Lecture 14:

Memory Consistency

Parallel Computer Architecture and Programming

CMU 15-418/15-618, Fall 2018

What is Correct Behavior for a Parallel Memory Hierarchy?

- Note: side-effects of writes are only observable when *reads* occur
  - so we will focus on the values returned by reads

- Intuitive answer:
  - reading a location should return the latest value written (by any thread)

- Hmm… what does "latest" mean exactly?
  - within a thread, it can be defined by program order
  - but what about across threads?
    - the most recent write in physical time?
      - hopefully not, because there is no way that the hardware can pull that off
        » e.g., if it takes >10 cycles to communicate between processors, there is no way that processor 0 can know what processor 1 did 2 clock ticks ago
    - most recent based upon something else?
      - Hmm…

Refining Our Intuition

Thread 0	Thread 1	Thread 2

```
// write evens to X
for (i=0; i<N; i+=2) {
    X = i;
    …
}
```

```
// write odds to X
for (j=1; j<N; j+=2) {
    X = j;
    …
}
```

```
…
A = X;
…
B = X;
…
C = X;
…
```

(Assume: X=0 initially, and these are the only writes to X.)

- What would be some clearly illegal combinations of (A,B,C)?

- How about:

    (4,8,1)?   (9,12,3)?   (7,19,31)?

- What can we generalize from this?
    - writes from any particular thread must be consistent with program order
        - in this example, observed even numbers must be increasing (ditto for odds)
    - across threads: writes must be consistent with *a valid interleaving of threads*
        - not physical time! (programmer cannot rely upon that)

Visualizing Our Intuition

Thread 0

```
// write evens to X
for (i=0; i<N; i+=2) {
    X = i;
    …
}
```

Thread 1

```
// write odds to X
for (j=1; j<N; j+=2) {
    X = j;
    …
}
```

Thread 2

```
…
A = X;
…
B = X;
…
C = X;
…
```

CPU 0

CPU 1

CPU 2

Single port to memory

Memory

- Each thread proceeds in program order
- Memory accesses interleaved (one at a time) to a single-ported memory
  - rate of progress of each thread is unpredictable

Correctness Revisited

Thread 0	Thread 1	Thread 2
``// write evens to X
for (i=0; i<N; i+=2) {
X = i;
…
}```	```// write odds to X
for (j=1; j<N; j+=2) {
X = j;
…
}```	```…
A = X;
…
B = X;
…
C = X;```

Single port to memory

Recall: "reading a location should return the <u>latest</u> value written (by any thread)"

→ "latest" means consistent with some interleaving that matches this model

– this is a hypothetical interleaving; the machine didn't necessary do this!

Part 2 of Memory Correctness: Memory Consistency Model

1. "Cache Coherence"
   – do all loads and stores to a given cache block behave correctly?

2. "Memory Consistency Model" (sometimes called "Memory Ordering")
   – do all loads and stores, even to separate cache blocks, behave correctly?

Recall: our intuition

CPU 0   CPU 1   CPU 2

Single port to memory

Memory

Carnegie Mellon

Why is this so complicated?

- Fundamental issue:
  - loads and stores are very expensive, even on a uniprocessor
    - can easily take 10's to 100's of cycles

- What programmers intuitively expect:
  - processor atomically performs one instruction at a time, in program order

- In reality:
  - if the processor actually operated this way, it would be painfully slow
  - instead, the processor *aggressively reorders instructions* to hide memory latency

- Upshot:
  - *within a given thread*, the processor preserves the program order illusion
  - but this illusion has nothing to do with what happens in physical time!
  - from the perspective of *other threads*, all bets are off!

Carnegie Mellon

Hiding Memory Latency is Important for Performance

- <u>Idea</u>: *overlap* memory accesses with other accesses and computation

write A

read B

➡

write A
read B

- Hiding write latency is simple in uniprocessors:
  - add a write buffer

- (But this affects correctness in multiprocessors)

Processor

READS   WRITES

write buffer

Cache

How Can We Hide the Latency of Memory Reads?

"Out of order" pipelining:

- when an instruction is stuck, perhaps there are subsequent instructions that can be executed

```
x = *p;        ⟵  suffers expensive cache miss
y = x + 1;     ⟵  stuck waiting on true dependence
z = a + 2;  }
b = c / 3;  }  ⟵  these do not need to wait
```

- Implication: memory accesses may be performed out-of-order!!!

