Lecture 5: Review of MIPS 5-stage Pipeline

Slides adapted and revised from UC Berkeley CS252, Fall 2006

Reading: Textbook (5th edition) Appendix C
Appendix A in 4th edition

Example: MIPS Assembly Code

```
; C code:
;       c = (a <= b) ? (a - b) : (b - a);
; a -- MEM(4), b -- MEM(8), c -- MEM(12)
; R8 -- a, R9 -- b, R10 -- tmp, R11 -- c

lw   $8,4($0)    ;load a to reg 8
lw   $9,8($0)    ;load b to reg 9
slt  $10,$9,$8   ;set reg 10 if b < a
beq     $10,$0,+2 ;no,skip next two
sub     $11,$9,$8 ;c=b-a
beq     $0,$0,+1       ;skip next
sub     $11,$8,$9 ;c=a-b
sw   $9,12($0)   ;store c
```

Outline

- MIPS – An ISA for Pipelining
- 5 stage pipelining
- Structural and Data Hazards
- Forwarding
- Branch Schemes
- Exceptions and Interrupts
- Conclusion

MIPS Instruction Format (32-bit)



A "Typical" RISC ISA

- 32-bit fixed format instruction (3 formats)
- 32 32-bit GPR (R0 contains zero, DP take pair)
- 3-address, reg-reg arithmetic instruction
- Single address mode for load/store: base + displacement
  - no indirect addressing
- Simple branch conditions
- Delayed branch

see: SPARC, MIPS, HP PA-Risc, DEC Alpha, IBM PowerPC, CDC 6600, CDC 7600, Cray-1, Cray-2, Cray-3

Example: MIPS Binary Code

```
100011_00000_01000_0000000000000100   // lw $8, 4($0)
100011_00000_01001_0000000000001000   // lw $9, 8($0)
000000_01001_01000_01010_00000_101010 // slt $10, $9, $8
000100_01010_00000_0000000000000010   // beq $10, $0, +2
000000_01001_01000_01011_00000_100010 // sub $11, $9, $8
000100_00000_00000_0000000000000001   // beq $0, $0, +1
000000_01000_01001_01011_00000_100010 // sub $11, $8, $9
101011_00000_01011_0000000000001100   // sw $9, 12($0)
```

Datapath vs Control



- Datapath: Storage, FU, interconnect sufficient to perform the desired functions
  - Inputs are Control Points
  - Outputs are signals
- Controller: State machine to orchestrate operation on the data path
  - Based on desired function and signals

Inst. Set Processor Controller



Approaching an ISA

- Instruction Set Architecture
  - Defines set of operations, instruction format, hardware supported data types, named storage, addressing modes, sequencing
- Meaning of each instruction is described by RTL on *architected registers* and memory
- Given technology constraints assemble adequate datapath
  - Architected storage mapped to actual storage
  - Function units to do all the required operations
  - Possible additional storage (eg. MAR, MBR, …)
  - Interconnect to move information among regs and FUs
- Map each instruction to sequence of RTLs
- Collate sequences into symbolic controller state transition diagram (STD)
- Lower symbolic STD to control points
- Implement controller

5 Steps of MIPS Datapath



5 Steps of MIPS Datapath

Figure C.21, Page C-34



Stage	Any instruction		
IF	IF/ID.IR ← Mem[PC]; IF/ID.NPC,PC ← (if ((EX/MEM.opcode == branch) & EX/MEM.cond){EX/MEM. ALUOutput} else {PC+4});		
ID	ID/EX.A ← Regs[IF/ID.IR[rs]]; ID/EX.B ← Regs[IF/ID.IR[rt]]; ID/EX.NPC ← IF/ID.NPC; ID/EX.IR ← IF/ID.IR; ID/EX.Imm ← sign-extend(IF/ID.IR[immediate field]);		
	ALU instruction	Load or store instruction	Branch instruction
EX	EX/MEM.IR ← ID/EX.IR; EX/MEM.ALUOutput ← ID/EX.A func ID/EX.B; or EX/MEM.ALUOutput ← ID/EX.A *op* ID/EX.Imm;	EX/MEM.IR to ID/EX.IR EX/MEM.ALUOutput ← ID/EX.A + ID/EX.Imm; EX/MEM.B ← ID/EX.B;	EX/MEM.ALUOutput ← ID/EX.NPC + (ID/EX.Imm << 2); EX/MEM.cond ← (ID/EX.A == 0);
MEM	MEM/WB.IR ← EX/MEM.IR; MEM/WB.ALUOutput ← EX/MEM.ALUOutput;	MEM/WB.IR ← EX/MEM.IR; MEM/WB.LMD ← Mem[EX/MEM.ALUOutput]; or Mem[EX/MEM.ALUOutput] ← EX/MEM.B;	
WB	Regs[MEM/WB.IR[rd]] ← MEM/WB.ALUOutput; or Regs[MEM/WB.IR[rt]] ← MEM/WB.ALUOutput;	For load only: Regs[MEM/WB.IR[rt]] ← MEM/WB.LMD;	

5 Steps of MIPS Datapath



- Data stationary control
  - local decode for each instruction phase / pipeline stage

One Memory Port/Structural Hazards



Visualizing Pipelining



One Memory Port/Structural Hazards



How do you "bubble" the pipe?

Pipelining is not quite that easy!

- 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
  - Control hazards: Caused by delay between the fetching of instructions and decisions about changes in control flow (branches and jumps).

Speed Up Equation for Pipelining

$$CPI_{pipelined} = \text{Ideal CPI} + \text{Average Stall cycles per Inst}$$

$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{\text{Ideal CPI} \times \text{Pipeline depth}}{\text{Ideal CPI} + \text{Pipeline stall CPI}} \times \frac{\text{Cycle Time}_{unpipelined}}{\text{Cycle Time}_{pipelined}}$$

For simple RISC pipeline, CPI = 1:

$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{\text{Pipeline depth}}{1 + \text{Pipeline stall CPI}} \times \frac{\text{Cycle Time}_{unpipelined}}{\text{Cycle Time}_{pipelined}}$$

Example: Dual-port vs. Single-port

- Machine A: Dual ported memory ("Harvard Architecture")
- Machine B: Single ported memory, but its pipelined implementation has a 1.05 times faster clock period
- Ideal CPI = 1 for both
- Loads are 40% of instructions executed

  $SpeedUp_A$ = Pipeline Depth/(1 + 0) x ($clock_{unpipe}$/$clock_{pipe}$)
  = Pipeline Depth
  $SpeedUp_B$ = Pipeline Depth/(1 + 0.4 x 1) x ($clock_{unpipe}$/($clock_{unpipe}$ / 1.05)
  = (Pipeline Depth/1.4) x 1.05
  = 0.75 x Pipeline Depth
  $SpeedUp_A$ / $SpeedUp_B$ = Pipeline Depth/(0.75 x Pipeline Depth) = 1.33
- Machine A is 1.33 times faster

Three Generic Data Hazards

- Write After Read (WAR)
  $Instr_J$ writes operand *before* $Instr_I$ reads it

```
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 Hazard on R1



Three Generic Data Hazards

- Write After Write (WAW)
  $Instr_J$ writes operand *before* $Instr_I$ writes it.

```
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 more complicated pipes

Three Generic Data Hazards

- Read After Write (RAW)
  $Instr_J$ tries to read operand before $Instr_I$ writes it

```
I: add r1,r2,r3
J: sub r4,r1,r3
```

- Caused by a "Dependence" (in compiler nomenclature). This hazard results from an actual need for communication.

Forwarding to Avoid Data Hazard

Figure A.7, Page A-19



HW Change for Forwarding



What circuit detects and resolves this hazard?

Data Hazard Even with Forwarding



How is this detected?

Forwarding to Avoid LW-SW Data Hazard



Software Scheduling to Avoid Load Hazards

Try producing fast code for

a = b + c;

d = e – f;

assuming a, b, c, d ,e, and f in memory.

Slow code:		Fast code:	
LW	Rb,b	LW	Rb,b
LW	Rc,c	LW	Rc,c
ADD	Ra,Rb,Rc	LW	Re,e
SW	a,Ra	ADD	Ra,Rb,Rc
LW	Re,e	LW	Rf,f
LW	Rf,f	SW	a,Ra
SUB	Rd,Re,Rf	SUB	Rd,Re,Rf
SW	d,Rd	SW	d,Rd

Compiler optimizes for performance. Hardware checks for safety.

Data Hazard Even with Forwarding



Control Hazard on Branches Three Stage Stall



What do you do with the 3 instructions in between?

How do you do it?

Where is the "commit"?

Branch Stall Impact

- If CPI = 1, 30% branch,
  Stall 3 cycles => new CPI = 1.9!
- Two part solution:
  - 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
  - 1 clock cycle penalty for branch versus 3

Four Branch Hazard Alternatives

#4: Delayed Branch

- Define branch to take place AFTER a following instruction

```
branch instruction
  sequential successor1
  sequential successor2
  ........
  sequential successorn
branch target if taken
```

Branch delay of length *n*

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

Pipelined MIPS Datapath



- Interplay of instruction set design and cycle time.

Scheduling Branch Delay Slots (Fig A.14)



- A is the best choice, fills delay slot & reduces instruction count (IC)
- In B, the sub instruction may need to be copied, increasing IC
- In B and C, must be okay to execute sub when branch fails

Four 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

Delayed Branch

- 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: As processor go to deeper pipelines and multiple issue, the branch delay grows and need more than one delay slot
  - Delayed branching has lost popularity compared to more expensive but more flexible dynamic approaches
  - Growth in available transistors has made dynamic approaches relatively cheaper

Evaluating Branch Alternatives

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

Assume 4% unconditional branch, 6% conditional branch-untaken, 10% conditional branch-taken

Scheduling scheme	Branch penalty	CPI	Speedup vs. unpipelined	Speedup vs. stall
Stall pipeline	3	1.60	3.1	1.0
Predict taken	1	1.20	4.2	1.33
Predict not taken	1	1.14	4.41	1.40
Delayed branch	0.5	1.10	4.5	1.45
Predict not taken	**1**	**1.14**	**4.4**	**1.40**
Delayed branch	**0.5**	**1.10**	**4.5**	**1.45**

And In Conclusion: Control and Pipelining

- Just overlap tasks; easy if tasks are independent
- Speed Up ≤ Pipeline Depth; if ideal CPI is 1, then:

$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{\text{Pipeline depth}}{1 + \text{Pipeline stall CPI}} \times \frac{\text{Cycle Time}_{\text{unpipelined}}}{\text{Cycle Time}_{\text{pipelined}}}$$

- Hazards limit performance on computers:
  - Structural: need more HW resources
  - Data (RAW,WAR,WAW): need forwarding, compiler scheduling
  - Control: delayed branch, prediction
- Exceptions, Interrupts add complexity
- Next time: Read Appendix C, record bugs online!

Problems with Pipelining

- **Exception**: An unusual event happens to an instruction during its execution
  - Examples: divide by zero, undefined opcode
- **Interrupt**: Hardware signal to switch the processor to a new instruction stream
  - Example: a sound card interrupts when it needs more audio output samples (an audio "click" happens if it is left waiting)
- Problem: It must appear that the exception or interrupt must appear between 2 instructions (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 can take place
- The interrupt (exception) handler either aborts program or restarts at instruction I_{i+1}

Pipelines and Cache

For in-order pipelines: Cache miss?

1. Stall the pipeline
2. Move data from memory to cache
3. Un-stall the pipeline



Precise Exceptions in Static Pipelines



Key observation: architected state only change in memory and register write stages.

Pipelines and Cache