

Computer Architecture

Lecture 15: Memory Contention: Performance, QoS, Complexity


Prof. Onur Mutlu

ETH Zürich

Fall 2022

17 November 2022

Recall: Memory Controller Design Is Becoming More Difficult



- Heterogeneous agents: CPUs, GPUs, HWAs, DMA engine, ...
- Main memory interference between CPUs, GPUs, HWAs
- Many timing constraints for various memory types
- Many goals at the same time: performance, fairness, QoS, energy efficiency, ...

Recall: Memory Performance Attacks

- Thomas Moscibroda and Onur Mutlu,
"Memory Performance Attacks: Denial of Memory Service in Multi-Core Systems"
*Proceedings of the 16th USENIX Security Symposium (**USENIX SECURITY**), pages 257-274, Boston, MA, August 2007. Slides (ppt)*

Memory Performance Attacks: Denial of Memory Service in Multi-Core Systems

Thomas Moscibroda Onur Mutlu
Microsoft Research
{moscitho,onur}@microsoft.com

Recall: Interconnect Based Starvation

- Boris Grot, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu,
"Preemptive Virtual Clock: A Flexible, Efficient, and Cost-effective QOS Scheme for Networks-on-Chip"
*Proceedings of the 42nd International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), pages 268-279, New York, NY, December 2009. Slides (pdf)*

Preemptive Virtual Clock: A Flexible, Efficient, and Cost-effective QOS Scheme for Networks-on-Chip

Boris Grot

Stephen W. Keckler

Onur Mutlu[†]

Department of Computer Sciences
The University of Texas at Austin
{bgrot, skeckler}@cs.utexas.edu

[†]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

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
 - QoS-aware interconnects
 - 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
 - QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers
 - QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores

Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control inter-thread memory interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling
2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks
3. **Core/source throttling**
4. **Application/thread scheduling**

Lecture on Other QoS Techniques

Application-to-Core Mapping

The diagram illustrates four application-to-core mapping techniques arranged in a 2x2 grid, each represented by a 4x4 grid of colored squares (yellow, black, and grey) with red triangles at the corners. The techniques are: **Balancing** (top-left), **Radial Mapping** (top-right), **Clustering** (bottom-left), and **Isolation** (bottom-right). Arrows connect the techniques in a clockwise cycle: Balancing to Radial Mapping, Radial Mapping to Isolation, Isolation to Clustering, and Clustering back to Balancing. The goals for each technique are: **Balancing** and **Radial Mapping** aim to **Improve Bandwidth Utilization**; **Clustering** and **Isolation** aim to **Improve Locality** and **Reduce Interference**.

89

ETH ZENTRUM

Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)

1,006 views • Nov 7, 2020

Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers


ANALYTICS EDIT VIDEO

SAFARI



Memory Channel Partitioning

Partitioning Channels Between Applications



Eliminates interference between applications' requests



21:30 / 1:20:55

ETH ZURICH D-ITET

Seminar in Computer Architecture - Lecture 4: Memory Channel Partitioning (Fall 2021)

379 views • Streamed live on Oct 14, 2021



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

19 0 SHARE SAVE ...

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Handling CPU-IO Interference

Donghyuk Lee, Lavanya Subramanian, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Jongmoo Choi, and Onur Mutlu,

"Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM"

Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT), San Francisco, CA, USA, October 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]




Figure 1: Methods to Connect Cores and Data Sources

Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM

Donghyuk Lee* Lavanya Subramanian* Rachata Ausavarungnirun* Jongmoo Choi† Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University


{donghyu1, lsubrama, rachata, onur}@cmu.edu

†Dankook University

choijm@dankook.ac.kr

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Revolution & Evolution

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

- **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, Top Picks'11]
 - 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: Memory Slowdown Model** [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
- **ASM: Application Slowdown Model** [Subramanian+ MICRO'15]
 - Idea: Extend MISE to take into account cache+memory interference
 - Takeaway: Cache access rate of an application can be estimated accurately and is a good proxy for application performance

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **BLISS: Blacklisting Memory Scheduler** [Subramanian+ ICCD'14, TPDS'16]
 - ❑ Idea: Deprioritize (i.e., blacklist) a thread that has consecutively serviced a large number of requests
 - ❑ Takeaway: **Blacklisting greatly reduces interference enables the scheduler to be simple without requiring full thread ranking**
- **DASH: Deadline-Aware Memory Scheduler** [Usui+ TACO'16]
 - ❑ Idea: Balance prioritization between CPUs, GPUs and Hardware Accelerators (HWA) by keeping HWA progress in check vs. deadlines such that HWAs do not hog performance and appropriately distinguishing between latency-sensitive vs. bandwidth-sensitive CPU workloads
 - ❑ Takeaway: **Proper control of HWA progress and application-aware CPU prioritization leads to better system performance while meeting HWA deadlines**

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **Prefetch-aware shared resource management** [Ebrahimi+ ISCA'11] [Ebrahimi+ MICRO'09] [Ebrahimi+ HPCA'09] [Lee+ MICRO'08'09]
 - 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 and write scheduling** [Lee+ HPS Tech Report'10] [Seshadri+ ISCA'14]
 - 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; writes should not be ignored

QoS-Aware Memory Scheduling: Evolution

- **FIRM: Memory Scheduling for NVM** [Zhao+ MICRO'14]
 - Idea: Carefully handle write-read prioritization with coarse-grained batching and application-aware scheduling
 - Takeaway: Carefully controlling and prioritizing write requests improves performance and fairness; write requests are especially critical in NVMs
- **Criticality-Aware Memory Scheduling for GPUs** [Jog+ SIGMETRICS'16]
 - Idea: Prioritize latency-critical cores' requests in a GPU system
 - Takeaway: Need to carefully balance locality and criticality to make sure performance improves by taking advantage of both
- **Worst-case Execution Time Based Memory Scheduling for Real-Time Systems** [Kim+ RTAS'14, JRTS'16]

Recall: STFM

- Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda,
"Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling for Chip Multiprocessors"
*Proceedings of the 40th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), pages 146-158, Chicago, IL, December 2007. [[Summary](#)] [[Slides \(ppt\)](#)]*

Stall-Time Fair Memory Access Scheduling for Chip Multiprocessors

Onur Mutlu Thomas Moscibroda

Microsoft Research
{onur,moscitho}@microsoft.com

Recall: PAR-BS Pros and Cons

- Upsides:
 - ❑ First scheduler to address bank parallelism destruction across multiple threads
 - ❑ Simple mechanism (vs. STFM)
 - ❑ Batching provides fairness
 - ❑ Ranking enables parallelism awareness

- Downsides:
 - ❑ Does not always prioritize the latency-sensitive applications
 - ❑ Scalability to many threads and heterogeneous cores unclear

More on PAR-BS

- Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda,
"Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling: Enhancing both Performance and Fairness of Shared DRAM Systems"
Proceedings of the 35th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), pages 63-74, Beijing, China, June 2008.
[Summary] [Slides (ppt)]
One of the 12 computer architecture papers of 2008 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.

Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling:

Enhancing both Performance and Fairness of Shared DRAM Systems

Onur Mutlu Thomas Moscibroda
Microsoft Research
{onur,moscitho}@microsoft.com

More on PAR-BS

- Onur Mutlu and Thomas Moscibroda,
"Parallelism-Aware Batch Scheduling: Enabling High-Performance and Fair Memory Controllers"
*IEEE Micro, Special Issue: Micro's Top Picks from 2008 Computer Architecture Conferences (**MICRO TOP PICKS**)*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pages 22-32, January/February 2009.

