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Abstract

While scalable coherence has been extensively studied in the context of general purpose chip multiprocessors (CMPs), GPU architectures present a new set of challenges. Introducing conventional directory protocols adds unnecessary coherence traffic overhead to existing GPU applications. Moreover, these protocols increase the verification complexity of the GPU memory system. Recent research, Library Cache Coherence (LCC) [34, 54], explored the use of time-based approaches in CMP coherence protocols.

This paper describes a time-based coherence framework for GPUs, called Temporal Coherence (TC), that exploits globally synchronized counters in single-chip systems to develop a streamlined GPU coherence protocol. Synchronized counters enable all coherence transitions, such as invalidation of cache blocks, to happen synchronously, eliminating all coherence traffic and protocol races. We present an implementation of TC, called TC-Weak, which eliminates LCC’s trade-off between stalling stores and increasing L1 miss rates to improve performance and reduce interconnect traffic.

By providing coherent L1 caches, TC-Weak improves the performance of GPU applications with inter-workgroup communication by 85% over disabling the non-coherent L1 caches in the baseline GPU. We also find that write-through protocols outperform a writeback protocol on a GPU as the latter suffers from increased traffic due to unnecessary refills of write-once data.

1 Introduction

Graphics processor units (GPUs) have become ubiquitous in high-throughput, general purpose computing. C-based programming interfaces like OpenCL [29] and NVIDIA CUDA [46] ease GPU programming by abstracting away the SIMD hardware and providing the illusion of independent scalar threads executing in parallel. Traditionally limited to regular parallelism, recent studies [21, 41] have shown that even highly irregular algorithms can attain significant speedups on a GPU. Furthermore, the inclusion of a multi-level cache hierarchy in recent GPUs [6, 44] frees the programmer from the burden of software managed caches and further increases the GPU’s attractiveness as a platform for accelerating applications with irregular memory access patterns [22, 40].

GPUs lack cache coherence and require disabling of private caches if an application requires memory operations to be visible across all cores [6, 44, 45]. General-purpose chip multiprocessors (CMPs) regularly employ hardware cache coherence [17, 30, 32, 50] to enforce strict memory consistency models. These consistency models form the basis of memory models for high-level languages [10, 35] and provide the synchronization primitives employed by multi-threaded CPU applications. Coherence greatly simplifies supporting well-defined consistency and memory models for high-level languages on GPUs. It also helps enable a unified address space in heterogeneous architectures with single-chip CPU-GPU integration [11, 26]. This paper focuses on coherence in the realm of GPU cores; we leave CPU-GPU cache coherence as future work.

Disabling L1 caches trivially provides coherence at the
cost of application performance. Figure 1(a) shows the potential improvement in performance for a set of GPU applications (described in Section 7) that contain inter-workgroup communication and require coherent L1 caches for correctness. Compared to disabling L1 caches (NO-L1), an ideally coherent GPU (IDEAL-COH), where coherence traffic does not incur any latency or traffic costs, improves performance of these applications by 88% on average.

GPUs present three main challenges for coherence. Figure 1(b) depicts the first of these challenges by comparing the interconnect traffic of the baseline non-coherent GPU system (NO-COH) to three GPU systems with cache coherence protocols: writeback MESI, inclusive write-through GPU-VI and non-inclusive write-through GPU-VIni (described in Section 4). These protocols introduce unnecessary coherence traffic overheads for GPU applications containing data that does not require coherence.

Second, on a GPU, CPU-like worst case sizing [18] would require an impractical amount of storage for tracking thousands of in-flight coherence requests. Third, existing coherence protocols introduce complexity in the form of transient states and additional message classes. They require additional virtual networks [58] on GPU interconnects to ensure forward progress, and as a result increase power consumption. The challenge of tracking a large number of sharers [28, 64] is not a problem for current GPUs as they contain only tens of cores.

In this paper, we propose using a time-based coherence framework for minimizing the overheads of GPU coherence without introducing significant design complexity. Traditional coherence protocols rely on explicit messages to inform others when an address needs to be invalidated. We describe a time-based coherence framework, called Temporal Coherence (TC), which uses synchronized counters to self-invalidate cache blocks and maintain coherence invariants without explicit messages. Existing hardware implementations synchronize across components [23, Section 17.12.1] to provide efficient timer services. Leveraging these counters allows TC to eliminate coherence traffic, lower area overheads, and reduce protocol complexity for GPU coherence. TC requires prediction of cache block lifetimes for self-invalidation.

Shim et al. [34, 54] recently proposed a time-based hardware coherence protocol, Library Cache Coherence (LCC), that implements sequential consistency on CMPs by stalling writes to cache blocks until they have been self-invalidated by all sharers. We describe one implementation of the TC framework, called TC-Strong, that is similar to LCC. Section 8.3 shows that TC-Strong performs poorly on a GPU. Our second implementation of the TC framework, called TC-Weak, uses a novel timestamp-based memory fence mechanism to eliminate stalling of writes. TC-Weak uses timestamps to drive all consistency operations. It implements Release Consistency [19], enabling full support of C++ and Java memory models [58] on GPUs.

Figure 2 shows the high-level operation of TC-Strong and TC-Weak. Two cores, C2 and C3, have addresses A and B cached in their private L1, respectively. In TC-Strong, C1’s write to A stalls completion until C2 self-invalidates its locally cached copy of A. Similarly, C1’s write to B stalls completion until C3 self-invalidates its copy of B. In TC-Weak, C1’s writes to A and B do not stall waiting for other copies to be self-invalidated. Instead, the fence operation ensures that all previously written addresses have been self-invalidated in other local caches. This ensures that all previous writes from this core will be globally visible after the fence completes.

