Directory-Based Cache Coherence

Daniel Sanchez
Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab
M.I.T.

http://www.csg.csail.mit.edu/6.823

Maintaining Cache Coherence

It is sufficient to have hardware such that

- only one processor at a time has write permission for a location
- no processor can load a stale copy of the location after a write

$\Rightarrow$ A correct approach could be:

write request:

The address is *invalidated* in all other caches *before* the write is performed

read request:

If a dirty copy is found in some cache, a write-back is performed before the memory is read

Directory-Based Coherence (Censier and Feautrier, 1978)

Snoopy Protocols



- Snoopy schemes broadcast requests over memory bus
- Difficult to scale to large numbers of processors
- Requires additional bandwidth to cache tags for snoop requests

Directory Protocols



- Directory schemes send messages to only those caches that might have the line
- Can scale to large numbers of processors
- Requires extra directory storage to track possible sharers

An MSI Directory Protocol



- Cache states: Modified (M) / Shared (S) / Invalid (I)
- Directory states:
  - Uncached (Un): No sharers
  - Shared (Sh): One or more sharers with read permission (S)
  - Exclusive (Ex): A single sharer with read & write permissions (M)
- Transient states not drawn for clarity; for now, assume no racing requests

MSI Protocol: Caches (1/3)

Transitions initiated by processor accesses:



Actions
Processor Read (PrRd)
Processor Write (PrWr)
Shared Request (ShReq)
Exclusive Request (ExReq)

MSI Protocol: Caches (2/3)

Transitions initiated by directory requests:



Actions
Invalidation Request (InvReq)
Downgrade Request (DownReq)
Invalidation Response (InvResp)
Downgrade Response (DownResp)

MSI Protocol: Caches (3/3)

Transitions initiated by evictions:



Actions
Writeback Request (WbReq)

MSI Protocol: Caches



→ Transitions initiated by processor accesses

→ Transitions initiated by directory requests

→ Transitions initiated by evictions

MSI Protocol: Directory (1/2)

Transitions initiated by data requests:



MSI Protocol: Directory (2/2)

Transitions initiated by writeback requests:



MSI Directory Protocol Example



MSI Directory Protocol Example



MSI Directory Protocol Example



MSI Directory Protocol Example



Why are 0xA's wb and 0xB's req serialized? Structural dependence

Possible solutions? Buffer outside of cache to hold write data

Miss Status Handling Register

MSHR – Holds load misses and writes outside of cache



- On eviction/writeback
  - No free MSHR entry: stall
  - Allocate new MSHR entry
  - When channel available send WBReq and data
  - Deallocate entry on WBResp

Miss Status Handling Register

MSHR – Holds load misses and writes outside of cache



- On cache load miss
  - No free MSHR entry: stall
  - Allocate new MSHR entry
  - Send ShReq (or ExReq)
  - On *Resp forward data to CPU and cache
  - Deallocate MSHR

Miss Status Handling Register

MSHR – Holds load misses and writes outside of cache



- On cache load miss
  - Look for matching address is MSHR
    - If not found
      - If no free MSHR entry: stall
      - Allocate new MSHR entry and fill in
    - If found, just fill in per ld/st slot
  - Send ShReq (or ExReq)
  - On *Resp forward data to CPU and cache
  - Deallocate MSHR

Per ld/st slots allow servicing multiple requests with one entry

Directory Organization

- Requirement: Directory needs to keep track of all the cores that are sharing a cache block.

- Challenge: For each block the space needed to hold the list of sharers grows with number of possible sharers…

Flat, Memory-based Directories

- Dedicate a few bits of main memory to store the state and sharers of every line
- Encode sharers using a bit-vector



✓ Simple

✗ Slow

✗ Very inefficient with many processors (~P bits / line)

Sparse Full-Map Directories

- Not every line in the system needs to be tracked – only those in private caches!
- Idea: Organize directory as a cache



✓ Low latency, energy-efficient

✗ Bit-vectors grow with # cores → Area scales poorly

✗ Limited associativity → Directory-induced invalidations

Directory-Induced Invalidations

- To retain inclusion, must invalidate all sharers of an entry before reusing it for another address
- Example: 2-way set-associative sparse directory



How many entries should the directory have?

