NetApp[™]

Requirements for NFSv4.2 IETF-76 draft-eisler-nfsv4-minorversion-2requirements-02 2009-11-12

Mike Eisler Senior Technical Director

Go further, faster™





- Disclaimer
- Motivation for NFSv4.2
- Proposed Next Steps



- draft-eisler-nfsv4-minorversion-2requirements-02 is not an official work item
- There is no commitment from IESG/IETF to charter the NFSv4 WG (or any other WG) to charter NFSv4.2
 - I am seeking that commitment

Motivation for NFSv4.2

- Storage in general and file access particular needs to react to IT trends
 - NFSv4.1 was a reaction to the trends toward
 - scale out (aka grid, aka cloud) computing: pNFS
 - high speed networking: sessions and exactly once semantics
 - All NFSv3/NFSv4.0 vendors/customers continue to struggle with limitations of XIDbased reply cache
- Storage is now faced with these major trends:
 - space/efficiency demands
 - drivers are cost of energy and backup times
 - flash
 - flash is now the least expensive storage medium compared to disk and DRAM when measuring cost/IOPS.
 - compliance
 - There are laws that regulate management of customer data
 - Lots more data, lots more devices increases the probability of mismanagement
 - automation might help
- NFSv4.1 was a big change relative to NFSv4.0
 - we certainly will find we didn't get every thing right



- Disk capacities are doubling on 1-2 year cycles
- Disk access times are not
- Neither are allotments for data management operations
 - e.g. Data Backups
- Energy price spikes are compounding problem
 - data centers are not going to expand
 - new data centers in expense regions are not going to be built
- Storage industry has responded with "De-Duplication"
 - NFS needs to catch up:
 - space reporting, hole punching, de-dupe mapping on read/ write, ...



- Peer-to-peer networking has been proven
 - For some workloads, NFS clients and servers would benefit from this model
 - see draft-myklebust-nfsv4-pnfs-backend
- Today pNFS allows I/O offload, but not meta-data offload
 - This doesn't have to be the case, see draft-eisler-nfsv4pnfs-metastripe
- File copy is more efficient if NFS servers take care of it
 - We now have APIs on some NFS clients for performing file copy
 - draft-lentini-nfsv4-server-side-copy has reached WG consensus



- Adding flash to storage arrays is goodness
 - doesn't require changes to storage protocols
- However, the value of flash is best realized on the client-side
 - We could cede this ground to Direct-Attached-Storage
 - Traumatic for data centers oriented toward network storage
 - Or we could embrace use cases that leverage client-side flash for network storage
 - caching
 - Sub-file caching is needed



- Data continues to expand rapidly
- The rules for managing this data and the penalties for mismanagement seem to be expanding nearly as rapidly
- The manual approach does not scale
- An immutable compliance attribute needs to be settable on a file when it is created
- Security labeling is a framework for reducing mistakes, and making malicious misuse harder
- See draft-quigley-nfsv4-sec-label

Bug fixes/minor enhancements in protocol

- Examples include:
 - pNFS connectivity problem reporting
 - trunking discovery
 - hints of I/O pattern (much harder to discern sequential when pNFS is in use)



- Make draft-eisler-nfsv4-minorversion-2requirements-02 a work item of NFSv4
 - When: November 16, 2009
- Drive to WG Consensus
 - When: January, 2010
- WG Last Call
 - When: February, 2010
- Re-charter WG based on final requirements
 - When: March, 2010 (before Anaheim IETF meeting)