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Now you've got $N$ problems

$$
\mathbf{N}=8 \text { probably }
$$



WHAT ARE WE BUILDING?
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= Work distribution
= Fault-tolerance

- Locality
$\checkmark$ Peer to Peer!
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How to get fault-tolerance without spam?

SERVICES
"MULTI-TENANT"
"MULTI-REGION"
"HIGHLY-AVAILABLE"
"REAL-TIME"
"STREAMING"
"PLATFORM"

How do cluster nodes find each other?

## Distribute code and configuration?

Know what happened when?
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## ARGUS OPERATIONAL VISIBILITY PROJECT

- Cluster membership and discovery
- Code and configuration dissemination
- Relative and convergent time



## MEMBERSHIP PROTOCOLS



JUST RUB SOME CONSENSUS ON IT

## WHY NOT ZOOKEEPER/CONSUL/ETCD?
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$\checkmark$ Low Clustering
$\checkmark$ High scalability

- Connectedness
- Balance
- Path-length
- Accuracy


## Partial
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## SWIM: Scalable Weakly-consistent Infection-style Process Group Membership Protocol

```
Abhinandan Das, Indranil Gupta, Ashish Motivala*
    Dept. of Computer Science, Cornell University
        Ithaca NY }14853\mathrm{ USA
{asdas,gupta,ashish}@cs.cornell.edu
```

SWIM - 2002
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SWIM - 2002
```

Heartbeat protocols

- Quadratic load
- Failure detection
- Response times
- False positives

ค. SWIM solutions

- Separate membership and failure detection
- Randomized probing
- Piggyback membership on probes


## SWIM - 2002



Figure 1. SWIM failure detection: Example protocol period at $M_{i}$. This shows all the possible messages that a protocol period may initiate. Some message contents excluded for simplicity.

