



Tiny-Tail Flash: Near-Perfect Elimination of Garbage Collection Tail Latencies in NAND SSDs

Shiqin Yan, Huaicheng Li, Mingzhe Hao, and Michael Hao Tong, *University of Chicago*;
Swaminathan Sundararaman, *Parallel Machines*;
Andrew A. Chien and Haryadi S. Gunawi, *University of Chicago*

<https://www.usenix.org/conference/fast17/technical-sessions/presentation/yan>

**This paper is included in the Proceedings of
the 15th USENIX Conference on
File and Storage Technologies (FAST '17).**

February 27–March 2, 2017 • Santa Clara, CA, USA

ISBN 978-1-931971-36-2

**Open access to the Proceedings of
the 15th USENIX Conference on
File and Storage Technologies
is sponsored by USENIX.**

Tiny-Tail Flash: Near-Perfect Elimination of Garbage Collection Tail Latencies in NAND SSDs

Shiqin Yan, Huaicheng Li, Mingzhe Hao, Michael Hao Tong,
Swaminathan Sundararaman[†], Andrew A. Chien, and Haryadi S. Gunawi

University of Chicago [†]Parallel Machines

Abstract

TTFLASH is a “tiny-tail” flash drive (SSD) that eliminates GC-induced tail latencies by circumventing GC-blocked I/Os with four novel strategies: plane-blocking GC, rotating GC, GC-tolerant read, and GC-tolerant flush. It is built on three SSD internal advancements: powerful controllers, parity-based RAIN, and capacitor-backed RAM, but is dependent on the use of intra-plane copyback operations. We show that TTFLASH comes significantly close to a “no-GC” scenario. Specifically, between 99–99.99th percentiles, TTFLASH is only 1.0 to 2.6× slower than the no-GC case, while a base approach suffers from 5–138× GC-induced slowdowns.

1 Introduction

Flash storage has become the mainstream destination for storage users. The SSD consumer market continues to grow at a significant rate [8], SSD-backed cloud-VM instances are becoming the norm [7, 13], and flash/SSD arrays are a popular solution for high-end storage servers [23, 30, 44]. From the users side, they demand fast and stable latencies [25, 28]. However, SSDs do not always deliver the performance that users expect [15]. Some even suggest that flash storage “may not save the world” (due to the tail latency problem) [5]. Some recent works dissect why it is hard to meet SLAs with SSDs [36] and reveal high performance variability in 7 million hours of SSDs deployments [30].

The core problem of flash performance instability is the well-known and “notorious” *garbage collection* (GC) process. A GC operation causes long delays as the SSD cannot serve (blocks) incoming I/Os. Due to an ongoing GC, read latency variance can increase by 100× [5, 24]. In the last decade, there is a large body of work that reduces the number of GC operations with a variety of novel techniques [29, 35, 36, 37, 39, 43, 48]. However, we find almost no work in literature that attempts to *eliminate* the *blocking* nature of GC operations and deliver steady SSD performance in long runs.

We address this urgent issue with “tiny-tail” flash drive (TTFLASH), a GC-tolerant SSD that can deliver and guarantee stable performance. The goal of TTFLASH is

to eliminate GC-induced tail latencies by *circumventing GC-blocked I/Os*. That is, ideally there should be *no* I/O that will be blocked by a GC operation, thus creating a flash storage that behaves close to a “no-GC” scenario. The key enabler is that SSD internal technology has changed in many ways, which we exploit to build novel GC-tolerant approaches.

Specifically, there are three major SSD technological advancements that we leverage for building TTFLASH. First, we leverage the increasing power and speed of today’s flash controllers that *enable more complex logic* (e.g., multi-threading, I/O concurrency, fine-grained I/O management) to be implemented at the controller. Second, we exploit the use of Redundant Array of Independent NAND (RAIN). Bit error rates of modern SSDs have increased to the point that ECC is no longer deemed sufficient [33, 37, 45]. Due to this increasing failure, modern commercial SSDs employ parity-based redundancies (RAIN) as a standard data protection mechanism [6, 12]. By using RAIN, we can *circumvent GC-blocked read I/Os with parity regeneration*. Finally, modern SSDs come with a large RAM buffer (hundreds of MBs) backed by “super capacitors” [10, 14], which we leverage to *mask write tail latencies* from GC operations.

The timely combination of the technology practices above enables four new strategies in TTFLASH: **(a)** *plane-blocking GC*, which shifts GC blocking from coarse granularities (controller/channel) to a finer granularity (plane level), which depends on intra-plane copyback operations, **(b)** *GC-tolerant read*, which exploits RAIN parity-based redundancy to proactively generate contents of read I/Os that are blocked by ongoing GCs, **(c)** *rotating GC*, which schedules GC in a rotating fashion to enforce at most one active GC in every plane group, hence the guarantee to always cut “one tail” with one parity, and finally **(d)** *GC-tolerant flush*, which evicts buffered writes from capacitor-backed RAM to flash pages, free from GC blocking.

One constraint of TTFLASH is its dependency on intra-plane copybacks where GC-ed pages move within a plane without the data flowing through the SSD controller, hence skipping ECC checks for garbage collected pages, which may reduce data reliability. The full extent

of this effect is not evaluated and left for future work. We recommend background ECC checks to be performed in the background to overcome this limitation (§7).

We first implemented TTFLASH in SSDSim [32] in order to simulate accurate latency analysis at the device level. Next, to run real file systems and applications, we also port TTFLASH to a newer QEMU/KVM-based platform based on VSSIM [50].

With a thorough evaluation (§6.1), we show that TTFLASH successfully eliminates GC blocking for a significant number of I/Os, reducing GC-blocked I/Os from 2–7% (base case) to only 0.003–0.7%. As a result, TTFLASH reduces tail latencies dramatically. Specifically, between the 99–99.99th percentiles, compared to the perfect no-GC scenario, a base approach suffers from 5.6–138.2× GC-induced slowdowns. TTFLASH on the other hand is only 1.0 to 2.6× slower than the no-GC case, which confirms our near-complete elimination of GC blocking and the resulting tail latencies.

We also show that TTFLASH is more stable than state-of-the-art approaches that reduce GC impacts such as preemptive GC [9, 40] (§6.2). Specifically, TTFLASH continuously delivers stable latencies while preemptive GC exhibits latency spikes under intensive I/Os. Furthermore, we contrast the fundamental difference of GC-impact elimination from reduction (§6.3, §8).

In summary, by leveraging modern SSD internal technologies in a unique way, we have successfully built novel features that provide a robust solution to the critical problem of GC-induced tail latencies. In the following sections, we present extended motivation (§2), SSD primer (§3), TTFLASH design (§4), implementation (§5), evaluation (§6), and limitations (§7), and related and conclusion (§7-9).

2 GC-Induced Tail Latency

We present two experiments that show GC cascading impacts, which motivate our work. Each experiment runs on a late-2014 128GB Samsung SM951, which can sustain 70 “KWPS” (70K of 4KB random writes/sec).

In Figure 1a, we ran a foreground thread that executes 16-KB random reads, concurrently with background threads that inject 4-KB random-write noises at 1, 2.5, and 5 KWPS (far below the max 70 KWPS) across three experiments. We measure L_i , the latency of every 16-KB foreground read. Figure 1a plots the CDF of L_i , clearly showing that *more frequent GCs (from more-intense random writes) block incoming reads and create longer tail latencies*. To show the tail is induced by GC, not queuing delays, we ran the same experiments but now with random-read noises (1, 2.5, and 5 KRPS). The read-noise results are plotted as the three overlapping thin lines marked “ReadNoise,” which represents a




Figure 1: GC-Induced Tail Latencies (Section 2).

perfect no-GC scenario. As shown, with 5 KWPS noise, read operations become 15×, 19×, and 96× slower compared to no-GC scenarios, at 90th, 95th and 99th percentiles, respectively.

In Figure 1b, we keep the 5-KWPS noise and now vary the I/O size of the foreground random reads (8, 16, 32, 64, and 128 KB across five experiments). Supposedly, a 2× larger read should only consume 2× longer latency. However, the figure shows that *GC induces more tail latencies in larger reads*. For example, at 85th percentile, a 64-KB read is 4× slower than a 32-KB read. The core of the problem is this: *if a single page of a large read is blocked by a GC, the entire read cannot complete*; as read size increases, the probability of one of the pages being blocked by GC also increases, as we explain later (§3, §4.1). The pattern is more obvious when compared to the same experiments but with 5-KRPS noises (the five thin gray lines marked “ReadNoise”).

