduce and Dataflow

- MR is a *dataflow* engine
- Lots of others
  - Dryad
  - DryadLINQ
  - Dandelion
  - CIEL

#### Taxonomies:

- DAG instead of BSP
- Interface variety
  - Memory FIFO
  - Disk
  - Network
- Flexible Modular Composition





### Dryad (2007): 2-D Piping

Unix Pipes: 1-D
 grep | sed | sort | awk | perl







#### **Dataflow Engines**



### Dataflow Job Structure



### Dataflow Job Structure



#### Channels

X Items M

#### Finite streams of items

- distributed filesystem files (persistent)
- SMB/NTFS files (temporary)
- TCP pipes (inter-machine)
  memory FIFOs

(intra-machine)

#### Channels

X Items M

Key idea: Encapsulate data movement behind channel abstraction → gets programmer out of the picture

#### Finite streams of items

- distributed filesystem files (persistent)
- SMB/NTFS files (temporary)
- TCP pipes (inter-machine)
- memory FIFOs (intra-machine)

#### Spark (2012) Background

Commodity clusters: important platform In industry: search, machine translation, ad targeting, ... In research: bioinformatics, NLP, climate simulation, ... Cluster-scale models (e.g. MR) de facto standard Fault tolerance through replicated durable storage Dataflow is the common theme

#### Spark (2012) Background

Commodity clusters: important platform In industry: search, machine translation, ad targeting, ... In research: bioinformatics, NLP, climate simulation, ... Cluster-scale models (e.g. MR) de facto standard Fault tolerance through replicated durable storage Dataflow is the common theme

Multi-core Iteration



Programming models for clusters transform data flowing from stable storage to stable storage

E.g., MapReduce:





Programming models for clusters transform data flowing from stable storage to stable storage

E.g., MapReduce:



#### Iterative Computations: PageRank

```
1. Start each page with a rank of 1
2. On each iteration, update each page's rank to
               Σ<sub>i∈neighbors</sub> rank<sub>i</sub> / |neighbors<sub>i</sub>|
links = // RDD of (url, neighbors) pairs
ranks = // RDD of (url, rank) pairs
for (i <- 1 to ITERATIONS) {</pre>
  ranks = links.join(ranks).flatMap {
    (url, (links, rank)) =>
      links.map(dest => (dest, rank/links.size))
  }.reduceByKey(_ + _)
}
```



#### Iterative Computations: PageRank

```
1. Start each page with a rank of 1
2. On each iteration, update each page's rank to
               \Sigma_{i \in neighbors} \operatorname{rank}_i / |neighbors_i|
links = // RDD of (url, neighbors) pairs
ranks = // RDD of (url, rank) pairs
for (i <- 1 to ITERATIONS) {</pre>
  ranks = links.join(ranks).flatMap {
    (url, (links, rank)) =>
      links.map(dest => (dest, rank/links.size))
  }.reduceByKey(_ + _)
}
```



#### Iterative Computations: PageRank



### Programming Model

- Resilient distributed datasets (RDDs)
  - Immutable collections partitioned across cluster that can be rebuilt if a partition is lost
  - Created by transforming data in stable storage using data flow operators (map, filter, group-by, ...)
  - Can be *cached* across parallel operations

### Programming Model

- Resilient distributed datasets (RDDs)
  - Immutable collections partitioned across cluster that can be rebuilt if a partition is lost
  - Created by transforming data in stable storage using data flow operators (map, filter, group-by, ...)
  - Can be *cached* across parallel operations
- Parallel operations on RDDs
  - Reduce, collect, count, save, ...

### Programming Model

- Resilient distributed datasets (RDDs)
  - Immutable collections partitioned across cluster that can be rebuilt if a partition is lost
  - Created by transforming data in stable storage using data flow operators (map, filter, group-by, ...)
  - Can be *cached* across parallel operations
- Parallel operations on RDDs
  - Reduce, collect, count, save, ...
- Restricted shared variables
  - Accumulators, broadcast variables



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

Base RDD lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...") Worker Driver Worker Worker

• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")



```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
                                                                Worker
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
                                                  Driver
                                                               Worker
                                               Worker
```



```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
                                                                Worker
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
                                                  Driver
                                                               Worker
                                               Worker
```

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
```



```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```





```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```

```
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("foo")).count
```





```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```

```
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("foo")).count
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```

cachedMsgs.filter(\_.contains("foo")).count


• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("foo")).count
Cache
Worker
```



Block 3

• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```

```
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("foo")).count
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("bar")).count
```



• Load error messages from a log into memory, then interactively search for various patterns

```
lines = spark.textFile("hdfs://...")
errors = lines.filter(_.startsWith("ERROR"))
messages = errors.map(_.split('\t')(2))
cachedMsgs = messages.cache()
```

```
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("foo")).count
cachedMsgs.filter(_.contains("bar")).count
```

**Result:** full-text search of Wikipedia in <1 sec (vs 20 sec for on-disk data)



### RDD Fault Tolerance

 RDDs maintain *lineage* information that can be used to reconstruct lost partitions



Application	
Language	
<b>E</b> very ution	
Execution	
Storage	














































































col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		

How to keep data in sync?

• Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		

How to keep data in sync?

• Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		



How to keep data in sync?

• Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		



- Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines
- Redundancy  $\rightarrow$  single datum spread over multiple machines



col	col	col <sub>2</sub>	 col <sub>c</sub>
0	1		



- Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines
- Redundancy  $\rightarrow$  single datum spread over multiple machines

#### Key Value Stores Document Stores Strong Consistency Replication Storage Query Support Unterflored Unte

#### Consistency





- Partitioning  $\rightarrow$  single row spread over multiple machines
- Redundancy  $\rightarrow$  single datum spread over multiple machines



Key Value Store

Document Store

## Consistency: the core problem



Kev Value Stor

Vide-Column Sto

• Clients perform reads and writes



Kev Value Sto

- Clients perform reads and writes
- Data is replicated among a set of servers



- Clients perform reads and writes
- Data is replicated among a set of servers
- Writes must be performed at all servers



- Clients perform reads and writes
- Data is replicated among a set of servers
- Writes must be performed at all servers
- Reads return the result of one or more past writes

Consistency: the core problem



- Clients perform reads and writes
- Data is replicated among a set of servers
- Writes must be performed at all servers
- Reads return the result of one or more past writes

Consistency: the core problem

How should we *implement* write?



- Clients perform reads and writes
- Data is replicated among a set of servers
- Writes must be performed at all servers
- Reads return the result of one or more past writes

How should we *implement* write?How to *implement* read?





• A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:



A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
1. Consistency:



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:
    - system allows operations all the time,
    - and operations return quickly
  - 3. Partition-tolerance:


- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly

#### 3. Partition-tolerance:

• system continues to work in spite of network partitions



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly

#### 3. Partition-tolerance:

• system continues to work in spite of netwo



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly

#### 3. Partition-tolerance:

• system continues to work in spite of netwo

#### Why care about CAP Properties? Availability

- •Reads/writes complete reliably and quickly.
- •E.g. Amazon, each ms latency → \$6M yearly loss.

#### **Partitions**

- Internet router outages
- Under-sea cables cut
- rack switch outage
- system should continue functioning normally!

#### Consistency

- all nodes see same data at any time, or reads return latest written value by any client.
- This basically means correctness!



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly

#### 3. Partition-tolerance:

• system continues to work in spite of netwo



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client

#### 2. Availability:

- system allows operations all the time,
- and operations return quickly

#### 3. Partition-tolerance:

• system continues to work in spite of netwo

#### Why is this "theorem" true?



- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:
    - system allows operations all the time,
    - and operations return quickly
  - 3. Partition-tolerance:
    - system continues to work in spite of netwo

#### Why is this "theorem" true?





- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:
    - system allows operations all the time,
    - and operations return quickly
  - 3. Partition-tolerance:
    - system continues to work in spite of netwo







- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:
    - system allows operations all the time,
    - and operations return quickly
  - 3. Partition-tolerance:
    - system continues to work in spite of netwo





- A distributed system can satisfy at most 2/3 guarantees of:
  - 1. Consistency:
    - all nodes see same data at any time
    - or reads return latest written value by any client
  - 2. Availability:
    - system allows operations all the time,
    - and operations return quickly
  - 3. Partition-tolerance:
    - system continues to work in spite of netwo





if(partition) { keep going }  $\rightarrow$  !consistent && available if(partition) { stop }  $\rightarrow$  consistent && !available

### **CAP** Implications



<u>Cassandra</u>, RIAK, Dynamo, Voldemort

### **CAP** Implications







Kev Value Sto

# Spectrum Ends: Eventual Consistency



- Eventual Consistency
  - If writes to a key stop, all replicas of key will converge
  - Originally from Amazon's Dynamo and LinkedIn's Voldemort systems



# Spectrum Ends: Strong Consistency



#### • Strict:

- Absolute time ordering of all shared accesses, reads always return last write
- Linearizability:
  - Each operation is visible (or available) to all other clients in real-time order
- Sequential Consistency [Lamport]:
  - "... the result of any execution is the same as if the operations of all the processors were executed in some sequential order, and the operations of each individual processor appear in this sequence in the order specified by its program.
  - After the fact, find a "reasonable" ordering of the operations (can re-order operations) that obeys sanity (consistency) at all clients, and across clients.
- ACID properties



# Many Many Consistency Models





# Many Many Consistency Models



- Amazon S3 eventual consistency
- Amazon Simple DB eventual or strong
- Google App Engine **strong** or eventual
- Yahoo! PNUTS eventual or strong

• ...