The contributions of this paper are:

- It discusses the challenges of introducing existing coherence protocols to GPUs. We introduce two optimizations to a VI protocol [30] to make it more suitable for GPUs.
- It provides detailed complexity and performance evaluations of inclusive and non-inclusive directory protocols on a GPU.
- It describes Temporal Coherence, a GPU coherence framework for exploiting synchronous counters in single-chip systems to eliminate coherence traffic and protocol races.
- It proposes the TC-Weak coherence protocol which employs timestamp based memory fences to implement Release Consistency [19] on a GPU.
- It proposes a simple lifetime predictor for TC-Weak that performs well across a range of GPU applications.

Our experiments show that TC-Weak with a simple lifetime predictor improves performance of a set of GPU applications with inter-workgroup communication by 85% over the baseline non-coherent GPU. On average, it performs as well as the VI protocols and 23% faster than MESI across all our benchmarks. Furthermore, for a set of GPU applications with intra-workgroup communication, it reduces the traffic overheads of MESI, GPU-VI and GPU-VIni by 56%, 23% and 22%, while reducing interconnect energy usage by
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Time-based self-invalidation does not require explicit events; the block will be invalid for the next access.
40%, 12% and 12%. Compared to TC-Strong, TC-Weak performs 28% faster with 26% lower interconnect traffic across all applications.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses related work, Section 3 reviews GPU architectures and cache coherence, Section 4 describes the directory protocols, and Section 5 describes the challenges of GPU coherence. Section 6 details the implementations of TC-Strong and TC-Weak, Sections 7 and 8 present our methodology and results, and Section 9 concludes.

## 2 Related Work

The use of timestamps has been explored in software coherence [42, 63]. Nandy et al. [43] first considered timestamps for hardware coherence. Library Cache Coherence (LCC) [34, 54] is a time-based hardware coherence proposal that stores timestamps in a directory structure and delays stores to unexpired blocks to enforce sequential consistency on CMPs. The TC-Strong implementation of the TC framework is similar to LCC as both enforce write atomicity by stalling writes at the shared last level cache. Unlike LCC, TC-Strong supports multiple outstanding writes from a core and implements a relaxed consistency model. TC-Strong includes optimizations to eliminate stalls due to private writes and L2 evictions. Despite these changes, we find that the stalling of writes in TC-Strong causes poor performance on a GPU. We propose TC-Weak and a novel time-based memory fence mechanism to eliminate all write-stalling, improve performance, and reduce interconnect traffic compared to TC-Strong. We also show that unlike for CPU applications [34, 54], the fixed timestamp prediction proposed by LCC is not suited for GPU applications. We propose a simple yet effective lifetime predictor that can accommodate a range of GPU applications. Lastly, we present a full description of our proposed protocol, including state transition tables that describe the implementation in detail.

Self invalidation of blocks in a private cache has also been previously explored in the context of cache coherence. Dynamic Self-Invalidation (DSI) [33] reduces critical path latency due to invalidation by speculatively self-invalidating blocks in private caches before the next exclusive request for the block is received. In the sequentially consistent implementation, DSI requires explicit messages to the directory at self-invalidation and would not alleviate the traffic problem on a GPU. In its relaxed consistency implementation, DSI can reduce traffic through the use of tear-off blocks, which are self-invalidated at synchronization points. Recently, Ros et al. [48] proposed extending tear-off blocks to all cache blocks to eliminate coherence directories entirely, reducing implementation complexity and traffic for CPU coherence. Their protocol requires self-invalidation of all shared data at synchronization points. Synchronization events, however, are much more frequent on a GPU.

Figure 3. Baseline non-coherent GPU Architecture.

Thousands of scalar threads share a single L1 cache and would cause frequent self-invalidations. Their protocol also requires blocking and buffering atomic operations at the last level cache. GPUs support thousands of concurrent atomic operations; buffering these would be very expensive.

Denovo [16] simplifies the coherence directory but uses a restrictive programming model that requires user annotated code. TC-Weak does not change the GPU programming model. Recent coherence proposals [28, 51, 64] simplify tracking sharer state for 1000s of cores. GPUs have tens of cores; exact sharer representation is not an issue.

## 3 Background

This section describes the memory system and cache hierarchy of the baseline non-coherent GPU architecture, similar to NVIDIA’s Fermi [44], that we evaluate in this paper. Cache coherence is also briefly discussed.

### 3.1 Baseline GPU Architecture

Figure 3 shows the organization of our baseline non-coherent GPU architecture. An OpenCL [29] or CUDA [46] application begins execution on a CPU and launches compute kernels onto a GPU. Each kernel launches a hierarchy of threads (an NDRange of work groups of wavefronts of work items/scalar threads) onto a GPU. Each workgroup is assigned to a heavily multi-threaded GPU core. Scalar threads are managed as a SIMD execution group consisting of 32 threads called a warp (NVIDIA terminology) or wavefront (AMD terminology).

**GPU Memory System.** A GPU kernel commonly accesses the local, thread-private and global memory spaces. Software managed local memory is used for intra-workgroup communication. Thread-private memory is private to each thread while the global memory is shared across all threads on a GPU. Both thread-private and global memory are stored in off-chip GDDR DRAM and cached in the multi-level cache hierarchy, however only global memory requires coherence. The off-chip DRAM memory is divided among a number of memory partitions that connect to the GPU cores through an interconnection network. Memory accesses to the same cache block from different threads
within a wavefront are merged into a single wide access by the Coalescing Unit. A memory instruction generates one memory access for every unique cache line accessed by the wavefront. All requests are handled in FIFO order by the in-order memory stage of a GPU core. Writes to the same word by multiple scalar threads in a single wavefront do not have a defined behaviour [46]; only one write will succeed. In this paper, from the memory consistency model's perspective, a GPU wavefront is similar to a CPU thread.

