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CDC 6600-style Scoreboard

Instructions are issued in order; An instruction is issued only if
- It cannot cause a RAW hazard
  \[\text{if operands are read immediately then no need to remember sources of instructions in the execute phases}\]
- It cannot cause a WAW hazard
  \[\text{There can be at most one instruction in the execute phase that can write in a particular register}\]

Scoreboard:
Two bit-vectors

Busy[FU#]: Indicates FU’s availability
These bits are hardwired to FU's.

WP[reg#]: Records if a write is pending for a register
Set to true by the Issue stage and set to false by the WB stage
### Reminder: Scoreboard Dynamics

#### Functional Unit Status

| t0  | I₁  |  | f6 |  |  | f6 |
|-----|-----|  |  |  |  |  |
| t1  | I₂  | f2 | f6 | f6 | f6, f2 |
| t2  |     | f6 | f2 | f6, f2 |
| t3  | I₃  | f0 | f6 | f6, f0 |
| t4  |     | f0 | f6 | f6, f0 |
| t5  | I₄  | f0 f8 |  | f0, f8 |
| t6  |     | f8 | f0 | f0, f8 |
| t7  | I₅  | f10 | f8 | f8, f10 |
| t8  |     | f8 | f10 | f8, f10 |
| t9  |     | f8 | f8 | I₅ |
| t10 | I₆  | f6 |  |  | f6 |
| t11 |     |  |  |  | f6 |

#### Issue Checks

- WP[dest]?
- WP[src1] or WP[src2]?
- Busy[FU#]?
# In-Order Issue Limitations: *an example*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>latency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F2, 34(R2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F4, 45(R3)</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MULTD</td>
<td>F6, F4, F2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUBD</td>
<td>F8, F2, F2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DIVD</td>
<td>F4, F2, F8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADDD</td>
<td>F10, F6, F4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-order: 1 (2,1) . . . . . . 2 3 4 4 3 5 . . . 5 6 6

In-order restriction prevents instruction 4 from being dispatched
Out-of-Order Issue

How can we address the delay caused by a RAW dependence associated with the next in-order instruction?

- Issue stage buffer holds multiple instructions waiting to issue.
- Decode adds next instruction to buffer if there is space and the instruction does not cause a WAR or WAW hazard.
- Can issue any instruction in buffer whose RAW hazards are satisfied (for now at most one dispatch per cycle). A writeback (WB) may enable more instructions.

Find something else to do!
**In-Order Issue Limitations: an example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Source/Operands</th>
<th>Latency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F2, 34(R2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F4, 45(R3)</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MULTD</td>
<td>F6, F4, F2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUBD</td>
<td>F8, F2, F2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DIVD</td>
<td>F4, F2, F8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADDD</td>
<td>F10, F6, F4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-order: \[ 1 \ (2,1) \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ 2 \ 3 \ 4 \ 4 \ 3 \ 5 \ . \ . \ . \ 5 \ 6 \ 6 \]

Out-of-order: \[ 1 \ (2,1) \ 4 \ 4 \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ . \ 2 \ 3 \ . \ . \ . \ 3 \ 5 \ . \ . \ . \ 5 \ 6 \ 6 \]

**Out-of-order execution did not allow any significant improvement!**
Instruction-level Parallelism via Renaming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>latency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F2, 34(R2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>F4, 45(R3)</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MULTD</td>
<td>F6, F4, F2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SUBD</td>
<td>F8, F2, F2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DIVD</td>
<td>F4', F2, F8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADDD</td>
<td>F10, F6, F4'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In-order: 1 (2,1) . . . . . . 2 3 4 4 3 5 . . . 5 6 6
Out-of-order: 1 (2,1) 4 4 5 . . . 2 (3,5) 3 6 6

Renaming eliminates WAR and WAW hazards
(renamning ⇒ additional storage)
How many Instructions can be in the pipeline

Which feature of an ISA limits the number of instructions in the pipeline?

