RPC and Clocks

Tom Anderson

Last Time

- Go
 - Synchronization
 - RPC
- Lab 1 RPC

Topics

- MapReduce
 - Fault tolerance
 - Discussion
- RPC
 - At least once
 - At most once
 - Exactly once
- Lamport Clocks
 - Motivation

MapReduce Fault Tolerance Model

Master is not fault tolerant

Assumption: this single machine won't fail while running a mapreduce app

Many workers, so have to handle their failures

- Assumption: workers are fail stop
- They can fail and stop
- They may reboot
- They don't send garbled weird packets after a failure

What kinds of faults does MapReduce need to tolerate?

- Network:
 - lost packets
 - duplicated packets
 - temporary network failure
 - server disconnected
 - network partitioned
- Worker:
 - crash+restart
 - Permanent failure
 - All workers fail simultaneously -- power/earthquake
 - Crash mid-way through complex operation
- · What if?
 - Bug in map function, so that mapper crashes every time?

Tools for Dealing With Faults

- Retry
 - if pkt is lost: resend
 - worker crash: give task to another worker
 - may execute MR job twice! (is this ok? Why?)
- Replicate
 - E.g., input files on multiple storage servers
- Replace
 - E.g., add new worker after old one fails

Lab 1 MapReduce Simplifications

- No key in map
- Assume global file system
- No partial failures
 - Files either completely written or not created
 - If restart some failed operation, ok to write to the same filename

DeWitt/Stonebraker Critique

- A giant step backward in the programming paradigm for large-scale data intensive applications
- A sub-optimal implementation, in that it uses brute force instead of indexing
- Not novel at all: represents a specific implementation of well known techniques developed nearly 25 years ago
- Missing most of the features that are routinely included in current DBMS
- Incompatible with all of the tools DBMS users have come to depend on

To understand why some technologies win: The Innovator's Dilemma, Clayton Christensen

Remote Procedure Call (RPC)

A request from the client to execute a function on the server.

- On client
 - Ex: z = DoMap(worker, i)
 - Parameters marshalled into a message (can be arbitrary types)
 - Message sent to server (can be multiple pkts)
 - Wait for reply
- On server
 - message is parsed
 - operation (DoMap(i)) invoked
 - Result marshalled into a message (can be multiple pkts)
 - Message sent to client

RPC vs. Procedure Call

- What is equivalent of:
 - The name of the procedure?
 - The calling convention?
 - The return value?
 - The return address?

RPC vs. Procedure Call

Binding

- Client needs a connection to server
- Server must implement the required function
- What if the server is running a different version of the code?

Performance

- procedure call: maybe 10 cycles = ~3 ns
- RPC in data center: 10 microseconds => ~1K slower
- RPC in the wide area: millions of times slower

Failures

- What happens if messages get dropped?
- What if client crashes?
- What if server crashes?
- What if server appears to crash but is slow?
- What if network partitions?

Three Options if RPC Doesn't Return

- At least once (NFS, DNS, ...)
 - keep retrying until RPC succeeds
- At most once (Go, ...)
 - Retry, but make sure RPC is never executed more than once
- Exactly once
 - Make sure RPC is always executed and never executed more than once

At Least Once

RPC library waits for response for a while If none arrives, re-send the request Do this a few times
Still no response -- return an error to the application

Non-replicated key/value server

Client sends Put(a)
Server gets request, but network drops reply
Client sends Put(a) again

- should server respond "yes"?
- or "no"?

What if operation is "deduct \$10 from bank account"?

Does TCP Fix This?

- TCP: reliable bi-directional byte stream between two endpoints
 - Retransmission of lost packets
 - Duplicate detection
- But what if TCP times out and client reconnects?
 - Browser connects to Amazon
 - RPC to purchase book
 - Wifi times out during RPC
 - Browser reconnects

When is at-least-once OK?

- If no side effects
 - read-only operations (or idempotent ops)
- If application has its own plan for detecting duplicates
- Example: NFS
 - readFileBlock
 - writeFileBlock

At Most Once

Client includes unique ID (UID) with each request

- use same UID for re-send

Server RPC code detects duplicate requests

```
- return previous reply instead of re-running handler
if seen[uid] {
    r = old[uid]
} else {
    r = handler()
    old[uid] = r
    seen[uid] = true
}
```

Some At-Most-Once Issues

How do we ensure UID is unique?

- Big random number?
- Combine unique client ID (IP address?) with sequence #?
- What if client crashes and restarts? Can it reuse the same UID?
- Maybe client should get its unique ID from the server?

When Can Server to Discard Old RPCs?

```
Option 1:
    Never?
Option 2:
    unique client IDs
    per-client RPC sequence numbers
    client includes "seen all replies <= X" with every RPC
Option 3: only allow client one outstanding RPC at a time
    arrival of seq+1 allows server to discard all <= seq
Option 4: client agrees to keep retrying for < 5 minutes
    server discards after 5+ minutes
```

What if Server Crashes?

If at-most-once list of recent RPC results is stored in memory, server will forget and accept duplicate requests when it reboots

- Does server need to write the recent RPC results to disk?
- If replicated, does replica also need to store recent RPC results?

Go RPC is "at most once" and "usually once"

- Open TCP connection
- Write request to TCP connection
- TCP may retransmit, but server's TCP will filter out duplicates
- No retry in Go code (i.e. will NOT create 2nd TCP connection)
- Go RPC code returns an error if it doesn't get a reply
 - perhaps after a timeout (from TCP)
 - perhaps server didn't see request
 - perhaps server processed request but server failed before reply came back
 - Perhaps server processed request and network failed

Go RPC at-most-once is not enough

What if RPC sent over TCP, but reply never arrives and socket fails?

- If worker doesn't respond, the master re-sends to another worker
- But original worker may have not failed, and is working on it too

Go RPC can't detect this kind of duplicate

 In lab 2 you will have to protect against these kinds of duplicates

Exactly Once

To survive client crashes, client needs to record pending RPC's on disk

So that we can replay them with the same UID

To survive server crashes, need to record results of completed RPC's on disk

So that we can suppress duplicates

In other words, similar to two phase commit!

Lamport Clocks

Can we make sure everyone agrees on the same order of events?

An issue if:

- multiple clients, multiple servers
- even if there are no failures
- even if messages are delivered in order sent by each client ("processor order")

Facebook Storage System

Initially:

- a few front end web servers to do application logic
- a single backend storage server

To scale, add more front ends, more back end servers:

- Each front end pulls data from multiple servers (e.g., one for privacy settings, one for pictures).
- Do users see a consistent view?

Now add some intermediate caches:

- 100+ lookups per page
- 1B+ users: 1M+ front ends, 1M+ caches, 1M+ servers

Example: Arranging Lunch

Example: Shared Whiteboard

Example: Parallel Make

Physical Clocks

- Can we assign every event in a distributed system a unique wall clock time stamp?
- Local clocks aren't perfect
 - Crystals oscillate at slightly different frequencies
 - Typical error is ~ 2 seconds/month
- Synchronize clocks across distributed system?
 - Network messages involve delays
 - Network message delays are variable

Physical Clocks

- Lets assume a network-attached GPS
 - How close can we bound clocks across multiple systems?
- Option 1: client polls the GPS server for current time.
 - How far off will the timestamp be when it arrives back at the client?
- Option 2: repeatedly fetch the GPS time, estimate relative rate of skew of the local clock

Logical Clocks (Centralized implementation)

Send every message to a central arbiter, which assigns an order for all messages.

Problems with centralization?

Space-Time Diagram