Google File System

CS 202

From paper by Ghemawat, Gobioff & Leung





The Need

Component failures normal

- Due to clustered computing
- Files are huge
 - By traditional standards (many TB)
- Most mutations are mutations
 - Not random access overwrite
- > Co-Designing apps & file system
- > Typical: 1000 nodes & 300 TB

Desiderata

- Must monitor & recover from comp failures
- Modest number of large files
- > Workload
 - Large streaming reads + small random reads
 - Many large sequential writes
 - Random access overwrites don't need to be efficient
- Need semantics for concurrent appends
- > High sustained bandwidth
 - More important than low latency



Interface

- Familiar
 - > Create, delete, open, close, read, write
- Novel
 - Snapshot
 - Low cost
 - Record append
 - Atomicity with multiple concurrent writes





Architecture

- Store all files
 - In fixed-size chucks
 - > 64 MB
 - > 64 bit unique handle
- > Triple redundancy



UC RIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



Architecture

Master

- Stores all metadata
 - Namespace
 - Access-control information
 - Chunk locations
 - 'Lease' management
- Heartbeats
- Having one master → global knowledge
 - Allows better placement / replication
 - Simplifies design



Architecture



UNIVER SITU DE CALIFORNIA FRIVERSEE d chunk size, translate filename & EN ERSIDE

byte offset to chunk index. Send request to master





UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE













No need to talk more About this 64MB chunk Until cached info expires or file reopened









Metadata

- Master stores three types
 - File & chunk namespaces
 - > Mapping from files \rightarrow chunks
 - Location of chunk replicas
- Stored in memory
- Kept persistent thru logging



Consistency Model

	Write	Record Append
Serial	defined	defined
success		interspersed with
Concurrent	consistent	in consistent
successes	but <i>undefined</i>	
Failure	inconsistent	

Consistent = all clients see same data



Consistency Model

	Wri	te	Record Append
Serial	defi	ned	defined
success			interspersed with
Concurrent	Cr	sistent	in consistent
successes		undefined	
Failure	P	inco	nsistent

Defined = consistent + clients see full effect of mutation Key: all replicas must process chunk-mutation requests in *same order*



Consistency Model

	Write	Record Append
Serial	defined	defined
success		interspersed with
Concurrent	consistent	in consistent
successes	but <i>undefined</i>	
Failure	inconsistent	

Different clients may see different data



Implications

- > Apps must rely on appends, not overwrites
- Must write records that
 - Self-validate
 - Self-identify
- Typical uses
 - Single writer writes file from beginning to end, then renames file (or checkpoints along way)
 - Many writers concurrently append
 - At-least-once semantics ok
 - Reader deal with padding & duplicates



Leases & Mutation Order

> Objective

- > Ensure data consistent & defined
- Minimize load on master
- Master grants 'lease' to one replica
 - Called 'primary' chunkserver
- > Primary serializes all mutation requests
 - Communicates order to replicas



Write Control & Dataflow





Atomic Appends

- As in last slide, but...
- Primary also checks to see if append spills over into new chunk
 - If so, pads old chunk to full extent
 - Tells secondary chunk-servers to do the same
 - > Tells client to try append again on *next* chunk
- > Usually works because
 - max(append-size) < ¼ chunk-size [API rule]</p>
 - (meanwhile other clients may be appending)



Other Issues

- Fast snapshot
- Master operation
 - Namespace management & locking
 - Replica placement & rebalancing
 - Garbage collection (deleted / stale files)
 - > Detecting stale replicas



Master Replication

- Master log & checkpoints replicated
- > Outside monitor watches master livelihood
 - Starts new master process as needed
- Shadow masters
 - Provide read-access when primary is down
 - Lag state of true master



Read Performance



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE



Write Performance





Record-Append Performance

