

# CAP Theorem

March 26, 2018

Thanks to Arvind K., Dong W., and Mihir N. for slides.

# CAP Theorem

- “It is impossible for a web service to provide these *three guarantees at the same time (pick 2 of 3)*:
  - **(Sequential) Consistency**
  - **Availability**
  - **Partition-tolerance”**
- Conjectured by Eric Brewer in '00
  - Proved by Gilbert and Lynch in '02
  - But with definitions that do not match what you'd assume (or Brewer meant)
- Influenced the NoSQL mania
- Highly controversial: *“the CAP theorem encourages engineers to make awful decisions.”* – Stonebraker
  - Many misinterpretations

# CAP Theorem

- Consistency:
  - Sequential consistency (a data item behaves as if there is one copy)
- Availability:
  - Node failures do not prevent survivors from continuing to operate
- Partition-tolerance:
  - The system continues to operate despite network partitions
- CAP says that *“A distributed system can satisfy any two of these guarantees at the same time **but not all three**”*

# C in CAP $\neq$ C in ACID


- They are different!
- CAP's C(onsistency) = **sequential consistency**
  - Similar to ACID's A(atomicity) = Visibility to all future operations
- ACID's C(onsistency) = Does the data satisfy schema constraints

# Sequential consistency

- Makes it appear as if there is one copy of the object
- Strict ordering on ops from same client
- A single linear ordering across client ops
  - If client a executes operations {a1, a2, a3, ...}, client b executes operations {b1, b2, b3, ...}
  - Then, globally, clients observe some serialized version of the sequence
    - e.g., {a1, b1, b2, a2, ...} (or whatever)


# CAP Theorem: Proof

- A simple proof using two nodes:




# CAP Theorem: Proof

- A simple proof using two nodes:



# CAP Theorem: Proof


- A simple proof using two nodes:



# CAP Theorem: Proof


- A simple proof using two nodes:

A gets updated from B



# CAP Misinterpretations

- Of the following three guarantees potentially offered by distributed systems:
  - Consistency
  - Availability
  - Partition tolerance
- Pick two
- This suggests there are three kinds of distributed systems:
  - CP
  - AP
  - CA



# Issues with CAP

- What does it mean to choose or not choose partition tolerance?
  - P is a property of the environment, C and A are goals
  - In other words, what's the difference between a "CA" and "CP" system? both give up availability on a partition!
- Better phrasing: *“if the network can have partitions, do we give up on consistency or availability?”*

# Witnesses: P is unavoidable

- Coda Hale, Yammer (Microsoft?) software engineer:
  - *“Of the CAP theorem’s Consistency, Availability, and Partition Tolerance, **Partition Tolerance is mandatory in distributed systems.** You cannot not choose it.”*



<http://codahale.com/you-cant-sacrifice-partition-tolerance/>

# Witnesses: P is unavoidable

- Werner Vogels, Amazon CTO
  - *“An important observation is that in larger distributed-scale systems, network partitions are a given; therefore, **consistency and availability cannot be achieved at the same time.**”*



[http://www.allthingsdistributed.com/2008/12/eventually\\_consistent.html](http://www.allthingsdistributed.com/2008/12/eventually_consistent.html)

# Witnesses: P is unavoidable

- Daneil Abadi (UMD), Co-founder of Hadapt; Vertica, VoltDB contributor
  - *“So in reality, there are only two types of systems ... i.e., if there is a partition, **does the system give up availability or consistency?**”*



# Witnesses: P?

## Who cares about P!?

- Michael Stonebraker
  - [VoltDB, TuringAward'14]
  - *“In my experience, **network partitions do not happen often**. Specifically, they occur less frequently than the sum of bohrbugs [deterministic DB crashes], application errors, human errors and reprovisioning events. So it doesn't much matter what you do when confronted with network partitions. **Surviving them will not “move the needle” on availability** because higher frequency events will cause global outages. **Hence, you are giving up something (consistency) and getting nothing in return.**”*




# CAP Theorem 12 year later

- Eric Brewer: father of CAP
  - “The “2 of 3” formulation was always **misleading** because it tended to oversimplify the tensions among properties. ...
  - **CAP prohibits only a tiny part of the design space:** *perfect availability and consistency in the presence of partitions, which are rare.*”



# Consistency or Availability

- Consistency and Availability is not a “binary” decision
- AP systems relax consistency in favor of availability – but are not inconsistent
- CP systems sacrifice availability for consistency- but are not unavailable
- This suggests both AP and CP systems can offer a degree of consistency, and availability, as well as partition tolerance



# AP: Best Effort Consistency

- Example:
  - CDNs / Web caches
  - DNS
  - BlockChain
  - CRDTs
- Trait:
  - Optimistic concurrency control
  - Expiration/Time-to-live
  - Conflict resolution

