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Memory Coherence in Shared Virtual Memory Systems
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“The paper shows how to simulate coherent shared memory on a cluster, and also introduces directory-based distributed cache-coherence. It spawned an entire research area, and introduced cache coherence mechanisms that are widely used in industry.” – SigOps HoF citation

Today’s Reminders

- No Class Friday or Monday
- My office hours: Today after class

Shared Virtual Memory

- Page data between the physical memories of the processors (as well as between physical memory & disk)
  - Common mechanism for both
  - Once page in, data access is familiar read/write
Memory Coherence Problem

- Memory coherence: read returns value of most recent write to same address

- Differs from multiprocessor cache coherence
  - Small caches, fast bus, done in HW => write conflicts incur small delay

  "Both theoretical & practical results show MC problem can be solved efficiently on a loosely coupled multiprocessor"

Why Shared Virtual Memory Should Have Good Performance

- Unshared data is fine
- Read-only shared data is fine
- Updates to shared data?
  - Each individual thread has good locality in its writes
  - Common goal in designing parallel algorithms is to minimize write contention among threads

Granularity

- Why larger pages?
  - Amortize communication overheads
  - 1000s of bytes roughly same cost as 10s of bytes

- Why smaller pages?
  - Minimizes chance for contention (false sharing)

- Choose size to match existing VM page size
  - Can use existing page protection mechanisms: single instructions will trigger page faults & trap to handlers, e.g. to enforce memory coherence mechanisms

Maintaining Coherence

- Each page can be
  - Read-shared by 1 or more processors, or
  - Exclusively owned by a processor who can write

- Directory-based coherence ("Fixed Distributed Manager")
  - Management of pages is partitioned across processors
  - On fault, consult manager for the page
  - Manager tracks set of read-sharers ("copyset") or exclusive owner ("owner") & serves as point of serialization

  [Run through example on board]

- Works well for Cache-coherence.
  - What’s the issue for Shared Virtual Memory?
    - Want to avoid extra hop to directory/manager
Dynamic Distributed Manager: Metadata on pages

- \( \text{Ptable}[p].\text{access} = \{\text{read, write, nil}\} \)
- \( \text{Ptable}[p].\text{copyset} = \text{processors with read copies} \)
- \( \text{Ptable}[p].\text{lock} \)
- \( \text{Ptable}[p].\text{probOwner} = \text{likely owner} \)

Dynamic Distributed Manager

Write fault handler:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&; \\
\text{ask PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} \text{ for write access to page } p;& \\
\text{Invalidat}(p, \text{PTable}(p).\text{copyset});& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} := \text{self};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{access} := \text{write};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{copyset} := \{\};& \\
\text{Unlock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&;
\end{align*}
\]

Write server:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&; \\
\text{IF I am owner THEN BEGIN}& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{access} := \text{nil};& \\
\text{send } p \text{ to } \text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} := \text{RequestNode};& \\
\text{END}& \\
\text{ELSE BEGIN}& \\
\text{forward request to PTable}(p).\text{probOwner};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} := \text{RequestNode};& \\
\text{END}& \\
\text{Unlock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&;
\end{align*}
\]

Dynamic Distributed Manager

Read-fault handler:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&; \\
\text{ask PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} \text{ for read access to page } p;& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} := \text{ReplyNode};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{access} := \text{read};& \\
\text{Unlock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&;
\end{align*}
\]

Read server:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&; \\
\text{IF I am owner THEN BEGIN}& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{copyset} := \text{PTable}(p).\text{copyset} \cup \{\text{RequestNode}\};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{access} := \text{read};& \\
\text{send } p \text{ to } \text{RequestNode};& \\
\text{END}& \\
\text{ELSE BEGIN}& \\
\text{forward request to PTable}(p).\text{probOwner};& \\
\text{PTable}(p).\text{probOwner} := \text{RequestNode};& \\
\text{END}& \\
\text{Unlock(}\text{PTable}(p).\text{lock})&;
\end{align*}
\]

Speedups for 3D PDE

**Fig. 5.** Speedups of a 3D PDE where \( n = 60^3 \).

**Fig. 7.** Speedups of a 2-D PDE where \( n = 40^2 \).

Note: Static mapping (CM*) only comes close to SVM with heroic programming effort.
Speedups for Sort & Dot-Product

![Graphs](image)

Coherence Algorithms

![Graphs](image)

Limitations

- Main classes of programs that would perform poorly:
  - Frequent updates to shared data
  - Excessively large data sets that are only read once
- Only ran on up to 8 processors

What should this paper get credit for?

Scaling Distributed Machine Learning with the Parameter Server
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Some Big Learning Frameworks

- **GraphLab** *(Dato)*
  - Carlos Guestrin (CMU->Washington)

- **Spark** *(Databricks)*
  - Ion Stoica (UC Berkeley)

- **Petuum**
  - Eric Xing, Greg Ganger, Phil Gibbons, Garth Gibson (CMU)

- **Parameter Server** *(Marianas Labs)*
  - Alex Smola, Dave Andersen (CMU)

Parameter Servers for Distributed ML

- Provides all machines with convenient access to global model parameters
- Enables easy conversion of single-machine parallel ML algorithms
  - “Distributed shared memory” programming style
  - Replace local memory access with PS access

```
UpdateVar(i) {
  old = y[i]
  delta = f(old)
  y[i] += delta
}
```

```
UpdateVar(i) {
  old = PS.read(y,i)
  delta = f(old)
  PS.inc(y,i,delta)
}
```

The Cost of Bulk Synchrony

Threads must wait for each other
End-of-iteration sync gets longer with larger clusters
Precious computing time wasted

But: Fully asynchronous => No algorithm convergence guarantees

Stale Synchronous Parallel (SSP)

Allow threads to *usually* run at own pace
Fastest/slowest threads not allowed to drift >S iterations apart
Protocol: check cache first; if too old, get latest version from network
Consequence: fast threads must check network every iteration
Slow threads check only every S iterations – fewer network accesses, so catch up!
Staleness Sweet Spot

- Early transmission of larger parameter changes, up to bandwidth limit
- Find sets of parameters with weak dependency to compute on in parallel
  - Reduces errors from parallelization
- Low-overhead work migration to eliminate transient straggler effects
- Exploit repeated access patterns of iterative algorithms (IterStore)
  - Optimizations: prefetching, parameter data placement, static cache policies, static data structures, NUMA memory management

Enhancements to SSP

Parameter Server

Overview of machine learning

- Scale of Industry problems
  - 100 billion examples
  - 10 billion features
  - 1T–1P training data
  - 100–1000 machines

Distributed Data Analysis Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Server</th>
<th>Shared Data</th>
<th>Consistency</th>
<th>Fault Tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sparse) vector/matrix</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>continuous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fair characterizations?
Parameter Server

Largest experiments of related systems
Data were collected on April'14

Traffic Reduction by Filters

Ad click prediction
636TB data, 1TB model, and 1000 machines

Fault Tolerance

+ Model is partitioned by consistent hashing
+ Default replication: Chain replication (consistent, safe)
+ Option: Aggregation reduces backup traffic (algo specific)
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