Distributed Systems

- *48 Communication Basics*
- 49 NFS
- 50 AFS
- GFS

NFS *Sun Microsystems*

- first widely used distributed file system
	- clients diskless
		- easy sharing
		- centralized admin
		- security

121

NFS

- distributed file system should be *transparent*
	- except possibly in performance
	- client issues same file-system calls as standalone system

NFS *actually NFSv2*

"a distributed system is one where a machine I've never heard of goes down and I can't read my email"

- Leslie Lamport: Turing Award Winner for his work on distributed systems

NFS goals:

- simple and fast file recovery
- *stateless* protocol : *server keeps no client state*
	- server scales well
	- client crashes transparent
	- server crashes transparent
	- client must maintain all state the the server needs for any communication

NFS *actually NFSv2*

- file handle : uniquely describe file or directory
	- volume ID
	- inode number
	- generation number (inumbers get re-used)

125

NFS *server failures*

- server crashes / restarts, knowing nothing about clients
	- because most client requests are *idempotent*
		- lookups, reads don't change server state
		- writes contain data and exact offset to write to
- client handles all timeouts in the same way

NFS *performance*

- client-side caching
	- read file data (and metadata) cached by client
	- all good unless the file changes on the server
- client-side write buffers
	- coalescing
	- aggregating disparate messages
	- writes sent back to server asynchronously (but before close())
- However : cache consistency!

NFS *cache consistency*

Problems:

- update visibility
	- \bullet C_1 writes foo.c, but does not immediately push to server
	- \bullet C_2 reads, sees old version
	- C_1 flushes to server
- stale cache
- \bullet $\,$ C_2 closes and reads again, sees old version (foo.c locally cached) Fixes:
- close-to-open consistency
	- every open guaranteed to see every prior write to the server
		- must validate cache (GETATTR)
		- but maybe not all the time

NFS consistency is weak… (so are most other FSs)

129

NFS *server caching*

- tons of memory
	- wants to use it for disk cache (satisfy reads)
	- wants to use it for write buffer (quickly ack writes)
		- what could go wrong?
- server could ack a write before writing to disk!
	- say file initially has three 4k blocks of data:

```
● client overwrites with:
```
- write(aaa…, 0)., write(bbb…, 4k), write(ccc…, 8k):
- server crashes after acking second block, before writing:
- client never evens knows that the server crashed

NFS *cache consistency*

Problem: poor performance for client_i the same file again

- fix: allow *client*_i to cache data and attributes on client
	- \bullet *but when client_i re-opens not guaranteed most recent version*
- fix: have clients re-validate on open
	- *but slow*
- fix: time out the cached attributes
	- means data can all be cached, attributes *sometimes* validated w/ server before accesses
	- \bullet *but when client_i re-opens not guaranteed most recent version (still)*

non-fix: *NFS consistency is weak… (same true for other FS's)*

131

NFS *innovations*

- stateless protocol
	- minimizes state server needs to track
	- server can crash and recover w/o clients being aware
- itempotent requests
	- necessary for statelessness
	- client treats network message drops, server failure the same
	- client does not need to know which is which
- client and server buffering
	- essential for performance
	- cache consistency issues
		- server flushes writes before acking
		- client attribute cache times out
- **VFS** interface
	- makes application API independent of underlying FS

NFS *later versions*

- version v3
	- 64-bit sizes and offsets (large files)
	- synchronous server writes
	- readdirplus (reads dir, also includes the file handles)
	- tcp
- version v4
	- strong security (kerberos, public key protocols)
	- performance improvements
	- stateful protocol (mostly for file consistency)
	- open standard (IETF)

Distributed Systems

- *48 Communication Basics*
- *49 NFS*
- 50 AFS
- **Review**

Andrew File System *AFS v1*

primary motivation was scale

- how many clients could a single server accommodate?
- user-visible behavior well-defined
- whole-file (not block) caching

Figure 50.1: AFSv1 Protocol Highlights

135

Andrew File System *AFS v2*

- Problems w/ v1:
	- full path traversal costs (on the server!)
	- client issues too many TestAuth msgs
	- also:
		- load not balanced across servers (fix using volumes)
		- server has a process per client (fix using threads)
- Improving the protocol:
	- client callbacks:
		- promise from the server to notify client if cached file changed
	- file identifier (FID)
		- volume id
		- file id
		- "uniquifier" (usually called epochs elsewhere)

Andrew File System *cache consistency*

Mentioned two issues w/ NFS:

- update visibility
	- when will server be updated w/ client write?
- cache staleness:
	- when will clients be informed their versions are out of date?
- AFS procedure:
	- client writes, possibly many times
	- *closes*
		- writes complete file back to server, becomes visible
		- server *breaks callback*
			- contact each server w/ a callback and invalidate its copy

all apps on single machine see same copy 138

Andrew File System *cache consistency*

Andrew File System *cache consistency*

- AFS provides also *close-to-open* consistency
	- whole-file caching and updating
		- never see concurrent writes diff clients in same version of a file
	- "last writer wins" (really last *closer* wins)
- **Crash recovery complicated**
	- crashing client might miss callback (*client treats cache as suspect after crash*)
	- crashing server loses callbacks table
		- server might inform all clients after recovery
		- or clients constantly check for server liveness w/ heartbeats
	- *there is a cost to building a more sensible and scalable caching model*

NFS vs AFS

- primarily differ in caching
	- What to cache?
		- NFS caches blocks
		- AFS entire files (on disk)
	- When to push writes to server?
		- Loosely defined for NFS:
			- any time from *right away*, to *when file is closed*
			- (only modified blocks)
		- If any part modified, AFS pushes entire file at close()
	- Final contents after concurrent merges by different clients:
		- NFS: writes by the different clients might be intermingled
		- AFS: final version reflects *the last write*; other write is lost

141

Exam 2 *review*

- exam topics:
	- disk performance: perf from latencies
	- disk scheduling: SSTF, CSCAN, SCAN
	- RAID $0, 1, 5$
	- FFS: advantages, write order
	- journaling, meta-data journaling
	- SSDS: simple mapping table, hybrid mapping table,
	- end-to-end argument
	- LFS: structure, write cost calculations
	- NFS and AFS: structure, cache consistency
- what to review
	- quizzes 7-10
	- lectures after spring break

RH 7 *review*

Q1.5 1 Point

In msecs, what would be the minimum expected cost of reading 10 sequentially ordered sectors?

 7.5

Explanation

The minimum expected would be if they were all laid out in the same track, so we only pay seek time and rotational latency once. After that we just pay the transfer time for the rest of the sectors.

 $7.05 + 9 * 0.05 = 7.5$ msec

RH 8 *review*

$Q2$ 5 Points

List the writes that should occur when creating a 100byte file **bar.c** in the directory /foo for a generic, non-journaling file system, in a correct order (there may be more than one):

Q₃ 5 Points

 $\mathbf{1}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

Instead, how many disk writes would a logstructured file system ideally issue?

(enter just an integer)

Explanation

write data block bitmap (async) write bar.c data (async) write inode bitmap (async) write bar.c inode write /foo data write /foo inode

done 4/16