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Small I/O

- Distinct problem from small files (though commonly found together)
- Very hard to offer good performance for small I/O
- 'Small' varies by who you ask: less than various natural boundaries (page size, RPC size, etc)
- The smaller the I/O, the worse the performance
- Natural minimum I/O size is 1 page
Unpleasant Surprises

- Crossing some size boundaries leads to nasty surprises
- Unaligned write to existing files can be 95% slower
- I/O < 1 page in size gets worse & worse, even though Linux does I/O 1 page at a time
- Poor user experience - “4096 bytes was fine, why is 4097 bytes terrible?”
Why is it so bad?

- Client side per I/O overhead
  - Much worse on Lustre than local filesystems
  - Lots of work done regardless of I/O size
  - Locking, cache management, etc, really adds up
- Network costs per I/O
- No obvious pain points – Death by a thousand cuts
- Disk hardware limits (small I/Os terrible for spinning disk, not good for flash)
What do we do for small I/O now?

- Re-use LDLM locks (most I/Os already have required lock)
- Sequential:
  - Read ahead and write aggregation
    - Avoid small I/Os over network/to disk
    - Still have to process small I/Os on client
- Random:
  - Tell people “Please don't do that.”
  - Direct I/O (Lower locking overhead)
Reads

- Readahead: Read more data than asked for
  - Guarantees large I/O
  - Could be better if more asynchronous (Tough, though: See LU-8964)
- Per I/O overhead still bad for small reads
  - Unaligned Overwrites
  - ‘Fast Reads’ - Andrew Perepechko (Cray), Jinshan Xiong (Uber)
Surprise #1: Unaligned Overwrites

- Overwriting an existing file is the same as a new write, until it’s suddenly not
- I/O happens a page at a time, must read in partial pages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bytes</th>
<th>New File</th>
<th>Overwrite</th>
<th>Overwrite/ New File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4096 (4K)</td>
<td>600 MB/s</td>
<td>600 MB/s</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4097</td>
<td>590 MB/s</td>
<td><strong>18 MB/s</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192 (8K)</td>
<td>900 MB/s</td>
<td>900 MB/s</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8193</td>
<td>880 MB/s</td>
<td><strong>35 MB/s</strong></td>
<td><strong>4%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Partial Page Readahead

- Shared file writing also counts as overwriting – can't know pages are empty
- Read in one page at a time... Very slow.
- We have a solution for this: Use readahead!
- LU-9618: Partial page readahead (PPR, Patrick Farrell/Jinshan Xiong)
# Write Performance with PPR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bytes</th>
<th>New File</th>
<th>Overwrite</th>
<th>Overwrite/New File</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4096 (4K)</td>
<td>600 MB/s</td>
<td>600 MB/s</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4097</td>
<td>590 MB/s</td>
<td><strong>401 MB/s</strong></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192 (8K)</td>
<td>900 MB/s</td>
<td>900 MB/s</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8193</td>
<td>880 MB/s</td>
<td><strong>598 MB/s</strong></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fast Reads

- Readahead brings in pages before they’re needed
- So, most userspace reads are satisfied from cache
- Old read code does a lot of work to check locking for cached pages
- But LDLM evicts pages on conflicting writes, so we can assume all cached pages are safe to read
- Really, really fast. Improves large & small I/O.
- Landed in 2.7-2.8 time fame
Read Performance vs I/O Size
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Read Performance vs I/O Size
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What about writes?

- Writes are harder – Pages are usually created by writing, so not already present
- More complicated than reads: File size, ENOSPC (grant) handling, dirty page writeout.
- If a dirty page is present, we know (most of...) this is handled already. But so what? Dirty pages aren’t present until we write to them.
Surprise #2: Tiny Writes

- Except for really small (< 1 page) sequential writes
- If writing a few bytes at a time, dirty page will usually be present
- Hence, tiny writes:
  When a write is < 1 page in size and page is already dirty, write directly to that page without full i/o
- New feature in 2.11
## Write Performance vs I/O Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bytes</th>
<th>Lustre</th>
<th>Lustre - Linear</th>
<th>Lustre + Tiny Writes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3 MB/s</td>
<td>1.2 MB/s</td>
<td>12 MB/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>19 MB/s</td>
<td>10 MB/s</td>
<td>90 MB/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>245 MB/s</td>
<td>159 MB/s</td>
<td>370 MB/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>635 MB/s</td>
<td>635 MB/s</td>
<td>635 MB/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Write Performance vs I/O Size

- Lustre
- Lustre - Tiny Writes
- Linear from 4K
Possible Future: Write Containers

- Tiny writes are very limited in applicability, can we do better?
- Write containers (Jinshan Xiong)
- Prepare many per I/O items in advance/do them in a batch (Ex.: Locking, grant, dirty page tracking)
- Design stage only, Jinshan is looking for volunteers
- Expect improvements of several times for smaller I/O
- Reduced contention for shared file I/O
- Only benefits sequential I/O, adds complexity
Small Random I/O

- Can't do readahead
- Can't batch at all to disk
- We do batch writes at RPC layer, benefit is significant
- Flash on servers helps a lot here (Much better IOPs than spinning disk.)
It's all about Latency

- If you can't batch I/O, then do it as fast as possible
- No silver bullets
- Direct I/O is slightly better than buffered I/O (less locking)
- Network request latency (smaller on HPC networks, but still matters)
LU-1757: Immediate Short I/O

- RPC required to set up RDMA for bulk transfer
- For small transfers, extra round trip is worse than larger non-RDMA message
- Ergo, put small I/Os in to buffer in RPC
- About 30% faster on 4K reads on Cray Aries to flash (Slower network would give a larger benefit)
- Too small to measure on writes (Most time spent in journaling)
Summary

- Small I/O is hard, especially for a parallel file system
- Lustre 2.11 contains some significant improvements
- Sequential: Reads are good, writes are OK
  Tiny writes (LU-9409)
  Partial page readahead (LU-9618)
  Write Containers
- Random:
  Immediate short I/O (LU-1757)
What next?

● Sequential:
  Tiny write append
  Write Containers
  Async readahead

● Random writes:
  Journaling – Can we make this faster? Special “no journal” mode for non-critical data?