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Roadmap

• Transactional Memories (TM)

• Distributed Transactional Memories (DTM)

• Data Replication in DTM
  – State of the Art of transactional replication
  – new challenges of DTM...
  – ...and two new protocols:
    • Asynchronous Lease Certification
    • Speculative Transaction Replications
The era of free performance gains is over

• Over the last 30 years:
  • new CPU generation = free speed-up

• Since 2003:
  • CPU clock speed plateaued...
  • but Moore’s law chase continues:
    • Multi-cores, Hyperthreading...

**FUTURE IS PARALLEL**
Multicore Software Scaling

Unfortunately, not so simple…
Real-World Multicore Scaling

Parallelization and Synchronization require great care...
Coarse grained parallelism? 
**simple but does not scale**

Amdahl’s Law:

\[
\text{Speedup} = \frac{1}{(\text{ParallelPart}/N + \text{SequentialPart})}
\]

Pay for N = 128 cores

\[
\text{SequentialPart} = 25\%
\]

As num cores grows the effect of 25% becomes more acute

2.3/4, 2.9/8, 3.4/16, 3.7/32…..
Fine grained parallelism? easier to say than to do

• Simple grained locking is a **conundrum:**
  – need to reason about deadlocks, livelocks, priority inversions:
    • complex/undocumented lock acquisition protocols
    • scarce composability of existing software modules

  ... and a **verification nightmare:**
    • subtle bugs that are extremely hard to reproduce

• Make parallel programming **accessible to the masses!**
Transactional memories

• Key idea:
  – hide away synchronization issues from the programmer
  – replace locks with atomic transactions:
    • avoid deadlocks, priority inversions, convoysing
    • way simpler to reason about, verify, compose
    • deliver performance of hand-crafted locking via speculation (+HW support)

• Brief historic overview:
  – Original idea dating back to early 90s
  – Today among the most relevant research topics in the areas of:
    • Computer architecture
    • Programming Languages
    • Operating Systems
    • Distributed Computing

  \[\text{STRICT} \quad \text{INTERDISCIPLINARITY}\]
TMs: where we are, challenges, trends

- Theoretical Aspects
  - formalization of adequate consistency guarantees, performance bounds

- Software-based implementations (STM)
  - performance/scalability improving, but overhead still unsatisfactory

- Hardware support
  - very promising simulation-based results, but no support in commercial processors

- Language integration
  - advanced supports (parallel nesting, conditional synchronization) are appearing...
  - ...but lack of standard APIs & tools hampers industrial penetration

- Operating system support
  - still in its infancy, but badly needed (conflict aware scheduling, transactional I/O)

- Recent trends:
  - shift towards distributed environments to enhance scalability & dependability
Distributed
Transactional Memories
An obvious evolution

• Real, complex STM based applications are starting to appear:
  – Apache Web Server
  – FenixEDU
  – Circuit Routing
  – ...

• ...and are being faced with classic production environment’s challenges:
  – scalability
  – high-availability
  – fault-tolerance

Distributed STMs
Distributed STMs

- At the convergence of two main areas:
  - >70% xacts are 10-100 times shorter:
    - larger impact of coordination

2. Boost performance by batching any remote synchronization during the commit phase
   unique, challenging requirements!
Existing Distributed STMs

• Very recent research area....
• Only a handful of existing prototypes:
  – DMV [PPoPP, 2006]
  – DiSTM [ICPP, 2008]
  – ClusterSTM [PPoPP, 2008]
Classic Synchronous Transactional Replication Schemes

**Single-master schemes:**
- primary runs all write xacts and propagates updates to backups
- backups exec read-only xacts

+ *simple*
- scales poorly with write intensive workloads

**Multi-master schemes:**
- all replicas can process both read&write xacts
- locks are acquired during xact’s execution or at commit time
- 2PC ensures agreement on the outcome of conflicting transactions (and their atomicity)

+ better load balancing & scalability
- high latency for intra-transaction lock acquisition
- distributed deadlocks grow cubically with #nodes:
  - 10x incr. nodes $\rightarrow$ 1000x incr. deadlocks
Atomic Broadcast-based Transactional Replication Schemes

• Multi-master schemes:
  – no intra-transaction coordination
  – rely on Atomic Broadcast (AB) rather than 2PC:
    • deadlock-freedom schemes
    • AB is (1 comm. step) faster than 2PC

• AB ensures:
  1. agreement on set of received messages:
    • all or none (correct) processes deliver a message
  2. agreement on the order of message delivery
  3. no blocking scenarios despite process crashes
A Conventional AB-based Replication Scheme
“Non-voting Certification Protocol”

- No communication overhead during xact execution:
  - one AB per xact

- No distributed deadlocks
Performance of AB-based replication schemes (database world)

Figure 4: Equiprobable accesses

Figure 5: Hot spots
• In STMs, transactions are often 10-100 times smaller than in DBs:
  – the cost of AB is correspondingly amplified

