Recall: Interconnection Network Basics

- **Topology**
  - Specifies the way switches are wired
  - Affects routing, reliability, throughput, latency, building ease

- **Routing (algorithm)**
  - How does a message get from source to destination
  - Static or adaptive

- **Buffering and Flow Control**
  - What do we store within the routers & links?
    - Entire packets, parts of packets, etc?
  - How do we throttle during oversubscription?
  - Tightly coupled with routing strategy
Buffered Flow Control
Review: Buffered Flow Control

- Store and Forward
  - Shrink Buffers
  - Reduce latency

- Wormhole

Any other issues?

- Head-of-Line Blocking
- Use Virtual Channels

Buffer full: blue cannot proceed
Blocked by other packets
Recall: Communicating Buffer Availability

- **Credit-based flow control**
  - Upstream knows how many buffers are downstream
  - Downstream passes back credits to upstream
  - Significant upstream signaling (esp. for small flits)

- **On/Off (XON/XOFF) flow control**
  - Downstream has on/off signal to upstream

- **ACK/NACK flow control**
  - Upstream optimistically sends downstream
  - Buffer cannot be deallocated until ACK/NACK received
  - Inefficiently utilizes buffer space
Interconnection Network Performance
Interconnection Network Performance

Latency

Injection rate into the network (or amount of load on the network)

Zero load latency: (topology+routing+flow control)

Min latency given by routing

Min latency given by topology

Saturation throughput: (topology+routing+flow control)

Max throughput given by routing

Max throughput given by topology

Saturation throughput: Injection rate at which latency asymptotes

“Zero load” latency: Latency with no contention
Ideal Latency

- Ideal latency
  - Solely due to wire delay between source and destination

\[ T_{ideal} = \frac{D}{v} + \frac{L}{b} \]

- D = Manhattan distance
  - The distance between two points measured along axes at right angles.
- v = propagation velocity
- L = packet size
- b = channel bandwidth
Actual Latency

- Dedicated wiring impractical
  - Long wires segmented with insertion of routers

$$T_{\text{actual}} = \frac{D}{v} + \frac{L}{b} + H \cdot T_{\text{router}} + T_c$$

- $D =$ Manhattan distance
- $v =$ propagation velocity
- $L =$ packet size
- $b =$ channel bandwidth
- $H =$ hops
- $T_{\text{router}} =$ router latency
- $T_c =$ latency due to contention
Load-Latency Curve

![Graph showing Load-Latency Curve with latency on the y-axis and injected load (fraction of capacity) on the x-axis. The graph compares ideal and on-chip network performance.]
Load-Latency Curve Examples

Figure 4. Load-latency graphs for 64-node mesh, CMesh, flattened butterfly and MECS topologies.

Figure 5. Load-latency graphs for 256-node mesh, CMesh, flattened butterfly and MECS topologies.

Examined Topologies in Prior Slide

Different topologies work differently for different communication patterns

Figure 1. Concentrated Mesh, Flattened Butterfly and MECS topologies for a 64-terminal network.

Multi-Drop Express Channels (MECS)

Kilo-NoC Building on MECS

- Boris Grot, Joel Hestness, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Kilo-NoC: A Heterogeneous Network-on-Chip Architecture for Scalability and Service Guarantees"
  Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), San Jose, CA, June 2011. Slides (pptx)
  One of the 12 computer architecture papers of 2011 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.
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Kilo-NoC Building on MECS


A QoS-Enabled On-Die Interconnect Fabric for Kilo-Node Chips

To meet rapidly growing performance demands and energy constraints, future chips will likely feature thousands of on-die resources. Existing network-on-chip solutions weren’t designed for scalability and will be unable to meet future interconnect demands. A hybrid network-on-chip architecture called Kilo-NoC co-optimizes topology, flow control, and quality of service to achieve significant gains in efficiency.
Network Performance Metrics

- Packet latency (avg/max)
- Round trip latency (avg/max)
- Saturation throughput

- Application-level performance: execution time
- System performance: job throughput
  - Affected by interference among threads/applications
Buffering and Flow Control in On-Chip Networks
On-Chip Networks

- Connect **cores, caches, memory controllers, etc**
  - Buses and crossbars are not scalable
- Usually packet switched
- **2D mesh**: Commonly used topology
- **XY Routing with FIFO or Round robin port arbitration** common
- **Virtual channel buffering** common
- Primarily serve **cache misses and memory requests**
On-Chip Networks

Router

Processing Element
(Cores, L2 Banks, Memory Controllers etc.)

Crossbar

Input Port with Buffers

VC Identifier
- VC 0
- VC 1
- VC 2

Control Logic
- Routing Unit (RQ)
- VC Allocator (VA)
- Switch Allocator (SA)

From East
From West
From North
From South
From PE
To East
To West
To North
To South
To PE
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Interconnects

- **On-chip advantages**
  - Low latency between cores
  - No pin constraints
  - Rich & low-power wiring resources
    - Very high bandwidth
    - Simpler (global) coordination

- **On-chip constraints/disadvantages**
  - 2D substrate limits easy-to-implement topologies
  - Energy/power consumption a key concern
    - Complex algorithms undesirable
    - Large buffers undesirable
  - Logic area & metal layers constrain use of wiring resources
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Interconnects (II)

- **Cost**
  - Off-chip: Channels, pins, connectors, cables
  - On-chip: Cost is storage and switches (wires are plentiful)
    - Leads to networks with many wide channels, less buffering

- **Channel characteristics**
  - On chip short distance $\rightarrow$ low latency
  - On chip RC lines $\rightarrow$ need repeaters every 1-2mm
    - Can put logic in repeaters

- **Workloads**
  - Off-chip: Large-scale parallel application multi-chip traffic
  - On-chip: Multi-core cache/memory traffic
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Tradeoffs


3 Challenges in architecture and design

While the same principles apply to interconnection networks at all scales, on-chip networks have a number of characteristics that make their design quite different than the inter-chip (and inter-board) networks that have been designed for years. In particular, wires and pins are more abundant than in inter-chip networks and buffers space is less abundant. These differences enable a number of new network topologies, flow control methods, and other techniques. In particular, we identify three areas that are ripe for future research:

3.1 What topologies are best matched to the abundant wiring resources available on chip?

On chip networks have enormous wiring resources at their disposal. In the example network described above, there can be up to 6,000 wires on each metal layer crossing each edge of a tile. It is quite easy to achieve over 24,000 ‘pins’ crossing the four edges of a tile. In contrast, inter-chip networks have historically been pin limited, required to limit the connections of one router chip to far less than 1,000 total pins. This large, 24:1, difference between router pin limitations allows the designer to trade wiring resources for network performance, making a qualitative difference in network architecture.

3.2 What flow control methods reduce buffer count and hence router overhead?

Buffer space in an on-chip router directly impacts the area overhead of the network and thus must be kept to a minimum. In contrast, most inter-chip network routers are pin limited and thus have ample room for very large buffers.

3.3 What circuits best exploit the structured wiring of on-chip networks?

Much of the advantage of on-chip networks derives from the regular, structured nature of their wiring. As described below, the well controlled electrical parameters of this wiring enable the use of high-performance circuits such as pulsed low-swing drivers and receivers to reduce power dissipation, reduce latency, and increase repeater spacing. While these transceivers yield big performance
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Tradeoffs

- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, Onur Mutlu, and Srinivasan Seshan,
  "On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-core Interconnects"
  Proceedings of the 2012 ACM SIGCOMM Conference (SIGCOMM), Helsinki, Finland, August 2012. Slides (pptx)
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On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Tradeoffs (II)

- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, and Onur Mutlu, "Next Generation On-Chip Networks: What Kind of Congestion Control Do We Need?" Proceedings of the 9th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HOTNETS), Monterey, CA, October 2010. Slides (ppt) (key)
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Buffers in NoC Routers

- Buffers are necessary for high network throughput
  \( \rightarrow \) buffers increase total available bandwidth in network
Buffers in NoC Routers

- Buffers are necessary for high network throughput
  → buffers increase total available bandwidth

- Buffers consume significant energy/power
  - Dynamic energy
  - Static energy

- Buffers add complexity and latency
  - Logic for buffer management
  - Virtual channel allocation
  - Credit-based flow control

- Buffers require significant chip area
  - E.g., in TRIPS prototype chip, input buffers occupy 75% of total on-chip network area [Gratz et al, ICCD’ 06]

Can we get rid of buffers...?
Going Bufferless…?

- How much throughput do we lose?
  - How is latency affected?

- Up to what injection rates can we use bufferless routing?
  - Are there realistic scenarios in which an NoC operates at injection rates below the threshold?

- Can we achieve energy reduction?
  - If so, how much…?

- Can we reduce area, complexity, etc…?

