

Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023

Exploring Performance Paradigm of HMB NVMe SSD's

Presented by: Pradeep SR, Ranjith T Samsung Electronics







Pradeep SR Ranjith T

This presentation and/or accompanying oral statements by Samsung representatives collectively, the "Presentation" is intended to provide information concerning the SSD and memory industry and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and certain affiliates (collectively, "Samsung"). While Samsung strives to provide information that is accurate and up-to-date, this Presentation may nonetheless contain inaccuracies or omissions. As a consequence, Samsung does not in any way guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information provided in this Presentation.

This Presentation may include forward-looking statements, including, but not limited to, statements about any matter that is not a historical fact; statements regarding Samsung's intentions, beliefs or current expectations concerning, among other things, market prospects, technological developments, growth, strategies, and the industry in which Samsung operates; and statements regarding products or features that are still in development. By their nature, forward-looking statements involve risks and uncertainties, because they relate to events and depend on circumstances that may or may not occur in the future. Samsung cautions you that forward looking statements are not guarantees of future performance and that the actual developments of Samsung, the market, or industry in which Samsung operates may differ materially from those made or suggested by the forward-looking statements in this Presentation. In addition, even if such forward-looking statements are shown to be accurate, those developments may not be indicative of developments in future periods.





- HMB Overview
- Performance Parameters Overview
- HMB vs DRAM Comparison
- HMB Tuning Comparison
- Conclusion



Pradeep SR Ranjith T



Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



HMB Overview

What & Why of HMB?

Host Memory Buffer (HMB)





NVMe HMB Feature

Device Requirements

- HMB Preferred Size (HMPRE)
- HMB Minimum Size (HMMIN)

Host configuration of HMB

- Enable HMB
- HMB Size
- Descriptor Structure with each entry having Buffer address & chunk size
- Memory Return

OS & Device Support

- Windows 10 OS & Above
- *Linux 5.12, Ubuntu 20.12 & Above
- NVMe 1.2 & above compliance devices



Pradeep SR Ranjith T



Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



Performance Parameters Overview

Key Factors

- Number of Queues
- Queue Depth
- IO Chunk size
- Workload types
- DRAM/ HMB Size
- Number of Threads



Pradeep SR Ranjith T



Experiment set up

Item	Configuration
NVMe SSD "A" with DRAM	DRAM Size: 1GB
NVMe SSD "B" with HMB	HMBPRE Size: 64MB HMMIN Size: 16MB Note: Both "A" & "B" are of same Density & NAND Type, Controllers are different.
Device Driver	Custom Test Driver* Note: Custom driver used in order to override the Queue creation at initialization
Focus Area(s) of Experiment	 Number of Queue HMB Size allocation Drive States
ТооІ	IO Meter
Workloads	Standard Sequential & Random workloads
Host OS & DRAM Size	Windows 10 OS, 32GB DRAM
	Item NVMe SSD "A" with DRAM NVMe SSD "B" with HMB Device Driver Focus Area(s) of Experiment Norkloads Host OS & DRAM Size



Pradeep SR Ranjith T

*Disclaimer(s):

- Custom Test Driver is in-house & not built for performance, thus numbers can vary across inbox driver.
- This Experiment purpose is to find behavior patterns Only



Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



HMB vs DRAM Comparison

10 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.

Workloads: Sequential Write (128K-T1-QD32)



Key Observations:

- DRAM device leads in all Drive states & gap widens multifold at aging
- HMB device at 1Q configuration shows lowest performance in Aging

Normal: No Pre-Condition Sustain: Turbo area Pre-Conditioned

- Aging : Full Drive Pre-conditioned
- Max-Q : Max Queues Supported by Device

500

0

1Q

20

HMB

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only 11 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.



4Q

Number of Queues

DRAM

8Q



"∢

Z

2000.00%

0.00%

Max-O

Workloads: Sequential Read (128K-T1-QD32)





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

COMPUTE + MEMORY

STORAGE SUMMIT

S

Workloads: Random Read (4K-T1-QD32)





0.00%

-2.00%

-4.00%

-6.00%

-8.00%

-12.00%

-14.00%

-16.00%

-18.00%

-20.00%

-8.00% ∰ -10.00% □

%

.76%

Max-Q

Pradeep SR Ranjith T

- HMB is more Consistent at Aging state a well.
- In Aging with increase in number of Q's, DRAM is able to perform better

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only

13 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.





Workloads: Random Read (4K-T16-QD32)





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

14 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.

COMPUTE + MEMORY Z + STORAGE SUMMIT

DRAM

HMB

Workloads: Random Write (4K-T1-QD32)





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

%

"∢

Z

COMPUTE + MEMORY

+ STORAGE SUMMIT

- In Normal & Sustain state Performance increased as number of Q's increased
- In Aging DRAM device leads by large margin

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only 15 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.



Workloads: Random Write (4K-T16-QD32)



Key Observations:

- In Normal & sustain States both device perform on par across majority of Queue states
- In Normal & Sustain state Performance increased as number of Q's increased
- In Aging DRAM device leads by large margin

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only 16 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.







Pradeep SR Ranjith T

"∢

COMPUTE + MEMORY

+ STORAGE SUMMIT

Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



HMB Tuning Comparison

Workloads: Sequential Write (128K-T1-QD32)





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

•≺

Z

COMPUTE + MEMORY

+ STORAGE SUMMIT

18 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.

2245

2243

(s/gW) 2239

2229

2227

Per 2231

Workloads: Sequential Read (128K-T1-QD32)





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

Workloads: Random Read (4K-T1-QD32)



Key Observations:

- Performance better for Max HMB allocation in majority cases.
- In Aging Half HMB size allocation is more consistent across all Queue configurations

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only 20 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.





Pradeep SR Ranjith T

COMPUTE + MEMORY

STORAGE SUMMIT

Workloads: Random Read (4K-T16-QD32)



- Key Observations:
 - HMB allocation Half the preferred size performed better in Normal & Aging states.
 - Half HMB Size allocation worked relatively poor in sustain state across all Queue configurations
- Min HMB allocation shows Aging performance decreased with increase in Queues configured.

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only 21 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.





Pradeep SR Ranjith T



Max HMB Half HMB Min HMB



Workloads: Random Write (4K-T1-QD32)



Pradeep SR Ranjith T



4Q

8Q

Max-Q



22 | © SNIA. All Rights Reserved.

Disclaimer: Results are based on Custom test driver only

Performance (IOPS)

Workloads: Random Write (4K-T16-QD32)



Key Observations:

- Min HMB size allocation shows better results in majority of configurations & drive states
- Half HMB size allocation shows low performance in majority of cases in sustain & aging states







Pradeep SR Ranjith T

COMPUTE + MEMORY

STORAGE SUMMIT

Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



Conclusion

Conclusion

On Sequential Workloads DRAM leads much ahead of HMB



Pradeep SR Ranjith T

- On Random Read workloads HMB worked better to DRAM
- On Random Writes HMB is competitive enough, but lose sheen as drive ages
- HMB Worked best with Max-Q configuration bridging gap with DRAM
- HMB Size Variation didn't impact Sequential workloads much, Variations seen on Random workloads & Drive states
- Across all HMB Sizes allocated, 4Q configurations has been optimal.



Architectures, Solutions, and Community VIRTUAL EVENT, APRIL 11-12, 2023



Please take a moment to rate this session.

Your feedback is important to us.