

# DPDK Locks Optimizations and New Locks APIs

GAVIN HU PHIL YANG ARM



# Agenda

- Generic locks implementations
  - Weaker memory model
  - C11 atomics (\_\_\_atomic vs \_\_\_sync)
    - Spinlock /RW lock
    - Ticket lock
    - MCS queued spinlock
- AArch64 specific lock implementations
  - WFE for Locks
    - Spinlock
    - RW Lock / Ticket Lock / MCS queued spinlock
- Key Takeaways



# Weaker Memory Model

- Observed ordering of memory accesses may be influenced by:
  - HW / Compiler
- AArch64 has a weaker hardware memory model
  - Allows the processor to re-order, repeat, and merge accesses.
  - One CPU core can see values change in shared memory in a different order than another core wrote them.
- This memory reordering is transparent to programmers most of time
- Still there are cases where the observed memory ordering needs to be formalized, especially for multiple threads.
  - Memory fences help govern observed memory ordering.
- Memory fences degrade performance
  - Weaker memory models typically suffer the most.
  - Compilers support the relaxed C11 memory model in atomic built-ins.



### C11 Atomics (<u>atomic vs</u> sync)

 Legacy \_\_\_\_sync built-ins considered a full barrier



- The DMB ISH instruction splits memory accesses in program order into two groups
- Observers will observe group 1 memory accesses before group 2.

- \_\_\_\_atomic built-ins are memory model aware atomic operations
- \_\_atomic allows one to specify less restrictive barriers
  - > Full memory barrier  $\rightarrow$ one-way barrier.





# **Generic Spinlock**

- \_\_\_\_atomic instead of \_\_\_\_sync built-ins
  - Full memory barrier →one-way barrier
- Calling \_\_atomic **built-ins** in spinlock
  - with RTE\_FORCE\_INTRINSICS enabled
  - Apply patches:
    - Spinlock test
       <a href="http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49822/">http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49822/</a>
    - Spinlock atomic one-way barrier
       <u>http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49824/</u>
- arm SoC#1 @ 3GHz vs arm SoC#2 @ 2GHz
- 12-cores vs 27-cores
  - Performance degrades as more cores are involved in lock contention.
  - \_\_\_\_atomic API implementation scales up much better with more cores contention



RTE>>spinlock\_autotest

5



# Generic RW Lock

- \_\_atomic instead of \_\_sync built-ins
  - Full memory barrier →one-way barrier
- Calling \_\_atomic built-ins in RW lock
  - with RTE\_FORCE\_INTRINSICS enabled
  - Apply patches:
    - RW lock atomic one-way barrier
       <u>http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49839/</u>
    - RW lock test
    - <u>http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49840/</u>
- arm SoC#1 @ 3GHz vs arm SoC#2 @ 2GHz



\$ sudo ./test/test/test -c 0xfff00 -n 4 --socket-mem=1024,1024 --file-prefix=~ -- -l ... RTE>>spinlock\_autotest



# Benchmarking on x86

- The default spinlock is a x86 architecture specified inline assembly lock.
  - Apply patch:
    - Spinlock test http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49822
- Calling \_\_sync built-ins on x86
  - with RTE\_FORCE\_INTRINSICS enabled
  - Apply patch:
    - Spinlock test <u>http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49822</u>
- Calling \_\_atomic built-ins on x86
  - with RTE\_FORCE\_INTRINSICS enabled
  - Apply patches:
    - Spinlock test http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49822/
    - Spinlock atomic one-way barrier
       http://patchwork.dpdk.org/patch/49824/
- The relaxed memory ordering atomics will not degrade spinlock's performance on strong memory model hardware.



\$ sudo ./test/test/test -c 0xf0 -n 4 --socket-mem=1024,1024 --file-prefix=~ -- -l ... RTE>>spinlock\_autotest

# Shortcomings of Current Spinlock implementation



#### Unfairness

- When PE releases the lock, will invalidate the other PE's private caches.
- The PE who owns the local cache is more likely to get the lock again, starving other PEs.

