

Order in Distributed Systems




Why Order?



Determine the potential order of events.

- **Determine the cause-effect relationship (causality) in a distributed computation.**




Enforce an ordering policy, i.e. an a priori specified sequence of events.

- **Coordination of joint activities.**



Order is important!



I.

What can be ordered?

In what way order is established in a distributed system?




What can be (causally) ordered?

e only has an impact on events in the future and only can be caused by events from the past.

e: event in the presence

Can we (in principle) establish a total temporal order in a distributed system?



The Precedence Relation

Events in a system can be ordered according to their causal relationship in a cause-effect chain (happens before relation, Lamport 78)).

Def.: Precedence Relation \rightarrow

1. for all $e_i^k, e_i^l \in h_i, k < l : e_i^k \rightarrow e_i^l$ (h_i is the "history" of process i) (local precedence)
2. If $e_i = \text{send}(m)$ and $e_j = \text{receive}(m) : e_i \rightarrow e_j$
3. If $e \rightarrow e'$ and $e' \rightarrow e'' : e \rightarrow e''$ (transitivity)

For concurrent events no causal relationship can be specified, i.e. neither $e \rightarrow e'$ nor $e' \rightarrow e$ holds. Notation: $e \parallel e'$


A distributed computation can formally be seen as a partially ordered set defined by the tuple (H, \rightarrow) where H is the combined History of all processes.



Computational Model

➔ **A distributed computation is performed as the joint activity of local, sequential processes.**

➔ **The activity of a local sequential process is modelled as a sequence of events.**



➔ **An event either is local to a process, i.e. it causes an internal, local state change, or**

➔ **A computation includes the communication with another process. This will be modelled by a send and a receive event.**

➔ **Messages are unambiguous single events, i.e. multiple messages with the same contents sent by the same process will be modelled as multiple individual events.**

➔ **All models of Data Sharing are abstracted as communication.**



Computational Model

Def.:

The local history of proces p_i is a (possibly infinite) sequence of events $h_i = e_i^1 e_i^2 e_i^3 \dots e_i^n \dots$ (canonical enumeration). It defines a total order of local events.


Def.:

The global history is the set $H = h_1 \cup h_2 \cup h_3 \cup \dots \cup h_n$.

Note: The global history does not specify any relative time or order between the elements.



Time-Space Diagram



$$e_1^2 \rightarrow e_3^6$$

$$e_3^1 \parallel e_1^2$$



What is the meaning of consistency in a distributed system



**A system state, that can be established by any possible sequential execution of processes.
Causality must be preserved.**



Global States and Cuts

➡ **Local state:**

z_i^k : local state of p_i after the execution of e_i^k

z_i^0 : Initial state of p_i

➡ **Global state:** $\Sigma = (z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$

➡ **Def.:** The *Cut* C of a distributed computation is the subset C of the global history H with:

$$C = h_1^{c_1} \cup h_2^{c_2} \cup h_3^{c_3} \cup \dots \cup h_n^{c_n} .$$

The tuple of integers (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) represents the respective index of the last event that has been considered for every process. The set of most recent events $\{ e_1^{c_1}, e_2^{c_2}, e_3^{c_3}, \dots, e_n^{c_n} \}$ is called the *front* of the cut.

A global state $(z_1^{c_1}, z_2^{c_2}, z_3^{c_3}, \dots, z_n^{c_n})$ is associated with every cut (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) .



Runs

Def.: *Run* of a distributed computation:

A *run* of a distributed computation is a totally ordered sequence R , that comprises all events of the global history and is compliant to every local history.



Consistency

1.) A *run* is consistent, if:

for all $e, e' : (e \in C)$ and $(e' \rightarrow e) \Rightarrow e' \in C$

2.) A consistent (distributed) state is represented by a consistent cut.

Analogies between sequential and distributed computations:


I. The point in time of an event in a sequential computation is equivalent to:
The *front* of a consistent cut in a distributed computation.

II. e appears *before* or *after* a certain point in time of a sequential computation is equivalent to:
 e appears *before* or *after* a cut C , if the event is *left* or *right* of the *front* of C in a distributed computation.

The *run* of a distributed computation is consistent if for all events the following condition holds:
 $e \rightarrow e'$ implies that e appears before e' . (R defines a total order)



Runs, global states and cuts



Ordering messages in Distributed Systems



How to order messages ?

Temporal order: messages are ordered in a way that the message m_1 sent before message m_2 also will arrive before m_2 .


FIFO

CAUSAL

TOTAL



FIFO-Receive order for pairs of processes



FIFO-order for pairs of processes

- ➔ **Idea:** Receive process reorders the messages.
- ➔ **Approach:** Distinguish the *reception* of the message at the node from the *delivery* to an application process

FIFO-delivery : $\text{send}_i(m) \rightarrow \text{send}_i(m') \Rightarrow \text{deliver}_j(m) \rightarrow \text{deliver}_j(m')$

FIFO-D prevents a message from overtaking a message sent later.



