Lecture 13:

Memory Consistency

+ Course-So-Far Review

Parallel Computer Architecture and Programming
CMU 15-418/15-618, Spring 2014

Tunes

Beggin’

Madcon

(So Dark the Con of Man)

“15-418 students tend to underestimate the midterm. We encourage them to study. Well, more than encourage… we’re beggin”

- Yosef Wolde-Mariam

Today: what you should know

- Understand the motivation for relaxed consistency models
- Understand the implications of the total store ordering (TSO) and program consistency (PC) relaxed models

Memory coherence vs. memory consistency

- **Memory coherence defines requirements for the observed behavior of reads and writes to the same memory location**
  - **All processors must agree on the order of reads/writes to X**



- **"Memory consistency" defines the behavior of reads and writes to different locations**
  - **Coherence only guarantees that writes WILL eventually propagate to other processors**
  - **Consistency deals with WHEN writes propagate relative to reads and writes to other variables**

Relaxing memory operation ordering

- A program defines a sequence of loads and stores

- Four types of memory operation orderings
  - W→R: write must complete before subsequent read
  - R→R: read must complete before subsequent read
  - R→W: read must complete before subsequent write
  - W→W: write must complete before subsequent write

- Sequentially consistent memory systems maintain all four memory operation orderings

- Relaxed memory consistency models allow certain orderings to be violated

Sequential consistency

- A parallel system is sequentially consistent if the result of any execution is the same as if all the memory operations were executed in some sequential order, and the memory operations of any one processor are executed in program order.



[Adve and Gharachorloo 95]

Motivation: hiding latency

- **Why are we interested in relaxing ordering requirements?**
  - To gain performance
  - Specifically, hiding memory latency: overlap memory accesses with other operations
  - Remember, memory access in a cache coherent system may entail much more work then simply reading bits from memory (finding data, sending invalidations, etc.)



vs.



Another way of thinking about relaxed ordering

Program order

(dependencies in red: required for sequential consistency)

Thread 1 (on P1)

```
A = 1;
B = 1;
unlock(L);
```

Thread 2 (on P2)

```
lock(L);
x = A;
y = B;
```

"sufficient" order for correctness

(logical dependencies in red)

Thread 1 (on P1)

```
A = 1;
B = 1;
unlock(L);
```

Thread 2 (on P2)

```
lock(L);
x = A;
y = B;
```

An intuitive notion of correct = execution produces the same results as a sequentially consistent system

Allowing reads to move ahead of writes

- Four types of memory operation orderings
  - ~~W→R: write must complete before subsequent read~~
  - R→R: read must complete before subsequent read
  - R→W: read must complete before subsequent write
  - W→W: write must complete before subsequent write

- Allow processor to hide latency of writes
  - Total Store Ordering (TSO)
  - Processor Consistency (PC)

Write buffering example

- **Write buffering is a common processor optimization that allows reads to proceed in front of prior writes**
  - When store is issued, processor buffers store in write buffer (assume store is to address X)
  - Processor immediately begins executing subsequent loads, provided they are not accessing address X (this is ILP in program)
  - Further writes can also be added to write buffer (since write buffer processed in order, there is no W→W reordering)



- **W→R ordering is relaxed**

Allowing reads to move ahead of writes

- Total store ordering (TSO)
  - Processor P can read B before its write to A is seen by all processors (processor can move its own reads in front of its own writes)
  - Reads by other processors cannot return new value of A until the write to A is observed by all processors

- Processor consistency (PC)
  - Any processor can read new value of A before the write is observed by all processors

- In TSO and PC, only W → R order is relaxed. The W → W constraint still exists. Writes by the same thread are not reordered (they occur in program order)

Four example programs

(Assume A and B have value 0 at start of code)

❶

Thread 1 (on P1)	Thread 2 (on P2)
`A = 1;`	`while (flag == 0);`
`flag = 1;`	`print A;`

❷

Thread 1 (on P1)	Thread 2 (on P2)
`A = 1;`	`print B;`
`B = 1;`	`print A;`

❸

Thread 1 (on P1)	Thread 2 (on P2)	Thread 3 (on P3)
`A = 1;`	`while (A == 0);`	`while (B == 0);`
	`B = 1;`	`print A;`

