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Abstract

Pure operation-based (op-based) Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDTs) are generic and very efficient as they allow for compact solutions in both sent messages and state size. Although the pure op-based model looks promising, it is still not fully understood in terms of practical implementation. In this paper, we explain the challenges faced in implementing pure op-based CRDTs in a real system: the well-known in-memory cache key-value store Redis. Our purpose of choosing Redis is to implement a multi-master replication feature, which the current system lacks. The experience demonstrates that pure op-based CRDTs can be implemented in existing systems with minor changes in the original API.
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1. Introduction

Eventually consistent replication using Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDTs) has been widely adopted by the industry (Shapiro et al. 2011). CRDTs are a materialization of the Strong Eventual Consistency model, which allows all system replicas to promptly perform read/write operations, leaving the synchronization to a background phase to achieve eventual consistency. More recently, the pure operation-based CRDT model (Baquero et al. 2014) has been introduced as a generic model to build CRDTs that can leverage the meta-data provided by the middleware and reduce the overhead of communication through exchanging more compact messages. However, although pure op-based CRDTs have been theoretically outlined in (Baquero et al. 2014), it is not yet understood how to implement them in concrete systems.

In this paper, we summarize our experience in implementing pure op-based CRDTs to build a multi-master replication feature in Redis (Redis), the famous in-memory cache system. We choose Redis because: (1) it helps us demonstrate how to integrate pure op-based CRDTs in an existing popular system; (2) we contribute with the community in building a crucial multi-master feature that is currently missing in Redis. Our experience reveals that implementing pure op-based CRDTs for many data types is straightforward, whereas integrating them in an existing system is somehow challenging if the aim is to preserve the legacy API and code-base intact.

2. Pure Op-based CRDTs

Conflict-free Replicated Data Types (CRDTs) (Shapiro et al. 2011) are used to replicate data across multiple replicas without immediate synchronization between them. They are designed in a formal way to resolve conflicts between replicas using eventual consistency (EC). There are two approaches for CRDTs: Operation-based CRDTs and State-based CRDTs (Shapiro et al. 2011). The former broadcasts the update operation itself while the latter broadcasts the local state to the other replicas. In the “Classical” operation-based approach in (Shapiro et al. 2011), the replica sends not only the operation and arguments but also meta-data containing information that will be needed to achieve convergence. This design may result in large state size and leads to confusion with the state-based approach. Pure operation-based CRDTs (Baquero et al. 2014) were introduced as a solution that offers very compact state size and a generic framework, independent of the data type.

In the pure op-based CRDT approach, every operation is applied locally and disseminated to all other replicas via a Tagged Reliable Causal Broadcast middleware (Baquero et al. 2014). The compact size of the message is given by the fact that the meta-data needed to preserve the causal order is provided by the middleware. As a result, the disseminated message size is reduced to containing only the operation name and arguments.

Each pure op-based CRDT has the following specification:

- **prepare**: returns the operation and arguments needed for the dissemination.
- **effect**: removes redundant operations from the POLog and checks for stable operations to move them to the sequential data type.
- **eval**: returns the result of the query from the state by combining the data of the POLog and the sequential data type.

3. Architecture

In order to implement the multi-master replication feature using pure op-based CRDTs, we integrated three layers into Redis Server’s code. We present below the three layers, shown in Figure 1, with a brief description of each layer.

**Request handler** The handler layer is the intermediate layer between Redis Client API and the TRCB and CRDT layers. Every client request is redirected by the original Redis Client API to this layer. Then, this layer prepares a client object containing the operation and arguments (if any), serializes it and ships it to the TRCB layer for dissemination.
Tagged Reliable Causal Broadcast The second layer (TRCB) is used to broadcast client requests (operations and arguments) to all nodes in the cluster. This layer tags the client objects received from the handler with a timestamp needed to guarantee causal delivery at each node. Also, the TRCB is implemented in a way to guarantee exactly-once delivery of each client object to each node in the cluster.

