Metadata Efficiency in a
Comprehensive Versioning File System

Craig A.N. Soules, Garth R. Goodson, John D. Strunk, Gregory R. Ganger

May 2002
CMU-CS-02-145

School of Computer Science

Carnegie Mellon University

Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Abstract

A comprehensive versioning file system creates and retains a new file version for every WRITE *or other modification request. The resulting history of file modifications provides a detailed view to tools and administrators seeking to investigate a suspect system state. Conventional versioning systems do not efficiently record the many prior versions that result. In particular, the versioned metadata they keep consumes almost as much space as the versioned data. This paper examines two space-efficient metadata structures for versioning file systems and describes their integration into the Comprehensive Versioning File System (CVFS). Journal-based metadata encodes each metadata version into a single journal entry; CVFS uses this structure for inodes and indirect blocks, reducing the associated space requirements by 80%. Multiversion b-trees extend the per-entry key with a timestamp and keep current and historical entries in a single tree; CVFS uses this structure for directories, reducing the associated space requirements by 99%. Experiments with CVFS verify that its current-version performance is similar to that of non-versioning file systems. Although access to historical versions is slower than conventional versioning systems, checkpointing is shown to mitigate this effect.*

1 Introduction

Self-securing storage [41] is a new use for versioning in which storage servers internally retain file versions to provide detailed information for post-intrusion diagnosis and recovery of compromised client systems [40]. We envision self-securing storage servers that retain every version of every file, where every modification (e.g., a WRITE operation or an attribute change) creates a new version. Such *comprehensive versioning* maximizes the information available for post-intrusion diagnosis. Specifically, it avoids pruning away file versions, since this might obscure intruder actions (or allow them to be hidden). For self-securing storage, these *pruning techniques* are particularly dangerous when they rely on client-provided information, such as CLOSE operations—recall that the versioning is being done specifically to protect information from malicious clients.

Obviously, finite storage capacities will limit the duration of time over which comprehensive versioning is possible. To be effective for intrusion diagnosis and recovery, this duration must be greater than the intrusion detection latency (i.e., the time from an intrusion to when it is detected). We refer to the desired duration as the *detection window*. In practice, the duration is limited by the rate of data change and the space efficiency of the versioning system. The rate of data change is an inherent aspect of a given environment, and an analysis of several real environments suggests that detection windows of several weeks or more can be achieved with only a 20% cost in storage capacity [41].

In the previous paper, we described a prototype self-securing storage system. By using standard copy-on-write and a log-structured data organization, the prototype provided comprehensive versioning with minimal performance overhead ($<10\%$) and reasonable space efficiency. We discovered, in that work, that a key design requirement is efficient encoding of metadata versions. While copy-on-write reduces data versioning costs, conventional versioning implementations still involve one or more new metadata blocks per version. On average, the metadata versions require as much space as the new data, halving the achievable detection window.

This paper evaluates mechanisms for encoding metadata versions more efficiently. Specifically, it describes two methods of storing metadata versions more compactly: journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees. Journal-based metadata encodes each version of a file's metadata in a journal entry. Each entry describes the difference between two versions, allowing the system

to roll-back to the earlier version of the metadata. Multiversion b-trees maintain all versions of a metadata structure within a single tree. Each entry in the tree is marked with timestamps indicating the time over which the entry is valid.

The two mechanisms have different strengths and weaknesses. We discuss these and describe how both techniques are integrated into a comprehensive versioning file system called CVFS. CVFS uses journal-based metadata for inodes and indirect blocks to encode changes to attributes and file data pointers; doing so reduces the space used for their histories by 80%. CVFS implements directories as multiversion b-trees to encode additions and removals of directory entries; doing so reduces the space used for their histories by 99%. Combined, these mechanisms nearly double the potential detection window over conventional versioning, without increasing the access time to current versions of the data.

Journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees are also valuable for uses of versioning other than self-securing storage, such as recovery from system corruption and accidental file deletion. In particular, more space-efficient versioning reduces the pressure to prune version histories. Identifying solid heuristics for such pruning remain an open area of research [37], so less pruning means fewer opportunities to mistakenly prune important versions.

The rest of this paper is divided as follows. Section 2 discusses traditional versioning and motivates this work. Section 3 discusses two space efficient metadata versioning mechanisms and their tradeoffs. Section 4 describes the CVFS versioning file system. Section 5 analyzes the efficiency of CVFS in terms of space efficiency and performance. Section 6 discusses related work. Section 7 summarizes the paper's contributions.

2   Versioning and Space Efficiency

Every modification to a file inherently results in a new version of the file. Instead of replacing the old version with the new, a *versioning file system* retains both. Users of such a system can then access any old versions that the system keeps as well as the most recent version. This section discusses uses of versioning, techniques for managing the associated capacity costs, and our goal of maximizing the window of comprehensive versioning.

2.1   Uses of Versioning

File versioning offers several benefits to both users and system administrators. These benefits can be grouped into three categories: recovery from user mistakes, recovery from system corruption, and analysis of historical changes. Each category stresses different features of the versioning system beneath it.

Recovery from user mistakes: Human users make mistakes, such as deleting or erroneously modifying files. Versioning can help [16, 28, 37]. Recovery from such mistakes usually starts with some a-priori knowledge about the nature of the mistake. Often, the exact file that should be recovered is known. Additionally, there are only certain versions that are of any value to the user; intermediate versions that contain incomplete data are useless. Therefore, versioning aimed at recovery from user mistakes should focus on retaining key versions of important files.

Recovery from system corruption: When a system becomes corrupted, administrators generally have no knowledge about the scope of the damage. Because of this, they recover the entire state of the file system at some well-known "good" time. To help with this, a common versioning technique is the online *snapshot*. Like a backup, a snapshot contains a version of every file in the system at a particular time. Thus, snapshot systems present a set of known-valid system images at a set of well-known times.

Analysis of historical changes: A history of versions can help answer questions about how a file reached a certain state. For example, version control systems (e.g., RCS [43], CVS [15]) keep a complete record of changes to specific files. In addition to selective recovery, this record allows developers to figure out who made specific changes and when those changes were made. Similarly, self-securing storage seeks to enable post-intrusion diagnosis by providing a record of what happened to stored files before, during, and after a digital intrusion. Given that intruders are able to determine the pruning heuristic of the system, it is likely that they will leverage this information to prune any file versions that might disclose their presence. Thus we believe that every version of every file must be stored. For example, intruders may make changes and then quickly revert them once damage is done in order to hide their tracks. With a complete history, administrators can determine which files were changed and estimate damage. Further, they can answer (or at least construct informed hypotheses for) questions such as "When and how did the

intruder get in?" and "What was their goal?" [40].