**GPU Cache Hierarchy.** The GPU cache hierarchy consists of per-core private L1 data caches and a shared L2 cache. Each memory partition houses a single bank of the L2 cache. The L1 caches are not coherent. They follow a write-evict [46] (write-purge [24]), write-no-allocate caching policy. The L2 caches are writeback with write-allocate. Memory accesses generated by the coalescing unit in each GPU core are passed, one per cycle, to the per-core MSHR table. The MSHR table combines read accesses to the same cache line from different wavefronts to ensure only a single read access per-cache line per-GPU core is outstanding. Writes are not combined and, since they write-through, any number of write requests to the same cache line from a GPU core may be outstanding. Point-to-point ordering in the interconnection network, L2 cache controllers and off-chip DRAM channels ensures that multiple outstanding writes from the same wavefront to the same address complete in program order. All cache controllers service one memory request per cycle in order. Misses at the L2 are handled by allocating an MSHR entry and removing the request from the request queue to prevent stalling.

**Atomic Operation.** Read-modify-write atomic operations are performed at each memory partition by an Atomic Operation Unit. In our model, the Atomic Operation Unit can perform a read-modify-write operation on a line resident in the L2 cache in a single cycle.

### 3.2 Consistency and Coherence

A cache coherence protocol performs the following three duties [3]. It propagates newly written values to all privately cached copies. It informs the writing thread or processor when a write has been completed and is visible to all threads and processors. Lastly, a coherence protocol may ensure write atomicity [3], i.e., a value from a write is logically seen by all threads at once. Write atomicity is commonly enforced in write-invalidate coherence protocols by requiring that all other copies of a cache block are invalidated before a write is completed. Memory consistency models may [4, 19, 57, 59] or may not [2, 19, 53] require write atomicity.

### 4 Directory Protocols

This section describes the MESI and GPU-VI directory protocols that we compare against in this paper. All of MESI, GPU-VI and GPU-VIni require a coherence directory to track the L1 sharers. MESI and GPU-VI enforce inclusion through invalidation (recall) of all L1 copies of a cache line upon L2 evictions. Inclusion allows the sharer list to be stored with the L2 tags. GPU-VIni is non-inclusive and requires separate on-chip storage for a directory.

#### 4.1 MESI

MESI is a four-state coherence protocol with writeback L1 and L2 caches. It contains optimizations to eliminate the point-to-point ordering requirement of the non-coherent GPU interconnect and cache controllers. Instead, MESI relies on five physical or virtual networks to support five different message classes to prevent protocol deadlocks. MESI implements complex cache controllers capable of selecting serviceable requests from a pool of pending requests. The write-allocate policy at L1 requires that write data be buffered until proper coherence permission has been obtained. This requires the addition of area and complexity to buffer stores in each GPU core.

#### 4.2 GPU-VI

GPU-VI is a two-state coherence protocol inspired by the write-through protocol in Niagara [30]. GPU-VI implements write-through, no write-allocate L1 caches. It requires that any write completing at the L2 invalidate all L1 copies. A write to a shared cache line cannot complete until the L2 controller has sent invalidation requests and received acknowledgments from all sharers.

GPU-VI adds two optimizations to a conventional VI protocol [60]. First, it writes data directly to the L1 cache on a write hit before receiving an acknowledgment, eliminating the area and complexity overheads of buffering stores. Second, it treats loads to L1 blocks with pending writes as misses. This reduces stalling at the cache controller while maintaining write atomicity. GPU-VI requires 4 physical or virtual networks to guarantee deadlock-free execution.

#### 4.3 GPU-VIni

The non-inclusive GPU-VIni decouples the directory storage in GPU-VI from the L2 cache to allow independent scaling of the directory size. It adds additional complexity to manage the states introduced by a separate directory structure. The same cache controller in GPU-VIni manages the directory and the L2 cache. Eviction from the L2 cache does not generate recall requests, however eviction from the directory requires recall. GPU-VIni implements an 8-way associative directory with twice the number of entries as the number of total private cache blocks (R=2 as in the framework proposed by Martin et al. [39]). Section 8.5 presents data for GPU-VIni with larger directory sizes.

### 5 Challenges of GPU Coherence

This section describes the main challenges of introducing conventional coherence protocols to GPUs.
Traditional coherence protocols introduce unnecessary traffic overheads to existing GPU applications that are designed for non-coherent GPU architectures. These overheads consist of recall traffic due to directory evictions, false sharing invalidation traffic, and invalidation traffic due to inter-kernel communication. Recall traffic becomes especially problematic for inclusive protocols on GPUs because the shared GPU L2 cache size matches the aggregate private L1 cache size [6, 44]. An inclusive cache hierarchy is an attractive [7] choice for low-complexity coherence implementations. Moreover, large directories required to reduce recall traffic [39] in non-inclusive protocols take valuable space from the GPU L2 cache.

An effective way to reduce coherence traffic is to selectively disable coherence for data regions that do not require it. Kelm et al. [27] proposed a hybrid coherence protocol to disable hardware coherence for regions of data. It requires additional hardware support and code modifications to allow data to migrate between coherence domains. Section 6.3 explains how TC-Weak uses timestamps to enforce coherence at cache line granularity without requiring any code modifications to identify coherent and non-coherent data.