Out-of-order dispatch by itself does not provide any significant performance improvement!
Little’s Law

Throughput \( T \) = Number in Flight \( N \) / Latency \( L \)

Example:

4 floating point registers
8 cycles per floating point operation

\[ \Rightarrow \text{½ issues per cycle!} \]
Overcoming the Lack of Register Names

Floating Point pipelines often cannot be kept filled with small number of registers.

IBM 360 had only 4 Floating Point Registers

Can a microarchitecture use more registers than specified by the ISA without loss of ISA compatibility?

Yes, Robert Tomasulo of IBM suggested an ingenious solution in 1967 based on on-the-fly register renaming.
Register Renaming

- Decode does register renaming and adds instructions to the issue stage reorder buffer (ROB)
  \[ \implies \text{renaming makes WAR or WAW hazards impossible} \]

- Any instruction in ROB whose RAW hazards have been satisfied can be dispatched.
  \[ \implies \text{Out-of-order or dataflow execution} \]
### Dataflow execution

Instruction slot is candidate for execution when:
- It holds a valid instruction ("use" bit is set)
- It has not already started execution ("exec" bit is clear)
- Both operands are available (p1 and p2 are set)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ins#</th>
<th>use</th>
<th>exec</th>
<th>op</th>
<th>p1</th>
<th>src1</th>
<th>p2</th>
<th>src2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reorder buffer

\[ \text{ptr}_2 \rightarrow \text{next to deallocate} \]

\[ \text{prt}_1 \rightarrow \text{next available} \]

\[ t_1 \]

\[ t_2 \]

\[ . \]

\[ . \]

\[ . \]

\[ t_n \]
Renaming & Out-of-order Issue

An example

Renaming table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>v1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>t35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>v4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

data (v_i) / tag(t_i)

Reorder buffer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ins#</th>
<th>use</th>
<th>exec</th>
<th>op</th>
<th>p1</th>
<th>src1</th>
<th>p2</th>
<th>src2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>LD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MUL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>v2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>v1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- When are names in sources replaced by data?
  Whenever an FU produces data
- When can a name be reused?
  Whenever an instruction completes
Instruction template (i.e., tag t) is allocated by the Decode stage, which also stores the tag in the reg file. When an instruction completes, its tag is deallocated.
### Simplifying Allocation/Deallocation

 Instruction buffer is managed circularly

- "exec" bit is set when instruction begins execution
- When an instruction completes its "use" bit is marked free
- \( \text{ptr}_2 \) is incremented only if the "use" bit is marked free

#### Reorder buffer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ins#</th>
<th>use</th>
<th>exec</th>
<th>op</th>
<th>p1</th>
<th>src1</th>
<th>p2</th>
<th>src2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( \text{ptr}_2 \) next to deallocate
- \( \text{ptr}_1 \) next available
- \( t_1 \), \( t_2 \), . . . , \( t_n \)
IBM 360/91 Floating Point Unit
R. M. Tomasulo, 1967

Common bus ensures that data is made available immediately to all the instructions waiting for it.
Effectiveness?

Renaming and Out-of-order execution was first implemented in 1969 in IBM 360/91 but did not show up in the subsequent models until mid-nineties.

Why?

1. Effective on a very small class of programs
2. Did not address the memory latency problem which turned out be a much bigger issue than FU latency
3. Made exceptions imprecise

One more problem needed to be solved

Control transfers

More on this in the next lecture
Precise Exceptions

Exceptions are relatively unlikely events that need special processing, but where adding explicit control flow instructions is not desired, e.g., divide by 0, page fault.

Exceptions can be viewed as an implicit conditional subroutine call that is inserted between two instructions.

