Scaling up

- Assumption so far: All replicas have entire state
  - Example: Every replica has value for every key

- What we need instead:
  - Partition state
  - Map partitions to servers
Partitioning state

- **Modulo hashing**
  - Apply hash function to key
  - Compute modulo to # of servers (N)
  - Store (key, value) pair at $\text{hash(key)} \mod N$

- **Example:**
  - Store student’s transcripts across 4 servers
  - Hash function = (Year of birth) mod 4
  - Hash function = (Date of birth) mod 4

- **Problem:** Skew in load across servers
Problem for modulo hashing:
Changing number of servers

$$h(x) = x + 1 \pmod{4}$$

Add one machine: $$h(x) = x + 1 \pmod{5}$$

Keys remapped to new nodes $\Rightarrow$ Need to transfer values
Consistent Hashing

- Represent hash space as a circle

- **Partition keys across servers**
  - Assign every server a random ID
  - Hash server ID
  - Server responsible for keys between predecessor and itself

- **How to map a key to a server?**
  - Hash key and execute read/write at successor
Adding/Removing Nodes

- Minimizes migration of state upon change in set of servers
  - **Server addition**: New server splits successor’s shard
  - **Server removal**: Successor takes over shard
Virtual nodes

- Each server gets multiple (say $v$) random IDs
  - Each ID corresponds to a virtual node

- If $N$ servers with $v$ virtual nodes per server, each virtual node owns $1/(vN)^{th}$ of hash space

- Larger $v \rightarrow$ better load balancing
  - Vary $v$ across servers to account for heterogeneity
Virtual nodes

- What happens upon server failure?
  - $v$ successors take over
  - Each now stores $(v+1)/v \times 1/N^{th}$ of hash space
Using Consistent Hashing

How does client map keys to servers?

Front-ends must agree on set of active servers
Distributed Hash Table

- Scalable lookup of node responsible for any key
  - Scale to thousands (or even millions) of nodes
  - No one node knows all nodes in the system

- Example usage:
  - Trackerless BitTorrent
  - Key = File content hash
  - Value = IP addresses of nodes that have file content
Successor pointers

- If you don’t have value for key, forward to succ.

Downside of approach?

O(N) Lookup
Efficient lookups

- What’s required to enable $O(1)$ lookups?
  - Every node must know all other nodes

- Need to convert linear search to binary search

- Idea: Maintain $\log(N)$ pointers to other nodes
  - Called finger table
  - Pointer to node $\frac{1}{2}$-way across hash space
  - Pointer to node $\frac{1}{4}$-way across hash space
  - ...
Finger tables

- i’th entry at node n points to successor of hash(n) + 2^i
  - # of entries = # of bits in hash value

- Binary lookup tree rooted at every node
  - Threaded through others’ finger tables
How to recursively use finger tables to locate node for key k?
Lookup with finger table

\textbf{Lookup}(key k, node n)

look in local finger table for

\begin{align*}
\text{highest } f \text{ s.t. } & \text{hash}(f) < \text{hash}(k) \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{if} \ f \ \text{exists}

\begin{align*}
\text{call } \text{Lookup}(k, f) \quad // \text{next hop}
\end{align*}

\textbf{else}

\begin{align*}
\text{return } n\text{'}s \text{ successor} \quad // \text{done}
\end{align*}
Lookups take $O(\log N)$ hops
Example

Resolving key 26 from node 1 and key 12 from node 28 using DHTs in Chord (using finger tables)
Is log(N) lookup fast or slow?

- For a million nodes, it’s 20 hops
- If each hop takes 50 ms, lookups take a second
- If each hop has 10% chance of failure, it’s a couple of timeouts
- So log(N) is better than O(N) but not great
Handling churn in nodes

- Need to update finger tables upon addition or removal of nodes

- Hard to preserve consistency in the face of these changes
Amazon Dynamo
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ABSTRACT
Reliability at massive scale is one of the biggest challenges we face at Amazon.com, one of the largest e-commerce operations in the world. A highly available key-value store is an essential service to meet this challenge. Typically, these systems are designed to hide failure, but at Amazon, we face failure constantly. Dynamo is our design for a highly available key-value store. It is based on a simple model of storage, failures, and access. It provides strong consistency and supports many applications, such as the core of Amazon’s e-commerce platform. One of the lessons our organization has learned from operating Amazon’s platform is that the reliability and scalability of a system is dependent on how its application state is managed. Amazon uses a highly decentralized, loosely coupled, service-oriented architecture.

