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data Item = Book | Shoes | ...
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    (\m -> (insert Book 1 m, ()))))
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p :: IO (Map Item Int)
p = do cart <- newIORef empty
     a1 <- async (atomicModifyIORef cart
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p :: IO (Map Item Int)
p = do
  cart <- newIORef empty
  a1 <- async (atomicModifyIORef cart
    (\m -> (insert Book 1 m, ()))))
  a2 <- async (atomicModifyIORef cart
    (\m -> (insert Shoes 1 m, ()))))
  res <- async (do waitBoth a1 a2
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  wait res

main = do v <- p
  print v

Deterministic
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p :: IO (Map Item Int)
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                 readIORef cart)
  wait res

main = do v <- p
          print v
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\textbf{data} Item = Book \mid Shoes \mid ...

\textbf{p :: IO (Map Item Int)}

\textbf{p} = \textbf{do}
\hspace{1em} \text{cart} \leftarrow \text{newIORef } \text{empty}
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\hspace{1em} \text{wait res}
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        (\m -> (insert Book 1 m, ())))
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* actually a bounded join-semilattice
Raises an error, since $3 \sqcup 4 = \top$

\begin{itemize}
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\[\textbf{data} \ Item = \text{Book} \mid \text{Shoes} \mid \ldots\]

\[p = \textbf{do} \]
\[
cart \leftarrow \text{newEmptyMap}
\]
\[
fork (\text{insert} \text{ Shoes} \ 1 \ cart)
\]
\[
fork (\text{insert} \text{ Book} \ 2 \ cart)
\]
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\text{getKey Book cart} -- \text{returns 2}
\]
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p = do
  cart <- newEmptyMap
  fork (insert Shoes 1 cart)
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```plaintext
\{(Book, 1), (Book, 2), \ldots\}

data Item = Book | Shoes | \ldots

p = do
  cart <- newEmptyMap
  fork (insert Shoes 1 cart)
  fork (insert Book 2 cart)
  getKey Book cart -- returns 2
```
The threshold set must be pairwise incompatible

\{(Book, 1), (Book, 2), \ldots\}

data Item = Book | Shoes | \ldots

p = do
    cart ← newEmptyMap
    fork (insert Shoes 1 cart)
    fork (insert Book 2 cart)
   getKey Book cart -- returns 2
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```haskell
runParIO :: Par lvl a
runParIO = do
    (startNode, seen) <- freeze seen
    traverse (insert v seen) (neighbors g startNode)
    quiesce h
    return ()
```

```haskell
freeze seen
```
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Quasi-Determinism

\[ \sigma' = \sigma'' \]

Strong Local Quasi-Confluence

\[ \sigma_a \leq 1 \sigma_c \leq 1 \sigma_b \]

Diagram:

- \( \sigma \)
- \( \sigma_a \) and \( \sigma_b \)
- \( \sigma_c \)
- Arrows indicate relationships and confluence conditions.
Independence

\[
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\]
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\]
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Frame rule
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\{p \ast r\} &\quad c \quad \{q \ast r\}
\end{align*}
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Eventual consistency.
Eventual consistency. How?
Dynamo: Amazon’s Highly Available Key-value Store
Giuseppe DeCandia, Deniz Hastorun, Madan Jampani, Gunavardhan Kakulapati, Avinash Lakshman, Alex Pilchin, Swaminathan Sivasubramanian, Peter Vosshall and Werner Vogels
Amazon.com

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; even the slightest outage has significant financial consequences and impacts customer trust. The Amazon.com platform, which provides services for many web sites worldwide, is implemented on top of an infrastructure of tens of thousands of servers and network components located in many data centers around the world. At this scale, small and large components fail continuously and the way persistent state is managed in the face of these failures drives the reliability and scalability of the software systems.

This paper presents the design and implementation of Dynamo, a highly available key-value storage system that some of Amazon’s core services use to provide an “always-on” experience. To achieve this level of availability, Dynamo sacrifices consistency under certain failure scenarios. It makes extensive use of object versioning and application-assisted conflict resolution in a manner that provides a novel interface for developers to use.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
D.4.2 [Operating Systems]: Storage Management; D.4.5 [Operating Systems]: Reliability; D.4.2 [Operating Systems]: Performance;

General Terms

1. INTRODUCTION
Amazon runs a world-wide e-commerce platform that serves tens of millions customers at peak times using tens of thousands of servers located in many data centers around the world. There are strict operational requirements on Amazon’s platform in terms of performance, reliability and efficiency, and to support continuous growth the platform needs to be highly scalable. Reliability is one of the most important requirements because even the slightest outage has significant financial consequences and impacts customer trust. In addition, to support continuous growth, the platform needs to be highly scalable.

