

# Finding a needle in Haystack: Facebook’s photo storage

Doug Beaver, Sanjeev Kumar, Harry C. Li, Jason Sobel, Peter Vajgel,  
Facebook Inc.  
{doug, skumar, hcli, jsobel, pv}@facebook.com

**Abstract:** This paper describes Haystack, an object storage system optimized for Facebook’s Photos application. Facebook currently stores over 260 billion images, which translates to over 20 petabytes of data. Users upload one billion new photos (~60 terabytes) each week and Facebook serves over one million images per second at peak. Haystack provides a less expensive and higher performing solution than our previous approach, which leveraged network attached storage appliances over NFS. Our key observation is that this traditional design incurs an excessive number of disk operations because of metadata lookups. We carefully reduce this per photo metadata so that Haystack storage machines can perform all metadata lookups in main memory. This choice conserves disk operations for reading actual data and thus increases overall throughput.

## 1 Introduction

Sharing photos is one of Facebook’s most popular features. To date, users have uploaded over 65 billion photos making Facebook the biggest photo sharing website in the world. For each uploaded photo, Facebook generates and stores four images of different sizes, which translates to over 260 billion images and more than 20 petabytes of data. Users upload one billion new photos (~60 terabytes) each week and Facebook serves over one million images per second at peak. As we expect these numbers to increase in the future, photo storage poses a significant challenge for Facebook’s infrastructure.

This paper presents the design and implementation of Haystack, Facebook’s photo storage system that has been in production for the past 24 months. Haystack is an object store [7, 10, 12, 13, 25, 26] that we designed for sharing photos on Facebook where data is written once, read often, never modified, and rarely deleted. We engineered our own storage system for photos because traditional filesystems perform poorly under our workload.

In our experience, we find that the disadvantages of a traditional POSIX [21] based filesystem are directories and per file metadata. For the Photos application most of this metadata, such as permissions, is unused

and thereby wastes storage capacity. Yet the more significant cost is that the file’s metadata must be read from disk into memory in order to find the file itself. While insignificant on a small scale, multiplied over billions of photos and petabytes of data, accessing metadata is the throughput bottleneck. We found this to be our key problem in using a network attached storage (NAS) appliance mounted over NFS. Several disk operations were necessary to read a single photo: one (or typically more) to translate the filename to an inode number, another to read the inode from disk, and a final one to read the file itself. In short, using disk IOs for metadata was the limiting factor for our read throughput. Observe that in practice this problem introduces an additional cost as we have to rely on content delivery networks (CDNs), such as Akamai [2], to serve the majority of read traffic.

Given the disadvantages of a traditional approach, we designed Haystack to achieve four main goals:

**High throughput and low latency.** Our photo storage systems have to keep up with the requests users make. Requests that exceed our processing capacity are either ignored, which is unacceptable for user experience, or handled by a CDN, which is expensive and reaches a point of diminishing returns. Moreover, photos should be served quickly to facilitate a good user experience. Haystack achieves high throughput and low latency by requiring at most one disk operation per read. We accomplish this by keeping all metadata in main memory, which we make practical by dramatically reducing the per photo metadata necessary to find a photo on disk.

**Fault-tolerant.** In large scale systems, failures happen every day. Our users rely on their photos being available and should not experience errors despite the inevitable server crashes and hard drive failures. It may happen that an entire datacenter loses power or a cross-country link is severed. Haystack replicates each photo in geographically distinct locations. If we lose a machine we introduce another one to take its place, copying data for redundancy as necessary.

**Cost-effective.** Haystack performs better and is less

expensive than our previous NFS-based approach. We quantify our savings along two dimensions: Haystack’s cost per terabyte of usable storage and Haystack’s read rate normalized for each terabyte of usable storage<sup>1</sup>. In Haystack, each usable terabyte costs  $\sim 28\%$  less and processes  $\sim 4x$  more reads per second than an equivalent terabyte on a NAS appliance.

**Simple.** In a production environment we cannot overstate the strength of a design that is straight-forward to implement and to maintain. As Haystack is a new system, lacking years of production-level testing, we paid particular attention to keeping it simple. That simplicity let us build and deploy a working system in a few months instead of a few years.

This work describes our experience with Haystack from conception to implementation of a production quality system serving billions of images a day. Our three main contributions are:

- Haystack, an object storage system optimized for the efficient storage and retrieval of billions of photos.
- Lessons learned in building and scaling an inexpensive, reliable, and available photo storage system.
- A characterization of the requests made to Facebook’s photo sharing application.

We organize the remainder of this paper as follows. Section 2 provides background and highlights the challenges in our previous architecture. We describe Haystack’s design and implementation in Section 3. Section 4 characterizes our photo read and write workload and demonstrates that Haystack meets our design goals. We draw comparisons to related work in Section 5 and conclude this paper in Section 6.

## 2 Background & Previous Design

In this section, we describe the architecture that existed before Haystack and highlight the major lessons we learned. Because of space constraints our discussion of this previous design elides several details of a production-level deployment.

### 2.1 Background

We begin with a brief overview of the typical design for how web servers, content delivery networks (CDNs), and storage systems interact to serve photos on a popular

<sup>1</sup>The term ‘usable’ takes into account capacity consumed by factors such as RAID level, replication, and the underlying filesystem




Figure 1: Typical Design

site. Figure 1 depicts the steps from the moment when a user visits a page containing an image until she downloads that image from its location on disk. When visiting a page the user’s browser first sends an HTTP request to a web server which is responsible for generating the markup for the browser to render. For each image the web server constructs a URL directing the browser to a location from which to download the data. For popular sites this URL often points to a CDN. If the CDN has the image cached then the CDN responds immediately with the data. Otherwise, the CDN examines the URL, which has enough information embedded to retrieve the photo from the site’s storage systems. The CDN then updates its cached data and sends the image to the user’s browser.

