Certifying a Crash-safe File System

Haogang Chen

Thesis Advisors Frans Kaashoek and Nickolai Zeldovich





File systems should not lose data

• People use file systems to store permanent data

File systems should not lose data

- People use file systems to store permanent data
- Computers can crash anytime
 - power failures
 - hardware failures (unplug USB drive)
 - software bugs



Windows

An error has occurred. To continue:

Press Enter to return to Windows, or

Press CTRL+ALT+DEL to restart your computer. If you do this, you will lose any unsaved information in all open applications.

Error: OE : 016F : BFF9B3D4

Press any key to continue

File systems should not lose data

- People use file systems to store permanent data
- Computers can crash anytime
 - power failures
 - hardware failures (unplug USB drive)
 - software bugs
- File systems should not lose or corrupt data in case of crashes



File systems are complex and have bugs

• Linux ext4: ~60,000 lines of code

File systems are complex and have bugs

• Linux ext4: ~60,000 lines of code



Cumulative number of bug patches in Linux file systems [Lu et al., FAST'13]

File systems are complex and have bugs

- Linux ext4: ~60,000 lines of code
- Some bugs are serious: data loss, security exploits, etc.



Cumulative number of bug patches in Linux file systems [Lu et al., FAST'13]

Researches in avoiding bugs in file systems

- Most research is on finding bugs
 - Crash injection (e.g., EXPLODE [OSDI'06])
 - Symbolic execution (e.g., EXE [Oakland'06])
 - Design modeling (e.g., in Alloy [ABZ'08])
- Some elimination of bugs by proving:
 - FS without directories [Arkoudas et al. 2004]
 - BilbyFS [Keller 2014]
 - UBIFS [Ernst et al. 2013]

Researches in avoiding bugs in file systems

- Most research is on finding bugs
 - Crash injection (e.g., EXPLODE [OSDI'06])
 - Symbolic execution (e.g., EXE [Oakland'06])
 - Design modeling (e.g., in Alloy [ABZ'08])
- Some elimination of bugs by proving:
 - FS without directories [Arkoudas et al. 2004]
 - BilbyFS [Keller 2014]
 - UBIFS [Ernst et al. 2013]

reduce # of bugs

Researches in avoiding bugs in file systems

- Most research is on finding bugs
 - Crash injection (e.g., EXPLODE [OSDI'06])
 - Symbolic execution (e.g., EXE [Oakland'06])
 - Design modeling (e.g., in Alloy [ABZ'08])
- Some elimination of bugs by proving:
 - FS without directories [Arkoudas et al. 2004]
 - BilbyFS [Keller 2014]
 - UBIFS [Ernst et al. 2013]

incomplete + no crashes

reduce # of bugs

Dealing with crashes is hard

- Crashes expose many partially-updated states
 - Reasoning about all failure cases is hard

Dealing with crashes is hard

- Crashes expose many partially-updated states
 - Reasoning about all failure cases is hard
- Performance optimizations lead to more tricky partial states
 - Disk I/O is expensive
 - Buffer updates in memory

Dealing with crashes is hard

- Crashes expose many partiallyupdated states
 - Reasoning about all failure cases is hard
- Performance

 optimizations lead
 to more tricky
 partial states
 - Disk I/O is expensive
 - Buffer updates in memory

A patch for Linux's write-ahead logging (jbd) in 2012: **"Is it safe to omit a disk write barrier here?"**

```
commit 353b67d8ced4dc53281c88150ad295e24bc4b4c5
Author: Jan Kara <jack@suse.cz>
       Sat Nov 26 00:35:39 2011 +0100
Date:
Title: jbd: Issue cache flush after checkpointing
     It's unlikely this will be necessary, ... but we
@@
     need this to guarantee correctness.
     Fortunately this function doesn't get called all
+
     that often.
       We need to make sure that any blocks that were recently writte
                                                                     out
       --- perhaps by log_do_checkpoint() --- a\ flushed out before we
       drop the transactions from the journal. It's unlikely this will be
      * necessary, especially with an appropriately sized journal, but we
     * need this to guarantee correctness. Fortunately
       cleanup_journal_tail() doesn't get called all that often.
      */
    if (journal->j flags & JFS BARRIER)
            blkdev issue flush(journal->j fs dev, GFP KERNEL, NULL);
    spin lock(&journal->j state lock);
    if (!tid gt(first tid, journal->j tail sequence)) {
            spin unlock(&journal->j state lock);
+
            /* Someone else cleaned up journal so return 0 */
            return 0;
    }
```

Goal: certify a file system under crashes

Goal: certify a file system under crashes

• **FSCQ**: first certified crash-safe file system



A complete file system with a machine-checkable proof that its implementation meets its specification, both under normal execution and under any sequence of crashes, including crashes during recovery.

