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Transparency in Distributed Systems

• Programmers accustomed to writing code for a single box

• Transparency: retain “feel” of writing for one box, when writing code that runs distributedly

• Goals:
  – Preserve original, unmodified client code
  – Preserve original, unmodified server code
  – RPC should glue together client and server without changing behavior of either
  – Programmer shouldn’t have to think about network
Transparency in Distributed Systems

How achievable is true transparency? We will use NFS as a case study. But first, an introduction to RPC itself.

Goals:
- Preserve original, unmodified client code
- Preserve original, unmodified server code
- RPC should glue together client and server without changing behavior of either
- Programmer shouldn’t have to think about network
Remote Procedure Call: Central Idea

- Within a single program, running on a single box, well-known notion of procedure call (aka function call):
  - Caller pushes arguments onto stack
  - Jumps to address of callee function
  - Callee reads arguments from stack
  - Callee executes, puts return value in register
  - Callee returns to next instruction in caller

- RPC aim: let distributed programming look no different from local procedure calls
RPC Abstraction

• Library makes an API available to locally running applications
• Let servers **export** their local APIs to be accessible over the network, as well
• On client, procedure call generates request over network to server
• On server, called procedure executes, result returned in response to client
RPC Implementation Details

- Data types may be different sizes on different machines (e.g., 32-bit vs. 64-bit integers)
- Little-endian vs. big-endian machines
  - Big-endian: 0x11223344 is 0x11, 0x22, 0x33, 0x44
  - Little-endian is 0x44, 0x33, 0x22, 0x11
- Need mechanism to pass procedure parameters and return values in machine-independent fashion
- Solution: Interface Description Language (IDL)
Interface Description Languages

• Compile interface description, produces:
  – Types in native language (e.g., Java, C, C++)
  – Code to marshal native data types into machine-neutral byte streams for network (and vice-versa)
  – Stub routines on client to forward local procedure calls as requests to server

• For Sun RPC, IDL is XDR (eXternal Data Representation)
Example: Sun RPC and XDR

• Define API for procedure calls between client and server in XDR file, e.g., proto.x
• Compile: rpcgen proto.x, producing
  – proto.h: RPC procedure prototypes, argument and return value data structure definitions
  – proto_clnt.c: per-procedure client stub code to send RPC request to remote server
  – proto_svc.c: server stub code to dispatch RPC request to specified procedure
  – proto_xdr.c: argument and result marshaling/unmarshaling routines, host-network/network-host byte order conversions
Example: Sun RPC and XDR

- Define API for procedure calls between client and server in XDR file, e.g., `proto.x`
- Compile: `rpcgen proto.x`, producing
  - `proto.h`: RPC procedure prototypes, argument and return value data structure definitions
  - `proto_svc.c`: server stub code to dispatch RPC request to specified procedure
  - `proto_xdr.c`: argument and result marshaling/unmarshaling routines, host-network/network-host byte order conversions

Let’s consider a simple example...
Sun RPC and XDR: Programming Caveats

• Server routine return values must always be pointers (e.g., `int *`, not `int`) – should declare return value static in server routine

• Arguments to server-side procedures are pointers to temporary storage – to store arguments beyond procedure end, must copy data, not merely pointers
  – in these cases, typically allocate memory for copy of argument using `malloc()`

• If new to C, useful background in Mark Handley’s “C for Java programmers” tutorial:
  – § 2.9 – 2.13 describe memory allocation
Sun RPC and XDR: Programming Caveats

• Server routine return values must always be pointers (e.g., int *, not int)
  – should declare return value static in server routine

• Arguments to server-side procedures are pointers to temporary storage
  – to store arguments beyond procedure end, must copy

Now, back to our NFS case study...

