Agenda for Today & Next Few Lectures

- Single-cycle Microarchitectures
- Multi-cycle and Microprogrammed Microarchitectures
- Pipelining
- Issues in Pipelining: Control & Data Dependence Handling, State Maintenance and Recovery, ...
- Out-of-Order Execution
- Other Execution Paradigms
Readings for Today

  - More advanced pipelining
  - Interrupt and exception handling
  - Out-of-order and superscalar execution concepts

- H&H Chapters 7.8 and 7.9

- Optional:
Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays
Branch Prediction Wrap-Up
Minimum branch penalty: 7 cycles
Typical branch penalty: 11+ cycles
48K bits of target addresses stored in I-cache
Predictor tables are reset on a context switch

Hybrid branch predictors work well
- E.g., 90-97% prediction accuracy on average

Some “difficult” workloads still suffer, though!
- E.g., gcc
- Max IPC with tournament prediction: 9
- Max IPC with perfect prediction: 35
Some Other Branch Predictor Types

- Loop branch detector and predictor
  - Loop iteration count detector/predictor
  - Works well for loops with small number of iterations, where iteration count is predictable
  - Used in Intel Pentium M

- Perceptron branch predictor
  - Learns the *direction correlations* between individual branches
  - Assigns weights to correlations

- Hybrid history length based predictor
  - Uses different tables with different history lengths
The advanced branch prediction in the Pentium M processor is based on the Intel Pentium® 4 processor’s [6] branch predictor. On top of that, two additional predictors to capture special program flows, were added: a Loop Detector and an Indirect Branch Predictor.

Figure 2: The Loop Detector logic

Gochman et al.,
“The Intel Pentium M Processor: Microarchitecture and Performance,”
Perceptrons for Learning Linear Functions

- A perceptron is a simplified model of a biological neuron
- It is also a simple **binary classifier**

- A perceptron maps an input vector $X$ to a 0 or 1
  - **Input** = Vector $X$
  - Perceptron learns the linear function (if one exists) of how each element of the vector affects the output (stored in an internal Weight vector)
  - **Output** = $Weight \cdot X + Bias > 0$

- In the branch prediction context
  - Vector $X$: Branch history register bits
  - Output: Prediction for the current branch
Perceptron Branch Predictor (I)

- **Idea:** Use a perceptron to learn the correlations between branch history register bits and branch outcome
- **A perceptron learns a target Boolean function of N inputs**

Each branch associated with a perceptron

A perceptron contains a set of weights $w_i$:

- Each weight corresponds to a bit in the GHR
- How much the bit is correlated with the direction of the branch
- Positive correlation: large + weight
- Negative correlation: large - weight

**Prediction:**

- Express GHR bits as 1 (T) and -1 (NT)
- Take dot product of GHR and weights
- If output > 0, predict taken

Perceptron Branch Predictor (II)

Prediction function:

\[ y = w_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i w_i. \]

Bias weight (bias of branch, independent of the history)

Dot product of GHR and perceptron weights

Output compared to 0

Training function:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{if } \text{sign}(y_{out}) \neq t & \text{ or } |y_{out}| \leq \theta \text{ then } \\
\text{for } i := 0 \text{ to } n \text{ do } \\
\quad w_i & := w_i + tx_i \\
\text{end for } \\
\text{end if }
\end{align*}
\]
Perceptron Branch Predictor (III)

- **Advantages**
  - More sophisticated learning mechanism → better accuracy

- **Disadvantages**
  - Hard to implement (adder tree to compute perceptron output)
  - Can learn only linearly-separable functions
    - e.g., cannot learn XOR type of correlation between 2 history bits and branch outcome
Prediction Using Multiple History Lengths

- **Observation:** Different branches require different history lengths for better prediction accuracy

- **Idea:** Have multiple PHTs indexed with GHRs with different history lengths and intelligently allocate PHT entries to different branches

State of the Art in Branch Prediction

- See the Branch Prediction Championship
  - https://www.jilp.org/cbp2016/program.html


Figure 1. The TAGE-SC-L predictor: a TAGE predictor backed with a Statistical Corrector predictor and a loop predictor
Branch Confidence Estimation

- Idea: **Estimate if the prediction is likely to be correct**
  - i.e., estimate how “confident” you are in the prediction

- Why?
  - Could be very useful in deciding how to speculate:
    - What predictor/PHT to choose/use
    - Whether to keep fetching on this path
    - Whether to switch to some other way of handling the branch, e.g. dual-path execution (eager execution) or dynamic predication
    - ...

