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Motivation

• Flash memory provides **better cost/performance** than RAM for DB systems.
• Solid-State Drives (SSDs) are the dominant way to package Flash memory.

=> **SSDs are crucial for modern DB systems, but ...**

... choosing an **SSD model for given workload** is not trivial.
  • There are so many of them. What are the design choices?
  • How to navigate the design space?
  • How is the design space evolving?

... **designing SSDs** for a given workload is now possible and desirable.
  • How to design workload-specific SSDs? How to co-design DBMS and SSD?
  • DBMS/SSD co-design requires the federation of expertise from Flash, Hardware, Operating System, Storage and DB experts.

**This tutorial is our attempt at engaging the DB community!**
Why Should You Care?

• You use SSDs in your experiments.
  • You want to better understand a device’s performance level and when it fails to deliver.

• You design SSD-Based DBMS.
  • You want to better understand advanced storage protocols and devices, and be able to tell when and how to resort to them.

• You are willing to be convinced that DBMS/SSD co-design is worth your time and energy.
  • You may want to hear about open problems and existing approaches for building such protocols, devices, or both.
What This Tutorial is Not

• This tutorial is not a complete coverage of the domain.
  • The 1.5 hours format constraints both breadth and depth of our presentation.
  • We present our curated survey of the domain and refer to resources that dive in specific topics.

• This tutorial is not neutral.
  • We have been pushing for a radical evolution of SSDs and for DBMS/SSD co-design. We have significant bias.
  • We emphasize what we see as the main take-aways throughout this tutorial.

• This tutorial will not settle current open questions.
  • But we introduce them and present our views on current approaches and possible areas of further study.
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Historical Perspective

• Flash invention.
• First SSDs, compatibility.
• Diversification, Speed and NVMe.
• Entering the era of co-Design.
  • NVMe carries built-in evolution mechanisms.
  • Increasing application control is possible.
  • Speed and Co-designing opportunities.
    • Through workload specialization.
    • Computational and Programmable devices.

Moving away from the drop-in replacement role and into SSDs becoming an active component of the architecture.
Architectural Perspective

• We will be discussing how data and control move between applications and devices and will look at systems and logical view to do so
Programmer’s Perspective

• But we will also talk in detail about the APIs and general *mechanics* involved in moving data around.
• “Grandpa” has been writing software that adapts to historical device restrictions that make little sense now.

• Some mechanisms are emerging that allow us to
  • Control the device “externally” by sending semantically richer commands
    • Higher abstractions give control at different levels
      • OCSSD – control PUs
      • Streams – tagging of workloads
  • Control the device “internally” by interacting directly with subsystem
    • Replace a policy (e.g., scheduling or caching)

• We can use the mechanism in new device designs.
The Path to Co-Design

• Speaking of designs, we can think of at least four new categories of devices with different co-design approaches:
  • Configurable: devices “levers” that can in be adjusted in the field.
  • Computational: devices in which application logic be embedded
  • Programmable: devices with sub-systems controlled by the user.
  • Codesigned: the holy grail.
Tutorial Structure

• Interfaces Sections
  • P2 - Internal
  • P3 - External

• Co-designing Sections
  • P4 - Computational and Programmable Devices
  • P5 - Examples of devices
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  • P7 - SPD tools: simulation, prototyping, and development
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From NAND-Flash to an SSD

• It is common to hear about NAND-Flash’s peculiarities:
  • Cannot be overwritten without prior erasing;
  • Read and Program (write) operations take different times, etc.

  These (and other) peculiarities are the reason SSDs are built the way they are.

• SSDs have internal sub-systems, each contributing to (or hindering) performance.
• The sub-systems interact through interfaces that are not visible to applications.
• They implement a Data Path from user application to NAND-Flash.

The understanding of the Data Path allows for a more systematic SSD performance (and design trade-offs) analysis.
Flash Data Path

- Flash is organized in "Logical Units" that independently serve a given number of pages/blocks.

- Data gets in and out of a LUN through the Data Register(s) (and optionally Cache Registers).

- These operations can be done with different throughput/latency trade-offs.

(Plug for the next module: the abstraction that sits atop of the process can expose or control the tradeoffs.)

Source: ONFi Specs
• There’s a standard called ONFI that governs:
  • The physical interface to Flash packages at the pin level;
  • How to move data and request services.
• A flash controller orchestrates the data movement through agreed upon protocols.
Moving Data In and Program Operation

Provides the data that to input to Page Register (The Program operation itself is not here, just moving data in.)

Delay between data input and program operation.

Designates which LUN will perform the operation.

Source: ONFi Specs
Moving Data In and Program Operation

Designates which LUN will perform the operation

Data Input

Program Operation

Delay between data input and program operation.

Provides the data that to input to Page Register (The Program operation itself is not here, just moving data in.)

Source: ONFi Specs
“Channel” Organization

• While a LUN is performing a flash operation (to or from the Page Register), its data pins are not used.

• Device share those pins across many LUNs through “channels” but LUNs are still controlled independently.

• The SSD controller tries to maximize the time the channel is carrying data by interleaving flash operations.

