

CSE 560 Computer Systems Architecture

Pipelining

Performance Review

What metric would you use to compare the performance of computers

1. With different ISAs?
2. With the same ISA?
3. With the same ISA and clock speed?
 - A. MIPS
 - B. Instructions/Program
 - C. Execution time
 - D. IPC
 - E. Clock speed


Performance Review

What metric would you use to compare the performance of computers

1. With different ISAs? Execution time
2. With the same ISA? MIPS
3. With the same ISA and clock speed? IPC
 - A. MIPS
 - B. Instructions/Program
 - C. Execution time
 - D. IPC
 - E. Clock speed

$$\frac{\text{seconds}}{\text{program}} = \frac{\text{instructions}}{\text{program}} \times \frac{\text{cycles}}{\text{instruction}} \times \frac{\text{seconds}}{\text{cycle}}$$


This Unit: (Scalar In-Order) Pipelining



- Principles of pipelining
 - Effects of overhead and hazards
 - Pipeline diagrams
- Data hazards
 - Stalling and bypassing
- Control hazards (Next lecture)
 - Branch prediction
 - Predication

Datapath Background

Datapath and Control



- **Datapath:** implements execute portion of fetch/exec. loop
 - Functional units (ALUs), registers, memory interface
- **Control:** implements decode portion of fetch/execute loop
 - Mux selectors, write enable signals regulate flow of data in datapath
 - Part of decode involves translating insn opcode into control signals

Single-Cycle Datapath

Single-cycle datapath: true "atomic" fetch/execute loop

- Fetch, decode, execute one complete instruction every cycle
- "Hardwired control":** opcode to control signals ROM
- + Low CPI: 1 by definition
- Long clock period: to accommodate slowest instruction

Washington University in St. Louis

Multi-Cycle Datapath

Multi-cycle datapath: attacks slow clock

- Fetch, decode, execute one complete insn over multiple cycles
- Micro-coded control:** "stages" control signals
- Allows insns to take different number of cycles** (main point)
- ± Opposite of single-cycle: short clock period, high CPI (think: CISC)

Washington University in St. Louis

Single-cycle vs. Multi-cycle Performance

- Single-cycle
 - Clock period = 50ns, CPI = 1
 - Performance = **50ns/insn**
- Multi-cycle has opposite performance split of single-cycle
 - + Shorter clock period
 - Higher CPI
- Multi-cycle
 - Branch: 20% (3 cycles), load: 20% (5 cycles), ALU: 60% (4 cycles)
 - Clock period = **11ns**, CPI = $(20\% * 3) + (20\% * 5) + (60\% * 4) = 4$
 - Why is clock period 11ns and not 10ns?
 - Performance = **44ns/insn**
- Aside:** CISC makes perfect sense in multi-cycle datapath

Washington University in St. Louis

Pipelining Basics

Washington University in St. Louis

Latency versus Throughput

Single-cycle

Multi-cycle

- Can we have both low CPI and short clock period?
 - Not if datapath executes only one insn at a time
- Latency vs. Throughput
 - Latency: no good way to make a single insn go faster
 - + **Throughput:** luckily, single insn latency not so important
 - Goal is to make programs, not individual insns, go faster
 - Programs contain billions of insns
 - Key: **exploit inter-insn parallelism**

Washington University in St. Louis







Pipelining






Multi-cycle

Pipelined

- Important performance technique
 - Improves insn throughput rather instruction latency**
- Begin with multi-cycle design
 - One insn advances from stage 1 to 2, next insn enters stage 1
 - Form of parallelism: "insn-stage parallelism"
 - Maintains illusion of sequential fetch/execute loop
 - Individual instruction takes the same number of stages
 - + **But instructions enter and leave at a much faster rate**
- Laundry analogy

Washington University in St. Louis





Pipeline Diagram

Pipeline diagram: shorthand for what we just saw

- Convention: **X** means `lw $4,0($5)` finishes execute stage and writes into X/M latch at end of cycle 4

