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Background

• Data Deduplication
  • Several steps
  • Container-based I/O

• Backup storage
  • Achieving about 10X-30X deduplication ratio
  • Workload: successive snapshots of the primary data

• Deduplication & Locality
  • Common chunks are shared
  • Locality of backups is broken
Background

- Fragmentation problem
  - Read amplification
  - Random access
  - Garbage collection

2X read amplification!
Related Work

• Rewrite techniques
  • Rewrite some duplicates according to their ‘fragmentation degree’ to maintain a level of data locality
  • CBR(Kaczmarczyk@SYSTOR’12)
  • Capping(Lillibridge@FAST’13)
  • HAR(Fu@ATC’14)

• Fragment problem is alleviated with huge cost
  • Read amplification remains 2X – 4X
  • Deduplication ratio is sacrificed (10%~40%)
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• How read amplification is generated?
  • Container-based I/O
  • Layout of chunks is the key issue
  • Chunks in containers have different lifecycles

• How to avoid read amplification?
  • Chunks in containers have the same lifecycle
  • Classifying chunks with their lifecycle into categories
  • Each category maps to a container

• But…
  • The amount of categories will be very large!!
  • Up to $2^n - 1$, unacceptable (n is the number of backups)
Observation & Motivation

• How to reduce the number of categories.
• We denote four kinds of chunks in a backup version $B_i$ as follows:
  • **Internal duplicate chunks**: exist identical chunks in $B_i$.
  • **Adjacent duplicate chunks**: exist identical chunks in $B_{i-1}$.
  • **Skip duplicate chunks**: exist identical chunks in $B_{i-2}$, $B_{i-3}$, or ....
  • **Unique chunks**: no identical chunks.
• Avoiding deduplicating Skip chunks slightly impacts deduplication ratio.
• The number of categories will be reduced to $n(n + 1)/2$.

![Figure 2: Distribution of four kinds of chunks on four backup datasets. Skip duplicate chunks are the least common.](image-url)
Remaining Challenges

- We create a feasible chunk layout of deduplicated data with no read amplification.
- How to acquire and keep this kind of chunk layout?
  - Reorganizing all chunks after each backup written is costly.
  - Mathematical-induction-like approach is considered.
Our approach

• Our approach implements iterative evolution of our classification-based chunk layout.
• Two techniques
  • Neighbor-Duplicate-Focus indexing
  • Across-Version-Aware Reorganization
• No read amplification in restoring
• Completely eliminates garbage collection (mark-sweep)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backup1</th>
<th>Chunk1</th>
<th>Chunk2</th>
<th>Chunk3</th>
<th>Chunk4</th>
<th>Chunk5</th>
<th>Chunk6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Natural classification-based layout, do not require arranging.
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Backup1's Fingerprint is already useless, release it.
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![Diagram showing backup categories and chunk lifecycle]

- **Backup 1**
  - Chunk1
  - Chunk2
  - Chunk3
  - Chunk4
  - Chunk5
  - Chunk6

- **Backup 2**
  - Chunk1
  - Chunk2' (Backup2's fingerprint)
  - Chunk3'
  - Chunk4'
  - Chunk5'
  - Chunk6

- **Active**
  - Cat. (2,2)
    - Chunk2'
    - Chunk3'
    - Chunk4'
    - Chunk5'

- **Active**
  - Cat. (1,2)
    - Chunk1

- **Archived**
  - Cat. (1,1)
    - Chunk2
    - Chunk3
    - Chunk4
    - Chunk5

**Volume 1: Archived Categories for Backup 1**

Iterative Evolution

Cat. (i,j) contains all chunks whose lifecycle is from Bi to Bj.

Start storing Backup3
Iterative Evolution

Cat.\((i,j)\) contains all chunks whose lifecycle is from \(B_i\) to \(B_j\)

Volume 1: Archived Categories for Backup 1

- Archived Cat. (1,1)
  - Chunk2
  - Chunk3
  - Chunk4
  - Chunk5

Backup 1

- Chunk1
- Chunk2
- Chunk3
- Chunk4
- Chunk5
- Chunk6

Backup 2

- Chunk1
- Chunk2'
- Chunk3'
- Chunk4'
- Chunk5'
- Chunk6

Backup 2's Fingerprint

Active Cat. (2,2)

- Chunk2'
- Chunk3'
- Chunk4'
- Chunk5'

Active Cat. (1,2)

- Chunk1
- Chunk6
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Backup1
- Chunk1
- Chunk2
- Chunk3
- Chunk4
- Chunk5
- Chunk6

Backup2
- Chunk1
- Chunk2'
- Chunk3'
- Chunk4'
- Chunk5'
- Chunk6

Backup3
- Chunk1
- Chunk2
- Chunk3''
- Chunk4''
- Chunk5''
- Chunk6

Backup2's Fingerprint is already useless, release it.

