MinBD:

Minimally-Buffered Deflection Routing for Energy-Efficient Interconnect

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

> Carnegie Mellon University *CMU and Tsinghua University

SAFARI Carnegie Mellon University

Motivation

 In many-core chips, on-chip interconnect (NoC) consumes significant power

Intel Terascale: ~28% of chip power Intel SCC: ~10% MIT RAW: ~36%

 Recent work¹ uses bufferless deflection routing to reduce power and die area

¹Moscibroda and Mutlu, "A Case for Bufferless Deflection Routing in On-Chip Networks." ISCA 2009.

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.

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

Bufferless Deflection Routing

 Key idea: Packets are never buffered in the network. When two packets contend for the same link, one is deflected.¹



¹Baran, "On Distributed Communication Networks." RAND Tech. Report., 1962 / IEEE Trans.Comm., 1964.

Bufferless Deflection Routing

 Input buffers are eliminated: flits are buffered in pipeline latches and on network links



Deflection Router Microarchitecture



Fallin et al., "CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router", HPCA 2011.

Issues in Bufferless Deflection Routing

- Correctness: Deliver all packets without livelock
 - CHIPPER¹: Golden Packet
 - Globally prioritize one packet until delivered
- Correctness: Reassemble packets without deadlock
 - □ CHIPPER¹: Retransmit-Once
- Performance: Avoid performance degradation at high load

MinBD

¹ Fallin et al., "CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router", HPCA 2011. $^{\circ}$

Key Performance Issues

- Link contention: no buffers to hold traffic → any link contention causes a deflection
 → use side buffers
- 2. Ejection bottleneck: only one flit can eject per router per cycle → simultaneous arrival causes deflection
 → eject up to 2 flits/cycle
- **3. Deflection arbitration**: practical (fast) deflection arbiters deflect unnecessarily

 \rightarrow new priority scheme (silver flit)

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration
- Results
- Conclusions

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

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 \rightarrow high dynamic energy
 - $\hfill\square$ Large buffers necessary \rightarrow 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



¹ Fallin et al., "CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router", HPCA 2011.

How to Buffer Deflected Flits



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)

 \rightarrow 4-flit buffer reduces deflection rate by 39%

 Relative to **buffered routers**, buffer is more efficiently used (need not buffer all flits)

 \rightarrow similar performance with 25% of buffer space

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

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
 - \rightarrow 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



Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck



Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

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

Fast Deflection Routing Implementation

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



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



Minimally-Buffered Deflection Router



Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Motivation

Background: Bufferless Deflection Routing

MinBD: Reducing Deflections

- Addressing Link Contention
- Addressing the Ejection Bottleneck
- Improving Deflection Arbitration

Results

Conclusions

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: CHIPPER¹
- Bufferless-buffered hybrid router: AFC²
 - 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)

¹Fallin et al., "CHIPPER: A Low-complexity Bufferless Deflection Router", HPCA 2011. ²Jafri et al., "Adaptive Flow Control for Robust Performance and Energy", MICRO 2010.

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

Reduced Deflections & Improved Perf.



Overall Performance Results



Within 2.7% of Buffered (4,4) (8.3% at high load)

Overall Power Results


Performance-Power Spectrum



Die Area and Critical Path



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

THANK YOU!

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

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

> Carnegie Mellon University *CMU and Tsinghua University

SAFARI Carnegie Mellon University

BACKUP SLIDES

Correctness: Golden Packet

- The Golden Packet is always prioritized long enough to be delivered (hop latency * (max # hops + serialization delay))
 - "Epoch length": e.g. 4x4: 3 * (7 + 7) = 42 cycles (pick 64 cyc)
- Golden Packet rotates statically through all packet IDs
 □ E.g. 4x4: 16 senders, 16 transactions/sender → 256 choices
- Max latency is GP epoch * # packet IDs
 - □ E.g., 64*256 = 16K cycles
- Flits in Golden Packet are arbitrated by sequence # (total order)

Correctness: Retransmit-Once

- Finite reassembly buffer size may lead to buffer exhaustion
- What if a flit arrives from a new packet and no buffer is free?
- Answer 1: Refuse ejection and deflect \rightarrow deadlock!
- Answer 2: Use large buffers → impractical
- Retransmit-Once (past work): operate opportunistically & assume available buffers
 - □ If no buffer space, drop packet (once) and note its ID
 - Later, reserve buffer space and retransmit (once)
- End-to-end flow control provides correct endpoint operation without in-network backpressure

Correctness: Side Buffer

- Golden Packet ensures delivery as long as flits keep moving
- What if flits get "stuck" in a side buffer?

Answer: **buffer redirection**

- If buffered flit cannot re-inject after C_{threshold} cycles, then:
 1. Force one input flit per cycle into buffer (random choice)
 2. Re-inject buffered flit into resulting empty slot in network
- If a flit is golden, it will never enter a side buffer
- If a flit becomes golden while buffered, redirection will rescue it after C_{threshold} * BufferSize (e.g.: 2 * 4 = 8 cyc)
- Extend Golden epoch to account for this

Why does Side Buffer Alone Lose Perf.?

- Adding a side buffer reduces deflection rate
 Raw network throughput increases
- But ejection is still the system bottleneck
 Ejection rate remains nearly constant
- Side buffers are utilized \rightarrow more traffic in flight
- Hence, latency increases (Little's Law): ~10%

Overall Power Results



MinBD vs. AFC

AFC:

Combines input buffers and deflection routing

- In a given cycle, all link contention is handled by **buffers** or by **deflection** (global router mode)
- Mode-switch is heavyweight (drain input buffers) and takes multiple cycles
- Router has area footprint of buffered + bufferless, but could save power with power-gating (assumed in Jafri et al.)
- Better performance at highest loads (equal to buffered)

MinBD:

- Combines deflection routing with a side buffer
- □ In a given cycle, some flits are buffered, some are deflected
- Smaller router and no mode switching
- But, loses some performance at highest load

Related Work

- **Baran**, 1964
 - Original "hot potato" (deflection) routing
- BLESS (Moscibroda and Mutlu, ISCA 2009)
 - Earlier bufferless deflection router
 - Age-based arbitration \rightarrow slow (did not consider critical path)
- CHIPPER (Fallin et al., HPCA 2011)
 - Assumed baseline for this work
- AFC (Jafri et al., MICRO 2010)
 - Coarse-grained bufferless-buffered hybrid
- SCARAB (Hayenga et al., MICRO 2009), BPS (Gomez+08)
 - Drop-based deflection networks
 - SCARAB: dedicated circuit-switched NACK network