- Added to “Hall of Fame” at SOSP’17
- Rumored to be underpinning of Amazon S3’s architecture
Dynamo settings

- **Setting:**
  - Tens of millions of customers
  - Data spread across tens of thousands of servers

- **Example use case:** *Store shopping carts*

- **Goals:**
  - High availability
  - Low latency
    - Consistency takes a hit
Recall: Consistent hashing maps value for key to successor in hash space.

Replicate value for every key at N nodes
- \(N\) clockwise successors of key

Execution of writes
- Write received by coordinator (successor of key)
- Coordinator forwards to successors
Replication in Dynamo
Using Consistent Hashing
Consistent Hashing in Dynamo

What would it take to make this work?

Client

Server
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Server

Server

1-hop DHT
Gossip

- Once per second, each server contacts a randomly chosen other server

- Servers exchange their lists of known servers
  - Including virtual node IDs
Sloppy quorums

- **N replicas for every key**
  - Higher durability with greater N

- **Serving reads and writes:**
  - Coordinator forwards request to first N-1 reachable successors
  - Waits for response from R or W to replicas

- **How to maximize availability/minimize latency?**
  - Low R and/or low W

- **How to ensure read sees last committed write?**
  - R+W > N
Latency/availability over consistency

\[ N = 3, \ W = 1, \ R = 1 \]
Consistency over latency/availability

N = 3, W = 2, R = 2

How to tell which of R copies read is latest version?

Put(k, y) → k: y → Client1

Get(k) → k: y → Client2

Put(k, x) → k: x → B

B → k: x → C

A → k: y → B → k: x

Client 1

Client 2
Vector clocks

- Store a vector clock with each key-value pair
- What we have discussed previously:
  - Vector with \# of components = \# of servers
  - Not scalable

- Dynamo’s adaptation of vector clocks:
  - List of (coordinator node, counter) pairs
  - Example: [(A, 1), (B, 3), ...]
Vector clocks

\( N = 3, \ W = 2, \ R = 2 \)

\[ ([A, 1]) \quad ([A, [A, B]]) \quad ([A, 1], (B, 1)) \]

A \quad B \quad C

Client 1 \quad \text{Put}(k, x) \quad \text{Put}(k, y) \quad \text{Client 2}
Vector clocks in Dynamo

- Consider following scenario:
  - Client1 executes PUT(k, v1)
  - Client2 executes GET(k) and gets v1
  - Client2 executes PUT(k, v2)

- How can vector clocks help in recognizing that okay to garbage collect v1?

- When responding to a GET, Dynamo returns the vector clock for value returned

- Client includes vector clock in subsequent PUT
Automatic conflict resolution

$v2 > v1$, so Dynamo automatically drops $v1$ at C
App-specific conflict resolution

v1 [(A,1)]

- put handled by node A

v2 [(A,1), (B,1)]

- put handled by node B

v3 [(A,1), (C,1)]

- put handled by node C

Client reads v2, v3; writes with [(A,1), (B,1), (C,1)]

v4 [(A,2), (B,1), (C,1)]

- v2 || v3, so client must perform reconciliation
Dynamo’s client interface

- **Client interface:**
  - `Get(key) \rightarrow value`
  - `Put(key, value)`

  - **Get(key)** \rightarrow List of `<value, context>` pairs
    - Returns one value or multiple conflicting values
    - Context describes version(s) of value(s)

  - **Put(key, value, context)**
    - Context indicates which versions this version supersedes or merges
Many nodes may process Puts to same key
- Version vectors may grow arbitrarily long

Dynamo’s clock truncation scheme
- Dynamo stores time of modification with each version vector entry
- When version vector > 10 nodes long, Dynamo drops node that least recently processed key

Problems with truncation?
- False concurrency
Impact of clock truncation

\[ \text{put handled by node A} \]

\[ v_1 [(A,1)] \]

\[ \text{put handled by node B} \]

\[ v_2 [(A,1), (B,1)] \]