A channel hides the LUNs latency and aggregates their throughput.
**Error Correction**

- Because Flash is **extremely sensitive**, it requires:
  - Scrambling data to roughly contain a balanced number of 1’s and 0’s;
  - Error Correction.
- These mechanisms are not entirely* supported by the LUNs; need to be built around it.

- How much and how a Flash Package deals with errors is not public information. This is one of the many reasons why, despite ONFi, different flash memory are not interchangeable.

- **Two main ECC techniques**
  - BCH
  - LDPC
Device Architecture

HIC
- Implements the NVMe controller.
- Performs data transfers in and out of the device.

Firmware
- Implements the FTL (page mapping, wear leveling, and GC)
- Not only FTL, but also:
  - Low-level scheduling;
  - DMA control, etc.

Storage Controller
- Interfaces with Flash packages.
- Performs scrambling and ECC.
SSD Basics Mini Survey

• Agrawal et al., “Design Tradeoffs for SSD Performance,” USENIX ATC’08.
• Dirik and Jacob, “The performance of PC solid-state disks (SSDs) as a function of bandwidth, concurrency, device architecture, and system organization,” ISCA’09.
• Kim, Choi, and Min, “Design Tradeoffs for SSD Reliability,” FAST’19.
Anatomy of an NVMe Command

Data needs to travel the data path to/from host memory.

Host Interface Controller → FTL → Low-Level Scheduler → Flash Controller

Host Memory → Data Buffer → P->L Mapping → Channel Queue
The decisions can be more or less effective, depending on the workload.
Speed Bumps on SSDs

• GC is slow but it is far from the only performance pitfall.
• Question: can an SSD that is servicing read operations only be slow? Yes!
  • Interference between workloads.
  • Not enough parallelism opportunities.
  • Other limitations on device design.

Generic devices are designed for non-descript applications, but many devices are used for very well understood workloads. Why not tune the device for these workloads?
Database Workloads

• DB systems produces few but varied workloads:
  • transaction log,
  • checkpoints,
  • buffer manager reads/write,
  • data loading,
  • external sort,
  • “spills” from other operators,
  • OLAP query scans, etc.

We can characterize these workloads!
(But this is an area that needs more work.)
## Workload Characterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Tx Log</th>
<th>Checkpoint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequential or random access</td>
<td>Seq</td>
<td>Seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read/write/mixed operations</td>
<td>Write (but for recovery)</td>
<td>Write (but for recovery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue depth (# of outstanding operations)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 or more per core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of an operation</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Multiple Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relevant characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circularity</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latency Sensitiveness</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursty-ness</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>high (user perceived)</td>
<td>depends on recovery goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then we can reason about policies: **Checkpoint is much more parallel than and can overpower Tx Log if proper scheduling is not in place.**
Database Workload Characterization Mini-Survey

- Chen et al., “TPC-E vs. TPC-C: Characterizing the New TPC-E Benchmark via an I/O Comparison Study,” SIGMOD Record 39(3), September, 2010.
Interface #1 - Caching

• Data buffer in the Firmware is finite; how to better utilize it?
• Without knowing anything about the workload: LRU to pick a victim.
• Workload information can help with:
  • Determining the “utility” of different pages, not just frequency of access;
  • Establishing different policies than LRU when necessary;
  • Allow a more active caching layer, for instance:
    • Issuing pre-fetches, or
    • ML for predicting future accesses.
Interface #2 – Data Placement

• Once again, without any information, pick the next available LUN to write a page.

• Severe problems arise from this lack of information:
  • Mixing pages with different lifespans makes GC harder.

• Workload information can help with:
  • Consider how the pages a workload writes are going to be read.
    • Recall the case of the slow scan? (Hotspot on a given LUN.)
Interface #3 – Channel Utilization

• Hiding latency and maximizing channel bandwidth may lead to lack of fairness.
  • We discussed the conflict between a Transaction Log workload and a Checkpoint one.

• Perhaps the metric to optimize here should be achieving a workload’s goal.
  • A low-level scheduler can keep putting Transaction Log writes in front of Checkpoints, and scheduling the latter in times when the former is not bursty.
Interface #4 – ECC Strength

• Devices assume that all data that is read should be error free.
  • ECC introduces latency to every operation.

• Certain applications may tolerate a controlled degree of error.
  • For example, bit flips in large images.
SSD Policies Examples

1. Caching
   - Park et al., “CFLRU: A Replacement Algorithm for Flash Memory,” CASES’06.
   - Kim and Ahn, “BPLRU: A Buffer Management Scheme for Improving Random Writes in Flash Storage,” FAST’08.

2. Placement

3. Channel Utilization
   - Wu and Re, “Reducing SSD Read Latency via NAND Flash Program and Erase Suspension,” FAST’12.

4. Longevity vs Correctness
Bonus: FTL Mini-Survey

FTLs combines different policies together


• Shin et al., “FTL Design Exploration in Reconfigurable High-Performance SSD for Server Applications,” ICS’09.
Advanced Interfaces

• Memory types
  • We will see later how devices can mix different memories
    • Amount of DRAM
    • SLC + xLC Flash
    • Use of Persistent Memory (e.g., Optane)
  • But let’s hold until we discuss a concrete design example.

