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NRS motivation

- Increased read and write throughput across the filesystem.
- Increased fairness amongst filesystem nodes, and better utilization of resources.
  - Clients.
  - OSTs.
  - Network.
- Deliberate and controlled unfairness amongst filesystem nodes; QoS semantics.
  - Client or export prioritization.
  - Guaranteed minimum and maximum throughput for a client.
NRS is a collaborative project between Whamcloud and Xyratex.

- Code is at git://git.whamcloud.com/fs/lustre-dev.git repo, branch liang/b_nrs.
- Jira ticket LU-398.
- Is waiting for some large-scale testing.

It allows the PTLRPC layer to reorder the servicing of incoming RPCs.

- We are mostly interested in bulk I/O RPCs.
- Predominantly server-based, although the clients could play a part in some use cases.
NRS policies

- A binary heap data type is added to libcfs.
  - Used to implement prioritized queues of RPCs at the server.
  - Sorts large numbers of RPCs (10,000,000+) with minimal insertion/removal time.
- FIFO - Logical wrapper around existing PTLRPC functionality.
  - Is the default policy for all RPC types.
- CRR-E - Client Round Robin, RR over exports.
- CRR-N - Client Round Robin, RR over NIDs.
- ORR - Object Round Robin, RR over backend-fs objects, with request ordering according to logical or physical offsets.
- TRR - Target Round Robin, RR over OSTs, with request ordering according to logical or physical offsets.
- Client prioritization policy (not yet implemented).
- QoS, or guaranteed availability policy (not yet implemented).
NRS features

- Allows to select a different policy for each PTLRPC service.
  - Potentially separate on HP and normal requests in the future.
- Policies can be hot-swapped via lprocsfs, while the system is handling I/O.
- Policies can fail handling a request:
  - Intentionally or unintentionally.
  - A failed request is handled by the FIFO policy.
  - FIFO cannot fail the processing of an RPC.
Questions to be answered

- Any performance regressions for the NRS framework with FIFO policy?
- Scalability to a large number of clients?
- Effective implementation of the algorithms?
- Are other policies besides FIFO useful?
  - A given policy may aid performance in particular situations, while hindering performance in other situations.
  - A given policy may also benefit more generic aspects of the filesystem workload.
- Provide quantified answers to the above via a series of tests performed at large scale.
Benchmarking environment

- NRS code rebased on the same Git commit as vanilla; apples vs apples.
- IOR for SSF and FPP runs of sequential I/O tests.
- mdtest for file and directory operations metadata performance.
- IOzone in clustered mode.
- Multi-client test script using groups of dd processes.
- 1 Xyratex CS3000; 2 x OSS, 4 x OSTs each.
- 10 - 128 physical clients, depending on test case and resource availability.
- Infiniband QDR fabric.
- Larger scale tests performed at University of Cambridge; smaller scale tests performed in-house.
Performance regression with FIFO policy

- IOR SSF and FPP, and mdtest runs.

- Looking for major performance regressions; minor performance regressions would be hidden by the variance between test runs.

- So these tests aim to give us indications, but not definite assurance.

- IOR FPP: IOR -v -a POSIX -i3 -g -e -w -W -r -b 16g -C -t 4m -F -o /mnt/lustre/testfile.fpp -O lustreStripeCount=1 .

- IOR SSF: IOR -v -a POSIX -i3 -g -e -w -W -r -b 16g -C -t 4m -o /mnt/lustre/testfile.ssf -O lustreStripeCount=-1 .

- mdtest: mdtest -u -d /mnt/lustre/mdtest{1-128} -n 32768 -i 3 .
IOR FPP regression testing

IOR FPP sequential 4MB I/O
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IOR SSF regression testing

IOR SSF sequential 4MB I/O
128 clients, 1 thread per client

IOR SSF sequential 4MB I/O
64 clients, 1 thread per client
mdtest file and dir ops regression testing

mdtest file operations
128 clients, 1 thread per client, 4.2 million files

mdtest directory operations
128 clients, 1 thread per client, 4.2 million directories
mdtest file and dir ops regression testing

mdtest file operations

64 clients, 1 thread per client, 2.1 million files

IOPS

- create
- stat
- unlink

mdtest directory operations

64 clients, 1 thread per client, 2.1 million directories

IOPS

- create
- stat
- unlink
mdtest file and dir ops regression testing

mdtest file operations

12 clients, 2 threads per client, 196608 files

- create: vanilla, FIFO
- stat: vanilla, FIFO
- unlink: vanilla, FIFO

mdtest directory operations

12 clients, 2 threads per client, 196608 directories

- create: vanilla, FIFO
- stat: vanilla, FIFO
- unlink: vanilla, FIFO
Groups of dd processes.

- Read test: `dd if=/mnt/lustre/dd_client*/BIGFILE* of=/dev/null bs=1M`.
- Write test: `dd if=/dev/zero of=/mnt/lustre/dd_client*/outfile* bs=1M`.