For a fairer experiment, because flash read latency is typically 20× faster than write latency, we also ran read noises that are 20× more intense and another where read noises is 20× larger in size. The results are similar.

3 SSD Primer: GC Blocking

Before presenting TTFLASH, we first need to describe SSD internals that are essential for understanding GC blocking. This section describes how GC operates from the view of the physical hardware.

SSD Layout: Figure 2 shows a basic SSD internal layout. Data and command transfers are sent via *parallel channels* ($C_1..C_N$). A channel connects multiple flash planes; 1–4 planes can be packaged as a single chip (dashed box). A plane contains *blocks* of flash pages. In every plane, there is a 4-KB *register* support; all flash reads/writes must transfer through the plane register. The controller is connected to a *capacitor-backed RAM* used for multiple purposes (*e.g.*, write buffering). For clarity, we use concrete parameter values shown in Table 1.




Figure 2: SSD Internals (Section 3).

GC operation (4 main steps): When used-page count increases above a certain threshold (e.g., 70%), a GC will start. A possible GC operation reads *valid* pages from an old block, writes them to a free block, and erases the old block, within the same plane. Figure 2 shows two *copybacks* in a GC-ing plane (two valid pages being copied to a free block). Most importantly, with 4-KB register support in every plane, page copybacks happen *within* the GC-ing plane *without* using the channel [11, 18].

The controller then performs the following *for-loop* of four steps for *every page copyback*: (1) send a flash-to-register read command through the channel (only $0.2\mu\text{s}$) to the GC-ing plane, (2) *wait* until the plane executes the 1-page read command ($40\mu\text{s}$ without using the channel), (3) send a register-to-flash write command, and (4) *wait* until the plane executes the 1-page write command ($800\mu\text{s}$ without using the channel). Steps 1–4 are repeated until all valid pages are copied and then the old block is erased. The key point here is that copyback operations (steps 2 and 4; roughly $840\mu\text{s}$) are done *internally* within the GC-ing plane *without* crossing the channel.

GC Blocking: GC blocking occurs when some resources (e.g., controller, channel, planes) are used by a GC activity, which will delay subsequent requests, similar to head-of-line blocking. Blocking designs are used as they are simple and cheap (small gate counts). But because GC latencies are long, blocking designs can produce significant tail latencies.

One simple approach to implement GC is with a blocking controller. That is, even when only *one plane* is performing GC, the *controller is busy* communicating with the GC-ing plane and unable to serve outstanding I/Os that are designated to *any* other planes. We refer to this as *controller-blocking GC*, as illustrated in Figure 3a. Here, a single GC (the striped plane) blocks the controller, thus technically all channels and planes are blocked (the bold lines and dark planes). *All* outstanding I/Os cannot be served (represented by the non-colored I/Os). OpenSSD [4], VSSIM [50], and low-cost systems such as eMMC devices adopt this implementation.

Another approach is to support multi-threaded/multi-CPU with channel queueing. Here, while a thread/CPU is communicating to a GC-ing plane (in a for-loop) and




Figure 3: **Various levels of GC blocking.** Colored I/Os in bright planes are servable while non-colored I/Os in dark planes are blocked. (a) In controller-blocking (§3), a GC blocks the controller/entire SSD. (b) In channel-blocking (§3), a GC blocks the channel connected to the GC-ing plane. (c) In plane-blocking (§4.1), a GC only blocks the GC-ing plane.

blocking the plane’s channel (e.g., bold line in Figure 3b), other threads/CPU can serve other I/Os designated to other channels (the colored I/Os in bright planes). We refer this as *channel-blocking GC* (i.e., a GC blocks the channel of the GC-ing plane). SSDSim [32] and disksim_{+SSD} [18] adopt this implementation. Commodity SSDs do not come with layout specifications, but from our experiments (§2), we suspect some form of channel-blocking (at least in client SSDs) exists.

Figure 1 also implicitly shows how blocked I/Os create cascading queueing delays. Imagine the “Outstanding I/Os” represents a full device queue (e.g., typically 32 I/Os). When this happens, the host OS cannot submit more I/Os, hence user I/Os are blocked in the OS queues. We show this impact in our evaluation.

4 TTFLASH Design

We now present the design of TTFLASH, a new SSD architecture that achieves guaranteed performance close to a no-GC scenario. We are able to remove GC blocking at all levels with the following four key strategies:

1. Devise a non-blocking controller and channel protocol, pushing any resource blocking from a GC to only the affected planes. We call this fine-grained architecture *plane-blocking GC* (§4.1).
2. Exploit RAIN parity-based redundancy (§4.2) and combine it with GC information to proactively regenerate reads blocked by GC at the plane level, which we name *GC-tolerant read* (§4.3).
3. Schedule GC in a rotating fashion to enforce at most one GC in every plane group, such that no reads will see more than one GC; one parity can only “cut one tail.” We name this *rotating GC* (§4.4).
4. Use capacitor-backed write buffer to deliver fast durable completion of writes, allowing them to be evicted to flash pages at a later time in GC-tolerant manner. We name this *GC-tolerant flush* (§4.5).

Sizes		Latencies	
SSD Capacity	256 GB	Page Read	40 μ s
#Channels	8	(flash-to-register)	
#Planes/channel	8	Page Write	800 μ s
Plane size	4 GB	(register-to-flash)	
#Planes/chip	** 1	Page data transfer	100 μ s
#Blocks/plane	4096	(via channel)	
#Pages/block	256	Block erase	2 ms
Page size	4 KB		

Table 1: **SSD Parameters.** *This paper uses the above parameters. (**) 1 planes/chip is for simplicity of presentation and illustration. The latencies are based on average values; actual latencies can vary due to read retry, different voltages, etc. Flash reads/writes must use the plane register.*

For clarity of description, the following sections will use concrete parameter values shown in Table 1.

4.1 Plane-Blocking GC (PB)

Controller- and channel-blocking GC are often adopted due to their simplicity of hardware implementation; a GC is essentially a for-loop of copyback commands. This simplicity, however, leads to severe tail latencies as independent planes are unnecessarily blocked. Channel-blocking is no better than controller-blocking GC for large I/Os; as every large I/O is typically striped across multiple channels, one GC-busy channel still blocks the entire I/O, negating the benefit of SSD parallelism. Furthermore, as SSD capacity increases, there will be more planes blocked in the same channel. Worse, GC period can be significantly long. A GC that copybacks 64 valid pages (25% valid) will lead to 54 ms (64 \times 840 μ s) of blocked channel, which potentially leaves *hundreds* of other I/Os unservable. An outstanding read operation that supposedly only takes less than 100 μ s is now delayed longer by order(s) of magnitude [5, 24].

To reduce this unnecessary blocking, we introduce *plane-blocking GC*, as illustrated in Figure 3c. Here, *the only outstanding I/Os blocked by a GC are the ones that correspond to the GC-ing plane* (\circ labels). All I/Os to non-GCing planes (non- \circ labels) are servable, including the ones in the same channel of the GC-ing plane. As a side note, plane-blocking GC can be interchangeably defined as chip-blocking GC; in this paper, we use 1 plane/chip for simplicity of presentation.

To implement this concept, the controller must perform a fine-grained I/O management. For illustration, let us consider the four GC steps (§3). In TTFASH, after a controller CPU/thread sends the flash-to-register read/write command (Steps 1 and 3), it will *not* be idle waiting (for 40 μ s and 800 μ s, respectively) until the next step is executable. (Note that in a common implementation, the controller is idling due to the simple for-loop and the need to access the channel to check the plane’s

copyback status). With plane-blocking GC, after Steps 1 and 3 (send read/write commands), the controller creates a future event that marks the completion time. The controller can reliably predict how long the intra-plane read/write commands will finish (e.g., 40 and 800 μ s on average, respectively). To summarize, with plane-blocking GC, TTFASH *overlaps* intra-plane copyback and channel usage for other outstanding I/Os. As shown in Figure 3c, for the duration of an intra-plane copyback (the striped/GC-ing plane), the controller can continue serving I/Os to other non-GCing planes in the corresponding channel (\blacktriangle I/Os).

