

Memory Systems in the Multi-Core Era

Lecture 2.3: Memory Interference and QoS-Aware Memory Systems

Prof. Onur Mutlu

<http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~omutlu>

onur@cmu.edu

Bogazici University

June 17, 2013

Carnegie Mellon

What Will You Learn in Mini Course 2?

- Memory Systems in the Multi-Core Era
 - June 13, 14, 17 (1-4pm)
- Lecture 1: Main memory basics, DRAM scaling
- Lecture 2: Emerging memory technologies and hybrid memories
- Lecture 3: Main memory interference and QoS
- Major Overview Reading:
 - Mutlu, “Memory Scaling: A Systems Architecture Perspective,” IMW 2013.

Readings and Videos

Memory Lecture Videos

- Memory Hierarchy (and Introduction to Caches)
 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JBdfZ5i21cs&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=22>
- Main Memory
 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZLCy3pG7Rc0&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=25>
- Memory Controllers, Memory Scheduling, Memory QoS
 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZSotvL3WXmA&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=26>
 - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1xe2w3_NzmI&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=27
- Emerging Memory Technologies
 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LzfOghMKyA0&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=35>
- Multiprocessor Correctness and Cache Coherence
 - <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-VZKMgItDM&list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ&index=32>

Readings for Lecture 2.1 (DRAM Scaling)

- Lee et al., "Tiered-Latency DRAM: A Low Latency and Low Cost DRAM Architecture," HPCA 2013.
- Liu et al., "RAIDR: Retention-Aware Intelligent DRAM Refresh," ISCA 2012.
- Kim et al., "A Case for Exploiting Subarray-Level Parallelism in DRAM," ISCA 2012.
- Liu et al., "An Experimental Study of Data Retention Behavior in Modern DRAM Devices," ISCA 2013.
- Seshadri et al., "RowClone: Fast and Efficient In-DRAM Copy and Initialization of Bulk Data," CMU CS Tech Report 2013.
- David et al., "Memory Power Management via Dynamic Voltage/Frequency Scaling," ICAC 2011.
- Ipek et al., "Self Optimizing Memory Controllers: A Reinforcement Learning Approach," ISCA 2008.

Readings for Lecture 2.2 (Emerging Technologies)

- Lee, Ipek, Mutlu, Burger, “Architecting Phase Change Memory as a Scalable DRAM Alternative,” ISCA 2009, CACM 2010, Top Picks 2010.
- Qureshi et al., “Scalable high performance main memory system using phase-change memory technology,” ISCA 2009.
- Meza et al., “Enabling Efficient and Scalable Hybrid Memories,” IEEE Comp. Arch. Letters 2012.
- Yoon et al., “Row Buffer Locality Aware Caching Policies for Hybrid Memories,” ICCD 2012 Best Paper Award.
- Meza et al., “A Case for Efficient Hardware-Software Cooperative Management of Storage and Memory,” WEED 2013.
- Kultursay et al., “Evaluating STT-RAM as an Energy-Efficient Main Memory Alternative,” ISPASS 2013.
- More to come in next lecture...

Readings for Lecture 2.3 (Memory QoS)

- Moscibroda and Mutlu, “Memory Performance Attacks,” USENIX Security 2007.
- Mutlu and Moscibroda, “Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling,” MICRO 2007.
- Mutlu and Moscibroda, “Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling,” ISCA 2008, IEEE Micro 2009.
- Kim et al., “ATLAS: A Scalable and High-Performance Scheduling Algorithm for Multiple Memory Controllers,” HPCA 2010.
- Kim et al., “Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling,” MICRO 2010, IEEE Micro 2011.
- Muralidhara et al., “Memory Channel Partitioning,” MICRO 2011.
- Ausavarungnirun et al., “Staged Memory Scheduling,” ISCA 2012.
- Subramanian et al., “MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems,” HPCA 2013.
- Das et al., “Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems,” HPCA 2013.

Readings for Lecture 2.3 (Memory QoS)

- Ebrahimi et al., “Fairness via Source Throttling,” ASPLOS 2010, ACM TOCS 2012.
- Lee et al., “Prefetch-Aware DRAM Controllers,” MICRO 2008, IEEE TC 2011.
- Ebrahimi et al., “Parallel Application Memory Scheduling,” MICRO 2011.
- Ebrahimi et al., “Prefetch-Aware Shared Resource Management for Multi-Core Systems,” ISCA 2011.

- More to come in next lecture...

Readings in Flash Memory

- Yu Cai, Gulay Yalcin, Onur Mutlu, Erich F. Haratsch, Adrian Cristal, Osman Unsal, and Ken Mai, **"Error Analysis and Retention-Aware Error Management for NAND Flash Memory"** *Intel Technology Journal (ITJ) Special Issue on Memory Resiliency*, Vol. 17, No. 1, May 2013.
- Yu Cai, Erich F. Haratsch, Onur Mutlu, and Ken Mai, **"Threshold Voltage Distribution in MLC NAND Flash Memory: Characterization, Analysis and Modeling"** *Proceedings of the Design, Automation, and Test in Europe Conference (DATE)*, Grenoble, France, March 2013. [Slides \(ppt\)](#)
- Yu Cai, Gulay Yalcin, Onur Mutlu, Erich F. Haratsch, Adrian Cristal, Osman Unsal, and Ken Mai, **"Flash Correct-and-Refresh: Retention-Aware Error Management for Increased Flash Memory Lifetime"** *Proceedings of the 30th IEEE International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD)*, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, September 2012. [Slides \(ppt\)](#) [\(pdf\)](#)
- Yu Cai, Erich F. Haratsch, Onur Mutlu, and Ken Mai, **"Error Patterns in MLC NAND Flash Memory: Measurement, Characterization, and Analysis"** *Proceedings of the Design, Automation, and Test in Europe Conference (DATE)*, Dresden, Germany, March 2012. [Slides \(ppt\)](#)

Online Lectures and More Information

■ Online Computer Architecture Lectures

- <http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL5PHm2jkkXmidJOd59REog9jDnPDTG6IJ>

■ Online Computer Architecture Courses

- Intro: <http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~ece447/s13/doku.php>
- Advanced: <http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~ece740/f11/doku.php>
- Advanced: <http://www.ece.cmu.edu/~ece742/doku.php>


■ Recent Research Papers

- <http://users.ece.cmu.edu/~omutlu/projects.htm>
- <http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=7XyGUGkAAAAJ&hl=en>


Main Memory Interference

Trend: Many Cores on Chip


- Simpler and lower power than a single large core
- Large scale parallelism on chip




AMD Barcelona
4 cores




Intel Core i7
8 cores




IBM Cell BE
8+1 cores




IBM POWER7
8 cores




Sun Niagara II
8 cores



Nvidia Fermi
448 "cores"



Intel SCC
48 cores, networked




Tiler TILE Gx
100 cores, networked

Many Cores on Chip


- What we want:
 - N times the system performance with N times the cores
- What do we get today?

Unfair Slowdowns due to Interference




Moscibroda and Mutlu, “[Memory performance attacks: Denial of in multi-core systems](#),” USENIX Security 2007.


Uncontrolled Interference: An Example



Memory System is the Major Shared Resource




Much More of a Shared Resource in Future



Inter-Thread/ Application Interference


- Problem: Threads share the memory system, but memory system does not distinguish between threads' requests
- Existing memory systems
 - ❑ Free-for-all, shared based on demand
 - ❑ Control algorithms thread-unaware and thread-unfair
 - ❑ Aggressive threads can deny service to others
 - ❑ Do not try to reduce or control inter-thread interference

Unfair Slowdowns due to Interference



Moscibroda and Mutlu, “[Memory performance attacks: Denial of in multi-core systems](#),” USENIX Security 2007.

Uncontrolled Interference: An Example



A Memory Performance Hog

```
// initialize large arrays A, B  
for (j=0; j<N; j++) {  
    index = j*linesize; streaming  
    A[index] = B[index];  
    ...  
}
```

STREAM

- Sequential memory access
- Very high row buffer locality (96% hit rate)
- Memory intensive


```
// initialize large arrays A, B  
for (j=0; j<N; j++) {  
    index = rand(); random  
    A[index] = B[index];  
    ...  
}
```

RANDOM

- Random memory access
- Very low row buffer locality (3% hit rate)
- Similarly memory intensive

Moscibroda and Mutlu, “[Memory Performance Attacks](#),” USENIX Security 2007.

What Does the Memory Hog Do?



Row size: 8KB, cache block size: 64B
128 (8KB/64B) requests of T0 serviced before T1

Moscibroda and Mutlu, “[Memory Performance Attacks](#),” USENIX Security 2007.


DRAM Controllers

- A row-conflict memory access takes significantly longer than a row-hit access
- Current controllers take advantage of the row buffer
- Commonly used scheduling policy (FR-FCFS) [Rixner 2000]*
 - (1) Row-hit first: Service row-hit memory accesses first
 - (2) Oldest-first: Then service older accesses first
- This scheduling policy aims to maximize DRAM throughput
 - But, it is unfair when multiple threads share the DRAM system

*Rixner et al., “Memory Access Scheduling,” ISCA 2000.

*Zuravleff and Robinson, “Controller for a synchronous DRAM ...,” US Patent 5,630,096, May 1997.


Effect of the Memory Performance Hog



Results on Intel Pentium D running Windows XP
(Similar results for Intel Core Duo and AMD Turion, and on Fedora Linux)

Moscibroda and Mutlu, “[Memory Performance Attacks](#),” USENIX Security 2007.


Greater Problem with More Cores



- Vulnerable to denial of service (DoS) [Usenix Security'07]
- Unable to enforce priorities or SLAs [MICRO'07,'10,'11, ISCA'08'11'12, ASPLOS'10]
- Low system performance [IEEE Micro Top Picks '09,'11a,'11b,'12]

Uncontrollable, unpredictable system

Greater Problem with More Cores



- Vulnerable to denial of service (DoS) [Usenix Security'07]
- Unable to enforce priorities or SLAs [MICRO'07,'10,'11, ISCA'08'11'12, ASPLOS'10]
- Low system performance [IEEE Micro Top Picks '09,'11a,'11b,'12]


Uncontrollable, unpredictable system

Distributed DoS in Networked Multi-Core Systems

Cores connected via
packet-switched
routers on chip

~5000X latency increase

Grot, Hestness, Keckler, Mutlu,
“Preemptive virtual clock: A Flexible,
Efficient, and Cost-effective QOS
Scheme for Networks-on-Chip,”
MICRO 2009.



How Do We Solve The Problem?

