# 

#### OVERVIEW OF THE NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND EVOLUTION OF STORAGE SYSTEMS FOR HANDLING LARGE VOLUME OF DATA

Giacinto Donvito - INFN-BARI

SuperB R&D Workshop -- Ferrara 2010

#### OUTLOOK

- New trends on open source storage software
- Overview on Lustre
  - Lustre architecture and features
  - Some Lustre examples
  - Future developments
- Hadoop: concepts and architecture
  - Feature of HDFS
  - Few HDFS examples
- CEPH: a new concept for the storage
  - Key Features
  - status and future plans
- Conclusions

#### TRENDS ON STORAGE SOFTWARE

#### **Requirements:**

- CPUs are always much more eager of data, and the performance of disks are not growing as much as CPUs
- Very often the users requires native posix file system
  - FUSE helps a lot in providing a layer that could be used to implement "something like" posix filesystem
- Scalability is the main issues: what is working with 10 CPUs surely may experience problems with 1000 CPUs
- But physics analysis is a particular use case





#### TYPICAL LUSTRE INFRASTRUCTURE

- Lustre file-system is a typical parallel file-system in which all the client are able to use standard posix call to access files
- The architecture is designed in order to have 3 different function that can be spitted among different host or joined in the same machine:
  - MDS: this service hosts the metadata information about each file and its location
    - There could be basically one active MDS per file-system
  - OSS: is the service that hosts the data
    - There could be up to 1000 OSS
  - Clients: are hosts that are able to read lustre file-system
    - There could be up to 20000 clients in a cluster





- All administrative operations can be done using few command line utilities and the "/proc/" file-system
  - The interface is very "admin-friendly"
- It is quite easy to put an OST in read-only
- It is possible to make snapshots and backups using standard linux tool and features like LVM and rsync
- It is possible to define easily how many stripes should be used to write each file and how big they will be (this could be configured at a file or directory level)
- Using SAN it is possible to serve the same OST with two servers and enable the automatic fail-over
- Very fast metadata handling
- In case of an OST failure only files (fully or partially) contained in that partition becomes unavailable
  - it is still possible to read partially the file in case it is split on few devices



- It is possible to have a "live copy" of each device (for example using DRDB and heartbeat)
  - it is feasible for both data and metadata
- The client caches both data and metadata in kernel space
- (temporarily) failure of a server are not disruptive in case of repetitive operation
- The cache buffer on the client is shared: this is an advanced if several processes read the same file
  - the size of this buffer could be tuned (by /proc/ file-system)
- It is easy to understand which OST hosts each file
- The performance obtained by the application does not depend on the version of the library used (this could help when old experiment framework is still used)
- It is possible to tune the algorithm used in order to distribute the files among the OSTs, giving more or less importance to the space available on each OST itself



- Using ext4 backend, it is possible to use 16TB OST.
- INFINIBAND supported as network connection
- Standard Posix ACLs are supported: it is possible to use standard unix tool to manage them
  - The ACLs should be enabled "system-wide" (on or off for the whole cluster)
- On the OSS, it is mandatory to recompile the kernel or it is possible to use one of few kernels provided from the official web-site
  - On the client it is not strictly required
  - The "Patchless" client could work basically on every distribution
    - Not all the kernel release are fully supported (2.6.16> kernel <= 2.6.30)
  - http://wiki.lustre.org/index.php/
     Lustre\_Release\_Information#Lustre\_Support\_Matrix

- OSS Read Cache:
  - It is now possible to cache read-only data on an OSS
  - It uses a regular Linux "pagecache" to store the data
  - OSS read cache improves Lustre performance when several clients access the same data set
- OST Pools
  - The OST pools feature allows the administrator to name a group of OSTs for file striping purposes
  - an OST pool could be associated to a specific directory or file and automatically will be inherited by the files/directory created inside it
- Adaptive Timeouts:
  - Automatically adjusts RPC timeouts as network conditions and server load changes.
  - Reduces server recovery time, RPC timeouts, and disconnect/reconnect cycles.

