Why Synchronization?

- You want to catch a bus at 6.05 pm, but your watch is off by 15 minutes
  - What if your watch is Late by 15 minutes?
    • You’ll miss the bus!
  - What if your watch is Fast by 15 minutes?
    • You’ll end up unfairly waiting for a longer time than you intended

- Time synchronization is required for both
  - Correctness
  - Fairness
Synchronization In The Cloud

• Cloud airline reservation system
• Server A receives a client request to purchase last ticket on flight ABC 123.
• Server A timestamps purchase using local clock 9h:15m:32.45s, and logs it. Replies ok to client.
• That was the last seat. Server A sends message to Server B saying “flight full.”
• B enters “Flight ABC 123 full” + its own local clock value (which reads 9h:10m:10.11s) into its log.
• Server C queries A’s and B’s logs. Is confused that a client purchased a ticket at A after the flight became full at B.
• This may lead to further incorrect actions by C
Why is it Challenging?

- **End hosts in Internet-based systems (like clouds)**
  - Each have their own clocks
  - Unlike processors (CPUs) within one server or workstation which share a system clock

- **Processes in Internet-based systems follow an asynchronous system model**
  - No bounds on
    - Message delays
    - Processing delays
  - Unlike multi-processor (or parallel) systems which follow a **synchronous** system model
Some Definitions

- An Asynchronous Distributed System consists of a number of processes.
- Each process has a state (values of variables).
- Each process takes actions to change its state, which may be an instruction or a communication action (send, receive).
- An event is the occurrence of an action.
- Each process has a local clock – events within a process can be assigned timestamps, and thus ordered linearly.
- But – in a distributed system, we also need to know the time order of events across different processes.
Each process (running at some end host) has its own clock.

When comparing two clocks at two processes:

- Clock Skew = Relative Difference in clock values of two processes
  - Like distance between two vehicles on a road
- Clock Drift = Relative Difference in clock frequencies (rates) of two processes
  - Like difference in speeds of two vehicles on the road

A non-zero clock skew implies clocks are not synchronized.

A non-zero clock drift causes skew to increase (eventually).
- If faster vehicle is ahead, it will drift away
- If faster vehicle is behind, it will catch up and then drift away
How often to Synchronize?

- Maximum Drift Rate (MDR) of a clock
- Absolute MDR is defined relative to Coordinated Universal Time (UTC). UTC is the “correct” time at any point of time.
  - MDR of a process depends on the environment.
- Max drift rate between two clocks with similar MDR is $2 \times$ MDR
- Given a maximum acceptable skew M between any pair of clocks, need to synchronize at least once every: $M / (2 \times \text{MDR})$ time units
  - Since time = distance/speed
Consider a group of processes

External Synchronization

- Each process $C(i)$'s clock is within a bound $D$ of a well-known clock $S$ external to the group
- $|C(i) - S| < D$ at all times
- External clock may be connected to UTC (Universal Coordinated Time) or an atomic clock
- E.g., Cristian’s algorithm, NTP

Internal Synchronization

- Every pair of processes in group have clocks within bound $D$
- $|C(i) - C(j)| < D$ at all times and for all processes $i, j$
- E.g., Berkeley algorithm
External vs Internal Synchronization (2)

- **External Synchronization with D \(\Rightarrow\) Internal Synchronization with \(2\times D\)**

- **Internal Synchronization does not imply External Synchronization**
  - In fact, the entire system may drift away from the external clock \(S\)!
• Algorithms for Clock Synchronization
Cristian’s Algorithm
Basics

- **External time synchronization**
- **All processes P synchronize with a time server S**

**Diagram:**

- **P** asks, "What's the time?"
- **S** responds, "Here's the time t!"
- **P** checks local clock to find time t.

**Time Line:**

- **Set clock to t**
What’s Wrong

• By the time response message is received at P, time has moved on
• P’s time set to $t$ is inaccurate!
• Inaccuracy a function of message latencies
• Since latencies unbounded in an asynchronous system, the inaccuracy cannot be bounded
Cristian’s Algorithm

- P measures the round-trip-time RTT of message exchange

What’s the time?