### 2.2 NFS-based Design

In our first design we implemented the photo storage system using an NFS-based approach. While the rest of this subsection provides more detail on that design, the major lesson we learned is that CDNs by themselves do not offer a practical solution to serving photos on a social networking site. CDNs do effectively serve the hottest photos— profile pictures and photos that have been recently uploaded—but a social networking site like Facebook also generates a large number of requests for less popular (often older) content, which we refer to as the *long tail*. Requests from the long tail account for a significant amount of our traffic, almost all of which accesses the backing photo storage hosts as these requests typically miss in the CDN. While it would be very convenient to cache all of the photos for this long tail, doing so would not be cost effective because of the very large cache sizes required.

Our NFS-based design stores each photo in its own file on a set of commercial NAS appliances. A set of




Figure 2: NFS-based Design

machines, Photo Store servers, then mount all the volumes exported by these NAS appliances over NFS. Figure 2 illustrates this architecture and shows Photo Store servers processing HTTP requests for images. From an image’s URL a Photo Store server extracts the volume and full path to the file, reads the data over NFS, and returns the result to the CDN.

We initially stored thousands of files in each directory of an NFS volume which led to an excessive number of disk operations to read even a single image. Because of how the NAS appliances manage directory metadata, placing thousands of files in a directory was extremely inefficient as the directory’s blockmap was too large to be cached effectively by the appliance. Consequently it was common to incur more than 10 disk operations to retrieve a single image. After reducing directory sizes to hundreds of images per directory, the resulting system would still generally incur 3 disk operations to fetch an image: one to read the directory metadata into memory, a second to load the inode into memory, and a third to read the file contents.

To further reduce disk operations we let the Photo Store servers explicitly cache file handles returned by the NAS appliances. When reading a file for the first time a Photo Store server opens a file normally but also caches the filename to file handle mapping in memcache [18]. When requesting a file whose file handle is cached, a Photo Store server opens the file directly using a custom system call, `open_by_filehandle`, that we added to the kernel. Regrettably, this file handle cache provides only a minor improvement as less popular photos are less likely to be cached to begin with.

One could argue that an approach in which all file handles are stored in memcache might be a workable solution. However, that only addresses part of the problem as it relies on the NAS appliance having all of its inodes in main memory, an expensive requirement for traditional filesystems. The major lesson we learned from the NAS approach is that focusing only on caching—whether the NAS appliance’s cache or an external cache like memcache—has limited impact for reducing disk operations. The storage system ends up processing the long tail of requests for less popular photos, which are not available in the CDN and are thus likely to miss in our caches.

### 2.3 Discussion

It would be difficult for us to offer precise guidelines for when or when not to build a custom storage system. However, we believe it still helpful for the community to gain insight into why we decided to build Haystack.

Faced with the bottlenecks in our NFS-based design, we explored whether it would be useful to build a system similar to GFS [9]. Since we store most of our user data in MySQL databases, the main use cases for files in our system were the directories engineers use for development work, log data, and photos. NAS appliances offer a very good price/performance point for development work and for log data. Furthermore, we leverage Hadoop [11] for the extremely large log data. Serving photo requests in the long tail represents a problem for which neither MySQL, NAS appliances, nor Hadoop are well-suited.

One could phrase the dilemma we faced as existing storage systems lacked the right RAM-to-disk ratio. However, there is no *right* ratio. The system just needs *enough* main memory so that all of the filesystem metadata can be cached at once. In our NAS-based approach, one photo corresponds to one file and each file requires at least one inode, which is hundreds of bytes large. Having enough main memory in this approach is not cost-effective. To achieve a better price/performance point, we decided to build a custom storage system that reduces the amount of filesystem metadata per photo so that having enough main memory is dramatically more cost-effective than buying more NAS appliances.

## 3 Design & Implementation

Facebook uses a CDN to serve popular images and leverages Haystack to respond to photo requests in the long tail efficiently. When a web site has an I/O bottleneck serving static content the traditional solution is to use a CDN. The CDN shoulders enough of the burden so that the storage system can process the remaining tail. At Facebook a CDN would have to cache an unrea-

sonably large amount of the static content in order for traditional (and inexpensive) storage approaches not to be I/O bound.

Understanding that in the near future CDNs would not fully solve our problems, we designed Haystack to address the critical bottleneck in our NFS-based approach: disk operations. We accept that requests for less popular photos may require disk operations, but aim to limit the number of such operations to only the ones necessary for reading actual photo data. Haystack achieves this goal by dramatically reducing the memory used for filesystem metadata, thereby making it practical to keep all this metadata in main memory.

Recall that storing a single photo per file resulted in more filesystem metadata than could be reasonably cached. Haystack takes a straight-forward approach: it stores multiple photos in a single file and therefore maintains very large files. We show that this straight-forward approach is remarkably effective. Moreover, we argue that its simplicity is its strength, facilitating rapid implementation and deployment. We now discuss how this core technique and the architectural components surrounding it provide a reliable and available storage system. In the following description of Haystack, we distinguish between two kinds of metadata. *Application metadata* describes the information needed to construct a URL that a browser can use to retrieve a photo. *Filesystem metadata* identifies the data necessary for a host to retrieve the photos that reside on that host's disk.

### 3.1 Overview

The Haystack architecture consists of 3 core components: the Haystack Store, Haystack Directory, and Haystack Cache. For brevity we refer to these components with 'Haystack' elided. The Store encapsulates the persistent storage system for photos and is the only component that manages the filesystem metadata for photos. We organize the Store's capacity by *physical volumes*. For example, we can organize a server's 10 terabytes of capacity into 100 physical volumes each of which provides 100 gigabytes of storage. We further group physical volumes on different machines into *logical volumes*. When Haystack stores a photo on a logical volume, the photo is written to all corresponding physical volumes. This redundancy allows us to mitigate data loss due to hard drive failures, disk controller bugs, etc. The Directory maintains the logical to physical mapping along with other application metadata, such as the logical volume where each photo resides and the logical volumes with free space. The Cache functions as our internal CDN, which shelters the Store from requests for the most popular photos and provides insulation if upstream CDN nodes fail and need to refetch content.