Answers in our paper (ISCA’09)!
BLESS: Bufferless Routing

- Always forward all incoming flits to some output port
- If no productive direction is available, send to another direction
- \( \rightarrow \) packet is deflected
- \( \rightarrow \) Hot-potato routing [Baran’ 62]
BLESS: Bufferless Routing

1. Create a ranking over all incoming flits
2. For a given flit in this ranking, find the best free output-port
   Apply to each flit in order of ranking
FLIT-BLESS: Flit-Level Routing

- Each flit is routed independently.
- **Oldest-first arbitration** (other policies evaluated in paper)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flit-Ranking</th>
<th>1. Oldest-first ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port-Prioritization</td>
<td>2. Assign flit to productive port, if possible. Otherwise, assign to non-productive port.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Network Topology:**
  - Can be applied to most topologies (Mesh, Torus, Hypercube, Trees, …)
    1) #output ports $\geq$ #input ports at every router
    2) every router is reachable from every other router

- **Flow Control & Injection Policy:**
  - Completely **local**, inject whenever input port is free

- **Absence of Deadlocks:** every flit is always moving
- **Absence of Livelocks:** with oldest-first ranking
BLESS: Advantages & Disadvantages

Advantages
- No buffers
- Purely local flow control
- Simplicity
  - no credit-flows
  - no virtual channels
  - simplified router design
- No deadlocks, livelocks
- Adaptivity
  - packets are deflected around congested areas!
- Router latency reduction
- Area savings

Disadvantages
- Increased latency
- Reduced bandwidth
- Increased buffering at receiver
- Header information at each flit
- Oldest-first arbitration complex
- QoS becomes difficult

Impact on energy…?
Evaluation – Synthetic Traces

• First, the bad news 😊
• Uniform random injection
• BLESS has significantly lower saturation throughput compared to buffered baseline.
Evaluation – Homogenous Case Study

- **milc** benchmarks (moderately intensive)
- **Perfect caches!**
- Very little performance degradation with BLESS (less than 4% in dense network)
- With router latency 1, BLESS can even outperform baseline (by ~10%)
- Significant energy improvements (almost 40%)
Evaluation – Homogenous Case Study

- milc benchmarks
- Perfect caches
- Very little performance degradation with BLESS (less than 4% in dense network)
- With router latency 1, BLESS can even outperform baseline (by ~10%)
- Significant energy improvements (almost 40%)

Observations:

1) Injection rates not extremely high on average
   → self-throttling!

2) For bursts and temporary hotspots, use network links as buffers!
For a very wide range of applications and network settings, buffers are not needed in NoC

- Significant energy savings (32% even in dense networks and perfect caches)
- Area-savings of 60%
- Simplified router and network design (flow control, etc…)
- Performance slowdown is minimal (can even increase!)

➢ A strong case for a rethinking of NoC design!

Future research:
- Support for quality of service, different traffic classes, energy-management, etc…
Bufferless Deflection Routing in NoCs


A Case for Bufferless Routing in On-Chip Networks
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Issues In Bufferless Deflection Routing

- Livelock
- Resulting Router Complexity
- Performance & Congestion at High Loads
- Quality of Service and Fairness

Low-Complexity Bufferless Routing

- Chris Fallin, Chris Craik, and Onur Mutlu, "CHIPPER: A Low-Complexity Bufferless Deflection Router"
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Motivation

- Recent work has proposed bufferless deflection routing (BLESS [Moscibroda, ISCA 2009])
  - Energy savings: ~40% in total NoC energy
  - Area reduction: ~40% in total NoC area
  - Minimal performance loss: ~4% on average
- Unfortunately: unaddressed complexities in router
  - long critical path, large reassembly buffers
- Goal: obtain these benefits while simplifying the router in order to make bufferless NoCs practical.
Problems that Bufferless Routers Must Solve

1. Must provide **livelock freedom**
   - A packet should not be deflected forever

2. Must **reassemble packets** upon arrival

**Flit**: atomic routing unit

**Packet**: one or multiple flits

0 1 2 3
A Bufferless Router: A High-Level View

Problem 1: Livelock Freedom

Problem 2: Packet Reassembly

Deflection Routing Logic

Crossbar

Reassembly Buffers

Eject
1. Must provide livelock freedom

   Flits are sorted by age, then assigned in age order to output ports

   ➔ 43% longer critical path than buffered router

2. Must reassemble packets upon arrival

   Reassembly buffers must be sized for worst case

   ➔ 4KB per node
     (8x8, 64-byte cache block)
Problem 1: Livelock Freedom
Livelock Freedom in Previous Work

- What stops a flit from deflecting forever?
- All flits are timestamped
- Oldest flits are assigned their desired ports
- Total order among flits

New traffic is lowest priority

Guaranteed progress!

Flit age forms total order

- But what is the cost of this?
Age-Based Priorities are Expensive: Sorting

- Router must **sort flits by age**: long-latency sort network
  - **Three comparator stages** for 4 flits
Age-Based Priorities Are Expensive: Allocation

- After sorting, flits assigned to output ports in priority order
- Port assignment of younger flits depends on that of older flits
  - **sequential dependence** in the port allocator

---

**GRANT:** Flit 1 ➔ East

1. East?

---

**DEFLECT:** Flit 2 ➔ North

2. East?

---

**GRANT:** Flit 3 ➔ South

3. South?

---

**DEFLECT:** Flit 4 ➔ West

4. South?

---

**SAFARI**
Age-Based Priorities Are Expensive

- Overall, **deflection routing logic** based on **Oldest-First** has a 43% longer critical path than a buffered router.

- Question: is there a cheaper way to route while guaranteeing livelock-freedom?
What is *really necessary* for livelock freedom?

**Key Insight**: No total order. It is enough to:

1. Pick one flit to *prioritize* until arrival
2. Ensure any flit is *eventually* picked

New traffic is lowest-priority

```
<
```

Guaranteed progress!

```
<
```

“Golden Flit”

```
<
```

Flit age forms total order partial ordering is sufficient!
Which Packet is Golden?

- We select the **Golden Packet** so that:
  1. A given packet stays golden long enough to ensure arrival → maximum no-contention latency
  2. The selection rotates through all possible packet IDs → static rotation schedule for simplicity

Packet Header:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle</th>
<th>Golden</th>
<th>Request ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Src 3</td>
<td>Req 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Does Golden Flit Routing Require?

- Only **need** to properly route the Golden Flit

- **First Insight**: no need for full sort
- **Second Insight**: no need for sequential allocation

![Diagram of Priority Sort and Port Allocator with crosses indicating they are not necessary]
Golden Flit Routing With Two Inputs

- Let’s route the Golden Flit in a two-input router first

  - **Step 1**: pick a “winning” flit: Golden Flit, else random
  - **Step 2**: steer the winning flit to its desired output and deflect other flit

  ➔ Golden Flit is always routed toward its destination
Golden Flit Routing with Four Inputs

- Each block makes decisions independently!
- Deflection is a distributed decision

![Diagram of Golden Flit Routing with Four Inputs]
Permutation Network Operation

- **Golden**
  - **NW** wins → swap!
  - **WS** wins → swap!

- **Port Allocator**
  - **NS** wins → no swap!
  - **WE** wins → no swap!

Diagram showing the permutation network operation with directions and swaps indicated.
Permutation Network-based Pipeline
Problem 2: Packet Reassembly

Inject/Eject

Inject

Eject

Reassembly Buffers
Reassembly Buffers are Large

- **Worst case**: every node sends a packet to one receiver
- Why can’t we **make reassembly buffers smaller**?

$O(N)$ space!
Small Reassembly Buffers Cause Deadlock

- What happens when reassembly buffer is too small?

Many Senders

Remaining flits must be injected for forward progress

One Receiver

Network

cannot eject: reassembly buffer full

cannot inject new traffic

network full
Reserve Space to Avoid Deadlock?

- What if every sender *asks permission* from the receiver before it sends?

➔ **adds additional delay to every request**

1. Reserve Slot
2. ACK
3. Send Packet

---

Sender

Reserve Slot?

Receiver

reassembly buffers

Reserved
Escaping Deadlock with Retransmissions

- Sender is optimistic instead: assume buffer is free
  - If not, receiver **drops** and NACKs; sender **retransmits**

→ no additional delay **in best case**
→ transmit buffering overhead for all packets
→ potentially many retransmits

1. Send (2 flits)
2. Drop, NACK
3. Other packet completes retransmit packet
4. Other packet completes
5. ACK
6. Sender frees data

---

**SAFARI**
**Solution: Retransmitting Only Once**

- **Key Idea:** Retransmit only when space becomes available.
  - Receiver *drops packet* if full; *notes* which packet it drops
  - When space frees up, receiver *reserves space* so retransmit is successful
  - Receiver notifies sender to retransmit
Use MSHRs as Reassembly Buffers

Outstanding Cache Misses

Miss Status Handling Register (MSHR)

Pending

Block 0x3C

Status

Address

Data Buffer

Reassembly buffering for “free”

→ A truly bufferless NoC!

