

# Locality and Availability in Distributed Storage

Dimitris Papailiopoulos

*Dimacs Workshop on Algorithms for Green Data Storage*

joint work with

Ankit Rawat

Alex Dimakis

Sriram Vishwanath




# Coding for Distributed Storage

- Current state of the art:
- 3 metrics that measure repair efficiency
- Helping in different system bottlenecks (network vs disk I/O etc).
- Repair locality.
- Mostly coding **cold** data (rarely accessed)
- (in analytics, most data is cold log data)
- Will define another dimension useful for **hot** data
- **Availability**

# Reliable Storage

- Large-scale storage (Facebook, Amazon, Google, Yahoo, ...)
- FB has the biggest Hadoop cluster (70PB).



*Cluster of machines running Hadoop at Yahoo! (Source: Yahoo!)*

- Failures are the **norm**.
- We need to protect the data: **use redundancy**
- **CODING!**

# Limitations of Traditional Codes

(14, 10)-RS (fb hdfs raid):  
- can tolerate 4 erasures



The diagram shows a RAID array with 10 nodes. Nodes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 are arranged in a line. Node 5 is shown with a red explosion icon, indicating it is failed. Nodes 1, 2, 3, and 4 are at the top, while nodes 10, 9, 8, and 5 are at the bottom. There are also three pink nodes labeled P1, P2, and P3 on the left side, connected to the main array. A large black box is overlaid on the center of the diagram.

Main issue: Recovery Cost

'I reconstruct the whole data to repair 1 node'

- 1) High network traffic!
- 2) High disk read!
- 3) 10x more than the lost information!

# Repair Metrics of Interest

- The number of bits communicated during repairs (**Repair BW**)

Capacity known (for two extreme points only).

No high-rate practical codes known for MSR point.

[Rashmi et al.], [Shah et al.], [El Rouayheb et al.], [Wang et al.], [Tamo et al.], [Suh et al.]  
[Cadambe et al.] [Papailiopoulos et al.], [Shum], [Oggier et al.] ....

- The number of bits read from disks during repairs (**Disk IO**)

Capacity unknown

Only known technique is bounding by Repair Bandwidth


- The number of nodes accessed during a repair (**Locality**)

Capacity computed [P, Dimakis, ISIT12, Trans. IT'13].

Scalar linear bounds [Gopalan et al., Allerton 2011]

General Code Constructions are open

# Low-locality codes?



- A code symbol has **locality**  $r$  if it is a function of  $r$  other codeword symbols.

- Can we have small repair locality?

- And tolerate many erasures (reliability)?

Q: Does locality come at a cost?

# Reliability: Minimum Distance

- The distance of a code  $d$  is the minimum number of erasures after which data is lost.
- Reed-Solomon (10,14) ( $n=14$ ,  $k=10$ ).  $d= 5$
- R. Singleton (1964) showed a bound on the best distance possible:

$$d \leq n - k + 1$$

- Reed-Solomon codes achieve the Singleton bound (hence called MDS)

# Generalizing Singleton: Locally Repairable Codes

- What happens when we put locality in the picture?

Thm1: an  $(n,k)$  code with locality  $r$  has

$$d \leq n - k + 1 - \left( \left\lceil \frac{k}{r} \right\rceil - 1 \right)$$


[Gopalan et. al, Allerton11] (scalar-linear codes)

[P., Dimakis, ISIT12, IT13] (information theoretic)

- Non-trivial locality induces a **distance penalty**
- Achievable using random linear network coding [P., Dimakis, ISIT12, IT13]
- Many extensions and explicit constructions  
(Rawat, Silberstein, Tamo, Cadambe, Mazumdar, Forbes...)
- LRCs in MS Azure, they ship with Windows 8.1 [Huang et al. '12]



# Example: code with information locality 5




All  $k=10$  message blocks can be recovered by reading  $r=5$  other blocks.


Have to pick L1, L2 in a very structured way (Rawat, Silberstein, Tamo...)

What if I wanted to reconstruct block 1 in parallel?


# Availability 2 (=2 parallel reads for a block)





# message availability 2




# message availability 2



# message availability 2



## message availability 2 (=2 parallel reads for a block)



- Therefore Block 1 can be read by 1 systematic read + 2 repair reads **simultaneously**
- Block 1 has availability  $t=2$  with groups of locality  $r_1=5$  and  $r_2=2$
- Notice also that the group (2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10, p1) of locality  $r=10$  can be used to recover 1 (but blocks all others, so not used)

Property: non-overlapping groups of size  $\leq 5$

# $(r, t)$ -information local code

- For each information (systematic) symbol  $c_i$ ,
  - $t$  disjoint repair groups.
  - size of each repair group at most  $r$ .
- Each systematic symbol has **locality**  $r$  and **availability**  $t$ .
- $(r, t)$ -local code:
  - Code is  $(r, t)$ -information local code.
  - In addition, non-systematic symbols have locality  $r$ .
    - one repair group of size **at most**  $r$ .
- $(r, 1)$ -information local code = code with information locality  $r$  (MSR LRC)
- $(r, 1)$ -local code = code with all symbol locality  $r$  (Facebook LRC)

Q: Does availability come at a cost?

