

Computer Architecture

ELE 475 / COS 475


Slide Deck 13: Parallel Programming
and Small Multiprocessors

David Wentzlaff

Department of Electrical Engineering


Princeton University

Trends in Computation




Data collected by M. Horowitz, F. Labonte, O. Shacham, K. Olukotun, L. Hammond, C. Batten, and D. Wentzlauff

Trends in Computation



Data collected by M. Horowitz, F. Labonte, O. Shacham, K. Olukotun, L. Hammond, C. Batten, and D. Wentzlauff³

Symmetric Multiprocessors



symmetric



- All memory is equally far away from all processors
- Any processor can do any I/O (set up a DMA transfer)

Synchronization


The need for synchronization arises whenever there are concurrent processes in a system
(even in a uniprocessor system)

Producer-Consumer: A consumer process must wait until the producer process has produced data

Mutual Exclusion: Ensure that only one process uses a resource at a given time



A Producer-Consumer Example



Producer posting Item x :

Load R_{tail} , (tail)

Store x , (R_{tail})

$R_{tail} = R_{tail} + 1$

Store R_{tail} , (tail)

Consumer:

Load R_{head} , (head)

spin: Load R_{tail} , (tail)

if $R_{head} == R_{tail}$ goto spin

Load R , (R_{head})

$R_{head} = R_{head} + 1$

Store R_{head} , (head)

process(R)

The program is written assuming instructions are executed in order.

Problems?

A Producer-Consumer Example

continued

Producer posting Item x:

```
    Load  $R_{tail}$ , (tail)
1  Store x, ( $R_{tail}$ )
     $R_{tail} = R_{tail} + 1$ 
2  Store  $R_{tail}$ , (tail)
```

*Can the tail pointer get updated
before the item x is stored?*

Consumer:

```
    Load  $R_{head}$ , (head)
spin: Load  $R_{tail}$ , (tail) 3
    if  $R_{head} == R_{tail}$  goto spin
    Load R, ( $R_{head}$ ) 4
     $R_{head} = R_{head} + 1$ 
    Store  $R_{head}$ , (head)
    process(R)
```


Programmer assumes that if 3 happens after 2, then 4 happens after 1.

Problem sequences are:

```
2, 3, 4, 1
4, 1, 2, 3
```

Sequential Consistency

A Memory Model



“ A system is *sequentially consistent* if the result of any execution is the same as if the operations of all the processors were executed in some sequential order, and the operations of each individual processor appear in the order specified by the program”

Leslie Lamport

Sequential Consistency =
arbitrary *order-preserving interleaving*
of memory references of sequential programs

Sequential Consistency

Sequential concurrent tasks: T1, T2
Shared variables: X, Y (initially X = 0, Y = 10)

T1:

Store 1, (X) (X = 1)
Store 11, (Y) (Y = 11)

T2:


Load R₁, (Y)
Store R₁, (Y') (Y' = Y)
Load R₂, (X)
Store R₂, (X') (X' = X)

what are the legitimate answers for X' and Y' ?

~~(X', Y') ∈ {(1, 11), (0, 10), (1, 10), (0, 11)} ?~~


If Y is 11 then X cannot be 0

Sequential Consistency





Sequential consistency imposes more memory ordering constraints than those imposed by uniprocessor program dependencies ()

What are these in our example ?

T1:

 Store 1, (X) ($X = 1$)
Store 11, (Y) ($Y = 11$)


T2:

 Load R₁, (Y)
 Store (Y'), R₁ ($Y' = Y$)
 Load R₂, (X)
 Store (X'), R₂ ($X' = X$)

 additional SC requirements

Does (can) a system with caches or out-of-order execution capability provide a *sequentially consistent* view of the memory ?

Multiple Consumer Example



Producer posting Item x:

```
Load  $R_{tail}$ , (tail)
Store x, ( $R_{tail}$ )
 $R_{tail} = R_{tail} + 1$ 
Store  $R_{tail}$ , (tail)
```

*Critical section:
Needs to be executed atomically
by one consumer \Rightarrow locks*

Consumer:

spin:

```
Load  $R_{head}$ , (head)
Load  $R_{tail}$ , (tail)
if  $R_{head} == R_{tail}$  goto spin
Load R, ( $R_{head}$ )
 $R_{head} = R_{head} + 1$ 
Store  $R_{head}$ , (head)
process(R)
```

What is wrong with this code?

