EOS on CephFS friend-or-foe

Andreas-Joachim Peters Dan van der Ster CERN IT-ST







Motivation 1

- distributed computing cluster [Wikipedia]
- - as Big Data storage in the context of HEP it is inefficient to use it on very old hardware
- EOS adds as a high-level service additional security features, extended quota and user ulletsync&share and CTA for tape integration
 - access to individual files and a very robust reliability layer for data

• CephFS is part of CEPH, an Open Source storage platform implementing object storage on a single

• CephFS client is part of Linux kernel, high-performant, very stable and nearly POSIX compliant

Ceph is used already in many production sites to provide block storage to virtual infrastructures

• if storage hardware is already optimised or tailored to support Ceph, it is a natural choice to use it also

management, remote access, token access & TPC for root:// and https:// protocol, CERNBOX for

• CephFS adds to EOS the ability to store files of "infinite" size, possibility for ultra-high-bandwidth





Motivation [2]

- - all services can be deployed in **container environments**
 - service making sure, services are running 'somewhere'
 - redundancy layer over computer centres/sites
- needs to be tuned for particular IO use cases

• EOS + CephFS allows a complete virtualisation of the storage environment

most of the HA functionality of EOS can be delegated to an orchestration

• HA of data is delegated to CephFS, EOS can be used to provide an additional

• CephFS can also be used only for a fraction of an EOS storage area, which







fabric deployment with CephFS virtual nodes + backend - fabric HA

orchestration environment







EOS+CephFS Deployment Options

Client



fabric deployment with CephFS virtual nodes + backend - fabric HA









Deployment Prototype Hybrid

QDB

Cinder

QDB

FST

MGM



pure virtual deployment 4xVM 20 core - 58GB

Ceph Leviton SSD cluster

3 x 600-750 MB/s [IO per FST] creation @500 Hz tested up to 80M files

2 GB/s storage front-end in four CERN Openstack VMs





usage of CephFS instead of hard disks was done with the kernel CephFS mount on FST nodes and a directory for an FST filesystem owned by daemon: daemon

FSTs and each FST manages a subdirectory inside CephFS

nost	port	id	path	schedgroup	geotag	boot	configstatus	drai	n active	e hea
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch st-120hd-100gb010.cern.ch	1095 1095	479 480	/cephfs/eos/data-09/ /cephfs/eos/data-10/	cept	h.0 0513: h.0 0513:	:EC bo	oted oted	rw no rw no	drain or drain or	line
st-120hd-100gb011.cern.ch st-120hd-100gb012.cern.ch	1095 1095	481 482	/cephfs/eos/data-11/ /cephfs/eos/data-12/	type	n	name groups	ize groupmod	N(fs) N(fs-	-rw) sum(u	sedbytes)
st-120hd-100gb013.cern.ch st-120hd-100gb014.cern.ch	1095 1095	483 484	/cephfs/eos/data-13/ /cephfs/eos/data-14/	space	view o	eph	10 10	8	8 ara±n or	2.96 PB
st-120hd-100gb015.cern.ch st-120hd-100gb016.cern.ch	1095 1095	485 486	/cephfs/eos/data-15/ /cephfs/eos/data-16/	cept cept	h.0 0513: h.0 0513:	EC bo	oted oted	rw по rw по	drain or drain or	line line
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1095	1	/data00	default.0	0513::EC	booted	 rw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1096	2	/data01	default.1	0513::EC	booted	nw	nodrai	n online	e no mda
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1097	3	/data02	default.2	0513::EC	booted	rw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1098	4	/data03	default.3	0513::EC	booted	rw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1099	5	/data04	default.4	0513::EC	booted	rw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1100	6	/data05	default.5	0513::EC	booted	rw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1101	7	/data06	default.6	0513::EC	booted	rw	nodrai	n online	e no mde
st-120hd-100gb009.cern.ch	1102	8	/data07	default.7	0513::EC	booted	nw	nodrai	n online	e no mds
				• • • •						