2.2 Pruning Heuristics

A comprehensive versioning system keeps all versions of all files for all time. Such a system could support all three goals described above. Unfortunately, storing this much data is not possible. As a result, all conventional versioning systems use *pruning heuristics*. These pruning heuristics decide when versions should be created and when they should be removed. In other words, pruning heuristics determine which versions to keep from the total set of versions that would be available in a comprehensive versioning system.

2.2.1 Common heuristics

A common pruning technique in versioning file systems is to keep only the last version of a file from each session; that is, each CLOSE of a file creates a distinct version. For example, the VMS file system [28] retains a fixed number of versions for each file. VMS's pruning heuristic creates a version after each CLOSE of a file, and if the file already has the maximum number of versions, removes the oldest version of the file when this new version is created. The more recent Elephant file system [37] also creates new versions after each CLOSE; however, it makes additional pruning decisions based on a set of rules derived from observed user behavior.

Version control systems prune in two ways. First, they retain only those versions explicitly committed by a user. Second, they retain versions for only an explicitly-chosen subset of the files on a system.

By design, snapshot systems [20, 32] prune all of the versions of files that are made between snapshots. Generally, these systems only create and delete snapshots on request, meaning that the system's administrator decides most aspects of the pruning heuristic.

2.2.2 Information Loss

Unfortunately, pruning heuristics act as a form of lossy compression. Rather than storing every version of a file, these heuristics throw some data away to save space. The result is that, just as a JPEG file loses some of its visual clarity with lossy compression, pruning heuristics reduce the

clarity of the actions that were performed on the file.

For recovery from user mistakes and system corruption, the loss of some history information is usually considered acceptable though not desirable. For example, recovery from a previous system snapshot means loss of all data changes since that snapshot, including those between the snapshot and the system corruption. Likewise, promising heuristics exist for deciding which file versions to retain for recovering from user mistakes [37], but it is impossible to be certain about which version of a file will eventually be important to a user. In both examples, creating versions more frequently could increase the accuracy of recovery.

The real problem arises when versioning is used to analyze historical changes. When versioning for intrusion survival, as in the case of self-securing storage, pruning heuristics create holes in the administrator's view of the system. Even creating a version on every CLOSE is not enough, as malicious users can leverage this heuristic to hide their actions (e.g. storing exploit tools in an open file and then truncating the file to zero before closing it).

To avoid traditional pruning heuristics, self-securing storage employs comprehensive versioning over a fixed window of time, expiring versions once they become older than the given window. This *detection window* can be thought of as the amount of time that an administrator has to detect, diagnose, and recover from an intrusion. As long as an intrusion is detected within the window, the administrator has access to the entire sequence of modifications since the intrusion.

2.3   Lossless Version Compression

For a system to avoid pruning heuristics, even over a fixed window of time, it needs some form of lossless version compression. To maximize the window of comprehensive versioning, the system must attempt to compress both versioned data and versioned metadata.

Data: Data block sharing is a common form of lossless compression in versioning systems. Unchanged data blocks are shared between versions by having their individual metadata point to the same physical block. Copy-on-write is used to avoid corrupting old versions if the block is modified.

An improvement on block sharing is byte-range differencing between versions. Rather than keeping the data blocks that have changed, the system keeps the bytes that have changed between

Figure 1: **Conventional versioning system.** In this example, a single logical block of file "log.txt" is overwritten several times. With each new version of the data block, new versions of the indirect block and inode that reference it are created. Notice that although only a single pointer has changed in both the indirect block and the inode, they must be rewritten entirely, since they require new versions. The system tracks each version with a pointer to that version's inode.

the set of blocks [26]. This is especially useful in situations where a small change is made to the file. For example, if a single byte is inserted at the beginning of a file, a block sharing system keeps two full copies of the entire file (since the data of every block in the file is shifted forward by one byte); however, a differencing system only stores the single byte that was added and a small description of the change.

Metadata: Conventional versioning file systems keep a full copy of the metadata with each version. While it simplifies version access, this method quickly exhausts capacity, since even small changes to file data or attributes result in a new, complete copy of the metadata.

Figure 1 shows an example of how the space overhead of versioned metadata can become

a problem in a conventional versioning system. In this example, a program is writing small log entries to the end of a large file. Since several log entries fit within a single data block, appending entries to the end of the file produces several different versions of the same block. Because each versioned data block has a different location on disk, the system must create a new version of the indirect block to track its location. In addition, the system must write a new version of the inode to track the location of the versioned indirect block. Since any data or metadata change will always result in a new version of the inode, each version is tracked using a pointer to that version's inode. Thus, writing a single data block results in a new indirect block, a new inode, and an entry in the version list, resulting in more metadata being written than data.

Access patterns that create such metadata versioning problems are common. Many applications create or modify files piece by piece. In addition, distributed file systems such as the Network File System (NFS) create this behavior by breaking large updates of a file into separate, block-sized updates. Since there is no way for the server to determine if these block-sized writes are one large update or several small ones, each must be treated as a separate update, resulting in several new versions of the file.

Again, the solution to this problem is some form of differencing between the versions. Mechanisms for creating and storing differences of metadata versions are the main focus of this work.

2.4   Objective

In a perfect world we could keep all versions of all files for an infinite amount of time with no impact on performance. This is obviously not possible.

The objective of this work is to minimize the space overhead of versioned metadata. For self-securing storage, doing so will increase the detection window. For other versioning purposes, doing so will reduce the pressure to prune. Because this space reduction will require compressing metadata versions, it is also important that the performance overhead of both version creation and version access be minimized.

3 Efficient Metadata Versioning

One aspect of versioned metadata is that the actual changes to the metadata between versions are generally quite small. In Figure 1, although an inode and an indirect block are written with each new version of the file, the only change to the metadata is an update to a single block pointer. The system can leverage these small changes to provide much more space efficient metadata versioning.

This section describes two solutions that leverage small metadata modifications. *Journal-based metadata* records metadata changes in a journal. Via journal "roll-back," the system can recreate old versions of the file. *Multiversion b-trees* encode changes within a single tree structure. This allows access to all of the versions without recreation, but at the price of potentially reduced current version access performance.

3.1 Journal-based Metadata

Journal-based metadata maintains a full copy of the current version's metadata and a journal of each previous metadata change. To recreate old versions of the metadata, each change is undone backward through the journal until the desired version is recreated. This process of undoing metadata changes is referred to as *journal roll-back*.

Figure 2 illustrates how journal-based metadata works in the example of writing log entries. Just as in Figure 1, the system writes a new data block for each version; however, in journal-based metadata, these blocks are tracked using small journal entries that note the locations of the new and old blocks. By keeping the current version of the metadata up-to-date, the journal entries can be rolled-back to any previous version of the file.

