Failures, Elections, and Raft
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Failures

• Omission failures
  – something doesn’t happen
    - process crashes
    - data lost in transmission
    - etc.

• Byzantine (arbitrary) failures
  – something bad happens
    - message is modified
    - message received twice
    - any kind of behavior, including malicious

• Timing failures
  – something takes too long
# Synchronous vs. Asynchronous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Synchronous</th>
<th>Asynchronous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execution speed</td>
<td>Bounded</td>
<td>Unbounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Message delays</td>
<td>Bounded</td>
<td>Unbounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock drift rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Detecting Crashes

- Synchronous systems
  - timeouts
- Asynchronous systems
  - ?
- Fail-stop
  - an oracle lets us know
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Consensus

• Setting: a group of processes, some correct, some faulty
• Two primitives, \textit{propose}(v) and \textit{decide}(v)
• If each correct process proposes a value:
  – Termination: every correct process eventually decides on a value
  – Agreement: if a correct process decides \( v \), then all processes eventually decide \( v \)
  – Integrity: if a correct process decides \( v \), then \( v \) was previously proposed by some process

\textit{Informally: think of this as voting for a value}
Consensus

• Variations on the problem, depending on assumptions
  – Synchronous vs asynchronous
  – Fail-stop vs crash/omission failures vs Byzantine failures
• Equivalent to reliable, totally- and causally-ordered broadcast (Atomic broadcast)
Byzantine Agreement Problem

- Will cover in a future lecture
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Impossibility of Consensus

• There is no deterministic protocol that solves consensus in a message-passing asynchronous system in which at most one process may fail by crashing.
  – Solve means to satisfy safety and liveness
  – Famous result from Fisher, Lynch, Paterson (FLP), 1985

• There is hope, though
  – Introducing (some) synchrony – timeouts
  – Introducing randomization
  – Introducing failure detectors

Oceanstore: Replicated Primary Replica

Inner ring of servers
State-Machine Replication

• An approach to dealing with failures by replication
• A data-structure with deterministic operations replicated among servers
• State consistent if every server sees the same sequence of operations
  – Multiple rounds of consensus
• Common algorithms (non-Byzantine):
  – Paxos [Lamport], Viewstamped Replication [Oki and Liskov], Zab [Junqueira et al.], Raft [Ongaro and Ousterhout]
Raft
Raft

• Proposed by Ongaro and Ousterhout in 2014
• Four components
  – Leader election
  – Log replication
  – Safety
  – Membership changes
• Assumes crash failures
• No dependency on time for safety
  – But depends on time for availability
Server States

- At any given time, each server is either:
  - Leader: handles all client interactions, log replication
    - At most 1 viable leader at a time
  - Follower: completely passive (issues no RPCs, responds to incoming RPCs)
  - Candidate: used to elect a new leader

- Normal operation: 1 leader, N-1 followers

---

![Server States Diagram]

- Follower
- Candidate
- Leader

- Starts up
- Times out, starts election
- Times out, new election
- Receives votes from majority of servers
- Discovers current leader or new term
- Discovers server with higher term

---

5.3 Leader election

5.4.3 Entries

5.4.3.1 Keys
• Time divided into terms:
  – Election
  – Normal operation under a single leader
• At most 1 leader per term
• Some terms have no leader (failed election)
• Each server maintains current term value
• Key role of terms: identify obsolete information
Heartbeats and Timeouts

- Servers start up as followers
- Followers expect to receive RPCs from leaders or candidates
- Leaders must send heartbeats (empty AppendEntries RPCs) to maintain authority
- If electionTimeout elapses with no RPCs:
  - Follower assumes leader has crashed
  - Follower starts new election
  - Timeouts typically 100-500ms
Election Basics

- Increment current term
- Change to Candidate state
- Vote for self
- Send RequestVote RPCs to all other servers, retry until either:
  1. Receive votes from majority of servers:
     - Become leader
     - Send AppendEntries heartbeats to all other servers
  2. Receive RPC from valid leader:
     - Return to follower state
  3. No-one wins election (election timeout elapses):
     - Increment term, start new election
Elections, cont’d

- Safety: allow at most one winner per term
  - Each server gives out only one vote per term (persist on disk)
  - Two different candidates can’t accumulate majorities in same term

- Liveness: some candidate must eventually win
  - Choose election timeouts randomly in \([T, 2T]\)
  - One server usually times out and wins election before others wake up
  - Works well if \(T > >\) broadcast time
Log Structure

- Log entry = index, term, command
- Log stored on stable storage (disk); survives crashes
- Entry committed if known to be stored on majority of servers
  - Durable, will eventually be executed by state machines
Life as a Leader

• Client sends command to leader
• Leader appends command to its log
• Leader sends AppendEntries RPCs to followers
• Once new entry committed:
  – Leader passes command to its state machine, returns result to client
  – Leader notifies followers of committed entries in subsequent AppendEntries RPCs
  – Followers pass committed commands to their state machines
• Crashed/slow followers?
  – Leader retries RPCs until they succeed
• Performance is optimal in common case:
  – One successful RPC to any majority of servers
Log Consistency Invariants

• If log entries on different servers have same index and term:
  – They store the same command
  – The logs are identical in all preceding entries

1  2  3  4  5  6

```plaintext
add  cmp  ret  mov  jmp  div
```

1  2  3  4  5  6

```plaintext
add  cmp  ret  mov  jmp  sub
```

• If a given entry is committed, all preceding entries are also committed
AppendEntries Consistency Check

- Each AppendEntries RPC contains index, term of entry preceding new ones
- Follower must contain matching entry; otherwise it rejects request
- Implements an induction step, ensures coherency

```
1  add  1  cmp  1  ret  1  mov  3  jmp
```

