

ID2203 - Distributed Systems, Advanced Course Exam Preparation

Course leader: Paris Carbone

Assistant: Harald Ng, Max Meldrum

{hng, mmeldrum}@kth.se



Exam Structure

- 2 Sections, 50P total
 - 30P Multiple Choice Questions
 - 20P Reasoning Questions
- 2h total time
- One attempt on Canvas



- (a) v(a) < v(b) implies that t(a) < t(b)
- (b) t(a) < t(b) implies that v(a) < v(b)
- (c) v(a) < v(b) implies that $\neg(t(b) < t(a))$
- (d) t(a) < t(b) implies that $v(a) \le v(b)$



- (a) v(a) < v(b) implies that t(a) < t(b)
- (b) t(a) < t(b) implies that v(a) < v(b)
- (c) v(a) < v(b) implies that $\neg(t(b) < t(a))$
- (d) t(a) < t(b) implies that $v(a) \le v(b)$



- (a) v(a) < v(b) implies that t(a) < t(b)
- (b) t(a) < t(b) implies that v(a) < v(b)
- (c) v(a) < v(b) implies that $\neg(t(b) < t(a))$
- (d) t(a) < t(b) implies that $v(a) \le v(b)$



```
(a) v(a) < v(b) implies that t(a) < t(b) +1/2P

(b) t(a) < t(b) implies that v(a) < v(b) -1/2P

(c) v(a) < v(b) implies that \neg(t(b) < t(a)) -1/2P

(d) t(a) < t(b) implies that v(a) \le v(b) +1/2P
```



MCQ Point Total

- The MCQ part of the exam is subdivided into multiple subsections (e.g., Basic Abstractions & Failure Detector)
- Each section has an associated point total (2P/Question)
- This means negative points do not carry across sections!



What to learn?

- All of the formal definitions
- All of the system/failure models
- All of the abstractions (their properties)
- Relationships between the abstractions (reductions)
- The high level mechanisms that make the algorithms work, e.g.
 - Read-Impose mechanism
 - Paxos invariants & log reconciliation in Raft
 - Atomic Commit & Distributed Snapshotting



What not to learn?

- Correctness Proofs for the algorithms
 - Though it might help you learn the mechanisms to read them again
- Pseudocode for the algorithms
 - You'll be given that in the exam, if required



Does the following statement satisfy the synchronous-computation assumption?

On my server, no request ever takes more than 1 week to be processed.



Does the following statement satisfy the synchronous-computation assumption? On my server, no request ever takes more than 1 week to be processed.

Yes! Known constant bound: 1 week



In a fail-stop model, mark the following properties as safety or liveness.

- 1. every process that crashes is eventually detected
- **S** 2. no process is detected before it crashes
- **S** 3. no two processes decide differently
- **S** 4. no two correct processes decide differently
- **S** 5. every correct process decides before t time units
- 6. if some correct process decides then every correct process decides.



Why do we need partial synchrony in Paxos? Which property of Uniform Consensus cannot be achieved if Paxos is used in an asynchronous model?

Uniform Consensus Properties:

- (1) Termination: Every correct process eventually decides on some value
- (2) Validity: If a process decides v, then v was proposed by some process
- (3) Integrity: No Process decides twice
- (4) Uniform agreement: No two processes decide differently



Why do we need partial synchrony in Paxos? Which property of Uniform Consensus cannot be achieved if Paxos is used in an asynchronous model?

Uniform Consensus Properties:

- (1) Termination: Every correct process eventually decides on some value
- (2) Validity: If a process decides v, then v was proposed by some process
- (3) Integrity: No Process decides twice
- (4) Uniform agreement: No two processes decide differently

(1) Termination

The system does not know if a process has failed or if it is just slow. May happen that proposers race each other forever!



Can we devise a uniform reliable broadcast algorithm with an eventually perfect failure detector but without assuming a majority of correct processes?



Can we devise a uniform reliable broadcast algorithm with an eventually perfect failure detector but without assuming a majority of correct processes?

No, we cannot. The uniform agreement property may be violated if values are lost during a partition.

Uniform Agreement: For any message m, if a process delivers m, then every correct process delivers m



Exercise 5a

Suppose an algorithm A implements a distributed programming abstraction M using a failure detector D that is assumed to be eventually perfect. Can A violate a safety property of M if D is not eventually perfect, for example, when D permanently outputs the empty set?



Exercise 5a

Suppose an algorithm A implements a distributed programming abstraction M using a failure detector D that is assumed to be eventually perfect. Can A violate a safety property of M if D is not eventually perfect, for example, when D permanently outputs the empty set?

No, because if that were possible A could already violate the same property if D were eventually perfect (during the non-perfect time)



Exercise 5b

Suppose an algorithm A implements a distributed programming abstraction M using a failure detector D that is assumed to be eventually perfect. Can A violate a safety property of M if D is not eventually perfect, for example, when D permanently outputs the empty set?

Now, what about a liveness property?



Exercise 5b

Suppose an algorithm A implements a distributed programming abstraction M using a failure detector D that is assumed to be eventually perfect. Can A violate a safety property of M if D is not eventually perfect, for example, when D permanently outputs the empty set?

Now, what about a liveness property?

Sure, anything that relies on at least some nodes being alive to make progress can be violated like this.