Appendix A - Pipelining

The Big Picture

- Requirements
- Algorithms
- Prog. Lang./OS
- ISA
- uArch
- Circuit
- Device

Problem Focus

- SPEC

Performance Focus

f2() {
  f3(s2, &j, &i);
  *s2->p = 10;
  i = *s2->q + i;
}

f2() {
  f3(s2, &j, &i);
  *s2->p = 10;
  i = *s2->q + i;
}

f2() {
  f3(s2, &j, &i);
  *s2->p = 10;
  i = *s2->q + i;
}
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Instruction Set Architecture

Application

Instruction Set Architecture

Implementation

...SPARC MIPS ARM x86 HP-PA IA-64...

Intel Pentium X
AMD K6, Athlon, Opteron
Transmeta Crusoe TM5x00
Instruction Set Architecture

• Strong influence on cost/performance

• New ISAs are rare, but versions are not
  – 16-bit, 32-bit and 64-bit X86 versions

• Longevity is a strong function of marketing prowess
Traditional Issues

• Strongly constrained by the number of bits available to instruction encoding
• Opcodes/operands
• Registers/memory
• Addressing modes
• Orthogonality
• 0, 1, 2, 3 address machines
• Instruction formats
• Decoding uniformity
Introduction

A.1 What is Pipelining?

A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining-Structural Hazards
   – Data Hazards
   – Control Hazards

A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented

A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?

A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations
What Is Pipelining

- Laundry Example
- Ann, Brian, Cathy, Dave each have one load of clothes to wash, dry, and fold
- Washer takes 30 minutes
- Dryer takes 40 minutes
- “Folder” takes 20 minutes
What Is Pipelining

Sequential laundry takes 6 hours for 4 loads
If they learned pipelining, how long would laundry take?
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What Is Pipelining

Start work ASAP

- Pipelined laundry takes 3.5 hours for 4 loads
What Is Pipelining

Pipelining Lessons

- Pipelining doesn’t help latency of single task, it helps throughput of entire workload
- Pipeline rate limited by slowest pipeline stage
- Multiple tasks operating simultaneously
- Potential speedup = Number pipe stages
- Unbalanced lengths of pipe stages reduces speedup
- Time to “fill” pipeline and time to “drain” it reduces speedup
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What Is Pipelining

MIPS Without Pipelining

Instruction Fetch
Instr. Decode
Reg. Fetch
Execute
Addr. Calc
Memory Access
Write Back
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What Is Pipelining

MIPS Functions

Passed To Next Stage

IR <- Mem[PC]
NPC <- PC + 4

Instruction Fetch (IF):
Send out the PC and fetch the instruction from memory into the instruction register (IR); increment the PC by 4 to address the next sequential instruction.
IR holds the instruction that will be used in the next stage.
NPC holds the value of the next PC.
What Is Pipelining

MIPS Functions

Instruction Decode/Register Fetch Cycle (ID):
Decode the instruction and access the register file to read the registers. The outputs of the general purpose registers are read into two temporary registers (A & B) for use in later clock cycles. We extend the sign of the lower 16 bits of the Instruction Register.

Passed To Next Stage
A ← Regs[IR6..IR10];
B ← Regs[IR10..IR15];
Imm ← ((IR16) ##IR16-31
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What Is Pipelining

MIPS Functions

Execute Address Calculation (EX):
We perform an operation (for an ALU) or an address calculation (if it’s a load or a Branch).
If an ALU, actually do the operation. If an address calculation, figure out how to obtain the address and stash away the location of that address for the next cycle.

Passed To Next Stage
A <- A func. B
cond = 0;
What Is Pipelining

MIPS Functions

Memory Access

Write Back

Instruction Fetch

Instr. Decode Reg. Fetch

Execute Addr. Calc

Memory Access

Passed To Next Stage
A = Mem[prev. B]
or
Mem[prev. B] = A

MEMORY ACCESS (MEM):
If this is an ALU, do nothing.
If a load or store, then access memory.
What Is Pipelining

WRITE BACK (WB):
Update the registers from either the ALU or from the data loaded.

Passed To Next Stage
Regs <- A, B;
The Basic Pipeline For MIPS

Latches between each stage provide pipelining.

FIGURE 3.4. The datapath is pipelined by adding a set of registers, one between each pair of pipe stages.
The Basic Pipeline For MIPS

Figure 3.3
Pipeline Hurdles

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining - Structural Hazards
   - Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations

Limits to pipelining: Hazards prevent next instruction from executing during its designated clock cycle

- **Structural hazards:** HW cannot support this combination of instructions (single person to fold and put clothes away)
- **Data hazards:** Instruction depends on result of prior instruction still in the pipeline (missing sock)
- **Control hazards:** Pipelining of branches & other instructions that change the PC
- Common solution is to **stall** the pipeline until the hazard is resolved, inserting one or more “**bubbles**” in the pipeline
Pipeline Hurdles

Definition
• conditions that lead to incorrect behavior if not fixed
• Structural hazard
  – two different instructions use same h/w in same cycle
• Data hazard
  – two different instructions use same storage
  – must appear as if the instructions execute in correct order
• Control hazard
  – one instruction affects which instruction is next

Resolution
• Pipeline interlock logic detects hazards and fixes them
• simple solution: stall -
• increases CPI, decreases performance
• better solution: partial stall -
• some instruction stall, others proceed better to stall early than late
Structural Hazards

When two or more different instructions want to use the same hardware resource in the same cycle. For example, MEM uses the same memory port as IF as shown in this slide.

