Lecture 3: Directory Protocol Implementations

- Topics: coherence vs. msg-passing, corner cases in directory protocols
Future Scalable Designs

• Intel’s Single Cloud Computer (SCC): an example prototype

• No support for hardware cache coherence

• Programmer can write shared-memory apps by marking pages as uncachable or L1-cacheable, but forcing memory flushes to propagate results

• Primarily intended for message-passing apps

• Each core runs a version of Linux

• Barreelfish-like OSes will likely soon be mainstream
Scalable Cache Coherence

• Will future many-core chips forego hardware cache coherence in favor of message-passing or sw-managed cache coherence?

• It’s the classic programmer-effort vs. hw-effort trade-off … traditionally, hardware has won (e.g. ILP extraction)

• Two questions worth answering: will motivated programmers prefer message-passing?, is scalable hw cache coherence do-able?
Message Passing

- Message passing can be faster and more energy-efficient
- Only required data is communicated: good for energy and reduces network contention
- Data can be sent before it is required (push semantics; cache coherence is pull semantics and frequently requires indirection to get data)
- Downsides: more software stack layers and more memory hierarchy layers must be traversed, and.. more programming effort
Scalable Directory Coherence

• Note that the protocol itself need not be changed

• If an application randomly accesses data with zero locality:
  - long latencies for data communication
  - also true for message-passing apps

• If there is locality and page coloring is employed, the directory and data-sharers will often be in close proximity

• Does hardware overhead increase? See examples in last class… the overhead is ~2-10% and sharing can be tracked at coarse granularity… hierarchy can also be employed, with snooping-based coherence among a group of nodes
SGI Origin 2000

- Flat memory-based directory protocol
- Uses a bit vector directory representation
- Two processors per node – combining multiple processors in a node reduces cost
Directory Structure

• The system supports either a 16-bit or 64-bit directory (fixed cost); for small systems, the directory works as a full bit vector representation

• Seven states, of which 3 are stable

• For larger systems, a coarse vector is employed – each bit represents p/64 nodes

• State is maintained for each node, not each processor – the communication assist broadcasts requests to both processors
Handling Reads

• When the home receives a read request, it looks up memory (speculative read) and directory in parallel.

• Actions taken for each directory state:
  ➢ shared or unowned: memory copy is clean, data is returned to requestor, state is changed to excl if there are no other sharers
  ➢ busy: a NACK is sent to the requestor
  ➢ exclusive: home is not the owner, request is forwarded to owner, owner sends data to requestor and home
Inner Details of Handling the Read

• The block is in exclusive state – memory may or may not have a clean copy – it is speculatively read anyway

• The directory state is set to busy-exclusive and the presence vector is updated

• In addition to fwding the request to the owner, the memory copy is speculatively forwarded to the requestor
  - Case 1: excl-dirty: owner sends block to requestor and home, the speculatively sent data is over-written
  - Case 2: excl-clean: owner sends an ack (without data) to requestor and home, requestor waits for this ack before it moves on with speculatively sent data
Inner Details II

• Why did we send the block speculatively to the requestor if it does not save traffic or latency?
  ➢ the R10K cache controller is programmed to not respond with data if it has a block in excl-clean state
  ➢ when an excl-clean block is replaced from the cache, the directory need not be updated – hence, directory cannot rely on the owner to provide data and speculatively provides data on its own
Handling Write Requests

• The home node must invalidate all sharers and all invalidations must be acked (to the requestor), the requestor is informed of the number of invalidates to expect

• Actions taken for each state:
  ➢ shared: invalidates are sent, state is changed to excl, data and num-sharers are sent to requestor, the requestor cannot continue until it receives all acks (Note: the directory does not maintain busy state, subsequent requests will be fwded to new owner and they must be buffered until the previous write has completed)
Handling Writes II

• Actions taken for each state:
  ➢ unowned: if the request was an upgrade and not a read-exclusive, is there a problem?
  ➢ exclusive: is there a problem if the request was an upgrade? In case of a read-exclusive: directory is set to busy, speculative reply is sent to requestor, invalidate is sent to owner, owner sends data to requestor (if dirty), and a “transfer of ownership” message (no data) to home to change out of busy
  ➢ busy: the request is NACKed and the requestor must try again
Handling Write-Back

• When a dirty block is replaced, a writeback is generated and the home sends back an ack

• Can the directory state be shared when a writeback is received by the directory?

