Multicore and Parallelism

CS 3410, Spring 2014

Computer Science

Cornell University

See P&H Chapter: 4.10, 1.7, 1.8, 5.10, 6.4, 2.11

Announcements

Dynamic Multiple Issue



Limits of Static Scheduling

Compiler scheduling for dual-issue MIPS…

```
lw   $t0, 0($s1)        # load A
addi $t0, $t0, +1       # increment A
sw   $t0, 0($s1)        # store A
lw   $t1, 0($s2)        # load B
addi $t1, $t1, +1       # increment B
sw   $t1, 0($s2)        # store B
```



Does Multiple Issue Work?

Q: Does multiple issue / ILP work?

A: Kind of… but not as much as we'd like

Limiting factors?

- Programs dependencies
- Hard to detect dependencies → be conservative
  - e.g. Pointer Aliasing: A[0] += 1; B[0] *= 2;
- Hard to expose parallelism
  - Can only issue a few instructions ahead of PC
- Structural limits
  - Memory delays and limited bandwidth
- Hard to keep pipelines full

Administrivia

Next few weeks

- Week 12 (Apr 22): Lab4 release and Proj3 due Fri
  - Note Lab 4 is now IN CLASS
- Week 13 (Apr 29): Proj4 release, ~~Lab4 due Tue~~, Prelim2
- Week 14 (May 6): Proj3 tournament Mon, Proj4 design doc due

Final Project for class

- Week 15 (May 13): Proj4 due Wed

Today

Many ways to improve performance

- Multicore
  - Performance in multicore
- Synchronization

Next 2 lectures: synchronization and GPUs

How to improve performance?

We have looked at

- Pipelining

- To speed up:
  - Deeper pipelining
  - Make the clock run faster
  - Parallelism
    - Not a luxury, a necessity

Why Multicore?

Moore's law

- A law about transistors
- Smaller means more transistors per die
- And smaller means faster too

But: need to worry about power too…

Power Wall

Power = capacitance * voltage^2 * frequency

approx. capacitance * voltage^3

Reducing voltage helps (a lot)

Better cooling helps

The power wall

- We can't reduce voltage further - leakage
- We can't remove more heat

Power Limits



Why Multicore?



Single-Core
Overclocked +20%

Single-Core

Dual-Core
Underclocked -20%
Undervolted -20%

Inside the Processor

AMD Barcelona Quad-Core: 4 processor cores





Inside the Processor

Intel Nehalem Hex-Core



Hardware multithreading

Hardware multithreading

- Increase utilization with low overhead

Switch between hardware threads for stalls

What is a thread?

Process includes multiple threads, code, data and OS state



Hardware multithreading

Fine grained vs. Coarse grained hardware multithreading

Simultaneous multithreading (SMT)

Hyperthreads (Intel simultaneous multithreading)

- Need to hide latency

Hardware multithreading

Fine grained vs. Coarse grained hardware multithreading

Fine grained multithreading

- Switch on each cycle
- Pros: Can hide very short stalls
- Cons: Slows down every thread

Coarse grained multithreading

- Switch only on quite long stalls
- Pros: removes need for very fast switches
- Cons: flush pipeline, short stalls not handled

Simultaneous multithreading

SMT

- Leverages multi-issue pipeline with dynamic instruction scheduling and ILP
- Exploits functional unit parallelism better than single threads
- Always running multiple instructions from multiple threads
  - No cost of context switching
  - Uses dynamic scheduling and register renaming through reservation stations

- Can use all functional units very efficiently


Issue slots
Thread A
Thread B
Thread C
Thread D
Time
Issue slots
Coarse MT
Fine MT
SMT
Time

Hyperthreading

Multi-Core vs. Multi-Issue vs. HT

Programs:	*N*	*1*	*N*
Num. Pipelines:	*N*	*1*	1
Pipeline Width:	*1*	*N*	*N*

Hyperthreads

- HT = MultiIssue + extra PCs and registers – dependency logic
- HT = MultiCore – redundant functional units + hazard avoidance

Hyperthreads (Intel)

- Illusion of multiple cores on a single core
- Easy to keep HT pipelines full + share functional units

Example: All of the above



8 multiprocessors
4 core per multiprocessor
2 HT per core

Dynamic multi-issue: 4 issue
Pipeline depth: 16

Note: each processor may have multiple processing cores, so this is an example of a multiprocessor multicore hyperthreaded system

Parallel Programming

Q: So lets just all use multicore from now on!

A: Software must be written as parallel program

Multicore difficulties

- Partitioning work, balancing load
- Coordination & synchronization
- Communication overhead
- How do you write parallel programs?
  - ... without knowing exact underlying architecture?