Figure 3.6
Structural Hazards

This is another way of looking at the effect of a stall.

Figure 3.7
This is another way to represent the stall we saw on the last few pages.
Structural Hazards

Dealing with Structural Hazards

Stall
• low cost, simple
• Increases CPI
• use for rare case since stalling has performance effect

Pipeline hardware resource
• useful for multi-cycle resources
• good performance
• sometimes complex e.g., RAM

Replicate resource
• good performance
• increases cost (+ maybe interconnect delay)
• useful for cheap or divisible resources
Structural Hazards

Structural hazards are reduced with these rules:
• Each instruction uses a resource at most once
• Always use the resource in the same pipeline stage
• Use the resource for one cycle only
Many RISC ISA’a designed with this in mind
Sometimes very complex to do this. For example, memory of necessity is used in the IF and MEM stages.

Some common Structural Hazards:
• Memory - we’ve already mentioned this one.
• Floating point - Since many floating point instructions require many cycles, it’s easy for them to interfere with each other.
• Starting up more of one type of instruction than there are resources. For instance, the PA-8600 can support two ALU + two load/store instructions per cycle - that’s how much hardware it has available.
Structural Hazards

We want to compare the performance of two machines. Which machine is faster?

- **Machine A**: Dual ported memory - so there are no memory stalls
- **Machine B**: Single ported memory, but its pipelined implementation has a 1.05 times faster clock rate

Assume:
- **Ideal CPI = 1** for both
- **Loads are 40% of instructions executed**

\[
\text{SpeedUp}_A = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1 + 0} \times \left( \frac{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}}}{\text{clock}_{\text{pipe}}} \right)
\]

\[
= \text{Pipeline Depth}
\]

\[
\text{SpeedUp}_B = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1 + 0.4 \times 1} \times \left( \frac{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}}}{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}} / 1.05} \right)
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1.4} \right) \times 1.05
\]

\[
= 0.75 \times \text{Pipeline Depth}
\]

\[
\frac{\text{SpeedUp}_A}{\text{SpeedUp}_B} = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{(0.75 \times \text{Pipeline Depth})} = 1.33
\]

- **Machine A** is 1.33 times faster
Data Hazards

These occur when at any time, there are instructions active that need to access the same data (memory or register) locations.

Where there’s real trouble is when we have:

instruction A

instruction B

and B manipulates (reads or writes) data before A does. This violates the order of the instructions, since the architecture implies that A completes entirely before B is executed.
Data Hazards

Read After Write (RAW)

Instr\textsubscript{j} tries to read operand before Instr\textsubscript{i} writes it

\begin{itemize}
  \item Caused by a “Dependence” (in compiler nomenclature). This hazard results from an actual need for communication.
\end{itemize}

Execution Order is:

Instr\textsubscript{i}
Instr\textsubscript{j}

\begin{align*}
  &I: \text{ add } r1, r2, r3 \\
  &J: \text{ sub } r4, r1, r3
\end{align*}
Data Hazards

Write After Read (WAR)

Instr$_j$ tries to write operand before Instr$_i$ reads i

– Gets wrong operand

I: sub r4, r1, r3
J: add r1, r2, r3
K: mul r6, r1, r7

– Called an “anti-dependence” by compiler writers. This results from reuse of the name “r1”.

• Can’t happen in MIPS 5 stage pipeline because:
  – All instructions take 5 stages, and
  – Reads are always in stage 2, and
  – Writes are always in stage 5
Data Hazards

Write After Write (WAW)

Instr\textsubscript{j} tries to write operand before Instr\textsubscript{i} writes it

– Leaves wrong result (Instr\textsubscript{i} not Instr\textsubscript{j})

I: sub r1, r4, r3
J: add r1, r2, r3
K: mul r6, r1, r7

• Called an “output dependence” by compiler writers
  This also results from the reuse of name “r1”.

• Can’t happen in MIPS 5 stage pipeline because:
  – All instructions take 5 stages, and
  – Writes are always in stage 5

• Will see WAR and WAW in later more complicated pipes
Data Hazards

Simple Solution to RAW

- Hardware detects RAW and stalls
- Assumes register written then read each cycle
  + low cost to implement, simple
  -- reduces IPC
- Try to minimize stalls

Minimizing RAW stalls

- Bypass/forward/short-circuit (We will use the word “forward”)
- Use data before it is in the register
  + reduces/avoids stalls
  -- complex
- Crucial for common RAW hazards
Data Hazards

The use of the result of the ADD instruction in the next three instructions causes a hazard, since the register is not written until after those instructions read it.

Figure 3.9
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Data Hazards

Forwarding To Avoid Data Hazard

Forwarding is the concept of making data available to the input of the ALU for subsequent instructions, even though the generating instruction hasn’t gotten to WB in order to write the memory or registers.

