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Multicore shift has happened (A. Agarwal - Keynote NOCS 2011)
Growing number of cores (W. Tichy - Keynote ICST 2011)

- **Intel 8 cores**
  - ~2.3 Bill. T. on 6.8cm²
- **AMD Opteron 12 cores**
  - ~1.8 Bill. T. on 2x3.46cm²
- **Sun Niagara3 16 cores**
  - ~1 Bill. T. on 3.7cm²
- **Intel SCC 48 cores**
  - ~1.3 Bill. T. on 5.6cm²

- **Intel 4 cores**
  - ~582 Mio. T. on 2.86cm²
- **Intel Research 80 cores**
  - ~100 Mio. T. on 2.75cm²
- **Tilera TILEPro64 64 cores**
  - ~167 Mio. T. on 1.1cm²
- **AMD Opteron 12 cores**
  - ~1.8 Bill. T. on 2x3.46cm²
80 Cores Research Chip

- Teraflops, 62 Watts
- 100 millions transistors, 275 mm²
- 25% node area for router

ASCI Red Supercomputer

- Teraflops (Dec. 1996)
- 10,000 Pentium Pro
- 104 cabinets, 230 m²
It is only the beginning ...
A key component:
the communication fabric or Network-on-Chip (NoC)

• 80 core research chip
  – 25% area for the NoC
  – 30% power consumption for the NoC

• Communication fabrics key
  – to performance and efficiency
  – to functional correctness
Verification challenges

- NoCs are very large systems
  - Verification methods must scale up to 100s of agents
  - Large number of parameters (routing, switching, buffers, etc.)
  - Regular and irregular topologies

- NoCs must be fault-tolerant
  - Deep sub-micron effect
  - Not all routers/processors are working
  - Static and dynamic fault-models

- NoCs have intricate message dependencies
  - Mix between interconnect and protocols
  - e.g. cache coherency or master/slave
  - Deadlocks can emerge from deadlock-free routing and protocols
Networks-on-Chips: Example 1, Hermes

- XY minimal deterministic routing
- Wormhole switching
- Frame structure based on flits (header, control, data)
A simple master/slave protocol

- Masters send requests and wait for responses
- Slaves produce responses when receiving requests
- Deadlock-free protocol
XY routing in a 2D-mesh

- Deterministic simple routing algorithm
- First route to the destination column and then to the correct row
- No cyclic dependencies and thus deadlock-free
All nodes are both masters and slaves

- Is the system deadlock-free?
All nodes are both masters and slaves

- Is the system deadlock-free?
- No! Two nodes are sufficient to create a deadlock.
Masters on even columns and slaves on odd columns

• Is the system deadlock-free?
Masters on even columns and slaves on odd columns

- Is the system deadlock-free?
- No if at least four columns, yes otherwise.

Green request cannot be consumed as it is waiting for the blue request to leave.
All masters on the right and all slaves on the left

• Is the system deadlock-free?
All masters on the right and all slaves on the left

- Is the system deadlock-free?
- Yes! A deadlock would require a response to wait for a request

No dependencies between responses and requests
From deadlock-free components a deadlock emerges!
Networks-on-Chips: Example 2, Spidergon

- Design by STMicroelectronics
- Simple shortest path routing algorithm
- Regular for an even number of nodes
- Packet, circuit, or wormhole switching

RelAd = (dest - current) mod 4 * N

if RelAd = 0 then
  stop
elseif 0 < RelAd <= N then
  go clockwise
elseif 3*N <= RelAd <= 4*N then
  go counter clockwise
else
  go across
endif

Route from 0 to 7? 1 to 6?
The interconnect has deadlocks!

- For instance, we can have a cycle of packets.
The only possible cycle is the ring

- Because routing is across first

6 to 3 route through 2 not 7
Nodes in first quarter are slaves only

• Is the system deadlock-free?
Nodes in first quarter are slaves only

- Is the system deadlock-free?
- Yes! A cycle would require a response going from 0 to 2.
From components with deadlocks a deadlock-free system emerges!
Nodes in first quarter are slaves only

- Is the system deadlock-free?
Nodes in first quarter are slaves only

- Is the system deadlock-free?
- No!
Confusing ...

