

ECE 350

Real-time

Operating

Systems



Lecture 10: I/O Subsystem and Storage Devices

Prof. Seyed Majid Zahedi

<https://ece.uwaterloo.ca/~smzahedi>


Outline

- I/O subsystem
- I/O performance
 - Some queueing theory
- Storage devices
 - Magnetic storage
 - Flash memory

What's Next?

- So far in this course
 - We have learned how to manage CPU and memory
- What about I/O?
 - Without I/O, computers are useless (disembodied brains?)
 - But ... there is incredible variety of I/O devices
 - Accelerator (e.g., GPU, TPU), storage (e.g., SSD, HDD), transmission (e.g., NIC, wireless adaptor), human-interface (e.g., keyboard, mouse)
 - How can we **standardize interfaces** to these devices?
 - Devices are unreliable: media failures and transmission errors
 - How can we make them **reliable**?
 - Devices are **unpredictable** and/or slow
 - How can we manage them if we don't know what they will do or how they will perform?

Example: Wide Range of I/O Transfer Rates



- Transfer rates vary over 7 orders of magnitude!
 - System better be able to handle this wide range
 - Better not have high overhead/byte for fast devices!
 - Better not waste time waiting for slow devices

Goal of I/O Subsystem

- Provide uniform interfaces, despite wide range of different devices
 - This code works on many different devices:

```
FILE fd = fopen("/dev/something", "rw");
for (int i = 0; i < 10; i++) {
    fprintf(fd, "Count %d\n", i);
}
close(fd);
```

- Why? Because device drivers implement standard interface
- We will get a flavor for what is involved in controlling devices in this lecture
 - We can only scratch the surface!

I/O Devices: Operational Parameters

- **Data granularity:** byte vs. block
 - Some devices provide single byte at a time (e.g., keyboard)
 - Others provide whole blocks (e.g., disks, networks, etc.)
- **Access pattern:** sequential vs. random
 - Some devices must be accessed sequentially (e.g., tape)
 - Others can be accessed “randomly” (e.g., disk, cd, etc.)
 - Fixed overhead to start transfers
- **Notification mechanisms:** polling vs. interrupt
 - Some devices require continual monitoring
 - Others generate interrupts when they need service

I/O Devices: Data Access

- **Character/byte devices:** e.g., keyboards, mice, serial ports, some USB devices
 - Access single characters at a time
 - Commands include `get()`, `put()`
 - Libraries layered to allow line editing
- **Block devices:** e.g., disk drives, tape drives, DVD-ROM
 - Access blocks of data
 - Commands include `open()`, `read()`, `write()`, `seek()`
- **Network devices:** e.g., ethernet, wireless, Bluetooth
 - Different enough from block/character to have its own interface
 - Unix and Windows include `socket` interface

I/O Devices: Timing


- **Blocking interface:** “wait”
 - When request data (e.g., `read()` system call), put to sleep until data is ready
 - When write data (e.g., `write()` system call), put to sleep until device is ready
- **Non-blocking interface:** “don’t wait”
 - Return quickly from read or write with count of bytes successfully transferred
 - Read may return nothing, write may write nothing
- **Asynchronous interface:** “tell me later”
 - When request data, take pointer to user’s buffer, return immediately; later kernel fills buffer and notifies user
 - When send data, take pointer to user’s buffer, return immediately; later kernel takes data and notifies user

I/O Devices: Notification Mechanisms

- **Polling:** CPU periodically checks device-specific status register
 - E.g., I/O device puts completion information in status register
 - + CPU is not frequently interrupted by unpredictable events
 - – CPU time is wasted if it polls for infrequent or unpredictable I/O events
- **Interrupt-driven:** device generates interrupt whenever it needs service
 - + CPU time could be spent on other things rather than polling for I/O
 - – Interrupt handling could introduce unpredictability
- **Hybrid:** combination of polling and interrupt-driven
 - E.g., high-bandwidth network adapter
 - Interrupt for first incoming packet
 - Poll for following packets until hardware queues are empty