### LUSTRE 1.8.2 -- EXAMPLE



#### LUSTRE -- HAAND HP



HEPTIER2

INFN

1.26

1.0 0

0.9

0.8

0.4

0.2

0.1

🗖 In 📑 Out

250TB800 concurrent10 serverjobs

#### Storage Cluster Network last hour Storage Cluster Network last hour Read: Up to 1.3GByte/s 1.0 0 (Luly 0.91 0.80 0.7 ŝ 0.6 à 0.5 0.4 0.3 ( 0.2 0 17:35 17:40 17:45 17:50 17:55 18:15 18:20 18:25 18:00 18:05 18:10 18:15 18:20 18:25 18:45 18:50

In Out

- It is possible to use the file system to run job hosting both input and output files
- The rate are measured with real "root" analysis jobs.
- SRM/gridftp layer provided by StoRM

### LUSTRE FUTURE

- ZFS back-end support:
  - end-to-end data integrity
  - SSD read cache
- Changelogs

- Record events that change the filesystem namespace or file metadata.
- lustre\_rsync
  - provides namespace and data replication to an external (remote) backup system without having to scan the file system for inode changes and modification times

#### LUSTRE -- AT A SUPERCOMPUTING CENTRE

#### Lustre at TACC Performance

- TACC ranger system has observed 46 GB/sec throughput
- They use 50 Sun Fire X4500 servers as OSS
- A single app achieved 35 GB/sec throughput



Figure 12. Lustre file system performance at TACC.

 "Typical numbers for a high-end MDT node (16-core, 64GB of RAM, DDR IB) is about 8-10k creates/sec, up to 20k lookups/sec from many clients."



#### HADOOP: CONCEPTS AND ARCHITECTURE

- Moving data to CPU is costly
  - Network infrastructure
  - And performance => latency
- Moving computational to data could be the solution
- Scaling the storage performance, following the increase of computational capacity, is hard
- Increasing the number of disks together with the number of CPU could help the performance
- There is the need to take into account machines failures in a computing centre
- DB also could benefit from this architecture

#### HADOOP: HIGHLIGHT

- It is developed till 2003 (born @google)
- It is a framework that provide: file-system, scheduler capabilities, distributed database
- Fault tolerant

- Data replication
- DataNode failure is ~transparent
- Rack awareness
- Highly scalable
  - It is designed to use the local disk on the worker nodes
- Java based
- XML based config file

- = A9.com
- = AOL
- Booz Allen Hamilton
- = EHarmony
- Facebook
- Freebase
- Fox Interactive Media
- = IBM
- ImageShack
- = ISI
- Joost
- Last.fm
- LinkedIn
- Metaweb
- Meebo
- Ning
- Powerset (now part of Microsoft)
- Proteus Technologies
- The New York Times
- Rackspace
- = Veoh
- = Twitter

#### HADOOP: HIGHLIGHT

• Using FUSE => some posix call supported

- Basically "all read operation" and only "serial write operations"
- Web interface to monitor the HDFS system
- Java APIs to build code is data location aware
- CKSUM at file-block level
- SPOF: metadata host

- HDFS shell to interact natively with the file system
- Metadata hosted in memory
  - sync with the file-system
  - it is easy to do back-up of the metadata

#### HADOOP: CONCEPTS AND ARCHITECTURE Anatomy of a file write



#### INFN HADOOP: CONCEPTS AND ARCHITECTURE

#### Anatomy of a file read

- Splitting files in different pools may give performance benefit when reading them back
- having the data replicated could be of help

[root@pccms64 hadoop-0.20.1]#



### HADOOP: CONCEPTS AND ARCHITECTURE

INFN

#### HDFS Replication Strategy



#### HADOOP: CONCEPTS AND ARCHITECTURE



Local to data. Outputs a lot less data. Output can cheaply move.

INFN

Shuffle sorts input by key. Reduces output significantly.



#### HADOOP: FEW EXAMPLES

#### "SORT EXERCISE"



Per node: 2 quad core Xeons @ 2.5ghz, 4 SATA disks, 8G RAM (upgraded to 16GB before petabyte sort), 1 gigabit ethernet. Per Rack: 40 nodes, 8 gigabit ethernet uplinks.

