




Chapter 6

Storage and Other I/O Topics

Introduction


- I/O devices can be characterized by
 - Behaviour: input, output, storage
 - Partner: human or machine
 - Data rate: bytes/sec, transfers/sec
- I/O bus connections



I/O System Characteristics

- Dependability is important
 - Particularly for storage devices
- Performance measures
 - Latency (response time)
 - Throughput (bandwidth)
 - Desktops & embedded systems
 - Mainly interested in response time & diversity of devices
 - Servers
 - Mainly interested in throughput & expandability of devices

Dependability




- Fault: failure of a component
 - May or may not lead to system failure

Dependability Measures

- Reliability: mean time to failure (MTTF)
- Service interruption: mean time to repair (MTTR)
- Mean time between failures
 - $MTBF = MTTF + MTTR$
- $Availability = MTTF / (MTTF + MTTR)$
- Improving Availability
 - Increase MTTF: fault avoidance, fault tolerance, fault forecasting
 - Reduce MTTR: improved tools and processes for diagnosis and repair

Disk Storage

- Nonvolatile, rotating magnetic storage



Disk Sectors and Access

- Each sector records
 - Sector ID
 - Data (512 bytes, 4096 bytes proposed)
 - Error correcting code (ECC)
 - Used to hide defects and recording errors
 - Synchronization fields and gaps
- Access to a sector involves
 - Queuing delay if other accesses are pending
 - Seek: move the heads
 - Rotational latency
 - Data transfer
 - Controller overhead

Disk Access Example


- Given
 - 512B sector, 15,000rpm, 4ms average seek time, 100MB/s transfer rate, 0.2ms controller overhead, idle disk
- Average read time
 - 4ms seek time
+ $\frac{1}{2} / (15,000/60) = 2\text{ms}$ rotational latency
+ $512 / 100\text{MB/s} = 0.005\text{ms}$ transfer time
+ 0.2ms controller delay
= 6.2ms
- If actual average seek time is 1ms
 - Average read time = 3.2ms

Disk Performance Issues

- Manufacturers quote average seek time
 - Based on all possible seeks
 - Locality and OS scheduling lead to smaller actual average seek times
- Smart disk controller allocate physical sectors on disk
 - Present logical sector interface to host
 - SCSI, ATA, SATA
- Disk drives include caches
 - Prefetch sectors in anticipation of access
 - Avoid seek and rotational delay

Flash Storage

- Nonvolatile semiconductor storage
 - 100× – 1000× faster than disk
 - Smaller, lower power, more robust
 - But more \$/GB (between disk and DRAM)



Flash Types

- NOR flash: bit cell like a NOR gate
 - Random read/write access
 - Used for instruction memory in embedded systems
- NAND flash: bit cell like a NAND gate
 - Denser (bits/area), but block-at-a-time access
 - Cheaper per GB
 - Used for USB keys, media storage, ...
- Flash bits wears out after 1000's of accesses
 - Not suitable for direct RAM or disk replacement
 - Wear leveling: remap data to less used blocks

Interconnecting Components

- Need interconnections between
 - CPU, memory, I/O controllers
- Bus: shared communication channel
 - Parallel set of wires for data and synchronization of data transfer
 - Can become a bottleneck
- Performance limited by physical factors
 - Wire length, number of connections
- More recent alternative: high-speed serial connections with switches
 - Like networks



Bus Types

- Processor-Memory buses
 - Short, high speed
 - Design is matched to memory organization
- I/O buses
 - Longer, allowing multiple connections
 - Specified by standards for interoperability
 - Connect to processor-memory bus through a bridge


Bus Signals and Synchronization

- Data lines
 - Carry address and data
 - Multiplexed or separate
- Control lines
 - Indicate data type, synchronize transactions
- Synchronous
 - Uses a bus clock
- Asynchronous
 - Uses request/acknowledge control lines for handshaking

