

## **Lecture 5: VLIW, Software Pipelining, and Limits to ILP**

**Professor David A. Patterson  
Computer Science 252  
Spring 1998**

DAP.F96 1

## **Review: Tomasulo**

- **Prevents Register as bottleneck**
- **Avoids WAR, WAW hazards of Scoreboard**
- **Allows loop unrolling in HW**
- **Not limited to basic blocks (provided branch prediction)**
- **Lasting Contributions**
  - Dynamic scheduling
  - Register renaming
  - Load/store disambiguation
- **360/91 descendants are PowerPC 604, 620; MIPS R10000; HP-PA 8000; Intel Pentium Pro**

DAP.F96 2


## Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Performance =  $f(\text{accuracy, cost of misprediction})$
- Branch History Table is simplest
  - Lower bits of PC address index table of 1-bit values
  - Says whether or not branch taken last time
  - No address check
- Problem: in a loop, 1-bit BHT will cause two mispredictions (avg is 9 iterations before exit):
  - End of loop case, when it exits instead of looping as before
  - First time through loop on *next* time through code, when it predicts exit instead of looping

DAP.F96 3

## Dynamic Branch Prediction

- Solution: 2-bit scheme where change prediction only if get misprediction *twice*: (Figure 4.13, p. 264)



- Red: stop, not taken
- Green: go, taken

DAP.F96 4

## BHT Accuracy

- **Mispredict because either:**
  - Wrong guess for that branch
  - Got branch history of wrong branch when index the table
- **4096 entry table programs vary from 1% misprediction (nasa7, tomcatv) to 18% (eqntott), with spice at 9% and gcc at 12%**
- **4096 about as good as infinite table (in Alpha 211164)**

DAP.F96 5

## Correlating Branches


- **Hypothesis: recent branches are correlated; that is, behavior of recently executed branches affects prediction of current branch**
- **Idea: record m most recently executed branches as taken or not taken, and use that pattern to select the proper branch history table**
- **In general, (m,n) predictor means record last m branches to select between  $2^m$  history tables each with n-bit counters**
  - Old 2-bit BHT is then a (0,2) predictor

DAP.F96 6

## Correlating Branches

### (2,2) predictor


- Then behavior of recent branches selects between, say, four predictions of next branch, updating just that prediction



DAP.F96 7

## Accuracy of Different Schemes

(Figure 4.21, p. 272)



DAP.F96 8

## Re-evaluating Correlation


- Several of the SPEC benchmarks have less than a dozen branches responsible for 90% of taken branches:

program	branch %	static	# = 90%
compress	14%	236	13
<b>eqntott</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>494</b>	<b>5</b>
gcc	15%	9531	2020
mpeg	10%	5598	532
real gcc	13%	17361	3214

- Real programs + OS more like gcc
- Small benefits beyond benchmarks for correlation? problems with branch aliases?

DAP.F96 9

## Need Address at Same Time as Prediction




## HW support for More ILP

- Avoid branch prediction by turning branches into conditionally executed instructions:

**if (x) then A = B op C else NOP**

- If false, then neither store result nor cause exception
- Expanded ISA of Alpha, MIPS, PowerPC, SPARC have conditional move; PA-RISC can annul any following instr.
- IA-64: 64 1-bit condition fields selected so conditional execution of any instruction



- Drawbacks to conditional instructions

- Still takes a clock even if “annulled”
- Stall if condition evaluated late
- Complex conditions reduce effectiveness; condition becomes known late in pipeline

DAP.F96 11

## Dynamic Branch Prediction Summary

- Branch History Table: 2 bits for loop accuracy
- Correlation: Recently executed branches correlated with next branch
- Branch Target Buffer: include branch address & prediction
- Predicated Execution can reduce number of branches, number of mispredicted branches

DAP.F96 12

## HW support for More ILP


- **Speculation**: allow an instruction to issue that is dependent on branch predicted to be taken *without* any consequences (including exceptions) if branch is not actually taken (“HW undo”); called “**boosting**”
- Combine branch prediction with dynamic scheduling to execute before branches resolved
- Separate **speculative** bypassing of results from real bypassing of results
  - When instruction no longer speculative, write boosted results (**instruction commit**) or discard boosted results
  - execute out-of-order but **commit in-order** to prevent irrevocable action (update state or exception) until instruction commits

