



Parallel Computing vs. Distributed Systems

- Parallel computing compute sub-tasks simultaneously so that work can be completed faster.
- Distributed systems a set of autonomous computers working together to appear as a single coherent system (and to achieve unified goals). Examples:
 - client-server web transactions
 - networked file systems
 - a data center with hundreds of thousands of machines
 - crowdsourcing among many smartphones
 -
- Parallel computing more identified with what it does
- Distributed systems more identified with what they are
- Not mutually exclusive
 - MPI and MapReduce

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Distributed Systems Model

- Study of general approaches requires a system model
- Autonomous computers
- Network connecting all computers (all-to-all reachable)
- Communications
 - Messages
 - Streams
- Failures
 - Messages may be lost
 - Nodes may stop working
 - Or worse!

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Distributed Systems Overview

- Time and order
 - Challenging but useful in distributed systems
- Fault tolerance
 - Make consistent decisions when nodes may fail
- Replication and consistency
 - Consistent replication with updates: Does each replica get all the updates? Are updates applied in the same order?
- Scalable Internet systems
 - Data centers, cloud computing, distributed data store (Bigtable etc.)

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

1



Time and Clocks

- Why is it important?
 - Determine the order of events occurred on different computers
- Examples
 - In "make", source files who have not been changed since last compile don't have to be recompiled
 - Compilation and editing on different computers
 - Two distributed updates to the same location need to be ordered to know the final state
 - More examples?

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

5



Physical Clocks

- How do we get time?
- Fixed-frequency events
 - Quartz crystal oscillates at fixed frequency to triggered timer interrupts
 - Atom vibrates (makes state transitions) at fixed frequency
- Consistent for a single timing device
- But drifts/skews common over multiple devices in a distributed system

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Physical Clock Synchronization

- Clock synchronization
 - Identify clock skewness and correct it by adjusting clock
 - No turning back in time
- Cristian's algorithm
 - A client requests time from a server, the server responds with current time
 - Delay in response estimate as half of request/response time
- Averaging of everyone's time
 - A central server polls everybody and does the averaging

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Distributed Clock Synchronization

- Basic mechanisms: broadcast or poll
 - Everyone (or some clock source) broadcasts its time periodically
 - A node can poll clock sources for the time
- Annroach
 - Calculate clock drifts from multiple sources and averages them
 - Marzullo's algorithm: the best estimate is taken to be the interval <u>consistent</u> with the largest number of sources http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marzullo%27s algorithm
 Also foundation of the Network Time Protocol

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Precise Timing

- Atom clock
 - Atomic Clock FOCS-1 (Switzerland) started operating in 2004 at an uncertainty of one second in 30 million years.
 - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:FOCS-1.jpg
- GPS computes precise time
 - 10s of nanoseconds accuracy, but affected by Selective Availability

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

9

11



Logical Ordering

- Agreement on ordering of events (rather than the absolute time) is what matters
- Lamport ordering of distributed events
 - Inherent ordering: a → b, or "a happens-before b" holds regardless of runtime conditions (such as processor speed, machine overload, and message delays)
 - Specifically, a happens-before b
 - if a occurs before b on the same computer or a/b are send/receive events of the same message on two computers
 - transitive relation
- Total ordering vs. partial ordering

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

10

12



Lamport Logical Clock

- Assign timestamp to each event C(e) that follows "happensbefore" partial ordering
 - Every computer maintains a local incrementing timestamp
 - Each message carries the sending time of the sender
 - Upon receipt of a message, the receiver clock is set to the greater of its own or the message timestamp + 1
- Lamport clock
 - follows "happens-before" but adds more ordering
 - is totally ordered?
 - Use machine ID as a secondary criterion to break ties

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014



Utilization in Totally Ordered Broadcasts

- Totally ordered broadcasts
 - Update management in replicated databases
- Assumptions
 - FIFO messages between same sender/receiver pair
 - Messages are not lost
- Solution
 - Each message carries sender's timestamp
 - Received broadcast messages are buffered, acknowledged (in broadcast)
 - Deliver a message if
 - it has the earliest timestamp in buffer
 - and already acknowledged by everyone
 - Guarantee: will not receive a new message with earlier timestamp

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

14



Vector Timestamps

- Lamport logical clock follows but may go beyond the "happensbefore" ordering
- Vector timestamp: n-element vector for n-computer system
 - At computer i:
 - VT[i] indicates the number of local events occurred so far (incremented after each local event)
 - VT[j≠i] = t means that computer i knows that t events have occurred at computer j (updated after each received message)
 - Each message carries the full timestamp, updates receiver
 - http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Vector Clock.svg
 - Event with VT_x happens before event with VT_y if and only if every element in VT_x is less than or equal to corresponding element in VT_y

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014

13



Utilization on Race Detection

- A distributed race condition may occur if two conflicting updates are not causally ordered (unordered by the vector clock)
 - Unordered updates may occur in either order depending on the runtime condition

3/27/2014

CSC 258/458 - Spring 2014