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 consisting of hundreds of services. In this environment there is a particular need for storage technologies that are always available. For example, customers should be able to view and add items to their shopping cart even if disks are failing, network routes are flapping, or data centers are being destroyed by tornadoes. Therefore, the service responsible for managing shopping carts requires that it can always write to and read from its data store, and that its data needs to be available across multiple data centers.

Dealing with failures in an infrastructure comprised of millions of components is our standard mode of operation; there are always a small but significant number of server and network components that are failing at any given time. As such Amazon’s software systems need to be constructed in a manner that treats failure handling as the normal case without impacting availability or performance.

To meet the reliability and scaling needs, Amazon has developed a number of storage technologies, of which the Amazon Simple Storage Service (also available outside of Amazon and known as Amazon S3), is probably the best known. This paper presents the design and implementation of Dynamo, another highly available and scalable distributed data store built for Amazon’s platform. Dynamo is used to manage the state of services that have very high reliability requirements and need tight control over the tradeoffs between availability, consistency, cost-effectiveness and performance. Amazon’s platform has a very diverse set of applications with different storage requirements. A select set of applications requires a storage technology that is flexible enough to let application designers configure their data store appropriately based on these tradeoffs to achieve high availability and guaranteed performance in the most cost effective manner.

There are many services on Amazon’s platform that only need primary-key access to a data store. For many services, such as those that provide best seller lists, shopping carts, customer preferences, session management, sales rank, and product catalog, the common pattern of using a relational database would lead to inefficiencies and limit scale and availability. Dynamo provides a simple primary-key only interface to meet the requirements of these applications.

Dynamo uses a synthesis of well known techniques to achieve scalability and availability: Data is partitioned and replicated using consistent hashing [10], and consistency is facilitated by object versioning [12]. The consistency among replicas during updates is maintained by a quorum-like technique and a decentralized replica synchronization protocol. Dynamo employs
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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; even the slightest outage has significant financial consequences and impacts customer trust. The Amazon.com platform, which provides services for many web-sites worldwide, is implemented on top of an infrastructure of tens of thousands of servers and network components located in many datacenters around the world. At this scale, small and large components fail continuously and the way persistent state is managed in the face of these failures drives the reliability and scalability of the software systems.

This paper presents the design and implementation of Dynamo, a highly available key-value storage system that some of Amazon’s core services use to provide an “always-on” experience. To achieve this level of availability, Dynamo sacrifices consistency under certain failure scenarios. It makes extensive use of object versioning and application-assisted conflict resolution in a manner that provides a novel interface for developers to use.

Categories and Subject Descriptors

since the application is aware of the data schema it can decide on the conflict resolution method that is best suited for its client’s experience. For instance, the application that maintains customer shopping carts can choose to “merge” the conflicting versions and return a single unified shopping cart.
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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 consisting of hundreds of services. In this environment there is a particular need for storage technologies that are always available. For example, customers should be able to view and add items to their shopping cart even if disks are failing, network routes are flapping, or data centers are being destroyed by tornadoes. Therefore, the service responsible for managing shopping carts requires that it can always write to and read from its data store, and that its data needs to be available across multiple data centers.

Dealing with failures in an infrastructure comprised of millions of components is our standard mode of operation; there are always a small but significant number of server and network components that are failing at any given time. As such Amazon’s software systems need to be constructed in a manner that treats failure handling as the normal case without impacting availability or performance.

To meet the reliability and scaling needs, Amazon has developed Dynamo, another highly available key value storage system built for Amazon’s platform. Amazon is a large set of services that have very high need tight control over the reliability, cost-effectiveness and scalability of services with a very diverse set of requirements. A select set of these services, such as the application that maintains shopping carts, customer sales rank, and product catalog, require high availability and cost effective manner.

Dynamo is a platform that only needs to be run on a single machine, and it is a scalable, robust, and consistent database that can handle the demands of any web service. Dynamo provides a way to meet the requirements of many services running on a single machine, and a new way to achieve scalability and availability.

Dynamo uses a synthesis of well known techniques to achieve scalability and availability. Data is partitioned and replicated using consistent hashing [10], and consistency is facilitated by object versioning [12]. The consistency among replicas during updates is maintained by a quorum-like technique and a decentralized replica synchronization protocol. Dynamo employs
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1 Introduction

Replication and consistency are essential features of any large distributed system, such as the WWW, peer-to-peer, or cloud computing platforms. The standard “strong consistency” approach serialises updates in a global total order [10]. This constitutes a performance and scalability bottleneck. Furthermore, strong consistency conflicts with availability and partition-tolerance [8]. When network delays are large or partitioning is an issue, as in delay-tolerant networks, disconnected operation, cloud computing, or P2P systems, eventual consistency promises better availability and performance [1721]. An update executes at some replica, without synchronisation; later, it is sent to the other replicas to propagate.