I/O Bus Examples

	Firewire	USB 2.0	PCI Express	Serial ATA	Serial Attached SCSI
Intended use	External	External	Internal	Internal	External
Devices per channel	63	127	1	1	4
Data width	4	2	2/lane	4	4
Peak bandwidth	50MB/s or 100MB/s	0.2MB/s, 1.5MB/s, or 60MB/s	250MB/s/lane 1x, 2x, 4x, 8x, 16x, 32x	300MB/s	300MB/s
Hot pluggable	Yes	Yes	Depends	Yes	Yes
Max length	4.5m	5m	0.5m	1m	8m
Standard	IEEE 1394	USB Implementers Forum	PCI-SIG	SATA-IO	INCITS TC T10

Typical x86 PC I/O System



I/O Management

- I/O is mediated by the OS
 - Multiple programs share I/O resources
 - Need protection and scheduling
 - I/O causes asynchronous interrupts
 - Same mechanism as exceptions
 - I/O programming is fiddly
 - OS provides abstractions to programs

I/O Commands

- I/O devices are managed by I/O controller hardware
 - Transfers data to/from device
 - Synchronizes operations with software
- Command registers
 - Cause device to do something
- Status registers
 - Indicate what the device is doing and occurrence of errors
- Data registers
 - Write: transfer data to a device
 - Read: transfer data from a device

I/O Register Mapping

- Memory mapped I/O
 - Registers are addressed in same space as memory
 - Address decoder distinguishes between them
 - OS uses address translation mechanism to make them only accessible to kernel
- I/O instructions
 - Separate instructions to access I/O registers
 - Can only be executed in kernel mode
 - Example: x86

Polling

- Periodically check I/O status register
 - If device ready, do operation
 - If error, take action
- Common in small or low-performance real-time embedded systems
 - Predictable timing
 - Low hardware cost
- In other systems, wastes CPU time

Interrupts

- When a device is ready or error occurs
 - Controller interrupts CPU
- Interrupt is like an exception
 - But not synchronized to instruction execution
 - Can invoke handler between instructions
 - Cause information often identifies the interrupting device
- Priority interrupts
 - Devices needing more urgent attention get higher priority
 - Can interrupt handler for a lower priority interrupt

I/O Data Transfer

- Polling and interrupt-driven I/O
 - CPU transfers data between memory and I/O data registers
 - Time consuming for high-speed devices
- Direct memory access (DMA)
 - OS provides starting address in memory
 - I/O controller transfers to/from memory autonomously
 - Controller interrupts on completion or error

DMA/Cache Interaction

- If DMA writes to a memory block that is cached
 - Cached copy becomes stale
- If write-back cache has dirty block, and DMA reads memory block
 - Reads stale data
- Need to ensure cache coherence
 - Flush blocks from cache if they will be used for DMA
 - Or use non-cacheable memory locations for I/O

DMA/VM Interaction

- OS uses virtual addresses for memory
 - DMA blocks may not be contiguous in physical memory
- Should DMA use virtual addresses?
 - Would require controller to do translation
- If DMA uses physical addresses
 - May need to break transfers into page-sized chunks
 - Or chain multiple transfers
 - Or allocate contiguous physical pages for DMA

Measuring I/O Performance

- I/O performance depends on
 - Hardware: CPU, memory, controllers, buses
 - Software: operating system, database management system, application
 - Workload: request rates and patterns
- I/O system design can trade-off between response time and throughput
 - Measurements of throughput often done with constrained response-time

Transaction Processing Benchmarks

- Transactions
 - Small data accesses to a DBMS
 - Interested in I/O rate, not data rate
- Measure throughput
 - Subject to response time limits and failure handling
 - ACID (Atomicity, Consistency, Isolation, Durability)
 - Overall cost per transaction
- Transaction Processing Council (TPC) benchmarks (www.tpc.org)
 - TPC-APP: B2B application server and web services
 - TCP-C: on-line order entry environment
 - TCP-E: on-line transaction processing for brokerage firm
 - TPC-H: decision support — business oriented ad-hoc queries

File System & Web Benchmarks

- SPEC System File System (SFS)
 - Synthetic workload for NFS server, based on monitoring real systems
 - Results
 - Throughput (operations/sec)
 - Response time (average ms/operation)
- SPEC Web Server benchmark
 - Measures simultaneous user sessions, subject to required throughput/session
 - Three workloads: Banking, Ecommerce, and Support

