15-410

NFS & AFS
Apr. 1, 2013

Dave Eckhardt

Garth Gibson

Synchronization

Crash box?

- Debugging your whole kernel onto hardware at once is harder than debugging a smaller partial kernel

Today

- NFS, AFS
- Partially covered by textbook: 11.9, 17.6
- Chapter 17 is short, why not just read it?

Outline

Why remote file systems?

VFS interception

NFSv2/v3 vs. AFS

- **Ping-pong mode: 5 topics discussed twice**

NFSv4

- ***Partial*** **description of evolution**

Why talk about NFSv2?

- **Still in use in some situations**
- **Better shows how design influences results**

Why?

Why remote file systems?

Lots of “access data everywhere” technologies

- Laptops
- iPods
- Multi-gigabyte flash-memory keychain USB devices

Are remote file systems dinosaurs?

Remote File System Benefits

Reliability

- **Not many people carry multiple copies of data**
  - **Multiple copies with you aren't much protection**
- **Backups are nice**
  - **Machine rooms are nice**
    - » **Temperature-controlled, humidity-controlled**
    - » **Fire-suppressed**
  - **Time travel is nice too**

Sharing

- **Allows multiple users to access data**
- **May provide authentication mechanism**

Remote File System Benefits

Scalability

- Large disks are cheaper

Locality of reference

- You don't use every file every day...
  - Why carry *everything* in expensive portable storage?

Auditability

- Easier to know who said what when with central storage...

VFS interception

VFS provides "pluggable" file systems

Standard flow of remote access

- User process calls read()
- Kernel dispatches to VOP_READ() in some VFS
- nfs_read()
  - check local cache
  - send RPC to remote NFS server
  - block process

VFS interception

Standard flow of remote access (continued)

- client kernel process manages call to server
  - retransmit if necessary
  - convert RPC response to file system buffer
  - store in local cache
  - unblock user process
- back to nfs_read()
  - copy bytes to user memory

Same story for AFS

Comparisons

Compared today

- Sun Microsystems NFS (mostly we discuss v2/v3)
- CMU/IBM/Transarc/IBM/OpenAFS.org AFS

Architectural assumptions & goals

- Architectural assumptions & goals
- Namespace
- Authentication, access control
- I/O flow
- Rough edges

Wrap-up: NFS v4 evolution

NFSv2 Assumptions, goals

Workgroup file system

- Small number of clients
- Very small number of servers

Single administrative domain

- All machines agree on “set of users”
  - ...which users are in which groups
- Client machines run mostly-trusted OS
  - “User #37 says read(...)”

NFSv2 Assumptions, goals

"Stateless" file server

- **Of course files are "state", but...**
- **Server *exports* files without creating extra state**
  - **No list of "who has this file open"**
  - **No "pending transactions" across crash**
- **Result: crash recovery "fast", protocol "simple"**

NFSv2 Assumptions, goals

“Stateless” file server

- **Of course files are “state”, but...**
- **Server *exports* files without creating extra state**
  - **No list of “who has this file open”**
  - **No “pending transactions” across crash**
- **Result: crash recovery “fast”, protocol “simple”**

Some inherently “stateful” operations (locking!!)

NFSv2 Assumptions, goals

“Stateless” file server

- Of course files are “state”, but...
- Server *exports* files without creating extra state
  - No list of “who has this file open”
  - No “pending transactions” across crash
- Result: crash recovery “fast”, protocol “simple”

Some inherently “stateful” operations (locking!!)

- Handled by “separate service” “outside of NFS”
  - Slick trick, eh?

AFS Assumptions, goals

Global distributed file system

- *Uncountable* clients, servers
- "One AFS", like "one Internet"
  - Why would you want more than one?

Multiple administrative domains

- username*@cellname*
  - de0u@andrew.cmu.edu
  - davide@cs.cmu.edu

AFS Assumptions, goals

Client machines are un-trusted

- Must *prove* they act for a specific user
  - Secure RPC layer
- Anonymous "system:anyuser"

Client machines have disks (!!)

- Can cache whole files over long periods

Write/write and write/read sharing are rare

- Most files updated by one user
- Most users on one machine at a time

AFS Assumptions, goals

Support *many* clients

- **1000 machines could cache a single file**
- **Some local, some (very) remote**

NFS Namespace

Constructed by client-side file system mounts

- **mount server1:/usr/local /usr/local**
- **mount server2:/usr/spool/mail /usr/spool/mail**

Group of clients *can achieve* common namespace

- **Every machine can execute same mount sequence at boot**
- **If system administrators are diligent**

NFS Namespace

“Auto-mount” process mounts based on “maps”