- Inter-thread interference is uncontrolled in all memory resources
 - Memory controller
 - Interconnect
 - Caches
- We need to control it
 - i.e., design an interference-aware (QoS-aware) memory system


QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Challenges

- How do we **reduce inter-thread interference**?
 - Improve system performance and core utilization
 - Reduce request serialization and core starvation
- How do we **control inter-thread interference**?
 - Provide mechanisms to enable system software to enforce QoS policies
 - While providing high system performance
- How do we **make the memory system configurable/flexible**?
 - Enable flexible mechanisms that can achieve many goals
 - Provide fairness or throughput when needed
 - Satisfy performance guarantees when needed

Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - **QoS-aware memory controllers** [Mutlu+ MICRO'07] [Moscibroda+, Usenix Security'07] [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09] [Kim+ HPCA'10] [Kim+ MICRO'10, Top Picks'11] [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'11, MICRO'11] [Ausavarungnirun+, ISCA'12]
 - QoS-aware interconnects [Das+ MICRO'09, ISCA'10, Top Picks '11] [Grot+ MICRO'09, ISCA'11, Top Picks '12]
 - QoS-aware caches
- **Dumb resources:** Keep each resource free-for-all, but reduce/control interference by injection control or data mapping
 - Source throttling to control access to memory system [Ebrahimi+ ASPLOS'10, ISCA'11, TOCS'12] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Nychis+ HotNets'10]
 - QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers [Muralidhara+ MICRO'11]
 - QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling







- How to schedule requests to provide
 - ❑ High system performance
 - ❑ High fairness to applications
 - ❑ Configurability to system software
- Memory controller needs to be aware of threads

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution


- **Stall-time fair memory scheduling** [Mutlu+ MICRO'07]
 - Idea: Estimate and balance thread slowdowns
 - Takeaway: **Proportional thread progress improves performance, especially when threads are "heavy"** (memory intensive)
- **Parallelism-aware batch scheduling** [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09]
 - Idea: Rank threads and service in rank order (to preserve bank parallelism); batch requests to prevent starvation
- **ATLAS memory scheduler** [Kim+ HPCA'10]

Within-Thread Bank Parallelism



Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling [ISCA'08]

- Principle 1: Schedule requests from a thread back to back
 - Preserves each thread's bank parallelism
 - But, this can cause starvation...
- Principle 2: Group a fixed number of oldest requests from each thread into a "batch"
 - Service the batch before all other requests
 - Form a new batch when the current batch is done
 - Eliminates starvation, provides fairness



QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **Stall-time fair memory scheduling** [Mutlu+ MICRO'07]
 - Idea: Estimate and balance thread slowdowns
 - Takeaway: **Proportional thread progress improves performance, especially when threads are "heavy"** (memory intensive)
- **Parallelism-aware batch scheduling** [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09]
 - Idea: Rank threads and service in rank order (to preserve bank parallelism); batch requests to prevent starvation
 - Takeaway: **Preserving within-thread bank-parallelism improves performance**; request batching improves fairness
- **ATLAS memory scheduler** [Kim+ HPCA'10]
 - Idea: Prioritize threads that have attained the least service from the memory scheduler
 - Takeaway: **Prioritizing "light" threads improves performance**

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- Thread cluster memory scheduling [Kim+ MICRO'10]
 - Idea: Cluster threads into two groups (latency vs. bandwidth sensitive); prioritize the latency-sensitive ones; employ a fairness policy in the bandwidth sensitive group
 - Takeaway: Heterogeneous scheduling policy that is different based on thread behavior maximizes both performance and fairness
- Integrated Memory Channel Partitioning and Scheduling [Muralidhara+ MICRO'11]
 - Idea: Only prioritize very latency-sensitive threads in the scheduler; mitigate all other applications' interference via channel partitioning
 - Takeaway: Intelligently combining application-aware channel partitioning and memory scheduling provides better performance than either

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **Parallel application memory scheduling** [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'11]
 - Idea: Identify and prioritize limiter threads of a multithreaded application in the memory scheduler; provide fast and fair progress to non-limiter threads
 - Takeaway: Carefully prioritizing between limiter and non-limiter threads of a parallel application improves performance
- **Staged memory scheduling** [Ausavarungnirun+ ISCA'12]
 - Idea: Divide the functional tasks of an application-aware memory scheduler into multiple distinct stages, where each stage is significantly simpler than a monolithic scheduler
 - Takeaway: Staging enables the design of a scalable and relatively simpler application-aware memory scheduler that works on very large request buffers

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **MISE** [Subramanian+ HPCA'13]
 - Idea: Estimate the performance of a thread by estimating its change in memory request service rate when run alone vs. shared → use this simple model to estimate slowdown to design a scheduling policy that provides predictable performance or fairness
 - Takeaway: Request service rate of a thread is a good proxy for its performance; alone request service rate can be estimated by giving high priority to the thread in memory scheduling for a while

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **Prefetch-aware shared resource management** [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'12] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Lee+ MICRO'08]
 - Idea: Prioritize prefetches depending on how they affect system performance; even accurate prefetches can degrade performance of the system
 - Takeaway: Carefully controlling and prioritizing prefetch requests improves performance and fairness

- **DRAM-Aware last-level cache policies** [Lee+ HPS Tech Report'10] [Lee+ HPS Tech Report'10]
 - Idea: Design cache eviction and replacement policies such that they proactively exploit the state of the memory controller and DRAM (e.g., proactively evict data from the cache that hit in open rows)
 - Takeaway: Coordination of last-level cache and DRAM policies improves performance and fairness

Stall-Time Fair Memory Scheduling


Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda,

"Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling for Chip Multiprocessors"

40th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**),

pages 146-158, Chicago, IL, December 2007. [Slides \(ppt\)](#)

The Problem: Unfairness



- Vulnerable to denial of service (DoS) [Usenix Security'07]
- Unable to enforce priorities or SLAs [MICRO'07,'10,'11, ISCA'08'11'12, ASPLOS'10]
- Low system performance [IEEE Micro Top Picks '09,'11a,'11b,'12]

Uncontrollable, unpredictable system

How Do We Solve the Problem?

- Stall-time fair memory scheduling [Mutlu+ MICRO'07]
- Goal: Threads sharing main memory should experience similar slowdowns compared to when they are run alone → fair scheduling
 - Also improves overall system performance by ensuring cores make “proportional” progress
- Idea: Memory controller estimates each thread's slowdown due to interference and schedules requests in a way to balance the slowdowns
- Mutlu and Moscibroda, “Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling for Chip Multiprocessors,” MICRO 2007.

Stall-Time Fairness in Shared DRAM Systems

- A DRAM system is fair if it equalizes the slowdown of equal-priority threads relative to when each thread is run alone on the same system
- DRAM-related stall-time: The time a thread spends waiting for DRAM memory
- ST_{shared} : DRAM-related stall-time when the thread runs with other threads
- ST_{alone} : DRAM-related stall-time when the thread runs alone
- **Memory-slowdown** = $ST_{\text{shared}}/ST_{\text{alone}}$
 - Relative increase in stall-time
- *Stall-Time Fair Memory scheduler (STFM)* aims to equalize **Memory-slowdown** for interfering threads, without sacrificing performance
 - Considers inherent DRAM performance of each thread
 - Aims to allow proportional progress of threads


STFM Scheduling Algorithm [MICRO' 07]

- For each thread, the DRAM controller
 - Tracks ST_{shared}
 - Estimates ST_{alone}
- Each cycle, the DRAM controller
 - Computes $\text{Slowdown} = ST_{\text{shared}} / ST_{\text{alone}}$ for threads with legal requests
 - Computes **unfairness = MAX Slowdown / MIN Slowdown**
- If $\text{unfairness} < \alpha$
 - Use DRAM throughput oriented scheduling policy
- **If unfairness $\geq \alpha$**
 - Use fairness-oriented scheduling policy
 - **(1) requests from thread with MAX Slowdown first**
 - (2) row-hit first , (3) oldest-first

How Does STFM Prevent Unfairness?

T0: Row 0
T1: Row 5
T0: Row 0
T1: Row 111
T0: Row 0
T0: Row 06

T0 Slowdown	1.00
T1 Slowdown	1.00
Unfairness	1.00
α	1.05



STFM Pros and Cons

- Upsides:
 - ❑ First work on fair multi-core memory scheduling
 - ❑ Good at providing fairness
 - ❑ Being fair improves performance

- Downsides:
 - ❑ Does not handle all types of interference
 - ❑ Somewhat complex to implement
 - ❑ Slowdown estimations can be incorrect



Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling

Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda,
**"Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling: Enhancing both
Performance and Fairness of Shared DRAM Systems"**
35th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA),
pages 63-74, Beijing, China, June 2008. [Slides \(ppt\)](#)

Another Problem due to Interference

- Processors try to tolerate the latency of DRAM requests by generating multiple outstanding requests
 - Memory-Level Parallelism (MLP)
 - Out-of-order execution, non-blocking caches, runahead execution
- Effective only if the DRAM controller actually services the multiple requests in parallel in DRAM banks
- Multiple threads share the DRAM controller
- DRAM controllers are not aware of a thread's MLP
 - Can service each thread's outstanding requests serially, not in parallel

Bank Parallelism of a Thread



Bank access latencies of the two requests overlapped
Thread stalls for ~ONE bank access latency

Bank Parallelism Interference in DRAM

Baseline Scheduler:




Bank 0	Bank 1
Thread A: Bank 0, Row 1	
Thread B: Bank 1, Row 99	
Thread B: Bank 0, Row 99	
Thread A: Bank 1, Row 1	


Bank access latencies of each thread serialized
Each thread stalls for ~TWO bank access latencies

Parallelism-Aware Scheduler


Baseline Scheduler:



Parallelism-aware Scheduler:



Bank 0 Bank 1



Thread A: Bank 0, Row 1

Thread B: Bank 1, Row 99


Thread B: Bank 0, Row 99

Thread A: Bank 1, Row 1

**Average stall-time:
~1.5 bank access
latencies**

Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling (PAR-BS)

- Principle 1: Parallelism-awareness
 - ❑ Schedule requests from a thread (to different banks) back to back
 - ❑ Preserves each thread's bank parallelism
 - ❑ But, this can cause starvation...
- Principle 2: Request Batching
 - ❑ Group a fixed number of oldest requests from each thread into a "batch"
 - ❑ Service the batch before all other requests
 - ❑ Form a new batch when the current one is done
 - ❑ Eliminates starvation, provides fairness
 - ❑ Allows parallelism-awareness within a batch



PAR-BS Components

- Request batching
- Within-batch scheduling
 - Parallelism aware

Request Batching

- Each memory request has a bit (*marked*) associated with it
- Batch formation:
 - Mark up to *Marking-Cap* oldest requests per bank for each thread
 - Marked requests constitute the batch
 - Form a new batch when no marked requests are left
- Marked requests are prioritized over unmarked ones
 - No reordering of requests across batches: no starvation, high fairness
- How to prioritize requests within a batch?

Within-Batch Scheduling

- Can use any existing DRAM scheduling policy
 - FR-FCFS (row-hit first, then oldest-first) exploits row-buffer locality
- But, we also want to preserve intra-thread bank parallelism
 - Service each thread's requests back to back

HOW?

- Scheduler computes a **ranking of threads** when the batch is formed
 - Higher-ranked threads are prioritized over lower-ranked ones
 - Improves the likelihood that requests from a thread are serviced in parallel by different banks
 - Different threads prioritized in the same order across ALL banks


How to Rank Threads within a Batch

- Ranking scheme affects system throughput and fairness
- Maximize system throughput
 - Minimize average stall-time of threads within the batch
- Minimize unfairness (Equalize the slowdown of threads)
 - Service threads with inherently low stall-time early in the batch
 - Insight: delaying memory non-intensive threads results in high slowdown
- Shortest stall-time first (shortest job first) ranking
 - Provides optimal system throughput [Smith, 1956]*
 - Controller estimates each thread's stall-time within the batch
 - Ranks threads with shorter stall-time higher

* W.E. Smith, "Various optimizers for single stage production," Naval Research Logistics Quarterly, 1956.

