Please write your name on the bottom of each page. You have 120 minutes to complete this exam.

Some questions may be much harder than others. Read them all through first and attack them in the order that allows you to make the most progress. If you find a question ambiguous, write down any assumptions you make. Write neatly. In order to receive full credit you must answer each question as precisely as possible.

You may use class notes, papers, and lab material. You may read them on your laptop, but you are not allowed to use any network. For example, you may not look at web sites, use ChatGPT, or communicate with anyone.

The maximum number points available is 74.

Gradescope E-Mail Address:

Name:
I Spanner

The intelligent computer HAL is using Spanner (as described in Spanner: Google’s Globally-Distributed Database by Corbett et al.) to store data. HAL notes that read/write transactions are being slowed down by Spanner’s commit-wait mechanism (see Section 4.2.1). HAL disables commit-wait in his Spanner installation; as a result, everything works just as described in the paper except that the coordinator leader does not wait until the timestamp $s$ is guaranteed to be in the past.

HAL uses just these three transactions:

T1:
  X=1
  Y=1

T2:
  X=22
  Y=22

T3:
  print X, Y

Initially, database records X and Y both have value 0. X and Y are in different Spanner shards, managed by different Paxos groups. T1 and T2 are read/write transactions; T3 is a read-only transaction.

HAL starts T1; waits for Spanner to say that T1 has completed; starts T2, waits for Spanner to say that T2 has completed; then starts T3 and observes T3’s output.

1. [5 points]: Which outputs from T3 are possible? (For each statement, circle True or False.)
   
   True / False : 22, 22
   True / False : 1, 1
   True / False : 1, 22
   True / False : 0, 0

Name:
II  Chardonnay

Consider the paper *Chardonnay: Fast and General Datacenter Transactions for On-Disk Databases*, by Eldeeb *et al*.

A read/write Chardonnay transaction reads database record A, then reads B, and then writes C. The system is busy with other read/write transactions at the same time, some of which might also use A, B, and/or C.

2. [4 points]: In which situation will Chardonnay’s “dry run” mechanism yield the most benefit? (Circle the single best answer.)

* A is hot, B is cold.
* A is cold, B is hot.
* A is cold, B is cold.
* A is hot, B is hot.

“Cold” means used rarely. “Hot” means used by many transactions.
A system that uses Chardonnay issues just these three transactions:

T1:
    X=1

T2:
    Y=1

T3:
    print X, Y

Initially, both database records (X and Y) start out with value 0. X and Y are in different ranges. T1 and T2 are read/write transactions. T3 is a read-only transaction (described in the paper’s Section 6). T3 does not use the waiting idea described in the last paragraph of Section 6.2.

One client starts T1. After T1 completes, another client starts T2. After T2 completes, a third client runs T3.

This version of Chardonnay has a bug somewhere in its code, causing T3 to print the incorrect output 0,1.

3. [4 points]: Which of the following bugs is the most plausible explanation for T3 printing 0,1? Circle the single most correct answer.

* The epoch server is stuck: it always returns the same epoch number, and never increases it.
* The epoch server is incrementing too quickly: more than once per 10 milliseconds.
* The epoch server is working correctly except it gave T2 an epoch that was too small.
* The epoch server is working correctly except it gave T2 an epoch that was too large.

Name: 
III  FaRM

Consider the following statements about FaRM as described in *No compromises: distributed transactions with consistency, availability, and performance*. For each statement, circle True or False.

4. [8 points]:

*True / False*: Because FaRM uses primary-backup replication for a region (instead of Paxos), FaRM must reconfigure to remove a failed replica before FaRM can continue to use the region.

*True / False*: FaRM can use short leases (10ms by default) because it has communication and scheduling optimizations to renew leases quickly.

*True / False*: A transaction that modifies only one object will never abort.

*True / False*: Read-only transactions require only the validate step of the Commit phase in Figure 4.

Name:
IV Ray

Consider the following Ray program, which creates a `sqrt_task` task for each number in the list `mylist`. The creation yields a DFut and the caller waits for the tasks to complete by calling `get` on each future. The code is as follows:

```python
# A call to sqrt_task yields a DFut
@ray.remote
def sqrt_task(n):
    # sqrt is a python function, which returns the square root of its argument
    return sqrt(n)

def sqrts0(n_list):
    # start tasks and collect futures
    l = []  # list holding DFuts
    for i in n_list:  # iterate over list of numbers
        l.append(sqrt_task(i))

    r = []
    for f in l:
        r.append(get(f))  # collect the result

    return r

print(sqrts0(mylist))  # invoke sqrts0 with a list of numbers and print result
```

Assume Ray behaves in the way described in Ownership: a distributed futures system for fine-grained tasks by Wang et al., and Ray is running on a cluster of computers.