Plane-blocking GC potentially frees up hundreds of previously blocked I/Os. However, there is an unsolved GC blocking issue and a new ramification. The unsolved GC blocking issue is that the I/Os to the GC-ing plane (\circ labels in Figure 3c) are *still blocked* until the GC completes; in other words, with only plane-blocking, we cannot entirely remove GC blocking. The new ramification of plane-blocking is a potentially *prolonged* GC operation; when the GC-ing plane is ready to take another command (end of Steps 2 and 4), the controller/channel might still be in the middle of serving other I/Os, due to overlaps. For example, the controller cannot start GC write (Step 3) exactly 40 μ s after GC read completes (Step 1), and similarly, the next GC read (Step 1) cannot start exactly 800 μ s after the previous GC write. If GC is prolonged, I/Os to the GC-ing plane will be blocked longer. Fortunately, the two issues above can be masked with RAIN and GC-tolerant read.

4.2 RAIN

To prevent blocking of I/Os to GC-ing planes, we leverage RAIN, a recently-popular standard for data integrity [6, 12]. RAIN introduces the notion of parity pages inside the SSD. Just like the evolution of disk-based RAIDs, many RAIN layouts have been introduced [33, 37, 41, 42], but they mainly focus on data protection, write optimization, and wear leveling. On the contrary, we design a RAIN layout that also targets tail tolerance. This section briefly describes our basic RAIN layout, enough for understanding how it enables GC-tolerant read (§4.3); our more advanced layout will be discussed later along with wear-leveling issues (§7).

Figure 4 shows our RAIN layout. For simplicity of illustration, we use 4 channels (C_0 – C_3) and the RAIN *stripe width* matches the channel count ($N=4$). The planes at the same position in each channel form a *plane group* (e.g., G_1). A stripe of pages is based on logical page numbers (LPNs). For every stripe ($N-1$ consecutive LPNs), we allocate a parity page. For example, for LPNs 0-2, we allocate a parity page P_{012} .

Regarding the FTL design (LPN-to-PPN mapping), there are two options: dynamic or static. Dynamic map-




Figure 4: **TTFLASH Architecture.** The figure illustrates our RAIN layout (§4.2), GC-tolerant read (§4.3), rotating GC (§4.4), and GC-tolerant flush (§4.5). We use four channels (C_0 – C_3) for simplicity of illustration. Planes at the same “vertical” position form a plane group (G_0 , G_1 , etc.). A RAIN stripe is based on $N-1$ LPNs and a parity page (e.g., $012P_{012}$).

ping, where an LPN can be mapped to *any* PPN, is often used to speed-up writes (flexible destination). However, in modern SSDs, write latency issues are absorbed by capacitor-backed RAM (§4.5); thus, writes are spread across multiple channels. Second, dynamic mapping works well when individual pages are independent; however, RAIN pages are *stripe dependent*. With dynamic mapping, pages in a stripe can be placed behind one channel, which will underutilize channel parallelism.

Given the reasons above, we create a page-level hybrid static-dynamic mapping. The static allocation policies are: (a) an LPN is statically mapped to a plane (e.g., LPN 0 to plane G_0C_0 in Figure 4), (b) $N-1$ consecutive LPNs and their parity form a stripe (e.g., $012P_{012}$), and (c) the stripe pages are mapped to planes across the channels within one plane group (e.g., $012P_{012}$ in G_0). Later, we will show how all of these are crucial for supporting GC-tolerant read (§4.3) and rotating GC (§4.4).

The dynamic allocation policy is: inside each plane/chip, an LPN can be dynamically mapped to *any* PPN (hundreds of thousands of choices). An overwrite to the same LPN will be redirected to a free page in the same plane (e.g., overwrites to LPN 0 can be directed to any PPN inside G_0C_0 plane).

To prevent parity-channel bottleneck (akin to RAID-4 parity-disk bottleneck), we adopt RAID-5 with a slightly customized layout. First, we treat the set of channels as a RAID-5 group. For example, in Figure 4, P_{012} and P_{345} are in different channels, in a diagonal fashion. Second, as SSD planes form a 2-dimensional layout (G_iC_j) with wearout issues (unlike disk’s “flat” LPNs), we need to ensure hot parity pages are spread out evenly. To handle this, we will present dynamic migrations later (§7).

4.3 GC-Tolerant Read (GTR)

With RAIN, we can easily support *GC-tolerant read (GTR)*. For a full-stripe read (which uses $N-1$ channels), GTR is straightforward: if a page cannot be fetched due to an ongoing GC, the page content is quickly regenerated by reading the parity from another plane. In Figure 4, given a full-stripe read of LPNs 0–2, and if LPN 1 is unavailable temporarily, the content is rapidly regenerated by reading the parity (P_{012}). Thus, the full-stripe read is *not* affected by the ongoing GC. The resulting latency is *order(s) of magnitude faster* than waiting for GC completion; parity computation overhead only takes less than $3\mu s$ for $N \leq 8$ and the additional parity read only takes a minimum of $40+100\mu s$ (read+transfer latencies; Table 1) and does not introduce much contention.

For a partial-stripe read (R pages where $R < N-1$), GC-tolerant read will generate in total $N-R$ extra reads; the worst case is when $R=1$. These $N-R$ extra parallel reads will add contention to each of the $N-R$ channels, which might need to serve other outstanding I/Os. Thus, we only perform extra reads if $T_{GCtoComplete} > B \times (40+100)\mu s$ where B is the number of busy channels in the $N-R$ extra reads (for non-busy channels the extra reads are free). In our experience, this simple policy cuts GC tail latencies effectively and fairly without introducing heavy contention. In the opposing end, a “greedy” approach that always performs extra reads causes high channel contention.

We emphasize that unlike tail-tolerant speculative execution, often defined as an optimization task that may *not* be actually needed, GC-tolerant read is *affirmative*, not speculative; the controller knows exactly when and where GC is happening and how long it will complete. GTR is effective but has a limitation: it does *not* work when *multiple* planes in a plane group perform GCs simultaneously, which we address with rotating GC.

4.4 Rotating GC (RGC)

As RAIN distributes I/Os evenly over all planes, multiple planes can reach the GC threshold and thus perform GCs simultaneously. For example, in Figure 4, if planes of LPNs 0 and 1 (G_0C_0 and G_0C_1) both perform GC, reading LPNs 0–2 will be delayed. The core issue is: one parity can only cut “one tail”. Double-parity RAIN is not used due to the larger space overhead.

To prevent this, we develop *rotating GC (RGC)*, which enforces that *at most one plane in each plane group can perform one GC at a time*. Concurrent GCs in different plane groups are still allowed (e.g., one in each G_i as depicted in Figure 4). Note that rotating GC depends on our RAIN layout that ensures every stripe to be statically mapped to a plane group.

We now emphasize our most important message: *there will be zero GC-blocked I/Os if rotating GC holds true all the time*. The issue here is that our rotating approach can delay a plane’s GC as long as $(N-1) \times T_{gc}$ (the GC duration). During this period, when all the free pages are exhausted, *multiple* GCs in a plane group *must* execute concurrently. This could happen depending on the combination of N and the write intensity. Later in Appendix A, we provide a proof sketch showing that with stripe-width $N \leq 26$, rotating GC can always be enforced under realistic write-intensive scenarios.

Employing a large stripe width (e.g., $N=32$) is possible but can violate rotating GC, implying that GC tail latencies cannot be eliminated all the time. Thus, in many-channel (e.g., 32) modern SSDs, we can keep $N=8$ or 16 (e.g., create four 8-plane or two 16-plane groups across the planes within the same vertical position). Increasing N is unfavorable not only because of rotating GC violation, but also due to reduced reliability and the more extra I/Os generated for small reads by GTR (§4.3). In our evaluation, we use $N=8$, considering 1/8 parity overhead is bearable.

4.5 GC-Tolerant Flush (GTF)

So far, we only address read tails. Writes are more complex (e.g., due to write randomness, read-and-modify parity update, and the need for durability). To handle write complexities, we leverage the fact that flash industry heavily employs *capacitor-backed RAM* as a durable write buffer (or “cap-backed RAM” for short) [14]. To prevent data loss, the RAM size is adjusted based on the capacitor discharge period after power failure; the size can range from tens to hundreds of MB, backed by “super capacitors” [10].

