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Introduction

Non-determinism

- Multiprocessor architectures are inherently non-deterministic
- The lack of reproducibility complicates software debugging, security analysis, and fault tolerance
Introduction

Deterministic Replay

- Gives computer users the ability to travel backward in time, recreating past states and events
- Checkpoint + Record all non-deterministic events

![Diagram of Deterministic Replay Process](image)
Deterministic Replay for Multi-processor

- Deterministic replay for single processor is relatively mature and well-developed
- Challenge on the multi-processor systems: Memory Access Interleaving
Background & Motivation

Hardware-based schemes

- Use special hardware support for recording memory access interleaving
- Redesign the cache coherence protocol

The FDR System [ISCA ’03]
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Hardware-based schemes

- Use special hardware support for recording memory access interleaving
- Redesign the cache coherence protocol

Issues

- Increase the complexity of the circuits, impractical for use in real systems
- Huge space overhead which limits the duration of the recorded interval
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Software-only schemes

- Modify OS, compiler, runtime libraries or VMM
- Virtualization-based approaches -- CREW protocol
- CREW: Concurrent-Read & Exclusive-Write

```
P0: 23 → P1: 5
P0: 24 → P1: 6
P1: 5 → P0: 25
P0: 25 → P1: 8
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Background & Motivation

Software-only schemes

- Modify OS, compiler, runtime libraries or VMM
- Virtualization-based approaches -- CREW protocol
- CREW: Concurrent-Read & Exclusive-Write

Issues

- Each memory access operation must be checked for logging before execution
- Serious performance degradation (about 10x compared to the native execution)
- Huge log sizes (approximately 1 MB/processor/second)
To summarize

- Software-only schemes are inefficient without proper hardware support
- No commodity processor with dedicated hardware-based record and replay capability
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To summarize

- Software-only schemes are inefficient without proper hardware support
- No commodity processor with dedicated hardware-based record and replay capability

Our goal

- To implement a software approach that can take full advantages of the latest hardware features in commodity processors to record and replay memory access interleaving efficiently without introducing any hardware modifications.
- Hardware-assisted virtualization (HAV) (e.g., Intel® Virtualization Technology)
Point-to-point logging approach (CREW protocol)

- Record dependences between pairs of instructions → Huge logs
- Large number of memory access detections (VM exit) → Excessive overhead

Record & Replay Memory Interleaving with HAV
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Point-to-point logging approach (CREW protocol)
- Record dependences between pairs of instructions
- Large number of memory access detections (VM exit)

Chunk-based Strategy
- Restrict processors’ execution into a series of chunks
- Record chunk size & commit order
- Chunk execution must satisfy:
  - Atomicity
  - Serializability

- Huge logs
- Excessive overhead
- **Serializability**: Conflict detection, Chunk commit
- **Atomicity**: Copy-on-write (COW), Rollback
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Obtain R&W-set Efficiently via HAV Extensions

- VM-based approaches: numerous VM exits (hardware page protection)
- Accessed and Dirty Flags of EPT (Extended Page Tables)
- Our approach: a simple EPT traversal
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Obtain R&W-set Efficiently via HAV Extensions

- VM-based approaches: numerous VM exits (hardware page protection)
- Accessed and Dirty Flags of EPT (Extended Page Tables)
- Our approach: a simple EPT traversal
Partial traversal of EPT

- EPT uses a hierarchical, tree-based design
- If the accessed flag of one internal entry is 0, then the accessed flags of all entries in its subtrees are guaranteed to be 0
- Locality of reference (just need to traverse a tiny part of EPT)
Observations

- Chunk commit is time-consuming
- Wait for lock
- Write-back operation
Decentralized Three-Phase Commit Protocol

- Move this out of the synchronized block
- Support parallel commit while ensuring serializability
- Three phases:
  - Pre-commit phase
  - Commit phase
  - Synchronization phase
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Replay Memory Interleaving

- Guarantee all chunks will be properly re-built and executed in the original order
- Design goal: maintain the same parallelism as the recoding phase
  - 1. Truncate a chunk at the recorded timestamp
  - 2. Ensure that all preceding chunks have been committed successfully before the current chunk starts
Samsara Overview

Virtual Machine
- Windows Applications
- Windows

Virtual Machine
- Linux Applications
- Linux

QEMU Controller
- DMA Recorder

QEMU Controller
- DMA Recorder

Log Record Daemon

Linux Applications

KVM
- Record and Replay Component
  - Memory Interleaving Recorder

x86 with Hardware-assisted Virtualization
Evaluation

Experimental Setup

- 4-core Intel Core i7-4790 processor, 12GB memory, 1TB Hard Drive
- Host: Ubuntu 12.04 with Linux kernel version 3.11.0 and Qemu-1.2.2
- Guest: Ubuntu 14.04 with Linux kernel version 3.13.1

Workloads

- Computation intensive applications
  - PARSEC
  - SPLASH-2
- I/O intensive applications
  - kernel-build
  - pbzip2
Evaluation

Log Size

- Samsara generates log at an average rate of 0.0027 MB/core/s and 0.0031 MB/core/s for recording two and four cores.
- Reduces the log file size by 98.6% compared to the previous software-only schemes.

![Log size produced by Samsara during recording (compressed with gzip).](image-url)
Evaluation

The proportion of each type of non-deterministic events

- The size of the chunk commit order log is practically negligible compared with other non-deterministic events
- 9.36% with two cores and 19.31% with four cores on average

The proportion of each type of nondeterministic events in a log file (without compression).
Evaluation

Recording Overhead Compared to Native Execution

- Compare the performance to native execution
- 2.3X and 4.1X for recording these workloads on two and four cores
- Previous software-only approaches cause about 10X with two cores

Recording overhead compared to the native execution.
Conclusion

We made the first attempt to leverage HAV extensions to achieve an efficient software-based replay system on commodity multiprocessors.

- We abandon the inefficient CREW protocol and instead use a chunk-based strategy.

- We avoid all memory access detections, and obtain each chunk’s read-set and write-set by retrieving the accessed and the dirty flags of the EPT.

- We propose a decentralized three-phase commit protocol which significantly reduces the performance overhead by allowing chunk commits in parallel while still ensuring serializability.
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