Two series of test runs:

- 10 clients with 10 dd processes each.
- 9 clients with 11 dd processes, 1 client with 1 dd process.

Observe the effect of NRS CRR-N vs vanilla for the above test runs.

- Measure throughput at each client.
- Calculate standard deviation of throughput.
CRR-N brw RPC distribution (dd test, 14 clients)

NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.128@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85593
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.122@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85682
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.124@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85686
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.127@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85734
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.123@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85744
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.126@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85757
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.118@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85794
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.117@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85839
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.131@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85861
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.121@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85923
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.129@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85969
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.125@o2ib, round 6975, seq: 85981
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.119@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85482
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.120@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85495
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.128@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85637
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.122@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85683
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.124@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85687
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.127@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85735
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.123@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85745
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.126@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85761
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.117@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85840
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.131@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85866
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.118@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85882
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.121@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85926
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.129@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 85970
NRS start crr2 request from 12345-172.18.1.125@o2ib, round 6976, seq: 86030
dd write test - 10 clients, each with 10 processes

### vanilla vs CRR-N

10 clients, 10 processes each, write test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>client</th>
<th>vanilla</th>
<th>CRR-N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3469 MB/sec</td>
<td>3537.5 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**handler**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>handler</th>
<th>stdev</th>
<th>throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>19.361 MB/sec</td>
<td>3469 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>0.425 MB/sec</td>
<td>3537.5 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dd write test – 9 clients with 11 procs, client 4 with 1 proc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>handler</th>
<th>stdev (client 4 excluded)</th>
<th>client 4</th>
<th>throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>22.756 MB/sec</td>
<td>49.2 MB/sec</td>
<td>3473.9 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>0.491 MB/sec</td>
<td>167 MB/sec</td>
<td>3444 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**vanilla vs CRR-N**

10 clients, 10 processes each, read test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>handle</th>
<th>stdev</th>
<th>throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>6.156 MB/sec</td>
<td>2193.8 MB/sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>7.976 MB/sec</td>
<td>2054.6 MB/sec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dd read test - 9 clients with 11 procs, client 3 with 1 proc, 128 threads

vanilla vs CRR-N

9 clients 11 processes, 1 client 1 process, read test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>handler</th>
<th>stdev (client 3 excluded)</th>
<th>client 3</th>
<th>throughput</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>7.490 MB/sec</td>
<td>161 MB/sec</td>
<td>2229.2 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>8.455 MB/sec</td>
<td>169 MB/sec</td>
<td>2106.6 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IOR FPP - vanilla vs NRS with CRR-N policy

IOR FPP sequential 4MB I/O

128 clients, 1 thread per client

IOR FPP sequential 4MB I/O

64 clients, 1 thread per client
IOR SSF - vanilla vs NRS with CRR-N policy

IOR SSF sequential 4MB I/O

128 client, 1 thread per client

IOR SSF sequential 4MB I/O

64 clients, 1 thread per client
CRR-N comments

- CRR-N causes a significant lowering of the stdev of write throughput.
  - i.e. it 'evens things out'.
  - Many users will want this.
- CRR-N shows a negative effect on dd test read operations, but IOR regression tests are fine.
  - Worst case, reads could be routed to FIFO or other policy.
- CRR-N may improve compute cluster performance when used with real jobs that do some processing.
- No performance regressions on IOR tests.
  - Confidence to deploy in real clusters and get real-world feedback.
- Future testing task is to see if these results scale.
ORR/TRR policies

- ORR serves bulk I/O RPCs (only OST_READs by default) in a Round Robin manner over available backend-fs objects.
  - RPCs are grouped in per-object groups of 'RR quantum' size; lprocfs tunable.
  - Sorted within each group by logical of physical disk offset.
  - Physical offsets are calculated using extent information obtained via fiemap.

- TRR performs the same scheduling, but in a Round Robin manner over available OSTs.

- The main aim is to minimize drive seek operations, thus increasing read performance.

- TRR should be able to help in cases where an OST is underutilized; this was not straightforward to test.
ORR (phys, 8) brw RPC distribution (IOR FPP test)
TRR (phys, 8) brw RPC distribution (IOR FPP test)
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NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 3, with round 2655
NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 0, with round 2656
NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 0, with round 2656
NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 0, with round 2656
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NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 1, with round 2657
NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 1, with round 2657
NRS start orr request for object with ID 0 from OST with index 1, with round 2657
ORR/TRR policy tests

