TCSS 558: APPLIED DISTRIBUTED COMPUTING

Chapter 6 – Coordination - IV

Wes J. Lloyd
School of Engineering & Technology (SET)
University of Washington - Tacoma



1

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
    Vector Clocks
- Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting
- Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion
  - Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.2

2

ONLINE DAILY FEEDBACK SURVEY

- Daily Feedback Quiz in Canvas – Available After Each Class
- Extra credit available for completing surveys ***ON TIME***
- Tuesday surveys: due by ~ Wed @ 10p
- Thursday surveys: due ~ Mon @ 10p



March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.3

3

TCSS 558 - Online Daily Feedback Survey - 1/5

Due Jan 6 at 10pm   Points 1   Questions 4
Available Jan 5 at 1:30pm - Jan 6 at 11:59pm 1 day   Time Limit None

Question 1   0.5 pts

On a scale of 1 to 10, please classify your perspective on material covered in today's class:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Mostly Review To Me | Equal New and Review | Mostly New to Me

Question 2   0.5 pts

Please rate the pace of today's class:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Slow | Just Right | Fast

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.4

4

MATERIAL / PACE

- Please classify your perspective on material covered in today's class (30 respondents):
- 1-mostly review, 5-equal new/review, 10-mostly new
- **Average – 6.47** (↑ - *previous 6.25*)

- Please rate the pace of today's class:
- 1-slow, 5-just right, 10-fast
- **Average – 5.83** (↑ - *previous 5.65*)

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.5

5

FEEDBACK FROM 3/2

In the 2 phase algorithm is there a need to use a concurrent locking mechanism or just a boolean variable is fine for the assignment?

- Atomic variables may be a good choice:

- https://docs.oracle.com/javase/tutorial/essential/concurrency/atomicvars.html
- https://winterbe.com/posts/2015/05/22/java8-concurrency-tutorial-atomic-concurrent-map-examples/

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.6

6

FEEDBACK - 2

- ***What is the format to switch between the membership tracking methods when starting the TCP server, as I am not sure how the membership tracking ids(F,FD, T,U) are going to be passed? (are these command-line arguments?)***
- To receive full extra credit points, you only need to implement 2 membership tracking approaches. **The key is, which ones.**
- These combinations will result in max extra credit: T and U or FD and U.
- There are 5 less points for "FD and T" or "F and T".
- There are no ***"extra" extra*** points for implementing ***three*** approaches.
- If three are implemented, then either T and U or FD and U are typically tested.

7

FEEDBACK - 3

- For F or FD, this is the default membership tracking method.
- The assumption is that the user will put a file in temp called "`/tmp/nodes.cfg`".
- Implement F or FD, but not both.
- There is no command line argument to specific to use F or FD for the server.
- The TCP server upon starting will read "`/tmp/nodes.cfg`"
- The readme.txt file should say that "F" or "FD" has been implemented and should be tested.

8

FEEDBACK - 4

- For T, when starting the servers you'll need to explicitly point to the TCP server that acts as the centralized membership server by providing the IP address and port number:
- java -jar GenericNode.jar ts <server port number> <membership-server-IP> <membership-server-port>
- #Example:
- `java -jar GenericNode.jar ts 1234 54.12.44.33 1111`
- See page 7

9

FEEDBACK - 5

- For U (UDP), there will be no configuration.
- The readme.txt needs to say to test "U".
- When the servers are turned on, they will start talking to each other by broadcasting messages.
- Very few groups will do "(F or FD) and U".
- If "F/FD and U" are implemented, it will probably be necessary to configure one approach or the other by passing in an argument to the server on startup.
- Most groups will either do "F or FD" and T, or T and U.
- For these combinations the differentiating factor is that T requires a centralized membership server to be explicitly specified on server startup. That's how we can tell the user wants "T" and not "F/FD" or "U"

10

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- **Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store**
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
    Vector Clocks
- Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting
- Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion
  - Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms

11

SHORT-HAND-CODES FOR MEMBERSHIP TRACKING APPROACHES

- Include readme.txt or doc file with instructions in submission
- Must document membership tracking method

