Clocks, Event Ordering, and Global Predicate Computation

Events and Histories

- Processes execute sequences of events
- Events can be of 3 types: local, send, and receive
- e_p^i is the i-th event of process p
- The local history h_p of process p is the sequence of events executed by process p

Ordering events

- Observation 1:
  - Events in a local history are totally ordered



- Observation 2:
  - For every message m, $send(m)$ precedes $receive(m)$



Lamport Clock: Increment Rules



$$LC(e_p^{i+1}) = LC(e_p^i) + 1$$

$$LC(e_q^j) = max(LC(e_q^{j-1}), LC(e_p^i)) + 1$$

Timestamp m with $TS(m) = LC(send(m))$

Discussion

- What are the strengths of Lamport clocks?
- What are the limitations of Lamport clocks?
- What model assumptions are too constraining in Lamport's clock paper?

Example of Global Predicate

- Setting: Locks in distributed system
  - Objects locked by nodes and moved to the node that is currently modifying it
  - Nodes requesting the object/lock, send a message to the current node locking it and blocks for a response
- How do we detect deadlocks in this scenario?

Global States & Clocks

- Need to reason about global states of a distributed system
- Global state: processor state + communication channel state
- Consistent global state: causal dependencies are captured
- Use virtual clocks to reason about the timing relationships between events on different nodes

Space-Time diagrams

A graphic representation of a distributed execution





H and $\rightarrow$ impose a partial order

Cuts

A cut C is a subset of the global history of H

The frontier of C is the set of events

$$e_1^{c_1}, e_2^{c_2}, \dots e_n^{c_n}$$



Consistent cuts and consistent global states

- A cut is consistent if

  $$\forall e_i, e_j : e_j \in C \wedge e_i \rightarrow e_j \Rightarrow e_i \in C$$

- A consistent global state is one corresponding to a consistent cut

What p_0 sees



Not a consistent global state: the cut contains the event corresponding to the receipt of the last message by p_3 but not the corresponding send event

Global Consistent States

- Can we use Lamport Clocks as part of a mechanism to get globally consistent states?

Global Snapshot

- Develop a simple global snapshot protocol
- Refine protocol as we relax assumptions
- Record:
  - processor states
  - channel states
- Assumptions:
  - FIFO channels
  - Each m timestamped with $T(send(m))$

Snapshot I

i. p_0 selects t_{ss}

ii. p_0 **sends** "take a snapshot at t_{ss}" **to** all processes

iii. **when** clock of p_i reads t_{ss} **then** p

   a. records its local state σ_i
   b. sends an empty message along its outgoing channels
   c. starts recording messages received on each of incoming channels
   d. stops recording a channel when it receives first message with timestamp greater than or equal to t_{ss}

Snapshot II

- processor p_0 selects Ω
- p_0 sends "take a snapshot at Ω" to all processes; it waits for all of them to reply and then sets its logical clock to Ω
- when clock of p_i reads Ω then p_i
  - records its local state σ_i
  - sends an empty message along its outgoing channels
  - starts recording messages received on each incoming channel
  - stops recording a channel when receives first message with timestamp greater than or equal to Ω

Relaxing synchrony



Snapshot III

- processor p_0 sends itself "take a snapshot "
- when p_i receives "take a snapshot" for the first time from p_j :
  - records its local state σ_i
  - sends "take a snapshot" along its outgoing channels
  - sets channel from p_j to empty
  - starts recording messages received over each of its other incoming channels
- when p_i receives "take a snapshot" beyond the first time from p_k:
  - stops recording channel from p_k
- when p_i has received "take a snapshot" on all channels, it sends collected state to p_0 and stops.

Same problem, different approach

- Monitor process does not query explicitly
- Instead, it passively collects information and uses it to build an observation.
  (reactive architectures, Harel and Pnueli [1985])

An observation is an ordering of events of the distributed computation based on the order in which the receiver is notified of the events.

Update rules



$$VC(e_i)[i] := VC[i] + 1$$



Message m is timestamped with $TS(m) = VC(send(m))$

$$VC(e_i) := max(VC, TS(m))$$
$$VC(e_i)[i] := VC[i] + 1$$

Example



Operational interpretation



$VC(e_i)[i]$ = no. of events executed by p_i up to and including e_i

$VC(e_i)[j]$ = no. of events executed by p_j that happen before e_i of p_i

VC properties: event ordering

Given two vectors V and V', less than is defined as:

$$V < V' \equiv (V \neq V') \wedge (\forall k : 1 \leq k \leq n : V[k] \leq V'[k])$$

- Strong Clock Condition: $e \rightarrow e' \equiv VC(e) < VC(e')$
- Simple Strong Clock Condition:

  Given e_i of p_i and e_j of p_j, where $i \neq j$

  $$e_i \rightarrow e_j \equiv VC(e_i)[i] \leq VC(e_j)[i]$$

- Concurrency

  Given e_i of p_i and e_j of p_j, where $i \neq j$

  $$e_i \parallel e_j \equiv (VC(e_i)[i] > VC(e_j)[i]) \wedge (VC(e_j)[j] > VC(e_i)[j])$$

The protocol

- p_0 maintains an array $D[1, \ldots, n]$ of counters
- $D[i] = TS(m_i)[i]$ where m_i is the last message delivered from p_i

Rule: Deliver m from p_j as soon as both of the following conditions are satisfied:

$$D[j] = TS(m)[j] - 1$$

$$D[k] \geq TS(m)[k], \forall k \neq j$$

Summary

- Lamport clocks and vector clocks provide us with good tools to reason about timing of events in a distributed system
- Global snapshot algorithm provides us with an efficient mechanism for obtaining consistent global states