

# BaseFS - Basically Available, Soft State, Eventually Consistent Filesystem for Cluster Management

Marc Aymerich Gubern  
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya UPC  
marc.aymerich@est.fib.upc.edu

## ABSTRACT

BaseFS is a peer-to-peer distributed filesystem for cluster configuration, designed to operate under the harsh network conditions commonly found on Community Networks. Nodes do not need to trust each other, the core data-structure is an append-only Merkle DAG with monotonic and cryptographic properties that allows for efficient and secure verification of data sent by untrusted nodes. Decentralized write permission is achieved using a hierarchy-based public key infrastructure (PKI) built into the Merkle DAG, allowing for write conflict automatic resolution. Finally, a gossip layer is used for disseminate changes very quickly and efficiently as well as for maintaining cluster membership in a scalable way. With no single point-of-failure, BaseFS can provide levels of availability, scalability and performance never seen before on a cluster configuration tool.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

One of the steps towards building a successful distributed system is establishing effective configuration management. It is a complex engineering process responsible for planning, identifying, tracking and verifying changes in the software and its configuration as well as maintaining configuration integrity throughout the life cycle of the system [?].

Some successful tools exist to aid in this process, Chef and Puppet only to name a few. The cluster configuration is written in recipes that converge every few minutes. While this approach works well for static configuration, it fails to provide an ideal solution for more dynamic state, where a near real-time convergence is desirable. Because of the need for faster provisioning (e.g. elasticity in cloud environments or quickly respond to failures) systems like Zookeeper, etcd or Consul have emerged that target this very specific problem. They are distributed key-value stores designed to keep the global state of the system. We can make a rough distinction between the *static configuration management* tasks solved by tools like Chef or Puppet and the *dynamic cluster management* commonly solved by K/V stores like Zookeeper, etcd or Consul.

Existing *dynamic cluster management* solutions are designed with strong consistency models and client-server architectures. They have server nodes that require a quorum of nodes to operate (usually a simple majority). They chose consistency over availability under the face of a network partition. [2] These design decisions are based on the assumption these systems are deployed on a datacenter-like environment, where machines are homogeneous, with predictable performance, connected by fast networks, with low

churn and operated by a team of highly technical engineers, while all being part of a single administrative domain. But this assumptions are not always true.

Community cloud computing is an emerging model where infrastructure is built using a collaborative effort. It is often the result of individual users providing spare resources to a common pool. As we can imagine the set of constraints faced on these kind of distributed systems are different from those we can find in the typical datacenter. Hardware is heterogeneous, it tends to be consumer-grade with higher failure rates and lower performance. The network is slow and unreliable; partitions occur often. The administrative boundary between organizations is sometimes blurry, with requirements for decentralize administration of the infrastructure. Limitations on the technical capacity for effectively deploying and managing complex distributed systems may also exist, since the operators are sometimes members of the community that volunteer their time, but with limited SLA commitment.

The main contribution of this thesis is to provide a novel approach to solve cluster configuration management problems on a decentralized, more networked constraint, environments. First we present a case for a more available and less consistent cluster management solution. Then, we introduce the BaseFS design, an eventually consistent distributed filesystem specifically designed for cluster and configuration management. Experimental results from a prototype implementation are presented in the ?? section and finally we think about the future of BaseFS.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Zookeeper, etcd and Consul are consolidated distributed key value stores for shared configuration and service discovery. But they present limitations in the context of community cloud computing. The more relevant, and the ones we hope to address, are: a) geographical and administrative scalability, b) trading consistency over availability and c) deployment complexities.

### 2.1 Scalability Limits

Fault-tolerant, distributed coordination algorithms like Paxos and Raft are used because of their strong consistency properties. But coordination is expensive, processes can't make progress independently, a majority of nodes have to agree on every decision first. Constant communication between nodes is needed, making the system hard to scale beyond small clusters or across wide-area networks. Coordination algorithms are notoriously hard to implement, and even

harder to make them tolerate Byzantine failures. In the end, nodes need to trust each other, making them hard to scale on number of administrative domains. The real scalability challenges faced by community cloud computing are not about the size of the cluster, but on **geographic** and **administrative** scalability.