SAFARI

Using miss buffers for reassembly makes this a truly bufferless network.
**CHIPPER: Cheap Interconnect Partially-Permuting Router**

Baseline Bufferless Deflection Router

- Large buffers for worst case
  - Retransmit-Once
  - Cache miss buffers

Long critical path:
1. Sort by age
2. Allocate ports sequentially

→ Golden Packet
→ Permutation Network

Crossbar

**SAFARI**
CHIPPER: Cheap Interconnect Partially-Permuting Router
Methodology

- **Multiprogrammed** workloads: CPU2006, server, desktop
  - 8x8 (64 cores), 39 homogeneous and 10 mixed sets

- **Multithreaded** workloads: SPLASH-2, 16 threads
  - 4x4 (16 cores), 5 applications

- **System configuration**
  - **Buffered** baseline: 2-cycle router, 4 VCs/channel, 8 flits/VC
  - **Bufferless** baseline: 2-cycle latency, FLIT-BLESS

- Instruction-trace driven, closed-loop, 128-entry OoO window
- 64KB L1, **perfect L2** (stresses interconnect), XOR mapping
Methodology

- **Hardware modeling**
  - Verilog models for CHIPPER, BLESS, buffered logic
    - Synthesized with commercial 65nm library
  - ORION for crossbar, buffers and links

- **Power**
  - Static and dynamic power from hardware models
  - Based on event counts in cycle-accurate simulations
Results: Performance Degradation

Small loss for low-to-medium-intensity workloads

Weighted Speedup

Multiprogrammed (subset of 49 total)

Buffered
BLESS
CHIPPER

Speedup (Normalized)

Multithreaded

1.8%
13.6%

5.6%
49.8%

SAFARI
Results: Power Reduction

Multiprogrammed (subset of 49 total)

- Buffered
- BLESS
- CHIPPER

Network Power (W)

- Multiprogrammed
- Multithreaded

- 54.9%
- 73.4%

👍 Removing buffers ➔ large power savings

👍 Slight savings from BLESS to CHIPPER
Results: Area and Critical Path Reduction

CHIPPER maintains area savings of BLESS

Critical path becomes competitive to buffered
CHIPPER Router: Conclusions

- Two key issues in bufferless deflection routing
  - livelock freedom and packet reassembly

- Bufferless deflection routers were high-complexity and impractical
  - Oldest-first prioritization $\rightarrow$ long critical path in router
  - No end-to-end flow control for reassembly $\rightarrow$ prone to deadlock with reasonably-sized reassembly buffers

- CHIPPER is a new, practical bufferless deflection router
  - Golden packet prioritization $\rightarrow$ short critical path in router
  - Retransmit-once protocol $\rightarrow$ deadlock-free packet reassembly
  - Cache miss buffers as reassembly buffers $\rightarrow$ truly bufferless network

- CHIPPER frequency comparable to buffered routers at much lower area and power cost, and minimal performance loss
More on CHIPPER
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Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing

- Bufferless deflection routing offers reduced power & area
- But, high deflection rate hurts performance at high load

**MinBD** (Minimally-Buffered Deflection Router) introduces:
- Side buffer to hold only flits that would have been deflected
- Dual-width ejection to address ejection bottleneck
- Two-level prioritization to avoid unnecessary deflections

MinBD yields reduced power (31%) & reduced area (36%) relative to buffered routers.
MinBD yields improved performance (8.1% at high load) relative to bufferless routers → closes half of perf. gap

MinBD has the best energy efficiency of all evaluated designs with competitive performance
Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing

- Chris Fallin, Greg Nazario, Xiangyao Yu, Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, and Onur Mutlu,
  "MinBD: Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing for Energy-Efficient Interconnect"
  One of the five papers nominated for the Best Paper Award by the Program Committee.
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Bufferless Deflection Routing

- **Key idea:** Packets are never buffered in the network. When two packets contend for the same link, one is **deflected.**

- Removing **buffers** yields significant benefits
  - Reduces **power** (CHIPPER: reduces NoC power by 55%)
  - Reduces **die area** (CHIPPER: reduces NoC area by 36%)

- But, at **high network utilization** (load), bufferless deflection routing causes **unnecessary link & router traversals**
  - Reduces network throughput and application performance
  - Increases dynamic power

- **Goal:** Improve high-load performance of low-cost deflection networks by reducing the deflection rate.
Outline: This Talk

- **Motivation**

- **Background**: Bufferless Deflection Routing

- **MinBD**: Reducing Deflections
  - Addressing Link Contention
  - Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
  - Improving Deflection Arbitration

- **Results**

- **Conclusions**
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Issues in Bufferless Deflection Routing

- **Correctness**: Deliver all packets without *livelock*
  - CHIPPER: Golden Packet
  - Globally prioritize one packet until delivered

- **Correctness**: Reassemble packets without *deadlock*
  - CHIPPER: Retransmit-Once

- **Performance**: Avoid performance degradation at *high load*
  - MinBD

---

Key Performance Issues

1. **Link contention**: no buffers to hold traffic \(\rightarrow\) any link contention causes a deflection
   \(\rightarrow\) use side buffers

2. **Ejection bottleneck**: only one flit can eject per router per cycle \(\rightarrow\) simultaneous arrival causes deflection
   \(\rightarrow\) eject up to 2 flits/cycle

3. **Deflection arbitration**: practical (fast) deflection arbiters deflect unnecessarily
   \(\rightarrow\) new priority scheme (silver flit)
Outline: This Talk
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Addressing Link Contention

- **Problem 1:** Any link contention causes a deflection

- **Buffering** a flit can avoid deflection on contention

- But, **input buffers** are expensive:
  - All flits are buffered on every hop → high dynamic energy
  - Large buffers necessary → high static energy and large area

- **Key Idea 1:** add a small buffer to a bufferless deflection router to buffer **only** flits that **would have been deflected**
How to Buffer Deflected Flits

Baseline Router

\[\text{Eject} \quad \text{Inject}\]

Destination

Destination

DEFLECTED

\[\text{Baseline Router}\]

\[\text{Fallin et al., “CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router”, HPCA 2011.}\]
How to Buffer Deflected Flits

Step 1. Remove up to one deflected flit per cycle from the outputs.

Step 2. Buffer this flit in a small FIFO “side buffer.”

Step 3. Re-inject this flit into pipeline when a slot is available.
Why Could A Side Buffer Work Well?

- Buffer some flits and deflect other flits at per-flit level

  - Relative to **bufferless routers**, deflection rate reduces (need not deflect all contending flits)
    - 4-flit buffer reduces deflection rate by 39%

  - Relative to **buffered routers**, buffer is more efficiently used (need not buffer all flits)
    - similar performance with 25% of buffer space
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Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck

- **Problem 2**: Flits deflect unnecessarily because only one flit can **eject** per router per cycle

- In 20% of all ejections, ≥ 2 flits could have ejected → all but one flit must **deflect** and try again → these deflected flits cause additional contention

- Ejection width of 2 flits/cycle reduces **deflection rate 21%**

- **Key idea 2**: Reduce deflections due to a single-flit ejection port by allowing **two flits** to eject per cycle
Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck

Single-Width Ejection
Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck

For fair comparison, **baseline routers** have dual-width ejection for perf. (not power/area)

Dual-Width Ejection

SAFARI
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Improving Deflection Arbitration

- **Problem 3:** Deflections occur unnecessarily because fast arbiters must use simple priority schemes

- Age-based priorities (several past works): full priority order gives fewer deflections, but requires slow arbiters

- State-of-the-art deflection arbitration (Golden Packet & two-stage permutation network)
  - Prioritize one packet globally (**ensure forward progress**)
  - Arbitrate other flits randomly (**fast critical path**)

- Random common case leads to **uncoordinated arbitration**
Let’s route in a two-input router first:

- **Step 1**: pick a “winning” flit (Golden Packet, else random)
- **Step 2**: steer the winning flit to its desired output and deflect other flit

⇒ Highest-priority flit always routes to destination
Fast Deflection Routing with Four Inputs

- Each block makes decisions **independently**
- Deflection is a distributed decision
Unnecessary Deflections in Fast Arbiters

- How does lack of coordination cause unnecessary deflections?
  1. No flit is golden (pseudorandom arbitration)
  2. Red flit wins at first stage
  3. Green flit loses at first stage (must be deflected now)
  4. Red flit loses at second stage; Red and Green are deflected

*all flits have equal priority*

[Diagram showing arbitration process with flits of different colors and deflection paths.]
Improving Deflection Arbitration

- **Key idea 3: Add a priority level** and prioritize one flit to ensure at least one flit is not deflected in each cycle

- **Highest priority**: one Golden Packet in network
  - Chosen in static round-robin schedule
  - Ensures correctness

- **Next-highest priority**: one silver flit per router per cycle
  - Chosen pseudo-randomly & local to one router
  - Enhances performance
Adding A Silver Flit

- Randomly picking a silver flit ensures **one flit is not deflected**
  1. No flit is golden but Red flit is silver
  2. Red flit wins at first stage (silver)
  3. Green flit is deflected at first stage
  4. Red flit wins at second stage (silver); not deflected