Typical North/Southbridge Layout



PCI Evolution


- PCI started life out as **parallel bus**
- But parallel bus has many limitations
 - Multiplexing address/data for many requests
 - Slowest devices must be able to tell what's happening (e.g., for arbitration)
 - Bus speed is set to that of the slowest device



PCI Express (PCIe)

- PCIe turned conventional PCI bus from parallel bus architecture into *serial, packet-switched, point-to-point* architecture
 - Each device is connected to PCIe *switch* with dedicated, bi-directional link
 - PCIe bus is very similar to packet-switched networks
- Devices can use as many *lanes* as they need to achieve desired bandwidth
 - Slow devices don't have to share with fast ones
- Device abstraction in Linux seamlessly migrated from PCI to PCIe
 - Physical interconnect changed completely, but old API still worked
 - PCIe added new features but kept the same standardized API
 - Drivers written for older PCI devices still worked on new PCIe buses
 - Without being able to use new features of course

I/O Device Controller




- Device controller (may) contains set of registers and memory buffers
 - CPU communicate with devices by reading from and writing to registers and buffers
 - PCI devices have *configuration space registers* used to perform auto configuration
 - E.g., during device enumeration, **base address register (BAR)** is used by PCI device to specify how much memory it needs

Accessing I/O Devices

- **Port-mapped:** I/O devices have separate address space from physical memory
 - Port-mapped I/O is also called *isolated I/O*
 - Entire bus could be dedicated to I/O devices
 - CPU performs I/O operations using special I/O instructions
 - Example: **in/out** instructions used in some Intel microprocessors (e.g., **out 0x21,al**)
- **Memory-mapped:** I/O devices use the same address space as physical memory
 - I/O devices listen to the same address bus that is connected to memory
 - Addresses reserved for I/O should not be available to physical memory
 - I/O devices are accessed like they are part of memory using
 - Example: **load/store** instructions

Example: Memory-mapped Display Controller

- Map registers and/or buffers into physical address space
 - Addresses are set by HW jumpers, BIOS, or OS at boot time
- Change image on screen by writing to display memory
 - Also called the “frame buffer”
 - E.g., address range of **0x8000F000-0x8000FFFF**
- Write graphics description to command-queue area
 - E.g., write set of triangles that describe some scene to address range of **0x80010000-0x8001FFFF**
- Send command to graphics HW by writing to command register
 - E.g., write to address **0x0007F004** to render triangles in above example
- Protect mapped addresses using address translation
 - Set them read only or write only, and typically non-cacheable



Recall: I/O Data Transfer


- Programmed I/O
 - Each byte transferred via processor in/out or load/store
 - + Simple hardware, easy to program
 - – Consumes processor cycles proportional to data size
- Direct memory access (DMA)
 - Give controller access to memory bus
 - Ask it to transfer data blocks to/from memory directly

DMA for PCIe Devices

- PCIe enables point-to-point communication between all endpoints
- Each device contains its own, proprietary DMA engine
 - Unlike ISA, there is no central DMA controller
- Device driver programs DMA engine and signals it to begin DMA transfer
- DMA engine sends packets directly to memory controller
- Once transfer is over, DMA engine raises interrupts (using same PCIe bus)

I/O Devices: Memory Protection


- Typically, I/O devices can only read/write from **contiguous range** of memory addresses
 - E.g., after device enumeration, BAR holds base address of mapped memory block
- In old computers, I/O devices could directly access physical memory
 - + Fast memory access: devices can transfer data at maximum speed possible
 - – Reduced flexibility: OS must reserve contiguous physical memory regions for devices
 - – No memory protection: malicious devices can compromise system (e.g., DMA attack)
- New architectures provide address translation for I/O devices
 - I/O memory management unit (IOMMU) maps virtual addresses to physical address for I/O devices
 - E.g., AMD Vi and Intel VT-d



