

IO 500?

John Bent, Seagate Government Solutions



LADÁNYI TAMÁS / ASTROPHOTO.HU

Why not an IO 500?



Not fair. Never apples-to-apples.



Don't repeat the horror of Linpack.



Impossible to design a good benchmark.

A single number is the only way it will work.

A single number means it's a horrible benchmark.

Why not #1: Not fair. Never apples to apples.



Sorry

Why not #2: Don't repeat Linpack



Don't repeat Linpack

- Linpack skewed supercomputers away from theoretical ideal architecture
- > A second skew can only pull them back towards theoretical!

Why not #3: Impossible to design a good benchmark

This is a **Challenge** I find **Interesting**

Thanks for helping!



Why an IO 500?

Make vendors be honest

- I recently asked three people how much bandwidth per disk drive;
 - o Marketer: "230 MB/s"
 - Sales: "100 MB/s"
 - o User: "15 MB/s"
- I recently asked three people how much bandwidth per supercomputer:
 - Marketer: "230 MB/s times the number of disks"
 - o Sales: "1 TB/s"
 - o User: "10 GB/s"



Make sites be honest

Well-aligned N-N is irrelevant.

Strawperson Benchmark Proposal



Two benchmarks, two modes, four results



E Pluribus Unum? (E Patru Unum?)



Another benchmark idea from Lance:

Y-axis is bandwidth, x-axis is block size, do IOR to preallocated files, compare the resulting curves

Next Steps