• Optimistic scheme subject to risk of high abort rate:
  – a posteriori certification
  – transactions might be indefinitely aborted, e.g. long xact VS stream of smaller xacts
Boosting STM’s Replication

• I’ll overview two recently proposed techniques:
  – Asynchronous Lease Certification (ALC)[Middleware2010]
  – Speculative Transactional Replication (STR)
    [SPAA2010/ISPA2010]

• ALC and STR pursue the same goal:

• ...though leveraging on antithetic approaches!
joint work with Nuno Carvalho and Luís Rodrigues
Key intuition

• Exploit data access locality by letting replicas dynamically establish *ownership* of memory regions:
  – replace AB with faster coordination primitives:
    • no need to establish serialization order among non-conflicting transactions
  – shelter transactions from remote conflicts

• Data ownership established by acquiring an *Asynchronous Lease*
  – mutual exclusion abstraction, as in classic leases...
  – ...but detached from the notion of time:
    • implementable in a partially synchronous system
Protocol’s overview

• Transactions are locally processed

• At commit, replicas checks if a lease on the accessed data is already owned:
  – NO
    1. an Asynchronous Lease is established
    2. the transaction is locally validated
    3. if validation succeeds, its writeset is propagated using Uniform Reliable Broadcast (URB):
      – no ordering guarantee, 30-60% faster than AB
    4. if validation fails, upon re-execution the node holds the lease:
      – xact cannot be aborted due to a remote conflict!
  – YES
    • as above, but from point 2.
Asynchronous Lease Establishment
Basic Protocol

Simple but sloppy:
If a node doesn’t own a lease, it incurs in the latency of 1 AB + 2 URB to commit a xact
Asynchronous Lease Establishment
Optimized Protocol

(Basic)

(Optimization 1)

(Optimization 2)
Benefits of ALC

• If applications exhibit some access locality:
  – avoid, or reduce frequency of, AB
  – locality enhanceable via conflict-aware load balancing

• Ensure transactions are aborted at most once due to remote conflicts:
  – essential to ensure liveness of long running transactions
  – benefic at high contention rate even with small running transactions
**Synthetic “Best case” scenario**

- Replicas accessing distinct memory regions

![Graph showing throughput versus number of replicas for ALC and CERT]
Synthetic “Worst case” scenario

- All replicas accessing the same memory region

On av. $\approx 3x$ speedup due to reduced abort abort rate
Lee Benchmark

- Complex application with diverse workload:
  - both long and short running transactions

- long running transactions subject to livelock:
  - aborted up to 10 times
Speculative Transational Replication

joint work with R. Palmieri, F. Quaglia, N. Carvalho and L. Rodrigues
Beyond certification mechanisms

• Certification schemes achieve no overlapping between transaction processing and replica coordination:
  – AB is started only after transaction ends!

• Can’t we do any better to minimize the coordination costs?
YES WE CAN!

• Using optimistic deliveries + state machine:
  – messages are received from the network long before their final order is established by the AB

1. AB incoming transactions and execute on all nodes:
   • RPC-like execution fashion of the xacts

2. start processing as soon as a xact is opt-delivered
   + overlapping between processing & communication

Certification Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processing</th>
<th>AB (rs&amp;ws)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Speculative Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB (xact req)</th>
<th>Processing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Easier to say than to do....

1. in STM transactions can be VERY small!!

...much ado for nothing!
Easier to say than to do....

2. This only works if transactions execute deterministically at all replicas

- classic concurrency controls (e.g. 2PL) are not deterministic
- existing solutions have several key limitations:
  - a-priori knowledge of readssets/writesets:
    - may force to large conflict over-estimation
  - acquire **ALL** locks as xact begins
    - way more pessimistic than classic 2PL

![Diagram showing transaction execution and concurrency issues](image-url)
3. Vulnerable to mismatches between final and optimistic delivery orders!
Don’t be pessimistic... be speculative!

Speculatively explore multiple Serialization Orders (SO)
+ SO can grow factorially with n-logs n, yet finally activities
  + commute from nest to seek every existing
  + SO in which a user observes distinct snapshots depends on actual conflict graph
Problem formalization: Optimal STR protocol

$\Sigma = \{T_1, ..., T_n\}$: set of Opt-delivered, but not yet TO-delivered, transactions

$\Sigma' = \{T_1^1, ..., T_k^1, ..., T_n^1, ..., T_n^m\}$: set of fully executed speculative transactions

An optimal STR protocol must guarantee:

**Consistency:** each speculative xact is view-serializable

**Non-redundancy:** no two speculative xacts observe the same snapshot

**Completeness:** if system is quiescent (stops Opt- and TO-delivering messages)
then, for every permutation $\pi(\Sigma)$ of $\Sigma$ and for every $T_i$ in $\Sigma$, eventually there is a $T_i^j$ in $\pi(\Sigma)$ that has observed the same snapshot generated by sequentially executing all the transactions preceding $T_i$.