Memory Translation for PCIe Devices

- **Problem 1:** address translation services (ATS) allows PCIe devices to bypass IOMMU
 - PCIe devices can implement address translation cache (ATC) similar to TLB
 - Using ATS protocol, any device can claim it is using addresses that have already been translated
 - For trusted devices, this is useful performance improvement
 - For untrusted devices, this introduces security threat
 - ATS protocol could allow malicious device to write to places it should not have access to
- **Problem 2:** PCIe packets do not reach IOMMU when devices communicate with each other
 - PCIe allows peer-to-peer communication between devices
 - Malicious devices can compromise other devices by reading from or writing to their registers/buffers
- **Solution:** access control services (ACS) disables ATS and prevents peer-to-peer transactions
 - ACS acts as gate-keeper, forcing all packets to go up to root complex and pass through IOMMU
 - Without ACS, PCIe endpoints can accidentally or intentionally write to invalid or illegal area on peer endpoints and physical memory


I/O Performance Concepts



- **Latency:** time to serve I/O request (response time)
 - From when it is placed in queue until its data is completely transferred
- **Throughput:** rate of serving I/O requests
 - To measure highest possible throughput, device should never become idle (queue should not become empty)
- **Overhead:** time to initiate data transfer for I/O request
 - From when it is placed in queue until data transfer starts



I/O Performance Concepts (cont.)

- Peak bandwidth: maximum rate of data transfer
 - Depends on bus bandwidth
 - E.g., PCIe v5.0: 3.93GBps (per lane)
 - Also depends on device bandwidth
 - E.g., rotational speed of disk
 - E.g., write/read rate of NAND flash
 - Whichever is the bottleneck ...
- Effective bandwidth: rate of data transfer for I/O request
 - Latency degrades bandwidth
 - For most I/O requests, latency is roughly linear in size of transferred data
 - $\text{Latency}(n) = \text{overhead} + n / \text{peak bandwidth}$
 - $\text{Effective bandwidth}(n) = n / \text{latency}(n)$




How Does Overhead Affect Effective Bandwidth?


- Latency(n) = $O + n/P$ (O for overhead and P for peak bandwidth)
- Effective bandwidth = $n/(O + n/P) = P/(P \times O/n + 1)$
 - E.g., effective bandwidth is half of peak bandwidth when $n = O \times B$
- Suppose that peak bandwidth is 1 Gbps
 - If overhead is 1ms, then $n = 125,000$ bytes
 - If overhead is 10ms, then $n = 1,250,000$ bytes




Contributing Factors to Overhead



- Overhead = wait time in queue + controller and device service time
- Queuing behavior can lead to big increases of latency as utilization increases




A Simple Deterministic World




- One arrival every T_A time units
- Fixed service time of T_S time units
- Service rate: $\mu = 1/T_S$
- Arrival rate: $\lambda = 1/T_A$
- Utilization: $\rho = \min(1, \lambda/\mu)$
- Throughput: $\tau = \min(\mu, \lambda)$

A Simple Deterministic World (cont.)


- Number of arrivals at time t : $A_t = t \times \lambda$
- Number of departures at time t : $D_t = t \times \min(\lambda, \mu)$
- Number of requests in queue at time t : $L_t = A_t - D_t$
- Wait time in queue for request arriving at time t : $W_t = L_t / \mu$
- $L_t = W_t = 0$ if $\lambda \leq \mu$




- $L_t = t \times (\lambda - \mu)$ and $W_t = t \times (\rho - 1)$ if $\lambda > \mu$



A Bursty World




- Requests arrive in burst, must queue up till served
- Same average arrival time, but requests experience large queue delays
- Even though average utilization is low



How Do We Model Burstiness?


- One option is to use probability distributions to model inter-arrival times
- Popular choice is exponential distribution
 - Cumulative distribution function (CDF): $\Pr(T_A \leq x) = 1 - e^{-\lambda x}$, for $x \geq 0$ & $E[T_A] = 1/\lambda$



- **Memoryless:** likelihood of new arrival is independent of time passed since the last one
 - $\Pr(T_A > t + s | T_A > S) = \Pr(T_A > t)$
 - Past tells us nothing about future
 - Many complex systems (or aggregates) are well described as memoryless

Background: Properties of Random Variables

- Consider random variable X taking values in $[x_1, x_2]$
 - Mean (average): $m_X = E[X] = \sum_{x_1}^{x_2} \Pr(x) x$
 - Variance (standard deviation): $\sigma_X^2 = \sum_{x_1}^{x_2} \Pr(x) (x - m)^2 = E[X^2] - E[X]^2$



