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DARK2 in a nutshell

1. Memory Systems (caches, VM, DRAM, microbenchmarks, ...)
2. Multiprocessors (TLP, coherence, interconnects, scalability, clusters, ...)
3. CPUs (pipelines, ILP, scheduling, Superscalars, VLIWs, embedded, ...)
4. Future: (physical limitations, TLP+ILP in the CPU,...)

Overview

- How it all started
- Options for ISA design
- A “Nörd” joke or two
- Pipelines and compiler optimizations
- Speculations and o-o-o
- VLIW

How it all started...the fossils

- ENIAC J.P. Eckert and J. Mauchly, Univ. of Pennsylvania, WW2
  - Electro Numeric Integrator And Calculator, 18,000 vacuum tubes
- EDVAC, J. V Neumann, operational 1952
  - Electric Discrete Variable Automatic Computer (stored programs)
- EDSAC, M.Wilkes, Cambridge University, 1949
  - Electric Delay Storage Automatic Calculator
- Mark-I... H. Aiken, Harvard, WW2, Electro-mechanic
- K. Zuse, Germany, electromech. computer, special purpose, WW2
- BARK, KTH, Gösta Neovius, Electro-mechanic early 50s
- BESK, KTH, Erik Stemme (now at Chalmers) early 50s
- SMIL, LTH mid 50s
How do you tell a good idea from a bad

The Book: The performance-centric approach
- CPI = #execution-cycles / #instructions executed (~ISA goodness – lower is better)
- CPI * cycle time → performance
- CPI = CPI\textsubscript{CPU} + CPI\textsubscript{Mem}

The book rarely covers other design tradeoffs
- The feature centric approach...
- The cost-centric approach...
- Energy-centric approach...
- Verification-centric approach...

The Book: Quantitative methodology
Make design decisions based on execution statistics.
Select workloads (programs representative for usage)
Instruction mix measurements: statistics of relative usage of different components in an ISA

Experimental methodologies
- Profiling through tracing
- ISA simulators

Two guiding stars -- the RISC approach:
Make the common case fast
- Simulate and profile anticipated execution
- Make cost-functions for features
- Optimize for overall end result (end performance)

Watch out for Amdahl's law
- Speedup = \frac{\text{Execution\_time}_{OLD}}{\text{Execution\_time}_{NEW}}
- \left[1-\text{Fraction \_ENHANCED}\right] + \frac{\text{Fraction \_ENHANCED}}{\text{Speedup \_ENHANCED}}

Instruction Set Architecture (ISA) -- the interface between software and hardware.

Tradeoffs between many options:
- functionality for OS and compiler
- wish for many addressing modes
- compact instruction representation
- format compatible with the memory system of choice
- desire to last for many generations
- bridging the semantic gap (old desire...)
- RISC: the biggest “customer” is the compiler
ISA trends today

- CPU families built around “Instruction Set Architectures” ISA
- Many incarnations of the same ISA
- ISAs lasting longer (~10 years)
- Consolidation in the market - fewer ISAs (not for embedded…)
- 15 years ago ISAs were driven by academia
- Today ISAs technically do not matter all that much (market-driven)
- How many of you will ever design an ISA?
- How many ISAs will be designed in Sweden?

Classification of ISAs

- ISAs are classified with respect to:
  - Operand model
  - Number of operands for each instruction
  - Addressing modes permitted
  - Operations provided in the instruction set
  - Type and size of operands

ISAs versus compilers

Rules of thumb when designing an ISA:
- Regularity (operations, data types and addressing modes should be orthogonal)
- Provide primitives, not high-level constructs. Complex instructions are often too specialized.

Compiler Organization

Machine-independent Translation

Procedure in-lining
Loop transformation
Register Allocation
Common sub-expressions
Instruction selection
constant folding
Compilers – a moving target!
The impact of compiler optimizations

- Compiler optimizations affect the number of instructions as well as the distribution of executed instructions (the instruction mix).

Memory allocation model also has a huge impact

- **Stack**
  - local variables in activation record
  - addressing relative to stack pointer
  - stack pointer modified on call/return

- **Global data area**
  - large constants
  - global static structures

- **Heap**
  - dynamic objects
  - often accessed through pointers

Operand models

Example: \( C := A + B \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stack</th>
<th>Accumulator</th>
<th>Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>PUSH [A]</code></td>
<td><code>LOAD [A]</code></td>
<td><code>LOAD R1,[A]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>PUSH [B]</code></td>
<td><code>ADD [B]</code></td>
<td><code>ADD R1,[B]</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>ADD</code></td>
<td><code>STORE [C]</code></td>
<td><code>STORE [C],R1</code></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>POP</code></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Execution in a CPU

"Machine Code" --- CPU --- "Data"
Stack-based machine
Example: $C := A + B$

Mem:

- PUSH [A]
- PUSH [B]
- ADD
- POP [C]

Mem:

- PUSH [A]
- PUSH [B]
- ADD
- POP [C]
### Stack-based machine

**Example:** $C := A + B$

Mem:

- **PUSH [A]**
- **PUSH [B]**
- **ADD**
- **POP [C]**

---

### Accumulator-based

- Implicit operands
- Compact code format (1 instr. = 1 byte)
- Simple to implement
- Not optimal for speed!!!
Register-based machine

Example: C := A + B

Data:

A: 12
B: 14
C: 26

LD R1, [A]
LD R7, [B]
ADD R2, R1, R7
ST R2, [C]

REGISTER-BASED

Commercial success:
- X86,
- RISCs (Alpha, SPARC, HP-PA...)
- VLIW (IA64, ...)