Contributions

- CHL: Crash Hoare Logic
 - Specification framework for crash-safety of storage
 - Crash condition and recovery semantics
 - Automation to reduce proof effort
- **FSCQ**: the first certified crash-safe file system
 - Basic Unix-like file system (no hard-links, no concurrency)
 - Precise specification for the core subset of POSIX
 - I/O performance on par with Linux ext4
 - CPU overhead is high

FSCQ (written in Coq)

Crash Hoare Logic (CHL) Top-level specification Internal specifications Program Proof







Linux kernel

/dev/sda



Linux kernel

[/]dev/sda

FSCQ's Trusted Computing Base



Linux kernel

[/]dev/sda

Outline

- Crash safety
 - What is the correct behavior after a crash?
- Challenge 1: formalizing crashes
 - Crash Hoare Logic (CHL)
- Challenge 2: incorporating performance optimizations
 - Disk sequences
- Building a complete file system
- Evaluation

- What guarantee should file system provide when it crashes and reboot?
- Look it up in the POSIX standard?

POSIX is vague about crash behavior

[...] a power failure [...] can cause data to be lost. The data may be associated with a file that is still open, with one that has been closed, with a directory, or with any other internal system data structures associated with permanent storage. This data can be lost, in whole or part, so that only careful inspection of file contents could determine that an update did not occur.

IEEE Std 1003.1, 2013 Edition

POSIX is vague about crash behavior

[...] a power failure [...] can cause data to be lost. The data may be associated with a file that is still open, with one that has been closed, with a directory, or with any other internal system data structures associated with permanent storage. This data can be lost, in whole or part, so that only careful inspection of file contents could determine that an update did not occur.

IEEE Std 1003.1, 2013 Edition

- POSIX's goal was to specify "common-denominator" behavior
- Gives freedom to file systems to implement their own optimizations

- What guarantee should file system provide when it crashes and reboot?
- Look it up in the POSIX standard? (Too Vague)

- What guarantee should file system provide when it crashes and reboot?
- Look it up in the POSIX standard? (Too Vague)
- A simple and useful definition is transactional
 - Atomicity: every file-system call is all-or-nothing
 - **Durability**: every call persists on disk when it returns

- What guarantee should file system provide when it crashes and reboot?
- Look it up in the POSIX standard? (Too Vague)
- A simple and useful definition is transactional
 - Atomicity: every file-system call is all-or-nothing
 - **Durability**: every call persists on disk when it returns
- Run every file-system call inside a transaction, using write-ahead logging.



→ log_begin()

Disk		0	Log
------	--	---	-----



- ⇒ log_write(2, 'a')
- ⇒ log_write(8, 'b')
- → log_write(5, 'c')

1. Append writes to the log

Disk		0	2 a	8 b	5 c	Log
------	--	---	--------	--------	--------	-----

- → log_begin()
- ⇒ log_write(2, 'a')
- → log_write(8, 'b')
- ⇒ log_write(5, 'c')
- → log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record

Disk	3	2 a	8 b	5 c	Log
------	---	--------	--------	--------	-----

- → log_begin()
- ➡ log_write(2, 'a')
- ⇒ log_write(8, 'b')
- \rightarrow log_write(5, 'c')
- ➡ log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record
- 3. Apply the log to disk locations



- → log_begin()
- ➡ log_write(2, 'a')
- → log_write(8, 'b')
- \rightarrow log_write(5, 'c')
- \rightarrow log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record
- 3. Apply the log to disk locations
- 4. Truncate the log

Disk	a	à	с		b		0	Log
------	---	---	---	--	---	--	---	-----

- → log_begin()
- ➡ log_write(2, 'a')
- → log_write(8, 'b')
- \rightarrow log_write(5, 'c')
- \rightarrow log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record
- 3. Apply the log to disk locations
- 4. Truncate the log