- Squared coefficient of variance (SCV): $C_X = \sigma_X^2/m_X^2$
 - No variance or deterministic $\Rightarrow C = 0$
 - Memoryless or exponential $\Rightarrow C = 1$

Little's Law [John Little, 1961]




- In any **stationary** system (i.e., system parameters do not change over time)

$$L = \lambda \times W$$

- Average number of items in system is equal to average arrival rate multiplied by average time each item spends in system


Little's Law Applied to Queues



- Average number of request in system is equal to average number of request waiting in queue plus average number of requests in server (i.e., utilization)
 - $L = (L_Q + \rho)$
- Average time of request in system is equal to average time of request in queue plus average service time
 - $W = (W_Q + 1/\mu)$
- Little's law implies
 - $L_Q = \lambda \times W_Q$


A Little Queuing Theory

- Assumptions
 - System is **stable** and **stationary** and there is no limit to size of queue
 - Time between successive arrivals is **random** and **memoryless**
- Parameters that describe our system
 - λ : arrival rate ($1/E[T_A]$)
 - μ : service rate ($1/E[T_S]$)
 - C_S : SCV of service time
 - ρ : utilization (λ/μ)
- Parameters we wish to compute
 - W_Q : average time spent waiting in queue
 - L_Q : average length of queue = $\lambda \times W$ (by Little's law)
- Important results for 1 server
 - Memoryless service time distribution (**M/M/1 queue**): $W_Q = \rho/\mu(1 - \rho)$
 - General service time distribution (**M/G/1 queue**): $W_Q = \rho(C_S + 1)/2\mu(1 - \rho)$




Why Unbounded Response Time?

- Assume deterministic arrival and service times
 - It is possible to sustain $\rho = 1$ with bounded response time!




- Assume stochastic arrival process (and service time)
 - No longer possible to achieve $\rho = 1$

This wasted time can never be reclaimed!
So we cannot achieve $\rho = 1$!




How Do Real-world Systems Avoid Unbounded Queueing Delays?

- Open system



- Closed system



- Clients adjust request rate based on response time of previous requests
- As system saturates delay increases, request rate is limited by service rate
- Many protocols are designed to have **self-limited behavior**
(e.g., TCP congestion control)

Example: M/M/I Queue and Disk

- Usage statistics (M/M/I queue)
 - User sends 10 requests per second for 8KB data block from disk
 - Inter-arrival times and service times are exponentially distributed
 - Average service time per request is 20ms
- Questions
 - How utilized is the disk ($\rho = \lambda/\mu$)
 - $10/50 = 0.2$
 - What is the average time spent in the queue (W_Q)?
 - $0.2 / (50 \times 0.8) = 5\text{ms}$
 - What is the average number of requests in the queue (L_Q)?
 - $5\text{ms} \times 10\text{req/s} = 0.05$
 - What is the average overhead for each disk request ($W_Q + 1/\mu$)?
 - $5\text{ms} + 20\text{ms} = 25\text{ms}$

Where are we?


- I/O subsystem
- I/O performance
 - Some queueing theory
- Storage devices
 - Magnetic storage
 - Flash memory

Storage Devices

- Magnetic disks
 - Storage that rarely becomes corrupted
 - Large capacity at low cost
 - Block level random access (except for Shingled Magnetic Recording (SMR))
 - Slow performance for random access
 - Better performance for sequential access
- Flash memory
 - Storage that rarely becomes corrupted
 - Capacity at intermediate cost (5-20x disk)
 - Block level random access
 - Good performance for reads; worse for random writes
 - Erasure requirement in large blocks
 - Wear patterns issue

The Amazing Magnetic Disk

- Unit of transfer: **sector**
 - Ring of sectors form **track**
 - Stack of tracks form **cylinder**
 - **Heads** position on cylinders
- Disk tracks $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$ (micron) wide
 - Wavelength of light is $\sim 0.5 \mu\text{m}$
 - Resolution of human eye: $50 \mu\text{m}$
 - **100K tracks on a typical 2.5" disk**
- Separated by unused guard regions
 - Reduces likelihood neighboring tracks are corrupted during writes
(still small non-zero chance)




The Amazing Magnetic Disk (cont.)