>> please indicate which types to test <<

ID	Description
F	Static file membership tracking – file is not reread
FD	Static file membership tracking DYNAMIC - file is periodically reread to refresh membership list
T	TCP membership tracking – servers are configured to refer to central membership server
U	UDP membership tracking - automatically discovers nodes with no configuration

12

ASSIGNMENT 2

- **Sunday March 12th**
- Goal: Replicated Key Value Store
- Team signup posted on Canvas under 'People'
- Builds off of Assignment 1 GenericNode
- Focus on TCP client/server w/ replication
- How to track membership for data replication?
  - Can implement multiple types of membership tracking for extra credit

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.13

13



CH. 6.2: LOGICAL CLOCKS

L18.14

14

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
  - Vector Clocks
- Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting
- Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion
  - Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.15

15

CHAPTER 6 - COORDINATION

- 6.1 Clock Synchronization
  - Physical clocks
  - Clock synchronization algorithms
- 6.2 Logical clocks
  - Lamport clocks
  - Vector clocks
- 6.3 Mutual exclusion
- 6.4 Election algorithms
- 6.6 Distributed event matching *(light)*
- 6.7 Gossip-based coordination *(light)*

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.16

16

VECTOR CLOCKS

- Lamport clocks don't help to determine causal ordering of messages
- Vector clocks capture causal histories and can be used as an alternative
- But what is causality? …

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.17

17

WHAT IS CAUSALITY?



- Having a causal relationship between two events (A and E) indicates that event E results from the occurrence of event A.
- When one event results from another, there is a causal relationship between the two events.
- This is also referred to as cause and effect.

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.18

18

CAUSALITY - 2

- **Disclaimer:**
- Without knowing actual information contained in messages, it is not possible to state with certainty that there is a causal relationship or perhaps a conflict
- Lamport/Vector clocks can help us suggest possible causality
- But we never know for sure…

19

CAUSALITY - 3

- Consider the messages:



- P2 receives m1, and subsequently sends m3
- **Causality:** Sending m3 ***may*** depend on what's contained in m1
- P2 receives m2, receiving m2 is ***not*** related to receiving m1
- ***Is sending m3 causally dependent on receiving m2?***

20

VECTOR CLOCKS

- Vector clocks help keep track of **causal history**
- If two local events happened at process P, then the causal history H(p2) of event p2 is {p1,p2}
- P sends messages to Q (*event p3*)
- Q previously performed event q1
- Q records arrival of message as q2
- Causal histories merged at Q H(q2)= {p1,p2,p3,q1,q2}
- Fortunately, can simply store history of last event, as a vector clock → H(q2) = (3,2)
- Each entry corresponds to the last event at the process

21

VECTOR CLOCKS - 2



- Each process maintains a vector clock which
  - Captures number of events at the local process (e.g. logical clock)
  - Captures number of events at all other processes
- Causality is captured by:
  - For each event at Pi, the vector clock (VC_i) is incremented
  - The msg is timestamped with VC_i; and sending the msg is recorded as a new event at P_i
  - P_j adjusts its VC_j choosing the **max** of: the message timestamp –or– the local vector clock (VC_j)

22

VECTOR CLOCKS - 3

- Pj knows the # of events at Pi based on the timestamps of the received message
- Pj learns how many events have occurred at other processes based on timestamps in the vector
- These events ***"may be causally dependent"***
- **In other words:** they may have been necessary for the message(s) to be sent…

23

VECTOR CLOCKS EXAMPLE

- Local clock is underlined

CAUSALITY



m_2	m_4	$m_2 < m_4$	$m_2 > m_4$	Conclusion
(2,1,0)	(4,3,0)	Yes	No	m2 may causally precede m4

24

VECTOR CLOCKS EXAMPLE - 2



m_2	m_4	$m_2 < m_4$	$m_2 > m_4$	Conclusion
(4,1,0)	(2,3,0)	No	No	m2 and m4 may conflict

- P3 can't determine if m4 may be causally dependent on m2
- **Is m4 causally dependent on m3 ?**

25

VECTOR CLOCKS EXAMPLE - 3



- Provide a vector clock label for unlabeled events

26

VECTOR CLOCKS EXAMPLE - 4



- TRUE/FALSE:
- The sending of message m_3 is causally dependent on the sending of message m_1.
- The sending of message m_2 is causally dependent on the sending of message m_1.