# CP: Best Effort Availability

- Example:
  - Majority protocols (Paxos, Raft)
  - Distributed Locking (Google Chubby Lock service)
- Trait:
  - Pessimistic locking
  - Make minority partition unavailable

# Types of Consistency

- **Strong Consistency**
  - After the update completes, **any subsequent access** will return the **same** updated value.
- **Weak Consistency**
  - It is **not guaranteed** that subsequent accesses will return the updated value.
- **Eventual Consistency**
  - Specific form of weak consistency
  - It is guaranteed that if **no new updates** are made to object, **eventually** all accesses will return the last updated value (e.g., *propagate updates to replicas in a lazy fashion*)

# Eventual Consistency Variations

- Causal consistency
  - Processes that have causal relationship will see consistent data
- Read-your-write consistency
  - A process always accesses the data item after it's update operation and never sees an older value
- Session consistency
  - As long as session exists, system guarantees read-your-write consistency
  - Guarantees do not overlap sessions

# Eventual Consistency Variations

- Monotonic read consistency
  - If a process has seen a particular value of data item, any subsequent processes will never return any previous values
- Monotonic write consistency
  - The system guarantees to serialize the writes by the *same* process
- In practice
  - A number of these properties can be combined
  - Monotonic reads and read-your-writes are most desirable

# Eventual Consistency

## - A Facebook Example

- Bob finds an interesting story and shares with Alice by posting on her Facebook wall
- Bob asks Alice to check it out
- Alice logs in her account, checks her Facebook wall but finds:
  - **Nothing is there!**



Wall  
facebook.




?



# Eventual Consistency

## - A Facebook Example

- Bob tells Alice to wait a bit and check out later
- Alice waits for a minute or so and checks back:
  - **She finds the Cambridge Analytica story Bob shared with her!**



# Eventual Consistency

## - A Facebook Example

- Reason: it is possible because Facebook uses an **eventual consistent model**
- **Why would Facebook choose an eventual consistent model over the strong consistent one?**
  - Facebook has more than 1 billion active users
  - It is non-trivial to efficiently and reliably store the huge amount of data generated at any given time
  - Eventual consistent model offers the option to **reduce the load and improve availability**

# Dynamic Tradeoff between C and A

- An airline reservation system:
  - When most of seats are available: it is ok to rely on somewhat out-of-date data, availability is more critical
  - When the plane is close to be filled: it needs more accurate data to ensure the plane is not overbooked, consistency is more critical
- Neither strong consistency nor guaranteed availability, but it may significantly increase the tolerance of network disruption



# Heterogeneity: Segmenting C and A

- No single uniform requirement
  - Some aspects require strong consistency
  - Others require high availability
- Segment the system into different components
  - Each provides different types of guarantees
- Overall guarantees neither consistency nor availability
  - Each part of the service gets exactly what it needs
- Can be **partitioned** along different dimensions

# Partitioning Strategies

- Data Partitioning
- Operational Partitioning
- Functional Partitioning
- User Partitioning
- Hierarchical Partitioning
  
- Idea: provide differentiated guarantees depending on  $X$  {data/op/func/user/component}

# Partitioning Examples

## Data Partitioning

- Different data may require different consistency and availability
- Example:
  - Shopping cart: high availability, responsive, can sometimes suffer anomalies
  - Product information need to be available, slight variation in inventory is sufferable
  - Checkout, billing, shipping records must be consistent

# Partitioning Examples

## Operational Partitioning

- Each operation may require different balance between consistency and availability
- Example:
  - Reads: high availability; e.g., “query”
  - Writes: high consistency, lock when writing; e.g., “purchase”

# Partitioning Examples

## Functional Partitioning

- System consists of sub-services
- Different sub-services provide different balances
- Example: A comprehensive distributed system
  - Distributed lock service (e.g., Chubby) :
    - Strong consistency
  - DNS service:
    - High availability

# Partitioning Examples

## User Partitioning

- Try to keep related data close together to assure better performance
- Example: Craigslist
  - Might want to divide its service into several data centers, e.g., east coast and west coast
    - Users get high performance (e.g., high availability and good consistency) if they query servers close to them
    - Poorer performance if a New York user query Craglist in San Francisco

# Partitioning Examples

## Hierarchical (node) Partitioning

- Large global service with local “extensions”
- Different location in hierarchy may use different consistency
- Example:
  - Local servers (better connected) guarantee more consistency and availability
  - Global servers has more partition and relax one of the requirement



# Take-aways

- CAP is a tool for thinking about trade-offs in distributed systems
- Misinterpreted + contentious
- The devil (in designing distributed systems) is often in the details: real systems cannot be classified into one of CA/AP/CP
- Many eventual consistency variants, widely adopted by popular systems