• Channel Architecture
  • The current architecture serves the purpose of hiding Flash latency and aggregating bandwidth well
  • But would it hold if certain user computations are generating traffic inside the device?

These may require deeper architectural changes to the devices.
Advanced Interfaces Mini-Survey

• Chang, “Hybrid solid-state disks: Combining heterogeneous NAND flash in large SSDs,” Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference’08.

• Im and Shin, “Storage Architecture and Software Support for SLC/MLC Combined Flash Memory,” SAC’09.
## Internal Interfaces Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architect’s Perspective</th>
<th>Programmer’s Perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Database systems design does not need to stop at the bottom of the Storage Manager.</td>
<td>• We gain from implementing I/O workloads that can be easily characterizable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Management and SSDs General References


• Lee et al., “A Case for Flash Memory SSD in Enterprise Database Applications,” SIGMOD’08.

• Xu et al., “Performance Analysis of NVMe SSDs and their Implication on Real World Databases,” SYSTOR’15.
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Abstractions and Mechanisms

How to incorporate SSDs into the overall system design?

1. What are the appropriate abstractions?
   Abstractions of storage at multiple levels. From bottom up:
   - SSD interface hiding the device complexity
   - Storage abstraction made available to applications, hiding I/O complexity.
   - Applications map their workload onto the storage abstraction.

2. What are the I/O mechanisms providing access to SSDs?
   - I/O mechanisms provided by operating system or user-space libraries.
Grandpa Abstractions: POSIX and Blocks

For decades, in Unix systems, applications mapped data structures onto files atop the block device interface.

- The block device interface abstracts storage as a linear array of fixed sized blocks.
  - Memory abstraction: payload <- read(LBA); write(LBA, payload).
- POSIX I/Os abstract storage as a collection of files.
  - Inodes map file onto collection of blocks.
  - The original POSIX specified synchronous commands, based on a buffer to avoid I/Os.
- Applications map data structures onto files
  - An ecosystem of tools and commands makes it easy to organize and manipulate files.
From HDD to SSD (*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I/O Performance (2020)</th>
<th>I/O performance does not matter</th>
<th>I/O performance is crucial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HDD</td>
<td>POSIX file with buffered I/O on top of Block-based HDD</td>
<td>Custom buffer management with direct POSIX I/Os on top of Block-based HDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 MiB seq. read: 718 usec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>HDD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>disk seek: 2msec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD (*)</td>
<td>POSIX file with buffered I/O on top of Block-based SSD</td>
<td>Beyond POSIX and Blocks with NVMe over PCIe-attached SSDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 MiB seq. read: 39 usec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rand. read: 16 usec</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) SSDs are not a uniform class of devices. Continuum from latency-optimized (Z-NAND) to archival.
Beyond POSIX and Blocks

• Beyond POSIX:
  • **POSIX** is the textbook example of a deep module. But it does not give applications control over (i) allocation and layout policies, (ii) I/O scheduling, and (iii) creates redundancies and missed optimization opportunities.
  • Need for streamlined I/O path.

• Beyond blocks:
  • The block device interface hides SSD parallelism and requires complex firmware to handle the idiosyncrasies of flash.
  • Need to expose parallelism and align storage interface with SSD characteristics (as well as application needs).

A streamlined I/O path exploiting SSD parallelism requires a deep understanding across layers.
Deeper Dive into PCIe

- PCIe is a layered network protocol.
  - Requests/responses (transaction layer) are exchanged atop a packet-based data link protocol (data link layer) and physical connections organized as a collection of lanes (physical layer).
  - Each lane is a pair of unidirectional, serial, point-to-point connections over short distance (max 1m).
  - PCIe fabric is organized as a tree, with a root complex and multiple endpoints connected directly or via switches.

- Each device is associated to a memory-mapped region of the host address space, defined through Base Address Registers (BAR)

- PCIe theoretical bandwidth is comparable to RAM’s theoretical bandwidth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x4 (M.2)</td>
<td>4 GB/sec</td>
<td>8 GB/sec</td>
<td>16 GB/sec</td>
<td>32 GB/sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x16</td>
<td>16 GB/sec</td>
<td>32 GB/sec</td>
<td>64 GB/sec</td>
<td>128 GB/sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deeper Dive into NVMe

- NVMe is a host-controller interface specification
  - Designed to attach SSDs directly to the PCIe fabric.
  - NVMe 2.0 released on 3/6/2021

Hosts and controllers communicate through pairs of submission/completion queues.

The queues are located in memory-mapped address space either on the host or on the device.
NVMe Host-Controller Interactions
NVMe 2.0 Transport Models

Memory
Commands/Responses & Data use Shared Memory

Example Transport
PCI Express

Message
Commands/Responses use Capsules
Data may use Capsules or Messages

Example Transports
Fibre Channel
TCP

Message / Memory
Commands/Responses use Capsules
Data may use Capsules or Shared Memory

Example Transports
RDMA
(InfiniBand, RoCE, iWARP)
NVMe & Memory Management

1. **Host memory buffer (HMB)** is a portion of host memory for the exclusive use of the controller.