Explicit operands (i.e., "registers")
Wasteful instr. format (1 instr. = 4 bytes)
Suits optimizing compilers
Optimal for speed!!!

Properties of operand models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressing mode</th>
<th>Example instruction</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stack</td>
<td>Add R4,R3</td>
<td>Regs[R4] ← Regs[R3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate (30%)</td>
<td>Add R4,R3</td>
<td>Regs[R4] ← Regs[R4]+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement (40%)</td>
<td>Add R4,100(R1)</td>
<td>Regs[R4] ← Regs[R4]+Mem[100+Regs[R1]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register deferred or indirect (20%)</td>
<td>Add R4,(R1)</td>
<td>Regs[R4] ← Regs[R4]+Mem[Regs[R1]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexed</td>
<td>Add R3,(1+R1)</td>
<td>Regs[R3] ← Regs[R3]+Mem[Regs[R1]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct or absolute</td>
<td>Add R1,(1001)</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Regs[R2]+Mem[1001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory indirect or memory deferred</td>
<td>Add R1,0(R3)</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Regs[R1]+Mem[Mem[Regs[R3]]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoincrement</td>
<td>Add R1,(R2)+</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Regs[R1]+Mem[Regs[R2]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autodecrement</td>
<td>Add R1,-(R2)</td>
<td>Regs[R2] ← Regs[R2]; Regs[R1] ← Regs[R1]+Mem[Regs[R2]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>Add R1,100(R2)(R3)</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← -[100+Regs[R2]+Regs[R3]*d]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General-purpose register model dominates today
Reason: general model for compilers and efficient implementation wise

Traditional Addressing Modes (VAX)
Actual use of addr. modes

- What addressing modes dominate usage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressing mode</th>
<th>Example instruction</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>When used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Register deferred or indirect</td>
<td>Add R4,(R1)</td>
<td>Regs[R4] ← Mem[Regs[R1]]</td>
<td>Accessing using a pointer or a computed address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaled</td>
<td>Add R1,100(R2)[R3]</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Regs[R1]+Mem[100+Regs[R2]+Regs[R3]*d]</td>
<td>Used to index arrays. May be applied to any indexed addressing mode in some machines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immediate and Displacement are the most common addressing modes in SPEC89 on a VAX

Size of immediates

- Immediate operands are very important for ALU and compare operations
- 16-bit immediates seem sufficient (75%-80%)

Operation types in the ISA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator type</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetical and logical</td>
<td>Integer arithmetic and logical operations: add, and, subtract, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data transfer</td>
<td>Loads/stores (move instructions on machines with memory addressing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Branch, jump, procedure call and return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>Operating system call, virtual memory management instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating point</td>
<td>Floating-point operations: add, multiply, ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimal</td>
<td>Decimal add, decimal multiply, decimal-to-character conversions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>String</td>
<td>String move, string compare, string search</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Control instructions

- Conditional branches
- Unconditional branches (jumps)

Conditional branches dominate by far
Intuition: program loops are common!

Branches

Three options:
- Condition Code: Most operations have "side effects" on set of CC-bits. A branch depends on some CC-bit
- Condition Register. A named register is used to hold the result from a compare instruction. A following branch instruction names the same register.
- Compare and Branch. The compare and the branch is performed in the same instruction.

Branch condition evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>How?</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition Code (CC)</td>
<td>Special bits are manipulated</td>
<td>CC set for free</td>
<td>Extra state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition register</td>
<td>Test general simple purpose register</td>
<td>Uses up registers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compare and branch</td>
<td>Compare is part of branch instead of two</td>
<td>Extra work per instr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruction formats

- A variable instruction format yields compact code but instruction decoding is more complex
DLX - A generic architecture

Load/store architecture (32 bits)

- Many (32) general purpose integer registers (GPR) and single precision floating point registers (GPR0 = 0)
- Fixed instruction width and format
- Addressing modes: immediate and displacement
- Supported data types: bytes, half word (16 bits), word (32 bits), single and double precision IEEE floating points

Generic instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load</td>
<td>LW R1,30(R2)</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Mem[30+Regs[R2]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store</td>
<td>SW 30(R2),R1</td>
<td>Mem[30+Regs[R2]] ← Regs[R1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALU</td>
<td>ADD R1,R2,R3</td>
<td>Regs[R1] ← Regs[R2] + Regs[R3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>BEQZ R1,KALLE</td>
<td>if (Regs[R1]==0) PC ← KALLE + 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specifying hardware

- `<--n` : Transfer n bits
- `R7n` : Bit n of register R7
- `R20..7` : The most significant byte of R2 (Big endian!)
- `08` : A byte of all zeroes (repeat the field n times)
- `M[40]` : byte 40 in memory
- `08 ## M[40]` : Concatenate zero-byte (MSB) with the byte @mem(40)

Generic Move Instructions

- Load and Store
  - LB, LBU, SB -- byte chunks
  - LH, LHU, SH -- half word chunks
  - LW, SW -- word chunks
  - LF, SF -- word chunks to floating point regs
  - LD, SD double precision to FP regs (2 regs per OP)
Examples Hardware Descriptions

LH R1, 40(R3) -- load halfword (signed)
R1 <-32 (M[40+R3]0) ## M[40+R3] ## M[41+R3]
LBU R1, 40(R3) -- load byte unsigned
R1 <-32 024 ## M[40+R3]

Examples Hardware Descriptions (2)