Carnegie Mellon

What About Conditional Branches?

- Do we need to wait for a conditional branch to be resolved before proceeding?
  - No! Just predict the branch outcome and continue executing speculatively.
    - if prediction is wrong, squash any side-effects and restart down correct path

```
x = *p;
y = x + 1;
z = a + 2;
b = c / 3;
if (x != z)          if hardware guesses that this is true
    d = e – 7;       then execute "then" part (speculatively)
                     (without waiting for x or z)
else d = e + 5;
…
```

Carnegie Mellon

# How Out-of-Order Pipelining Works in Modern Processors

- Fetch and graduate instructions in-order, but issue out-of-order

PC: 0x1c → **Inst. Cache**

Branch Predictor

Reorder Buffer:

`0x1c: b = c / 3;`	← issue (out-of-order)
`0x18: z = a + 2;`	← issue (out-of-order)
`0x14: y = x + 1;`	← can't issue
`0x10: x = *p;`	← issue (cache miss)

- Intra-thread dependences are preserved, but memory accesses get reordered!

Analogy: Gas Particles in Balloons

Thread 0   Thread 1   Thread 2   Thread 3

Time

(wikiHow)

- Imagine that each instruction within a thread is a gas particle inside a twisty balloon
- They were numbered originally, but then they start to move and bounce around
- When a given thread observes memory accesses from a *different* thread:
    - those memory accesses can be (almost) arbitrarily jumbled around
        - like trying to locate the position of a particular gas particle in a balloon
- As we'll see later, the only thing that we can do is to put *twists* in the balloon

Carnegie Mellon

Uniprocessor Memory Model

- Memory model specifies ordering constraints among accesses

- Uniprocessor model: memory accesses atomic and in program order

```
write A
write B
read A
read B
```

Reads check for matching addresses in write buffer

Processor

READS   WRITES

write buffer

Cache

- Not necessary to maintain sequential order for correctness
    - hardware: buffering, pipelining
    - compiler: register allocation, code motion

- Simple for programmers

- Allows for high performance

Carnegie Mellon

In Parallel Machines (with a Shared Address Space)

- Order between accesses to different locations becomes important

(Initially A and Ready = 0)

P1   P2

```
A = 1;

Ready = 1;
                                    while (Ready != 1);

                                    … = A;
```

How Unsafe Reordering Can Happen

Processor

`A = 1;`
`Ready = 1;`

Processor

Processor

wait (`Ready`== 1);
… = `A`;

Memory

• • •

Memory

`A: 0`

Memory

`Ready:0`→`1`

`A = 1;`

`Ready = 1;`

Interconnection Network

- Distribution of memory resources
  - accesses issued in order may be observed out of order

Caches Complicate Things More

- Multiple copies of the same location

`A = 1;` ⟶ wait (`A` == 1);
`B = 1;` ⟶ wait (`B` == 1);
… = `A`; **Oops!**

Processor	Processor	Processor
Cache	Cache	Cache
`A:0` ➔ `1`	`A:0` ➔ `1`	`A:0`
	`B:0` ➔ `1`	`B:0` ➔ `1`
Memory	Memory	Memory

`A = 1;`   `B = 1;`

`A = 1;`

Interconnection Network

Our Intuitive Model: "Sequential Consistency" (SC)

- Formalized by Lamport (1979)
  - accesses of each processor in program order
  - all accesses appear in sequential order

- Any order implicitly assumed by programmer is maintained

Example with Sequential Consistency

Simple Synchronization:

P0		P1	
A = 1	(a)		
Ready = 1	(b)	**x = Ready**	(c)
		y = A	(d)

- all locations are initialized to 0

- possible outcomes for (x,y):

  - (0,0), (0,1), (1,1)

- (x,y) = (1,0) is not a possible outcome (i.e. **Ready** = 1, **A** = 0):

  - we know a->b and c->d by program order

  - b->c implies that a->d

  - y==0 implies d->a which leads to a contradiction

  - *but real hardware will do this!*

Another Example with Sequential Consistency

Stripped-down version of a 2-process mutex (minus the turn-taking):

P0
```
want[0] = 1   (a)
x = want[1]   (b)
```

P1
```
want[1] = 1  (c)
y = want[0]  (d)
```

- all locations are initialized to 0
- possible outcomes for (x,y):
  - (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)
- (x,y) = (0,0) is not a possible outcome (i.e. **want[0]** = **0**, **want[1]** = **0**):
  - a->b and c->d implied by program order
  - x = 0 implies b->c which implies a->d
  - a->d says y = 1 which leads to a contradiction
  - similarly, y = 0 implies x = 1 which is also a contradiction
  - *but real hardware will do this!*

One Approach to Implementing Sequential Consistency

1. Implement cache coherence
   → writes to the same location are observed in same order by all processors

2. For each processor, delay start of memory access until previous one completes
   → each processor has only one outstanding memory access at a time

- What does it mean for a memory access to complete?