In addition to storing version information, the journal is used as a write-ahead log for metadata consistency, just as in a conventional journaling file system. This is why the new block pointer is recorded in addition to the old. Using this, a journal-based metadata implementation can safely maintain the current version of the metadata in memory, flushing it to disk only when it is forced from the cache.

Figure 2: **Journal-based metadata system.** Just as in the conventional versioning example, this figure shows a single logical block of file "log.txt" being overwritten several times. Journal-based metadata also retains all versions of the data block; however, each block is tracked using journal entries. Each entry points to both the new block and the block that was overwritten. Only the current version of the inode and indirect block are kept, significantly reducing the amount of space required for metadata.

3.1.1 Space vs. Performance

While journal-based metadata is more space efficient than conventional versioning, it must pay a performance penalty for recreating old versions of the metadata. The more changes to a file, the higher the penalty, since all entries written between the current version and the requested version must be read and rolled-back.

One way the system can reduce this overhead is to *checkpoint* a full copy of a file's metadata to the disk occasionally. By storing checkpoints and remembering their locations, a system can start journal roll-back from the closest checkpoint in time rather than always starting with the current

9

(a) Initial tree structure.　　　　　　　　　　(b) After removal of E and update of G.

Figure 3: **Multiversion b-tree.** This figure shows the layout of a multiversion b-tree. Each entry of the tree is designated by a <user-key, timestamp> tuple which acts as a key for the entry. A question mark (?) in the timestamp indicates that the entry is valid through the current time. Different versions of an entry are separate entries using the same user-key with different timestamps. Entries are packed into entry blocks, which are tracked using index blocks. Each index pointer holds the key of the last entry along the subtree that it points to.

version.

The frequency with which these checkpoints are written dictates the space/performance trade-off. If the system keeps a checkpoint with each modification, journal-based metadata performs like a conventional versioning scheme (using the most space, but offering the best back-in-time performance). However, if no checkpoints are written, the only copy of the metadata is the current version, resulting in the lowest space utilization (but reduced back-in-time performance).

3.2　Multiversion B-trees

A multiversion b-tree is a variation on standard b-trees that keeps old versions of entries in the tree [2]. As in a standard b-tree, an entry in a multiversion b-tree contains a key/data pair; however, the key consists of both a user-defined key and the time at which the entry was written. With the addition of this time-stamp, each key becomes unique. Having unique keys means that entries within the tree are never overwritten; therefore, multiversion b-trees can have the same basic structure and operations as a standard b-tree. To facilitate current version lookups, entries are sorted first by the user-defined key and then by the timestamp.

Figure 3a shows an example of a multiversion b-tree. Each entry contains both the user-defined

key and the time over which the entry is valid. The entries are packed into entry blocks, which act as the leaf nodes of the tree. The entry blocks are tracked using index blocks, just as in standard b+trees. In this example, each pointer in the index block references the last entry of the subtree beneath it. So in the case of the root block, the G subtree holds all entries with values less than or equal to G, with $<G, 6-?>$ as its last entry. The Q subtree holds all entries with values between G and Q, with $<Q, 4-?>$ as its last entry.

Figure 3b shows the tree after a remove of entry E and an update to entry G. When entry E is removed at time 8, the only change is an update to the entry's timestamp. This indicates that E is only valid from time 6 through time 8. When entry G is updated, a new entry is created and associated with the new data. Also, the old entry for G must be updated to indicate its bounded window of validity. In this case, the index blocks must also be updated to reflect the new state of the subtree (since the last entry of the subtree has changed).

Since both current and history entries are stored in the same tree, accesses to old and current versions have the same performance. For this reason, large numbers of history entries can decrease the performance of accessing current entries.

3.3   Solution Comparison

Both journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees reduce the space utilization of versioning but incur some performance penalty. Journal-based metadata pays with reduced back-in-time performance. Multiversion b-trees pay with reduced current version performance.

Because the two mechanisms have different drawbacks, they each perform certain operations more efficiently. As mentioned above, the number of history entries in a multiversion b-tree can adversely affect the performance of accessing the current version. This emerges in two situations: linear scan operations and files with a large number of versions. Although the penalty on lookup operations is minimal (due to the logarithmic nature of the tree structure), linearly scanning all current entries requires accessing every entry in the tree, which becomes expensive if the number of history entries is high. In situations where the ratio of history entries to current entries is high (e.g., there are many more history entries than current entries), even the lookup operation of a multiversion b-tree can be affected, since tree depth is affected. In both of these cases, it is better

11

to use journal-based metadata.

When lookup of a single entry is common or history access time is important, it is preferable to use multiversion b-trees. Using a multiversion b-tree, all versions of the entry are located together in the tree and have logarithmic lookup time (for both current and history entires), giving a performance benefit over the linear roll-back operation required by journal-based metadata.

4   Implementation

We have integrated journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees into a comprehensive versioning file system (CVFS). CVFS provides comprehensive versioning within our self-securing storage prototype. Because of this, some of the design decisions (such as the implementation of a strict detection window) are specific to self-securing storage. Regardless, we believe that this design would be effective in any versioning system.

4.1   Overview

Since current versions of file data cannot be overwritten in a comprehensive versioning system, CVFS uses a log-structured data layout similar to LFS [36]. Not only does this eliminate overwriting of old versions on disk, but it also improves update performance by combining data and metadata updates into a single write. This is important because creating a new file version with each modification results in more file updates that must be written to disk than in a traditional file system.

CVFS uses both mechanisms described in Section 3. It uses journal-based metadata to version file data and file attributes, and multiversion b-trees to version directory entries. We chose this division of methods based on the expected usage patterns of each. Assuming many versions of file attributes and a need to access them in their entirety most of the time, we decided that journal-based metadata would be much more efficient. On the other hand, directories are updated less frequently than file metadata and a large fraction of operations are entry lookup rather than full listing. Thus the cost of having expired entries within the tree is expected to be lower.

Since the only pruning heuristic in CVFS is expiration, it requires a cleaner to find and remove expired versions. Although CVFS's background cleaner is not discussed in this work, its

Entry Type	Description	Cause
Attribute	Holds new inode attribute information	Inode change
Delete	Holds inode number and delete time	Inode change
Truncate	Holds the new size of the file	File data change
Write	Points to the new file data	File data change
Checkpoint	Points to checkpointed metadata	Metadata checkpoint / Inode change

Table 1: **Journal entry types.** This table lists the five different types of journal entry. Journal entries are written when inodes are modified, file data is modified, or file metadata is flushed from the cache. CVFS writes a checkpoint entry when an inode is created, since the inode cannot be read through the inode pointer until a checkpoint occurs.

implementation closely resembles the background cleaner in LFS. The only added complication is that, when moving a data block in a versioning system, the cleaner must update all of the historical metadata that points to the block. Locating and modifying all of this metadata can be very expensive. To address this problem, each data block on the disk is assigned a virtual block number. This allows us to move the physical location of the data and only have to update a single pointer within a virtual indirection table, rather than all of the associated metadata.