- Track length varies across disk
 - Outside: More sectors per track, higher bandwidth
 - Disk is organized into regions of tracks with same # of sectors/track
 - Only outer half of radius is used
 - Most of disk area in outer regions of disk
- Disks are so big that some companies (like Google) reportedly only use part of disk for active data
 - Rest is archival data




Magnetic Disks

- Recall: cylinder is all tracks under head at any given point on all surface
- Read/write data includes three stages
 - **Seek time**: position r/w head over proper track
 - **Rotational latency**: wait for desired sector to rotate under r/w head
 - **Transfer time**: transfer block of bits (sector) under r/w head



Disk Latency = Queuing Time + Controller time + Seek Time + Rotation Time + Transfer Time



Disk Performance Example


- Assumptions
 - Ignoring queuing and controller times for now
 - Average seek time of 5ms
 - 7200RPM \Rightarrow time for rotation: $60000 \text{ (ms/minute)} / 7200 \text{ (rotation/minute)} \cong 8\text{ms}$
 - Transfer rate of 4 MiB/s, sector size of 1KiB $\Rightarrow 2^{10} \text{ B} / 2^{22} \text{ (B/s)} = 2^{-12} \text{ s} \cong 0.24\text{ms}$
- Read sector from random place on disk
 - Seek (5ms) + rotational delay (4ms) + transfer (0.24ms)
 - Approximately 10ms to fetch/put data: 100KiB/s
- Read sector from random place in same cylinder
 - Rotational delay (4ms) + transfer (0.24ms)
 - Approximately 5ms to fetch/put data: 200 KiB/s
- Read next sector on same track
 - Transfer (0.24ms): 4 MiB/s
- Key to using disk effectively (especially for file systems) is to minimize seek & rotational delays

More Examples

- How long to complete 500 random disk reads (in FIFO order)?
 - $500 \times 9.24\text{ms} = 4.12\text{s}$
- How long to complete 500 sequential disk reads (starting from random sector)?
 - Seek (5ms) + rotational delay (4ms) + transfer ($500 \times 0.24\text{ms}$) = 0.129s
 - Might need an extra head or track switch
 - Track buffer may allow some sectors to be read off disk out of order
- How large transferred data should be to achieve 80% of max disk transfer rate (zero track-to-track seek time)?
 - Assume R rotations are needed, then solve for R
 - Recall: effective bandwidth = data size/latency = peak bandwidth × transfer time/latency
 - Transfer time / latency = 0.8
 - Transfer time = $R \times$ rotation time = $R \times 8\text{ms}$
 - Latency = Seek (5ms) + transfer time ($R \times 8\text{ms}$)
 - Note that rotational delay is zero because entire track is transferred
 - $R = 2.5 \Rightarrow$ transferred data size = $2.5 \times 8\text{ms} \times 4 \text{ MB/s} \cong 8\text{KiB}$

(Lots of) Intelligence in Controller

- Sectors contain sophisticated **error correcting codes**
 - Disk head magnet has field wider than track
 - Hide corruptions due to neighboring track writes
- **Sector sparing**
 - Remap bad sectors transparently to spare sectors on the same surface
- **Slip sparing**
 - Remap all sectors (when there is a bad sector) to preserve sequential behavior
- **Track skewing**
 - Offset sector numbers to allow for disk head movement to achieve sequential operations
- ...




Example of Current HDDs

- Seagate EXOS X14 (2018)
 - 14 TB hard disk
 - 8 platters, 16 heads
 - 4.16 ms average seek time
 - 4 KB physical sectors
 - 7200 RPMs
 - 6 Gbps SATA / 12Gbps SAS interface
 - 261 MB/s MAX transfer rate
 - Cache size: 256 MB
- IBM Personal Computer/AT (1986)
 - 30 MB hard disk
 - 30-40 ms seek time
 - 0.7-1 MB/s (est.)





