Unbounded Transactional Memory

C. Scott Ananian, Krste Asanović, Bradley C. Kuszmaul, Charles E. Leiserson, Sean Lie

Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
{cananian,krste,bradley,cel}@mit.edu,
sean@slie.ca

Thanks to Marty Deneroff (then at SGI)

This research supported in part by a DARPA HPCS grant with SGI, DARPA/AFRL Contract F33615-00-C-1692, NSF Grants ACI-0324974 and CNS-0305606, NSF Career Grant CCR00093354, and the Singapore-MIT Alliance

Transactional Memory (definition)

- **A transaction is a sequence of memory loads and stores that either commits or aborts**
- **If a transaction commits, all the loads and stores appear to have executed atomically**
- **If a transaction aborts, none of its stores take effect**
- **Transaction operations aren't visible until they commit or abort**
- **Simplified version of traditional ACID database transactions (no durability, for example)**
- **For this talk, we assume no I/O within transactions**

Locks are not our friends

```
void pushFlow(Vertex v1, Vertex v2,
              double flow) {
  lock_t lock1, lock2;
  if (v1.id < v2.id) {/* avoid deadlock */
    lock1 = v1.lock; lock2 = v2.lock;
  } else {
    lock1 = v2.lock; lock2 = v1.lock;
  }
  lock(lock1);
  lock(lock2);
  if (v2.excess > f) {
    /* move excess flow */
    v1.excess += f;
    v2.excess -= f;
  }
  unlock(lock2);
  unlock(lock1);
}
```

- Deadlocks/ordering
- Multi-object operations
- Priority inversion
- Faults in critical regions
- Inefficient

Invisible transactions?

- Rajwar & Goodman: Speculative Lock Elision and Transactional Lock Removal
  - speculatively identify locks; make xactions
- Martinez & Torrellas: Speculative Synchronization
  - guarantee fwd progress w/ non-speculative thread

Keep transactions visible

Infrequent, Small, Mostly-Serial?

To date, xactions assumed to be:

- **Small**
  - BBN Pluribus (~1975): 16 clock-cycle bus-locked "transaction"
  - Knight; Herlihy & Moss: transactions which fit in cache
- **Infrequent**
  - Software Transactional Memory (Shavit & Touitou; Harris & Fraser; Herlihy et al)
- **Mostly-serial**
  - Transactional Coherence & Consistency (Hammond, Wong, et al)

Transact-ifying Linux



- Experiment to discover xaction properties of large real-world app.
  - First complete OS investigated!
- **User-Mode Linux 2.4.19**
  - instrumented every load and store, all locks
  - locks→xactions; locks not held over I/O!
  - run 2-way SMP (two processes; two processors)
- Two workloads
  - Parallel make of Linux kernel ('`make linux`')
  - **dbench** running three clients
- Run program to get a trace; run trace through **Transactional Memory simulator**
  - 1MB 4-way set-associative 64-byte-line cache
  - Paper also has simulation runs for SpecJVM98

TM Cache-size requirements (Linux)



- # of overflowing xactions as a function of (fully-associative) cache size for `make_linux` & dbench
- Almost all of the xactions require < 100 cache lines
  - **99.9% need fewer than 54 cache lines**
- There are, however, some very large transactions!
  - **>500k-byte fully-associative cache required**

May Be Large, Frequent, and Concurrent

- Lots of small xactions
  - Millions of xactions in these benchmarks
  - **Problem for software-only schemes**
- Significant tail: large xactions are few, but very large
  - Thousands of cache lines touched
  - **Problem for bounded transactional schemes**
- Potential for additional concurrency
  - Distribution of hot cache lines suggest that **4x more concurrency** may be possible on our Linux benchmarks

Programmers want unbounded xactions…

Transactional Programming



- Locks: the devil we know
- Complex sync techniques: library-only
  - Nonblocking synchronization
  - Bounded transactions
    - Compilers don't expose memory references (Indirect dispatch, optimizations, constants)
    - Not portable! Changing cache-size breaks apps.
- Unbounded Transactions:
  - Can be thought about at high-level
  - Match programmer's intuition about atomicity
  - Allow black box code to be composed safely
  - Promise future excitement!
    - Fault-tolerance / exception-handling
    - Speculation / search

LTM: Visible, Large, Frequent, Scalable

- "Large Transactional Memory"
  - not truly unbounded, but simple and cheap
- Minimal architectural changes, high performance
  - Small mods to cache and processor core
  - No changes to main memory, cache coherence protocols or messages
  - Can be pin-compatible with conventional proc

- Design presented here based on SGI Origin 3000 shared-memory multi-proc
  - distributed memory
  - directory-based write-invalidate coherency protocol

Two new instructions

- **`XBEGIN pc`**
  - Begin a new transaction. Entry point to an ***abort handler*** specified by pc.
  - If transaction must fail, roll back processor and memory state to what it was when `XBEGIN` was executed, and jump to pc.
    - Think of this as a mispredicted branch.
- **`XEND`**
  - End the current transaction. If `XEND` completes, the xaction is committed and appeared atomic.
- Nested transactions are subsumed into outer transaction.

