ESE680-002 (ESE534): Computer Organization

Day 15: March 12, 2007
Interconnect 3: Richness

Last Time

- Rent's Rule
  - And its implications
- Superlinear growth rate of interconnect
  p>0.5
  → Area growth $\Omega(N^{2p})$

Today

- How rich should interconnect be?
  - specifics of understanding interconnect
  - methodology for attacking these kinds of questions

Now What?

- There is structure (locality)
- Rent characterizes locality

- How rich should interconnect be?
  - Allow full utilization?
  - Most area efficient?
  - Model requirements and area impact

Step 1: Build Architecture Model

- Assume geometric growth
- Pick parameters: Build architecture can tune
  - F, C
  - α, p



Tree of Meshes



- Nature model is hierarchical
- Restricted internal bandwidth
- Can match to model

Parameterize C



Parameterize Growth



(2 1)* => $\alpha=\sqrt{2}$

(2 2 1)* => $\alpha=2^{(3/4)}$

(2 2 1)* => $\alpha=(2*2)^{(1/3)}=2^{(2/3)}$

Step 2: Area Model

- Need to know effect of architecture parameters on area (costs)
  - focus on dominant components
    - wires
    - switches
    - logic blocks(?)

Area Parameters

- $A_{logic} = 40K\lambda^2$
- $A_{sw} = 2.5K\lambda^2$
- Wire Pitch = 8λ

Switchbox Population

- Full population is excessive (next lecture)
- **Hypothesis:** linear population adequate
  - still to be (dis)proven



"Cartoon" VLSI Area Model



(Example artificially small for clarity)

Larger "Cartoon"



Effects of P (α) on Area



1024 LUT Area Comparison

Effects of P on Capacity



Step 3: Characterize Application Requirements

- Identify representative applications.
  - Today: IWLS93 logic benchmarks
- How much structure there?
- How much variation among applications?

Application Requirements



Max: C=7, P=0.68 Avg: C=5, P=0.72

Benchmark Wide



Benchmark Parameters



Complication

- Interconnect requirements vary among applications
- Interconnect richness has large effect on area
- What is effect of architecture/application mismatch?
  - Interconnect too rich?
  - Interconnect too poor?

Interconnect Mismatch in Theory



Step 4: Assess Resource Impact

- Map designs to parameterized architecture
- Identify architectural resource required

Compare: mapping to k-LUTs; LUT count vs. k.

Mapping to Fixed Wire Schedule

- Easy if need less wires than Net
- If need more wires than net, must depopulate to meet interconnect limitations.



Mapping to Fixed-WS

- Better results if "reassociate" rather than keeping original subtrees.



Observation

- Don't really want a "bisection" of LUTs
  - subtree filled to capacity by either of
    - LUTs
    - root bandwidth
  - May be profitable to cut at some place other than midpoint
    - not require "balance" condition
  - "Bisection" should account for both LUT and wiring limitations

Challenge

- Not know where to cut design into
  - not knowing when wires will limit subtree capacity

Brute Force Solution

- Explore all cuts
  - start with all LUTs in group
  - consider "all" balances
  - try cut
  - recurse

Brute Force

- Too expensive
- Exponential work
- …viable if solving same subproblems

Simplification

- Single linear ordering
- Partitions = pick split point on ordering
- Reduce to finding cost of [start,end] ranges (subtrees) within linear ordering
- Only n^2 such subproblems
- Can solve with dynamic programming

Dynamic Programming

- Start with base set of size 1
- Compute all splits of size n, from solutions to all problems of size n-1 or smaller
- Done when compute where to split 0,N-1



Dynamic Programming

- Just one possible "heuristic" solution to this problem
  - not optimal
  - dependent on ordering
  - sacrifices ability to reorder on splits to avoid exponential problem size
- Opportunity to find a better solution here...

Ordering LUTs

- Another problem
  - lay out gates in 1D line
  - minimize sum of squared wire length
    - tend to cluster connected gates together
  - Is solvable mathematically for optimal
    - Eigenvector of connectivity matrix
- Use this 1D ordering for our linear ordering

Mapping Results



Step 5: Apply Area Model

- Assess impact of resource results

Resources × Area Model ⇒ Area



Net Area



Picking Network Design Point



Minimize Objective	params C	P	Sigma rel area	LUT Util.
relative area	6	0.6	1.23	0.87
area with full util	10	0.75	2.98	1.00

Don't optimize for 100% compute util. (100% yield)
…also don't optimize for highest peak.

What about a single design?



LUT Utilization predict Area?



Methodology

1. Architecture model (parameterized)
2. Cost model
3. Important task characteristics
4. Mapping Algorithm
   - Map to determine resources
5. Apply cost model
6. Digest results
   - find optimum (multiple?)
   - understand conflicts (avoidable?)

Admin

- Wire requirement assignment due Wednesday
- Next assignment out today
  - Will require computer use
- Reading for today, tomorrow online

Big Ideas [MSB Ideas]

- Interconnect area dominates logic area
- Interconnect requirements vary
  - among designs
  - within a single design
- To minimize area
  - focus on using dominant resource (interconnect)
  - may underuse non-dominant resources (LUTs)

Big Ideas
[MSB Ideas]

- Two different resources here
  - compute, interconnect
- Balance of resources required varies among designs (even within designs)
- Cannot expect full utilization of every resource
- Most area-efficient designs may *waste* some compute resources (cheaper resource)