Backup3's Fingerprint

Active Cat. (2,2)
- Chunk2'
- Chunk3'
- Chunk4'
- Chunk5'

Active Cat. (3,3)
- Chunk3''
- Chunk4''
- Chunk5''

Active Cat. (1,2)
- Chunk1
- Chunk6

Volume 1: Archived Categories for Backup 1

Archived Cat. (1,1)
- Chunk2
- Chunk3
- Chunk4
- Chunk5

Archived Cat. (1,1)
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Volume 1: Archived Categories for Backup 1

Archived Cat. (1,1)
- Chunk2
- Chunk3
- Chunk4
- Chunk5

Active Cat. (1,2)
- Chunk1
- Chunk6

Active Cat. (2,2)

Backup3's Fingerprint

Active Cat. (3,3)

Active Cat. (1,2)
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Restore backups

- If $n$ backup versions stored, required categories are always in $n$ sequences.
- Required Cat. $= \{\text{Cat.}(i, j)\}$, where $1 \leq i \leq k \leq j \leq n$
  $$= \bigcup_{j=k}^{n} \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} \text{Cat.}(i, j)$$
- No read amplification
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- If \( n \) backup versions stored, required categories are always in \( n \) sequences.
- Required Cat. = \{Cat.(i, j)\}, where \( 1 \leq i \leq k \leq j \leq n \)
  \[ = \bigcup_{j=k}^{n} \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} \text{Cat.}(i, j) \]
- No read amplification
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- Deleting Backup k means reclaiming all unique chunks of Backup k
- FIFO deletion: simply delete the earliest category
- Out-of-order deletion
  - Truncating corresponding Volume to remove the category which storing unique chunks of Backup k
Evaluations

- Storage is divided into backup space (HDD) and user space (SSD).
- Tested datasets are backed up from the user space to the backup space version by version while the restore runs in the reverse direction.
- Retaining the most recent 20 versions.

Table 1: Four backup datasets used in evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Total Size Before Dedup</th>
<th>Versions</th>
<th>Workload Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEB</td>
<td>269 GB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Backup snapshots of website: news.sina.com, captured from June to September in 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHM</td>
<td>279 GB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Source codes of Chromium project from v82.0.4066 to v85.0.4165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMS</td>
<td>1.55 TB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Backups of an Ubuntu 12.04 Virtual Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYN</td>
<td>1.38 TB</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Synthetic backups by simulating file create/delete/modify operations [36]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluations: Actual Deduplication Ratio

• Actual Deduplication Ratio is defined as  \( \frac{\text{Total Size of the Dataset}}{\text{Size after Running an Approach}} \).  

• The storage cost of rewriting techniques, not perfect garbage collections, and other issues are considered.  

• CMA means the laziest GC strategy, and PGC means the greediest GC strategy, and they give two kinds of extreme impacts of GC.

Figure 7: Actual Deduplication Ratio of MF Dedup and five approaches running on four datasets (retaining 20 backups).
Evaluations: Restore Performance (Metric)

- Speed factor is not feasible, we extend it to two metrics
  - Seek Factor
  - Read Amplification Factor
- MFDedup’s Seek Factor is always to be 20.
  - The number of retained backup versions.
- Because of internal duplicate chunks, MFDedup’s Read Amplification Factor could be smaller than 1.

![Graphs showing seek factor and read amplification factor for WEB and VMS datasets.](image)
Evaluations: Restore Performance (Speed)

- `fread()` denotes sequential throughput of the backup device.
- According to the share of internal chunks in datasets, MFDedup nearly completely utilize the performance of storage devices.
Q & A

• Thanks for listening

• Our code is available at https://github.com/Borelset/MFDedup/

• Email: xiangyu.zou@hotmail.com