PARALLELISM-AWARE BATCH SCHEDULING: ENABLING HIGH-PERFORMANCE AND FAIR SHARED MEMORY CONTROLLERS

UNCONTROLLED INTERTHREAD INTERFERENCE IN MAIN MEMORY CAN DESTROY INDIVIDUAL THREADS' MEMORY-LEVEL PARALLELISM, EFFECTIVELY SERIALIZING THE MEMORY REQUESTS OF A THREAD WHOSE LATENCIES WOULD OTHERWISE HAVE LARGELY OVERLAPPED, THEREBY REDUCING SINGLE-THREAD PERFORMANCE. THE PARALLELISM-AWARE BATCH SCHEDULER PRESERVES EACH THREAD'S MEMORY-LEVEL PARALLELISM, ENSURES FAIRNESS AND STARVATION FREEDOM, AND SUPPORTS SYSTEM-LEVEL THREAD PRIORITIES.

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 \(pptx\)](#)

ATLAS: Summary

- Goal: To maximize system performance
- Main idea: Prioritize the thread that has attained the least service from the memory controllers (Adaptive per-Thread Least Attained Service Scheduling)
 - Rank threads based on attained service in the past time interval(s)
 - Enforce thread ranking in the memory scheduler during the current interval
- Why it works: Prioritizes “light” (memory non-intensive) threads that are more likely to keep their cores busy


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

ATLAS Pros and Cons

■ Upsides:

- ❑ Good at improving overall throughput (compute-intensive threads are prioritized)
- ❑ Low complexity
- ❑ Coordination among controllers happens infrequently

■ Downsides:

- ❑ Lowest/medium ranked threads get delayed significantly → high unfairness

More on 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"**
Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Bangalore, India, January 2010. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)
Best paper session. One of the four papers nominated for the Best Paper Award by the Program Committee.

ATLAS: A Scalable and High-Performance Scheduling Algorithm for Multiple Memory Controllers

Yoongu Kim Dongsu Han Onur Mutlu Mor Harchol-Balter


Carnegie Mellon University

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


Good for throughput



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*

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

activated row




- 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?



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
- ❑ Caters to the needs for different types of threads (latency vs. bandwidth sensitive)
- ❑ (Relatively) simple

■ Downsides:

- ❑ Scalability to large buffer sizes?
- ❑ Robustness of clustering and shuffling algorithms?
- ❑ Ranking is still too complex?

More on TCM

- Yoongu Kim, Michael Papamichael, Onur Mutlu, and Mor Harchol-Balter, **"Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling: Exploiting Differences in Memory Access Behavior"**

*Proceedings of the 43rd International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), pages 65-76, Atlanta, GA, December 2010. Slides (pptx) (pdf)*

One of the 11 computer architecture papers of 2010 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.

Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling: Exploiting Differences in Memory Access Behavior

Yoongu Kim

yoonguk@ece.cmu.edu

Michael Papamichael

papamix@cs.cmu.edu

Onur Mutlu

onur@cmu.edu

Mor Harchol-Balter

harchol@cs.cmu.edu

Carnegie Mellon University

More on TCM

- Yoongu Kim, Michael Papamichael, Onur Mutlu, and Mor Harchol-Balter, **"Thread Cluster Memory Scheduling"** *IEEE Micro*, Special Issue: Micro's Top Picks from 2010 Computer Architecture Conferences (**MICRO TOP PICKS**), Vol. 31, No. 1, pages 78-89, January/February 2011.
-

THREAD CLUSTER MEMORY SCHEDULING

MEMORY SCHEDULERS IN MULTICORE SYSTEMS SHOULD CAREFULLY SCHEDULE MEMORY REQUESTS FROM DIFFERENT THREADS TO ENSURE HIGH SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND FAIR, FAST PROGRESS OF EACH THREAD. NO EXISTING MEMORY SCHEDULER PROVIDES BOTH THE HIGHEST SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND HIGHEST FAIRNESS. THREAD CLUSTER MEMORY SCHEDULING IS A NEW ALGORITHM THAT ACHIEVES THE BEST OF BOTH WORLDS BY DIFFERENTIATING LATENCY-SENSITIVE THREADS FROM BANDWIDTH-SENSITIVE ONES AND EMPLOYING DIFFERENT SCHEDULING POLICIES FOR EACH.

The Blacklisting Memory Scheduler

Lavanya Subramanian, Donghyuk Lee, Vivek Seshadri, Harsha Rastogi, and Onur Mutlu,


"The Blacklisting Memory Scheduler: Achieving High Performance and Fairness at Low Cost"

Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD),


Seoul, South Korea, October 2014. [[Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)]

Tackling Inter-Application Interference: Application-aware Memory Scheduling

Monitor




Rank




*Full ranking increases
critical path latency and area
significantly to improve
performance and fairness*

*Enforce
Ranks*




Performance vs. Fairness vs. Simplicity



Key Observation 1: Group Rather Than Rank

Observation 1: Sufficient to separate applications into two groups, rather than do full ranking




Benefit 2: Lower slowdowns than ranking


Key Observation 1: Group Rather Than Rank

Observation 1: Sufficient to separate applications into two groups, rather than do full ranking

Monitor




Rank




Group

Vulnerable



**Interference
Causing**

>



How to classify applications into groups?

Key Observation 2

***Observation 2:** Serving a large number of consecutive requests from an application causes interference*


Basic Idea:

- *Group* applications with a large number of consecutive requests as *interference-causing* → *Blacklisting*
- *Deprioritize* blacklisted applications
- *Clear* blacklist periodically (1000s of cycles)


Benefits:

- *Lower complexity*
- *Finer grained grouping decisions* → *Lower unfairness*

Performance vs. Fairness vs. Simplicity




Performance and Fairness



- 1. Blacklisting achieves the highest performance*
- 2. Blacklisting balances performance and fairness*

Complexity



Blacklisting reduces complexity significantly

More on BLISS (I)

- Lavanya Subramanian, Donghyuk Lee, Vivek Seshadri, Harsha Rastogi, and Onur Mutlu,
"The Blacklisting Memory Scheduler: Achieving High Performance and Fairness at Low Cost"
Proceedings of the 32nd IEEE International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD), Seoul, South Korea, October 2014.
[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]

The Blacklisting Memory Scheduler: Achieving High Performance and Fairness at Low Cost

Lavanya Subramanian, Donghyuk Lee, Vivek Seshadri, Harsha Rastogi, Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
{lsubrama,donghyu1,visesh,harshar,onur}@cmu.edu

More on BLISS: Longer Version

- Lavanya Subramanian, Donghyuk Lee, Vivek Seshadri, Harsha Rastogi, and Onur Mutlu,
"BLISS: Balancing Performance, Fairness and Complexity in Memory Access Scheduling"
IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems (***TPDS***), to appear in 2016. [arXiv.org version](#), April 2015.
[An earlier version](#) as *SAFARI Technical Report*, TR-SAFARI-2015-004, Carnegie Mellon University, March 2015.
[\[Source Code\]](#)

BLISS: Balancing Performance, Fairness and Complexity in Memory Access Scheduling

Lavanya Subramanian, Donghyuk Lee, Vivek Seshadri, Harsha Rastogi, and Onur Mutlu