Figure 3: Serving a photo

Figure 3 illustrates how the Store, Directory, and Cache components fit into the canonical interactions between a user's browser, web server, CDN, and storage system. In the Haystack architecture the browser can be directed to either the CDN or the Cache. Note that while the Cache is essentially a CDN, to avoid confusion we use 'CDN' to refer to external systems and 'Cache' to refer to our internal one that caches photos. Having an internal caching infrastructure gives us the ability to reduce our dependence on external CDNs.

When a user visits a page the web server uses the Directory to construct a URL for each photo. The URL contains several pieces of information, each piece corresponding to the sequence of steps from when a user's browser contacts the CDN (or Cache) to ultimately retrieving a photo from a machine in the Store. A typical URL that directs the browser to the CDN looks like the following:

```
http://<CDN>/<Cache>/<Machine id>/<Logical volume, Photo>
```

The first part of the URL specifies from which CDN to request the photo. The CDN can lookup the photo internally using only the last part of the URL: the logical volume and the photo id. If the CDN cannot locate the photo then it strips the CDN address from the URL and contacts the Cache. The Cache does a similar lookup to find the photo and, on a miss, strips the Cache address from the URL and requests the photo from the specified Store machine. Photo requests that go directly to the Cache have a similar workflow except that the URL is missing the CDN specific information.




Figure 4: Uploading a photo

Figure 4 illustrates the upload path in Haystack. When a user uploads a photo she first sends the data to a web server. Next, that server requests a write-enabled logical volume from the Directory. Finally, the web server assigns a unique id to the photo and uploads it to each of the physical volumes mapped to the assigned logical volume.

### 3.2 Haystack Directory

The Directory serves four main functions. First, it provides a mapping from logical volumes to physical volumes. Web servers use this mapping when uploading photos and also when constructing the image URLs for a page request. Second, the Directory load balances writes across logical volumes and reads across physical volumes. Third, the Directory determines whether a photo request should be handled by the CDN or by the Cache. This functionality lets us adjust our dependence on CDNs. Fourth, the Directory identifies those logical volumes that are read-only either because of operational reasons or because those volumes have reached their storage capacity. We mark volumes as read-only at the granularity of machines for operational ease.

When we increase the capacity of the Store by adding new machines, those machines are write-enabled; only write-enabled machines receive uploads. Over time the available capacity on these machines decreases. When a machine exhausts its capacity, we mark it as read-only. In the next subsection we discuss how this distinction has subtle consequences for the Cache and Store.

The Directory is a relatively straight-forward component that stores its information in a replicated database accessed via a PHP interface that leverages memcache

to reduce latency. In the event that we lose the data on a Store machine we remove the corresponding entry in the mapping and replace it when a new Store machine is brought online.

### 3.3 Haystack Cache

The Cache receives HTTP requests for photos from CDNs and also directly from users' browsers. We organize the Cache as a distributed hash table and use a photo's id as the key to locate cached data. If the Cache cannot immediately respond to the request, then the Cache fetches the photo from the Store machine identified in the URL and replies to either the CDN or the user's browser as appropriate.

We now highlight an important behavioral aspect of the Cache. It caches a photo only if two conditions are met: (a) the request comes directly from a user and not the CDN and (b) the photo is fetched from a write-enabled Store machine. The justification for the first condition is that our experience with the NFS-based design showed post-CDN caching is ineffective as it is unlikely that a request that misses in the CDN would hit in our internal cache. The reasoning for the second is indirect. We use the Cache to shelter write-enabled Store machines from reads because of two interesting properties: photos are most heavily accessed soon after they are uploaded and filesystems for our workload generally perform better when doing either reads or writes but not both (Section 4.1). Thus the write-enabled Store machines would see the most reads if it were not for the Cache. Given this characteristic, an optimization we plan to implement is to proactively push recently uploaded photos into the Cache as we expect those photos to be read soon and often.

### 3.4 Haystack Store

The interface to Store machines is intentionally basic. Reads make very specific and well-contained requests asking for a photo with a given id, for a certain logical volume, and from a particular physical Store machine. The machine returns the photo if it is found. Otherwise, the machine returns an error.

Each Store machine manages multiple physical volumes. Each volume holds millions of photos. For concreteness, the reader can think of a physical volume as simply a very large file (100 GB) saved as `~/hay/haystack_<logical volume id>`. A Store machine can access a photo quickly using only the id of the corresponding logical volume and the file offset at which the photo resides. This knowledge is the keystone of the Haystack design: retrieving the filename, offset, and size for a particular photo without needing disk operations. A Store machine keeps open file descriptors for




Figure 5: Layout of Haystack Store file

Field	Explanation
Header	Magic number used for recovery
Cookie	Random number to mitigate brute force lookups
Key	64-bit photo id
Alternate key	32-bit supplemental id
Flags	Signifies deleted status
Size	Data size
Data	The actual photo data
Footer	Magic number for recovery
Data Checksum	Used to check integrity
Padding	Total needle size is aligned to 8 bytes

Table 1: Explanation of fields in a needle

each physical volume that it manages and also an in-memory mapping of photo ids to the filesystem metadata (i.e., file, offset and size in bytes) critical for retrieving that photo.

We now describe the layout of each physical volume and how to derive the in-memory mapping from that volume. A Store machine represents a physical volume as a large file consisting of a superblock followed by a sequence of *needles*. Each needle represents a photo stored in Haystack. Figure 5 illustrates a volume file and the format of each needle. Table 1 describes the fields in each needle.

