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## Recommended reading

- "Distributed Systems: Concepts and Design", (5 $5^{\text {th }} \mathrm{Ed}$ ) Coulouris et al, Addison-Wesley 2012
- "Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms" (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ed), Tannenbaum et al, Prentice Hall, 2006
- "Designing Data-Intensive Applications", Kleppmann, O’Reilly Media, 2017
- "Operating Systems, Concurrent and Distributed S/W Design", Bacon \& Harris, Addison-Wesley 2003
- or "Concurrent Systems", (2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Ed), Jean Bacon, Addison-Wesley 1997


## What are distributed systems?

- A set of discrete computers ("nodes") that cooperate to perform a computation
- Operates "as if" it were a single computing system
- Examples include:
- Compute clusters (e.g. CERN, HPCF)
- BOINC (aka SETI@Home and friends)
- Distributed storage systems (e.g. NFS, Dropbox, ...)
- The Web (client/server; CDNs; and back-end too!)
- Peer-to-peer systems such as Tor
- Vehicles, factories, buildings (?)


# Preview: Lecture 15-Google architecture (Or: How to treat 100,000 computers as 1 computer) 

| Parallel data |
| :---: |
| processing: |
| MapReduce |

## Fast data analytics: Dremel

## Web serving: GWS

Cross-datacenter RDBMS: Spanner

## Structured storage: BigTable

Distributed locking: Chubby

Distributed storage: Colossus

Cluster managment and scheduling:
Borg / Omega

## Concurrent systems reminder

- Foundations of concurrency: processor(s), threads
- Mutual exclusion: locks, semaphores, monitors, etc.
- Producer-consumer, active objects, message passing
- Races, deadlock, livelock, starvation, priority inversion
- Transactions, ACID, isolation, serialisability, schedules
- 2-phase locking, rollback, time-stamp ordering (TSO), optimistic concurrency control (OCC)
- Durability, write-ahead logging, recovery
- Lock-free algorithms, transactional memory
- Operating-system case study loss of global visibility; loss of global ordering; new failure modes


## Distributed systems: advantages

- Scale and performance
- Cheaper to buy 100 PCs than a supercomputer...
- ... and easier to incrementally scale up too!
- Sharing and Communication
- Allow access to shared resources (e.g. a printer) and information (e.g. distributed FS or DBMS)
- Enable explicit communication between machines (e.g. EDI, CDNs) or people (e.g. email, twitter)
- Reliability
- Can hopefully continue to operate even if some parts of the system are inaccessible, or simply crash


## Distributed systems: challenges

- Distributed Systems are Concurrent Systems
- Need to coordinate independent execution at each node (c/f first part of course)
- Faults arise in any component (nodes, network)
- At any time, for any reason
- Often we want to tolerate faults
- Network delays
- Can't distinguish congestion from crash/partition
- No global visibility
- Can't even agree what time it is, let alone anything more profound


## Middleware



- Middleware helps application authors write software intended to run on more than one machine at a time.


## Transparency \& middleware

- Recall a distributed system should appear "as if" it were executing on a single computer
- We often call this transparency:
- User is unaware of multiple machines
- Programmer is unaware of multiple machines
- How "unaware" can vary quite a bit
- e.g. web user probably aware that there's network communication ... but not the number or location of the various machines involved
- e.g. programmer may explicitly code communication, or may have layers of abstraction: middleware


## Types of transparency

| Transparency | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Access | Hide differences in data representation and how a resource is <br> accessed |
| Location | Hide where a resource is located |
| Migration | Hide that a resource may move to another location |
| Relocation | Hide that a resource may be moved to another location .. <br> while in use |
| Replication | Hide that a resource may be provided by multiple <br> cooperating systems |
| Concurrency | Hide that a resource may be simultaneously shared by several <br> competitive users |
| Failure | Hide the failure and recovery of a resource |
| Persistence | Hide whether a (software) resource is in memory or on disk |
| Performance | Hide the level of demand for a service as demand changes |

## In Distributed Systems...

- We will look at techniques, protocols \& algorithms used in distributed systems
- in many cases, these will be provided for you by a middleware software suite
- but knowing how things work will still be useful!
- Assume OS \& networking support
- processes, threads, synchronization
- basic communication via messages
- (will see later how assumptions about messages will influence the systems we [can] build)
- Let's start with a simple client-server systems


## Client-server model

- 1970s: development of Local Area Networks (LANs)
- 1980s: standard deployment involves small number of servers, plus many workstations
- Servers: always-on, powerful machines
- Workstations: personal computers
- Workstations request 'service' from servers over the network, e.g. access to a shared file-system:



## Request-reply protocols



- Basic scheme:
- Client issues a request message
- Server performs operation, and sends reply
- Example: HTTP 1.0
- Client (browser) sends "GET /index.html"
- Web server loads file and returns it
- Browser displays HTML web page


## Synchrony and asynchrony

- Synchrony and asynchrony have to do with waiting
- For software, this relates to a program's event model:
- Synchronous clients block awaiting a reply
- Asynchronous clients can continue work while awaiting a reply
- E.g., a command-line fetch tool vs. an interactive web browser
- For protocols, this relates to the ability to express multiple concurrent operations within a logical connection:
- Synchronous protocols require that replies be issued in the same order that requests are sent
- Asynchronous protocols allow out-of-order replies - e.g., by tagging replies with the ID number of the request
- E.g., SMTP (one operation at a time) vs. IMAP (tagged requests)
- We often find complex combinations of synchrony and asynchrony within a single software/protocol stack


## Errors, faults, and failures

- Errors are application-level things => easy ;-)
- E.g. client requests non-existent web page
- Need special reply (e.g. "404 Not Found")
- Faults are things that go wrong in the system
- lost message, client/server crash, network down, ...
- Fault-tolerant systems try to prevent faults from escalating into failures
- Failure: system fails to provide required service to the user
- To detect/handle faults: timeout, retry, replicate, ...
- How do you choose timeout period T?