❹

Thread 1 (on P1)	Thread 2 (on P2)
`A = 1;`	`B = 1;`
`print B;`	`print A;`

Execution matches Sequential Consistency (SC)

	1	2	3	4
Total Store Ordering (TSO)	✔	✔	✔	✗
Processor Consistency (PC)	✔	✔	✗	✗

Allowing writes to be reordered

- **Four types of memory operation orderings**
  - ~~**W→R: write must complete before subsequent read**~~
  - **R→R: read must complete before subsequent read**
  - **R→W: read must complete before subsequent write**
  - ~~**W→W: write must complete before subsequent write**~~

- **Partial Store Ordering (PSO)**
  - **Execution may not match sequential consistency on program 1 (P2 may observe change to `flag` before change to `A`)**

Thread 1 (on P1)	Thread 2 (on P2)
`A = 1;`	`while (flag == 0);`
`flag = 1;`	`print A;`

Allowing all reorderings

- Four types of memory operation orderings
  - ~~W→R: write must complete before subsequent read~~
  - ~~R→R: read must complete before subsequent read~~
  - ~~R→W: read must complete before subsequent write~~
  - ~~W→W: write must complete before subsequent write~~

- Examples:
  - Weak ordering (WO)
  - Release Consistency (RC)
    - Processors support special synchronization operations
    - Memory accesses before memory `fence` instruction must complete before the `fence` issues
    - Memory access after fence cannot begin until fence instruction is complete

```
reorderable reads
and writes here

...

FENCE

...

reorderable reads
and writes here

...

FENCE
```

Example: expressing synchronization in relaxed models

- Intel x86/x64 ~ total store ordering
  - Provides sync instructions if software requires a specific instruction ordering not guaranteed by the consistency model
    - `mm_lfence` ("load fence")
    - `mm_sfence` ("store fence")
    - `mm_mfence` ("mem fence")

- ARM processors: very relaxed consistency model

A cool post on the role of memory fences in x86:
http://bartoszmilewski.com/2008/11/05/who-ordered-memory-fences-on-an-x86/

ARM has some great examples in their programmer's reference:
http://infocenter.arm.com/help/topic/com.arm.doc.genc007826/Barrier_Litmus_Tests_and_Cookbook_A08.pdf

Conflicting data accesses

- Two memory accesses by different processors conflict if
  - They access the same memory location
  - At least one is a write

- Unsynchronized program
  - Conflicting accesses not ordered by synchronization (e.g., a fence, barrier, etc.)

- Synchronized programs yield SC results on non-SC systems

Relaxed consistency performance





Base: Sequentially consistent execution. Processor issues one memory operation at a time, stalls until completion

W-R: relaxed W → R ordering constraint
(write latency almost fully hidden)

Summary: relaxed consistency

- Motivation: obtain higher performance by allowing memory operation reordering for latency hiding (reordering is not allowed by sequential consistency)

- One cost is software complexity: programmer or compiler must correctly insert synchronization to ensure certain specific ordering
  - But in practice complexities encapsulated in libraries that provide intuitive primitives like lock/unlock, barrier (or lower level primitives like fence)

- Relaxed consistency models differ in which memory ordering constraints they ignore

Eventual consistency in distributed systems

- **Relaxed memory For many of you, relaxed memory consistency will be a key factor in writing web-scale programs in distributed environments**

- **"Eventual consistency"**
  - **Say machine A writes to an object X in a shared distributed database**
  - **Many copies of database for performance scaling and redundancy**
  - **Eventual consistency guarantees that if there are no other updates to X, A's update will <u>eventually</u> be observed by <u>all</u> other nodes in the system (note: no guarantees on when, so updates to objects X and Y might propagate to different clients differently)**



Course-so-far review

Exam details

- Closed book, closed laptop
- One "post it" of notes (but we'll let you use both sides)
- Covers all lecture material so far in course, including today's discussion of memory consistency
- The TAs will lead a review session on Saturday at 5pm in GHC 4307
  - Please come with questions
- I will release a practice exam Friday night (-ish)
- My office hours are:
  - Thursday 1-2pm
  - Saturday 1-2pm
  - Sunday 5-6:30pm

Throughput vs. latency

THROUGHPUT

The rate at which work gets done.