#### HADOOP: FEW EXAMPLES "CMS EXAMPLE"

#### **Cluster Summary**

INFN

575761 files and directories, 2204886 blocks = 2780647 total. Heap Size is 3.86 GB / 7.11 GB (54%)



2.5TB < Each DataNode < 21TB</li>
~600 Core
SRM/gridftp layer provided by FUSE and BestMan



#### HADOOP: FUTURE

- Support for "append"
- Support for "sync" operation
- Cluster NameNode





- Designed to be scalable, reliable, fast
  - avoid SPOF
  - avoid shared disk (SAN, etc => too expensive)
- Data Placement is realized by means of "hash functions":
  - Location of data is calculated => no lookup tables
    - this means: unstable mapping and adding disk servers means reshuffling
    - "Rules" driven by replica:
       "three replica should be in different cabinet"



#### INFN

#### CEPH: CONCEPT AND ARCHITECTURE

- fd=open("/foo/bar", O\_RDONLY)
  - Client: requests open from MDS
  - MDS: reads directory /foo from object store
  - MDS: issues capability for file content
- read(fd, buf, 1024)
  - Client: reads data from object store
- close(fd)
  - Client: relinquishes capability to MDS
  - MDS out of I/O path
  - Object locations are well known–calculated from object name



**Object Store** 



- Intelligent server: replicate data, migrate object, detect node failures
  - this could happen because everyone know where object belongs
- inodes are stored together with the directory object: you can load complete directory and inodes with a single I/O ("find" or "du" are greatly faster)
- It is easy to build a cluster of metadata servers (MDS)
  - Than it is scalable and adaptive
    - The work is moved from busy servers to idle ones



MDS 1

MDS 2

MDS 3

MDS 4

- Up to 128 MDS nodes and 250kops/s
- I/O rates of potentially many TB/s
- File system containing many petabytes of storage







Overall, things are looking good. If you've been standing on the sidelines waiting for something more stable to test, now is a good time to try things out. There are some lingering OSD performance problems (see below), and we are still a long ways off from something we would recommend for use in a production environment, but otherwise this release is looking pretty good for evaluation purposes.

- Subtree based usage accounting (half the work of a quota system)
- Near-posix, strong consistency
- Support snapshots
- kernel > 2.6.25 is required
  - or is there a FUSE client

\$ ls -al drwx----- 1 root root 5438384 Oct 20 14:51 ./ drwx----- 1 root root 5438387 Oct 20 14:51 ../ drwxr-xr-x 1 root root 2342034 Apr 20 2009 ghostscript/ drwxr-xr-x 1 root root 276961 Apr 20 2009 libthai/ drwx----- 1 root root 2817666 Oct 20 14:51 python-support/ drwxr-xr-x 1 root root 1723 Apr 20 2009 readline/

#### CEPH: FUTURE WORK

Focus on:
OSD performance
Stability
Reliability
Cluster MDS

INFN

### CONCLUSIONS

	Lustre	Hadoop	Ceph
Posix Functionalities	True	Partially	Partially
Quota	True	<b>Directory Quota</b>	Not enforced
Data Replica	Not easy	True	True
Metadata Replica	Not natively	Not natively	True
Resilient on SPOF	Not natively	Not natively	True
Management Cost	Low	<b>Could be costly</b>	Could be costly
Platform Supported	SLC4/5 - Suse Linux	<b>Every Platform</b>	Debian - Suse Linux
Installation procedure	Easy	Quite easy	Not so easy
Doc/Support	Good	Quite good	Need to be improved
Hep experience	Fairly good	Just starting now	No experience

### CONCLUSIONS

- Lustre born in the HPC environment can guarantee good performance on standard servers (SAN or similar)
  - completely posix compliant
  - the scalability seems guaranteed from the biggest installation in supercomputing centres, but the use case are different from the HEP analysis
- Hadoop can provide needed performance and scalability by means of commodity hw
  - maybe it requires more man power to manage it
  - not fully posix compliant
  - Is not easy to use MapReduce on HEP code, it could be an interesting development?
- CEPH is based on very good ideas and it could become a good option if it proves the needed stability and reliability



#### BACKUP SLIDES





# LUSTRE -- INSTALLATION

- # rpm -ivh lustreldiskfs-3.0.6-2.6.9\_67.0.22.EL\_lustre.1.6.6smp.i686.rpm lustre-modules-1.6.6-2.6.9\_67.0.22.EL\_lustre.1.6.6smp.i686.rpm kernel-lustresmp-2.6.9-67.0.22.EL\_lustre.1.6.6.i686.rpm lustre-1.6.6-2.6.9\_67.0.22.EL\_lustre. 1.6.6smp.i686.rpm e2fsprogs-1.40.11.sun1-0redhat.i386.rpm #!!!!!reboot!!!!!
- # mkfs.lustre --fsname=lustre --mdt --mgs / dev/sdb1
- # mkdir -p /mnt/test/mdt
- # mount -t lustre /dev/sdb1 /mnt/test/mdt
- # cat / proc/fs/lustre/devices
- # mkfs.lustre --fsname lustre --ost --mgsnode=\${mdt\_server}@tcp0 / dev/sdc
- # mkdir -p / mnt/test/ost0
- # mount -t lustre /dev/sdc /mnt/test/ost0
- # mkdir /lustre
- # mount -t lustre \${mdt\_server}@tcp0,1@elan:/lustre /lustre