5. [4 points]:
Will the `sqrt` computations complete in the order that `sqrts0` appends to `r`? (Briefly explain your answer)

Name:
Alyssa creates a function `sqrts1` whose body is the same as `sqrts0`, but is declared as a remote task. She then modifies the program to invoke many `sqrts1`'s, each with a large distinct, non-overlapping slice of the number list. The code is as follows:

```python
@ray.remote
def sqrts1(n_list):
    ...
    # same code as sqrts0
    ...
    return r

f0 = sqrts1(mylist[...])
f1 = sqrts1(mylist[...])
f2 = sqrts1(mylist[...])
...

print(get(f0))
print(get(f1))
...
```

6. [4 points]:
Ben is worried that the above program creates so many `sqrt_tasks` tasks that Ray will be bottle-necked by managing the tasks and the futures they yield. Briefly explain why Ray can manage many tasks in parallel for the above program?
V  Memcache at Facebook

Ben Bitdiddle runs a web site. Ben reads the paper *Scaling Memcache at Facebook* by Nishtala et al., and thinks that the design is too complex. So Ben decides to ignore the paper’s design: he *doesn’t* use leases, mcrouter, pools, etc. Ben uses *only* the mechanisms described below.

Ben has just a single region, with some web servers, some memcache servers, and a single database server. Ben programs each of his web servers to use the following client code to read and write data:

```python
read(k):
    if v = memcache_get(k) succeeds
        return v
    else
        return database_get(k)

write(k, v):
    database_put(k, v)
    memcache_put(k, v)
```

Note that `read()` does not insert anything into memcache, and note that `write()` always inserts the new data into memcache, whether it was already cached or not. Ben knows this may be wasteful, since it may cause memcache to cache data that’s never read, but he doesn’t mind.

7. [5 points]: Sadly, Ben sees that `read()`s sometimes return stale data for a long time after the `write()` of a newer value has succeeded and returned. Explain how this could happen.
VI  Lab 4

Ben implements the RPC handlers and the applier in Lab 4 as follows. The RPC handlers for Get, Put, and Append take the following steps:

A. Submit a command to the Raft library via Start. The command includes the client ID, request ID, operation type, and arguments.

B. Loop to wait until the reply for that command to show up in the reply table, which maps from client IDs to the replies of clients’ latest requests. Each reply contains the request ID and the result to that request. If Raft’s leadership changes during the loop, return ErrWrongLeader.

C. Return the result stored in the reply table.

The applier detail is irrelevant to this question and is shown on the next page.

8. [4 points]:

Ben observes that Get does not modify the application state. He changes Get’s RPC handler to read the key-value table and return immediately to the client the result. Does this implementation preserve linearizability? (Briefly explain your answer.)
The applier takes the following steps:

**D.** Read a command from the apply channel.

**E.** De-duplicate the command with the reply table: if the request ID in the reply table for the client is greater than or equal to that in the command, then skip the command.

**F.** Apply the command and insert the result to the reply table.

9. **[4 points]:**

Separately from the previous change, Ben modifies his implementation to perform de-duplication early in the RPC handlers. Concretely, he removes step **E** in the applier, and adds an additional step at the start of the RPC handlers (i.e., before step **A**) as follows:

If the request ID in the reply table for the client is greater than or equal to that in the RPC arguments, return the result stored in the reply table.

Does this implementation preserve linearizability? (Briefly explain your answer.)
VII AWS Lambda

Consider the guest lecture about the paper *On-demand container loading in AWS Lambda* by Brooker et al. For each of the following statements, indicate whether it is true or false.

10. [8 points]:
   
   **True / False**: AWS Lambda is attractive to customers because it allows them to run cloud computations without having to provision a machine.

   **True / False**: Many containers of AWS Lambda customers don’t contain unique chunks because customers upload the same container multiple times.

   **True / False**: AWS Lambda may deduplicate popular chunks less than unpopular chunks.

   **True / False**: AWS Lambdas use LRU-K to ensure that if many infrequently-used Lambdas are running at the same time, they don’t evict the chunks of frequently-used Lambdas.
VIII  Boki

Consider Figure 6(a) in Boki: Stateful Serverless Computing with Shared Logs by Jia and Witchel. The left column describes how Boki makes the execution of a workflow of serverless functions with database side-effects exactly-once.