Disk Scheduling

- **FCFS**: schedule requests in order they arrive
 - + Fair among requests
 - – Poor performance for sequence of requests that alternate between outer and inner tracks
- **Shortest seek time first (SSTF)**: pick the request that is closest to head
 - + Avoid frequent long seeks
 - – May lead to starvation!
- **SCAN**: move disk arm in one direction, take the closest request in direction of travel, then reverse direction also called “elevator scheduling”)
 - + No starvation
 - + Low seek
 - – Favoring middle tracks



Disk Scheduling (cont.)

- **CSCAN:** move disk arm in one direction, take the closest request in direction of travel, then start again from farthest request
 - + Fairer than SCAN
 - - Longer seeks on the way back




- **R-CSCAN:** CSCAN but consider that short track switch has rotational delay

Example: FCFS

queue = 98, 183, 37, 122, 14, 124, 65, 67


head starts at 53



Example: SCAN

queue = 98, 183, 37, 122, 14, 124, 65, 67


head starts at 53



Example: C-SCAN

queue = 98, 183, 37, 122, 14, 124, 65, 67

head starts at 53






Final Notes on Disk Performance

- When is disk performance highest?
 - When there are big sequential reads, or
 - When there is so much work to do that they can be piggy backed (reordering queues)
- OK to be inefficient when things are mostly idle
- Bursts are both a threat and an opportunity
- Other techniques:
 - Reduce overhead through user level drivers
 - Reduce the impact of I/O delays by doing other useful work in the meantime


Flash Memory

- 1995: replace rotating magnetic media with battery backed DRAM
- 2009: use NAND multi-level cell (e.g., 2 or 3-bit cell) flash memory
 - No charge on FG \Rightarrow 1 and negative charge on FG \Rightarrow 0



- Data can be addressed, read, and modified in pages, typically between 4KiB and 16KiB
- But ... data can only be erased at level of entire blocks (MB in size)
- When block is erased all cells are logically set to 1
- No moving parts (no rotate/seek motors)
 - Eliminates seek and rotational delay
 - Very low power and lightweight
 - Limited “write cycles”


Flash Memory: Reads



- Reading data similar to memory read
 - No seek or rotational latency
- Transfer rate is limited by controller and bus
 - E.g., transfer 4KiB page over SATA: 300-600 MiB/s \Rightarrow 4KiB / 400MiB/s \sim 10us
- Latency = queuing time + controller time + transfer time
- Highest bandwidth: sequential OR random reads

Flash Memory: Writes


- Writing data is complex!
- Write and erase cycles require “high” voltage
 - Damages memory cells, limits SSD lifespan
 - Controller uses ECC, performs wear leveling
- Data can only be written into empty pages in each block
- Pages cannot be erased individually, erasing entire block takes time



Flash Memory Controller

- Includes flash translation layer (FTL)
 - Maps logical page numbers to physical locations
- Maintains pool of empty blocks by coalescing used pages
 - Garbage collects blocks by copying live pages to new location, then erase
 - More efficient if blocks stored at the same time are deleted at the same time (e.g., keep blocks of file together)
- Wear-levels by only writing each physical page a limited number of times
- Remaps pages that no longer work (sector sparing)
- How does flash device know which blocks are live?
 - File system tells device when blocks are no longer in use (*Trim command*)


Example: Writes with GC



- Rewriting some data requires reading, updating, and writing to new locations
- If new location was previously used, it also needs to be erased
- Much larger portions of flash may be erased and rewritten than required by size of new data

Flash Memory: Write Amplification

- Flash memory must be erased before it can be rewritten
- Erasure happens in much coarser granularity than writes
- Flash controllers end up moving (or rewriting) user data and metadata more than once



- This multiplying effect increases number of writes required
 - Shortens life cycle of SSD
 - Consumes bandwidth, which reduces random write performance
- Result is very workload dependent performance
- Latency = queuing time + controller time (find free block) + transfer time
- Highest bandwidth: Sequential OR random writes (limited by empty pages)