**Figure 3.10**

- **add** $r1, r2, r3$
- **sub** $r4, r1, r3$
- **and** $r6, r1, r7$
- **or** $r8, r1, r9$
- **xor** $r10, r1, r11$
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Data Hazards

There are some instances where hazards occur, even with forwarding. Figure 3.12
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Data Hazards

There are some instances where hazards occur, even with forwarding.

Figure 3.13
Data Hazards

LW  R1, 0(R2)  IF  ID  EX  MEM  WB
SUB R4, R1, R5  IF  ID  EX  MEM  WB
AND R6, R1, R7  IF  ID  EX  MEM  WB
OR  R8, R1, R9  IF  ID  EX  MEM  WB

LW  R1, 0(R2)  IF  ID  EX  MEM  WB
SUB R4, R1, R5  IF  ID  stall  EX  MEM  WB
AND R6, R1, R7  IF  stall  ID  EX  MEM  WB
OR  R8, R1, R9  IF  stall  ID  EX  MEM  WB

This is another representation of the stall.
Data Hazards

Instruction scheduled by compiler - move instruction in order to reduce stall.

```
lw Rb, b                      -- code sequence for a = b+c before scheduling
lw Rc, c
Add Ra, Rb, Rc                -- stall
sw a, Ra
lw Re, e                      -- code sequence for d = e+f before scheduling
lw Rf, f
sub Rd, Re, Rf                -- stall
sw d, Rd
```

Arrangement of code after scheduling.

```
lw Rb, b
lw Rc, c
lw Re, e
Add Ra, Rb, Rc
lw Rf, f
sw a, Ra
sub Rd, Re, Rf
sw d, Rd
```
Data Hazards

Pipeline Scheduling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Scheduled</th>
<th>Unscheduled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gcc</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spice</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tex</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% loads stalling pipeline
Control Hazards

A control hazard is when we need to find the destination of a branch, and can’t fetch any new instructions until we know that destination.

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining-Structural Hazards
   -- Structural Hazards
   – Data Hazards
   – Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations
Control Hazards

10: beq r1, r3, 36
14: and r2, r3, r5
18: or r6, r1, r7
22: add r8, r1, r9
36: xor r10, r1, r11

Control Hazard on Branches
Three Stage Stall
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Control Hazards

Branch Stall Impact

• If CPI = 1, 30% branch, Stall 3 cycles => new CPI = 1.9!
  (Whoa! How did we get that 1.9???)

• Two part solution to this dramatic increase:
  – Determine branch taken or not sooner, AND
  – Compute taken branch address earlier

• MIPS branch tests if register = 0 or ^ 0

• MIPS Solution:
  – Move Zero test to ID/RF stage
  – Adder to calculate new PC in ID/RF stage
    • must be fast
    • can't afford to subtract
    • compares with 0 are simple
    • Greater-than, Less-than test sign-bit, but not-equal must OR all bits
    • more general compares need ALU
  – 1 clock cycle penalty for branch versus 3

In the next chapter, we'll look at ways to avoid the branch all together.
Control Hazards  Five Branch Hazard Alternatives

#1: Stall until branch direction is clear

#2: Predict Branch Not Taken
   - Execute successor instructions in sequence
   - “Squash” instructions in pipeline if branch actually taken
   - Advantage of late pipeline state update
   - 47% MIPS branches not taken on average
   - PC+4 already calculated, so use it to get next instruction

#3: Predict Branch Taken
   - 53% MIPS branches taken on average
   - But haven’t calculated branch target address in MIPS
     - MIPS still incurs 1 cycle branch penalty
     - Other machines: branch target known before outcome
Control Hazards

Five Branch Hazard Alternatives

#4: Execute Both Paths

#5: Delayed Branch
- Define branch to take place AFTER a following instruction

\[
\text{branch instruction} \\
\text{sequential successor}_1 \\
\text{sequential successor}_2 \\
\ldots \\
\text{sequential successor}_n \\
\text{branch target if taken}
\]

- 1 slot delay allows proper decision and branch target address in 5 stage pipeline
- MIPS uses this
Control Hazards

Delayed Branch

• Where to get instructions to fill branch delay slot?
  – Before branch instruction
  – From the target address: only valuable when branch taken
  – From fall through: only valuable when branch not taken
  – Cancelling branches allow more slots to be filled

• Compiler effectiveness for single branch delay slot:
  – Fills about 60% of branch delay slots
  – About 80% of instructions executed in branch delay slots useful in computation
  – About 50% (60% x 80%) of slots usefully filled

• Delayed Branch downside: 7-8 stage pipelines, multiple instructions issued per clock (superscalar)
Control Hazards  Evaluating Branch Alternatives

Pipeline speedup = \frac{\text{Pipeline depth}}{1 + \text{Branch frequency} \times \text{Branch penalty}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduling scheme</th>
<th>Branch penalty</th>
<th>CPI</th>
<th>speedup v. unpipelined</th>
<th>Speedup v. stall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stall pipeline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict not taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed branch</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional & Unconditional = 14%, 65% change PC
Control Hazards

Pipelining Introduction

Summary

• Just overlap tasks, and easy if tasks are independent
• Speed Up Š Pipeline Depth; if ideal CPI is 1, then:

\[
\text{Speedup} = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1 + \text{Pipeline stall CPI}} \times \frac{\text{Clock Cycle Unpipelined}}{\text{Clock Cycle Pipelined}}
\]

• Hazards limit performance on computers:
  – Structural: need more HW resources
  – Data (RAW,WAR,WAW): need forwarding, compiler scheduling
  – Control: delayed branch, prediction
Control Hazards

The compiler can program what it thinks the branch direction will be. Here are the results when it does so.

