

# 5.11 Parallelism and memory hierarchy: Redundant arrays of inexpensive disks

 This section has been set as optional by your instructor.

Amdahl's law in COD Chapter 1 (Computer Abstractions and Technology) reminds us that neglecting I/O in this parallel revolution is foolhardy. A simple example demonstrates this.

## Example 5.11.1: Impact of I/O on system performance.

Suppose we have a benchmark that executes in 100 seconds of elapsed time, of which 90 seconds is CPU time, and the rest is I/O time. Suppose the number of processors doubles every 2 years, but the processors remain at the same speed, and I/O time doesn't improve. How much faster will our program run at the end of 6 years?

### Answer

We know that

$$\text{Elapsed time} = \text{CPU time} + \text{I/O time}$$

$$100 = 90 + \text{I/O time}$$

$$\text{I/O time} = 10 \text{ seconds}$$

The new CPU times and the resulting elapsed times are computed in the following table.

After <i>n</i> years	CPU time	I/O time	Elapsed time	% I/O time
0 years	90 seconds	10 seconds	100 seconds	10%
2 years	$\frac{90}{2} = 45 \text{ seconds}$	10 seconds	55 seconds	18%
4 years	$\frac{45}{2} = 23 \text{ seconds}$	10 seconds	33 seconds	31%
6 years	$\frac{23}{2} = 11 \text{ seconds}$	10 seconds	21 seconds	47%

The improvement in CPU performance after 6 years is

$$\frac{90}{11} = 8$$

However, the improvement in elapsed time is only

$$\frac{100}{21} = 4.7$$

and the I/O time has increased from 10% to 47% of the elapsed time.

Hence, the parallel revolution needs to come to I/O as well as to computation, or the effort spent in parallelizing could be squandered whenever programs do I/O, which they all must do.

Accelerating I/O performance was the original motivation of disk arrays. In the late 1980s, the high-performance storage of choice was large, expensive disks. The argument was that by replacing a few big disks with many small disks, performance would improve because there would be more read heads. This shift is a good match for multiple processors as well, since many read/write heads mean the storage system could support many more independent accesses as well as large transfers spread across many disks. That is, you could get both high I/Os per second and high data transfer rates. In addition to higher performance, there could be advantages in cost, power, and floor space, since smaller disks are generally more efficient per gigabyte than larger disks.

The flaw in the argument was that disk arrays could make reliability much worse. These smaller, inexpensive drives had lower MTTF ratings than the large drives, but more importantly, by replacing a single drive with, say, 50 small drives, the failure rate would go up by at least a factor of 50.

The solution was to add redundancy so that the system could cope with disk failures without losing information. By having many little disks, the cost of extra redundancy to improve dependability is small, relative to the solutions for a few large disks. Thus, **dependability** was more affordable if you constructed a redundant array of inexpensive disks. This observation led to its name: *redundant arrays of inexpensive disks*, abbreviated **RAID**.



**Redundant arrays of inexpensive disks (RAID):** An organization of disks that uses an array of small and inexpensive disks so as to increase both performance and reliability.


In retrospect, although its invention was motivated by performance, dependability was the key reason for the widespread popularity of RAID. The parallel revolution has resurfaced the original performance side of the argument for RAID. The rest of this section surveys the options for dependability and their impacts on cost and performance.

How much redundancy do you need? Do you need extra information to find the faults? Does it matter how you organize the data and the additional check information on these disks? The paper that coined the term gave an evolutionary answer to these questions, starting with the simplest but most expensive solution. The figure below shows the evolution and example cost in number of extra check disks. To keep track of the evolution, the authors numbered the stages of RAID, and they are still used today.

Figure 5.11.1: RAID for an example of four data disks showing extra check disks per RAID level and companies that use each level (COD Figure 5.11.1).

COD Figures 5.11.2 (Small write update on RAID 4) and 5.11.3 (Block-interleaved parity (RAID 4) versus distributed block-interleaved parity (RAID 5)) explain the difference between RAID 3, RAID 4,

and RAID 5.



#### PARTICIPATION ACTIVITY 5.11.1: Disk parallelism.

- 1) Accelerating \_\_\_\_ performance was the original motivation of disk arrays.  
☐ I/O  
☐ processor
- 2) If a large single disk is replaced with 35 smaller disks, the disk failure rate would go up by at least a factor of \_\_\_\_ .  
☐ 35  
☐ 70
- 3) \_\_\_\_ was added to collections of small disks to improve dependency and reliability in the case of a disk failure.  
☐ Parallelism  
☐ Redundancy

### No redundancy (RAID 0)

Simply spreading data over multiple disks, called *striping*, automatically forces accesses to several disks. Striping across a set of disks makes the collection appear to software as a single large disk, which simplifies storage management. It also improves performance for large accesses, since many disks can operate at once. Video-editing systems, for example, frequently stripe their data and may not worry about dependability as much as, say, databases.