Example of Current SSDs



Samsung SSD 970 EVO Plus					
Usage Application	Client PCs				
Interface	PCIe Gen 3.0 x4, NVMe 1.3				
Hardware Information	Capacity ¹⁾	250GB	500GB	1TB	2TB
	Controller	Samsung Phoenix Controller			
	NAND Flash Memory	Samsung V-NAND 3bit MLC			
	DRAM Cache Memory	512MB LPDDR4		1GB LPDDR4	2GB LPDDR4
	Dimension	Max 80.15 x Max 22.15 x Max 2.38 (mm)			
	Form Factor	M.2 (2280) ²⁾			
Performance (Up to.) ³⁾⁴⁾	Sequential Read	3500 MB/s			
	Sequential Write	2300 MB/s	3200 MB/s	3300 MB/s	
	QD1	Ran. Read	17K IOPS	19K IOPS	
	Thread 1	Ran. Write	60K IOPS		
		QD 32	Ran. Read	480K IOPS	600K IOPS
	Thread 4	Ran. Write	550K IOPS		
			620K IOPS		

Is Full Kindle Heavier Than Empty One?

- Actually, “Yes”, but not by much
- Flash works by trapping electrons:
 - So, erased state lower energy than written state
- Assuming that:
 - Kindle has 4 GB flash
 - $\frac{1}{2}$ of all bits in full Kindle are in high-energy state
 - High-energy state about 10-15 joules higher
 - Then: Full Kindle is 1 attogram (10^{-18} gram) heavier (Using $E = mc^2$)
- Of course, this is less than most sensitive scale can measure (10^{-9} grams)
- This difference is overwhelmed by battery discharge, weight from getting warm, ...

According to John Kubiatowicz (New York Times, Oct 24, 2011)

SSD Summary



- Pros (vs. hard disk drives)
 - Low latency, high throughput (eliminate seek/rotational delay)
 - No moving parts (very light weight, low power, silent, very shock insensitive)
 - Read at memory speeds (limited by controller and I/O bus)
- Cons (these are changing rapidly!)
 - Expensive
 - Asymmetric block write performance
 - Controller garbage collection (GC) algorithms have major effect on performance
 - Limited drive lifetime
 - 1-10K writes/page for MLC NAND
 - Average failure rate is 6 years, life expectancy is 9–11 years

HDD vs. SSD



Usually 10 000 or 15 000 rpm SAS drives

0.1 ms

Access times

5.5 ~ 8.0 ms

SSDs deliver at least
6000 io/s

Random I/O Performance

SSDs are at least 15 times faster than HDDs

HDDs reach up to
400 io/s

SSDs have a failure rate of less than
0.5 %

Reliability

This makes SSDs 4 - 10 times more reliable

HDD's failure rate fluctuates between
2 ~ 5 %

SSDs consume between
2 & 5 watts

Energy savings

This means that on a large server like ours, approximately 100 watts are saved

HDDs consume between
6 & 15 watts

SSDs have an average I/O wait of
1 %

CPU Power

You will have an extra 6% of CPU power for other operations

HDDs' average I/O wait is about
7 %

the average service time for an I/O request while running a backup remains below

20 ms

the I/O request time with HDDs during backup rises up to

400~500 ms

SSD backups take about
6 hours

Backup Rates


SSDs allows for 3 - 5 times faster backups for your data

HDD backups take up to
20~24 hours

Summary

- I/O devices
 - Different speeds, different access patterns, different access timing
- I/O controllers
 - Hardware that controls actual device
 - Processor accesses through I/O instructions, load/store to special physical memory
- I/O performance
 - $\text{Latency} = \text{overhead} + \text{transfer}$
 - Queueing theory help in analyzing overhead
- Disk scheduling
 - FIFO, SSTF, SCAN, CSCAN, R-CSCAN
- HDD performance
 - $\text{Latency} = \text{queuing time} + \text{controller} + \text{seek} + \text{rotation} + \text{transfer}$
- SSD performance
 - $\text{Latency} = \text{queuing time} + \text{controller} + \text{transfer}$ (erasure & wear)

Questions?



Acknowledgment

- Slides by courtesy of Anderson, Culler, Stoica, Silberschatz, Joseph, and Canny