Cache Coherence

• Recall the memory wall
  – In multiprocessors the wall might even be higher!
  – Contention on shared-bus
  – Time to travel through an interconnection network
• In addition to the 3 C’s of the cache hierarchy
  – Cache coherence misses
• Cache coherence protocols
  – Shared-bus: Snoopy protocols
  – Other interconnection schemes: Directory protocols
Cache Coherence: The problem

Initial state: P2 reads A; P3 reads A (note already a decision to make: who sends the value of A?)
Cache coherence (shared-bus)

• Now P2 wants to write A
• Two choices:
  – Broadcast the new value of A on the bus; value of A snooped by
cache of P3: Write-update (or write broadcast) protocol (resembles
write-through). Memory is also updated.
  – Broadcast an invalidation message with the address of A; the
address snooped by cache of P3 which invalidates its copy of A:
Write-invalidate protocols. Note that the copy in memory is not
up-to-date any longer (resembles write-back).
• If instead of P2 wanting to write A, we had a write miss in
P4 for A, the same two choices of protocol apply.
Write-update

P2 and P3 have read line A; P4 has a write miss on an element of line A

A write miss looks like a read miss (bring the old value of A in P4) followed by a write hit and a broadcast of the new value of A
**Write-invalidate**

P2 and P3 have read line A; P4 has a write miss on an element of line A

A write miss looks like a read miss (bring the old value of A in P4) followed by a write hit and an invalidation
Snoopy Cache Coherence Protocols

- Associate states with each cache line; for example:
  - Invalid (I)
  - Shared (S) (or Clean) one or more copies are up to date
  - Modified (M) (or Dirty) exists in only one cache

- Fourth state (and sometimes more) for performance purposes
  - MOESI protocols: E stands for Exclusive and O for Ownership
State Transitions for a Given Cache Line

- Those incurred as answers to processor associated with the cache
  - Read miss, write miss, write on shared line
- Those incurred by snooping on the bus as result of other processor actions, e.g.,
  - Read miss by Q might make P’s line transit from M to S
  - Write miss by Q might make P’s line transit from M or S to I (write invalidate protocol)
Basic Write-invalidate Protocol (write-back write-allocate caches)

• Needs 3 states associated with each cache line
  – Invalid
  – Shared (read only – can be shared)
  – Modified (only valid copy in the system)

• Need to decompose state transitions into those:
  – Induced by the processor attached to the cache
  – Induced by snooping on the bus
Basic 3 State Protocol: Processor Actions

Transitions from Invalid state won’t be shown in forthcoming figures
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Basic 3 State Protocol: Processor Actions

Inv.
Basic 3 State Protocol: Transitions from Bus Snooping

Diagram: A graph showing transitions between three states: Inv., Modified, and Shared. Transitions include:
- Bus write from Inv. to Modified
- Bus read from Modified to Shared
- Bus write from Shared to Inv.
Snoopy protocol implementation

- Simple 3-state fsm?
- Yes but
  - Many more “internal states” because of write buffers, lock-up free caches, prefetching, split-transaction bus etc.
  - Example: split-transaction bus. Caches A and B have line L in state I and cache C has it in state S. Both A and B want to write L at the same time.
  - Split-transaction means for A and B (in this case) “Request to read” and for C “Data transfer” But the 2 “Request for read” should not arrive at C before the “Data transfer”. Need for intermediate states
An Example of Write-invalidate Protocol: the Illinois Protocol

- **States:**
  - Invalid
  - (Valid)Exclusive (clean, only copy)
  - Shared (clean, possibly other copies)
  - Modified (modified, only copy)
  - In the MOESI notation, a **MESI** protocol
Illinois Protocol: Design Decisions

• The Exclusive state is there to enhance performance
  – On a write to a line in E state, no need to send an invalidation message (occurs often for private variables).

• On a read miss with no cache having the line in Modified state
  – Who sends the data: memory or cache (if any)?
    • Answer: cache for that particular protocol; other protocols might use the memory
  – If more than one cache, which one?
    • Answer: the first to grab the bus (tri-state devices)
Illinois Protocol: State Diagram

- **Proc. induced**
- **Bus induced**

**I**
- Read miss from mem.
- Write hit
- Read/Write Hit
- Bus write miss
- Read hit

**M**
- Write miss
- Bus read miss
- Write hit
- Read hit

**S**
- Read miss from cache
- Bus write miss

**E**
- Read hit
- Bus read miss
- Read hit and bus read miss
Example: P2 reads A (A only in memory)
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Example: P3 reads A (A comes from P2)
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Example: P4 writes A (A comes from P2)

P2 and P3 will have A in state I; P4 will be in state M.
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Cache Parameters for Multiprocessors

- In addition to the 3 C’s types of misses, add a 4th C: coherence misses
- As cache sizes increase, the misses due to the 3 C’s decrease but coherence misses increase
- Shared data has been shown to have less spatial locality than private data; hence large line sizes could be detrimental
- Large line sizes induce more false sharing
  - P1 writes the first part of line A; P2 writes the second part. From the coherence protocol viewpoint, both look like “write A”
Performance of Snoopy Protocols

- Protocol performance depends on the length of a write run.
- Write run: sequence of write references by 1 processor to a shared address (or shared line) uninterrupted by either access by another processor or replacement.
  - Long write runs better to have write invalidate.
  - Short write runs better to have write update.
- There have been proposals to make the choice between protocols at run time.
  - Competitive algorithms.
What About Cache Hierarchies?