**Striping:** Allocation of logically sequential blocks to separate disks to allow higher performance than a single disk can deliver.

RAID 0 is something of a misnomer, as there is no redundancy. However, RAID levels are often left to the operator to set when creating a storage system, and RAID 0 is often listed as one of the options. Hence, the term RAID 0 has become widely used.

### Mirroring (RAID 1)

This traditional scheme for tolerating disk failure, called *mirroring* or *shadowing*, uses twice as many disks as does RAID 0. Whenever data are written to one disk, those data are also written to a redundant disk, so that there are always two copies of the information. If a disk fails, the system just goes to the "mirror" and reads its contents to get the desired information. Mirroring is the most expensive RAID solution, since it requires the most disks.

**Mirroring:** Writing identical data to multiple disks to increase data availability.

### Error detecting and correcting code (RAID 2)

RAID 2 borrows an error detection and correction scheme most often used for memories (see COD Section 5.5 (Dependable memory hierarchy)). Since RAID 2 has fallen into disuse, we'll not describe it here.

### Bit-interleaved parity (RAID 3)

The cost of higher availability can be reduced to  $1/n$ , where  $n$  is the number of disks in a *protection group*. Rather than have a complete copy of the original data for each disk, we need only add enough redundant information to restore the lost information on a failure. Reads or writes go to all disks in the group, with one extra disk to hold the check information in case there is a failure. RAID 3 is popular in applications with large data sets, such as multimedia and some scientific codes.

**Protection group:** The group of data disks or blocks that share a common check disk or block.

*Parity* is one such scheme. Readers unfamiliar with parity can think of the redundant disk as having the sum of all the data in the other disks. When a disk fails, then you subtract all the data in the good disks from the parity disk; the remaining information must be the missing

information. Parity is simply the sum modulo two.

Unlike RAID 1, many disks must be read to determine the missing data. The assumption behind this technique is that taking longer to recover from failure but spending less on redundant storage is a good tradeoff.

### Block-interleaved parity (RAID 4)


RAID 4 uses the same ratio of data disks and check disks as RAID 3, but they access data differently. The parity is stored as blocks and associated with a set of data blocks.

In RAID 3, every access went to all disks. However, some applications prefer smaller accesses, allowing independent accesses to occur in parallel. That is the purpose of the RAID levels 4 to 7. Since error detection information in each sector is checked on reads to see if the data are correct, such "small reads" to each disk can occur independently as long as the minimum access is one sector. In the RAID context, a small access goes to just one disk in a protection group while a large access goes to all the disks in a protection group.

Writes are another matter. It would seem that each small write would demand that all other disks be accessed to read the rest of the information needed to recalculate the new parity, as in the left in the figure below. A "small write" would require reading the old data and old parity, adding the new information, and then writing the new parity to the parity disk and the new data to the data disk.

Figure 5.11.2: Small write update on RAID 4 (COD Figure 5.11.2).

This optimization for small writes reduces the number of disk accesses as well as the number of disks occupied. This figure assumes we have four blocks of data and one block of parity. The naive RAID 4 parity calculation in the left of the figure reads blocks D1, D2, and D3 before adding block D0' to calculate the new parity P'. (In case you were wondering, the new data D0' comes directly from the CPU, so disks are not involved in reading it.) The RAID 4 shortcut on the right reads the old value D0 and compares it to the new value D0' to see which bits will change. You next read the old parity P and then change the corresponding bits to form P'. The logical function exclusive OR does exactly what we want. This example replaces three disk reads (D1, D2, D3) and two disk writes (D0', P') involving all the disks for two disk reads (D0, P) and two disk writes (D0', P'), which involve just two disks. Enlarging the size of the parity group increases the savings of the shortcut. RAID 5 uses the same shortcut.



The key insight to reduce this overhead is that parity is simply a sum of information; by watching which bits change when we write the new information, we need only change the corresponding bits on the parity disk. The right of the figure above shows the shortcut. We must read the old data from the disk being written, compare old data to the new data to see which bits change, read the old parity, change the corresponding bits, and then write the new data and new parity. Thus, the small write involves four disk accesses to two disks instead of accessing all disks. This organization is RAID 4.

### Distributed block-interleaved parity (RAID 5)


RAID 4 efficiently supports a mixture of large reads, large writes, and small reads, plus it allows small writes. One drawback to the system is that the parity disk must be updated on every write, so the parity disk is the bottleneck for back-to-back writes.

To fix the parity-write bottleneck, the parity information can be spread throughout all the disks so that there is no single bottleneck for writes. The distributed parity organization is RAID 5.