By removing the need for coordination geographic scalability improves naturally, progress is no longer restricted by network delay anymore. Administrative scalability can be improved by removing the need of nodes having to trust each other.

## 2.2 Availability Under Network Partition

The CAP theorem, while recently the subject of scrutiny and debate over whether it's overstated or not[?], is a valid and useful tool for reasoning about fundamental trade-offs made on the design of a distributed system. The acronym stands for:

- Consistency: All nodes see the same data at the same time.
- Availability: node failures do not prevent survivors from continuing
- Partition tolerance: the system continues to operate despite message loss due to network failure

The theorem states that a distributed system facing a network partition has to choose between staying available or being consistent. In our case all the current solutions err on the side of consistency. These solutions are commonly called CP (Consistent but not available under Partition). The main implication is that in case of partition nodes under a minority partition will not be able to perform writes.

CP system are a fragile and complex piece of the infrastructure, making your system depend on them will make progress impossible for minority partitions. It is important to stress that consistency presented by the CAP theorem actually refers to **strong consistency**. This consistency definition can be relaxed and allow availability and some kind of consistency less than "all nodes see the same data at the same time". For example, eventual consistency, which guarantees that after some undefined amount of time all replicas will converge on the same value.

Cheap and unreliable wireless links is the network infrastructure of choice for some community cloud deployments. A CP system deployed on these harsh network conditions will have a hard time staying available and perform well, because of latency, packet loss and network partitions. In this situation a cluster management solution that **focuses on availability** while at the same time providing a low conflict rate, fast convergence, and low divergence time will be desirable.

## 2.3 Complexity

Existing cluster management solutions are complex to deploy and maintain. They need dedicated quorum servers that have to be protected from untrusted parties. Extra efforts need to be placed on making sure network partitions do not occur, the entire system's availability may depend on it. The use of non-standardized APIs that operators need to learn also increases its complexity.

While all this complexity has not been a problem for corporations with teams of highly skilled engineers that are well

paid for taking care of it, Community cloud is sometimes build and operated by volunteers, and there is not always a good enough incentive for investing large amount of effort learning how to deal with it.

Complexity can be lowered by removing the need for dedicated servers and make the system P2P, without single point-of-failure nor need for nodes to trust each other. Just look at how Bittorrent has achieve massive adoption because of it. On the other hand, we can provide APIs that developers already know and programing language have libraries for, like a filesystem API.

## 2.4 Existing P2P Filesystems

Before reinventing the wheel with a new solution, we take a look at existing P2P filesystems and see if they provide the needed requirements for building a successful cluster management solution.

First we discard Syncthing and other P2P-based Dropbox-like applications because they lack fundamental properties that will make the system work with untrusted nodes. For starters a secret needs to be shared between nodes. Syncthing is also based on periodic state synchronization, which is a bad model for dynamic configuration.

IPFS, short for InterPlanetary File System, is a new peer-to-peer hypermedia protocol, addressed by content and identities. The main problem with IPFS is the lack of update notification, applications have to actively fetch the updates for the content they are interested in. A fetching model is certainly not scalable for data that changes frequently, and even though adding a gossip layer on top of IPFS for change dissemination may solve this problem, we still need to face the single-point of contention of its Merkle DAG design. IPFS uses a Merkle DAG inspired on GIT. The problem with GIT Merkle DAG is that all changes are linked by the *commit tree*, effectively creating a single-point-of-conflict for the whole file system. Simultaneous changes on **different files** will be conflicting, seriously limiting concurrent writes scalability. For an application that allows concurrent writes from multiple nodes we consider per-file point-of-conflict to be the minimal granularity we should expect.

## 3. BASEFS DESIGN

BaseFS builds on top of ideas and concepts coming from existing technologies used by successful distributed systems that have been developed over the last decade or so. The inspiration from BaseFS comes from Bitcoin, GIT, BitTorrent, IPFS or Consul, just to name a few. In this section we present the main design aspects including:

1. **Log** - a Merkle DAG of content-addressed immutable entries. Described in 3.0.1
2. **View** - provides a conflict free composition of the log entries. Described in 3.1
3. **Network** - maintains membership, manages connections to other peers, uses various underlying network protocols. Described in 3.2

### 3.0.1 Log

The BaseFS log is an append-only data structure used for storing all filesystem information, blocks and metadata.