Set clock to t

Here’s the time t!

Check local clock to find time t
Cristian’s Algorithm (2)

- P measures the round-trip-time RTT of message exchange
- Suppose we know the minimum P → S latency min1
- And the minimum S → P latency min2
  - min1 and min2 depend on Operating system overhead to buffer messages, TCP time to queue messages, etc.

![Diagram showing P and S with RTT, Set clock to t, What’s the time?, and Here’s the time t! with Check local clock to find time t]
Cristian’s Algorithm (3)

- P measures the round-trip-time RTT of message exchange
- Suppose we know the minimum P → S latency min1
- And the minimum S → P latency min2
  - min1 and min2 depend on Operating system overhead to buffer messages, TCP time to queue messages, etc.
- The actual time at P when it receives response is between \([t+\min2, t+\text{RTT}-\min1]\)

![Graph showing the process of time calculation](image)
• The actual time at P when it receives response is between \([t+\text{min2}, t+\text{RTT-min1}]\)

• P sets its time to halfway through this interval
  – To: \(t + (\text{RTT}+\text{min2}-\text{min1})/2\)

• Error is at most \((\text{RTT}-\text{min2}-\text{min1})/2\)
  – Bounded!
Gotchas

• Allowed to increase clock value but should never decrease clock value
  – May violate ordering of events within the same process

• Allowed to increase or decrease speed of clock

• If error is too high, take multiple readings and average them
NTP = Network Time Protocol

- NTP Servers organized in a tree
- Each Client = a leaf of tree
- Each node synchronizes with its tree parent
NTP Protocol

Let's start protocol

Message 1 send time $t_{s1}$

Message 1 recv time $t_{r1}$

Message 2 send time $t_{s2}$

Message 2 recv time $t_{r2}$

$ts1, tr2$
What the Child Does

- Child calculates offset between its clock and parent’s clock
- Uses $ts1$, $tr1$, $ts2$, $tr2$
- Offset is calculated as
  $$o = (tr1 - tr2 + ts2 - ts1)/2$$
Why $o = (tr1 - tr2 + ts2 - ts1)/2$?

- Offset $o = (tr1 - tr2 + ts2 - ts1)/2$
- Let's calculate the error
- Suppose real offset is $oreal$
  - Child is ahead of parent by $oreal$
  - Parent is ahead of child by $-oreal$
- Suppose one-way latency of Message 1 is $L1$
  ($L2$ for Message 2)
- No one knows $L1$ or $L2$!
- Then
  
  $tr1 = ts1 + L1 + oreal$
  $tr2 = ts2 + L2 - oreal$
Why $o = (tr1 - tr2 + ts2 - ts1)/2$? (2)

- Then
  
  $tr1 = ts1 + L1 + oreal$
  
  $tr2 = ts2 + L2 - oreal$

- Subtracting second equation from the first
  
  $oreal = (tr1 - tr2 + ts2 - ts1)/2 + (L2 - L1)/2$
  
  $=> oreal = o + (L2 - L1)/2$
  
  $=> |oreal - o| < |(L2 - L1)/2| < |(L2 + L1)/2|$
  
  – Thus, the error is bounded by the round-trip-time
And yet…

• We still have a non-zero error!
• We just can’t seem to get rid of error
  – Can’t, as long as message latencies are non-zero
• Can we avoid synchronizing clocks altogether, and still be able to order events?
Lamport Timestamps
To order events across processes, trying to sync clocks is one approach.

What if we instead assigned timestamps to events that were not absolute time?

