CS5412: HOW DURABLE SHOULD IT BE?
Durability

- When a system accepts an update and won’t lose it, we say that event has become durable.

- Everyone jokes that the cloud has a permanent memory and this of course is true.
  - Once data enters a cloud system, they rarely discard it.
  - More common to make lots of copies, index it…

- But loss of data due to a failure is an issue.
Should Consistency “require” Durability?

- The Paxos protocol guarantees durability to the extent that its command lists are durable.

- Normally we run Paxos with the command list on disk, and hence Paxos can survive any crash.
  - In Isis², this is g.SafeSend with the “DiskLogger” active.
  - But costly.
Consider the first tier of the cloud

- Recall that applications in the first tier are limited to what Brewer calls “Soft State”
  - They are basically prepositioned virtual machines that the cloud can launch or shutdown very elastically
  - But when they shut down, lose their “state” including any temporary files
  - Always restart in the initial state that was wrapped up in the VM when it was built: no durable disk files
Examples of soft state?

- Anything that was cached but “really” lives in a database or file server elsewhere in the cloud
  - If you wake up with a cold cache, you just need to reload it with fresh data
- Monitoring parameters, control data that you need to get “fresh” in any case
  - Includes data like “The current state of the air traffic control system” – for many applications, your old state is just not used when you resume after being offline
  - Getting fresh, current information guarantees that you’ll be in sync with the other cloud components
- Information that gets reloaded in any case, e.g. sensor values
Would it make sense to use Paxos?

- We do maintain sharded data in the first tier and some requests certainly trigger updates.

- So that argues in favor of a consistency mechanism.

- In fact consistency can be important even in the first tier, for some cloud computing uses.
Control of the smart power grid

- Suppose that a cloud control system speaks with “two voices”
- In physical infrastructure settings, consequences can be very costly

“Canadian 50KV bus going offline”

“Switch on the 50KV Canadian bus”

Bang!
So... would we use Paxos here?

- In discussion of the CAP conjecture and their papers on the BASE methodology, authors generally assume that “C” in CAP is about ACID guarantees or Paxos.
- Then argue that these bring too much delay to be used in settings where fast response is critical.
- Hence they argue against Paxos.
By now we’ve seen a second option

- Virtual synchrony Send is “like” Paxos yet different

- Paxos has a very strong form of durability

- Send has consistency but weak durability unless you use the “Flush” primitive. Send+Flush is amnesia-free

- Further complicating the issue, in Isis² Paxos is called SafeSend, and has several options
  - Can set the number of acceptors
  - Can also configure to run in-memory or with disk logging
How would we pick?

- The application code looks nearly identical!
  - `g.Send(GRIDCONTROL, action to take)`
  - `g.SafeSend(GRIDCONTROL, action to take)`

- Yet the behavior is very different!
  - SafeSend is slower
  - ... and has stronger durability properties. *Or does it?*
SafeSend in the first tier

- Observation: like it or not we just don’t have a durable place for disk files in the first tier

- The only forms of durability are
  - In-memory replication within a shard
  - Inner-tier storage subsystems like databases or files

- Moreover, the first tier is expect to be rapidly responsive and to talk to inner tiers asynchronously
So our choice is simplified

- No matter what anyone might tell you, in fact the only real choices are between two options

  - Send + Flush: Before replying to the external customer, we know that the data is replicated in the shard

  - In-memory SafeSend: On an update by update basis, before each update is taken, we know that the update will be done at every replica in the shard
Virtual synchrony is a “consistency” model:

- **Synchronous runs:** indistinguishable from non-replicated object that saw the same updates (like Paxos)
- **Virtually synchronous runs** are indistinguishable from synchronous runs
SafeSend versus Send

- Send can have different delivery orders if there are different senders
  - In fact Isis² offers other options, we’ll discuss them next time.

- SafeSend can’t have the strange amnesia problem see in the top right corner on the timeline picture

- But these guarantees are pretty costly!
Looking closely at that “oddity”

Virtually synchronous execution “amnesia” example (Send but without calling Flush)
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What made it odd?