Carnegie Mellon

When Do Memory Accesses Complete?

- <u>Memory Reads</u>:
    - a read completes when its return value is bound

        `load r1 ← x`

        X = ???

        *(Find **x** in memory system)*

        X = **17**

        r1 = **17**

When Do Memory Accesses Complete?

- <u>Memory Reads</u>:
    - a read completes when its return value is bound

- <u>Memory Writes</u>:
    - a write completes when the new value is "visible" to other processors

    ```
    store 23 → x
    ```

    x = 23

    (Commit to memory order)
    (aka "serialize")

- What does "visible" mean?
    - it does NOT mean that other processors have necessarily seen the value yet
    - it means the new value is committed to the hypothetical serializable order (HSO)
        - a later read of **x** in the HSO will see either this value or a later one
    - (for simplicity, assume that writes occur atomically)

Summary for Sequential Consistency

- Maintain order between shared accesses in each processor

READ	READ	WRITE	WRITE
↓	↓	↓	↓
READ	WRITE	READ	WRITE

Don't start until previous access completes

- Balloon analogy:
  - like putting a twist between each individual (ordered) gas particle

- Severely restricts common hardware and compiler optimizations

Performance of Sequential Consistency

- Processor issues accesses one-at-a-time and stalls for completion


From Gupta et al, "Comparative evaluation of latency reducing and tolerating techniques." In Proceedings of the 18th annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA '91)

- Low processor utilization (17% - 42%) even with caching

Alternatives to Sequential Consistency

- Relax constraints on memory order

| READ	READ	**WRITE**	WRITE
↓	↓		↓
READ	WRITE	**READ**	WRITE

Total Store Ordering (TSO) (Similar to Intel)

See Section 8.2 of "Intel® 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer's Manual, Volume 3A: System Programming Guide, Part 1",
http://www.intel.com/content/dam/www/public/us/en/documents/manuals/64-ia-32-architectures-software-developer-vol-3a-part-1-manual.pdf

READ	READ	**WRITE**	**WRITE**
↓	↓		
READ	WRITE	**READ**	**WRITE**

Partial Store Ordering (PSO)

Performance Impact of TSO vs. SC

"Base" = SC
"WR" = TSO

- Can use a write buffer
- Write latency is effectively hidden

Carnegie Mellon

But Can Programs Live with Weaker Memory Orders?

- "Correctness": same results as sequential consistency
- Most programs don't require strict ordering (all of the time) for "correctness"

<u>Program Order</u>   <u>Sufficient Order</u>

```
A = 1;                          A = 1;

B = 1;                          B = 1;

unlock L;    lock L;            unlock L;    lock L;

             … = A;                          … = A;

             … = B;                          … = B;
```

- But how do we know when a program will behave correctly?

Carnegie Mellon

Identifying Data Races and Synchronization

- Two accesses *conflict* if:
  - (i) access same location, and (ii) at least one is a write
- Order accesses by:
  - program order (po)
  - dependence order (do): op1 --> op2 if op2 reads op1

<div align="center">

P1   P2

Write A

↓ po

Write Flag   do   → **Read Flag**

↓ po

Read A

</div>

- Data Race:
  - two conflicting accesses on different processors
  - not ordered by intervening accesses
- Properly Synchronized Programs:
  - all synchronizations are explicitly identified
 - all data accesses are ordered through synchronization

Optimizations for Synchronized Programs

- <u>Intuition</u>: many parallel programs have mixtures of "private" and "public" parts*
  - the "private" parts must be protected by synchronization (e.g., locks)
  - can we take advantage of synchronization to improve performance?

<u>Example:</u>

READ/WRITE ← Grab a lock

Insert node into data structure
- Essentially a "private" activity; reordering is ok

Release the lock
- Now we make it "public" to the other nodes

Caveat: shared data is in fact always visible to other threads.