We adopt cap-backed RAM to absorb all writes quickly. When the buffer occupancy is above 80%, a *background flush* will run to evict some pages. When the buffer is full (e.g., due to intensive large writes), a *foreground flush* will run, which will *block* incoming writes until some space is freed. The challenge to address here is that foreground flush can induce write tails when the evicted pages must be sent to GC-ing planes.

To address this, we introduce *GC-tolerant flush (GTF)*, which ensures that *page eviction is free from GC blocking, which is possible given rotating GC*. For example, in Figure 4, pages belonging to 3’, 4’ and P_{3’4’5’} can be evicted from RAM to flash while page 5’ eviction is delayed until the destination plane finishes the GC. With proven rotating GC, GTF can evict $N-1$ pages in every N pages per stripe without being blocked. Thus, the minimum RAM space needed for the pages yet to be flushed is small. Appendix A suggests that modern SSD RAM size is sufficient to support GTF.

For partial-stripe writes, we perform the usual RAID read-modify-write eviction, but still without being blocked by GC. Let us imagine a worst-case scenario of updates to pages 7’ and 8’ in Figure 4. The new parity should be P_{6’7’8’}, which requires read of page 6 first. Despite page 6 being unreachable, it can be regenerated by reading the old pages P_{6’7’8’}, 7, and 8, after which pages 7’, 8’, and P_{6’7’8’} can be evicted.

We note that such an expensive parity update is rare as we prioritize the eviction of full-stripe dirty pages to non-GCing planes first and then full-stripe pages to mostly non-GCing planes with GTF. Next, we evict partial-stripe dirty pages to non-GCing planes and finally partial-stripe pages to mostly non-GCing planes with GTF. Compared to other eviction algorithms that focus on reducing write amplification [35], our method adds GC tail tolerance.

5 Implementation

This section describes our implementations of TTFLASH, which is available on our website [1].

- **ttFlash-Sim (SSDSim):** To facilitate accurate latency analysis at the device level, we first implement TTFLASH in SSDSim [32], a recently-popular simulator whose accuracy has been validated against a real hardware platform. We use SSDSim due to its clean-slate design. We implemented all the TTFLASH features by adding 2482 LOC to SSDSim. This involves a substantial modification (+36%) to the vanilla version (6844 LOC). The breakdown of our modification is as follow: plane-blocking (523 LOC), RAIN (582), rotating GC (254), GC-tolerant read (493) and write (630 lines).

- **ttFlash-Emu (“VSSIM++”):** To run Linux kernel and file system benchmarks, we also port TTFLASH to VSSIM, a QEMU/KVM-based platform that “facilitates the implementation of the SSD firmware algorithms” [50]. VSSIM emulates NAND flash latencies on RAM disk. Unfortunately, VSSIM’s implementation is based on 5-year old QEMU-v0.11 IDE interface, which only delivers 10K IOPS. Furthermore, as VSSIM is a single-threaded design, it essentially mimics a controller-blocking SSD (1K IOPS under GC).

These limitations led us to make major changes. First, we migrated VSSIM’s single-threaded logic to a multi-threaded design within the QEMU AIO module, which enables us to implement channel-blocking. Second, we migrated this new design to a recent QEMU release (v2.6) and connected it to the PCIe/NVMe interface. Our modification, which we refer as “VSSIM++”, can sustain 50K IOPS. Finally, we port TTFLASH features to VSSIM++, which we refer as ttFlash-Emu, for a total of 869 LOC of changes.

- **Other attempts (OpenSSD and LightNVM):** We attempted implementing TTFLASH on real hardware platforms (2011 Jasmine and 2015 Cosmos OpenSSD boards [4]). After a few months trying, we hit many limitations of OpenSSD: single threaded (no pthread support), single logic for all channels (cannot control channel queues), no accessible commands for data transfer from flash RAM to host DRAM (preventing parity regeneration), no support for wall-clock time (preventing GC time prediction), inaccessible request queues and absence of GC queues (OpenSSD is whole-blocking). We would like to reiterate that these are not hardware limitations, but rather, the ramifications of the elegant simplicity of OpenSSD programming model (which is its main goal). Nevertheless, our conversations with hardware architects suggest that TTFLASH is implementable on a real firmware (e.g., roughly a 1-year development and testing project on a FPGA-based platform).

Finally, we also investigated the LightNVM (OpenChannel SSD) QEMU test platform [16]. LightNVM [21] is an in-kernel framework that manages OpenChannel SSD (which exposes individual flash channels to the host, akin to Software-Defined Flash [44]). Currently, neither OpenChannel SSD nor LightNVM’s QEMU test platform support intra-SSD copy-page command. Without such support and since GC is managed by the host OS, GC-ed pages must cross back and forth between the device and the host. This creates heavy background-vs-foreground I/O transfer contention between GC and user I/Os. For example, the user’s maximum 50K IOPS can downgrade to 3K IOPS when GC is happening. We leave this integration for future work after the intra-SSD copy-page command is supported.

6 Evaluation

We now present extensive evaluations showing that TTFLASH significantly eliminates GC blocking (§6.1), delivers more stable latencies than the state-of-the-art preemptive GC (§6.2) and other GC optimization techniques (§6.3), and does not significantly increase P/E cycles beyond the RAIN overhead (§6.4).

Workloads: We evaluate two implementations: ttFlash-Sim (on SSDSim) and ttFlash-Emu (on VS-SIM++), as described in Section 5. For ttFlash-Sim evaluation, we use 6 real-world block-level traces from Microsoft Windows Servers as listed in the figure titles of Figure 5. Their detailed characteristics are publicly reported [3, 34]. By default, for each trace, we chose the busiest hour (except the 6-minute TPCC trace). For ttFlash-Emu evaluation, we use filebench [2] with six personalities as listed in the x-axis of Figure 8.

Hardware parameters: For ttFlash-Sim, we use the same 256-GB parameter values provided in Table 1




Figure 5: **Tail Latencies.** The figures show the CDF of read latencies ($x=0-80ms$) in different workloads as we add each TTFLASH strategy: +PB (§4.1), +GTR (§4.3), and +RGC (§4.4). The y-axis shows 95–100th percentiles.

with 64 MB cap-backed RAM and a typical device queue size of 32. ttFlash-Emu uses the same parameters but its SSD capacity is only 48 GB (limited by the machine’s DRAM). We use a machine with 2.4GHz 8-core Intel Xeon Processor E5-2630-v3 and 64-GB DRAM. The simulated and emulated SSD drives are pre-warmed up with the same workload.

6.1 Main Results

- **Tiny tail latencies:** Figure 5 shows the CDF of read latencies from the six trace-driven experiments run on ttFlash-Sim. Note that we only show read latencies; write latencies are fast and stable as all writes are absorbed by cap-backed RAM (§4.5). As shown in Figure 5, the base approach (“Base” = the default SSDSim with channel-blocking and its most-optimum FTL [32] and without RAIN) exhibits long tail latencies. In contrast, as we add each TTFLASH feature one at a time on top of the other: +PB (§4.1), +GTR (§4.3), and +RGC (§4.4), sig-




Figure 6: **Average Latencies.** The figure compares the average read latencies of Base, TTFLASH, and NoGC scenarios from the same experiments in Figure 5.

Percentile:	DAP	DTRS	Exch	LMBE	MSN	TPCC
99.99 th	1.00x	1.24	1.18	1.96	1.00	2.56
99.9 th	1.00x	1.01	1.01	1.02	1.01	1.01
99 th	1.00x	1.02	1.10	1.01	1.03	1.02

Table 2: **TTFLASH vs. NoGC (almost no tail).** The numbers above represent the *slowdown ratio* of TTFLASH read latencies compared to NoGC at high percentiles. For example, in DTRS, at 99.99th percentile, TTFLASH’s read latency is only 1.24× slower than NoGC’s read latency.

nificant improvements are observed. When all features are added (RGC+GTR+PB), the tiny tail latencies are close to those of the no-GC scenario, as we explain later.