AppendEntries succeeds: matching entry

```
1  add  1  cmp  1  ret  1  mov
```

AppendEntries fails: mismatch

```
1  add  1  cmp  1  ret  1  shl
```
Leader Changes

- At beginning of new leader’s term:
  - Old leader may have left entries partially replicated
  - No special steps by new leader: just start normal operation
  - Leader’s log is “the truth”
  - Will eventually make follower’s logs identical to leader’s
  - Multiple crashes can leave many extraneous log entries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>log index</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₃</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₄</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S₅</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safety Requirement

Once a log entry has been applied to a state machine, no other state machine must apply a different value for that log entry

- Raft safety property:
  - If a leader has decided that a log entry is committed, that entry will be present in the logs of all future leaders

- This guarantees the safety requirement
  - Leaders never overwrite entries in their logs
  - Only entries in the leader’s log can be committed
  - Entries must be committed before applying to state machine

Committed $\rightarrow$ Present in future leaders’ logs

Restrictions on commitment

Restrictions on leader election
Picking the Best Leader

• Followers can’t tell which entries are committed!

  - During elections, choose candidate with log most likely to contain all committed entries
    - Candidates C include log info in RequestVote RPCs (index & term of last log entry)
    - Voting server V doesn’t vote if its log is “more complete”:
      \((\text{lastTerm}_V > \text{lastTerm}_C) \lor (\text{lastTerm}_V == \text{lastTerm}_C) \land (\text{lastIndex}_V > \text{lastIndex}_C)\)
    - Leader will have “most complete” log among electing majority
Commuting Entry from Current Term

- Case #1/2: Leader decides entry in current term is committed

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
s_1 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
s_2 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & \\
s_3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & \\
s_4 & 1 & 1 & 2 & & \\
s_5 & 1 & 1 & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

- Safe: leader for term 3 must contain entry 4
Committing Entry from Earlier Term

- Case #2/2: Leader is trying to finish committing entry from an earlier term

Entry 3 not safely committed:
- $s_5$ can be elected as leader for term 5
- If elected, it will overwrite entry 3 on $s_1$, $s_2$, and $s_3$!
New Commitment Rules

• For a leader to decide an entry is committed:
  – Must be stored on a majority of servers
  – At least one new entry from leader’s term must also be stored on majority of servers

• Once entry 4 committed:
  – $s_5$ cannot be elected leader for term 5
  – Entries 3 and 4 both safe

Combination of election rules and commitment rules makes Raft safe
Log Inconsistencies

Leader changes can result in log inconsistencies:

log index
leader for
term 8

possible
followers

Extraneous Entries

(a)
(b)
(c)
(d)
(e)
(f)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

Extraneous Entries

Missing Entries

possible
followers
Repairing Follower Logs

• New leader must make follower logs consistent with its own
  – Delete extraneous entries
  – Fill in missing entries

• Leader keeps nextIndex for each follower:
  – Index of next log entry to send to that follower
  – Initialized to (1 + leader’s last index)

• When AppendEntries consistency check fails, decrement
  nextIndex and try again:
Repairing Logs, cont’d

- When follower overwrites inconsistent entry, it deletes all subsequent entries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>log index</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leader for term 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follower (before)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follower (after)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram of nextIndex, log index, leader for term 7, follower (before), follower (after)](attachment:diagram.png)
Neutralizing Old Leaders

• Deposed leader may not be dead:
  – Temporarily disconnected from network
  – Other servers elect a new leader
  – Old leader becomes reconnected, attempts to commit log entries

• **Terms** used to detect stale leaders (and candidates)
  – Every RPC contains term of sender
  – If sender’s term is older, RPC is rejected, sender reverts to follower and updates its term
  – If receiver’s term is older, it reverts to follower, updates its term, then processes RPC normally

• Election updates terms of majority of servers
  – Deposed server cannot commit new log entries
Client Protocol

• Send commands to leader
  – If leader unknown, contact any server
  – If contacted server not leader, it will redirect to leader

• Leader does not respond until command has been logged, committed, and executed by leader’s state machine

• If request times out (e.g., leader crash):
  – Client reissues command to some other server
  – Eventually redirected to new leader
  – Retry request with new leader
Client Protocol, cont’d

- What if leader crashes after executing command, but before responding?
  - Must not execute command twice
- Solution: client embeds a unique id in each command
  - Server includes id in log entry
  - Before accepting command, leader checks its log for entry with that id
  - If id found in log, ignore new command, return response from old command
- Result: exactly-once semantics as long as client doesn’t crash
- Enforces linearizability (will see in upcoming lecture)
Partitioned Leader

- A client talking to a partitioned leader could be delayed forever.
  - Solution: leader will step down after a number of rounds of heartbeats with no response from majority
What if clients can crash?

• Servers maintain a session for each client
  – Keep track of latest sequence number processed for client, and response

• Generalizes for multiple outstanding requests
  – Server keeps set of <seq, resp> for client
  – Client includes with request lowest seq with no response
  – Server can discard smaller sequence numbers

• Must expire sessions
  – All replicas must agree on when to do this
  – Raft uses leader timestamp, committed to log
Alive clients with expired sessions

• How to distinguish between client which exited from client which just took too long?

• Require clients to register with the leader when starting a session
  – `RegisterClient` RPC
  – Leader returns unique ID to the client
  – Client uses this ID in subsequent request

• If server receives request for non-existing session…
  – Return an error. Current implementation crashes the client, forcing restart
Configuration Changes

Cannot switch directly from one configuration to another: conflicting majorities could arise.

See the paper for details.
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