## 6.033 Spring 2019

Lecture #15

- When replication fails us
  - Atomicity via shadow copies
  - Isolation
  - Transactions

# high-level goal: build reliable systems from unreliable components

this is difficult because reasoning about failures is difficult. we need some abstractions that will let us simplify.

#### atomicity

an action is atomic if it **happens completely or not at all**. if we can guarantee atomicity, it will be much easier to reason about failures

```
transfer (bank, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
```

problem: account\_a lost amount dollars, but
 account\_b didn't gain amount dollars

```
transfer (bank, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount

    crash! **
```

**solution:** make this action atomic. ensure that the system completes both steps or neither step.

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount crash! **
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts(bank_file)
```

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts(bank_file) ← crash! ※
```

problem: a crash during write\_accounts
leaves bank\_file in an intermediate state

(shadow copies)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts(tmp_file)
    rename(tmp_file, bank_file)
```

(shadow copies)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts(tmp_file)
    rename(tmp_file, bank_file) ← crash! ※
```

(shadow copies)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
   bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
   bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
   bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
   write_accounts(tmp_file)
   rename(tmp_file, bank_file) ← crash! ※
```

problem: a crash during rename potentially
leaves bank\_file in an intermediate state

(shadow copies)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
   bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
   bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
   bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
   write_accounts(tmp_file)
   rename(tmp_file, bank_file) ← crash! ※
```

solution: make rename atomic

```
rename(tmp_file, orig_file):
    // point bank_file's dirent at inode 2
    // delete tmp_file's dirent
    // remove refcount on inode 1
```

```
directory entries
  filename "bank_file" -> inode 2
```

```
directory entries
  filename "bank_file" -> inode 2
```

directory entries

decref(orig inode)

```
filename "bank_file" -> inode 1
          filename "tmp_file" -> inode 2
inode 1: // old data
                              inode 2: // new data
    data blocks: [...]
                                   data blocks: [...]
    refcount: 1
                                   refcount: 1
   rename(tmp_file, orig_file):
       tmp inode = lookup(tmp file) // = 2
       orig inode = lookup(orig file) // = 1
                                           - crash! 🮇
       orig file dirent = tmp inode
                                       rename didn't happen
       remove tmp file dirent
```

```
directory entries
          filename "bank_file" -> inode 2
          filename "tmp_file" -> inode 2
inode 1: // old data
                               inode 2: // new data
    data blocks: [...]
                                   data blocks: [...]
    refcount: 1
                                   refcount: 1
   rename(tmp_file, orig_file):
       tmp inode = lookup(tmp file) // = 2
       orig inode = lookup(orig file) // = 1
       orig_file dirent = tmp_inode
                                       - crash! 💥
       remove tmp file dirent
                                    rename happened,
       decref(orig inode)
                                   but refcounts are wrong
```

filename "bank\_file" -> inode ?

directory entries

```
filename "tmp_file" -> inode 2
inode 1: // old data
                                inode 2: // new data
    data blocks: [...]
                                     data blocks: [...]
    refcount: 1
                                     refcount: 1
   rename(tmp_file, orig_file):
       tmp inode = lookup(tmp file) // = 2
       orig inode = lookup(orig file) // = 1
       orig file dirent = tmp inode ← crash! ¾
       remove tmp file dirent crash during this line seems bad...
                                but is okay because single-sector writes
       decref(orig inode)
                                      are themselves atomic
```

#### interlude

we're trying to make a sequence of actions atomic using shadow copies: write to a temporary file, and then rename it to the original.

rename itself must be atomic, and we've almost got that working — thanks in part to atomic single-sector writes — but our refcounts aren't quite correct.

```
directory entries
          filename "bank_file" -> inode 2
          filename "tmp_file" -> inode 2
inode 1: // old data
                               inode 2: // new data
    data blocks: [...]
                                   data blocks: [...]
    refcount: 1
                                   refcount: 1
   rename(tmp_file, orig_file):
       tmp inode = lookup(tmp file) // = 2
       orig inode = lookup(orig file) // = 1
       orig_file dirent = tmp_inode
                                       - crash! 💥
       remove tmp file dirent
                                    rename happened,
       decref(orig inode)
                                   but refcounts are wrong
```

#### solution: recover from failure

(clean things up)

```
recover(disk):
    for inode in disk.inodes:
        inode.refcount = find_all_refs(disk.root_dir, inode)
    if exists("tmp_file"):
        unlink("tmp_file")
```

(shadow copies)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts(tmp_file)
    rename(tmp_file, bank_file)
```

#### atomicity

(first abstraction)

not quite solved; shadow copies perform poorly even for a single user and a single file, and we haven't even talked about concurrency

#### isolation

(second abstraction)

if we guarantee isolation, then two actions A1 and A2 will appear to have run **serially** even if they were executed concurrently (i.e., A1 before A2, or vice versa)

#### transactions: provide atomicity and isolation

```
Transaction 1

begin

transfer(A, B, 20)

withdraw(B, 10)

end

Transaction 2

begin

transfer(B, C, 5)

deposit(A, 5)

end
```

**atomicity:** each transaction will appear to have run to completion, or not at all

isolation: when multiple transactions are run concurrently, it will appear as if they were run sequentially (serially)

# atomicity and isolation — and thus, transactions — make it easier to reason about failures (and concurrency)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    acquire(lock)
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts("tmp_file")
    rename("tmp_file", bank_file)
    release(lock)
```

### couldn't we just put locks around everything?

(isn't that what locks are for?)

```
transfer (bank_file, account_a, account_b, amount):
    acquire(lock)
    bank = read_accounts(bank_file)
    bank[account_a] = bank[account_a] - amount
    bank[account_b] = bank[account_b] + amount
    write_accounts("tmp_file")
    rename("tmp_file", bank_file)
    release(lock)
```

#### this particular strategy will perform poorly

(would force a single transfer at a time)

### locks sometimes require global reasoning, which is messy

eventually, we'll incorporate locks, but in a systematic way

# **goal:** to implement **transactions**, which provide atomicity and isolation, while not hindering performance

shadow copies. work, but perform poorly and don't allow for concurrency
?
(coarse-grained locks perform poorly, finer-grained locks are difficult to

eventually, we also want transaction-based systems to be **distributed**: to run across multiple machines

reason about)

- Transactions provide atomicity and isolation, both of which make it easier for us to reason about failures because we don't have to deal with intermediate states.
- Shadow copies are one way to achieve atomicity. The work, but perform poorly: require copying an entire file even for small changes, and don't allow for concurrency.