Work Partitioning

Partition work so all cores have something to do



Load Balancing

Need to partition so all cores are actually working



Amdahl's Law

If tasks have a serial part and a parallel part…

Example:

step 1: divide input data into *n* pieces

step 2: do work on each piece

step 3: combine all results

Recall: Amdahl's Law

As number of cores increases …

- time to execute parallel part? goes to zero
- time to execute serial part? Remains the same
- *Serial part eventually dominates*

Amdahl's Law



Pitfall: Amdahl's Law

Execution time after improvement =

$$\frac{\text{affected execution time}}{\text{amount of improvement}} + \text{execution time unaffected}$$

$$T_{\text{improved}} = \frac{T_{\text{affected}}}{\text{improvement factor}} + T_{\text{unaffected}}$$

Pitfall: Amdahl's Law

Improving an aspect of a computer and expecting a proportional improvement in overall performance

$$T_{\text{improved}} = \frac{T_{\text{affected}}}{\text{improvement factor}} + T_{\text{unaffected}}$$

Example: multiply accounts for 80s out of 100s

- How much improvement do we need in the multiply performance to get 5× overall improvement?

$$20 = 80/n + 20$$ – ***Can't be done!***

Scaling Example

Workload: sum of 10 scalars, and 10 × 10 matrix sum

- Speed up from 10 to 100 processors?

Single processor: Time = (10 + 100) × t_{add}

10 processors

- Time = 100/10 × t_{add} + 10 × t_{add} = 20 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 110/20 = 5.5

100 processors

- Time = 100/100 × t_{add} + 10 × t_{add} = 11 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 110/11 = 10

Assumes load can be balanced across processors

Scaling Example

What if matrix size is 100 × 100?

Single processor: Time = (10 + 10000) × t_{add}

10 processors

- Time = 10 × t_{add} + 10000/10 × t_{add} = 1010 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 10010/1010 = 9.9

100 processors

- Time = 10 × t_{add} + 10000/100 × t_{add} = 110 × t_{add}
- Speedup = 10010/110 = 91

Assuming load balanced

Scaling

Strong scaling vs. weak scaling

Strong scaling: scales with same problem size

Weak scaling: scales with increased problem size

Parallelism is a necessity

Necessity, not luxury

- Power wall

Not easy to get performance out of

Many solutions

- Pipelining
- Multi-issue
- Hyperthreading
- Multicore

Parallel Programming

Q: So lets just all use multicore from now on!

A: Software must be written as parallel program

Multicore difficulties

- Partitioning work
- Coordination & synchronization
- Communications overhead

HW

SW

Your career…

- Balancing load over cores
- How do you write parallel programs?
  - … without knowing exact underlying architecture?

Synchronization

P&H Chapter 2.11 and 5.10

Parallelism and Synchronization

How do I take advantage of *parallelism*?

How do I write (**correct**) parallel programs?

What primitives do I need to implement correct parallel programs?

Topics

Understand Cache Coherency

Synchronizing parallel programs

- Atomic Instructions
- HW support for synchronization

How to write parallel programs

- Threads and processes
- Critical sections, race conditions, and mutexes

Parallelism and Synchronization

Cache Coherency Problem: What happens when two or more processors cache ***shared*** data?

Parallelism and Synchronization

Cache Coherency Problem: What happens when two or more processors cache *shared* data?

i.e. the view of memory held by two different processors is through their individual caches

As a result, processors can see different (incoherent) values to the *same* memory location

Parallelism and Synchronization

Each processor core has its own L1 cache



Parallelism and Synchronization

Each processor core has its own L1 cache



Shared Memory Multiprocessors

Shared Memory Multiprocessor (SMP)

- Typical (today): 2 – 8 cores each
- HW provides *single physical address* space for all processors
- Assume uniform memory access (UMA) (ignore NUMA)



Shared Memory Multiprocessors

Shared Memory Multiprocessor (SMP)

- Typical (today): 2 – 8 cores each
- HW provides *single physical address* space for all processors
- Assume uniform memory access (ignore NUMA)



Cache Coherency Problem

Thread A (on Core0)

```
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

Thread B (on Core1)

```
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

What will the value of x be after both loops finish?

Start: x = 0



iClicker

Thread A (on Core0)

```
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

Thread B (on Core1)

```
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

Cache Coherency Problem

Thread A (on Core0)

```
for(int i = 0, i < 5; i++) {
        LW $t0, addr(x)
        ADDIU $t0, $t0, 1
        SW $t0, addr(x)
}
```

Thread B (on Core1)

```
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
        LW $t1, addr(x)
        ADDIU $t1, $t1, 1
        SW $t1, addr(x)
}
```

iClicker

Thread A (on Core0)

```
for(int i = 0; i < 5; i++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

Thread B (on Core1)

