

Carnegie Mellon University in Qatar

Distributed Systems

15-440 - Fall 2022

Project 2

Out: September 15, 2022

Due: October 4, 2022

Contents

1	Learning Objective	3
2	Project Objective	3
3	Conceptual Architecture	3
3.1	System Description	4
3.2	Consistency	4
3.2.1	Reader Operation	4
3.2.2	Writer Operation	4
3.2.3	Locking a File/Directory in the Hierarchy of the Path	5
3.3	Replication	5
3.3.1	Replication Policy	6
3.3.2	Read-request Handling for Hot-files	7
3.3.3	Write-request Handling for Hot-files	7
4	Design and Implementation Guidelines	7
4.1	File Concurrency and Synchronization	7
4.2	Replication	7
5	Starter Code	8
6	Implementation Notes	9
6.1	Summary of Changes since Project 1	9
6.2	Locking	9
6.3	Replication	10
7	Test Suite	11
8	Rubric	11
9	Deliverable	12
10	Submission	12
11	Late Policy	12

1 Learning Objective

Project 2 applies the theory of two important aspects of distributed systems: *synchronization* and *replication*. The learning objective of this project is two-fold:

1. Examine and apply synchronization algorithms that enable correct and consistent sharing of common resources.
2. Apply intelligent replication strategies for load-balancing and performance.

2 Project Objective

FileStack (Project 1) was described as a distributed file system which allows clients to read or write files on remote storage servers. Two important aspects of such file systems are to:

1. **Ensure correctness when multiple clients read/write:** this problem is known as maintaining "consistency." You will now maintain locks for reader and writer clients. Since reads do not change the file, you can allow as many readers as possible to access the file at the same time. However, if a writer has to write to a file, you have to ensure that there are no other readers or writers who have locked the file. This concept is referred to as read-write locks. In addition to ensuring basic consistency, you will also solve the unfairness problem that manifests while ensuring consistency.
2. **Improve performance by smart-allocation of files across multiple servers:** we solve this problem by dynamic replication of files. Instead of all clients fetching a file from one storage server, we can now parallelize - and hence improve read/write times - by redirecting clients to different replicas. It also aids in load-balancing of storage servers: many clients who access a very popular file will now not go to a single storage server.

3 Conceptual Architecture




Figure 1: Architecture of *FileStack* (Project 1)

The conceptual architecture of the *FileStack* system, shown in Figure 1, remains the same as that of project 1:

1. The Clients will contact the naming server to access files.
2. The Naming Server will redirect the clients towards Storage Servers.
3. The Clients will read/write files on Storage Servers.

However, in this project, you will: **(1)** make sure that the files are *consistent*, and **(2)** implement a *replication* policy.

3.1 System Description

In this section, we describe the functionalities that you will implement and the nature of the protocol to ensure consistency and reliability. You will implement two main functionalities: *consistency* and *replication*.

3.2 Consistency

You will implement a scheme to ensure consistency in distributed systems called "read-write locks." The main concept is for reader and writer clients to grab locks before performing operations, and release them once these operations are done. If some other client already owns a lock, this means that the file is currently being accessed by that client. In such a case, it is possible for the file to become inconsistent if more than one client accesses the file at the same time. For example, if one writer is modifying a part of a file, and another writer modifies an overlapping part, then the file becomes inconsistent. The goal in this project is to avert the occurrence of such a scenario (and alike) via ensuring consistency when multiple clients are present. You will implement and design algorithms that achieve that goal.

In particular, you will implement *coarse-grained locks* (similar to Google Chubby). Here, the user will ask for an **exclusive lock** or a **non-exclusive lock** from the naming server for proceeding with a write or a read, respectively. As such, you have to provision two more methods in the Naming Server (in the Service interface).

3.2.1 Reader Operation

A reader will grab a **non-exclusive lock** to a file before reading, and will release the lock once it is done. While one reader is reading the file, you will allow other readers to concurrently read the file (i.e., other readers will also be able to grab non-exclusive lock to the file). This is because read operations do not modify files, and hence, cannot cause inconsistencies. Nonetheless, simultaneous reads to a file can decrease the time taken for reading the file by multiple readers (as readers do not wait for each other), and accordingly, improving performance.

3.2.2 Writer Operation

A writer will grab an **exclusive lock** to a file before writing, and will release the lock once the operation is completed. In order to keep the file consistent, a writer can successfully grab the lock only when:

1. None of the readers are reading, or
2. None of the other writers are writing.

Handout continues on the next page(s)

3.2.3 Locking a File/Directory in the Hierarchy of the Path

Consider writing to a file in the absolute path `/home/users/student1/work/project2.txt`. While obtaining a write lock to the file, you have to make sure that:

1. No other reader or writer is operating on file `project2.txt`
2. No writer is modifying the hierarchy of directory. For example, consider a scenario where **client 1** is trying to rename sub-directory "work" to "play," and **client 2** is writing to `project2.txt`. Then **client 2** should write - after **client 1** is finished - to the new location `/home/users/student1/play/project2.txt` (and not to `/home/users/student1/work/project2.txt`). The likelihood of inconsistencies in DFSs renders increasingly high if whole directory paths are not locked. You will avoid inconsistencies in your *FileStack* system by:
 - (a) Obtaining non-exclusive locks to all the directories in a given path, and
 - (b) Obtaining an exclusive lock for the file to be altered (e.g., in the aboveexample).

