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**

 $-\text{less}$ interconnect traffic \rightarrow 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 \rightarrow 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 \rightarrow 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

CSAIL

CSAIL

CSAIL

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 \rightarrow 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?

Completion time vs baseline

- **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!) (** \rightarrow **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 \leftrightarrow 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