#### Unpredictability

- Starvation causes unpredictable waiting time
- Starvation may cause throughput loss or more latency.

#### **Cache bouncing**

- Once the lock acquired and released. The PE will invalidate the other PE's private caches.
- If the lock struct shared the cache line with other shared memory, the shared data modification will also cause cache bouncing

Ref: https://lwn.net/Articles/267968/

#### Spinlock UT shows the unfairness

RTE>>spinlock\_autotest

Test with lock on 12 cores... Core [20] count = 14541 Core [21] count = 15573 Core [22] count = 180639 Core [23] count = 180372 Core [24] count = 1 Core [25] count = 1 Core [26] count = 17 Core [27] count = 28 Core [28] count = 6 Core [29] count = 7 Core [30] count = 1 Core [31] count = 1 Total count = 391187



# **Ticket Lock**

#### The problems to address

- Unfairness
- Unpredictability

#### How to address

- Ticket based
  - Each request increases the next ticket by 1.
  - Each release increases the current ticket by 1.
  - Whose current matches next takes the lock.
- FIFO service

#### Ticket lock



http://patchwork.dpdk.org/cover/50359/



# MCS Queued Lock

The MCS lock (proposed by Mellor-Crummey and Scott) is a simple spin-lock with each CPU trying to acquire the lock spinning on its own variable.

#### **Advantages**

- Guarantees FIFO lock services
- Remove cache line bouncing
  - Spins on the core own local variables only
- Requires a small constant amount of space per lock
- Requiring only O(1) cache coherency transactions per lock acquisition

typedef struct rte\_mcs\_spinlock {
 struct rte\_mcs\_spinlock \*next;
 int locked; /\* 1 if locked, 0 otherwise \*/
} rte\_mcs\_spinlock\_t;

http://web.mit.edu/6.173/www/currentsemester/readings/R06-scalable-synchronization-1991.pdf https://lwn.net/Articles/590243/

10



# MCS Queued Lock cont.



• CAS cpu2 mcs\_spinlock with lock, prev != NULL, lock taken.

• Repeat previous operation: CAS cpu2 with cpu1's mcs\_spinlock. Then cpu3.



• Pointer in the "main" lock is the tail of the queue of waiting CPUs.

typedef struct rte\_mcs\_spinlock {
 struct rte\_mcs\_spinlock \*next;
 int locked; /\* 1 if locked, 0 otherwise \*/
} rte\_mcs\_spinlock\_t;





11



# Aarch64 specific Spinlock implementation

#### • WFE

- Tight loop → suspend execution
- Less stress to memory subsystem
- Less power
- Benchmarking
  - WFE spinlock is on par with \_\_\_\_sync spinlock when testing on 12 lcores.
  - With increasing contentions(12→ 96 lcores contending for the lock), more contention cause less total number of locking and unlocking.
  - WFE scales much better than \_\_\_\_sync.





### How does WFE work?

- WFE (wait for event)
  - Suspend execution when the lock was held by other PEs, instead of continuous polling
  - Get wake up events if the other PE releases the lock
- Use cases : busy-polling waiting
  - Spinlock
  - RW lock
  - Ticket lock
  - MCS spinlock





# Work in progress

- Generic implementations
  - Spinlock (under community review arming at 19.05)
  - RW lock (under community review arming at 19.05)
  - Ticket lock (under community review arming at 19.05)
  - MCS queued spinlock (under internal review arming at 19.08)
- Aarch64 specific implementations
  - WFE Spinlock (under internal review, aiming at 19.08)
  - Planning to use it in RW lock, ticket lock and MCS lock



# Key Takeaways

- More performant, scalable RW lock, spinlock
- New ticket lock, MCS queued spinlock
- Integration of Arm specific features in locks



Gavin Hu <u>gavin.hu@arm.com</u> Phil Yang <u>phil.yang@arm.com</u>

# Thanks !