- We need tools to (quickly) check for deadlocks
  - in large systems
  - with message dependencies
Outline

• Intel's micro-architectural description language
  – xMAS language
  – Capturing high-level structure and message dependencies

• Deadlock verification for xMAS
  – Definition of deadlocks
  – Labelled dependency graph
  – Feasible logically closed subgraph

• Conclusion and future work
Intel's abstraction for communication fabrics

- High-level of abstraction
- Exploit high-level structure

Automatic proofs using invariant generation and hardware model-checking
xMAS - Executable MicroArchitectural Specifications

- Fair sinks and sometimes sources
- Diagram is formal model
- Friendly to microarchitects
Composing modules via channels

- Channels with three signals
  - data, input ready, target ready
- Transfer cycle
  - both input and target are "true"

FIFO of size $k$

```
data
irdy
trdy
```
A simple example

- Two sources
  - both inject responses
Another simple example

- Two message types
  - requests and responses
An academic example - Dining Philosophers

- Philosophers model in xMAS
  - Hands as 2 message types
  - Spoons as queues of size 1
  - "Eat" as join between hands
• Two message types
  – blue and red

• Sorting queues

• Reds and blues synchronized before sink
Processing node for XY routing in a 2D-mesh

L  N  S  E  W

h.x = X  h.y = Y  h.y < Y  h.y > Y  N
h.x ≠ X  h.y ≠ Y  E
h.x > X  h.x < X  W
Processing node with requests and responses
Processing node for Spidergon
Outline
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Formal definition of "deadlock" in xMAS

• Intuition is a "dead" channel

• Formal definition based on Linear Temporal Logic
  – Predicate logic
  – Temporal operators "eventually" (F) and "globally" (G)

• Channel u is dead iff
  – F (u.irdy => G ~u.trdy)
  – Eventually the input is ready and the target is globally (forever) not ready
  – A packet arrives at a channel but will never be able to cross it
A simple example

- Two sources
  - one for requests
  - one for responses

- Is it deadlock-free?
A simple example

- Two sources for responses
- There is a deadlock
  - no cycle
  - no message dependencies
A simple example

- Two sources for responses

- There is a deadlock
  - no cycle
  - no message dependencies
A simple example

- Two sources for responses
- There is a deadlock
  - no cycle
  - no message dependencies
Another simple example

- Two message types
  - requests and responses

- Types at source $x$ without creating a deadlock?
Another simple example - deadlock configuration

- Two message types
  - requests and responses

- Types at source x without creating a deadlock?
  - If x = rsp no deadlock
  - If x = req then requests get blocked in q1
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (1)

- Inject two requests in q0
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (2)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (3)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (3)
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Another simple example - deadlock configuration (3)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (3)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (4)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
- Inject two responses in q0
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (5)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
- Inject two responses in q0
- If x never injects responses, q1 is blocking
Another simple example - deadlock configuration (5)

- Inject two requests in q0
- Fork creates two copies
- One pair is sunk
- Inject two responses in q0
- If x never injects responses, q1 is blocking

We have a deadlock without a circular wait!
General approach for deadlock detection in xMAS networks

• Define deadlock equations for all components
  – Equations capture the reason why a component is idle or blocking

• Build a labelled waiting graph for each queue
  – Labels correspond to the equations
  – Graph captures the topology, i.e., the dependencies between the xMAS components

• Search for a feasible logically closed subgraph
  – Corresponds to a deadlock situation
  – Feasibility checked using Linear Programming

• This approach may output unreachable deadlocks
  – A first step generates invariants to rule out false deadlocks
  – Invariants are rather weak and simple - false deadlocks are in theory still possible
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Idle and blocked channels - searching for deadlocks

- Definition of a deadlock
  - $F(\text{u.irdy} \Rightarrow G\neg\text{u.trdy})$

- Two reasons for a deadlock
  - a blocked channel ($G\neg\text{u.trdy}$)
  - an "idle" channel ($G\neg\text{u.irdy}$)

\[\text{v is blocked} \quad \text{w is idle}\]
Deadlock equations for a channel

- Depends on the target component connected to the channel
- We look at the input port of the target component
Deadlock equations for queues