Handling Memory Interference In Multithreaded Applications

Eiman Ebrahimi, Rustam Miftakhutdinov, Chris Fallin,
Chang Joo Lee, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,

"Parallel Application Memory Scheduling"

*Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**),
Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)*

Lecture on Parallel Application Scheduling

[illegible]

ETH ZENTRUM
Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)

1,006 views • Nov 7, 2020

👍 23 🗨️ 0 ➦ SHARE ≡+ SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS EDIT VIDEO

Lecture on Bottleneck Acceleration

Observation: Limiting Bottlenecks Change Over Time

A=full linked list; B=empty linked list

repeat

Lock A

Traverse list A

Remove X from A

Unlock A

Compute on X


Lock B

Traverse list B

Insert X into B

Unlock B

until A is empty



Computer Architecture - Lecture 17: Bottleneck Acceleration (ETH Zürich, Fall 2020)

880 views • Nov 20, 2020

13 0 SHARE SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Multithreaded (Parallel) Applications

- Threads in a multi-threaded application can be inter-dependent
 - As opposed to threads from different applications
- Such threads can synchronize with each other
 - Locks, barriers, pipeline stages, condition variables, semaphores, ...
- Some threads can be on the critical path of execution due to synchronization; some threads are not
- Even within a thread, some “code segments” may be on the critical path of execution; some are not

Critical Sections

- Enforce mutually exclusive access to shared data
- Only one thread can be executing it at a time
- Contended critical sections make threads wait → threads causing serialization can be on the critical path

Each thread:

loop {

Compute

N


lock(A)

Update shared data

unlock(A)

C

}



Barriers

- Synchronization point
- Threads have to wait until all threads reach the barrier
- Last thread arriving at the barrier is on the critical path

Each thread:


```
loop1 {  
    Compute
```

```
}
```

```
barrier
```


```
loop2 {  
    Compute
```

```
}
```



Stages of Pipelined Programs



- Loop iterations are statically divided into code segments called *stages*
- Threads execute stages on different cores
- Thread executing the slowest stage is on the critical path



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 executing the slowest pipeline stage
 - Thread that is falling behind the most in reaching a barrier

Prioritizing Requests from Limiter Threads



Parallel App Mem Scheduling: Pros and Cons

■ Upsides:

- ❑ Improves the performance of multi-threaded applications
- ❑ Provides a mechanism for estimating “limiter threads”
- ❑ Opens a path for slowdown estimation for multi-threaded applications

■ Downsides:

- ❑ What if there are multiple multi-threaded applications running together?
- ❑ Limiter thread estimation can be complex
 - Joao+, “Bottleneck Identification and Scheduling,” ASPLOS 2012

More on PAMS

- Eiman Ebrahimi, Rustam Miftakhutdinov, Chris Fallin, Chang Joo Lee, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,
"Parallel Application Memory Scheduling"
Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)

Parallel Application Memory Scheduling

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Rustam Miftakhutdinov[†] Chris Fallin[§]
Chang Joo Lee[‡] José A. Joao[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, rustam, joao, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Carnegie Mellon University
{cfallin,onur}@cmu.edu

[‡]Intel Corporation
chang.joo.lee@intel.com

Lecture on Parallel Application Scheduling

Prioritizing Requests from Limiter Threads

Non-Critical Section — Critical Section 1 — Barrier |

Waiting for Sync or Lock — Critical Section 2 — Critical Path —

Thread A

Thread B

Thread C

Thread D

Barrier

Time

Limiter Thread Identification

Thread A

Thread B

Thread C

Thread D

Time

Most Contended Critical Section: 1

Limiter Thread: B

Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)

👍 23 🗨️ 0 ➦ SHARE ≡+ SAVE ...

[EDIT VIDEO](#)

Bottleneck Identification & Scheduling

- Jose A. Joao, M. Aater Suleman, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt,
"Bottleneck Identification and Scheduling in Multithreaded Applications"

Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), London, UK, March 2012. [Slides \(ppt\)](#) ([pdf](#))

Bottleneck Identification and Scheduling in Multithreaded Applications

José A. Joao

ECE Department

The University of Texas at Austin

joao@ece.utexas.edu

M. Aater Suleman

Calxeda Inc.

aater.suleman@calxeda.com

Onur Mutlu

Computer Architecture Lab.

Carnegie Mellon University

onur@cmu.edu

Yale N. Patt

ECE Department

The University of Texas at Austin

patt@ece.utexas.edu

Utility-Based Bottleneck Acceleration

- Jose A. Joao, M. Aater Suleman, Onur Mutlu, and Yale N. Patt, **"Utility-Based Acceleration of Multithreaded Applications on Asymmetric CMPs"**
Proceedings of the 40th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), Tel-Aviv, Israel, June 2013. [Slides \(ppt\)](#)
[Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Utility-Based Acceleration of Multithreaded Applications on Asymmetric CMPs

José A. Joao [†] M. Aater Suleman ^{‡†} Onur Mutlu [§] Yale N. Patt [†]

[†] ECE Department
The University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX, USA
{joao, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[‡] Flux7 Consulting
Austin, TX, USA
suleman@hps.utexas.edu

[§] Computer Architecture Laboratory
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA, USA
onur@cmu.edu

Lecture on Bottleneck Acceleration

Observation: Limiting Bottlenecks Change Over Time


A=full linked list; B=empty linked list
repeat

Lock A
 Traverse list A
 Remove X from A
Unlock A

Compute on X

Lock B
 Traverse list B
 Insert X into B
Unlock B

until A is empty



Computer Architecture - Lecture 17: Bottleneck Acceleration (ETH Zürich, Fall 2020)

880 views • Nov 20, 2020

13 0 SHARE SAVE ...




Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Memory Scheduling for Heterogeneous Systems


Current SoC Architectures: Heterogeneity



- Heterogeneous agents: CPUs, GPUs, HWAs, DMA engine, ...
- Memory resources shared by CPUs/GPUs/HWAs → Interference

How to allocate resources to heterogeneous agents to mitigate interference and provide predictable performance?

Current SoC Architectures: Heterogeneity



Apple M1,
2021

Lecture on Heterogeneous System Scheduling

SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling

The diagram illustrates the SMS (Staged Memory Scheduling) process across three stages:

- Stage 1: Batch Formation** shows five processing units: Core 1, Core 2, Core 3, Core 4, and GPU. Each unit contains one or more colored blocks representing tasks. Core 1 has a yellow block. Core 2 has two blue blocks. Core 3 has two red blocks. Core 4 has two green blocks. The GPU has two purple blocks.
- Stage 2: Batch Scheduler** is a central green box that receives input from Stage 1 and outputs to Stage 3.
- Stage 3: DRAM Command Scheduler** shows four DRAM banks: Bank 1, Bank 2, Bank 3, and Bank 4. Bank 1 contains three blocks (blue, blue, yellow). Bank 2 contains two blocks (green, purple). Bank 3 contains two red blocks. Bank 4 is empty. An arrow labeled "To DRAM" points from Bank 2.

The video player interface shows a progress bar at 16:23 / 2:59:25, a volume icon, and a play button. The video title is "Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)". The channel is "Onur Mutlu Lectures" with 19.8K subscribers. The video has 1,006 views and was uploaded on Nov 7, 2020. The video player controls include a play button, a progress bar, a volume icon, and a share icon.

ETH ZENTRUM
Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)
1,006 views • Nov 7, 2020

Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

23 0 SHARE SAVE ...

