Lazy Modular Upgrades in Persistent Object Stores

Barbara Liskov MIT CSAIL October 2003

Persistent Object Store

- Stores objects with methods
 - Objects belong to classes
 - Classes implement types



Transactions

Objects are accessed within transactions

 Transactions mask concurrency and failures



Upgrades

- Upgrades are needed to
 - Correct errors
 - Improve performance
 - Meet changing requirements

Outline

- Defining upgrades
- Upgrade execution
- Upgrade modularity conditions
- Performance

Defining Upgrades

- Upgrade must preserve persistent state
 - E.g., set implementation changes from vector to hash table
- A class-upgrade is <old-class, new-class, TF>
- TF: old-class \rightarrow new-class
 - TF changes representation of objects
 - System preserves identity

Completeness

- Upgrades can be
 - Compatible
 - Incompatible
- An upgrade is a set of class-upgrades

 must contain all class-upgrades needed to
 maintain type correctness

System executes Upgrades

- Requires transforming all old-class objects
- Goal: don't interfere with applications
 Don't stop the world
- Goal: be efficient in space and time
 Don't copy the database or use versions
- Goal: be expressive
 - Don't limit expressive power of TFs

Solution: Lazy, Just in Time

- Applications continue to run

 Objects are transformed just before first use
- Later upgrades run in parallel with earlier ones
 - If x has two pending transforms, they run in upgrade order

How System Works

- When application accesses x
 - Interrupt the application
 - Run earliest pending transform for x
 - Each transform runs in its own transaction
- Application continues after transform commits
- Transforms can be interrupted too

Example

- ...; U1; ... TF(x); A1; ... TF(y); A2; ...
 - U1 is installed
 - A1 starts to run, accesses x
 - TF(x) runs and commits
 - A1 continues and commits
 - A2 starts to run, accesses y
 - TF(y) runs and commits
 - A2 continues and commits

Example

...; U1; ... TF(x); A1; ... TF(y); A2; ... U1 is installed A1 starts to run, accesses x TF(x) runs and commits

A1 continues and commits

A2 starts to run, accesses y

TF(y) runs and commits

A2 continues and commits

Problem: suppose TF(y) accesses x

Modular Reasoning

- Want to support modular reasoning:
 - Programmer can reason about TF as if it were an extra method of the old-class
 - Programmer can assume same old-class interfaces and invariants



Desired Semantics

- Upgrades appear to run when installed
 - Serialized before all later application transactions
- Upgrades appear to run in upgrade order
- Within an upgrade, transforms run as if each was the first to run

Order within an Upgrade

• Consider x and y due to be upgraded



 If TF(y) uses x (transitively) then if [TF(x); TF(y)], this must have same effect as [TF(y); TF(x)]

Ensuring Correct Behavior

 Based on encapsulation: An object must encapsulate every object it depends on



 A TF is well-behaved if it uses only encapsulated sub-objects

Approach

- Analyze TFs
- Usually they will be well-behaved
- Otherwise notify user
 - User can use triggers to control order
 - Or, we maintain versions



Performance

- Implemented in Thor
- Analyzed overhead



Baseline Overhead



Transform Overhead

Time per object (µs)	T1	T2b
Transform	11.3	11.5
Commit	19.9	1.0

Conclusions

- Correctness conditions for any upgrade system
 - Support modular reasoning
- Our lazy implementation approach – Correct and efficient
- Future work: upgrades in distributed systems

Lazy Modular Upgrades in Persistent Object Stores

- Joint work with
 - C. Boyapati
 - L. Shrira
 - C-H. Moh
 - S. Richman
- http://pmg.csail.mit.edu/

Execution Goals

- Goal: don't interfere with applications
 Don't stop the world
- Goal: be efficient in space and time
 Don't copy the database or use versions
- Goal: be expressive
 - Don't limit expressive power of TFs

The Right Time

- Upgrades are transactions

 Serialized at moment of "installation"
- Upgrades must be serialized w.r.t
 - Application transactions
 - Other upgrades