Figure 6 plots the average latencies of the same experiments. This graph highlights that although the latencies of TTFLASH and Base are similar at 90th percentile (Figure 5), the Base’s long tail latencies severely impact its average latencies. Compared to Base, TTFLASH’s average latencies are 2.5–7.8× faster.

- **TTFLASH vs. NoGC:** To characterize the benefits of TTFLASH’s tail latencies, we compare TTFLASH to a perfect “no-GC” scenario (“NoGC” = TTFLASH without GC and with RAIN). In NoGC, the same workload runs without any GC work (with a high GC threshold), thus all I/Os observe raw flash performance.

Table 2 shows the slowdown from NoGC to TTFLASH at various high percentiles. As shown, TTFLASH significantly reduces GC blocking. Specifically, at 99–99.9th percentiles, TTFLASH’s slowdowns are only 1.00 to 1.02×. Even at 99.99th percentile, TTFLASH’s slowdowns are only 1.0 to 2.6×. In comparison, Base suffers from 5.6–138.2× slowdowns between 99–99.99th percentiles (as obvious in Figure 5); for readability, NoGC lines are not plotted in the figure. In terms of average latencies, Figure 6 shows that TTFLASH performs the same with or without GC.

- **GC-blocked I/Os:** To show what is happening inside the SSD behind our speed-ups, we count the percentage of read I/Os that are blocked by GC (“%GC-blocked I/Os”), as plotted in Figure 7. As important, we emphasize that GC-blocked I/Os fill up the device queue, creat-




Figure 7: **%GC-blocked read I/Os.** The figure above corresponds to the results in Figure 5. The bars represent the ratio (in percent) of read I/Os that are GC-blocked (bottom bar) and queue-blocked (top bar) as explained in §6.1. “All” implies PB+GTR+RGC (please see Figure 5’s caption).

ing queueing delays that prevent new host I/Os from entering the device, which we count as “%queue-blocked I/Os.” Thus, each bar in the figure has two parts: %GC-blocked (bottom, bold edge) and %queue-blocked I/Os (top), divided with a small horizontal borderline.

Figure 7 shows that with Base, *without* GC tolerance, 2–5% of reads are blocked by GC. As they further cause queueing delays, in total, there are 2–7% of blocked I/Os that cannot be served. As each TTFLASH feature is added, more I/Os are unblocked. With *all* the features in place (“All” bars), there are only 0.003–0.05% of blocked I/Os, with the exception of MSNFS (0.7%). The only reason why it is not 0% is that for non-full-stripe reads, TTFLASH will wait for GC completion *only if* the remaining time is shorter than the overhead of the extra reads (as explained in §4.3). We still count these I/Os as blocked, albeit only momentarily.

We next evaluate ttFlash-Emu with filebench [2]. Figure 8 shows the average latencies of filebench-level read operations (including kernel, file-system, and QEMU overheads in addition to device-level latencies) and the percentage of GC-blocked reads measured inside ttFlash-Emu. We do not plot latency CDF as filebench only reports average latencies. Overall, ttFlash-Emu shows the same behavior as ttFlash-Sim.

6.2 TTFLASH vs. Preemptive GC

As mentioned before, many existing work optimize GC, but does not eliminate its impact. One industry standard in eliminating (“postponing”) GC impact is preemptive GC [9]. We implement preemptive GC in SSDSim based on existing literature [40]. The basic idea is to interleave user I/Os with GC operations. That is, if a user I/O arrives while a GC is happening, future copybacks should be postponed.

Figure 9a compares ttFlash-Sim, preemptive, and NoGC scenarios for the DTRS workload (other workloads lead to the same conclusion). As shown, TTFLASH is closer to NoGC than preemptive GC. The reason is that preemptive GC must incur a delay from waiting for




Figure 8: **Filebench on ttFlash-Emu.** The top and bottom figures show the average latencies of read operations and the percentage of GC-blocked reads, respectively, across six filebench personalities. “Base” represents our VSSIM++ with channel-blocking (§5).

the block erase (up to 2 ms) or the current page copy-back to finish (up to 800 μ s delay), mainly because the finest-grained preemption unit is a page copyback (§3). TTFLASH on the other hand can rapidly regenerate the delayed data.

Most importantly, TTFLASH does *not* postpone GC indefinitely. In contrast, preemptive GC piles up GC impact to the future, with the hope that there will be idle time. However, with a continuous I/O stream, at one point, the SSD will hit a GC high watermark (not enough free pages), which is when preemptive GC becomes non-preemptive [40]. To create this scenario, we run the same workload but make SSDSim GC threshold hit the high watermark. Figure 9b shows that as preemptive GC becomes non-preemptive, it becomes GC-intolerant and creates long tail latencies.

To be more realistic with the setup, we perform a similar experiment as in the Semi-Preemptive GC paper [40, §IV]. We re-rate DTRS I/Os by 10 \times and re-size them by 30 \times , in order to reach the high GC watermark (which we set to 75% to speed up the experiment). Figure 9c shows the timeline of observed latencies with TTFLASH and preemptive GC. We also run a synthetic workload with continuous I/Os to prevent idle time (Figure 9d); the workload generates 28-KB I/Os (full-stripe) every 130 μ s with 70% read and 30% write). Overall, Figures 9c–d highlight that preemptive GC creates backlogs of GC activities, which will eventually cause SSD “lock-down” when page occupancy reaches the high watermark. On the other hand, TTFLASH can provide stable latencies without postponing GC activities indefinitely.

The last two experiments above create high intensity of writes, and within the same experiments, our GC-tolerant flush (GTF; §4.5) provides stable latencies, as implicitly shown in Figures 9c–d.




Figure 9: **TTFLASH vs. Preemptive GC.** The figures are explained in Section 6.2.

6.3 TTFLASH vs. GC Optimizations

GC can be optimized and reduced with better FTL management, special coding, novel write buffer scheme or SSD-based log-structured file system. For example, in comparison to base approaches, Value locality reduces erase count by 65% [29, Section 5], flash-aware RAID by 40% [33, Figure 20], BPLRU by 41% [35, Section 4 and Figure 7], eSAP by 10–45% [37, Figures 11–12], F2FS by 10% [39, Section 3], LARS by 50% [41, Figure 4], and FRA by 10% [42, Figure 12], SFS by 7.5 \times [43, Section 4], WOM codes by 33% [48, Section 6].

Contrary to these efforts, our approach is fundamentally different. We do not focus in reducing the number of GCs, but instead, we eliminate the blocking nature of GC operations. With reduction, even if GC count is reduced by multiple times, it only makes GC-induced tail latencies shorter, but not disappear (*e.g.*, as in Figure 5). Nevertheless, the techniques above are crucial in extending SSD lifetime, hence orthogonal to TTFLASH.

6.4 Write (P/E Cycle) Overhead

Figure 10 compares the number of GCs (P/E cycles) completed by the Base approach and TTFLASH within the experiments in Figure 5. We make two observations. First, TTFLASH does not delay GCs; it actively performs GCs at a similar rate as in the base approach, but yet still delivers predictable performance. Second, TTFLASH introduces 15–18% of additional P/E cycles (in 4 out of 6 workloads), which mainly comes from RAIN; as we use $N=8$, there are roughly 15% (1/7) more writes in




Figure 10: **GC Completions (P/E Cycles).** The figure is explained in Section 6.4.

minimum, from one parity write for every seven ($N-1$) consecutive writes. The exceptions are 53% of additional P/E cycles in MSNFS and TPCC, which happen because the workloads generate many small random writes, causing one parity write for almost every write. For this kind of workload, large buffering does not help. Overall, higher P/E cycles is a limitation of TTFFLASH, but also a limitation of any scheme that employs RAIN.

6.5 TTFFLASH vs. No RAIN

Earlier, in Figure 6, we show that TTFFLASH has about the same average latencies as NoGC (TTFFLASH without GC and *with* RAIN). In further experiments (not shown due to space), we also compare TTFFLASH to “NoGC_{IR}” (*i.e.*, Base without GC and *without* RAIN). We observed TTFFLASH’s average latencies are $1.09-1.33\times$ of NoGC_{IR}’s. The RAIN-less NoGC_{IR} is faster because it can utilize all channels. This is a limitation of TTFFLASH; that is, as TTFFLASH (or any SSD that) employs RAIN, the channels experience a slight contention. In Figure 4 for example, reading LPNs 0–3 will incur contention on channel-0 (from LPNs 0 and 3). In a RAIN-less setup, the same read will utilize all four channels.