Other Ways of Handling Branches
How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.

- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
  - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
  - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
  - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
  - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
  - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
  - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)
Delayed Branching (I)

- Change the semantics of a branch instruction
  - Branch after N instructions
  - Branch after N cycles

- Idea: Delay the execution of a branch. N instructions (delay slots) that come after the branch are always executed regardless of branch direction.

- Problem: How do you find instructions to fill the delay slots?
  - Branch must be independent of delay slot instructions

- Unconditional branch: Easier to find instructions to fill the delay slot
- Conditional branch: Condition computation should not depend on instructions in delay slots → difficult to fill the delay slot
Delayed Branching (II)

Normal code:

```
A
B
C
BC X
D
E
F
G
```

Timeline:
```
if  ex
```
```
A
B  A
C  B
BC  C
--  BC
G  --
```

Delayed branch code:
```
A
C
BC X
B
D
E
F
G
```

Timeline:
```
if  ex
```
```
A
C  A
BC  C
B  BC
G  B
```

6 cycles

5 cycles
Fancy Delayed Branching (III)

- Delayed branch with squashing
  - In SPARC
  - Semantics: If the branch falls through (i.e., it is not taken), the delay slot instruction is not executed
  - Why could this help?

Normal code:        Delayed branch code:        Delayed branch w/ squashing:

```
X: A
   B
   C
   BC X
   D
   E
```

```
X: A
   B
   C
   BC X
   NOP
   D
   E
```

```
X: A
   B
   C
   BC X
   A
   D
   E
```
Delayed Branching (IV)

- Advantages:
  + Keeps the pipeline full with useful instructions in a simple way assuming
    1. Number of delay slots == number of instructions to keep the pipeline full before the branch resolves
    2. All delay slots can be filled with useful instructions

- Disadvantages:
  -- Not easy to fill the delay slots (even with a 2-stage pipeline)
    1. Number of delay slots increases with pipeline depth, superscalar execution width
    2. Number of delay slots should be variable with variable latency operations. Why?
  -- Ties ISA semantics to hardware implementation
    -- SPARC, MIPS, HP-PA: 1 delay slot
    -- What if pipeline implementation changes with the next design?
An Aside: Filling the Delay Slot

reordering data independent (RAW, WAW, WAR) instructions does not change program semantics.

within same basic block

For correctness: add a new instruction to the not-taken path?

For correctness: add a new instruction to the taken path?

Safe?

Based on original figure from P&H CO&D, COPYRIGHT 2004 Elsevier. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]
How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.

- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
  - **Stall** the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
  - Guess the next fetch address (**branch prediction**)
  - Employ delayed branching (**branch delay slot**)
  - Do something else (**fine-grained multithreading**)
  - Eliminate control-flow instructions (**predicated execution**)
  - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (**multipath execution**)
Predicate Combining (not Predicated Execution)

- Complex predicates are converted into multiple branches
  - if ((a == b) && (c < d) && (a > 5000)) { ... }
    - 3 conditional branches

- Problem: This increases the number of control dependencies

- Idea: Combine predicate operations to feed a single branch instruction instead of having one branch for each
  - Predicates stored and operated on using condition registers
  - A single branch checks the value of the combined predicate

+ Fewer branches in code → fewer mipredictions/stalls

-- Possibly unnecessary work
  -- If the first predicate is false, no need to compute other predicates

- Condition registers exist in IBM RS6000 and the POWER architecture
Predication (Predicated Execution)

- **Idea:** *Convert control dependence to data dependence*

- **Simple example:** Suppose we had a Conditional Move instruction...
  - CMOV condition, R1 ← R2
  - R1 = (condition == true) ? R2 : R1
  - Employed in most modern ISAs (x86, Alpha)

- **Code example with branches vs. CMOVs**
  - if (a == 5) {b = 4;} else {b = 3;}

  CMOPEQ condition, a, 5;
  CMOV condition, b ← 4;
  CMOV !condition, b ← 3;
**Predication (Predicated Execution)**

**Idea:** Compiler converts control dependence into data dependence $\rightarrow$ branch is eliminated
- Each instruction has a predicate bit set based on the predicate computation
- Only instructions with TRUE predicates are committed (others turned into NOPs)