• If new to C, useful background in Mark Handley’s “C for Java programmers” tutorial:
  – § 2.9 – 2.13 describe memory allocation
“Non-Distributed” NFS

- Applications
- Syscalls
- Kernel filesystem implementation
- Local disk

- RPC must “split up” the above
- Where does NFS make the split?
NFS Structure on Client

- NFS splits client at vnode interface, below syscall implementation
- Client-side NFS code essentially stubs for system calls:
  - Package up arguments, send them to server
NFS and Syntactic Transparency

• Does NFS preserve the syntax of the client function call API (as seen by applications)?
  – Yes!
    – Arguments and return values of system calls not changed in form or meaning
NFS and Server-Side Transparency

• Does NFS require changes to pre-existing filesystem code on server?
  – Some, but not much.
  – NFS adds in-kernel threads (to block on I/O, much like user-level processes do)
  – Server filesystem implementation changes:
    • File handles over wire, not file descriptors
    • Generation numbers added to on-disk i-nodes
    • User IDs carried as arguments, rather than implicit in process owner
    • Support for synchronous updates (e.g., for WRITE)
NFS and File System Semantics
NFS and File System Semantics

• You don’t get transparency merely by preserving the same API
• System calls must mean the same thing!
  • If they don’t, pre-existing code may compile and run, but yield incorrect results!
• Does NFS preserve the UNIX filesystem’s semantics?
  • No! Let us count the ways...
NFS’s New Semantics: Server Failure

- On one box, open() only fails if file doesn’t exist
- Now open() and all other syscalls can fail if server has died!
  - Apps must know how to retry or fail gracefully
- **Or** open() could hang forever—never the case before!
  - Apps must know how to set own timeouts if don’t want to hang
- **This is not** a quirk of NFS—it’s fundamental!
NFS’s New Semantics: close() Might Fail

• Suppose server out of disk space
• But client WRITEs asynchronously, only on close(), for performance
• Client waits in close() for WRITEs to finish
• close() never returns error for local fs!
  – Apps must check not only write(), but also close(), for disk full!

• Reason: NFS batches WRITEs
  – If WRITEs were synchronous, close() couldn’t fill disk, but performance would be awful
NFS’s New Semantics: Errors Returned for Successful Operations

- Suppose you call `rename("a", "b")` on file in NFS-mounted fs
- Suppose server completes RENAME, crashes before replying
- NFS client resends RENAME
- "a" doesn’t exist; error returned!
- **Never happens on local fs…**
- Side effect of statelessness of NFS server:
  - Server could remember all ops it’s completed, but that’s hard
  - Must keep that state consistent and persistent across crashes (i.e., on disk)!
  - Update the state first, or perform the operation first?
NFS’s New Semantics: Deletion of Open Files

- Client A open()s file for reading
- Client B deletes it while A has it open
- Local UNIX fs: A’s subsequent reads work
- NFS: A’s subsequent reads fail
- Side effect of statelessness of NFS server:
  - Could have fixed this—server could track open()s
  - AFS tracks state required to solve this problem
Semantics vs. Performance

• Insight: preserving semantics produces poor performance
• e.g., for write() to local fs, UNIX can delay actual write to disk
  – Gather writes to multiple adjacent blocks, and so write them with one disk seek
  – If box crashes, you lose both the running app and its dirty buffers in memory
• Can we delay WRITEs in this way on NFS server?
NFS Server and WRITE Semantics

• Suppose WRITE RPC stores client data in buffer in memory, returns success to client
• Now server crashes and reboots
  – App doesn’t crash—in fact, doesn’t notice!
  – And written data mysteriously disappear!
• Solution: NFS server does synchronous WRITEs
  – Doesn’t reply to WRITE RPC until data on disk
  – If write() returns on client, even if server crashes, data safe on disk
  – Per previous lecture: 3 seeks, 45 ms, 22 WRITES/s, 180 KB/s max throughput!
  – < 10% of max disk throughput
• NFS v3 and AFS fix this problem (more complex)
Semantics vs. Performance (2)

• Insight: 

  improving performance changes consistency semantics!

• Suppose clients cache disk blocks when they read them

• But writes always go through to server

• Not enough to get consistency!
  – Write editor buffer on one box, make on other
  – Do make/compiler see changes?