### 5.2 Storage Requirements

With only tens of threads per core, CPU coherence implementations can dedicate enough on-chip storage resources to buffer the worst case number of coherence requests [18]. GPUs, however, execute tens of thousands of scalar threads in parallel. In a GPU-like coherence implementation [18] with enough storage to handle the worst case number of memory accesses (one memory request per thread), a directory protocol would require an impractical on-chip buffer as large as 28% of the total GPU L2 cache for tracking coherence requests. Reducing the worst-case storage overhead requires throttling the network via back-pressure flow-control mechanisms when the end-point queues fill up [37]. TC-Weak eliminates coherence messages and the storage cost of buffering them.

### 5.3 Protocol Complexity

Table 1 lists the number of states in the protocols we evaluate. We term stable states as states conventionally associated with a coherence protocol, for example, Modified, Exclusive, Shared and Invalid for the MESI protocol. Stable states are intermediate states occurring between stable states. Specifically, transient cache states are states associated with regular cache operations, such as maintaining the state of a cache block while a read miss is serviced. Transient cache states are present in a coherence protocol as well as the non-coherent architecture. Transient coherent states are additional states needed by the coherence protocol. An example is a state indicating that the given block is waiting for invalidation acknowledgments. Coherence protocol verification is a significant challenge that grows with the number of states [16], a problem referred to as state space explosion [47]. As shown in Table 1, MESI, GPU-VIni and GPU-VI add 13, 9 and 4 transient coherent states over the baseline non-coherent caches, increasing verification complexity. TC-Weak requires only a single transient state in the L1 and L2. Message based coherence protocols require additional virtual networks [58] or deadlock detection mechanisms [31] to ensure forward progress. As shown in Table 4, MESI requires 3 additional, and GPU-VI and GPU-VI require 2 additional virtual networks over the baseline GPU. The additional virtual networks prevent deadlocks when circular resource dependencies, introduced by coherence messages, arise. Since TC-Weak eliminates coherence messages, additional virtual networks are not necessary.

### 6 Temporal Coherence

This section presents Temporal Coherence (TC), a timestamp-based cache coherence framework designed to address the needs of high-throughput GPU architectures. Like LCC, TC uses time-based self-invalidation to eliminate coherence traffic. Unlike LCC, which implements sequential consistency for CMPs, TC provides a relaxed memory model [58] for GPU applications. TC requires fewer modifications to GPU hardware and enables greater memory level parallelism. Section 6.1 describes time-based coherence. Section 6.2 describes TC-Strong and compares it to LCC. Section 6.3 describes TC-Weak, a novel TC protocol that uses time to drive both coherence and consistency operations.

#### 6.1 Time and Coherence

In essence, the task of an invalidation-based coherence protocol is to communicate among a set of nodes the beginnings and ends of a memory location’s epochs [58]. Time-based coherence uses the insight that single chip systems can implement synchronized counters [23, Section 17.12.1] to enable low cost transfer of coherence information. Specifically, if the lifetime of a memory address’ current epoch can be predicted and shared among all readers when the location is read, then these counters allow the readers to self-invalidate synchronously, eliminating the need for end-of-epoch invalidation messages.

Figure 4 compares the handling of invalidations between the GPU-VI directory protocol and TC. The figure depicts a
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Type</th>
<th>Non-Coh.</th>
<th>GPU-VI</th>
<th>GPU-Vln</th>
<th>MESI</th>
<th>TC-Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 Cache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient cache</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total L1 States</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 Cache</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Cache</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total L2 States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 1. Number of protocol states.
read by processors C1 and C2, followed by a store from C1, all to the same memory location. Figure 4(a) shows the sequence of events that occur for the write-through GPU-VI directory protocol. C1 issues a load request to the directory (①), and receives data. C2 issues a load request (②) and receives the data as well. C1 then issues a store request (③). The directory, which stores an exact list of sharers, sees that C2 needs to be invalidated before the write can complete and sends an invalidation request to C2 (④). C2 receives the invalidation request, invalidates the block in its private cache, and sends an acknowledgment back (⑤). The directory receives the invalidation acknowledgment from C2 (⑥), completes C1’s store request, and sends C1 an acknowledgment (⑦).

Figure 4(b) shows how TC handles the invalidation for this example. When C1 issues a load request to the L2, it predicts that the read-only epoch for this address will end at time T=15 (⑧). The L2 receives C1’s load request and epoch lifetime prediction, records it, and replies with the data and timestamp of T=15 (⑨). The timestamp indicates to C1 that it must self-invalidate this address in its private cache by T=15. When C2 issues a load request, it predicts the epoch to end at time T=20 (⑩). The L2 receives C2’s request, checks the timestamp stored for this address and extends it to T=20 to accommodate C2’s request, and replies with the data and a timestamp of T=20 (⑪). At time T=15 (⑫), C1’s private cache self-invalidates the local copy of the address. At time T=20 (⑬), C2 self-invalidates its local copy. When C1 issues a store request to the L2 (⑭), the L2 finds the global timestamp (T=20) to be less than the current time (T=25) indicating that no L1’s contain a valid copy of this address. The L2 completes the write instantly and sends an acknowledgment to C1 (⑮).

Figure 5. Hardware extensions for TC-Weak. (a) GPU cores and memory partitions with synchronized counters. A GWCT table added to each GPU core. (b) L1 and L2 cache lines with timestamp field.

Compared to GPU-VI, TC does not use invalidation messages. Globally synchronized counters allow the L2 to make coherence decisions locally and without indirection. This example shows how a TC framework can achieve our desired goals for GPU coherence; all coherence traffic has been eliminated and, since there are no invalidation messages, the transient states recording the state of outstanding invalidation requests are no longer necessary. Lifetime prediction is important in time-based coherence as it affects cache utilization and application performance. Section 6.4 describes our simple predictor for TC-Weak that adjusts the requested lifetime based on application behaviour.