- Queue blocking when full and blocked message at its head
- We look at the input channel of the queue

\[ \text{Block}(u) = \text{Full}(q) \cdot \text{Block}(v) \]
Deadlock equations for a join

- 2 cases
  - output is blocked
  - the other input is idle

- \( \text{Block}(u) = \text{Idle}(v) + \text{Block}(w) \)
Deadlock equations for a join

- 2 cases
  - output is blocked
  - the other input is idle

- $\text{Block}(u) = \text{Idle}(v) + \text{Block}(w)$

We need to know when a channel is idle!
Idle equations for a channel

- Depends on the **initiator** component connected to the channel
- We are looking at the input port of the initiator
Idle equations for a join

- A join is idle if one of the input channels is idle

- \( \text{Idle}(w) = \text{Idle}(u) + \text{Idle}(v) \)
Idle equations for a fork

- A fork output is idle if the input is idle or the other output is blocked

- \( \text{Idle}(w) = \text{Idle}(u) + \text{Block}(v) \)
Idle equations for a queue

- A queue is idle if it is empty and its input channel is idle
- This is for one message type which might be blocked by another type

- \( \text{Idle}(w) = \text{Empty}(q) \cdot \text{Idle}(u) + \text{Block}(w') \)
  - where \( w' \) is a message with a type different from \( w \)
Our quest for "dead" queues

• Definition of a deadlock
  – F (u.irdy => G¬u.trdy)

• We look for a "dead" queue
  – with a message in it (u.irdy)
  – output blocked (G¬u.trdy)

• Over approximation
  – configuration not always reachable
  – we may output false deadlocks
General approach for deadlock detection in xMAS networks

- Define deadlock equations for all components
  - Equations capture the reason why a component is idle or blocking

- Build a labelled waiting graph for each queue
  - Labels correspond to the equations
  - Graph captures the topology, i.e., the dependencies between the xMAS components

- Search for a feasible logically closed subgraph
  - Corresponds to a deadlock situation
  - Feasibility checked using Linear Programming

- This approach may output unreachable deadlocks
  - A first step generates invariants to rule out false deadlocks
  - Invariants are rather weak and simple - false deadlocks are in theory still possible
Step 1 / simulation - req

queues with req

inject req

requests

responses

req, rsp

q₀

q₁

q₂

req

rsp
Step 1 / simulation - req

injection req

queues with req
Step 1 / simulation - req

inject req

queues with req
Step 1 / simulation - rsp

queues with req and rsp

inject rsp
Step 1 / simulation - rsp

queues with req and rsp

inject rsp
Step 1 / simulation - rsp

Inject rsp

Queues with req and rsp
General approach for deadlock detection in xMAS networks

- Define deadlock equations for all components
  - Equations capture the reason why a component is idle or blocking

- Build a labelled waiting graph for each queue
  - Labels correspond to the equations
  - Graph captures the topology, i.e., the dependencies between the xMAS components

- Search for a feasible logically closed subgraph
  - Corresponds to a deadlock situation
  - Feasibility checked using Linear Programming

- This approach may output unreachable deadlocks
  - A first step generates invariants to rule out false deadlocks
  - Invariants are rather weak and simple - false deadlocks are in theory still possible
Step 2 / labelled dependency graph (1)

start with a message in q1 and visit the join
analyse the join according to its deadlock equation

we go forward to the merge and backward to the switch
**Step 2 / labelled dependency graph (2)**

\[ \text{Block}(u) = \text{Block}(w) \]

Forwards to the switch - then the sink can never be blocked.