6.6 TTFFLASH under Write Bursts

TTFFLASH can circumvent GC blocking when rotating GC is enforced (§4.4). A limitation of TTFFLASH is that under heavy write bursts, multiple GCs per plane group must be allowed to keep the number of free pages stable. Figure 11a shows the limit of our 256GB drive setup (Table 1) with $N=8$. As shown, at 6 DWPD (55 MB/s), there is almost no GC-blocked reads, hence tiny tail latencies. 1 DWPD (“Drive Writes Per Day”) implies 256GB/8hours (9.1 MB/s) of writes; we generously use 8 hours to represent a “Day” (Appendix A). However, at 7 DWPD (64 MB/s), TTFFLASH exhibits some tail latencies, observable at the 90th percentile. We emphasize that this is still much better than the Base approach, where the tail latencies are observed starting at 20th percentile (not shown). We also believe that such intensive writes are hopefully rare; for 3-5yr lifespans, modern MLC/TLC drives must conform to 1-5 DWPD [17]. Figure 11b shows that if we force only one GC




Figure 11: **TTFFLASH under Write Bursts.** The figure is explained in Section 6.6.

per plane group all the time (“F-RGC”), at 7 DWPD, the percentage of free pages (the y-axis) continuously drops over time (the x-axis). That is, RGC cannot keep up with the write bursts. Thus, to keep the number of free pages stable, under write bursts, we must allow multiple GCs to happen per plane group (the “RGC, 7DWPD” line).

7 Limitations and Discussions

We now summarize the limitations of TTFFLASH. First, TTFFLASH depends on RAIN, hence the loss of one channel per N channels (as evaluated in §6.5). Increasing N will reduce channel loss but cut less tail latencies under write bursts (Appendix A). Under heavy write bursts, TTFFLASH cannot cut all tails (as evaluated in §6.6 and discussed in Appendix A). Finally, TTFFLASH requires intra-plane copybacks, skipping ECC checks, which requires future work as we address below.

- **ECC checking (with scrubbing):** ECC-check is performed when data pass through the ECC engine (part of the controller). On foreground reads, before data is returned to the host, ECC is *always* checked (TTFFLASH does *not* modify this property). Due to increasing bit errors, it is suggested that ECC checking runs more frequently, for example, by forcing all background GC copyback-ed pages read out from the plane and through the controller, albeit reduced performance.

TTFFLASH, however, depends on *intra-plane* copybacks, which implies *no* ECC checking on copyback-ed pages, potentially compromising data integrity. A simple possible solution to compensate this problem is periodic idle-time scrubbing within the SSD, which will force flash pages (user and parity) flow through the ECC engine. This is a reasonable solution for several reasons. First, SSD scrubbing (unlike disk) is fast given the massive read bandwidth. For example, a 2 GB/s 512-GB client SSD can be scrubbed under 5 minutes. Second, scrubbing can be easily optimized, for example, by only selecting blocks that are recently GC-ed or have higher P/E counts and history of bit flips, which by implication can also reduce read disturbs. Third, periodic background operations can be scheduled without affecting

foreground performance (a rich literature in this space [19]). However, more future work is required to evaluate the ramifications of background ECC checks.

- **Wear leveling** (*via horizontal shifting and vertical migration*): Our static RAIN layout (§4.2) in general does not lead to wear-out imbalance in common cases. However, rare cases such as random-write transactions (*e.g.*, MSNFS) cause imbalanced wear-outs (at chip/plane level).

Imbalanced wear-outs can happen due to the two following cases: (1) There is write imbalance *within* a stripe (MSNFS exhibits this pattern). In Figure 4 for example, if in stripe S_0 $\{012P_{012}\}$, LPN 1 is more frequently updated than the rest, the planes of LPN 1 and P_{012} will wear out faster than the other planes in the same group. (2) There is write imbalance *across* the stripes. For example, if stripes in group G_0 (*e.g.*, stripe $\{012P_{012}\}$) are more frequently updated than stripes in other groups, then the planes in G_0 will wear out faster.

The two wear-out problems above can be fixed by *dynamic* horizontal shifting and vertical migration, respectively. With horizontal shifting, we can shift the parity locations of stripes with imbalanced hot pages. For example, S_0 can be mapped as $\{12P_{012}0\}$ across the 4 planes in the same group; LPN 1 and P will now be directed to colder planes. With vertical migration, hot stripes can be migrated from one plane group to another (“vertically”), balancing the wear-out across plane groups.

As a combined result, an LPN is still and always statically mapped to a stripe number. A stripe, by default, is statically mapped to a plane group and has a static parity location (*e.g.*, S_0 is in group G_0 with P_{012} behind channel C_3). However, to mark dynamic modification, we can add a “mapping-modified” bit in the standard FTL table (LPN-PPN mapping). If the bit is zero, the LPN-PPN translation performs as usual, as the stripe mapping stays static (the common case). If the bit is set (the rare case in rare workloads), the LPN-PPN translation must consult a new stripe-information table that stores the mapping between a stripe (S_k) to a group number (G_i) and parity channel position (C_j).

8 Related Work

We now discuss other works related to TTFFLASH.

GC-impact reduction: Our work is about eliminating GC impacts, while many other existing works are about reducing GC impacts. There are two main reduction approaches: *isolation* and *optimization*, both with drawbacks. First, isolation (*e.g.*, OPS isolation [36]) only isolates a tenant (*e.g.*, sequential) from another one (*e.g.*, random-write). It does not help a tenant with both random-write and sequential workloads on the same dataset. OPS isolation must differentiate

users while TTFFLASH is user-agnostic. Second, GC optimization, which can be achieved by better page layout management (*e.g.*, value locality [29], log-structured [23, 39, 43]) only helps in reducing GC period but does not eliminate blocked I/Os.

GC-impact elimination: We are only aware of a handful of works that attempt to eliminate GC impact, which fall into two categories: without or with redundancy. Without redundancy, one can eliminate GC impact by *preemption* [22, 40, 47]. We already discussed the limitations of preemptive GC (§6.2; Figure 9). With redundancy, one must depend on RAIN. To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first one that leverages SSD internal redundancy to eliminate GC tail latencies. There are other works that leverage redundancy in flash array (described later below).

RAIN: SSD’s internal parity-based redundancy (RAIN) has become a reliability standard. Some companies reveal such usage but unfortunately without topology details [6, 12]. In literature, we are aware of only four major ones: eSAP [37], PPC[33], FRA [42] and LARS [41]. These efforts, however, mainly concern about write optimization and wear leveling in RAIN but do not leverage RAIN to eliminate GC tail latencies.

Flash array: TTFFLASH works within a single SSD. In the context of SSD array, we are aware of two published techniques on GC tolerance: Flash on Rails [46] and Harmonia [38]. Flash on Rails [46] eliminates read blocking (read-write contention) with a ring of multiple drives where 1–2 drives are used for write logging and the other drives are used for reads. The major drawback is that read/write I/Os cannot utilize the aggregate bandwidth of the array. In Harmonia [38], the host OS controls all the SSDs to perform GC at the same time (*i.e.*, it is better that all SSDs are “unavailable” at the same time, but then provide stable performance afterwards), which requires more complex host-SSD communication.

Storage tail latencies: A growing number of works recently investigated sources of storage-level tail latencies, including background jobs [19], file system allocation policies [31], block-level I/O schedulers [49], and disk/SSD hardware-level defects [26, 27, 30]. An earlier work addresses load-induced tail latencies with RAID parity [20]. Our work specifically addresses GC-induced tail latencies.

9 Conclusion

SSD technologies have changed rapidly in the last few years; faster and more powerful flash controllers are capable of executing complex logic; parity-based RAIN has become a standard means of data protection; and capacitor-backed RAM is a de-facto solution to address write inefficiencies. In our work, we leverage a combina-

tion of these technologies in a way that has not been done before. This in turn enables us to build novel techniques such as plane-blocking GC, rotating GC, GC-tolerant read and flush, which collectively deliver a robust solution to the critical problem of GC-induced tail latencies.