6.2 TC-Strong Coherence

TC-Strong implements release consistency with write atomicity [19]. It uses write-through L1’s and a writeback L2. TC-Strong requires synchronized timestamp counters at the GPU cores and L2 controllers shown in Figure 5(a) to provide the components with the current system time. A small timestamp field is added to each cache line in the L1 and L2 caches, as shown in Figure 5(b). The local timestamp value in the L1 cache line indicates the time until the particular cache line is valid. An L1 cache line with a local timestamp less than the current system time is invalid. The global timestamp value in the L2 indicates a time by when all L1 caches will have self-invalidated this cache line.

6.2.1 TC-Strong Operation

Every load request checks both the tag and the local timestamp of the L1 line. It treats a valid tag match but an expired local timestamp as a miss; self-invalidating an L1 block does not require explicit events. A load miss at the L1 generates a request to the L2 with a lifetime prediction. The L2 controller updates the global timestamp to the maximum of the current global timestamp and the requested local timestamp to accommodate the amount of time requested. The L2 responds to the L1 with the data and the global timestamp. The L1 updates its data and local timestamp with values in the response message before completing the load. A store request writes through to the L2 where its completion is delayed until the global timestamp has expired.
The fence instruction 
Fence waiting for pending requests (both) 
Fence waiting for GWCT (TC-Weak)

Figure 6. TC coherence. (a) Code snippet from [58]. (b) Sequence of events for C1 (left) that occur due to code in (a) and state of C2’s blocks (right) for TC-Strong. (c) Sequence of events with TC-Weak.

Figure 6(b) illustrates how TC-Strong maintains coherence. The code snippet shown in Figure 6(a) is an example from Sorin et al. [58] and represents a common programming idiom used to implement non-blocking queues in pipeline parallel applications [20]. Figure 6(b) shows the memory requests generated by core C1 on the left, and the state of the two memory locations, flag and data, in C2’s L1 on the right. Initially, C2 has flag and data cached with local timestamps of 60 and 30, respectively. For simplicity, we assume that C2’s operations are delayed.

C1 executes instruction S1 and generates a write request to L2 for data (1), and subsequently issues the memory fence instruction F1 (2). F1 defers scheduling the wavefront because the wavefront has an outstanding store request. When S1’s store request reaches the L2 (3), the L2 stalls it because data’s global timestamp will not expire until time T=30. At T=30, C2 self-invalidate data (4), and the L2 processes S1’s store (5). The fence instruction completes when C1 receives the acknowledgment for S1’s request (6). The same sequence of events occurs for the store to flag by S2. The L2 stalls S2’s write request (7) until flag self-invalidate in C2 (8).

L2 Eviction Optimization. Evictions at the write-through L1s do not generate messages to the L2. Only expired global timestamps can be evicted from the L2 to maintain inclusion. TC-Strong uses L2 MSHR entries to store unexpired timestamps.

Private Write Optimization. TC-Strong implements an optimization to eliminate write-stalling for private data. It differentiates the single valid L2 state into two stable states, P and S. The P state indicates private data while the S state indicates shared data. An L2 line read only once exists in P. Writes to L2 lines in P are private writes if they are from the core that originally performed the read. In TC-Strong, store requests carry the local timestamp at the L1, if it exists, to the L2. This timestamp is matched to the global timestamp at the L2 to check that the core that originally performed the read is performing a private write.

6.2.2 TC-Strong and LCC comparison

Both LCC and TC-Strong use time-based self-invalidation and require synchronized counters and timestamps in L1 and L2. Both protocols stall writes at the last level cache to unexpired timestamps.

TC-Strong requires minimal hardware modifications to the baseline non-coherent GPU architecture. It supports multiple outstanding write requests per GPU wavefront. In contrast, LCC assumes only one outstanding write request per core. By relaxing the memory model and utilizing the point-to-point ordering guarantee of the baseline GPU memory system, TC-Strong provides much greater memory level parallelism for the thousands of concurrent scalar threads per GPU core.

LCC stalls evictions of unexpired L2 blocks. TC-Strong removes this stall by allocating an L2 MSHR entry to store the unexpired timestamp. This reduces expensive stalling of the in-order GPU L2 cache controllers. LCC also penalizes private read-write data by stalling writes to private data until the global timestamp expires. The private write optimization in TC-Strong detects and eliminates these stalls.

6.3 TC-Weak Coherence

This section describes TC-Weak. TC-Weak relaxes the write atomicity of TC-Strong. As we show in Section 8.3, doing so improves performance by 28% and lowers interconnect traffic by 26% compared to TC-Strong.

TC-Strong and LCC enforce coherence across all data by stalling writes. TC-Weak uses the insight that GPU applications may contain large amounts of data which does not require coherence and is unnecessarily penalized by write-stalling. By relaxing write-atomicity, TC-Weak eliminates write-stalling and shifts any potential stalling to explicit
memory fence operations. This provides two main benefits. First, it eliminates expensive stalling at the shared L2 cache controllers, which affects all cores and wavefronts, and shifts it to scheduling of individual wavefronts at memory fences. A wavefront descheduled due to a memory fence does not affect the performance of other wavefronts. Second, it enforces coherence only when required and specified by the program through memory fences. It implements the RCp [19] consistency model; a detailed discussion on this is available elsewhere [56].

