

Improving Performance of Flash Based Key-Value Stores Using Storage Class Memory as a Volatile Memory Extension

Hiwot Tadese Kassa (Presenter), Jason Akers, Mrinmoy Ghosh, Zhichao Cao, Vaibhav Gogte, Ronald Dreslinski



Data Center Memory Requirements



High-Performance Storage Servers at Facebook

2P server



- 2 CPUs and 256 GB DRAM
- High performance but expensive

Source: https://engineering.fb.com/core- data/introducing-yosemite-the-first-open- source-modular-chassis-for-high-powered- microservers/.

1P server

- 1 CPU and 64 GB DRAM
- Cost effective but lower performance

per node

3



Storage Class Memory (SCM) Characteristics



• Slower than DRAM but are faster than SSD and give us very large memory density



Intel Optane DC Persistent Memory (DCPMM)



- Byte addressable over **DDR-T** bus (pin compatible with DDR4)
- Are cheaper per GB than DRAM and comes in higher capacities than DRAM (upto 512 GB per module)
- New high performance and cost effective 1P server variant with SCM addition



RocksDB Architecture



- RocksDB is a KV store used by many companies such as Facebook
- We studied representative production RocksDB
 workloads
- Largest memory consumption comes from block cache used for reads
- Read paths are critical and optimizing reads provides overall performance benefit



Facebook RocksDB Workload Characteristics

• We studied three large RocksDB workloads at Facebook, focused on read dominated workloads (WhatsApp, Tectonic Metadata, Laser)



• Temporal locality in our workloads characterized by power law



Intel Optane DC Persistent Memory Evaluations (WhatsApp)





Optimized **App-direct** mode gives better performance than **Memory-mode**

Optimized App-direct throughput relative to naive SCM block cache



Optimized **App-direct** mode gives better performance than **naïve SCM block cache**



Facebook RocksDB extended with SCM









Facebook RocksDB extended with SCM





Facebook RocksDB extended with SCM





Hybrid Cache Design and Components

- New top level module in RocksDB to manage hierarchical block cache
- Supports multiple block caches and multiple memory types
- Admission policies to handle block transfer between multiple block caches





DRAM First Admission Policy



Evaluation Setup and Implementations

Hardware spec

- Two Socket Cascade Lake with Intel Apache Pass DIMMs (48 cores)
- 192GB DRAM, 1.5TB SCM
- Evaluated 1P variants based on DRAM and SCM component granularities and minimum DRAM to run linux OS/software.

Server Type	1P (64 - 0)	1P variant (64 - 128)	1P variant (32 – 128)	1P variant (32 – 256)
DRAM size (GB)	64	64	32	32
SCM size (GB)	0	128	128	256

RocksDB 6.10 with libmemkind library used for memory allocations



Workload Creation

- We run db_bench with multiple dbs sharing the block cache
- Number of threads to simulate number of readers
- Realistic workload patterns sampled from production hosts
 - KV access distribution
 - Value distribution per put query
 - Average key and value sizes when creating db
 - Query composition for get, put, and seek
- Three sample workloads; WhatsApp, Tectonic Metadata and Laser



DRAM First Policy Throughput all workloads



DRAM (GB) - SCM(GB)

 Adding SCM to 1P servers with 64GB DRAM provide 25% - 80% throughput improvement in all configuration for all workloads



DRAM First Policy Latency improvement for all workloads (P50 latency)



• P50 latency stays the same with small variations



DRAM First Policy Latency improvement for all workloads (P95 and P99)



P95 and P99 are affected much more by the reduction of DRAM size, an average of ~20% and ~10% improvement in P95 and P99



Deep Dive Analysis



- WhatsApp IO bandwidth, cache hit rate, and IO wait and CPU utilization for dram 1st policy shown above
- SCM increases cache hit rate upto 30% and IO bandwidth reduced by 0.8 GB/s.
- CPU utilization increases but still within the one CPU limit
- Other workloads also follow the same trend as above



Cost and Performance



- 1P variants (32 256) achieve ~95% performance of 2P servers
- SCM cost relative to DRAM per GB is 0.38
- Reduces TCO by 43% 48% compared to 2P servers, leading to power reduction per service



Limitations of SCM Deployments

• **Workloads**: A number of write-heavy workloads at Facebook that would not benefit from SCMs.

• **Reliability**: SCMs are not widely available in the market, the reliability of SCMs is a concern until they have been proven in mass deployments.

• **SKU diversification:** Adding a new hardware configuration into the fleet incurs additional qualification, maintenance, and scale deployment costs not included in this TCO analysis.



Conclusion

- We studied the benefit of SCM using Intel Optane memory for 3 read dominated RocksDB workloads
- We extended RocksDB to add new hybrid cache with multiple block cache that uses different kinds of memories
- Demonstrate up to ~50% throughput improvement and ~20% latency decrease by creating new 1P server variants



Acknowledgement

- Yanqin Jin
- Jesse Koh
- Siying Dong
- Pallab Bhattacharya
- Shumin Wu
- Darryl Gardner
- Vijay Balakrishnan
- Anonymous reviewers for their feedback



Thank You

Contact Info: Hiwot Tadese Kassa (hiwot@umich.edu)

