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Challenges in Leveraging Fast SSDs

We observed that:

- Increasing IO bandwidth of SSDs requires more host system resources
  - At least, one dedicated IO core is needed to saturate one NVMe SSD without any interference

- There are already many compute and IO intensive tasks in enterprise storage systems
  - Indexing, journaling, compressions, deduplications ..
  - Fast PCI-e based SSDs are making the situation worse
Challenges in Leveraging Fast SSDs

- Increased per-device resource demands can limit scalability or performance
  - CPU and memory are limited resources
  - Only a small number of devices in a node can be supported at their full performance

- Offloading resource-intensive tasks can be helpful
  - Compute and storage nodes (offload IO tasks to remote storage nodes)
  - Local compute-enabled devices (GPU, Smart NIC ...)

Separate CPUs for IOs
Network congestion
Lots of data transfer

Local data processing
Efficient data movement
What can be offloaded from Host CPUs?

- Many resource-intensive tasks are running in storage systems
  - e.g. networking, checksum, compression, erasure coding, indexing ..

- Key-Value Stores
  - Widely used as an internal data store in scale-out storage systems
    - Data can be independently moved to other nodes or devices
  - Complex storage stack that requires lots of host CPU and memory
    - indexing, logging and data reorganization
  - Improving its efficiency can benefit the systems running on top of it
Existing Approaches In Conventional Key-Value Stores

- **Offloading tasks to background processes**
  - Foreground logging: to accept the requests at the speed of devices
  - Background organization: re-organize the written data

- **Bypassing kernel layers**
  - Directly access block device through user-level or kernel-level drivers
Performance Impact of I/O Stacks

- **Use of Direct IO (Aerospike)**
  - Bypass page cache & kernel file system
  - Did not find much difference in performance compared to RocksDB

- **RocksDB-SPDK**
  - Provides 2x better resource utilization and performance than RocksDB
    - WAL is disabled
    - Without WAL, Rocksdb’s performance can also be improved
  - Compared to Rocksdb-NOWAL, Rocksdb-SPDK provides 20% better performance
    - Asynchronous I/O, Huge pages, large block sizes
    - 20% improvement on IO efficiency was not enough to solve the issues with limited scalability
Resource Demands of Foreground and Background Processes in Host Key-Value Stores

- **Overheads of Foreground Processes**
  - Rocksdb and Aerospike require 8 flush threads
    - Rocksdb requires Write-ahead Log (WAL) and fsync
    - Aerospike uses a pool of synchronous I/O threads
  - Rocksdb-SPDK saturates the device with 2 flush threads

- **Overheads of Background Processes**
  - The amount of overheads depends on several factors
    - the number of key-value pairs, the size of values, and the type of a workload
    - Many overwrites or randomly generated keys increases the overheads
    - Slow background processes can make foreground processes stall or slow-down
    - Overall performance degradation was around 20% - 80% compared to the sequential performance

Resource contention problem still exists
Offloading the Key-Value Management to Storage Devices

- Expected benefits of offloading
  - Host foreground processes -> save 1-7 flush threads per device
  - Host background processes -> save 2-3 background threads per device

- Among various compute resources that are available today, we chose to use SSDs
  - No extra data transfers for key-value processing
  - Use of existing hardware components
    - SSDs are already capable of supporting fixed-length key and variable-length value requests
  - Avoid metadata update overheads
    - no indexing, journaling, WAL in a host system
Finding a boundary between Key-Value SSD and Host for Performance and Scalability

**Goals**

- **No dirty metadata** in a host system
  - Device provides indexing: large keys and key groups

- Saturate KV-SSD with minimal CPU resources (one CPU core)

---

Key-Value SSD

- Our KV-SSD prototype is implemented as **SSD firmware** that runs on the existing block NVMe SSD hardware
  - Block SSDs can be switched to KVSSDs

- Main components
  - Key-Value Request Handler
  - Hash-based FTL
  - Iterators
  - Garbage Collector for key-value pairs

- KV API and driver
  - API and driver for key-value SSDs are available in github
Supporting Variable-length Key and Key Groups in KV-SSD

- Use of Hash-based data structure
  - Limit the memory per key-value pair in SSDs
- Global and Local Hash tables
  - Reduce lock contention between Index Managers
  - Advanced features (e.g. transactions)

- Key Groups
  - First 4B of the key is used as an index of a group
  - Stored to the write buffer and later flushed to an iterator bucket identified by the prefix
Evaluation

We compare the performance and resource utilization of KVSSDs against the three state-of-the-art key-value stores using up to 18 NVMe devices:
- Rocksdb, Rocksdb + SPDK, AeroSpike

Key-Value Store Configuration with multiple SSDs:
- Assigned multiple instances per device to saturate the bandwidth

Key-Value Benchmark, KVSB:
- Launch all instances of key-value stores at once
- NUMA-aware CPU and memory assignment (core and memory pinning when needed)
- Support sequential / uniform / zipfian distributions and YCSB A,B,C and D workloads
Evaluation Environment

- Server: Custom-designed storage server for PCIe SSDs (Mission Peak System)
  - 2 Xeon E5 2.1GHz CPUs (48 cores with hyper-threading per CPU)
  - 768 GB DRAM

- 18 PCIe SSDs are attached to one CPU
  - Samsung PM 983 PCIe SSD
  - Same hardware is used for both host key-value stores and KV-SSDs

Sequential Workloads (Small Background Overheads)

Throughput and CPU utilization

- **Linear Scalability**

- **High CPU Contention**

- **CPU is Saturated**

- **Small CPU Overhead**

Throughput (TPS) and CPU utilization as a function of the number of devices.
Zipfian Workloads (Large Background Overheads)

Throughput and CPU utilization

High Background Overheads

Linear Scalability

CPU utilization increases linearly
Read/Write Amplification

- Background operations write 5 times more data
  - Write-ahead Log
  - Compaction

- Read/Write amplification will make devices busy but the throughput will become lower
YCSB Workloads (Mixed Reads and Writes)

- KVSSD *without cache* scales linearly providing comparable performance
- YCSB-A suffers from high background processing overheads
- Host key-value stores’ read cache shows high memory usage

50% read – 50% write
Zipfian Distribution

95% read – 5% write
Zipfian Distribution
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Effects of Caching

- Read cache can be easily added to KVSSD ecosystems for better performance
- With 10GB of LRU cache per device (180 GB total),
  - 4 times better read performance per device
  - 50% lower memory footprint than other key-value stores
- Where do the benefits come from?
  - No Lock contention
  - Finer-grained caching (key-value vs. page)
Conclusion and Future Work

- **Summary**
  - High resource demands of host key-value stores make it difficult to utilize fast SSDs
  - The performance of KV-SSDs scales linearly while requiring significantly lower host-system resources and outperforming conventional host-side key-value stores

- **Standardization**
  - Key-Value Device Commands: submitted for a review to NVMe standard committee

- **KV APIs and Drivers**
  - Available at [https://github.com/OpenMPDK/KVSSD](https://github.com/OpenMPDK/KVSSD)
  - Key-Value SSD will become commercially available soon
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