Shortest Stall-Time First Ranking

- Maximum number of marked requests to any bank (max-bank-load)
 - Rank thread with lower max-bank-load higher (\sim low stall-time)
- Total number of marked requests (total-load)
 - Breaks ties: rank thread with lower total-load higher




	max-bank-load	total-load


Ranking:
T0 > T1 > T2 > T3

Example Within-Batch Scheduling Order

Baseline Scheduling Order (Arrival order)



PAR-BS Scheduling Order



Ranking: T0 > T1 > T2 > T3

	T0	T1	T2	T3
Stall times				

AVG: 5 bank access latencies

	T0	T1	T2	T3
Stall times				

AVG: 3.5 bank access latencies

Putting It Together: PAR-BS Scheduling Policy

■ PAR-BS Scheduling Policy

(1) Marked requests first

Batching

(2) Row-hit requests first

(3) Higher-rank thread first (shortest stall-time first)

Parallelism-aware
within-batch
scheduling

(4) Oldest first

■ Three properties:

- ❑ Exploits row-buffer locality **and** intra-thread bank parallelism
- ❑ Work-conserving
 - Services unmarked requests to banks without marked requests
- ❑ Marking-Cap is important
 - Too small cap: destroys row-buffer locality
 - Too large cap: penalizes memory non-intensive threads


■ Many more trade-offs analyzed in the paper

Hardware Cost


- <1.5KB storage cost for
 - 8-core system with 128-entry memory request buffer
- No complex operations (e.g., divisions)
- Not on the critical path
 - Scheduler makes a decision only every DRAM cycle

Unfairness on 4-, 8-, 16-core Systems

Unfairness = MAX Memory Slowdown / MIN Memory Slowdown [MICRO 2007]



System Performance (Hmean-speedup)



PAR-BS Pros and Cons

- Upsides:
 - First work to identify the notion of bank parallelism destruction across multiple threads
 - Simple mechanism

- Downsides:
 - Implementation in multiple controllers needs coordination for best performance → too frequent coordination since batching is done frequently
 - Does not always prioritize the latency-sensitive applications

ATLAS Memory Scheduler

Yoongu Kim, Dongsu Han, Onur Mutlu, and Mor Harchol-Balter,

"ATLAS: A Scalable and High-Performance

Scheduling Algorithm for Multiple Memory Controllers"


16th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA),

Bangalore, India, January 2010. Slides (pptx)

Rethinking Memory Scheduling

A thread alternates between two states (episodes)

- **Compute episode:** Zero outstanding memory requests → **High IPC**
- **Memory episode:** Non-zero outstanding memory requests → **Low IPC**



Goal: Minimize time spent in memory episodes


How to Minimize Memory Episode Time



Prioritize thread whose memory episode will end the soonest


- Minimizes time spent in memory episodes across all threads
- Supported by queueing theory:
 - **Shortest-Remaining-Processing-Time** scheduling is optimal in single-server queue

Remaining length of a memory episode?



Predicting Memory Episode Lengths

We discovered: past is excellent predictor for future




Large **attained service** → Large expected **remaining service**

Q: Why?

A: Memory episode lengths are **Pareto distributed...**

Pareto Distribution of Memory Episode Lengths



Memory episode lengths of
SPEC benchmarks

Pareto distribution

The longer an episode has lasted
→ The longer it will last further

Attained service correlates with
remaining service

Favoring **least-attained-service** memory episode
= Favoring memory episode which will **end the soonest**

Least Attained Service (LAS) Memory Scheduling

Our Approach

Prioritize the memory episode with least-**remaining**-service

- Remaining service: Correlates with attained service
- Attained service: Tracked by per-thread counter

Prioritize the memory episode with least-**attained**-service

Least-attained-service (LAS) scheduling:
Minimize memory episode time


Queueing Theory

Prioritize the job with shortest-remaining-processing-time

Provably optimal

However, LAS does not consider long-term thread behavior


Long-Term Thread Behavior




Prioritizing Thread 2 is more beneficial:
results in very long stretches of compute episodes

Quantum-Based Attained Service of a Thread

Short-term
thread behavior



Long-term
thread behavior




We divide time into large, fixed-length intervals:
quanta (millions of cycles)

LAS Thread Ranking

During a quantum

Each thread's attained service (AS) is tracked by MCs

$AS_i = A \text{ thread's AS during only the } i\text{-th quantum}$




End of a quantum

Each thread's **TotalAS** computed as:

$$TotalAS_i = \alpha \cdot TotalAS_{i-1} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot AS_i$$

High $\alpha \rightarrow$ More bias towards history

Threads are ranked, favoring threads with lower TotalAS



Next quantum

Threads are serviced according to their ranking

ATLAS Scheduling Algorithm


ATLAS

- **A**daptive per-**T**hread **L**east **A**ttained **S**ervice
- Request prioritization order
 1. **Prevent starvation**: Over threshold request
 2. **Maximize performance**: Higher LAS rank
 3. **Exploit locality**: Row-hit request
 4. **Tie-breaker**: Oldest request

How to coordinate MCs to agree upon a consistent ranking?


System Throughput: 24-Core System

$$\text{System throughput} = \sum \text{Speedup}$$



ATLAS consistently provides higher system throughput than all previous scheduling algorithms

System Throughput: 4-MC System



of cores increases → ATLAS performance benefit increases

Properties of ATLAS

Goals

- Maximize system performance
- Scalable to large number of controllers
- Configurable by system software

Properties of ATLAS

- LAS-ranking
- Bank-level parallelism
- Row-buffer locality
- Very infrequent coordination
- Scale attained service with thread weight (in paper)
- **Low complexity:** Attained service requires a single counter per thread in each MC

ATLAS Pros and Cons


- Upsides:
 - ❑ Good at improving performance
 - ❑ Low complexity
 - ❑ Coordination among controllers happens infrequently

- Downsides:
 - ❑ Lowest ranked threads get delayed significantly → high unfairness

TCM: Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling

Yoongu Kim, Michael Papamichael, Onur Mutlu, and Mor Harchol-Balter,
**"Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling:
Exploiting Differences in Memory Access Behavior"**
43rd International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO),
pages 65-76, Atlanta, GA, December 2010. [Slides \(pptx\)](#) [\(pdf\)](#)

Previous Scheduling Algorithms are Biased




No previous memory scheduling algorithm provides both the best fairness and system throughput

Throughput vs. Fairness

Throughput biased approach

Prioritize less memory-intensive threads



Fairness biased approach


Take turns accessing memory

Does not starve




Single policy for all threads is insufficient

Achieving the Best of Both Worlds




Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling [Kim+ MICRO'10]

1. Group threads into two *clusters*
2. Prioritize *non-intensive cluster*
3. Different policies for each cluster




TCM Outline

1. Clustering



Clustering Threads

Step1 Sort threads by **MPKI** (misses per kiloinstruction)




T = Total *memory bandwidth usage*

$\alpha < 10\%$
ClusterThreshold

Step2 Memory bandwidth usage αT divides clusters

TCM Outline




Prioritization Between Clusters

Prioritize *non-intensive* cluster




- **Increases system throughput**
 - *Non-intensive* threads have greater potential for making progress
- **Does not degrade fairness**
 - *Non-intensive* threads are “light”
 - Rarely interfere with *intensive* threads

TCM Outline




Non-Intensive Cluster

Prioritize threads according to MPKI




- **Increases system throughput**
 - Least intensive thread has the greatest potential for making progress in the processor

TCM Outline



Intensive Cluster

Periodically shuffle the priority of threads



- Is treating all threads equally good enough?
- ***BUT: Equal turns \neq Same slowdown***

Case Study: A Tale of Two Threads


Case Study: Two intensive threads contending

1.random-access


2.streaming

} *Which is slowed down more easily?*

Prioritize *random-access*



Prioritize *streaming*



random-access thread is more easily slowed down

Why are Threads Different?


random-access

req

stuck →

streaming

req




- All requests parallel
- High **bank-level parallelism**

- All requests → Same row
- High **row-buffer locality**




Vulnerable to interference

TCM Outline



Niceness

How to quantify difference between threads?




Shuffling: Round-Robin vs. Niceness-Aware

1. Round-Robin shuffling

← What can go wrong?

2. Niceness-Aware shuffling

GOOD: Each thread prioritized once




Shuffling: Round-Robin vs. Niceness-Aware

1. Round-Robin shuffling

← What can go wrong?

2. Niceness-Aware shuffling


GOOD: Each thread prioritized once



Shuffling: Round-Robin vs. Niceness-Aware

1. Round-Robin shuffling


2. Niceness-Aware shuffling




Shuffling: Round-Robin vs. Niceness-Aware

1. Round-Robin shuffling


2. Niceness-Aware shuffling



TCM Outline



TCM: Quantum-Based Operation



TCM: Scheduling Algorithm

1. Highest-rank: Requests from higher ranked threads prioritized

- **Non-Intensive** cluster > **Intensive** cluster
- **Non-Intensive** cluster: lower intensity → higher rank
- **Intensive** cluster: rank shuffling

2. Row-hit: Row-buffer hit requests are prioritized

3. Oldest: Older requests are prioritized

TCM: Implementation Cost

Required storage at memory controller (24 cores)

Thread memory behavior	Storage
MPKI	~0.2kb
Bank-level parallelism	~0.6kb
Row-buffer locality	~2.9kb
Total	< 4kbits

- No computation is on the critical path

Previous Work

FRFCFS [Rixner et al., ISCA00]: Prioritizes row-buffer hits

- Thread-oblivious → Low throughput & Low fairness

STFM [Mutlu et al., MICRO07]: Equalizes thread slowdowns

- Non-intensive threads not prioritized → Low throughput

PAR-BS [Mutlu et al., ISCA08]: Prioritizes oldest batch of requests while preserving bank-level parallelism


- Non-intensive threads not always prioritized → Low throughput

ATLAS [Kim et al., HPCA10]: Prioritizes threads with less memory service

- Most intensive thread starves → Low fairness

TCM: Throughput and Fairness


24 cores, 4 memory controllers, 96 workloads



*TCM, a heterogeneous scheduling policy,
provides best fairness and system throughput*

TCM: Fairness-Throughput Tradeoff

When configuration parameter is varied...



TCM allows robust fairness-throughput tradeoff

Operating System Support

- ***ClusterThreshold*** is a tunable knob
 - OS can trade off between fairness and throughput
- Enforcing thread weights
 - OS assigns weights to threads
 - TCM enforces thread weights within each cluster

Conclusion

- No previous memory scheduling algorithm provides both high ***system throughput*** and ***fairness***
 - **Problem:** They use a single policy for all threads
- TCM groups threads into two ***clusters***
 1. Prioritize ***non-intensive*** cluster → throughput
 2. Shuffle priorities in ***intensive*** cluster → fairness
 3. Shuffling should favor ***nice*** threads → fairness
- ***TCM provides the best system throughput and fairness***

TCM Pros and Cons

- Upsides:
 - Provides both high fairness and high performance

- Downsides:
 - Scalability to large buffer sizes?
 - Effectiveness in a heterogeneous system?