### LUSTRE -- FEW CLI EXAMPLE

# lfs df [-i] UUID 1K-blocks Used Available Use% Mounted on lustre-MDT0000\_UUID 27226500 1950044 23720488 7% /lustre[MDT:0] lustre-OST0000\_UUID 2884113492 1310544468 1427064248 45% /lustre[OST:0] lustre-OST0001\_UUID 2402260432 1104465044 1175765056 45% /lustre[OST:1] .....

filesystem summary: 201971633276 91551804884 100160181456 45% /lustre

# echo '64' > /proc/fs/lustre/llite/\*/max\_cached\_mb
# echo '64' > /proc/sys/lustre/max\_dirty\_mb

# lfs setstripe -c 10 -p pool\_name -d /lustre/directory
# lfs getstripe [-r] /lustre/directory [/lustre/directory/file1]
# lfs getstripe -r --obd lustre-OST004e\_UUID /lustre > /tmp/list\_files

# lctl pool\_new <fsname>.<poolname>
# lctl pool\_add <fsname>.<poolname> <ostname indexed list>
# lctl pool\_list <fsname>[.<poolname>] | <pathname>

# LUSTRE -- FEW CLI EXAMPLE

# lfs quotaon -ug /lustre
# lfs quotacheck -ug /lustre
# lfs setquota -u [-g] <name> <block-softlimit> <block-hardlimit> <inode-softlimit>
<inode-hardlimit> /lustre

#### # tail -f /var/log/messages

Dec 3 05:36:41 lustre01 kernel: LustreError: 4478:0:(import.c: 909:ptlrpc\_connect\_interpret()) lustre-OST0048\_UUID went back in time (transno 8590306664 was previously committed, server now claims 0)! See <u>https://</u> <u>bugzilla.lustre.org/show\_bug.cgi?id=9646</u> Dec 3 05:36:41 lustre01 kernel: LustreError: 4478:0:(import.c: 909:ptlrpc\_connect\_interpret()) Skipped 1 previous similar message Dec 3 05:36:41 lustre01 kernel: Lustre: 4478:0:(quota\_master.c:1680:mds\_quota\_recovery ()) Only 81/79 OSTs are active, abort quota recovery Dec 3 05:36:41 lustre01 kernel: Lustre: lustre-OST0048-osc: Connection restored to service lustre-OST0048 using nid 212.189.205.106@tcp.

# LUSTRE -- FEW CLI EXAMPLE

#### # pwd /proc/fs/lustre/llite/lustre-ffff8101264f5c00

# ls

blocksizefstypemax\_read\_ahead\_mbstatahead\_statschecksum\_pageskbytesavailmax\_read\_ahead\_whole\_mbstatscontention\_secondskbytesfreemax\_rw\_chunkstats\_track\_giddump\_page\_cachekbytestotalmdcstats\_track\_pidextents\_statslazystatfsoffset\_statsstats\_track\_ppidextents\_stats\_per\_processlockless\_truncatepgcache\_balanceuuidfilesfreelovread\_ahead\_statsstatshead\_max

# LUSTRE POSSIBLE SCENARIO



# HADOOP -- INSTALLATION

# wget http://mirror.nohup.it/apache/hadoop/core/stable/ hadoop-0.20.2.tar.gz # tar xfvz hadoop-0.20.2.tar.gz # mkdir -p /hadoop/namenode\_dir # mkdir -p /hadoop/datanode\_dir # cd hadoop-0.20.2 (modify configuration files) conf/hadoop-env.sh conf/slaves conf/hdfs-site.xml conf/core-site.xml conf/masters # ./bin/hadoop namenode -format # ./bin/start-all.sh

# HADOOP -- FEW CLI

# ./bin/hadoop dfsadmin -refreshNodes

- # ./bin/hadoop dfsadmin -report
- # ./bin/hadoop balancer

# ./bin/hadoop dfsadmin -safemode leave

# ./bin/hadoop fsck / -files