LHI R1, #42 -- load high immediate
R1 <-32 “42” ## 016
ADDI R1, R2, #6 -- add immediate
R1 <-32 R3 + “6”

Generic ALU Instructions

- Integer arithmetic
  - [add, sub] x [signed, unsigned] x [register, immediate]
  - e.g., ADD, ADDI, ADDU, ADDUI, SUB, SUBI, SUBU, SUBUI
- Logical
  - [and, or, xor] x [register, immediate]
  - e.g., AND, ANDI, OR, ORI, XOR, XORI
- Load upper half immediate load
  - It takes two instruction to load a 32 bit immediate

More Generic ALU Ops

- Shifts
  - [left, right] x [logical, arithmetic] x [immediate, reg]
  - e.g., SLL, SRAI, ...
- Set conditional
  - [lt, gt, le, ge, eq, ne] x [immediate, reg]
  - e.g., SLT, SGEI, ...
Generic Instruction Formats

I-type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>Rs</th>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>Immediate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>Rs1</th>
<th>Rs2</th>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>Func</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

J-type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>Offset added to PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generic FP Instructions

- Floating Point arithmetic
  - [add, sub, mult, div] x [double, single]
  - e.g., ADDD, ADDF, SUBD, SUBD, ...
- Compares (sets “compare bit”)
  - [lt, gt, le, ge, eq, ne] x [double, immediate]
  - e.g., LTD, GEF, ...
- Convert from/to integer, Fpregs
  - CVTF2I, CVTF2D, CVTI2D, ...

Simple Control

- Branches if equal or if not equal
  - BEQZ, BNEZ, cmp to register,
    \[ \text{PC} := \text{PC}+4+\text{immediate}_{16} \]
  - BFPT, BFPF, cmp to “FP compare bit”,
    \[ \text{PC} := \text{PC}+4+\text{immediate}_{16} \]
- Jumps
  - J: Jump
    \[ \text{PC} := \text{PC} + \text{immediate}_{26} \]
  - JAL: Jump And Link
    \[ \text{PC} := \text{PC}+4; \text{PC} := \text{PC} + \text{immediate}_{26} \]
  - JALR: Jump And Link Register
    \[ \text{R31} := \text{PC}+4; \text{PC} := \text{PC} + \text{Reg} \]
  - JR: Jump Register
    \[ \text{PC} := \text{PC} + \text{Reg} \] ("return from JAL or JALR")

Implementing ISAs

--pipelines

Erik Hagersten
Uppsala University
EXAMPLE: pipeline implementation
Add R1, R2, R3

Load Operation:
LD R1, mem[cnst+R2]

Store Operation:
ST mem[cnst+R1], R2

EXAMPLE: Branch to R2 if R1 == 0
BEQZ R1, R2
Initially

- D: IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
- C: RegC := RegC + 1
- B: RegB := RegA + 1
- A: LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 1

- D: IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
- C: RegC := RegC + 1
- B: RegB := RegA + 1
- A: LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 2

- D: IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
- C: RegC := RegC + 1
- B: RegB := RegA + 1
- A: LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 3

- D: IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
- C: RegC := RegC + 1
- B: RegB := RegA + 1
- A: LD RegA, (100 + RegC)
Cycle 4

PC →

LD IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
RegC := RegC + 1
RegB := RegA + 1
LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 5

PC →

LD IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
RegC := RegC + 1
RegB := RegA + 1
LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 6

PC →

LD IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
RegC := RegC + 1
RegB := RegA + 1
LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Cycle 7

PC →

LD IF RegC < 100 GOTO A
RegC := RegC + 1
RegB := RegA + 1
LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Branch ➔ Next PC
Cycle 8

- If RegC < 100 GOTO A
- RegC := RegC + 1
- RegB := RegA + 1
- LD RegA, (100 + RegC)

Example: 5-stage pipeline

- Instruction fetch
- Instruction decode/regular task
- Execute/operate calculation
- Memory access
- Write back

Example: 5-stage pipeline
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- Instruction decode/regular task
- Execute/operate calculation
- Memory access
- Write back

Example: 5-stage pipeline

- Instruction fetch
- Instruction decode/regular task
- Execute/operate calculation
- Memory access
- Write back

Example: 5-stage pipeline

- Instruction fetch
- Instruction decode/regular task
- Execute/operate calculation
- Memory access
- Write back
Example: 5-stage pipeline

Pipeline Challenges
- Balance the pipeline stages
- Handle the feed-back cases
- Minimize pipeline stalls
- Predict and perform speculative work
- Undo speculative work

Fundamental limitations
Hazards prevent instructions from executing in parallel:
- Structural hazards: Simultaneous use of same resource
  If unified I+D$: LW will conflict with later I-fetch
- Data hazards: Data dependencies between instructions
  LW R1, 100(R2) /* result avail in 2 - 100 cycles */
  ADD R5, R1, R7
- Control hazards: Change in program flow
  BNEQ R1, #OFFSET
  ADD R5, R2, R3

Serialization of the execution by stalling the pipeline is one, although inefficient, way to avoid hazards

Fundamental types of data hazards

Code sequence

$Op_i, A$

RAW (Read-After-Write)
$Op_i + 1$ reads $A$ before $Op_i$ modifies $A$. $Op_i + 1$ reads old $A$!

WAR (Write-After-Read) $Op_i + 1$ modifies $A$ before $Op_i$ reads $A$. $Op_i$ reads new $A$

WAW (Write-After-Write) $Op_i + 1$ modifies $A$ before $Op_i$. The value in $A$ is the one written by $Op_i$, i.e., an old $A$. 