Compiler “Static” Prediction of Taken/Untaken Branches

Always taken

Taken backwards

Not Taken Forwards
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Control Hazards

Compiler “Static” Prediction of Taken/Untaken Branches

• Improves strategy for placing instructions in delay slot

• Two strategies
  – Backward branch predict taken, forward branch not taken
  – Profile-based prediction: record branch behavior, predict branch based on prior run
Control Hazards

Evaluating Static Branch Prediction Strategies

- Misprediction ignores frequency of branch
- “Instructions between mispredicted branches” is a better metric
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

A.1 What is Pipelining?

A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining—Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards

A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented

A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?

A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Examples of interrupts:
- Power failing,
- Arithmetic overflow,
- I/O device request,
- OS call,
- Page fault

Interrupts (also known as: faults, exceptions, traps) often require
- surprise jump (to vectored address)
- linking return address
- saving of PSW (including CCs)
- state change (e.g., to kernel mode)

Interrupts cause great havoc!

There are 5 instructions executing in 5 stage pipeline when an interrupt occurs:
- How to stop the pipeline?
- How to restart the pipeline?
- Who caused the interrupt?
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

What happens on interrupt while in delay slot?

- Next instruction is not sequential
  - solution #1: save multiple PCs
  - Save current and next PC
  - Special return sequence, more complex hardware
  - solution #2: single PC plus
    - Branch delay bit
    - PC points to branch instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Problem that causes the interrupt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Page fault on instruction fetch; misaligned memory access; memory-protection violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Undefined or illegal opcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Arithmetic interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>Page fault on data fetch; misaligned memory access; memory-protection violation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

- Simultaneous exceptions in more than one pipeline stage, e.g.,
  - Load with data page fault in MEM stage
  - Add with instruction page fault in IF stage
  - Add fault will happen BEFORE load fault

- Solution #1
  - Interrupt status vector per instruction
  - Defer check until last stage, kill state update if exception

- Solution #2
  - Interrupt ASAP
  - Restart everything that is incomplete

Another advantage for state update late in pipeline!
## What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Here’s what happens on a data page fault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- page fault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+5</td>
<td>trap -&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+6</td>
<td>trap handler -&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interrupts cause great havoc!
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Complex Addressing Modes and Instructions

• Address modes: Autoincrement causes register change during instruction execution
  – Interrupts? Need to restore register state
  – Adds WAR and WAW hazards since writes are no longer the last stage.

• Memory-Memory Move Instructions
  – Must be able to handle multiple page faults
  – Long-lived instructions: partial state save on interrupt

• Condition Codes
Handling Multi-cycle Operations

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining - Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations

Multi-cycle instructions also lead to pipeline complexity.

A very lengthy instruction causes everything else in the pipeline to wait for it.
Multi-Cycle Operations

Floating point gives long execution time. This causes a stall of the pipeline.

It’s possible to pipeline the FP execution unit so it can initiate new instructions without waiting full latency. Can also have multiple FP units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP Instruction</th>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Initiation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add, Subtract</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square root</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP compare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Multi-Cycle Operations

Divide, Square Root take -10X to -30X longer than Add

- Interrupts?
- Adds WAR and WAW hazards since pipelines are no longer same length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I + 1</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 2</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 3</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 4</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 5</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 6</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- I + 2: no WAW, but this complicates an interrupt
- I + 4: no WB conflict
- I + 5: stall forced by structural hazard
- I + 6: stall forced by in-order issue
Summary of Pipelining Basics

- Hazards limit performance
  - Structural: need more HW resources
  - Data: need forwarding, compiler scheduling
  - Control: early evaluation & PC, delayed branch, prediction
- Increasing length of pipe increases impact of hazards; pipelining helps instruction bandwidth, not latency
- Interrupts, Instruction Set, FP makes pipelining harder
- Compilers reduce cost of data and control hazards
  - Load delay slots
  - Branch delay slots
  - Branch prediction
Credits
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A.1 What is Pipelining?

A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining - Structural Hazards
   – Data Hazards
   – Control Hazards

A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented

A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?

A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations
The big picture. Talk about the levels of abstraction. Talk about the fact that this is where all programs get ushered into hardware execution.

Circuits are increasing providing both opportunities (resources, bandwidth) and challenges (noise, power).

Circuits are locally designed; software is globally intertwined.

Software is increasingly over designed for portability and productivity.

The path between the two domains is increasingly stressed and inadequate due to this mismatch.

The focus of the thrust is to provide a very strong path from the productivity oriented software domain into the performance oriented hardware domain.