4.2   Layout and Allocation

Because of CVFS's log-structured format, disk space is managed in contiguous sets of disk blocks called *segments*. At any particular time, there is a single segment marked as the *write segment*. All data block allocations are done within this segment. Once the segment is completely allocated, a new write segment is chosen. Free segments on the disk are tracked using a bitmap.

As CVFS performs allocations from the write segment, the allocated blocks are marked as either journal blocks or data blocks. Journal blocks hold the journal entries, and they contain pointers that string all of the journal blocks together into a single contiguous journal. Data blocks contain file data and metadata checkpoints.

CVFS uses inodes to store a file's metadata, including file size, access permissions, creation time, modification time, and the time of the oldest version still stored on the disk. The inode also holds direct and indirect data pointers for the associated file or directory.

The in-memory copy of an inode is always kept up-to-date with the current version, allowing quick access for standard operations. To ensure that the current version can always be accessed directly off the disk, CVFS checkpoints the inode to disk on a cache flush.

13

CVFS tracks inodes with a unique inode number. This inode number indexes into an array of inode pointers that are kept at a fixed location on the disk. Each pointer holds the block number of the most current metadata checkpoint for that file, which is guaranteed to hold the most current version of the file's inode.

4.3   The Journal

The string of journal blocks that runs through the segments of the disk is called the *journal*. Each journal block holds several time-ordered, variably-sized journal entries. CVFS uses the journal to implement both conventional file system journaling (a.k.a. write-ahead logging) and journal-based metadata.

Each journal entry contains information specific to a single change to a particular file. This information must be enough to do both roll-forward and roll-back of the metadata. Roll-forward is needed for update consistency in the face of failures. Roll-back is for reconstructing old versions. Each entry also contains the time at which the entry was written and a pointer to the location of the previous entry that applies to this particular file. This pointer allows us to trace the changes of a single file through time.

Table 1 lists the five different types of journal entries. CVFS writes entries in three different cases: inode modifications (creation, deletion, and attribute updates), data modifications (writing or truncating file data), and metadata checkpoints (due to a cache flush or history optimization).

4.4   Metadata

There are three types of file metadata that can be altered individually: inode attributes, file data pointers, and directory entries. Each has characteristics that match it to a particular method of metadata versioning.

4.4.1   Attributes

There are four operations that act upon inode attributes: creation, deletion, attribute updates, and attribute lookups.

CVFS creates inodes by building an initial copy of the new inode and checkpointing it to the disk. Once this checkpoint completes and the inode pointer is updated, the file is accessible.

To delete an inode, CVFS writes a "delete" journal entry, which notes the inode number of the file being deleted. It then sets a flag in the current version of the inode specifying that the file was deleted, since it cannot actually be removed from the disk until it expires.

CVFS stores attribute modifications entirely within a journal entry. This journal entry contains all the attributes of the inode before and after the modification. Therefore, an attribute update involves writing a single journal entry, and updating the current version of the inode in memory.

CVFS accesses the current version of the attributes by reading in the current inode, since all of the attributes are stored within it. To access old versions of the attributes, CVFS traverses the journal entries searching for modifications that affect the attributes of that particular inode. Once all of these have been applied, it then has a copy of the attributes at the requested point in time.

4.4.2 File Data Pointers

CVFS tracks file data locations using direct and indirect pointers [29]. Each file's inode contains thirty direct pointers, as well as one single, one double and one triple indirect pointer.

When CVFS writes to a file, it allocates space for the new data within the current write segment and creates a "write" journal entry. The journal entry contains pointers to the data blocks within the segment, the range of logical block numbers that the data covers, the old size of the file, and pointers to the old data blocks that were overwritten (if there were any). Once the journal entry is allocated, CVFS updates the current version of the file to point at the new data.

If a write is larger than the amount of data that will fit within the current write segment, CVFS breaks the write into several data/journal entry pairs across different segments. This compartmentalization simplifies cleaning.

To truncate a file, CVFS first checkpoints the file to the log. This is necessary because CVFS must be able to locate truncated indirect blocks when reading back-in-time. If they are not checkpointed, then the information in them will be lost during the truncate (while earlier journal entries could be used to recreate this information, these entries could leave the detection window and be expired, resulting in lost information). Once the checkpoint is complete, a "truncate" journal entry is created containing both a pointer to the checkpointed metadata and the new size of the file.

Figure 4: **Back-in-time access.** This diagram shows a series of checkpoints of inode 4 (highlighted with a dark border) and updates of logical block 3 of inode 4. Each checkpoint and update is marked with a time t at which the event occured. Each checkpoint holds a pointer to the block that is valid at the time of the checkpoint. Each update is accompanied by a journal entry (marked by thin, grey boxes) which holds a pointer to the new block and the old block that it overwrote (if one exists).

To access current file data, CVFS finds the most current inode and reads the data pointers directly, since they are guaranteed to be up-to-date. To access historical data versions, CVFS uses a combination of checkpoint tracking and journal roll-back to recreate the original version of the requested data pointers.

CVFS's checkpoint tracking and journal roll-back work together in the following way. Assume a user wishes to read data from a file at time T. First, CVFS locates the oldest checkpoint it is tracking with time T_c such that $T_c \geq T$. Next, it searches backward from that checkpoint through the journal looking for changes to the logical block numbers it is reading. If it finds an older version of a logical block that applies, it will use that. Otherwise it reads the logical block from the checkpointed metadata.

To illustrate this interaction, Figure 4 shows a sequence of updates to logical block 3 of inode 4 interspersed with checkpoints of inode 4. Each block update and inode checkpoint is labeled with the time t that it was written. To read block 3 at time $T_1 = 12$, CVFS first reads in the checkpoint at time $t = 18$, then reads the journal entries to see if a different data block should be used. In this case, it finds that the block was overwritten at time $t = 15$, and so returns the older block written at time $t = 10$. In the case of time $T_2 = 6$, CVFS starts with the checkpoint at time $t = 7$, and then reads the journal entry, and realizes that no such block existed at time $t = 6$.