Hazard avoidance techniques

Static techniques (compiler): code scheduling to avoid hazards

Dynamic techniques: hardware mechanisms to eliminate or reduce impact of hazards (e.g., out-of-order stuff)

Hybrid techniques: rely on compiler as well as hardware techniques to resolve hazards (e.g. VLIW support – later)

Data dependency)

Cycle 3

Fix alt1: code scheduling
Fix alt2: Bypass hardware

- Forwarding (or bypassing): provide a direct path from M and WB to EX
- Only helps for ALU ops. What about load operations?

DLX with bypass

Avoiding control hazards

Branch delays

8 cycles per iteration of 4 instructions ✗
Need longer basic blocks with independent instr.

Duplicate resources in ALU to compute branch condition and branch target address earlier
Branch delay cannot be completely eliminated
Branch prediction and code scheduling can reduce the branch penalty
Fix1: Minimizing Branch Delay Effects

Fix2: Static tricks

Delayed branch (schedule useful instr. in delay slot)
- Define branch to take place after a following instruction
- CONS: this is visible to SW, i.e., forces compatibility between generations

Predict Branch not taken (a fairly rare case)
- Execute successor instructions in sequence
- "Squash" instructions in pipeline if the branch is actually taken
- Works well if state is updated late in the pipeline
- 30%-38% of conditional branches are not taken on average

Predict Branch taken (a fairly common case)
- 62%-70% of conditional branches are taken on average
- Does not make sense for the generic arch. but may do for other pipeline organizations

Static scheduling to avoid stalls

- Scheduling an instruction from before is always safe
- Scheduling from target or from the not-taken path is not always safe; must be guaranteed that speculative instr. do no harm.
Static Scheduling of Instructions

Erik Hagersten
Uppsala University
Sweden

Architectural assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Latency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP ALU</td>
<td>FP ALU</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP ALU</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>FP ALU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Latency = number of cycles between the two adjacent instructions

Delayed branch: one cycle delay slot

Scheduling example

for (i=1; i<=1000; i=i+1)
    x[i] = x[i] + 10;

Iterations are independent => parallel execution

loop: LD \( F_0, 0(R1) \); \( F_0 \) = array element
       ADDD \( F_4, F_0, F_2 \); Add scalar constant
       SD \( 0(R1), F_4 \); Save result
       SUBI \( R_1, R_1, #8 \); decrement array ptr.
       BNEZ \( R_1, \) loop; reiterate if \( R_1 \neq 0 \)

Can we eliminate all penalties in each iteration?

How about moving SD down?

Scheduling in each loop iteration

Original loop

loop: LD \( F_0, 0(R1) \)
       ADDD \( F_4, F_0, F_2 \)
       SD \( 0(R1), F_4 \)
       SUBI \( R_1, R_1, #8 \)
       BNEZ \( R_1, \) loop

5 instruction + 4 bubbles = 9 cycles / iteration
(~one cycle per iteration on a vector architecture)

Can we do better by scheduling across iterations?
Vector architectures (a footnote)

CRAY, NEC, Fujitsu, ...

- 8 vector register contains 64 vector entries each
- A single LD/ST instr loads/stores entire vectors
- A single ALU instr V1 \( \rightarrow \) V2 op V3
- 64 bit mask vectors make execution conditional
- Overlaps Mem and ALU ops
- One form of “SIMD” -- Single Instruction Multiple Data

Scheduling in each loop iteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original loop</th>
<th>Statically scheduled loop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>loop: LD F0, 0(R1)</td>
<td>loop: LD F0, 0(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F4, F0, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F4, F0, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F8, F6, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F8, F6, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD F6, -8(R1)</td>
<td>SD F6, -8(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F10, -16(R1)</td>
<td>LD F10, -16(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F14, -24(R1)</td>
<td>ADDD F14, -24(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBI R1, R1, #8</td>
<td>SUBI R1, R1, #8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNEZ R1, loop</td>
<td>BNEZ R1, loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 8(R1), F4</td>
<td>SD 8(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOOP</td>
<td>NOOP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 instruction + 4 bubbles = 9c / iteration 5 instruction + 1 bubble = 6c / iteration

Can we do even better by scheduling across iterations?

Unoptimized loop unrolling 4x

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>loop: LD F0, 0(R1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F4, F0, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F8, F6, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD F6, -8(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F10, -16(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F14, -24(R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F12, F10, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F16, F14, F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBI R1, R1, #32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNEZ R1, loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 8(R1), F16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: alter to 4*8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24c/ 4 iterations = 6c / iteration

Important steps:
- Push loads up
- Push stores down
- Note: the displacement of the last store must be changed

Benefits of loop unrolling:
- Provides a larger seq. instr. window (larger basic block)
- Simplifies for static and dynamic methods to extract ILP

All penalties are eliminated. CPI=1
14 cycles / 4 iterations ==> 3.5 cycles / iteration
From 9c to 3.5c per iteration ==> speedup 2.6
Software pipelining 1(3)

Symbolic loop unrolling

- The instructions in a loop are taken from different iterations in the original loop

Example:
loop: LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4
SUBI R1,R1,#8
BNEQ R1,loop

Looking at three rolled-out iterations of the loop body:

Iteration i:
LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

Iteration i+1:
LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

Iteration i+2:
LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

Software pipelining 2(3)

Example:
Software Pipelined Loop 1
BNEQ SUB ST ADD LD
BNEQ SUB ST ADD LD
Software Pipelined Loop 2

Instructions from three consecutive iterations form the loop body:

< prologue code >
loop: SD 0(R1),F4 ; from iteration i
ADDD F4,F0,F2 ; from iteration i+1
LD F4,-16(R1) ; from iteration i+2
SUBI R1,R1,#8
BNEQ R1,loop

< prologue code >

Software pipelining 3(3)

Instructions from three consecutive iterations form the loop body:

< prologue code >
loop: SD 0(R1),F4 ; from iteration i
ADDD F4,F0,F2 ; from iteration i+1
LD F4,-16(R1) ; from iteration i+2
SUBI R1,R1,#8
BNEQ R1,loop

< prologue code >

- No data dependencies within a loop iteration
- The dependence distance is 1 iterations
- WAR hazard elimination is needed (register renaming)
- 5c / iteration, but only uses 2 FP regs (instead of 8)

Software pipelining 2(3)

Example:
loop:
LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4
SUBI R1,R1,#8
BNEZ R1,loop

Looking at three rolled-out iterations of the loop body:

LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

LD F0,0(R1)
ADDD F4,F0,F2
SD 0(R1),F4

Execute in the same loop!!

Software pipelining 3(3)

Instructions from three consecutive iterations form the loop body:

< prologue code >
loop: SD 0(R1),F4 ; from iteration i
ADDD F4,F0,F2 ; from iteration i+1
LD F4,-16(R1) ; from iteration i+2
SUBI R1,R1,#8
BNEQ R1,loop

< prologue code >

- “Symbolic Loop Unrolling”
- Very tricky for complicated loops
- Less code expansion than outlining
- Register-lean if “rotating” is used
- Needed to hide large latencies (see IA-64)
Detecting data dependencies

Finding dependencies is fundamental to
- perform instruction scheduling;
- determine the degree of parallelism in loops; and
- eliminate name dependencies

```c
for (i = 1; i <= 100; i = i+1) {
    A[i] = B[i] + C[i];
    D[i] = A[i] + E[i];
}
```

The absence of loop-carried dependencies increases
the amount of *exploitable* parallelism

Loop-carried dependencies

A loop iteration is often dependent on results
calculated in an earlier iteration.

*Example:*

```c
for (i = 6; i <= 100; i = i+1)
    Y[i] = Y[i-5] + Y[i];
```

- This loop has a dependence distance of 5 and we
  can extract ILP in 5 consecutive iterations

Dependencies: Revisited

Two instructions must be *independent* in order to
execute in parallel

- Three classes of dependencies that limit parallelism:
  - Data dependencies
    ```c
    X := ...
    .... := ... X ....
    ```
  - Name dependencies
    ```c
    ... := ... X
    X := ...
    ```
  - Control dependencies
    ```c
    If (X > 0) then
        Y := ...
    ```

Getting desperate for ILP
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Multiple instruction issue per clock

Goal: Extracting ILP so that CPI < 1, i.e., IPC > 1

Superscalar:
- Combine static and dynamic scheduling to issue multiple instructions per clock
- HW finds independent instructions in “sequential” code
- Predominant: (PowerPC, SPARC, Alpha, HP-PA)

Very Long Instruction Words (VLIW):
- Static scheduling used to form packages of independent instructions that can be issued together
- Relies on compiler to find independent instructions (IA-64)

Example: A Superscalar DLX

- Issue 2 instructions simultaneously: 1 FP & 1 integer
- Fetch 64-bits/clock cycle; Integer instr. on left, FP on right
- Can only issue 2nd instruction if 1st instruction issues
- Need more ports to the register file

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Pipe stages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int.</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>IF ID EX MEM WB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex stage should be fully pipelined
1 load delay slot corresponds to three instructions!

Statically Scheduled Superscalar DLX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>FP instruction</th>
<th>Clock cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loop: 12</td>
<td>F0,3(RS)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5,6(RSI)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F10,1(EI) ADDP F4,RS,F2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1,24(RI) ADDP F6,F5,F2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F13,-35(RI) ADDP F14,F15,F2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9(RSI),F4 ADDP F16,F17,F2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-8(RS),F8 ADDP F20,F18,F2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-16(RS),F22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-24(RS),F16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMI R2,R2</td>
<td>#10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MULI R1,Loop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-32(RS),#20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can be scheduled dynamically with Tomasulo’s alg.

Issue: Difficult to find a sufficient number of instr. to issue
Limits to superscalar execution

- Difficulties in scheduling within the constraints on number of functional units and the ILP in the code chunk
- Instruction decode complexity increases with the number of issued instructions
- Data and control dependencies are in general more costly in a superscalar processor than in a single-issue processor

Techniques to enlarge the instruction window to extract more ILP are important

Simple superscalar relying on compiler instead of HW complexity → VLIW

Superscalars

VLIW: Very Long Instruction Word

Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)

Compiler is responsible for instruction scheduling

VLIW will be revisited later on...
Dynamic branch prediction

Branches limit performance because:
- Branch penalties are high
- Prevent a lot of ILP from being exploited

Solution: Dynamic branch prediction to predict the outcome of conditional branches.