Translate device/circuit level innovations into visible benefit at the application/software level!
Instruction Set Architecture

Application

Instruction Set Architecture

Implementation

...SPARC  MIPS  ARM  x86  HP-PA  IA-64...

Intel Pentium X
AMD K6, Athlon, Opteron
Transmeta Crusoe TM5x00
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Instruction Set Architecture

• Strong influence on cost/performance

• New ISAs are rare, but versions are not
  – 16-bit, 32-bit and 64-bit X86 versions

• Longevity is a strong function of marketing prowess
Traditional Issues

- Strongly constrained by the number of bits available to instruction encoding
- Opcodes/operands
- Registers/memory
- Addressing modes
- Orthogonality
- 0, 1, 2, 3 address machines
- Instruction formats
- Decoding uniformity
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Introduction

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining-Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations
What Is Pipelining

• Laundry Example
• Ann, Brian, Cathy, Dave each have one load of clothes to wash, dry, and fold
• Washer takes 30 minutes
• Dryer takes 40 minutes
• “Folder” takes 20 minutes
What Is Pipelining

Sequential laundry takes 6 hours for 4 loads
If they learned pipelining, how long would laundry take?
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What Is Pipelining

Start work ASAP

• Pipelined laundry takes 3.5 hours for 4 loads
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What Is Pipelining

Task Order

A

B

C

D

6 PM  7  8  9

Time

30  40  40  40  40  20

Pipelining Lessons

• Pipelining doesn't help latency of single task, it helps throughput of entire workload
• Pipeline rate limited by slowest pipeline stage
• Multiple tasks operating simultaneously
• Potential speedup = Number pipe stages
• Unbalanced lengths of pipe stages reduces speedup
• Time to “fill” pipeline and time to “drain” it reduces speedup
Appendix A - Pipelining

What Is Pipelining

MIPS Without Pipelining


IR  L  M  D
What Is Pipelining

MIPS Functions

Instruction Fetch (IF):
Send out the PC and fetch the instruction from memory into the instruction register (IR); increment the PC by 4 to address the next sequential instruction.
IR holds the instruction that will be used in the next stage.
NPC holds the value of the next PC.

Passed To Next Stage
IR <- Mem[PC]
NPC <- PC + 4
Instruction Decode/Register Fetch Cycle (ID):
Decode the instruction and access the register file to read the registers. The outputs of the general purpose registers are read into two temporary registers (A & B) for use in later clock cycles. We extend the sign of the lower 16 bits of the Instruction Register.

Passed To Next Stage
A <- Regs[IR6..IR10];
B <- Regs[IR10..IR15];
Imm <- ([IR16] ##IR16-31
What Is Pipelining

Execute Address Calculation (EX):
We perform an operation (for an ALU) or an address calculation (if it's a load or a Branch).
If an ALU, actually do the operation. If an address calculation, figure out how to obtain the address and stash away the location of that address for the next cycle.

Passed To Next Stage
A <- A func. B
cond = 0;
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**What Is Pipelining**

**MIPS Functions**

MEMORY ACCESS (MEM):
If this is an ALU, do nothing.
If a load or store, then access memory.

Passed To Next Stage
A = Mem[prev. B]
or
Mem[prev. B] = A
**What Is Pipelining**

**MIPS Functions**

WRITE BACK (WB):
Update the registers from either the ALU or from the data loaded.

Passed To Next Stage
Regs <- A, B;
The Basic Pipeline For MIPS

Latches between each stage provide pipelining.

FIGURE 3.4 The datapath is pipelined by adding a set of registers, one between each pair of pipe stages.
The Basic Pipeline For MIPS

Figure 3.3
Pipeline Hurdles

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining: Structural Hazards
   - Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations

Limits to pipelining: Hazards prevent next instruction from executing during its designated clock cycle

- **Structural hazards:** HW cannot support this combination of instructions (single person to fold and put clothes away)
- **Data hazards:** Instruction depends on result of prior instruction still in the pipeline (missing sock)
- **Control hazards:** Pipelining of branches & other instructions that change the PC
- Common solution is to **stall** the pipeline until the hazard is resolved, inserting one or more “**bubbles**” in the pipeline

Appendix A - Pipelining 18
Pipeline Hurdles

Definition
• conditions that lead to incorrect behavior if not fixed
• Structural hazard
  – two different instructions use same h/w in same cycle
• Data hazard
  – two different instructions use same storage
  – must appear as if the instructions execute in correct order
• Control hazard
  – one instruction affects which instruction is next

Resolution
• Pipeline interlock logic detects hazards and fixes them
• simple solution: stall -
• increases CPI, decreases performance
• better solution: partial stall -
• some instruction stall, others proceed better to stall early than late
Structural Hazards

When two or more different instructions want to use the same hardware resource in the same cycle, e.g., MEM uses the same memory port as IF as shown in this slide.

Figure 3.6
Structural Hazards

This is another way of looking at the effect of a stall.