(normal branch code)  
```
if (cond) {
  b = 0;
}
else {
  b = 1;
}
```

(predicated code)
```
if (cond) {
  p1 = (cond);
  branch p1, TARGET
}
else {
  !p1
  mov b, 1
  jmp JOIN
}
TARGET:
  mov b, 0
  add x, b, 1
```

```
Predicated Execution References


Conditional Move Operations

- Very limited form of predicated execution

- CMOV R1 ← R2
  - $R1 = (\text{ConditionCode} == \text{true}) \ ? R2 : R1$
  - Employed in most modern ISAs (x86, Alpha)
Predicated execution can be high performance and energy-efficient

Predicated Execution
Fetch Decode Rename Schedule RegisterRead Execute

Branch Prediction
Fetch Decode Rename Schedule RegisterRead Execute

Pipeline flush!!
Predicated Execution

- Eliminates branches → enables straight line code (i.e., larger basic blocks in code)

Advantages

- Eliminates hard-to-predict branches
- Always-not-taken prediction works better (no branches)
- Compiler has more freedom to optimize code (no branches)
  - control flow does not hinder inst. reordering optimizations
  - code optimizations hindered only by data dependencies

Disadvantages

- Useless work: some instructions fetched/executed but discarded (especially bad for easy-to-predict branches)
- Requires additional ISA (and hardware) support
- Can we eliminate all branches this way?
Predicated Execution vs. Branch Prediction

+ Eliminates mispredictions for hard-to-predict branches
  + No need for branch prediction for some branches
  + Good if misprediction cost > useless work due to predication

-- Causes useless work for branches that are easy to predict
  -- Reduces performance if misprediction cost < useless work
-- Adaptivity: Static predication is not adaptive to run-time branch behavior. Branch behavior changes based on input set, program phase, control-flow path.
Predicated Execution in Intel Itanium

- Each instruction can be separately predicated
- 64 one-bit predicate registers
- Each instruction carries a 6-bit predicate field
- An instruction is effectively a NOP if its predicate is false
Conditional Execution in the ARM ISA

- Almost all ARM instructions can include an optional condition code.
  - Prior to ARM v8

- An instruction with a condition code is executed only if the condition code flags in the CPSR meet the specified condition.
Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cond</th>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Rn</th>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>Operand2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>A S</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>U A S</td>
<td>RdHi</td>
<td>RdLo</td>
<td>Rs</td>
<td>1 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td>B 0 0</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>I P U B W L</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Offset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 0</td>
<td>P U S W L</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Register List</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>F U 1 W L</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Offset1 1</td>
<td>S H 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0</td>
<td>F U 0 W L</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>S H 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 0 1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Offset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 0</td>
<td>P U N W L</td>
<td>Rn</td>
<td>CRd</td>
<td>CPNum</td>
<td>Offset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Op1</td>
<td>CRn</td>
<td>CRd</td>
<td>CPNum</td>
<td>Op2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1 0</td>
<td>Op1</td>
<td>CRn</td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>CPNum</td>
<td>Op2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 1</td>
<td>SWI Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instruction type**
- Data processing / PSR Transfer
- Multiply
- Long Multiply (v3M / v4 only)
- Swap
- Load/Store Byte/Word
- Load/Store Multiple
- Halfword transfer: Immediate offset (v4 only)
- Halfword transfer: Register offset (v4 only)
- Branch
- Branch Exchange (v4T only)
- Coprocessor data transfer
- Coprocessor data operation
- Coprocessor register transfer
- Software interrupt
Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

- **0000 = EQ - Z** set (equal)
- **0001 = NE - Z** clear (not equal)
- **0010 = HS / CS - C** set (unsigned higher or same)
- **0011 = LO / CC - C** clear (unsigned lower)
- **0100 = MI - N** set (negative)
- **0101 = PL - N** clear (positive or zero)
- **0110 = VS - V** set (overflow)
- **0111 = VC - V** clear (no overflow)
- **1000 = HI - C set and Z** clear (unsigned higher)
- **1001 = LS - C** clear or Z (set unsigned lower or same)
- **1010 = GE - N** set and V set, or N clear and V clear (>=)
- **1011 = LT - N** set and V clear, or N clear and V set (>)
- **1100 = GT - Z** clear, and either N set and V set, or N clear and V set (>)
