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Abstract

High Availability Using Fault Tolerance in the SAN

This session will appeal to those seeking a fundamental understanding of the role fault tolerance plays in High Availability (HA) configurations. Modern SANs have developed numerous methods using hardware and software fault tolerance to assure high availability of storage to customers. The session will explore basic concepts of HA, move through a sample configuration from end-to-end, and discuss some of the challenges faced in testing HA configurations.
The 50,000 Foot View

High Availability Using Fault Tolerance in the SAN
- Promises a certain amount of uptime
- Promises access to critical functions of the system
- Allows system to handle faults or failures in a system
- Involves redundant components
- Allows component upgrades or maintenance without impacting availability

What This Is Not
- A guarantee of 100% availability
- An inexpensive solution
- A DR solution
- Susceptible to poor implementation
The Language of HA

❖ Uptime
  ❫ Measure of the time a computer system has been “up” and running (does not imply availability)
❖ Availability
  ❫ The proportion of time a system is production capable
❖ High Availability
  ❫ System design protocol and associated implementation that ensures a certain absolute degree of operational continuity during a given measurement period
❖ Fault Tolerance
  ❫ The ability to continue properly when a hardware or software fault or failure occurs. Designed for reliability by building multiples of critical components like controllers, adapters, memory and disk drives.
❖ Redundancy
  ❫ The duplication of components to ensure that should a primary resource fail, a secondary resources can take over its function

Definition sources: Google, wikipedia
And Now For The Parts

- **Storage Controller/Controller**
  - The control logic in a storage subsystem that performs, among other things, command transformation and routing, I/O prioritization, error recovery and performance optimization

- **Fabric**
  - Interconnection method that allows multiple hosts and/or storage devices connected with a multi-port hub, simultaneous and concurrent data transfers

- **Adapter**
  - Circuit board that provides I/O processing and physical connectivity between a server and storage device

- **Multipathing**
  - The use of redundant storage networking components (adapters, cables, switches) responsible for the transfer of data between the server and the storage

Definition sources: Google, wikipedia
The Seven R’s Of High Availability

- Redundancy
  - Eliminate single points of failures
- Reputation
  - What’s the track record of the key suppliers in your solution?
- Reliability
  - How dependable are the components and coding of the products?
- Repairability
  - How quickly and easily can suppliers fix or replace failing parts?
- Recoverability
  - Can your solution overcome a momentary failure and not impact users?
- Responsiveness
  - A sense of urgency is essential in all aspects of High Availability
- Robustness
  - Can your solution survive a variety of forces working against it?
## Five Nines...And Then Some

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Downtime/Yr</th>
<th>Downtime/Mo</th>
<th>Downtime/Wk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90%</td>
<td>36.5 days</td>
<td>72 hours</td>
<td>16.8 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>18.25 days</td>
<td>36 hours</td>
<td>8.4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98%</td>
<td>7.30 days</td>
<td>14.4 hours</td>
<td>3.36 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%</td>
<td>3.65 days</td>
<td>7.20 hours</td>
<td>1.68 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>1.83 days</td>
<td>3.60 hours</td>
<td>50.4 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.8%</td>
<td>17.52 hours</td>
<td>86.23 minutes</td>
<td>20.16 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>8.76 hours</td>
<td>43.2 minutes</td>
<td>10.1 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.95%</td>
<td>4.38 hours</td>
<td>21.56 minutes</td>
<td>5.04 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.99%</td>
<td>52.6 minutes</td>
<td>4.32 minutes</td>
<td>1.01 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.999%</td>
<td>5.26 minutes</td>
<td>25.9 seconds</td>
<td>6.05 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.9999%</td>
<td>31.5 seconds</td>
<td>2.59 seconds</td>
<td>0.605 seconds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hit Me Again!

- **Redundancy Based Fault Tolerance**
  - Designed to ensure it takes two independent local faults, in a short time period, to cause end-to-end failure

- **Even the best designs can be defeated**
  - Undetected faults: single local fault not detected and addressed
  - Dependent faults: two faults assumed to be independent are actually related
  - Out-of-scope Faults: additional categories of faults not addressed by the design
Why Didn’t I See That?

Undetected Faults

- Single local fault not detected and addressed
- Complexity of SAN access paths
  - Often hundreds or thousands of SAN access paths
  - Many thousand SAN configuration changes, often undocumented
  - Relationship between components often not understood well enough to ensure that redundant fault tolerance is adhered to

Example

- Planned switch upgrade brings down critical business because a fault in the redundant access path was not detected
- Vendor merges have combined previously separate redundant paths into one when combined under new controller
Dependent Faults

- Two faults assumed to be independent are actually dependent
- Operations often performed twice, once for each redundant system
  - Operation error initiated in one system can be replicated to redundant system

Example

- Application downtime caused by zoning errors made in one fabric repeated across redundant dual-fabrics
That Can’t Happen Here

- Out-Of-Scope Faults
  - Faults that were not anticipated in the original fault tolerant design
  - Misconfigurations or failure to clean up old configurations