Staged Memory Scheduling

Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Kevin Chang, Lavanya Subramanian, Gabriel Loh, and Onur Mutlu,
**"Staged Memory Scheduling: Achieving High Performance
and Scalability in Heterogeneous Systems"**
39th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA),
Portland, OR, June 2012.


Executive Summary

- **Observation:** Heterogeneous CPU-GPU systems require memory schedulers with **large request buffers**
 - **Problem:** Existing monolithic application-aware memory scheduler designs are **hard to scale** to large request buffer sizes
 - **Solution:** Staged Memory Scheduling (SMS)
decomposes the memory controller into three simple stages:
 - 1) Batch formation: maintains row buffer locality
 - 2) Batch scheduler: reduces interference between applications
 - 3) DRAM command scheduler: issues requests to DRAM
 - Compared to state-of-the-art memory schedulers:
 - ❑ SMS is significantly simpler and more scalable
 - ❑ SMS provides higher performance and fairness
-

Outline

- Background
- Motivation
- Our Goal
- Observations
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- Results
- Conclusion

Main Memory is a Bottleneck



- All cores contend for limited on-chip bandwidth
 - Inter-application interference **degrades system performance**
 - The memory scheduler can help mitigate the problem
- How does the memory scheduler deliver good performance and fairness?

Three Principles of Memory Scheduling

- Prioritize row-buffer-hit requests [Rixner+, ISCA'00]
 - To maximize memory bandwidth
- Prioritize latency-sensitive applications [Kim+, HPCA'10]
 - To maximize system throughput
- Ensure that no application is starved [Mutlu and Moscibroda, MICRO'07]
 - To minimize starvation

Older

Req 1

Row A

Application	Memory Intensity (MPKI)	row
1	5	
2	1	
3	2	
4	10	

Newer


Outline

- Background
- Motivation: CPU-GPU Systems
- Our Goal
- Observations
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- Results
- Conclusion

Memory Scheduling for CPU-GPU Systems


- Current and future systems integrate a GPU along with multiple cores
- GPU shares the main memory with the CPU cores
- GPU is **much more (4x-20x) memory-intensive** than CPU
- How should memory scheduling be done when GPU is integrated on-chip?

Introducing the GPU into the System



- GPU occupies a significant portion of the request buffers
 - Limits the MC's visibility of the CPU applications' differing memory behavior → can lead to a **poor scheduling decision**

Naïve Solution: Large Monolithic Buffer



Problems with Large Monolithic Buffer

Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req
Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req
Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req
Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req
Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req	Req
Req	Req						

More Complex Memory Scheduler

- This leads to high complexity, high power, large die area

Our Goal

- Design a new memory scheduler that is:
 - ❑ Scalable to accommodate a large number of requests
 - ❑ Easy to implement
 - ❑ Application-aware
 - ❑ Able to provide high performance and fairness, especially in heterogeneous CPU-GPU systems

Outline

- Background
- Motivation: CPU-GPU Systems
- Our Goal
- **Observations**
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- Results
- Conclusion

Key Functions of a Memory Controller

- Memory controller must consider three different things concurrently when choosing the next request:
 - 1) Maximize row buffer hits
 - Maximize memory bandwidth
 - 2) Manage contention between applications
 - Maximize system throughput and fairness
 - 3) Satisfy DRAM timing constraints
- Current systems use a **centralized memory controller design** to accomplish these functions
 - **Complex, especially with large request buffers**


Key Idea: Decouple Tasks into Stages

- Idea: **Decouple the functional tasks** of the memory controller
 - Partition tasks across several simpler HW structures (stages)
 - 1) Maximize row buffer hits
 - **Stage 1: Batch formation**
 - Within each application, groups requests to the same row into batches
 - 2) Manage contention between applications
 - **Stage 2: Batch scheduler**
 - Schedules batches from different applications
 - 3) Satisfy DRAM timing constraints
 - **Stage 3: DRAM command scheduler**
 - Issues requests from the already-scheduled order to each bank
-


Outline

- Background
- Motivation: CPU-GPU Systems
- Our Goal
- Observations
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- Results
- Conclusion

SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling




SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling




Stage 1: Batch Formation

- Goal: **Maximize row buffer hits**
- At each core, we want to batch requests that access the same row within a limited time window
- A batch is ready to be scheduled under two conditions
 - 1) When the next request accesses a different row
 - 2) When the time window for batch formation expires
- Keep this stage simple by using per-core FIFOs

Stage 1: Batch Formation Example



SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling



Stage 2: Batch Scheduler

- Goal: **Minimize interference between applications**
- Stage 1 forms batches **within each application**
- Stage 2 schedules batches **from different applications**
 - Schedules the oldest batch from each application
- Question: Which application's batch should be scheduled next?
- Goal: Maximize system performance and fairness
 - To achieve this goal, the batch scheduler chooses between two different policies

Stage 2: Two Batch Scheduling Algorithms

■ **Shortest Job First (SJF)**

- ❑ Prioritize the applications with the fewest outstanding memory requests because **they make fast forward progress**
- ❑ **Pro:** Good system performance and fairness
- ❑ **Con:** GPU and memory-intensive applications get deprioritized


■ **Round-Robin (RR)**

- ❑ Prioritize the applications in a round-robin manner to ensure that **memory-intensive applications can make progress**
- ❑ **Pro:** GPU and memory-intensive applications are treated fairly
- ❑ **Con:** GPU and memory-intensive applications significantly slow down others

Stage 2: Batch Scheduling Policy

- The importance of the GPU varies between systems and over time → Scheduling policy needs to adapt to this
- **Solution:** Hybrid Policy
- At every cycle:
 - With probability p : Shortest Job First → Benefits the CPU
 - With probability $1-p$: Round-Robin → Benefits the GPU
- System software can configure p based on the importance/weight of the GPU
 - Higher GPU importance → Lower p value


SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling



Stage 3: DRAM Command Scheduler

- High level policy decisions have already been made by:
 - Stage 1: Maintains row buffer locality
 - Stage 2: Minimizes inter-application interference
- Stage 3: No need for further scheduling
- Only goal: **service requests while satisfying DRAM timing constraints**
- Implemented as **simple per-bank FIFO queues**

Putting Everything Together



Complexity

- Compared to a row hit first scheduler, SMS consumes*
 - 66% less area
 - 46% less static power
- Reduction comes from:
 - Monolithic scheduler → stages of simpler schedulers
 - Each stage has a simpler scheduler (considers fewer properties at a time to make the scheduling decision)
 - Each stage has simpler buffers (FIFO instead of out-of-order)
 - Each stage has a portion of the total buffer size (buffering is distributed across stages)

Outline

- Background
- Motivation: CPU-GPU Systems
- Our Goal
- Observations
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- **Results**
- Conclusion

Methodology

■ Simulation parameters

- ❑ 16 OoO CPU cores, 1 GPU modeling AMD Radeon™ 5870
- ❑ DDR3-1600 DRAM 4 channels, 1 rank/channel, 8 banks/channel

■ Workloads

- ❑ CPU: SPEC CPU 2006
- ❑ GPU: Recent games and GPU benchmarks
- ❑ 7 workload categories based on the memory-intensity of CPU applications
 - Low memory-intensity (L)
 - Medium memory-intensity (M)
 - High memory-intensity (H)

Comparison to Previous Scheduling Algorithms

- FR-FCFS [Rixner+, ISCA'00]
 - ❑ Prioritizes row buffer hits
 - ❑ Maximizes DRAM throughput
 - ❑ Low multi-core performance ← Application unaware
- ATLAS [Kim+, HPCA'10]
 - ❑ Prioritizes latency-sensitive applications
 - ❑ Good multi-core performance
 - ❑ Low fairness ← Deprioritizes memory-intensive applications
- TCM [Kim+, MICRO'10]
 - ❑ Clusters low and high-intensity applications and treats each separately
 - ❑ Good multi-core performance and fairness
 - ❑ Not robust ← Misclassifies latency-sensitive applications

Evaluation Metrics

- CPU performance metric: Weighted speedup

$$CPU_{WS} = \sum \frac{IPC_{Shared}}{IPC_{Alone}}$$

- GPU performance metric: Frame rate speedup

$$GPU_{Speedup} = \frac{FrameRate_{Shared}}{FrameRate_{Alone}}$$

- CPU-GPU system performance: CPU-GPU weighted speedup

$$CGWS = CPU_{WS} + GPU_{Speedup} * GPU_{Weight}$$

Evaluated System Scenarios

- CPU-focused system
- GPU-focused system

Evaluated System Scenario: CPU Focused


- GPU has **low** weight (weight = 1)

$$CGWS = CPU_{WS} + GPU_{Speedup} * GPU_{Weight}$$

1

- Configure SMS such that p , SJF probability, is set to 0.9
 - **Mostly uses SJF** batch scheduling → prioritizes latency-sensitive applications (mainly CPU)

Performance: CPU-Focused System



- SJF batch scheduling policy allows latency-sensitive applications to get serviced as fast as possible

Evaluated System Scenario: GPU Focused


- GPU has **high** weight (weight = 1000)

$$CGWS = CPU_{WS} + GPU_{Speedup} * GPU_{Weight}$$

1000


- Configure SMS such that p , SJF probability, is set to 0
 - **Always uses round-robin** batch scheduling → prioritizes memory-intensive applications (GPU)

Performance: GPU-Focused System




- Round-robin batch scheduling policy schedules GPU requests more frequently

Performance at Different GPU Weights



Performance at Different GPU Weights



- At every GPU weight, SMS outperforms the best previous scheduling algorithm for that weight

Additional Results in the Paper

- Fairness evaluation
 - 47.6% improvement over the best previous algorithms
- Individual CPU and GPU performance breakdowns
- CPU-only scenarios
 - Competitive performance with previous algorithms
- Scalability results
 - SMS' performance and fairness scales better than previous algorithms as the number of cores and memory channels increases
- Analysis of SMS design parameters

Outline

- Background
- Motivation: CPU-GPU Systems
- Our Goal
- Observations
- Staged Memory Scheduling
 - 1) Batch Formation
 - 2) Batch Scheduler
 - 3) DRAM Command Scheduler
- Results
- Conclusion

Conclusion

- **Observation:** Heterogeneous CPU-GPU systems require memory schedulers with **large request buffers**
 - **Problem:** Existing monolithic application-aware memory scheduler designs are **hard to scale** to large request buffer size
 - **Solution:** Staged Memory Scheduling (SMS)
decomposes the memory controller into three simple stages:
 - 1) Batch formation: maintains row buffer locality
 - 2) Batch scheduler: reduces interference between applications
 - 3) DRAM command scheduler: issues requests to DRAM
 - Compared to state-of-the-art memory schedulers:
 - **SMS is significantly simpler and more scalable**
 - **SMS provides higher performance and fairness**
-

