Hardware-level thread migration in a 110-core shared-memory multiprocessor



Mieszko Lis Keun Sup Shim Brandon Cho Ilia Lebedev Srinivas Devadas

1

Execution Migration Machine: Highlights

110-core chip multiprocessor

- unified shared memory, general-purpose

- Fast, autonomous thread migration
 - -fast: migration entirely in hardware
 - -fine-grained: instruction granularity
 - -autonomous: hardware decides when to migrate
- Reduces on-chip traffic up to 14-fold

–less interconnect traffic → lower dynamic power





Problem statement

The Execution Migration Machine

Costs and performance



Problem? On-chip traffic

- On-chip interconnect power already significant
 - MIT RAW (16 RISCy cores): **39%** of tile [ISPLED 2003]
 - Intel TeraFLOPS (80 double-MAC cores): 28% of tile power [JSSC 2008]

This is getting worse...

- transistor dimensions continue to scale
- but shrinking wires makes them **slow** and **hot:** higher RC-delay, power, crosstalk
- relatively shorter and shorter wires feasible

...and worse

- scaling technology nodes + short wires → lots (100s–1000s) of cores
- more cores need more data to process
- so interconnects have to carry more and more data



What causes this traffic?

- In a typical multicore CPU...
 - fast private caches (say L1)
 - slower shared caches (say L2)
 - shared caches in per-tile shards





What causes this traffic?

- In a typical multicore CPU...
 - fast private caches (say L1)
 - slower shared caches (say L2)
 - shared caches in per-tile shards
- Data fetched to threads
 - threads generally pinned to cores
 - interconnect brings data to the locus of computation





What causes this traffic?

- In a typical multicore CPU...
 - fast private caches (say L1)
 - slower shared caches (say L2)
 - shared caches in per-tile shards
- Data fetched to threads
 - threads generally pinned to cores
 - interconnect brings data to the locus of computation



- If workloads exceed L1 capacity...
 - repeated L1 fetches from remote L2 chunks
 → lots of traffic

- common with big datasets: db apps, machine learning, etc.

How can we reduce this traffic?

Locality is everything

- many remote L2 requests = bad
- would prefer to access **local** L2





How can we reduce this traffic?

- Locality is everything
 - many remote L2 requests = bad
 - would prefer to access **local** L2
- Move the threads around!
 - threads follow data
 - makes remote accesses local
 - one-off accesses can be remote



- ...but this requires an efficient hardware solution
 - even high-locality apps can't amortize slow migrations



Thread migration desiderata

- Frequent use requires fast migration
 - should not involve software (e.g., OS)
 - should not involve round-trips (e.g., via cache coherence)
- Frequent use requires *fine-grained* migration
 - data accesses are dynamic, need to respond quickly
 - should not involve centralized scheduling
- Reducing on-chip traffic requires small migrations
 - either keep thread context small
 - or migrate only a useful subset
- Realistic evaluation requires a large core count
 - simple core and scalable memory model



The Execution Migration Machine

- Goals:
 - most efficient thread migration
 - simple & scalable design
 - explore what is possible
 - focus on on-chip data movement

• ASIC:

- 10mm x 10mm in 45nm
- 110 homogeneous cores
- single level of cache
- 2D mesh interconnect
- 2 off-chip memory interfaces
- optimized for efficient migration





Tile architecture

Caches: over half of each tile

- 32KB data cache
- 8KB instruction cache

Six on-chip network routers

- 64-bit flits, wormhole DoR
- single-cycle if no congestion
- six ensure deadlock freedom 10mm

Custom stack-based core

- instruction-granularity migrations
- allows partial-context xfers (min. 128 bits)
- two stacks, automatically spilled/refilled via the data cache
- two SMT contexts ensure deadlock-free migrations





C S A I I



C S A I I







Shared memory model

Shared D\$ architecture

- one D\$ slice in each core
- top 7 bits of address \rightarrow core ID
- a specific address can only be cached in a specific core
- memory consistency trivial

LD/ST: via remote D\$ access

- LD/ST/LD_RSV/ST_CND
- word request to remote D\$
- result / ack from remote D\$
- cannot cache data locally
 round-trip for every access

Migration accelerates this

 turns multiple round-trips into one trip + local accesses



+ d6000000–ffffffff cacheable in all cores

Shared memory & migration



Supported modes of migration

Instruction-based

- e.g., migrate to core 10
- LD/ST-triggered, static
 - determine if effective address cached in remote D\$
 - if remote, **memory instruction** specifies whether to migrate
 - suitable for access patterns amenable to static/profiling analysis (or for the particularly determined programmer)

LD/ST-triggered, fully automatic

- determine if effective address cached in remote D\$
- if remote, learning predictor decides whether to migrate
- suitable for dynamically changing access patterns (or the not-so-determined programmer)



- Per-tile predictors trigger migrations when advantageous
 - detect long runs of accesses to the same core





- Per-tile predictors trigger migrations when advantageous
 - detect long runs of accesses to the same core
 - enter sequence start PC into predictor table, migrate on this PC next time



- Per-tile predictors trigger migrations when advantageous
 - detect long runs of accesses to the same core
 - enter sequence start PC into predictor table, migrate on this PC next time
 - adjust migrated stack size if migrated back on stack over/underflow



- Per-tile predictors trigger migrations when advantageous
 - detect long runs of accesses to the same core
 - enter sequence start PC into predictor table, migrate on this PC next time
 - adjust migrated stack size if migrated back on stack over/underflow
 - remove start PC from table if too few accesses after migration



How much does this cost?

- Arch. overhead
 - extra core context
 - extra routers
 - predictor (tiny)
- Area & leakage
 - total +23% area
 - leakage similar

Single tile area contributions, 45nm [µm²]



- Dynamic power overhead
 - dominates but highly benchmark-dependent
 - cache accesses same for EM and RA, on-chip traffic different

(synthesized ASIC cell area, 800MHz; CC areas estimated) 24

How well does it perform?



- Benchmarks optimized for migration-friendly access patterns
- Significant improvements in performance (up to 25%)



(RTL simulation using 110-core chip) 25

How well does it perform?



- Benchmarks optimized for migration-friendly access patterns
- Significant improvements in performance (up to 25%)
- Huge improvements in on-chip traffic reduction (up to 14x!)
 (→ significant reduction in dynamic power dissipation)

Summary

Advantages

- significantly reduces traffic on high-locality workloads up to 14x reduction in traffic in some benchmarks
- simple to implement and verify (indep. of core count, no transient states)
- decentralized & trivially scalable (only # core ID bits, addr⇔core mapping)

Challenges

- workloads should be optimized with memory model in mind (like allocating data on cache line boundaries but more coarse-grained)
- automatically mapping allocation over cores not a trivial problem

Opportunities

- fine-grained migration is an enabling technology
- since it's cheap and responsive, can be used for almost anything
- e.g., if only some cores have FPUs, migrate to access FPU