In TC-Weak, writes to unexpired global timestamps at the L2 do not stall. The write response returns with the global timestamp of the L2 cache line at the time of the write. The returned global timestamp is the guaranteed time including a memory fence operation. This provides two main benefits. First, it eliminates expensive stalling at the shared L2 cache controllers, which affects all cores and wavefronts, and shifts it to scheduling of individual wavefronts at memory fences. A wavefront descheduled due to a memory fence does not affect the performance of other wavefronts. Second, it enforces coherence only when required and specified by the program through memory fences. It implements the RCp [19] consistency model; a detailed discussion on this is available elsewhere [56].

In TC-Weak, writes to unexpired global timestamps at the L2 do not stall. The write response returns with the global timestamp of the L2 cache line at the time of the write. The returned global timestamp is the guaranteed time including a memory fence operation. This provides two main benefits. First, it eliminates expensive stalling at the shared L2 cache controllers, which affects all cores and wavefronts, and shifts it to scheduling of individual wavefronts at memory fences. A wavefront descheduled due to a memory fence does not affect the performance of other wavefronts. Second, it enforces coherence only when required and specified by the program through memory fences. It implements the RCp [19] consistency model; a detailed discussion on this is available elsewhere [56].

6.3.1 TC-Weak Operation

A memory fence in TC-Weak deschedules a wavefront until all pending write requests from the wavefront have returned acknowledgments, and until the wavefront’s timestamp in the GWCT table has expired. The latter ensures that all previous writes have become visible to the system by fence completion.

Figure 6(c) illustrates how coherence is maintained in TC-Weak by showing the execution of C1’s memory instructions from Figure 6(a). C1 executes S1 and sends a store request to the L2 for data (1). Subsequently, C1 issues a memory fence operation (2) that defers scheduling of the wavefront because S1 has an outstanding memory request. The L2 receives the store request (3) and returns the current global timestamp stored in the L2 for data. In this case, the value returned is 30 and corresponds to C2’s initially cached copy. The L2 does not stall the write and sends back an acknowledgment with the GWCT, which updates the C1’s GWCT entry for this wavefront. After C1 receives the acknowledgment (4), no memory requests are outstanding. The scheduling of the wavefront is now deferred because the GWCT entry of this wavefront containing a timestamp of 30 has not yet expired. As data self-invalidates in C2’s cache (5), the wavefront’s GWCT expires and the fence is allowed to complete (6). The next store instruction, S2, sends a store request (7) to the L2 for flag. The L2 returns a GWCT time of 60 (8), corresponding to the copy cached by C2.

![Table 2. Complete TC-Weak Protocol (Left: L1 FSM, Right: L2 FSM). Shaded regions indicate additions to non-coherent protocol.](image-url)
Comparing Figure 6(c) to 6(b) shows that TC-Weak performs better than TC-Strong because it only stalls at explicit memory fence operations. This ensures that writes to data that does not require coherence has minimal impact.

Table 2 presents TC-Weak’s complete L1 and L2 state machines in the format used by Martin [36]. Each table entry lists the actions carried out and the final cache line state for a given transition (top) and an initial cache line state (left). The 4 stable L2 states, I, P, S and E, correspond to invalid lines, lines with one reader, lines with multiple readers, and lines with expired global timestamps, respectively. The \( LS \) and \( LM \) L2 transient cache states track misses at the L2 for read and write requests. The \( MJ \) transient coherent state tracks evicted L2 blocks with unexpired global timestamps. Note the lack of transient states and stalling at the L2 for writes to valid (P, S and E) lines. At the L1, the stable I state indicates invalid lines or lines with expired local timestamps, and the stable V state indicates valid local timestamps. The \( LV \) and \( LJ \) transient cache states are used to track read and write misses, while the \( VM \) transient coherent state tracks write requests to valid lines.

**Private Write Optimization.** To ensure that memory fences are not stalled by writes to private data, TC-Weak uses a private write optimization similar to the one employed by TC-Strong and described in Section 6.2.1. Write requests to L2 lines in the P state where the L1 local timestamp matches the L2 global timestamp indicate private writes and do not return a GWCT. Since TC-Weak does not stall writes at the L2, an L2 line in P may correspond to multiple unexpired but stale L1 lines. Writes in TC-Weak always modify the global timestamp by incrementing it by one. This ensures that a write request from another L1 cache with stale data carries a local timestamp that mismatches with the global timestamp at the L2, and that the write response replies with the updated data.

### 6.4 Lifetime Prediction

Predicted lifetimes should not be too short that L1 blocks are self-invalidated too early, and not too long that storing evicted timestamps wastes L2 cache resources and potentially introduces resource stalls. In Section 8.4 we show that a single lifetime value for all accesses performs well. Moreover, this value is application dependent. Based on this insight, we propose a simple lifetime predictor that maintains a single lifetime prediction value at each L2 cache bank, and adjusts it based on application behaviour. A load obtains its lifetime prediction at the L2 bank.

The predictor updates the predicted lifetime based on events local to the L2 bank. First, the local prediction is decreased by \( t_{\text{evict}} \) cycles if an L2 block with an unexpired timestamp is evicted. This reduces the number of timestamps that need to be stored past an L2 eviction. Second, the local prediction is increased by \( t_{\text{hit}} \) cycles if a load request misses at the L1 due to an expired L1 block. This helps reduce L1 misses due to early self-invalidation. The lifetime is also increased by \( t_{\text{hit}} \) cycles if the L2 receives a load request to a valid block with an expired global timestamp. This ensures that the prediction is increased even if L1 blocks are quickly evicted. Third, the lifetime is decreased by \( t_{\text{write}} \) cycles if a store operation writes to an unexpired block at the L2. This helps reduce the amount of time that fence operations wait for the GWCT to expire, \( t_{\text{write}} \), for writes to become globally visible. This third mechanism is disabled for applications not using fences as it would unnecessarily increase the L1 miss rate. Table 4 lists the constant values used in our evaluation; we found these to yield the best performance across all applications.