To retrieve needles quickly, each Store machine maintains an in-memory data structure for each of its volumes. That data structure maps pairs of (key, alternate key)<sup>2</sup> to the corresponding needle's flags, size in

<sup>2</sup>For historical reasons, a photo's id corresponds to the key while its type is used for the alternate key. During an upload, web servers scale each photo to four different sizes (or types) and store them as separate needles, but with the same key. The important distinction among these

bytes, and volume offset. After a crash, a Store machine can reconstruct this mapping directly from the volume file before processing requests. We now describe how a Store machine maintains its volumes and in-memory mapping while responding to read, write, and delete requests (the only operations supported by the Store).

### 3.4.1 Photo Read

When a Cache machine requests a photo it supplies the logical volume id, key, alternate key, and cookie to the Store machine. The cookie is a number embedded in the URL for a photo. The cookie's value is randomly assigned by and stored in the Directory at the time that the photo is uploaded. The cookie effectively eliminates attacks aimed at guessing valid URLs for photos.

When a Store machine receives a photo request from a Cache machine, the Store machine looks up the relevant metadata in its in-memory mappings. If the photo has not been deleted the Store machine seeks to the appropriate offset in the volume file, reads the entire needle from disk (whose size it can calculate ahead of time), and verifies the cookie and the integrity of the data. If these checks pass then the Store machine returns the photo to the Cache machine.

### 3.4.2 Photo Write

When uploading a photo into Haystack web servers provide the logical volume id, key, alternate key, cookie, and data to Store machines. Each machine synchronously appends needle images to its physical volume files and updates in-memory mappings as needed. While simple, this append-only restriction complicates some operations that modify photos, such as rotations. As Haystack disallows overwriting needles, photos can only be modified by adding an updated needle with the same key and alternate key. If the new needle is written to a different logical volume than the original, the Directory updates its application metadata and future requests will never fetch the older version. If the new needle is written to the same logical volume, then Store machines append the new needle to the same corresponding physical volumes. Haystack distinguishes such duplicate needles based on their offsets. That is, the latest version of a needle within a physical volume is the one at the highest offset.

### 3.4.3 Photo Delete

Deleting a photo is straight-forward. A Store machine sets the delete flag in both the in-memory mapping and synchronously in the volume file. Requests to get deleted photos first check the in-memory flag and return errors if that flag is enabled. Note that the space occu-

needles is the alternate key field, which in decreasing order can be 'n,' 'a,' 's,' or 't'.




Figure 6: Layout of Haystack Index file

ped by deleted needles is for the moment lost. Later, we discuss how to reclaim deleted needle space by compacting volume files.

### 3.4.4 The Index File

Store machines use an important optimization—the *index file*—when rebooting. While in theory a machine can reconstruct its in-memory mappings by reading all of its physical volumes, doing so is time-consuming as the amount of data (terabytes worth) has to all be read from disk. Index files allow a Store machine to build its in-memory mappings quickly, shortening restart time.

Store machines maintain an index file for each of their volumes. The index file is a checkpoint of the in-memory data structures used to locate needles efficiently on disk. An index file’s layout is similar to a volume file’s, containing a superblock followed by a sequence of index records corresponding to each needle in the superblock. These records must appear in the same order as the corresponding needles appear in the volume file. Figure 6 illustrates the layout of the index file and Table 2 explains the different fields in each record.

Restarting using the index is slightly more complicated than just reading the indices and initializing the in-memory mappings. The complications arise because index files are updated asynchronously, meaning that index files may represent stale checkpoints. When we write a new photo the Store machine synchronously appends a needle to the end of the volume file and asynchronously appends a record to the index file. When we delete a photo, the Store machine synchronously sets the flag in that photo’s needle without updating the index file. These design decisions allow write and delete operations to return faster because they avoid additional synchronous disk writes. They also cause two side effects we must address: needles can exist without corresponding index records and index records do not reflect deleted photos.

Field	Explanation
Key	64-bit key
Alternate key	32-bit alternate key
Flags	Currently unused
Offset	Needle offset in the Haystack Store
Size	Needle data size

Table 2: Explanation of fields in index file.

We refer to needles without corresponding index records as *orphans*. During restarts, a Store machine sequentially examines each orphan, creates a matching index record, and appends that record to the index file. Note that we can quickly identify orphans because the last record in the index file corresponds to the last non-orphan needle in the volume file. To complete the restart, the Store machine now initializes its in-memory mappings using only the index files.

Since index records do not reflect deleted photos, a Store machine may retrieve a photo that has in fact been deleted. To address this issue, after a Store machine reads the entire needle for a photo, that machine can then inspect the deleted flag. If a needle is marked as deleted the Store machine updates its in-memory mapping accordingly and notifies the Cache that the object was not found.

### 3.4.5 Filesystem

We describe Haystack as an object store that utilizes a generic Unix-like filesystem, but some filesystems are better suited for Haystack than others. In particular, the Store machines should use a filesystem that does not need much memory to be able to perform random seeks within a large file quickly. Currently, each Store machine uses XFS [24], an extent based file system. XFS has two main advantages for Haystack. First, the blockmaps for several contiguous large files can be small enough to be stored in main memory. Second, XFS provides efficient file preallocation, mitigating fragmentation and reining in how large block maps can grow.

Using XFS, Haystack can eliminate disk operations for retrieving filesystem metadata when reading a photo. This benefit, however, does not imply that Haystack can *guarantee* every photo read will incur exactly one disk operation. There exists corner cases where the filesystem requires more than one disk operation when photo data crosses extents or RAID boundaries. Haystack preallocates 1 gigabyte extents and uses 256 kilobyte RAID stripe sizes so that in practice we encounter these cases rarely.

### 3.5 Recovery from failures

Like many other large-scale systems running on commodity hardware [5, 4, 9], Haystack needs to tolerate a variety of failures: faulty hard drives, misbehaving RAID controllers, bad motherboards, etc. We use two straight-forward techniques to tolerate failures—one for detection and another for repair.