- Windows Azure Storage **strong** (or eventual)
- Cassandra eventual or strong (if R+W > N)



# Many Many Consistency Models



- Amazon S3 eventual consistency
- Amazon Simple DB eventual or strong
- Google App Engine strong or eventual
- Yahoo! PNUTS eventual or strong

• ...

- Windows Azure Storage **strong** (or eventual)
- Cassandra eventual or strong (if R+W > N)

# <u>Question</u>: How to choose what to use or support?

### Some Consistency Guarantees

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.

### Some Consistency Guarantees

		CO <sub>NSISTER</sub>	Deron Cher	OVQIJOL	Nillo-
Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.	А	D	F	
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.	D	А	А	
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.	С	В	А	
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.	В	С	D	
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.	С	В	В	
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.	С	С	С	

### Some Consistency Guarantees







for half = 1 .. 2 {

for half = 1 .. 2 {

while half not over {

for half = 1 .. 2 {

while half not over {

kick-the-ball-at-the-goal

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {

kick-the-ball-at-the-goal

for each goal {

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
 kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
 for each goal {
 if visiting-team-scored {
 }
}

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
 kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
 for each goal {
 if visiting-team-scored {
 score = Read ("visitors");
 }
 }
}

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
 kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
 for each goal {
 if visiting-team-scored {
 score = Read ("visitors");
 Write ("visitors", score + 1);
 }
 }
}

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
 kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
 for each goal {
 if visiting-team-scored {
 score = Read ("visitors");
 Write ("visitors", score + 1);
 } else {
 }
}

for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
 kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
 for each goal {
 if visiting-team-scored {
 score = Read ("visitors");
 Write ("visitors", score + 1);
 } else {
 score = Read ("home");
 }
 }
}

for half = 1 .. 2 { while half not over { kick-the-ball-at-the-goal for each goal { if visiting-team-scored { score = Read ("visitors"); Write ("visitors", score + 1); } else { score = Read ("home"); Write ("home", score + 1);

```
for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
     kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
     for each goal {
      if visiting-team-scored {
        score = Read ("visitors");
        Write ("visitors", score + 1);
      } else {
        score = Read ("home");
        Write ("home", score + 1);
```
```
for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
     kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
     for each goal {
      if visiting-team-scored {
        score = Read ("visitors");
        Write ("visitors", score + 1);
      } else {
        score = Read ("home");
        Write ("home", score + 1);
      hScore = Read("home");
```

```
for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
     kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
     for each goal {
      if visiting-team-scored {
        score = Read ("visitors");
        Write ("visitors", score + 1);
      } else {
        score = Read ("home");
        Write ("home", score + 1);
      hScore = Read("home");
vScore = Read("visit");
```

```
for half = 1 .. 2 {
 while half not over {
     kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
     for each goal {
      if visiting-team-scored {
        score = Read ("visitors");
        Write ("visitors", score + 1);
      } else {
        score = Read ("home");
        Write ("home", score + 1);
      hScore = Read("home");
vScore = Read("visit");
if (hScore == vScore)
```

```
for half = 1 .. 2 {
  while half not over {
     kick-the-ball-at-the-goal
     for each goal {
      if visiting-team-scored {
        score = Read ("visitors");
        Write ("visitors", score + 1);
      } else {
        score = Read ("home");
        Write ("home", score + 1);
      } } }
hScore = Read("home");
vScore = Read("visit");
if (hScore == vScore)
  play-overtime
```

for half = 1 .. 2 { while half not over { kick-the-ball-at-the-goal for each goal { if visiting-team-scored { score = Read ("visitors"); Write ("visitors", score + 1); } else { score = Read ("home"); Write ("home", score + 1); hScore = **Read**("home"); vScore = **Read**("visit"); if (hScore == vScore) play-overtime





score = Read ("visitors");
Write ("visitors", score + 1);

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

score = Read ("visitors");
Write ("visitors", score + 1);

#### Desired consistency?



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

score = Read ("visitors");
Write ("visitors", score + 1);

#### Desired consistency? Strong



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

score = Read ("visitors");
Write ("visitors", score + 1);

Desired consistency?