- In this example a network partition occurred and, before anyone noticed, some messages were sent and delivered
  - “Flush” would have blocked the caller, and SafeSend would not have delivered those messages
  - Then the failure erases the events in question: no evidence remains at all
  - So was this bad? OK? A kind of transient internal inconsistency that repaired itself?
Looking closely at that “oddity”
Looking closely at that “oddity”
Looking closely at that “oddity”
Paxos avoided the issue... at a price

- SafeSend, Paxos and other multi-phase protocols don’t deliver in the first round/phase

- This gives them stronger safety on a message by message basis, but also makes them slower and less scalable

- Is this a price we should pay for better speed?
An online monitoring system might focus on real-time response and be less concerned with data durability.
\( \text{Isis}^2: \) Send v.s. in-memory SafeSend

Send scales best, but SafeSend with in-memory (rather than disk) logging and small numbers of acceptors isn’t terrible.
Jitter: how “steady” are latencies?

The “spread” of latencies is much better (tighter) with Send: the 2-phase SafeSend protocol is sensitive to scheduling delays.
Flush delay as function of shard size

Flush is fairly fast if we only wait for acks from 3-5 members, but is slow if we wait for acks from all members. After we saw this graph, we changed Isis\(^2\) to let users set the threshold.
First-tier “mindset” for tolerant $f$ faults

- Suppose we do this:
  - Receive request
  - Compute locally using consistent data and perform updates on sharded replicated data, consistently
  - Asynchronously forward updates to services deeper in cloud but don’t wait for them to be performed
  - Use the “flush” to make sure we have $f+1$ replicas

- Call this an “amnesia free” solution. Will it be fast enough? Durable enough?
Which replicas?

- One worry is this
  - If the first tier is totally under control of a cloud management infrastructure, elasticity could cause our shard to be entirely shut down “abruptly”

- Fortunately, most cloud platforms do have some ways to notify management system of shard membership
  - This allows the membership system to shut down members of multiple shards without ever depopulating any single shard
  - Now the odds of a sudden amnesia event become low
Advantage: Send + Flush?

- It seems that way, but there is a counter-argument

- The problem centers on the Flush delay
  - We pay it both on writes and on some reads
  - If a replica has been updated by an unstable multicast, it can’t safely be read until a Flush occurs
  - Thus need to call Flush prior to replying to client even in a read-only procedure
    - Delay will occur only if there are pending unstable multicasts
We don’t need this with SafeSend

- In effect, it does the work of Flush prior to the delivery (“learn”) event

- So we have slower delivery, but now any replica is always safe to read and we can reply to the client instantly

- In effect the updater sees delay on his critical path, but the reader has no delays, ever
Argument would be that with both protocols, there is a delay on the critical path where the update was initiated.

But only Send+Flush ever delays in a pure reader.

So SafeSend is faster!

But this argument is flawed…
Flaws in that argument

□ The delays aren’t of the same length (in fact the pure reader calls Flush but would rarely be delayed)

□ Moreover, if a request does multiple updates, we delay on each of them for SafeSend, but delay just once if we do Send…Send…Send…Send…Flush

□ How to resolve?
Only real option is to experiment

- In the cloud we often see questions that arise at
  - Large scale,
  - High event rates,
  - ... and where millisecond timings matter

- Best to use tools to help visualize performance

- Let’s see how one was used in developing Isis²
Something was... strangely slow

- We weren’t sure why or where
- Only saw it at high data rates in big shards
- So we ended up creating a visualization tool just to see how long the system needed from when a message was sent until it was delivered
- Here’s what we saw
Debugging: Stabilization bug

At first Isis$^2$ is running very fast (as we later learned, too fast to sustain)

Eventually it pauses. The delay is similar to a Flush delay. A backlog was forming.
Debugging: Stabilization bug fixed

The revised protocol is actually a tiny bit slower, but now we can sustain the rate.
Debugging: 358-node run slowdown

Original problem but at an even larger scale
358-node run slowdown: Zoom in

Hard to make sense of the situation: Too much data!
Filtering is a necessary part of this kind of experimental performance debugging!
Conclusions?

- A question like “how much durability do I need in the first tier of the cloud” is easy to ask…
  - … much harder to answer!

- Study of the choices reveals that there are really two options
  - Send + Flush
  - SafeSend, in-memory

- They actually are similar but SafeSend has an internal “flush” before any delivery occurs, on each request
  - SafeSend seems more costly
  - But must do experiments to really answer such questions