2. **Controller memory buffer (CMB)** is a region of general purpose read/write memory on the controller.
   - Associated to a PCI Express address (additional BAR)
   - Potentially used for peer to peer communications

3. **Persistent memory region (PMR)** is a region of general purpose PCI Express read/write persistent memory.
• A namespace is a formatted quantity of non-volatile memory that may be accessed by a host.
• Each namespace has an ID, a size, a capacity (max number of LBAs used), and a utilization.

Command sets are the operations associated to a namespace.
NVMe Command Sets

- Admin command set include the creation and deletion of submission/completion queues, as well as primitives for device identification, or getting log-pages, device capabilities, and features.

- Three types of I/O command sets:
  - **NVM**: The namespace is a collection of logical blocks, with read, write, write-zeroes commands. This is the block device abstraction.
  - **Zoned**: The namespace is partitioned into zones. Each zone is a collection of logical block addresses. The command set establishes that logical blocks must be written sequentially within a zone and that zones must be reset before they are written. It also defines the append command.
  - **Key-Value**: The namespace is organized as a collection of key-value pairs. The maximum key size is 16B. The commands supported are store/retrieve, list, exist, delete.
NVMe Directives

NVMe directives make it possible for hosts to cooperate with the SSD.

- I/O Command Directive are used as part of an I/O command.
  - The stream directive, only associated to writes, allows a host to indicate that LBAs belong to separate streams.
  - SSDs equipped with support for multi-streams isolate data from different streams on different blocks, thus ensuring that they can be accessed or garbage collected together.

SPDK makes it possible for applications to associate directives to I/O commands.

Stream directives generated from lifetime hints in the `fcntl` system call.
NVMe Extensions

The Open-Channel Interface specification (LightNVM): defines a hierarchical address space and let applications manage data placement and I/O scheduling.

A parallel unit is a collection of chunks \( (= \text{unit of erase}) \).

Each chunk is composed of sectors \( (= \text{unit of read; 4 KB}) \).

No interferences across groups

Multiple sectors constitute a logical block \( (= \text{unit of write}) \): function of flash characteristics. Logical blocks must be written sequentially within a chunk.
Legacy Linux I/O Frameworks

- The original POSIX interface was based on synchronous commands
  - Exposed through C standard library (unistd.h)
- Two flavours of asynchronous I/Os introduced in mid-2000s:
  - `aio` is a user-space emulation of POSIX asynchronous I/Os that relies on worker threads issuing synchronous I/O calls.
  - `libaio`, actually issues asynchronous I/Os through the `io_submit` system call.
    - This system call takes as input a context (initialized through the `io_setup` system call), and a control block (`iocb`).
    - On completion, the system call `io_getevent` is used to reap `io_event` data structures that may contain a pointer to a callback function.
    - Note that `libaio` requires that a file be opened with `O_DIRECT`. It only works with the following file systems: `ext2`, `ext3`, `jfs` and `xfs`. `Libaio` requires two system calls per I/O.
Modern Linux I/O Framework

• io_uring was introduced by Jens Axboe in 2019
  • It relies on pairs of circular submission/completion queues shared between user-space and kernel-space.
  • The queues are single producer and single consumer. Submission queue entries are 64B, while completion queue entries are 16B.
  • System calls are available for (a) setting up queues, (b) registering application memory referenced in submission queue entries and (c) initiating/completing a number of asynchronous I/Os. By default, io_uring requires a single system call for multiple I/O submissions and completions.
  • It is also possible to setup a queue pair with a flag (SETUP_SQPOLL) so that io_uring starts a kernel thread that polls the shared submission queue for entries.

• io_uring is available through liburing that defines a range of helper functions for setting up queues, manipulating buffers and generating submission queue entries.

• io_uring can be used with any file system with buffered or unbuffered I/Os. It recently added support for submitting ioctlS.
Design Choices

• Bypassing the buffer cache
  • Using the O_DIRECT flag.

• Bypassing the file system
  • After opening a device file, read and write operations at a given file offset are passed on to the block layer without interference.
  • The block layer receives bio requests. It may reorganize them, independently on each core, in software queues. Bio requests are then dispatched to the NVMe driver via hardware queues.
  • The block layer provides various mechanisms to deal with completion: signal-based, continuous polling or hybrid polling.

• Bypassing the block layer
  • ioctl give applications direct access to the NVMe driver via synchronous commands.

• Bypassing the kernel
  • SPDK framework based on a user-space NVMe driver, packaged as a library that maps PCIe BARs directly into the application process thus supporting zero-copy.
  • Functions are provided to allocate the queue pairs used for I/O submission and completion, as well as payload buffers in this DMA-transferrable memory.
  • NVMe SSDs can be accessed directly via a C API (nvme.h for block devices nvme_zns.h for ZNS drives).
  • The application must ensure that a single thread submits I/O and that this thread polls for completion.
I/O frameworks Trade-Offs

- SPDK supports zero-copy and enables trading higher CPU utilization for lower I/O latency, but exposes applications to PCIe/NVMe limitations (number of queues, number of entries per queues, buffer region size, single thread handling submission/completion).