Filters out trivial solutions that blindly enumerate all permutations of $\Sigma$

Shelters from any mismatch between optimistic and final delivery order
An Optimal STR Protocol
Core Technical Challenge

• Design a provably optimal speculative concurrency control:
  • online algorithm driving the dynamic generation of speculative transactions based on conflict patterns

• Key Idea:
  • each speculative xact maintains a Speculative Polygraph (SP)
    • keeps track of conflicts developed with other xacts
    • embeds a family of digraphs, each associated with an equivalent serialization order for the transaction
    • unlike traditional polygraphs accommodate for the coexistence of non-conciliable speculative transactions
Performance speed-up
(20% reordering, only one SO explored)
**ALC vs STR**

Bridle concurrency to exploit lighter synchronization schemes & reduce conflict

- higher scalability with less intensive processing and work
- update dependencies are possibly large (writeset)
- no overhead of contention
- efficient with better locality
- can generate larger messages (least requests / writeset)
- doesn’t work for long running transactions

Overlap comm. & proc. via speculation, reduce abort via redundant computation

- by all replicas and can be intensive
- updates’ dependencies is small and can be expensive
- optimized for different workloads

**NO ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL SOLUTION!**
Conclusions & Future work

• Overhead of conventional transactional replication schemes is strongly amplified in STMs

• ALC & STR:
  – up to 10x performance boost via antithetic approaches
  – optimized for different workloads

• Future work:
  – Workload-driven adaptive replication
  – Partial replication
  – Deployment on elastic cloud computing platforms
Thanks for the attention

Q&A
Serialization Orders per transaction
Optimal protocol VS Blind speculation

Simulation study based on real (STM) workloads:

Optimal STR scheme: #SOs≈[2.5-5] with 15 opt-delivered xacts
Blind enumeration: #SOs≈1,000,000 with 10 opt-delivered xacts
BACKUP SLIDES
Atomic Broadcast – how expensive?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>protocol</th>
<th>resilience</th>
<th># comm. steps</th>
<th># msgs.</th>
<th># forced writes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sequencer based AB (i)</td>
<td>Blocking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n+1</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Phase Commit</td>
<td>Blocking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencer based AB(ii)</td>
<td>Non-blocking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three phase commit</td>
<td>Non-blocking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cloud-TM Kick-off Meeting – Atomic Broadcast Based Replication Schemes

45
An optimal STR Protocol
Classic Polygraphs

- $P=(N,A,B)$
  - $N$: set of vertexes, one per xact
  - $A$: set of edges $(T_i \rightarrow T_j)$ tracking read-from relationships
    - $T_i$: $w(x_i)$
    - $T_j$: $r(x_i)$
  - $B$: set of bipaths $<(T_k \rightarrow T_i),(T_j \rightarrow T_i)>$ serializing two writers with respect to a reader

- $P$ is associated with a family of directed graphs, called $D(P)$
  
  A history $H$ is view serializable iff exists an acyclic direct graph in $D(P(H))$
Polygraphs don’t work with speculative histories!

$T_1$: $w(x)$ $w(y)$
$T_2$: $w(y)$ $w(z)$
$T_3^0$: $r(x,T_1)$ $r(y,T_1)$ $r(z,T_2)$

equivalent to:
$T_2$ $T_1$ $T_3^0$

$T_3^1$: $r(x,T_1)$ $r(y,T_2)$ $r(z,T_2)$

equivalent to:
$T_2$ $T_1$ $T_3^0$

The classic approach would merge the two above polygraphs, yielding a cycle between $T1$ and $T2$!
Speculative polygraphs (SPs)

Basic intuition:

- keep into account history as perceived by each speculative transaction $T_i^j$
- $\text{SP}(T_i^j)$ selectively merges the polygraphs of speculative transactions $T^*$ s.t.:
  1. $T^*$ conflict, either directly or indirectly, with $T_i^j$
  2. at least a serialization order exists allowing both $T^*$ and $T_i^j$ to exist

$\text{SP}(T_i^j) = (N,A,B)$ where:

- $N$ is a set of vertex, associated with (speculative) transactions
- $A$ is a set of merging edges ($T_r^s \otimes \rightarrow T_i^j$) which merges $\text{SP}(T_r^s)$ and $\text{SP}(T_i^j)$

\[ T_r^s: w(x_r^s) \quad T_i^j: r(x_r^s) \]

- $B$ is a set of asymmetric bipaths denoted as $<(T_u^v \otimes \rightarrow T_i^j), (T_i^j \rightarrow T_u^v)>$

\[ T_r^s: w(x_r^s) \quad T_i^j: r(x_r^s) \]

\[ T_u^v: w(x_u^v) \]
Performance speed-up
(20% reordering, only one SO explored)
Performance evaluation

- Based on fully fledged prototype
- Relies on a state-of-the-art multi-versioned STM for local concurrency regulation
- Permits transparent execution of legacy (distribution agnostic) STM applications