Locks or Semaphores

E. W. Dijkstra, 1965

A *semaphore* is a non-negative integer, with the following operations:

P(s): if $s > 0$, decrement s by 1, otherwise wait
probeer te verlagen, literally ("try to reduce")

V(s): increment s by 1 and wake up one of
the waiting processes
verhogen ("increase")

P's and V's must be executed atomically, i.e., without

- *interruptions* or
- *interleaved accesses to s* by other processors

Process i
P(s)
<critical section>
V(s)

initial value of s determines
the maximum no. of processes
in the critical section

Implementation of Semaphores

Semaphores (mutual exclusion) can be implemented using ordinary Load and Store instructions in the Sequential Consistency memory model. However, protocols for mutual exclusion are difficult to design...

Simpler solution:

atomic read-modify-write instructions

Examples: *m is a memory location, R is a register*

```
Test&Set (m), R:  
  R  $\leftarrow$  M[m];  
  if R==0 then  
    M[m]  $\leftarrow$  1;
```

```
Fetch&Add (m), Rv, R:  
  R  $\leftarrow$  M[m];  
  M[m]  $\leftarrow$  R + Rv;
```

```
Swap (m), R:  
  Rt  $\leftarrow$  M[m];  
  M[m]  $\leftarrow$  R;  
  R  $\leftarrow$  Rt;
```

Multiple Consumers Example

using the Test&Set Instruction

P: Test&Set (mutex), R_{temp}
 if (R_{temp} != 0) goto P

spin: Load R_{head}, (head)
 Load R_{tail}, (tail)
 if R_{head} == R_{tail} goto spin
 Load R, (R_{head})
 R_{head} = R_{head} + 1
 Store R_{head}, (head)

V: Store 0, (mutex)
 process(R)

*Critical
Section*



Other atomic read-modify-write instructions (Swap, Fetch&Add, etc.) can also implement P's and V's

What if the process stops or is swapped out while in the critical section?

Nonblocking Synchronization

```
Compare&Swap(m), Rt, Rs:  
  if (Rt==M[m])  
    then M[m]=Rs;  
        Rs=Rt;  
        status ← success;  
  else status ← fail;
```

status is an
implicit
argument

```
try:  Load Rhead, (head)  
spin: Load Rtail, (tail)  
      if Rhead==Rtail goto spin  
      Load R, (Rhead)  
      Rnewhead = Rhead+1  
      Compare&Swap(head), Rhead, Rnewhead  
      if (status==fail) goto try  
      process(R)
```

Load-link & Store-conditional

aka Load-reserve, Load-Locked

Special register(s) to hold reservation flag and address, and the outcome of store-conditional

Load-link R, (m):

```
<flag, adr> ← <1, m>;  
R ← M[m];
```

Store-conditional (m), R:

```
if <flag, adr> == <1, m>  
then cancel other procs'  
      reservation on m;  
      M[m] ← R;  
      status ← succeed;  
else status ← fail;
```

try:
spin:

```
Load-link Rhead, (head)  
Load Rtail, (tail)  
if Rhead == Rtail goto spin  
Load R, (Rhead)  
Rhead = Rhead + 1  
Store-conditional Rhead, (head)  
if (status == fail) goto try  
process(R)
```


Performance of Locks

Blocking atomic read-modify-write instructions

e.g., Test&Set, Fetch&Add, Swap

VS

Non-blocking atomic read-modify-write instructions

*e.g., Compare&Swap,
Load-link/Store-conditional*

VS

Protocols based on ordinary Loads and Stores


Performance depends on several interacting factors:

degree of contention,

caches,

out-of-order execution of Loads and Stores

Issues in Implementing Sequential Consistency



Implementation of SC is complicated by two issues

- *Out-of-order execution capability*

Load(a); Load(b)	yes
Load(a); Store(b)	yes if $a \neq b$
Store(a); Load(b)	yes if $a \neq b$
Store(a); Store(b)	yes if $a \neq b$

- *Caches*

Caches can prevent the effect of a store from being seen by other processors

SC complications motivate architects to consider *weak or relaxed* memory models

Memory Fences

Instructions to sequentialize memory accesses

Processors with *relaxed or weak memory models* permit Loads and Stores to different addresses to be reordered, remove some/all extra dependencies imposed by SC

- LL, LS, SL, SS

Need to provide *memory fence* instructions to force the serialization of memory accesses


Examples of relaxed memory models:

- Total Store Order: LL, LS, SS, enforce SL with fence
- Partial Store Order: LL, LS, enforce SL, SS with fences
- Weak Ordering: enforce LL, LS, SL, SS with fences

Memory fences are expensive operations – mem instructions wait for all relevant instructions in-flight to complete (including stores to retire – need store acks)

However, cost of serialization only when it is required!