10 Acknowledgments

We thank Sam H. Noh (our shepherd), Nisha Talagala, and the anonymous reviewers for their tremendous feedback. This material is based upon work supported by the NSF (grant Nos. CCF-1336580, CNS-1350499, CNS-1526304, CNS-1405959, and CNS-1563956) as well as generous donations from EMC, Google, Huawei, Net-App, and CERES Research Center.

A Proof Sketch

Limitation of maximum stripe width (N): We derive the maximum stripe width allowable (N) such that rotating GC (§4.4) is always enforced. That is, as we can only cut one tail, there should be *at most one GC per plane group* at all time. Thus, a plane might need to *postpone* its GC until other planes in the same group complete their GCs (*i.e.*, delayed by $(N-1) \times T_{gc}$). We argue that N should be at least 8 for a reasonable parity space overhead (12.5%); a lower stripe width will increase space overhead. Below we show that $N=8$ is safe even under *intensive* write. Table 3 summarizes our proof, which is based on a *per-plane, per-second* analysis. We first use concrete values and later generalize the proof.

- Table 3a: We use typical parameters: 4-KB page (S_{page}), 4-KB register size (S_{reg}), 25% valid pages ($\%_{validPg}$), 840 μ s of GC copyback time per page ($T_{copyback}$), and 900 μ s of user write latency per page (T_{usrWrt}). Due to intensive copybacks (tens of ms), the 2ms erase time is set to “0” for proving simplicity.
- Table 3b: Each plane’s bandwidth (BW_{pl}) defines the maximum write bandwidth, which is 4.5 MB/s, from the register size (S_{reg}) divided by the user-write latency (T_{usrWrt}); all writes must go through the register.
- Table 3c: With the 4.5 MB/s maximum plane bandwidth, there are 1152 pages written per second ($\#W_{pg/s}$), which will eventually be GC-ed.
- Table 3d: *Intensive* writes imply frequent overwrites; we assume 25% valid pages ($\%_{validPg}$) to be GC-ed, resulting in 288 pages copybacked per second ($\#CB_{pg/s}$). The $\%_{validPg}$ can vary depending on user workload.
- Table 3e: With 288 page copybacks, the total GC time per second per plane ($T_{gc/s}$) is 242 ms.
- Table 3f: N planes in each group must *finish* their GCs in rotating manner. As each plane needs T_{gc} time every second, **the constraint is:** $N < 1/T_{gc}$. With our concrete values above, for rotating GC to hold true all the time, N must be less than 4 (T_{gc} of 242 ms). *Fortunately, N can*

a.	$S_{page}=4KB; S_{reg}=4KB; \%_{validPg}=25\%;$ $T_{prog}=800\mu s; T_{read}=40\mu s; T_{channel}=100\mu s;$ $T_{copyback}=T_{prog}+T_{read}=840\mu s; (T_{erase}="0");$ $T_{usrWrt}=T_{prog}+T_{channel}=900\mu s;$	
b.	$BW_{pl} = S_{reg}/T_{usrWrt}$	=4.5 MB/s
c.	$\#W_{pg/s} = BW_{pl}/S_{page}$	=1152 pg/s
d.	$\#CB_{pg/s} = \%_{validPg} \times \#W_{pg/s}$	=288 pg/s
e.	$T_{gc/s} = \#CB_{pg/s} \times T_{copyback}$	=242 ms
f.	$N < 1/T_{gc}$	< 4
g.	$N < \frac{S_{page}}{BW_{plane} \times \%_{validPg} \times T_{copyback}}$	
h.	$DWPD=5; PWD=5; S_{pl}=4GB; day=8hrs$	
i.	$BW_{pl} = S_{pl} \times DWPD/day$ (in practice) $= 4GB \times 5/8hrs$	=0.7 MB/s
j.	$T_{gc/s} =$ plug (i) to (c,d,e)	=38 ms
	$N < 1/T_{gc}$	< 26

Table 3: **Proof Sketch (Appendix A).**

be larger in practice (Table 3g-j). To show this, below we first generalize the proof.

- Table 3g: We combine all the equations above to the equation in Table 3g, which clearly shows that N goes down if BW_{pl} or $\%_{validPg}$ is high. Fortunately, we find that the *constant* 4.5 MB/s throughput (BW_{pl}) in Table 3b is *unrealistic* in practice, primarily due to *limited SSD lifetime*. MLC block is only limited to about 5000–10,000 erase cycles and TLC block 3000 erase cycles. To ensure multi-year (3–5) lifespan, users typically conform to the *Drive Writes Per Day (DWPD)* constraint (1–5 DWPD for MLC/TLC drives) [17].
- Table 3h: Let us assume a worst-case scenario of 5 DWPD, which translates to 5 *PWD* (planes write per day) per plane. To make it worse, let us assume a “*day*” is 8 hours. We set plane size (S_{pl}) to 4 GB (§3).
- Table 3i: The more realistic parameters above suggest that a plane only receives 0.7 MB/s (4GB*5/8hrs), which is $6.5 \times$ less intense than the raw bandwidth (3b).
- Table 3j: If we plug in 0.7 MB/s to the equations in Table 3c-e, the GC time per plane (T_{gc}) is only 38 ms, which implies that N **can be as large as 26**.

In conclusion, $N=8$ is likely to always satisfy rotating GC in practice. In 32-channel SSD, $N=32$ can violate rotating GC; GC-tolerant read (§4.3) cannot always cut the tails. Overall, Table 3g defines the general constraint for N . We believe the most important value is BW_{pl} . The other parameters relatively stay the same; S_{page} is usually 4 KB, $\%_{validPg}$ is low with high overwrites, and $T_{copyback}$ can increase by 25% in TLC chips (vs. MLC).

Minimum size of cap-backed RAM: With rotating GC, the RAM needs to only hold at most $1/N$ of the pages whose target planes are GC-ing (§4.5). In general, the minimum RAM size is $1/N$ of the SSD maximum write bandwidth. Even with an extreme write bandwidth of the latest datacenter SSD (*e.g.*, 2 GB/s) the minimum RAM size needed is only 256 MB.