- **1101 = LE - Z** set, or N set and V clear, or N clear and V set (<, or =)
- **1110 = AL - always**
- **1111 = NV - reserved.**
Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

* To execute an instruction conditionally, simply postfix it with the appropriate condition:
  
  • For example an add instruction takes the form:
    - \text{ADD} \text{ r0}, \text{r1}, \text{r2} \quad ; \quad \text{r0} = \text{r1} + \text{r2} \quad (\text{ADDL})
  
  • To execute this only if the zero flag is set:
    - \text{ADDEQ} \text{ r0}, \text{r1}, \text{r2} \quad ; \quad \text{If zero flag set then}...
      \quad ; \quad \ldots \quad \text{r0} = \text{r1} + \text{r2}

* By default, data processing operations do not affect the condition flags (apart from the comparisons where this is the only effect). To cause the condition flags to be updated, the S bit of the instruction needs to be set by postfixing the instruction (and any condition code) with an “S”.
  
  • For example to add two numbers and set the condition flags:
    - \text{ADDS} \text{ r0}, \text{r1}, \text{r2} \quad ; \quad \text{r0} = \text{r1} + \text{r2}
      \quad ; \quad \ldots \ldots \text{and set flags}
Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

* Convert the GCD algorithm given in this flowchart into
  1) “Normal” assembler, where only branches can be conditional.
  2) ARM assembler, where all instructions are conditional, thus improving code density.

* The only instructions you need are CMP, B and SUB.
Conditional Execution in ARM ISA

“Normal” Assembler

gcd cmp r0, r1 ;reached the end?
  beq stop
  blt less ;if r0 > r1
  sub r0, r0, r1 ;subtract r1 from r0
  bal gcd
less sub r1, r1, r0 ;subtract r0 from r1
  bal gcd
stop

ARM Conditional Assembler

gcd cmp r0, r1 ;if r0 > r1
  subgt r0, r0, r1 ;subtract r1 from r0
  sublt r1, r1, r0 ;else subtract r0 from r1
  bne gcd ;reached the end?
How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.

- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
  - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
  - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
  - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
  - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
  - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
  - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)
Multi-Path Execution

- **Idea:** Execute both paths after a conditional branch
  - For a hard-to-predict branch: Use dynamic confidence estimation

- **Advantages:**
  + Improves performance if misprediction cost > useless work
  + No ISA change needed

- **Disadvantages:**
  -- What happens when the machine encounters another hard-to-predict branch? Execute both paths again?
    -- Paths followed quickly become exponential
  -- Each followed path requires its own context (registers, PC, GHR)
  -- Wasted work (and reduced performance) if paths merge
Dual-Path Execution versus Predication

Hard to predict

Dual-path
path 1
C
D
E
F

path 2
C
D
E
F

Predicated Execution
path 1
C
D
E
F

path 2
C
D
E
F

CFMerge

CFMerge
Handling Other Types of Branches
# Remember: Branch Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Direction at fetch time</th>
<th>Number of possible next fetch addresses?</th>
<th>When is next fetch address resolved?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditional</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Execution (register dependent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional</td>
<td>Always taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decode (PC + offset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td>Always taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Decode (PC + offset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return</td>
<td>Always taken</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Execution (register dependent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Always taken</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>Execution (register dependent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## How can we predict an indirect branch with many target addresses?
Call and Return Prediction

- **Direct calls are easy to predict**
  - Always taken, single target
  - Call marked in BTB, target predicted by BTB

- **Returns are indirect branches**
  - A function can be called from many points in code
  - A return instruction can have many target addresses
    - Next instruction after each call point for the same function
  - Observation: Usually a return matches a call
  - **Idea:** Use a stack to predict return addresses (Return Address Stack)
    - A fetched call: pushes the return (next instruction) address on the stack
    - A fetched return: pops the stack and uses the address as its predicted target
    - Accurate most of the time: 8-entry stack $\rightarrow$ > 95% accuracy
Indirect Branch Prediction (I)