Red flits have higher priority

At least one flit is not deflected

Destination

Red flit wins at first stage (silver)
Minimally-Buffered Deflection Router

Problem 1: Link Contention
Solution 1: Side Buffer

Problem 2: Ejection Bottleneck
Solution 2: Dual-Width Ejection

Problem 3: Unnecessary Deflections
Solution 3: Two-level priority scheme
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Methodology: Simulated System

- **Chip Multiprocessor Simulation**
  - **64-core** and **16-core** models
  - **Closed-loop** core/cache/NoC cycle-level model
  - Directory cache coherence protocol (SGI Origin-based)
  - 64KB L1, perfect L2 (stresses interconnect), XOR-mapping
  - Performance metric: **Weighted Speedup**
    (similar conclusions from network-level latency)
  - Workloads: multiprogrammed SPEC CPU2006
    - 75 randomly-chosen workloads
    - Binned into network-load categories by average injection rate
Methodology: Routers and Network

- **Input-buffered** virtual-channel router
  - 8 VCs, 8 flits/VC [Buffered(8,8)]: large buffered router
  - 4 VCs, 4 flits/VC [Buffered(4,4)]: typical buffered router
  - 4 VCs, 1 flit/VC [Buffered(4,1)]: smallest deadlock-free router
  - All power-of-2 buffer sizes up to (8, 8) for perf/power sweep

- **Bufferless deflection** router: CHIPPER\(^1\)

- **Bufferless-buffered hybrid** router: AFC\(^2\)
  - Has input buffers and deflection routing logic
  - Performs coarse-grained (multi-cycle) mode switching

- **Common parameters**
  - 2-cycle router latency, 1-cycle link latency
  - 2D-mesh topology (16-node: 4x4; 64-node: 8x8)
  - Dual ejection assumed for baseline routers (for perf. only)

\(^1\)Fallin et al., “CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router”, HPCA 2011.
Methodology: Power, Die Area, Crit. Path

- **Hardware modeling**
  - **Verilog models** for CHIPPER, MinBD, buffered control logic
    - Synthesized with commercial 65nm library
  - **ORION 2.0** for datapath: crossbar, muxes, buffers and links

- **Power**
  - Static and dynamic power from hardware models
  - Based on event counts in cycle-accurate simulations
  - Broken down into buffer, link, other
1. All mechanisms individually reduce deflections.
2. Side buffer alone is not sufficient for performance (ejection bottleneck remains).
3. Overall, 5.8% over baseline, 2.7% over dual-eject by reducing deflections 64% / 54%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deflection Rate</th>
<th>28%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>22%</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weighted Speedup</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Baseline
- B (Side Buffer)
- D (Dual-Eject)
- S (Silver Flits)
- B+D
- B+S+D (MinBD)
Overall Performance Results

- Similar perf. to Buffered (4,1) @ 25% of buffering space
- Within **2.7%** of Buffered (4,4) (**8.3%** at high load)
Overall Power Results

- Dynamic power increases with deflection routing
- There are significant reductions in power in baseline routers
- Dynamic power reduces in MinBD relative to CHIPPER
Performance-Power Spectrum

- Most **energy-efficient** (perf/watt) of any evaluated network router design
Die Area and Critical Path

**Normalized Die Area**

- **Buffered (8,8)**
- **Buffered (4,4)**
- **Buffered (4,1)**
- **CHIPPER**
- **MinBD**

**Normalized Critical Path**

- **Buffered (8,8)**
- **Buffered (4,4)**
- **Buffered (4,1)**
- **CHIPPER**
- **MinBD**

Only 3% area increase over CHIPPER (4-flit buffer).

- Increases by **7%** over CHIPPER, **8%** over Buffered (4,4).
MinBD Router: Conclusions

- Bufferless deflection routing offers **reduced power & area**
- But, high deflection rate hurts **performance at high load**

**MinBD** (Minimally-Buffered Deflection Router) introduces:
- **Side buffer** to hold only flits that would have been deflected
- **Dual-width ejection** to address ejection bottleneck
- **Two-level prioritization** to avoid unnecessary deflections

- MinBD yields **reduced power (31%) & reduced area (36%)** relative to **buffered** routers
- MinBD yields **improved performance (8.1% at high load)** relative to **bufferless** routers → closes half of perf. gap

- MinBD has the **best energy efficiency** of all evaluated designs with **competitive performance**
Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing

- Chris Fallin, Greg Nazario, Xiangyao Yu, Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, and Onur Mutlu,

"MinBD: Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing for Energy-Efficient Interconnect"


One of the five papers nominated for the Best Paper Award by the Program Committee.

MinBD: Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing for Energy-Efficient Interconnect

Chris Fallin, Greg Nazario, Xiangyao Yu*, Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu

Carnegie Mellon University
{cfallin,gnazario,kevincha,rachata,onur}@cmu.edu

*Tsinghua University & Carnegie Mellon University
yxythu@gmail.com
HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks

Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, and Onur Mutlu,
"HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks"
Executive Summary

• **Problem:** Packets contend in on-chip networks (NoCs), causing congestion, thus reducing performance

• **Observations:**
  1) Some applications are more sensitive to network latency than others
  2) Applications must be throttled differently to achieve peak performance

• **Key Idea:** Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)
  1) Application-aware source throttling
  2) Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment

• **Result:** Improves performance and energy efficiency over state-of-the-art source throttling policies
Source Throttling in Bufferless NoCs


---

HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks

Kevin Kai-Wei Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
{kevincha, rachata, cfallin, onur}@cmu.edu
“Bufferless” Hierarchical Rings

- Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Chris Fallin, Xiangyao Yu, Kevin Chang, Greg Nazario, Reetuparna Das, Gabriel Loh, and Onur Mutlu, "Design and Evaluation of Hierarchical Rings with Deflection Routing"


- Describes the design and implementation of a mostly-bufferless hierarchical ring

Design and Evaluation of Hierarchical Rings with Deflection Routing

Rachata Ausavarungnirun  Chris Fallin  Xiangyao Yu†  Kevin Kai-Wei Chang
Greg Nazario  Reetuparna Das§  Gabriel H. Loh‡  Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University  §University of Michigan  †MIT  ‡Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.
“Bufferless” Hierarchical Rings (II)


Achieving both High Energy Efficiency and High Performance in On-Chip Communication using Hierarchical Rings with Deflection Routing

Rachata Ausavarungnirun  Chris Fallin  Xiangyao Yu†  Kevin Kai-Wei Chang  
Greg Nazario  Reetuparna Das§  Gabriel H. Loh‡  Onur Mutlu  
Carnegie Mellon University  §University of Michigan  †MIT  ‡AMD
Chapter 1
Bufferless and Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing

Chris Fallin, Greg Nazario, Xiangyao Yu, Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarunngirun, Onur Mutlu
Energy-Efficient Deflection-based On-chip Networks: Topology, Routing, Flow Control

Rachata Ausavarungnirun\textsuperscript{b}, Onur Mutlu\textsuperscript{a}

\textit{SAFARI Research Group}

\textsuperscript{aETH Zürich}
\textsuperscript{bKing Mongkut’s University of Technology North Bangkok}

\section*{Abstract}

As the number of cores scales to tens and hundreds, the energy consumption of routers across various types of on-chip networks in chip multiprocessors (CMPs) increases significantly. A major source of this energy consumption comes from the input buffers inside Network-on-Chip (NoC) routers, which are traditionally designed to maximize performance. To mitigate this high energy cost, many works propose bufferless router designs that utilize deflection routing to resolve port contention. While this approach is able to maintain high performance relative to its buffered counterparts at low network traffic, the bufferless router design suffers performance degradation under high network load.

In order to maintain high performance and energy efficiency under both low and high network loads, this chapter discusses critical drawbacks of traditional bufferless designs and describes recent research works focusing on two major modifications to improve the overall performance of the traditional bufferless network-on-chip design. The first modification is a minimally-buffered design that introduces limited buffering inside critical parts of the on-chip network in order to reduce the number of deflections. The second modification is a hierarchical bufferless interconnect design that aims to further improve performance by limiting the number of hops each packet needs to travel while in the network. In both approaches, we discuss design tradeoffs and provide evaluation results based on common CMP configurations with various network topologies to show the effectiveness of each proposal.