- Example
  - LUN accidentally assigned to two different hosts, resulting in data corruption
  - Reuse of an old HBA in a new server caused downtime because previous zonings using that HBA had not been cleaned up
A “Simple” Fault Tolerant SAN

Controller 1

Adapter 1  Adapter 2

Adapter 1  Adapter 2

Node 1  Node 2

Controller 2

Adapter 3  Adapter 4

Fabric 1  Fabric 2
Can’t Have Too Much Control

Storage Controller/Controller
- Typical features
  - Redundant internal HDs
  - Fault Tolerant Internal Fabric
  - Hot swappable components
  - Predictive failure analysis
- Redundant controllers allow for
  - Scheduled maintenance
  - Single controller faults
  - System upgrades
- Single controller boxes can result in downtime if they experience a fault
Adapters

- Multiple adapters allow redundant access
- In a good fault tolerant system, the adapters can be managed by either controller, providing greater availability

Like A Six Lane Highway
Are We In “The Matrix?”

*Fabric*

- Fabric redundancy allows for fault tolerance as well as multiple paths for delivering I/O
- Need at least two switches

*Multipathing*

- When path fails, it’s disabled and I/O routed to other paths
- Active/Active or Active/Passive
End Servers

- There are different ways to provide fault tolerance on end servers
  - Configure a high availability cluster
  - Multiple adapters in each server
  - Fault tolerant hardware configuration on each server (disks, CPUs, etc)

All The User Really Cares About

- Configure a high availability cluster
- Multiple adapters in each server
- Fault tolerant hardware configuration on each server (disks, CPUs, etc)
High Availability Failover Cluster

- **Server-side Protection**
  - Ensure service by providing redundant nodes
  - Builds redundancy through multiple network connections and multiple SAN connections
  - Detects hardware or software faults on one node, restarts application on alternate node
  - Minimum two nodes per cluster, but can scale depending on vendor

- **Active/Active**
  - I/O for failed node passed on to surviving nodes, or balanced across remaining

- **Active/Passive**
  - Redundant node brought online only when a failure occurs
HA Testing - Known Knowns

“There are known knowns. These are things we know that we know. There are known unknowns. That is to say, there are things that we know we don't know. But there are also unknown unknowns. There are things we don't know we don't know.”

- Donald Rumsfeld, February 12th, 2004 DOD News Briefing

Good summary of what HA testing and configuration involves!
Swiss Cheese Matrix

High Availability configuring/testing is hugely complex
- Multiple components from multiple vendors
- Only subsets of entire solution often tested together
- Portion may be officially supported, but entire configuration is not
- Test matrix is absolutely huge, riddled with holes, requiring SMEs

Knowns vs. Unknowns
- There are often known problems in a configuration, but only to SMEs, and only for those components
- Unknown problems exist around every corner, if configuration components have not been tested together
- Details of configuration rules not known to everybody

Everybody Getting Too Smart
- As more products bring their version of “self-healing,” integration issues increase
- For any given single point of failure, only one product should be responsible for protecting configuration
Somebody’s Gotta Win!

- Clustering configured to stop/restart services when outage on node discovered
- DBA takes down node for routine maintenance
- Clustering takes down DB and filesystems, then restarts applications
- DBA confused
- DBA tries again
- Cycle repeats until clustering gives up, cancels future checking
- DBA able to perform maintenance actions
- Clustering has disabled future checking, now entire cluster exposed!
Looks Good…Feels Good…But…

Controller 1
Controller 2

Adapter 1
Adapter 2
Adapter 3
Adapter 4

Fabric

Server

Adapters 1 and 2 connected to the server and the fabric.
Despite redundant paths and adapters, there are several single points of failure

Fabric
- Single point of failure with only one switch
- Unable to take unit offline for maintenance, etc, without impacting users

Server
- Single server offers no redundancy
- Unable to take unit down for maintenance or upgrade
- Multiple paths out, but at mercy of system as a whole
Vital Lessons

❖ Planning is essential
  ❖ All parties together, make requirements clear
  ❖ Good advice, pick right components for the solution
  ❖ Single points of failure can exist outside production servers

❖ Testing is vital
  ❖ Test everything, even what you think will work
  ❖ Expect problems with initial test, allow time to fix
  ❖ Periodic testing after solution live to ensure nothing has broken

❖ Manage change
  ❖ New requirements may cause problems with other parts of solution
  ❖ Many hands do not always make light work

❖ Document everything
  ❖ Document the plan, stick to it
  ❖ Document the testing to show how it worked. If the results change, something in the solution has changed.
Of Course There’s A Downside!

- High Availability Using Fault Tolerance
  - Requires at least two of each component
  - Increases system complexity
  - Increases administrative responsibility
  - Increases capital expenditures
  - Can be incorrectly configured

- Questions You Should Ask
  - Is it worth it?
  - How important is your data to you?
  - Can your business stand any downtime?
  - What is acceptable recovery time?
  - How soon do you want to be back in business?
Q&A / Feedback

Please send any questions or comments on this presentation to SNIA: trackstoragemgmt@snia.org
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Appendix

Resources

- http://searchstorage.techtarget.com/news/article/0,289142,sid5_gci1080870,00.html#