BaseFS log has the convenience of being a *conflict-free replicated data type* (CRDT), which enables strong eventual consistency (SEC) and monotonicity (absence of rollbacks). Properties that, guarantee convergence to the same value in spite of network delays, partitions and message reordering. Under the constraints of the CAP theorem, CRDT provide the strongest consistency guarantees for available/partition-tolerant (AP) settings.

Additionally, links between log objects are cryptographic hashes of the targets, providing many useful properties, including:

- **Content addressing:** all content is uniquely identified by its SHA-224 hash checksum.
- **Tamper resistance:** all content is verified with its hash.
- **Deduplication:** all objects that hold the exact same content are equal, and only stored once.
- **Notion of time:** the object linked is older than the object itself, hashes can not be calculated in advance.

The log is composed of three types of hash addressable objects:

- **log entry** - Nodes of a Merkle DAG containing the whole history of file system operations
- **block list** - Merkle tree containing all the block hashes of a file
- **block** - A file content chunk

The **log entries** form a Merkle DAG representing the hierarchy of the filesystem. A Merkle DAG, is a directed acyclic graph where links between objects are cryptographic hashes of the targets embedded in the sources, with all the interesting properties mentioned earlier. Following a non formal representation of a *log entry* DAG.

```
mkdir("/")
|- grant("root", "<root_pubkey>")
|- create(".cluster", "127.0.0.1:3232")
'- mkdir("home")
  |- grant("usr1", "<usr1_pubkey>")
  |   '- grant("usr2", "<usr2_pubkey>")
  |       '- revoke("usr1", "<usr1_pubkey>")
  +- mkdir("documents")
  |   '- create("doc.txt", "Initial content")
  |       '- update("New content")
  |           '- revert("<00eee-hash>")
  |               '- delete()
  +-mkdir("videos")
  |   +- create('mddmoe.mkv', "<content>")
  |   |   '-delete()
  |   '- link("my_movie.mkv", "<mddmoe.mkv-hash>")
  +- create("myprogram", "#!/bin/sh\ncho hola")
  |   '- mode(100755)
  '- create("myprogram", "#!/bin/sh\nrm -fr /")
```

The specifications for the log entry fields are the following:

1. **Prent hash** - SHA-224 hash hexdigest of the target entry.

2. **Timestamp** - a UNIX timestamp that represents the time at which the log entry was created. BaseFS does not provide any mechanism to validate this timestamp with a global clock, this field is purely informative used for example by `te *ls*` command.

3. **Action** - we have devised some actions needed for enabling all the requirements commonly

- **mkdir:** make a new directory
- **create:** create a new file
- **update:** update a file content
- **delete:** deletes an entry
- **revert:** reverts a path to some previous state
- **grant:** enables write permissions to specific key
- **revoke:** disables write permissions for an specific key
- **ack:** acknowledge a log branch as valid, needed for maintaining state after key granting or revocation.
- **link:** a hard link between two entries
- **slink:** a symbolic link pointing to some path
- **mode:** give or remove executable file permissions

remove operations are implemented with **delete** and **link** actions

4. **Name** - determines the name of the directory, file, link or key. Like UNIX file names, BaseFS name size is limited to 256 characters. Paths are constructed using these names.

5. **Size** - size of the file in bytes. This is a performance optimization because computing the whole file size every time an `ls` is performed is expensive.

6. **Content** - depending on the action, the log entry content may contain:

- **create:** SHA-224 hexdigest of the first block content
- **grant:** Base64 encoded EC public key
- **slink:** target path, could be any path, not restricted to BaseFS filesystem.
- **link and revert:** target entry hexdigest SHA-224 hash
- **mode:** mode value

7. **Key fingerprint** - The public key fingerprint used to sign the log entry.

8. **Signature** - base64 encoding of the entry's signature. Elliptic curve cryptography is used for the smaller size of the keys compared to equivalent RSA security level.