- Using IOR to perform read tests; each IOR process reads 16 GB of data.
  - Kernel caches cleared between reads.
- Performance is compared with vanilla and NRS FIFO for different TRR/ORR policy parameters.
- Tests with 1 process per client and 8 processes per client.
- Only 14 clients, read operations generate few RPCs.
  - ost_io.threads_max=128 on both OSS nodes.
- The OSS nodes are not totally saturated with this number of clients.
IOR FPP sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 1 thread per client, 16 GB file per thread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>MB/sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>3092.91 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO</td>
<td>3102.17 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR log 256:</td>
<td>3146.97 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR phys 256:</td>
<td>3150.86 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR log 256:</td>
<td>3164.66 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR phys 256:</td>
<td>3268.98 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IOR SSF sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 1 thread per client, 16 GB file per thread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>MB/sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>2744.15 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO</td>
<td>2741.78 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR log 256</td>
<td>2689.12 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR phys 256</td>
<td>2728.89 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR log 256</td>
<td>2684.42 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR phys 256</td>
<td>2720.96 MB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IOR FPP sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 8 threads per client, 16 GB file per thread

- vanilla: 2274.55 MB/sec
- FIFO: 2248.62 MB/sec
- ORR log 256: 2432.78 MB/sec
- ORR phys 256: 2424.69 MB/sec
- TRR log 256: 1540.82 MB/sec
- TRR phys 256: 1778.56 MB/sec
IOR SSF sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 8 threads per client, 16 GB file per thread

vanilla: 2260.37 MB/sec
FIFO: 2257.9 MB/sec
ORR log 256: 1089.385 MB/sec
ORR phys 256: 1236.72 MB/sec
TRR log 256: 1086.18 MB/sec
TRR phys 256: 1258.907 MB/sec
IOzone read test – all policies

14 clients, 1 process per client

IOzone read, 1MB, 16GB per process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>MB/sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR log 256</td>
<td>3200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR phys 256</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR log 256</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR phys 256</td>
<td>3700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**IOzone read test – throughput per process**

14 clients, 1 process per client

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>handler</th>
<th>min (MB/sec)</th>
<th>max (MB/sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vanilla</td>
<td>190.18</td>
<td>606.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIFO</td>
<td>191.51</td>
<td>618.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRR-N</td>
<td>188.79</td>
<td>513.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR (log, 256)</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>425.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORR (phys, 256)</td>
<td>198.8</td>
<td>418.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR (log, 256)</td>
<td>208.48</td>
<td>476.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRR (phys, 256)</td>
<td>217.56</td>
<td>488.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 14 clients, for 512 ost_io threads tests, increase number of RPCs by:

- max_read_ahead_mb=256
- max_read_ahead_per_file_mb=256

These lead to curious results.

- Tests were without the LU-983 fix for readahead.
IOR FPP sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 1 thread per client, 32 GB file per thread

- vanilla: 3219.73 MB/sec
- FIFO: 3252.52 MB/sec
- ORR log 256: 3396.07 MB/sec
- ORR phys 256: 3398.86 MB/sec
- TRR log 256: 3512.55 MB/sec
- TRR phys 256: 3602.22 MB/sec
Performance is highest at a ~ 512 quantum size.
The exact number may vary between workloads.
IOR SSF sequential read, 1MB I/O

14 clients, 1 thread per client, 448GiB file

- vanilla: 3404.8 MB/sec
- FIFO: 3364.2 MB/sec
- ORR log 256: 3138.4 MB/sec
- ORR phys 256: 3293.1 MB/sec
- TRR log 256: 3165.3 MB/sec
- TRR phys 256: 3285.5 MB/sec
Notes on ORR and TRR policies

- TRR/ORR increase performance in some test cases, but decrease it in others.
- TRR/ORR may improve the performance of small and/or random reads.
  - Random reads produce a small number of RPCs with few clients, so this was not tested.
- TRR may improve the performance of widely striped file reads.
  - Only 8 OSTs were available for these tests, so this was not tested.
- ORR/TRR may improve the performance of backward reads.
  - Again, few RPCs were generated for this test, so this was not tested.
- TRR on a multi-layered NRS policy environment can be simplified.
- ORR policy will need an LRU-based or similar method for object destruction; TRR much less so.
- TRR and ORR should be less (if at all) beneficial on SSD-based OSTs.
The NRS framework with FIFO policy: no significant performance regressions.

- Data and metadata operations tested at reasonably large scale.

The CRR-N and ORR/TRR policies look promising for some use cases; CRR-N tends to smooth reads out, ORR/TRR improve performance for reads in some test cases.

- May be useful in specific scenarios, or for more generic usage.
- We may get the best of policies when they are combined in a multi-layer NRS arrangement.

Further testing may be required.

- CRR-N and ORR/TRR benefits at larger scale.
- We ran out of large-scale resources for LUG, but will follow up on this presentation with more results.
Future tasks

- Decide whether the NRS framework with FIFO policy and perhaps others, can land soon.
  - Work out a test plan with the community if further testing is required.
- We should be able to perform testing at larger scale soon.
- Two policies operating at the same time should be useful.
- NRS policies as separate kernel modules?
- QoS policy.
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