Disk	a	a	С		b		0	Log
------	---	---	---	--	---	--	---	-----

• **Recovery**: after crash, replay (apply) any **committed** transaction in the log
Write-ahead logging

- → log_begin()
- ⇒ log_write(2, 'a')
- \rightarrow log_write(8, 'b')
- \rightarrow log_write(5, 'c')
- \rightarrow log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record
- 3. Apply the log to disk locations
- 4. Truncate the log

Disk		а		с		b		0	Log
------	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	-----

- **Recovery**: after crash, replay (apply) any **committed** transaction in the log
- Atomicity: either all writes appear on disk or none do

Write-ahead logging

- → log_begin()
- ⇒ log_write(2, 'a')
- \rightarrow log_write(8, 'b')
- \rightarrow log_write(5, 'c')
- \rightarrow log_commit()

- 1. Append writes to the log
- 2. Set commit record
- 3. Apply the log to disk locations
- 4. Truncate the log

Disk		а		с		b		0	Log
------	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	-----

- **Recovery**: after crash, replay (apply) any **committed** transaction in the log
- Atomicity: either all writes appear on disk or none do
- **Durability**: all changes are persisted on disk when log_commit() returns

```
def create(dir, name):
    log_begin()
    newfile = allocate_inode()
    newfile.init()
    dir.add(name, newfile)
    log_commit()
```

... after crash ...

def create(dir, name):
 log_begin()
 newfile = allocate_inode()
 newfile.init()
 dir.add(name, newfile)
 log_commit()

def log_recover():
 if committed:
 log_apply()
 log_truncate()

... after crash ...

def create(dir, name):
 log_begin()
 newfile = allocate_inode()
 newfile.init()
 dir.add(name, newfile)
 log_commit()

def log_recover():
 if committed:
 log_apply()
 log_truncate()

• Q: How to formally define what happens when the computer crashes?

... after crash ...

def create(dir, name):
 log_begin()
 newfile = allocate_inode()
 newfile.init()
 dir.add(name, newfile)
 log_commit()

def log_recover():
 if committed:
 log_apply()
 log_truncate()

- Q: How to formally define what happens when the computer crashes?
- Q: How to formally specify the behavior of "create" in presence of crash and recovery?

Approach: Crash Hoare Logic

{pre} code {post}

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PRE $a \mapsto v_0$ POST $a \mapsto v$

Approach: Crash Hoare Logic

{pre} code {post}
 {crash}

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PRE $a \mapsto v_0$ POST $a \mapsto v$ CRASH $a \mapsto v_0 \lor a \mapsto v$

• Crash condition: all intermediate disk states (plus two end-states)

Approach: Crash Hoare Logic

{pre} code {post}
 {crash}

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PRE $a \mapsto v_0$ POST $a \mapsto v$ CRASH $a \mapsto v_0 \lor a \mapsto v$

- Crash condition: all intermediate disk states (plus two end-states)
- CHL's disk model matches what most other file systems assume:
 - Writing a single block is an atomic operation, no data corruption





- For performance, hard drive caches writes in its internal volatile buffer
 - Writes **do not persist** immediately





- For performance, hard drive caches writes in its internal volatile buffer
 - Writes **do not persist** immediately
- Disk flushes the buffer to media in background
 - Writes might be **reordered**





- For performance, hard drive caches writes in its internal volatile buffer
 - Writes **do not persist** immediately
- Disk flushes the buffer to media in background
 - Writes might be **reordered**
- Use write barrier (disk_sync) to force flushing the buffer
 - Make data persistent & enforce ordering
 - Disk syncs are expensive!





• **Challenge**: when crashes, the disk might lose **some** of the recent writes

• Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

a → 0, b → 0
disk_write(a, 1)
disk_write(b, 2)
disk_write(a, 3)

• **Challenge**: when crashes, the disk might lose **some** of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

disk_write(a, 3)

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

• Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

- disk_write(a, 3)
- Idea: use value-sets: $a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$
 - **Read** returns the latest value:
 - Write adds a value to the set:
 - **Sync** discards previous values:
 - **Reboot** chooses a random value:

 Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

- a → 0, b → 0 disk_write(a, 1) disk_write(b, 2)
- disk_write(a, 3)
- Idea: use value-sets: $a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$
 - Read returns the latest value:

V₀

- Write adds a value to the set:
- **Sync** discards previous values:
- **Reboot** chooses a random value:

 Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

- Idea: use value-sets: $a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$
 - **Read** returns the latest value:
 - Write adds a value to the set:
 - **Sync** discards previous values:
 - **Reboot** chooses a random value:

 v_0 $a\mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\}\cup vs
angle$

a → 0, b → 0
disk_write(a, 1)
disk_write(b, 2)
disk_write(a, 3)

 Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

- Idea: use value-sets: $a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$
 - **Read** returns the latest value:
 - Write adds a value to the set:
 - **Sync** discards previous values:
 - **Reboot** chooses a random value:

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{v}_0\\ a\mapsto \langle \mathsf{v},\,\{\mathsf{v}_0\}\cup\mathsf{v}s\rangle\\ a\mapsto \langle \mathsf{v}_0,\,\varnothing\rangle \end{array}$

• Challenge: when crashes, the disk might lose some of the recent writes

Q: What are the possible disk states if crashing after the 3 writes?

A: 6 cases: $a \mapsto 0$ or 1 or 3, $b \mapsto 0$ or 2

- Idea: use value-sets: $a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$
 - **Read** returns the latest value:
 - Write adds a value to the set:
 - **Sync** discards previous values:
 - **Reboot** chooses a random value:

 $\begin{array}{l} \mathsf{v}_{0} \\ a \mapsto \langle \mathsf{v}, \, \{\mathsf{v}_{0}\} \cup \mathsf{v}s \rangle \\ a \mapsto \langle \mathsf{v}_{0}, \, \varnothing \rangle \\ a \mapsto \langle \mathsf{v}', \, \varnothing \rangle, \, \, \mathsf{v}' \in \{\mathsf{v}_{0}\} \cup \mathsf{v}s \end{array}$

 $a \mapsto 0, b \mapsto 0$

disk_write(a, 1)

disk_write(b, 2)

disk_write(a, 3)

CHL asynchronous disk model

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PREdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$ POSTdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$ CRASHdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle \lor$ $a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$

CHL asynchronous disk model

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PREdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$ POSTdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$ CRASHdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle \lor$ $a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$

Specifications for disk_write, disk_read, and disk_sync are axioms

CHL asynchronous disk model

SPECdisk_write (a, v)PREdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle$ POSTdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$ CRASHdisk $\models a \mapsto \langle v_0, vs \rangle \lor$ $a \mapsto \langle v, \{v_0\} \cup vs \rangle$

- Specifications for disk_write, disk_read, and disk_sync are axioms
- "disk |= ..." means the disk address space entails the predicate













- Each abstraction layer forms an address space
- **Representation invariants** connect logical states between layers



Example: representation invariant

```
SPEClog_write (a, v)PREold_state\models a \mapsto v_0POSTnew_state\models a \mapsto v
```

old_state and new_state are "logical disks" exposed by the logging system

Example: representation invariant

- SPEC log_write (*a*, *v*)
- PRE disk $\models \log_rep$ (ActiveTxn, start_state, old_state) old_state $\models a \mapsto v_0$
- **POST** disk $\models \log_rep$ (ActiveTxn, start_state, new_state) new_state $\models a \mapsto v$

CRASH disk |= **log_rep** (ActiveTxn, *start_state*, *any_state*)

- old_state and new_state are "logical disks" exposed by the logging system
- log_rep connects transaction state to an on-disk representation
- Describes the log's on-disk layout using many \mapsto primitives

• **bmap**: return the block address at a given offset for an inode

```
def bmap(inode, bnum):
    if bnum >= NDIRECT:
        indirect = log_read(inode.blocks[NDIRECT])
        return indirect[bnum - NDIRECT]
    else:
        return inode.blocks[bnum]
```

• **bmap**: return the block address at a given offset for an inode



• Follow the control flow graph



- Follow the control flow graph
- Need pre/post/crash conditions for each called procedure


Certifying procedures

- Follow the control flow graph
- Need pre/post/crash conditions for each called procedure
- Chain pre- and postconditions, forming proof obligations



Certifying procedures

- Follow the control flow graph
- Need pre/post/crash conditions for each called procedure
- Chain pre- and postconditions, forming **proof obligations**
- CHL: combines crash conditions, get more proof obligations



Proof automation

• CHL follows the CFG, and generates proof obligations



Proof automation

- CHL follows the CFG, and generates proof obligations
- CHL solves trivial obligations automatically (common case)