ANALYTICS EDIT VIDEO

Lecture on Heterogeneous Computing Systems

Asymmetry Enables Customization


C	C	C	C
C	C	C	C
C	C	C	C
C	C	C	C

Symmetric

C1		C2	
		C3	
C4	C4	C4	C4
C5	C5	C5	C5

Asymmetric

- Symmetric: One size fits all
 - ❑ Energy and performance suboptimal for different “workload” behaviors
- Asymmetric: Enables customization and adaptation
 - ❑ Processing requirements vary across workloads (applications and phases)
 - ❑ Execute code on best-fit resources (minimal energy, adequate perf.)



Computer Architecture - Lecture 16b: Parallelism and Heterogeneity (ETH Zürich, Fall 2020)

840 views • Nov 20, 2020

17 DISLIKE SHARE SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.9K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

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"
Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), Portland, OR, June 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

Staged Memory Scheduling: Achieving High Performance and Scalability in Heterogeneous Systems

Rachata Ausavarungnirun[†] Kevin Kai-Wei Chang[†] Lavanya Subramanian[†] Gabriel H. Loh[‡] Onur Mutlu[†]

[†]Carnegie Mellon University
{rachata,kevincha,lsubrama,onur}@cmu.edu

[‡]Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.
gabe.loh@amd.com

DASH: Deadline-Aware Memory Scheduler

- Hiroyuki Usui, Lavanya Subramanian, Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, and Onur Mutlu,
"DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators"
ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO), Vol. 12, January 2016.
Presented at the 11th HiPEAC Conference, Prague, Czech Republic, January 2016.
[[Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)]
[[Source Code](#)]

DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators

HIROYUKI USUI, LAVANYA SUBRAMANIAN, KEVIN KAI-WEI CHANG, and ONUR MUTLU, Carnegie Mellon University

Handling CPU-IO Interference

Donghyuk Lee, Lavanya Subramanian, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Jongmoo Choi, and Onur Mutlu,

"Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM"

Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT), San Francisco, CA, USA, October 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]




Figure 1: Methods to Connect Cores and Data Sources

Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM

Donghyuk Lee* Lavanya Subramanian* Rachata Ausavarungnirun* Jongmoo Choi† Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University

{donghyu1, lsubrama, rachata, onur}@cmu.edu

†Dankook University

choijm@dankook.ac.kr


Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM

Decoupled Direct Memory Access

Donghyuk Lee


Lavanya Subramanian, Rachata Ausavarungnirun,
Jongmoo Choi, Onur Mutlu

Logical System Organization




Main memory connects processor and IO devices as an *intermediate layer*

Physical System Implementation



Our Approach




Enabling IO channel,
decoupled & isolated from CPU channel


Executive Summary

- Problem
 - CPU and IO accesses contend for the shared memory channel
- Our Approach: *Decoupled Direct Memory Access (DDMA)*
 - Design new DRAM architecture with two independent data ports
→ *Dual-Data-Port DRAM*
 - Connect one port to CPU and the other port to IO devices
→ *Decouple CPU and IO accesses*
- Applications
 - Communication between compute units (e.g., CPU – GPU)
 - In-memory communication (e.g., bulk in-memory copy/init.)
 - Memory-storage communication (e.g., page fault, IO prefetch)
- Result
 - Significant *performance improvement* (20% in 2 ch. & 2 rank system)
 - *CPU pin count reduction* (4.5%)

Problem 1: Memory Channel Contention




Problem 1: Memory Channel Contention




A large fraction of the execution time
is spent on IO accesses

Problem 2: High Cost for IO Interfaces



959 pins in total

Processor Pin Count
(w/ power pins)



359 pins in total


Processor Pin Count
(w/o power pins)

Integrating IO interface on the processor chip
leads to *high area cost*

Shared Memory Channel


- **Memory channel contention** for IO access and CPU access
- **High area cost** for integrating **IO interfaces** on processor chip

Decoupled DMA Approach



Decoupled DMA Approach

Decoupled Direct Memory Access



Importance in Real Systems [HotNets'22]

Understanding Host Interconnect Congestion

Saksham Agarwal
Cornell University

Rachit Agarwal
Cornell University

Behnam Montazeri
Google

Masoud Moshref
Google

Khaled Elmeleegy
Google

Luigi Rizzo
Google

Marc Asher de
Kruijf
Google

Gautam Kumar
Google

Sylvia Ratnasamy
Google & UC Berkeley

David Culler
Google

Amin Vahdat
Google

We present evidence and characterization of *host congestion* in production clusters: adoption of high-bandwidth access links leading to emergence of bottlenecks within the host interconnect (NIC-to-CPU data path). We demonstrate that contention on existing IO memory management units and/or the memory subsystem can significantly reduce the available NIC-to-CPU bandwidth, resulting in hundreds of microseconds of queueing delays and eventual packet drops at hosts (even when running a state-of-the-art congestion control protocol that accounts for CPU-induced host congestion). We also discuss implications of host interconnect congestion to design of future host architecture, network stacks and network protocols.

Importance in Real Systems [HotNets'22]




Figure 2: The host datapath between the NIC and the CPU.


3.2 Memory bus induced host congestion

Intuition. Another root cause of host congestion is the rapidly reducing gap between access link bandwidth and memory bus bandwidth: in large servers, applications that perform large volumes of memory operations can lead to starvation of memory requests coming from the NIC. Specifically, within the host interconnect, CPUs reading/writing data to memory share the memory bus with the NIC performing DMA operations; when memory bus is contended, per-DMA latency increases for memory requests coming

from the NIC. This increase leads to an effect similar to the IOMMU case discussed in the previous subsection: increase in latency eventually results in PCIe bandwidth underutilization, and in-flight packets resulting in NIC buffers quickly building up. This, in turn, results in large host delays and packet drops even when host is receiving data at rate lower than the access link bandwidth; these delays and drops can result in subsequent rate reduction and link underutilization.

Predictable Performance: Strong Memory Service Guarantees


Goal: Predictable Performance in Complex Systems



- Heterogeneous agents: CPUs, GPUs, HWAs, DMA engine, ...
- Memory resources shared by CPUs/GPUs/HWAs → Interference

How to allocate resources to heterogeneous agents to mitigate interference and provide predictable performance?

Lecture on Predictable Performance



ETH ZÜRICH HAUPTGEBÄUDE

Computer Architecture - Lecture 17: Memory Interference and QoS II (ETH Zürich, Fall 2018)

274 views • Nov 23, 2018

4 0 SHARE SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Lecture on Predictable Performance

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

SAFARI

161



25:29 / 1:11:14



Memory Systems - Lecture 6.4: Memory Interface and QoS (Technion, Summer 2018)

163 views • Oct 12, 2018

5 0 SHARE SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Predictable Performance Readings (I)

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"

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. [Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Best paper award.