Strong Memory Service Guarantees

- Goal: Satisfy performance bounds/requirements in the presence of shared main memory, prefetchers, heterogeneous agents, and hybrid memory

- Approach:
 - Develop techniques/models to accurately estimate the performance of an application/agent in the presence of resource sharing
 - Develop mechanisms (hardware and software) to enable the resource partitioning/prioritization needed to achieve the required performance levels for all applications
 - All the while providing high system performance

MISE:


Providing Performance Predictability in Shared Main Memory Systems

Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri,
Yoongu Kim, Ben Jaiyen, Onur Mutlu



SAFARI

Carnegie Mellon

Main Memory Interference is a Problem



Unpredictable Application Slowdowns



An application's performance depends on which application it is running with

Need for Predictable Performance

- There is a need for predictable performance
 - When multiple applications share resources
 - Especially if some applications require performance guarantees

**Our Goal: Predictable performance
in the presence of memory interference**

- Example 2: In server systems
 - Different users' jobs consolidated onto the same server
 - Need to provide bounded slowdowns to critical jobs

Outline

1. Estimate Slowdown

2. Control Slowdown

Outline

1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown


- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

Slowdown: Definition

$$\text{Slowdown} = \frac{\text{Performance}_{\text{Alone}}}{\text{Performance}_{\text{Shared}}}$$

Key Observation 1

For a memory bound application,
Performance \propto Memory request service rate




Key Observation 2

Request Service Rate $_{\text{Alone}}$ ($\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}}$) of an application can be estimated by giving the application highest priority in accessing memory


Highest priority → Little interference
(almost as if the application were run alone)

Key Observation 2


1. Run alone



2. Run with another application



3. Run with another application: **highest priority**




Memory Interference-induced Slowdown Estimation (MISE) model for **memory bound** applications

$$\text{Slowdown} = \frac{\text{Request Service Rate}_{\text{Alone}} (\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}})}{\text{Request Service Rate}_{\text{Shared}} (\text{RSR}_{\text{Shared}})}$$

Key Observation 3

- Memory-bound application




Memory phase slowdown dominates overall slowdown

Key Observation 3

■ Non-memory-bound application

Memory Interference-induced Slowdown Estimation (MISE) model for **non-memory bound** applications

$$\text{Slowdown} = (1 - \alpha) + \alpha \frac{\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}}}{\text{RSR}_{\text{Shared}}}$$



Only memory fraction (α) slows down with interference


1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown

- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

Interval Based Operation



Measuring RSR_{Shared} and α

- Request Service Rate $_{\text{Shared}}$ (RSR_{Shared})
 - Per-core counter to track number of requests serviced
 - At the end of each interval, measure

$$RSR_{\text{Shared}} = \frac{\text{Number of Requests Serviced}}{\text{Interval Length}}$$

- Memory Phase Fraction (α)
 - Count number of stall cycles at the core
 - Compute fraction of cycles stalled for memory

Estimating Request Service Rate $_{\text{Alone}}$ ($\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}}$)

- Divide each interval into shorter epochs
- At the beginning of each epoch
 - Memory controller randomly picks an application as the highest priority application


Goal: Estimate $\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}}$

How: Periodically give each application

- At the end of an interval, for each application, estimate highest priority in accessing memory

$$\text{RSR}_{\text{Alone}} = \frac{\text{Number of Requests During High Priority Epochs}}{\text{Number of Cycles Application Given High Priority}}$$

Inaccuracy in Estimating RSR_{Alone}



Accounting for Interference in RSR_{Alone} Estimation

- **Solution: Determine and remove interference cycles from RSR_{Alone} calculation**

$$RSR_{Alone} = \frac{\text{Number of Requests During High Priority Epochs}}{\text{Number of Cycles Application Given High Priority} - \text{Interference Cycles}}$$

- A cycle is an interference cycle if
 - ❑ a request from the highest priority application is waiting in the request buffer *and*
 - ❑ another application's request was issued previously

Outline


1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown

- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

MISE Model: Putting it All Together



Outline

1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown

- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

Previous Work on Slowdown Estimation

- Previous work on slowdown estimation
 - **STFM** (Stall Time Fair Memory) Scheduling [Mutlu+, MICRO '07]
 - **FST** (Fairness via Source Throttling) [Ebrahimi+, ASPLOS '10]
 - **Per-thread Cycle Accounting** [Du Bois+, HiPEAC '13]
- Basic Idea:

$$\text{Slowdown} = \frac{\text{Stall Time Alone}}{\text{Stall Time Shared}}$$

Diagram illustrating the Basic Idea of Slowdown Estimation:

- The numerator, **Stall Time Alone**, is circled and labeled **Hard** (indicating a difficult or high-cost scenario).
- The denominator, **Stall Time Shared**, is labeled **Easy** (indicating an easier or lower-cost scenario).

Count number of cycles application receives interference

Two Major Advantages of MISE Over STFM


- Advantage 1:
 - STFM estimates alone performance while an application is receiving interference → Hard
 - MISE estimates alone performance while giving an application the highest priority → Easier
- Advantage 2:
 - STFM does not take into account compute phase for non-memory-bound applications
 - MISE accounts for compute phase → Better accuracy

Methodology


- Configuration of our simulated system
 - 4 cores
 - 1 channel, 8 banks/channel
 - DDR3 1066 DRAM
 - 512 KB private cache/core
- Workloads
 - SPEC CPU2006
 - 300 multi programmed workloads

Quantitative Comparison

SPEC CPU 2006 application
leslie3d



Comparison to STFM



Outline

1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown

- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

Providing “Soft” Slowdown Guarantees

- Goal

1. Ensure QoS-critical applications meet a prescribed slowdown bound
2. Maximize system performance for other applications

- Basic Idea

- Allocate just enough bandwidth to QoS-critical application
- Assign remaining bandwidth to other applications


MISE-QoS: Mechanism to Provide Soft QoS

- Assign an initial bandwidth allocation to QoS-critical application
- Estimate slowdown of QoS-critical application using the MISE model
- After every N intervals
 - If slowdown $>$ bound $B \pm \epsilon$, increase bandwidth allocation
 - If slowdown $<$ bound $B \pm \epsilon$, decrease bandwidth allocation
- When slowdown bound not met for N intervals
 - Notify the OS so it can migrate/de-schedule jobs

Methodology

- Each application (25 applications in total) considered the QoS-critical application
- Run with 12 sets of co-runners of different memory intensities
- Total of 300 multiprogrammed workloads
- Each workload run with 10 slowdown bound values
- Baseline memory scheduling mechanism
 - Always prioritize QoS-critical application
[Iyer+, SIGMETRICS 2007]
 - Other applications' requests scheduled in FRFCFS order
[Zuravleff +, US Patent 1997, Rixner+, ISCA 2000]

A Look at One Workload



MISE is effective in

1. meeting the slowdown bound for the QoS-critical application
2. improving performance of non-QoS-critical applications

leslie3d hmmer lbm omnetpp

QoS-critical **non-QoS-critical**


Effectiveness of MISE in Enforcing QoS

Across 3000 data points

	Predicted Met	Predicted Not Met
QoS Bound Met	78.8%	2.1%
QoS Bound Not Met	2.2%	16.9%

MISE-QoS correctly predicts whether or not the bound is met for 95.7% of workloads

Performance of Non-QoS-Critical Applications



When slowdown bound is 10/3
MISE-QoS improves system performance by 10%

Outline

1. Estimate Slowdown

- ❑ Key Observations
- ❑ Implementation
- ❑ MISE Model: Putting it All Together
- ❑ Evaluating the Model

2. Control Slowdown

- ❑ Providing Soft Slowdown Guarantees
- ❑ Minimizing Maximum Slowdown

Other Results in the Paper

- Sensitivity to model parameters
 - Robust across different values of model parameters
- Comparison of STFM and MISE models in enforcing soft slowdown guarantees
 - MISE significantly more effective in enforcing guarantees
- Minimizing maximum slowdown
 - MISE improves fairness across several system configurations

Summary

- Uncontrolled memory interference slows down applications unpredictably
- Goal: **Estimate and control** slowdowns
- Key contribution
 - MISE: An accurate slowdown estimation model
 - Average error of MISE: 8.2%
- Key Idea
 - Request Service Rate is a proxy for performance
 - Request Service Rate_{Alone} estimated by giving an application highest priority in accessing memory
- **Leverage slowdown estimates to control slowdowns**
 - Providing soft slowdown guarantees
 - Minimizing maximum slowdown

MISE:

Providing Performance Predictability in Shared Main Memory Systems

Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri,
Yoongu Kim, Ben Jaiyen, Onur Mutlu

SAFARI

Carnegie Mellon

Some Current Directions

- Building a comprehensive slowdown estimation model
 - Performance predictability with other shared resources
 - Performance predictability in heterogeneous systems
 - Interaction with power and energy consumption
- Integrated techniques for enforcing performance levels
 - Scheduling, partitioning, prioritization, interleaving, ...
- Exploiting slowdown information in software
 - Admission control
 - Migration policies
 - Billing policies

Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - QoS-aware memory controllers [Mutlu+ MICRO'07] [Moscibroda+, Usenix Security'07] [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09] [Kim+ HPCA'10] [Kim+ MICRO'10, Top Picks'11] [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'11, MICRO'11] [Ausavarungnirun+, ISCA'12]
 - QoS-aware interconnects [Das+ MICRO'09, ISCA'10, Top Picks '11] [Grot+ MICRO'09, ISCA'11, Top Picks '12]
 - QoS-aware caches
- **Dumb resources:** Keep each resource free-for-all, but reduce/control interference by injection control or data mapping
 - Source throttling to control access to memory system [Ebrahimi+ ASPLOS'10, ISCA'11, TOCS'12] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Nychis+ HotNets'10]
 - QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers [Muralidhara+ MICRO'11]
 - QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores


Fairness via Source Throttling

Eiman Ebrahimi, Chang Joo Lee, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,

**"Fairness via Source Throttling: A Configurable and High-Performance
Fairness Substrate for Multi-Core Memory Systems"**

15th Intl. Conf. on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS),
pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. Slides (pdf)

Many Shared Resources



The Problem with “Smart Resources”

- Independent interference control mechanisms in caches, interconnect, and memory can contradict each other
- Explicitly coordinating mechanisms for different resources requires complex implementation
- How do we enable fair sharing of the **entire memory system** by controlling interference in a **coordinated manner**?