Using Memory Fences



Producer posting Item x :

Load R_{tail} , (tail)

Store x , (R_{tail})

MFence_{SS}

$R_{tail} = R_{tail} + 1$

Store R_{tail} , (tail)

*ensures that tail ptr
is not updated before
 x has been stored*

Consumer:

Load R_{head} , (head)

spin: Load R_{tail} , (tail)

if $R_{head} == R_{tail}$ goto spin

MFence_{LL}

Load R , (R_{head})

$R_{head} = R_{head} + 1$

Store R_{head} , (head)

process(R)

*ensures that R is
not loaded before
 x has been stored*

Mutual Exclusion Using Load/Store

A protocol based on two shared variables $c1$ and $c2$.
Initially, both $c1$ and $c2$ are 0 (*not busy*)

Process 1

```
...  
c1=1;  
L: if c2==1 then go to L  
   < critical section >  
c1=0;
```

Process 2

```
...  
c2=1;  
L: if c1==1 then go to L  
   < critical section >  
c2=0;
```

What is wrong? *Deadlock!*

Mutual Exclusion: *second attempt*

To avoid *deadlock*, let a process give up the reservation (i.e. Process 1 sets $c1$ to 0) while waiting.

Process 1

```
...  
L:  c1=1;  
    if c2==1 then  
        { c1=0; go to L}  
    < critical section >  
    c1=0
```

Process 2

```
...  
L:  c2=1;  
    if c1==1 then  
        { c2=0; go to L}  
    < critical section >  
    c2=0
```

- Deadlock is not possible but with a low probability a *livelock* may occur.
- An unlucky process may never get to enter the critical section \Rightarrow *starvation*

A Protocol for Mutual Exclusion

T. Dekker, 1966

A protocol based on 3 shared variables *c1*, *c2* and *turn*.
Initially, both *c1* and *c2* are 0 (*not busy*)

Process 1

```
...  
c1=1;  
turn = 1;  
L: if c2==1 && turn==1  
    then go to L  
    < critical section >  
c1=0;
```

Process 2

```
...  
c2=1;  
turn = 2;  
L: if c1==1 && turn==2  
    then go to L  
    < critical section >  
c2=0;
```

- *turn == i* ensures that only process *i* can wait
- variables *c1* and *c2* ensure *mutual exclusion*

*Solution for n processes was given by Dijkstra
and is quite tricky!*

N-process Mutual Exclusion

Lamport's Bakery Algorithm

Process i

Initially $\text{num}[j] = 0$, for all j

Entry Code


```
choosing[i] = 1;
num[i] = max(num[0], ..., num[N-1]) + 1;
choosing[i] = 0;

for(j = 0; j < N; j++) {
    while( choosing[j] );
    while( num[j] &&
           ( ( num[j] < num[i] ) ||
             ( num[j] == num[i] && j < i ) ) );
}
```

Exit Code

```
num[i] = 0;
```



Symmetric Multiprocessors




symmetric

- All memory is equally far away from all processors
- Any processor can do any I/O (set up a DMA transfer)


Multidrop Memory Bus




Pipelined Memory Bus



Pipelined Memory Bus



Memory Coherence in SMPs



Suppose CPU-1 updates **A** to **200**.

write-back: memory and cache-2 have stale values

write-through: cache-2 has a stale value

Do these stale values matter?

What is the view of shared memory for programming?

Write-back Caches & SC

	prog T1	cache-1	memory	cache-2	prog T2
• T1 is executed	ST 1, X ST 11, Y	X = 1 Y = 11	X = 0 Y = 10 X' = Y' =	Y = Y' = X = X' =	LD Y, R1 ST R1, Y' LD X, R2 ST R2, X'
• cache-1 writes back Y		X = 1 Y = 11	X = 0 Y = 11 X' = Y' =	Y = Y' = X = X' =	
• T2 executed		X = 1 Y = 11	X = 0 Y = 11 X' = Y' =	Y = 11 Y' = 11 X = 0 X' = 0	
• cache-1 writes back X		X = 1 Y = 11	X = 1 Y = 11 X' = Y' =	Y = 11 Y' = 11 X = 0 X' = 0	
• cache-2 writes back X' & Y'		X = 1 Y = 11	X = 1 Y = 11 X' = 0 Y' = 11	Y = 11 Y' = 11 X = 0 X' = 0	

inconsistent

Write-through Caches & SC

prog T1	cache-1	memory	cache-2	prog T2
ST 1, X ST 11, Y	X = 0 Y = 10	X = 0 Y = 10 X' = Y' =	Y = Y' = X = 0 X' =	LD Y, R1 ST Y', R1 LD X, R2 ST X', R2

- T1 executed

X = 1 Y = 11	X = 1 Y = 11 X' = Y' =	Y = Y' = X = 0 X' =
-----------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------

- T2 executed


X = 1 Y = 11	X = 1 Y = 11 X' = 0 Y' = 11	Y = 11 Y' = 11 X = 0 X' = 0
-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Write-through caches don't preserve sequential consistency either