16

		Versioned Data	Versioned Metadata	Metadata Savings
Files:	Conventional versioning	10.1 GB	8.2 GB	
	Journal-based metadata	10.1 GB	1.6 GB	80.5%
Directories:	Conventional versioning	—	1.5 GB	
	Multiversion b-trees	—	0.011 GB	99.3%
Total:	Conventional versioning	10.1 GB	9.7 GB	
	CVFS	10.1 GB	1.611 GB	83.3%

Table 2: **Space utilization.** This table compares the space utilization of conventional versioning with CVFS, which uses journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees. The space utilization for versioned data is identical for conventional versioning and journal-based metadata because neither address data beyond block sharing. Directories contain no versioned data because they are entirely a metadata construct.

4.4.3 Directory Entries

Directories in CVFS are implemented as multiversion b-trees. Each entry in the tree represents a directory entry; therefore, each b-tree entry must contain the entry's name, the inode number of the associated file, and the time over which the entry is valid. Each entry also contains a fixed-size hash of the name. Although the actual name must be used as the key while searching through the entry blocks, this fixed-size hash allows the index blocks to use fixed-size keys.

CVFS uses a full data block for each entry block of the tree, and sorts the entries within them first by hash and then by time. If needed, index nodes of the tree are also full data blocks consisting of a set of index pointers. Each index pointer consists of a <subtree, hash, time-range> tuple. The *subtree* is a pointer to the appropriate child block, the *hash* is the name hash of the last entry along the subtree, and the *time-range* is the time over which that same entry is valid. These pointers are also sorted first by hash and then by time-range. This gives a total ordering of the entries within the tree, which simplifies searching for an entry.

With this structure, lookup and listing operations on the directory are the same as with a standard b-tree, except that the requested time of the operation becomes part of the key. For example, in Figure 3a, a lookup of $<C,\ 6>$ would search through the tree for entries with name C, and then check the time-ranges of each to determine the correct entry to return (in this case $<C,\ 4-7>$). Similarly, a listing of the directory at time 5 would do an in-order tree traversal (just as in a standard b-tree), but would exclude any entries that are not valid at time 5.

Insert, remove, and update are also very similar. Insert is identical, with the time-range of the

new entry starting at the current time. Remove is an update of the time-range for the requested name. For example, in Figure 3b, entry E is removed at time 8. Update is a remove and an insert of the same entry name, at the same time. For example, in Figure 3b, entry G is updated at time 9. This involves removing the old entry G at time 9 (updating the time-range), and inserting entry G at time 9 (the new entry $<G, \; 9-?>$).

5   Evaluation

Since the objective of this work is to reduce the space overheads of versioning without reducing the performance of current version access, our evaluation of CVFS is broken into two parts. The first is an analysis of the space utilization of CVFS. We find that using journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees gives versioned metadata savings greater than 80%. The second is an analysis of the performance characteristics of CVFS, finding that it performs similarly to non-versioning systems for current version access, and that back-in-time performance can be bounded to acceptable levels.

5.1   Setup

For the evaluation, we used CVFS as the underlying file system for S4, our self-securing NFS server. S4 exports an NFSv2 interface and treats it as a security perimeter between the storage system and the client operating systems. Although the NFSv2 specification requires that all changes be synchronous, S4 also has a mode of operation that is asynchronous, allows us to analyze the performance overheads of comprehensive versioning.

In all experiments, the client system has a 550 MHz Pentium III, 128 MB RAM, and a 3Com 3C905B 100 Mb network adapter. The servers have two 700 MHz Pentium IIIs, 512 MB RAM, a 9 GB 10,000 RPM Quantum Atlas 10K II drive, an Adaptec AIC-7896/7 Ultra2 SCSI controller, and an Intel EtherExpress Pro100 100 Mb network adapter. The client and server are on the same 100 Mb network switch.

5.2 Space Utilization

To evaluate the space utilization of our system, we measured a month long trace of an NFS server holding the home directories and CVS repository that support the activities of approximately 50 graduate students and faculty. The trace started with a 33GB snapshot, and tracked 24GB of traffic to the NFS server over the one month period.

We replayed the trace onto both a standard configuration of CVFS and a modified version of CVFS. The modified version simulated a conventional versioning system by checkpointing the metadata with each modification. It also performed copy-on-write of directory blocks, overwriting the entries in the new blocks (that is, it used normal b-trees). By observing the amount of allocated data for each request, we calculated the exact overheads of our two metadata versioning schemes as compared to a conventional system.

5.2.1 Journal-based Metadata

Table 2 compares the space utilization of versioned files using conventional versioning and journal-based metadata. There are two space overheads for file versioning: versioned data and versioned metadata. The overhead of versioned data is the overwritten or deleted data blocks that are retained. In both cases, the versioned data consumes 10.1 GB, since both use block sharing for versioned data. The overhead of versioned metadata is the information needed to track the versioned data. In a conventional system, this consumes 8.2 GB, meaning that there is nearly as much metadata as data. With journal-based metadata, only 1.6 GB of metadata is needed to track the same history information, which is an 80% savings over conventional versioning.

5.2.2 Multiversion B-trees

Using multiversion b-trees for directories provides even larger space utilization gains. Table 2 compares the space utilization of versioned directories using conventional versioning and multiversion b-trees. Because directories are a metadata construct, there is no versioned data. The overhead of versioned metadata in directories is the space used to store the overwritten and deleted directory entries. In a conventional versioning system, each entry creation, modification, or removal results in a new block being written that contains the change. Since the entire block must be kept

19

over the detection window, it results in approximately 1.5 GB of space for versioned entries. With multiversion b-trees, the only overhead is keeping the extra entries in the tree, which results in approximately 11 MB of space for versioned entries.

5.3 Performance Overheads

The performance evaluation is broken into three parts. First, we compare our system to non-versioning systems using several macro benchmarks. Second, we measure the back-in-time performance characteristics of journal-based metadata. Third, we measure the general performance characteristics of multiversion b-trees.

5.3.1 General Comparison

The purpose of the general comparison is to verify that the S4 prototype performs comparably to non-versioning systems. Since part of our objective is to avoid undue performance overheads for versioning, it is important that we confirm that the prototype performs reasonably relative to similar systems. To evaluate the performance relationship between S4 and non-versioning systems, we ran two macro benchmarks designed to simulate realistic workloads.

For both, we compare S4 in both synchronous and asynchronous modes against three other systems: a NetBSD NFS server running FFS, a NetBSD NFS server running LFS, and a Linux NFS server running EXT2. Each of these systems was measured using an NFS client running on Linux. Our S4 measurements use the S4 server and a Linux client. For "Linux," we run RedHat 6.1 with a 2.2.17 kernel. For "NetBSD," we run a stock NetBSD 1.5 installation.

