Jin-Soo Kim (*jinsoo.kim@snu.ac.kr*) Systems Software & Architecture Lab. Seoul National University

Spring 2024

Log-Structured File System

#### (M. Rosenblum and J. K. Ousterhout, SOSP 1991)



## Technology Trends

- **CPU** speed is increasing at an exponential rate
- Main memory size is increasing at an exponential rate
- Disk technology is also improving rapidly, in the areas of cost and capacity rather than performance
	- Disk bandwidth can be improved substantially with the use of disk arrays and parallel-head disks
	- No major improvements for access time

## Workloads Trends

- Office and engineering applications tend to be dominated by accesses to small files
	- Small random disk I/Os
	- File creation and deletion times are dominated by updates to file system metadata
- Larger main memories make larger file caches possible
	- Disk traffic will become more and more dominated by \_
	- They can serve as write buffers; large numbers of modified disk blocks can be collected

## FFS Example

■ Reading "/foo/a"



### Problems

#### ■ Too many \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ accesses

- The inode for a file and the directory entry containing the file's name are separated from the file's contents
- Several disk I/Os needed to create a new file
- The disk traffic is dominated by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ metadata writes

- Directories and inodes are written synchronously
- Defeat the potential use of the file caches as a write buffer

## Sprite LFS

- Buffer a sequence of file system changes in the file cache
- Write all the changes to disk in a sequential structure called the
- Improves the write performance by eliminating almost all seeks
- The sequential nature of logs permits much faster
- How to retrieve information from the log?
- How to manage the free space on disk?

### Inode

- The inode structure is same
	- File attributes
	- Disk addresses of the first ten blocks
	- Indirect and double indirect blocks for handling large files
- LFS inodes are not in fixed locations on disk



## Inode Map

- Maintain the current location of each inode
	- An array indexed by the file's i-number
	- <the current inode address, flags, version number, the last access time of the file>
	- The maximum number of inode map entries is fixed (BSD LFS uses inode file: the maximum number of inodes can grow)

#### ■ Divided into blocks that are written to the log much like file data blocks

- The locations of the inode map blocks are kept in a fixed **with a same in the conduct** on disk
- Frequently accessed blocks of the inode map are cached
- Hit rate for inode map reference: 99.1% ~ 99.9% (On average only 15% of the inode map blocks is cached)



- The disk is divided into fixed-size segments
	- All live data must be copied out of a segment before the segment can be rewritten
	- The log can be \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ through clean segments

#### ■ Segments should be large enough

- The transfer time to read/write a whole segment should be much greater than the cost of a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
- 512KB or IMB in Sprite LFS

#### ■ Segment cleaning

• Generates clean segments from segments containing live blocks

## Segment Summary Block

- Used to identify live blocks
	- <file's i-number, version number, block number within the file> for each data block
	- Used to find and update the file's inode to reflect the block's new location during segment cleaning
- $\blacksquare$  A block is  $\ldots$ 
	- Live if the block is still pointed by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
		- No free-block list or bitmap needed  $\rightarrow$  save space, simplify crash recovery
	- Not live if the file's version number (in the segment summary block) does not match the version number stored in
		- The version number is incremented whenever the file is deleted or truncated to length zero
		- No need to examine the file's inode to discard such a block



■ File 2 modified, file 3 created, and two blocks append to file 1



### Write Cost

- The performance metric for cleaning policies
	- The average amount of time the disk is busy per byte of new data written, including all the cleaning overheads

write  $cost =$ total bytes read and written new data written =  $\boldsymbol{read} \ \boldsymbol{segs} + \boldsymbol{write} \ \boldsymbol{live} + \boldsymbol{write} \ \boldsymbol{new}$ new data written =  $N + N * u + N * (1 - u)$  $N*(1-u)$ =  $\overline{\mathbf{2}}$  $1-u$ 

- Utilization *u*: the fraction of data still live in segments
- Seek and rotational latency are negligible in LFS
- Normalized to the ideal write time (no cleaning, no seek time or rotational delay)

### Utilization vs. Write Cost



# Greedy Policy

- Choose the segments
- LFS Uniform
	- Uniform file access patterns
- LFS Hot-and-cold
	- 10% of files are accessed 90% of the time
	- Sorts the live data by age before writing it out again
- No variance
	- All segments always have exactly



## Greedy Policy: Analysis

■ "Hot-and-cold" is worse than "Uniform"!



## Cost-Benefit Policy

■ Choose the segment with the Tatio of benefit to cost



- **•** Free space in a  $\qquad$  segment is more valuable than free space in a \_\_\_\_\_\_ segment
	- Once a cold segment has been cleaned, it will take a long time before it reaccumulates the unusable free space
	- It is less beneficial to clean a hot segment because the data will likely die quickly
	- The most recent modified time of any block in the segment is used as an estimate of how long the space is likely to stay free

## Cost-Benefit Policy: Goal

#### **Produces the <u>secon security</u>** distribution of segments

- Cleans cold segments at about 75% utilization
- But waits until hot segment reach about 15% utilization before cleaning them



## Cost-Benefit Policy: Results

■ LFS outperforms the best possible Unix FFS even at relatively high disk capacity utilization



## Segment Usage Table

- Used to guide in the selection of segments to clean and to keep track of clean segments
- For each segment, segment usage table describes
	- The state of the segment (clean/dirty)
	- The number of live bytes in the segment
	- An estimate of the age of the youngest block in the segment (using the modified time for a file)
- The segment usage table is broken into blocks that can be cached in the file cache

## **Checkpoints**

- **EXECTE Creating a checkpoint** 
	- Write out all modified information to the log
		- File data blocks, indirect blocks, inodes, blocks of the inode map, segment usage table
	- Write a checkpoint region to a special fixed position on disk
		- The addresses of all the blocks in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
		- A pointer to the last segment written
		- The current time (in the last block of the checkpoint region)
- Handling a crash during a checkpoint operation
	- Use two checkpoint regions
	- Alternate checkpoint operations between them
	- If the checkpoint fails, the time will not be updated

## Roll-forward

- Recover inode map using segment summary blocks
	- The presence of a new inode  $\rightarrow$  update the inode map
	- Data blocks without a new copy of the file's inode  $\rightarrow$  ignored
- $\blacksquare$  Adjust the utilizations in the
	- Maybe increased due to the live data left after roll-forward
	- Maybe decreased due to file deletions and overwrites
- Restore consistency between directory entries and inodes

• <u>\_</u> for each directory change

### Small-file Performance

■ 10x performance for the creation and deletion of small files



## Large-file Performance

**EXTER TERRIBE SEQUENTED FRAUST READER** FRAUST FIRE



## Major Data Structures



## Summary: FFS vs. LFS



## Seltzer vs. Ousterhout Debate

- Margo Seltzer implemented LFS on BSD and published a paper
	- M. Seltzer et al., "An Implementation of a Log-Structured File System for UNIX", *Proc. Winter 1993 USENIX Conference*.
- A Critique of Seltzer's 1993 USENIX Paper (Ousterhout)
- Seltzer published revised paper
	- M. Seltzer et al., "File System Logging Versus Clustering: A Performance Comparison*," Proc. Winter 1995 USENIX Conference*.
- A Critique of Seltzer's LFS Measurements (Ousterhout)
- A Response to Ousterhout's Critique of LFS Measurements (Seltzer)
- A Response to Seltzer's Response (Ousterhout)