

Beware of What You Wish For

William D. Gropp Mathematics and Computer Science www.mcs.anl.gov/~gropp

Argonne National Laboratory

A U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science Laboratory Operated by The University of Chicago



Container of data, often indexed by name

- But also:
 - Usually implies strong consistency requirements:
 - When a write to file completes, any system anywhere that reads from the file gets the new data (stronger than sequential consistency)
 - Extreme consequences for parallel access, difficult to use caches to optimize (and impossible without some cost)
 - NFS doesn't implement POSIX semantics for this reason
 - Why is POSIX required for high-performance file systems when it is considered too expensive for the file system used to edit files and read email?





- See, for example, http://www.nitrd.gov/subcommittee/hec/workshop/ 20050816_storage/talks/koester.pdf
- How do you determine requirements?
 - Find out what users need, or
 - Find out what they are doing now, and multiply by one guess as to future system size, or
 - Let users do the multiplication, based on what they think the future system looks like
- Resulting in these:
 - 32K file creates/s
 - 1 Trillion files
 - 10K metadata operations/second
 - 30 GB/s (easy!)
 - But stay tuned...





- Why are separate directory entries required?
- Are files unrelated or are they (or some subset of them) part of a related cluster of data objects?
 - Alternatives are 1 file (classical, Parallel I/O) or 1 container (new API, semantics tuned for real requirements)
 - Note that the separate file approach introduces many scaling problems, starting with the description of the data set by enumeration
- Is this really a database operation?
 - Possibly with different types of entries from classic database





1 Trillion total files

• Why are these separate files?

- Many problems with separate files.
 - Enforcing POSIX atomicity (including directory updates).
 - No efficient search API for directory operations in POSIX.
 - Can't use 32-bit int for inodes.
- Is this 1 trillion records?
 - What are the operations on these records?
 - What are the atomicity requirements?
 - A (custom) database system built from low-level I/O (like real databases) might be a more effective and realistic solution
 - What are the requirements for that?





1 PF => 1PB main => 1 TB/s for 1000 seconds for checkpoint

- A checkpoint requirement can lead to massive bandwidth requirements
 - 1PB of memory may cost way more than you expect; memory prices may be leveling off
 - There is a danger that the requirement becomes decoupled from the actual system (e.g., change 0.1 PB memory for cost, but retain 1TB/s for checkpoint)

Is this continuous or burst?

- Continuous require enough bandwidth to file system hardware (e.g., spinning disks)
 - 1 TB/s / (20 MB/s/disk) = $10^{12}/2 \times 10^7$ = 50000 disks
 - Use sustained transfer rate, not burst transfer rate
 - Buy stock in Segway or stock up on roller blades
- Burst option to buffer in higher speed storage (faster than disk semiconductor memory)
 - But still need order of 1PB memory of some kind
- Is the checkpoint for all 1PB of memory?
 - May not need to dump entire memory to disk, at every checkpoint
 - Can reduce requirements by an order of magnitude







Summary

- Don't say "file" when you mean "data"
- Be careful what you wish/ask for
 - Who is going to answer "Do you want a POSIX file system" with "no"?
 - But what if you add in the consequences of that choice?
- POSIX consistency is a very strong requirement
 - Hard to implement both correctly and fast
 - NFS does neither
- Simple scaling of current approaches to the next generation of machines leads to unnecessarily expensive requirements
- We shouldn't be talking about files at all
 - Rather, persistent data with defined consistency rules and defined persistency (checkpoint data may need less persistence than science data; other data may be immutable)
 - RENCI Petascale Data System is an example of this approach



