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Part 1: Benefits of single chip designs

Vast potential intercommunication bandwidth
- Multiple layers of metal (up to 11 now, in 2020 14)
- Low power consumption (up to 1000 GOPS/W achievable at 45 nm technology in 2009, more later)

Large amount of logic/storage can be integrated to a single chip
- Extremely compact footprint
SOC-PE DESIGN COMPLEXITY TRENDS

- Capacity is still expected to grow exponentially for ten years
- Room for many on-chip processing engines
Challenges of (future) single chip designs

- **Power density** problems (have almost killed the clock rate growth)
- **Crosstalk** between parallel wires (makes interconnect design more complex, slows down communication)
- Increasing **static power** consumption is becoming a problem (see Figure)
- High number of **fast off-chip** connections increasingly difficult to implement (makes design of multichip systems more difficult)

*Figure 14  SOC-PE Power Consumption Trends*
Cu resistivity

Raising conductor resistance slows down signal propagation on parallel interconnects

\[
D_1 = 0.7 \frac{KR_{\text{drv}}}{H} \left( \frac{C_s}{K} + H C_{\text{drv}} + 4.4 \frac{C_c}{K} \right) + \frac{R_c L_w}{T_w W_w} \left( 0.4 \frac{C_s}{K} + 1.51 \frac{C_c}{K} + 0.7 H C_{\text{drv}} \right) + \frac{D_r}{2}
\]

Resistance = Resistivity \* Length / Cross section area
Signal propagation slows down as feature size shrinks
Hierarchical Scaling of interconnect widths (ASIC)

Repeater and upscaling the interconnect cross-section as the length increases helps a bit.

The rest must be compensated with pipelining.

Figure 71  Cross-section of Hierarchical Scaling—ASIC Device
Amdahl’s rule of thumb:

“A balanced system has 1 MB memory and 1 Mbps I/O capacity per 1 MIPS”

According to this general-purpose SOCs are not realistic within 10 years at least without wafer-scale integration!

**Do you believe in Amdahl?**
- it is clear that this does not hold for special purpose processing, e.g. DSP
- what about general purpose case?

**SW solutions:** Memory usage minimization, in-place algorithms

**HW solutions:** Virtual memory, multichip modules/wafer-scale integration
Part 2: Implementing PRAM on a Chip

For PRAM realization we need

- An ability to **hide the latency** of the intercommunication network/memory system (via multithreading and pipelined memory system; caches as they are defined now can not be used for latency hiding)
- **Sufficient bandwidth** for solving an arbitrary routing problem with a high probability
- A method to **avoid hot spots** in communication with a high probability
- Technique to **handle concurrent references** to a single location
- Support for **multioperations**
- **Efficient synchronization** mechanisms

Single chip designs provide good possibilities for PRAM implementation! In this part we will outline a single chip **EREW PRAM** implementation.
Processor—multithreading, chaining & inter-thread pipelining

For PRAM realization processors needs to be **multithreaded**. Previous presentation suggest also that **interthread superpipelining** and **chaining** should be used.

Such a processor is composed of
- *A* ALUs,
- *M* memory units (MU),
- a hash address calculation unit,
- a compare unit,
- a sequencer, and
- a distributed register file of *R* registers.
Features & raw performance

- **zero overhead** multithreading
- **superpipelining for clock cycle minimization**
- **hazard-free** pipelining with multiple functional units
- support for totally **cacheless memory** system
- Chaining of functional units to allow execution of **truly sequential** code in one step

According to our tests a such a processor (MTAC) with 4 FUs runs a suite of simple integer benchmarks 2.7 times faster on average than a basic five-stage pipelined RISC processor (DLX) with 4 FUs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DLX</th>
<th>MTAC</th>
<th>MTAC</th>
<th>MTAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Network—sufficient bandwidth, deadlock/hot spot avoidance, physical feasibility, synchronicity

For PRAM realization intercommunication network needs to have **sufficient bandwidth**, **deadlock free routing**, mechanism for **hot spot avoidance**, and retaining **synchronicity** at step and thread levels. Finally, it needs to be **physically feasible**.

Although **logarithmic diameter** network topologies seem attractive, they are **not** physically **scalable** since the lower bound for a diameter for fixed length link topology is **square root P** rather than **log P**.

This seems to suggest that a **2D mesh** topology would be suitable, but unfortunately the 2D mesh **does not have** enough **bandwidth** for solving a random routing problem.