Figure 3.7
This is another way to represent the stall we saw on the last few pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Load instruction</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+1</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+2</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+3</td>
<td>stall</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+4</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+5</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction i+6</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structural Hazards

Dealing with Structural Hazards

Stall
• low cost, simple
• Increases CPI
• use for rare case since stalling has performance effect

Pipeline hardware resource
• useful for multi-cycle resources
• good performance
• sometimes complex e.g., RAM

Replicate resource
• good performance
• increases cost (+ maybe interconnect delay)
• useful for cheap or divisible resources
Structural Hazards

Structural hazards are reduced with these rules:

- Each instruction uses a resource at most once
- Always use the resource in the same pipeline stage
- Use the resource for one cycle only

Many RISC ISA’s designed with this in mind

Sometimes very complex to do this. For example, memory of necessity is used in the IF and MEM stages.

Some common Structural Hazards:

- Memory - we've already mentioned this one.
- Floating point - Since many floating point instructions require many cycles, it's easy for them to interfere with each other.
- Starting up more of one type of instruction than there are resources. For instance, the PA-8600 can support two ALU + two load/store instructions per cycle - that's how much hardware it has available.
We want to compare the performance of two machines. Which machine is faster?

- Machine A: Dual ported memory - so there are no memory stalls
- Machine B: Single ported memory, but its pipelined implementation has a 1.05 times faster clock rate

Assume:

- Ideal CPI = 1 for both
- Loads are 40% of instructions executed

\[
\text{SpeedUp}_A = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{(1 + 0)} \times \left(\frac{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}}}{\text{clock}_{\text{pipe}}}\right) \\
= \text{Pipeline Depth} \\
\text{SpeedUp}_B = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{(1 + 0.4 \times 1)} \times \left(\frac{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}}}{\text{clock}_{\text{unpipe}} / 1.05}\right) \\
= \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1.4} \times 1.05 \\
= 0.75 \times \text{Pipeline Depth} \\
\text{SpeedUp}_A / \text{SpeedUp}_B = \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{(0.75 \times \text{Pipeline Depth})} = 1.33
\]

- Machine A is 1.33 times faster
Data Hazards

These occur when at any time, there are instructions active that need to access the same data (memory or register) locations.

Where there's real trouble is when we have:

instruction A
instruction B

and B manipulates (reads or writes) data before A does. This violates the order of the instructions, since the architecture implies that A completes entirely before B is executed.
Data Hazards

Read After Write (RAW)
Instr\_i tries to read operand before Instr\_j writes it

Execution Order is:
Instr\_i
Instr\_j

• Caused by a “Dependence” (in compiler nomenclature). This hazard results from an actual need for communication.

I: add r\_1, r\_2, r\_3
J: sub r\_4, r\_1, r\_3
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Data Hazards

Write After Read (WAR)

Instr, tries to write operand before Instr reads i

– Gets wrong operand

• Can't happen in MIPS 5 stage pipeline because:
  – All instructions take 5 stages, and
  – Reads are always in stage 2, and
  – Writes are always in stage 5

Execution Order is:

Instr_i, Instr_j

I: sub r4, r1, r3
J: add r1, r2, r3
K: mul r6, r1, r7

– Called an “anti-dependence” by compiler writers. This results from reuse of the name “r1”.
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Data Hazards

Write After Write (WAW)
Instr\textsubscript{i} tries to write operand before Instr\textsubscript{j} writes it
- Leaves wrong result (Instr\textsubscript{i} not Instr\textsubscript{j})

• Called an “output dependence” by compiler writers
  This also results from the reuse of name “r1”.

• Can’t happen in MIPS 5 stage pipeline because:
  – All instructions take 5 stages, and
  – Writes are always in stage 5

• Will see WAR and WAW in later more complicated pipes

Execution Order is:
Instr\textsubscript{i}, Instr\textsubscript{j}

I: sub r\textsubscript{1}, r\textsubscript{4}, r\textsubscript{3}
J: add r\textsubscript{1}, r\textsubscript{2}, r\textsubscript{3}
K: mul r\textsubscript{6}, r\textsubscript{1}, r\textsubscript{7}
Data Hazards

Simple Solution to RAW

- Hardware detects RAW and stalls
- Assumes register written then read each cycle
  + low cost to implement, simple
  -- reduces IPC
- Try to minimize stalls

Minimizing RAW stalls

- Bypass/forward/short-circuit (We will use the word “forward”)
- Use data before it is in the register
  + reduces/avoids stalls
  -- complex
- Crucial for common RAW hazards
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Data Hazards

Time (clock cycles)

IF | ID/RF | EX | MEM | WB
---|------|----|-----|-----
add \( r_1, r_2, r_3 \) | fetch | Reg | ALU | Reg
sub \( r_4, r_1, r_3 \) | fetch | Reg | ALU | Reg
and \( r_6, r_1, r_7 \) | fetch | Reg | ALU | Reg
or \( r_8, r_1, r_9 \) | fetch | Reg | ALU | Reg
xor \( r_{10}, r_1, r_{11} \) | fetch | Reg | ALU | Reg

The use of the result of the ADD instruction in the next three instructions causes a hazard, since the register is not written until after those instructions read it.