```
SCAMP - 2003
```


## Peer-to-Peer Membership Management for Gossip-Based Protocols <br> Ayalvadi J. Ganesh, Anne-Marie Kermarrec, and Laurent Massoulié
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## SCAMP - 2003

o Full views limit scalability

- Flexible partial-view size, asymmetric
$\Rightarrow$ Reactive view management

ت Join ("subscribe") via random walk
a Automatic balancing via indirection and leases

## SCAMP-2003



Fig. 5. Impact of c on the partial view size distribution in a 50,000 node group.

## SCAMP-2003



Fig. 8. Distribution of the partial views by size in a 50,000 node group with and without the lease mechanism.
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## CYCLON: Inexpensive Membership Management for Unstructured P2P Overlays

Spyros Voulgaris, ${ }^{1,2}$ Daniela Gavidia, ${ }^{1}$ and Maarten van Steen ${ }^{1}$
$\sqrt{N}$ CYCLON - 2005
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## CYCLON - 2005

- Random shuffling doesn't create good balance
$\Rightarrow$ Fixed partial-view size, symmetric
$\Rightarrow$ Cyclic view management
- Join via random walk
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Fig. 1. An example of shuffling between nodes 2 and 9 . Note that, among other changes, the link between 2 and 9 reverses direction.

## CYCLON - 2005



Fig. 2. (a) Average shortest path length between two nodes for different cache sizes. (b) Average clustering coefficient taken over all nodes.

## PROBLEMS WITH SCAMP \& CYCLON

- No failure detectors
- SCAMP: asymmetric views $\Rightarrow$ disconnection
- SCAMP: unbounded view size $\Rightarrow$ imbalance

HyParView: a membership protocol for reliable gossip-based broadcast

João Leitão<br>José Pereira<br>Luís Rodrigues
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## HYPARVIEW - 2007

- Fanout is related to reliability
o High failure rates decrease quality
- TCP for transport and failure detector
= Small reactive view ("active")
- Larger cyclic view ("passive")
- Join and shuffle via random walk


## HYPARVIEW - 2007

## Algorithm 1: Membership Operations

upon init do
Send(Join, contactNode, myself);
upon Receive(Join, newNode) do if isfull(activeView) then
trigger dropRandomElementFromActiveView activeView $\longleftarrow$ activeView $\cup$ newNode
foreach $n \in$ activeView and $n \neq$ newNode do
Send(ForwardJoin, $n$, newNode, ARWL, myself)
upon Receive(ForwardJoin, newNode, timeToLive, sender) do if timeToLive $==0 \| \#$ activeView $==0$ then
trigger addNodeActiveView(newNode) else
if timeToLive $==$ PRWL then
trigger addNodePassiveView(newNode)
$n \longleftarrow n \in$ activeView and $n \neq$ sender
Send(ForwardJoin, $n$, newNode, timeToLive-1, myself)
upon dropRandomElementFromActiveView do $n \longleftarrow n \in$ activeView Send(Disconnect, $n$, myself) activeView $\longleftarrow$ activeView $\backslash\{n\}$ passiveView $\longleftarrow$ passiveView $\cup\{n\}$

HYPARVIEW - 2007

Passive view maintenance


## HYPARVIEW - 2007



Figure 2: Reliability for 1000 messages


Figure 4: Healing time

## WE CHOSE HYPARVIEW

- Only active view maintenance
- Passive view maintains full membership (unbounded)
- Later: switch to complete passive maintenance Ne nimia propinquita alic erruncata. Aparce hac demeum, latududine pensacalums.


## DISSEMINATION PROTOCOLS



Turris llupendz altitudinis cum diruta, renovata.
Et ipsa ades una cumm nfuñatum ndccxLIU,
FRIDERICl, val fatifocret, choxtuin A moccxxvv, is difpendio fectit
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$\Rightarrow$ Reliability

- Scalability
- Efficiency
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## EPIDEMIC

BROADCAST (GOSSIP)

- Send to random peers
$\Rightarrow$ Messages rebroadcast by recipients
o High redundancy
o Low scalability


WITHOUT REDUCING DELIVERY GUARANTEES, WE NEED

## INCREASED EFFICIENCY



# Epidemic Broadcast Trees 

João Leitão<br>José Pereira<br>Luís Rodrigues

DI-FCUL
TR-07-14

PLUMTREE - 2009
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## PLUMTREE - 2009 CONSTRUCTION

- All nodes start with full "eager" set
- Broadcast triggers eager-push
- Duplicate messages cause "pruning" (move to "lazy")
- Regular broadcasts proceed with new "eager" sets
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## PLUMTREE - 2009 REPAIR

- Lazy-push sends "I Have" messages
- Timeout triggers "grafting" (move to "eager")
- Lazy-push batched to reduce overhead
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## WE CHOSE PLUMTREE

- Good tradeoff between reliability and redundancy
- Optimizes for lowest-latency paths
- Existing open-source implementations
- Excellent fit with HyParView
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POPULATION PROTOCOLS USE

## RANDOMIZED INTERACTIONS



## Logical Physical Clocks and Consistent Snapshots in Globally Distributed Databases

Sandeep Kulkarni*, Murat Demirbas**, Deepak Madeppa**, Bharadwaj Avva**, and Marcelo Leone*
*Michigan State University
${ }^{* *}$ University at Buffalo, SUNY

JON MOORE
DISTRIBUTED MONOTONIC CLOCKS


## DMC PROBLEMS

- "Wacky clock mode"
- Hierarchy imbalances load
- Long-lived partitions
- No convergence proof


Bridging the Gap between Population and Gossip-based Protocols
Yann Busnel, Marin Bertier, Anne-Marie Kermarrec

## APPLYING DMC

- Use existing dissemination with DMC
- Transmit clocks along with other messages
- Use monotonic clocks as a drift-detection mechanism

LESSONS LEARNED



THANK YOU!

## @SEANCRIBBS

## 3 <br> COMCAST