Configuration of CephFS in EOS Native

if IO bw to CephFS should be scaled out, CephFS can be mounted on several



tat tat tat tat



Configuration of CephFS in EOS

• in the described deployment model each **FST** is a **point of failure**

• EOS4 supports to transparently move a filesystem from one node to another if the backend is shared

eos fs mv -force 479 st-120hd-100gb010.cern.ch:1095

- service to the MGM server
- transfer instead of retrying the current disk server
- ightarrowdone when the last writer has finished

currently this functionality is manually, it is straight forward to add this as a convenience

moves can be done without any impact for readers and eosxd clients - xrdcp will support in a future version to re-iniate a complete upload if an upload is failed during a

for node maintenance filesystems can be configured to be read-only and the *mv* can be





Experiences with CephFS & EOS

 we have deployed a 6 PB CephFS+EOS cluster with 100GE technology and evaluated performance with various CephFS erasure coding configurations

results will be published and presented at vCHEP 2021

 the impact on throughput performance of EOS front-end is small if there are no network bottlenecks







Experiences with CephFS & EOS EOS fsck vs the CephFS MDS

- MDS grants caps to CephFS clients so they can read/write/cache/etc • each cap requires the inode to be in memory on the MDS, a few kB each Caps are granted on demand and recalled according to MDS memory pressure • MDS has a tunable memory target, 4GB by default, allowing around 1M inodes to be cached

•Problem:

•Solution:

- ceph config set mds mds recall caps max 30000
- more aggressive caps recall is now the default: <u>https://github.com/ceph/ceph/pull/38574</u>

EOS fsck needs to stat all files in the FST: roughly equivalent to find /cephfs

•Caps can be granted at up to 30-40kHz per client, but recall is limited by default to 5kHz per client •MDS memory usage will quickly exceed the mds_target_memory, going OOM if poorly configured





Experiences with CephFS & EOS CephFS throughput limitations

each client limits its in-flight write op bytes to 100MiB by default: removed this artificial limitation by setting objecter inflight op bytes = 1GiB





CephFS throughput limitations

Experiences with CephFS & EOS in one test write rates dropped from nominal 25GiB/s to below 3GiB/s:

- iperf tests look OK, disks are all ~idle. Where is the bottleneck?
- we found one disk (osd.256) with 40x latency from other drives!
- likely caused by a poor SATA connection
- we marked the drive out of the crush map and 25GiB/s returned immediately
- visible in ceph internal perf metrics, but no HEALTH_WARN for this https://tracker.ceph.com/issues/49505

[root@eosprojectx-ec	~]# ceph osd p	erf sort -n -k3 tail
78	50	50
427	50	50
85	52	
227	52	
335	53	
252	54	
30	57	\bigcirc
455	59	59
186	64	64
256 2	306	2306
[root@eosprojectx-ec	~]#	





Recommandations

- in such a setup you should use a CephFS EOS area only via EOS
 - the namespace in CephFS created by FSTs is not attractive and there is no original ownership of files visible in the backend
- in principle FSTs could run on OSDs, however there is a certain risk of kernel deadlocks under memory pressure when CephFS is mounted on OSDs
- a possible optimisation for the future could be a local redirect to a read-only mount on client side if the data privacy policy allows that
- we have seen a performance bottleneck of approx. 6 GiB/s per 100GE FST and the network layout has to foresee the additional impact of a front-end layer





reasons to use or not use CephFS+EOS can be manifold

- once done it is all clear and easy
- the integration and configuration of CephFS inside EOS is trivial
- we can do several small improvements to deal better with shared filesystems under FSTs - automatic failover mechanism
 - it could be an option to run EOS without it's own namespace and use it mainly as
 - implement a VFS namespace plug-in
- experience so far is quite positive
- to be continued ...

Summary

• deployment and tuning of CephFS alone can be challenging or not (it was) - same is true for EOS

protocol gateway with real-time configuration options and comfortable user management