To proactively find Store machines that are having problems, we maintain a background task, dubbed *pitchfork*, that periodically checks the health of each Store machine. Pitchfork remotely tests the connection to each Store machine, checks the availability of each volume file, and attempts to read data from the Store machine. If pitchfork determines that a Store machine consistently fails these health checks then pitchfork automatically marks all logical volumes that reside on that Store machine as read-only. We manually address the underlying cause for the failed checks offline.

Once diagnosed, we may be able to fix the problem quickly. Occasionally, the situation requires a more heavy-handed *bulk sync* operation in which we reset the data of a Store machine using the volume files supplied by a replica. Bulk syncs happen rarely (a few each month) and are simple albeit slow to carry out. The main bottleneck is that the amount of data to be bulk synced is often orders of magnitude greater than the speed of the NIC on each Store machine, resulting in hours for mean time to recovery. We are actively exploring techniques to address this constraint.

### 3.6 Optimizations

We now discuss several optimizations important to Haystack’s success.

#### 3.6.1 Compaction

Compaction is an online operation that reclaims the space used by deleted and duplicate needles (needles with the same key and alternate key). A Store machine compacts a volume file by copying needles into a new file while skipping any duplicate or deleted entries. During compaction, deletes go to both files. Once this procedure reaches the end of the file, it blocks any further modifications to the volume and atomically swaps the files and in-memory structures.

We use compaction to free up space from deleted photos. The pattern for deletes is similar to photo views: young photos are a lot more likely to be deleted. Over the course of a year, about 25% of the photos get deleted.

#### 3.6.2 Saving more memory

As described, a Store machine maintains an in-memory data structure that includes flags, but our current system only uses the flags field to mark a needle as deleted. We eliminate the need for an in-memory representation of

flags by setting the offset to be 0 for deleted photos. In addition, Store machines do not keep track of cookie values in main memory and instead check the supplied cookie after reading a needle from disk. Store machines reduce their main memory footprints by 20% through these two techniques.

Currently, Haystack uses on average 10 bytes of main memory per photo. Recall that we scale each uploaded image to four photos all with the same key (64 bits), different alternate keys (32 bits), and consequently different data sizes (16 bits). In addition to these 32 bytes, Haystack consumes approximately 2 bytes per image in overheads due to hash tables, bringing the total for four scaled photos of the same image to 40 bytes. For comparison, consider that an `xfs_inode_t` structure in Linux is 536 bytes.

#### 3.6.3 Batch upload

Since disks are generally better at performing large sequential writes instead of small random writes, we batch uploads together when possible. Fortunately, many users upload entire albums to Facebook instead of single pictures, providing an obvious opportunity to batch the photos in an album together. We quantify the improvement of aggregating writes together in Section 4.

## 4 Evaluation

We divide our evaluation into four parts. In the first we characterize the photo requests seen by Facebook. In the second and third we show the effectiveness of the Directory and Cache, respectively. In the last we analyze how well the Store performs using both synthetic and production workloads.

### 4.1 Characterizing photo requests

Photos are one of the primary kinds of content that users share on Facebook. Users upload millions of photos every day and recently uploaded photos tend to be much more popular than older ones. Figure 7 illustrates how popular each photo is as a function of the photo’s age. To understand the shape of the graph, it is useful to discuss what drives Facebook’s photo requests.

#### 4.1.1 Features that drive photo requests

Two features are responsible for 98% of Facebook’s photo requests: News Feed and albums. The News Feed feature shows users recent content that their friends have shared. The album feature lets a user browse her friends’ pictures. She can view recently uploaded photos and also browse all of the individual albums.

Figure 7 shows a sharp rise in requests for photos that are a few days old. News Feed drives much of the traffic for recent photos and falls sharply away around 2 days when many stories stop being shown in the default Feed






Figure 7: Cumulative distribution function of the number of photos requested in a day categorized by age (time since it was uploaded).

Operations	Daily Counts
Photos Uploaded	~120 Million
Haystack Photos Written	~1.44 Billion
Photos Viewed	80-100 Billion
[ <i>Thumbnails</i> ]	10.2 %
[ <i>Small</i> ]	84.4 %
[ <i>Medium</i> ]	0.2 %
[ <i>Large</i> ]	5.2 %
Haystack Photos Read	10 Billion

Table 3: Volume of daily photo traffic.

view. There are two key points to highlight from the figure. First, the rapid decline in popularity suggests that caching at both CDNs and in the Cache can be very effective for hosting popular content. Second, the graph has a long tail implying that a significant number of requests cannot be dealt with using cached data.

#### 4.1.2 Traffic Volume

Table 3 shows the volume of photo traffic on Facebook. The number of Haystack photos written is 12 times the number of photos uploaded since our application scales each image to 4 sizes and saves each size in 3 different locations. The table shows that Haystack responds to approximately 10% of all photo requests from CDNs. Observe that smaller images account for most of the photos viewed. This trait underscores our desire to minimize metadata overhead as inefficiencies can quickly add up. Additionally, reading smaller images is typically a more latency sensitive operation for Facebook as they are displayed in the News Feed whereas larger im-




Figure 8: Volume of multi-write operations sent to 9 different write-enabled Haystack Store machines. The graph has 9 different lines that closely overlap each other.

ages are shown in albums and can be prefetched to hide latency.

## 4.2 Haystack Directory

The Haystack Directory balances reads and writes across Haystack Store machines. Figure 8 depicts that as expected, the Directory’s straight-forward hashing policy to distribute reads and writes is very effective. The graph shows the number of multi-write operations seen by 9 different Store machines which were deployed into production at the same time. Each of these boxes store a different set of photos. Since the lines are nearly indistinguishable, we conclude that the Directory balances writes well. Comparing read traffic across Store machines shows similarly well-balanced behavior.

## 4.3 Haystack Cache

Figure 9 shows the hit rate for the Haystack Cache. Recall that the Cache only stores a photo if it is saved on a write-enabled Store machine. These photos are relatively recent, which explains the high hit rates of approximately 80%. Since the write-enabled Store machines would also see the greatest number of reads, the Cache is effective in dramatically reducing the read request rate for the machines that would be most affected.