Figure 3.9
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Data Hazards

Forwarding To Avoid Data Hazard

Forwarding is the concept of making data available to the input of the ALU for subsequent instructions, even though the generating instruction hasn't gotten to WB in order to write the memory or registers.

Figure 3.10
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Data Hazards

The data isn't loaded until after the MEM stage.

Time (clock cycles)

![Diagram showing the execution of instructions with data hazards]

There are some instances where hazards occur, even with forwarding. Figure 3.12
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There are some instances where hazards occur, even with forwarding. The stall is necessary as shown here.

Figure 3.13
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Data Hazards

This is another representation of the stall.

LW R1, 0(R2) IF ID EX MEM WB
SUB R4, R1, R5 IF ID EX MEM WB
AND R6, R1, R7 IF ID EX MEM WB
OR R8, R1, R9 IF ID EX MEM WB

LW R1, 0(R2) IF ID EX MEM WB
SUB R4, R1, R5 IF ID stall EX MEM WB
AND R6, R1, R7 IF stall ID EX MEM WB
OR R8, R1, R9 stall IF ID EX MEM WB
Data Hazards

Instruction scheduled by compiler - move instruction in order to reduce stall.

lw Rb, b  -- code sequence for a = b+c before scheduling
lw Rc, c
Add Ra, Rb, Rc  -- stall
sw a, Ra
lw Re, e  -- code sequence for d = e+f before scheduling
lw Rf, f
sub Rd, Re, Rf  -- stall
sw d, Rd

Arrangement of code after scheduling.

lw Rb, b
lw Rc, c
lw Re, e
Add Ra, Rb, Rc
lw Rf, f
sw a, Ra
sub Rd, Re, Rf
sw d, Rd
Data Hazards

Pipeline Scheduling

- gcc: scheduled 31%, unscheduled 54%
- spice: scheduled 14%, unscheduled 42%
- tex: scheduled 25%, unscheduled 65%

% loads stalling pipeline
Control Hazards

A control hazard is when we need to find the destination of a branch, and can't fetch any new instructions until we know that destination.
Control Hazards

Control Hazard on Branches
Three Stage Stall

10: beq r1, r3, 36
14: and r2, r3, r5
18: or r6, r1, r7
22: add r8, r1, r9
36: xor r10, r1, r11
Branch Stall Impact

- If CPI = 1, 30% branch, Stall 3 cycles => new CPI = 1.9!
  (Whoa! How did we get that 1.9???)
- Two part solution to this dramatic increase:
  - Determine branch taken or not sooner, AND
  - Compute taken branch address earlier
- MIPS branch tests if register = 0 or ^ 0
- MIPS Solution:
  - Move Zero test to ID/RF stage
  - Adder to calculate new PC in ID/RF stage
    - must be fast
    - can't afford to subtract
    - compares with 0 are simple
    - Greater-than, Less-than test sign-bit, but not-equal must OR all bits
    - more general compares need ALU
  - 1 clock cycle penalty for branch versus 3

In the next chapter, we’ll look at ways to avoid the branch all together.
# Control Hazards

## Five Branch Hazard Alternatives

### #1: Stall until branch direction is clear

### #2: Predict Branch Not Taken
- Execute successor instructions in sequence
- “Squash” instructions in pipeline if branch actually taken
- Advantage of late pipeline state update
- 47% MIPS branches not taken on average
- PC+4 already calculated, so use it to get next instruction

### #3: Predict Branch Taken
- 53% MIPS branches taken on average
- But haven’t calculated branch target address in MIPS
  - MIPS still incurs 1 cycle branch penalty
  - Other machines: branch target known before outcome
Control Hazards

Five Branch Hazard Alternatives

#4: Execute Both Paths

#5: Delayed Branch
- Define branch to take place \textit{AFTER} a following instruction

\begin{align*}
\text{branch instruction} \\
\text{sequential successor,} \\
\text{sequential successor,} \\
\vdots \\
\text{sequential successor,} \\
\text{branch target if taken}
\end{align*}

- 1 slot delay allows proper decision and branch target address in 5 stage pipeline
- MIPS uses this
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Control Hazards

Delayed Branch

• Where to get instructions to fill branch delay slot?
  – Before branch instruction
  – From the target address: only valuable when branch taken
  – From fall through: only valuable when branch not taken
  – Cancelling branches allow more slots to be filled

• Compiler effectiveness for single branch delay slot:
  – Fills about 60% of branch delay slots
  – About 80% of instructions executed in branch delay slots useful in computation
  – About 50% (60% x 80%) of slots usefully filled

• Delayed Branch downside: 7-8 stage pipelines, multiple instructions issued per clock (superscalar)
### Control Hazards

Evaluating Branch Alternatives

Pipeline speedup = \[
\text{Pipeline depth} \div (1 + \text{Branch frequency} \times \text{Branch penalty})
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheduling scheme</th>
<th>Branch penalty</th>
<th>CPI speedup v. unpipelined</th>
<th>Speedup v. stall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stall pipeline</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predict not taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed branch</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional & Unconditional = 14%, 65% change PC
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Control Hazards

Pipelining Introduction

Summary

- Just overlap tasks, and easy if tasks are independent
- Speed Up \( \frac{\text{Pipeline Depth}}{1 + \text{Pipeline stall CPI}} \) \( \times \) \( \frac{\text{Clock Cycle Unpipelined}}{\text{Clock Cycle Pipelined}} \)

- Hazards limit performance on computers:
  - Structural: need more HW resources
  - Data (RAW, WAR, WAW): need forwarding, compiler scheduling
  - Control: delayed branch, prediction

Appendix A - Pipelining  45
Control Hazards

The compiler can program what it thinks the branch direction will be. Here are the results when it does so.

