



Optimizing SSD Performance Efficiently with Realistic Workloads Presented by: Bob Weisickle, CTO and Co-Founder OakGate Technology



Data Center Industry Challenges



Lack of adequate analytic tools to identify and assess the challenges with their production data center workloads





The Case for Workload Analytics



Hard Disk Drives





Solid State Drives

SSD provides

- Improved application performance
- Greater storage utilization
- Reduced operating expenses
- Lowered total cost of ownership



Identifying

Bottleneck?

However...

- Replacing slow spinning disks with faster flash storage doesn't remove the bottleneck. It just moves it somewhere else
- Additionally, it may shift over time as processors and memory advance and applications and firmware are updated
- And the introduction of NVMe will likely move it again





•

Shared Value Proposition



Datacenters and Cloud SPs get:

- Drives validated and tested with production workloads
- Real-world performance data to make intelligent business decisions on purchases and configurations

SSD suppliers and Storage System OEMs

SSD and Storage System OEMs get:

to test and validate their drives

optimize the drives/systems

Production workloads that can be replayed

Real-world performance data that can help

Datacenters & Cloud Service Providers

Both get a deeper insight of storage system behavior and performance



Workload Characteristics



- I/O Mix: is the workload read heavy, write heavy or balanced?
- I/O Type: does the workload write or read data sequentially or randomly?
- Data/Metadata Mix: does the workload read or manipulate metadata more so than actual data?
- Block or File Size Distribution: does the workload write in small or large blocks?
- Host Resource Usage: CPU, Process IDs, Memory
- **Data Efficiency:** does the workload have highly redundant or compressible data so that functions like deduplication and compression work effectively?
- Is the workload prone to **specific hot spots?**
- How do all of the above characteristics change over the relevant time period?







Use Case High Latency Bursts within Hyperscale Data Center Workload



Background



- Hyperscale Data Center Customer
- Single 56-core CPU system (28 cores with Hyper-Threading enabled)
- 5 minute workload (Linux "Block Trace" 5Gb file)
- 157 million transactions
- 700+ individual process IDs
- Read-intensive application workload



Latency vs Time





Santa Clara, CA August 2019 Latency vs Time Graph



QDepth and Process ID Count



Qdepth Vs. Time 🖋 Distinct PID Count Qdepth Vs Time 🖋 Latency vs Time d DQQ DQQ Export V DQQ Export V Export ¥ 190000 3000 180000 170000 160000 2400 150000 260 140000 130000 120000 41da0 1600 110000 > 100000 anano 1400 90000 80000 60000 100 800 50000 80 40000 30000 20000 10000 100 60 Time (Seconds) Time (Seconds) Time (Seconds)

Santa Clara, CA August 2019 Queue Depth and Process ID Count correlated with latency time stamp



Discards vs Time





Santa Clara, CA August 2019

Discards vs Time correlated with Latency



IOPs vs Time





Santa Clara, CA August 2019 IOPs vs Time Graph



CPU vs Latency





Santa Clara, CA August 2019 CPU vs Latency



Positive Customer Reactions



- Provided deeper insight into what is actually happening at the storage layer than we could get previously
- Provided "Feedback" mechanism to help the application team improve overall performance
- Workload Replay allowed comparison of workload behavior and performance across various drive vendors
- Provided insights to tune Linux block layer to achieve better workload performance













Audience Q&A