Cycles →

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
add \$3,\$2,\$1	F	D	X	M	W				
lw \$4,0(\$5)		F	D	X	M	W			
sw \$6,4(\$7)			F	D	X	M	W		

Instructions ↓

Washington University in St. Louis 24

Example Pipeline Perf. Calculation

- Single-cycle
 - Clock period = 50ns, CPI = 1
 - Performance = 50ns/insn
- Multi-cycle
 - Branch: 20% (3 cycles), load: 20% (5 cycles), ALU: 60% (4 cycles)
 - Clock period = 11ns, CPI = $(20\% \cdot 3) + (20\% \cdot 5) + (60\% \cdot 4) = 4$
 - Performance = 44ns/insn
- 5-stage pipelined
 - Clock period = **12ns** approx. (50ns / 5 stages) + overheads
 - + CPI = **1** (each insn takes 5 cycles, but 1 completes each cycle)
 - + Performance = **12ns/insn**
 - Well actually ... CPI = 1 + some penalty for pipelining (next)
 - CPI = **1.5** (on average insn completes every 1.5 cycles)
 - Performance = **18ns/insn**
 - Much higher performance than single-cycle or multi-cycle

Clock Period of a Pipelined Processor

Delay_{dp} = time it takes to travel through original datapath
 N_{ps} = number of pipeline stages

Pipeline Clock Period > $\text{Delay}_{\text{dp}} / N_{\text{ps}}$

- Latches add delay
- Extra "bypassing" logic adds delay
- Pipeline stages have different delays, clock period is max delay
- These factors have implications for ideal number pipeline stages
 - Diminishing clock frequency gains for longer (deeper) pipelines

CPI Calculation: Accounting for Stalls


- Why is Pipelined CPI > 1 ?
- CPI for scalar in-order pipeline is **1 + stall penalties**
 - Stalls used to resolve hazards
 - **Hazard**: condition that jeopardizes sequential illusion
 - **Stall**: pipeline delay introduced to restore sequential illusion
 - Calculating pipeline CPI
 - **Frequency of stall * stall cycles**
 - Penalties add (stalls generally don't overlap in in-order pipelines)
 - $1 + \text{stall-freq}_1 \cdot \text{stall-cyc}_1 + \text{stall-freq}_2 \cdot \text{stall-cyc}_2 + \dots$
 - Correctness/performance/make common case fast (MCCF)
 - Long penalties OK if rare, e.g., $1 + 0.01 \cdot 10 = 1.1$
 - Stalls have implications for ideal number of pipeline stages

Data Dependences, Pipeline Hazards, and Bypassing

Dependences and Hazards

- **Dependence**: relationship between two insns
 - **Data**: two insns use same storage location
 - **Control**: 1 insn affects whether another executes at all
 - *Not a bad thing*, programs would be boring otherwise
 - Enforced by making older insn go before younger one
 - Happens naturally in single-/multi-cycle designs
 - But not in a pipeline
- **Hazard**: dependence & possibility of wrong insn order
 - Effects of wrong insn order cannot be externally visible
 - **Stall**: for order by keeping younger insn in same stage
 - *Hazards are a bad thing*: stalls reduce performance

Why Does Every Insn Take 5 Cycles?



- Could/should we allow `add` to skip M and go to W?
 - It wouldn't help: peak fetch still only 1 insn per cycle
 - **Structural hazards**: who gets the register file write port?

Structural Hazards


- **Structural hazards**
 - Two insns trying to use same circuit at same time
 - E.g., structural hazard on register file write port
- **To fix structural hazards:** proper ISA/pipeline design
 - Each insn uses every structure exactly once
 - For at most one cycle
 - Always at same stage relative to F (fetch)
- **Tolerate structure hazards**
 - Add stall logic to stall pipeline when hazards occur

Example Structural Hazard

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ld r2,0(r1)	F	D	X	M	W				
add r1,r3,r4		F	D	X	M	W			
sub r1,r3,r5			F	D	X	M	W		
st r6,0(r1)				F	D	X	M	W	