### 6.5 Timestamp Rollover

L1 blocks in the valid state but with expired timestamps may become unexpired when the global time counters rollover. This could be handled by simply flash invalidating the valid bits in the L1 cache [52]. More sophisticated approaches are possible, but beyond the scope of this work. None of the benchmarks we evaluate execute long enough to trigger an L1 flush with 32-bit timestamps.

### 7 Methodology

We model a cache coherent GPU architecture by extending GPGPU-Sim version 3.1.2 [8] with the Ruby memory system model from GEMS [38]. The baseline non-coherent memory system and all coherence protocols are implemented in SLICC. The MESI cache coherence protocol is acquired from gem5 [9]. Our GPGPU-Sim extended with Ruby is configured to model a generic NVIDIA Fermi GPU [44]. We use Orion 2.0 [25] to estimate the interconnect power consumption.

The interconnection network is modelled using the detailed fixed-pipelined network model in Garnet [5]. Two crossbars, one per direction, connect the GPU cores to the memory partitions. Each crossbar can transfer one 32-byte flit per interconnect cycle to/from each memory partition for a peak bandwidth of \( \sim 175\text{GB/s} \) per direction. GPU cores connect to the interconnection network through private ports. The baseline non-coherent and all coherence protocols use the detailed GDDR5 DRAM model from GPGPU-Sim. Minimum L2 latency of 340 cycles and minimum DRAM latency of 460 cycles (in core cycles) is modelled to match the latencies observed on Fermi GPU hardware via microbenchmarks released by Wong et al. [62]. Table 4 lists other major configuration parameters.

We used two sets of benchmarks for evaluation: one set contains inter-workgroup communication and requires coherent caches for correctness, and the other only contains intra-workgroup communication. While coherence can be disabled for the latter set, we kept coherence enabled and used this set as a proxy for future workloads which contain
both data needing coherence and data not needing it. The following benchmarks fall into the former set:

**Barnes Hut (BH)** implements the Barnes Hut n-body algorithm in CUDA [13]. We report data for the tree-building kernel which iteratively builds an octree of 30000 bodies.

**CudaCuts (CC)** implements the maxflow/mincut algorithm for image segmentation in CUDA [61]. We optimized CC by utilizing a coherent memory space to combine the push, pull and relabel operations into a single kernel, improving performance by 30% as a result.

**Cloth Physics (CL)** is a cloth physics simulation based on “RopaDemo” [12]. We focus on the Distance Solver kernel which adjusts cloth particle locations using a set of constraints to model a spring-mass system.

**Dynamic Load Balancing (DLB)** implements task-stealing in CUDA [14]. It uses non-blocking task queues to load balance the partitioning of an octree. We report data for an input graph size of 100000 nodes.

**Stencil (STN)** uses stencil computation to implement a finite difference solver for 3D wave propagation useful in seismic imaging. Each workgroup processes a subset of the stencil nodes. Each node in the stencil communicates with 24 adjacent neighbours. A coherent memory space ensures that updates to neighbours in a different subset are visible. STN uses fast barriers [55] to synchronize workgroups between computational time steps.

### Table 3. Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-workgroup communication</th>
<th>Intra-workgroup communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Hut [13]</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CudaCuts [61]</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Physics [12]</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Load Balancing [14]</td>
<td>DLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stencil (Wave Propagation)</td>
<td>SNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile Place and Route</td>
<td>VPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-workgroup communication</th>
<th>Intra-workgroup communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes Hut [13]</td>
<td>BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CudaCuts [61]</td>
<td>CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth Physics [12]</td>
<td>CL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Load Balancing [14]</td>
<td>DLB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stencil (Wave Propagation)</td>
<td>SNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile Place and Route</td>
<td>VPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Simulation Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPUGSim Core Model</th>
<th>GPU/GPU-Sim Core Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># GPU Cores</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnect</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Channels</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rough Memory Model**

| L1 Private Data      | 128KB, 8-way, 128B line, 128 MSHRs |
| L2 Shared Bank       | 128KB, 8-way, 128B line, 128 MSHRs |
| # Mem. Partitions    | 8                       |
| Interconnect         | 32 bytes clock          |
| Virtual Channels     | 32 bytes buffer per VC   |

**Cloth Physics (CL)** is a cloth physics simulation based on “RopaDemo” [12]. We focus on the Distance Solver kernel which adjusts cloth particle locations using a set of constraints to model a spring-mass system.

**Dynamic Load Balancing (DLB)** implements task-stealing in CUDA [14]. It uses non-blocking task queues to load balance the partitioning of an octree. We report data for an input graph size of 100000 nodes.

**Stencil (STN)** uses stencil computation to implement a finite difference solver for 3D wave propagation useful in seismic imaging. Each workgroup processes a subset of the stencil nodes. Each node in the stencil communicates with 24 adjacent neighbours. A coherent memory space ensures that updates to neighbours in a different subset are visible. STN uses fast barriers [55] to synchronize workgroups between computational time steps.

### 8 Results

This section compares the performance of the coherence protocols on a GPU. Section 8.3 compares TC-Weak to TC-Strong. TCW implements TC-Weak with the lifetime predictor described in Section 6.4.