SSH-build was constructed as a replacement for the Andrew file system benchmark [19, 39]. It consists of 3 phases: The unpack phase, which unpacks the compressed tar archive of SSH v1.2.27 (approximately 1 MB in size before decompression), stresses metadata operations on files of varying sizes. The configure phase consists of the automatic generation of header files and Makefiles, which involves building various small programs that check the existing system configuration. The build phase compiles, links, and removes temporary files. This last phase is the most CPU intensive, but it also generates a large number of object files and a few executables. Both the server and client caches are flushed between phases.

Figure 5: **SSH comparison.** This figure shows the performance of five systems on the unpack, configure, and build phases of the SSH-build benchmark. Performance is measured in the elapsed time of the phase.

Figure 5 shows the SSH-build results for each of the five different systems. As we hoped, our S4 prototype performs similarly to the other systems measured.

LFS does significantly worse on unpack and configure because it has poor small write performance. This is due to the fact that NetBSD's LFS implementation uses a 1 MB segment size, and NetBSD's NFS server requires a full sync of this segment with each modification (S4 uses a 64kB segment size, and supports partial segments). FFS performs worse than S4 because FFS must update both the bitmap and inode with each file modification, which are in separate locations on the disk. EXT2 performs more closely to S4 in asynchronous mode because it fails to satisfy NFS's requirement of synchronous modifications. It does slightly better in the unpack and configure stages because it maintains no consistency guarantees, however it loses in the build phase due to S4's segment-sized reads.

Postmark was designed to measure the performance of a file system used for electronic mail,

netnews, and web based services [21]. It creates a large number of small randomly-sized files (between 512 B and 9 KB) and performs a specified number of transactions on them. Each transaction consists of two sub-transactions, with one being a create or delete and the other being a read or append. The default configuration used for the experiments consists of 20,000 transactions on 5,000 files, and the biases for transaction types are equal.

Figure 6 shows the Postmark results for the five server configurations. These show similar results to the SSH-build benchmark. Again, S4 performs comparably. In particular, LFS continues to perform poorly due to its small write performance penalty caused by its interaction with NFS. FFS maintains its slight performance loss due to multiple updates per file create or delete. EXT2 performs even better in this benchmark because the random, small file accesses done in Postmark are not assisted by aggressive prefetching, unlike the sequential, larger accesses done during a compilation; however, S4 continues to pay the cost of doing larger accesses, while EXT2 does not.

5.3.2   Journal-based Metadata

Because the metadata structure of a file's current version is the same in both journal-based metadata and conventional versioning systems, their current version access times are identical. Given this, our performance measurements focus on the performance of back-in-time operations with journal-based metadata.

There are two main factors that affect the performance of back-in-time operations: checkpointing and clustering. Checkpointing refers to the frequency of metadata checkpoints. Since journal roll-back can begin with any checkpoint, CVFS keeps a list of metadata checkpoints for each file, allowing it to start roll-back from the closest checkpoint. The more frequently CVFS creates checkpoints, the better the back-in-time performance.

Clustering refers to the physical distance between the journal entries. With CVFS's log-structured layout, if several changes are made to a file in a short span of time, then the journal entries for these changes are likely to be clustered together in a single segment. If several journal entries are clustered in a single segment together, then they are all read together, speeding up journal roll-back. The "higher" the clustering, the better the performance is expected to be.

Figure 7 shows the back-in-time performance characteristics of journal-based metadata. This graph shows the access time in milliseconds for a particular version number of a file back-in-time.

22

Figure 6: **Postmark comparison.** This figure shows the the elapsed time for both the entire run of postmark and the transactions phase of postmark for the five test systems.

For example, in the worst-case, accessing the 60th version back-in-time would take 350ms. The graph examines four different scenarios: best-case behavior, worst-case behavior, and two potential cases (one involving low clustering and one involving high clustering).

The best-case performance is the situation where a checkpoint is kept for each version of the file, and so any version can be immediately accessed with no journal roll-back. This is the performance of a conventional versioning system. The worst-case performance is the situation where no checkpoints are kept, and every version must be created through journal roll-back. In addition there is no clustering, each journal entry is in a separate segment on the disk. This results in a separate disk access to read each entry. In the high clustering case, changes are made in bursts, causing journal entries to be clustered together into segments. This reduces the slope of the back-in-time performance curve. In the low clustering case, journal entries are spread more evenly across the segments, giving a higher slope. In both the low and high clustering cases, the points

where the performance drops back to the best-case are the locations of checkpoints.

Using this knowledge of back-in-time performance, the system could perform a few optimizations. By tracking the frequency of checkpoints and clustering of journal entries we can predict the back-in-time performance of a file while it is being written. Also, with this information, CVFS could bound the performance of the back-in-time operations for a particular file by forcing a checkpoint whenever back-in-time performance is expected to be poor. For example, in Figure 7, the low-clustering case keeps checkpoints in such a way as to bound back-in-time performance to around 100ms at worst. Another possibility is to keep checkpoints at the point at which we believe the user would wish to access the file. Using a heuristic such as in the Elephant FS [37] to decide when to create file checkpoints might closely simulate the back-in-time performance of conventional versioning.

5.3.3   Multiversion B-trees

Figure 8 shows the average access time of a single entry from a directory given some fixed number of entries currently stored within the directory (notice the log scale of the x-axis). To see how a multiversion b-tree performs as compared to a standard b-tree, we must compare two different points on the graph. The point on the graph corresponding to the number of current entries in the directory represents the access time of a standard b-tree. The point on the graph corresponding to the combined number of current and history entries represents the access time of a multiversion b-tree. The difference between these values is the lookup performance lost by keeping the extra versions.

Using the traces gathered from our NFS server, we found that the average number of current entries in a directory is approximately 16. Given a detection window of one month, the number of history entries is less than 100 over 99% of the time, and between zero and five over 95% of the time. Since approximately 200 entries can fit into a block, there is generally no performance lost by keeping the history. This block-based performance is the reason for the stepped behavior of Figure 8.

5.4 Summary

Our results show that CVFS reduces the space utilization of versioned metadata by more than 80% without causing noticeable performance degradation to current version access. In addition, through intelligent checkpointing, it is possible to achieve back-in-time performance similar to that of conventional versioning systems.

6 Related Work

Much work has been done in the areas of versioning and versioned data structures, log-structured file systems, and journaling.

Several file systems have used versioning to provide recovery from both user errors and system failure. Both Cedar [16] and VMS [28] use file systems that offer simple versioning heuristics to help users recover from their mistakes. The more recent Elephant file system provides a more complete range of versioning options for recovery from user error [37]. Its heuristics attempt to keep only those versions of a file that are most important to users.

