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Revisit HDFS Reconstruction

- GFS & HDFS triplicate every data block
  - Triplication: one local + two remote copies
- 200% space overhead
  - But RAID5 is simple?
  - Can be done at scale
    - Panasas does it
      >PF, >50 GB/s, >10K clients
    - But sync error handling hard
- GFS & HDFS defer repair
  - Background task repairs copies
    - Notably less scary to developers
Since June 09 Summit talk

- Hadoop HDFS (0.22.0) implemented a version of DiskReduce v1 (two copies + RAID 5 encoding)
- Thanks to Druba Borthakur & the HDFS team

HDFS Raid

- Start the same: triplicate every data block
- Background encoding
  - Combine third replica of blocks from a single file to create parity block
  - Remove third replica
  - Apache JIRA HDFS-503
- DiskReduce from CMU
  - Garth Gibson research

DiskReduce v2: RAID6 Encoding

Step 0: N0 picks a codeword \((x, N1, N2, N3, N4)\) randomly

Step 1: N0 creates D1 and sends to N1, N2

Step 2: N0 creates D2 and sends to N1, N3

Step 3: N0 creates D3 and sends to N1, N4

Step 4: N0 and N1 encode D1, D2 and D3 and \(P1 = f1(D1, D2, D3), P2 = f2(D1, D2, D3)\)
Implementation - Write

- Write unchanged
- Except policy for selecting location of replicas
- A key design principle is that initial writing is unchanged, starting with triplication
Implementation - Read

• HDFS Read unchanged
• Except if block not found, then 2nd data server implements reconstruction
• HDFS client code unchanged!
Implementation – Recovery & Encoding

- Recovery extended
- A missing block is queued for recovery as in original but data server does RAID reconstruct
- Encoding is triggered using same queuing but computing check block can be all local if triplication of blocks in RAID set chosen appropriately
Basic Implementation Working

- Write 1TB (40 x 25GB) flat out: 1.25 user GB/s
- Flush cache and enable encoding: “compress” at 1.6 user GB/s for first 95% of data
- Background encoding is comparable in duration to initial write
- If “idle” time per “day” equal to “write” time, encoding is free
Implementation - Delete

- Delete can be harder
- HDFS async deletes each block in a file
- In DiskReduce if a deleted block was in a RAID set with blocks that are not deleted, check codes become wrong when block is gone – check blocks must be recomputed to recover capacity
Why not restrict RAID set to one file?

• In Hadoop clusters, files are mostly much smaller (in blocks) than the desired RAID set size
• Restriction of RAID set to one file simplifies delete, but costs significant overhead: 3% -> up to 60%
• Traces from Yahoo M45 and from Facebook

![RAID6 - within a file vs. across files](image)
Delaying Encoding – Advantages?

- Delaying encoding – performance advantages from having multiple copies to read from?
- Simple test: 29 nodes, 116 files each 4GB, 64MB blocks, read each byte once via Hadoop in Y seconds
- Three cases: one, two or three copies of each block
- No significant advantage (useful bytes on every disk)
Delaying Encoding – Advantages II?

- Delaying encoding – performance advantages from having multiple copies to read from ??
- Try harder: small hot files: 512MB file in one 512MB block, read redundantly by X maps (30 nodes)
- Two copies faster by 25% - 50%, three copies faster by 40% - 60%
- There are significant performance benefits from replication, but harder to get than we expected
Let's Cache!

- Recently written data is triplicated, so delay encoding and treat two copies as performance improvement
- 80% of reads “hit” on 3 copies with 1 day delay
- Implementation underway
Let's also Delay Delete

- Deleting a block in a RAID set forces check codes to be recomputed in order to recover block's space.
- Delaying delete to avoid recomputing (xor below) comes with a capacity penalty.
- Penalty huge if wait for all blocks in RAID set to die.
- Need to recompute to recover space, but can shift to "idle" time.
- Interesting choices of which blocks in a RAID set to improve temporal locality of deletion.

![Graph showing ratio of User Data to Ideal RAID6 over time with various delay options.]
What about Reliability Differences?

- Two fault tolerant is not the whole story
- Three copies more reliable
- Bigger systems less likely to have >2 blocks lost in any RAID set (8+2)/triple (3)
- Bigger systems “repair” in parallel faster (declustered)
- Triplication has ~3X disks for same user data, so ~3X faster repair
- Assume .8TB/disk used, 64MB blocks, 1% AFR disk fail, exponential repair is either 12/N or 0.5+12/N (Markov model)
Closing

• DiskReduce for HDFS
  • Give users ~3X more stored data
  • Exploit async encode/delete for performance
  • Exploration of complexity in storage stack
  • Fragmentation, the never beaten annoyance

• CMU Open Cirrus, Open Cloud & DCO
  • Data-Intensive Scalable Computing resources
    – Utility for CMU science, testbed for PDL+
  • Broader agenda is “The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Data” for science and commerce