An Alternative Approach: Source Throttling

- Manage inter-thread interference at the **cores**, **not** at the **shared resources**
- **Dynamically estimate unfairness** in the memory system
- Feed back this information into a controller
- **Throttle cores' memory access rates** accordingly
 - Whom to throttle and by how much depends on performance target (throughput, fairness, per-thread QoS, etc)
 - E.g., if unfairness > system-software-specified target then **throttle down** core causing unfairness & **throttle up** core that was unfairly treated
- Ebrahimi et al., "**Fairness via Source Throttling**," ASPLOS'10, TOCS'12.

queue of requests to shared resources

Request Generation Order:

A1, A2, A3, A4, B1

Unmanaged Interference

B1

A4

A3

A2

A1

A: Compute Stall on A1 Stall on A2 Stall on A3 Stall on A4

B: Compute Stall waiting for shared resources Stall on B1

Core A's stall time

Core B's stall time

Oldest

Shared Memory Resources

Intensive application A generates many requests and causes long stall times for less intensive application B

queue of requests to shared resources

Request Generation Order

A1, ~~B1~~, ~~A2~~, ~~A3~~, ~~A4~~, B1

Throttled Requests

Fair Source Throttling

A4

A3

A2

B1

A1

A: Compute Stall on A1 Stall wait. Stall on A2 Stall on A3 Stall on A4

B: Compute Stall wait. Stall on B1

Extra Cycles Core A

Core A's stall time

Core B's stall time

Saved Cycles Core B

Oldest


Shared Memory Resources

Dynamically detect application A's interference for application B and throttle down application A

Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)

- Two components (interval-based)
- Run-time unfairness evaluation (in hardware)
 - Dynamically estimates the unfairness in the memory system
 - Estimates which application is slowing down which other
- Dynamic request throttling (hardware or software)
 - Adjusts how aggressively each core makes requests to the shared resources
 - Throttles down request rates of cores causing unfairness
 - Limit miss buffers, limit injection rate

Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)



FST

Runtime
Unfairness
Evaluation

Unfairness Estimate

App-slowest

App-interfering


Dynamic
Request Throttling

- 1- Estimating system unfairness
- 2- Find app. with the highest slowdown (App-slowest)
- 3- Find app. causing most interference for App-slowest (App-interfering)

```
if (Unfairness Estimate > Target)
{
  1-Throttle down App-interfering
  2-Throttle up App-slowest
}
```

Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)


FST




Estimating System Unfairness

- $$\text{Unfairness} = \frac{\text{Max}\{\text{Slowdown } i\} \text{ over all applications } i}{\text{Min}\{\text{Slowdown } i\} \text{ over all applications } i}$$
- $$\text{Slowdown of application } i = \frac{T_i^{\text{Shared}}}{T_i^{\text{Alone}}}$$
- How can T_i^{Alone} be estimated in shared mode?
- T_i^{Excess} is the number of **extra cycles** it takes application i to execute **due to interference**
- $$T_i^{\text{Alone}} = T_i^{\text{Shared}} - T_i^{\text{Excess}}$$


Tracking Inter-Core Interference



Tracking DRAM Row-Buffer Interference



Tracking Inter-Core Interference



Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)

FST

Runtime
Unfairness
Evaluation

Unfairness Estimate

App-slowest

App-interfering


Dynamic
Request Throttling

1- Estimating system unfairness
2- Find app. with the highest slowdown (App-slowest)
3- Find app. causing most interference for App-slowest (App-interfering)

```
if (Unfairness Estimate > Target)
{
  1-Throttle down App-interfering
  2-Throttle up App-slowest
}
```



Tracking Inter-Core Interference

- To identify App-interfering, for each core i
 - FST separately tracks interference caused by each core j ($j \neq i$)



Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)

FST



Dynamic Request Throttling

- Goal: Adjust **how aggressively** each core makes requests to the shared memory system
- Mechanisms:
 - Miss Status Holding Register (MSHR) quota
 - Controls the **number of concurrent requests** accessing shared resources from each application
 - Request injection frequency
 - Controls **how often memory requests are issued** to the last level cache from the MSHRs


Dynamic Request Throttling

- **Throttling level** assigned to each core determines both **MSHR quota** and **request injection rate**

Throttling level	MSHR quota	Request Injection Rate
100%	128	Every cycle
50%	64	Every other cycle
25%	32	Once every 4 cycles
10%	12	Once every 10 cycles
5%	6	Once every 20 cycles
4%	5	Once every 25 cycles
3%	3	Once every 30 cycles
2%	2	Once every 50 cycles

Total # of
MSHRs: 128

FST at Work



System Software Support

- Different fairness objectives can be configured by system software
 - Keep maximum slowdown in check
 - Estimated **Max Slowdown** < Target **Max Slowdown**
 - Keep slowdown of particular applications in check to achieve a particular performance target
 - Estimated **Slowdown(i)** < Target **Slowdown(i)**
- Support for thread priorities
 - $\text{Weighted Slowdown}(i) = \text{Estimated Slowdown}(i) \times \text{Weight}(i)$


FST Hardware Cost

- Total storage cost required for 4 cores is $\sim 12\text{KB}$
- FST does not require any structures or logic that are on the processor's critical path


FST Evaluation Methodology

- x86 cycle accurate simulator
- Baseline processor configuration
 - Per-core
 - 4-wide issue, out-of-order, 256 entry ROB
 - Shared (4-core system)
 - 128 MSHRs
 - 2 MB, 16-way L2 cache
 - Main Memory
 - DDR3 1333 MHz
 - Latency of 15ns per command (tRP, tRCD, CL)
 - 8B wide core to memory bus

FST: System Unfairness Results



FST: System Performance Results



Source Throttling Results: Takeaways

- Source throttling alone provides better performance than a combination of “smart” memory scheduling and fair caching
 - Decisions made at the memory scheduler and the cache sometimes contradict each other
- Neither source throttling alone nor “smart resources” alone provides the best performance
- **Combined approaches** are even more powerful
 - Source throttling and resource-based interference control


Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - QoS-aware memory controllers [Mutlu+ MICRO'07] [Moscibroda+, Usenix Security'07] [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09] [Kim+ HPCA'10] [Kim+ MICRO'10, Top Picks'11] [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'11, MICRO'11] [Ausavarungnirun+, ISCA'12]
 - QoS-aware interconnects [Das+ MICRO'09, ISCA'10, Top Picks '11] [Grot+ MICRO'09, ISCA'11, Top Picks '12]
 - QoS-aware caches
- **Dumb resources:** Keep each resource free-for-all, but reduce/control interference by injection control or data mapping
 - Source throttling to control access to memory system [Ebrahimi+ ASPLOS'10, ISCA'11, TOCS'12] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Nychis+ HotNets'10]
 - QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers [Muralidhara+ MICRO'11]
 - QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores


Memory Channel Partitioning

Sai Prashanth Muralidhara, Lavanya Subramanian, Onur Mutlu, Mahmut Kandemir, and Thomas Moscibroda,
**"Reducing Memory Interference in Multicore Systems via
Application-Aware Memory Channel Partitioning"**
44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO),
Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

Outline



Previous Approach



Application-Aware Memory Request Scheduling

- **Monitor** application memory access characteristics
- **Rank** applications based on memory access characteristics
- **Prioritize** requests at the memory controller, based on ranking

An Example: Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling




Figure: Kim et al., MICRO 2010

Application-Aware Memory Request Scheduling


Advantages

- Reduces interference between applications by request reordering
- Improves system performance


Disadvantages

- Requires modifications to memory scheduling logic for
 - Ranking
 - Prioritization
- Cannot completely eliminate interference by request reordering

Our Approach




Observation: Modern Systems Have Multiple Channels




A new degree of freedom
Mapping data across multiple channels

Data Mapping in Current Systems



Causes interference between applications' requests

Partitioning Channels Between Applications



Eliminates interference between applications' requests

Overview: Memory Channel Partitioning (MCP)

■ Goal

- Eliminate harmful interference between applications

■ Basic Idea


- Map the data of **badly-interfering applications** to different channels

■ Key Principles


- Separate **low and high memory-intensity applications**
- Separate **low and high row-buffer locality applications**

Key Insight 1: Separate by Memory Intensity

High memory-intensity applications interfere with low memory-intensity applications in shared memory channels




Conventional Page Mapping



Channel Partitioning

Map data of low and high memory-intensity applications to different channels

Key Insight 2: Separate by Row-Buffer Locality



Map data of low and high row-buffer locality applications to different channels

Memory Channel Partitioning (MCP) Mechanism

Hardware


1. Profile applications
2. Classify applications into groups
3. Partition channels between application groups
4. Assign a preferred channel to each application
5. Allocate application pages to preferred channel

**System
Software**


1. Profile Applications

- Hardware counters collect application memory access characteristics
- Memory access characteristics
 - **Memory intensity:**
Last level cache **Misses Per Kilo Instruction (MPKI)**
 - **Row-buffer locality:**
Row-buffer Hit Rate (RBH) - percentage of accesses that hit in the row buffer


2. Classify Applications



3. Partition Channels Among Groups: Step 1




3. Partition Channels Among Groups: Step 2



4. Assign Preferred Channel to Application


- Assign **each application a preferred channel** from its group's allocated channels
- Distribute applications to channels such that **group's bandwidth demand is balanced** across its channels




5. Allocate Page to Preferred Channel

- **Enforce channel preferences**
computed in the previous step
- On a page fault, the operating system
 - ❑ allocates page to preferred channel **if free page available** in preferred channel
 - ❑ **if free page not available**, replacement policy tries to allocate page to preferred channel
 - ❑ **if it fails**, allocate page to another channel

Interval Based Operation



Integrating Partitioning and Scheduling



Observations

- Applications with very low memory-intensity rarely access memory
 - Dedicating channels to them results in precious memory bandwidth waste
- They have the most potential to keep their cores busy
 - We would really like to prioritize them
- They interfere minimally with other applications
 - Prioritizing them does not hurt others

Integrated Memory Partitioning and Scheduling (IMPS)

- Always prioritize very low memory-intensity applications in the memory scheduler
- Use memory channel partitioning to mitigate interference between other applications

Hardware Cost

- Memory Channel Partitioning (MCP)
 - ❑ Only profiling counters in hardware
 - ❑ No modifications to memory scheduling logic
 - ❑ 1.5 KB storage cost for a 24-core, 4-channel system
- Integrated Memory Partitioning and Scheduling (IMPS)
 - ❑ A single bit per request
 - ❑ Scheduler prioritizes based on this single bit

Methodology

■ Simulation Model

- ❑ 24 cores, 4 channels, 4 banks/channel
- ❑ Core Model
 - Out-of-order, 128-entry instruction window
 - 512 KB L2 cache/core
- ❑ Memory Model – DDR2

■ Workloads

- ❑ 240 SPEC CPU 2006 multiprogrammed workloads (categorized based on memory intensity)

■ Metrics


- ❑ System Performance $Weighted\ Speedup = \sum_i \frac{IPC_i^{shared}}{IPC_i^{alone}}$

Previous Work on Memory Scheduling

- **FR-FCFS** [Zuravleff et al., US Patent 1997, Rixner et al., ISCA 2000]
 - ❑ Prioritizes row-buffer hits and older requests
 - ❑ Application-unaware
- **ATLAS** [Kim et al., HPCA 2010]
 - ❑ Prioritizes applications with low memory-intensity
- **TCM** [Kim et al., MICRO 2010]
 - ❑ Always prioritizes low memory-intensity applications
 - ❑ Shuffles request priorities of high memory-intensity applications


Comparison to Previous Scheduling Policies

Averaged over 240 workloads



Better system performance than the best previous scheduler
Significant performance improvement over baseline FRFCFS
at lower hardware cost

Interaction with Memory Scheduling



IMPS improves performance regardless of scheduling policy
Highest improvement over FRFCFS as IMPS designed for FRFCFS