**Typical networks**, e.g. **2D meshes**, do **not** provide **enough bandwidth** for random access patterns.
Solution: Acyclic sparse mesh, bandwidth scaling, hashing, synchronization wave

A scalable communication solution for PRAM realization is e.g. double acyclic sparse mesh network featuring

- \( P \) processors, \( S \) switches
- Constant degree switches
- Fixed length intercommunication wiring
- Chip-wide synchronization wave scheme
- Linear bandwidth scaling mechanism

Hashing does not have effect on network design since it can be computed at processors, networks just routes references.
Superswitch

Switches related to each resource pair are grouped as a single superswitch to keep switches constant degree.

A superswitch is composed of $P/16$ switches, two switch elements and decoders.

A switch is composed of four 2x3 and four 3x2 switch elements

Processor and memory can send replies simultaneously

$\Rightarrow$ Separate lines (networks) for messages going from processors to memories and from memories to processors
A 3x2 switch element is composed of two Q-slot FIFO-queue elements which are directed by two arbiter units.

Each FIFO queue accepts up to the number of inputs messages (3 for 3x2 switch element) each clock cycle if there is enough room for them.
The processors can send memory requests (reads and writes) and synchronization messages to the memory modules and modules can send replies and synchronization messages back to processors.

There are four types of messages which are identified by the two-bit header field.

- 0 = Empty
- 1 = Read (or read reply)
- 2 = Write
- 3 = Synchronization

### Messages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wr</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Col</th>
<th>ModuleAddress</th>
<th>WriteData</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Col</th>
<th>ModuleAddress</th>
<th>RRow</th>
<th>RCol</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>ReadData</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Col</th>
<th>Addr</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>ReadData</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sync</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wr</th>
<th>Write message</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>Read or reply message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>Empty message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sync</td>
<td>Synchronization wave message</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Log2 (length of data reference in bytes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row</td>
<td>The row of the target resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>The column of the target resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addr</td>
<td>Low 4 bits of the module address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Thread identification number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRow</td>
<td>The source row of the sender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCol</td>
<td>The source column of the sender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Switch number for returning messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>Unsigned read (0=Unsigned,1=Signed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deadlock free routing algorithm

Go via two intermediate targets (randomly chosen switches in the superswitches related to sender and target) at the rate of one hop per clock cycle if there is room in the queues:

1. Go to the first intermediate target

Go to the second intermediate target greedily:
2. Go to the right row using N/E lines
3. Switch to the W/E network
4. Go go to the right column using W/E lines
5. Go from the second intermediate target to the target resource.

Deadlocks are not possible during communication because the network formed by possible routing paths is acyclic.
Bandwidth scaling & hot spot avoidance

The network should provide sufficient bandwidth for random routing problem

- A linear bandwidth scaling mechanism
  \[ S \geq P^2/16 \Rightarrow \text{Bisection bandwidth} \geq P/2 \]

- Randomized hashing of memory locations to avoid congestion/hot spots of references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processors</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switches</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \Rightarrow \text{For large values of } P \text{ a 3D sparse mesh is needed!} \]
Synchronization mechanisms

**Implicit** — *Advanced synchronization wave*
- Used to implement synchronous execution of instructions
- Separates the references belonging to subsequent steps
- Sent by the processors to the memory modules and vice versa
- Principle: when a switch receives a synchronization message from one of its inputs, it waits, until it has received a synchronization message from all of its inputs, then it forwards the synchronization wave to all of its outputs

**Explicit** — *Arbitrary barrier synchronizations*
- Used to synchronize after thread-private control structures
- Executes in constant number of steps
- Realized via partial CRCW/active memory operations
Area reduced alternative

Eliminate all switches except those on the diagonal of superswitches

- Topology becomes \( \sqrt{S/P} \) parallel acyclic two-dimensional meshes
- Area of superswitches reduces by the factor of \( \sqrt{S/P} \).
- Can be seen as a 3D sparse mesh that is flatten onto 2D surface.
- The diameter of the network reduces to \( O(\sqrt{P}) \)
- Consists of \( O(P^{1.5}) \) switches \( \Rightarrow \) can hide the latency of messages sent by \( O(P) \) processors
- Routing like in the baseline network, but both intermediate targets must belong to the same mesh

In practice the complexity of superswitches becomes more acceptable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processors</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>64</th>
<th>256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switches</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relative bandwidth compared to the ideal case and maximum latency in random communication:

- \( C \) = the processor/memory clock speed ratio
- \textit{Read} = read test
- \textit{Mix} = read and write mix in 2:1.
Evaluation results 2

Relative bandwidth compared to the ideal case and latency as the functions of the length of output queues.

Execution time overhead with real parallel programs in respect to ideal PRAM.