- **Structural hazard:** resource needed twice in one cycle
 - Example: unified instruction & data memories (caches)
 - Solutions:
 - Separate instruction/data memories (caches)
 - Have cache allow 2 accesses per cycle (slow, expensive)
 - Stall pipeline

Data Hazards




- Would these instructions execute correctly on this pipeline?
- Which instructions execute with correct inputs?
 - **add** writes result into **\$3** in current cycle
 - **lw** read **\$3** two cycles ago → got wrong value
 - **addi** read **\$3** one cycle ago → got wrong value
 - **sw** reads **\$3** this cycle → maybe (depends on register file)

Memory Data Hazards




- Are memory data hazards a problem for this pipeline? No
 - **lw** following **sw** to same address in next cycle, gets right value
 - Why? D\$ read/write always take place in same stage
- Data hazards through registers? Yes (previous slide)
 - Occur because register write is three stages after register read
 - Can only read a register value three cycles after writing it

Observation!



- *Technically*, we have a problem:
 - **lw \$4,0(\$3)** has already read **\$3** from regfile
 - **add \$3,\$5,\$1** hasn't yet written **\$3** to regfile
- Fundamentally, this *should work*
 - **lw \$4,0(\$3)** hasn't actually used **\$3** yet
 - **add \$3,\$5,\$1** has already computed **\$3**

Reducing Data Hazards: Bypassing



Bypassing

- Reading a value from an intermediate (μarchitectural) source
- Not waiting until it is available from primary source
- Here, we bypass the register file
- Also called **forwarding**

WX Bypassing

- What about this combination?
 - Add another bypass path and MUX (multiplexor) input
 - First one was an **MX** bypass
 - This one is a **WX** bypass

Washington University in St. Louis 37

ALUinB Bypassing

- Can also bypass to ALU input B

Washington University in St. Louis 38

WM Bypassing?

- Does WM bypassing make sense?
 - Not to the address input (why not?)
 - But to the store data input, yes

Washington University in St. Louis 39

Bypass Logic

Each MUX has its own logic; here it is for MUX ALUinA
 $(D/X.IR.RegSource1 == X/M.IR.RegDest) ==> 0$
 $(D/X.IR.RegSource1 == M/W.IR.RegDest) ==> 1$
 Else $=> 2$

Washington University in St. Louis 40

Pipeline Diagrams with Bypassing

- If bypass exists, "from"/"to" stages execute in same cycle
- Example: full bypassing, use MX bypass

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
add r2,r3→r1	F	D	X	M	W					
sub r1,r4→r2		F	D	X	M	W				
- Example: full bypassing, use WX bypass

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
add r2,r3→r1	F	D	X	M	W					
ld [x7]→r5		F	D	X	M	W				
sub r1,r4→r2			F	D	X	M	W			
- Example: WM bypass

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
add r2,r3→r1	F	D	X	M	W					
?		F	D	X	M	W				

Washington University in St. Louis 41

Have We Prevented All Data Hazards?

- No. Consider a "load" followed by a dependent "add" insn
- Bypassing alone isn't sufficient!
- Hardware solution: detect this situation and inject a stall cycle
- Software solution: ensure compiler doesn't generate such code

Washington University in St. Louis 42

Stalling to Avoid Data Hazards

- Prevent F/D insns from reading (advancing) this cycle
- Write `nop` into D/X.IR (effectively, insert `nop` in hardware)
- Also reset (clear) the datapath control signals
- Disable F/D latch and PC write enables (why?)
- Re-evaluate situation next cycle

Washington University in St. Louis

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences

```

add $4, $2, $3      lw $3, 4($2)
Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
        ((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
         (F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))
    
```

Washington University in St. Louis

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences

```

add $4, $2, $3      (stall bubble)      lw $3, 4($2)
Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
        ((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
         (F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))
    
```

Washington University in St. Louis

Stalling on Load-To-Use Dependences

```

add $4, $2, $3      (stall bubble)      lw $3, ...
Stall = (D/X.IR.Operation == LOAD) &&
        ((F/D.IR.RegSrc1 == D/X.IR.RegDest) ||
         (F/D.IR.RegSrc2 == D/X.IR.RegDest) && (F/D.IR.OP != STORE))
    
```