Such a strategy will ensure that writers do not introduce inconsistencies in your file system. For readers, you will also follow almost the same strategy: you will lock all the directories and the file in the path by using non-exclusive locks. By applying this approach, you will not allow any writer (similar to **client 1** above) to rename or delete a directory when a reader is reading. Finally, be aware of deadlocks while locking a hierarchy of directories/files. You have to lock different directories and a file in a path. You might obtain locks to some and fail in getting locks to others. Design a mechanism that precludes deadlocks.

3.3 Replication

The second problem is to improve the performance through replication. The problem is motivated from the type of access-pattern to files that are seen in normal file systems and distributed file systems. Some files have a lot of requests (e.g., system log files), while others are very rarely accessed (e.g., some remote photos in a user's home directory). We refer to the former as *hot-files*, and the latter as *cold-files*. In distributed systems, if there are a lot of requests attempting to read/write to one *hot-file*, the networking and processing loads on the storage server that stores the *hot-file* is very high, while that of the storage servers that host only *cold-files* are rarely utilized. Consequently, the waiting queue for accessing the hot-files becomes very large, and might demonstrate a bottleneck. You will provide a solution to avoid such potential bottlenecks through replication.

Handout continues on the next page(s)

3.3.1 Replication Policy

The naming server maintains a counter that keeps track of the number of requesters to a file. This information will be useful to measure the *hot-ness* of a file (e.g., the larger the number of requesters to a file; the higher the *hot-ness* of the file). To avoid stressing a replica as well as its hosting storage server, you will scale replicas linearly as the number of requesters increases. Specifically, you can set the number of replicas per a file as follows:

$$\text{num_replicas} = \text{ALPHA} * \text{num_requesters}$$

where ALPHA is a positive constant. By controlling ALPHA, you control the number of replicas per file. In addition, you would want to limit the replicas of a file. For that sake, you can maintain a REPLICA_UPPER_BOUND, and avoid replicating a file whose number of replicas has exceeded this threshold. In particular, you can now set the number of replicas per file as follows:

$$\text{num_replicas} = \min(\text{ALPHA} * \text{num_requesters}, \text{REPLICA_UPPER_BOUND})$$

This fine-grained control of replication will alter the number of replicas even upon a change of one or two requesters. This might add to an already large overhead of dynamic replication (what we are essentially implementing). To enhance the policy, you can rather apply a coarse-grained approach by rounding the number of replicas to the next integer that is a multiple of 20 (as an example). That is,

$$\text{num_requesters_coarse} = \{N \mid N \geq \text{num_requesters} \ \& \ \text{a multiple of } 20\}$$

Afterwards, you can compute the number of replicas as follows (*this is the final formula that you should implement*):

$$\text{num_replicas} = \min(\text{ALPHA} * \text{num_requesters_coarse}, \text{REPLICA_UPPER_BOUND})$$

Figure 2 shows an illustrative graph that demonstrates how the number of replicas for a file changes upon changing the number of requesters.




Figure 2: Linear Replication Policy with an upper-bound

3.3.2 Read-request Handling for Hot-files

A simple approach for the server to perform load-balancing is by randomly redirecting requests to replicas.

3.3.3 Write-request Handling for Hot-files

You will implement an *invalidation-based* policy. Specifically, during a write call, you will invalidate all-but-one replicas, and subsequently write on the remaining replica (the remaining file). Keep in mind that if you are to write to a replicated file, you have to wait for every reader or a writer (*if any*) to release their/its lock(s).

4 Design and Implementation Guidelines

In this project, you will improve your Project 1 to add concurrency and replication. Hence, it is vital that basic components of project 1 (RMI, storage and naming) are working well.

4.1 File Concurrency and Synchronization

The first important part in implementing correct synchronization is to provide each file/directory with a capability to lock. But where do you implement the lock? Do you implement it at the naming server? Or do you implement it at the storage server where the file resides? How would you ensure that locks work with replicated files (second part of this project)? First, think about these questions.

The second design decision is regarding queues. Recall that there are readers and writers waiting to access a file. A writer can lock only when there are no readers: what happens when multiple readers request the file - one after another? Will the writer ever get a chance to lock the file for writing?