#### Strong

= Read My Writes!



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

score = Read ("visitors");
Write ("visitors", score + 1);

Desired consistency?

Strong

= Read My Writes!

Write	("home", 1);
Write	("visitors", 1);
Write	("home", 2);
Write	("home", 3);
Write	("visitors", 2);
Write	("home", 4);
Write	("home", 5);
Visito Home =	ors = 2 5



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

## Referee

vScore = **Read** ("visitors"); hScore = **Read** ("home"); if vScore == hScore play-overtime



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

## Referee

vScore = **Read** ("visitors"); hScore = **Read** ("home"); if vScore == hScore play-overtime



#### Desired consistency?

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

## Referee

vScore = **Read** ("visitors"); hScore = **Read** ("home"); if vScore == hScore play-overtime



Desired consistency? Strong consistency

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
do {
    BeginTx();
    vScore = Read ("visitors");
    hScore = Read ("home");
    EndTx();
    report vScore and hScore;
    sleep (30 minutes);
}
```

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
do {
    BeginTx();
    vScore = Read ("visitors");
    hScore = Read ("home");
    EndTx();
    report vScore and hScore;
    sleep (30 minutes);
}
```

#### Desired consistency?

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
do {
    BeginTx();
    vScore = Read ("visitors");
    hScore = Read ("home");
    EndTx();
    report vScore and hScore;
    sleep (30 minutes);
}
```

#### Desired consistency? Consistent Prefix

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
do {
    BeginTx();
    vScore = Read ("visitors");
    hScore = Read ("home");
    EndTx();
    report vScore and hScore;
    sleep (30 minutes);
}
```

Desired consistency? Consistent Prefix Monotonic Reads

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
do {
    BeginTx();
    vScore = Read ("visitors");
    hScore = Read ("home");
    EndTx();
    report vScore and hScore;
    sleep (30 minutes);
}
```

Desired consistency? Consistent Prefix Monotonic Reads or Bounded Staleness

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

do {
 BeginTx();
 vScore = Read ("visitors");
 hScore = Read ("home");
 EndTx();
 report vScore and hScore;
 sleep (30 minutes);
}

Desired consistency? Consistent Prefix Monotonic Reads or Bounded Staleness



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
While not end of game {
    drink beer;
    smoke cigar;
}
go out to dinner;
vScore = Read ("visitors");
hScore = Read ("home");
write article;
```



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
While not end of game {
    drink beer;
    smoke cigar;
}
go out to dinner;
vScore = Read ("visitors");
hScore = Read ("home");
write article;
```

#### **Desired consistency?**



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
While not end of game {
    drink beer;
    smoke cigar;
}
go out to dinner;
vScore = Read ("visitors");
hScore = Read ("home");
write article;
```

#### Desired consistency? Eventual



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

```
While not end of game {
    drink beer;
    smoke cigar;
}
go out to dinner;
vScore = Read ("visitors");
hScore = Read ("home");
write article;
```

Desired consistency? Eventual Bounded Staleness



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

Wait for end of game; score = **Read** ("home"); stat = **Read** ("season-goals"); **Write** ("season-goals", stat + score);



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

Wait for end of game; score = Read ("home"); stat = Read ("season-goals"); Write ("season-goals", stat + score);

#### Desired consistency?



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

Wait for end of game;
score = Read ("home");
stat = Read ("season-goals");
Write ("season-goals", stat + score);

#### Desired consistency? Strong Consistency (1st read)





Wait for end of game;
score = Read ("home");
stat = Read ("season-goals");
Write ("season-goals", stat + score);

Desired consistency? Strong Consistency (1st read) Read My Writes (2<sup>nd</sup> read)



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

## Stat Watcher

do {

stat = Read ("season-goals");
discuss stats with friends;
sleep (1 day);



Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.

## Stat Watcher

do {

stat = Read ("season-goals");
discuss stats with friends;
sleep (1 day);

#### Desired consistency?





### Stat Watcher

do {

stat = Read ("season-goals");
discuss stats with friends;
sleep (1 day);



#### Desired consistency? Eventual Consistency

Strong Consistency	See all previous writes.
Eventual Consistency	See subset of previous writes.
Consistent Prefix	See initial sequence of writes.
Monotonic Reads	See increasing subset of writes.
Read My Writes	See all writes performed by reader.
Bounded Staleness	See all "old" writes.