## Retry semantics



1. Request lost
2. Request sent, but server crashed before op. performed
3. Request sent \& received, op. performed, server crashed before reply
4. Request sent \& received, operation performed, reply sent ... but lost
5. As \#4, but reply has just been delayed for longer than $T$

- For read-only stateless requests (e.g., HTTP GET), can retry in all cases, but what if request was an order with Amazon?
- For \#1, we (probably) want to re-order... in \#5 we want to wait ....?
- Worse: We don't know which case it actually was!


## Ideal semantics

- What we want is exactly-once semantics:
- Our request occurs once no matter how many times we retry (or if the network duplicates our messages)
- E.g. add a unique ID to every request
- Server remembers IDs, and associated responses
- If sees a duplicate, just returns old response
- Client ignores duplicate responses
- Pretty tricky to ensure exactly-once in practice
- E.g. if server explodes ;-)


## Practical semantics

- In practice, protocols guarantee one of:
- All-or-nothing (atomic) semantics
- Use scheme on previous page; persistent log
- (similar idea to transaction processing)
- At-most-once semantics
- Request carried out once, or not at all
- If no reply, we don't know which outcome it was
- e.g. send one request; give up on timeout

Server state required to suppress retries

Server state not required

- At-least-once semantics
- Retry on timeout; risk operation occurring again
- Ok if the operation is read-only, or idempotent
- Note: Assumption of no network duplication


## Remote Procedure Call (RPC)

- Request/response protocols are useful - and widely used - but rather clunky to use
- e.g. need to define the set of requests, including how they are represented in network messages
- A nicer abstraction is Remote Procedure Call (RPC)
- Programmer simply invokes a procedure...
- ...but it executes on a remote machine (the server)
- RPC subsystem handles message formats, sending \& receiving, handling timeouts, etc
- Aim is to make distribution (mostly) transparent
- Certain failure cases wouldn’t happen locally
- Distributed and local function call performance different


## Marshalling arguments

- RPC is integrated with the programming language
- Some additional magic to specify things are remote
- RPC layer marshals parameters to the call, as well as any return value(s), e.g.



## IDLs and stubs

- To marshal, the RPC layer (on both sides!) must know:
- how many arguments the procedure has,
- how many results are expected, and
- the types of all of the above
- The programmer must specify this by describing things in an interface definition language (IDL)
- In higher-level languages, this may already be included as standard (e.g. C\#, Java)
- In others (e.g. C), IDL is part of the middleware
- The RPC layer can then automatically generate stubs
- Small pieces of code at client and server (see previous)
- May also provide authentication, encryption
- Provides integrity, confidentiality


## Example: SunRPC

- Developed mid 80's for Sun Unix systems
- Simple request/response protocol:
- Server registers one or more "programs" (services)
- Client issues requests to invoke specific procedures within a specific service
- Messages can be sent over any transport protocol (most commonly UDP/IP and later TCP/IP)
- Requests have a unique transaction id which can be used to detect \& handle retransmissions
- At-least-once semantics
- Various types of access transparency including byteorder


## eXternal Data Representation (XDR)

- SunRPC used XDR for describing interfaces:

```
// file: test.x
program test {
    version testver {
    int get(getargs) = 1; // procedure number
    int put(putargs) = 2; // procedure number
    } = 1; // version number
} = 0x12345678; // program number
```

- rpcgen generates [un]marshaling code, stubs
- Single arguments... but recursively convert values
- Some support for following pointers too
- Data on the wire always in big-endian format (oops!)


## Using SunRPC

1. Write XDR, and use rpcgen to generate skeleton code
2. Fill in blanks (i.e. write client/server), compile code
3. Run server \& register with portmapper (now: rpcbind)

- Mappings from \{ prog\#, ver\#, proto \}-> port
- (on Linux/UNIX, try "/usr/sbin/rpcinfo-p")
- Portmapper is an RPC service on a well-known port

4. Server process will then listen(), awaiting clients
5. When a client starts, client stub calls clnt_create()

- Sends \{ prog\#, ver\#, proto \} to portmapper on server, receives port number to use for actual RPC connection
- Client invokes remote procedures as needed

6. Lately: GSS authentication/encryption (e.g., Kerberos)

## Summary + next time

- About this course
- Advantages and challenges of distributed systems
- Types of transparency (+scalability)
- Middleware, the client-server model
- Errors and retry semantics
- RPC, marshalling, SunRPC, and XDR
- Case study: the Network File System (NFS)