As long as these timestamps obey causality, that would work:
- If an event A causally happens before another event B, then timestamp(A) < timestamp(B).
- Humans use causality all the time:
  - E.g., I enter a house only after I unlock it.
  - E.g., You receive a letter only after I send it.
Logical (or Lamport) Ordering

- Proposed by Leslie Lamport in the 1970s
- Used in almost all distributed systems since then
- Almost all cloud computing systems use some form of logical ordering of events
Logical (or Lamport) Ordering(2)

- Define a logical relation *Happens-Before* among pairs of events
- *Happens-Before* denoted as $\rightarrow$
- Three rules
  1. On the same process: $a \rightarrow b$, if $\text{time}(a) < \text{time}(b)$ (using the local clock)
  2. If $p_1$ sends $m$ to $p_2$: $\text{send}(m) \rightarrow \text{receive}(m)$
  3. (Transitivity) If $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow c$ then $a \rightarrow c$
- Creates a *partial order* among events
  - Not all events related to each other via $\rightarrow$
While P1 and P3 each have an event labeled E, these are different events as they occur at different processes.
Happens-Before

- A → B
- B → F
- A → F

Instruction or step → Message
Happens-Before (2)

- Instruction or step
- Message

A                      B               C                   D        E

E’                    F            G

H                                I                                          J

P1

P2

P3

• H → G
• F → J
• H → J
• C → J
In practice: Lamport timestamps

- **Goal:** Assign logical (Lamport) timestamp to each event
- **Timestamps obey causality**
- **Rules**
  - Each process uses a local counter (clock) which is an integer
    - initial value of counter is zero
  - A process increments its counter when a send or an instruction happens at it. The counter is assigned to the event as its timestamp.
  - A send (message) event carries its timestamp
  - For a receive (message) event the counter is updated by
    \[
    \text{max}(\text{local clock, message timestamp}) + 1
    \]
Example

Time

Instruction or step

Message
Lamport Timestamps

Initial counters (clocks)

Instruction or step

Message
Lamport Timestamps

- P1: Message send at ts = 1
- P2: Message carry at ts = 1
- P3: Message send at ts = 1

Instruction or step

Message
**Lamport Timestamps**

- **Message carries**
  - ts = 1

- **Instruction or step**
  - ts = max(local, msg) + 1
  - = max(0, 1) + 1
  - = 2
Lamport Timestamps

- **Message carries** $ts = 2$
- $\text{max}(2, 2)+1 = 3$
Lamport Timestamps

max(3, 4) + 1 = 5

Instruction or step
Message
Lamport Timestamps

- Instruction or step
- Message

Diagram showing Lamport timestamps with three processes (P1, P2, P3) and corresponding timestamps for each step.
Obeying Causality

- A → B :: 1 < 2
- B → F :: 2 < 3
- A → F :: 1 < 3
Obeying Causality (2)

P1

0
A
0
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B
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C
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D
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E
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E’
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J
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P2

0

H
1

I
2

P3

0

H → G :: 1 < 4
F → J :: 3 < 7
H → J :: 1 < 7
C → J :: 3 < 7

Instruction or step
Message
Not always \textit{implying} Causality

- $? \text{C} \Rightarrow \text{F} \Leftrightarrow 3 = 3$
- $? \text{H} \Rightarrow \text{C} \Leftrightarrow 1 < 3$
- (C, F) and (H, C) are pairs of \textit{concurrent} events
Concurrent Events

- A pair of concurrent events doesn’t have a causal path from one event to another (either way, in the pair)
- Lamport timestamps not guaranteed to be ordered or unequal for concurrent events
- Ok, since concurrent events are not causality related!
- Remember

\[
E_1 \rightarrow E_2 \Rightarrow \text{timestamp}(E_1) < \text{timestamp}(E_2), \quad \text{BUT}
\]
\[
\text{timestamp}(E_1) < \text{timestamp}(E_2) \Rightarrow
\]
\[
\{E_1 \rightarrow E_2\} \text{ OR } \{E_1 \text{ and } E_2 \text{ concurrent}\}
\]
Can we have causal or logical timestamps from which we can tell if two events are concurrent or causally related?
Vector Timestamps

- Used in key-value stores like Riak
- Each process uses a vector of integer clocks
- Suppose there are $N$ processes in the group $1 \ldots N$
- Each vector has $N$ elements
- Process $i$ maintains vector $V_i[1 \ldots N]$
- $j$th element of vector clock at process $i$, $V_i[j]$, is $i$’s knowledge of latest events at process $j$
Assigning Vector Timestamps

