CMSC 611: Advanced Computer Architecture

Distributed & Shared Memory

Centralized Shared Memory MIMD

Processors share a single centralized memory through a bus interconnect

- Feasible for small processor count to limit memory contention
- Caches serve to:
	- Increase bandwidth versus bus/memory
	- Reduce latency of access
	- Valuable for both private data and shared data
	- Access to shared data is optimized by replication
		- Decreases latency
		- Increases memory bandwidth
		- Reduces contention
		- Replication introduces the problem of cache coherence

Cache Coherency

A cache coherence problem arises when the cache reflects a view of memory which is different from reality

A memory system is coherent if:

- P reads X, P writes X, no other processor writes X, P reads X
	- Always returns value written by P
- P reads X, Q writes X, P reads X
	- Returns value written by Q (provided sufficient W/R separation)
- P writes X, Q writes X
	- Seen in the same order by all processors

Potential HW Coherency Solutions

Snooping Solution (Snoopy Bus)

- Send all requests for data to all processors
- Processors snoop to see if they have a copy and respond accordingly
- Requires broadcast, since caching information is at processors
- Works well with bus (natural broadcast medium)
- Dominates for small scale machines (most of the market)

Directory-Based Schemes

- Keep track of what is being shared in one centralized place
- Distributed memory \Rightarrow distributed directory for scalability (avoids bottlenecks)
- Send point-to-point requests to processors via network
- Scales better than Snooping
- Actually existed before Snooping-based schemes

Basic Snooping Protocols

Write Invalidate Protocol:

- Write to shared data: an *invalidate* is sent to all caches which snoop and invalidate any copies
- Cache invalidation will force a cache miss when accessing the modified shared item
- For multiple writers only one will win the race ensuring serialization of the write operations
- Read Miss:
	- Write-through: memory is always up-to-date
	- Write-back: snoop in caches to find most recent copy

* Slide is partially a courtesy of Dave Patterson

Basic Snooping Protocols

Write Broadcast (Update) Protocol (typically write through):

- Write to shared data: broadcast on bus, processors snoop, and update any copies
- To limit impact on bandwidth, track data sharing to avoid unnecessary broadcast of written data that is not shared
- Read miss: memory is always up-to-date
- Write serialization: bus serializes requests!

* Slide is partially a courtesy of Dave Patterson

Invalidate vs. Update

Write-invalidate has emerged as the winner for the vast majority of designs Qualitative Performance Differences :

- Spatial locality
	- WI: 1 transaction/cache block;
	- WU: 1 broadcast/word

• Latency

- WU: lower write–read latency
- WI: must reload new value to cache

Invalidate vs. Update

Because the bus and memory bandwidth is usually in demand, write-invalidate protocols are very popular

Write-update can causes problems for some memory consistency models, reducing the potential performance gain it could bring

The high demand for bandwidth in writeupdate limits its scalability for large number of processors

An Example Snoopy Protocol

Invalidation protocol, write-back cache

Each block of memory is in one state:

- Clean in all caches and up-to-date in memory (Shared)
- OR Dirty in exactly one cache (Exclusive)
- OR Not in any caches

Each cache block is in one state (track these):

- Shared : block can be read
- OR Exclusive : cache has only copy, it is write-able, and dirty
- OR Invalid : block contains no data

Read misses: cause all caches to snoop bus

Writes to clean line are treated as misses

Snoopy-Cache Controller

Complications

- Cannot update cache until bus is obtained
- Two step process:
	- Arbitrate for bus
	- Place miss on bus and complete operation
- Split transaction bus:
	- Bus transaction is not atomic
	- Multiple misses can interleave, allowing two caches to grab block in the Exclusive state
	- **Must track and prevent** multiple misses for one block

Assumes memory blocks A1 and A2 map to same cache block, initial cache state is invalid

Distributed Directory Multiprocessors

Directory per cache that tracks state of every block in every cache

- Which caches have a copy of block, dirty vs. clean, ...
- Info per memory block vs. per cache block?
	- PLUS: In memory => simpler protocol (centralized/one location)
- MINUS: In memory \Rightarrow directory is f (memory size) vs. f (cache size) To prevent directory from being a bottleneck, distribute directory entries with memory, each keeping track of which processor have copies of their blocks

Directory Protocol

Similar to Snoopy Protocol: Three states

- Shared: Multiple processors have the block cached and the contents of the block in memory (as well as all caches) is up-todate
- Uncached No processor has a copy of the block (not valid in any cache)
- Exclusive: Only one processor (owner) has the block cached and the contents of the block in memory is out-to-date (the block is dirty)

In addition to cache state, must track which processors have data when in the shared state

• usually bit vector, 1 if processor has copy

Directory Protocol

Keep it simple(r):

- Writes to non-exclusive data => write miss
- Processor blocks until access completes
- Assume messages received and acted upon in order sent Terms: typically 3 processors involved
- Local node where a request originates
- Home node where the memory location of an address resides
- Remote node has a copy of a cache block, whether exclusive or shared

No bus and do not want to broadcast:

- interconnect no longer single arbitration point
- all messages have explicit responses

Example Directory Protocol

Message sent to directory causes two actions:

- Update the directory
- More messages to satisfy request

We assume operations atomic, but they are not; reality is much harder; must avoid deadlock when run out of buffers in network

Directory Protocol Messages

Cache Controller State

Directory Controller State Machine

Same states and structure as the transition diagram for an individual cache

- Actions:
	- update of directory state
	- send messages to satisfy requests
- Tracks all copies of each memory block
	- Sharers set implementation can use a bit vector of a size of # processors for each block

Assumes memory blocks A1 and A2 map to same cache block

* Slide is a courtesy of Dave Patterson

Assumes memory blocks A1 and A2 map to same cache block

* Slide is a courtesy of Dave Patterson

Assumes memory blocks A1 and A2 map to same cache block

* Slide is a courtesy of Dave Patterson

Assumes memory blocks A1 and A2 map to same cache block

* Slide is a courtesy of Dave Patterson