Notice that the monotonicity and object immutability properties of the log entry data structure are ideal for enabling version control. It is trivial to revert a path state to a previous one. Since all the history is available, the **revert** action only needs to reference a previous entry hash.

BaseFS Merkle DAG is very similar to the more-generalized used by Git. The main reason why we did not use Git as

storage backend, is that the Git Merkle DAG is constructed only by `commit` objects, creating a *single point-of-conflict* for the whole filesystem. This is desirable in software development where we want to create commits and branches (conflicts) containing changes from different parts of the tree. But, for a distributed filesystem where changes are propagated in real time, and conflicts are resolved automatically, it is more interesting to have a low conflict rate than the ability to create checkpoints spanning the whole filesystem. BaseFS Merkle DAG has a *per-path point-of-conflict* but also a per-path visioning granularity. In the next section we will talk about conflicts and how BaseFS deals with them.

### 3.1 View

Conflict resolved view of the log. Conflicts happen when two entries have the same parent link and path name. TODO self certified filesystem

Conflict probability? low I hope

Systems that allow replicas to diverge must have a way to eventually reconcile two different values. Detect conflicts and apply conflict resolution methods.

Because we want to avoid a coordination consensus model, for its sacrifice on availability, we establish a set of rules for interpreting the Merkle DAG, enabling the cluster to eventually reach a consistent state that makes sense. The strategy is similar to the *proof-of-work* [1] that BitCoin uses to achieve consensus with decentralized-authority [1]. BaseFS does not use *proof-of-work* but takes advantage of its self-contained permission system, and choose those conflicting branches with higher authority. Perhaps this consensus model can be called *proof-of-authority*. More specifically, the rules that we use to solve conflicting writes are:

[1] [https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Proof\\_of\\_work](https://en.bitcoin.it/wiki/Proof_of_work)

1. Log entries with incomplete files are ignored until completed
2. Select the branch where its contributors have a higher key on the filesystem hierarchy. Allows keys to be revoked.
3. If equal, select the branch with more contributors. More nodes seem to agree on the same branch.
4. If equal, select the branch with a higher root hash. This step is unambiguous, since two branches can not have the same hash without being the same.

#### 3.1.1 Grant and Revoke

Because leaf entries with invalid keys are ignored, when revoking a user key we have to acknowledge the related leafs in order to preserve the current state. This is done by appending an **ACK** entry to those leafs, so they are not leaf entries anymore.

A similar thing happens when we want to grant higher permissions on an existing key. Because conflicting branches may have been resolved by scoring on higher hierarchy. This balance may change because the increase of hierarchy score of one of the losing branches. Therefore, we may need to acknowledge the current winning branch with an **ACK** entry.

### 3.2 Network

BaseFS uses two different protocols for communicating updates to other nodes and maintain all replicas synchronized:

- gossip protocol - near-real time communication, asynchronous, maintains cluster membership
- synchronization protocol - an anti-entropy protocol for repairing replicated data, which operate by comparing replicas and reconciling differences.

replication is asynchronous, changes are performed locally and then sent to the rest of the network. From the performance perspective this means that the system is fast: the client does not need to spend any additional time waiting for the internals of the system to do their work. The system is also more tolerant to network latency since fluctuations in internal latency do not cause additional waiting.

Nodes on the system not always contain the same state, reads may return different results from different locations.

#### 3.2.1 Gossip Protocol

A gossip protocol is a style of computer-to-computer communication protocol inspired by the form of gossip seen in social networks. The basic behaviour is that each node forwards events to a random subset of other nodes. Because of its simplicity they are effective means by which failures detected in large, distributed systems in an asynchronous manner without the limitations associated with reliable multicasting for group communications.

BaseFS uses Serf for a) membership maintenance and b) broadcast of new log entries to all cluster members. The gossip protocol used by Serf is based on SWIM, Scalable Weakly-consistent Infection-style Process Group Membership Protocol[?]. Serf can maintain cluster membership in highly dynamic settings, quickly detecting failed members and notify the rest of the cluster in an efficient manner.