DAP.F96 13

## HW support for More ILP

- Need HW buffer for results of uncommitted instructions:  
**reorder buffer**

- 3 fields: instr, destination, value
- Reorder buffer can be operand source => more registers like RS
- Use reorder buffer number instead of reservation station when execution completes
- Supplies operands between execution complete & commit
- Once operand commits, result is put into register
- Instructions **commit in order**
- As a result, its easy to undo speculated instructions on mispredicted branches or on exceptions



DAP.F96 14

## Four Steps of Speculative Tomasulo Algorithm

### 1. **Issue**—get instruction from FP Op Queue

If reservation station and reorder buffer slot free, issue instr & send operands & reorder buffer no. for destination (this stage sometimes called “dispatch”)

### 2. **Execution**—operate on operands (EX)

When both operands ready then execute; if not ready, watch CDB for result; when both in reservation station, execute; checks RAW (sometimes called “issue”)

### 3. **Write result**—finish execution (WB)

Write on Common Data Bus to all awaiting FUs & reorder buffer; mark reservation station available.

### 4. **Commit**—update register with reorder result

When instr. at head of reorder buffer & result present, update register with result (or store to memory) and remove instr from reorder buffer. Mispredicted branch flushes reorder buffer (sometimes called “graduation”)

DAP.F96 15

## Renaming Registers


- Common variation of speculative design
- Reorder buffer keeps instruction information but **not** the result
- Extend register file with extra renaming registers to hold speculative results
- Rename register allocated at issue; result into rename register on execution complete; rename register into real register on commit
- Operands read either from register file (real or speculative) or via Common Data Bus
- Advantage: operands are always from single source (extended register file)

DAP.F96 16



## Dynamic Scheduling in PowerPC 604 and Pentium Pro

- Both In-order Issue, Out-of-order execution, In-order Commit



Pentium Pro more like a scoreboard since central control vs. distributed

DAP.F96 17

## Dynamic Scheduling in PowerPC 604 and Pentium Pro

Parameter	PPC	PPro
Max. instructions issued/clock	4	3
Max. instr. complete exec./clock	6	5
Max. instr. committed/clock	6	3
Window (Instrs in reorder buffer)	16	40
Number of reservations stations	12	20
Number of rename registers	8int/12FP	40
No. integer functional units (FUs)	2	2
No. floating point FUs	1	1
No. branch FUs	1	1
No. complex integer FUs	1	0
No. memory FUs	1	1 load +1 store

Q: How pipeline 1 to 17 byte x86 instructions?

DAP.F96 18

## Dynamic Scheduling in Pentium Pro

- PPro doesn't pipeline 80x86 instructions
- PPro decode unit translates the Intel instructions into 72-bit micro-operations (- DLX)
- Sends micro-operations to reorder buffer & reservation stations
- Takes 1 clock cycle to determine length of 80x86 instructions + 2 more to create the micro-operations
- 12-14 clocks in total pipeline (- 3 state machines)
- Many instructions translate to 1 to 4 micro-operations
- Complex 80x86 instructions are executed by a conventional microprogram (8K x 72 bits) that issues long sequences of micro-operations

DAP.F96 19

## Getting CPI < 1: Issuing Multiple Instructions/Cycle

- Two variations
- **Superscalar**: varying no. instructions/cycle (1 to 8), scheduled by compiler or by HW (Tomasulo)
  - IBM PowerPC, Sun UltraSparc, DEC Alpha, HP 8000
- **(Very) Long Instruction Words (V)LIW**: fixed number of instructions (4-16) scheduled by the compiler; put ops into wide templates
  - Joint HP/Intel agreement in 1999/2000?
  - Intel Architecture-64 (IA-64) 64-bit address
  - Style: “Explicitly Parallel Instruction Computer (EPIC)”
- Anticipated success lead to use of **Instructions Per Clock cycle (IPC)** vs. CPI

DAP.F96 20

## Getting CPI < 1: Issuing Multiple Instructions/Cycle

- **Superscalar DLX: 2 instructions, 1 FP & 1 anything else**
  - Fetch 64-bits/clock cycle; Int on left, FP on right
  - Can only issue 2nd instruction if 1st instruction issues
  - More ports for FP registers to do FP load & FP op in a pair

Type	PipeStages						
Int. instruction	IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB		
FP instruction	IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB		
Int. instruction		IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB	
FP instruction		IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB	
Int. instruction			IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB
FP instruction			IF	ID	EX	MEM	WB

- **1 cycle load delay expands to 3 instructions in SS**
  - instruction in right half can't use it, nor instructions in next slot