# Distance vs. Locality-Availability trade-off

## Main Result

- For  $(r, t)$ -Information local codes\*:

$$d_{\min} \leq n - k + 1 - \left( \left\lceil \frac{kt}{r} \right\rceil - t \right)$$



# Distance vs. Locality-Availability trade-off

## Main Result

- For  $(r, t)$ -Information local codes\*:

$$d_{\min} \leq n - k + 1 - \left( \left\lceil \frac{kt}{r} \right\rceil - t \right)$$

\*The dirty details:

- We can only prove this for scalar linear codes.
- Only one parity symbol per repair group is assumed.
- Not known what happens for all-symbol availability.
- For some cases we can achieve this using combinatorial designs.

# Local Parities using Resolvable Combinatorial Designs

- Set of  $k$  symbols:  $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k\}$ .
- Family of  $b$  subsets (blocks) of  $X$ :  $B = \{B_1, B_2, \dots, B_b\}$ .
- $(X, B)$  is a  $2$ -( $k, b, r, c$ ) **resolvable** design if
  - I.  $|B_i| = r$  for all  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, b\}$ .
  - II. Each symbol appears in  $c$  subsets (blocks).
  - III. Any two symbols  $(x_i, x_j)$  appear in exactly 1 subset (block).
  - IV. Design admits **parallelism**:
    - There exist classes  $E_1, E_2, \dots, E_c \subset B$  such that subsets in  $E_i$  partition  $X$ .

Property: non-overlapping groups of size =  $r$

# Example[1]

- $2\text{-(}k, b, r, c) = 2\text{-(}15, 35, 3, 7)$  resolvable design.

|              |             |             |              |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| {1, 2, 3}    | {1, 5, 6}   | {2, 6, 11}  | {2, 5, 9}    | {3, 5, 11}  | {5, 7, 13}  | {3, 4, 13}  |
| {6, 7, 8}    | {4, 7, 11}  | {4, 5, 12}  | {3, 7, 12}   | {2, 4, 8}   | {2, 12, 14} | {5, 8, 14}  |
| {11, 12, 13} | {8, 9, 12}  | {9, 10, 13} | {1, 8, 13}   | {7, 9, 15}  | {3, 6, 9}   | {6, 12, 15} |
| {4, 9, 14}   | {3, 10, 14} | {3, 8, 15}  | {11, 14, 15} | {1, 10, 12} | {8, 10, 11} | {1, 9, 11}  |
| {5, 10, 15}  | {2, 13, 15} | {1, 7, 14}  | {4, 6, 10}   | {6, 13, 14} | {1, 4, 15}  | {2, 7, 10}  |

[1] **Kirkman's schoolgirl problem:** 15 girls walking in groups of 3, each day of the week. How to place them so that no two walk twice together.

Proposed by Rev. Thomas Kirkman in 1850.

The first solution was by Arthur Cayley. This was shortly followed by Kirkman's own solution.

J.J. Sylvester also investigated the problem and ended up declaring that Kirkman stole the idea from him.

# Example[1]

- $2\text{-}(k, b, r, c) = 2\text{-}(15, 35, 3, 7)$  resolvable design.

Subset (block)


|              |             |             |              |             |             |             |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| {1, 2, 3}    | {1, 5, 6}   | {2, 6, 11}  | {2, 5, 9}    | {3, 5, 11}  | {5, 7, 13}  | {3, 4, 13}  |
| {6, 7, 8}    | {4, 7, 11}  | {4, 5, 12}  | {3, 7, 12}   | {2, 4, 8}   | {2, 12, 14} | {5, 8, 14}  |
| {11, 12, 13} | {8, 9, 12}  | {9, 10, 13} | {1, 8, 13}   | {7, 9, 15}  | {3, 6, 9}   | {6, 12, 15} |
| {4, 9, 14}   | {3, 10, 14} | {3, 8, 15}  | {11, 14, 15} | {1, 10, 12} | {8, 10, 11} | {1, 9, 11}  |
| {5, 10, 15}  | {2, 13, 15} | {1, 7, 14}  | {4, 6, 10}   | {6, 13, 14} | {1, 4, 15}  | {2, 7, 10}  |

Class

- Subsets (blocks) in each class (column) partition set  $X = \{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$ .

# Example

- $(n, k, r, t) = (30, 15, 3, 2)$  and  $N = 20$ .



- First **two** ( $t = 2$ ) classes of the resolvable design from Kirkman's schoolgirl problem are used to split  $p_6$  and  $p_7$ .

|   |  |
|---|--|
| $l_1 = a_1 m_1 + a_2 m_2 + a_3 m_3$                   | $l_6 = b_1 m_1 + b_5 m_5 + b_6 m_6$                |
| $l_2 = a_6 m_6 + a_7 m_7 + a_8 m_8$                   | $l_7 = b_4 m_4 + b_7 m_7 + b_{11} m_{11}$          |
| $l_3 = a_{11} m_{11} + a_{12} m_{12} + a_{13} m_{13}$ | $l_8 = b_8 m_8 + b_9 m_9 + b_{12} m_{12}$          |
| $l_4 = a_4 m_4 + a_9 m_9 + a_{14} m_{14}$             | $l_9 = b_3 m_3 + b_{10} m_{10} + b_{14} m_{14}$    |
| $l_5 = a_5 m_5 + a_{10} m_{10} + a_{15} m_{15}$       | $l_{10} = b_2 m_2 + b_{13} m_{13} + b_{15} m_{15}$ |

# Conclusions

- Locality–Distance Trade-off
- Defined **Availability**: the number of parallel reads allowed by a code.
- Showed a tradeoff between distance-locality and availability.
- Created codes with good availability using combinatorial designs.
- All-symbol availability remains open as well as vector-linear codes.
- Also achievability remains open in many cases.