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- Dual-function links
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- Power and area estimation
- Simulation results (power, throughput)
- Design headroom for Negative Bias Temperature I nstability (NBTI) related reliability issues
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## Motivation for Networks-on-Chips

(1/2)
-Technology scaling - I ncrease in transistor density on a single chip
-Chip MultiProcessors (CMPs) and MultiProcessor System-on-Chip (MPSoC) architectures


## - Challenges in future scaling of CMPs and MPSoCs :

- Overcoming the increasing wire delays
- Minimizing the power consumption


## Motivation for Networks-on-Chips

(2/2)
Wire delay constraint with decreasing feature size


| * Gate Delay |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\pm$ Sum of Delays, $\mathrm{Al} \& \mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ |  |
| -- Sum of Delays, Cu \& Low $\kappa$ |  |
| -- Interconnect Delay, $\mathrm{Al} \& \mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ |  |
| - Interconnect Delay, Cu \& Low K |  |
| AI | $3.0 \mu \Omega-\mathrm{cm}$ |
| Cu | $1.7 \mu \Omega-\mathrm{cm}$ |
| $\mathrm{SiO}_{2}$ | $\kappa=4.0$ |
| Low K | $\kappa=2.0$ |
| Al \& Cu | . $8 \mu$ Thick |
| Al \& Cu Line | $43 \mu$ Long |

- RC delay of local wires increasing by 32\% per year ${ }^{2}$
- Cross-chip (global) wire delays increasing by 49\% per year ${ }^{2}$

1. 1997 Roadmap of the Semiconductor I ndustry Association
2. W. J. Dally and J. W. Poulton, Digital Systems Engineering, Cambridge University Press, NY, USA, 2001.

## The Network-on-Chip (NoC) Paradigm



## Significance of Router Buffers in NoCs

## Recent NSF-sponsored workshop on On-Chip I nterconnection Networks ${ }^{[1]}$ :

- "The most important technology constraint for on-chip networks is power consumption".
- Power consumption of OCI Ns implemented with current techniques exceeds expected needs by a factor of 10 .

Power Break-up in the NoC Router [2]


Area profile of a generic NoC Router ${ }^{[2]}$


1. J.D.Owens, W.J .Dally, R.Ho, D.N.J ayasimha, S.W.Keckler and L.S.Peh, "Research Challenges for On-Chip I nterconnection Networks", I EEE Micro, vol. 27, no. 5, pp. 96 - 108, September-October 2007.
2. S.R.Vangal, et al., "An 80-Tile Sub-100-W TeraFLOPS Processor in 65-nm CMOS", I EEE J. Solid-State Circuits, Vol. 43, no. 1, J anuary 2008.

## iDEAL - I nter-router Dual-function Energy and Areaefficient Links for NoC architectures



## iDEAL - I nter-router Dual-function Energy and Areaefficient Links for NoC architectures

## iDEAL Methodology

- Reduce the number of router buffers
(power and area savings)
- Use adaptive link buffers to store data along the links when required (create more storage)
- Dynamic buffer allocation within the router buffers
(to sustain performance)


## Conventional (Repeater-I nserted) Links



## iDEAL - Link Buffer Design (1/2)



## iDEAL - Link Buffer Design (2/2)

## Control block

Functions as a conventional repeater when there is no congestion.

Control block is turned 'OFF'.


Repeater tri-stated and holds the sampled value, during congestion.

Control block is turned 'ON'.

## Control Block



- Uses double-sampling technique ${ }^{2}$ for stable error-free operation under varying frequencies
- Power consumption (about $6 \mu \mathrm{~W}$ when enabled)


## Dual-function Link



## Statically Allocated Router Buffer



- Static buffer allocation
- Fixed number of buffers per VC
- HoL blocking
$\mathrm{RP}=$ read pointer, $\mathrm{WP}=$ write pointer, $\mathrm{OP}=$ output port, $\mathrm{OVC}=$ output $\mathrm{VC}, \mathrm{CR}=$ credits, $\mathrm{C}^{*}=$ congestion Status = status of the VC (idle, waiting, RC, VA, SA, ST)


## Dynamically Allocated Router Buffer (1/2)


$\mathrm{RP}=$ read pointer, $\mathrm{WP}=$ write pointer, $\mathrm{OP}=$ output port, $\mathrm{OVC}=$ output $\mathrm{VC}, \mathrm{CR}=$ credits, $\mathrm{C}^{*}=$ congestion Status = status of the VC (idle, waiting, RC, VA, SA, ST)

## Dynamically Allocated Router Buffer (2/2)

- Example illustrating Dynamic buffer allocation in iDEAL

$\mathrm{RP}=$ read pointer, $\mathrm{WP}=$ write pointer, $\mathrm{OP}=$ output port, $\mathrm{OVC}=$ output $\mathrm{VC}, \mathrm{CR}=$ credits, $\mathrm{C}^{*}=$ congestion Status = status of the VC (idle, waiting, RC, VA, SA, ST)


## Performance Evaluation

- Evaluated on a cycle-accurate on-chip network simulator
- Simulated $8 \times 8$ Mesh and $8 \times 8$ Folded Torus topologies
- Synthetic benchmarks such as uniform, and non-uniform workloads (Butterfly, Complement, Perfect Shuffle, Matrix Transpose, Bit Reversal) as well as SPLASH-2 suite benchmarks (FFT, LU, MP3D, WATER, RADIX) were evaluated
- Parameters evaluated include throughput, latency and overall network power
- Considered 5 different configurations - $\left(v n_{V}-\mathrm{rn}_{R}-\mathrm{Cn} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}}\right)$
( $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{V}}=$ No. of VCs per input port, $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{R}}=$ No. of router buffers per VC, $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{C}}=$ number of channel buffers)
- Baseline $=440$
- 434, 428, 344, 531