#### Sequential Consistency

- weaker than strict/strong consistency
  - All operations are executed in *some* sequential order
  - each process issues operations in program order
    - Any valid interleaving is allowed
    - All agree on the same interleaving
    - Each process preserves its program order

P1: W	(x)a			P1: W(x	)a		
P2:	W(x)b			P2:	W(x)b		
P3:		R(x)b	R(x)a	P3:	R()	()b	R(x)
P4:		R(x)b	R(x)a	P4:		R(x)a	R(x)
		(a)			(b)		

#### Sequential Consistency

- weaker than strict/strong consistency
  - All operations are executed in *some* sequential order
  - each process issues operations in program order
    - Any valid interleaving is allowed
    - All agree on the same interleaving
    - Each process preserves its program order

<b>P1</b> :	W(x)a		
P2:	W(x)b		
P3:		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:		R(x)b	R(x)a

<b>P1</b> :	W(x)a		
P2:	W(x)b		
<b>P</b> 3:		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:		R(x)a	R(x)b
		(b)	

• Why is this weaker than strict/strong?

#### Sequential Consistency

- weaker than strict/strong consistency
  - All operations are executed in *some* sequential order
  - each process issues operations in program order
    - Any valid interleaving is allowed
    - All agree on the same interleaving
    - Each process preserves its program order

<b>P1</b> :	W(x)a		
P2:	W(x)b		
<b>P</b> 3:		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:		R(x)b	R(x)a

P1:	W(x)a		
P2:	W(x)b		
<b>P3</b> :		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:		R(x)a	R(x)b
		(b)	

- Why is this weaker than strict/strong?
- Nothing is said about "most recent write"

## Linearizability

## Linearizability

- Assumes sequential consistency and
  - If TS(x) < TS(y) then OP(x) should precede OP(y) in the sequence
  - Stronger than sequential consistency
  - Difference between linearizability and serializability?
    - Granularity: reads/writes versus transactions
## Linearizability

• Assumes sequential consistency and

- If TS(x) < TS(y) then OP(x) should precede OP(y) in the sequence
- Stronger than sequential consistency
- Difference between linearizability and serializability?
  - Granularity: reads/writes versus transactions

•Example:

Stay tuned...relevant for lock free data structures
Importantly: *a property of concurrent objects*

• Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?

#### **Causal:**

- Causally related writes seer If a write produces a value that
  - Causally?

causes another write, they are causally related

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?
  - *Concurrent* writes may be seen in different orders on different machines

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?
  - *Concurrent* writes may be seen in different orders on different machines

P1: W(x)a				
P2:	R(x)a	W(x)b		
P3:			R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:			R(x)a	R(x)b
		(a)		

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?
  - *Concurrent* writes may be seen in different orders on different machines

P1: W(x)a					
P2:	R(x)a	W(x)b			-
P3:			R(x)b	R(x)a	_
P4:			R(x)a	R(x)b	-
		(a)			

#### Not permitted

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?
  - *Concurrent* writes may be seen in different orders on different machines

P1: W(x)a					P1: W(x)a			
P2:	R(x)a	W(x)b			P2:	W(x)b		
P3:			R(x)b	R(x)a	P3:		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:			R(x)a	R(x)b	P4:		R(x)a	R(x)b
		(a)				(b)		

#### Not permitted

- Causally related writes seen by all processes in same order.
  - Causally?
  - *Concurrent* writes may be seen in different orders on different machines

P1: W(x)a					P1: W(x)a			
P2:	R(x)a	W(x)b			P2:	W(x)b		
P3:			R(x)b	R(x)a	P3:		R(x)b	R(x)a
P4:			R(x)a	R(x)b	P4:		R(x)a	R(x)b
		(a)				(b)		

Permitted

#### Not permitted

### Consistency models summary

# Consistency models summary

Consistency	Description
Strict	Absolute time ordering of all shared accesses matters.
Linearizability	All processes must see all shared accesses in the same order. Accesses are furthermore ordered according to a (nonunique) global timestamp
Sequential	All processes see all shared accesses in the same order. Accesses are not ordered in time
Causal	All processes see causally-related shared accesses in the same order.
FIFO	All processes see writes from each other in the order they were used. Writes from different processes may not always be seen in that order
	(a)

Consistency	Description
Weak	Shared data can be counted on to be consistent only after a synchronization is done
Release	Shared data are made consistent when a critical region is exited
Entry	Shared data pertaining to a critical region are made consistent when a critical region is entered.