DAP.F96 21

## Review: Unrolled Loop that Minimizes Stalls for Scalar

```

1 Loop: LD      F0,0(R1)           LD to ADDD: 1 Cycle
2      LD      F6,-8(R1)          ADDD to SD: 2 Cycles
3      LD      F10,-16(R1)
4      LD      F14,-24(R1)
5      ADDD    F4,F0,F2
6      ADDD    F8,F6,F2
7      ADDD    F12,F10,F2
8      ADDD    F16,F14,F2
9      SD      0(R1),F4
10     SD      -8(R1),F8
11     SD      -16(R1),F12
12     SUBI    R1,R1,#32
13     BNEZ    R1,LOOP
14     SD      8(R1),F16      ; 8-32 = -24

```

**14 clock cycles, or 3.5 per iteration**

DAP.F96 22

## Loop Unrolling in Superscalar

	Integer instruction	FP instruction	Clock cycle
Loop:	LD F0,0(R1)		1
	LD F6,-8(R1)		2
	LD F10,-16(R1)	ADDD F4,F0,F2	3
	LD F14,-24(R1)	ADDD F8,F6,F2	4
	LD F18,-32(R1)	ADDD F12,F10,F2	5
	SD 0(R1),F4	ADDD F16,F14,F2	6
	SD -8(R1),F8	ADDD F20,F18,F2	7
	SD -16(R1),F12		8
	SD -24(R1),F16		9
	SUBI R1,R1,#40		10
	BNEZ R1,LOOP		11
	SD -32(R1),F20		12

- Unrolled 5 times to avoid delays (+1 due to SS)
- 12 clocks, or 2.4 clocks per iteration (1.5X)

DAP.F96 23

## Multiple Issue Challenges

- While Integer/FP split is simple for the HW, get CPI of 0.5 only for programs with:
  - Exactly 50% FP operations
  - No hazards
- If more instructions issue at same time, greater difficulty of decode and issue
  - Even 2-scalar => examine 2 opcodes, 6 register specifiers, & decide if 1 or 2 instructions can issue
- VLIW: tradeoff instruction space for simple decoding
  - The long instruction word has room for many operations
  - By definition, all the operations the compiler puts in the long instruction word are independent => execute in parallel
  - E.g., 2 integer operations, 2 FP ops, 2 Memory refs, 1 branch
    - » 16 to 24 bits per field => 7\*16 or 112 bits to 7\*24 or 168 bits wide
  - Need compiling technique that schedules across several branches

DAP.F96 24

## Loop Unrolling in VLIW

Memory reference 1	Memory reference 2	FP operation 1	FP op. 2	Int. op/ branch	Clock
LD F0,0(R1)	LD F6,-8(R1)				1
LD F10,-16(R1)	LD F14,-24(R1)				2
LD F18,-32(R1)	LD F22,-40(R1)	ADDD F4,F0,F2	ADDD F8,F6,F2		3
LD F26,-48(R1)		ADDD F12,F10,F2	ADDD F16,F14,F2		4
		ADDD F20,F18,F2	ADDD F24,F22,F2		5
SD 0(R1),F4	SD -8(R1),F8	ADDD F28,F26,F2			6
SD -16(R1),F12	SD -24(R1),F16				7
SD -32(R1),F20	SD -40(R1),F24			SUBI R1,R1,#48	8
SD -0(R1),F28				BNEZ R1,LOOP	9

**Unrolled 7 times to avoid delays**

**7 results in 9 clocks, or 1.3 clocks per iteration (1.8X)**

**Average: 2.5 ops per clock, 50% efficiency**

**Note: Need more registers in VLIW (15 vs. 6 in SS)**

P.F96 25

## Trace Scheduling

- Parallelism across IF branches vs. LOOP branches
- Two steps:

- **Trace Selection**

- » Find likely sequence of basic blocks (**trace**) of (statically predicted or profile predicted) long sequence of straight-line code

- **Trace Compaction**

- » Squeeze trace into few VLIW instructions
    - » Need bookkeeping code in case prediction is wrong



- Compiler undoes bad guess (discards values in registers)
- Subtle compiler bugs mean wrong answer vs. poorer performance; no hardware interlocks

DAP.F96 26

## **Advantages of HW (Tomasulo) vs. SW (VLIW) Speculation**

- HW determines address conflicts
- HW better branch prediction
- HW maintains precise exception model
- HW does not execute bookkeeping instructions
- Works across multiple implementations
- SW speculation is much easier for HW design

DAP.F96 27

## **Superscalar v. VLIW**

- Smaller code size
- Binary compatability across generations of hardware
- Simplified Hardware for decoding, issuing instructions
- No Interlock Hardware (compiler checks?)
- More registers, but simplified Hardware for Register Ports (multiple independent register files?)