```
for(int j = 0; j < 5; j++) {
        x = x + 1;
}
```

What can the value of x be after both loops finish?

a) 6

b) 8

c) 10

d) All of the above

e) None of the above

Cache Coherence Problem

Suppose two CPU cores share a physical address space

- Write-through caches

Time step	Event	CPU A's cache	CPU B's cache	Memory
0				0
1	CPU A reads X	0		0
2	CPU B reads X	0	0	0
3	CPU A writes 1 to X	1	0	1



Two issues

Coherence

What values can be returned by a read

Consistency

When a written value will be returned by a read

Coherence Defined

Informal: Reads return most recently written value

Formal: For concurrent processes P_1 and P_2

- P writes X before P reads X (with no intervening writes)
  $\Rightarrow$ read returns written value
- P_1 writes X before P_2 reads X
  $\Rightarrow$ read returns written value
- P_1 writes X and P_2 writes X
  $\Rightarrow$ all processors see writes in the same order
  - all see the same final value for X
  - Aka write serialization

Coherence Defined

Formal: For concurrent processes P_1 and P_2

- P writes X before P reads X (with no intervening writes)
  ⇒ read returns written value
  - (preserve program order)
- P_1 writes X before P_2 reads X
  ⇒ read returns written value
  - (coherent memory view, can't read old value forever)
- P_1 writes X and P_2 writes X
  ⇒ all processors see writes in the same order
  - all see the same final value for X
  - Aka write serialization
  - (else X can see P2's write before P1 and Y can see the opposite; their final understanding of state is wrong)

Cache Coherence Protocols

Operations performed by caches in multiprocessors to ensure coherence and support shared memory

- Migration of data to local caches
  - Reduces bandwidth for shared memory (performance)
- Replication of read-shared data
  - Reduces contention for access (performance)

Snooping protocols

- Each cache monitors bus reads/writes (correctness)

Snooping

Snooping for Hardware Cache Coherence

- All caches monitor bus and all other caches

Write invalidate protocol

- Bus read: respond if you have dirty data
- Bus write: update/invalidate your copy of data



Invalidating Snooping Protocols

Cache gets **exclusive access** to a block when it is to be written

- Broadcasts an invalidate message on the bus
- Subsequent read is another cache miss
  - Owning cache supplies updated value

Time Step	CPU activity	Bus activity	CPU A's cache	CPU B's cache	Memory
0					0
1	CPU A reads X	Cache miss for X	0		0
2	CPU B reads X	Cache miss for X	0	0	0
3	CPU A writes 1 to X	Invalidate for X	1		0
4	CPU B read X	Cache miss for X	1	1	

Invalidating Snooping Protocols

Cache gets **exclusive access** to a block when it is to be written

- Broadcasts an invalidate message on the bus
- Subsequent read is another cache miss
  - Owning cache supplies updated value

Time Step	CPU activity	Bus activity	CPU A's cache	CPU B's cache	Memory
0					0
1	CPU A reads X	Cache miss for X	0		0
2	CPU B reads X	Cache miss for X	0	0	0
3	CPU A writes 1 to X	Invalidate for X	1		0
4	CPU B read X	Cache miss for X	1	1	1

Writing

Write-back policies for bandwidth

Write-invalidate coherence policy

- First invalidate all other copies of data
- Then write it in cache line
- Anybody else can read it

Works with one writer, multiple readers

In reality: many coherence protocols

- Snooping doesn't scale
- Directory-based protocols
  - Caches and memory record sharing status of blocks in a directory

Summary of cache coherence

Informally, Cache Coherency requires that reads return most recently written value

Cache coherence hard problem

Snooping protocols are one approach

Next Goal: Synchronization

Is cache coherency sufficient?

i.e. Is cache coherency (***what*** values are read) sufficient to maintain consistency (***when*** a written value will be returned to a read)

Need both coherency and consistency

Synchronization

Two processors sharing an area of memory

- P1 writes, then P2 reads
- Data race if P1 and P2 don't ***synchronize***
  - Result depends of order of accesses

Hardware support required

- Atomic read/write memory operation
- No other access to the location allowed between the read and write

Could be a single instruction

- E.g., atomic swap of register ↔ memory (e.g. ATS, BTS; x86)
- Or an atomic pair of instructions (e.g. LL and SC; MIPS)

Synchronization in MIPS

Load linked: `LL rt, offset(rs)`

Store conditional: `SC rt, offset(rs)`

- Succeeds if location not changed since the LL
  - Returns 1 in rt
- Fails if location is changed
  - Returns 0 in rt

Example: atomic swap (to test/set lock variable)

```
try: MOVE $t0,$s4  ;copy exchange value
     LL  $t1,0($s1);load linked
     SC  $t0,0($s1);store conditional
     BEQZ $t0,try  ;branch store fails
     MOVE $s4,$t1  ;put load value in $s4
```

Any time a processor intervenes and modifies the value in memory between the LL and SC instruction, SC returns 0 in $t0, causing the code to try again