\textit{Keywords}: network-on-chip, deflection routing, topology, bufferless router, energy efficiency, high-performance computing, computer architecture, emerging technologies, latency, low-latency computing

\url{https://arxiv.org/pdf/2112.02516.pdf}
Bufferless Interconnects in Real Systems

Application Defined On-chip Networks for Heterogeneous Chiplets: An Implementation Perspective

Tianqi Wang¹,*, Fan Feng¹,*, Shaolin Xiang¹,*, Qi Li¹, and Jing Xia¹,**

¹Huawei

THEME ARTICLE: COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS 2021

Kunpeng 920: The First 7-nm Chiplet-Based 64-Core ARM SoC for Cloud Services

Jing Xia, Chuanning Cheng, Xiping Zhou, Yuxing Hu †, and Peter Chun, HiSilicon Technologies Company, Ltd., Shenzhen, 518129, China
More Readings

- Studies of congestion and congestion control in on-chip vs. internet-like networks


- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, and Onur Mutlu, "Next Generation On-Chip Networks: What Kind of Congestion Control Do We Need?". Proceedings of the 9th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HOTNETS), Monterey, CA, October 2010. Slides (ppt) (key)
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Congestion Control


On-Chip Networks from a Networking Perspective: Congestion and Scalability in Many-Core Interconnects

George Nychis†, Chris Fallin†, Thomas Moscibroda§, Onur Mutlu†, Srinivasan Seshan†

† Carnegie Mellon University
{gnychis,cfallin,onur,srini}@cmu.edu

§ Microsoft Research Asia
moscitho@microsoft.com
On-Chip vs. Off-Chip Congestion Control

George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, and Onur Mutlu,
"Next Generation On-Chip Networks: What Kind of Congestion Control Do We Need?"
Proceedings of the 9th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HOTNETS), Monterey, CA, October 2010. Slides (ppt) (key)

Next Generation On-Chip Networks: What Kind of Congestion Control Do We Need?

George Nychis†, Chris Fallin†, Thomas Moscibroda§, Onur Mutlu†
†Carnegie Mellon University
§Microsoft Research
{gnychis,cfallin,onur}@cmu.edu
moscitho@microsoft.com
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Summary of Study [SIGCOMM 2012]

- Highlighted a traditional networking problem in a new context
  - Unique design requires novel solution

- Showed congestion limits efficiency and scalability, and that self-throttling nature of cores prevents congestion collapse

- Showed on-chip congestion control requires application-awareness

- Our application-aware congestion controller provided:
  - A more efficient network-layer (reduced latency)
  - Improvements in system throughput (by 27%)
  - Effectively scale the CMP (shown for up to 4096 cores)
Heterogeneous Networks


A Heterogeneous Multiple Network-On-Chip Design: An Application-Aware Approach

Asit K. Mishra  
Intel Corporation  
Hillsboro, OR 97124, USA  
asit.k.mishra@intel.com

Onur Mutlu  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA  
onur@cmu.edu

Chita R. Das  
The Pennsylvania State University  
University Park, PA 16802, USA  
das@cse.psu.edu
Packet Scheduling
Packet Scheduling

- **Which packet to choose for a given output port?**
  - Router needs to prioritize between competing flits
  - Which input port?
  - Which virtual channel?
  - Which application’s packet?

- **Common strategies**
  - Round robin across virtual channels
  - Oldest packet first (or an approximation)
  - Prioritize some virtual channels over others

- **Better policies in a multi-core environment**
  - Use application characteristics
Application-Aware Packet Scheduling

The Problem: Packet Scheduling

Network-on-Chip is a critical resource shared by multiple applications
The Problem: Packet Scheduling

Routers
Processing Element (Cores, L2 Banks, Memory Controllers etc)
The Problem: Packet Scheduling

- Routing Unit (RC)
  - VC Allocator (VA)
  - Switch Allocator (SA)

From East
- VC0
- VC1
- VC2

From West

From North

From South

From PE
The Problem: Packet Scheduling

- Routing Unit (RC)
- VC Allocator (VA)
- Switch Allocator (SA)

From East: VC0, VC1, VC2
From West: VC0, VC1, VC2
From North: VC0, VC1, VC2
From South: VC0, VC1, VC2
From PE: VC0, VC1, VC2

Conceptual View

- App1, App2, App3, App4
- App5, App6, App7, App8

- From East: VC 0, VC 1, VC 2
- From West: VC 0, VC 1, VC 2
- From North: VC 0, VC 1, VC 2
- From South: VC 0, VC 1, VC 2
- From PE: VC 0, VC 1, VC 2
The Problem: Packet Scheduling

Which packet to choose?
The Problem: Packet Scheduling

- Existing scheduling policies
  - Round Robin
  - Age

- Problem 1: Local to a router
  - Lead to contradictory decision making between routers: packets from one application may be prioritized at one router, to be delayed at next.

- Problem 2: Application oblivious
  - Treat all applications packets equally
  - But applications are heterogeneous

- Solution: Application-aware global scheduling policies.
STC Scheduling Example

Packet Injection Order at Processor

Batching interval length = 3 cycles
Ranking order =
STC Scheduling Example

Router

8
4

3
1

6
2

3
2

2

Round Robin

3 2 8 7 6

STALL CYCLES  |  Avg
---|---
RR  | 8 6 11 | 8.3
Age |
STC |
STC Scheduling Example

Router
5
8
4
3
7
1
6
2
3
2

Round Robin
5
4
3
1
2
2
3
2
8
7
6

Age
3
3
5
4
6
7
8

STALL CYCLES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STC Scheduling Example

Router

Scheduler

Round Robin

Age

STC

STALL CYCLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>STC</th>
<th>Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Application-Aware Prioritization in NoCs


Application-Aware Prioritization Mechanisms for On-Chip Networks

Reetuparna Das§ Onur Mutlu† Thomas Moscibroda‡ Chita R. Das§
§Pennsylvania State University {rdas,das}@cse.psu.edu †Carnegie Mellon University onur@cmu.edu ‡Microsoft Research moscitho@microsoft.com
Slack-Based Packet Scheduling


One of the 11 computer architecture papers of 2010 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.

Aérgia: Exploiting Packet Latency Slack in On-Chip Networks

Reetuparna Das§  Onur Mutlu†  Thomas Moscibroda‡  Chita R. Das§

§Pennsylvania State University  †Carnegie Mellon University  ‡Microsoft Research
{rdas,das}@cse.psu.edu  onur@cmu.edu  moscitho@microsoft.com
Slack-Based Packet Scheduling

- The notion of “packet slack”
  - Slack of a packet is the number of cycles it can be delayed in a router without (significantly) reducing application’s performance
  - Local network slack

- Source of slack: Memory-Level Parallelism (MLP) or other latency tolerance mechanisms
  - Latency of an application’s packet hidden from application due to overlap with latency of pending cache miss requests or other long-latency operations

- Key idea of slack-based packet scheduling:
  - Estimate the slack of each packet
  - Prioritize packets with lower slack
A Model for Application Slowdown Estimation in On-Chip Networks and Its Use for Improving System Fairness and Performance

Xiyue Xiang†
Saugata Ghose‡
Onur Mutlu§‡
Nian-Feng Tzeng†

†University of Louisiana at Lafayette
‡Carnegie Mellon University
§ETH Zürich
Handling Multicast and Hotspot Issues

- Xiyue Xiang, Wentao Shi, Saugata Ghose, Lu Peng, Onur Mutlu, and Nian-Feng Tzeng,
  "Carpool: A Bufferless On-Chip Network Supporting Adaptive Multicast and Hotspot Alleviation"
  Proceedings of the International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS), Chicago, IL, USA, June 2017.
  [Slides (pptx) (pdf)]

Carpool: A Bufferless On-Chip Network Supporting Adaptive Multicast and Hotspot Alleviation
Xiyue Xiang†  Wentao Shi*  Saugata Ghose‡  Lu Peng*  Onur Mutlu§‡  Nian-Feng Tzeng†
†University of Louisiana at Lafayette  *Louisiana State University  ‡Carnegie Mellon University  §ETH Zürich
Heterogeneous Networks

  Proceedings of the 50th Design Automation Conference (DAC), Austin, TX, June 2013. Slides (pptx) Slides (pdf)

A Heterogeneous Multiple Network-On-Chip Design: An Application-Aware Approach

Asit K. Mishra
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Onur Mutlu
Carnegie Mellon University
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Chita R. Das
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Low-Cost QoS in On-Chip Networks (I)

- Boris Grot, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Preemptive Virtual Clock: A Flexible, Efficient, and Cost-effective QoS Scheme for Networks-on-Chip"

Preemptive Virtual Clock: A Flexible, Efficient, and Cost-effective QOS Scheme for Networks-on-Chip

Boris Grot
Department of Computer Sciences
The University of Texas at Austin
{bgrot, skeckler@cs.utexas.edu}

Stephen W. Keckler

Onur Mutlu†
†Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu
Low-Cost QoS in On-Chip Networks (II)

- Boris Grot, Joel Hestness, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Kilo-NOC: A Heterogeneous Network-on-Chip Architecture for Scalability and Service Guarantees"
  Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA), San Jose, CA, June 2011. Slides (pptx)
  One of the 12 computer architecture papers of 2011 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.