- Register-indirect branches have multiple targets

- Used to implement
  - Switch-case statements
  - Virtual function calls
  - Jump tables (of function pointers)
  - Interface calls

Conditional (Direct) Branch

Indirect Jump

\[
\text{TARG} \quad \text{A} \quad \text{A+1}
\]

\[
\text{T} \quad \text{N} \quad \text{br.cond TARGET}
\]

\[
\text{R1} = \text{MEM[R2]}
\]

\[
\alpha \quad \beta \quad \delta \quad \rho
\]

\[
\text{branch R1}
\]
Indirect Branch Prediction (II)

- No direction prediction needed
- Idea 1: **Predict the last resolved target as the next fetch address**
  - Simple: Use the BTB to store the target address
  - Inaccurate: 50% accuracy (empirical). Many indirect branches switch between different targets

- Idea 2: **Use history based target prediction**
  - E.g., Index the BTB with GHR XORED with Indirect Branch PC
  - Chang et al., “**Target Prediction for Indirect Jumps,**” ISCA 1997.
  - More accurate
  - An indirect branch maps to (too) many entries in BTB
    - Conflict misses with other branches (direct or indirect)
    - Inefficient use of space if branch has few target addresses
The advanced branch prediction in the Pentium M processor is based on the Intel Pentium® 4 processor’s [6] branch predictor. On top of that, two additional predictors to capture special program flows, were added: a Loop Detector and an Indirect Branch Predictor.

Figure 2: The Loop Detector logic

Figure 3: The Indirect Branch Predictor logic

Issues in Branch Prediction (I)

- Need to identify a branch before it is fetched

- How do we do this?
  - BTB hit → indicates that the fetched instruction is a branch
  - BTB entry contains the “type” of the branch
  - Pre-decoded “branch type” information stored in the instruction cache identifies type of branch

- What if no BTB?
  - Bubble in the pipeline until target address is computed
  - E.g., IBM POWER4
Latency of Branch Prediction

- **Latency:** Prediction is latency critical
  - Need to generate next fetch address for the next cycle
  - Bigger, more complex predictors are more accurate but slower
Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays
VLIW
VLIW Concept

- **Superscalar**
  - Hardware fetches multiple instructions and checks dependencies between them

- **VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)**
  - Software (compiler) packs independent instructions in a larger “instruction bundle” to be fetched and executed concurrently
  - Hardware fetches and executes the instructions in the bundle concurrently

- No need for hardware dependency checking between concurrently-fetched instructions in the VLIW model

- ELI: Enormously longword instructions (512 bits)
VLIW (Very Long Instruction Word)

- A very long instruction word consists of multiple independent instructions packed together by the compiler
  - Packed instructions can be logically unrelated (contrast with SIMD/vector processors, which we will see soon)

- Idea: Compiler finds independent instructions and statically schedules (i.e. packs/bundles) them into a single VLIW instruction

- Traditional Characteristics
  - Multiple functional units
  - All instructions in a bundle are executed in lock step
  - Instructions in a bundle statically aligned to be directly fed into the functional units
VLIW Performance Example (2-wide bundles)

$lw\ \$t0, 40(\$s0)$
$add\ \$t1, \$s1, \$s2$
$sub\ \$t2, \$s1, \$s3$
$and\ \$t3, \$s3, \$s4$
$or\ \$t4, \$s1, \$s5$
$sw\ \$s5, 80(\$s0)$

Ideal IPC = 2

Actual IPC = 2 (6 instructions issued in 3 cycles)
VLIW Lock-Step Execution

- Lock-step (all or none) execution: If any operation in a VLIW instruction stalls, all instructions stall.

- In a truly VLIW machine, the compiler handles all dependency-related stalls, hardware does not perform dependency checking.
  - What about variable latency operations?
VLIW Philosophy

- Philosophy similar to RISC (simple instructions and hardware)
  - Except multiple instructions in parallel

- RISC (John Cocke, 1970s, IBM 801 minicomputer)
  - Compiler does the hard work to translate high-level language code to simple instructions (John Cocke: control signals)
    - And, to reorder simple instructions for high performance
  - Hardware does little translation/decoding → very simple

- VLIW (Josh Fisher, ISCA 1983)
  - Compiler does the hard work to find instruction level parallelism
  - Hardware stays as simple and streamlined as possible
    - Executes each instruction in a bundle in lock step
    - Simple → higher frequency, easier to design
Commercial VLIW Machines

- Multiflow TRACE, Josh Fisher (7-wide, 28-wide)
- Cydrome Cydra 5, Bob Rau
- Transmeta Crusoe: x86 binary-translated into internal VLIW
- TI C6000, Trimedia, STMicro (DSP & embedded processors)
  - Most successful commercially

- Intel IA-64
  - Not fully VLIW, but based on VLIW principles
  - EPIC (Explicitly Parallel Instruction Computing)
  - Instruction bundles can have dependent instructions
