Lecture 22: Transactional Memory

• Topics: transactional memory implementations

• Reminders:
  ▪ Assgn 7 posted (due in 2 weeks) – get started early!
Summary of TM Benefits

• As easy to program as coarse-grain locks

• Performance similar to fine-grain locks

• Speculative parallelization

• Avoids deadlock

• Resilient to faults
Design Space

- **Data Versioning**
  - Eager: based on an undo log
  - Lazy: based on a write buffer

- **Conflict Detection**
  - Optimistic detection: check for conflicts at commit time (proceed optimistically thru transaction)
  - Pessimistic detection: every read/write checks for conflicts (so you can abort quickly)
"Lazy" Implementation

• An implementation for a small-scale multiprocessor with a snooping-based protocol

• Lazy versioning and lazy conflict detection

• Does not allow transactions to commit in parallel
“Lazy” Implementation

• When a transaction issues a read, fetch the block in read-only mode (if not already in cache) and set the rd-bit for that cache line

• When a transaction issues a write, fetch that block in read-only mode (if not already in cache), set the wr-bit for that cache line and make changes in cache

• If a line with wr-bit set is evicted, the transaction must be aborted (or must rely on some software mechanism to handle saving overflowed data)
“Lazy” Implementation

• When a transaction reaches its end, it must now make its writes permanent

• A central arbiter is contacted (easy on a bus-based system), the winning transaction holds on to the bus until all written cache line addresses are broadcasted (this is the commit) (need not do a writeback until the line is evicted – must simply invalidate other readers of these cache lines)

• When another transaction (that has not yet begun to commit) sees an invalidation for a line in its rd-set, it realizes its lack of atomicity and aborts (clears its rd- and wr-bits and re-starts)
“Lazy” Implementation

• Lazy versioning: changes are made locally – the “master copy” is updated only at the end of the transaction

• Lazy conflict detection: we are checking for conflicts only when one of the transactions reaches its end

• Aborts are quick (must just clear bits in cache, flush pipeline and reinstate a register checkpoint)

• Commit is slow (must check for conflicts, all the coherence operations for writes are deferred until transaction end)

• No fear of deadlock/livelock – the first transaction to acquire the bus will commit successfully

• Starvation is possible – need additional mechanisms
“Lazy” Implementation – Parallel Commits

• Writes cannot be rolled back – hence, before allowing two transactions to commit in parallel, we must ensure that they do not conflict with each other.

• One possible implementation: the central arbiter can collect signatures from each committing transaction (a compressed representation of all touched addresses).

• Arbiter does not grant commit permissions if it detects a possible conflict with the rd-wr-sets of transactions that are in the process of committing.

• The “lazy” design can also work with directory protocols.
“Eager” Implementation

• A write is made permanent immediately (we do not wait until the end of the transaction)

• This means that if some other transaction attempts a read, the latest value is returned and the memory may also be updated with this latest value

• Can’t lose the old value (in case this transaction is aborted) – hence, before the write, we copy the old value into a log (the log is some space in virtual memory -- the log itself may be in cache, so not too expensive)

  This is eager versioning
“Eager” Implementation

• Since Transaction-A’s writes are made permanent rightaway, it is possible that another Transaction-B’s rd/wr miss is re-directed to Tr-A

• At this point, we detect a conflict (neither transaction has reached its end, hence, *eager conflict detection*): two transactions handling the same cache line and at least one of them does a write

• One solution: requester stalls: Tr-A sends a NACK to Tr-B; Tr-B waits and re-tries again; hopefully, Tr-A has committed and can hand off the latest cache line to B → neither transaction needs to abort
“Eager” Implementation

• Can lead to deadlocks: each transaction is waiting for the other to finish

• Need a separate (hw/sw) contention manager to detect such deadlocks and force one of them to abort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr-A</th>
<th>Tr-B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>write X</td>
<td>write Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read Y</td>
<td>read X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Eager” Implementation

• Note that if Tr-B is doing a write, it may be forced to stall because Tr-A may have done a read and does not want to invalidate its cache line just yet

• If new reading transactions keep emerging, Tr-B may be starved – again, need other sw/hw mechanisms to handle starvation

• Since logs are stored in virtual memory, there is no cache overflow problem and transactions can be large

• Commits are inexpensive (no additional step required); Aborts are expensive (must reinstate data from logs)
Other Issues

• Nesting: when one transaction calls another
  ▪ flat nesting: collapse all nested transactions into one large transaction
  ▪ closed nesting: inner transaction’s rd-wr set are included in outer transaction’s rd-wr set on inner commit; on an inner conflict, only the inner transaction is re-started
  ▪ open nesting: on inner commit, its writes are committed and not merged with outer transaction’s commit set

• What if a transaction performs I/O? (buffering can help)
Useful Rules of Thumb

• Transactions are often short – more than 95% of them will fit in cache

• Transactions often commit successfully – less than 10% are aborted

• 99.9% of transactions don’t perform I/O

• Transaction nesting is not common

• Amdahl’s Law again: optimize the common case!

• For much more on TM: CS 7820 in Spring’08
Title

• Bullet