27

VECTOR CLOCKS EXAMPLE - 5



- TRUE/FALSE:
- P_1 (1,0,0) and P_3 (0,0,1) may be concurrent events.
- P_2 (0,1,1) and P_3 (0,0,1) may be concurrent events.
- P_1 (1,0,0) and P_2 (0,1,1) may be concurrent events.

28

WE WILL RETURN AT 2:40 PM

29

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
    Vector Clocks
- **Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting**
- **Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks**
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion
  - Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms

30

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
    Vector Clocks
- Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting
- Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - **Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion**
  - Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms

31



CH. 6.3: DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION

32

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS

- Coordinating access among distributed processes to a shared resource requires **Distributed Mutual Exclusion**
- **Algorithms in 6.3**
- Token-ring algorithm
- ***Permission-based algorithms:***
- Centralized algorithm
- Distributed algorithm (Ricart and Agrawala)
- Decentralized voting algorithm (Lin et al.)

33

TOKEN-BASED ALGORITHMS

- Mutual exclusion by passing a "token" between nodes
- Nodes often organized in ring
- Only one token, holder has access to shared resource
- Avoids starvation: ***everyone gets a chance to obtain lock***
- Avoids deadlock: easy to avoid

34

TOKEN-RING ALGORITHM

- Construct overlay network
- Establish logical ring among nodes



- Single token circulated around the nodes of the network
- Node having token can access shared resource
- If no node accesses resource, token is constantly circulated around ring

35

TOKEN-RING CHALLENGES

1. If token is lost, token must be regenerated
   - **Problem**: may accidentally circulate multiple tokens
2. Hard to determine if token is lost
   - What is the difference between token being lost and a node holding the token (***lock***) for a long time?
3. When node crashes, circular network route is broken
   - Dead nodes can be detected by adding a receipt message for when the token passes from node-to-node
   - When no receipt is received, node assumed dead
   - Dead process can be "jumped" in the ring

36

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS - 3

- **Permission-based algorithms**
- Processes must require permission from other processes before first acquiring access to the resource
  - CONTRAST: Token-ring did not ask nodes for permission

- **Centralized algorithm**
- Elect a single leader node to coordinate access to shared resource(s)
- Manage mutual exclusion on a distributed system similar to how mutual exclusion is managed for a single system
- Nodes must all interact with leader to obtain ***"the lock"***

37

CENTRALIZED MUTUAL EXCLUSION

Permission granted from coordinator V No response from coordinator



P_1 executes P_2 blocks P_1 finishes; P_2 executes

- When resource not available, coordinator can block the requesting process, or respond with a reject message
- P2 must ***poll*** the coordinator if it responds with reject otherwise can wait if simply blocked
- Requests are granted permission fairly using FIFO queue
- Just three messages: (request, grant (OK), release)

38

CENTRALIZED MUTUAL EXCLUSION - 2

- **Issues**
- Coordinator is a single point of failure
- Processes can't distinguish dead coordinator from ***"blocking"*** when resource is unavailable
  - No difference between CRASH and BLOCK (*for a long time*)
- Large systems, coordinator becomes performance bottleneck
  - Scalability: Performance does not scale

- **Benefits**
- Simplicity:
  Easy to implement compared to distributed alternatives

39

DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM

- Ricart and Agrawala [1981], use total ordering of all events
  - Leverages Lamport logical clocks

- Package up resource request message (AKA Lock Request)
- Send to all nodes
- Include:
  - Name of resource
  - Process number
  - Current (logical) time

- Assume messages are sent reliably
  - No messages are lost

40

DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM - 2

- When each node receives a request message they will:
1. Say OK (***if the node doesn't need the resource***)
2. Make **no reply**, queue request (***node is using the resource***)
3. ***If node is also waiting to access the resource:*** perform a timestamp comparison -
   1. Send OK if requester has lower logical clock value
   2. Make **no reply** if requester has higher logical clock value
- Nodes sit back and wait for all nodes to grant permission

- Requirement: every node must know the entire membership list of the distributed system

41

DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM - 3

- Node 0 and Node 2 simultaneously request access to **resource**
- Node 0's time stamp is lower (8) than Node 2 (12)
- Node 1 and Node 2 grant Node 0 access
- Node 1 is not interested in the resource, it OKs both requests