• Incrementing vector clocks
  1. On an instruction or send event at process $i$, it increments only its $i$th element of its vector clock
  2. Each message carries the send-event’s vector timestamp $V_{\text{message}}[1...N]$
  3. On receiving a message at process $i$:
     \[
     V_i[i] = V_i[i] + 1
     \]
     \[
     V_i[j] = \max(V_{\text{message}}[j], V_i[j]) \text{ for } j \neq i
     \]
Vector Timestamps

Initial counters (clocks)
Vector Timestamps

P1
(0,0,0) → (1,0,0)

P2
(0,0,0)

P3
(0,0,0) → (0,0,1)

Message(0,0,1)
Vector Timestamps

P1: (0,0,0) -> (1,0,0)

P2: (0,0,0) -> (0,1,1)

P3: (0,0,0) -> (0,0,1)

Message: (0,0,1)

Time: (0,0,0)  (0,0,1)
Vector Timestamps

P1
(0,0,0) (1,0,0) (2,0,0)

P2
(0,0,0) (0,1,1) (2,2,1)

P3
(0,0,0) (0,0,1)

Message(2,0,0)
Vector Timestamps

P1
(0,0,0) → (1,0,0) → (2,0,0) → (3,0,0) → (4,3,1) → (5,3,1)

P2
(0,0,0) → (0,1,1) → (2,2,1) → (2,3,1)

P3
(0,0,0) → (0,0,1) → (0,0,2) → (5,3,3)
Causally-Related ...

- \( VT_1 = VT_2, \)
  
  \( \text{iff} \) (if and only if)
  
  \( VT_1[i] = VT_2[i], \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, N \)

- \( VT_1 \leq VT_2, \)
  
  \( \text{iff} \) \( VT_1[i] \leq VT_2[i], \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, N \)

- Two events are causally related \( \text{iff} \)
  
  \( VT_1 < VT_2, \) i.e.,
  
  \( \text{iff} \) \( VT_1 \leq VT_2 \) &
  
  there exists \( j \) such that
  
  \( 1 \leq j \leq N \) \& \( VT_1[j] < VT_2[j] \)
Two events VT$_1$ and VT$_2$ are concurrent iff

$\neg (VT_1 \leq VT_2) \land \neg (VT_2 \leq VT_1)$

We’ll denote this as VT$_2$ $|||_1$ VT$_1$
Obeying Causality

- $A \rightarrow B :: (1,0,0) < (2,0,0)$
- $B \rightarrow F :: (2,0,0) < (2,2,1)$
- $A \rightarrow F :: (1,0,0) < (2,2,1)$
Obeying Causality (2)

- $H \rightarrow G :: (0,0,1) < (2,3,1)$
- $F \rightarrow J :: (2,2,1) < (5,3,3)$
- $H \rightarrow J :: (0,0,1) < (5,3,3)$
- $C \rightarrow J :: (3,0,0) < (5,3,3)$
Identifying Concurrent Events

- C & F :: (3,0,0) ||| (2,2,1)
- H & C :: (0,0,1) ||| (3,0,0)
- (C, F) and (H, C) are pairs of concurrent events
Logical Timestamps: Summary

- **Lamport timestamps**
  - Integer clocks assigned to events
  - Obeys causality
  - Cannot distinguish concurrent events

- **Vector timestamps**
  - Obey causality
  - By using more space, can also identify concurrent events
Time and Ordering: Summary

- Clocks are unsynchronized in an asynchronous distributed system
- But need to order events, across processes!
- Time synchronization
  - Cristian’s algorithm
  - NTP
  - Berkeley algorithm
  - But error a function of round-trip-time
- Can avoid time sync altogether by instead assigning logical timestamps to events
Reminders

• (4 cr students) MP2 due this Sunday, Demos on Monday
  – Signup sheet (soon) on Piazza

• (All) HW2 due next Tuesday
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- On-campus Undergrads: 0, 80, 56, 65, 24.1
- On-campus Grads: 0, 80, 63.5, 72, 22.1
- MCS-online: 0, 78, 50.2, 52, 19.4
- MCS-DS: 0, 77, 38.7, 42, 26.6
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