Washington University in St. Louis

Performance Impact of Load/Use Penalty

- Assume
 - Branch: 20%, load: 20%, store: 10%, other: 50%
 - 50% of loads are followed by dependent instruction
 - require 1 cycle stall (i.e., insertion of 1 `nop`)
- Calculate CPI
 - CPI = $1 + (1 * 20\% * 50\%) = 1.1$

Washington University in St. Louis

Reducing Load-Use Stall Frequency


	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
add \$3, \$2, \$1	F	D	X	M	W				
lw \$4, 4(\$3)		F	D	X	M	W			
addi \$6, \$4, 1			F	D*	X	M	W		
sub \$8, \$3, \$1					F	D	X	M	W

- Use compiler scheduling to reduce load-use stall frequency
- More on compiler scheduling later

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
add \$3, \$2, \$1	F	D	X	M	W				
lw \$4, 4(\$3)		F	D	X	M	W			
sub \$8, \$3, \$1			F	D	X	M	W		
addi \$6, \$4, 1				F	D	X	M	W	


Washington University in St. Louis

Pipelining and Multi-Cycle Operations



- What if you wanted to add a multi-cycle operation?
 - E.g., 4-cycle multiply
 - P/W**: separate output latch connects to W stage
 - Controlled by pipeline control finite state machine (FSM)

A Pipelined Multiplier



- Multiplier itself is often pipelined, what does this mean?
 - Product/multiplicand register/ALUs/latches replicated
 - Can start a new multiply operation every cycle

Pipeline Diagram with Multiplier

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
mul \$4 \$3,\$5	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
addi \$6 \$4,1		F	d*	d*	d*	D	X	M	W

- What about...
 - Two instructions trying to write regfile in same cycle?
 - Structural hazard!
- Must prevent:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
mul \$4 \$3,\$5	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
addi \$6 \$1,1		F	D	X	M	W			
add \$5 \$6,\$10			F	D	X	M	W		

More Multiplier Nasties

- What about...
 - Mis-ordered register writes
 - SW thinks **add** gets \$4 from **addi**, actually gets it from **mul**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
mul \$4 \$3,\$5	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
addi \$4 \$1,1		F	D	X	M	W			
...									
add \$10 \$4,\$6					F	D	X	M	W

- Common? Not for a 4-cycle multiply with 5-stage pipeline
 - More common with deeper pipelines
 - Frequency irrelevant: must be correct no matter how rare

Corrected Pipeline Diagram

- With the correct stall logic
 - Prevent mis-ordered writes to the same register
 - Why two cycles of delay?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
mul \$4 \$3,\$5	F	D	P0	P1	P2	P3	W		
addi \$4 \$1,1		F	d*	d*	D	X	M	W	
...									
add \$10 \$4,\$6					F	D	X	M	W

Multi-cycle operations complicate pipeline logic

Pipelined Functional Units

- Almost all multi-cycle functional units are pipelined
 - Each operation takes N cycles
 - Can initiate a new (independent) operation every cycle
 - Requires internal latching and some hardware replication
- + Cheaper than multiple (non-pipelined) units

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
mul f \$0 \$1,\$2	F	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	W				
mul f \$3 \$4,\$5		F	D	E1	E2	E3	E4	W			

- Exception: int/FP divide: difficult to pipeline; not worth it

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
div f \$0 \$1,\$2	F	D	E/	E/	E/	E/	W				
div f \$3 \$4,\$5		F	s*	s*	s*	D	E/	E/	E/	E/	W

s* = structural hazard, two insns need same structure

- ISAs and pipelines designed minimize these
- Canonical example: all insns go through M stage

ISA Implementability Review

Give an example of an ISA feature that makes pipelining more difficult and the particular pipeline stages it affects.

ISA Implementability Review

Give an example of an ISA feature that makes pipelining more difficult and the particular pipeline stages it affects.

- Variable instruction length and format make pipelining fetch and decode difficult.
- Implicit state makes dynamic scheduling difficult.
- Variable latencies makes scheduling difficult.