

Carnegie Mellon.

Directions for Shingled-Write and TDMR System Architectures: Synergies with Solid-State Disks

> Garth Gibson www.pdl.cmu.edu May 7, 2009

Short Bio

- Co-author, A Case for RAID, 1988
- Professor, CS & ECE, CMU, 1991-



- Systems Thrust Leader, DSSC, CMU, 1990s
- Founder, Parallel Data Lab, CMU, 1993
- Founder & CTO, Panasas Inc, 1999
 - HPC storage @ Los Alamos, BP, Intel, Boeing, NIH, Ferrari, Citadel
- Co-Instigator, SCSI OSD & IETF Parallel NFS stds
- Storage Networking Industry Tech Council, 2000s
- Steering Cmte, File & Storage Tech (FAST) Conf
- PI, DOE Petascale Data Storage Inst., 2006-

Shingled-Writing

Garth's simple world view

HAMR, BPMR:



big changes in fab/assembly

Shingled-writing does not need big changes

Shingle-writing means

Partially overwriting tracks, for closer pitch Inability to modify one embedded sector without rewriting cross-track neighbors

Loss of Update-in-place

Banding of shingles Last track is wider, capacity overhead Tracks per band (@ 90% overlap): 1% ov => 1000 & 10% ov => 100



Modifying a random sector in a band of 100 tracks Avg. of 50 revs to rewrite overlapped tracks!

Writing System Model

Shingled-write disk is N bands, each of order 1 GB Append to end of a band has today's performance Overwriting non-end of band "deletes" rest of band Writing start of band deletes prior content Performance prohibitive to update-in-place at all

Can systems software cope with this? No

File Systems 101

File systems store structured data Metadata (block lists, attributes, ...) are generally small

Page-at-a-time from OS Disk fragments with delete Small writes b/c Metadata! Hole filling





& Files are Small

CDF of general file size Historically

> 75% < 32KB

Today's supercomputers 99999 60-99% < 1MB .9999 .999 raction of files whose capacity used is < X .99 < 0.1% > 1GB 0.8 Most space in large 0.6 0.4 files, but no 0.2 avoiding the .001 small ones .0001 .00001 **Carnegie Mellon** .000001



Parallel Data Laboratory

System Model for Hard Disks

Hard disk is a memory model: billions of sectors File system allocation is search for free sectors To avoid "losing" space, small holes written Durability/fault tolerance forces prompt writing Metadata is small and often written

Storage performance improvement is always: "Make disk writes larger by merging data" But can't fundamentally avoid small writes

Same Problem for Flash

Flash SSD organized as "bands" of "sectors"

Must pre-erase band before programming data



9

Shingled-write needs "FTL"

Use embedded processor to translate full SCSI/ATA command set to "append" & "rewrite"

Host "overwrite" is append and record new location Prior location is now "wasted space" Overprovision space to absorb waste Background cleaning rewrites live part of bands Same as today's defrag tools New TRIM command to expose waste Not new: 1992 Log-structured file system paper NetApp, Panasas use remapping disk layout

Example: Flash Write Speeds

Measuring today's simple and smart flash SSDs 100x – 1000x more small writes per second Remapping can rescue Shingled-writing disks!



Shingled-write w/ translation

Its just code 🙂

Okay, that means a faster CPU and more DRAM

and Complexity!

But you can start with flash translation code Hire from FusionIO alumni ⓒ



What About Reading?

Reading a shingle involves signal processing in two dimensions (TD) – down and cross track

One approach to TDMR involves gathering signal from 1-2 adjacent tracks on both sides

Means 3 to 5 revs to read a single sector

3x – 5x lower small random read rates Remapping on write probably doesn't help Read traffic depends more on applications than on system software/translation layer

Summary

Shingled-written disk is N bands of sequentially written sectors, each of order GB

Disk can still offer normal commands, write speed using "translation layer" embedded code Take Flash SSD FTL as starting point

Flash-inspired TRIM command helps

TDMR reading a bigger problem

3-5 revs per small read hard to hide

This could reduce market acceptance

A Little More on SSD & Disks

Memoright-MTron 100,000 **Random Read** SSD performance !! X25-M X25–E ioDrive 10,000 15000rpm 10000rpm **Big impact on** 7200rpm IOPS 1,000 systems coming 100 Hybrid SSD+Disk 10 4K8K 16K 32K 64K Cost of Disk bits Request size 100,000 Random Write Speed of SSD Memoright 10,000 Compelling! IOPS 1,000 SSD hybrid could 100 "solve" TDMR speed issues 10 8K 16K 32K 64K **Carnegie Mellon** Request size Parallel Data Laboratory

MTron X25-M Х25-Е

5000rpm 10000rpm 7200rpm



Carnegie Mellon.

www.pdl.cmu.edu

A few references

- Rosenblum, M., J. Ousterhout, "The Design and Implementation of a Log-Structured File System," ACM Trans. on Computer Systems, v10, n1, 1992.
- Gal, E., Toledo, S., "Algorithms and data structures for flash memories," ACM Computing Surveys, v37, n2, June 2005.
- Agrawal, N., Prabhakaran, V., Wobber, T., Davis, J. D., Manasse, M., Panigrahy, R., "Design tradeoffs for SSD performance," USENIX 2008 Annual Technical Conference, Boston MA, June 2008.
- Polte, M., J. Simsa, "Enabling Enterprise Solid State Disk Performance," Integrating Solid-state Memory into the Storage Hierarchy (WISH09), 2009.

www.pdl.cmu.edu and www.cs.cmu.edu/~garth