We assume fair sinks.
Step 2 / labelled dependency graph (2)

\[ q_{1}.req \geq 1 \]

\[ \text{Idle}(u) = \text{Idle}(w) \]

backwards to the switch
Step 2 / labelled dependency graph (2)

\[ \text{Idle}(u) = \text{Idle}(w) \cdot \text{Empty}(q_2) \]

backwards to the queue

note that we forgot the \text{Block}(w') case
Step 2 / labelled dependency graph (2)

\[
\text{Idle}(w) = \text{Idle}(u) + \text{Idle}(v)
\]

backwards to the merge and branch

note branching is bad for us
Idle(u) = Block(v) + Idle(w)

backwards to the merge and branch
to the source - idle if no type produced
to the fork
Idle(u) = Idle(w) . Empty(q0)

backwards to q0 and the source

src1
false
q0
q0.rsp = 0
frk
src2
q2
q2.rsp = 0
mrg1
mrg2
sink
false
q1
q1.req \geq 1
join
sw
q0
q0.rsp = 0
frk
Block(u) = Block(w) . Full(q1)

forwards back to q1 and stop expansion
General approach for deadlock detection in xMAS networks

• Define deadlock equations for all components
  – Equations capture the reason why a component is idle or blocking

• Build a labelled waiting graph for each queue
  – Labels correspond to the equations
  – Graph captures the topology, i.e., the dependencies between the xMAS components

• Search for a feasible logically closed subgraph
  – Corresponds to a deadlock situation
  – Feasibility checked using Linear Programming

• This approach may output unreachable deadlocks
  – A first step generates invariants to rule out false deadlocks
  – Invariants are rather weak and simple - false deadlocks are in theory still possible
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 1
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 1

req,rsp

q0

q1

q2

rsp

req

requests

responses

src1

false

q0

+ q1 = q1.size

frk

join

mrg2

sink

src2

mrg1

q2

sw

false

q1.req ≥ 1

q2.rsp = 0

q0.rsp = 0

rsp ∉ x
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 1

\[
q_1 \text{req} \geq 1
\]

\[
rsp = 0 \quad \text{(not feasible)}
\]

\[
q_1 = q_1.\text{size}
\]

\[
q_2.\text{rsp} = 0
\]

\[
\text{requests} \quad \frac{0}{0} \quad \text{responses}
\]
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 2

\begin{align*}
q_0 &\geq 1 \\
q_1 &\geq 1 \\
rsp &\in x
\end{align*}
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 2
Step 2 / logically closed subgraph 2

req

src1 q0

src2

feasible if x is req

q1 q2

join

mrg2

sink

frk

mrg1

requests

responses

req,rsp

q0

q1

q2

rsp

req

\(q_0.rsp = 0\)

\(q_1 = q_1.size\)

\(q_1.req \geq 1\)

\(q_2.rsp = 0\)

\(rsp \notin x\)
Implementation and case studies

• Implementation of algorithm in C

• 2 topologies
  – Spidergon from STMicroelectronics
  – HERMES from Univ. Rio Grande (Brazil)
Experimental results
An academic example - Dining Philosophers

- Philosophers model in xMAS
  - Hands as 2 message types
  - Spoons as queues of size 1
  - "Eat" as join between hands

- A ring of philosophers
  - Easy problem for our algorithm
  - 3 000 philos in 0.06s
An example too hard for Intel but not for us!

- Two message types
  - blue and red

- Sorting queues

- Reds and blues synchronized before sink

- Is this network deadlock-free?
An example too hard for Intel but not for us!

- Two message types
  - blue and red
- Sorting queues
- Reds and blues synchronized before sink
- Is this network deadlock-free?
An example too hard for Intel but not for us!

- Two message types
  - blue and red
- Sorting queues
- Reds and blues synchronized before sink
- Is this network deadlock-free?

deadlock-free

ordering for blues and reds
Outline

• Intel's micro-architectural description language
  – xMAS definition
  – examples

• Deadlock verification for xMAS
  – definition of deadlocks
  – labelled dependency graph
  – feasible logically closed subgraph

• Conclusion and future work
Conclusion and future work

- Tool to detect message dependent deadlocks
  - Very efficient
  - Intel's our only concurrent
  - We can already handle more cases than Intel's techniques

- Still need to be formally proven
  - Connection with our previous work on GeNoC

- Composition/Hierarchy
  - Check sub-networks first and then compose

- Memory consistency proofs
  - e.g. Producer Consumer relations
  - Open PhD position sponsored by Intel/Open Universiteit/Radboud
Thanks !
Deadlock example 3

• Channels with three signals
  – data, input ready, target ready

• Transfer cycle
  – both input and target are "true"