Therefore, it must appear as if the exception is taken between two instructions (say $I_i$ and $I_{i+1}$)

- the effect of all instructions up to and including $I_i$ is complete
- no effect of any instruction after $I_i$ has taken place

The handler either aborts the program or restarts it at $I_{i+1}$. 
Effect on Exceptions
Out-of-order Completion

\[
\begin{align*}
I_1 & \quad \text{DIVD} & \quad f6, & \quad f6, & \quad f4 \\
I_2 & \quad \text{LD} & \quad f2, & \quad 45(r3) \\
I_3 & \quad \text{MULTD} & \quad f0, & \quad f2, & \quad f4 \\
I_4 & \quad \text{DIVD} & \quad f8, & \quad f6, & \quad f2 \\
I_5 & \quad \text{SUBD} & \quad f10, & \quad f0, & \quad f6 \\
I_6 & \quad \text{ADDD} & \quad f6, & \quad f8, & \quad f2
\end{align*}
\]

\textcolor{red}{\text{out-of-order comp}} \\
\begin{align*}
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 2 & \quad 3 & \quad 1 & \quad 4 & \quad 3 & \quad 5 & \quad 5 & \quad 4 & \quad 6 & \quad 6
\end{align*}

Consider exceptions

Precise exceptions are difficult to implement at high speed
- want to start execution of later instructions before exception checks finished on earlier instructions
Exceptions

- Exceptions create a dependence on the value of the next PC

- Options for handling this dependence:
  - Stall: No
  - Bypass: No
  - Find something else to do: No
  - Change the architecture: Sometimes: Alpha, Multiflow
  - Speculate!: Most common approach!

- How can we handle rollback on mis-speculation
  
  Delay state update until commit on speculated instructions

- Note: earlier exceptions must override later ones
Phases of Instruction Execution

### Fetch
- **In order:** PC → I-cache → Fetch Buffer

#### Fetch: Instruction bits retrieved from cache.

### Decode
- **Out of order:** Issue Buffer → Func. Units → Reorder Buffer → Commit Buffer → Arch. State

#### Decode: Instructions placed in appropriate issue (aka “dispatch”) stage buffer

### Execute
- **In-order:** Issue Buffer → Func. Units

#### Execute: Instructions and operands sent to execution units.
When execution completes, all results and exception flags are available.

### Commit
- **In-order:** Reorder Buffer → Commit Buffer → Arch. State

#### Commit: Instruction irrevocably updates architectural state (aka “graduation” or “completion”).
Exception Handling
*(In-Order Five-Stage Pipeline)*

Hold exception flags in pipeline until commit point (M stage)
- If exception at commit:
  - update Cause/EPC registers
  - kill all stages
  - fetch at handler PC
- Inject external interrupts at commit point
In-Order Commit for Precise Exceptions

- Instructions fetched and decoded into instruction reorder buffer in-order
- Execution is out-of-order (⇒ out-of-order completion)
- Commit (write-back to architectural state, i.e., regfile & memory, is in-order)

Temporary storage needed to hold results before commit (shadow registers and store buffers)
Extensions for Precise Exceptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inst#</th>
<th>use</th>
<th>exec</th>
<th>op</th>
<th>p1</th>
<th>src1</th>
<th>p2</th>
<th>src2</th>
<th>pd</th>
<th>dest</th>
<th>data</th>
<th>cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- add \(<pd, dest, data, cause>\) fields in the instruction template
- commit instructions to reg file and memory in program order \(\Rightarrow\) buffers can be maintained circularly
- on exception, clear reorder buffer by resetting \(ptr_1 = ptr_2\)

(\textit{stores must wait for commit before updating memory})
Rollback and Renaming

Register file does not contain renaming tags any more.

How does the decode stage find the tag of a source register?

Search the “dest” field in the reorder buffer.
Renaming Table

Renaming table is a cache to speed up register name lookup. It needs to be cleared after each exception taken. When else are valid bits cleared? **Control transfers**
Physical Register Files

- Reorder buffers are space inefficient – a data value may be stored in multiple places in the reorder buffer
- Idea – keep all data values in a physical register file
  - Tag represents the name of the data value and name of the physical register that holds it
  - Reorder buffer contains only tags

Thus, 64 data values may be replaced by 8-bit tags for a 256 element physical register file

More on this in later lectures ...
Branch Penalty

How many instructions need to be killed on a misprediction?

Modern processors may have > 10 pipeline stages between nextPC calculation and branch resolution!

next lecture: Branch prediction & Speculative execution