Benefits:
- Reduce time to determine branch condition
- Reduce time to calculate the branch target address

Predict next PC

Branch history table

A simple branch prediction scheme

- The branch-prediction buffer is indexed by bits from branch-instruction PC values
- If prediction is wrong, then invert prediction

Problem: can cause two mispredictions in a row
A two-bit prediction scheme

- Requires prediction to miss twice in order to change prediction => better performance

Dynamic Scheduling Of Branches

N-level history

- Not only the PC of the BR instruction matters, also how you’ve got there is important
- Approach:
  - Record the outcome of the last N branches in a vector of N bits
  - Include the bits in the indexing of the branch table
- Pros/Cons: Same BR instruction may have multiple entries in the branch table

(N,M) prediction = N levels of M-bit prediction

Tournament prediction

- Issues:
  - No one predictor suits all applications
- Approach:
  - Implement several predictors and dynamically select the most appropriate one
- Performance example SPEC98:
  - 2-bit prediction: 7% miss prediction
  - (2,2) 2-level, 2-bit: 4% miss prediction
  - Tournaments: 3% miss prediction
Branch target buffer

- Predicts branch target address in the IF stage
- Can be combined with 2-bit branch prediction

Putting it together

- BTB stores info about taken instructions
- Combined with a separate branch history table
- Instruction fetch stage highly integrated for branch optimizations

Folding branches

- BTB often contains the next few instructions at the destination address
- Unconditional branches (and some cond as well) branches execute in zero cycles
  - Execute the dest instruction instead of the branch (if there is a hit in the BTB at the IF stage)
  - "Branch folding"

Branch prediction penalties for a Branch Target Buffer scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction in buffer</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Actual branch</th>
<th>Penalty cycles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Taken</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Itanium: ranging from 0 to 9 cycles...
**Procedure calls & BTB**

BTB can predict "normal" branches

**Procedure A**

- BR
- BR
- BR

BTB can do a good job

- BR
- BR

BTB does not stand a chance

**Return address stack**

- Popular subroutines are called from many places in the code.
- Branch prediction may be confused!!
- May hurt other predictions
- New approach:
  - Push the return address on a [small] stack at the time of the call
  - Pop addresses on return

**Multicycle operations in the pipeline (floating point)**

(Not a SuperScalar...)

- Integer unit: Handles integer instructions, branches, and loads/stores
- Other units: May take several cycles each. Some units are pipelined (mult,add) others are not (div)
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**Parallelism between integer and FP instructions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
<th>M3</th>
<th>M4</th>
<th>M5</th>
<th>M6</th>
<th>M7</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>WB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTD F2,F4,F6</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>M7</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDD F8,F10,F12</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBI R2,R3,#8</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F14,0(R2)</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to avoid structural and RAW hazards:
- Stall in ID stage when
  - The functional unit can be occupied
  - Many instructions can reach the WB stage at the same time
- RAW hazards:
  - Normal bypassing from MEM and WB stages
  - Stall in ID stage if any of the source operands is a destination operand of an instruction in any of the FP functional units

**WAR and WAW hazards for multicycle operations**

WAR hazards are a non-issue because operands are read in program order (in-order)

WAW hazards are avoided by:
- Stalling the SUBF until DIVF reaches the MEM stage, or
- Disabling the write to register F0 for the DIVF instruction

**WAR Example:**
- DIVF F0,F2,F4 FP divide 24 cycles
- ...SUBF F0,F8,F10 FP sub 3 cycles
- SUB finishes before DIV ; out-of-order completion

**Dynamic Instruction Scheduling**

Key idea: allow subsequent independent instructions to proceed

- DIVD F0,F2,F4 ; takes long time
- ADDD F10,F0,F8 ; stalls waiting for F0
- SUBD F12,F8,F13 ; Let this instr. bypass the ADDD
  - Enables out-of-order execution (& out-of-order completion)

Two historical schemes used in "recent" machines:
- **Tomasulo** in IBM 360/91 in 1967 (also in Power-2)
- **Scoreboard** dates back to CDC 6600 in 1963

**Simple Scoreboard Pipeline**
(covered briefly in this course)

- **Issue**: Decode and check for structural hazards
- **Read operands**: wait until no RAW hazard, then read operands (RAW)
- All data hazards are handled by the scoreboard mechanism
Extended Scoreboard

**Issue**: Instruction is issued when:
- No structural hazard for a functional unit
- No WAW with an instruction in execution

**Read**: Instruction reads operands when they become available (RAW)

**EX**: Normal execution

**Write**: Instruction writes when all previous instructions have read or written this operand (WAW, WAR)

*The scoreboard is updated when an instruction proceeds to a new stage*

Limitations with scoreboards

The scoreboard technique is limited by:
- Number of scoreboard entries *(window size)*
- Number and types of functional units
- Number of ports to the register bank
- Hazards caused by name dependencies

Tomasulo’s algorithm addresses the last two limitations

A more complicated example

```
DIV F0,F2,F4 ;delayed a long time
ADD F6,F0,F8
SUB F8,F10,F14
MULD F6,F10,F8
```

WAR and WAW avoided through “register renaming”

Register Renaming:

```
DIV F0,F2,F4
ADD F6,F0,F8
SUB tmp1,F10,F14 ;can be executed right away
MULD tmp2,F10,tmp1 ;delayed a few cycles
```

Tomasulo’s Algorithm

- IBM 360/91 mid 60’s
- High performance without compiler support
- Extended for modern architectures
- Many implementations (PowerPC, Pentium…)
**Simple Tomasulo’s Algorithm**

1. **Read Register:**
   - Rename DestReg to the Res. Station location
2. **Wait for all dependencies at Res. Station**
3. **After Execution**
   - Put result in Reorder Buffer (ROB)
   - Broadcast result on CDB to all waiting instructions
   - Rename DestReg to the ROB location
4. **When all preceeding instr. have arrived at ROB:**
   - Write value to DestReg