- Implement snoopy protocol at L2 (board-level) cache
- Impose multilevel inclusion property
  - Encode in L2 whether the line (or part of it if lines in L2 are longer than lines in L1) is in L1 (1 bit/line or subblock)
  - Disrupt L1 on bus transactions from other processors only if data is there, i.e., L2 shields L1 from unnecessary checks
  - Total inclusion might be expensive (need for large associativity) if several L1’s share a common L2 (like in clusters). Instead use partial inclusion (i.e., possibility of slightly over invalidating L1)
Cache Coherence in NUMA Machines

- Snooping is not possible on media other than bus/ring
- Broadcast / multicast is not that easy
  - In Multistage Interconnection Networks (MINs), potential for message blocking is very large
  - In mesh-like networks, broadcast to every node is very inefficient
- How to enforce cache coherence
  - Having no caches (Tera MTA)
  - By software: disallow/limit caching of shared variables (Cray 3TD)
  - By hardware: having a data structure (a directory) that records the state of each line
Information Needed for Cache Coherence

• What information should the directory contain
  – At the very least whether a line is cached or not
  – Whether the cache copy – or copies – is shared (clean) or modified

• Where are the copies of the line
  – Directory structure associated with the line in memory
  – Linked list of all copies in the caches, including the one in memory
Full Directory

- Full information associated with each line in memory
- Entry in the directory: state vector associated with the line
  - For an \( n \) processor system, an \((n+1)\) bit vector
  - Bit 0, clean/dirty
  - Bits 1-n: “location” vector; Bit \( i \) set if \( i \)th cache has a copy
  - Protocol is write-invalidate
- Memory overhead:
  - For a 64 processor system, 65 bits / block
  - If a block is 64 bytes, overhead = \( 65 / (64 * 8) \), i.e., over 10%
  - This data structure is not scalable (but see later)
Home Node

- Definition
  - **Home node**: the node that contains the initial value of the line as determined by its physical address
  - Home node contains the directory entry for a line
  - **Remote node**: any other node

- On a cache miss (read and write), the request for data will be sent to the home node

- If a line has to be evicted from a cache, and it is dirty, its value should be written back in the home node
Basic protocol

- Assume write-back, write-allocate caches with a clean/dirty bit per line
- Read hit: Do nothing
- Write hit on dirty line: Do nothing
Basic Protocol – Read Miss on Uncached/clean Line

- Cache $i$ has a **read miss on an uncached line** (state vector full of 0’s)
  - The home node responds with the data
  - Add entry in directory (set clean and $i$th bit)
- Cache $i$ has a **read miss on a clean line** (clean bit on in directory; at least one of the other bits on)
  - The home node responds with the data
  - Add entry in directory (set $i$th bit)
Basic Protocol – Read Miss on Dirty Line

- Cache $i$ has a **read miss on a dirty line**
  - If dirty line is in home node, say node $j$ (dirty and $j$th bits on) home node:
    - Updates memory (write back from its own cache $j$)
    - Changes the line encoding (dirty -> clean and set $i$th bit);
    - Sends data to cache $i$ (1-hop)
  - If dirty line is not in home node but is in cache $k$ (dirty and $k$th bits on) then the home node:
    - Asks cache $k$ to send the line and updates memory
    - Change entry in directory (dirty -> clean and set $i$th bit);
    - Sends the data (2-hops)
Basic Protocol – Write Miss on Uncached/clean Block

• Cache $i$ has a write miss on an uncached line (state vector full of 0’s)
  – The home node responds with the data
  – Add entry in directory (set dirty and $i$th bits)

• Cache $i$ has a write miss on a clean line (clean bit on; at least one of the other bits on)
  – Home node sends an invalidate message to all caches whose bits are on in the state vector (this is a series of messages)
  – The home node responds with the data
  – Change entry in directory (clean -> dirty and set $i$th bit)