Optimizations for Synchronized Programs

- Exploit information about synchronization

```
┌─────────────┐
│ READ/WRITE  │
│     ...     │
│ READ/WRITE  │
└─────────────┘
      │
   ┌──────┐
   │ SYNCH │
   └──────┘
      │
┌─────────────┐
│ READ/WRITE  │
│     ...     │
│ READ/WRITE  │
└─────────────┘
      │
   ┌──────┐
   │ SYNCH │
   └──────┘
      │
┌─────────────┐
│ READ/WRITE  │
│     ...     │
│ READ/WRITE  │
└─────────────┘
```

Between synchronization operations:
- we can allow reordering of memory operations
- *(as long as intra-thread dependences are preserved)*

Just before and just after synchronization operations:
- thread must wait for all prior operations to complete

"Weak Ordering" (WO)

- properly synchronized programs should yield the same result as on an SC machine

Intel's MFENCE (Memory Fence) Operation

- An **MFENCE** operation enforces the ordering seen on the previous slide:
    - does not begin until all prior reads & writes from that thread have completed
    - no subsequent read or write from that thread can start until after it finishes

```
READ/WRITE
READ/WRITE
    │
    ▼
 MFENCE
    │
    ▼
READ/WRITE
READ/WRITE
    │
    ▼
 MFENCE
    │
    ▼
READ/WRITE
READ/WRITE
```

Balloon analogy: it is a twist in the balloon
- no gas particles can pass through it

(wikiHow)

Good news: `xchg` does this implicitly!

ARM Processors

- ARM processors have a very relaxed consistency model

- 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`

- A great list regarding relaxed memory consistency in general:
    - `http://www.cl.cam.ac.uk/~pes20/weakmemory/`

Common Misconception about MFENCE

- MFENCE operations do NOT push values out to other threads
  - it is not a magic "make every thread up-to-date" operation
- Instead, they simply stall the thread that performs the MFENCE

MFENCE operations create *partial orderings*
- that are observable across threads

Earlier (Broken) Example Revisited

Where exactly should we insert MFENCE operations to fix this?

| P0	P1
[1: Here?]	
A = 1	
[2: Here?]	*[4: Here?]*
Ready = 1	**x = Ready**
[3: Here?]	*[5: Here?]*
	y = A
	[6: Here?]

Exploiting Asymmetry in Synchronization: "Release Consistency"

- <u>Lock</u> operation: only gains ("acquires") permission to access data
- <u>Unlock</u> operation: only gives away ("releases") permission to access data

Weak Ordering (WO)

Release Consistency (RC)

Intel's Full Set of Fence Operations

- In addition to **MFENCE**, Intel also supports two other fence operations:
  - **LFENCE**: serializes only with respect to load operations (not stores!)
  - **SFENCE**: serializes only with respect to store operations (not loads!)
    - Note: It does slightly more than this; see the spec for details:
      - *Section 8.2.5 of "Intel® 64 and IA-32 Architectures Software Developer's Manual, Volume 3A: System Programming Guide, Part 1*

- In practice, you are most likely to use:
  - **MFENCE**
  - **xchg**

Take-Away Messages on Memory Consistency Models

- **DON'T** use only normal memory operations for synchronization
    - e.g., Peterson's solution (from Synchronization #1 lecture)

```
boolean want[2] = {false, false};
int turn = 0;


want[i] = true;
turn = j;
while (want[j] && turn == j)
    continue;
… critical section …
want[i] = false;
```

Exercise for the reader: Where should we add fences (and which type) to fix this?

- **DO** use either explicit synchronization operations (e.g., **xchg**) or fences

```
while (!xchg(&lock_available, 0)
    continue;
… critical section …
xchg(&lock_available, 1);
```

Summary: Relaxed Consistency

- <u>Motivation</u>:
  - obtain higher performance by allowing reordering of memory operations
    - (reordering is not allowed by sequential consistency)

- One cost is software complexity:
  - the programmer or compiler must insert synchronization
    - to ensure certain specific orderings when needed

- <u>In practice</u>:
  - complexities often encapsulated in libraries that provide intuitive primitives
    - e.g., lock/unlock, barriers (or lower-level primitives like fence)

- Relaxed models differ in which memory ordering constraints they ignore