FusionRAID: Achieving Consistent Low Latency for Commodity SSD Arrays

Tianyang Jiang, Guangyan Zhang, Zican Huang, Xiaosong Ma, Junyu Wei, Zhiyue Li, Weimin Zheng

Tsinghua University Qatar Computing Research Institute, HBKU







• Widely used in recent years



Banks



Datacenters



Banks

• Widely used in recent years





• AFA market

- Rapidly growing in past years
- Growth projected to continue
- Many products on market



Data source: www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/all-flash-array-market-41080938.html

• Widely used in recent years



Banks



Datacenters



• AFA market

- Rapidly growing in past years
- Growth projected to continue
- Many products on market



Data source: www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/all-flash-array-market-41080938.html

• Widely used in recent years



Banks



Datacenters



Clouds

• AFA market

- Rapidly growing in past years
- Growth projected to continue
- Many products on market



Data source: www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/all-flash-array-market-41080938.html









NetApp AFF

- Higher latency variability compared to HDD RAID
 - Tail deviate more from norm

- Higher latency variability compared to HDD RAID
 - Tail deviate more from norm



- Higher latency variability compared to HDD RAID
 - Tail deviate more from norm



- Higher latency variability compared to HDD RAID
 - Tail deviate more from norm



- Higher latency variability compared to HDD RAID
 - Tail deviate more from norm
 - Further agitated by disk aging



- 1. Workloads usually irregular, with interleaving bursts
 - All-for-all model better than physically partitioning



Bandwidth consumption in 4-workload mix

- Workloads usually irregular, with interleaving bursts
 All-for-all model better than physically partitioning
- 2. SSD RAID writes suffer significant software overhead
 - Much higher relative overhead than w. HDD, and higher absolute overhead than w. RAM
 - Mainly caused by synchronization
 - Shorter write path desirable



- Workloads usually irregular, with interleaving bursts
 All-for-all model better than physically partitioning
- 2. SSD RAID writes suffer significant software overhead
 - Much higher relative overhead than w. HDD, and higher absolute overhead than w. RAM
 - Mainly caused by synchronization
 - Shorter write path desirable



- Workloads usually irregular, with interleaving bursts
 All-for-all model better than physically partitioning
- 2. SSD RAID writes suffer significant software overhead
 - Much higher relative overhead than w. HDD, and higher absolute overhead than w. RAM
 - Mainly caused by synchronization
 - Shorter write path desirable



Bandwidth consumption in 4-workload mix

RAID write latency breakdown

- 1. Workloads usually irregular, with interleaving bursts
 - All-for-all model better than physically partitioning
- 2. SSD RAID writes suffer significant software overhead
 - Much higher relative overhead than w. HDD, and higher absolute overhead than w. RAM
 - Mainly caused by synchronization
 - Shorter write path desirable
- 3. SSD performance anomaly common, w. significant magnitude and duration
 - Found in all 6 SSD models tested, both consumer and DC
 - · Latency spikes tall and lasting enough to be identified and sidestepped at runtime



- New RAID design for AFAs
 - Reduces both average- and worst-case latencies
 - Works on commodity SSDs
 - Consolidates solutions motivated by individual observations

- New RAID design for AFAs
 - Reduces both average- and worst-case latencies
 - Works on commodity SSDs

Shared

storage pool

 Consolidates solutions motivated by individual observations



- New RAID design for AFAs
 - Reduces both average- and worst-case latencies
 - Works on commodity SSDs

Two-phase

writes

 Consolidates solutions motivated by individual observations



- New RAID design for AFAs
 - Reduces both average- and worst-case latencies
 - Works on commodity SSDs
 - Consolidates solutions motivated by individual observations





User logical address space









Large write request (Direct RAID write)





Replicated storage



Large write request (Direct RAID write)





Replicated storage











 \mathbb{N}


















FusionRAID Optimized Writes











Reactive request redirection





Reactive request redirection





Reactive request redirection





Testbed

CPU	2 Intel Xeon E5-2650 V4
DRAM	128 GB
SSD	30 Intel D3-S4510
OS	Ubuntu 16.04, Linux kernel 4.15.0

Testbed

CPU	2 Intel Xeon E5-2650 V4
DRAM	128 GB
SSD	30 Intel D3-S4510
OS	Ubuntu 16.04, Linux kernel 4.15.0

- Benchmark
 - Trace-driven workloads
 - Real application (YCSB + RocksDB)

• Testbed

CPU	2 Intel Xeon E5-2650 V4
DRAM	128 GB
SSD	30 Intel D3-S4510
OS	Ubuntu 16.04, Linux kernel 4.15.0

- Benchmark
 - Trace-driven workloads
 - Real application (YCSB + RocksDB)
- Systems
 - Commercial RAID: 4-RAID5, RAID50
 - Latest RAID in paper: ToleRAID (FAST'16), LogRAID (SYSTOR'14, ATC'19)



- Running 4-workload mixes on compared RAID systems
- Randomly selected 20 mixes from 8 storage workloads

- Running 4-workload mixes on compared RAID systems
- Randomly selected 20 mixes from 8 storage workloads



- Running 4-workload mixes on compared RAID systems
- Randomly selected 20 mixes from 8 storage workloads



- Running 4-workload mixes on compared RAID systems
- Randomly selected 20 mixes from 8 storage workloads



FusionRAID reduces median latency by 45%~81% and P99 latency by 8.3×~35×!

Evaluation: Applications and FusionRAID Overhead

Evaluation: Applications and FusionRAID Overhead

- Real application results
 - Running RocksDB on FusionRAID and RAID50
 - FusionRAID reduces tail latency by 4.1×

Evaluation: Applications and FusionRAID Overhead

- Real application results
 - Running RocksDB on FusionRAID and RAID50
 - FusionRAID reduces tail latency by 4.1×
- Conversion only brings 18% increase in tail latency

Evaluation: Applications and FusionRAID Overhead

- Real application results
 - Running RocksDB on FusionRAID and RAID50
 - FusionRAID reduces tail latency by 4.1×
- Conversion only brings 18% increase in tail latency
- FusionRAID without conversion consumes 2× space within running, and decrease to 1.17× if conversion on



FusionRAID: Achieving Consistent Low Latency for Commodity SSD Arrays

Thank you!



