

Striping without Sacrifices: Maintaining POSIX Semantics in a Parallel File System



Outline



- Introduction
- Problem Description
- Striping Protocol
- Summary



Introduction

- Striping increases the performance of file systems
 - a single file is split up in chunks scattered across multiple storage resources
 - chunks can be accessed in parallel
 - a single file can be accessed with the accumulated performance of multiple storage resources
- Parallel file systems have distributed storage resources
 - chunks reside on different storage servers



XTREEN





- well-defined interfaces and behavior
- no specific API, applications run w/o being modified or relinked
- POSIX-compliant file systems can be used by any application
- POSIX defines how read and write operations behave in certain corner cases:
 - "gaps"
 - reading beyond EOF



Introduction



- Gaps
 - writes at an offset beyond EOF implicitly creates a gap, i.e. a region of missing data
 - reading bytes in a gap must return binary zeros
- EOF
 - reading a range of bytes to an offset beyond EOF must prune the resulting buffer (less bytes than requested)





Problem Description

- <u>Problem</u>: How to distinguish between a gap and the EOF in a parallel file system?
 - process A creates new file by writing chunk 1 and 3
 - chunk 2 is not explicitly filled with data



XTREEM



- process *B* requests missing chunk 2
- storage server 2 must decide whether to respond with an empty buffer (EOF) or a zero-padded buffer (gap)



Problem Description

- <u>Basic idea</u>: provide for a consistent view on the file size among all storage servers
- However, ...
 - synchronizing each append-write operation across all storage servers is too expensive
 - a central server that stores the file size would be a bottleneck



XTREE

- <u>Solution</u>: decentralized, loosely-synchronized approach
 - storage servers disseminate and keep track of hints about the current file size (i.e. the globally last chunk number)

hint seen locally:

- if a requested chunk is missing, these hints are used to decide between a gap and an EOF
- if no decision is possible, the file size is explicitly synchronized by fetching the last chunk number from all storage servers
- implicit assumption:
 files grow monotonously









• Write





•







• Truncate

- problem: violates our monotony assumption on the file size
- solution: "truncate epochs"
- file size hints consist of chunk number + epoch number
- a designated server is responsible for truncate operations
 - it increments the epoch number
 - it synchronously updates the file size + epoch on all remote servers
- a server receiving a file size hint updates its local chunk and epoch number if
 - the received epoch number is greater than the local one
 - both epoch numbers are equal and the received chunk number is greater than the local chunk number







Experimental Results

- reads and append writes scale linearly
- low latency for reading gaps and data, as no file size synchronization is necessary
- higher latency for reading beyond the EOF, due to file size synchronization







Summary



- The suggested protocol exhibits a POSIX-compliant behavior while ensuring scalability
- Frequent operations are fast
 - append and random writes
 - reads in file bounds
- The protocol does not enforce locking
 - parallel access is possible by multiple clients
- The protocol inherently supports sparse files





Questions?

Funded by the European Commision's FP6 programme under contract #FP6-033576



Björn Kolbeck, Jan Stender · LASCO '08, Boston, 23-JUN-2008 · Page 14