For broadcasting events, Serf uses UDP. This is what allows the gossip layer to perform so well, have low and predictable network load and fast converge rate. UDP is message oriented and avoids the overhead of ordering, delivery or retransmission of stream oriented protocols like TCP. However, it has the limitation of how much information can be sent by a single event. Specifically, Serf allows event payloads as big as 512 bytes. A conscious effort has been made in order to ensure that log entries do not exceed this capacity. Figure 1 shows how BaseFS assembles a log entry into a Serf event payload, the key efforts that have allowed to squeeze log entries are:

1. The hash function of choice is SHA-224, the smallest SHA (28B) considered secure<sup>1</sup>.
2. We use elliptic curve cryptography with 192bits key size (equivalent to a 2048b RSA key<sup>2</sup>). Keys of this size produce 48 Bytes signatures.
3. File size value is limited to 6 bytes, restricting the maximum file size to 2 PiB.
4. Even though text protocols are easier to work with, we choose to use a more space-efficient binary representation of the entry fields. When possible, field delimitation is based on the field size. Otherwise, a dedicated offset byte is used, which can delimit up to 256byte,

<sup>1</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SHA-2#Comparison\\_of\\_SHA\\_functions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SHA-2#Comparison_of_SHA_functions)

<sup>2</sup><https://tools.ietf.org/html/draft-ietf-msec-mikey-ecc-03>

1B	28B	4B	1B	1B	0-256B	1B	0-256B	0-6B	16B	48B
event	parent hash	timestamp	action mkdir,create,update, delete,revert, grant,revoke,ack, link,slink,mode	offset	name mkdir,write,link,slink: path name grant: key name	offset	content write: first block hash grant: EC public key slink: target path link,revert: entry hash mode: mode value	file size @2PiB	key fingerprint	signature EC signature

Figure 1: A sample black and white graphic (.eps format) that has been resized with the epsfig command.




Figure 2: A sample black and white graphic (.eps format) that has been resized with the epsfig command.

just enough to comply with our 256 character upper limit on names.

Even though the efforts made compacting log entries, log blocks are another story. Updates uses bsdiff4 algorithm, which produces a very space-efficient binary diff of two files. Therefore, most of the updates will fit into a single Serf event. However, if updates are big they will not. Fortunately, configuration files are small. In order to have a better understanding of how many events are needed in worst-case scenarios we have characterize the /etc directory of a few Linux system, since all the results are very similar we only present the results of a web server running Debian in figure ??

full state sync dissemination probability 1

They are used for maintaining cluster membership and for broadcasting short events to all the cluster members.

BaseFS uses Serf, a tool for cluster membership, failure detection, and orchestration that is decentralized, fault-tolerant and highly available.

cluster membership and event broadcast a gossip protocol [1]<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.160.2604>

a) cluster membership maintenance, b) failure detection and recovery of members and c) broadcast of short events to a cluster.

Gossip protocols, in general and serf in particular, have been useful for two tasks: membership maintenance and broadcast of short events (usually of the size of a UDP packet). The properties that enable:

- scale well in number of nodes, the number of messages stays constant as nodes are added.

- strong completeness of crashed-failing nodes
- speed of failure detection
- accuracy

re very efficient and accurate on maintaining cluster membership and detecting failing nodes.

### 3.2.2 Synchronization Protocol

While gossip produces the initial spread of information, a full state synchronization protocol is run infrequently in order to deal with nodes rejoining the cluster after being partitioned, or when a failed node is replaced or partially recovered. Additionally, because the number of blocks sent through the gossip layer is limited, a mechanism to spread remaining blocks is needed.

In order to make the information exchange during replica synchronization efficient, BaseFS uses Merkle trees. Data is hashed at multiple levels of granularity and nodes can quickly find out which part of the data is divergent. The Merkle tree is built conforming to the filesystem hierarchy. Each path hash is computed recursively, using the XOR of its sub-paths as well as its own related entries. The root path is the XOR of all the log entries. The protocol communication is an iterative process, walking and expanding those paths with a mismatching hash. Nodes will detect divergence and interchange log entries and blocks until they are fully synchronized.

The block hashes are not included on the Merkle tree. Doing so will make the synchronization protocol very unstable during periods of gossip dissemination. The root hash will flap its value very rapidly. To avoid this effect, as well as preventing nodes to simultaneously retrieve the same blocks from multiple peers, we introduce the notion of *block state*. Files can be in one of the following three states:




Figure 3: Block state diagram

- Receiving - indicates an initial state, the node has received a new *write* entry. The sync protocol will announce this file as being received, no change performed to the Merkle tree.