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

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Chang Joo Lee[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, cjlee, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Predictable Performance Readings (II)

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Yoongu Kim, Ben Jaiyen, and Onur Mutlu,
"MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems"
Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems

Lavanya Subramanian

Vivek Seshadri

Yoongu Kim

Ben Jaiyen

Onur Mutlu

Carnegie Mellon University

Predictable Performance Readings (III)

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Arnab Ghosh, Samira Khan, and Onur Mutlu,
"The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory"
Proceedings of the 48th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), Waikiki, Hawaii, USA, December 2015.
[[Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Lightning Session Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Poster \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)]
[[Source Code](#)]

The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory

Lavanya Subramanian*§ Vivek Seshadri* Arnab Ghosh*†
Samira Khan*‡ Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University §Intel Labs †IIT Kanpur ‡University of Virginia

Predictable Performance Readings (IV)

- Hiroyuki Usui, Lavanya Subramanian, Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, and Onur Mutlu,
"DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators"
ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO),
Vol. 12, January 2016.
Presented at the 11th HiPEAC Conference, Prague, Czech Republic,
January 2016.
[Slides (pptx)] [pdf]
[Source Code]

DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators

HIROYUKI USUI, LAVANYA SUBRAMANIAN, KEVIN KAI-WEI CHANG,
and ONUR MUTLU, Carnegie Mellon University

Predictable Performance Readings (V)

Donghyuk Lee, Lavanya Subramanian, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Jongmoo Choi, and Onur Mutlu,

"Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM"

Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT), San Francisco, CA, USA, October 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]




Figure 1: Methods to Connect Cores and Data Sources

Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-Data-Port DRAM

Donghyuk Lee* Lavanya Subramanian* Rachata Ausavarungnirun* Jongmoo Choi† Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University

{donghyu1, lsubrama, rachata, onur}@cmu.edu

†Dankook University

choijm@dankook.ac.kr

Other QoS Approaches

Recall: Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control inter-thread memory interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling

2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks

3. **Core/source throttling**

4. **Application/thread scheduling**

Lecture on Other QoS Techniques

Application-to-Core Mapping

The diagram illustrates four application-to-core mapping techniques arranged in a 2x2 grid, each represented by a 4x4 grid of colored squares (yellow, black, and grey) with arrows indicating data flow or mapping. The techniques are: Balancing (top-left), Radial Mapping (top-right), Clustering (bottom-left), and Isolation (bottom-right). Arrows connect the techniques in a clockwise cycle: Balancing to Radial Mapping, Radial Mapping to Isolation, Isolation to Clustering, and Clustering back to Balancing. The goals for each technique are: Balancing (Improve Bandwidth Utilization), Radial Mapping (Improve Bandwidth Utilization), Clustering (Improve Locality, Reduce Interference), and Isolation (Reduce Interference).

Improve Bandwidth Utilization

Balancing

Radial Mapping

Improve Locality
Reduce Interference

Clustering

Isolation

Reduce Interference

SAFARI

2:40:08 / 2:59:25

89

ETH ZENTRUM


Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)

1,006 views • Nov 7, 2020

Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS EDIT VIDEO

Lecture on Other QoS Techniques



ETH ZENTRUM

Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)

1,006 views • Nov 7, 2020

23 0 SHARE SAVE ...




Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Memory Channel Partitioning

Partitioning Channels Between Applications



Eliminates interference between applications' requests

ETH ZURICH D-ITET

Seminar in Computer Architecture - Lecture 4: Memory Channel Partitioning (Fall 2021)

379 views • Streamed live on Oct 14, 2021



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

19 0 SHARE SAVE ...

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

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"
*Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)*

Reducing Memory Interference in Multicore Systems via Application-Aware Memory Channel Partitioning

Sai Prashanth Muralidhara
Pennsylvania State University
smuralid@cse.psu.edu

Lavanya Subramanian
Carnegie Mellon University
lsubrama@ece.cmu.edu

Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Mahmut Kandemir
Pennsylvania State University
kandemir@cse.psu.edu

Thomas Moscibroda
Microsoft Research Asia
moscitho@microsoft.com

Source Throttling (I)

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"

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. [Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Best paper award.

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

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Chang Joo Lee[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, cjlee, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Source Throttling (II)

- Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, and Onur Mutlu, **"HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks"**
Proceedings of the 24th International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD), New York, NY, October 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#) [\(pdf\)](#)

HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks

Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
{kevincha, rachata, cfallin, onur}@cmu.edu

Source Throttling (III)

- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, Onur Mutlu, and Srinivasan Seshan,
"On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-core Interconnects"
*Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGCOMM Conference (**SIGCOMM**), Helsinki, Finland, August 2012. Slides (pptx)*

On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-Core Interconnects

George Nychis[†], Chris Fallin[†], Thomas Moscibroda[§], Onur Mutlu[†], Srinivasan Seshan[†]
[†] Carnegie Mellon University [§] Microsoft Research Asia
{gnychis,cfallin,onur,srini}@cmu.edu moscitho@microsoft.com

Application-to-Core Mapping to Reduce Interference

- Reetuparna Das, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu, Akhilesh Kumar, and Mani Azimi,

"Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems"

Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013.

Slides (pptx)

Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems

Reetuparna Das* Rachata Ausavarungnirun† Onur Mutlu† Akhilesh Kumar‡ Mani Azimi‡
University of Michigan* Carnegie Mellon University† Intel Labs‡

Architecture-Aware DRM

- Hui Wang, Canturk Isci, Lavanya Subramanian, Jongmoo Choi, Depei Qian, and Onur Mutlu,

"A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters"

Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE), Istanbul, Turkey, March 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]

A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters

Hui Wang^{†*}, Canturk Isci[‡], Lavanya Subramanian*, Jongmoo Choi^{‡*}, Depei Qian[†], Onur Mutlu*

[†]Beihang University, [‡]IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, *Carnegie Mellon University, [‡]Dankook University
{hui.wang, depei.qian}@buaa.edu.cn, canturk@us.ibm.com, {lsubrama, onur}@cmu.edu, choijm@dankook.ac.kr

Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control inter-thread memory interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling

2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks

3. **Core/source throttling**

4. **Application/thread scheduling**

Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - ❑ QoS-aware memory controllers
 - ❑ QoS-aware interconnects
 - ❑ 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
 - ❑ QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers
 - ❑ 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 \(pptx\)](#)

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"
*Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)*

Reducing Memory Interference in Multicore Systems via Application-Aware Memory Channel Partitioning

Sai Prashanth Muralidhara
Pennsylvania State University
smuralid@cse.psu.edu


Lavanya Subramanian
Carnegie Mellon University
lsubrama@ece.cmu.edu

Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Mahmut Kandemir
Pennsylvania State University
kandemir@cse.psu.edu


Thomas Moscibroda
Microsoft Research Asia
moscitho@microsoft.com

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



Interval Based Operation



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

Performance of Channel Partitioning



Better system performance than the best previous scheduler
at lower hardware cost

An Example of Poor Channel Partitioning



Combining Multiple Interference Control Techniques

- Combined interference control techniques can mitigate interference much more than a single technique alone can do
- The key challenge is:
 - Deciding what technique to apply when
 - Partitioning work appropriately between software and hardware

MCP and IMPS: Pros and Cons

■ Upsides:

- ❑ Keeps the memory scheduling hardware simple
- ❑ Combines multiple interference reduction techniques
- ❑ Can provide performance isolation across applications mapped to different channels
- ❑ General idea of partitioning can be extended to smaller granularities in the memory hierarchy: banks, subarrays, etc.

■ Downsides:

- ❑ Reacting is difficult if workload changes behavior after profiling
- ❑ Overhead of moving pages between channels restricts benefits

More on 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"
*Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)*

Reducing Memory Interference in Multicore Systems via Application-Aware Memory Channel Partitioning

Sai Prashanth Muralidhara
Pennsylvania State University
smuralid@cse.psu.edu

Lavanya Subramanian
Carnegie Mellon University
lsubrama@ece.cmu.edu

Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Mahmut Kandemir
Pennsylvania State University
kandemir@cse.psu.edu

Thomas Moscibroda
Microsoft Research Asia
moscitho@microsoft.com

Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control inter-thread memory interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling
2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks
3. **Core/source throttling**
4. **Application/thread scheduling**


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**?