## 4.4 Haystack Store

Recall that Haystack targets the long tail of photo requests and aims to maintain high-throughput and low-latency despite seemingly random reads. We present performance results of Store machines on both synthetic and production workloads.

Benchmark	[ Config # Operations ]	Reads			Writes		
		Throughput (in images/s)	Latency (in ms)		Throughput (in images/s)	Latency (in ms)	
			Avg.	Std. dev.		Avg.	Std. dev.
Random IO	[ Only Reads ]	902.3	33.2	26.8	—	—	—
Haystress	[ A # Only Reads ]	770.6	38.9	30.2	—	—	—
Haystress	[ B # Only Reads ]	877.8	34.2	28.1	—	—	—
Haystress	[ C # Only Multi-Writes ]	—	—	—	6099.4	4.9	16.0
Haystress	[ D # Only Multi-Writes ]	—	—	—	7899.7	15.2	15.3
Haystress	[ E # Only Multi-Writes ]	—	—	—	10843.8	43.9	16.3
Haystress	[ F # Reads & Multi-Writes ]	718.1	41.6	31.6	232.0	11.9	6.3
Haystress	[ G # Reads & Multi-Writes ]	692.8	42.8	33.7	440.0	11.9	6.9

Table 4: Throughput and latency of read and multi-write operations on synthetic workloads. Config **B** uses a mix of 8KB and 64KB images. Remaining configs use 64KB images.




Figure 9: Cache hit rate for images that might be potentially stored in the Haystack Cache.

#### 4.4.1 Experimental setup

We deploy Store machines on commodity storage blades. The typical hardware configuration of a 2U storage blade has 2 hyper-threaded quad-core Intel Xeon CPUs, 48 GB memory, a hardware raid controller with 256–512MB NVRAM, and 12 x 1TB SATA drives.

Each storage blade provides approximately 9TB of capacity, configured as a RAID-6 partition managed by the hardware RAID controller. RAID-6 provides adequate redundancy and excellent read performance while keeping storage costs down. The controller’s NVRAM write-back cache mitigates RAID-6’s reduced write performance. Since our experience suggests that caching photos on Store machines is ineffective, we reserve the NVRAM fully for writes. We also disable disk caches in order to guarantee data consistency in the event of a

crash or power loss.

#### 4.4.2 Benchmark performance

We assess the performance of a Store machine using two benchmarks: Randomio [22] and Haystress. Randomio is an open-source multithreaded disk I/O program that we use to measure the raw capabilities of storage devices. It issues random 64KB reads that use direct I/O to make sector aligned requests and reports the maximum sustainable throughput. We use Randomio to establish a baseline for read throughput against which we can compare results from our other benchmark.

Haystress is a custom built multi-threaded program that we use to evaluate Store machines for a variety of synthetic workloads. It communicates with a Store machine via HTTP (as the Cache would) and assesses the maximum read and write throughput a Store machine can maintain. Haystress issues random reads over a large set of dummy images to reduce the effect of the machine’s buffer cache; that is, nearly all reads require a disk operation. In this paper, we use seven different Haystress workloads to evaluate Store machines.

Table 4 characterizes the read and write throughputs and associated latencies that a Store machine can sustain under our benchmarks. Workload **A** performs random reads to 64KB images on a Store machine with 201 volumes. The results show that Haystack delivers 85% of the raw throughput of the device while incurring only 17% higher latency.

We attribute a Store machine’s overhead to four factors: (a) it runs on top of the filesystem instead of accessing disk directly; (b) disk reads are larger than 64KB as entire needles need to be read; (c) stored images may not be aligned to the underlying RAID-6 device stripe size so a small percentage of images are read from more

than one disk; and (d) CPU overhead of Haystack server (index access, checksum calculations, etc.)

In workload **B**, we again examine a read-only workload but alter 70% of the reads so that they request smaller size images (8KB instead of 64KB). In practice, we find that most requests are not for the largest size images (as would be shown in albums) but rather for the thumbnails and profile pictures.

Workloads **C**, **D**, and **E** show a Store machine’s write throughput. Recall that Haystack can batch writes together. Workloads **C**, **D**, and **E** group 1, 4, and 16 writes into a single multi-write, respectively. The table shows that amortizing the fixed cost of writes over 4 and 16 images improves throughput by 30% and 78% respectively. As expected, this reduces per image latency, as well.

Finally, we look at the performance in the presence of both read and write operations. Workload **F** uses a mix of 98% reads and 2% multi-writes while **G** uses a mix of 96% reads and 4% multi-writes where each multi-write writes 16 images. These ratios reflect what is often observed in production. The table shows that the Store delivers high read throughput even in the presence of writes.

#### 4.4.3 Production workload

The section examines the performance of the Store on production machines. As noted in Section 3, there are two classes of Stores—write-enabled and read-only. Write-enabled hosts service read and write requests, read-only hosts only service read requests. Since these two classes have fairly different traffic characteristics, we analyze a group of machines in each class. All machines have the same hardware configuration.

Viewed at a per-second granularity, there can be large spikes in the volume of photo read and write operations that a Store box sees. To ensure reasonable latency even in the presence of these spikes, we conservatively allocate a large number of write-enabled machines so that their average utilization is low.

Figure 10 shows the frequency of the different types of operations on a read-only and a write-enabled Store machine. Note that we see peak photo uploads on Sunday and Monday, with a smooth drop the rest of the week until we level out on Thursday to Saturday. Then a new Sunday arrives and we hit a new weekly peak. In general our footprint grows by 0.2% to 0.5% per day.