• Actions taken for each directory state:
  ➢ exclusive: change directory state to unowned and send an ack
  ➢ busy: a request and the writeback have crossed paths: the writeback changes directory state to shared or excl (depending on the busy state), memory is updated, and home sends data to requestor, the intervention request is dropped
Writeback Cases

This is the “normal” case
D3 sends back an Ack
If someone else has the block in exclusive, D3 moves to busy.
If Wback is received, D3 serves the requester.
If we didn’t use busy state when transitioning from E:P1 to E:P2, D3 may not have known who to service 
(since ownership may have been passed on to P3 and P4...) 
(although, this problem can be solved by NACKing the Wback and having P1 buffer its “strange” intervention requests)
If \( \text{Wback} \) is from new requester, \( \text{D3} \) sends back a NACK
Floating unresolved messages are a problem
Alternatively, can accept the \( \text{Wback} \) and put \( \text{D3} \) in some new busy state

Conclusion: could have got rid of busy state between \( \text{E:P1} \rightarrow \text{E:P2} \), but with \( \text{Wback} \) ACK/NACK and other buffering could have kept the busy state between \( \text{E:P1} \rightarrow \text{E:P2} \), could have got rid of ACK/NACK, but need one new busy state\(^{16} \)
Sequent NUMA-Q

• Employs a flat cache-based directory protocol between nodes – IEEE standard SCI (Scalable Coherent Interface) protocol

• Each node is a 4-way SMP with a bus-based snooping protocol

• The communication assist includes a large “remote access cache” – the directory protocol tries to keep the remote caches coherent, while the snooping protocol ensures that each processor cache is kept coherent with the remote access cache and local-mem
Directory Structure

- The physical address identifies the home node – the home node directory stores a pointer to the head of a linked list – each cache stores pointers to the next and previous sharer.

- A main memory block can be in three directory states:
  - Home: (similar to unowned) the block does not exist in any remote access cache (may be in the home node’s processor caches, though)
  - Fresh: (similar to shared) read-only copies exist in remote access caches and memory copy is up-to-date
  - Gone: (similar to exclusive) writeable copy exists in some remote cache
Cache Structure

• 29 stable states and many more pending/busy states!

• The stable states have two descriptors:
  ➢ position in linked list: ONLY, HEAD, TAIL, MID
  ➢ state within cache: dirty, clean, fresh, valid, etc.

• SCI defines and implements primitive operations to facilitate linked list manipulations:
  ➢ List construction: add a new node to the list head
  ➢ Rollout: remove a node from a list
  ➢ Purging: invoked by the head to invalidate all other nodes
Handling Read Requests

• On a read miss, the remote cache sets up a block in busy state and other requests to the block are not entertained.

• The requestor sends a “list construction request” to the home and the steps depend on the directory state:
  ➢ Home: state updated to fresh, head updated to requestor, data sent to requestor, state at requestor is set to ONLY_FRESH.
  ➢ Fresh: head updated to requestor, home responds with data and pointer to old head, requestor moves to a different busy state, sends list construction request to old head, old head moves from HEAD_FRESH to MID_VALID, sends ack, requestor \(\rightarrow\) HEAD_FRESH.
Handling Read Requests II

- Gone: home does not reply with data, it remains in Gone state, sends old head pointer to requestor, requestor moves to a different busy state, asks old head for data and “list construction”, old head moves from HEAD_DIRTY to MID_VALID, returns data, requestor moves to HEAD_DIRTY (note that HEAD_DIRTY does not mean exclusive access; the head can write without talking to the home, but sharers must be invalidated)

- Home keeps forwarding requests to head even if head is busy – this results in a pending linked list that is handled as transactions complete
Handling Write Requests

• At all times, the head of a list is assumed to have the latest copy and only the head is allowed to write.

• The writer starts by moving itself to the head of the list; actions depend on the state in the cache:

  ➢ **HEAD_DIRTY**: the home is already in GONE state, so home is not informed, sharing list is purged (each list element invalidates itself and informs the requestor of the next element – simple, but slow – works well for small invalidation sizes).
Handling Write Requests II

- **HEAD_FRESH**: home directory is updated from FRESH to GONE, sharing list is purged; if the home directory is not in FRESH state, some other node’s request is in flight – the requestor will have to move to the head again and retry

- **ONLY_DIRTY**: the write happens without generating any interconnect traffic
Writeback & Replacement

• Replacements are no longer “quiet” as the linked lists have to be updated – the “rollout” operation is used

• To rollout, a node must set itself to pending, inform the neighbors, and set itself to invalid – to prevent deadlock in the case of two neighbors attempting rollout, the node closer to the tail is given priority

• If the node is the head, it makes the next element the head and informs home
Writeback & Replacement II

• If the head is attempting a rollout, it sends a message home, but the home is pointing to a different head: the old head will eventually receive a request from the new head – at this point, the writeback is complete, and the new head is instead linked with the next node.

• To reduce buffering needs, the writeback happens before the new block is fetched.
Serialization

• The home serves as the point of serialization – note that requests are almost never NACKed – requests are usually re-directed to the current head – helps avoid race conditions

• Since requests get queued in a pending list and buffers are rarely used, the protocol is less prone to starvation, unfairness, deadlock, and livelock problems
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