The figure below shows how data are distributed in RAID 4 versus RAID 5. As the organization on the right shows, in RAID 5 the parity associated with each row of data blocks is no longer restricted to a single disk. This organization allows multiple writes to occur simultaneously as long as the parity blocks are not located on the same disk. For example, a write to block 8 on the right must also access its parity block P2, thereby occupying the first and third disks. A second write to block 5 on the right, implying an update to its parity block P1, accesses the second and fourth disks and thus could occur concurrently with the write to block 8. Those same writes to the organization on the left result in changes to blocks P1 and P2, both on the fifth disk, which is a bottleneck.

Figure 5.11.3: Block-interleaved parity (RAID 4) versus distributed block-interleaved parity (RAID 5) (COD Figure 5.11.3).

By distributing parity blocks to all disks, some small writes can be performed in parallel.



### P + Q redundancy (RAID 6)

Parity-based schemes protect against a single self-identifying failure. When a single failure correction is not sufficient, parity can be generalized to have a second calculation over the data and another check disk of information. This second check block allows recovery from a second failure. Thus, the storage overhead is twice that of RAID 5. The small write shortcut of COD Figure 5.11.2 (Small write update on RAID 4) works as well, except now there are six disk accesses instead of four to update both P and Q information.

PARTICIPATION ACTIVITY

5.11.2: RAID stages.

Match each RAID to an organization technique

RAID 1

RAID 0

RAID 3

RAID 6

RAID 5

Mirroring

Bit-interleaved parity

Striping

P+Q redundancy

Distributed block-interleaved parity

Reset

### RAID summary

RAID 1 and RAID 5 are widely used in servers; one estimate is that 80% of disks in servers are found in a RAID organization.

One weakness of the RAID systems is repair. First, to avoid making the data unavailable during repair, the array must be designed to allow the failed disks to be replaced without having to turn off the system. RAIDs have enough redundancy to allow continuous operation, but *hot-swapping* disks place demands on the physical and electrical design of the array and the disk interfaces. Second, another failure could occur during repair, so the repair time affects the chances of losing data: the longer the repair time, the greater the chances of another failure that will lose data. Rather than having to wait for the operator to bring in a good disk, some systems include *standby spares* so that the data can be reconstructed instantly upon discovery of the failure. The operator can then replace the failed disks in a more leisurely fashion. Note that a human operator ultimately determines which disks to remove. Operators are only human, so they occasionally remove the good disk instead of the broken disk, leading to an unrecoverable disk failure.

**Hot-swapping:** Replacing a hardware component while the system is running.

**Standby spares:** Reserve hardware resources that can immediately take the place of a failed component.

In addition to designing the RAID system for repair, there are questions about how disk technology changes over time. Although disk manufacturers quote very high MTTF for their products, those numbers are under nominal conditions. If a particular disk array has been subject to temperature cycles due to, say, the failure of the air-conditioning system, or to shaking due to a poor rack design, construction, or installation, the failure rates can be three to six times higher (see the fallacy in COD Section 5.16 (Fallacies and pitfalls)). The calculation of RAID reliability assumes independence between disk failures, but disk failures could be correlated, because such damage due to the environment would likely happen to all the disks in the array. Another concern is that since disk bandwidth is growing more slowly than disk capacity, the time to repair a disk in a RAID system is increasing, which in turn enhances the chances of a second failure. For example, a 3-TB disk could take almost 9 hours to read sequentially, assuming no interference. Given that the damaged RAID is likely to continue to serve data, reconstruction could be stretched considerably. Besides increasing that time, another concern is that reading much more data during reconstruction means increasing the chance of an uncorrectable read media failure, which would result in data loss. Other arguments for concern about simultaneous multiple failures are the increasing number of disks in arrays and the use of higher-capacity disks.

Hence, these trends have led to a growing interest in protecting against more than one failure, and so RAID 6 is increasingly being offered as an option and being used in the field.

PARTICIPATION ACTIVITY

5.11.3: Check yourself.

Which of the following are true about RAID levels 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6?

1) RAID systems rely on redundancy to achieve high availability.

☐ True

☐ False

2) RAID 1 (mirroring) has the highest check disk overhead.

☐ True

☐ False

3) For small writes, RAID 3 (bit-interleaved parity) has the worst throughput.

☐ True

☐ False

4) For large writes, RAID 3, 4, and 5 have the same throughput.

☐ True

☐ False

### Elaboration

One issue is how mirroring interacts with striping. Suppose you had, say, four disks' worth of data to store and eight physical disks to use. Would you create four pairs of disks—each organized as RAID 1—and then stripe data across the four RAID 1 pairs? Alternatively, would you create two sets of four disks—each organized as RAID 0—and then mirror writes to both

*RAID 0 sets? The RAID terminology has evolved to call the former RAID 1 + 0 or RAID 10 ("striped mirrors") and the latter RAID 0 + 1 or RAID 01 ("mirrored stripes").*

 [Provide feedback on this section](#)