The third decision is ensuring the ordering of reads/writes. A simple way is *FIFO*: the first request (read/write) occurs before the second, second before the third, and so on. However, note that there is no ordering between reads and writes. This compromises the exact ordering, but helps improve the performance of distributed systems: all reads can go on together even if there is one write in-between. For some systems (Google search, for instance), this works perfectly fine (Read the section 7.3.1 "Eventual consistency" in the *Tanenbaum* textbook). All reads should be in *FIFO*, and all writes should be in *FIFO*. How do you ensure the order of reads and writes? How are the requests queued?

4.2 Replication

Replication introduces whole new range of challenges. The exact logic of replication is not too complicated. However, remember that you have to copy files from storage servers to others. This might require ensuring that directory hierarchy for a file is exactly created (but do not overwrite the files that already exists in sub-trees) as in the original storage server.

The second issue is to re-think file functionalities. What will happen if you read a file? How do you write a file, and update all replicas at different storage servers? How do you handle file/directory deletions?

5 Starter Code

Please use the code in **P2_StarterCode.zip**.

The starter code is an extension of the starter code for Project 1. The starter code includes complete replacements for the `apps/`, `test/`, and `conformance/` directories, as these are all entirely the course staff's responsibility, and are affected by the changes going from Project 1 from Project 2.

The main features of the starter code are as follows:

- The `build/` and `client/` directories are unaffected, and are included just for completeness.
- The `naming/` and `storage/` directories contain only the new `.java` files for the updated *Command* and *Service* interfaces. These files are meant to replace the existing ones that you have. You should copy your implementations of the interfaces from Project 1, and edit them to conform to the new interfaces. There are only a few new methods - **lock** and **unlock** - in *Service*, and **copy** in *Command*.
- The `unit/` directory is not included. You should copy your own, if you want to use the unit tests that you already have.
- The `rmi/` directory is not included. It is completely unaffected, and you should copy your own rmi code into this directory.
- The `common/` directory is not included, because there is only one file in there. It does change, but most of it stays the same as in Project 1. You should copy your Project 1 version, and then make the **Path** class implement *Comparable* for Project 2. The purpose of this is to allow applications to pick a locking order when taking multiple locks - the order on the paths will help to prevent deadlocks. A file "NOTE" is included with the starter code to give you a starting point in doing this, but if you choose to use it, you should copy the method skeleton in "NOTE" into your own copy of `Path.java`.

Handout continues on the next page(s)

6 Implementation Notes

6.1 Summary of Changes since Project 1

The naming server supports file and directory locking. The Service interface therefore has two new methods: lock and unlock. Each node in the directory tree on the naming server now has a read-write lock. Locks for a path are always taken in order from root to final node. Threads requesting the lock are granted it in first-come first-serve order, with the exception that threads requesting shared access are granted the lock at the same time (if there is a block of threads in the queue all requesting shared access, then when one of them gets shared access, they all do, until the next thread requesting exclusive access, or until the end of the queue).

The naming and storage servers support replication. Read and write accesses are noted on the naming server when file lock requests occur. The storage server Command interface provides the new copy method to support replication.

`Path` objects now implement `Comparable`. This is meant to allow an application to choose a locking order if multiple locks need to be taken. All applications must take locks in the order defined by `Path.compareTo`. See the big comment by that method for further explanation.

`StorageServer` now has an additional constructor `StorageServer(File, int, int)`, which takes two port numbers to force the client/storage and command interfaces to use the given ports.

6.2 Locking

Naming server methods should not all be synchronized anymore. The read-write locks now provide most of the mutual exclusion needed. There are a few exceptions, however. A student that leaves all methods synchronized is not relying on the read-write locks.

Locking must be done carefully. For example, it is not acceptable to traverse a path and get a list of directory tree objects along that path, and then lock each one. This is because if the parent of an object remains unlocked, another thread can unlink the object from the tree after the path is traversed, but before the object is locked. Then, the locking thread has locked an object that no longer exists. When locking, it is necessary to lock an object, then consult its child list, and then attempt to lock the next object, and so on. Locking an object should prevent its child list from being modified (at least by well-behaved clients).

It is also important to unlock all objects that have been locked when locking fails. For example, if three components are locked before it is discovered that the fourth does not exist, then those three components must all be unlocked.

It is desirable, but not necessary, to make the locks interruptible. This is because when the naming server is shut down, a large number of service threads may still be pooled in lock queues. It is better to stop these threads as soon as possible, instead of permitting them to take the locks and continue performing operations on naming server data structures.

External control of locks is deliberate. This allows an external tool to take a lock, perform several operations atomically, & then release it. Without explicit external locking, complex atomic operations cannot be performed by a client.

Attempting to take the same lock twice for reading can result in deadlock if another client tries to take the lock for exclusive access in between the 2 attempts.