- io_uring isolates applications from PCIe and NVMe, supports a range of targets (raw device, file, ioctl) and tuning options (sqpoll) with a single system call for a collection of I/Os. But it traverses multiple software layers, requires a copy between software and hardware queues in the block layer and exposes significant complexity to applications.

- xNVMe is a user-space library that abstracts I/O mechanisms across a range of operating systems. It is a means to design portable, simple, yet efficient NVMe-based software (xnvme.io).
Linux I/O Frameworks

File system extensions for ZNS
In F2FS, XFS

mlq-blk for NVMe since 2013

No support for KV in NVMe driver yet

POSIX API

Legacy Application

aio, io_uring

File System

Block Layer

NVMe driver

SSD

New Application (xNVMe)

io_uring

loctls (io_uring)

SPDK

User-space

POSIX API

filesystem

Block layer

NVMe driver

Kernel-space

Application

SSD
## External Interfaces Summary

### Architect’s Perspective

- NVMe is the narrow-waist of the storage stack.
  
  => Transport-based storage stack (PCIe, fabric). What is the impact of memory-centric interconnects CXL/Gen-Z?

- Variety of abstractions, but no sweet-spot for database workloads.
  - NVM: log-on-log.
  - ZNS: no placement or scheduling
  - KV: no caching.
  - Open-Channel: unknown internal policies.
  
  => Is computational storage the answer?

### Programmer’s Perspective

- NVMe directives as cross-layer communication mechanism

- New abstractions and mechanisms require a storage manager re-design
External Interfaces General References

• Matias Bjørling. From Open-Channel SSDs to Zoned Namespaces. USENIX Vault, 2019.
• Ivan Luiz Picoli et al. Open-Channel SSD (What is it Good For). In Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR), 2020.
• PCIe specification. https://pcisig.com/specifications
Computational, Programmable and Co-Designed SSDs
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The case for SSD Interfaces
Adapted to Database Workloads

Functionality Argument
• Reduce complexity of host software with higher-level storage abstractions
  • Example: OX-Batch
    • Transactional interface
      • Avoids log-on-log
    • Batch objects writes
      • No application-level mapping
      • Avoids round-trips

Performance Argument
• Latency:
  • Streamlined software on I/O Path to avoid duplications and leverage optimization opportunities (e.g., hardware acceleration).
• Cost:
  • Reduce CPU load
• Energy consumption:
  • Reduce data movement
• Throughput
  • Leverage internal SSD throughput
New SSD Interfaces

Providing new SSD interfaces adapted to database workloads requires a transitions from standard memory (read/write) interfaces to a communication (send/receive) interface

This transition requires

(i) computation on SSD side to process messages sent by host,
(ii) a communication protocol, and
(iii) integration of computation and SSDs within storage.

\[\text{Application} \quad \text{SSD} \quad \text{Reaad/Write} \quad \text{PCIe} \quad \text{NVMe driver} \]

\[\text{Application} \quad \text{SSD} \quad \text{Receive/send} \quad \text{PCIe} \quad \text{NVMe driver}\]
## SSD Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard External Interface</th>
<th>SSD as Black box</th>
<th>SSD as White Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard SSD</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Programmable SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td>PCIe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTL</td>
<td>FTL with new policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSD</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New External Interface</th>
<th>Computational SSD</th>
<th>Co-Designed SSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td>PCIe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New interface</td>
<td>PCIe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computational Storage Processor (CSP)</td>
<td>New interface / new policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTL</td>
<td>FTL with new policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSD</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SSD Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard External Interface</th>
<th>SSD as Black Box</th>
<th>SSD as White Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard SSD</strong></td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td>PCIe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decades of Research on SSD internals</strong></td>
<td>FTL</td>
<td>FTL with new policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Designed SSD</strong></td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
<td>NVMe driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td>PCIe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCIe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programming CSD for deployments on cloud and HPC</strong></td>
<td>New interface / new policies</td>
<td>SSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database SSDs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decades of Research on near-data processing
Computational Storage: 1 Slide Survey

- Longer Surveys review the state-of-the-art and identify open issues.
- Prototypes tailored for the need of a specific system on a given hardware platform:
  - FPGA-based, ARM-based, x86-based computational storage devices.
  - Research prototypes of a database system, a dataflow processing engine, a machine learning platform, a similarity search algorithm or a scientific computing application.
  - Deployments on Public clouds (Alibaba, AWS) and HPC clusters (Los Alamos National Lab).

- **Software frameworks** for computational storage:
  - **Willow**: SSD apps called via RPC, cannot be composed.
  - **Biscuit**: SSD Task Pipelines programmed in C++, compiled on the host and shipped to CSD.
Computational Storage: Industry Viewpoint

• Standardization efforts to integrate computational storage into existing storage ecosystem.
  • SNIA: Fixed vs. Programmable Computational Storage Services
    • Fixed services: Pipeline, Database filter, Scatter-Gather, Compression, Data deduplication
    • Programmable services: OS, container, bitstream, BPF
  • NVMe: New command set for computational storage
    • Task force led by Eideticom, Intel, Samsung with deadline early 2022
    • Educated guess:
      • Command set based on load/unload/execute abstraction
      • Data transferred with existing command sets
Role of BPF

• BPF is a vendor-neutral Instruction Set Architecture (ISA)
  • Assembly-like byte code
  • Standardized in Linux kernel, JIT on variety of controllers.
  • BPF backends for clang and gcc.