Kilo-NOC: A Heterogeneous Network-on-Chip Architecture for Scalability and Service Guarantees

Boris Grot\textsuperscript{1}  bgrot@cs.utexas.edu
Joel Hestness\textsuperscript{1}  hestness@cs.utexas.edu
Stephen W. Keckler\textsuperscript{1,2}  sheckler@nvidia.com
Onur Mutlu\textsuperscript{3}  onur@cmu.edu

\textsuperscript{1}The University of Texas at Austin  Austin, TX
\textsuperscript{2}NVIDIA  Santa Clara, CA
\textsuperscript{3}Carnegie Mellon University  Pittsburgh, PA
Low-Cost QoS in On-Chip Networks (III)


A QoS-Enabled On-Die Interconnect Fabric for Kilo-Node Chips

To meet rapidly growing performance demands and energy constraints, future chips will likely feature thousands of on-die resources. Existing network-on-chip solutions weren't designed for scalability and will be unable to meet future interconnect demands. A hybrid network-on-chip architecture called Kilo-NOC co-optimizes topology, flow control, and quality of service to achieve significant gains in efficiency.
Kilo-NoC: Topology-Aware QoS

Boris Grot, Joel Hestness, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Kilo-NOC: A Heterogeneous Network-on-Chip Architecture for Scalability and Service Guarantees"
Proceedings of the 38th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCAs), San Jose, CA, June 2011. Slides (pptx)
Motivation

- Extreme-scale chip-level integration
  - Cores
  - Cache banks
  - Accelerators
  - I/O logic
  - Network-on-chip (NOC)
- 10-100 cores today
- 1000+ agents in the near future
Kilo-NOC requirements

- High efficiency
  - Area
  - Energy
- Good performance
- Strong service guarantees (QoS)
Topology-Aware QoS

- Problem: QoS support in each router is expensive (in terms of buffering, arbitration, bookkeeping)

- Goal: Provide QoS guarantees at low area and power cost

- Idea:
  - Isolate shared resources in a region of the network, support QoS within that area
  - Design the topology so that applications can access the region without interference
Baseline QOS-enabled CMP

Multiple VMs sharing a die

- Shared resources (e.g., memory controllers)
- VM-private resources (cores, caches)
- QOS-enabled router
Conventional NOC QOS

Contention scenarios:
- Shared resources
  - memory access
- Intra-VM traffic
  - shared cache access
- Inter-VM traffic
  - VM page sharing
Conventional NOC QOS

Contention scenarios:
- Shared resources
  - memory access
- Intra-VM traffic
  - shared cache access
- Inter-VM traffic
  - VM page sharing

Network-wide guarantees *without* network-wide QOS support
Kilo-NOC QOS

- Insight: leverage rich network connectivity
  - Naturally reduce interference among flows
  - Limit the extent of hardware QOS support
- Requires a low-diameter topology
  - This work: Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)

_Grot et al., HPCA 2009_
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)

- **Pros**
  - One-to-many topology
  - Low diameter: 2 hops
  - $k$ channels row/column
  - Asymmetric

- **Cons**
  - Asymmetric
  - Increased control (arbitration) complexity
Multi-Drop Express Channels (MECS)

- Boris Grot, Joel Hestness, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Express Cube Topologies for On-Chip Interconnects" 

Express Cube Topologies for On-Chip Interconnects

Boris Grot  Joel Hestness  Stephen W. Keckler  Onur Mutlu

Department of Computer Sciences
The University of Texas at Austin
{brot, hestness, skeckler}@cs.utexas.edu

†Computer Architecture Laboratory (CALCM)
Carnegie Mellon University
onur@cmu.edu
Topology-Aware QOS

- Dedicated, QOS-enabled regions
  - Rest of die: QOS-free
- Richly-connected topology
  - Traffic isolation
- Special routing rules
  - Manage interference
**Topology-Aware QOS**
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  - Manage interference
## Topology-Aware QOS

- Dedicated, QOS-enabled regions
  - Rest of die: QOS-free

- Richly-connected topology
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Toplogy-Aware QOS

- Dedicated, QOS-enabled regions
  - Rest of die: QOS-free
- Richly-connected topology
  - Traffic isolation
- Special routing rules
  - Manage interference
Kilo-NOC view

- Topology-aware QOS support
  - Limit QOS complexity to a fraction of the die
- Optimized flow control
  - Reduce buffer requirements in QOS-free regions
## Evaluation Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>15 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vdd</td>
<td>0.7 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1024 tiles: 256 concentrated nodes (64 shared resources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Networks:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECS+PVC</td>
<td>VC flow control, QOS support (PVC) at each node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECS+TAQ</td>
<td>VC flow control, QOS support only in shared regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MECS+TAQ+EB</td>
<td>EB flow control outside of SRs, Separate Request and Reply networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-MECS</td>
<td>Proposed organization: TAQ + hybrid flow control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area comparison

Area (mm²)

- MECS+PVC
- MECS+TAQ
- MECS+ TAQ+EB
- K-MECS

- SR Routers
- Routers
- Link EBs
- Links
Energy comparison

Network energy/packet (pJ)

- MECS+PVC
- MECS+TAQ
- MECS+EB+TAQ
- K-MECS

SR Routers
Routers
Link EBs
Links
Energy comparison

![Graph showing energy comparison between different configurations.](image)

- **MECS**
- **MECS EB**
- **MECS hybrid**

**Y-axis:** Average packet latency (cycles)

**X-axis:** Load (%)

**Configurations:**
- MECS + PVC
- MECS + TAQ
- MECS + EB + TAQ
- K-MECS

Legend:
- SR Routers
- Routers
- Link EBs
- Links
Summary

Kilo-NOC: a heterogeneous NOC architecture for kilo-node substrates

- Topology-aware QOS
  - Limits QOS support to a fraction of the die
  - Leverages low-diameter topologies
  - Improves NOC area- and energy-efficiency
  - Provides strong guarantees
More on Kilo-NoC (I)
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More on Kilo-NoC (II)


---

**A QoS-Enabled On-Die Interconnect Fabric for Kilo-Node Chips**

To meet rapidly growing performance demands and energy constraints, future chips will likely feature thousands of on-die resources. Existing network-on-chip solutions weren’t designed for scalability and will be unable to meet future interconnect demands. A hybrid network-on-chip architecture called Kilo-NoC co-optimizes topology, flow control, and quality of service to achieve significant gains in efficiency.
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Express-Cube Topologies

Boris Grot, Joel Hestness, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu,
"Express Cube Topologies for On-Chip Interconnects"
2-D Mesh
2-D Mesh

- **Pros**
  - Low design & layout complexity
  - Simple, fast routers

- **Cons**
  - Large diameter
  - Energy & latency impact
Concentration (Balfour & Dally, ICS ‘06)

- **Pros**
  - Multiple *terminals* attached to a router node
  - Fast nearest-neighbor communication via the crossbar
  - Hop count reduction proportional to *concentration* degree

- **Cons**
  - Benefits limited by crossbar complexity
Concentration

- Side-effects
  - Fewer channels
  - Greater channel width
Replication

Benefits

- Restores bisection channel count
- Restores channel width
- Reduced crossbar complexity

CMesh-X2
Flattened Butterfly *(Kim et al., Micro ‘07)*

- **Objectives:**
  - Improve connectivity
  - Exploit the wire budget
Flattened Butterfly (Kim et al., Micro ‘07)
Flattened Butterfly \textit{(Kim et al., Micro ‘07)}
Flattened Butterfly (Kim et al., Micro ‘07)
Flattened Butterfly \textit{(Kim et al., Micro '07)}
Flattened Butterfly *(Kim et al., Micro ‘07)*

- **Pros**
  - Excellent connectivity
  - Low diameter: 2 hops

- **Cons**
  - High channel count: $k^2/2$ per row/column
  - Low channel utilization
  - Increased control (arbitration) complexity
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)

Objectives:
- Connectivity
- More scalable channel count
- Better channel utilization
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)
Multidrop Express Channels (MECS)

- **Pros**
  - One-to-many topology
  - Low diameter: 2 hops
  - \( k \) channels row/column
  - Asymmetric

- **Cons**
  - Asymmetric
  - Increased control (arbitration) complexity
Partitioning: a GEC Example

MECS

MECS-X2

Partitioned MECS

Flattened Butterfly
## Analytical Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CMesh</th>
<th></th>
<th>FBfly</th>
<th></th>
<th>MECS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Size</strong></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Radix (conctr’ d)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diameter</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channel count</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Channel width</strong></td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Router inputs</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Router outputs</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Experimental Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topologies</th>
<th>Mesh, CMesh, CMesh-X2, FBFly, MECS, MECS-X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network sizes</td>
<td>64 &amp; 256 terminals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing</td>
<td>DOR, adaptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messages</td>
<td>64 &amp; 576 bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic traffic</td>
<td>Uniform random, bit complement, transpose, self-similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARSEC benchmarks</td>
<td>Blackscholes, Bodytrack, Canneal, Ferret, Fluidanimate, Freqmine, Vip, x264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-system config</td>
<td>M5 simulator, Alpha ISA, 64 OOO cores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy evaluation</td>
<td>Orion + CACTI 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
64 nodes: Uniform Random

Latency (cycles) vs. injection rate (%)

Graph showing latency (cycles) on the y-axis and injection rate (%) on the x-axis. Different types of networks are compared, such as mesh, cmesh, cmesh-x2, fbfly, mecs, and mecs-x2. The graph illustrates how each network type performs under varying injection rates.
256 nodes: Uniform Random

