Crash Consistency Operating Systems

Moshe Sulamy

Tel-Aviv Academic College

Crash Consistency

- File system data structures must persist
 - Major challenge: update structures despite power loss or system crash
- Crash-consistency problem
 - On-disk structures left in an inconsistent state

Crashes can occur at arbitrary points in time. How do we ensure the file system remains valid?

- Workload: append 4KB data block to existing file
 - Open file \rightarrow lseek() \rightarrow issue 4KB write \rightarrow close file
- Simple file system
 - inode bitmap, data bitmap, inodes, and data blocks

Inode Bmap	Data Bmap	Inodes			Data Blocks							
		I[v1]	ļ						Da			

- Write three blocks to disk:
 - Updated inode, updated data bitmap, data block
 - Final on-disk image:

Da Db	Inode Bmap	Data Bmap	Inodes			Data Blocks								
				I[v2]							Da	Db		

- Write three blocks to disk:
 - Updated inode, updated data bitmap, data block
 - Final on-disk image:

Inode Da Bmap Bn	ata nap	Inodes			Data Blocks							
		I[v2]							Da	Db		

- Usually not immediate
 - Data in main memory (page cache or buffer cache)
 - File system issues write requests later

- Write three blocks to disk:
 - Updated inode, updated data bitmap, data block
 - Final on-disk image:

Inode		Inodes			Data Blocks							
Bmap	Bmap											
		I[v2							Da	Db		
			•	•								

- Usually not immediate
 - Data in main memory (page cache or buffer cache)
 - File system issues write requests later
- What if a crash happens after one or two writes?

Crash Scenarios

- Only a single write succeeds:
 - Data block
 - Data is on disk
 - No inode points to it
 - No bitmap says it is allocated
 - Not a problem! (except lost data for the user)
 - Updated inode
 - The inode points to Db, but no data
 - Will read garbage data from disk
 - File-system inconsistency: on-disk bitmap says block is free
 - Updated bitmap
 - Bitmap indicates block is allocated
 - No inode points to it
 - Inconsistent: space leak

Crash Scenarios

- Two writes succeed and the last one fails:
 - Updated inode and bitmap
 - File system metadata is consistent
 - Data block has garbage data
 - Updated inode and data block
 - The inode pointing to correct data
 - Inconsistency: bitmap shows block as free
 - Bitmap and data block
 - Inconsistency between inode and data bitmap
 - Block was written but no idea which file it belongs to

Crash Scenarios

- Ideally: move file system from one consistent state to another atomically
 - But disk only commits one write at a time
 - Crashes or power loss may occur
- Called: crash-consistency problem

- Let inconsistencies happen, fix them later
- The File System Checker (fsck)
 - UNIX tool for finding and repairing inconsistencies
 - Can't fix all problems
 - e.g., file system looks consistent but inode points to garbage data
 - Only goal: keep file system metadata consistent

- Summary of what fsck does:
 - Superblock: make sanity checks
 - e.g., file system size greater than allocated blocks
 - Suspect superblock? may use alternate copy
 - Free blocks: scan inodes to produce correct version of bitmap
 - ullet Inconsistency o trust information within inodes
 - Same check is performed for all the inodes (inode bitmaps)
 - **Inode state**: each inode is checked for corruption
 - Also indirect blocks, double indirect blocks
 - e.g., valid type field (regular file, directory, symbolic link, etc.)
 - Problems not easily fixed? clear inode

- Summary of what fsck does:
 - Inode links: verify link count of each allocated inode
 - Scans through entire directory tree
 - Mismatch: fix count within the inode
 - No directory refers to it: moved to lost+found directory
 - Duplicates: check for duplicate pointers
 - Two different inodes refer to same block
 - Clear bad inode, or copy pointed-to block
 - Bad blocks: check bad block pointers outside valid range
 - While scanning through list of pointers
 - e.g., block address greater than partition size
 - Directory checks: additional integrity checks on contents
 - Directories contain specifically formatted information
 - "." and ".." are the first entries
 - Each referred inode is allocated
 - No directory is linked to more than once

File System Checker

- Building fsck requires intricate knowledge of file system
- Fundamental problem: too slow
 - Scan entire disk to find allocated blocks
 - Read entire directory tree
 - Can take many minutes or hourse
- Consider previous example:
 - Just three blocks are written to disk
 - Incredibly expensive to scan entire disk for problem during an update of three blocks

• Journaling (write-ahead logging)

- \bullet Add a bit of work during updates \to reduce work during recovery
- How journaling works:
 - Before overwriting structures: write a note describing operation
 - Note is "write ahead" part, structure organized as "log"
 - If a crash takes place, go back and look at the note to try again
 - Know exactly what/how to fix instead of scanning entire disk

