## SharedArrayBuffer and Atomics Stage 2.95 to Stage 3

Shu-yu Guo Lars Hansen

Mozilla

November 28, 2016

### What We Have Consensus On

TC39 agreed on Stage 2.95, July 2016

- Agents
- API (frozen)

### What We Have Consensus On

TC39 agreed on Stage 2.95, July 2016

- Agents
- ► API (frozen)

# Memory model had fatal bug

## Outline

### Memory Model

- 1. Motivation
- 2. Intuition
- 3. What the Model Does

## Should We Allow This Optimization?

```
 \begin{array}{lll} \textbf{let} & \texttt{x} = \texttt{U8[0]}; \\ \textbf{if} & (\texttt{x}) & \Rightarrow & \textbf{if} & (\texttt{U8[0]}) \\ & & \texttt{print(x)}; & & & \texttt{print(U8[0])}; \\ \end{array}
```

## What About This One?

```
while (U8[0] == 0); \Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \text{let } c = \text{U8[0]} == 0; \\ \text{while } (c); \end{array}
```

### Or This One?

```
\begin{array}{lll} \textbf{let} & \texttt{A} = \texttt{Atomics}; & & \textbf{let} & \texttt{A} = \texttt{Atomics}; \\ & \Rightarrow & \textbf{let} & \texttt{c} = \texttt{A.load}(\texttt{U8,0}) == 1; \\ \textbf{while} & (\texttt{A.load}(\texttt{U8,0}) == 1) \ ; & \textbf{while} & (\texttt{c}) \ ; \end{array}
```

## What Can Be Printed Here?

## What's a Memory Model Good For?

- Arbitrates optimization affordance
- Captures hardware reality

## Memory Model Design Space

- 1. No model
- 2. Undefined behavior/values for data races
- 3. Fully defined; races have meaning

## Why

Because we're the web.

- Interoperability
- Security

## Why

Because we're the web.

- Interoperability
- Security
- WebAssembly

## What

The model prescribes the set of values that can be read by SAB operations.

### Intuition

Strong enough for programmers to reason about programs Weak enough for hardware and compiler reality

## Programmers' Intuition

Sequential Consistency for Data Race Free Programs

Sequential consistency just means interleaving.

Data race freedom means no concurrent, non-atomic memory accesses where one's a write.

## Implementors' Intuition: Codegen

### Obvious code generation

- ▶ Non-atomics compiled to bare stores and loads
- Atomics to atomic instructions or with fences

## Implementors' Intuition: Optimizations

- Atomics are carved in stone
- ▶ Reads must be stable (e.g. no read rematerialization)
- Writes must be stable (i.e. can't make observable changes to writes)
- ► Don't completely remove writes (i.e. can coalesce adjacent writes but not remove them completely)

## What We Talk About When We Talk About Atomicity

Access atomicity
Indivisible action

## What We Talk About When We Talk About Atomicity

## Access atomicity

Indivisible action

## Copy atomicity

Ordering: what memory accesses become visible to what cores when

## What We Talk About When We Talk About Atomicity

The memory model orders shared memory events and prescribes what values can be read by them.

## Ordering Analogies: Atomics

- ► C++ memory\_order\_seq\_cst
- LLVM SequentiallyConsistent

## Ordering Analogies: Non-Atomics

- ▶ Between C++ non-atomics and memory\_order\_relaxed
- Between LLVM non-atomics and Unordered

Details with all the math in the spec.

#### THIS SLIDE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Model Overview

- Axiomatic memory model
- ▶ Interfacing with ES evaluation semantics

#### Axiomatic Model

Ordering is done by an axiomatic model.

Input is a candidate execution—a set of memory events and a set of relations ordering them.

Output is a decision whether the candidate execution is valid.

The meaning of a program is the set of all valid executions.

#### Axiomatic Model

Ordering is done by an axiomatic model.

Input is a candidate execution—a set of memory events and a set of relations ordering them.

Output is a decision whether the candidate execution is valid.

The meaning of a program is the set of all valid executions.

Not operational!

#### **Events**

- Read (atomic and non-atomic)
- Write (atomic and non-atomic)
- ReadModifyWrite (atomic)
- Host-specific events (e.g. postMessage)

## Candidate Execution

#### A candidate execution is

- ► A set of events
- agent-order
- ► reads-from
- ▶ synchronizes-with
- happens-before

## agent-order

The union of evaluation orders of all agents.

If E occurred before D in some agent, E is agent-order before D.

#### reads-from

Maps Read and ReadModifyWrite events to Write and ReadModifyWrite events.

If R reads-from W, then R reads one or more bytes written by W.

## synchronizes-with

A subset of  $\operatorname{reads-from}$  that relates synchronizing atomic Read and ReadModifyWrite events to atomic Write and ReadModifyWrite events.

An atomic Read R synchronizes-with an atomic Write W when R reads every byte from W.

## happens-before

- agent-order relates intra-agent events
- agent-order relates inter-agent events
- ▶ happens-before connects the two

 $(agent-order \cup synchronizes-with)^+$ 

### Valid Executions

A candidate execution is valid when it has. . .

- ...coherent reads
- ... tear free reads
- ... sequentially consistent atomics
- ... no out of thin air reads (if we have time)

### Coherent Reads

A read of some byte is coherent if it reads the most happens-before recent write to that byte.

R reads-from  $W \Rightarrow \not\exists W'.W$  happens-before W'

## Tear Free Reads

Aligned accesses are well-behaved.

## Sequentially Consistent Atomics

- All synchronizes-with atomic events exist in a strict total order consistent with happens-before.
- ▶ An atomic write becomes visible to atomic reads in finite time.

### Data Race Redux

#### E is in a data race with D iff

- ightharpoonup E and D aren't related by happens-before
- ▶ E or D is a Write or ReadModifyWrite event
- lacktriangleright E and D aren't synchronized atomics

### **Event Semantics**

- ▶ A read event reads a value composed of bytes from write events it reads-from in a valid execution.
- ▶ Even racy reads have well-defined values!

Where do events come from?

Where do events come from?

Evaluation semantics introduces events

#### Where do events come from?

- Evaluation semantics introduces events
- Value of read events is any possible byte value

Without SAB the evaluation semantics constructs a correct execution directly.

With SAB the evaluation semantics constructs many candidate executions nondeterministically and the memory-model decides which ones are valid.

## Out of Thin Air

Artifact of axiomatic models (If we have time)