CSC2/458 Parallel and Distributed Systems Paxos

Sreepathi Pai April 19, 2018

URCS

State Machine Replication (SMR)

Paxos

State Machine Replication (SMR)

Paxos

- Use replicas
- Each replica runs a deterministic algorithm
- If all replicas:
 - starts in the same initial state
 - execute messages in the same order
 - then a majority vote among them will allow fault tolerance
- t faults can be tolerated by 2t + 1 machines

How can replicas always agree on the same order in the presence of faults?

Hint: this is the consensus problem

They can't: FLP theorem tells us there is no deterministic consensus algorithm that works even in the face of one failure.

Recall: To prove FLP, we showed that all algorithms could always get trapped in states where they made no decision.

Can we build a distributed system where if replicas agree, they will all agree on the same order? Even in the presence of failures?

From Lamport (2001):

- Only a value that has been proposed may be chosen
- Only a single value is chosen
- A process never learns that a value has been chosen unless it actually has been

- Asynchronous communication
- Non-Byzantine Fail-stop failures
 - However, machines have stable memory that can tolerate failures (why?)
 - Byzantine failures: arbitrary failures
- Messages can take:
 - delayed,
 - duplicated
 - lost
 - but NOT corrupted

State Machine Replication (SMR)

Paxos

- Three classes of "agents"
 - Proposers: proposes a value v
 - Acceptors: accepts a value v that is proposed
 - Learners: learns that a value v was accepted
- These agents may be mapped to the same process, so a process could play all three roles

- As an acceptor, you may accept a value that is not accepted (i.e. not *chosen*) by the majority.
 - Multiple proposers, different values
 - implies multiple rounds of acceptance
- But you must accept a value
 - Single proposer, one value
 - i.e., you don't know if there are other proposers

As acceptor, accept the first proposal you receive, [but also accept multiple proposals, if they have the same value you accepted.]

Let proposals have a unique number n in the system n : v.

Ensure that if a proposal with value v is chosen (i.e. accepted by majority), then every higher-numbered proposal that is chosen has the value v

You can ensure this by:

- Acceptors only accept higher-numbered proposals if these have the chosen value v
- Proposers only propose v in their higher-numbered proposals if v was chosen
- How do we ensure this (esp. if we're a proposer)?

The two invariants hold, if when proposal n : v is issued:

- no majority set of acceptors has accepted a proposal < n
 - otherwise, we couldn't propose n: v unless v was chosen
- v has been chosen by a set of acceptors with a proposal < n

- Proposer sends a "prepare" request, using a value n
- An acceptor who responds to this message:
 - promises that it will not accept a proposal < n
 - if it has already accepted a proposal < n, it sends the value v that has been accepted
- If a majority of acceptors respond, a proposal is made ("accept"):
 - *n* : *v* where *v* is the value of the highest-numbered proposal accepted so far
 - or is the value of the proposer itself

- An acceptor responds to a prepare if its *n* is greater than any *n'* it has seen so far
- An acceptor accepts a proposal numbered *n* iff:
 - it has not responded to a prepare request > n
- It can ignore:
 - prepare requests with *n*' where *n*' < *n* and it has already responded to prepare *n*
 - duplicate prepare requests

- Learners learn chosen value by (e.g.) broadcast
- But could also use a single distinguished learner that communicates with other learners

- An acceptor must remember n, below which it will not accept
 - save this before responding to prepare
- An acceptor must remember n' : v, which it has accepted
 - save this before accepting
- A proposer must remember all proposal numbers it has used in the past
 - and must not reuse them
 - save this before proposing

- Proposal *p* prepares *n*1 and succeeds
- Proposal q prepares $n^2 > n^1$ and also succeeds
 - Causing accepts of p to fail, since majority will not accept n1 < n2
- Proposal p restarts with n3 > n2
 - Causing accepts of q to fail, since majority will not accept n2 < n3
- ad infinitum

- To ensure progress, elect a distinguished proposer
 - Must have access to a majority of acceptors
 - eventually will have a proposal accepted
- "If enough of the system (proposers, acceptors, communication network) is working properly", liveness can therefore be achieved...
 - This is not guaranteed
- But safety is guaranteed.

Lecture largely follows the treatment in Lamport (2001), "Paxos made simple" $% \left(\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right) \right) =\left(1-\frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1-\frac{1$