- mesh
- cmesh-x2
- fbfly
- mecs
- mecs-x2

Latency (cycles) vs. Injection rate (%)
Energy (100K pkts, Uniform Random)

![Energy Figure]

Average packet energy (nJ)

- **Link Energy**
- **Router Energy**

**Network Topologies:**
- mesh
- cmesh
- cmesh-x2
- fbfly
- mecs
- mecs-x2
- mesh
- cmesh-x2
- fbfly
- mecs
- mecs-x2

**Node Counts:**
- 64 nodes
- 256 nodes
64 Nodes: PARSEC

![Graph showing total network energy and average packet latency for different workloads and configurations. The graph includes workloads such as Blackscholes, Canneal, Vip, and x264, with metrics for router energy, link energy, and latency.]
Summary

- **MECS**
  - A new one-to-many topology
  - Good fit for planar substrates
  - Excellent connectivity
  - Effective wire utilization

- **Generalized Express Cubes**
  - Framework & taxonomy for NOC topologies
  - Extension of the k-ary n-cube model
  - Useful for understanding and exploring on-chip interconnect options
  - Future: expand & formalize
Scalability: Express Cube Topologies
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One of the 11 computer architecture papers of 2010 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.
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Low-Cost QoS in On-Chip Networks (I)

- Boris Grot, Stephen W. Keckler, and Onur Mutlu, "Preemptive Virtual Clock: A Flexible, Efficient, and Cost-effective QoS Scheme for Networks-on-Chip"
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Low-Cost QoS in On-Chip Networks (III)


A QoS-Enabled On-Die Interconnect Fabric for Kilo-Node Chips

To meet rapidly growing performance demands and energy constraints, future chips will likely feature thousands of on-die resources. Existing network-on-chip solutions weren’t designed for scalability and will be unable to meet future interconnect demands. A hybrid network-on-chip architecture called Kilo-NOC co-optimizes topology, flow control, and quality of service to achieve significant gains in efficiency.
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“Bufferless” Hierarchical Rings


- Describes the design and implementation of a mostly-bufferless hierarchical ring
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Chapter 1
Bufferless and Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing

Chris Fallin, Greg Nazario, Xiangyao Yu, Kevin Chang, Rachata Ausavarungnirun, Onur Mutlu
Summary of Eight Years of Research

Energy-Efficient Deflection-based On-chip Networks: Topology, Routing, Flow Control
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\textit{SAFARI Research Group}
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Abstract

As the number of cores scales to tens and hundreds, the energy consumption of routers across various types of on-chip networks in chip multiprocessors (CMPs) increases significantly. A major source of this energy consumption comes from the input buffers inside Network-on-Chip (NoC) routers, which are traditionally designed to maximize performance. To mitigate this high energy cost, many works propose bufferless router designs that utilize deflection routing to resolve port contention. While this approach is able to maintain high performance relative to its buffered counterparts at low network traffic, the bufferless router design suffers performance degradation under high network load.

In order to maintain high performance and energy efficiency under \textit{both} low and high network loads, this chapter discusses critical drawbacks of traditional bufferless designs and describes recent research works focusing on two major modifications to improve the overall performance of the traditional bufferless network-on-chip design. The first modification is a minimally-buffered design that introduces limited buffering inside critical parts of the on-chip network in order to reduce the number of deflections. The second modification is a hierarchical bufferless interconnect design that aims to further improve performance by limiting the number of hops each packet needs to travel while in the network. In both approaches, we discuss design tradeoffs and provide evaluation results based on common CMP configurations with various network topologies to show the effectiveness of each proposal.

\textit{Keywords:} network-on-chip, deflection routing, topology, bufferless router, energy efficiency, high-performance computing, computer architecture, emerging technologies, latency, low-latency computing
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Summary of Study [SIGCOMM 2012]

- Highlighted a traditional networking problem in a new context
  - Unique design requires novel solution

- Showed congestion limits efficiency and scalability, and that self-throttling nature of cores prevents congestion collapse

- Showed on-chip congestion control requires application-awareness

- Our application-aware congestion controller provided:
  - A more efficient network-layer (reduced latency)
  - Improvements in system throughput (by 27%)
  - Effectively scale the CMP (shown for up to 4096 cores)
Slowdown Estimation in NoCs

- Xiyue Xiang, Saugata Ghose, Onur Mutlu, and Nian-Feng Tzeng, "A Model for Application Slowdown Estimation in On-Chip Networks and Its Use for Improving System Fairness and Performance" Proceedings of the 34th IEEE International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD), Phoenix, AZ, USA, October 2016. [Slides (pptx) (pdf)]
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Heterogeneous Networks
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More Readings

- Studies of congestion and congestion control in on-chip vs. internet-like networks


- George Nychis, Chris Fallin, Thomas Moscibroda, and Onur Mutlu, "Next Generation On-Chip Networks: What Kind of Congestion Control Do We Need?". Proceedings of the 9th ACM Workshop on Hot Topics in Networks (HOTNETS), Monterey, CA, October 2010. Slides (ppt) (key)
Source Throttling in Bufferless NoCs
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HAT: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling for On-Chip Networks
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Executive Summary

- **Problem:** Packets contend in on-chip networks (NoCs), causing congestion, thus reducing performance

- **Observations:**
  1) Some applications are more sensitive to network latency than others
  2) Applications must be throttled differently to achieve peak performance

- **Key Idea:** Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)
  1) Application-aware source throttling
  2) Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment

- **Result:** Improves performance and energy efficiency over state-of-the-art source throttling policies
Outline

• **Background and Motivation**
  • Mechanism
  • Prior Works
  • Results
On-Chip Networks

- Connect **cores, caches, memory controllers, etc**
- **Packet switched**
- **2D mesh**: Most commonly used topology
- Primarily serve **cache misses** and **memory requests**
- **Router designs**
  - Buffered: **Input buffers** to hold contending packets
  - Bufferless: **Misroute (deflect)** contending packets

**Diagram**

- **PE**: Processing Element (Cores, L2 Banks, Memory Controllers, etc)
- **R**: Router

**Legend**

- PE: Processing Element
- R: Router
Network Congestion Reduces Performance

Limited shared resources (buffers and links)
- Design constraints: power, chip area, and timing

Network congestion:
- Network throughput
- Application performance

Router
Packet
Processing Element
(Cores, L2 Banks, Memory Controllers, etc)
Goal

• **Improve performance in a highly congested NoC**

• Reducing network load decreases network congestion, hence improves performance

• **Approach: source throttling to reduce network load**
  – Temporarily delay new traffic injection

• **Naïve mechanism: throttle every single node**
Key Observation #1

Different applications respond differently to changes in network latency

**gromacs:** network-non-intensive

**mcf:** network-intensive

Throttling network-intensive applications benefits system performance more
Key Observation #2

Different workloads achieve peak performance at different throttling rates

Dynamically adjusting throttling rate yields better performance than a single static rate
Outline

• Background and Motivation

• Mechanism

• Prior Works

• Results
Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)

1. **Application-aware throttling:**
   Throttle *network-intensive* applications that interfere with *network-non-intensive* applications

2. **Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment:**
   Dynamically adjusts throttling rate to adapt to different workloads
Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)

1. **Application-aware throttling:**
   Throttle *network-intensive* applications that interfere with *network-non-intensive* applications

2. **Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment:**
   Dynamically adjusts throttling rate to adapt to different workloads
Application-Aware Throttling

1. **Measure Network Intensity**
   Use **L1 MPKI** (misses per thousand instructions) to estimate network intensity

2. **Classify Application**
   Sort applications by L1 MPKI

   - Network-non-intensive
   - Network-intensive

   $$\sum \text{MPKI} < \text{NonIntensiveCap}$$  \[ \text{Higher L1 MPKI} \]

3. **Throttle network-intensive applications**
Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)

1. **Application-aware throttling:** Throttle *network-intensive* applications that interfere with *network-non-intensive* applications.

