# CS202 (003): Operating Systems Disks

Instructor: Jocelyn Chen

Most of the materials covered in this slide come from the lecture notes of Mike Walfish's CS202



## Last Time

## Disks

By I, Surachit, CC BY-SA 3.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=4275514







### Stack of magnetic platters

# Geometry of a disk

By Henry Mühlpfordt, png version from 2010: Bagok - Own work, vectorization of: Festplattengeometrie.PNG, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=79334677



disk read-and-write heads



### roughly lined up on a cylinder

## Generally, one head is active at a time

### Four phases of seek:

*speedup:* accelerate arm to max speed or half way point *coast:* at max speed (for long seeks) *slowdown:* stops arm near destination *settle:* adjusts head to actual desired track



### Disk positioning system:

move head to a specific track and keep it there

## Performance

Total transfer time **Rotational delay + seek delay + transfer time**

Seeking track-to-track: comparatively fast (~1ms). mainly settle time Short seeks (200-400 cyl.): dominated by speedup Longer seeks: dominated by coast Head switches: comparable to short seeks

Seek

*Note:* settle time takes longer for writes than reads. (because if read strays, the error will be caught, and the disk can retry, if the write strays, some other track just got clobbered, so write settles need to be done precisely)

"Average seek time"

Time to seek 1/3 of the disk 1/3 of the time to seek the whole disk

Question: are they the same? No!

## Common #s

### Capacity: in TBs

Platters: 8

# of cylinders: >= tens of thousands

RPM: 10,000

Transfer rate: 50-150 MB/s

Mean time between failures: ~1-2 million hours

# How driver interfaces to disk?

**Sectors** 

Disk maps logical sector # to physical sectors

OS has no idea what is going on with all these!

### Disk interface presents linear array of sectors

Traditionally 512 bytes (moving to 4KB nowadays) Written atomically (even if power failure; disk saves enough momentum to complete) Larger atomic units have to be synthesized by OS (will discuss later)

> **Track skewing**: sector 0 position varies by track, but let the disk worry about it. Why? (for speed when doing sequential access) Sparing: flawed sectors remapped elsewhere

Some optimizations

**Zoning:** puts more sectors on longer tracks

# Disk performance example

Spindle Speed: 7200 RPM Avg Seek Time, read/write: 10.5ms / 12 ms Maximum seek time: 19ms Track-to-track seek time: 1ms Transfer rate (surface to buffer): 54-128 MB/s Transfer rate (buffer to host): 375 MB/s

```
on average, you have to wait for half a rotation: 4.15 ms
transfer time: 512 bytes * 1 s/54 MB * 1MB/10^6 bytes = .0095 ms
```
How long would it take to do 500 sector reads, spread out randomly over the disk (and serviced in FIFO order)?

(rotation delay + seek time + transfer\_time)\*500 rotation delay:  $60s/1min * 1 min/7200$  rotations = 8.33 ms seek time: 10.5 ms (given) \*\*per read\*\*:  $4.15$  ms + 10.5 ms + .0095 ms = 14.66 ms 500 reads: 14.66 ms/request \* 500 requests = 7.3 seconds. total throughput: data/time = 35KB/s

# Disk performance example

Spindle Speed: 7200 RPM Avg Seek Time, read/write: 10.5ms / 12 ms Maximum seek time: 19ms Track-to-track seek time: 1ms Transfer rate (surface to buffer): 54-128 MB/s Transfer rate (buffer to host): 375 MB/s

rotation delay + seek time +  $500*$ transfer time rotation delay: 4.15 ms (same as above) seek time: 10.5 ms (same as above) transfer time:  $500 * .0095$  ms =  $4.75$  ms total:  $4.15$  ms +  $10.5$  ms +  $4.75$  ms =  $19.5$  ms total throughput: 13.1 MB/s

## How long would it take to do 500 sector reads, **sequentially on the disk** (and serviced in FIFO order)?

# Sequential vs. Random Reads

Sequential reads are MUCH faster than random reads!

# So what do we do?

*"The secret to making disks fast is to treat them like tape"*

### Dish Cache for Read-ahead

### Write Caching

### Minimize seek times

Disk keeps reading at last host request otherwise sequential read would incur whole revolution Should read-ahead cross track boundaries? a head-switch cannot be stopped, so there is a cost to aggressive read ahead.

(if battery backed): data in buffer can be written over many times before actually being put back to disk. also, many writes can be stored so they can be scheduled more optimally (if not battery backed): then policy decision between disk and host about whether to report data in cache as on disk or not

- Multiple pending I/O requests must be available
- System must support I/O concurrency
- More requests = better optimization opportunities

The system (OS or disk controller) can reorder pending I/O requests to minimize head movement

Requirements for effective request ordering:

### • Strategy 1: Maximize I/O Concurrency:

- Issue multiple I/O requests simultaneously
- Allows the system to optimize request ordering
- Strategy 2: Memory-Centric Design:
	- Keep primary data structures in memory
	- Use write-logging for persistence
	- Write backups sequentially to disk
	- Avoid random-access reads entirely





# Technology and System Trends

## Disk Performance

Storage Density

Addressing Disk Access Bottleneck

Memory Size Impact

Cloud Computing Impact

Mechanics of disks (seeks and rotational delays) have not kept up with huge growth in other computer components (CPU, RAM, …)

Density (byte\_stored/\$) is growing fast! (because it is less about mechanical limits) Key: minimizing the distance between the read/write head and disk surface (well, what happen if the head touch the surface?)

However, data transfer bandwidth has shown steady improvement at roughly 10x per decade

Leverage increased bandwidth to fetch larger chunks of data per access Trade higher latency for better bandwidth utilization Optimize data placement by clustering related data physically close together on disk (This clustering allows efficient retrieval of related data once the initial seek cost is paid)

System memory (RAM) size is growing faster than typical workload sizes, leading to: • More data fitting in file cache

- 
- 
- 

• Changed disk access patterns: predominantly writes and new data access

• Makes logging and journaling more practical as performance strategies



Allow decoupling computer from storage: Small CPUs with a lot of storage attached

# Remarks about Disks

HDD have historically been the bottleneck in many systems

Although this becomes less and less true every year (because of SSDs, PM, …)

Disks are still widely used (cheap, better durability than SSD, great for backup),

Hmmm, so why are we studying them? especially in large cloud infrastructure

Many filesystems were designed with disk in mind (sequential access throughput much higher than random access)

Pattern: large setup costs, followed by efficient batch transfer, shows up in a lot of hardware and systems