Proof automation

- CHL follows the CFG, and generates proof obligations
- CHL solves trivial obligations automatically (common case)
- Remaining proof effort: changing **representation invariants**
 - Show that rep invariant holds at entry and exit



SPECcreate (dnum, fn)PREdisk $\models log_rep(NoTxn, start_state)$
start_state $\models dir_rep(tree) \land$
 $\exists path, tree[path].node = dnum \land$
 $fn \notin tree[path]$

SPECcreate (dnum, fn)PREdisk $\models \log_rep(NoTxn, start_state)$
start_state $\models dir_rep(tree) \land$
 $\exists path, tree[path].node = dnum \land$
 $fn \notin tree[path]POSTdisk <math>\models \log_rep(NoTxn, new_state)$
new_state $\models dir_rep(new_tree) \land$
 $new_tree = tree.update(path, fn, EmptyFile)$

SPEC create (dnum, fn) PRE **disk** = log_rep(NoTxn, start_state) **start_state** |= dir_rep(*tree*) ∧ \exists path, tree[path].node = dnum \land fn \notin tree[path] **disk** |= log_rep(NoTxn, *new_state*) POST **new_state** |= dir_rep(*new_tree*) \land *new_tree = tree.update(path, fn, EmptyFile)* **CRASH** disk = log_rep(NoTxn, start_state) \lor log_rep(NoTxn, *new_state*) ∨ log_rep(ActiveTxn, start_state, any_state) V log_rep(CommittingTxn, start_state, new_state)



would_recover_either (start_state, new_state)

SPEC create (dnum, fn)
PRE disk ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, start_state)
start_state ⊨ dir_rep(tree) ∧
 ∃ path, tree[path].node = dnum ∧
 fn ∉ tree[path]
POST disk ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, new_state)
 new_state ⊨ dir_rep(new_tree) ∧
 new_tree = tree.update(path, fn, EmptyFile)
CRASH disk ⊨ would_recover_either (start_state, new_state)

Specifying log recovery

- **PRE disk** |= **would_recover_either** (*last_state*, *committed_state*)
- **POST disk** ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, *last_state*) ∨

log_rep(NoTxn, committed_state)

CRASH disk |= **would_recover_either** (*last_state*, *committed_state*)

Specifying log recovery

- log_recover() is idempotent:
 - Crash condition implies its own precondition
 - OK to run log_recover() again after a crash in itself









• Whenever **bmap (or log_recover)** crashes, run **log_recover** after reboot

End-to-end specification

SPEC create (drum, fn) ⋈ log_recover ()
PRE disk ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, start_state)
start_state ⊨ dir_rep(tree) ∧
 ∃ path, tree[path].node = drum ∧
 fn ∉ tree[path]
POST disk ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, new_state)
new_state ⊨ dir_rep(new_tree) ∧
 new_tree = tree.update(path, fn, EmptyFile)
RECOVER disk ⊨ log_rep(NoTxn, new_state) ∨
 log_rep(NoTxn, new_state)

- create() is atomic, if log_recover() runs after every crash
- POST is stronger than RECOVER

CHL summary

- Key ideas: crash conditions and recovery semantics
- CHL benefit: enables precise failure specifications
 - Allows for automatic chaining of pre/post/crash conditions
 - Reduces proof burden
- CHL cost: must write crash condition for every function, loop, etc.
 - Crash conditions are often simple (above logging layer)

Outline

- Crash safety
 - What is the correct behavior after a crash?

Challenge 1: formalizing crashes

- Crash Hoare Logic (CHL)
- Challenge 2: incorporating performance optimizations
 - Disk sequences
- Building a complete file system
- Evaluation

FSCQ implements many optimizations

• Group commit

- Buffer transactions in memory, and flush them in a single batch
- Relax durability guarantee
- Log-bypass writes
 - File data writes go to the disk (buffer cache) directly
- Log checksums
 - Checksum log entries to reduce write barriers
- Deferred apply
 - Apply the log only when the log is full



 Each file-system call forms a transaction, and are buffered in the transaction cache



- ⇒ mkdir('d')
- ⇒ create('d/a')
- → rename('d/a', 'd/b')
- Each file-system call forms a transaction, and are buffered in the transaction cache