MCP Summary

- Uncontrolled inter-application interference in main memory degrades system performance
 - Application-aware memory channel partitioning (MCP)
 - Separates the data of badly-interfering applications to different channels, eliminating interference
 - Integrated memory partitioning and scheduling (IMPS)
 - Prioritizes very low memory-intensity applications in scheduler
 - Handles other applications' interference by partitioning
 - MCP/IMPS provide better performance than application-aware memory request scheduling at lower hardware cost
-

Summary: Memory QoS Approaches and Techniques

- Approaches: **Smart** vs. **dumb** resources
 - ❑ Smart resources: QoS-aware memory scheduling
 - ❑ Dumb resources: Source throttling; channel partitioning
 - ❑ Both approaches are effective in reducing interference
 - ❑ No single best approach for all workloads
- Techniques: Request **scheduling**, source **throttling**, memory **partitioning**
 - ❑ All approaches are effective in reducing interference
 - ❑ Can be applied at different levels: hardware vs. software
 - ❑ No single best technique for all workloads
- **Combined approaches and techniques are the most powerful**
 - ❑ **Integrated Memory Channel Partitioning and Scheduling [MICRO'11]**

Handling Interference in Parallel Applications

- Threads in a multithreaded application are inter-dependent
- Some threads can be on the critical path of execution due to synchronization; some threads are not
- How do we schedule requests of inter-dependent threads to maximize multithreaded application performance?
- Idea: **Estimate limiter threads** likely to be on the critical path and prioritize their requests; **shuffle priorities of non-limiter threads** to reduce memory interference among them [Ebrahimi+, MICRO'11]
- Hardware/software cooperative limiter thread estimation:
 - Thread executing the most contended critical section
 - Thread that is falling behind the most in a *parallel for* loop


Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - QoS-aware memory controllers [Mutlu+ MICRO'07] [Moscibroda+, Usenix Security'07] [Mutlu+ ISCA'08, Top Picks'09] [Kim+ HPCA'10] [Kim+ MICRO'10, Top Picks'11] [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'11, MICRO'11] [Ausavarungnirun+, ISCA'12]
 - QoS-aware interconnects [Das+ MICRO'09, ISCA'10, Top Picks '11] [Grot+ MICRO'09, ISCA'11, Top Picks '12]
 - QoS-aware caches
- **Dumb resources:** Keep each resource free-for-all, but reduce/control interference by injection control or data mapping
 - Source throttling to control access to memory system [Ebrahimi+ ASPLOS'10, ISCA'11, TOCS'12] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Nychis+ HotNets'10]
 - QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers [Muralidhara+ MICRO'11]
 - QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores [Das+ HPCA'13]


Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference

Reetuparna Das* Rachata Ausavarungnirun\$ Onur Mutlu\$
Akhilesh Kumar\$ Mani Azimi\$


*University of Michigan \$Carnegie Mellon University \$Intel



Multi-Core to Many-Core



Multi-Core



Many-Core

Many-Core On-Chip Communication


Applications



Light



Heavy



 **Memory Controller**

 **Shared Cache Bank**

Task Scheduling

- Traditional

When to schedule a task? – Temporal

- Many-Core

When to schedule a task? – Temporal

+ Where to schedule a task? – **Spatial**


- Spatial scheduling impacts performance of memory hierarchy

- Latency and interference in interconnect, memory, caches

Problem: Spatial Task Scheduling

Applications

Cores



How to map applications to cores?

Challenges in Spatial Task Scheduling

Applications

Cores




How to reduce communication distance?


How to reduce destructive interference between applications?

How to prioritize applications to improve throughput?

Application-to-Core Mapping




Step 1 — Clustering



Inefficient data mapping to memory and caches

Step 1 — Clustering



Improved Locality

Reduced Interference

Step 1 — Clustering

■ Clustering memory accesses

□ Locality aware page replacement policy (cluster-CLOCK)

- When allocating free page, give preference to pages belonging to the cluster's memory controllers (MCs)
- Look ahead “N” pages beyond the default replacement candidate to find page belonging to cluster's MC

■ Clustering cache accesses

- Private caches automatically enforce clustering
- Shared caches can use Dynamic Spill Receive* mechanism

Step 2 — Balancing

Applications




Heavy



Light

Cores



Too much load in clusters with heavy applications

Step 2 — Balancing

Applications




Heavy



Light

Cores



Better bandwidth utilization

Is this the best we can do? Let's take a look at application characteristics

Application Types

YOUR THESIS COMMITTEE

Also known as: an impossibly difficult group to get together in one room but who nevertheless hold your future in their hands depending on their ability to reach a civilized consensus.



Your Professor

Simultaneously your biggest ally and your worst enemy. Will be the first to suggest you do more work.



The Guru

Only here for the free cookies. Don't forget to bring cookies.



Adversary
~~The Asshole~~

Has bitter rivalry with your Professor and will argue the exact opposite view. Work this to your advantage.



The Strawman/woman

Nice guy.
No opinions.



The Assistant Professor

Still doesn't believe just a few months ago they were on the other side just like you. Pretends to be an adult.

NONE OF THEM WILL ACTUALLY READ YOUR ENTIRE THESIS.

Application Types

Applications



Sensitive

High Miss Rate
Low MLP



Medium

Med Miss Rate
High MLP



Heavy

High Miss Rate
High MLP



Light

Low Miss Rate

Identify and **isolate sensitive applications** while ensuring load balance

Thesis Committee



Advisor
Sensitive



Guru
There for cookies



Adversary
Bitter rival



Nice Guy
No opinions



Asst.
Professor

Step 3 — Isolation

Applications



Sensitive



Light




Medium



Heavy

Cores



Isolate **sensitive** applications to a cluster

Balance load for remaining applications across clusters

Step 3 — Isolation

- How to estimate sensitivity?
 - ❑ High Miss— high misses per kilo instruction (MPKI)
 - ❑ Low MLP— high relative stall cycles per miss (STPM)
 - ❑ Sensitive if $\text{MPKI} > \text{Threshold}$ and relative STPM is high

- Whether to or not to allocate cluster to sensitive applications?

- How to map sensitive applications to their own cluster?
 - ❑ Knap-sack algorithm

Step 4 — Radial Mapping

Applications




Sensitive



Light




Medium



Heavy

Cores




Map applications that benefit most from being close to memory controllers close to these resources

Step 4 — Radial Mapping


- What applications benefit most from being close to the memory controller?
 - High memory bandwidth demand
 - Also affected by network performance
 - Metric \Rightarrow Stall time per thousand instructions

Putting It All Together


Inter-Cluster Mapping



Clustering




Balancing



Isolation

Intra-Cluster Mapping



Radial Mapping

Improve Locality

Reduce Interference

Improve Shared Resource Utilization

Evaluation Methodology

- 60-core system
 - ❑ x86 processor model based on Intel Pentium M
 - ❑ 2 GHz processor, 128-entry instruction window
 - ❑ 32KB private L1 and 256KB per core private L2 caches
 - ❑ 4GB DRAM, 160 cycle access latency, 4 on-chip DRAM controllers
 - ❑ CLOCK page replacement algorithm

- Detailed Network-on-Chip model
 - ❑ 2-stage routers (with speculation and look ahead routing)
 - ❑ Wormhole switching (4 flit data packets)
 - ❑ Virtual channel flow control (4 VCs, 4 flit buffer depth)
 - ❑ 8x8 Mesh (128 bit bi-directional channels)

Configurations


■ Evaluated configurations

- ❑ **BASE**—Random core mapping
- ❑ **BASE+CLS**—Baseline with clustering
- ❑ **A2C**

■ Benchmarks


- ❑ Scientific, server, desktop benchmarks (35 applications)
- ❑ 128 multi-programmed workloads
- ❑ 4 categories based on aggregate workload MPKI
 - MPKI500, MPKI1000, MPKI1500, MPKI2000

System Performance



System performance improves by 17%


Network Power



Average network power consumption reduces by 52%

Summary of Other Results

- A2C can reduce page fault rate




Summary of Other Results


- A2C can reduce page faults
- **Dynamic A2C also improves system performance**
 - Continuous “Profiling” + “Enforcement” intervals
 - Retains clustering benefits
 - Migration overheads are minimal
- A2C complements application-aware packet prioritization* in NoCs
- A2C is effective for a variety of system parameters
 - Number of and placement of memory controllers
 - Size and organization of last level cache

Conclusion


- **Problem:** Spatial scheduling for Many-Core processors
 - Develop fundamental insights for core mapping policies
- **Solution:** Application-to-Core (A2C) mapping policies




Clustering



Balancing



Isolation




Radial

- A2C improves system performance, system fairness and network power significantly

Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference

Reetuparna Das* Rachata Ausavarungnirun\$ Onur Mutlu\$
Akhilesh Kumar\$ Mani Azimi\$

*University of Michigan \$Carnegie Mellon University \$Intel



Parallel Application Memory Scheduling

Eiman Ebrahimi^{*}

Rustam Miftakhutdinov^{*}, Chris Fallin[‡]

Chang Joo Lee^{*+}, Jose Joao^{*}


Onur Mutlu[‡], Yale N. Patt^{*}

^{*} HPS Research Group The
University of Texas at Austin


[‡] Computer Architecture Laboratory
Carnegie Mellon University

⁺ Intel Corporation
Austin

Background



Background




- Memory requests from different cores **interfere** in shared memory resources
- **Multi-programmed** workloads
- System Performance and Fairness
- **A single multi-threaded** application?