  - A few bits in the instruction format specify explicitly which instructions in the bundle are dependent on which other ones
VLIW Tradeoffs

- **Advantages**
  - + No need for dynamic scheduling hardware  \(\rightarrow\) simple hardware
  - + No need for dependency checking within a VLIW instruction  \(\rightarrow\) simple hardware for multiple instruction issue + no renaming
  - + No need for instruction alignment/distribution after fetch to different functional units  \(\rightarrow\) simple hardware

- **Disadvantages**
  - -- Compiler needs to find N independent operations per cycle
    -- If it cannot, inserts NOPs in a VLIW instruction
    -- Parallelism loss AND code size increase
  - -- Recompilation required when execution width (N), instruction latencies, functional units change (Unlike superscalar processing)
  - -- Lockstep execution causes independent operations to stall
    -- No instruction can progress until the longest-latency instruction completes
VLIW Summary

- VLIW simplifies hardware, but requires complex compiler techniques
- Solely-compiler approach of VLIW has several downsides that reduce performance
  -- Too many NOPs (not enough parallelism discovered)
  -- Static schedule intimately tied to microarchitecture
    -- Code optimized for one generation performs poorly for next
  -- No tolerance for variable or long-latency operations (lock step)

++ Most compiler optimizations developed for VLIW employed in optimizing compilers (for superscalar compilation)
  - Enable code optimizations
++ VLIW successful when parallelism is easier to find by the compiler (traditionally embedded markets, DSPs)
An Example Work: Superblock

The Superblock: An Effective Technique for VLIW and Superscalar Compilation

Wen-mei W. Hwu    Scott A. Mahlke    William Y. Chen    Pohua P. Chang
Nancy J. Warter    Roger A. Bringmann    Roland G. Ouellette    Richard E. Hank
Tokuzo Kiyohara    Grant E. Haab    John G. Holm    Daniel M. Lavery *


Lecture Video on Static Instruction Scheduling
  https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=isBEVkJgGA
Another Example Work: IMPACT

IMPACT: An Architectural Framework for Multiple-Instruction-Issue Processors

Pohua P. Chang    Scott A. Mahlke    William Y. Chen    Nancy J. Warter    Wen-mei W. Hwu

Center for Reliable and High-Performance Computing
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

The performance of multiple-instruction-issue processors can be severely limited by the compiler’s ability to generate efficient code for concurrent hardware. In the IMPACT project, we have developed IMPACT-I, a highly optimizing C compiler to exploit instruction level concurrency. The optimization capabilities of the IMPACT-I C compiler are summarized in this paper. Using the IMPACT-I C compiler, we ran experiments to analyze the performance of multiple-instruction-issue processors executing some important non-numerical programs. The multiple-instruction-issue processors achieve solid speedup over high-performance single-instruction-issue processors.

Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- Superscalar Execution
- VLIW
- Fine-Grained Multithreading
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays
Recall: How to Handle Data Dependences

- Anti and output dependences are easier to handle
  - write to the destination in one stage and in program order

- Flow dependences are more interesting

- Five fundamental ways of handling flow dependences
  - Detect and wait until value is available in register file
  - Detect and forward/bypass data to dependent instruction
  - Detect and eliminate the dependence at the software level
    - No need for the hardware to detect dependence
  - Predict the needed value(s), execute “speculatively”, and verify
  - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
    - No need to detect
How to Handle Control Dependences

- Critical to keep the pipeline full with correct sequence of dynamic instructions.

- Potential solutions if the instruction is a control-flow instruction:
  - Stall the pipeline until we know the next fetch address
  - Guess the next fetch address (branch prediction)
  - Employ delayed branching (branch delay slot)
  - Do something else (fine-grained multithreading)
  - Eliminate control-flow instructions (predicated execution)
  - Fetch from both possible paths (if you know the addresses of both possible paths) (multipath execution)
Fine-Grained Multithreading
Fine-Grained Multithreading

- Idea: Hardware has multiple thread contexts (PC+registers). Each cycle, fetch engine fetches from a different thread.
  - By the time the fetched branch/instruction resolves, no instruction is fetched from the same thread
  - Branch/instruction resolution latency overlapped with execution of other threads’ instructions

+ No logic needed for handling control and data dependences within a thread
-- Single thread performance suffers
-- Extra logic for keeping thread contexts
