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Simple Disk Geometry

Areal Density = BPI x TPI

2.5" or 3.5" platters

5400, 6400, 7200, 10000 RPM

Areal density (and capacity) has been doubling every 2-3 years

I/O Buffering Schemes

- Purpose: Smooth out I/O traffic

No Buffering

Single Buffering

Double Buffering

Ring Buffering
Physical Disk Management

**Physical Formatting**
- Create (on the disk surface) the electronic patterns that define the smallest data transfer unit (sector)
  - Header: Sector number, bad sector information
  - Body: Data (sector contents)
  - Trailer: Error detection/correction
- Create an initial disk label
  - Define partitions (cylinder groupings)
  - Record disk geometry (# cylinders, # heads, # sectors/track)

**Bad sector (a sector with at least 1 bad bit)**
- Sector Forwarding: Chain bad sector to a sector in extra cylinder
- Sector Slipping: Forward shift header information on a track

**Disk Request Time**
- **Average Seek Time**
  \[ t_{\text{seek}} = k_0 + n_{\text{cylinders}} k_1 \]
- **Average Rotational Latency (Delay)**
  \[ t_{\text{rotation}} = T_r/2 \]
- **Average Transfer Time**
  \[ t_{\text{transfer}} = T_r L_{\text{block}}/C_{\text{track}} \]
- **Average Access Time**
  \[ t_{\text{access}} = t_{\text{seek}} + T_r/2 + T_r L_{\text{block}}/C_{\text{track}} \]

**Disk Request Time Examples**
- **Disk Parameters**
  - Average Seek Time: 20 ms
  - Rotation Speed: 7200 RPM
    - \( T_r \approx 8.35 \text{ ms} \) rotation time
  - 512-Byte sectors
  - 64 sectors per track \( C_{\text{track}} = 64 \times 512 \text{ bytes} \)
- **Average time to read 128K bytes**
  - Read 4 whole tracks
  - Average Time (ms): 4 \( (4.18 + 8.35) = 50.12 \text{ ms} \)
- **Average time to read 128K bytes**
  - Read 256 random sectors
  - Average Time (ms): 256 \( (20 + 4.18 + 0.13) = 6223.36 \text{ ms} = 6.2 \text{ sec} \)
- **Significant Effect:** Physical grouping of sectors

**Zoned Recording**
- The greater the distance from the center
  - The higher the recording density
  - The higher the data transfer rate
- Typically, 10 or more zones
  - Transfer rate highest at outer track
  - All EDI and SCSI drives are now zoned (Hidden from PC BIOS)
Quantum Fireball 3.8 GB Drive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>#Tracks</th>
<th>Sectors/Track Transfer Rate (Mbps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (outer)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All IDE and SCSI drives use zoned bit recording
- 6,810 tracks/surface
- Each surface has 1,259,396 sectors (615 MB)
- Disk controller built into drive
  - Drive appears to have same #sectors/track to BIOS

Source: Scott Mueller, Upgrading and Repairing PCs

Disk Scheduling Policies
- Example (Start Cylinder = 100; Largest Cyl# = 199)
  - Cylinder Numbers in Request Queue:
    55, 58, 39, 18, 90, 160, 150, 38
- **FIFO** (First-In-First-Out): 55, 58, 39, 18, 90, 160, 150, 38
- **SSTF** (Shortest-Seek-Time-First):
  90, 58, 55, 39, 38, 18, 150, 160
- **SCAN** (Elevator Algorithm):
  (right first) 150, 160, 199, 90, 58, 55, 39, 38, 18, 0
  - Bidirectional: Increasing, goto max, decreasing, goto 0, ...
- **C-SCAN** (Circular SCAN):
  (right first) 150, 160, 199, 0, 18, 38, 39, 55, 58, 90
  - Unidirectional: Increasing, goto max, goto 0, increasing, ...
- **LOOK**:
  (right first) 150, 160, 90, 58, 55, 39, 38, 18
  - Don't go to extreme cylinders unless necessary
- **C-LOOK**:
  (right first) 150, 160, 18, 38, 39, 55, 58, 90

Server Configurations
- **Laboratory** (circa 1983) - $250K
  - VAX 750 CPU (0.7 MIPS), 4 MB RAM, 2-250 MB CDC disk, 75 ips 1600 bpi tape, 10 Mbps Ethernet coax
- **Laboratory** (circa 1992) - $60K
  - Sun SPARC CPU, 16 MB RAM, 2-500 MB SCSI-1 disk, Exabyte tape, 10 Mbps Ethernet thin
- **Neuroscience Data Cache** (circa 2000) - $500K
  - Dual CPU SUN SPARCcenter, 1 GB RAM, 1.8 TB RAID-5 (48 x 9 GB + 24 x 18 GB + 24 x 36 GB SCSI-2, quad power, dual controller), 10/100 Mbps Ethernet cat5, 600 Mbps ATM fiber, remote DLT robot backup
- **Laboratory** (circa 2005) - $25K
  - Dual 3 GHz Xeon CPU, 2 GB RAM, 1.5 TB RAID-5, GigE copper, remote tape robot backup