- /home/dae means server1:/home/dae
- /home/owens means server2:/home/owens

Referring to something in /home may trigger an automatic mount

- “After a while” the remote file system may be automatically unmounted

NFS Security

Client machine presents credentials

- user #, list of group #s – from Unix process

Server accepts or rejects credentials

- “root squashing”
  - map uid 0 to uid -1 unless client on “special machine” list

Kernel process on server “adopts” credentials

- Sets user #, group vector based on RPC
- Makes system call (e.g., read()) with those credentials

AFS Namespace

Assumed-global list of AFS cells

Everybody sees same files in each cell

- **Multiple servers inside cell invisible to user**

Group of clients *can achieve* private namespace

- **Use custom cell database**

AFS Security

Client machine presents Kerberos ticket

- **Allows arbitrary binding of (machine,user) to (realm,principal)**
  - **davide on a cs.cmu.edu machine can be de0u@andrew.cmu.edu**
  - **iff the password is known!**

Server checks against *access control list*

AFS ACLs

Apply to directory, not to individual files

ACL format

- de0u rlidwka
- davide@cs.cmu.edu rl
- de0u:friends rl

Negative rights

- Disallow “joe rl” even though joe is in de0u:friends

AFS ACLs

AFS ACL semantics are not Unix semantics

- Some parts obeyed in a vague way
  - Cache manager checks for files being executable, writable
- Many differences
  - Inherent/good: can name people in different administrative domains
  - "Just different"
    - » ACLs are per-directory, not per-file
    - » Different privileges: create, remove, lock

NFS protocol architecture

root@client executes "mount filesystem" RPC

- returns "file handle" for root of remote file system

client RPC for each pathname component

- /usr/local/lib/emacs/foo.el in /usr/local file system
  - h = lookup(root-handle, "lib")
  - h = lookup(h, "emacs")
  - h = lookup(h, "foo.el")
- Allows disagreement over pathname syntax
  - Look, Ma, no "/"!

NFS protocol architecture

I/O RPCs are *idempotent*

- multiple repetitions have same effect as one
- lookup(h, "emacs") generally returns same result
- read(file-handle, offset, length) ⇒ same bytes
- write(file-handle, offset, buffer, bytes) ⇒ "ok"

RPCs do not create server-memory state

- no RPC calls for open()/close()
- write() succeeds (to disk), or fails, before RPC completes

NFS file handles

Goals

- Reasonable size
- Quickly map to file on server
- "Capability"
  - Hard to forge, so possession serves as "proof"

Implementation (inode #, inode generation #)

- inode # - small, fast for server to map onto data
- "inode generation #" - must match value stored in inode
  - "unguessably random" number chosen in create()

NFS Directory Operations

Primary goal

- Insulate clients from server directory format

Approach

- readdir(dir-handle, cookie, nbytes) returns list
  - name, inode # (for display by ls -l), cookie

AFS protocol architecture

Volume **= miniature file system**

- One user's files, project source tree, ...
- Unit of disk quota administration, backup
- ***Mount points*** are pointers to other volumes

Client machine has Cell-Server Database

- /afs/andrew.cmu.edu is a ***cell***
- ***protection server*** handles authentication
- ***volume location server*** maps volumes to ***file servers***

AFS protocol architecture

Volume location is *dynamic*

- Moved between servers transparently to user

Volumes may have multiple *replicas*

- Increase throughput, reliability
- Restricted to “read-only” volumes
  - /usr/local/bin
  - /afs/andrew.cmu.edu/usr

AFS Callbacks

Observations

- Client disks can cache files indefinitely
  - Even across reboots
- Many files nearly read-only
  - Contacting server on each open() is wasteful

Server issues *callback promise*

- "If this file changes in 15 minutes, I will tell you"
  - Via *callback break* message
- 15 minutes of free open(), read() for that client
  - More importantly, 15 minutes of peace for server

AFS file identifiers

AFS “fid” has three parts

- Volume number
  - Each file lives *in a volume*
  - Unlike NFS “server1's /usr0”
- File number
  - inode # (as NFS)
- “Uniquifier”
  - allows inodes to be re-used
  - Similar to NFS file handle inode generation #s

AFS Directory Operations

Primary goal

- **Don't overload servers!**

Approach

- **Server stores directory as hash table on disk**
- **Client fetches entire directory as if a file**
- ***Client* parses hash table**
  - **Directory maps name to fid**
- **Client caches directory (indefinitely, across reboots)**
  - **Server load reduced**

AFS access pattern

open("/afs/cs.cmu.edu/service/systypes")

- VFS layer hands off "/afs" to AFS client module
- Client maps cs.cmu.edu to pt & vldb servers
- Client authenticates to pt server
- Client volume-locates root.cell volume
- Client fetches "/" directory
- Client fetches "service" directory
- Client fetches "systypes" file

AFS access pattern

open("/afs/cs.cmu.edu/service/newCSDB")

- **VFS layer hands off "/afs" to AFS client module**
- **Client fetches "newCSDB" file**

open("/afs/cs.cmu.edu/service/systypes")

- **Assume**
  - **File is in cache**
  - **Server hasn't broken callback**
  - **Callback hasn't expired**
- **Client can read file with *no server interaction***

AFS access pattern

Data transfer is by *chunks*

- **Minimally 64 KB**
- **May be whole-file**

Write*back* cache

- **AFSv2 stored entire file back atomically**
- **AFSv3 stores "chunks" back to server**
  - **When cache overflows**
  - **On last user close()**

AFS access pattern

Is writeback crazy?