Journaling

Linux ext3

- Most on-disk structures identical to Linux ext2, with journaling
- e.g., block groups, each contains inode and data bitmaps, inodes, data blocks

Super	Group 0	Group 1		Group N	
-------	---------	---------	--	---------	--

Journaling

Linux ext3

- Most on-disk structures identical to Linux ext2, with journaling
- e.g., block groups, each contains inode and data bitmaps, inodes, data blocks



- New key structure: journal itself
 - Occupies small amount of space within partition or another device



- Example: our canonical update
 - Wish to write inode (I[v2]), bitmap (B[v2]) and data block (Db)
- Before writing to final disk locations, first write to log (journal)



- TxB: transaction begin block
- Middle three blocks: exact content of blocks themselves
 - Physical logging
 - Alternate idea: logical logging
- TxE: transaction end block

Checkpoint

- ullet Transaction safely on disk o ready to overwrite structures in file system
- Initial sequence of operations:
 - Journal write: write the transaction
 - Including transaction-begin block, all pending data and metadata updates, and a transaction-end block, to the log
 - Wait for writes to complete
 - Checkpoint
 - Write pending metadata and data updates to final locations

- Crash occurs during write to the journal:
 - Issue one write at a time
 - Wait for each to complete, then issue next
 - Slow
 - Write all five blocks at once
 - ullet Five writes into one sequential write o faster
 - Unsafe: may crash between writes
 - Looks like a valid transaction



• Bad for user data, worse for critical piece, e.g., superblock

- Issue transactional write in two steps
 - Write all blocks except TxE



When writes complete, issue write of TxE



- Our current protocol:
 - Journal write
 - Write transaction contents (TxB, metadata, and data)
 - Wait for these writes to complete
 - Journal commit
 - Write transaction commit block (TxE)
 - Wait for write to complete → transaction is committed
 - Checkpoint
 - Write pending metadata and data updates to final locations

Recovery

- Crash before transaction written to log?
 - Our job is easy: pending update is skipped
- After transaction committed, before checkpoint is complete?
 - Can recover the update
 - On boot, scan log for committed transactions to replay
 - Called redo logging

Batching Log Updates

- Create two files in the same directory
 - Commit to journal twice
 - Write same blocks over and over
- Solution: buffer updates to a global transaction
 - Mark as dirty: in-memory inode bitmap, inodes, directory data, directory inode
 - Add to list of blocks that form current transaction
 - ullet Commit a single global transaction o avoid excessive writes

Finite Log

- Two problems with log of finite size
 - 1 The larger the log, the longer the recovery
 - 2 Log full \rightarrow no more transactions can be committed

_						
Journal	Tx1	Tx2	Tx3	Tx4	Tx5	

Finite Log

- Solution? circular log
 - 1 Take action some time after a checkpoint
 - Free the log space used by the transaction
- Journal superblock
 - Marks oldest and newest non-checkpointed trnsactions



Finite Log

- Another step in our protocol:
 - Journal write
 - Write transaction contents (TxB, metadata, and data)
 - Wait for these writes to complete
 - Journal commit
 - Write transaction commit block (TxE)
 - Wait for write to complete → transaction is committed
 - Checkpoint
 - Write pending metadata and data updates to final locations
 - Free
 - Some time later, mark transaction as free in journal
 - By updating the journal superblock

Metadata Journaling

- Still a problem: Writing every data block twice
 - Commit to log
 - Checkpoint to disk
- Ordered journaling: user data is not written to the journal
 - Write data block to file system proper



Metadata Journaling

- Still a problem: Writing every data block twice
 - Commit to log
 - Checkpoint to disk
- Ordered journaling: user data is not written to the journal
 - Write data block to file system proper



- Write data after transaction?
 - ullet Problem o may point to garbage data
- Write data before transaction → avoids problem

Metadata Journaling

- The protocol:
 - Data write
 - Write data to final location
 - Wait for completion
 - Journal metadata write
 - Write transaction contents (TxB and metadata)
 - Wait for writes to complete
 - Journal commit
 - Write transaction commit block (TxE)
 - Wait for write to complete → transaction is committed
 - Checkpoint
 - Write pending metadata and data updates to final locations
 - Free
 - Later, mark the transaction free in journal superblock

Summary

Crash consistency problem

- On-disk structures left in an inconsistent state
- File System Checker (fsck)
 - · Let inconsistencies happen, fix them later
 - Scan superblock, free blocks, inode state, inode links, duplicates, bad blocks, directories
 - Keep file system metadata consistent
 - Fundamental problem: too slow
- Journaling (write-ahead logging)
 - ullet Add work during updates o reduce work during recovery
 - Before writing structures: write note describing operation
 - Checkpoint: transaction safely on disk
 - Batch log updates, circular log, metadata journaling