Source Throttling: A Fairness Substrate

- Key idea: Manage inter-thread interference at the **cores (sources)**, **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.

Fairness via Source Throttling (FST)

- Two components (interval-based)
- Run-time unfairness evaluation (in hardware)
 - Dynamically estimates the unfairness (application slowdowns) 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) [ASPLOS'10]



FST



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
    (limit injection rate and parallelism)
  2-Throttle up App-slowest
}
```


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

Total # of
MSHRs: 128

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
 - $\text{Weighted Slowdown}(i) = \text{Estimated Slowdown}(i) \times \text{Weight}(i)$

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

Source Throttling: Ups and Downs

■ Advantages

- + Core/request throttling is easy to implement: no need to change the memory scheduling algorithm
- + Can be a general way of handling shared resource contention
- + Can reduce overall load/contention in the memory system

■ Disadvantages

- Requires slowdown estimations → difficult to estimate
- Thresholds can become difficult to optimize
 - throughput loss due to too much throttling
 - can be difficult to find an overall-good configuration

More on Source Throttling (I)

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"

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. [Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Best paper award.

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

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Chang Joo Lee[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, cjlee, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

More on Source Throttling (II)

- Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, and Onur Mutlu, **"HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks"**
Proceedings of the 24th International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD), New York, NY, October 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#) [\(pdf\)](#)

HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks

Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
`{kevincha, rachata, cfallin, onur}@cmu.edu`

More on Source Throttling (III)

- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, Onur Mutlu, and Srinivasan Seshan,
"On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-core Interconnects"
*Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGCOMM Conference (**SIGCOMM**), Helsinki, Finland, August 2012. Slides (pptx)*

On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-Core Interconnects

George Nychis[†], Chris Fallin[†], Thomas Moscibroda[§], Onur Mutlu[†], Srinivasan Seshan[†]
[†] Carnegie Mellon University [§] Microsoft Research Asia
{gnychis,cfallin,onur,srini}@cmu.edu moscitho@microsoft.com

Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling
2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks
3. **Core/source throttling**

4. **Application/thread scheduling**


Idea: Pick threads that do not badly interfere with each other to be scheduled together on cores sharing the memory system

Application-to-Core Mapping to Reduce Interference


- Reetuparna Das, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu, Akhilesh Kumar, and Mani Azimi,
"Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems"
Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013.
Slides (pptx)

- Key ideas:
 - ❑ Cluster threads to memory controllers (to reduce across chip interference)
 - ❑ Isolate interference-sensitive (low-intensity) applications in a separate cluster (to reduce interference from high-intensity applications)
 - ❑ Place applications that benefit from memory bandwidth closer to the controller

Multi-Core to Many-Core



Multi-Core



Many-Core

Many-Core On-Chip Communication


Applications



Light



Heavy



**Memory
Controller**




**Shared
Cache Bank**

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



 **Memory
Controller**

Inefficient data mapping to memory and caches


Step 1 — Clustering



Improved Locality


Reduced Interference

System Performance



System performance improves by 17%

Network Power



Average network power consumption reduces by 52%

More on App-to-Core Mapping

- Reetuparna Das, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu, Akhilesh Kumar, and Mani Azimi,

"Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems"

Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013.

Slides (pptx)

Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems

Reetuparna Das* Rachata Ausavarungnirun† Onur Mutlu† Akhilesh Kumar‡ Mani Azimi‡
University of Michigan* Carnegie Mellon University† Intel Labs‡

Interference-Aware Thread Scheduling

- An example from scheduling in compute clusters (data centers)
 - Data centers can be running virtual machines
- How to co-schedule virtual machines such that system throughput in the entire data center is maximized?
- Interference in a single node matters

A-DRM: Architecture-aware DRM

- **Goal**: Take into account microarchitecture-level shared resource interference in cluster scheduling
 - Shared cache capacity
 - Shared memory bandwidth
- **Key Idea**:
 - Monitor and detect microarchitecture-level shared resource interference
 - Balance microarchitecture-level resource usage across cluster to minimize memory interference while maximizing system performance

More on Architecture-Aware DRM

- Hui Wang, Canturk Isci, Lavanya Subramanian, Jongmoo Choi, Depei Qian, and Onur Mutlu,

"A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters"

Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE), Istanbul, Turkey, March 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]

A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters

Hui Wang^{†*}, Canturk Isci[‡], Lavanya Subramanian^{*}, Jongmoo Choi^{‡*}, Depei Qian[†], Onur Mutlu^{*}

[†]Beihang University, [‡]IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, ^{*}Carnegie Mellon University, [‡]Dankook University
{hui.wang, depei.qian}@buaa.edu.cn, canturk@us.ibm.com, {lsubrama, onur}@cmu.edu, choijm@dankook.ac.kr

Interference-Aware Thread Scheduling

■ Advantages

- + Can eliminate/minimize interference by scheduling “symbiotic applications” together (as opposed to just managing the interference)
- + Less intrusive to hardware (less need to modify the hardware resources)

■ Disadvantages and Limitations

- High overhead to migrate threads and data between cores and machines
- Does not work (well) if all threads are similar and they interfere

Summary

Summary: Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control interference

- 1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling

- 2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks

- 3. **Core/source throttling**

- 4. **Application/thread scheduling**

Best is to combine all. How would you do that?

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 at reducing interference
 - No single best approach for all workloads
- Techniques: Request/thread **scheduling**, source **throttling**, memory **partitioning**
 - All approaches are effective at 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]**

Summary: Memory Interference and QoS

- QoS-unaware memory → uncontrollable and unpredictable system
- Providing QoS awareness improves performance, predictability, fairness, and utilization of the memory system
- Discussed many new techniques to:
 - Minimize memory interference
 - Provide predictable performance
- Many new research ideas needed for integrated techniques and closing the interaction with software

What Did We Not Cover?

- **Prefetch-aware shared resource management**
- DRAM-controller co-design
- Cache interference management
- **Interconnect interference management**
- Write-read scheduling
- **DRAM designs to reduce interference**
- Interference & QoS in processing-in-memory
- ...

What the Future May Bring

- **Memory QoS techniques for heterogeneous SoC systems**
 - Many accelerators, processing in/near memory, better predictability, higher performance
- **Combinations of memory QoS/performance techniques**
 - E.g., data mapping and scheduling
- **Use of machine learning techniques to manage resources**
- **End-to-end QoS, predictability, and performance in complex systems**

Computer Architecture

Lecture 15: Memory Contention: Performance, QoS, Complexity

Prof. Onur Mutlu

ETH Zürich

Fall 2022

17 November 2022

Backup Slides

Memory Scheduling for Heterogeneous Systems

Lecture on Heterogeneous System Scheduling

SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling

The diagram illustrates the SMS (Staged Memory Scheduling) process across three stages:

- Stage 1: Batch Formation** - Shows five processing units: Core 1, Core 2, Core 3, Core 4, and GPU. Each unit contains a single colored block representing a batch: Core 1 (yellow), Core 2 (blue), Core 3 (red), Core 4 (green), and GPU (purple).
- Stage 2: Batch Scheduler** - A central green box labeled "Batch Scheduler" receives input from all units in Stage 1. It outputs to Stage 3.
- Stage 3: DRAM Command Scheduler** - Shows four DRAM banks: Bank 1, Bank 2, Bank 3, and Bank 4. Bank 1 contains three blocks (blue, blue, yellow). Bank 2 contains two blocks (green, purple). Bank 3 contains two blocks (red, red). Bank 4 is empty. An arrow labeled "To DRAM" points from Bank 2.

The video player interface shows the video is at 16:23 / 2:59:25. The video is titled "Computer Arch - Lecture 13: Memory Interference and Quality of Service II (ETH Zürich, Spring 2020)" and is by "Onur Mutlu Lectures" (19.8K subscribers). The video has 1,006 views and was uploaded on Nov 7, 2020. The video player controls show 23 likes, 0 comments, and options to share, save, and view analytics or edit the video.


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.


SMS: 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


SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling



SMS: Staged Memory Scheduling




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)

Performance at Different GPU Weights



Performance at Different GPU Weights



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

More on SMS

- Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Kevin Chang, Lavanya Subramanian, Gabriel Loh, and Onur Mutlu,
"Staged Memory Scheduling: Achieving High Performance and Scalability in Heterogeneous Systems"
Proceedings of the 39th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), Portland, OR, June 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

Staged Memory Scheduling: Achieving High Performance and Scalability in Heterogeneous Systems

Rachata Ausavarungnirun[†] Kevin Kai-Wei Chang[†] Lavanya Subramanian[†] Gabriel H. Loh[‡] Onur Mutlu[†]


[†]Carnegie Mellon University
{rachata,kevincha,lsubrama,onur}@cmu.edu

[‡]Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.
gabe.loh@amd.com

DASH Memory Scheduler

[TACO 2016]

Current SoC Architectures



- Heterogeneous agents: CPUs and HWAs
 - HWA : Hardware Accelerator
- Main memory is shared by CPUs and HWAs → Interference

How to schedule memory requests from CPUs and HWAs to mitigate interference?

DASH Scheduler: Executive Summary

- Problem: Hardware accelerators (HWAs) and CPUs share the same memory subsystem and interfere with each other in main memory
- Goal: Design a memory scheduler that improves CPU performance while meeting HWAs' deadlines
- Challenge: Different HWAs have different memory access characteristics and different deadlines, which current schedulers do not smoothly handle
 - ❑ Memory-intensive and long-deadline HWAs significantly degrade CPU performance *when they become high priority* (due to slow progress)
 - ❑ Short-deadline HWAs sometimes miss their deadlines *despite high priority*
- Solution: DASH Memory Scheduler
 - ❑ Prioritize HWAs over CPU anytime when the HWA is not making good progress
 - ❑ Application-aware scheduling for CPUs and HWAs
- Key Results:
 - 1) Improves CPU performance for a wide variety of workloads by 9.5%
 - 2) Meets 100% deadline met ratio for HWAs
- DASH source code freely available on our GitHub

Goal of Our Scheduler (DASH)

- **Goal:** Design a memory scheduler that
 - Meets GPU/accelerators' frame rates/deadlines *and*
 - Achieves high CPU performance
- **Basic Idea:**
 - *Different CPU applications and hardware accelerators have different memory requirements*
 - Track progress of different agents and prioritize accordingly

Key Observation:

Distribute Priority for Accelerators

- GPU/accelerators need priority to meet deadlines
- Worst case prioritization not always the best
- Prioritize when they are **not** on track to meet a deadline

Distributing priority over time mitigates impact of accelerators on CPU cores' requests

Key Observation: Not All Accelerators are Equal

- **Long-deadline** accelerators are more likely to **meet** their deadlines
- **Short-deadline** accelerators are more likely to **miss** their deadlines

*Schedule short-deadline accelerators
based on worst-case memory access time*

Key Observation:

Not All CPU cores are Equal

- **Memory-intensive** cores are much **less vulnerable** to interference
- **Memory non-intensive** cores are much **more vulnerable** to interference

Prioritize accelerators over memory-intensive cores to ensure accelerators do not become urgent

DASH Summary:

Key Ideas and Results

- *Distribute priority for HWAs*
- *Prioritize HWAs over memory-intensive CPU cores even when not urgent*
- *Prioritize short-deadline-period HWAs based on worst case estimates*

Improves CPU performance by 7-21%
Meets (almost) 100% of deadlines for HWAs

DASH: Scheduling Policy

- DASH scheduling policy
 1. Short-deadline-period HWAs with high priority
 2. Long-deadline-period HWAs with high priority
 3. Memory non-intensive CPU applications
 4. Long-deadline-period HWAs with low priority
 5. Memory-intensive CPU applications
 6. Short-deadline-period HWAs with low priority
- } Switch probabilistically

More on DASH


- Hiroyuki Usui, Lavanya Subramanian, Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, and Onur Mutlu,
"DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators"
ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO), Vol. 12, January 2016.
Presented at the 11th HiPEAC Conference, Prague, Czech Republic, January 2016.
[Slides (pptx)] [pdf]
[Source Code]

DASH: Deadline-Aware High-Performance Memory Scheduler for Heterogeneous Systems with Hardware Accelerators

HIROYUKI USUI, LAVANYA SUBRAMANIAN, KEVIN KAI-WEI CHANG,
and ONUR MUTLU, Carnegie Mellon University

Predictable Performance: Strong Memory Service Guarantees

Lecture on Predictable Performance



ETH ZÜRICH HAUPTGEBÄUDE

Computer Architecture - Lecture 17: Memory Interference and QoS II (ETH Zürich, Fall 2018)

274 views • Nov 23, 2018

4 0 SHARE SAVE ...



Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Lecture on Predictable Performance

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

SAFARI

161



25:29 / 1:11:14



Memory Systems - Lecture 6.4: Memory Interface and QoS (Technion, Summer 2018)

163 views • Oct 12, 2018

5 0 SHARE SAVE ...




Onur Mutlu Lectures
19.8K subscribers

ANALYTICS

EDIT VIDEO

Goal: Predictable Performance in Complex Systems



- Heterogeneous agents: CPUs, GPUs, HWAs, DMA engine, ...
- Memory resources shared by CPUs/GPUs/HWAs → Interference

How to allocate resources to heterogeneous agents to mitigate interference and provide predictable performance?

Strong Memory Service Guarantees

- Goal: Satisfy performance/SLA requirements in the presence of shared main memory, heterogeneous agents, and hybrid memory/storage
- Approach:
 - Develop techniques/models to accurately estimate the performance loss 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
- Subramanian et al., “MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems,” HPCA 2013.
- Subramanian et al., “The Application Slowdown Model,” MICRO 2015.

Predictable Performance Readings (I)

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"

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. [Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Best paper award.

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

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Chang Joo Lee[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, cjlee, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Predictable Performance Readings (II)

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Yoongu Kim, Ben Jaiyen, and Onur Mutlu,
"MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems"
Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013. Slides (pptx)

MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems

Lavanya Subramanian

Vivek Seshadri

Yoongu Kim

Ben Jaiyen

Onur Mutlu

Carnegie Mellon University

Predictable Performance Readings (III)

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Arnab Ghosh, Samira Khan, and Onur Mutlu,
"The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory"
Proceedings of the 48th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), Waikiki, Hawaii, USA, December 2015.