CRDT layer The CRDT layer is where we implement the pure op-based CRDTs and their related structures, such as the POLog (Partially-Ordered Log), a map where the key is a timestamp and the value is the operation and arguments, following the designs and specifications in (Baquero et al. 2014). In addition to that, we perform a two-phase POLog compaction to make CRDTs even more efficient. The first phase removes obsolete and redundant information from the POLog in a way that does not affect the result of the queries, keeping only relevant of operations. The second one is by using causal stability information from the middleware to discard the timestamps of causally stable operations and move them from the POLog to the Redis data types.

4. Challenges

In order to implement a multi-master replication feature in Redis using pure op-based CRDTs, we had to figure out solutions for the challenges we faced. The challenges are in terms of architecture design, preserving original API with minor changes, reusability of Redis code, configurability of the system, choice of messaging pattern and implementation of causal stability. We address, in each of the subsections below, these challenges as well as our solution for each of them.

4.1 Design

A major challenge was the choice of the architecture design, as shown in section 3. On one hand, implementing pure op-based CRDTs on top of Redis allows us to use Redis primitive data types as sequential data types for our CRDTs, but this would require us to implement a new client API. On the other hand, implementing Redis on top of pure op-based CRDTs preserves the same Redis client API and uses CRDTs to store the data, but we do not benefit from Redis’ data types and related APIs. Instead, we integrated, within Redis code, three layers responsible for the replication process, keeping the same client API and benefiting from Redis’s data types as sequential data types in our pure op-based model.

Moreover, from the multithreading perspective, understanding the way these layers work and how they interact with each other is crucial for the pure op-based model to work both correctly and efficiently. The handler layer is always waiting for client requests, independently from the TRCB and CRDT layers. Both the TRCB and CRDT layers work independently and in parallel. The TRCB constantly reads from two buffers (UNIX file descriptors): one containing the client requests and another the peer updates. The TRCB layer has a subthread, using the subscribe pattern, listening to peer updates, which runs continuously and independently from the main TRCB thread which deals with causal reliable dissemination. The CRDT layer reads operations delivered by the TRCB and adds them to the POLog. It has a subthread responsible of the 2-phase POLog compaction process.

4.2 Preserving Redis client API

We implemented most of Redis data types such as keys, strings, sets, hashes, bitmaps and hyperloglogs due to the ability to map these data types to pure op-based CRDTs. In the current version we do not support sorted sets and lists.

The main factor that makes this possible is that the use of CRDTs is only transient and for replication purposes; the storage happens in Redis data types. This preserves the original behaviour of Redis from the application developer’s perspective.

We use the Redis Set as an example to illustrate the changes we made to implement the pure op-based ORSet specification. A Redis Set is an unordered collection of strings. The operation to add an element to a set is \texttt{SADD} and is used as \texttt{SADD myset element1}, returning 1 if \texttt{element1} was added to the set, and 0 if not. The \texttt{SREM} command removes an element from the set using \texttt{SREM myset element1}, returning 1 if \texttt{element1} was removed from the set, and 0 if not. The command \texttt{SMEMBERS} allows the client to query the set, returning all the elements in the set.

We use a pure op-based observed-remove set (ORSet) to map the original Redis Set. A pure op-based ORSet has a POLog and the Redis Set itself used as a sequential data type. No changes were made to API; the operations are added to the POLog until they are causally stable and then added to/removed from the Redis Set using \texttt{SADD}/\texttt{SREM}, returning 1/0 in case of success/failure.
In the pure op-based CRDT specification in (Baquero et al. 2014), each CRDT uses two main structures: the POLog and the sequential data type. However, the ability to map most of Redis primitive data types to pure op-based CRDTs allowed us to use the Redis data types as sequential data types for the CRDT, with the CRDTs being used only for dissemination and to store data temporarily, before it is stored in Redis when causal stability is achieved.

In some cases we didn’t even need to change the command implementation. Considering the previous example in subsection 4.2, the command implementation for both SADD and SREM were used as is. For SMEMBERS, we had to change the implementation as we needed to read elements from both the POLog and the Redis Set and return the combination to the client.