• NVMe is extensible, however ...
  • Defining a new extension for each new storage interface is cumbersome.
  • BPF as generic mechanism to call computational storage services from host
  • BPF programs as means to compose and orchestrate function calls on CSP.
Handling New Storage Interfaces with BPF

- NVMe: Admin command set
- NVM/ZNS/CS I/O command sets
- CS: load/unload/execute

Registers external functions in uBPF VM
Allocates/deallocates memory
Maintains state

Computational Storage: Open Issues

• SSD Integration
  • How to support NVMe access from CSP?
  • How to deal with data movement across multiple devices?
    • CMB provides support for peer-to-peer transfers, but those transfers need to be orchestrated and streamlined.

• Computational Storage Processor
  • How to handle namespaces from CSP programs? Need for data virtualization.
  • How to orchestrate multiple offloaded programs?
  • How to isolate multiple tenants?
  • What to hardware accelerate? How?
  • What is the attack surface? How to protect it? How to verify BPF on CSD?

• System Design
  • What to offload?
  • What services to call? How to program CSP?
  • How to place data and processing?
  • How to deploy CSP software?
Co-Designed SSDs: 1 Slide Survey

• Framework for offloading computation on co-designed SSD
  • **INSIDER**: FPGA-based reconfigurable controller as computational storage processor. INSIDER provides a file system abstraction. Operations on computational storage are exposed as operations on files, internally organized as a pipeline of sub-programs. INSIDER manages the isolation and scheduling of offloaded programs. They rely on a customized I/O stack to access stored data.
Co-Design SSDs: Research Agenda

How can database system experts program a co-designed SSD that is tailored for their workload?

• What abstractions to support the definition of new storage interfaces?
• How to define new policies that support new storage interfaces?
## Computational & Programmable SSDs

### Summary

**Architect’s Perspective**
- Computational storage soon part of NVMe ecosystem.

**Programmer’s Perspective**
- Many open issues programming and deploying CSPs at scale for a range of different data-intensive systems and applications:
  - Who programs CSP? How?
  - Target workloads/use-cases?
  - How to integrate CSP with overall system design?

---

What are appropriate abstractions for programming Co-Designed SSDs?  
⇒ Today, it is possible to explore this question experimentally (P7: Tooling)
Computational Storage General References

• A. Barbalace et al., Computational Storage: Where Are We Today?, CIDR 2021.
• Z. Ruan et al., ‘INSIDER: Designing In-Storage Computing System for Emerging High-Performance Drive’
• Yuhong Zhong, et al., BPF for storage: an exokernel-inspired approach. HotOS ’21
Example of Programmable Devices
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Examples of Advanced Devices

**Programmable device**

- The 2B-SSD creates a device with a dual (sided) interface: the traditional one and a byte-addressable one.
- The byte-addressable interface has the same functionality as Persistent Memory but is managed by the device.
- The application can control the “side” in which a given page resides and benefit from that side's advantages momentarily.

**Computational Device**

- Moves the workload generation into the device.
- The Graph-SSD creates a command set to access graph data and moves certain graph computations into the device.
A Hybrid PM-SSD Device

• There are various possible storage hierarchies in a system:
  a) A two-level hierarchy of DRAM and Flash (via SSD devices);
  b) A two-level hierarchy of DRAM and Persistent Memory (with a CPU-base PM Controller);
  c) A DRAM and PM store controlled via software;
  d) [2B-SSD] A hybrid PM/NAND-Flash SSD.
An Alternative Data Path

• An application can write directly to the fast, byte-addressable “side” of the 2B-SSD:
  • Just write against an established address region.
• The region can be backed by a LBA (logical block address) determined by the application.
• Meanwhile, other LBA can be read/written to via NVMe.
• 2B-SSD changes some subsystem (page mapping) using internal interfaces.

Source: Bae 2018
Software API

• The application can move an LBA between “sides” of the device

• WAL can be implemented using the “fast” side

• Results:
  • 1.74x to 2.71x faster in Postgres and RocksDB workloads

• BA-PIN
  LBA: Flash->PM managed

• BA-FLUSH
  LBA: Flash content == PM content

• BA-SYNC
  LBA: Flash<-PM managed
Let’s talk about PM

• 2B-SSD implements persistent memory via NVDIMM (DRAM + capacitors).

• Nothing prevents this design from using another type of byte addressable memory such as Optane.
  • As we’ve seen, NVMe allows for a Persistent Memory Region in the device.

We don’t believe in PM vs. Flash; PM + Flash in a device is another design region that can help certain workloads better than separate access to PM and Flash.
Motivation for A “Graph-Friendly” Device

• Large graphs can occupy entire devices.

• Sparse graphs are represented in compressed adjacency matrices such as CSR [paper].