Taking a lock for shared access on a directory ensures that its child list will not be altered, but does not ensure that the children will not be changed. A subdirectory's child list can be altered, and a file can be written. Taking a lock for exclusive access on a directory ensures that neither it nor the entire subdirectories under it are being accessed in any way by any client.

All the above statements concerning locking assume that it has been implemented correctly, and that all clients are well-behaved. Operations that modify a file or directory should lock that file or directory for exclusive access. Operations that work on an entire directory tree at once should lock the root for exclusive access. Operations that read the state or contents of one file or directory should take the lock on that object for shared access.

6.3 Replication

Since the naming server has no good way to measure actual read and write requests on the storage servers, it considers a lock for shared access to be a read, and a lock for exclusive access to be a write.

During replication, the naming server should allow threads other than the current reader to read existing copies of the file. It is acceptable to make the reader that caused the replication wait for the replication to complete. However, the gold standard in this is to make replication asynchronous with all readers. Caution must be used if this is attempted however - if the asynchronous replication thread has to take the lock on the object for shared access, it is important that it will not go to the end of the lock queue when attempting to do this, but take the lock together with the current thread. It would be a mistake if the replication thread went into the queue after an exclusive access thread, which will invalidate the copy it has not yet created.

You should be careful about race conditions related to replication. A second reader should not be able to access a copy of a file that has not yet been completely downloaded by the server making the copy. On the other hand, if this other reader causes another replication, then it should not go to the same server that is still currently downloading a copy.

Threads reading the same file may still access it concurrently, even though there are locks, because these locks allow shared access. It may still be necessary to make a few synchronized statements when these threads access shared server or per-file data structures. Depending on the design, this may be especially important in the code for replication.

The storage server copy method should support large files - up to 2^{31} bytes in size (file sizes in the file system are reported as longs). However, it is not practical to copy that many bytes at a time, in great part because the JVM cannot support an array whose size is not an int, or even one whose size is just very large. Therefore, the copy method should download one block at a time, where a block can be 1MB or some other size chosen by the implementor.

7 Test Suite

We have provided test code for Project 2 as well. The test cases test if your code is conforming to the above design guidelines, and to check if the implementation is correct. **Please note that this is a service offered to help you design and test faster. You are solely responsible to make sure that your code works perfectly.** During grading, we will also use other test cases to make sure that your project is working as expected. We have also provided "apps" that will let you use your distributed file system using command-line.

8 Rubric

Common Package (1 Points)

- 1pt
- CompareTo is implemented

Naming Server (85 Points)

- Lock Test
 - 3pts ○ Lock rejects null arguments and bad paths
 - 3pts ○ Two readers can simultaneously lock the same file
 - 3pts ○ Two writers can simultaneously lock different files under the same directory
 - 3pts ○ A reader and a writer can simultaneously lock a directory and its child respectively
 - 3pts ○ A writer cannot lock a file currently locked by another reader
 - 3pts ○ A reader cannot lock a file currently locked by another writer
 - 3pts ○ A writer cannot lock a file currently locked by another writer
 - 3pts ○ A reader cannot lock a file whose parent is currently locked by a writer
 - 3pts ○ A writer cannot lock a directory whose child is currently locked by a reader
 - 3pts ○ A writer cannot lock a directory whose child is currently locked by a writer
- Queue Test
 - 4pts ○ Two readers simultaneously lock a file
 - 8pts ○ A writer is queued until first two readers unlock
 - 8pts ○ Two readers are queued until writer unlocks and then simultaneously
- Replication Test
 - 3pts ○ File is replicated after a large number of read lock requests
 - 3pts ○ File is not invalidated due to read lock requests
 - 3pts ○ All (but one) replicas are invalidated after a write lock request
 - 3pts ○ Copy rejects null arguments
 - 3pts ○ Copy is provided with the up-to-date storage server
 - 3pts ○ Copy rejects duplicate copy requests
 - 3pts ○ Delete rejects null arguments
 - 3pts ○ Delete rejects wrong path
 - 3pts ○ Delete rejects duplicate delete requests

- Deletion Test
 - Delete deletes all replicas of a file
 - Delete deletes all replicas of a directory

4pts

4pts

Storage Server (9 Points)

- Replication Test
 - Copy rejects null arguments and bad paths
 - Copy creates new destination files and their parent directories (if non-existent)
 - Copy correctly replaces existing destination files

3pts

3pts

3pts

Code Style (5 Points)

- Method Comments, Block comments, Readability, Dead code, Code design

5pts

9 Deliverable

As a final deliverable, you should submit an archive containing the source code for the RMI library, naming server, storage server, and test cases in separate directories.

10 Late Policy

- If you hand in on time, there is no penalty.
- 0-24 hours late = 25% penalty.
- 24-48 hours late = 50% penalty.
- More than 48 hours late = you lose all the points for this project.

NOTE: You can use your grace-days quota. For details about the quota, please refer to the syllabus.