Alyssa notices that if Boki reruns a workflow it will append a record to the workflow’s LogBook, even if an append of an earlier failed execution already logged the record. Alyssa proposes to change the pattern of append-read to read-append-read: that is, she modifies Boki to read before an append to see if the append already logged its record; if so, it uses the first value returned by the read and skips the subsequent append and read. (If not, Boki executes as before, doing an append followed by read.)

For example, Alyssa changes write as follows:

```python
def write(table, key, val):
    tag = hashLogTag([ID, STEP])
    # first read
    rec = logReadNext(tag: tag, minSeqnum: 0)
    # if no record, then append and read again
    if rec == None:
        logAppend([tags: [tag], data: [table, key, val])
        rec = logReadNext(tag: tag, minSeqnum: 0)
    rawDBWRITE(...)  # same call as before
    STEP = STEP + 1
```

11. [5 points]:
Alyssa runs one workflow on her modified Boki. The workflow crashes during its execution and then restarts from the beginning and completes. With Alyssa’s modification will write preserve exactly-once semantics? (Briefly explain your answer.)
IX SUNDR

Consider the straw-man design in the paper *Secure Untrusted Data Repository (SUNDR)* by Li *et al*.

Users A, B, and C share a SUNDR server. The server may be malicious, though the server does not know any of the private keys. User A creates a new file *aaa* in the SUNDR file system. After that, user B looks for file *aaa*, but does *not* see the file. After that, user C creates a new empty file *ccc*.

There is no client activity other than what is described here. None of the stronger consistency ideas from the paper’s Section 3.2 are in use. All three users are honest and run correct SUNDR client software.

All three users now use the `ls` command to check whether they can see file *ccc*. All three users’ client SUNDR implementations report that the data they receive from SUNDR passes all validity checks. Nevertheless, a malicious SUNDR server can cause a number of different outcomes.

12. **[6 points]**: What combinations are possible for which users can see *ccc*? For each statement, circle True if the SUNDR server could cause the indicated results, and False if not.

   - True / False: All three users can see *ccc*.
   - True / False: Only A and B can see *ccc*, but not C.
   - True / False: Only A and C can see *ccc*, but not B.
   - True / False: Only B and C can see *ccc*, but not A.
   - True / False: Only C can see *ccc*, but not A or B.
   - True / False: None of the users can see *ccc*.

Name:
X PBFT

Consider the PBFT protocol as described in the paper *Practical Byzantine Fault Tolerance* by Castro and Liskov.

13. [5 points]:

PBFT chooses the primary for a view deterministically based on the view number. What could go wrong if PBFT were to use Raft’s voting algorithm to select a primary for a view? (Briefly explain your answer.)

Name: ___________________________
XI Bitcoin

Section 4 of Nakamoto’s Bitcoin paper explains that the difficulty of mining is determined by the number of required leading zeros in the SHA-256 hash of the block. The paper also says that Bitcoin automatically varies the difficulty of mining (the number of required leading zeros) by observing the recent average rate of new block mining, relative to the target block every ten minutes; if blocks have been generated too quickly, the difficulty is increased; if too slowly, decreased. All honest Bitcoin peers use the same algorithm to determine the difficulty.

Ben dreams of being able to buy tickets to the latest Taylor Swift concert. To obtain the money required, Ben has been running the Bitcoin peer software on his laptop, but he hasn’t been earning mining rewards very quickly, because his laptop is only the winning miner very infrequently. Hoping to realize his dream faster, Ben modifies his copy of the Bitcoin peer software so that the difficulty determination algorithm always yields a low difficulty, with the result that his peer can mine new blocks very quickly, often before any other Bitcoin miner produces a given new block in the chain.

14. [5 points]: It turns out that Ben won’t actually earn any bitcoins with this scheme. Explain why not.
XII 6.5840

15. [1 points]: Which lectures/papers should we omit in future years?
   - Spanner
   - Chardonnay
   - FaRM
   - DynamoDB
   - Ray
   - Memcache at Facebook
   - AWS Lambda
   - Boki
   - SUNDR
   - PBFT
   - Bitcoin

16. [1 points]: Porcupine, the linearizability checker used in the labs, comes with a visualizer that displays in a web browser the entire history of client operations, and highlights non-linearizable errors, if any. Circle the one closest to your experience with the visualizer.
   - I don’t know its existence.
   - I’ve used it, but it isn’t particularly helpful to me.
   - I’ve used it, and sometimes I understand the result but sometimes don’t.
   - I’ve used it, and it successfully explains to me why the result is non-linearizable.
   - I’ve used it, and it significantly improves my debugging experience.
   - Other (please briefly describe your experience):

17. [1 points]: Do you have any feedback for us about 6.5840?

Name:
End of Exam II