• In this scenario, the main workload fetches the data necessary for the host to calculate the neighbors of a vertex.

• What if the device knew how to navigate CRS files?

Source: Matam 2019
A Graph API

• Commands are passed through the NVMe interface
  • Although using reserve bits rather than new command sets

• Can leverage page placement and caching internal interfaces, as it understands the CPR format and the primitives ran atop of it.

• Results:
  • Between 1.29x to 1.85x faster in several basic graph primitive benchmarks.
An Actual SSD Implementation

• The GraphSSD is operational.
  • Implemented on top of the OpenSSD, which we discuss in the Tooling Section.
  • None of the authors belong to an SSD manufacturing company; they were all in Academia.
  • None of the authors was from the OpenSSD project.
Discussion

• Programmable and Computational devices represent two powerful axes for creating specialized devices.

• The specialization aims at servicing a given workload (or a set thereof) better than a workload-agnostic device would.

• A question may arise as to why go to all this trouble to obtain, at best, 1.8x and 2.7x acceleration? 10x or 100x would look better.
  • Unfortunately, these works do not quantify the CPU savings they create.
  • They do so with devices that are not too different than COTS ones.
  • The true question is why would you peg your CPU (in this post-Moore era of ours) with tasks that can be offloaded to a device?

• Our job is to create the means to make this offloading more accessible.
The Co-Design “Continuum” of Techniques
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Application-Device “Pairing”

• We characterized applications before by the workload they generate.

• Different devices would perform differently under a given workload.

• If we understand the workload issued and the ideal workload for a device, we can determine application-device “compatibility.”


“Grandpa” Pairing Approach

• We often assume that the application is the one that should adapt to the device. But how?

• Shape the workload to fit the devices “unwritten contract”:
  • issue large requests, in parallel if possible;
  • prefer locality of access;
  • favor sequential Requests;
  • group requests by life-time;
  • prefer uniform life-times.

Why tailor only the application?!
“Unwritten Contract” Mini-Survey


Choice of Device Variation

• As we said before, different devices perform differently under a different workload.

• That’s because they make different design decisions along a few axes:
  • Read- vs write-oriented
    • Type of cell used (SLC/MLC/...)
  • Low-latency at QD1
    • Optane and Z-NAND
  • Parallelism Degree
    • Number of planes or number of channels
  • Write performance variance
    • Over-provisioning level

Type of cell is arguably one of the biggest sources of performance variation!
Single-Level Flash Cells

• Simply put, a NAND-flash cell traps voltage.

• In Single-Level Cells, a cell has two voltage levels.

• If the voltage trapped is below the $V_{\text{READ}}$ that’s a 1, otherwise 0.

• To program a 0, the voltage level is increased using a method called *Incremental Step Pulse Programming*.

Source: Micheloni 2013
Multi-level Flash Cells

• In Multi-Level Cells, there are more than two possible voltage levels.

• Devices encode bits of two or more pages in a single cell, the Lower and Upper page (or Least Significant Bit or Most Significant Bit)

• The figure is for an MLC cell of 2-bits but TLC and QLC devices exist of 3- and 4- bits, respectively.

Source: Micheloni 2013
Programming LSB and MSB

• Note, however, that voltages can only be increased.
  • We must write the lower page (LSB) in a 1st round, before writing the upper page (MSB).
  • The 2nd round is more time consuming the first round.
• Writing to the upper page is slower than to the lower one!

Source: Micheloni 2013
Understand the Design of a Device

- Check whether your device is SLC/MLC/TLC/QLC or 3D
  - 1-, 2-, 3-, 4-bit cells or stacked
  - An example of a mixed SLC-MLC device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Read</th>
<th>SLC mode</th>
<th>99 µs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLC mode</td>
<td>LSB page</td>
<td>58 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSB page</td>
<td>90 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write</td>
<td>SLC mode</td>
<td>486 µs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLC mode</td>
<td>LSB page</td>
<td>481 µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MSB page</td>
<td>2,295µs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,388µs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Modern devices can implement several optimizations
  - Some cells in the device may be “downgraded” to single-bit
  - Writes may go to (fast) downgrade SLC cells

Source: Kwak 2020

MSB is 4.7x slower!!
Configurable and Programmable Devices

- Configurable ones use current NVMe directives:
  - Queue Priorities;
  - Streams.

- Programmable ones introduce new semi-specialized devices by replacing components:
  - Specialty caching such as GALRU and 2R;
  - Specialty scheduling such as Flin;
  - Specialty placement such as DC-Store;
  - Specialty ECC such as the Approximate SSD;
  - Multiple components as in X-FTL and 2B-SSD.
Programmable Devices References

• Li et al., “ASCache: An Approximate SSD Cache for Error-Tolerant Applications,” DAC’19.
Computational Devices

- Move the workload generation into the device.

