

Managing Concurrency Using Transactions

Advanced Operating Systems
Lecture 13

Lecture Outline

- Transactions for managing concurrency
- Programming model
- Integration into Haskell
- Integration into other languages
- Discussion

Transactions for Managing Concurrency

- An alternative to locking: use *atomic transactions* to manage concurrency
 - A program is a sequence of concurrent atomic actions
 - Atomic actions succeed or fail in their entirety, and intermediate states are not visible to other threads
 - The runtime must ensure actions have the usual ACID properties:
 - **Atomicity** – all changes to the data are performed, or none are
 - **Consistency** – data is in a consistent state when a transaction starts, and when it ends
 - **Isolation** – intermediate states of a transaction are invisible to other transactions
 - **Durability** – once committed, results of a transaction persist
- **Advantages:**
 - Transactions can be composed arbitrarily, without affecting correctness
 - Avoid deadlock due to incorrect locking, since there are no locks

```
atomic {  
    a1.debit(v)  
    a2.credit(v)  
}
```

Programming Model

- Simple programming model:
 - Blocks of code can be labelled `atomic {...}`
 - Run concurrently and atomically with respect to every other `atomic {...}` blocks – controls concurrency and ensures consistent data structures
- Implemented via optimistic synchronisation
 - A thread-local *transaction log* is maintained, records every memory read and write made by the atomic block
 - When an atomic block completes, the log is *validated* to check that it has seen a consistent view of memory
 - If validation succeeds, the transaction *commits* its changes to memory; if not, the transaction is rolled-back and retried from scratch
 - Progress may be slow if conflicting transactions cause repeated validation failures, but will eventually occur

Programming Model – Consequences

- Transactions may be re-run automatically, if their transaction log fails to validate
- Places restrictions on transaction behaviour:
 - Transactions must be referentially transparent
 - They produce the same answer each time they're executed
 - Transactions must do nothing irrevocable

```
atomic(n, k) {  
    doSomeStuff()  
    if (n > k) then launchMissiles();  
    doMoreStuff();  
}
```

 - Might launch the missiles multiple times, if it gets re-run due to validation failure caused by `doMoreStuff()`
 - Might accidentally launch the missiles if a concurrent thread modifies `n` or `k` while the transaction is running (this will cause a transaction failure, but too late to stop the launch)
- These restrictions *must* be enforced, else we trade hard-to-find locking bugs for hard-to-find transaction bugs

Controlling I/O

- Unrestricted I/O breaks transaction isolation
 - Reading and writing files
 - Sending and receiving data over the networks
 - Taking mouse or keyboard input; changing the display
- Require language control of when I/O is performed
 - Remove global functions to perform I/O from the standard library
 - Add an *I/O context* object, local to `main()`, passed explicitly to functions that need to perform I/O
 - Compare sockets, that behave in this manner, with file I/O that typically does not
 - I/O functions (e.g., `printf()` and friends) then become methods on the I/O context object
 - The I/O context is not passed to transactions, so they cannot perform I/O
 - Example: the IO monad in Haskell

Controlling Side Effects

- Code that has side effects must be controlled
 - Pure and referentially transparent functions can be executed normally
 - Functions that only perform memory actions can be executed normally, *provided* transaction log tracks the memory actions and validates them before the transaction commits – and can potentially roll them back
 - A *memory action* is an operation that manipulates data on the heap, that could be seen by other threads
 - Tracking memory actions can be done by language runtime (software transactional memory, STM), or using dedicated hardware to enforce transactional memory behaviour and rollback
- Similar principle as controlling I/O
 - Disallow unrestricted heap access – only see data in *transaction context*
 - Pass transaction context explicitly to transactions; this has operations to perform transactional memory operations, and rollback if the transaction fails to commit
 - Very similar to the state monad in Haskell

Monadic STM Implementation (1)

- Monads → well-defined way to control side-effects in functional languages
 - A monad **M** **a** describes an action (i.e., a function) that, when executed, produces a result of type **a** performed in the context **M**
 - Along with rules for chaining operations in that context
 - A common use is for controlling I/O operations:
 - The `putChar` function takes a character, operates on the IO context to add the character, and returns nothing
 - The `getChar` operates on the IO context to return a character
 - The `main` function has an IO context, that wraps and performs other actions
 - The definition of the I/O monad type ensures that a function that is not passed the IO context cannot perform I/O operations
 - One part of a software transactional memory implementation: ensure type of the `atomic {...}` function does not allow it to be passed an IO context, hence preventing I/O

```
putChar :: Char -> IO ()  
getChar :: IO Char
```


Monadic STM Implementation (2)

- How to track side-effecting memory actions?

- Define an STM monad to wrap transactions
- Based on the state monad; manages side-effects via a **TVar** type

- The **newTVar** function takes a value of type **a**, returns a new **TVar** to hold the value, wrapped in an STM monad

```
newTVar    :: a -> STM (TVar a)
readTVar   :: TVar a -> STM a
writeTVar  :: TVar a -> a -> STM ()
```

- **readTVar** takes a **TVar** and returns an STM monad; when performed this returns the value of that **TVar**; **writeTVar** function takes a **TVar** and a value, and returns an STM monad that can validate the transaction and commit the value to the **TVar**

- The **atomic {...}** function operates in an STM context and returns an IO context that performs the operations needed to validate and commit the transaction

```
atomic :: STM a -> IO a
```

- The **newTVar**, **readTVar**, and **writeTVar** functions need an STM action, and so can only run in the context of an atomic block that provides such an action
- I/O is prohibited within the transaction, since operations in **atomic {...}** don't have access to the I/O context

Integration into Haskell

- Transactional memory is a good fit with Haskell
 - Pure functions and monads ensure transaction semantics are preserved
 - I/O and side-effects contained in **STM** monad of an **atomic** {...} block
 - The **TVar** implementation is responsible for tracking side effects
 - The **atomic** {...} block validates, then commits the transaction (by returning an IO monad action to perform the transaction)
 - Untracked I/O or side-effects cannot be performed within an **atomic** {...} block, since there is no way to access the IO monad directly
 - There is no IO monad in scope within the transaction, so code requiring one will not compile
 - A **TVar** requires an STM monad, but these are only available in an **atomic** {...} block; can't update a **TVar** outside a transaction, so can't break atomicity guidelines – Haskell doesn't allow unrestricted heap access via pointers, so can't subvert

Integration into Other Languages

- STM in Haskell is very powerful – but relies on the type system to ensure safe composition and retry
- Integration into mainstream languages is difficult
 - Most languages cannot enforce use of pure functions
 - Most languages cannot limit the use of I/O and side effects
 - Transaction memory can be used without these, but requires programmer discipline to ensure correctness – and has silent failure modes
- Unclear if the transactional approach generalises to other languages

Discussion and Further Reading

- T. Harris, S. Marlow, S. Peyton Jones and M. Herlihy, “Composable Memory Transactions”, CACM, 51(8), August 2008. DOI:10.1145/1378704.1378725
- <http://www.cmi.ac.in/~madhavan/courses/pl2009/reading-material/harris-et-al-cacm-2008.pdf>
- Is transactional memory a realistic technique?
- Do its requirements for a purely functional language, with controlled I/O, restrict it to being a research toy?
- How much benefit can be gained from transactional memory in more traditional languages?

