

DiskReduce v2.0 for HDFS

Open Cirrus Summit, Jan 28, 2010

Garth Gibson Carnegie Mellon University and Panasas Inc garth@cs.cmu.edu

Bin Fan, Wittawat Tantisiriroj, Lin Xiao Carnegie Mellon University

Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory YAHOO!

Revisit HDFS Triplication

- GFS & HDFS triplicate every data block
 - Triplication: one local + two remote copies
- 200% space overhead
 - But RAID5 is simple?





Revisit HDFS Triplication

- GFS & HDFS triplicate every data block
 - Triplication: one local + two remote copies
- 200% space overhead
 - But RAID5 is simple?
 - Can be done at scale
 - Panasas does it
 Object RAID over servers







Revisit HDFS Triplication

- GFS & HDFS triplicate
 - Triplication: one local -
- 200% space overhead
 - But RAID5 is simple?
 - Can be done at scale



- Panasas does it
 >PF, >50 GB/s, >10K clients
- But sync error handling hard









Revisit HDFS Reconstruction

- GFS & HDFS triplicate every data block
 - Triplication: one local + two remote copies
- 200% space overhead
 - But RAID5 is simple?
 - Can be done at scale
 - Panasas does it
 PF, >50 GB/s, >10K clients
 - But sync error handling hard
- GFS & HDFS defer repair
 - Background task repairs copies
 - Notably less scary to developers

Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory



R

Since June 09 Summit talk

- Hadoop HDFS (0.22.0) implemented a version of DiskReduce v1 (two copies + RAID 5 encoding)
- Thanks to Druba Borthakur & the HDFS team



DiskReduce v2: RAID6 Encoding

Step0: N0 picks a codeword (x,N1,N2,N3,N4) randomly



Implementation - Write

- Write unchanged
- Except policy for ulletselecting location of replicas
- A key design principle is that initial writing is unchanged, starting with triplication



Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory

Implementation - Read

- HDFS Read unchanged
- Except if block not found, then 2nd data server implements reconstruction



HDFS client code unchanged !



Implementation – Recovery & Encoding

- Recovery extended
- A missing block is queued for recovery as in original but data server does RAID reconstruct
- Encoding is triggered using same queuing but computing check block can be all local if triplication of blocks in RAID set chosen appropriately









Basic Implementation Working

- Write 1TB (40 x 25GB) flat out: 1.25 user GB/s
- Flush cache and enable encoding: "compress" at 1.6 user GB/s for first 95% of data
- Background encoding is comparable in duration to initial write
- If "idle" time per "day" equal to "write" time, encoding is free



Carnegie Mellon

Parallel Data Laboratory

Implementation - Delete

- Delete can be harder
- HDFS async deletes each block in a file
- In DiskReduce if a deleted block was in a RAID set with blocks that are not deleted check codes become wrong when block is gone – check blocks must be recomputed to recover capacity



Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory



Garth Gibson, 1/28/2010

Why not restrict RAID set to one file?

- In Hadoop clusters, files are mostly much smaller (in blocks) than the desired RAID set size
- Restriction of RAID set to one file simplifies delete, but costs significant overhead: 3% -> up to 60%
 RAID6 - within a file vs. across files 140%
- Traces from Yahoo M45 and from Facebook



RAID6 - Across files

fa **pdsi**

Parallel Data Laboratory

Carnegie Mellon

Delaying Encoding – Advantages?

- Delaying encoding performance advantages from having multiple copies to read from?
- Simple test: 29 nodes, 116 files each 4GB, 64MB blocks, read each byte once via Hadoop in Y seconds
- Three cases: one, two or three copies of each block



Delaying Encoding – Advantages II?

- Delaying encoding performance advantages from having multiple copies to read from ??
- Try harder: small hot files: 512MB file in one 512MB block, read redundantly by X maps (30 nodes)
- Two copies faster by 25% 50%, three copies faster by 40% 60%
- There are significant performance benefits from replication, but harder to get than we expected



Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory

Lets Cache!

- Recently written data is triplicated, so delay encoding and treat two copies as performance improvement
- 80% of reads "hit" on 3 copies with 1 day delay



Implementation underway

www.pdl.cmu.edu

Lets also Delay Delete

- Deleting a block in a RAID set forces check codes to be recomputed in order to recover block's space
- Delaying delete to avoid recompute (xor below) comes with a capacity penalty
- Penalty huge if wait for all blocks in RAID set to die
- Need to recompute to recover space, but can shift to "idle" time
- Interesting choices of which blocks in a RAID set to improve temporal locality of deletion



Garth Gibson, 1/28/2010

Carnegie Mellon Parallel Data Laboratory

What about Reliability Differences?

- Two fault tolerant is not the whole story
- Three copies more reliable
- Bigger systems less likely to have >2 blocks lost in any RAID set (8+2)/triple (3)
- Bigger systems "repair" in parallel faster (declustered)
- Triplication has ~3X disks for same user data, so ~3X faster repair
- Assume .8TB/disk used, 64MB blocks, ٠ 1% AFR disk fail, exponential repair is either 12/N or 0.5+12/N (Markov model) **Carnegie Mellon**

Annual data loss (bytes) ⁰⁰ ⁰⁰ ⁰⁰ ⁰⁰ 100 50 20 10



Parallel Data Laboratory

Closing

- DiskReduce for HDFS
 - Give users ~3X more stored data
 - Exploit async encode/delete for performance
 - Exploration of complexity in storage stack
 - Fragmentation, the never beaten annoyance
- CMU Open Cirrus, Open Cloud & DCO
 - Data-Intensive Scalable Computing resources

 Utility for CMU science, testbed for PDL+
 - Broader agenda is "The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Data" for science and commerce

