ESE532: System-on-a-Chip Architecture

Day 5: September 16, 2018
Dataflow Process Model

Today

Dataflow Process Model

- Terms
- Issues
- Abstraction
- Performance Prospects
- Basic Approach
- If time permits
  - Dataflow variants
  - Motivations/demands for variants

Message

- Parallelism can be natural
- Expression can be agnostic to substrate
  - Abstract out implementation details
  - Tolerate variable delays may arise in implementation
- Divide-and-conquer
  - Start with coarse-grain streaming dataflow
- Basis for performance optimization and parallelism exploitation

Programmable SoC

- Implementation Platform for innovation
  - This is what you target (avoid NRE)
  - Implementation vehicle



Reminder

- Goal: exploit parallelism on heterogeneous PSoC to achieve desired performance (energy)



Term: Process

- Abstraction of a processor
- Looks like each process is running on a separate processor
- Has own state, including
  - Program Counter (PC)
  - Memory
  - Input/output
- May not actually run on processor
  - Could be specialized hardware block
  - May share a processor

Thread

- Has a separate locus of control (PC)
- May share memory (contrast process)
  - Run in common address space with other threads

FIFO

- First In First Out
- Delivers inputs to outputs in order
- Data presence (empty signal)
  - Consumer knows when data available
- Back Pressure (full signal)
  - Producer knows when at capacity
    - Typically stalls
- Decouples producer and consumer processes
  - Hardware: maybe even different clocks

Process

- Processes allow *expression* of independent control
- Convenient for things that advance independently
- Process (thread) is the easiest way to express some behaviors
  - Easier than trying to describe as a single process
- Can be used for performance optimization to improve resource utilization

Preclass 2

- Throughput with FIFO?
  - (for concrete example on preclass)
- Correlation in delays?
- What benefit from FIFO and processes?



Preclass 2

- Independent probability of miss
  - P_f, P_g
- Concretely
  - 1 cycle in map
  - 100 run function and put in map
- If each runs independently (in isolation)
  - T~= 1*(1-P)+P*100
- If run together in lock step
  - Either can stall: $P=P_f+P_g-P_fP_g$
  - T~= 1*(1-P)+(P)*100

Model (from Day 4) Communicating Threads

- Computation is a collection of sequential/control-flow "threads"
- Threads may communicate
  - Through dataflow I/O
  - (Through shared variables)
- View as hybrid or generalization
- CSP – Communicating Sequential Processes → canonical model example

Issues

- **Communication** – how move data between processes?
  - What *latency* does this add?
  - *Throughput* achievable?
- **Synchronization** – how define how processes advance relative to each other?
- **Determinism** – for the same inputs, do we get the same outputs?

Today's Stand

- Communication – FIFO-like channels
- Synchronization – dataflow with FIFOs
- Determinism – how to achieve
  - …until you must give it up.

Dataflow Process Model



Operation/Operator

- **Operation** – logic computation to be performed
  - A *process* that communicates through dataflow inputs and outputs
- **Operator** – physical block that performs an Operation
  - E.g. processor, hardware block

Day 4

Dataflow / Control Flow

Dataflow

- Program is a graph of operations
- Operation consumes **tokens** and produces tokens
- All operations run concurrently
  - All processes

Control flow (e.g. C)

- Program is a sequence of operations
- Operation reads inputs and writes outputs into common store
- One operation runs at a time
  - defines successor

Token

- Data value with presence indication
  - May be conceptual
    - Only exist in high-level model
    - Not kept around at runtime
  - Or may be physically represented
    - One bit represents presence/absence of data

Stream

- Logical abstraction of a persistent point-to-point communication link between operations (processes)
  - Has a (single) source and sink
  - Carries data presence / flow control
  - Provides in-order (FIFO) delivery of data from source to sink



Streams

- Captures communications structure
  - Explicit producer→consumer link up
- Abstract communications
  - Physical resources or implementation
  - Delay from source to sink
- Contrast
  - C: producer->consumer implicit through memory
  - Verilog/VHDL: cycles visible in implementation
  - (can add **on top of** either C or Verilog)

Variable Delay Source to Sink

- Why might delay be variable between source and sink?