**8.1 Performance and Interconnect Traffic**

Figure 7(a) compares the performance of coherence protocols against a baseline GPU with L1 caches disabled (NO-L1) for applications with inter-workgroup communication. Figure 7(b) compares them against the non-coherent baseline protocol with L1 caches enabled (NO-COH) for applications with intra-workgroup communication. TCW achieves a harmonic mean 85% performance improvement over the baseline GPU for applications with inter-workgroup communication. While all protocols achieve similar average performance for applications with inter-workgroup communication, MESI performs significantly worse compared to the write-through protocols on applications without such communication. This is a result of MESI’s L1 writeback write-allocate policy which favours write locality but introduces unnecessary traffic for write-once access patterns common in GPU applications. The potentially larger effective cache capacity in non-inclusive GPU-VI adds no performance benefit over the inclusive GPU-VI. In DLB, each workgroup fetches and inserts tasks...
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8.2 Power

GPU-VIni for this set of applications. TCW removes all invalidations. The write-through GPU-VI and GPU-VIni introduce unnecessary refills of write-once data. On average, MESI increases interconnect traffic by 75% across all applications. The write-through GPU-VI and GPU-VIni introduce unnecessary invalidation and recall traffic, averaging to a traffic overhead of 31% and 30% for applications without inter-workgroup communication. TCW removes all invalidations and recalls and as a result reduces interconnect traffic by 56% over MESI, 23% over GPU-VI and 23% over GPU-VIni for this set of applications.

8.3 TC-Weak vs. TC-Strong

Figures 10(a) and 10(b) compare the harmonic mean speedup and average interconnect traffic, respectively, across all applications for TC-Strong and TC-Weak. TCW-FIXED has the same predictor as TCS but outperforms it by 15% while reducing traffic by 13%. TCW-FIXED uses TC-Weak and a fixed lifetime of 800 core cycles, which was found to be best performing over other values. TCW-FIXED uses TC-Weak and a fixed lifetime of 3200 core cycles, which was found to be best performing over other values. TCW implements TC-Weak with the proposed predictor, as before.

TCW-FIXED has the same predictor as TCS but outperforms it by 15% while reducing traffic by 13%. TCW achieves a 28% improvement in performance over TCS and reduces interconnect traffic by 26%. TC-Strong has a trade-off between additional write stalls with higher lifetimes and additional L1 misses with lower lifetimes. TC-Weak avoids this trade-off by not stalling writes. This permits longer lifetimes and fewer L1 misses, improving performance and reducing traffic over TC-Strong.
Speedup vs. NO-L1

Figure 11. Speedup with different fixed lifetimes for TCW-FIXED. ↓ indicates average lifetime observed on TCW.

8.4 TC-Weak Performance Profile

Figure 11 presents the performance of TC-Weak with various fixed lifetime prediction values for the entire duration of the application. The downward arrows in Figure 11 indicate the average lifetime predictions in TCW. An increase in performance with increasing lifetimes results from an improved L1 hit rate. A decrease in performance with larger lifetimes is a result of stalling fences and L2 resource stalls induced by storage of evicted but unexpired timestamps. Note that in DLB, TCW-FIXED with a lifetime of 0 is 3x faster than NO-L1 because use of L1 MSHRs in TCW-FIXED reduces load requests by 50% by merging redundant requests across wavefronts. The performance profile yields two main observations. First, each application prefers a different fixed lifetime. For example, NDL’s streaming access pattern benefits from a short lifetime, or an effectively disabled L1. Conversely, HSP prefers a large lifetime to fully utilize the L1 cache. Second, the arrows indicating TCW’s average lifetime lie close to the peak performance lifetimes for each application. Hence, our simple predictor can effectively locate the best fixed lifetime for each benchmark for these applications.

8.5 Directory Size Scaling

Figures 12(a) and 12(b) compare the performance and traffic of TCW to GPU-VIni with directories ranging from 8-way associative and 2x the number of entries as total L1 blocks (VIni-2x-8w) to 32-ways and 16x the number of L1 blocks (VIni-16x-32w). In Figure 12(a), directory size and associativity have no impact on performance of GPU applications. In Figure 12(b), while high associativity and large directory sizes reduce the coherence traffic overheads in intra-workgroup communication, they cannot eliminate them. Figure 12(c) shows the breakdown in RG’s traffic for these directory configurations. As the directory size is increased from 2x to 16x, the reduction in recall traffic is offset by the increase in invalidation traffic due to inter-kernel communication. Hence, while larger directories may reduce recall traffic, the coherence traffic cost of true communication cannot be eliminated. TCW is able to eliminate both sources of coherence traffic overheads by using synchronized time to facilitate communication.

9 Conclusion

This paper presents and addresses the set of challenges introduced by GPU cache coherence. We find that conventional coherence implementations are not well suited for GPUs. The management of transient state for thousands of in-flight memory accesses adds hardware and complexity overhead. Coherence adds unnecessary traffic overheads to existing GPU applications. Accelerating applications with both coherent and non-coherent data requires that the latter introduce minimal coherence overheads.

We present Temporal Coherence, a timestamp based coherence framework that reduces overheads of GPU coherence. We propose an implementation of this framework, TC-Weak, which uses novel timestamp based memory fences to reduce these overheads.

Our evaluation shows that TC-Weak with a simple lifetime predictor reduces the traffic of MESI, GPU-VI and GPU-VIni directory coherence protocols by 56%, 23% and 22% across a set of applications without coherent data. Against TC-Strong, a TC protocol based on LCC, TC-Weak performs 28% faster with 26% lower interconnect traffic. It also provides a 85% speedup over disabling the non-coherent L1’s for a set of applications that require coherent caches. A TC-Weak-enhanced GPU provides programmers with a well understood memory consistency model and simplifies the development of irregular GPU applications.
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