The silicon area excl. wiring of various switch logic blocks synthesized with a 0.18 um process as mm^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block Description</th>
<th>Area (mm^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Switch element 3x2 (E4, E16, E64, E64+)</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch (E4, E16, E64, E64+)</td>
<td>2.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor output decoder 1x8 (E4, E16, E64, E64+)</td>
<td>0.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processor switch element 8x1 (E4, E16, E64, E64+)</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superswitch 1x1 (E4, E16)</td>
<td>2.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superswitch 2x2 (E64)</td>
<td>9.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superswitch 2x2 (E64+)</td>
<td>4.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switch (estimated for M4, M16, M64)</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary area model for ECLIPSE:
- Communication network logic takes 0.6\% of the overall logic area in a E16 with 1.5MB SRAM per processor.
Implementation estimations

Based on our **performance-area-power model** relying on our analytical modeling and ITRS 2005 we can estimate that:

- A 16-processor Eclipse with 1 MB data memory per processor fits into 170 mm$^2$ with state of the art 65 nm technology

- An version without power-saving techniques would consume about 250 W power with the clock frequency of 2 GHz
Part 2: Extension to CRCW PRAM

Part 1 outlined a single chip EREW PRAM realization

**Missing: Ability to provide CRCW memory access**

CRCW provide logarithmically faster execution of certain algorithms.
Existing solutions

Sequentilization of references on memory banks
- Causes severe congestion since an excessive amount of references gets routed to the same target location
- Requires fast SRAM memory
- Used e.g. in the baseline Eclipse architecture

Combining of messages during transport
- Combine messages that are targeted to the same location
- Requires a separate sorting phase prior to actual routing phase => decreased performance and increased complexity
- Used e.g. in Ranade’s algorithm for shared memory emulation and in SB-PRAM
Approach

Can CRCW be implemented easily on a top of existing solutions?

- Possible solutions: 1. Combining
  2. Combining-serializing hybrid

We will describe the latter one since it seems currently more promising. It will be based on step caches.

Step caches are caches which retain data inserted to them only until the end of on-going step of execution.
Step caches—A novel class of caches

A C line, single W-bit word per line cache with
- two special fields (pending, step)
- a slightly modified control logic
- step-aware replacement policy

Fields of a cache line:

\( In \ use \) A bit indicating that the line is in use.

\( Pending \) A bit indicating that the data is currently being retrieved from the memory

\( Tag \) The address tag of the line

\( Step \) Two least significant bits of the step of the data write

\( Data \) Storage for a data word

A fully associative step cache consists of
- \( C \) lines
- \( C \) comparators
- \( C \) to 1 multiplexer
- simplified decay logic matched for a \( T_p \)-threaded processor attached to a \( M \)-word memory.
Implementing concurrent access

Consider a shared memory MP-SOC with $P$ $T_p$-threaded processors attached to a shared memory:

Add fully associative $T_p$-line step caches between processors and the memory system.

- Step caches filter out step-wisely all but the first reference for each referred location and avoid conflict misses due to sufficient capacity and step-aware replacement policy.

- Traffic generated by concurrent accesses drops radically: At most $P$ references can occur per a memory location per single step.
Reducing the associativity and size

Allow an initiated sequence of references to a memory location to be interrupted by another reference to a different location if the capacity of the referred set of cache lines is exceeded.

In order to distribute this kind of conflicts (almost) evenly over the cache lines, access addresses are hashed with a randomly selected hashing function.

- Implements concurrent memory access with a low overhead with respect to the fully associative solution with a high probability.

- Cuts the size dependence of step caches on the number of threads per processor, \( T_p \), but with the cost of increased memory traffic.

S-way set associative step cache
Evaluation on Eclipse MP-SOC framework

Configurations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E16</th>
<th>E64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threads per processor</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank access time</td>
<td>1 c</td>
<td>1 c</td>
<td>1 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank cycle time</td>
<td>1 c</td>
<td>1 c</td>
<td>1 c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of FIFOs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-component benchmark scheme:

CRCW: A parallel program component that reads and writes concurrently a given sequence of locations in the shared memory.

EREW: A parallel program component issuing a memory pattern extracted from random SPEC CPU 2000 data reference trace on Alpha architecture for each thread.

Components are mixed in 0%-100%, 25%-75%, 50%-50%, 75%-25% and 100%-0% ratios to form benchmarks.
Execution time overhead

- **FA** = fully associative
- **SA4** = 4-way set associative
- **DM** = direct mapped
- **SA4-H** = 4-way set associative half size
- **SA4-Q** = 4-way set associative quarter size
- **NSC** = non-step cached

- Decreases as the degree of CRCW increases
- Remains low for FA and SA4
- Comes close to #processors for NSC
- Increases slowly as the #processors increases
**Step cache hit rate**

- Comes close to the mix ratio except in SA4-Q
- Decreases slowly as #processors increases

---

**Notes:**
- FA=fully associative
- SA4=4-way set associative
- DM=direct mapped
- SA4-H=4-way set associative half size
- SA4-Q=4-way set associative quarter size
Area overhead of CRCW

According to our performance-area-power model:

- The silicon area overhead of the CRCW implementation using step caches is typically less than 0.5%.
Part 3: Extension to MCRCW

Can MCRCW be implemented on a top of the solution described in Part 2?