FIFO-order for pairs of processes

Properties:

Overhead: Process needs to add a sequence number


FIFO-D is sufficient to guarantee that an observation complies to **some run because FIFO-D maintains the order of local events.**

BUT:

Because FIFO-D is defined between pairs of processes only it is not sufficient to guarantee that the observation corresponds to a **consistent run !**



FIFO-D is not sufficient



The order of events which p_1 constructs based on the sequence of messages is inconsistent.

FIFO-D doesn't reflect causality for messages sent by different processes!



Causal Delivery

Causal Delivery:

For all messages m, m' and all processes p_i, p_j (send-processes) and p_k (receive-process) holds:

Causal-D (CD): $\text{send}_i(m) \rightarrow \text{send}_j(m') \Rightarrow \text{deliver}_k(m) \rightarrow \text{deliver}_k(m')$

CD maintains the global causal order of all messages in the system.



Causal Delivery

Events e und e' may be causally dependent.

To realize causal delivery, we must be able to decide

Is there any event e'' with the property:

$$e \rightarrow e'' \rightarrow e'$$

?


It is necessary to order the events along causal dependencies.

The temporal sequence of events only defines a potential causal relationship.

Note: Temporal order does not violate causal order.



Is causal order sufficient ?



Every sensor process s_i maintains a variable W that represents a global state e.g. the state of the environment. A new value is calculated from the old value and the messages from the other sensors $W_t = \max(W_{t-1}, \text{sensor message}) + 5$



Requirement:

- 1. All nodes have the same order of messages**
- 2. The order should reflect the causal relationships correctly.**
- 3. Concurrent messages have an arbitrary order.**

How to realize?



Total order

Goal: Observer, which orders all local events in a consistent global stream of events
⇒ produce a *totally ordered* event stream.

Intuitive solution:
Use global time.

Assumptions:

1. All processes have access to a global clock and can take timestamps from that.
2. Communication latencies can be bounded by d .

RC(e) is the value of the global clock when the event e occurs.
RC(e) is added as timestamp TS to the message.

Delivery rule:

**DR 1 : At time t deliver all received messages in ascending order of the timestamps TS
with $TS = t - d$.**



Why is global consistency ensured by DR 1?

Condition I:

The latency of messages is bound by d . Therefore, at time t all messages sent before $t-d$ have been received. No message sent earlier than $t-d$ will ever be received after t .

Condition II:

The observation is consistent iff the clock condition : $e \rightarrow e' \Rightarrow RC(e) < RC(e')$ holds.
This condition is ensured by the global time.

Disadvantage: Availability of global time.

Question: Can consistency of ordering be achieved without physical time?



Logic Clocks (Lamport 1978)

Basic Idea: To achieve a consistent order of messages, we only have to consider the causal relationships. Concurrent messages can be ordered arbitrarily.

i.e.

The order based on ascending logical time must correspond to the causal order.




Logic Clocks

- ➔ Every process maintains a variable **LC** that represents the individual logical clock. LC maps local events on positive integers.
- ➔ $LC(e_i)$: logical clock value of process p_i , when event e_i is generated.
- ➔ Every message m that is sent carries the timestamp $TS(m)$, which represents the logical clock value of the sending process.
- ➔ **Initialization:** Before any event is generated, all logical clocks will be reset to "0".
- ➔ The following update rule defines the logical clock modification of process p_i when event e_i occurs:


$$LC(e_i) := \begin{cases} LC + 1 & \text{if } e_i \text{ is a local event or a send event} \\ \max\{LC, TS(m)\} + 1 & \text{if } e_i \text{ is a receive event} \end{cases}$$




Properties of Logic Clocks



Local clocks always produce increasing values



Logic clock values are increasing with respect to causal order




Logic clocks satisfy the condition : $e \rightarrow e' \Rightarrow LC(e) < LC(e')$.

This is called the **weak** Clock Condition because: $LC(e) < LC(e') \not\Rightarrow e \rightarrow e'$


Question: Are logic clocks sufficient to guarantee consistent observations?



Total Order




Total Order



Total order is correctly established by logic clocks

← safety property



← liveness property

BUT: in an asynchronous system it is impossible to determine when a message may be delivered.



Gap-Detection Property (GDP)

Given the events e und e' with clock values $LC(e)$ and $LC(e')$.
The condition $LC(e) < LC(e')$ holds.

GDP denotes the ability to decide whether there exist an event e'' which satisfies $LC(e) < LC(e'') < LC(e')$

GDP is needed to guarantee liveness.

Problem: Find an algorithm with the following properties:

1. All events are totally ordered
2. On the basis of receive events it can be decided when a message can be delivered

Note: Real-time clocks don't solve the problem!



Gap-Detection Property (GDP)

Matrix Clocks
Vector Clocks } **have the GAP detection property**

Synchronous protocols solve the GAP detection problem.