- Write conflicts “assumed rare”
- Who needs to see a half-written file?
- Locking can be used (often isn't)

NFS v2/v3 "rough edges"

Locking

- **Inherently stateful**
  - **lock must persist across client calls**
    - » **lock(), read(), write(), unlock()**
- **"Separate service"**
  - **Handled by same server**
  - **Horrible things happen on server crash**
  - **Horrible things happen on client crash**

NFS v2/v3 “rough edges”

Some operations not really idempotent

- unlink(file) returns “ok” once, then “no such file”
- server caches “a few” client requests

Caching

- No real consistency guarantees
- Clients typically cache attributes, data “for a while”
- No way to know when they're wrong

NFS v2/v3 “rough edges”

Large NFS installations are brittle

- Everybody must agree on *many* mount points
- Hard to load-balance files among servers
  - No volumes
  - No atomic moves

Cross-realm NFS access basically nonexistent

- No good way to map uid#47 from an unknown host

AFS “rough edges”

Locking

- Server refuses to keep a waiting-client list
- Client cache manager refuses to poll server
- Result
  - Lock returns “locked” or “try again later”
  - User program must invent polling strategy

Chunk-based I/O

- No real consistency guarantees
- close() failures are surprising to many programs

AFS "rough edges"

ACLs apply to directories

- "Makes sense" if files in a directory logically should be protected the same way
  - Not always true
- Confuses users

New directories inherit ACL from parent

- Easy to expose a whole tree accidentally
- What else to do?
  - No good solution known
  - (Though *complex* solutions exist...)

AFS “rough edges”

Small AFS installations are punitive

- Step 1: Install Kerberos
  - 2-3 servers
  - Inside locked boxes!
- Step 2: Install ~4 AFS servers (2 data, 2 pt/vldb)
- Step 3: Explain Kerberos to your users
  - Ticket expiration!
- Step 4: Explain ACLs to your users

Summary - NFSv2

Workgroup network file service

Any Unix machine can be a server (easily)

Machines can be both client & server

- **My files on my disk, your files on your disk**
- **Everybody in group can access all files**

Serious trust, scaling problems

“Stateless file server” model only partial success

Summary – AFS

Worldwide file system

Good security, scaling

Global namespace

“Professional” server infrastructure per cell

- **Don't try this at home**
- **Only ~200 AFS cells**
  - **9 are cmu.edu, ~15 are in Pittsburgh**
  - **These numbers are basically static since 2002**

“No write conflict” model only partial success

NFSv4 Changes

Genuine authentication

- Each client RPC is authenticated via Kerberos

ACL's

- "Like NTFS", "Like POSIX"
- Include allow/deny, plus audit/alarm
- "Create file" is a separate ability from "create directory'
- Can specify different access for "network user" and "dialup user" (???)
- NFSv4 ACL's don't match any OS native ACL format
  - Server can approximate or reject any ACL you try to set

NFSv4 Changes

Compound RPC

- open()+lock()+read()+write()+unlock()+close() in one packet
- Can look up multiple pathname components
- Greatly speeds up performance on long-latency wide-area networks

“Delegations” of file data & metadata to clients

- More general than AFS callbacks

Better locking architecture

- Locks can persist across crashes
- Requires tricky “client identification” semantics

NFSv4 Changes

Other additions

- Replication of mostly-read-only trees
- “Redirect” support for file relocation
  - Tricky pathname-rewrite step

NFSv4.2 in progress

- Multi-realm operation
- Parallel NFS

Conclusions

NFS v2

- Goals limited to near-term achievability

AFS

- Available-now large cells and cross-realm operation

NFS v4

- Evolution may be a better strategy than revolution!

Further Reading

NFS

- RFC 1094 for v2 (3/1989)
- RFC 1813 for v3 (6/1995)
- RFC 3530 for v4 (4/2003, not yet universally available)

Further Reading

AFS

- “The ITC Distributed File System: Principles and Design”, Proceedings of the 10th ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles, Dec. 1985, pp. 35-50.
- “Scale and Performance in a Distributed File System”, ACM Transactions on Computer Systems, Vol. 6, No. 1, Feb. 1988, pp. 51-81.
- IBM AFS User Guide, version 36
- http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~help/afs/index.html