- There is still work required to allow a generic workload to be moved to the device.
  - Borrowing from the BPF work is only one out of several possible approaches.
Computational Devices References

Fully Co-Designed Devices

- Inherit abilities from both Computational and Programmable devices.
- The workload is sent through the standard interfaces, but the device distills application’s computations from the workload, sparing the former from performing those.
- The device is designed so that the computational device and the SSD blend perfectly.
  - The computational portions has access to the SSD internal interfaces.
Navigating the Co-Design Space

Perform device selection

Configure device to the workload

Shift workload generation to the device

Tailor the device to the workload

Configurable
Computational

Programmable
Co-designed

Co-Design

generic computations (standard)

Database SSDs
Additional References


• Kim et al., “In-storage processing of database scans and joins,” Elsevier Information Sciences, 327, 2016.
Simulation, Prototyping, and Development SSD Platforms
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SPD Techniques

• What to use if we want to build or alter an SSD?
• There are at least three alternatives:
  • Work entirely on a software-Simulation of the hardware;
  • Work entirely on Prototyping the actual hardware;
  • Work on hardware-assisted Development.

• Each has pros and cons we we discuss here.
Software-based Simulation Techniques

- Use **cycle-accurate software** to simulate different portions of a system
  - Flash alone
    - FlashSim
  - Inside a device
    - MQSim
  - Inside a system
    - Gem5
- Workloads should be compatible with the simulation level
Example of an SSD Simulator

- MQSIM can be used **stand-alone or inside a system-wide simulator** such as Gem5.
- Allows access to three (out of four) internal interfaces we discussed.
- Can be used to implement new NVMe directives or command sets.

Source: Tavakkol 2018
Simulation Trade-offs

**Pros**
- 100% software.
- *Easy learning curve* to use certain simulators.
- The sky is the limit as to what new hardware can be modeled.
  - As long as it reflects a reasonable datasheet of such hardware (which is not always available).

**Cons**
- Can’t capture aspects that are not modeled:
  - non-determinism in general, e.g., flash errors, flash aging.
- Slow execution:
  - Gen5 is equivalent to a *machine running at a few MHz.*
Simulation References


• Jung et al., “NANDFlashSim: Intrinsic latency variation aware NAND flash memory system modeling and simulation at microarchitecture level,” MSST’12.

• Gouk et al., “Amber: Enabling precise full-system simulation with detailed modeling of all SSD resources,” MICRO’18.

Hardware-Based Prototyping Platforms

• OpenSSD Family of Devices
  • 3rd generation of devices using actual Flash memory.
  • Full-fledged SSD, 100% compatible with Linux/Windows NVMe drive
  • Large functionality set implemented as firmware (C coding) running on ARM cores

• Daisy Family
  • Informal 4th generation of OpenSSDs
  • Commercial spin-off backed by CRZ in Korea
Prototyping Trade-Offs

**Pros**
- Real flash with real (at times idiosyncratic) behavior.
- Many examples of programmable devices.
- Growing community.

**Cons**
- Software-based features can add latency.
- Not many options of Flash and channel designs.
- Changing features close to the Flash require a steep learning curve.
Hardware Prototyping References


• Lee and Song, “Experimental Results of Implementing NVMe-based Open Channel SSDs,” Flash Memory Summit, 2017.

Hardware-Assisted Development Platform

- Full-fledged NVMe device with emulated Flash
  - Carrier: any recent FPGA with PCIe and FMC connectors
  - OpenExpress NVMe controller (open for Academia)
  - Flash Emulator running on M.2 form factor FPGA (on the right)
Example Setting

• Carrier
  
  Hitech Global HTG-937
  (technically a base network card)

• Flash Module Emulator
  
  FMC-M2 Adapter and Bittware 250-M2D
  (technically an OpenCompute Module on an M.2 package)
Hardware-Assisted Development Trade-Offs

**pros**
- Can be as fast as a “mem disk”
- Can emulate different kinds of Flash and Persistent Memory
- Can potentially emulate different channel architectures

**cons**
- Flash emulator is currently still under development
- M.2 capacity is limited (32GB)
Hardware Development References


## Summary of the Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Development Speed</th>
<th>Execution Speed</th>
<th>Accuracy of results</th>
<th>Hardware Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software simulation</td>
<td>Fastest</td>
<td>Low MHz</td>
<td>Within a margin or error</td>
<td>Anything that has a datasheet available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware prototyping</td>
<td>Slow</td>
<td>GHz</td>
<td>Exact results</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware-assisted simulation</td>
<td>Slow to medium</td>
<td>100’s of MHz to GHz</td>
<td>Close to exact results</td>
<td>As wide as software when it comes to Flash memories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion
Take Away #1

• Making SSD behavior a part of a Database’s stack is desirable and, currently, possible.
  • The design space for Database algorithms is free to explore beyond the current devices’ limitations.
  • Computing paths and resource usage can become more efficient.
  • Devices can perform part of Database computations.
Take Away #2

• The changes made to a device should be guided by a workload you understand, i.e., that you can characterize:
  • You can design a device that can adapt to the workload,
  • you can program a device to serve only that workload, or
  • you can move the logic that generates the workload into the device.
Take Away #3

• You have the **external and internal interfaces** at your disposal to export and implement your changes.
  • Your device can be 100% compatible with NVMe if you wish!
Take Away #4

• There are several alternative platforms to implement and evaluate your changes, ranging from pure software to pure hardware.
Thank you

Q&A