Distributed Algorithms

Reliable & Causal Broadcast 2nd exercise session

Matteo Monti <<u>matteo.monti@epfl.ch</u>> Jovan Komatovic <<u>jovan.komatovic@epfl.ch</u>>

Reliable broadcast

Specification:

- Validity: If a *correct* process broadcasts *m*, then it eventually delivers *m*.
- Integrity: m is delivered by a process at most once, and only if it was previously broadcast.
- **Agreement**: If a correct process delivers *m*, then all correct processes eventually deliver *m*.

Algorithm: Lazy Reliable Broadcast

Implements:

ReliableBroadcast, instance rb.

Uses:

BestEffortBroadcast, **instance** *beb*; PerfectFailureDetector, **instance** \mathcal{P} .

upon event $\langle rb, Init \rangle$ **do** *correct* := Π ; *from*[p] := [\emptyset]^N;

upon event $\langle rb, Broadcast | m \rangle$ **do trigger** $\langle beb, Broadcast | [DATA, self, m] \rangle;$

```
upon event \langle beb, Deliver | p, [DATA, s, m] \rangle do

if m \notin from[s] then

trigger \langle rb, Deliver | s, m \rangle;

from[s] := from[s] \cup \{m\};

if s \notin correct then

trigger \langle beb, Broadcast | [DATA, s, m] \rangle;
```

upon event $\langle \mathcal{P}, Crash | p \rangle$ **do** *correct* := *correct* \ {*p*}; **forall** $m \in from[p]$ **do trigger** $\langle beb, Broadcast | [DATA, p, m] \rangle;$ Strong accuracy: No correct process is ever suspected:

 $\forall F, \forall H, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall p \in correct(F), \forall q : p \notin H(q, t)$

Strong completeness:

Eventually, every faulty process is permanently suspected by every correct process:

 $\forall F, \forall H, \exists t \in \mathcal{T}, \forall p \in crashed(F), \forall q \in correct(F), \forall t' \ge t : p \in H(q, t')$

Where:

- crashed(F) is the set of crashed processes.
- correct(F) is the set of correct processes.
- H(p, t) is the output of the failure detector of process p at time t.

Implement a reliable broadcast algorithm without using any failure detector, i.e., using only *BestEffort-Broadcast(BEB)*.

The reliable broadcast algorithm presented in class has the processes continuously fill their different buffers without emptying them.

```
Implements: ReliableBroadcast (rb).
```

```
Uses:
BestEffortBroadcast (beb).
PerfectFailureDetector (P).
upon event < Init > do
delivered := Ø;
correct := S;
forall pi ∈ S do from[pi] := Ø;
```

- r upon event < rbBroadcast, m> do
 delivered := delivered U {m};
 trigger < rbDeliver, self, m>;
 trigger < bebBroadcast, [Data,self,m]>;
- - r trigger < bebBroadcast,[Data,pj,m]>;

- r upon event < bebDeliver, pi, [Data,pj,m]> do
 - ✓ if m ∉ delivered then
 - delivered := delivered U {m};
 - frigger < rbDeliver, pj, m>;
 - ✓ if pi ∉ correct then
 - trigger < bebBroadcast,[Data,pj,m]>;
 - else
 - from[pi] := from[pi] U {[pj,m]};

Modify it to remove (i.e. garbage collect) unnecessary messages from the buffers:

- A. from, and
- B. delivered

Uniform reliable broadcast

Specification:

- Validity: If a *correct* process broadcasts *m*, then it eventually delivers *m*.
- Integrity: m is delivered by a process at most once, and only if it was previously broadcast.
- **Uniform Agreement**: If a correct process delivers *m*, then all correct processes eventually deliver *m*.

Algorithm: All-Ack Uniform Reliable Broadcast

Implements:

UniformReliableBroadcast, instance urb.

Uses:

BestEffortBroadcast, **instance** *beb*. PerfectFailureDetector, **instance** \mathcal{P} .

```
upon event \langle urb, Init \rangle do

delivered := \emptyset;

pending := \emptyset;

correct := \Pi;

forall m do ack[m] := \emptyset;
```

```
upon event \langle urb, Broadcast | m \rangle do

pending := pending \cup \{(self, m)\};

trigger \langle beb, Broadcast | [DATA, self, m] \rangle;
```

```
upon event \langle beb, Deliver | p, [DATA, s, m] \rangle do

ack[m] := ack[m] \cup \{p\};

if (s,m) \notin pending then

pending := pending \cup \{(s,m)\};

trigger \langle beb, Broadcast | [DATA, s, m] \rangle;
```

upon event $\langle \mathcal{P}, Crash | p \rangle$ **do** *correct* := *correct* \ {*p*};

function candeliver(m) returns Boolean is return (correct $\subseteq ack[m]$);

upon exists $(s,m) \in pending$ such that $candeliver(m) \land m \notin delivered$ **do** $delivered := delivered \cup \{m\};$ **trigger** $\langle urb, Deliver | s, m \rangle;$

What happens in the reliable broadcast and uniform reliable broadcast algorithms if the:

- A. accuracy, or
- B. completeness

property of the failure detector is violated?

Implement a **uniform** reliable broadcast algorithm without using any failure detector, i.e., using only *BestEffort-Broadcast(BEB)*.