Inexact Representations of Sharer Sets

- Coarse-grain bit-vectors (e.g., 1 bit per 4 cores)



- Limited pointers: Maintain a few sharer pointers, on overflow mark 'all' and broadcast (or invalidate another sharer)



- Allow false positives (e.g., Bloom filters)

  ✓ Reduced area & energy
  × Overheads still not scalable (these techniques simply play with constant factors)
  × Inexact sharers → Broadcasts, invalidations or spurious invalidations and downgrades

Protocol Races

- Directory serializes multiple requests for the same address
  - Same-address requests are queued or NACKed and retried
- But races still exist due to conflicting requests
- Example: Upgrade race



Caches 0 and 1 issue simultaneous ExReqs

Directory starts serving cache 0's ExReq, queues cache 1's

Cache 1 expected ExResp, but got InvReq!

Cache 1 should transition from S->M to I->M and send InvResp

CC and False Sharing
Performance Issue - 1

A cache block contains more than one word and cache-coherence is done at the block-level and not word-level

Suppose P_1 writes $word_i$ and P_2 writes $word_k$ and both words have the same block address.

What can happen? The block may be invalidated (ping pong) many times unnecessarily because the addresses are in same block.

CC and Synchronization

Performance Issue - 2



Cache-coherence protocols will cause mutex to *ping-pong* between P1's and P2's caches.

Ping-ponging can be reduced by first reading the mutex location *(non-atomically)* and executing a swap only if it is found to be zero.

CC and Bus Occupancy
Performance Issue - 3

In general, an atomic *read-modify-write* instruction requires two memory (bus) operations without intervening memory operations by other processors

In a multiprocessor setting, bus needs to be locked for the entire duration of the atomic read and write operation

⇒ expensive for simple buses

⇒ *very expensive* for split-transaction buses, directories

modern processors use

load-reserve

store-conditional

Load-reserve & Store-conditional

Special register(s) to hold reservation flag and address, and the outcome of store-conditional

```
Load-reserve R, (a):
    <flag, adr> ← <1, a>;
    R ← M[a];
```

```
Store-conditional (a), R:
    if <flag, adr> == <1, a>
    then  cancel other procs'
          reservation on a;
          M[a] ← <R>;
          status ← succeed;
    else  status ← fail;
```

If the snooper sees a store transaction to the address in the reserve register, the reserve bit is set to 0

- Several processors may reserve 'a' simultaneously
- These instructions are like ordinary loads and stores with respect to the bus traffic

Load-Reserve/Store-Conditional

Swap implemented with Ld-Reserve/St-Conditional

```
#       Swap(R1, mutex):

L:      Ld-Reserve R2, (mutex)
        St-Conditional (mutex), R1
        if (status == fail) goto L
        R1 <- R2
```

Performance:
Load-reserve & Store-conditional

The total number of memory (bus) transactions is not necessarily reduced, but splitting an atomic instruction into load-reserve & store-conditional:

- *increases bus utilization* (and reduces processor stall time), especially in split-transaction buses
- *reduces cache ping-pong effect* because processors trying to acquire a semaphore do not have to perform stores each time

Extra Hops and 3-Hop Protocols
Performance Issue - 4

- Data in another cache needs to pass through the directory, instead of being forwarded directly.



Coherence in Multi-Level Hierarchies

- Can use the same or different protocols to keep coherence across multiple levels
- Key invariant: Ensure sufficient permissions in all intermediate levels
- Example: 8-socket Xeon E7 (8 cores/socket)



In-Cache Directories

- Common multicore memory hierarchy:
  - 1+ levels of private caches
  - A shared last-level cache
  - Need to enforce coherence among private caches
- Idea: Embed the directory information in shared cache tags
  - Shared cache must be inclusive



✓ Avoids tag overheads & separate lookups

✗ Can be inefficient if shared cache size >> sum(private cache sizes)

Avoiding Protocol Deadlock

- Protocols can cause deadlocks even if network is deadlock-free! (*more on this later*)



Example: Both nodes saturate all intermediate buffers with requests to each other, blocking responses from entering the network

- Solution: Separate *virtual networks*
  - Different sets of virtual channels and endpoint buffers
  - Same physical routers and links

- Most protocols require at least 2 virtual networks (for requests and replies), often >2 needed

Next Lecture: Consistency and Relaxed Memory Models