- **Operations per second**
- **Bytes per second (bandwidth)**
- **Tasks per hour**

LATENCY

The amount of time for an operation to complete

- **An instruction takes 4 clocks**
- **A cache miss takes 200 clocks to complete**
- **It takes 20 seconds for a program to complete**

Ubiquitous parallelism

- **What motivated the shift toward multi-core parallelism in modern processor design?**
  - **Inability to scale clock frequency due to power limits**
  - **Diminishing returns when trying to further exploit ILP**



Is the new performance focus on throughput, or latency?

Techniques for exploiting independent operations in applications

	What is it? What is the benefit?
1. superscalar execution	Processor executes multiple instructions per clock. Super-scalar execution exploits instruction level parallelism (ILP). When instructions in the same thread of control are independent they can be executed in parallel on a super-scalar processor.
2. SIMD execution	Processor executes the same instruction on multiple pieces of data at once (e.g., one operation on vector registers). The cost of fetching and decoding the instruction is amortized over many arithmetic operations.
3. multi-core execution	A chip contains multiple (mainly) independent processing cores, each capable of executing independent instruction streams.
4. multi-threaded execution	Processor maintains execution contexts (state: e.g, a PC, registers, virtual memory mappings) for multiple threads. Execution of thread instructions is interleaved on the core over time. Multi-threading reduces processor stalls by automatically switching to execute other threads when one thread is blocked waiting for a long-latency operation to complete.

Techniques for exploiting independent operations in applications

	Who is responsible for mapping?
1. superscalar execution	Usually not a programmer responsibility: ILP automatically detected by processor hardware or by compiler (or both) (But manual loop unrolling by a programmer can help)
2. SIMD execution	In simple cases, data parallelism is automatically detected by the compiler, (e.g., assignment 1 saxpy). In practice, programmer explicitly describes SIMD execution using vector instructions or by specifying independent execution in a high-level language (e.g., ISPC gangs, CUDA)
3. multi-core execution	Programmer defines independent threads of control. e.g., pthreads, ISPC tasks, openMP #pragma
4. multi-threaded execution	Programmer defines independent threads of control. But programmer must create more threads than processing cores.

Frequently discussed processor examples

- **Intel Core i7 CPU**
  - 4 cores
  - Each core:
    - Supports 2 threads ("Hyper-Threading")
    - Can issue 8-wide SIMD instructions (AVX instructions)
    - Can execute multiple instructions per clock (superscalar)

- **NVIDIA GTX 680 GPU**
  - 6 "cores" (called an SMX by NVIDIA)
  - Each core:
    - Supports up to 64 warps (warp is a group of 32 "CUDA threads")
    - Issues 32-wide SIMD instructions (same instruction for all 32 "CUDA threads" in a warp)
    - Also capable of issuing multiple instructions per clock

- **Blacklight Supercomputer**
  - 512 CPUs
    - Each CPU: 8 cores
      - Each core: supports 2 threads, issues 4-wide SIMD instructions (SSE instructions)

Multi-threaded, SIMD execution on GPU



= SIMD functional unit, control shared across 32 units (1 MUL-ADD per clock)

= "special" SIMD functional unit, control shared across 32 units (operations like sin/cos)

= SIMD load/store unit (handles warp loads/stores, gathers/scatters)

- Describe how CUDA threads are mapped to the execution resources on this GTX 680 GPU?
  - e.g., describe how the processor executes instructions each clock

Decomposition: assignment 1, program 3

- You used ISPC to parallelize the Mandelbrot generation
- You created a bunch of tasks. How many? Why?

```
uniform int rowsPerTask = height / 2;

// create a bunch of tasks
launch[2] mandelbrot_ispc_task(
                x0, y0, x1, y1,
                width, height,
                rowsPerTask,
                maxIterations,
                output);
```

Amdahl's law

- Let S = the fraction of sequential execution that is inherently sequential
- Max speedup on P processors given by:

$$\text{speedup} \leq \frac{1}{s + \frac{1-s}{p}}$$



Thought experiment

- Your boss gives your team a piece of code for which 25% of the operations are inherently serial and instructs you to parallelize the application on a six-core machines in GHC 3000. He expects you to achieve 5x speedup on this application.