Communication Latency

- Once map to multiple processors
- Need to move data between processors
- That costs time



Day 3

On-Chip Delay

- Delay is proportional to distance travelled
- Make a wire twice the length
  - Takes twice the latency to traverse
  - (can pipeline)
- Modern chips
  - Run at 100s of MHz to GHz
  - Take 10s of ns to cross the chip

Dataflow gives Clock Independent Semantics





Dataflow Process Network

- Collection of Operations
- Connected by Streams
- Communicating with Data Tokens
- (CSP restricted to stream communication)



Dataflow Abstracts Timing

- Doesn't say
  - on which cycle calculation occurs
- Does say
  - What order operations occur in
  - How data interacts
    - i.e. which inputs get mixed together
- Permits
  - Scheduling on different # and types of resources
  - Operators with variable delay
  - Variable delay in interconnect

Some Task Graphs



Synchronous Dataflow (SDF) with fixed operators

- Particular, restricted form of dataflow
- Each operation
  - Consumes a fixed number of input tokens
  - Produces a fixed number of output tokens
  - Operator performs fixed number of operations (in fixed time)
  - When full set of inputs are available
    - Can produce output
  - Can fire any (all) operations with inputs available at any point in time

SDF Operator

FFT

- 1024 inputs
- 1024 outputs
- 10,240 multiplies
- 20,480 adds
- (or 30,720 primitive operations)





Processor Model

- Simple (for today's lecture)
  - Assume one primitive operation per cycle
- Could embelish
  - Different time per operation type
    - E.g. adds: 1 cycle, multiply: 3 cycles
  - Multiple memories with different timings

Time for Graph Iteration on Processors

- Single processor $T_{one} = \sum_i Nops_i$
- One processor per Operator
  - ❑ T_{each} = max(Nop_1,Nop_2,Nop_3,…)
- General

$$T_{map} = max\left(\sum_i c(1,i)\times Nops_i, \sum_i c(2,i)\times Nops_i, \sum_i c(3,i)\times Nops_i, \ldots\right)$$

c(x,y) – 1 if Processor x runs task y

Intel Knights Landing



https://www.nextplatform.com/2016/06/20/intel-knights-landing-yields-big-bang-buck-jump/

[Intel, Micro 2016]

GRVI/Phallanx

- Puts 1680 RISC-V32b Integer cores
- On XCVU9P FPGA
- http://fpga.org/2017/01/12/grvi-phalanx-joins-the-kilocore-club/



Fig 6: A 400 GRVI Phalanx. 10x5 clusters of 8 PEs (KU040)

[Gray, FCCM 2016]

Map to different processors



- Map to (preclass 1)
  - One processor performance?
  - One process per processor performance?
  - Two processors
    - How?
    - Performance?
  - Bottleneck?

Refine Data Parallel

- If component is data parallel, can split out parallel tasks



Refine Pipeline

- If operation internally pipelineable, break out pipeline into separate tasks



Performance with one processor per operator?

Achieve same performance with how many processors?

Apple A12 Bionic

- 84mm^2, 7nm
- 7 Billion Tr.
- iPhone XS, XR
  - IPad 2019
- 6 ARM cores
  - 2 fast
  - 4 low energy
- 4 custom GPUs
- Neural Engine
  - 5 Trillion ops/s?



A13 8.5B tr; still 6 ARM cores



Heterogeneous Processor



- GPU perform 10 primitive FFT Ops per cycle
- Fast CPU can perform 2 ops/cycle
- Slow CPU 1 op/cycle
- Map: FFT to GPU, Select to 2 Fast CPUs, quantize and Entropy each to own Slow CPU
- Cycles/graph iteration?

Custom Accelerator

- Dataflow Process doesn't need to be mapped to a processor
- Map FFT to custom datapath on FPGA logic
  - Read and produce one element per cycle
  - 1024 cycles to process 1024-point FFT



Operations

- Can be implemented on different operators with different characteristics
  - Small or large processor
  - Hardware unit
  - Different levels of internal
    - Data-level parallelism
    - Instruction-level parallelism
    - Pipeline parallelism
- May itself be described as
  - Dataflow process network, sequential, hardware register transfer language

Streams

- Stream: logical communication link
- How might we implement:
  - Two threads running on a single processor (sharing common memory)?
  - Two processes running on different processors on the same die?
  - Two processes running on different hosts
    - E.g. one at Penn, one on Amazon cloud

Add Delay

- What do to computation if add an operation that copies inputs to outputs with some latency?
  - Impact on function?
  - Throughput impact if Identity operation has
    - Latency 10, throughput 1 value per cycle?
    - (reminder 1024 values between FFT and Select Freq.)