Transaction Semantics

```
    XBEGIN L1
A   ADD R1, R1, R1
    ST 1000, R1
    XEND
L2: XBEGIN L2
    ADD R1, R1, R1      B
    ST 2000, R1
    XEND
```

- Two transactions
  - "A" has an abort handler at L1
  - "B" has an abort handler at L2
    - Here, very simplistic retry. Other choices!
- Always need "current" and "rollback" values for both registers and memory

Handling conflicts

Processor 1	Processor 2
XBEGIN L1	ST 1000, 65 ←
ADD R1, R1, R1	
→ ST 1000, R1	
XEND	
L2: XBEGIN L2	
ADD R1, R1, R1	
ST 2000, R1	
XEND	

- We need to track locations read/written by transactional and non-transactional code
- When we find a conflict, transaction(s) must be aborted
  - We always "kill the other guy"
  - This leads to non-blocking systems

Restoring register state



- Minimally invasive changes; build on existing rename mechanism
- Both "current" and "rollback" architectural register values **stored in physical registers**
- In conventional speculation, "rollback" values stored until the speculative instruction graduates (order **100 instrs**)
- Here, we keep these until the transaction commits or aborts (**unbounded # of instrs**)
- But we only need one copy!
  - only one transaction in the memory system per processor

Multiple in-flight transactions



- This example has two transactions, with abort handlers at L1 and L2
- Assume instruction window of length 5
  - allows us to speculate into next transaction(s)

Multiple in-flight transactions



- **During instruction decode:**
  - Maintain rename table and "saved" bits
  - "Saved" bits track registers mentioned in current rename table
    - Constant # of set bits: every time a register is added to "saved" set we also remove one

Multiple in-flight transactions

graduate

decode

Original	*Rename Table*	*Saved set*
XBEGIN L1	R1→P1, ...	{ P1, ... }
ADD P2, P1, P1	R1→P2, ...	{ P2, ... }
ST 1000, R1		
XEND		
XBEGIN L2		
ADD R1, R1, R1		
ST 2000, R1		
XEND		

- **When XBEGIN is decoded:**
  - Snapshots taken of current Rename table and S-bits.
  - This snapshot is not active until XBEGIN graduates

Multiple in-flight transactions

graduate

decode

Original	*Rename Table*	*Saved set*
XBEGIN L1	R1→P1, ...	{ P1, ... }
ADD P2, P1, P1		
ST 1000, P2	R1→P2, ...	{ P2, ... }
XEND		
XBEGIN L2		
ADD R1, R1, R1		
ST 2000, R1		
XEND		

Multiple in-flight transactions



Original	*Rename Table*	*Saved set*
XBEGIN L1	R1→P1, ...	{ P1, ... }
ADD P2, P1, P1		
ST 1000, P2		
XEND	R1→P2, ...	{ P2, ... }
XBEGIN L2		
ADD R1, R1, R1		
ST 2000, R1		
XEND		

Multiple in-flight transactions



Original	*Rename Table*	*Saved set*
XBEGIN L1	R1→P1, ...	{ P1, ... }
ADD P2, P1, P1		
ST 1000, P2		
XEND		
XBEGIN L2	R1→P2, ...	{ P2, ... }
ADD R1, R1, R1		
ST 2000, R1		
XEND		

- **When XBEGIN graduates:**
  - Snapshot taken at decode becomes **active**, which will prevent P1 from being reused
  - 1st transaction queued to become active in memory
  - To abort, we just restore the active snapshot's rename table

Multiple in-flight transactions



- We're only reserving registers in the active set
  - This implies that exactly #AR registers are saved
  - This number is strictly limited, even as we speculatively execute through multiple xactions

Multiple in-flight transactions



- Normally, P1 would be freed here
- Since it's in the active snapshot's "saved" set, we put it on the register reserved list instead

Multiple in-flight transactions



- **When XEND graduates:**
  - Reserved physical registers (P1) are freed, and active snapshot is cleared.
  - Store queue is empty

Multiple in-flight transactions



- **Second transaction becomes active in memory.**

Cache overflow mechanism



Overflow hashtable

key	data

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

- Need to keep "current" values as well as "rollback" values
  - Common-case is commit, so keep "current" in cache
  - What if uncommitted "current" values don't all fit in cache?
- Use overflow hashtable as extension of cache
  - Avoid looking here if we can!