## Different Test Cases Considered

Baseline NoC Router with 4 VCs per input port, 4 128-bit router buffers per

VC and no adaptive link buffers


Case with 4 VCs per input port, 2 128-bit router buffers per VC and 8 adaptive link
buffers - v4-r2-c8


## Power Estimation - Summary with values from Synopsys Design Compiler

| $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{v n}_{\mathrm{v}}- \\ \mathrm{rn}_{\mathrm{R}}- \\ \mathrm{cn}_{\mathrm{c}} \end{gathered}$ | Buffer Power (mW) | Mesh <br> Link + Control Power (mW) | Folded <br> Torus <br> Link + Control Power (mW) | Mesh Total Power (Buffer + Link) (mW) | \% Change | Folded Torus Total Power (Buffer + Link) (mW) | \% <br> Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v4-r4-c0 | 19.54 | 2.45 + 0 | $3.94+0$ | 21.99 | - | 23.48 | - |
| v4-r3-c4 | 14.51 | $2.90+0.0012$ | $4.39+0.0012$ | 17.42 | -20.78 | 18.91 | -19.46 |
| v4-r2-c8 | 11.57 | $3.55+0.02$ | $5.04+0.02$ | 15.14 | -31.15 | 16.63 | -29.17 |
| v3-r4-c4 | 15.09 | $2.90+0.0012$ | $4.39+0.0012$ | 18.00 | -18.14 | 19.49 | -16.99 |
| v3-r3-c7 | 12.56 | $3.49+0.0180$ | $4.98+0.0180$ | 16.06 | -26.96 | 17.55 | -25.25 |

$n_{V}=$ number of $V C S$ per input port, $n_{R}=$ number of router buffers per $V C, n_{C}=$ number of link buffers

## Area Estimation - Summary with values from Synopsys Design Compiler

| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{vn}_{\mathrm{v}}^{-} \mathrm{rn}_{\mathrm{R}} \end{gathered}$ | Buffer Area ( $\mu \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | Link Repeater Area ( $\mu$ m²) | Total Buffer + Link Area ( $\mu \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) | \% Change |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| v4-r4-c0 | 81,407 | 8,960 | $\mathbf{9 0 , 3 6 7}$ | - |
| v4-r3-c4 | 63,991 | 6,656 | 70,647 | -21.8 |
| v4-r2-c8 | 48,066 | 10,240 | 58,306 | -35.5 |
| v3-r4-c4 | 63,250 | 6,656 | 69,906 | -22.6 |
| v3-r3-c7 | 50,373 | 9,344 | 59,717 | -34.0 |

$n_{V}=$ number of VCs per input port, $n_{R}=$ number of router buffers per VC, $n_{C}=$ number of link buffers

## Network Simulation Results



- Uniformly distributed traffic
$\Rightarrow$ Only about 3\% drop in throughput for the v4-r2-c8 case
(428 = 4 VCs per port, 2 router buffers per VC, 8 link buffers)


## Network Simulation Results



- Total power consumed for a network load of 0.5
$\Rightarrow$ Nearly 30\% savings in overall network power for the v4-r2-c8 case
(428 = 4 VCs per port, 2 router buffers per VC, 8 link buffers)


## Buffer Power - Synthetic Traffic



- Reduction in power for all configurations, under all traffic patterns, compared to the baseline (440)
- For example, under Complement traffic the 4-2-8 configuration achieves 40\% savings


## Throughput - Synthetic Traffic (4/6)

Throughput ( $8 \times 8$ Mesh) at an Offered Load $=0.5$


- No significant decrease in throughput under any traffic pattern, using Dynamic allocation


## Simulation results for the SPLASH-2 suite (5/6)



Overall Network Power (8x8 Mesh)

- Nearly 30\% savings in overall network power for the v4-r2-c8 case with only about 1\% drop in performance
(v4-r2-c8 = 4 VCs per port, 2 router buffers per VC, 8 link buffers)


## Aggressive Speculation

Saturation Throughput (8x8 Folded Torus) Uniform Traffic


Average Latency (8x8 Folded Torus) -


- Aggressive speculation by increasing the number of credits available to 8
- Additional credits are accounted for by the link buffers
$\Rightarrow$ Saturation throughput improves by 10\% for the 428 case



## Design Headroom for NBTI-related issues

- Negative Bias Temperature Instability (NBTI) affects PMOS gates with a ' 0 ' input. Additional circuits may be employed to change the input of 'I dle' PMOS gates to ' 1 ' ${ }^{3}$.
- iDEAL architecture 'moves some of the buffers from the router to the links' and provides a low-power area-efficient solution with
- Reduced power density and temperature in the routers, thereby alleviating NBTI-related degradation
- Sufficient design headroom for the Thermal Design Power (TDP) of the auxiliary circuits

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{TDP}_{\text {NoC }} \leqslant \mathrm{P}_{\text {saved }} \\
& \mathrm{TDP}_{\mathrm{NoC}}=\mathrm{K} \times \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{r}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\left(P_{\text {saved }}=\text { power reduction achieved by iDEAL, } K=\right.\text { impact of the area on the TDP, }
$$

$$
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{r}}=\text { area reduction achieved by iDEAL) }
$$

## Conclusion

- iDEAL architecture provides a low-power area-efficient solution for NoCs, by reducing power consumption through circuit-level and architecture-level techniques.
- Simulation results show that by reducing the buffer size in half, a 30\% savings in overall network power and $35 \%$ savings in overall area is achieved.
- There is only a marginal 1-3\% drop in performance, under dynamic buffer allocation. (note: Performance degradation has been solved already)
- Further, the significant reduction in power and area provide sufficient headroom for monitoring NBTI effects.


## Questions?

## kodi@ohio.edu