As noted in Section 3, write operations to the Store are always multi-writes on production machines to amortize the fixed cost of write operations. Finding groups of images is fairly straightforward since 4 different sizes of each photo is stored in Haystack. It is also common for users to upload a batch of photos into




Figure 10: Rate of different operations on two Haystack Store machines: One read-only and the other write-enabled.

a photo album. As a combination of these two factors, the average number of images written per multi-write for this write-enabled machine is 9.27.

Section 4.1.2 explained that both read and delete rates are high for recently uploaded photos and drop over time. This behavior can be also be observed in Figure 10; the write-enabled boxes see many more requests (even though some of the read traffic is served by the Cache).

Another trend worth noting: as more data gets written to write-enabled boxes the volume of photos increases, resulting in an increase in the read request rate.

Figure 11 shows the latency of read and multi-write operations on the same two machines as Figure 10 over the same period.

The latency of multi-write operations is fairly low (between 1 and 2 milliseconds) and stable even as the volume of traffic varies dramatically. Haystack ma-




Figure 11: Average latency of Read and Multi-write operations on the two Haystack Store machines in Figure 10 over the same 3 week period.

chines have a NVRAM-backed raid controller which buffers writes for us. As described in Section 3, the NVRAM allows us to write needles asynchronously and then issue a single fsync to flush the volume file once the multi-write is complete. Multi-write latencies are very flat and stable.

The latency of reads on a read-only box is also fairly stable even as the volume of traffic varies significantly (up to 3x over the 3 week period). For a write-enabled box the read performance is impacted by three primary factors. First, as the number of photos stored on the machine increases, the read traffic to that machine also increases (compare week-over-week traffic in figure 10). Second, photos on write-enabled machines are cached in the Cache while they are not cached for a read-only machine<sup>3</sup>. This suggests that the buffer cache would be more effective for a read-only machine. Third, recently written photos are usually read back immediately because Facebook highlights recent content. Such reads on Write-enabled boxes will always hit in the buffer cache and improve the hit rate of the buffer cache. The shape of the line in the figure is the result of a combination of these three factors.

The CPU utilization on the Store machines is low. CPU idle time varies between 92-96%.

## 5 Related Work

To our knowledge, Haystack targets a new design point focusing on the long tail of photo requests seen by a

<sup>3</sup>Note that for traffic coming through a CDN, they are cached in the CDNs and not in the Cache in both instances

large social networking website.

**Filesystems** Haystack takes after log-structured filesystems [23] which Rosenblum and Ousterhout designed to optimize write throughput with the idea that most reads could be served out of cache. While measurements [3] and simulations [6] have shown that log-structured filesystems have not reached their full potential in local filesystems, the core ideas are very relevant to Haystack. Photos are appended to physical volume files in the Haystack Store and the Haystack Cache shelters write-enabled machines from being overwhelmed by the request rate for recently uploaded data. The key differences are (a) that the Haystack Store machines write their data in such a way that they can efficiently serve reads once they become read-only and (b) the read request rate for older data decreases over time.

Several works [8, 19, 28] have proposed how to manage small files and metadata more efficiently. The common thread across these contributions is how to group related files and metadata together intelligently. Haystack obviates these problems since it maintains metadata in main memory and users often upload related photos in bulk.

**Object-based storage** Haystack’s architecture shares many similarities with object storage systems proposed by Gibson et al. [10] in Network-Attached Secure Disks (NASD). The Haystack Directory and Store are perhaps most similar to the File and Storage Manager concepts, respectively, in NASD that separate the logical storage units from the physical ones. In OBFS [25], Wang et al. build a user-level object-based filesystem that is  $\frac{1}{25^{th}}$  the size of XFS. Although OBFS achieves greater write throughput than XFS, its read throughput (Haystack’s main concern) is slightly worse.

**Managing metadata** Weil et al. [26, 27] address scaling metadata management in Ceph, a petabyte-scale object store. Ceph further decouples the mapping from logical units to physical ones by introducing generating functions instead of explicit mappings. Clients can *calculate* the appropriate metadata rather than look it up. Implementing this technique in Haystack remains future work. Hendricks et. al [13] observe that traditional metadata pre-fetching algorithms are less effective for object stores because related objects, which are identified by a unique number, lack the semantic groupings that directories implicitly impose. Their solution is to embed inter-object relationships into the object id. This idea is orthogonal to Haystack as Facebook explicitly stores these semantic relationships as part of the social

graph. In Spyglass [15], Leung et al. propose a design for quickly and scalably searching through metadata of large-scale storage systems. Manber and Wu also propose a way to search through entire filesystems in GLIMPSE [17]. Patil et al. [20] use a sophisticated algorithm in GIGA+ to manage the metadata associated with billions of files per directory. We engineered a simpler solution than many existing works as Haystack does not have to provide search features nor traditional UNIX filesystem semantics.

**Distributed filesystems** Haystack’s notion of a logical volume is similar to Lee and Thekkath’s [14] *virtual disks* in Petal. The Boxwood project [16] explores using high-level data structures as the foundation for storage. While compelling for more complicated algorithms, abstractions like B-trees may not have high impact on Haystack’s intentionally lean interface and semantics. Similarly, Sinfonia’s [1] *mini-transactions* and PNUTS’s [5] database functionality provide more features and stronger guarantees than Haystack needs. Ghemawat et al. [9] designed the Google File System for a workload consisting mostly of append operations and large sequential reads. Bigtable [4] provides a storage system for structured data and offers database-like features for many of Google’s projects. It is unclear whether many of these features make sense in a system optimized for photo storage.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper describes Haystack, an object storage system designed for Facebook’s Photos application. We designed Haystack to serve the long tail of requests seen by sharing photos in a large social network. The key insight is to avoid disk operations when accessing metadata. Haystack provides a fault-tolerant and simple solution to photo storage at dramatically less cost and higher throughput than a traditional approach using NAS appliances. Furthermore, Haystack is incrementally scalable, a necessary quality as our users upload hundreds of millions of photos each week.

