NFS

CS 537: Introduction to Operating Systems

Louis Oliphant & Tej Chajed

University of Wisconsin - Madison

Spring 2024

Administrivia

- Project 7 due April 30th @ 11:59pm
- Final Exam:
 - Cumulative, focusing on new material
 - Lec 1 May 8th, 12:25-2:25 (Biochem 1125)
 - Lec 2 May 6th, 2:45-4:45 (Sterling Hall 1310)
 - McBurney: May 6th, 2:40-6:50 (Nancy Nicholas Hall 1135)
 - If you can't take the exam for a *legitimate reason* at your designated time, please fill out the alternate exam form to take the exam with the other lecture. Legitimate Reasons include:
 - Another exam at the same time, Religious conflict, University Sanctioned conflict, Scheduled Medical conflict, Civic Duty (e.g. jury duty), Military Service, Family Caregiving Responsibility, Family Emergency, Serious Illness, 3 or more exams scheduled during a 24 hour period

Review: distributed systems

- Transparent: UDP (unreliable), TCP (reliable stream)
- RPC abstraction and library
 - has a stub generator and run-time library
 - handles issues like fragmentation and byte ordering
 - Typically synchronous calls (wait for completion)

Quiz 23 Distributed Systems

https://tinyurl.com/cs537-sp24-q23



Distributed file systems

- Local FS: processes on one machine access shared files
- Network FS: processes on multiple machines access shared files

Goals for distributed file systems

Transparent access: don't change applications

Crash recovery: both clients and file server may crash

Reasonable performance?

Network File System (NFS)

Protocol for sharing files

Many independent implementations: Oracle, NetApp, Windows, Linux Note: this lecture is NFSv3, NFSv4 has many changes

NFS architecture

File server + many independent clients

- Communicate via RPCs
- Note: client goes through an NFS file system in the kernel

NFS overview

- Architecture
- Stateless network API
- Caching and cache coherency

Protocol design: failed attempt 1

First thought for protocol: same as UNIX system calls

```
int fd = open("foo", O_RDONLY);
read(fd, buf, MAX);
... // server crash here!
read(ff, buf, MAX);
```

Attempt 2: put all info in requests

pread(char *path, buf, size, offset)
pwrite(char *path, buf, size, offset)

Stateless: server maintain no state about clients

- Pros: server can crash and reboot, no state lost
- Cons: slow, server must look up path on each request

NFSv3: file handles

open(char *path) -> file_handle
pread(fh, buf, size, offset)
pwrite(fh, buf, size, offset)

file handle = <volume ID, inode number, generation number>

Cli	ent
-----	-----

Server

fd = open("/foo", ...); Send LOOKUP (rootdir FH, "foo")

> Receive LOOKUP request look for "foo" in root dir return foo's FH + attributes

Receive LOOKUP reply allocate file desc in open file table store foo's FH in table store current file position (0) return file descriptor to application

read(fd, buffer, MAX);

Index into open file table with fd get NFS file handle (FH) use current file position as offset Send READ (FH, offset=0, count=MAX)

> Receive READ request use FH to get volume/inode num read inode from disk (or cache) compute block location (using offset) read data from disk (or cache) return data to client

Receive READ reply

update file position (+bytes read) set current file position = MAX return data/error code to app

What about append?

```
open(char *path) -> file_handle
pread(fh, buf, size, offset)
pwrite(fh, buf, size, offset)
```

append(fh, buf, size) // what if we add this?

Idempotent operations

Design API so no harm to executing an RPC more than once If f() is idempotent, then f() as same effect as f(); f()

If f() is idempotent and server doesn't respond, client can safely retry

What operations are idempotent?

Idempotent: read, pwrite

Not idempotent: append

Sort of: mkdir, create

Cache consistency

NFS clients cache data to avoid server requests

Multiple clients means cache consistency issues



Server S disk: F[v1] at first F[v2] eventually

Oddities caused by caching

- Update visibility: when one client updates a file, when are they propagated to the server/other clients?
- Stale cache: when a client has a cached file, when is it invalidated due to changes by other clients?

Provide "close-to-open" consistency ("flush-on-close"): flush on close, so open sees any writes before close

NFSv2 solution: GETATTR

- Clients track the modified time of files
- Cache modified time and update periodically (e.g., every 3 seconds)
- (NFSv3 has a slightly better solution called "weak cache consistency")



- Architecture: many clients accessing one server
- Stateless protocol design
- Caching and cache consistency issues