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Problem

- Designing a Replicated (Deterministic) State Machine.
- Requires consensus regarding the ordering of commands.
- Availability of the system
  - Paxos algorithm achieves distributed consensus
  - Can survive f out of 2f+1 failures
- The idea seems simple, the implementation does not in the scenario where machines come & go.
- This paper tries to answer some of these questions.
Models

• Original Paxos model:
  ● Achieve consensus amongst the ordering of the commands as well aside from ensuring a majority of machines know about the execution of the command.

• Liskov model (conceptualized in 1988, before Lamport):
  ● No need to achieve consensus on ordering, designate a primary to do that for you, just ensure the second property.
Groups and cohorts
Designated Primary

- Communicates directly with the client.
- Imposes a total order on the commands.
- Removes non-determinism from the commands.
- Ensures that a majority of backup cohorts log the command.
- Executes it and sends the reply back.
Single Point of Failure?

- The primary, if it fails results in some disruption.
- But this is just temporary, since it’s easy to get the system back up and running.
- Not an issue with the Lamport’s model.
- This calls for a need for automatic reorganization of views (defined as a set of cohorts with a designated primary) depending on failures or cohort preferences.
Achieving a new view

- Interestingly this itself turns out to be another instance of Paxos itself.
- A view Manager first proposes a new view_id.
- If majority of cohorts agree, the view manager instantiates it.
- Designates a new primary.
- Good to go!
Problems with this model

- Essentially only one server executes the request.
- The others are just ‘capable’ of executing them.
- What if one is not sufficient to meet the demand?
- The previous model could get around since each cohort can be responsible for a subset of requests.
- Overheads?
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