The answer is yes, although the implementation is not anymore trivial.

Multioperation solution of original Eclipse

- Add special active memory units consisting of a simple ALU and fetcher to memory modules, and switch memories to faster ones allowing a read and a write per one processor cycle
- Implement multioperations as two consecutive single step operations
- Add separate processor-level multioperation memories, called scratchpads (We need to store the id of the initiator thread of each multioperation sequence to the step cache and internal initiator thread id register as well as reference information to a storage that saves the information regardless of possible conflicts that may wipe away information on references from the step cache)
Implementing multioperations
—add active memory units, step caches and scratchpads
**PROCEDURE** Processor::Execute::BMPADD (Write_data, Write_Address)

Search Write_Address from the StepCache and put the result in matching_index

**IF** not found **THEN**

**IF** the target line pending **THEN**

Mark memory system busy until the end of the current cycle

**ELSE**

Read_data := 0
StepCache[matching_index].data := Write_data
StepCache[matching_index].address := Write_Address
StepCache[matching_index].initiator_thread := Thread_id
ScratchPad[Thread_id].Data := Write_data
ScratchPad[Thread_id].Address := Write_Address

**ELSE**

Read_data := StepCache[matching_index].data
StepCache[matching_index].data := Write_data + Read_data
ScratchPad[Initiator_thread].Data := Write_data + Read_data
Initiator_thread := StepCache[matching_index].Initiator_thread

Algorithm 1. Implementation of a two step MPADD multioperation 1/3
PROCEDURE Processor::Execute::EMPADD (Write_data, Write_Address)

IF Thread_id<>Initiator_thread THEN
    IF ScratchPad[Initiator_thread].pending THEN
        Reply_pending := True
    ELSE
        Read_data := Write_data + ScratchPad[Initiator_thread].Data
    ENDIF
ELSE
    IF Write_Address = ScratchPad[Initiator_thread].Address THEN
        Send a EMPADD reference to the memory system with
        - address = Write_Address
        - data = ScratchPad[Initiator_thread].Data
        ScratchPad[Thread_id].pending := True
    ELSE
        Commit a Multioperation address error exception
    ENDIF
ENDIF

Algorithm 1. Implementation of a two step MPADD multioperation 2/3
**PROCEDURE** Module::Commit_access::EMPADD (Data, Address)
Temporary_data := Memory [Address]
Memory[Address] := Memory[Address] + Data
Reply_data := Temporary_data

**PROCEDURE** Processor::Receive_reply::EMPADD (Data, Address, Thread)
Read_Data[Thread] := Data
ScratchPad[Thread].Data := Data
ScratchPad[Thread].Pending := False
ReplyPending[Thread_id] := False

FOR each successor of Thread DO
    IF ReplyPending[succesor] THEN
        Read_data := Data
        ReplyPending[succesor] := False

Algorithm 1. Implementation of a two step MPADD multioperation 3/3
## Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>EREW</th>
<th>MCRCW</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprefix</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barrier</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fft</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mmul</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>search</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spread</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssearch</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>M+log N</td>
<td>MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sum</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>log N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluated computational problems and features of their EREW and MCRCW implementations (E=execution time, M=size of the key string, N=size of the problem, P=number of processors, T=number of threads, W=work).
The speedup of the proposed MCRCW solution versus the baseline step cached CRCW solution.

The speedup of the proposed MCRCW solution versus the existing limited and partial LCRCW solution.
Area overhead of MCRCW

According to our performance-area-power model:

- The silicon area overhead of the MCRCW implementation using step caches is typically less than 1.0%.
Conclusions

We have described a number of single chip PRAM realizations

- EREW PRAM (multithreaded processors with chaining, 2D acyclic sparse mesh interconnect)
- Extension to CRCW using step caches
- Extension to MCRCW using stepec caches and scratchpads

Single chip silicon platform seems suitable for PRAM implementation, but there are still a number technical/commercial/educational issues open

- How to provide enough memory?
- How to survive if there is not enough parallelism available?
- The interconnection network appears to be quite complex, are there (simpler) alternatives?
- Who will try manufacturing PRAM on-chip?
- How to migrate to (explicit) parallel computing from existing code base?
- How will teach this kind of parallel computing to masses?