DAP.F96 28

## Intel/HP “Explicitly Parallel Instruction Computer (EPIC)”

- 3 Instructions in 128 bit “groups”; field determines if instructions dependent or independent
  - Smaller code size than old VLIW, larger than x86/RISC
  - Groups can be linked to show independence > 3 instr
- 64 integer registers + 64 floating point registers
  - Not separate filesper functional unit as in old VLIW
- Hardware checks dependencies (interlocks => binary compatibility over time)
- Predicated execution (select 1 out of 64 1-bit flags)  
=> 40% fewer mispredictions?
- IA-64: name of instruction set architecture; EPIC is type
- Merced is name of first implementation (1999/2000?)
- LIW = EPIC?

DAP.F96 29

## Dynamic Scheduling in Superscalar

- Dependencies stop instruction issue
- Code compiler for old version will run poorly on newest version
  - May want code to vary depending on how superscalar

DAP.F96 30

## Dynamic Scheduling in Superscalar

- How to issue two instructions and keep in-order instruction issue for Tomasulo?
  - Assume 1 integer + 1 floating point
  - 1 Tomasulo control for integer, 1 for floating point
- Issue 2X Clock Rate, so that issue remains in order
- Only FP loads might cause dependency between integer and FP issue:
  - Replace load reservation station with a load queue; operands must be read in the order they are fetched
  - Load checks addresses in Store Queue to avoid RAW violation
  - Store checks addresses in Load Queue to avoid WAR,WAW
  - Called “decoupled architecture”

DAP.F96 31

## Performance of Dynamic SS

Iteration no.	Instructions	Issues	Executes	Writes result
clock-cycle number				
1	LD F0,0(R1)	1	2	4
1	ADDD F4,F0,F2	1	5	8
1	SD 0(R1),F4	2	9	
1	SUBI R1,R1,#8	3	4	5
1	BNEZ R1,LOOP	4	5	
2	LD F0,0(R1)	5	6	8
2	ADDD F4,F0,F2	5	9	12
2	SD 0(R1),F4	6	13	
2	SUBI R1,R1,#8	7	8	9
2	BNEZ R1,LOOP	8	9	


- 4 clocks per iteration; only 1 FP instr/iteration  
 Branches, Decrements issues still take 1 clock cycle  
 How get more performance?

DAP.F96 32



## Software Pipelining

- Observation: if iterations from loops are independent, then can get more ILP by taking instructions from different iterations
- Software pipelining: reorganizes loops so that each iteration is made from instructions chosen from different iterations of the original loop (- Tomasulo in SW)



DAP.F96 33

## Software Pipelining Example

Before: Unrolled 3 times

```

1 LD  F0,0(R1)
2 ADDD F4,F0,F2
3 SD  0(R1),F4
4 LD  F6,-8(R1)
5 ADDD F8,F6,F2
6 SD  -8(R1),F8
7 LD  F10,-16(R1)
8 ADDD F12,F10,F2
9 SD  -16(R1),F12
10 SUBI R1,R1,#24
11 BNEZ R1,LOOP
    
```


After: Software Pipelined

```

1 SD  0(R1),F4; Stores M[i]
2 ADDD F4,F0,F2; Adds to M[i-1]
3 LD  F0,-16(R1); Loads M[i-2]
4 SUBI R1,R1,#8
5 BNEZ R1,LOOP
    
```

### • Symbolic Loop Unrolling

- Maximize result-use distance
- Less code space than unrolling
- Fill & drain pipe only once per loop vs. once per each unrolled iteration in loop unrolling



DAP.F96 34

## Limits to Multi-Issue Machines

- **Inherent limitations of ILP**
  - 1 branch in 5: How to keep a 5-way VLIW busy?
  - Latencies of units: many operations must be scheduled
  - Need about Pipeline Depth x No. Functional Units of independent operations to keep machines busy, e.g.  $5 \times 4 = 15$ –20 independent instructions?
- **Difficulties in building HW**
  - Easy: More instruction bandwidth
  - Easy: Duplicate FUs to get parallel execution
  - Hard: Increase ports to Register File (bandwidth)
    - » VLIW example needs 7 read and 3 write for Int. Reg. & 5 read and 3 write for FP reg
  - Harder: Increase ports to memory (bandwidth)
  - Decoding Superscalar and impact on clock rate, pipeline depth?