RAID
- **Redundant Array of Inexpensive Disks**
  - Array Management
    - Software and Controller
  - Physical Disks
    - Disk 0
    - Disk m-1
  - Logical Disk
    - n-1
    - m-1
    - 0, 1, ...
The RAID Idea

- Redundant Array of Inexpensive (Independent) Disks
  - Set of physical disk drives seen by OS as a single logical drive
  - Data distributed across physical drives of an array
  - Redundant disk space is used to store parity information which guarantees data recoverability in case of disk failure
- Motivation
  - Replace large, expensive disk drives with multiple, less-expensive, smaller-capacity drives
- Tradeoff
  - Increase availability at the cost of increased unreliability (probability of a single failure)

RAID Levels

- RAID 0: Striping
- RAID 1: Mirroring
- RAID 2: Hamming Code
- RAID 3: Bit-Interleaved Parity
- RAID 4: Block-Interleaved Parity
- RAID 5: Distributed RAID 4

RAID 0 (Striping)

- A strip is N sectors
- Data are striped across the disk drives
  - Example: Strips 0, 1, 2, 3 = Stripe 0
- Performance
  - Function of request pattern and data layout
- High Data Transfer Capacity
  - Need high transfer capacity from drive to host memory
  - Need requests to be for large amounts of logically contiguous data
    - Overlap seek and transfer times of all disk drives
    - Compare to 1 seek followed by large transfer while other drives are idle
- High I/O Request Rate
  - Initiate concurrent, independent requests (each reading 1 strip)
- Disadvantage
  - One drive fails ➔ Array is useless
**Effect of Striping**

- Two 1-stripe accesses (1 stripe = 1 block)
  - Non-RAID (1 Large Disk)
  - RAID 0 (2 Disks)

- One 2-stripe access (1 stripe = 1 block)
  - Non-RAID (1 Large Disk)
  - RAID 0 (2 Disks)

---

**RAID 1 (Mirroring)**

- **Pros**
  - Easy to implement
    - Read Request: Service from disk drive which minimizes service time
    - Write Request: Update strip and its mirror in parallel
    - Simple recovery from disk failure: Access disk mirror
  - Very good data reliability
  - Improves read performance

- **Cons**
  - 100% storage overhead \( \rightarrow \) High byte cost

**Case for RAID 1**
- Storage costs are dropping; Down time cost is rising.

---

**RAID 3 (Bit-Interleaved Parity)**

- **Pros**
  - Easy to implement
    - Read Request: Service from disk drive which minimizes service time
    - Write Request: Update strip and its mirror in parallel
    - Simple recovery from disk failure: Access disk mirror
  - Very good data reliability
  - Improves read performance

**Cons**
- 100% storage overhead \( \rightarrow \) High byte cost

**Case for RAID 3**
- Storage costs are dropping; Down time cost is rising.
RAID 3

- Stripe bits or bytes over disks and compute parity over stripe
- Simple parity bit computed for same bit position on all drives
  - For \( m = 4 \) drives, parity bit \( i \) on drive 4 (the parity drive):
    \[
    X4(i) = X0(i) \oplus X1(i) \oplus X2(i) \oplus X3(i)
    \]
  - 1 parity drive, no matter how large the disk array
  - Parallel access with data distributed in small strips
- Recovery From Failure
  - Reconstruct data from remaining drives until failed drive is replaced
  - Example: Drive X1 fails when \( m = 4 \) drives
    \[
    X1(i) = X0(i) \oplus X2(i) \oplus X3(i) \oplus X4(i)
    \]

RAID 4 AND 5 (Block-level Parity)

- RAID 4: Parity Disk
  - \((\text{Bit } i, \text{Block } j) = f(\text{Bit } i, \text{Block } j, \text{all data disks})\)
  - Stripe blocks over disks and compute block parity over stripe of blocks
  - Can read a single block in a stripe (independent drives)
  - Write requires waiting for parity block(s) to be written
    - Parity drive becomes a bottleneck
- RAID 5: Distribute parity blocks among all disks (Avoid parity disk bottleneck)
  - The most popular type today
  - Very good read performance
  - Write performance is better than RAID 4, but is still slow because of parity block.