Cache Coherence vs. Memory Consistency


- A cache coherence protocol ensures that all writes by one processor are eventually visible to other processors, for one memory address
 - i.e., updates are not lost
- A memory consistency model gives the rules on when a write by one processor can be observed by a read on another, across different addresses
 - Equivalently, what values can be seen by a load
- A cache coherence protocol is not enough to ensure sequential consistency
 - But if sequentially consistent, then caches must be coherent
- Combination of cache coherence protocol plus processor memory reorder buffer implements a given machine's memory consistency model

Warmup: Parallel I/O



(DMA stands for "Direct Memory Access", means the I/O device can read/write memory autonomous from the CPU)

Problems with Parallel I/O




Memory → Disk: Physical memory may be stale if cache copy is dirty


Disk → Memory: Cache may hold stale data and not see memory writes

Snoopy Cache *Goodman & Ravishankar 1983*

- Idea: Have cache watch (or snoop upon) DMA transfers, and then “do the right thing”
- Snoopy cache tags are dual-ported



Shared Memory Multiprocessor



Use snoopy mechanism to keep all processors' view of memory coherent

Update(Broadcast) vs. Invalidate Snoopy Cache Coherence Protocols

- Write Update (Broadcast)
 - Writes are broadcast and update all other cache copies
- Write Invalidate
 - Writes invalidate all other cache copies

Write Update (Broadcast) Protocols

write miss:

Broadcast on bus, other processors update copies (in place)

read miss:

Memory is always up to date

Write Invalidate Protocols

write miss:

the address is *invalidated* in all other caches *before* the write is performed

read miss:

if a dirty copy is found in some cache, a write-back is performed before the memory is read

Cache State Transition Diagram

The MSI protocol


Each cache line has state bits



M: Modified

S: Shared



I: Invalid




Two Processor Example

(Reading and writing the same cache line)

P_1 reads
 P_1 writes
 P_2 reads
 P_2 writes
 P_1 reads
 P_1 writes
 P_2 writes
 P_1 writes



Observation



- If a line is in the **M** state then no other cache can have a copy of the line!
 - Memory stays coherent, multiple differing copies cannot exist

MESI: An Enhanced MSI protocol

increased performance for private data (Illinois Protocol)

Each cache line has a tag




M: Modified Exclusive

E: Exclusive but unmodified

S: Shared

I: Invalid



Cache state in processor P_1

MOESI (Used in AMD Opteron)

Each cache line has a tag




M: Modified Exclusive

O: Owned

E: Exclusive but unmodified

S: Shared

I: Invalid




MESIF (Used by Intel Core i7)

Each cache line has a tag



M: Modified Exclusive
E: Exclusive but unmodified
S: Shared
I: Invalid
F: Forward



Cache state in processor P_1

Scalability Limitations of Snooping

- Caches
 - Bandwidth into caches
 - Tags need to be dual ported or steal cycles for snoops
 - Need to invalidate all the way to L1 cache
- Bus
 - Bandwidth
 - Occupancy (As number of cores grows, atomically utilizing bus becomes a challenge)

False Sharing

state	blk addr	data0	data1	...	dataN
-------	----------	-------	-------	-----	-------

A cache block contains more than one word

Cache-coherence is done at the block-level and not word-level

Suppose M_1 writes $word_i$ and M_2 writes $word_k$ and both words have the same block address.

What can happen?

Acknowledgements

- These slides contain material developed and copyright by:
 - Arvind (MIT)
 - Krste Asanovic (MIT/UCB)
 - Joel Emer (Intel/MIT)
 - James Hoe (CMU)
 - John Kubiatowicz (UCB)
 - David Patterson (UCB)
 - Christopher Batten (Cornell)
- MIT material derived from course 6.823
- UCB material derived from course CS252 & CS152
- Cornell material derived from course ECE 4750

Blackboard Example: Sequential Consistency

		Valid			Not Valid
P1	P2	1	1	5	5
1	5	2	2	6	1
2	6	5	3	7	3
3	7	3	4	1	2
4	8	6	5	2	4
		7	6	3	6
		8	7	4	7
		4	8	8	8

Analysis of Dekker's Algorithm

Scenario 1

```
...          Process 1
c1=1;
turn = 1;
L: if c2=1 & turn=1
    then go to L
    < critical section >
c1=0;
```

```
...          Process 2
c2=1;
turn = 2;
L: if c1=1 & turn=2
    then go to L
    < critical section >
c2=0;
```

Scenario 2

```
...          Process 1
c1=1;
turn = 1;
L: if c2=1 & turn=1
    then go to L
    < critical section >
c1=0;
```

```
...          Process 2
c2=1;
turn = 2;
L: if c1=1 & turn=2
    then go to L
    < critical section >
c2=0;
```

Copyright © 2013 David Wentzlaff