



Unified Diagnosis and Reconfiguration for Frugal Bypass of NoC Faults

Ritesh Parikh and Valeria Bertacco

MICRO-46, December 7-11, Davis, CA



Permanent Faults in NoCs

- Permanent wear-out
- Device aging

NoCs: significant silicon footprint and heavy activity

Detection → **Diagnosis** → **Reconfiguration** → **Recovery**

- Detection:** Detect if fault has occurred
- Diagnosis:** Diagnose where fault has occurred
- Reconfiguration:** Reconfigure network to account for fault
 - cannot send on faulty path
 - need to re-route around fault
- Recovery:** Recover and resume normal operation

uDIREC solves two problems:

- Fault diagnosis at a fine resolution
- Reconfiguration to find new routes

1

Unified Diagnosis and Reconfiguration

Diagnosis

- Entire regions/routers
- One or more bidirectional links
- End-to-end scheme in SW
- Based on analyzing faulty routes
- Passive and fine-grained

Reconfiguration

- Based on routing on irregular networks
- Constrained by number and location of faults
- Based on a novel routing algorithm
- Tightly integrated with the diagnosis scheme
- Unconstrained by number and location of faults

Faulty irregular network with deadlock-free routes

Past Work

- Entire regions/routers
- One or more bidirectional links
- End-to-end scheme in SW
- Based on analyzing faulty routes
- Passive and fine-grained

uDIREC

- Based on routing on irregular networks
- Constrained by number and location of faults
- Based on a novel routing algorithm
- Tightly integrated with the diagnosis scheme
- Unconstrained by number and location of faults

– Dedicated testing is not required → no overhead in absence of errors

– Unified implementation in software → low area overhead

2

Fine-Resolution Fault Diagnosis

Differentiable vs **Undifferentiable**

Finest granularity of diagnosis and reconfiguration

96% faults localized to a single datapath segment, or a unidirectional link

fault manifestation coarse-grain fault model fine-grain fault model

Growing Trees Concurrently

up-tree and down-tree can be constructed:

- independently:** may lead to inconsistent marking
- concurrently:** consistent labeling guaranteed by construction

expand trees beyond a node only if reachable by both up-tree and down-tree

root choice: node 0 vs root choice: node 1

choice of root node affects connectivity

6

Routing in Irregular Networks

- Routing algorithm should disable paths that lead to deadlock
- Up*/down* routing disables turns to avoid deadlock

- Construct **spanning tree** rooted at a node (assumes bidirectional links)
- Mark links towards root: **up** (down otherwise)
- Disable all **down**→**up** turns
- Follow **up** links towards root and **down** links to destination

Up*/down* does not work with unidirectional links

4

Routing with Unidirectional Links

- Separate spanning trees for **up** (up-tree) and **down** (down-tree) links
- Up-tree:** unidirectional links towards root
- Down-tree:** unidirectional links away from root
- Consistent ordering/labeling:** no link marked both up and down

– As links are marked according to up*/down* principle (and no conflicts)

- uDIREC routing is **deadlock free** (disable down→up turns)
- Network is **connected** if both trees are complete

5

Reconfiguration Algorithm

- Exhaustive search of the optimal root node
- Based on critical functionality or number of connected nodes

root trial #1: node 1 is root (local winner!)

root trial #2: node 2 is root (local winner!)

root trial #6: node 6 is root (local winner!)

root trial #8: node 6 is root

Low-overhead distribution of routing tables

Serial transfer of control and data

Supervisor node

7

Reliability Results

1/3rd dropped nodes

2x less partitioning

– As faults accumulate networks become disconnected

– uDIREC loses fewer nodes and partitions into fewer networks

8

Performance Results

7% lower latency

>20% higher throughput

– Initially latency degrades gracefully; at higher fault rates up*/down* drops much more nodes, hence lower latency

– uDIREC consistently delivers higher throughput

9