Memory System Interference in A Single Multi-Threaded Application

- *Inter-dependent threads* from the same application **slow each other down**
- Most importantly the **critical path** of execution can be **significantly slowed down**
- Problem and goal are very different from interference between independent applications
 - Interdependence between threads
 - Goal: **Reduce execution time** of a single application
 - **No notion of fairness** among the threads of the same application

Potential in A Single Multi-Threaded Application



If all main-memory related interference is *ideally* eliminated, execution time is reduced by **45% on average**

Outline

- Problem Statement
- Parallel Application Memory Scheduling
- Evaluation
- Conclusion

Outline

- Problem Statement
- Parallel Application Memory Scheduling
- Evaluation
- Conclusion

Parallel Application Memory Scheduler

- Identify the set of threads **likely to be on the critical path** as **limiter threads**
 - Prioritize requests from limiter threads
- Among limiter threads:
 - Prioritize requests from latency-sensitive threads (those with lower MPKI)
- Among non-limiter threads:
 - **Shuffle priorities** of *non-limiter* threads to reduce inter-thread memory interference
 - Prioritize requests from threads falling behind others in a *parallel for-loop*




Parallel Application Memory Scheduler

- Identify the set of threads **likely to be on the critical path** as **limiter threads**
 - Prioritize requests from limiter threads
- Among limiter threads:
 - Prioritize requests from latency-sensitive threads (those with lower MPKI)
- Among non-limiter threads:
 - **Shuffle priorities** of *non-limiter* threads to reduce inter-thread memory interference
 - Prioritize requests from threads falling behind others in a *parallel for-loop*

Runtime System Limiter Identification

- Contended critical sections are often on the critical path of execution
- Extend **runtime system** to identify thread executing **the most contended** critical section as **the limiter thread**
 - Track total amount of time all threads **wait on** each lock in a given interval
 - Identify the lock with **largest waiting time** as the most contended
 - Thread holding the most contended lock is a **limiter** and this information is **exposed** to the memory controller


Prioritizing Requests from Limiter Threads



Parallel Application Memory Scheduler

- Identify the set of threads **likely to be on the critical path** as **limiter threads**
 - Prioritize requests from limiter threads
- Among limiter threads:
 - Prioritize requests from latency-sensitive threads (those with lower MPKI)
- Among non-limiter threads:
 - **Shuffle priorities** of *non-limiter* threads to reduce inter-thread memory interference
 - Prioritize requests from threads falling behind others in a *parallel for-loop*

Time-based classification of threads as latency- vs. BW-sensitive




Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling (TCM) [Kim et. al., MICRO'10]

Terminology

- A *code-segment* is defined as:
 - A program region between two consecutive synchronization operations
 - Identified with a 2-tuple:
<beginning IP, lock address>

- Important for classifying threads as latency- vs. bandwidth-sensitive
 - Time-based vs. code-segment based classification

Code-segment based classification of threads as latency- vs. BW-sensitive



Parallel Application Memory Scheduler

- Identify the set of threads **likely to be on the critical path** as **limiter threads**
 - Prioritize requests from limiter threads
- Among limiter threads:
 - Prioritize requests from latency-sensitive threads (those with lower MPKI)
- Among non-limiter threads:
 - **Shuffle priorities** of *non-limiter* threads to reduce inter-thread memory interference
 - Prioritize requests from threads falling behind others in a *parallel for-loop*

Shuffling Priorities of Non-Limiter Threads

■ Goal:


- Reduce inter-thread interference among a set of threads with the same importance in terms of our estimation of the critical path
- **Prevent** any of these threads from becoming **new bottlenecks**

■ Basic Idea:

- Give each thread a chance to be high priority in the memory system and exploit **intra-thread bank parallelism** and **row-buffer locality**
- Every interval assign a set of random priorities to the threads and **shuffle priorities at the end of the interval**

Shuffling Priorities of Non-Limiter Threads


Threads with *similar* memory behavior



Legend


— Active
- - - Waiting

Threads with *different* memory behavior




PAMS dynamically monitors memory intensities and chooses appropriate shuffling policy for non-limiter threads at runtime

Shuffling



Shuffling



Outline

- Problem Statement
- Parallel Application Memory Scheduling
- Evaluation
- Conclusion

Evaluation Methodology


- x86 cycle accurate simulator

- Baseline processor configuration
 - Per-core
 - 4-wide issue, out-of-order, 64 entry ROB

 - Shared (16-core system)
 - 128 MSHRs
 - 4MB, 16-way L2 cache

 - Main Memory
 - DDR3 1333 MHz
 - Latency of 15ns per command (tRP, tRCD, CL)
 - 8B wide core to memory bus

PAMS Evaluation



Thread criticality predictors (TCP) [Bhattacharjee+, ISCA'09]

Sensitivity to system parameters

L2 Cache Size		
4 MB	8 MB	16 MB
$\Delta FR-FCFS$	$\Delta FR-FCFS$	$\Delta FR-FCFS$
-16.7%	-15.9%	-10.5%

Number of Memory Channels		
1 Channel	2 Channels	4 Channels
$\Delta FR-FCFS$	$\Delta FR-FCFS$	$\Delta FR-FCFS$
-16.7%	-11.6%	-10.4%

Conclusion

- Inter-thread main memory interference within a multi-threaded application increases execution time
- Parallel Application Memory Scheduling (PAMS) improves a single multi-threaded application's performance by
 - Identifying a set of threads likely to be on the critical path and prioritizing requests from them
 - Periodically shuffling priorities of non-likely critical threads to reduce inter-thread interference among them
- PAMS significantly outperforms
 - Best previous memory scheduler designed for multi-programmed workloads
 - A memory scheduler that uses a state-of-the-art thread criticality predictor (TCP)

Parallel Application Memory Scheduling

Eiman Ebrahimi^{*}

Rustam Miftakhutdinov^{*}, Chris Fallin[‡]

Chang Joo Lee^{*+}, Jose Joao^{*}

Onur Mutlu[‡], Yale N. Patt^{*}

^{*} HPS Research Group The
University of Texas at Austin

[‡] Computer Architecture Laboratory
Carnegie Mellon University

⁺ Intel Corporation
Austin

Conclusions: Lecture 2.3

- Technology, application, architecture trends dictate new needs from memory system
- A fresh look at (re-designing) the memory hierarchy
 - **Scalability**: DRAM-System Codesign and New Technologies
 - **QoS**: Reducing and controlling main memory interference: QoS-aware memory system design
 - **Efficiency**: Customizability, minimal waste, new technologies
- QoS-unaware memory: uncontrollable and unpredictable
- Providing QoS awareness improves performance, predictability, fairness, and utilization of the memory system

Related Works

Some Related Past Work

- That I could not cover...
- How to handle prefetch requests in a QoS-aware multi-core memory system?
 - ❑ Prefetch-aware shared resource management, ISCA'11. [ISCA 2011 Talk](#)
 - ❑ Prefetch-aware memory controllers, MICRO'08, IEEE-TC'11. [Micro 2008 Talk](#)
 - ❑ Coordinated control of multiple prefetchers, MICRO'09. [Micro 2009 Talk](#)
- How to design QoS mechanisms in the interconnect?
 - ❑ Topology-aware, scalable QoS, ISCA'11, IEEE Micro'12.
 - ❑ Slack-based packet scheduling, ISCA'10, IEEE Micro'11.
 - ❑ Efficient bandwidth guarantees, MICRO'09.
 - ❑ Application-aware request prioritization, MICRO'09.

Other Research in My Group

Some Issues in Cache Design

DRAM-Aware LLC Writeback

- Problem 1: Writebacks to DRAM interfere with reads and cause additional performance penalty
 - Write-to-read turnaround time in DRAM bus
 - Write-recovery latency in DRAM bank
 - Change of row buffer → reduced row-buffer locality for read requests
- Problem 2: Writebacks that occur once in a while have low row buffer locality
- Idea: When evicting a dirty cache block to a row, proactively search the cache for other dirty blocks to the same row → evict them → write to DRAM in a batch
 - Improves row buffer locality
 - Reduces write-to-read switching penalties on DRAM bus
 - Improves performance on both single-core and multi-core systems

More Information

- Chang Joo Lee, Veynu Narasiman, Eiman Ebrahimi, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,
"DRAM-Aware Last-Level Cache Writeback: Reducing Write-Caused Interference in Memory Systems"
HPS Technical Report, TR-HPS-2010-002, April 2010.

DRAM-Aware Last-Level Cache Writeback: Reducing Write-Caused Interference in Memory Systems

Abstract

Read and write requests from a processor contend for the main memory data bus. System performance depends heavily on when read requests are serviced since they are required for an application's forward progress whereas writes do not need to be performed immediately. However, writes eventually have to be written to memory because the storage required to buffer them on-chip is limited.

In modern high bandwidth DDR (Double Data Rate)-based memory systems write requests significantly interfere with the servicing of read requests by delaying the more critical read requests and by causing the memory bus to become idle when switching between the servicing of a write and read request. This interference significantly degrades overall system performance. We call this phenomenon write-caused interference. To reduce write-caused interference, this paper proposes a new last-level cache writeback policy, called DRAM-aware writeback. The key idea of the proposed technique is to aggressively send out writeback requests that are expected to hit in DRAM row buffers before they would normally be evicted by the last-level cache replacement policy and have the DRAM controller service as many writes as possible together. Doing so not only reduces the amount of time to service writes by improving their row buffer locality but also reduces the idle bus cycles wasted due to switching between the servicing of a write and a read request.

DRAM-aware writeback improves system performance by 7.1% and 12.8% on single and 4-core systems respectively. The performance benefits of the mechanism increases in systems with prefetching since such systems have higher contention between reads and writes in the DRAM system.


DRAM-Aware Cache Design: An Example of Resource Coordination

DRAM-aware Cache Design


- Coordination of cache policies with memory controllers
- Chang Joo Lee, Veynu Narasiman, Eiman Ebrahimi, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,
"DRAM-Aware Last-Level Cache Writeback: Reducing Write-Caused Interference in Memory Systems"
HPS Technical Report, TR-HPS-2010-002, April 2010.
- Chang Joo Lee, Eiman Ebrahimi, Veynu Narasiman, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,
"DRAM-Aware Last-Level Cache Replacement"
HPS Technical Report, TR-HPS-2010-007, December 2010.

Write-Caused Interference: Read-Write Switching

- Row-hit read-to-read (write-to-write) to **any** bank:
back-to-back data transfer




- Read-write switching penalty for requests to **any** bank




Frequent read-write switching incurs many idle cycles

Write-Caused Interference: Write-to-Row-Conflict

- Row-conflict after read (in the **same** bank)



- Row-conflict after write (in the **same** bank)



Row-conflict after a write causes more idle cycles


Write-Caused Interference

- **Read-Write Switching**
 - Frequent read-write switching incurs many idle cycles
- **Write-to-Row-Conflict**
 - A row-conflict after a write causes more idle cycles

Generating many row-hit writes rather than row-conflict writes is preferred


LRU vs. Interference-Aware Replacement

All requests are to the *same* cache set



➤ Conventional LRU:

Write B (row-hit), Write C (row-conflict)



Clean A Last-level cache


•			
•			
Clean	Clean	Dirty B	Dirty C
•			
•			

Set X

→
Less recently used


LRU vs. Interference-Aware Replacement

All requests are to the *same* cache set




➤ Conventional LRU:

Write B (row-hit), Write C (row-conflict)



➤ Interference-aware:

Write B (row-hit), Write B (row-hit)



Clean A Last-level cache


		⋮	
		⋮	
Clean	Clean	Dirty B	Dirty C
		⋮	

Set X


→
Less recently used

A simple policy can reduce write service time

Performance of DRAM-Aware Replacement



1-core **11.4%**



4-core **12.3%**

Outline

- Problem
- **Solutions**
 - Prefetch-Aware DRAM Controller
 - BLP-Aware Request Issue Policies
 - DRAM-Aware Cache Replacement
 - **DRAM-Aware Writeback**
- Combination of Solutions
- Related Work
- Conclusion


DRAM-Aware Writeback

- Write-caused interference-aware replacement is not enough
 - Row-hit writebacks are sent only when a replacement occurs
 - Lose opportunities to service more writes quickly
- **To minimize write-caused interference, *proactively* clean row-hit dirty lines**
 - Reads are serviced without write-caused interference for a longer period


DRAM-Aware Writeback

1. When a dirty line is evicted for the last-level cache, store its address
 2. Using the stored address, search all possible sets for row-hit dirty lines and clean them whenever the cache bank is idle
- Many row-hit writes (up to the row size) are serviced quickly
 - Reads can be serviced for a longer time without being interfered with by writes

Performance of DRAM-Aware Writeback



1-core **7.1%**



4-core **12.8%**