Compiler “Static” Prediction of Taken/Untaken Branches

Always taken
Taken backwards
Not Taken Forwards
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Control Hazards

Compiler “Static”
Prediction of
Taken/Untaken Branches

- Improves strategy for placing instructions in delay slot

- Two strategies
  - Backward branch predict taken, forward branch not taken
  - Profile-based prediction: record branch behavior, predict branch
    based on prior run
Control Hazards

- Misprediction ignores frequency of branch
- “Instructions between mispredicted branches” is a better metric

Evaluating Static Branch Prediction Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Profile-based</th>
<th>Direction-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alwn</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compress</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dodac</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>espresso</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gcc</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hydro2d</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mjisp2</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ora</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smw256</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomcatv</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What Makes Pipelining Hard?

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining-
   Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to
   Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to
   Handle Multi-cycle Operations
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Examples of interrupts:
- Power failing,
- Arithmetic overflow,
- I/O device request,
- OS call,
- Page fault

Interruption causes great havoc!

There are 5 instructions executing in 5 stage pipeline when an interrupt occurs:
- How to stop the pipeline?
- How to restart the pipeline?
- Who caused the interrupt?

Interruptions (also known as: faults, exceptions, traps) often require
- surprise jump (to vectored address)
- linking return address
- saving of PSW (including CCs)
- state change (e.g., to kernel mode)
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

What happens on interrupt while in delay slot?

- Next instruction is not sequential
  - solution #1: save multiple PCs
- Save current and next PC
- Special return sequence, more complex hardware
- solution #2: single PC plus
  - Branch delay bit
  - PC points to branch instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Problem that causes the interrupt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td>Page fault on instruction fetch; misaligned memory access; memory-protection violation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Undefined or illegal opcode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Arithmetic interrupt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>Page fault on data fetch; misaligned memory access; memory-protection violation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What Makes Pipelining Hard?

- Simultaneous exceptions in more than one pipeline stage, e.g.,
  - Load with data page fault in MEM stage
  - Add with instruction page fault in IF stage
  - Add fault will happen BEFORE load fault

- **Solution #1**
  - Interrupt status vector per instruction
  - Defer check until last stage, kill state update if exception

- **Solution #2**
  - Interrupt ASAP
  - Restart everything that is incomplete

Another advantage for state update late in pipeline!

Interrupts cause great havoc!
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Here's what happens on a data page fault.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- page fault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>&lt;- squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+5</td>
<td>trap -&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i+6</td>
<td>trap handler -&gt;</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Makes Pipelining Hard?

Complex Addressing Modes and Instructions

- Address modes: Autoincrement causes register change during instruction execution
  - Interrupts? Need to restore register state
  - Adds WAR and WAW hazards since writes are no longer the last stage.

- Memory-Memory Move Instructions
  - Must be able to handle multiple page faults
  - Long-lived instructions: partial state save on interrupt

- Condition Codes
Handling Multi-cycle Operations

A.1 What is Pipelining?
A.2 The Major Hurdle of Pipelining:
   Structural Hazards
   - Data Hazards
   - Control Hazards
A.3 How is Pipelining Implemented
A.4 What Makes Pipelining Hard to Implement?
A.5 Extending the MIPS Pipeline to Handle Multi-cycle Operations

Multi-cycle instructions also lead to pipeline complexity.

A very lengthy instruction causes everything else in the pipeline to wait for it.
Multi-Cycle Operations

Floating point gives long execution time. This causes a stall of the pipeline.

It's possible to pipeline the FP execution unit so it can initiate new instructions without waiting full latency. Can also have multiple FP units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FP Instruction</th>
<th>Latency</th>
<th>Initiation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Add, Subtract</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiply</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square root</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute value</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP compare</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Multi-Cycle Operations

Divide, Square Root take -10X to -30X longer than Add
- Interrupts?
- Adds WAR and WAW hazards since pipelines are no longer same length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 1</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 2</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 3</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 4</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 5</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I + 6</td>
<td>IF</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- I + 2: no WAW, but this complicates an interrupt
- I + 4: no WB conflict
- I + 5: stall forced by structural hazard
- I + 6: stall forced by in-order issue
Summary of Pipelining Basics

- Hazards limit performance
  - Structural: need more HW resources
  - Data: need forwarding, compiler scheduling
  - Control: early evaluation & PC, delayed branch, prediction
- Increasing length of pipe increases impact of hazards; pipelining helps instruction bandwidth, not latency
- Interrupts, Instruction Set, FP makes pipelining harder
- Compilers reduce cost of data and control hazards
  - Load delay slots
  - Branch delay slots
  - Branch prediction
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