Many modern systems support snapshots to assist recovery from system failure [11, 18, 19, 24]. Most closely related to CVFS is Spiralog, which uses a log-structured file system to do online backup by recording the entire log to tertiary storage [14, 20]. Chervenak, et. al, performed an evaluation of several snapshot systems [10].

Version control systems are user programs that implement a versioning system on top of a traditional file system [15, 26, 43]. These systems store the current version of the file, along with differences that can be applied to retrieve old versions. These systems usually have no concept of checkpointing, and so recreating old versions is expensive.

Write-once storage media keeps a copy of any data written to it. The Plan 9 system [33] utilized this media using a log-structured technique similar to CVFS. A recent improvement to this method is the Venti archival storage system. Venti creates a hash of each block written and uses that as a unique identifier to map identical data blocks onto the same physical location [34]. This removes the need to rewrite identical blocks, reducing the space required by individual data versions and files that contain similar data. While this could be used as the underlying storage of a versioning system, it would still require the metadata versioning techniques in CVFS to provide

efficient comprehensive versioning.

In addition to the significant file system work in versioning, there has been quite a bit of work done in the database community for keeping versions of data through time. Most of this work has been done in the form of "temporal" data structures [2, 22, 23, 44, 45]. Our directory structure borrows from these techniques.

The log-structured data layout was developed for write-once media [33], and later extended to provide write performance benefits for read-write disk technology [36]. Since its inception, LFS has been evaluated [3, 27, 35, 38] and used [1, 7, 12, 17] by many different groups. Much of the work done to improve both LFS and LFS cleaners is directly applicable to CVFS.

While journal-based metadata is a new concept, journaling has been used in several different file systems to provide metadata consistency guarantees efficiently [8, 9, 11, 39, 42]. Database systems also use the roll-back and roll-forward concepts to ensure consistency during transactions [13].

Several systems have used copy-on-write and differencing techniques that are common to versioning systems to decrease the bandwidth required during system backup or distributed version updates [4, 6, 25, 30, 31]. Specifically, some of these data differencing techniques [5, 25, 30] could be applied to CVFS to reduce the space utilization of versioned data.

7   Conclusion

This paper shows that journal-based metadata and multiversion b-trees address the space-inefficiency of comprehensive versioning. Integrating them into the CVFS file system has nearly doubled the detection window that it can provide with a given storage capacity. Further, current version performance is affected minimally, and back-in-time performance can be kept reasonable with check-pointing. Thus, these space-efficient metadata versioning structures should be part of self-securing storage implementations.

Acknowledgments

References

[1] Thomas E. Anderson, Michael D. Dahlin, Jeanna M. Neefe, David A. Patterson, Drew S. Roselli, and Randolph Y. Wang. Serverless network file systems. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Copper Mountain Resort, CO, 3–6 December 1995). Published as *Operating Systems Review*, **29**(5):109–126, 1995.

[2] Bruno Becker, Stephan Gschwind, Thomas Ohler, Peter Widmayer, and Bernhard Seeger. An asymptotically optimal multiversion b-tree. *Very large data bases journal*, **5**(4):264–275, 1996.

[3] Trevor Blackwell, Jeffrey Harris, and Margo Seltzer. Heuristic cleaning algorithms in log-structured file systems. *Annual USENIX Technical Conference* (New Orleans, LA, 16–20 January 1995), pages 277–288. USENIX Association, 1995.

[4] Randal C. Burns. Version management and recoverability for large object data. *International Workshop on Multimedia Database Management* (Dayton, OH), pages 12–19. IEEE Computer Society, 5–7 August 1998.

[5] Randal C. Burns. *Differential compression: a generalized solution for binary files*. Masters thesis. University of California at Santa Cruz, December 1996.

[6] Randal C. Burns and Darrell D. E. Long. Efficient distributed backup with delta compression. *Workshop on Input/Output in Parallel and Distributed Systems* (San Jose, CA), pages 26–36. ACM Press, December 1997.

[7] Michael Burrows, Charles Jerian, Butler Lampson, and Timothy Mann. *On-line data compression in a log-structured file system*. 85. Digital Equipment Corporation Systems Research Center, Palo Alto, CA, April 1992.

[8] Louis Felipe Cabrera, Brian Andrew, Kyle Peltonen, and Norbert Kusters. Advances in Windows NT storage management. *Computer*, **31**(10):48–54, October 1998.

[9] A. Chang, M. F. Mergen, R. K. Rader, J. A. Roberts, and S. L. Porter. Evolution of storage facilities in AIX Version 3 for RISC System/6000 processors. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, **34**(1):105–110, January 1990.

[10] Ann L. Chervenak, Vivekanand Vellanki, and Zachary Kurmas. Protecting file systems: a survey of backup techniques. *Joint NASA and IEEE Mass Storage Conference* (March 1998), 1998.

[11] Sailesh Chutani, Owen T. Anderson, Michael L. Kazar, Bruce W. Leverett, W. Anthony Mason, and Robert N. Sidebotham. The Episode file system. *Annual USENIX Technical Conference* (San Francisco, CA), pages 43–60, 1992.

[12] Wiebren de Jonge, M. Frans Kaashoek, and Wilson C. Hsieh. The Logical Disk: a new approach to improving file systems. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Asheville, NC), pages 15–28, 5–8 December 1993.

[13] Jim Gray, Paul McJones, Mike Blasgen, Bruce Lindsay, Raymond Lorie, Tom Price, Franco Potzulo, and Irving Traiger. The recovery manager of the System R database manager. *ACM Computing Surveys*, **13**(2):223–242, June 1981.

[14] Russell J. Green, Alasdair C. Baird, and J. Christopher. Designing a fast, on-line backup system for a log-structured file system. *Digital Technical Journal*, **8**(2):32–45, 1996.

[15] Dick Grune, Brian Berliner, and Jeff Polk. Concurrent Versioning System, http://www.cvshome.org/. http://www.cvshome.org/.

[16] Robert Hagmann. Reimplementing the Cedar file system using logging and group commit. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Austin, Texas, 8–11 November 1987). Published as *Operating Systems Review*, **21**(5):155–162, November 1987.

[17] John H. Hartman and John K. Ousterhout. The Zebra striped network file system. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, **13**(3):274–310. ACM Press, August 1995.

[18] David Hitz, James Lau, and Michael Malcolm. File system design for an NFS file server appliance. *Winter USENIX Technical Conference* (San Francisco, CA, 17–21 January 1994), pages 235–246. USENIX Association, 1994.

