Lab 4 Heads Up

- Lab 4a out
  - Branch handling and branch predictors

- Lab 4b will be out soon
  - Fine-grained multithreading

- Due March 21st

- You have 4 weeks!
- Get started very early – Exam and S. Break are on the way
- Finish Lab 4a first and check off
- Finish Lab 4b next and check off
- Do the extra credit
Lab 2 Extra Credit Recognition

1. Albert Cho (260/263)
2. Bailey Forrest (252/263)
3. Jeremie Kim (248/263)
4. Clement Loh (240/263)
5. Xiang Lin (184/263)
Readings Specifically for Today

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

Readings for Next Lecture

- SIMD Processing
- Basic GPU Architecture
- Other execution models: VLIW, Dataflow


- Stay tuned for more readings...
Review: Out-of-Order Execution with Precise Exceptions

- Hump 1: Reservation stations (scheduling window)
- Hump 2: Reordering (reorder buffer, aka instruction window or active window)
Register renaming eliminates false dependencies, enables linking of producer to consumers

Buffering enables the pipeline to move for independent ops

Tag broadcast enables communication (of readiness of produced value) between instructions

Wakeup and select enables out-of-order dispatch
An out-of-order engine dynamically builds the dataflow graph of a piece of the program
- which piece?

The dataflow graph is limited to the instruction window
- Instruction window: all decoded but not yet retired instructions

Can we do it for the whole program?
- Why would we like to?
- In other words, how can we have a large instruction window?
- Can we do it efficiently with Tomasulo’s algorithm?
Dataflow Graph for Our Example

MUL R3 ← R1, R2
ADD R5 ← R3, R4
ADD R7 ← R2, R6
ADD R10 ← R8, R9
MUL R11 ← R7, R10
ADD R5 ← R5, R11
State of RAT and RS in Cycle 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V Tag</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>~2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>~4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>~4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>~6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>~6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>~8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>~8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>~9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>~9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>~9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

end of cycle 7:

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All 6 instreets renamed.
Note what happened to R5.
Dataflow Graph

Nodes: operations performed by the instruction

Arcs: tags in Tmasulo’s algorithm

```
MUL R1, R2 → R3 (x)
ADD R3, R4 → R5 (a)
ADD R2, R6 → R7 (b)
ADD R8, R9 → R10 (c)
MUL R7, R10 → R11 (y)
ADD R5, R11 → R5 (d)
```
Restricted Data Flow

- An out-of-order machine is a “restricted data flow” machine
  - Dataflow-based execution is restricted to the microarchitecture level
  - ISA is still based on von Neumann model (sequential execution)

- Remember the data flow model (at the ISA level):
  - Dataflow model: An instruction is fetched and executed in data flow order
  - i.e., when its operands are ready
  - i.e., there is no instruction pointer
  - Instruction ordering specified by data flow dependence
    - Each instruction specifies “who” should receive the result
    - An instruction can “fire” whenever all operands are received
Questions to Ponder

- Why is OoO execution beneficial?
  - What if all operations take single cycle?
  - Latency tolerance: OoO execution tolerates the latency of multi-cycle operations by executing independent operations concurrently

- What if an instruction takes 500 cycles?
  - How large of an instruction window do we need to continue decoding?
  - How many cycles of latency can OoO tolerate?
  - What limits the latency tolerance scalability of Tomasulo’s algorithm?
    - Active/instruction window size: determined by both scheduling window and reorder buffer size
Registers versus Memory, Revisited

- So far, we considered register based value communication between instructions

- What about memory?

- What are the fundamental differences between registers and memory?
  - Register dependences known statically – memory dependences determined dynamically
  - Register state is small – memory state is large
  - Register state is not visible to other threads/processors – memory state is shared between threads/processors (in a shared memory multiprocessor)
Memory Dependence Handling (I)

- Need to obey memory dependences in an out-of-order machine
  - and need to do so while providing high performance

- Observation and Problem: Memory address is not known until a load/store executes

- Corollary 1: Renaming memory addresses is difficult
- Corollary 2: Determining dependence or independence of loads/stores need to be handled after their execution
- Corollary 3: When a load/store has its address ready, there may be younger/older loads/stores with undetermined addresses in the machine
When do you schedule a load instruction in an OOO engine?