- **Stalled** - a file enters this state when no related block has been received after some time  $t$ . Both, the entry hash and the last received block are added to the Merkle tree.
- **Completed** - all related blocks have been received. The *Entry* hash is included to the Merkle tree. In case the previous state was stalled, the last block hash is removed.

The synchronization protocol is a text-based streaming protocol, using new line characters as delimiters and encoding binary information (block content) in base64. Its alphabet is:

- **HASH** - Filesystem root hash. Only sync when equal
- **LS** - Path list, includes all path entry hashes, sub-paths hashes and the last-block hash of incomplete files.
- **PATH\_REQ** - Path request, indicates a node is missing an entire path and requests all its content to its peer.
- **ENTRY\_REQ** - Entry request, used by a node to request a missing entry to its peer.
- **BLOCK\_REQ** - idem for blocks
- **ENTRIES** - Contains a log entry, can be a response to an **ENTRY\_REQ** or when a node finds out that its peer is missing some entry.
- **BLOCKS** - idem for blocks
- **BLOCKS\_REC** - A node announces files in receiving state. In case of divergence the peer can apply this hash to the Merkle tree.
- **CLOSE** - Indicates a node is fully synchronize with its peer and communication is terminated.
- **EOF** - End of transmission. TODO

The pattern of communication is probabilistic, nodes have some probability  $p$  of attempting to synchronize with each other. Every  $t$  seconds, each node picks a node to communicate with. To initiate synchronization nodes send a **HASH** and **LS** / requests containing their own state, and things continue from there.

## 4. IMPLEMENTATION

- **Filesystem** - The emulation of filesystem operations on *view* operations. Described in ??.

BaseFS makes extensive use of concurrency including processes, threads and an event loop. The FUSE interface runs on the main Python thread, as required by its implementation. The Serf agent runs on a separated Python process, and we talk with it using Serf own RPC protocol. We spawn an additional thread for the event loop. Implemented with asyncio, the event loop handles all the remaining network communication in a non-blocking fashion, including the sync protocol, receiving of custom gossip events and commands sent by BaseFS CLI utility. The event loop thread shares memory with the main FUSE thread, and only a single instance of the View has to be maintained, saving memory and computation time.

File Handler also spawns a new process for each registered handler script




Figure 4: ShareLaTeX logo

### 4.1 Filesystem

The filesystem layer is implemented using FUSE Python bindings<sup>3</sup>. FUSE stands for Filesystem in Userspace, and Wikipedia defines it as "an operating system mechanism for Unix-like computer operating systems that lets non-privileged users create their own filesystems without editing kernel code". This is achieved by running filesystem code in user space while the FUSE module provides only a "bridge" to the actual kernel interfaces. The implementation is very straightforward, and almost limited to *View* operations.

The filesystem, however, needs to be aware of new changes made by other nodes. Because of its cost, the *view layer* does not rebuild automatically when new changes arrive. Instead each time we want to read something, the filesystem layer checks if its log seek value is up-to-date with the actual log seek value. A mismatch indicates new entries have arrive and a rebuild of the *view* is performed before doing the actual read.

Another detail worth mentioning is the caching layer used for file write operations. Because the blabla we cluster writes so we can do diff, and safe stuff

#### 4.1.1 Watchers

The naive approach for applications to react to changes is periodic reading (pulling) the state they are interested in. Modern Linux kernels provide support for filesystem notifications via the inotify subsystem. Unfortunately FUSE is missing support for triggering those events. Since the main objective of BaseFS is to act as a middleware providing shared state between applications, contribute and effective mechanisms that allow applications to react to state changes is very convenient. Support for executing scripts in response to new log entries is natively provided in the form of event handlers.