[[Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Lightning Session Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Poster \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)]
[[Source Code](#)]

The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory

Lavanya Subramanian*§ Vivek Seshadri* Arnab Ghosh*†
Samira Khan*‡ Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University §Intel Labs †IIT Kanpur ‡University of Virginia

MISE:



Providing Performance Predictability in Shared Main Memory Systems

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

SAFARI

Carnegie Mellon

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 _{Alone} (RSR_{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 ()
 - 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**

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

- 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


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: Pros and Cons

- Upsides:
 - ❑ Simple new insight to estimate slowdown
 - ❑ Much more accurate slowdown estimations than prior techniques (STFM, FST)
 - ❑ Enables a number of QoS mechanisms that can use slowdown estimates to satisfy performance requirements

- Downsides:
 - ❑ Slowdown estimation is not perfect - there are still errors
 - ❑ Does not take into account caches and other shared resources in slowdown estimation

More on MISE

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Yoongu Kim, Ben Jaiyen, and Onur Mutlu,
"MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems"
Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

MISE: Providing Performance Predictability and Improving Fairness in Shared Main Memory Systems

Lavanya Subramanian

Vivek Seshadri

Yoongu Kim

Ben Jaiyen

Onur Mutlu

Carnegie Mellon University

Extending MISE to Shared Caches: ASM

- Lavanya Subramanian, Vivek Seshadri, Arnab Ghosh, Samira Khan, and Onur Mutlu,
"The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory"
Proceedings of the 48th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO), Waikiki, Hawaii, USA, December 2015.
[[Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Lightning Session Slides \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)] [[Poster \(pptx\)](#)] [[pdf](#)]
[[Source Code](#)]

The Application Slowdown Model: Quantifying and Controlling the Impact of Inter-Application Interference at Shared Caches and Main Memory

Lavanya Subramanian*§ Vivek Seshadri* Arnab Ghosh*†
Samira Khan*‡ Onur Mutlu*

*Carnegie Mellon University §Intel Labs †IIT Kanpur ‡University of Virginia

Other Ways of Handling Memory Interference

Fundamental Interference Control Techniques

- **Goal:** to reduce/control inter-thread memory interference

1. **Prioritization** or request scheduling

2. **Data mapping** to banks/channels/ranks

3. **Core/source throttling**

4. **Application/thread scheduling**

Designing QoS-Aware Memory Systems: Approaches

- **Smart resources:** Design each shared resource to have a configurable interference control/reduction mechanism
 - ❑ QoS-aware memory controllers
 - ❑ QoS-aware interconnects
 - ❑ 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
 - ❑ QoS-aware data mapping to memory controllers
 - ❑ QoS-aware thread scheduling to cores

More on 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"
*Proceedings of the 44th International Symposium on Microarchitecture (**MICRO**), Porto Alegre, Brazil, December 2011. Slides (pptx)*

Reducing Memory Interference in Multicore Systems via Application-Aware Memory Channel Partitioning

Sai Prashanth Muralidhara
Pennsylvania State University
smuralid@cse.psu.edu

Lavanya Subramanian
Carnegie Mellon University
lsubrama@ece.cmu.edu

Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

Mahmut Kandemir
Pennsylvania State University
kandemir@cse.psu.edu

Thomas Moscibroda
Microsoft Research Asia
moscitho@microsoft.com

More on Source Throttling (I)

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"

Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS), pages 335-346, Pittsburgh, PA, March 2010. [Slides \(pdf\)](#)

Best paper award.

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

Eiman Ebrahimi[†] Chang Joo Lee[†] Onur Mutlu[§] Yale N. Patt[†]

[†]Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
The University of Texas at Austin
{ebrahimi, cjlee, patt}@ece.utexas.edu

[§]Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu

More on Source Throttling (II)

- Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, and Onur Mutlu, **"HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks"**
Proceedings of the 24th International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD), New York, NY, October 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#) [\(pdf\)](#)

HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks

Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
{kevincha, rachata, cfallin, onur}@cmu.edu

More on Source Throttling (III)

- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, Onur Mutlu, and Srinivasan Seshan,
"On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-core Interconnects"
Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGCOMM Conference
(SIGCOMM), Helsinki, Finland, August 2012. [Slides \(pptx\)](#)

On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-Core Interconnects

George Nychis[†], Chris Fallin[†], Thomas Moscibroda[§], Onur Mutlu[†], Srinivasan Seshan[†]
[†] Carnegie Mellon University [§] Microsoft Research Asia
{gnychis,cfallin,onur,srini}@cmu.edu moscitho@microsoft.com

More on App-to-Core Mapping

- Reetuparna Das, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu, Akhilesh Kumar, and Mani Azimi,

"Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems"

Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA), Shenzhen, China, February 2013.

Slides (pptx)


Application-to-Core Mapping Policies to Reduce Memory System Interference in Multi-Core Systems

Reetuparna Das* Rachata Ausavarungnirun† Onur Mutlu† Akhilesh Kumar‡ Mani Azimi‡
University of Michigan* Carnegie Mellon University† Intel Labs‡

Interference-Aware Thread Scheduling



- An example from scheduling in compute clusters (data centers)
- Data centers can be running virtual machines

Virtualized Cluster




Conventional DRM Policies

Based on **operating-system-level metrics**
e.g., **CPU utilization**, **memory capacity**
demand



Microarchitecture-level Interference




- VMs within a host compete for:
 - Shared cache capacity
 - Shared memory bandwidth





Can operating-system-level metrics capture the microarchitecture-level resource interference?

Microarchitecture Unawareness


VM	Operating-system-level metrics		Microarchitecture-level metrics	
	CPU Utilization	Memory Capacity	LLC Hit Ratio	Memory Bandwidth
App	92%	369 MB	2%	2267 MB/s
App	93%	348 MB	98%	1 MB/s





Impact on Performance



Impact on Performance




We need microarchitecture-level interference awareness in DRM!



A-DRM: Architecture-aware DRM

- **Goal**: Take into account microarchitecture-level shared resource interference
 - Shared cache capacity
 - Shared memory bandwidth
- **Key Idea**:
 - Monitor and detect microarchitecture-level shared resource interference
 - Balance microarchitecture-level resource usage across cluster to minimize memory interference while maximizing system performance

A-DRM: Architecture-aware DRM



More on Architecture-Aware DRM

- Hui Wang, Canturk Isci, Lavanya Subramanian, Jongmoo Choi, Depei Qian, and Onur Mutlu,

"A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters"

Proceedings of the 11th ACM SIGPLAN/SIGOPS International Conference on Virtual Execution Environments (VEE), Istanbul, Turkey, March 2015.

[[Slides \(pptx\)](#) ([pdf](#))]

A-DRM: Architecture-aware Distributed Resource Management of Virtualized Clusters

Hui Wang^{†*}, Canturk Isci[‡], Lavanya Subramanian^{*}, Jongmoo Choi^{‡*}, Depei Qian[†], Onur Mutlu^{*}

[†]Beihang University, [‡]IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center, ^{*}Carnegie Mellon University, [‡]Dankook University

{hui.wang, depei.qian}@buaa.edu.cn, canturk@us.ibm.com, {lsubrama, onur}@cmu.edu, choijm@dankook.ac.kr

Interference-Aware Thread Scheduling

■ Advantages

- + Can eliminate/minimize interference by scheduling “symbiotic applications” together (as opposed to just managing the interference)
- + Less intrusive to hardware (less need to modify the hardware resources)

■ Disadvantages and Limitations

- High overhead to migrate threads and data between cores and machines
- Does not work (well) if all threads are similar and they interfere