Cost-Effective Error Detection through Mersenne Modulo Shadow Datapaths

Keith Campbell, Chen-Hsuan Lin, Deming Chen University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign







Motivation





Computation Efficiency

- **Problems**
 - Demand for more **computation density**
 - Demand for more performance per watt
- Solutions
 - Scale transistors **End of Dennard Scaling**
 - Use custom hardware
 - Accelerators in SoCs
 - **FPGAs in datacenters**
 - **3D Stacking**

Apple A10 **Fusion SoC** (2016)

Insightszuccess



ECE ILLINOIS 3

Hardware Reliability

- Problems
 - Transistor wear-out
 - Soft errors
 - Timing errors
 - Electromigration



- Solutions
 - Modular / time redundancy
 - Razor logic
 - Flip-flop hardening
 - Parity
 - Algorithm-Based Fault Tolerance (ABFT)

Has 2–3× cost.

Adds timing constraints, limits fault types.

Does not protect combinational logic.

Expensive across computation.

Adds memory accesses, limited to matrices.





Our Approach: Modulo Shadow Datapaths

- Small (2-8 bit) modulo 2ⁿ⁻¹ checksums
 - Like ECC, but for *computation*
- Minimum assumptions about fault behavior
 - Protect against bits flips anytime, anywhere
- Focus on complex datapaths
- Maximum cost-effectiveness
 - Rethink gate-level architecture
 - 6–10% area cost for 3–61× reliability benefit
 - 15–20% area cost for 121–2,477× reliability benefit





What is a shadow datapath?

Given a datapath *D*, we define a shadow datapath *D*' as a redundant datapath that performs a similar computation as *D*, but with compressed versions of the inputs and outputs.



In math speak: *D'* does computation in a *homomorphism* of the algebra of *D*.

- A reduction function maps inputs and outputs to shadow inputs and outputs.
- Shadow outputs are computed redundantly, enabling output checking



 $y' \leftarrow reduce(y)$ b' ?= reduce(b)





What is modulo arithmetic?

Arithmetic with the hands of a clock







¹³ 6

How do modulo shadow datapaths work?







How do modulo shadow datapaths work?







Modulo Arithmetic: Existing Solutions

- Lookup-table based approach for mod-3 (DAC'15)
- Interleaved full adders and inverters for mod-3 reduction (Piestrak et al., EUSIPCO'98)
- Signed-digit architecture (Wei et. al., JSCS'03)
- Modulo exponentiation architectures for cryptography

Exponential scaling to wider bases

Trick only works for mod-3

Requires 2 bits per digit

Highly specialized algorithms





Mersenne Modulo Hardware Architectures





Previous Modulo Arithmetic Design (DAC'15)



- Cost is dominated by reducer functional units
- Traditional design is a tree of modulo adders
- Cost increases exponentially with larger bases
- Not a typical pattern for logic synthesis tools





New Wallace-Tree Like Reduction Strategy







New Reducer Design

- Almost all full adders (standard cells)
- Extends to any Mersenne number base (2ⁿ-1)
 - mod-7, mod-15, mod-31, etc.
- Each full-adder reduces (eliminates) one bit
- Fixed area cost for given input width







New Modulo Adder Design



- Ripple-carry adder with a "wraparound" twist
- 8 = 1 (mod 7)
- Carry circulation eventually stops
- Output not normalized
- Two representations for "0": 000 and 111



ECE ILLINOIS¹⁵

New Modulo Multiplier Design

a

- Array multiplier with a "wraparound" twist
- Leverage reduction technique to reduce product bits



Ê







Cost-Effectiveness Results





Functional-Unit Level Cost (32-bit main datapath)

- Large reductions in reducer cost
- New designs scale well to larger Mersenne bases

	Functional	DAC'15		Ours		Difference	
Unit	Unit	Area	Delay	Area	Delay	Area	Delay
Mod-3 (2-bits)	add	8.30	0.09	12.76	0.13	53.7%	42.9%
	subtract	8.30	0.09	14.02	0.15	68.9%	60.4%
	multiply	4.47	0.04	17.84	0.16	299.3%	292.7%
	reduce	177.80	0.73	155.56	0.39	-12.5%	-47.1%
Mod-7 (3-bits)	add	55.86	0.32	21.06	0.21	-62.3%	-35.8%
	subtract	59.69	0.33	22.95	0.22	-61.6%	-32.7%
	multiply	30.01	0.21	47.79	0.30	59.2%	42.3%
	reduce	493.18	1.27	153.64	0.61	-68.8%	-52.0%
Mod-15 (4-bits)	add	188.01	0.46	29.33	0.27	-84.4%	-41.6%
	subtract	192.80	0.53	31.85	0.29	-83.5%	-46.0%
	multiply	133.43	0.51	90.45	0.42	-32.2%	-16.8%
	reduce	687.57	1.55	151.73	0.53	-77.9%	-66.1%

45nm ARM technology library Area unit: μm^2 Delay unit: ns

TILLINOIS



Aside: Reliability Evaluation

- Reliability models not created equal
- Ad-hoc error injection
 - Error injection method does not model real faults.
- Assumptions about fault behavior
 - "Soft errors only affect flip-flops."
- Specialized to a particular kind of fault
 - Stuck-at faults
 - Timing errors

Did you forget Murphy's law?





Reliability Evaluation: Our Approach

- Model Single-Event Transients (SETs)
 - Flip random gate output at random cycle
- Single bit flip for each experiment
- All gates are sampled
 - Both combinational and sequential logic
 - Both main and shadow datapaths
- Harder test than other fault models
 - Stuck-at faults last multiple cycles
 - Superset of flip-flop bit flips
- Reliability Metric: probability of undetected error





Self-Checking Multiply Accumulate (MAC) Design

- Reducers double as summation blocks
- Negation = Bitwise NOT
- Avoid reduction below 2*n* bits
 - Similar to carry save
- Zero comparator optimized for 2n bit input
 - Handles non-normalized input
- Shadow datapath uses only 1× gates
 - Area and energy efficient







Self-Checking MAC Cost-Effectiveness



ECE ILLINOIS 22



Aside: Error Recovery

- Error detection should be integrated into a higher-level recovery strategy
 - Restart the accelerator
 - Flush the pipeline
 - Rollback to a checkpoint





Adding pipeline stages

- Bake inverters into flip-flops
- Error signal has 2-cycle delay
 - Not in the critical path in error-free operation
- Target clock period is minimum delay of original MAC







Pipelined MAC Cost-Effectiveness



ECE ILLINOIS 25



Aside: Pushing Maximum Performance

- Clock period target is very aggressive: single multiplier
- Pushing shadow datapath *f*_{max} higher is possible:
 - Retime flip-flops
 - Resize gates
 - Add pipeline stages





Self-Checking Linear Algebra









Linear Algebra Primitive Cost Effectiveness (32-bit datapath)



ECE ILLINOIS 28



Conclusions: Modulo Shadow Datapaths

- Revisited gate-level optimization
 - Found significant savings
- Implemented self-checking linear algebra
 - Key application for accelerators
- Considered single-event transients (SETs)
 - Hard fault to detect
- Technique is cost-effective
 - 6–10% area cost for 3–61× reliability benefit
 - 15–20% area cost for 121–2,477× reliability benefit

- Future work
 - Fixed-point optimization
 - Synthesis automation
 - Other kinds of shadow datapaths