Event handlers are registered on mounting time and can be any executable, including piped executables (such as `awk 'print $2' | grep foo`), since event handlers are invoked within the context of a shell. The event handler is executed anytime a new log entry is stored. Context for the scripts is given by `BASEFS_EVENT_TYPE` and `BASEFS_EVENT_PATH` environment variables.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/terencehonles/fusepy>

## 4.2 Commands

- mount Mount an existing filesystem
- run Run an existing filesystem without mounting it (testing)
- bootstrap Create a new self-contained filesystem
- genkey Generate a new EC private key
- keys List keys and their directories
- grant Grant key write permission
- revoke Revoke key write permission
- list List all available logs
- show Show a log file using a tree representation
- revert Revert object to previous state, 'log' command lists all revisions
- blocks Block state
- members List cluster members
- serf Serf RPC Command proxy
- get Get log from peer address
- installserf Download and install Serf
- resources Display BaseFS resource consumption in real-time

## 5. EVALUATION

For the test setup, a set of UNIX shell and Expect scripts was designed to automate the testing and ensure each run was handled consistently. The Expect scripts began by configuring the network emulator, via its XML-RPC interface, to the desired delay, line rate constraints, and bit error per packet rate. The Expect script would then spawn a tcpdump packet capture of all the test traffic by listening on the network emulator interface's connected to the receiver. It would then remotely connect to the source and destination nodes via SSH and execute the protocol executables for the desired protocol implementation run. Once the run was complete, it would tear down the spawned processes and loop back around for another run if necessary dissemination correlation

best sync mechanism: random or seed after write

balanced load on the nodes (is the traffic per node even?)

talk about our methodology and approach, reference to other benchmarks (serf?) get inspired by other papers evaluating DS.

conflicts probability? Low I hope

maybe merge with basefs design (support the design decisions with evidence))

IPFS vs BaseFS ?

gossip layer saturation limit etc characterization bsdiff (designed for executables) ram hungry: bsdiff is quite memory-hungry. It requires  $\max(17*n, 9*n+m)+O(1)$  bytes of memory, where  $n$  is the size of the old file and  $m$  is the size of the new file. bspatch requires  $n+m+O(1)$  bytes.

A note about our implementation, we use highly concurrent design featuring processes, threads and event loops.

performance of async core, talk a little bit here convergence time of sync protocol convergence time gossip layer Fs memory and time vs ext4 or other filesystems: iotests (networked vs single node tests) NAT resistance

confine tests locality aware sync protocol based on serf coordinates and locality in terms of network hops?

## 6. THE FUTURE

Some nice features have been left out of the scope of this project, just because our focus has been to prove that our idea works and has meaningful value.

Multiple diff algorithms for diffing, maybe let user choose. diff of large files, don't put them in memory: fs mount option?

enabler for decentralize cloud platforms

for simplicity we used next hash -> but introduce merklize infohashes is best

gossip layer problems: Keep track of bad behaviour and ban bad nodes.

sync protocol room for improvement: biased instead of random uniformly distributed For small files it is not really important to give incentives for sharing because the resources that each node has to contribute for becoming part of the network are small. However for large files or very-very large file systems we can consider to incentive mechanisms: a) block-market swarm: write content contains all the blocks hashes of that file, the original content has to be fetched from a bitTorrent-like swarm, much like swaptorrent works (ipfs) b) nodes do not contribute all the missing parts when syncing, they can keep track of the behaviour of the other nodes and decide to choke them if appropriate

more than cluster management

a. decentralized state Dropbox-like applications: each user with each folder, and shared folders SO upgrade on large clusters shared configuration for decentralized cloud computing: zookeeper, etcd shared in-memory-state for clusters: memcached

b. mutable P2P content Mutable P2P file sharing, ok for small files, but incentive mechanism to avoid free-riders and block sharing swarm may be needed (WRITE magnetlink). Live documents: encyclopedia or discographies that self-update when new updates are available

c. monotonicity Version control system

Notice that file contents nor metadata (size, name, date) are not encrypted in anyway. Privacy is left intentionally out of the scope of this project since our focus is to prove that our idea works.

Biased getPeer(randomize algorithm) : network proximity, published new content improve serf membership maintenance: when a failing node is removed from the member list? If battery power, bandwidth, and other resources are scarce, selfish users may not wish to forward packets for other users

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

we presented a system with properties that enables more than decentralize configuration.