**Tomasulo’s: What is going on?**

1. Read operands
2. Issue
3. Mem
4. Int
5. Mem
6. FP
7. Add
8. FP
9. Mul1
10. FP
11. Mul2
12. FP
13. Div
14. Mem
15. IF
16. Res. Station
17. 0:a
18. 1:
19. 2:b
20. 3:
21. 4:c
22. 5:
23. 6:d
24. 7:
25. 8:e
26. 9:
27. Common Data Bus (CDB)
28. Op:div
29. D:F0
30. S1:v/ptr
31. S2:v/ptr
32. #3
33. Write
34. Stage
35. Reg. Write
36. Path
37. #3 DIV
38. F0, F2, F4
39. #4 ADD
40. F6, F0, F8
41. #5 SUBD
42. F8, F10, F14
43. #6 MULD
44. F6, F10, F8
45. #7 MULD
46. F6, F10, F8
47. #8 MULD
48. F6, F10, F8
49. #9 MULD
50. F6, F10, F8
Simple Tomasulo's Algorithm

1. Read operands
2. Issue
3. Int
4. Mem
5. FP
6. Add
7. Mul1
8. Mul2
9. Div

Common Data Bus (CDB):
- Data 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

ReOrder Buffer (ROB):
- Write Stage
- Reg. Write Path
- Op
- D: Op
- S1: v
- S2: v
- #
- D: #
- answ: D: #

Example:
- #3: DIV F0,F2,F4
- #4: ADD D F6,F0,F8
- #5: SUB D F8,F10,F14
- #6: MULD F6,F10,F8
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Simple Tomasulo’s Algorithm

Tomasulo’s: What is going on?
1. Read Register:
   - Rename DestReg to the Res. Station location
2. Wait for all dependencies at Res. Station
3. After Execution
   a) Put result in Reorder Buffer (ROB)
   b) Broadcast result on CDB to all waiting instructions
   c) Rename DestReg to the ROB location
4. When all preceeding instr. have arrived at ROB:
   - Write value to DestReg

Dynamic Scheduling Past Branches

Wrong Prediction!!!
Do not commit!
Summing up Tomasulo’s

- Out-of-order (O-O-O) execution
- In order commit
  - Allows for speculative execution (beyond branches)
  - Allows for precise exceptions
- Distributed implementation
  - Reservation stations – wait for RAW resolution
  - Reorder Buffer (ROB)
  - Common Data Bus “snoops” (CDB)
- “Register renaming” avoids WAW, WAR
- Costly to implement (complexity and power)

Dealing with Exceptions
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Exception handling in pipelines
Example: Page fault from TLB

Must restart an instruction that causes an exception (interrupt, trap, fault) “precise interrupts”

(...as well as all instructions following it.)
A solution (in-order...):
1. Force a trap instruction into the pipeline
2. Turn off all writes for the faulting instruction
3. Save the PC for the faulting instruction
   - to be used in return from exception
   - may need to save multiple PC values

Guaranteeing the execution order

Exceptions may be generated in another order than the instruction execution order

Example sequence:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pipeline stage</th>
<th>Problem causing exception</th>
<th>Example sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Page fault on instruction fetch; misaligned memory access; memory protection violation</td>
<td>lw (e.g., page fault in MEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Undefined or illegal opcode</td>
<td>add (e.g., page fault in IF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Arithmetic exception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>Page fault on data access; misaligned memory access; memory protection violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FP Exceptions

Example:  
\[
\text{DIVF } F0,F2,F4 \quad 24 \text{ cycles} \\
\text{ADDF } F10,F10,F8 \quad 3 \text{ cycles} \\
\text{SUBF } F12,F12,F14 \quad 3 \text{ cycles}
\]

SUBF may generate a trap before DIVF has completed!!

Revisiting Exceptions:

A pipeline implements precise interrupts iff:

- All instructions before the faulting instruction can complete
- All instructions after (and including) the faulting instruction must not change the system state and must be restartable
- ROB helps the implementation in O-O-O execution

VLIW: Very Long Instruction Word

HW support for [static] speculation and improved ILP
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Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)

- Independent functional units with no hazard detection

Compiler is responsible for instruction scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mem ref 1</th>
<th>Mem ref 2</th>
<th>FP op 1</th>
<th>FP op 2</th>
<th>Int op/branch</th>
<th>Clock</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD F0,0(R1)</td>
<td>LD F0,8(R1)</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F10,16(R1)</td>
<td>LD F14,24(R1)</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F18,-32(R1)</td>
<td>LD F22,-40(R1)</td>
<td>ADDD F4,F0,F2</td>
<td>ADDD F8,F6,F2</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD F26,-48(R1)</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>ADDD F12,F10,F2</td>
<td>ADDD F16,F14,F2</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>ADDD F20,F18,F2</td>
<td>ADDD F24,F22,F2</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F4</td>
<td>SD -8(R1), F8</td>
<td>ADDD F28,F26,F2</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -16(R1), F12</td>
<td>SD -24(R1), F8</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD -32(R1), F20</td>
<td>SD -40(R1), F24</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>SUBI R1,R1,#48</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD 0(R1), F28</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>BNEZ R1,LOOP</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limits to VLIW

- Difficult to exploit parallelism
  - $N$ functional units and $K$ “dependent” pipeline stages implies $N \times K$ independent instructions to avoid stalls

- Memory and register bandwidth

- Code size

- No binary code compatibility

- But, .... simpler hardware
  - short schedule
  - high frequency

HW support for static speculation in VLIWs

Speculative execution = allow to execute instructions before all control dependencies are resolved

A combination of three main ideas we’ve covered:

- Dynamic Instruction scheduling; take advantage of ILP
- Dynamic branch prediction; allows instruction scheduling across branches
- Hardware based speculation uses a data-flow approach: instructions execute when their operands are available

HW support for static speculation

- Move LD up and ST down. But, how far?
  - Normally not outside of the basic block!