[19] John H. Howard, Michael L. Kazar, Sherri G. Menees, David A. Nichols, M. Satyanarayanan, Robert N. Sidebotham, and Michael J. West. Scale and performance in a distributed file system. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, **6**(1):51–81, February 1988.

[20] James E. Johnson and William A. Laing. Overview of the Spiralog file system. *Digital Technical Journal*, **8**(2):5–14, 1996.

[21] Jeffrey Katcher. *PostMark: a new file system benchmark*. Technical report TR3022. Network Appliance, October 1997.

[22] Anil Kumar, Vassilis J. Tsotras, and Christos Faloutsos. Designing access methods for bitemporal databases. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, **10**(1), February 1998.

[23] Sitaram Lanka and Eric Mays. Fully Persistent B+-trees. *ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data* (Denver, CO, May 1991), pages 426–435. ACM, 1991.

[24] Edward K. Lee and Chandramohan A. Thekkath. Petal: distributed virtual disks. *Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (Cambridge, MA, 1–5 October 1996). Published as *SIGPLAN Notices*, **31**(9):84–92, 1996.

[25] Josh MacDonald. *File system support for delta compression*. Masters thesis. Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, University of California at Berkeley, 2000.

[26] Josh MacDonald, Paul N. Hilfinger, and Luigi Semenzato. PRCS: The project revision control system. *European Conference on Object-Oriented Programming* (Brussels, Belgium, July, 20–21). Published as *Proceedings of ECOOP*, pages 33–45. Springer-Verlag, 1998.

[27] Jeanna Neefe Matthews, Drew Roselli, Adam M. Costello, Randolph Y. Wang, and Thomas E. Anderson. Improving the performance of log-structured file systems with adaptive methods. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Saint-Malo, France, 5–8 October 1997). Published as *Operating Systems Review*, **31**(5):238–252. ACM, 1997.

[28] K. McCoy. *VMS file system internals*. Digital Press, 1990.

[29] Marshall K. McKusick, William N. Joy, Samuel J. Leffler, and Robert S. Fabry. A fast file system for UNIX. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems*, **2**(3):181–197, August 1984.

[30] Athicha Muthitacharoen, Benjie Chen, and David Mazieres. A low-bandwidth network file system. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Chateau Lake Louise, Canada, 21–24 October 2001). Published as *Operating System Review*, **35**(5):174–187. ACM, 2001.

[31] Hugo Patterson, Stephen Manley, Mike Federwisch, Dave Hitz, Steve Kleiman, and Shane Owara. SnapMirror: file system based asynchronous mirroring for disaster recovery. *Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (Monterey, CA, 28–30 January 2002), pages 117–129. USENIX Association, 2002.

[32] Rob Pike, Dave Presotto, Ken Thompson, and Howard Trickey. Plan 9 from Bell Labs. *United Kingdom UNIX systems User Group* (London, UK, 9–13 July 1990), pages 1–9. United Kingdom UNIX systems User Group, Buntingford, Herts, 1990.

[33] Sean Quinlan. A cached WORM file system. *Software—Practice and Experience*, **21**(12):1289–1299, December 1991.

[34] Sean Quinlan and Sean Dorward. Venti: a new approach to archival storage. *Conference on File and Storage Technologies* (Monterey, CA, 28–30 January 2002), pages 89–101. USENIX Association, 2002.

[35] John T. Robinson. Analysis of steady-state segment storage utilizations in a log-structured file system with least-utilized segment cleaning. *Operating Systems Review*, **30**(4):29–32, October 1996.

[36] Mendel Rosenblum and John K. Ousterhout. The design and implementation of a log-structured file system. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Pacific Grove, CA, 13–16 October 1991). Published as *Operating Systems Review*, **25**(5):1–15, 1991.

[37] Douglas S. Santry, Michael J. Feeley, Norman C. Hutchinson, Ross W. Carton, Jacob Ofir, and Alistair C. Veitch. Deciding when to forget in the Elephant file system. *ACM Symposium on Operating System Principles* (Kiawah Island Resort, SC, 12–15 December 1999). Published as *Operating Systems Review*, **33**(5):110–123. ACM, 1999.

[38] Margo Seltzer, Keith A. Smith, Hari Balakrishnan, Jacqueline Chang, Sara McMains, and Venkata Padmanabhan. File system logging versus clustering: a performance comparison. *Annual USENIX Technical Conference* (New Orleans, LA, 16–20 January 1995), pages 249–264. Usenix Association, 1995.

[39] Margo I. Seltzer, Gregory R. Ganger, M. Kirk McKusick, Keith A. Smith, Craig A. N. Soules, and Christopher A. Stein. Journaling versus Soft Updates: Asynchronous Meta-data Protection in File Systems. *USENIX Annual Technical Conference* (San Diego, CA, 18–23 June 2000), 2000.

[40] John D. Strunk, Garth R. Goodson, Adam G. Pennington, Craig A. N. Soules, and Gregory R. Ganger. *Intrusion detection, diagnosis, and recovery with self-securing storage*. Technical report CMU–CS–02–140. Carnegie Mellon University, 2002.

[41] John D. Strunk, Garth R. Goodson, Michael L. Scheinholtz, Craig A. N. Soules, and Gregory R. Ganger. Self-securing storage: protecting data in compromised systems. *Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation* (San Diego, CA, 23–25 October 2000), pages 165–180. USENIX Association, 2000.

[42] Adam Sweeney. Scalability in the XFS file system. *USENIX*. (San Diego, CA, 22–26 January 1996), pages 1–14, 1996.

[43] W. F. Tichy. *Software development control based on system structure description*. PhD thesis. Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, January 1980.

[44] V. J. Tsotras and N. Kangelaris. The snapshot index - an I/O-optimal access method for timeslice queries. *Information Systems*, **20**(3):237–260, May 1995.

[45] Peter J. Varman and Rakesh M. Verma. An efficient multiversion access structure. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, **9**(3). IEEE, May 1997.

Figure 7: **Journal-based metadata back-in-time performance.** This figure shows several potential curves for back-in-time performance. The worst-case is when journal roll-back is used exclusively, and each journal entry is in a separate segment on the disk. The best-case is if a checkpoint is available for each version, as in a conventional versioning system. The high and low clustering cases are examples of how checkpointing and access patterns can affect back-in-time performance. The cliffs in these curves indicate the locations of checkpoints, since the access time for a checkpointed version drops to the best-case performance. As the level of clustering increases, the slope of the curve decreases, since multiple journal entries are read together in a single segment.

30

Figure 8: **Directory entry performance.** This figure shows the average time to access a single entry out of the directory given the total number of entries within the directory. History entries affect performance by increasing the effective number of entries within the directory. The larger the ratio of history entries to current entries, the more current version performance will suffer.