

Undo for Recovery: Approaches and Models Aaron Brown UC Berkeley ROC Group

Motivation

- Human operator error is a major cause of system failures
 - systems are not tolerant of human error during system administration
- Undo effectively tolerates human error
 - *recovery*-based: repairs unanticipated mistakes
 - familiar model: ubiquitous in productivity applications
- Undo has "fringe benefits"
 - makes sysadmin's job easier, improving maintainability
 - enables trial-and-error learning
 - helps shift recovery burden from sysadmin to users
 - helps recover from more than just human error
 - » SW/HW failure, security breaches, virus infections, ...

An Undo paradigm

- ROC Undo combines time travel with repair
- $\boldsymbol{\cdot}$ The Three R's of Undo
 - **Rewind:** roll system state backwards in time
 - Repair: fix latent or active errors

» automatically or via human intervention

- Replay: roll system state forward, replaying user interactions lost during rewind

» we assume a service model with well-defined user actions

- All three steps are critical
 - rewind enables undo
 - repair lets user/administrator fix problems
 - replay preserves updates, propagates fixes forward

Undo examples: email

Coarse-grained Undo

- roll back OS or app. upgrade without losing user data
- revert system-wide configuration changes
- "go back in time" to retroactively install virus filter on email server; effects of virus are squashed on redo

Fine-grained Undo

- undo deletion of a user, mailbox, or email message
- reverse changes to a user's profile or filtering rules
- maybe even unsend mail (?)
- Undo paradigm must support both granularities

Challenges in 3R paradigm

Handling externalized events

- externalized event: event visible outside of system

» example: user downloads/reads email message

- » example: user forwards email message over the Internet
- undo can invalidate externalized events
 - » repair can cause events to change/disappear on replay
 » result: inconsistency between system and external env't
- solutions depend on acceptable level of inconsistency
 - » human users willing to accept inconsistency in some apps
 - » issue compensating or explanatory events
 - » delay execution of externalized events for an undo window
 - » convert external to internal by expanding system boundary

Challenges in 3R paradigm (2)

- Integrated coarse- and fine-grained undo
 - coarse-grained undo best handled by physical logging
 - fine-grained undo best handled by logical logging
 - best: hybrid system with physical logging for Rewind and logical logging for Replay
 - » caveat: limits full 3R semantics to logically-logged system state; allows simple undo/redo of unmonitored state
 - i.e., redo of unmonitored state won't propagate repairs
- Managing state dependencies
 - Rewind/Repair cycle can invalidate logged events
 - Replay system must understand dependencies between logged state and state touched during repair

Towards system models for undo

- Goal: abstract model for undo-capable system
 - template for constructing undoable services
 - needed to analyze generality and limitations of undo

Model components

- state entities
- state update events (analogue of transactions)
- event queues and logs
- untracked system changes

Assumptions

- storage layer that supports bidirectional time-travel » via non-overwriting FS, snapshots, etc.
 - Email as example application

Simple model

• Entire system is one state entity



- Analysis

- + simple, easy to implement, easier to trust, most general
- huge overhead for fine-grained undo operations
- serialization bottleneck at single queue/log
- difficult to distinguish different users' events

Hierarchical model

• System composed of multiple state entities

- each state entity supports undo as in simple model
- state entities join hierarchically to give multiple granularities of undo



- Analysis

- + multiple undo granularities reduces overhead, bottlenecks
- + distributed undo possible
- greater complexity; tricky to coordinate different layers

Status

- Refining system model for undo
 - hierarchical seems best bet, but many issues to solve
 - feedback welcome!
- Learning about real-world email systems
 - to help calibrate the undo model
 - working with Sun/iPlanet Messaging Server team
 » likely will get source code access

Continuing maintainability benchmarking work helps illustrate what kinds of things need undo

- Preparing for proof-of-concept implementation
 - in the context of iPlanet Messaging Server