DAP.F96 35

## Limits to Multi-Issue Machines

- **Limitations specific to either Superscalar or VLIW implementation**
  - Decode issue in Superscalar: how wide practical?
  - VLIW code size: unroll loops + wasted fields in VLIW
    - » IA-64 compresses dependent instructions, but still larger
  - VLIW lock step => 1 hazard & all instructions stall
    - » IA-64 not lock step? Dynamic pipeline?
  - VLIW & binary compatibility is practical weakness as vary number FU and latencies over time
    - » IA-64 promises binary compatibility

DAP.F96 36

## Limits to ILP

- Conflicting studies of amount of parallelism available in late 1980s and early 1990s. Different assumptions about:
  - Benchmarks (vectorized Fortran FP vs. integer C programs)
  - Hardware sophistication
  - Compiler sophistication
- How much ILP is available using existing mechanisms with increasing HW budgets?
- Do we need to invent new HW/SW mechanisms to keep on processor performance curve?

DAP.F96 37

## Limits to ILP

Initial HW Model here; MIPS compilers.


Assumptions for ideal/perfect machine to start:

1. **Register renaming**—infinite virtual registers and all WAW & WAR hazards are avoided
  2. **Branch prediction**—perfect; no mispredictions
  3. **Jump prediction**—all jumps perfectly predicted => machine with perfect speculation & an unbounded buffer of instructions available
  4. **Memory-address alias analysis**—addresses are known & a store can be moved before a load provided addresses not equal
- 1 cycle latency for all instructions; unlimited number of instructions issued per clock cycle

DAP.F96 38


## Upper Limit to ILP: Ideal Machine

(Figure 4.38, page 319)




## More Realistic HW: Branch Impact

Figure 4.40, Page 323




## Selective History Predictor




## More Realistic HW: Register Impact

Figure 4.44, Page 328




## More Realistic HW: Alias Impact

Figure 4.46, Page 330




## Realistic HW for '9X: Window Impact

(Figure 4.48, Page 332)



## Braniac vs. Speed Demon(1993)

- 8-scalar IBM Power-2 @ 71.5 MHz (5 stage pipe)  
vs. 2-scalar Alpha @ 200 MHz (7 stage pipe)




## 3 1996 Era Machines

	Alpha 21164	PPro	HP PA-8000
Year	1995	1995	1996
Clock	400 MHz	200 MHz	180 MHz
Cache	8K/8K/96K/2M	8K/8K/0.5M	0/0/2M
Issue rate	2int+2FP	3 instr (x86)	4 instr
Pipe stages	7-9	12-14	7-9
Out-of-Order	6 loads	40 instr (μop)	56 instr
Rename regs	none	40	56


DAP.F96 46

## SPECint95base Performance (July 1996)



DAP.F96 47

## SPECfp95base Performance (July 1996)



DAP.F96 48




### 3 1997 Era Machines

	Alpha 21164	Pentium II	HP PA-8000
Year	1995	1996	1996
Clock	<u>600 MHz ('97)</u>	<u>300 MHz ('97)</u>	<u>236 MHz ('97)</u>
Cache	8K/8K/96K/2M	<u>16K/16K/0.5M</u>	<u>0/0/4M</u>
Issue rate	2int+2FP	3 instr (x86)	4 instr
Pipe stages	7-9	12-14	7-9
Out-of-Order	6 loads	40 instr (μop)	56 instr
Rename regs	none	40	56


DAP.F96 49

### SPECint95base Performance (Oct. 1997)



DAP.F96 50

## SPECfp95base Performance (Oct. 1997)



## Summary

- **Branch Prediction**
  - Branch History Table: 2 bits for loop accuracy
  - Recently executed branches correlated with next branch?
  - Branch Target Buffer: include branch address & prediction
  - Predicated Execution can reduce number of branches, number of mispredicted branches
- **Speculation: Out-of-order execution, In-order commit (reorder buffer)**
- **SW Pipelining**
  - Symbolic Loop Unrolling to get most from pipeline with little code expansion, little overhead
- **Superscalar and VLIW: CPI < 1 (IPC > 1)**
  - Dynamic issue vs. Static issue
  - More instructions issue at same time => larger hazard penalty