I/O vs. CPU Performance

- Amdahl's Law
 - Don't neglect I/O performance as parallelism increases compute performance
- Example
 - Benchmark takes 90s CPU time, 10s I/O time
 - Double the number of CPUs/2 years
 - I/O unchanged

Year	CPU time	I/O time	Elapsed time	% I/O time
now	90s	10s	100s	10%
+2	45s	10s	55s	18%
+4	23s	10s	33s	31%
+6	11s	10s	21s	47%



RAID

- Redundant Array of Inexpensive (Independent) Disks
 - Use multiple smaller disks (c.f. one large disk)
 - Parallelism improves performance
 - Plus extra disk(s) for redundant data storage
- Provides fault tolerant storage system
 - Especially if failed disks can be “hot swapped”
- RAID 0
 - No redundancy (“AID”?)
 - Just stripe data over multiple disks
 - But it does improve performance

RAID 1 & 2

- RAID 1: Mirroring
 - $N + N$ disks, replicate data
 - Write data to both data disk and mirror disk
 - On disk failure, read from mirror
- RAID 2: Error correcting code (ECC)
 - $N + E$ disks (e.g., $10 + 4$)
 - Split data at bit level across N disks
 - Generate E -bit ECC
 - Too complex, not used in practice



RAID 3: Bit-Interleaved Parity

- N + 1 disks
 - Data striped across N disks at byte level
 - Redundant disk stores parity
 - Read access
 - Read all disks
 - Write access
 - Generate new parity and update all disks
 - On failure
 - Use parity to reconstruct missing data
- Not widely used

RAID 4: Block-Interleaved Parity


- N + 1 disks
 - Data striped across N disks at block level
 - Redundant disk stores parity for a group of blocks
 - Read access
 - Read only the disk holding the required block
 - Write access
 - Just read disk containing modified block, and parity disk
 - Calculate new parity, update data disk and parity disk
 - On failure
 - Use parity to reconstruct missing data
- Not widely used

RAID 3 vs RAID 4



RAID 5: Distributed Parity

- N + 1 disks
 - Like RAID 4, but parity blocks distributed across disks
 - Avoids parity disk being a bottleneck
- Widely used



RAID 6: P + Q Redundancy

- N + 2 disks
 - Like RAID 5, but two lots of parity
 - Greater fault tolerance through more redundancy
- Multiple RAID
 - More advanced systems give similar fault tolerance with better performance

RAID Summary

- RAID can improve performance and availability
 - High availability requires hot swapping
- Assumes independent disk failures
 - Too bad if the building burns down!
- See “Hard Disk Performance, Quality and Reliability”
 - <http://www.pcguide.com/ref/hdd/perf/index.htm>

I/O System Design

- Satisfying latency requirements
 - For time-critical operations
 - If system is unloaded
 - Add up latency of components
- Maximizing throughput
 - Find “weakest link” (lowest-bandwidth component)
 - Configure to operate at its maximum bandwidth
 - Balance remaining components in the system
- If system is loaded, simple analysis is insufficient
 - Need to use queuing models or simulation

Server Computers

- Applications are increasingly run on servers
 - Web search, office apps, virtual worlds, ...
- Requires large data center servers
 - Multiple processors, networks connections, massive storage
 - Space and power constraints
- Server equipment built for 19" racks
 - Multiples of 1.75" (1U) high



Rack-Mounted Servers



Sun Fire x4150 1U server



2 Redundant
power Supplies

3 PCI Express Slots

System Status LEDs

Management NIC


Management
Serial

2 USB Ports

4 Gigabit NICs

Video

Sun Fire x4150 1U server



I/O System Design Example

- Given a Sun Fire x4150 system with
 - Workload: 64KB disk reads
 - Each I/O op requires 200,000 user-code instructions and 100,000 OS instructions
 - Each CPU: 10^9 instructions/sec
 - FSB: 10.6 GB/sec peak
 - DRAM DDR2 667MHz: 5.336 GB/sec
 - PCI-E 8× bus: $8 \times 250\text{MB/sec} = 2\text{GB/sec}$
 - Disks: 15,000 rpm, 2.9ms avg. seek time, 112MB/sec transfer rate
- What I/O rate can be sustained?
 - For random reads, and for sequential reads