• Ask server “has file changed?” at every read()?
  – Almost as slow as just reading from server...
NFS: Semantics vs. Performance

- NFS’ solution: close-to-open consistency
  - Ask server “has file changed?” at each open()
  - Don’t ask on each read() after open()
  - If B changes file while A has it open, A doesn’t see changes
- OK for emacs/make, but not always what you want:
  - make > make.log (on server)
  - tail -f make.log (on my desktop)
- Side effect of statelessness of NFS server
  - Server could track who has cached blocks on reads
  - Send “invalidate” messages to clients on changes
Security Radically Different
Security Radically Different

- Local system: UNIX enforces read/write protections per-user
  - Can’t read my files without my password
- How does NFS server authenticate user?
- Easy to send requests to NFS server, and to forge NFS replies to client
- Does it help for server to look at source IP address?
- **So why aren’t NFS servers ridiculously vulnerable?**
  - Hard to guess correct file handles!
Security Radically Different

- Local system: UNIX enforces read/write protections per-user
  - Can’t read my files without my password
- How does NFS server authenticate user?
- Easy to send requests to NFS server, and to forge NFS replies to client
- Does it help for server to look at source IP address?

Fixable: SFS, AFS, some NFS versions use cryptography to authenticate client

Very hard to reconcile with statelessness!
NFS Still Very Useful

• People fix programs to handle new semantics
  – Must mean NFS useful enough to motivate them to do so!
• People install firewalls for security
• NFS still gives many advantages of transparent client/server
Multi-Module Distributed Systems

• NFS in fact rather simple:
  – One server, one data type (file handle)
• What if symmetric interaction, many data types?
• Say you build system with three modules in one address space:
  – Web front end, customer DB, order DB
• Represent user connections with object:
  ```
  class connection {
    int fd; int state; char *buf;
  }
  ```
• Easy to pass object references among three modules (e.g., pointer to current connection)
Multi-Module Distributed Systems

- NFS in fact rather simple:
  - One server, one data type (file handle)
- What if symmetric interaction, many data types?

What if we split system into three separate servers?

- Web front end, customer DB, order DB

- Represent user connections with object:
  ```
  class connection {
    int fd; int state; char *buf;
  }
  ```

- Easy to pass object references among three modules (e.g., pointer to current connection)
Multi-Module Systems: Challenges

• How do you pass class connection between servers?
  – Could RPC stub just send object’s elements?

• What if processing flow for connection goes: order DB -> customer DB -> front end to send reply?

• Front end only knows contents of passed connection object; underlying connection may have changed!

• Wanted to pass object references, not object contents

• NFS solution: file handles
  – No support from RPC to help with this!
RPC: Failure Happens

- New failure modes not seen in simple, same-host procedure calls:
  - Remote server failure
  - Communication (network) failure
- RPCs can return “failure” instead of results
- Possible failure outcomes:
  - Procedure didn’t execute
  - Procedure executed once
  - Procedure executed multiple times
  - Procedure partially executed
- Generally, “at most once” semantics preferred
Achieving At-Most-Once Semantics

• Risk: Request message lost
  – Client must retransmit requests when no reply received

• Risk: Reply message lost
  – Client may retransmit previously executed request
  – OK when operations idempotent; some aren’t, though (e.g., “charge customer”)
  – Server can keep “replay cache” to reply to repeated requests without re-executing them
Summary: RPC Non-Transparency

- Partial failure, network failure
- Latency
- Efficiency/semantics tradeoff
- Security—rarely transparent!
- Pointers: write-sharing, portable object references
- Concurrency (if multiple clients)

**Solutions:**
- Expose “remoteness” of RPC to application, or
- Work harder to achieve transparent RPC
Conclusions

• Of RPC’s goals, automatic marshaling most successful

• Mimicking procedure call interface in practice not so useful

• Attempt at full transparency mostly a failure!
  – (You can try hard: consider Java RMI)

• Next time: implicit communication through distributed shared memory!