- ⇒ mkdir('d')
- ⇒ create('d/a')
- → rename('d/a', 'd/b')
- → fsync('d')

- Each file-system call forms a transaction, and are buffered in the transaction cache
- 2. fsync() flushes cached transactions to the on-disk log in a batch
 - Preserve order



Challenge: formalizing group commit

- Many more crash states (e.g., before or after mkdir())
- On-disk state can be irrelevant to create() itself, but to some previous operations

```
SPECcreate (dnum, fn)<br/>disk \models \log\_rep(NoTxn, start\_state)<br/>start\_state \models dir\_rep(tree) \land<br/>\exists path, tree[path].node = dnum \land<br/>fn \notin tree[path]\bullet \mkdir(`d`)<br/>\bullet \create(`d/a')POSTdisk \models \log\_rep(NoTxn, new\_state)<br/>new\_state \models dir\_rep(new\_tree) \land<br/>new\_tree = tree.update(path, fn, Empty)CRASHdisk \models \would\_recover\_either(start\_state, new\_state)
```





• Each (cached) system call adds a new logical disk to the sequence



- Each (cached) system call adds a new logical disk to the sequence
- Each logical disk has a corresponding tree



- Each (cached) system call adds a new logical disk to the sequence
- Each logical disk has a corresponding tree
- Capture the idea that metadata updates must be ordered



New specification with disk sequence

SPECcreate (dnum, fn)PREdisk \models log_rep(NoTxn, disk_seq)
disk_seq.latest \models dir_rep(tree) \land
 \exists path, tree[path].node = dnum \land
fn \notin tree[path]POSTdisk \models log_rep(NoTxn, disk_seq ++ {new_state})
new_state \models dir_rep(new_tree) \land
new_tree = tree.update(path, fn, EmptyFile)CRASHdisk \models would_recover_any (disk_seq ++ {new_state})

• Specification isn't more complicated

Specification for fsync on directories

• After fsync(), there is only one possible on-disk state (the latest one)

Formalization techniques for optimizations



- **Disk sequences**: captures ordered metadata updates
- Log-bypass writes
 - **Disk relations**: enforces safety w.r.t. metadata updates
- Log checksums
 - Checksum model: soundly reasons about hash collision

Outline

- Crash safety
 - What is the correct behavior after a crash?
- Challenge 1: formalizing crashes
 - Crash Hoare Logic (CHL)
- Challenge 2: incorporating performance optimizations
 - Disk sequences
- Building a complete file system
- Evaluation

FSCQ: building a complete file system

• File system design is close to v6 Unix (+ logging)


- File system design is close to v6 Unix (+ logging)
- Implementation aims to reduce proof effort



- File system design is close to v6 Unix (+ logging)
- Implementation aims to reduce proof effort
 - Many precise internal abstraction layers
 - e.g., split File and Inode



- File system design is close to v6 Unix (+ logging)
- Implementation aims to reduce proof effort
 - Many precise internal abstraction layers
 - e.g., split File and Inode
 - Reuse proven components
 - e.g., general bitmap allocator



- File system design is close to v6 Unix (+ logging)
- Implementation aims to reduce proof effort
 - Many precise internal abstraction layers
 - e.g., split File and Inode
 - Reuse proven components
 - e.g., general bitmap allocator
 - Simpler specifications
 - e.g., no hard link \Rightarrow tree spec



Evaluation

- What bugs do FSCQ's theorems eliminate?
- How much development effort is required for FSCQ?
- How well does FSCQ perform?

Does FSCQ eliminate bugs?

- One data point: once theorems proven, no implementation bugs in proven code
 - Did find some mistakes in spec, as a result of end-to-end checks
 - E.g., forgot to specify that extending a file should zero-fill

Does FSCQ eliminate bugs?