References

- [1] <http://ucare.cs.uchicago.edu/projects/tinyTailFlash/>.
- [2] Filebench. http://filebench.sourceforge.net/wiki/index.php/Main_Page.
- [3] SNIA IOTTA: Storage Networking Industry Association's Input/Output Traces, Tools, and Analysis. <http://iotta.snia.org>.
- [4] The OpenSSD Project. <http://www.openssd-project.org>.
- [5] Google: Taming The Long Latency Tail - When More Machines Equals Worse Results. <http://highscalability.com/blog/2012/3/12/google-taming-the-long-latency-tail-when-more-machines-equal.html>, 2012.
- [6] The Crucial M550 SSD. <http://www.crucial.com/usa/en/storage-ssd-m550>, 2013.
- [7] New SSD-Backed Elastic Block Storage. <https://aws.amazon.com/blogs/aws/new-ssd-backed-elastic-block-storage/>, 2014.
- [8] Report: SSD market doubles, optical drive shipment rapidly down. <http://www.myce.com/news/report-ssd-market-doubles-optical-drive-shipment-rapidly-down-70415/>, 2014.
- [9] Sandisk: Pre-emptive garbage collection of memory blocks. <https://www.google.com/patents/US8626986>, 2014.
- [10] Supercapacitors have the power to save you from data loss. http://www.theregister.co.uk/2014/09/24/storage_supercapacitors/, 2014.
- [11] L74A NAND datasheet. <https://www.micron.com/parts/nand-flash/mass-storage/mt29f256g08cmcabh2-12z>, 2015.
- [12] Micron P420m Enterprise PCIe SSD Review. http://www.storagereview.com/micron_p420m_enterprise_pcie_ssd_review, 2015.
- [13] Microsoft Rolls Out SSD-Backed Azure Premium Cloud Storage. <http://www.eweek.com/cloud/microsoft-rolls-out-ssd-backed-azure-premium-cloud-storage.html>, 2015.
- [14] What Happens Inside SSDs When the Power Goes Down? http://www.army-technology.com/contractors/data_recording/solidata-technology/presswhat-happens-ssds-power-down.html, 2015.
- [15] Why SSDs don't perform. <http://www.zdnet.com/article/why-ssds-dont-perform/>, 2015.
- [16] Open-Channel Solid State Drives. <http://lightnvm.io/>, 2016.
- [17] What's the state of DWPD? endurance in industry leading enterprise SSDs. <http://www.storagesearch.com/dwpd.html>, 2016.
- [18] Nitin Agrawal, Vijayan Prabhakaran, Ted Wobber, John D. Davis, Mark Manasse, and Rina Panigrahy. Design Tradeoffs for SSD Performance. In *Proceedings of the USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATC)*, 2008.
- [19] George Amvrosiadis, Angela Demke Brown, and Ashvin Goel. Opportunistic Storage Maintenance. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 2015.
- [20] Yitzhak Birk. Random RAIDs with Selective Exploitation of Redundancy for High Performance Video Servers. In *Proceedings of 7th International Workshop on Network and Operating System Support for Digital Audio and Video (NOSSDAV)*, 1997.
- [21] Matias Björling, Javier González, and Philippe Bonnet. LightNVM: The Linux Open-Channel SSD Subsystem. In *Proceedings of the 15th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2017.
- [22] Li-Pin Chang, Tei-Wei Kuo, and Shi-Wu Lo. Real-time Garbage Collection for Flash-memory Storage Systems of Real-time Embedded Systems. *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems (TECS)*, 3(4), November 2004.
- [23] John Colgrove, John D. Davis, John Hayes, Ethan L. Miller, Cary Sandvig, Russell Sears, Ari Tamches, Neil Vachharajani, and Feng Wang. Purity: Building Fast, Highly-Available Enterprise Flash Storage from Commodity Components. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD)*, 2015.
- [24] Jeffrey Dean and Luiz Andr Barroso. The Tail at Scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 56(2), February 2013.
- [25] Giuseppe DeCandia, Deniz Hastorun, Madan Jampani, Gunavardhan Kakulapati, Avinash Lakshman, Alex Pilchin, Swaminathan Sivasubramanian, Peter Voshall, and Werner Vogels. Dynamo: Amazon's Highly Available Key-value Store. In *Proceedings of 21st ACM SIGOPS symposium on Operating systems principles (SOSP)*, 2007.
- [26] Thanh Do, Mingzhe Hao, Tanakorn Leesatapornwongsa, Tiratat Patana-anake, and Haryadi S. Gunawi. Limpinck: Understanding the Impact of Limpinck on Scale-Out Cloud Systems. In *Proceedings of the 4th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC)*, 2013.
- [27] Haryadi S. Gunawi, Mingzhe Hao, Tanakorn Leesatapornwongsa, Tiratat Patana-anake, Thanh Do, Jeffry Adityatama, Kurnia J. Eliazar, Agung Laksono, Jeffrey F. Lukman, Vincentius Martin, and Anang D. Satria. What Bugs Live in the Cloud? A Study of 3000+ Issues in Cloud Systems. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC)*, 2014.
- [28] Haryadi S. Gunawi, Mingzhe Hao, Riza O. Suminto, Agung Laksono, Anang D. Satria, Jeffry Adityatama, and Kurnia J. Eliazar. Why Does the Cloud Stop Computing? Lessons from Hundreds of Service Outages. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing (SoCC)*, 2016.

- [29] Aayush Gupta, Raghav Pisolkar, Bhuvan Urgaonkar, and Anand Sivasubramaniam. Leveraging Value Locality in Optimizing NAND Flash-based SSDs. In *Proceedings of the 9th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2011.
- [30] Mingzhe Hao, Gokul Soundararajan, Deepak Kenchammana-Hosekote, Andrew A. Chien, and Haryadi S. Gunawi. The Tail at Store: A Revelation from Millions of Hours of Disk and SSD Deployments. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2016.
- [31] Jun He, Duy Nguyen, Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau. Reducing File System Tail Latencies with Chopper. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2015.
- [32] Yang Hu, Hong Jiang, Dan Feng, Lei Tian, Hao Luo, and Shuping Zhang. Performance Impact and Interplay of SSD Parallelism through Advanced Commands, Allocation Strategy and Data Granularity. In *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS)*, 2011.
- [33] Soojun Im and Dongkun Shin. Flash-Aware RAID Techniques for Dependable and High-Performance Flash Memory SSD. *IEEE Transactions on Computers (TOC)*, 60(1), October 2010.
- [34] Swaroop Kavalanekar, Bruce Worthington, Qi Zhang, and Vishal Sharda. Characterization of Storage Workload Traces from Production Windows Servers. In *IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, 2008.
- [35] Hyojun Kim and Seongjun Ahn. BPLRU: A Buffer Management Scheme for Improving Random Writes in Flash Storage. In *Proceedings of the 6th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2008.
- [36] Jaeho Kim, Donghee Lee, and Sam H. Noh. Towards SLO Complying SSDs Through OPS Isolation. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2015.
- [37] Jaeho Kim, Jongmin Lee, Jongmoo Choi, Donghee Lee, and Sam H. Noh. Improving SSD Reliability with RAID via Elastic Striping and Anywhere Parity. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Dependable Systems and Networks (DSN)*, 2013.
- [38] Youngjae Kim, Sarp Oral, Galen M. Shipman, Junghee Lee, David A. Dillow, and Feiyi Wang. Harmonia: A Globally Coordinated Garbage Collector for Arrays of Solid-State Drives. In *Proceedings of the 27th IEEE Symposium on Massive Storage Systems and Technologies (MSST)*, 2011.
- [39] Changman Lee, Dongho Sim, Joo-Young Hwang, and Sangyeun Cho. F2FS: A New File System for Flash Storage. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2015.
- [40] Junghee Lee, Youngjae Kim, Galen M. Shipman, Sarp Oral, Feiyi Wang, and Jongman Kim. A Semi-Preemptive Garbage Collector for Solid State Drives. In *IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*, 2011.
- [41] Sehwan Lee, Bitna Lee, Kern Koh, and Hyokyung Bahn. A Lifespan-aware Reliability Scheme for RAID-based Flash Storage. In *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM Symposium on Applied Computing (SAC)*, 2011.
- [42] Yangsup Lee, Sanghyuk Jung, and Yong Ho Song. FRA: A Flash-aware Redundancy Array of Flash Storage Devices. In *Proceedings of the 7th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Hardware/Software Codesign and System (CODES+ISSS)*, 2009.
- [43] Changwoo Min, Kangnyeon Kim, Hyunjin Cho, Sang-Won Lee, and Young Ik Eom. SFS: Random Write Considered Harmful in Solid State Drives. In *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2012.
- [44] Jian Ouyang, Shiding Lin, Song Jiang, Zhenyu Hou, Yong Wang, and Yuanzheng Wang. SDF: Software-Defined Flash for Web-Scale Internet Storage System. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS)*, 2014.
- [45] Bianca Schroeder, Raghav Lagisetty, and Arif Merchant. Flash Reliability in Production: The Expected and the Unexpected. In *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2016.
- [46] Dimitris Skourtis, Dimitris Achlioptas, Noah Watkins, Carlos Maltzahn, and Scott Brandt. Flash on Rails: Consistent Flash Performance through Redundancy. In *Proceedings of the 2014 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (ATC)*, 2014.
- [47] Guanying Wu and Xubin He. Reducing SSD Read Latency via NAND Flash Program and Erase Suspension. In *Proceedings of the 10th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2012.
- [48] Gala Yadgar, Eitan Yaakobi, and Assaf Schuster. Write Once, Get 50% Free: Saving SSD Erase Costs Using WOM Codes. In *Proceedings of the 13th USENIX Symposium on File and Storage Technologies (FAST)*, 2015.
- [49] Suli Yang, Tyler Harter, Nishant Agrawal, Salini Selvaraj Kowsalya, Anand Krishnamurthy, Samer Al-Kiswany, Rini T. Kaushik, Andrea C. Arpaci-Dusseau, and Remzi H. Arpaci-Dusseau. Split-Level I/O Scheduling. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP)*, 2015.
- [50] Jinsoo Yoo, Youjip Won, Joongwoo Hwang, Sooyong Kang, Jongmoo Choi, Sungroh Yoon, and Jaehyuk Cha. VSSIM: Virtual Machine based SSD Simulator. In *Proceedings of the 29th IEEE Symposium on Massive Storage Systems and Technologies (MSST)*, 2013.