

CONCURRENT SYSTEMS

LECTURE 8

Prof. Daniele Gorla



Enhancing Liveness Properties

For MUTEX-based concurrency we saw that a weak liveness property (deadlock freedom) can be always enhanced to a stronger one (bounded bypass)

We want to do the same in the framework of MUTEX-free concurrency

Contention manager: is an object that allows progress of processes by providing contention-free periods for completing their invocations. It provides 2 operations:

- `need_help(i)` : invoked by p_i when it discovers that there is contention
- `stop_help(i)` : invoked by p_i when it terminates its current invocation

Enriched implementation: when a process realizes that there is contention, it invokes `need_help`; when it completes its current operation, it invokes `stop_help`.

REMARK: this is different from lock/unlock because in this framework we allow (fail-stop) failures, that can also happen during the contention-free period

→ the contention-free period always terminates

PROBLEM: to distinguish a failure from a long delay, we need objects called *failure detectors*, that provide processes information on the failed processes of the system.

→ according to the type/quality of the info, several F.D.s can be defined





From obstruction-freedom to non-blocking

Eventually restricted leadership: given a non-empty set of process IDs X , the failure detector Ω_X provides each process a local variable $ev_leader(X)$ such that

1. (*Validity*) $ev_leader(X)$ always contains a process ID
2. (*Eventual leadership*) Eventually, all $ev_leader(X)$ of all non-crashed processes of X for ever contain the same process ID, that is one of them

REMARK: the moment in which all variables contain the same leader is unknown

`NEED_HELP[1..n] : SWMR atomic R/W boolean registers init at false`

```
need_help(i) :=  
    NEED_HELP[i] ← true  
    repeat  
        X ← {j : NEED_HELP[j]}  
    until ev_leader(X) = i
```

```
stop_help(i) :=  
    NEED_HELP[i] ← false
```





Thm.: the contention manager just seen transforms an obstr.-free implementation into a non-blocking enriched implementation.

Proof:

By contr., $\exists \tau$ s.t. \exists many (> 0) op.'s invoked concurrently that never terminate

Let Q be the set of proc.'s that performed these invocations.

- By enrichment, eventually $NEED_HELP[i]=T$ ($\forall i \in Q$) forever
- Since crashes are fail-stop, eventually $NEED_HELP[j]$ is no longer modified ($\forall j \notin Q$)
 $\rightarrow \exists \tau' \geq \tau$ when all proc.'s in Q compute the same X

OBS.: $Q \subseteq X$ (it is possible that p_j sets $NEED_HELP[j]$ and then fails)

By def. of Ω_X , $\exists \tau'' \geq \tau'$ s.t. all proc.'s in Q have the same $ev_leader(X)$

- \rightarrow the leader belongs to Q , since it cannot be failed
- \rightarrow this is the only process allowed to proceed
- \rightarrow because run in isolation, it eventually terminates (bec. of obstr-freedom)



On implementing Ω

It can be proved that there exists no wait-free implementation of Ω in an asynchronous system with atomic R/W registers and any number of crashes

- crashes are indistinguishable from long delays
- need of timing constraints

1. \exists time τ_1 , time interval Δ and correct process p_L s.t. after τ_1 every two consecutive writes to a specific SWMR atomic R/W register by p_L are at most Δ time units apart one from the other
2. Let t be an upper bound on the number of possible failing processes and f the real number of processes failed (hence, $0 \leq f \leq t \leq n-1$, with f unknown and t known in advance).

Then, there are at least $t-f$ correct processes different from p_L with a timer s.t.

\exists time $\tau_2 \forall$ time interval δ , if their timer is set to δ after τ_2 it expires at least after δ

REMARK: τ_1 , τ_2 , Δ and p_L are all unknown





On implementing Ω

IDEA:

- $\text{PROGRESS}[1..n]$ is an array of SWMR atomic registers used by proc's to signal that they're alive
 - p_i regularly increases $\text{PROGRESS}[i]$
 - p_L eventually increases $\text{PROGRESS}[L]$ every Δ time units at the latest
- p_i suspects p_j if p_i doesn't see any progress of p_j after a proper time interval (to be guessed) set in its timer
- The leader is the least suspected process, or the one with smallest/biggest ID among the least suspected ones (if there are more than one)
 - this changes in time, but not forever

Guessing the time duration for suspecting a process:

- $\text{SUSPECT}[i,j] = \text{\#times } p_i \text{ has suspected } p_j$
- For all k , take the $t+1$ minimum values in $\text{SUSPECT}[1..n, k]$
- Sum them, to obtain S_k
- The interval to use in the timers is the minimum S_k
 - it can be proved that this eventually becomes $\geq \Delta$





From obstruction-freedom to wait-freedom

Eventually perfect: the failure detector $\diamond P$ provides each process p_i a local variable suspected_i such that

1. (*Eventual completeness*) Eventually, suspected_i contains all the indexes of crashed processes, for all correct p_i
2. (*Eventual accuracy*) Eventually, suspected_i contains only indexes of crashed processes, for all correct p_i

Def.: FD1 is **stronger** than FD2 if there exists an algorithm that builds FD2 from instances of FD1 and atomic R/W registers

Prop.: $\diamond P$ is stronger than Ω_X .

Proof:

Forall i

- $i \notin X \rightarrow \text{ev_leader}_i(X)$ is any ID (and may change in time)
- $i \in X \rightarrow \text{ev_leader}_i(X) = \min((\Pi \setminus \text{suspected}_i) \cap X)$

where Π denotes the set of all proc. IDs





From obstruction-freedom to wait-freedom

Ω_X is NOT stronger than $\Diamond P$ (so, $\Diamond P$ is strictly stronger).

One possible idea (WRONG!) is

- Run Ω_Π that eventually fixes p_{ℓ_1}
- After this, run $\Omega_{\Pi \setminus \{\ell_1\}}$ that eventually fixes p_{ℓ_2}
- After this, run $\Omega_{\Pi \setminus \{\ell_1, \ell_2\}}$ that eventually fixes p_{ℓ_3}
- ...

This eventually calculates the set of all non-crashed proc.'s

→ PROBL.: we cannot know when a leader is elected (permanently)

The formal proof consists in showing that, if Ω was stronger than $\Diamond P$, then consensus would be possible in an asynchronous system with crashes and atomic R/W registers.





From obstruction-freedom to wait-freedom

We assume a *weak timestamp generator*, i.e. a function such that, if it returns a positive value t to some process, only a finite number of invocations can obtain a timestamp smaller than or equal to t

$TS[1..n]$: SWMR atomic R/W registers init at 0

```
need_help(i) :=  
    TS[i]  $\leftarrow$  weak_ts()  
    repeat  
        competing  $\leftarrow$  {j : TS[j]  $\neq$  0  $\wedge$  j  $\notin$  suspectedi}  
         $\langle t, j \rangle \leftarrow$  min{ $\langle TS[x], x \rangle$  | x  $\in$  competing}  
    until j = i
```

```
stop_help(i) :=  
    TS[i]  $\leftarrow$  0
```





Thm.: the contention manager just seen transforms an obstr-free implementation into a wait-free enriched implementation.

Proof:

By contr., \exists an invocation of a correct p_i that never terminates; let t_i be its timestamp

→ choose the minimum of such $\langle t_i, i \rangle$

By constr. of $\text{weak_ts}()$, the set of invocations smaller than $\langle t_i, i \rangle$ (call it I) is finite

- For every invocation $\in I$ from a process p_j that crashes during its execution
 - p_i will eventually and forever suspect p_j (i.e., $j \in \text{suspected}_i$)
 - eventually, $j \notin \text{competing}_i$ and, thus, won't prevent p_i from proceeding
- Since $\langle t_i, i \rangle$ is the minimum index of a non-terminating invocation
 - all invocations $\in I$ of correct processes terminate
 - if such processes invoke $\text{need_help}()$ again, they obtain greater indexes
 - eventually I gets emptied

Since p_i is correct, eventually (for all p_k correct):

- $i \notin \text{suspected}_k$
- $\langle t_i, i \rangle = \min \{ \langle \text{TS}[x], x \rangle \mid x \in \text{competing}_k \}$

Hence, the invocation with index $\langle t_i, i \rangle$ will eventually have exclusive execution

→ because of obstr.-freedom it eventually terminates

OBS: since non-blocking implies obstr.-fr., the Thm holds also for non-blocking impl.



On implementing $\Diamond P$:

- Every non-failed process has eventually an upper bound on the write delay
- By properly setting timers, eventually crashed processes are distinguished from the non-crashed ones by looking at the suspicions: for the crashed ones, this numbers increases indefinitely; for non-crashed ones, some reset eventually happens.