## References

- [1] M. K. Aguilera, A. Merchant, M. Shah, A. Veitch, and C. Karmanolis. Sinfonia: a new paradigm for building scalable distributed systems. In *SOSP '07: Proceedings of twenty-first ACM SIGOPS symposium on Operating systems principles*, pages 159–174, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [2] Akamai. <http://www.akamai.com/>.
- [3] M. G. Baker, J. H. Hartman, M. D. Kupfer, K. W. Shirriff, and J. K. Ousterhout. Measurements of a distributed file system. In *Proc. 13th SOSP*, pages 198–212, 1991.
- [4] F. Chang, J. Dean, S. Ghemawat, W. C. Hsieh, D. A. Wallach, M. Burrows, T. Chandra, A. Fikes, and R. E. Gruber. Bigtable: A distributed storage system for structured data. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 26(2):1–26, 2008.
- [5] B. F. Cooper, R. Ramakrishnan, U. Srivastava, A. Silberstein, P. Bohannon, H.-A. Jacobsen, N. Puz, D. Weaver, and R. Yerneni. Pnuts: Yahoo!’s hosted data serving platform. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 1(2):1277–1288, 2008.
- [6] M. Dahlin, R. Wang, T. Anderson, and D. Patterson. Cooperative Caching: Using Remote Client Memory to Improve File System Performance. In *Proceedings of the First Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, pages 267–280, Nov 1994.
- [7] M. Factor, K. Meth, D. Naor, O. Rodeh, and J. Satran. Object storage: the future building block for storage systems. In *LGDI '05: Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE International Symposium on Mass Storage Systems and Technology*, pages 119–123, Washington, DC, USA, 2005. IEEE Computer Society.
- [8] G. R. Ganger and M. F. Kaashoek. Embedded inodes and explicit grouping: exploiting disk bandwidth for small files. In *ATEC '97: Proceedings of the annual conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pages 1–1, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1997. USENIX Association.
- [9] S. Ghemawat, H. Gobioff, and S.-T. Leung. The google file system. In *Proc. 19th SOSP*, pages 29–43. ACM Press, 2003.
- [10] G. A. Gibson, D. F. Nagle, K. Amiri, J. Butler, F. W. Chang, H. Gobioff, C. Hardin, E. Riedel, D. Rochberg, and J. Zelenka. A cost-effective, high-bandwidth storage architecture. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, 32(5):92–103, 1998.
- [11] The hadoop project. <http://hadoop.apache.org/>.
- [12] S. He and D. Feng. Design of an object-based storage device based on i/o processor. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, 42(6):30–35, 2008.
- [13] J. Hendricks, R. R. Sambasivan, S. Sinnamohideen, and G. R. Ganger. Improving small file performance in object-based storage. Technical Report 06-104, Parallel Data Laboratory, Carnegie Mellon University, 2006.
- [14] E. K. Lee and C. A. Thekkath. Petal: distributed virtual disks. In *ASPLOS-VII: Proceedings of the seventh international conference on Architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, pages 84–92, New York, NY, USA, 1996. ACM.
- [15] A. W. Leung, M. Shao, T. Bisson, S. Pasupathy, and E. L. Miller. Spyglass: fast, scalable metadata search for large-scale storage systems. In *FAST '09: Proceedings of the 7th conference on File and storage technologies*, pages 153–166, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2009. USENIX Association.
- [16] J. MacCormick, N. Murphy, M. Najork, C. A. Thekkath, and L. Zhou. Boxwood: abstractions as the foundation for storage infrastructure. In *OSDI'04: Proceedings of the 6th conference on Symposium on Operating Systems Design & Implementation*, pages 8–8, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2004. USENIX Association.
- [17] U. Manber and S. Wu. Glimpse: a tool to search through entire file systems. In *WTEC'94: Proceedings of the USENIX Winter 1994 Technical Conference on USENIX Winter 1994 Technical Conference*, pages 4–4, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1994. USENIX Association.
- [18] memcache. <http://memcached.org/>.
- [19] S. J. Mullender and A. S. Tanenbaum. Immediate files. *Softw. Pract. Exper.*, 14(4):365–368, 1984.

- [20] S. V. Patil, G. A. Gibson, S. Lang, and M. Polte. Giga+: scalable directories for shared file systems. In *PDSW '07: Proceedings of the 2nd international workshop on Petascale data storage*, pages 26–29, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [21] Posix. <http://standards.ieee.org/regauth/posix/>.
- [22] Randomio. <http://members.optusnet.com.au/clausen/ideas/randomio/index.html>.
- [23] M. Rosenblum and J. K. Ousterhout. The design and implementation of a log-structured file system. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 10(1):26–52, 1992.
- [24] A. Sweeney, D. Doucette, W. Hu, C. Anderson, M. Nishimoto, and G. Peck. Scalability in the xfs file system. In *ATEC '96: Proceedings of the 1996 annual conference on USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pages 1–1, Berkeley, CA, USA, 1996. USENIX Association.
- [25] F. Wang, S. A. Brandt, E. L. Miller, and D. D. E. Long. Obfs: A file system for object-based storage devices. In *In Proceedings of the 21st IEEE / 12TH NASA Goddard Conference on Mass Storage Systems and Technologies*, pages 283–300, 2004.
- [26] S. A. Weil, S. A. Brandt, E. L. Miller, D. D. E. Long, and C. Maltzahn. Ceph: a scalable, high-performance distributed file system. In *OSDI '06: Proceedings of the 7th symposium on Operating systems design and implementation*, pages 307–320, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2006. USENIX Association.
- [27] S. A. Weil, K. T. Pollack, S. A. Brandt, and E. L. Miller. Dynamic metadata management for petabyte-scale file systems. In *SC '04: Proceedings of the 2004 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, page 4, Washington, DC, USA, 2004. IEEE Computer Society.
- [28] Z. Zhang and K. Ghose. hfs: a hybrid file system prototype for improving small file and metadata performance. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.*, 41(3):175–187, 2007.