- **In case of conflict, lowest timestamp wins!**
  - Node 2 rejects its own request (12) in favor of node 0 (8)

42

CHALLENGES WITH DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM

- **Problem:** Algorithm has N points of failure !
- Where N = Number of Nodes in the system
- **No Reply Problem:** When node is accessing the resource, it does not respond
  - Lack of response can be confused with **failure**
  - ***Possible Solution:*** When node receives request for resource it is accessing, always send a reply either granting or denying permission (ACK)
  - Enables requester to determine when nodes have died

43

CHALLENGES WITH DISTRIBUTED ALGORITHM - 2

- **Problem**: Multicast communication required –or- each node must maintain full group membership
  - Track nodes entering, leaving, crashing…
- **Problem**: Every process is involved in reaching an agreement to grant access to a shared resource
  - This approach ***may not scale*** on resource-constrained systems
- **Solution**: Can relax total agreement requirement and proceed when a **simple majority** of nodes grant permission (>50%)
  - *Presumably any one node locking the resource prevents agreement*
  - *If one node gets majority of acknowledges no other can*
  - *Requires every node to know size of system (# of nodes)*
- **Problem:** 2 concurrent transactions get 50% permission → **deadlock**?
- Distributed algorithm for mutual exclusion works best for:
  - Small groups of processes
  - When memberships rarely change

44

DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHM

- Lin et al. [2004], decentralized voting algorithm
- Resource is replicated N times
- Each replica has its own coordinator …(N coordinators)
- Accessing resource requires majority vote: total votes (m) > N/2 coordinators
- **Assumption #1:** When coordinator does not give permission to access a resource (because it is busy) it will inform the requester

45

DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHM - 2

- **Assumption #2:** When a coordinator crashes, it recovers quickly, but will have forgotten votes before the crash.
- Approach assumes coordinators reset **arbitrarily** at any time
- **Risk**: on crash, coordinator forgets it previously granted permission to the shared resource, and on recovery it errantly grants permission again
- **The Hope**: if coordinator crashes, *upon recovery*, ***the node granted access to the resource has already finished before the restored coordinator grants access again . . .***

46

DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHM - 3

- With 99.167% coordinator availability (30 sec downtime/hour) chance of violating correctness **is so low** it can be neglected in comparison to other types of failure
- Leverages fact that a new node must obtain a majority vote to access resource, ***which requires time***

N	m	p	Violation
8	5	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-15}$
8	6	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-18}$
16	9	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-27}$
16	12	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-36}$
32	17	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-52}$
32	24	3 sec/hour	$< 10^{-73}$

N	m	p	Violation
8	5	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-10}$
8	6	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-11}$
16	9	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-18}$
16	12	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-24}$
32	17	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-35}$
32	24	30 sec/hour	$< 10^{-49}$

N = number of resource replicas, m = required "majority" vote
p=seconds per hour coordinator is offline

47

DECENTRALIZED ALGORITHM - 4

- **Back-off Polling Approach for *permission-denied:***
- If permission to access a resource is denied via majority vote, process can poll to gain access again with a ***random*** delay (***known as back-off***)
- Node waits for a random amount, retries…
- If too many nodes compete to gain access to a resource, majority vote can lead to low resource utilization
  - ***No one can achieve majority vote to obtain access to the shared resource***
  - *Mimics elections where with too many candidates, where no one candidate can get >50% of the total vote*
- Problem Solution detailed in [Lin et al. 2014]

48



49



50



51



52

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS REVIEW

- Which algorithm offers the best scalability to support distributed mutual exclusion in a large distributed system?
- (A) Token-ring algorithm
- (B) Centralized algorithm
- (C) Distributed algorithm
- (D) Decentralized voting algorithm

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.53

53

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS REVIEW - 2

- Which algorithm(s) involve blocking (no reply) when a resource is not available?
- (A) Token-ring algorithm
- (B) Centralized algorithm
- (C) Distributed algorithm
- (D) Decentralized voting algorithm

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.54

54

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS REVIEW - 3

- Which algorithm(s) involve arriving at a consensus (majority opinion) to determine whether a node should be granted access to a resource?
- (A) Token-ring algorithm
- (B) Centralized algorithm
- (C) Distributed algorithm
- (D) Decentralized voting algorithm

55

DISTRIBUTED MUTUAL EXCLUSION ALGORITHMS REVIEW - 4

- Which algorithm(s) have N points of failure, where N = Number of Nodes in the system?
- (A) Token-ring algorithm
- (B) Centralized algorithm
- (C) Distributed algorithm
- (D) Decentralized voting algorithm

56

OBJECTIVES – 3/7

- Questions from 3/2
- Assignment 2: Replicated Key Value Store
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.2: Logical Clocks
    Vector Clocks
- Class Activity 4 – Total Ordered Multicasting
- Class Activity 5 – Causality and Vector Clocks
- Chapter 6: Coordination
  - Chapter 6.3: Distributed Mutual Exclusion
  - **Chapter 6.4: Election Algorithms**

57



CH. 6.4: ELECTION ALGORITHMS

58

ELECTION ALGORITHMS

- Many distributed systems require one process to act as a coordinator, initiator, or provide some special role
- Generally any node (or process) can take on the role
  - In some situations there are special requirements
  - <u>Resource requirements</u>: compute power, network capacity
  - <u>Data</u>: access to certain data/information
- Assumption:
  - Every node has access to a "node directory"
  - Process/node ID, IP address, port, etc.
  - Node directory may not know "current" node availability
- Goal of election: at conclusion all nodes agree on a coordinator or "leader"

59

ELECTION ALGORITHMS

- Consider a distributed system with N processes (*or nodes*)
- Every process has an identifier id(P)
- Election algorithms attempt to locate the highest numbered process to designate as coordinator
- **<u>Algorithms:</u>**
- Bully algorithm
- Ring algorithm
- Elections in wireless environments
- Elections in large-scale systems

60

BULLY ALGORITHM

- When ***any*** process notices the coordinator is no longer responding to requests, it initiates an election
- Process P_k initiates an election as follows:
  1. P_k sends an ELECTION message to all processes with higher process IDs (P_{k+1}, P_{k+2}, … P_{N-1})
  2. If no one responds, P_k wins the election and becomes coordinator
  3. If a "higher-up" process answers (P_{k+n}), it will take over and run the election. P_k will quit sending ELECTION messages.
- When the higher numbered process receives an ELECTION message from a lower-numbered colleague, it responds with "OK", indicating it's alive, and it takes over the election.

61

BULLY ALGORITHM - 2

- The higher numbered process then holds an election with ***only*** higher numbered processes (nodes).
- Eventually ***all*** processes give up except one, and the remaining process becomes the new coordinator.
- The coordinator announces victory by sending all processes a message stating it is starting as the coordinator.
- If a higher numbered node that was previously down comes back up, it holds an election, and ultimately takes over the coordinator role.
- The process with the *"biggest"* ID in town always wins.
- Hence the name, **bully algorithm**

62

BULLY ALGORITHM - 3

Note that node 7 (*the previous leader*) has failed…





[1] Process 4 starts an election

[2] Process 5 and 6 respond

[3] Process 5 and 6 each hold an election

[4] Process 6 tells Process 5 to stop

[5] Process 6 wins and tells everyone

63

BULLY ALGORITHM - 4

- **Requirement:** Every node knows who is participating in the distributed system
  - Each node has a group membership directory
- First process to notice the leader is offline launches a new election
- GOAL: Find the highest number node that is running
  - Loop over the nodes until the highest numbered node is found
  - May require multiple election rounds
- Highest numbered node is always the ***"BULLY"***

64

RING ALGORITHM

- Election algorithm based on a network of nodes in logical ring
- *Does not use a token*
- Any process (P_k) starts the election by noticing the coordinator is not functioning
1. P_k builds an **election message**, and sends to its successor in the ring
   - If successor is down, successor is skipped
   - Skips continue until a running process is found
2. When the **election message** is passed around, each node adds its ID to a *separate* **active node list**
3. When **election message** returns to P_k, P_k recognizes its own identifier in the **active node list**. Message is changed to COORDINATOR and "**elected(**P_k**)**" message is circulated.
   - Second message announces P_k is the NEW coordinator