Semantics (meaning)

- Need to implement semantics
  - *i.e.* get same result as if computed as indicated
- But can implement any way we want
  - That preserves the semantics
  - Exploit freedom of implementation

Basic Approach

Approach (1)

- Identify natural parallelism
- Convert to streaming flow
  - Initially leave operations in software
  - Focus on correctness
- Identify flow rates, computation per operator, parallelism needed
- Refine operations
  - Decompose further parallelism?
  - E.g. data parallel split, ILP implementations
  - model potential hardware

Approach (2)

- Refine coordination as necessary for implementation
- Map operations and streams to resources
  - Provision hardware
  - Scheduling: Map operations to operators
  - Memories, interconnect
- Profile and tune
- Refine

Dataflow Variants

Time Permitting

Turing Complete

- Can implement any computation describable with a Turing Machine
  - (theoretical model of computing by Alan Turing)
- Turing Machine – captures our notion of what is computable
  - If it cannot be computed by a Turing Machine, we don't know how to compute it

DataFlow (DF) Process Network Roundup

Model	Deterministic Result	Deterministic Timing	Turing Complete
SDF+fixed-delay operators	Y	Y	N
SDF+variable delay operators	Y	N	N
DDF blocking	Y	N	Y
DDF non-blocking	N	N	Y

Synchronous Dataflow (SDF) with fixed operators

- Particular, restricted form of dataflow
- Each operation
  - Consumes a fixed number of input tokens
  - Produces a fixed number of output tokens
  - Operator performs fixed number of operations (in fixed time)
  - When full set of inputs are available
    - Can produce output
  - Can fire any (all) operations with inputs available at any point in time

Synchronous Dataflow (SDF)

- Particular, restricted form of dataflow
- Each operation
  - Consumes a fixed number of input tokens
  - Produces a fixed number of output tokens
  - (can take variable computation for operator)
  - When full set of inputs are available
    - Can produce output
  - Can fire any (all) operations with inputs available at any point in time

Multirate Synchronous Dataflow

- Rates can be different
  - Allow lower frequency operations
  - Communicates rates to tools
    - Use in scheduling, provisioning
  - Rates must be constant
    - Data independent





Dynamic Dataflow

- (Less) restricted form of dataflow
- Each operation
  - Conditionally consume input based on data value
  - Conditionally produce output based on data value
  - When full set of inputs are available
    - Can (optionally) produce output
  - Can fire any (all) operations with data-specified necessary inputs available at any point in time

Blocking

- Key to determinism: behavior doesn't depend on timing
  - Cannot ask **if** a token is present
- If (not_empty(in))
  - Out.put(3);
- Else
  - Out.put(2);

Process Network Roundup

Model	Deterministic Result	Deterministic Timing	Turing Complete
SDF+fixed-delay operators	Y	Y	N
SDF+variable delay operators	Y	N	N
DDF blocking	Y	N	Y
DDF non-blocking	N	N	Y

Motivations and Demands for Options

Time Permitting

Variable Delay Operators

- What are example of variable delay operators we might have?

Variable Delay Operators

- Operators with Variable Delay
  - Cached memory or computation
  - Shift-and-add multiply
  - Iterative divide or square-root

GCD (Preclass 3)

- What is delay of GCD computation?

- while(a!=b)
  - t=max(a,b)-min(a,b)
  - a=min(a,b)
  - b=t
- return(a);

Dynamic Rates?

- When might static rates be limiting? (prevent useful optimizations?)

Dynamic Rates?

- Static Rates limiting
  - Compress/decompress
    - Lossless
    - Even Run-Length-Encoding
  - Filtering
    - Discard all packets from spamRus
  - Anything data dependent

When non-blocking necessary?

- What are cases where we need the ability to ask if a data item is present?
- Consider an IP packet router:



Non-Blocking

- Removed model restriction
  - Can ask if token present
- Gained expressive power
  - Can grab data as shows up
- Weaken our guarantees
  - Possible to get non-deterministic behavior

Process Network Roundup

Model	Deterministic Result	Deterministic Timing	Turing Complete
SDF+fixed-delay operators	Y	Y	N
SDF+variable delay operators	Y	N	N
DDF blocking	Y	N	Y
DDF non-blocking	N	N	Y

Big Ideas

- Capture gross parallel structure with Process Network
- Use dataflow synchronization for determinism
  - Abstract out timing of implementations
  - Give freedom of implementation
- Exploit freedom to refine mapping to optimize performance
- Minimally use non-determinism as necessary

Admin

- Reading for Day 6 on web
- HW3 due Friday
  - Implementing multiprocessor solutions on homogeneous (ARM A53) processor cores