Design Example (cont)

- I/O rate for CPUs
 - Per core: $10^9 / (100,000 + 200,000) = 3,333$
 - 8 cores: 26,667 ops/sec
- Random reads, I/O rate for disks
 - Assume actual seek time is average/4
 - Time/op = seek + latency + transfer
 $= 2.9\text{ms}/4 + 4\text{ms}/2 + 64\text{KB}/(112\text{MB/s}) = 3.3\text{ms}$
 - 303 ops/sec per disk, 2424 ops/sec for 8 disks
- Sequential reads
 - $112\text{MB/s} / 64\text{KB} = 1750$ ops/sec per disk
 - 14,000 ops/sec for 8 disks

Design Example (cont)

- PCI-E I/O rate
 - $2\text{GB/sec} / 64\text{KB} = 31,250 \text{ ops/sec}$
- DRAM I/O rate
 - $5.336 \text{ GB/sec} / 64\text{KB} = 83,375 \text{ ops/sec}$
- FSB I/O rate
 - Assume we can sustain half the peak rate
 - $5.3 \text{ GB/sec} / 64\text{KB} = 81,540 \text{ ops/sec per FSB}$
 - $163,080 \text{ ops/sec for 2 FSBs}$
- Weakest link: disks
 - $2424 \text{ ops/sec random, } 14,000 \text{ ops/sec sequential}$
 - Other components have ample headroom to accommodate these rates

Fallacy: Disk Dependability

- If a disk manufacturer quotes MTTF as 1,200,000hr (140yr)
 - A disk will work that long
- Wrong: this is the mean time to failure
 - What is the distribution of failures?
 - What if you have 1000 disks
 - How many will fail per year?

$$\text{Annual Failure Rate (AFR)} = \frac{1000 \text{ disks} \times 8760 \text{ hrs/disk}}{1200000 \text{ hrs/failure}} = 0.73\%$$



Fallacies

- Disk failure rates are as specified
 - Studies of failure rates in the field
 - Schroeder and Gibson: 2% to 4% vs. 0.6% to 0.8%
 - Pinheiro, *et al.*: 1.7% (first year) to 8.6% (third year) vs. 1.5%
 - Why?
- A 1GB/s interconnect transfers 1GB in one sec
 - But what's a GB?
 - For bandwidth, use $1\text{GB} = 10^9 \text{ B}$
 - For storage, use $1\text{GB} = 2^{30} \text{ B} = 1.075 \times 10^9 \text{ B}$
 - So 1GB/sec is 0.93GB in one second
 - About 7% error

Pitfall: Offloading to I/O Processors

- Overhead of managing I/O processor request may dominate
 - Quicker to do small operation on the CPU
 - But I/O architecture may prevent that
- I/O processor may be slower
 - Since it's supposed to be simpler
- Making it faster makes it into a major system component
 - Might need its own coprocessors!

Pitfall: Backing Up to Tape

- Magnetic tape used to have advantages
 - Removable, high capacity
- Advantages eroded by disk technology developments
- Makes better sense to replicate data
 - E.g, RAID, remote mirroring

Fallacy: Disk Scheduling

- Best to let the OS schedule disk accesses
 - But modern drives deal with logical block addresses
 - Map to physical track, cylinder, sector locations
 - Also, blocks are cached by the drive
 - OS is unaware of physical locations
 - Reordering can reduce performance
 - Depending on placement and caching

Pitfall: Peak Performance

- Peak I/O rates are nearly impossible to achieve
 - Usually, some other system component limits performance
 - E.g., transfers to memory over a bus
 - Collision with DRAM refresh
 - Arbitration contention with other bus masters
 - E.g., PCI bus: peak bandwidth ~133 MB/sec
 - In practice, max 80MB/sec sustainable

Concluding Remarks

- I/O performance measures
 - Throughput, response time
 - Dependability and cost also important
- Buses used to connect CPU, memory, I/O controllers
 - Polling, interrupts, DMA
- I/O benchmarks
 - TPC, SPECIFS, SPECWeb
- RAID
 - Improves performance and dependability