- Problem: A younger load can have its address ready before an older store’s address is known
- Known as the memory disambiguation problem or the unknown address problem

Approaches

- **Conservative:** Stall the load until all previous stores have computed their addresses (or even retired from the machine)
- **Aggressive:** Assume load is independent of unknown-address stores and schedule the load right away
- **Intelligent:** Predict (with a more sophisticated predictor) if the load is dependent on the/any unknown address store
Handling of Store-Load Dependencies

- A load’s dependence status is not known until all previous store addresses are available.

How does the OOO engine detect dependence of a load instruction on a previous store?
- Option 1: Wait until all previous stores committed (no need to check)
- Option 2: Keep a list of pending stores in a store buffer and check whether load address matches a previous store address

How does the OOO engine treat the scheduling of a load instruction wrt previous stores?
- Option 1: Assume load dependent on all previous stores
- Option 2: Assume load independent of all previous stores
- Option 3: Predict the dependence of a load on an outstanding store
Memory Disambiguation (I)

- Option 1: Assume load dependent on all previous stores
  + No need for recovery
  -- Too conservative: delays independent loads unnecessarily

- Option 2: Assume load independent of all previous stores
  + Simple and can be common case: no delay for independent loads
  -- Requires recovery and re-execution of load and dependents on misprediction

- Option 3: Predict the dependence of a load on an outstanding store
  + More accurate. Load store dependencies persist over time
  -- Still requires recovery/re-execution on misprediction
  - Alpha 21264: Initially assume load independent, delay loads found to be dependent
Memory Disambiguation (II)


- Predicting store-load dependencies important for performance
- Simple predictors (based on past history) can achieve most of the potential performance
Food for Thought for You

- Many other design choices

- Should reservation stations be centralized or distributed across functional units?
  - What are the tradeoffs?

- Should reservation stations and ROB store data values or should there be a centralized physical register file where all data values are stored?
  - What are the tradeoffs?

- Exactly when does an instruction broadcast its tag?
- ...
More Food for Thought for You

- How can you implement branch prediction in an out-of-order execution machine?
  - Think about branch history register and PHT updates
  - Think about recovery from mispredictions
    - How to do this fast?

- How can you combine superscalar execution with out-of-order execution?
  - These are different concepts
  - Concurrent renaming of instructions
  - Concurrent broadcast of tags

- How can you combine superscalar + out-of-order + branch prediction?
Recommended Readings

- Out-of-order execution processor designs


And More Readings…


Other Approaches to Concurrency (or Instruction Level Parallelism)
Approaches to (Instruction-Level) Concurrency

- Pipelining
- Out-of-order execution
- Dataflow (at the ISA level)
- SIMD Processing (Vector and array processors, GPUs)
- VLIW

- Decoupled Access Execute
- Systolic Arrays
Data Flow: Exploiting Irregular Parallelism
Remember: State of RAT and RS in Cycle 7

end of cycle 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>~1</th>
<th>~1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X1</td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2</td>
<td>~1</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All 6 instructs removed.
- Note what happened to R5
Remember: Dataflow Graph

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MUL} & \quad R1, R2 \rightarrow R3 \quad (x) \\
\text{ADD} & \quad R3, R4 \rightarrow R5 \quad (a) \\
\text{ADD} & \quad R2, R6 \rightarrow R7 \quad (b) \\
\text{ADD} & \quad R8, R9 \rightarrow R10 \quad (c) \\
\text{MUL} & \quad R7, R10 \rightarrow R11 \quad (y) \\
\text{ADD} & \quad R5, R11 \rightarrow R5 \quad (d)
\end{align*}
\]