-- Does not overlap latency if not enough threads to cover the whole pipeline
Fine-Grained Multithreading (II)

- Idea: Switch to another thread every cycle such that no two instructions from a thread are in the pipeline concurrently.
- Tolerates the control and data dependency latencies by overlapping the latency with useful work from other threads.
- Improves pipeline utilization by taking advantage of multiple threads.

Fine-Grained Multithreading: History

- CDC 6600’s peripheral processing unit is fine-grained multithreaded
  - Processor executes a different I/O thread every cycle
  - An operation from the same thread is executed every 10 cycles

- Denelcor HEP (Heterogeneous Element Processor)
  - 120 threads/processor
  - available queue vs. unavailable (waiting) queue for threads
  - each thread can have only 1 instruction in the processor pipeline; each thread independent
  - to each thread, processor looks like a non-pipelined machine
  - system throughput vs. single thread performance tradeoff
Fine-Grained Multithreading in HEP

- Cycle time: 100ns
- 8 stages $\rightarrow$ 800 ns to complete an instruction
  - assuming no memory access
- No control and data dependency checking

Burton Smith (1941-2018)
Multithreaded Pipeline Example

Slide credit: Joel Emer
Sun Niagara Multithreaded Pipeline

Fine-grained Multithreading

**Advantages**
- No need for dependency checking between instructions
  (only one instruction in pipeline from a single thread)
- No need for branch prediction logic
- Otherwise-bubble cycles used for executing useful instructions from different threads
- Improved system throughput, latency tolerance, utilization

**Disadvantages**
- Extra hardware complexity: multiple hardware contexts (PCs, register files, ...), thread selection logic
- Reduced single thread performance (one instruction fetched every N cycles from the same thread)
- Resource contention between threads in caches and memory
- Some dependency checking logic *between* threads remains (load/store)
Modern GPUs are FGMT Machines
NVIDIA GeForce GTX 285 “core”

= data-parallel (SIMD) func. unit, control shared across 8 units
  = multiply-add
  = multiply

= instruction stream decode

= execution context storage

64 KB of storage for thread contexts (registers)

Slide credit: Kayvon Fatahalian
NVIDIA GeForce GTX 285 “core”

- Groups of 32 threads share instruction stream (each group is a Warp): they execute the same instruction on different data
- **Up to 32 warps are interleaved in an FGMT manner**
- Up to 1024 thread contexts can be stored

Slide credit: Kayvon Fatahalian
30 cores on the GTX 285: 30,720 threads
End of Fine-Grained Multithreading
In Memory of Burton Smith

A PIPELINED, SHARED RESOURCE MIMD COMPUTER

Burton J. Smith
Denelcor, Inc.
Denver, Colorado 80205

Architecture and applications of the HEP multiprocessor computer system

Burton J. Smith
Denelcor, Inc., 14221 E. 4th Avenue, Aurora, Colorado 80011

Burton Smith
(1941-2018)
The Tera Computer System

Robert Alverson        David Callahan        Daniel Cummings
Allan Porterfield     Burton Smith          Brian Koblenz

Tera Computer Company
Seattle, Washington USA

4 Processors

Each processor in a Tera computer can execute multiple instruction streams simultaneously. In the current implementation, as few as one or as many as 128 program counters may be active at once. On every tick of the clock, the processor logic selects a stream that is ready to execute and allows it to issue its next instruction. Since instruction interpretation is completely pipelined by the processor and by the network and memories as well, a new instruction from a different stream may be issued in each tick without interfering with its predecessors. When an instruction finishes, the stream to which it belongs thereby becomes ready to execute the next instruction. As long as there are enough instruction streams in the processor so that the average instruction latency is filled with instructions from other streams, the processor is being fully utilized. Thus, it is only necessary to have enough streams to hide the expected latency (perhaps 70 ticks on average); once latency is hidden the processor is running at peak performance and additional streams do not speed the result.
We did not cover the following slides in lecture. These are for your preparation for the next lecture.
Burton Smith

• Technical Fellow at Microsoft
• Past: Co-founder, chief scientist, chairman of Tera/Cray, Denelcor, Professor at Colorado
• Eckert-Mauchly Award in 1991, Seymour Cray Award, US National Academy of Engineering, AAAS/ACM/IEEE Fellow and many other honors
• Many wide-range contributions spanning architecture, system software, compilers, ..., including:
  – Denelcor HEP, Tera MTA
  – fine-grained synchronization, communication, multithreading
  – parallel architectures, resource management, interconnection networks
  – ...
• One I would like to share: