

Reliable Architectures

Joel Emer
Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

http://www.csg.csail.mit.edu/6.823

Event Changes State of a Single Bit



- **Soft Error –** Changes that are not permanent
- **Hard Error –** Changes that are permanent

Impact of Neutron Strike on a Si Device



Strikes release electron & hole pairs that can be absorbed by source & drain to alter the state of the device

- Secondary source of upsets: alpha particles from packaging

Cosmic Rays Come From Deep Space



- Neutron flux is higher at higher altitudes

  3x - 5x increase in Denver at 5,000 feet

  100x increase in airplanes at 30,000+ feet

Basics of Charge Generation

Cosmic rays of >1GeV result in neutrons of >1MeV

Energy (eV)	Electron-Hole Pairs	Charge (Femtocoulombs)
3.6ev	1	3.2×10^{-4}
1MeV	$\sim 2.8 \times 10^{5}$	~44
1Gev	$\sim 2.8 \times 10^{8}$	$\sim 44 \times 10^{3}$

In 2010:

- Critical charge on a DRAM - ~25 fCoulomb
- Critical charge on an SRAM - <4 fCoulomb

Cosmic Ray Strikes: Evidence & Reaction

- Publicly disclosed incidence
  - Error logs in large servers, E. Normand, “Single Event Upset at Ground Level,” IEEE Trans. on Nucl Sci, Vol. 43, No. 6, Dec 1996.
  - Sun Microsystems found cosmic ray strikes on L2 cache with defective error protection caused Sun’s flagship servers to crash, R. Baumann, IRPS Tutorial on SER, 2000.
  - Cypress Semiconductor reported in 2004 a single soft error brought a billion-dollar automotive factory to a halt once a month, Zielger & Puchner, “SER – History, Trends, and Challenges,” Cypress, 2004.
  - In 2003, a "single-event upset" was blamed for an electronic voting error in Schaerbeekm, Belgium. A bit flip in the electronic voting machine added 4,096 extra votes to one candidate.

Physical Solutions are hard

- Shielding?
  - No practical absorbent (e.g., approximately > 10 ft of concrete)
  - This is unlike Alpha particles which are easily blocked

- Technology solution?
  - Partially-depleted SOI of some help, effect on logic unclear
  - Fully-depleted SOI may help, but is challenging to manufacture
  - FINFETs are showing significantly lower vulnerability

- Circuit level solution?
  - Radiation hardened circuits can provide 10x improvement with significant penalty in performance, area, cost
  - 2-4x improvement may be possible with less penalty

Triple Modular Redundancy
(Von Neumann, 1956)



V does a majority vote on the results

Dual Modular Redundancy (eg., Binac, Stratus)



- Processing stops on mismatch
- Error signal used to decide which processor be used to restore state to other

Pair and Spare Lockstep
(e.g., Tandem, 1975)



- Primary creates periodic checkpoints
- Backup restarts from checkpoint on mismatch

Redundant Multithreading
(e.g., Reinhardt, Mukherjee, 2000)

Leading Thread





Trailing Thread



- Writes are checked

Component Protection



- Fujitsu SPARC in 130 nm technology (ISSCC 2003)
  - 80% of 200k latches protected with parity

Strike on a bit (e.g., in register file)



SDC = Silent Data Corruption, DUE = Detected Unrecoverable Error

Metrics

- Interval-based
  - MTTF = Mean Time to Failure
  - MTTR = Mean Time to Repair
  - MTBF = Mean Time Between Failures = MTTF + MTTR
  - Availability = MTTF / MTBF
- Rate-based
  - FIT = Failure in Time = 1 failure in a billion hours
  - 1 year MTTF = 10^9 / (24 * 365) FIT = 114,155 FIT
  - SER FIT = SDC FIT + DUE FIT



Hypothetical Example

Cache: 0 FIT
+ IQ: 100K FIT
+ FU: 58K FIT

Total of 158K FIT

Vulnerable Bits Growing with Moore’s Law



Typical SDC goal: 1000 year MTBF
Typical DUE goal: 10-25 year MTBF

Architectural Vulnerability Factor (AVF)

AVF_{bit} = Probability Bit Matters

$$= \frac{\text{\# of Visible Errors}}{\text{\# of Bit Flips from Particle Strikes}}$$

FIT_{bit} = intrinsic FIT_{bit} * AVF_{bit}

Statistical Fault Injection (SFI) with RTL



+ Naturally characterizes all logical structures

- RTL not available until late in the design cycle
- Numerous experiments to flip all bits
- Generally done at the chip level
  - Limited structural insight

Architectural Vulnerability Factor
Does a bit matter?

- Branch Predictor
  - Doesn’t matter at all (AVF = 0%)
- Program Counter
  - Almost always matters (AVF ~ 100%)

Architecturally Correct Execution (ACE)



- ACE path requires only a subset of values to flow correctly through the program's data flow graph (and the machine)
- Anything else (un-ACE path) can be derated away

Example of un-ACE instruction: Dynamically Dead Instruction



Most bits of an un-ACE instruction do not affect program output

Vulnerability of a structure

AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state



$$= \frac{\text{Average number of ACE bits in a cycle}}{\text{Total number of bits in the structure}}$$

Little's Law for ACEs



$$\overline{N}_{ace} = \overline{T}_{ace} \times \overline{L}_{ace}$$

$$AVF = \frac{\overline{N}_{ace}}{N_{total}}$$

Computing AVF

- Approach is conservative
  - Assume every bit is ACE unless proven otherwise
- Data Analysis using a Performance Model
  - Prove that data held in a structure is un-ACE
- Timing Analysis using a Performance Model
  - Tracks the time this data spent in the structure

Dynamic Instruction Breakdown



Mapping ACE & un-ACE Instructions to the Instruction Queue

NOP

Prefetch

ACE Inst

Ex-ACE Inst

Wrong-Path Inst

Idle

Architectural un-ACE

Micro-architectural un-ACE

ACE Lifetime Analysis (1)
(e.g., write-through data cache)

- Idle is unACE



- Assuming all time intervals are equal
- For 3/5 of the lifetime the bit is valid
- Gives a measure of the structure's utilization
  - Number of useful bits
  - Amount of time useful bits are resident in structure
  - Valid for a particular trace

ACE Lifetime Analysis (2)
(e.g., write-through data cache)

- Valid is not necessarily ACE



- ACE % = AVF = 2/5 = 40%
- Example Lifetime Components
  - ACE: fill-to-read, read-to-read
  - unACE: idle, read-to-evict, write-to-evict

ACE Lifetime Analysis (3)
(e.g., write-through data cache)

- Data ACEness is a function of instruction ACEness



- Second Read is by an unACE instruction

- AVF = 1/5 = 20%

Instruction Queue



ACE percentage = AVF = 29%

Strike on a bit (e.g., in register file)



SDC = Silent Data Corruption, DUE = Detected Unrecoverable Error

DUE AVF of Instruction Queue with Parity



Coping with Wrong-Path Instructions
(assume parity-protected instruction queue)



- Problem: not enough information at issue

The π (Possibly Incorrect) Bit
(assume parity-protected instruction queue)



At commit point, declare error only if not wrong-path instruction and π bit is set

Sources of False DUE in an Instruction Queue

- Instructions with uncommitted results
  - e.g., wrong-path, predicated-false
  - solution: π (possibly incorrect) bit till commit
- Instruction types neutral to errors
  - e.g., no-ops, prefetches, branch predict hints
  - solution: anti- π bit
- Dynamically dead instructions
  - instructions whose results will not be used in future
  - solution: π bit beyond commit



Thank you !

http://www.csg.csail.mit.edu/6.823