*This work was done while the author was at IBM Research.
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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; even the slightest outage has significant financial consequences and impacts customer trust. The Amazon.com platform, which provides services for many web sites worldwide, is implemented on top of an infrastructure of tens of thousands of servers and network components located in many datacenters around the world. At this scale, small and large components fail continuously and the way persistent state is managed in the face of these failures drives the reliability and scalability of the software systems.

This paper presents the design and implementation of Dynamo, a highly available key-value storage system that some of Amazon’s core services use to provide an “always-on” experience. To achieve this level of availability, Dynamo sacrifices consistency under certain failure scenarios. It makes extensive use of object versioning and application-assisted conflict resolution in a manner that provides a novel interface for developers to use.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
5.3.2 [Databases]: Concurrency Control and Data Integrity; 5.3.3 [Databases]: Design Issues; 5.3.4 [Databases]: Performance

Dynamo is aware of the data schema it manages and uses a method that is best suited for the application that maintains its data. The long-term goal of Dynamo is to “merge” the conflicting replicas from the many instances of the replicated shopping cart.

To meet the reliability and scaling needs, Amazon has developed Dynamo, another highly available key-value store built for Amazon’s platform. Dynamo is of services that have very high need tight control over the consistency, cost-effectiveness and has a very diverse set of requirements. A select set of a thin layer of software that is flexible enough for its data store appropriately, they have high availability and cost effective manner.

Amazon’s platform that only need to scale. For many services, such as shopping carts, customer ratings, rank, and product catalog, a relational database would lead to scalability. Dynamo provides a way to meet the requirements of Dynamo uses a synthesis of well-known techniques to achieve scalability and availability. Dynamo is partitioned and replicated using consistent hashing [10], and consistency is facilitated by object versioning [12]. The consistency among replicas during updates is maintained by a quorum-like technique and a decentralized replica synchronization protocol. Dynamo employs...
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1 Introduction

Replication and consistency are essential features of any large distributed system, such as the WWW, peer-to-peer, or cloud computing platforms. The standard “strong consistency” approach serialises updates in a global total order [10].

When network delays are large or partitioning is an issue, as in delay-tolerant networks, disconnected operation, cloud computing, or P2P systems, eventual consistency promises better availability and partition-tolerance [8].

This constitutes a performance and scalability bottleneck. Furthermore, strong consistency conflicts with availability and partition-tolerance [5].

One of the lessons our organization has learned from operating Amazon’s platform is that the reliability and scalability of an application is dependent on how its application state is managed. Amazon uses a highly decentralized, loosely coupled, service-oriented architecture consisting of hundreds of services. In this environment there is a particular need for storage technologies that are always available. For example, customers should be able to add to and remove items to their shopping cart even if disks are going down, network routes are flapping, or data centers are being rebooted by人工. Therefore, the service responsible for managing shopping carts requires that it can always write to and read from its data store, and that its data needs to be available to multiple data centers.
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ABSTRACT

Conciseness is aware of the data schema it manipulates. It is designed as a method that is best suited for read operations, the application that maintains CRM it is close to “merge” the conflicting events in a database with a transactional database. Dynamo uses a synthesis of well-known techniques to achieve scalability and availability. Data is partitioned and replicated using consistent hashing [10], and consistency is facilitated by group memberships [12]. The consistency among replicas during updates is maintained by a consensus-like technique and a decentralized replica synchronisation protocol. Dynamo employs
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<tr>
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<th>CvRDTs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold reads</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ordinary reads</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(deterministic)</td>
<td>(nondeterministic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-upper-bound writes</td>
<td>General inflationary writes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(every write computes a join)</td>
<td>(only <em>merges</em> must be joins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared memory</td>
<td>Replicated!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVars vs. CvRDTs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threshold reads</th>
<th>Ordinary reads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(deterministic)</td>
<td>(nondeterministic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least-upper-bound writes</td>
<td>General inflationary writes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(every write computes a join)</td>
<td>(only $merges$ must be joins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared memory</td>
<td>Replicated!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

so we're proposing
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LVars vs. CvRDTs

- **Threshold reads** (deterministic)
- **Ordinary reads** (nondeterministic)

- Least-upper-bound writes (every write computes a join)
- Genaral inflationary writes (only merges must be joins)

Shared memory

Replicated!

- Adding threshold reads to CvRDTs
- One framework for reasoning about both eventual and strong consistency

- Adding general inflationary writes to LVars
- Non-idempotent, incrementable counters

so we’re proposing
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Distributed systems
Parallel systems

$LVars$

Distributed systems
Parallel systems
LVars

Distributed systems
CvRDTs
Parallel systems

\[ \text{LVars} \ \texttt{join} \ \text{CvRDTs} \]
Thank you!

Email: lkuper@cs.indiana.edu
Project repo: github.com/iu-parfunc/lvars
Code from this talk: github.com/lkuper/lvar-examples
Papers: cs.indiana.edu/~lkuper
Research blog: composition.al
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handlers, quiescence, freezing