Causal Broadcast

Definition (Happens-before):

 $\exists e'' \ s, t, e \rightarrow e'' \rightarrow e'$

We say that an event *e* happens-before an event *e*', and we write $e \rightarrow e'$, if one of the following three cases holds (is true):

$$egin{aligned} \exists p_i \in \Pi \ s. \, t. \ e = e^r_i, \ e' = e^s_i, \ r < s \ e = send(m, st) \wedge e' = receive(m) \end{aligned}$$

(e and e' are executed by the same process)

(e and e' are send/receive events of a message respectively)

(i.e. \rightarrow is transitive)

Causal Broadcast

Specification:

It has the same specification of reliable broadcast, with the additional ordering constraint of causal order.

More precisely (causal order):

 $broadcast_p(m)
ightarrow broadcast_q(m') \Rightarrow deliver_r(m)
ightarrow deliver_r(m')$

Which means that:

If the broadcast of a message m happens-before the broadcast of a message m, then no process delivers m unless it has previously delivered m.

Can we devise a broadcast algorithm that does **not** ensure the causal delivery property **but only** (in) its non-uniform variant:

No correct process p_i delivers a message m_2 unless p_i has already delivered every message m_1 such that $m_1 \rightarrow m_2$?

Suggest a memory optimization of the garbage collection scheme of the following algorithm:

No-Waiting Causal Broadcast

Implements:

CausalOrderReliableBroadcast, instance crb.

Uses:

ReliableBroadcast, instance rb.

upon event ⟨ *crb*, *Init* ⟩ **do** *delivered* := ∅; *past* := [];

```
upon event ⟨ crb, Broadcast | m ⟩ do

trigger ⟨ rb, Broadcast | [DATA, past, m] ⟩;

append(past, (self, m));
```

 $\begin{array}{l} \textbf{upon event} \ \langle \ rb, \ Deliver \mid p, \ [DATA, \ mpast, \ m] \ \rangle \ \textbf{do} \\ \textbf{if} \ m \not\in \ delivered \ \textbf{then} \\ \textbf{forall} \ (s, n) \in \ mpast \ \textbf{do} \qquad // \ by \ \textbf{the order in the list} \\ \textbf{if} \ n \not\in \ delivered \ \textbf{then} \\ \textbf{trigger} \ \langle \ crb, \ Deliver \mid s, n \ \rangle; \\ delivered \ := \ delivered \cup \{n\}; \\ \textbf{if} \ (s, n) \not\in \ past \ \textbf{then} \\ append(past, (s, n)); \\ \textbf{trigger} \ \langle \ crb, \ Deliver \mid p, m \ \rangle; \\ delivered \ := \ delivered \cup \{m\}; \\ \textbf{if} \ (p, m) \not\in \ past \ \textbf{then} \\ append(past, (p, m)); \end{array}$

Garbage-Collection of Causal Past in the "No-Waiting Causal Broadcast"

Implements:

CausalOrderReliableBroadcast, instance crb.

Uses:

ReliableBroadcast, **instance** rb; PerfectFailureDetector, **instance** \mathcal{P} .

// Except for its \langle Init \rangle event handler, the pseudo code on the left is // part of this algorithm.

upon event ⟨ *crb*, *Init* ⟩ **do** *delivered* := ∅; *past* := []; *correct* := Π; **forall** m **do** ack[m] := ∅;

upon event $\langle \mathcal{P}, Crash | p \rangle$ **do** *correct* := *correct* \ {*p*};

upon exists $m \in delivered$ such that $self \notin ack[m]$ **do** $ack[m] := ack[m] \cup \{self\};$ **trigger** $\langle rb, Broadcast | [ACK, m] \rangle;$

upon event $\langle rb, Deliver | p, [ACK, m] \rangle$ **do** $ack[m] := ack[m] \cup \{p\};$

upon $correct \subseteq ack[m]$ **do** forall $(s', m') \in past$ such that m' = m **do** remove(past, (s', m));

Can we devise a Best-effort Broadcast algorithm that satisfies the causal delivery property, *without* being a causal broadcast algorithm, i.e., without satisfying the *agreement* property of a reliable broadcast?

In the "Waiting Causal Broadcast", we say that $V \le W$ if, for every i = 1, ..., N, it holds that $V[i] \le W[i]$.

Question: Why do we not use "<" instead of "≤"?

Algorithm 3.15: Waiting Causal Broadcast Implements: CausalOrderReliableBroadcast, instance crb. Uses: ReliableBroadcast, instance rb. upon event (crb, Init) do $V := [0]^N;$ lsn := 0: pending := \emptyset ; **upon event** $\langle crb, Broadcast | m \rangle$ **do** W := V: W[rank(self)] := lsn;lsn := lsn + 1;**trigger** $\langle rb, Broadcast | [DATA, W, m] \rangle;$ **upon event** $\langle rb, Deliver | p, [DATA, W, m] \rangle$ **do** pending := pending $\cup \{(p, W, m)\};$ while exists $(p', W', m') \in pending$ such that W' < V do pending := pending $\setminus \{(p', W', m')\};$ V[rank(p')] := V[rank(p')] + 1;**trigger** $\langle crb, Deliver | p', m' \rangle$;