- Your friend shouts at your boss, "that is %#*$(%*!@ impossible"!

- Your boss shouts back, "I want employees with a can-do attitude! You haven't thought hard enough."

- Who is in the right?

Work assignment



STATIC ASSIGNMENT

Assignment of subproblems to processors is determined before (or right at the start) of execution. Assignment does not dependent on execution behavior.

Good: very low (almost none) run-time overhead

Bad: execution time of subproblems must be predictable (so programmer can statically balance load)

Examples: solver kernel, OCEAN, mandlebrot in asst 1, problem 1, ISPC foreach

DYNAMIC ASSIGNMENT

Assignment of subproblems to processors is determined as the program runs.

Good: can achieve balance load under unpredictable conditions
Bad: incurs runtime overhead to determine assignment

Examples: ISPC tasks, executing grid of CUDA thread blocks on GPU, assignment 3, shared work queue

Balancing the workload

Ideally all processors are computing all the time during program execution
(they are computing simultaneously, and they finish their portion of the work at the same time)



Load imbalance can significantly reduce overall speedup

Dynamic assignment using work queues

Sub-problems
(aka "tasks", "work")



Shared work queue: a list of work to do
(for now, let's assume each piece of work is independent)

Worker threads:
Pull data from work queue
Push new work to queue as it's created

Decomposition in assignment 2

- Most solutions decomposed the problem in several ways
  - Decomposed screen into tiles ("task" per tile)
    - Decomposed tile into per circle "tasks"
    - Decomposed tile into per pixel "tasks"

Artifactual vs. inherent communication

INHERENT COMMUNICATION

ARTIFACTUAL COMMUNICATION

FALSE SHARING



Problem assignment as shown. Each processor reads/writes only from its local data.

Programming model abstractions

	Structure?	Communication?	Sync?
1. shared address space	Multiple processors sharing an address space.	Implicit: loads and stores to shared variables	Synchronization primitives such as locks and barriers
2. message passing	Multiple processors, each with own memory address space.	Explicit: send and receive messages	Build synchronization out of messages.
3. data-parallel	Rigid program structure: single logical thread containing `map(f, collection)` where "iterations" of the map can be executed concurrently	Typically not allowed within map except through special built-in primitives (like "reduce"). Comm implicit through loads and stores to address space	Implicit barrier at the beginning and end of the map.

Cache coherence

Why cache coherence?

Hand-wavy answer: would like shared memory to behave "intuitively" when two processors read and write to a shared variable. Reading a value after another processor writes to it should return the new value. (despite replication due to caches)

Requirements of a coherent address space

1. **A read by processor P to address X that follows a write by P to address X, should return the value of the write by P *(assuming no other processor wrote to X in between)***

2. **A read by a processor to address X that follows a write by another processor to X returns the written value... if the read and write are sufficiently separated in time *(assuming no other write to X occurs in between)***

3. **Writes to the same location are serialized; two writes to the same location by any two processors are seen in the same order by all processors.**
   (Example: if values 1 and then 2 are written to address X, no processor observes 2 before 1)

Condition 1: program order (as expected of a uniprocessor system)

Condition 2: write propagation: The news of the write has to eventually get to the other processors. Note that precisely <u>when</u> it is propagated is not defined by definition of coherence.

Condition 3: write serialization

Implementing cache coherence

Main idea of invalidation-based protocols: before writing to a cache line, obtain exclusive access to it

SNOOPING

Each cache broadcasts its cache misses to all other caches. Waits for other caches to react before continuing.

Good: simple, low latency

Bad: broadcast traffic limits scalability

DIRECTORIES

Information about location of cache line and number of shares is stored in a centralized location. On a miss, requesting cache queries the directory to find sharers and communicates with these nodes using point-to-point messages.

Good: coherence traffic scales with number of sharers, and number of sharers is usually low

Bad: higher complexity, overhead of directory storage, additional latency due to longer critical path

MSI state transition diagram



A / B: if action A is observed by cache controller, action B is taken

Broadcast (bus) initiated transaction

Processor initiated transaction