Cache overflow mechanism



Overflow hashtable

key	data

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

- T bit per cache line
  - set if accessed during xaction
- O bit per cache set
  - indicates set overflow
- Overflow storage in physical DRAM
  - allocated/resized by OS
  - probe/miss: complexity of search ≈ page table walk

Cache overflow mechanism



Overflow hashtable

key	data

- Start with non-transactional data in the cache

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```


Cache overflow: recording reads



Overflow hashtable

key	data

- Transactional read sets the T bit.

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

Cache overflow: recording writes

	Way 0			Way 1		
O	T	tag	data	T	tag	data
	T	1000	55	T	2000	66

Overflow hashtable

key	data

- Most transactional writes fit in the cache.

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```


Cache overflow: spilling

	Way 0			Way 1		
O	T	tag	data	T	tag	data
O	T	3000	77	T	2000	66

Overflow hashtable

key	data
1000	55

- Overflow sets O bit
- New data replaces LRU
- Old data spilled to DRAM

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

Cache overflow: miss handling



Overflow hashtable

key	data
3000	77

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

- Miss to an overflowed line checks overflow table
- If found, swap overflow and cache line; proceed as hit
- Else, proceed as miss.

Cache overflow: commit/abort



Overflow hashtable

key	data
3000	77

```
ST 1000, 55
XBEGIN L1
LD R1, 1000
ST 2000, 66
ST 3000, 77
LD R1, 1000
XEND
```

- Abort:
  - invalidate all lines with T set
  - discard overflow hashtable
  - clear O and T bits
- Commit:
  - write back hashtable; NACK interventions during this
  - clear O and T bits

Cycle-level LTM simulation

- LTM implemented on top of UVSIM (itself built on RSIM)
  - shared-memory multiprocessor model
  - directory-based write-invalidate coherence
- Contention behavior:
  - C microbenchmarks w/ inline assembly
  - Up to 32 processors
- Overhead measurements:
  - Modified MIT FLEX Java compiler
  - Compared no-sync, spin-lock, and LTM xaction
  - Single-threaded, single processor

Contention behavior



- Contention microbenchmark: '`Counter`'
  - 1 shared variable; each processor repeatedly adds
  - locking version uses global LLSC spinlock
  - **Small xactions commit even with high contention**
  - Spin-lock causes lots of cache interventions even when it can't be taken (standard SGI library impl)

LTM Overhead: SPECjvm98



Is this good enough?

- Problems solved:
  - Xactions as large as physical memory
  - Scalable overflow and commit
  - Easy to implement!
  - Low overhead
  - May speed up Linux!
- Open Problems...
  - Is "physical memory" large enough?
  - What about duration?
    - Time-slice interrupts!

Beyond LTM: UTM

- We can do better!
- The UTM architecture allows transactions as **large as virtual memory**, of **unlimited duration**, which can **migrate** without restart
- Same `XBEGIN pc`/`XEND` ISA; same register rollback mechanism
- Canonical transaction info is now stored in single **xstate** data struct in main memory

xstate data structure



- Transaction log in DRAM for each active transaction
  - **commit record**: `PENDING`, `COMMITTED`, `ABORTED`
  - vector of **log entries** w/ "rollback" values
    - each corresponds to a block in main memory
- Log ptr & **RW bit** for each application memory block
  - **Log ptr/next reader** form linked list of all log entries for a given block

Caching in UTM

- **Most log entries don't need to be created**
- Transaction state stored in cache/overflow DRAM and monitored using cache-coherence, as in LTM
- Only create transaction log when thread is descheduled, or run out of physical mem.
- Can discard all log entries when xaction commits or aborts
  - Commit – block left in X state in cache
  - Abort – use old value in main memory
- In-cache representation need not match xstate representation

Performance/Limits of UTM

- Limits:
  - **More-complicated** implementation
    - Best way to create xstate from LTM state?
  - **Performance** impact of swapping.
    - When should we abort rather than swap?
- Benefits:
  - Unlimited **footprint**
  - Unlimited **duration**
  - **Migration** and **paging** possible
  - **Performance** may be as fast as LTM in the common case

Conclusions

- First look at xaction properties of Linux:
  - 99.9% of xactions touch ≤ 54 cache lines
  - but may touch > 8000 cache lines
  - 4x concurrency?
- Unbounded, scalable, and efficient Transactional Memory systems can be built.
  - Support large, frequent, and concurrent xactions
  - What *could* software for these look like?
    - Allow programmers to (finally!) use our parallel systems!
- Two implementable architectures:
  - LTM: easy to realize, almost unbounded
  - UTM: truly unbounded

Open questions

- I/O interface?
- Transaction ordering?
  - Sequential threads provide inherent ordering
- Programming model?
- Conflict resolution strategies