2. **Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment:** *Dynamically* adjusts throttling rate to adapt to different workloads.
Dynamic Throttling Rate Adjustment

• For a given network design, peak performance tends to occur at a fixed network load point

• Dynamically adjust throttling rate to achieve that network load point
Dynamic Throttling Rate Adjustment

- **Goal:** maintain network load at a peak performance point

1. **Measure network load**
2. **Compare and adjust throttling rate**
   - If network load > peak point:
     - Increase throttling rate
   - Elif network load ≤ peak point:
     - Decrease throttling rate
Epoch-Based Operation

• Continuous HAT operation is expensive
• Solution: performs HAT at epoch granularity

**During epoch:**
1) Measure L1 MPKI of each application
2) Measure network load

**Beginning of epoch:**
1) Classify applications
2) Adjust throttling rate
3) Reset measurements

Current Epoch (100K cycles)  Next Epoch (100K cycles)
Outline

• Background and Motivation
• Mechanism
• Prior Works
• Results
Prior Source Throttling Works

• **Source throttling for bufferless NoCs**
  [Nychis+ Hotnets’10, SIGCOMM’12]
  – Application-aware throttling based on starvation rate
  – Does not adaptively adjust throttling rate
  – “Heterogeneous Throttling”

• **Source throttling off-chip buffered networks**
  [Thottethodi+ HPCA’01]
  – Dynamically trigger throttling based on fraction of buffer occupancy
  – Not application-aware: fully block packet injections of every node
  – “Self-tuned Throttling”
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Methodology

• Chip Multiprocessor Simulator
  – **64-node** multi-core systems with a **2D-mesh topology**
  – Closed-loop core/cache/NoC cycle-level model
  – 64KB L1, perfect L2 (always hits to stress NoC)

• Router Designs
  – **Virtual-channel buffered** router: 4 VCs, 4 flits/VC [Dally+ IEEE TPDS’92]
  – **Bufferless deflection** routers: **BLESS** [Moscibroda+ ISCA’09]

• Workloads
  – 60 multi-core workloads: SPEC CPU2006 benchmarks
  – Categorized based on their network intensity
    • Low/Medium/High intensity categories

• **Metrics:** Weighted Speedup (perf.), perf./Watt (energy eff.), and maximum slowdown (fairness)
Performance: Bufferless NoC (BLESS)

HAT provides better performance improvement than past work.
Highest improvement on heterogeneous workload mixes.
- L and M are more sensitive to network latency.
Performance: Buffered NoC

Congestion is much lower in Buffered NoC, but HAT still provides performance benefit
HAT provides better fairness than prior works
Network Energy Efficiency

HAT increases energy efficiency by reducing congestion
Other Results in Paper

• Performance on CHIPPER

• Performance on multithreaded workloads

• Parameters sensitivity sweep of HAT
Conclusion

• **Problem:** Packets contend in on-chip networks (NoCs), causing congestion, thus reducing performance

• **Observations:**
  1) Some applications are more sensitive to network latency than others
  2) Applications must be throttled differently to achieve peak performance

• **Key Idea: Heterogeneous Adaptive Throttling (HAT)**
  1) Application-aware source throttling
  2) Network-load-aware throttling rate adjustment

• **Result:** Improves performance and energy efficiency over state-of-the-art source throttling policies
Source Throttling in Bufferless NoCs

Slack-Driven Packet Scheduling

Reetuparna Das, Onur Mutlu, Thomas Moscibroda, and Chita R. Das,
"Aergia: Exploiting Packet Latency Slack in On-Chip Networks"
Packet Scheduling in NoC

- Existing scheduling policies
  - Round robin
  - Age

- Problem
  - Treat all packets equally
  - Application-oblivious

- Packets have **different criticality**
  - Packet is critical if latency of a packet affects application’s performance
  - Different criticality due to memory level parallelism (MLP)


All packets are not the same…!!!
MLP Principle

Packet Latency $\neq$ Network Stall Time

Different Packets have different criticality due to MLP

$\text{Criticality}(\text{Packet 1}) > \text{Criticality}(\text{Packet 2}) > \text{Criticality}(\text{Packet 3})$
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What is Aérgia?

- Aérgia is the spirit of laziness in Greek mythology
- Some packets can afford to slack!
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Slack of Packets

- What is slack of a packet?
  - Slack of a packet is number of cycles it can be delayed in a router without (significantly) reducing application’s performance
  - Local network slack

- Source of slack: Memory-Level Parallelism (MLP)
  - Latency of an application’s packet hidden from application due to overlap with latency of pending cache miss requests

- Prioritize packets with lower slack
Concept of Slack

Instruction Window

Load Miss

Causes

Load Miss

Causes

Execution Time

Latency (↑)

Latency (↓)

Stall

Compute

Slack

Network-on-Chip

Slack (↑) = Latency (↑) – Latency (↓) = 26 – 6 = 20 hops

Packet(↓) can be delayed for available slack cycles without reducing performance!
Prioritizing using Slack

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Packet</th>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Slack</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 hops</td>
<td>0 hops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 hops</td>
<td>10 hops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interference at 3 hops
Slack( 데이터 ) > Slack (slack)
Prioritize Slack( 데이터 )
Slack in Applications

- 50% of packets have 350+ slack cycles
- 10% of packets have <50 slack cycles

Percentage of all Packets (%) vs. Slack in cycles (in cycles)

- Non-critical
- Critical

10% of packets have <50 slack cycles
Slack in Applications

68% of packets have zero slack cycles
Diversity in Slack

Slack varies **between packets of different applications**

Slack varies **between packets of a single application**
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Estimating Slack Priority

\[ \text{Slack} (P) = \max (\text{Latencies of P’s Predecessors}) - \text{Latency of P} \]

- \text{Predecessors}(P) are the packets of outstanding cache miss requests when P is issued
  - Packet latencies not known when issued

- Predicting latency of any packet Q
  - Higher latency if Q corresponds to an L2 miss
  - Higher latency if Q has to travel farther number of hops
Estimating Slack Priority

- Slack of P = Maximum Predecessor Latency – Latency of P

- Slack(P) = \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PredL2} \\
(2 \text{ bits})
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{MyL2} \\
(1 \text{ bit})
\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{HopEstimate} \\
(2 \text{ bits})
\end{array}
\]

\textbf{PredL2:} Set if any predecessor packet is servicing L2 miss

\textbf{MyL2:} Set if P is NOT servicing an L2 miss

\textbf{HopEstimate:} Max (# of hops of Predecessors) – hops of P
Estimating Slack Priority

- How to predict L2 hit or miss at core?
  - *Global Branch Predictor* based L2 Miss Predictor
    - Use Pattern History Table and 2-bit saturating counters
  - *Threshold* based L2 Miss Predictor
    - If \#L2 misses in “M” misses \( \geq \) “T” threshold then next load is a L2 miss.

- Number of miss predecessors?
  - List of outstanding L2 Misses

- Hops estimate?
  - Hops \( \Rightarrow \) \( \Delta X + \Delta Y \) distance
  - Use predecessor list to calculate slack hop estimate
Starvation Avoidance

Problem: Starvation
- Prioritizing packets can lead to starvation of lower priority packets

Solution: Time-Based Packet Batching
- New batches are formed at every $T$ cycles
- Packets of older batches are prioritized over younger batches
Putting it all together

- Tag header of the packet with priority bits before injection

Priority (P) =

- Priority(P)?
  - P’s batch
  - P’s Slack
  - Local Round-Robin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Batch</th>
<th>PredL2</th>
<th>MyL2</th>
<th>HopEstimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3 bits)</td>
<td>(2 bits)</td>
<td>(1 bit)</td>
<td>(2 bits)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evaluation Methodology

- 64-core system
  - x86 processor model based on Intel Pentium M
  - 2 GHz processor, 128-entry instruction window
  - 32KB private L1 and 1MB per core shared L2 caches, 32 miss buffers
  - 4GB DRAM, 320 cycle access latency, 4 on-chip DRAM controllers

- Detailed Network-on-Chip model
  - 2-stage routers (with speculation and look ahead routing)
  - Wormhole switching (8 flit data packets)
  - Virtual channel flow control (6 VCs, 5 flit buffer depth)
  - 8x8 Mesh (128 bit bi-directional channels)

- Benchmarks
  - Multiprogrammed scientific, server, desktop workloads (35 applications)
  - 96 workload combinations
Qualitative Comparison

- **Round Robin & Age**
  - Local and application oblivious
  - Age is biased towards heavy applications

- **Globally Synchronized Frames (GSF)**
  [Lee et al., ISCA 2008]
  - Provides *bandwidth fairness* at the expense of *system performance*
  - Penalizes heavy and bursty applications

- **Application-Aware Prioritization Policies (SJF)**
  [Das et al., MICRO 2009]
  - **Shortest-Job-First Principle**
  - Packet scheduling policies which prioritize network sensitive applications which inject lower load
System Performance

- SJF provides 8.9% improvement in weighted speedup
- Aergia improves system throughput by 10.3%
- Aergia+SJF improves system throughput by 16.1%
Network Unfairness

- SJF does not imbalance network fairness
- Aergia improves network unfairness by 1.5X
- SJF+Aergia improves network unfairness by 1.3X
Conclusions & Future Directions

- Packets have different criticality, yet existing packet scheduling policies **treat all packets equally**
- We propose a new approach to packet scheduling in NoCs
  - We define **Slack** as a key measure that characterizes the relative importance of a packet.
  - We propose **Aërgia** a novel architecture to accelerate low slack critical packets
- Result
  - Improves system performance: 16.1%
  - Improves network fairness: 30.8%
Slack-Based Packet Scheduling

  One of the 11 computer architecture papers of 2010 selected as Top Picks by IEEE Micro.

Aérgia: Exploiting Packet Latency Slack in On-Chip Networks

Reetuparna Das§  Onur Mutlu†  Thomas Moscibroda‡  Chita R. Das§
§Pennsylvania State University  †Carnegie Mellon University  ‡Microsoft Research
{rdas,das}@cse.psu.edu  onur@cmu.edu  moscitho@microsoft.com