Microsecond Consensus for Microsecond Applications

Marcos K. Aguilera, Naama Ben-David, Rachid Guerraoui, Virendra J. Marathe, Athanasios Xygkis, Igor Zablotchi





Does Consensus Have to Be Slow?

- With the right technology and the right algorithms, no
 - Near-microsecond consensus is possible

Why Care About Microsecond Consensus?

Microsecond-scale computing is here



Finance (e.g., high-frequency trading)



Embedded systems (e.g., industrial robots)



Microservices (e.g., key-value stores)

Why Care About Microsecond Consensus?

- Sometimes desirable to replicate
- Replication should also be at microsecond level
- Existing solutions are too costly
 - TCP/IP adds overhead of >100 us
 - RDMA solutions exist, but we can do better

Need algorithmic solutions!

Our Contribution: Mu U

- SMR system for fast networks (datacenter setting)
- Common case: no failures, no asynchrony
 - Replication time is just **1.3 us** (small requests)
 - 61% better than state-of-the-art
- If leader fails
 - Fail-over to new leader in under 1 ms
 - 90% better than state-of-the-art

- Background: RDMA and SMR
- How does Mu achieve 1.3 us replication latency?
- How does Mu achieve <1 ms fail-over time?
- Evaluation

Background: RDMA

- Networking hardware feature
- Direct access to remote memory
 - No CPU at remote side
 - No OS at either side
- Good performance
 - ~1us latency
 - ~100Gbps bandwidth
- Configurable access permissions



Background: State Machine Replication

- Replicates a service across several machines = replicas
- Availability, consistency despite replica failures
- Strong consistency: linearizability



Server



crash fault

Server



8

- Background: RDMA and SMR
- How does Mu achieve 1.3 us replication latency?
- How does Mu achieve <1 ms fail-over time?
- Evaluation



Mu Roles



Leader(s):

- Accept requests from client(s)
- Replicate to followers
- Apply to local app copy
- Respond to client(s)

Followers:

- Passively wait for replicated requests
- Apply to local app copy
- Monitor leader health; if leader is slow, switch to new leader

Mu Common Case Replication



Q: How does Mu achieve ~1 us replication?

1. issue write

2. wait for completion

Common Case Replication: Intuition

Invariant: only 1 server has write permission on a given memory



NOT OK



Mu Background Plane

Q: How does Mu achieve ~1 us replication?

A: Replication = single round trip. Leader simply writes on followers, relies on permissions to ensure safety.

- Background: RDMA and SMR
- How does Mu achieve 1.3 us replication latency?
- How does Mu achieve <1 ms fail-over time?
- Evaluation

Mu Failure Detection

Pull-score failure detection

- Increment local heartbeat
- Read remote heartbeats
- Assign badness score to other servers
- Heartbeat stays the same: score ↑
- Heartbeat increases: score ↓

Score not affected by slow reads!

Q: How does Mu achieve <1 ms fail-over?

A: Aggressive timeout enabled by pull-score mechanism.

- Background: RDMA and SMR
- How does Mu achieve 1.3 us replication latency?
- How does Mu achieve <1 ms fail-over time?
- Evaluation

Evaluation: Setup

- Metrics
 - Latency
 - Fail-over time
 - Throughput
- Applications:
 - RDMA-based: HERD
 - Financial: Liquibook
 - TCP/IP-based: Redis, Memcached
- Competition:
 - DARE, APUS, Hermes

L
Memcacheo

	Mu	DARE	Hermes	APUS	
iquibook	>	×	X	X	
HERD	>	X	X	X	
d & Redis	>	X	X	<	

Evaluation: Replication Latency

Evaluation: Fail-over time

+

Failure detection

Permission switch time Fail-over time ≈

Conclusion

- Near-microsecond consensus is possible!
- Important for microsecond apps
- Mu: an RDMA-based SMR system
 - Single round-trip replication \rightarrow 1.3 *us* replication time
 - Pull-score failure detection $\rightarrow <1 \, ms$ fail-over time

https://github.com/LPD-EPFL/mu

Check out paper for more!