65

RING: MULTIPLE ELECTION EXAMPLE



- **PROBLEM:** Two nodes start election at the same time: P_3 and P_6
- P_3 sends **ELECT(**P_3**)** message, P_6 sends **ELECT(**P_6**)** message
  - P_3 and P_6 both circulate ELECTION messages at the same time
- Also circulated with ELECT message is an **active node list**
- Each node adds itself to the **active node list**
- Each node votes for the highest numbered candidate
- P_6 wins the election because it's the candidate with the **highest ID**

66

ELECTIONS WITH WIRELESS NETWORKS

- Assumptions made by traditional election algorithms not realistic for wireless environments:
  - >>> Message passing is reliable
  - >>> Topology of the network does not change
- A few protocols have been developed for elections in ad hoc wireless networks
- Vasudevan et al. [2004] solution handles failing nodes and partitioning networks.
  - Best leader can be elected, rather than just a random one

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.67

67

VASUDEVAN ET AL. WIRELESS ELECTION

1. Any node (***source***) (P) starts the **election** by sending an ELECTION message to immediate neighbors (any nodes in range)
2. Receiving node (Q) designates sender (P) as parent
3. (Q) Spreads election message to neighbors, ***but not to parent***
4. Node (R), receives message, designates (Q) as parent, and spreads ELECTION message to neighbors, ***but not to parent***
5. Neighbors that have already selected a parent immediately respond to R.
   - If ***all*** neighbors already have a parent, R is a leaf-node and will report back to Q quickly.
   - When reporting back to Q, R includes metadata regarding battery life and resource capacity
6. Q eventually acknowledges the ELECTION message sent by P, and also indicates the most eligible node (based on battery & resource capacity)

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.68

68

WIRELESS ELECTION - 2 SOURCE NODE: [A]

Node [A] initiates election: **find the highest capacity**

Election messages propagated to all nodes

Each node reports to its parent node with best capacity

Node A then facilitates Node H becoming leader



March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.69

69

WIRELESS ELECTION - 3

- When multiple elections are initiated, nodes only join one
- Source node tags its ELECTION message with unique identifier, to uniquely identify the election.
- With minor adjustments protocol can operate when the network partitions, and when nodes join and leave

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.70

70

ELECTIONS FOR LARGE-SCALE SYSTEMS

- Large systems often require several nodes to serve as coordinators/leaders
- These nodes are considered ***"super peers"***
- ***Super peers*** must meet operational requirements:

1. Network latency from normal nodes to ***super peers*** must be low
2. ***Super peers*** should be evenly distributed across the overlay network (ensures proper load balancing, availability)
3. Must maintain set ratio of ***super peers*** to normal nodes
4. ***Super peers*** must not serve ***too many*** *normal nodes*

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.71

71

ELECTIONS FOR DHT BASED SYSTEMS

- DHT-based systems use a bit-string to identify nodes
- **Basic Idea**: Reserve fraction of ID space for super peers
- Reserve first **$\log_2(N)$** bits for super-peer IDs
- m=number of bits of the identifier
- k=# of nodes each node is responsible for (Chord system)
- **Example:**
- For a system with m=8 bit identifier, and k=3 keys per node
- Required number of super peers is $2^{(k-m)} \cdot N$, where N is the number of nodes
  - In this case N=32
  - **Only 1 super peer is required for every 32 nodes**

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.72

72

SUPER PEERS IN AN M-DIMENSIONAL SPACE

- Given an overlay network, the idea is to position superpeers throughout the network so they are evenly disbursed

- **Use tokens:**
- Give N tokens to N randomly chosen nodes
- No node can hold more than (1) token
- Tokens are "repelling force". Other tokens move away
- All tokens exert the same repelling force
- This automates token distribution across an overlay network

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.73

73

OVERLAY TOKEN DISTRIBUTION

- Gossping protocol is used to disseminate token location and force information across the network
- If forces acting on a node with a token exceed a **threshold**, token is moved away
- Once nodes hold token for awhile they become superpeers



March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.74

74

QUESTIONS

March 7, 2023 | TCSS558: Applied Distributed Computing [Winter 2023] School of Engineering and Technology, University of Washington - Tacoma | L18.75

75