- These techniques will allow larger moves and increase the effective size of a basic block
  - Removing branches: predicate execution
  - Move LD above ST: hazard detection
  - Move LD above branch
Compiler speculation

The compiler moves instructions before a branch so that they can be executed before the branch condition is known.

Advantage: creates longer schedulable code sequences => more ILP can be exploited.

Example:
if (A == 0) then A = B; else A = A+4;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non speculative code</th>
<th>Speculative code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LW R1,0(R3)</td>
<td>LW R1,0(R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNEZ R1,1L1</td>
<td>LW R14,0(R2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LW R1,0(R2)</td>
<td>BEQZ R1,L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J L2</td>
<td>ADD R14,R14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1: ADD R1,R1,4</td>
<td>L3: SW 0(R3),R14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2: SW 0(R3),R1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What about exceptions?

Speculative instructions

Moving a LD up, may make it speculative:
- Moving past a branch
- Moving past a ST (that may be to the same address)

Issues:
- Non-intrusive
- Correct exception handling (again)
- Low overhead
- Good prediction

Example: Moving LD above a branch

LD.s R1, 100(R2) ; "Speculative LD" to R1
....
BRNZ R7, #200

... LD.chk R1 ; Get exception if poison bit of R1 is set

Good performance if the branch is not taken.

Example: Moving LD above a ST

LD.a R1, 100(R2) ; "advanced LD"
....
ST R7, 50(R3) ; invalidate entry if ALAT addr match

....
LD.c R1 ; Redo LD if entry in ALAT invalid

ALAT (advanced load address table) is an associative data structure storing tuples of: <addr, dest-reg>
Conditional execution

- Removes the need for some branches 😊
- Conditional Instructions
  - Conditional register move
    `CMOVZ R1, R2, R3` ; move R2 to R1 if (R3 == 0)
  - Compare-and-swap (atomics memory operations later)
    `CAS R1, R2, R3` ; swap R2 and mem(R1) if (mem(R1)== R3)
  - Avoiding a branch makes the basic block larger!!! ➔ More instructions for the code scheduler to play with
- Predicate execution
  - A more generalized technique
  - Each instruction executed if the associated 1-bit predicate REG is 1.

Predicate example

```
IF R1 > R2 then
  LD R7, 100(R1)
  ADD R1, R1, #1
else
  LD R7, 100(R2)
  ADD R2, R2, #1
end
```

Standard Technique
```
CGT R3,R1,R2
BRNZ R3, elseLD R7, 100(R1)
ADD R1, R1, #1
else: LD R7, 100(R2)
ADD R2, R2, #1
end:
```

Predicate example

```
IF R1 > R2 then
  LD R7, 100(R1)
  ADD R1, R1, #1
else
  LD R7, 100(R2)
  ADD R2, R2, #1
end:
```

Standard Technique
```
CGT R3,R1,R2
BRNZ R3, elseLD R7, 100(R1)
ADD R1, R1, #1
else: LD R7, 100(R2)
ADD R2, R2, #1
end:
```

HW vs. SW speculation

Advantages:
- Dynamic runtime disambiguation of memory addresses
- Dynamic branch prediction is often better than static which limits the performance of SW speculation.
- HW speculation can maintain a precise exception model

Main disadvantage:
- Complex implementation and extensive need of hardware resources (conforms with technology trends)
Example: IA64 and Itanium(I)

Erik Hagersten
Uppsala University
Sweden

Little of everything

- VLIW
- Advanced loads supported by ALAT
- Load speculation supported by predication
- Dynamic branch prediction
- “All the tricks in the book”

Itanium instructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Instr 1</th>
<th>Instr 2</th>
<th>Instr 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Instruction bundle (128 bits)
  - (5bits) template (identifies I types and dependencies)
  - 3 x (41bits) instruction
- Can issue up to two bundles per cycle (6 instr)
- The “Type” specifies if the instr. are independent
- Latencies:
  - Instruction Latency
  - I-LD 1
  - FP-LD 9
  - Pred branch 0-3
  - Misspred branch 0-9
  - I-ALU 0
  - FP-ALU 4

Itanium Registers

- 128 65-bit GPR (w/ poison bit)
- 128 82-bit FP REGS
- 64 1-bit predicate REGS
- 8 64-bit branch registers
- A bunch of CSRs (control/status registers)
Dynamic register window

ExplicitRegs (seen by the instructions)

Physical Regs

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

Calling Procedure A

Procedure!!! (not processes)

ExplicitRegs (seen by main) (seen by proc A)

Physical Regs

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

Calling Procedure B

(automatic passing of parameters)

ExplicitRegs (seen by main)

ExplicitRegs (Proc A)

ExplicitRegs (Proc B)

Physical Regs

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005

DARK2 2005
Register Stack Engine (RSE)

- Saves and restores registers to memory on register spills
- Implemented in hardware
- Works in the background
- Gives the illusion of an unlimited register stack
- This is similar to SPARC and UCB’s RISC

Register rotation: FP and GPRs

- Used in software pipelining
- Register renaming for each iteration
- Removes the need for prologue/epilogue
- RSE (register stack engine)

What is the alternative?

- VLIW was meant to simplify HW
- Itanium has 230 M transistors and consumes 130W?
- Will it scale with technology?
- Other alternatives:
  - Increase cache size,
  - Increase the frequency, or,
  - Run more than one thread/chip (More about this during “Future Technologies”)