• Note: the memory is not up-to-date
Basic Protocol – Write Miss on Dirty Block

- Cache $i$ has a write miss on a dirty line
  - If dirty line is in home node, say node $j$ (dirty and $j$th bits on) home node:
    - Updates memory (write back from its own cache $j$)
    - Changes the line encoding (clear $j$th bit and set $i$th bit);
    - Sends data to cache $i$ (1-hop)
  - If dirty line is not in home node but is in cache $k$ (dirty and $k$th bits on), then the home node:
    - Asks cache $k$ to send the line and updates memory
    - Change entry in directory (clear $k$th bit and set $i$th bit);
    - Sends the data (2-hops)
Basic Protocol – Request to Write a Clean Block

- Cache $i$ wants to write one of its lines which is clean
  - Known because clean/dirty bits also exist in the cache metadata
  - Perform as in write miss on a clean block except that the memory does not have to send the data
Basic Protocol - Replacing a Line

• What happens when a line is replaced
  – If dirty, it is of course written back and its state becomes a vector of 0’s
  – If clean could either “do nothing” but then encoding is wrong leading to possibly unneeded invalidations (and acks) or could send message and modify state vector accordingly (reset corresponding bit)
  – Acks are necessary to ensure correctness mostly if messages can be delivered out of order
The Most Economical (Memory-wise) Protocol

• Recall the minimal number of states needed
  – Not cached anywhere (i.e., valid in home memory)
  – Cached in one or more caches but not modified (clean)
  – Cached in one cache and modified (dirty)

• Simply encode the states (2-bit protocol) and perform broadcast invalidations (expensive because most often the data is not shared by many processors)

• Fourth state to enhance performance, say exclusive (E):
  – Cached in one cache only and still clean: no need to broadcast invalidations on a request for that cache to write its clean line. The cache metadata must include an Exclusive state also (set on reading a line that is not cached anywhere)
2-bit Protocol

• Differences with full directory protocol
  – Of course no bit setting in “location” vector
  – On a read miss to uncached line go to state exclusive (in directory and in cache)
  – On “request to write a clean line” from a cache that has the line in exclusive state, if the line is still in exclusive state in the directory, no need to broadcast invalidations
  – On a read miss to an exclusive line, change state to clean
  – On a write miss to clean and to exclusive line from another cache and read/write miss to dirty line, need to send a broadcast invalidate signal to all processors; in the case of dirty, the one with the copy of the line will send it back along with its ack.
Need for Partial Directories

• Full directory not scalable.
  – Location vector depends on number of processors
  – Might become too much memory overhead
• 2-bit protocol invalidations are costly
• Observation: Sharing is often limited to a small number of processors
  – Instead of full directory, have room for a limited number of processor id’s.
Examples of Partial Directories

- **Coarse bit-vector**
  - Share a “location” bit among 2 or 4 or 8 processors etc.
  - Advantage: scalable since fixed amount of memory/line

- **Dynamic pointer** *(many variations)*
  - Directory for a block has 1 bit for local cache, one or more fields for a limited number of other caches, and possibly a pointer to a linked list in memory for overflow.
  - Need to “reclaim” pointers on clean replacements and/or to invalidate blindly if there is overflow
  - Protocols are Dir\textsubscript{i}B (i pointers and broadcast) or Dir\textsubscript{i}NB (i pointers and No Broadcast, i.e., forced invalidations)
Directories in the Cache -- The SCI Approach

• Copies of lines residing in various caches are linked via a doubly linked list
  – Doubly linked so that it is easy to insert/delete
• Header in the line’s home node memory
  – Insertions “between” home node and new cache
• Economical in memory space
  – Proportional to cache space rather than memory space
• Invalidations can be lengthy (list traversal)
A Caveat about Cache Coherence Protocols

• They are more complex in the details than they look!
• Snoopy protocols
  – Writes are not atomic (first detect write miss and send request on the bus; then get line and write data -- only then should the line become dirty)
  – The cache controller must implement “pending states” for situations which would allow more than one cache to write data in a line, or replace a dirty line, i.e., write in memory
  – Things become more complex for split-transaction buses
  – Things become even more complex for lock-up free caches (but it’s manageable)
Subtleties in Directory Protocols

- No transaction is atomic.
- If they were treated as atomic, deadlock could occur
  - Assume line A from home node X is dirty in P1
  - Assume line B from home node Y is dirty in P2
  - P1 reads miss on B and P2 reads miss on A
  - Home node Y generates a “purge” for B in P2 and Home node X generates a “purge” for A in P1
  - Both P1 and P2 wait for their read misses and cannot answer the home node purges hence deadlock.
- So assume non-atomicity of transactions and allow only one in-flight transaction per line (nack any other while one is in progress)
Problems with Buffering

- Directory and cache controllers might have to send/receive many messages at the same time
  - Protocols must take into account finite amount of buffers
  - This leads to possibility of deadlocks
  - This is even more important for 2-bit protocol with lots of broadcasts
  - Solutions involve one or more of the following
    - separate networks for requests and replies so that requests don’t block replies which free buffer space
    - each request reserves buffer room for its reply
    - use of nacks and of retries