- One data point: once theorems proven, no implementation bugs in proven code
 - Did find some mistakes in spec, as a result of end-to-end checks
 - E.g., forgot to specify that extending a file should zero-fill
- Systematic study
 - Categorize bugs from Linux kernel's patch history
 - Manually examine if FSCQ can eliminate bugs in each category

FSCQ's theorems eliminate many bugs

Bug category	Prevented?	
Mistakes in logging logic e.g., combining incompatible optimizations		
Misuse of logging API e.g., releasing indirect block in two transactions	 Image: A set of the set of the	
Mistakes in recovery protocol e.g., issuing write barrier in the wrong order		
Improper corner-case handling e.g., running out of blocks during rename		

FSCQ's theorems eliminate many bugs

Bug category	Prevented?		
Mistakes in logging logic e.g., combining incompatible optimizations			
Misuse of logging API e.g., releasing indirect block in two transactions			
Mistakes in recovery protocol e.g., issuing write barrier in the wrong order			
Improper corner-case handling e.g., running out of blocks during rename			
Low-level bugs e.g., double free, integer overflow	Some (memory safe)		
Returning incorrect error code	Some		

FSCQ's theorems eliminate many bugs

Bug category	Prevented?			
Mistakes in logging logic e.g., combining incompatible optimizations				
Misuse of logging API e.g., releasing indirect block in two transactions				
Mistakes in recovery protocol e.g., issuing write barrier in the wrong order				
Improper corner-case handling e.g., running out of blocks during rename	 Image: A set of the set of the			
Low-level bugs e.g., double free, integer overflow	Some (memory safe)			
Returning incorrect error code	Some			
Concurrency	Not supported			
Security	Not supported			

Development effort

- Total of ~50,000 lines of verified code, specs, and proofs in Coq
 - > 50% reusable infrastructure



Development effort

- Total of ~50,000 lines of verified code, specs, and proofs in Coq
 - > 50% reusable infrastructure
- Comparison: ext4 has ~60,000 lines of C code (many more features)



Development effort

- Total of ~50,000 lines of verified code, specs, and proofs in Coq
 - > 50% reusable infrastructure
- Comparison: ext4 has ~60,000 lines of C code (many more features)
- What's the cost of adding new features to FSCQ?





- Indirect blocks:
 - + 1,500 lines in Inode



- Indirect blocks:
 - + 1,500 lines in Inode
- Write-back buffer cache:
 - + 2300 lines beneath log
 ~ 600 lines in rest of FSCQ



- Indirect blocks:
 - + 1,500 lines in Inode
- Write-back buffer cache:
 - + 2300 lines beneath log
 ~ 600 lines in rest of FSCQ
- Group commit:
 - + 1800 lines in Log
 ~ 100 lines in rest of FSCQ



- Indirect blocks:
 - + 1,500 lines in Inode
- Write-back buffer cache:
 - + 2300 lines beneath log
 ~ 600 lines in rest of FSCQ
- Group commit:
 - + 1800 lines in Log
 ~ 100 lines in rest of FSCQ
- Changed lines include code, specs and proofs



Performance comparison

- File-system-intensive workload
 - LFS "largefile" benchmark
 - mailbench, a qmail-like mail server
- Compare with ext4 (non-certified) in default mode
 - Mount option: async,data=ordered
 - Use FUSE to forward and serialize requests (disable concurrency)
- Running on an hard disk on a desktop
 - Quad-core Intel i7-980X 3.33 GHz / 24 GB / Hitachi HDS721010CLA332
 - Linux 3.11 / GHC 8.0.1 / all file systems run on a separate partition

FSCQ Performance



- FSCQ's CPU overhead is high
- FSCQ's I/O performance is on par with ext4

FSCQ Performance



Number of disk I/Os per operation

	largefile		mailbench	
	write	sync	write	sync
FSCQ	1.0	1.0	50.0	9.8
ext4	1.0	1.0	38.0	12.3

- FSCQ's CPU overhead is high
- FSCQ's I/O performance is on par with ext4

Future directions

- Extracting to native code
 - Reduce both CPU overhead and TCB
- Certifying crash-safe applications
 - Use FSCQ's top-level spec to certify a mail server or a KV store
- Supporting concurrency
 - Run FSCQ in a multi-user environment
 - Exploit both I/O concurrency and parallelism

Conclusion

- CHL helps specify and prove crash safety
 - Crash conditions
 - Recovery execution semantics
- FSCQ: first certified crash-safe file system
 - Precise specification in presence of crashes
 - I/O performance on par with Linux ext4
 - Moderate development effort

Conclusion

- CHL helps specify and prove crash safety
 - Crash conditions
 - Recovery execution semantics
- FSCQ: first certified crash-safe file system
 - Precise specification in presence of crashes
 - I/O performance on par with Linux ext4
 - Moderate development effort



https://github.com/mit-pdos/fscq-impl