**Dataflow graph**

- **Nodes:** Operations performed by the instruction
- **Arrows:** Tags in Terasuilo's algorithm
Review: More on Data Flow

- In a data flow machine, a program consists of data flow nodes
  - A data flow node fires (fetched and executed) when all its inputs are ready
    - i.e. when all inputs have tokens

- Data flow node and its ISA representation
Data Flow Nodes

*Conditional

*Relational

*Barrier Synch
Dataflow Nodes (II)

- A small set of dataflow operators can be used to define a general programming language.
Dataflow Graphs

Values in dataflow graphs are represented as tokens

An operator executes when all its input tokens are present; copies of the result token are distributed to the destination operators

no separate control flow
Example Data Flow Program
Figure 2. A comparison of control flow and dataflow programs. On the left a control flow program for a computer with memory-to-memory instructions. The arcs point to the locations of data that are to be used or created. Control flow arcs are indicated with dashed arrows; usually most of them are implicit. In the equivalent dataflow program on the right only one memory is involved. Each instruction contains pointers to all instructions that consume its results.
Data Flow Characteristics

- Data-driven execution of instruction-level graphical code
  - Nodes are operators
  - Arcs are data (I/O)
  - As opposed to control-driven execution
- Only real dependencies constrain processing
- No sequential instruction stream
  - No program counter
- Execution triggered by the presence/readiness of data
- Operations execute asynchronously
A Dataflow Processor

Token = Data1 + Tag + Destination

Matching Area

Group = Data1 + Data2 + Tag + Destination

Instruction Fetch Area

Execution Package = Data1 + Data2 + OpCode + Tag + Destination

Data Flow Proc. Element

Token = Data + Tag + Destination
MIT Tagged Token Data Flow Architecture

- **Wait-Match Unit:** try to match incoming token and context id and a waiting token with same instruction address
  - Success: Both tokens forwarded
  - Fail: Incoming token $\rightarrow$ Waiting Token Mem, bubble (no-op forwarded)
TTDA Data Flow Example

Conceptual

Encoding of graph

Program memory:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opcode</th>
<th>Destination(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>op1 120L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>op2 120R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>+ 141, 159L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>op3 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>op4 ... , ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Re-entry ("dynamic" dataflow):
- Each invocation of a function or loop iteration gets its own, unique, "Context"
- Tokens destined for same instruction in different invocations are distinguished by a context identifier

Encoding of token:

A "packet" containing:

120R 6.847 Destination instruction address, Left/Right port Value

120R Ctxt 6.847 Destination instruction address, Left/Right port Context Identifier Value
TTDA Data Flow Example
TTDA Data Flow Example

Conceptual:

Encoding of graph:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program memory: Opcode</th>
<th>Destination(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Fetch, 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>op1, ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manchester Data Flow Machine

- Matching Store: Pairs together tokens destined for the same instruction
- Large data set → overflow in overflow unit
- Paired tokens fetch the appropriate instruction from the node store
Data Flow Advantages/Disadvantages

**Advantages**
- Very good at exploiting irregular parallelism
- Only real dependencies constrain processing

**Disadvantages**
- No precise state
  - Debugging very difficult
  - Interrupt/exception handling is difficult
- Bookkeeping overhead (tag matching)
- Too much parallelism? (Parallelism control needed)
  - Overflow of tag matching tables
- Implementing dynamic data structures difficult
Data Flow Summary

- Availability of data determines order of execution
- A data flow node fires when its sources are ready
- Programs represented as data flow graphs (of nodes)

- Data Flow at the ISA level has not been (as) successful

- Data Flow implementations under the hood (while preserving sequential ISA semantics) have been very successful
  - Out of order execution
  - Hwu and Patt, “HPSm, a high performance restricted data flow architecture having minimal functionality,” ISCA 1986.
Further Reading on Data Flow

- ISA level dataflow

- Microarchitecture-level dataflow:
  - Hwu and Patt, “HPSm, a high performance restricted data flow architecture having minimal functionality,” ISCA 1986.