The Walls and the Dark Silicon Era: An Arithmetic Perspective

LEDOUX Louis

Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC)
Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC)

TARAN Seminar
December 2nd, 2024

Agenda

1. *Marenotrum et ego*
2. Presentation context
3. Tradeoff 1: Accuracy vs. Energy Efficiency
4. Tradeoff 2: Latency vs. Parallelism
5. Closing

Who Am I? — Basic Info

- Louis Ledoux, 29 yo, PhD arithmetic HW
- My website, a pointer to many things:
  - papers
  - CV
  - projects
  - this presentation's slides

https://bynaryman.github.io/

Who Am I? — Research Interests

- **Computer Architecture:**
  - Floating-Point Units, Systolic Arrays, Matrix-Matrix Multiply (MMM) Units
  - GPUs, FPGAs, workload-specific accelerators
- **Computer Arithmetic:**
  - Number Representations, Posit, IEEE 754 Standards
  - FloPoCo, Application-Specific Circuits
  - Kulisch Accumulator
- **High Performance Computing:**
  - BLAS, GEMMs, Heterogeneous Workloads
  - Numerical Analysis, Supercomputing

Who Am I? — Research Interests

- **Computer Architecture:**
  - Floating-Point Units, Systolic Arrays, Matrix-Matrix Multiply (MMM) Units
  - GPUs, FPGAs, workload-specific accelerators
- **Computer Arithmetic:**
  - Number Representations, Posit, IEEE 754 Standards
  - FloPoCo, Application-Specific Circuits
  - Kulisch Accumulator
- **High Performance Computing:**
  - BLAS, GEMMs, Heterogeneous Workloads
  - Numerical Analysis, Supercomputing

Who Am I? — Research Interests

- **Computer Architecture:**
  - Floating-Point Units, Systolic Arrays, Matrix-Matrix Multiply (MMM) Units
  - GPUs, FPGAs, workload-specific accelerators
- **Computer Arithmetic:**
  - Number Representations, Posit, IEEE 754 Standards
  - FloPoCo, Application-Specific Circuits
  - Kulisch Accumulator
- **High Performance Computing:**
  - BLAS, GEMMs, Heterogeneous Workloads
  - Numerical Analysis, Supercomputing

Who Am I? — Education

- **2013-2015** - Integrated Preparatory Class (CUPGE) - *Rennes*
- **2015-2018** - ESIR (École Supérieure d'Ingénieurs de *Rennes*)
  - Engineer + Master's Degree, specializing in Computer Science.
  - Last year coopt student at b<>com made me go to hardware
- **2018-2024** - UPC (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya) - *Barcelona*
  - Also Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC) / Marenostrum4/5
  - Thesis: *"Floating-Point Arithmetic Paradigms for High-Performance Computing: Software Algorithms and Hardware Designs"*
- **2025-2027** - Coming Soon: Postdoc at INSA - *Lyon*
  - with Florent de Dinechin on MLIR-FloPoCo

Who Am I? — Education

- **2013-2015** - Integrated Preparatory Class (CUPGE) - *Rennes*
- **2015-2018** - ESIR (École Supérieure d'Ingénieurs de *Rennes*)
  - Engineer + Master's Degree, specializing in Computer Science.
  - Last year coopt student at b<>com made me go to hardware
- **2018-2024** - UPC (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya) - *Barcelona*
  - Also Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC) / Marenostrum4/5
  - Thesis: *"Floating-Point Arithmetic Paradigms for High-Performance Computing: Software Algorithms and Hardware Designs"*
- **2025-2027** - Coming Soon: Postdoc at INSA - *Lyon*
  - with Florent de Dinechin on MLIR-FloPoCo

Who Am I? — Education

- **2013-2015** - Integrated Preparatory Class (CUPGE) - *Rennes*
- **2015-2018** - ESIR (École Supérieure d'Ingénieurs de *Rennes*)
  - Engineer + Master's Degree, specializing in Computer Science.
  - Last year coopt student at b<>com made me go to hardware
- **2018-2024** - UPC (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya) - *Barcelona*
  - Also Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC) / Marenostrum4/5
  - Thesis: *"Floating-Point Arithmetic Paradigms for High-Performance Computing: Software Algorithms and Hardware Designs"*
- **2025-2027** - Coming Soon: Postdoc at INSA - *Lyon*
  - with Florent de Dinechin on MLIR-FloPoCo

Who Am I? — Education

- **2013-2015** - Integrated Preparatory Class (CUPGE) - *Rennes*
- **2015-2018** - ESIR (École Supérieure d'Ingénieurs de *Rennes*)
  - Engineer + Master's Degree, specializing in Computer Science.
  - Last year coopt student at b<>com made me go to hardware
- **2018-2024** - UPC (Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya) - *Barcelona*
  - Also Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC) / Marenostrum4/5
  - Thesis: *"Floating-Point Arithmetic Paradigms for High-Performance Computing: Software Algorithms and Hardware Designs"*
- **2025-2027** - Coming Soon: Postdoc at INSA - *Lyon*
  - with Florent de Dinechin on MLIR-FloPoCo

Who Am I? — Hobbies

- **Mixing science and art**
  - Crafting weird instruments (FDD, HDD, scanner)
  - Modular Synthesis (Eurorack)
  - Visualing birth of chips
  - Rendering chips polygons
  - Hacking a bit of everything
  - ...
- **Time for a showcase**
  - but let's talk about it afterwards :)

Who Am I? — Hobbies

- **Mixing science and art**
  - Crafting weird instruments (FDD, HDD, scanner)
  - Modular Synthesis (Eurorack)
  - Visualing birth of chips
  - Rendering chips polygons
  - Hacking a bit of everything
  - ...
- **Time for a showcase**
  - but let's talk about it afterwards :)

Render Systolic Array

Edge detetion iteration 256 neterov.

Systolic Array GDS Raytracing + artistic blur lens

Raytracing W&B and blur.

Systolic Array Tapeout

Photo taken with a lens and a smartphone.

303 Synthesizer reproduction

Proud of my weldings

Like steve jobs, my home lab :)

Custom Eurorack power modules

Custom Eurorack case

Flopotron / RetrOrchestre

It started long time ago..

Barcelona Supercomputing Center (BSC)

- *Origin* by Dawn Brown, sci-fi
- 2005
- Public research center
- 60% Spanish Governance
- 30% Catalan Governance
- 10% UPC Governance
- Money similar + industrial and european fundings
- **Host the most beautiful SuperComputer of the world**

The deconsecrated church and Repsol.

Marenostrum 1

- 2004
- IBM and Spanish gov. sign contract
- 42.35 TeraFlop/s

Marenostrum 1.

Marenostrum 2

- 2006
- extension of MN1
- 2x the Perf.
- 4812 cores to 10240
- 94.21 TeraFlop/s

Marenostrum 2.

Marenostrum 3

- 2012
- 48896 cores of sandy bridge
- 1.1 PetaFlop/s
- 115 TeraByte of RAM

Marenostrum 3.

Marenostrum 4

- 2017
- 3456 nodes
- each node = 2 Intel Xeon with 24 cores
- 165888 processors
- 390 TeraBytes of RAM
- peak 13-ish PetaFlop/s
- 1.3 MegaWatt·year
- Heterogeneous:
  - MN4 CTE-Power
  - MN4 CTE-AMD
  - MN4 CTE-ARM

Marenostrum 4.

Marenostrum 5

- 2020 (2023 really)
- top500 now: 11th (acc) and 35th (gpp)
- top500 october: top8
- *pre-exascale* 175 PetaFlop/s
- 10MW·year
- **No more the most beautiful SC of the world, RIP :')**
- one node of MN5 is the full church of MN1

Marenostrum 5.

Current Progress

Introduction: Modern Challenges for Computer Architects and HPC

Presentation Context

2.1 Challenges

2.2 Background

HPC Community Challenges

A. The Walls

Challenges in the "Dark Silicon" era, the slowdown of Moore's Law, the stalling of Dennard Scaling, the Power Wall, and the Memory Wall.

B. Numerical Sparsity of Workloads

The necessity ranges from **2** bits in Large Language Models to **1000** bits in experimental mathematics.

C. "Communication Dominates Arithmetic"

The majority of time is spent **moving data**, which **costs orders of magnitude more than computation**.

A. The Walls

Dark Silicon and Power Wall

Dark Silicon, restricting the simultaneous activation of transistors and pushing towards **specialized**, rather than **general-purpose**, computing solutions [SGH+14].

Memory Wall

The growing gap between processor speeds and memory latency severely limits system performance [DGY+99].

Arithmetic Perspective

General Purpose Floating-Point / FPU goes against **specialization**. Floating-Point **Performance** impacted by the **Memory Wall**.

A. The Walls

Dark Silicon and Power Wall

Dark Silicon, restricting the simultaneous activation of transistors and pushing towards **specialized**, rather than **general-purpose**, computing solutions [SGH+14].

Memory Wall

The growing gap between processor speeds and memory latency severely limits system performance [DGY+99].

Arithmetic Perspective

General Purpose Floating-Point / FPU goes against **specialization**.
Floating-Point **Performance** impacted by the **Memory Wall**.

A. The Walls

Dark Silicon and Power Wall

Dark Silicon, restricting the simultaneous activation of transistors and pushing towards **specialized**, rather than **general-purpose**, computing solutions [SGH+14].

Memory Wall

The growing gap between processor speeds and memory latency severely limits system performance [DGY+99].

Arithmetic Perspective

General Purpose Floating-Point / FPU goes against **specialization**. Floating-Point **Performance** impacted by the **Memory Wall**.

B. Numerical Sparsity of Workloads

Precision-Hungry Workloads

E.g. scientific computing, quantum calculations, and detailed simulations, where high precision ensures **accuracy and reproducibility** [BM13, ZYD96, EGK+09, LQR96].

Precision-Resilient Workloads

Emerging deep learning models demonstrate robustness to reduced precision, optimizing computational resources [Joh18, CHS+16].

General-Purpose Computing Challenge

Developers are often limited to a few floating-point formats, compilation flags, and Floating-Point Units (FPU).

B. Numerical Sparsity of Workloads

Precision-Hungry Workloads

E.g. scientific computing, quantum calculations, and detailed simulations, where high precision ensures **accuracy and reproducibility** [BM13, ZYD96, EGK+09, LQR96].

Precision-Resilient Workloads

Emerging deep learning models demonstrate robustness to reduced precision, optimizing computational resources [Joh18, CHS+16].

General-Purpose Computing Challenge

Developers are often limited to a few floating-point formats, compilation flags, and Floating-Point Units (FPU).

B. Numerical Sparsity of Workloads

Precision-Hungry Workloads

E.g. scientific computing, quantum calculations, and detailed simulations, where high precision ensures **accuracy and reproducibility** [BM13, ZYD96, EGK+09, LQR96].

Precision-Resilient Workloads

Emerging deep learning models demonstrate robustness to reduced precision, optimizing computational resources [Joh18, CHS+16].

General-Purpose Computing Challenge

Developers are often limited to a few floating-point formats, compilation flags, and Floating-Point Units (FPU).

C. "Communication dominates Arithmetic"

60% of time spent in communication [BRM+18].

Integer Operation	# of Operations	Latency (Clock Cycle)
Add	12	1
Multiply	4	1
Memory	**Size (KBytes)**	**Latency (Clock Cycle)**
L1 Data Cache	32	4 - 5
L2 Cache	256	12
L3 Cache	8192	36 - 58
DRAM	-	230 - 422

Latency comparison [Hor14].

Arithmetic Operation	Bit Width	Energy (pJ)	Normalized Energy (per bit)
Integer Add	32	0.1	1
Integer Multiply	32	3.1	31
Float Add (16-bit)	16	0.4	8
Float Add (32-bit)	32	0.9	9
Float Multiply (16-bit)	16	1.1	22
Float Multiply (32-bit)	32	3.7	37
Memory	**Bit Width**	**Energy (pJ)**	**Normalized Energy (per bit)**
L1 Data Cache	64	20	100
DRAM	64	1300 - 2600	6500 - 13000

Energy consumption [Hor14].

"Arithmetic wall"

Definition of the Arithmetic wall

Collectively, these problems exhibit the **gap** between the **arithmetic solutions** and the **HPC challenges**

Ideas To Address Those Concerns

I. Format Adaptability

Beyond IEEE754: adaptative formats for more tasks. **Maximize the entropy** per datum and avoid **leaving the chips for memory**.
targets: A, B, and C.

II. Arithmetic Efficiency

Every bit and wire count in the ALU. Toward **necessary** and **sufficient** circuitry.
targets: mainly A, but C.

III. Bridging Software and Hardware

Providing cohesive solutions that span from high-performance computing (HPC) libraries to silicon layout.
targets: A, B, and C.

Ideas To Address Those Concerns

I. Format Adaptability

Beyond IEEE754: adaptative formats for more tasks. **Maximize the entropy** per datum and avoid **leaving the chips for memory**.
targets: A, B, and C.

II. Arithmetic Efficiency

Every bit and wire count in the ALU. Toward **necessary** and **sufficient** circuitry.
targets: mainly A, but C.

III. Bridging Software and Hardware

Providing cohesive solutions that span from high-performance computing (HPC) libraries to silicon layout.
targets: A, B, and C.

Ideas To Address Those Concerns

I. Format Adaptability

Beyond IEEE754: adaptative formats for more tasks. **Maximize the entropy** per datum and avoid **leaving the chips for memory**.
targets: A, B, and C.

II. Arithmetic Efficiency

Every bit and wire count in the ALU. Toward **necessary** and **sufficient** circuitry.
targets: mainly A, but C.

III. Bridging Software and Hardware

Providing cohesive solutions that span from high-performance computing (HPC) libraries to silicon layout.
targets: A, B, and C.

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Historical Background of Floating-Point Arithmetic

- 1840: Babbage and Lovelace conceptualize the first floating-point.
- 1914: Leonardo T. Quevedo builds an electromechanical calculator with floating-point.
- 1938: Konrad Zuse **Z1**, the first programmable mechanical computer with floating-point arithmetic.
- 1954: IBM 704, the first mass-produced computer with floating-point hardware.
- 1980: Intel introduces the 8087 co-processor.
- 1981: **Kulisch**: "Computer Arithmetic in Theory and Practice"
- 1985: **IEEE754**-85 standard.
- 2008: IEEE754-08 introduces half-precision and FMA
- 2012: AlexNet sparks the AI revolution with its CNN structure.
- 2015: Introduction of bfloat16, optimizing neural network computations.
- 2017: Introduction of the **Posit** format, a new take on floating-point representation.
- 2019: IEEE754 standard evolves to fix errors
- 2022: **LLM revolution**, chatgpt, MX format (e2m2, e4m3, e5m2), tensor cores

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{5}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{11}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{12}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{14}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{19}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{32}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: $\boxed{32}$

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

1. Jun 2018: Posit draft evolves.
2. Dec 2020: MSFP at NeurIPS [RLZ+20].
3. Sep 2021: Unum-IV [Ser21].
4. Oct 2021: Tesla Cfloat8/Cfloat16 [TWS22].
5. Mar 2022: Posit draft becomes a standard.
6. Jun 2023: Bfloat16 with subnormals.
7. Jun 2023: MXFP formats MXINT8 [DRZE+23].
8. Jun 2023: OCP 8-bit FP spec.
9. Sep 2023: OCP announcement [RZM+23].
10. Sep 2023: IEEE P3109 report on 8-bit FP.
11. May 2024: PT-Float at ARITH 2024 [SLS+24].
12. May 2024: IEEE P3109: 28 new formats.

Approximate number of new float formats: **53**

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

Timeline Zoom: "LLM Revolution"

Modern history emphasizes "Arithmetic wall"

The "LLM revolution" introduces dozens of formats. SOTA constantly evolves and standards now specify **meta-formats**.

Background: Kulisch Accumulation

- **Exact accumulator**.
- Fixed-point circuitry ⇒ **One bit per binade**.
- **Easy pipelining:** One branch accumulation.
- Shift in place the addend.
- Postpones rounding.
- **Fused** summation and dot product.

Cost consideration

IEEE754-64 **exact** accumulation of product requires over **4000 bits**.
Never adopted by the standard.

Background: Kulisch Accumulation

- **Exact accumulator**.
- Fixed-point circuitry ⇒ **One bit per binade**.
- **Easy pipelining:** One branch accumulation.
- Shift in place the addend.
- Postpones rounding.
- **Fused** summation and dot product.

Cost consideration

IEEE754-64 **exact** accumulation of product requires over **4000 bits**.
Never adopted by the standard.

Comparison of Accumulation Methods

Comparison of Accumulation Methods

Comparison of Accumulation Methods

Comparison of Accumulation Methods

Comparison of Accumulation Methods

Results

$$R_{\text{exact}} = 46.89794921875$$
$$R_{\text{FMA}} = 45.4375$$
$$R_{\text{Kulisch}} = 46.89794921875$$

Background: Posit format

- **"Tapered-Precision"** Posit$\langle N, es \rangle$.
- N the bitwidth, es exponent size.
- **Variable-Lenght** fields.
- **Golomb Rice** regime (r).
- **Regime** is super-exponent
- **Quire:** Kulisch in standard.
- **Claim** to replace *IEEE754*
- **1** NaN
- **Dynamic Range** enhanced
- **Precision around one** enhanced

Background: Posit format

- **"Tapered-Precision"** Posit$\langle N, es \rangle$.
- N the bitwidth, es exponent size.
- **Variable-Lenght** fields.
- **Golomb Rice** regime (r).
- **Regime** is super-exponent
- **Quire:** Kulisch in standard.
- **Claim** to replace *IEEE754*
- **1** NaN
- **Dynamic Range** enhanced
- **Precision around one** enhanced

Background: Posit format

- **"Tapered-Precision"** Posit$\langle N, es \rangle$.
- N the bitwidth, es exponent size.
- **Variable-Lenght** fields.
- **Golomb Rice** regime (r).
- **Regime** is super-exponent
- **Quire:** Kulisch in standard.
- **Claim** to replace *IEEE754*
- **1** NaN
- **Dynamic Range** enhanced
- **Precision around one** enhanced

Current Progress

Accuracy/Precision versus Energy Efficiency in light of numerical requirements

Accuracy vs. Energy Efficiency

3.1 Executive Summary

3.2 Numerically-tailored GEMMs

3.3 Bridging to real workloads

3.4 Conclusions

Executive Summary

General Matrix Multiplication kernel acceleration

A **large variety of scientific applications** rely on **GEMM** multiplication kernel. The numerical requirements are **very heterogeneous**, e.g., AI or weather forecasting.

State-of-the-Art Accelerators

Matrix-Matrix Multiplication (MMM) accelerators **have no focus on precision/accuracy**, but on performance.

Our Proposal

Generation of scalable Systolic Arrays with **adaptative precision** Processing Elements.

Executive Summary

General Matrix Multiplication kernel acceleration

A **large variety of scientific applications** rely on **GEMM** multiplication kernel. The numerical requirements are **very heterogeneous**, e.g., AI or weather forecasting.

State-of-the-Art Accelerators

Matrix-Matrix Multiplication (MMM) accelerators **have no focus on precision/accuracy**, but on performance.

Our Proposal

Generation of scalable Systolic Arrays with **adaptative precision** Processing Elements.

Executive Summary

General Matrix Multiplication kernel acceleration

A **large variety of scientific applications** rely on **GEMM** multiplication kernel. The numerical requirements are **very heterogeneous**, e.g., AI or weather forecasting.

State-of-the-Art Accelerators

Matrix-Matrix Multiplication (MMM) accelerators **have no focus on precision/accuracy**, but on performance.

Our Proposal

Generation of scalable Systolic Arrays with **adaptative precision** Processing Elements.

Systolic Array Generator: Overview

- BLAS level 3 GEMM routine
- Generator 2D Systolic Arrays
- Target agnostic
- Performance:
  - Scalable
  - HSSD Extraction scheme
- **Arithmetic focus**:
  - S3: Computer format agnostic
  - 3 Accumulators

3×3 Systolic Array.

Systolic Array Generator: Overview

- BLAS level 3 GEMM routine
- Generator 2D Systolic Arrays
- Target agnostic
- Performance:
  - Scalable
  - HSSD Extraction scheme
- **Arithmetic focus**:
  - S3: Computer format agnostic
  - 3 Accumulators

3×3 Systolic Array.

Systolic Array Generator: Overview

- BLAS level 3 GEMM routine
- Generator 2D Systolic Arrays
- Target agnostic
- Performance:
  - Scalable
  - HSSD Extraction scheme
- **Arithmetic focus**:
  - S3: Computer format agnostic
  - 3 Accumulators

3×3 Systolic Array.

Systolic Array Generator: S3 Format

- **S**ign **S**cale **S**ignificand
- All our datapaths are in **S3** format
- **Arithmetic Agnostic** once translated/mapped
- Simple arithmetic:
  - necessary and sufficient bits
  - Eliminate redundancy, dual zeros, special cases
- A quintuple format: ⟨NaN, Sign, Scale, Implicit, Fraction⟩

Common computer number formats and their S3 translations.

Comp. Arith.	Value	$S3\ \omega S$	Bias	$S3\ \omega F$	S3 Quintuple
IEEE-754 16	0	5	$2^{\omega S-1}-1=15$	10	$\langle 0, x, xxxxx, 0, 0000000000\rangle$
Posit $\langle 8,0\rangle$	1	4	$(N-2)\cdot 2^{es}=6$	5	$\langle 0, 0, 0110, 1, 00000\rangle$
Posit $\langle 16,2\rangle$	NaN	7	$(N-2)\cdot 2^{es}=56$	11	$\langle 1, x, xxxxxxx, x, xxxxxxxxxxx\rangle$
bfloat16	3.5	8	$2^{\omega S-1}-1=127$	7	$\langle 0, 0, 10000000, 1, 1100000\rangle$

Systolic Array: Building Blocks

- **A2S3**: Arithmetic to S3 - Translates any arithmetic format into **S3**
- **PEs**: Processing Elements - Include the **S3** Fused Dot Product (**S3FDP**)
- **L2A**: Large Accumulator to Arithmetic - output results in the chosen format (**exact**, **same**, **specific**).

Systolic Array key components.
$n + m$ "A2S3"

Systolic Array: Building Blocks

- **A2S3**: Arithmetic to S3 - Translates any arithmetic format into **S3**
- **PEs**: Processing Elements - Include the **S3** Fused Dot Product (**S3FDP**)
- **L2A**: Large Accumulator to Arithmetic - output results in the chosen format (**exact**, **same**, **specific**).

Systolic Array key components.
$n * m$ "PE"

Systolic Array: Building Blocks

- **A2S3**: Arithmetic to S3 - Translates any arithmetic format into **S3**
- **PEs**: Processing Elements - Include the **S3** Fused Dot Product (**S3FDP**)
- **L2A**: Large Accumulator to Arithmetic - output results in the chosen format (**exact**, **same**, **specific**).

Systolic Array key components.
m "L2A"

Processing Element (PE)

Schematic of a PE. HSSD highlighted.

Algorithm 5 Local program view of a PE.

```
module PE: (instantiates S3FDP s)
    S3_A_Q ← S3_A
    S3_B_Q ← S3_B                    } 1.Passing data
    SOB_Q ← SOB
    EOB_Q ← EOB                      } 2.Distributed control
    s.(x) ⇐ S3_A
    s.(y) ⇐ S3_B
    s.(FTZ) ⇐ SOB                    } 3.Fused Dot Product
    s.(EOB) ⇐ EOB
    C_OUT_Q ← C2
    C2 ← C1
    if s.(EOB_Q == 1'b1) then
        C1 ← s.({A,NaN,C})           } 4.HSSD
    else
        C1 ← C_OUT
    end if
endmodule
```

S3 Fused-Dot-Product (S3FDP)

Adaptative Kulisch Fixed-Point Accumulator [DPC+08]

1. Exact Product into extended S3
2. S3 translation and alignment to fixed-point
3. Accumulation with RCA or CSA (radix-2^k approach)

Circuit design of a generic S3FDP

S3 Fused-Dot-Product (S3FDP)

Adaptative Kulisch Fixed-Point Accumulator [DPC+08]

1. Exact Product into extended S3
2. S3 translation and alignment to fixed-point
3. Accumulation with RCA or CSA (radix-2^k approach)

Circuit design of a generic S3FDP

S3 Fused-Dot-Product (S3FDP)

Adaptative Kulisch Fixed-Point Accumulator [DPC+08]

1. Exact Product into extended S3
2. S3 translation and alignment to fixed-point
3. Accumulation with RCA or CSA (radix-2^k approach)

Circuit design of a generic S3FDP

Design Space Exploration (DSE)

22 arithmetic formats

bfloat16, "ieee8", ieee16, ieee32, ieee64, tfp8, tfp16, tfp32, tfp64, posit<4,0>, posit<8,0>, posit<8,1>, posit<8,2>, posit<16,0>, posit<16,1>, posit<16,2>, posit<32,0>, posit<32,1>, posit<32,2>, posit<64,1>, posit<64,2>, posit<64,3>.

3 Accumulator Configurations

α - Small accumulator with small MSB for AI; β - Exact accumulator (Kulisch and Quire), preventing roundoff errors; γ - 100-bit accumulator.

Combinations

A total of 66 combinations (arithmetic, accumulator) explored in our design space exploration.

Design Space Exploration (DSE)

22 arithmetic formats

bfloat16, "ieee8", ieee16, ieee32, ieee64, tfp8, tfp16, tfp32, tfp64, posit<4,0>, posit<8,0>, posit<8,1>, posit<8,2>, posit<16,0>, posit<16,1>, posit<16,2>, posit<32,0>, posit<32,1>, posit<32,2>, posit<64,1>, posit<64,2>, posit<64,3>.

3 Accumulator Configurations

α - Small accumulator with small MSB for AI; β - Exact accumulator (Kulisch and Quire), preventing roundoff errors; γ - 100-bit accumulator.

Combinations

A total of 66 combinations (arithmetic, accumulator) explored in our design space exploration.

Design Space Exploration (DSE)

22 arithmetic formats

bfloat16, "ieee8", ieee16, ieee32, ieee64, tfp8, tfp16, tfp32, tfp64, posit<4,0>, posit<8,0>, posit<8,1>, posit<8,2>, posit<16,0>, posit<16,1>, posit<16,2>, posit<32,0>, posit<32,1>, posit<32,2>, posit<64,1>, posit<64,2>, posit<64,3>.

3 Accumulator Configurations

α - Small accumulator with small MSB for AI; β - Exact accumulator (Kulisch and Quire), preventing roundoff errors; γ - 100-bit accumulator.

Combinations

A total of 66 combinations (arithmetic, accumulator) explored in our design space exploration.

Design Space Exploration Results

Routed resource of S3FDPs@250MHz

IEEE754 comparison

Hardware cost of "IEEE754" S3 vs. Xilinx FMA IP.

8-bit configurations

Config.	α	β	γ	*FMA*
LUTs	85	109	166	233
FFs	18	42	102	342
DSPs	0	0	0	1
CARRY8s	2	6	13	17
Power(PE)(W)	0.003	0.004	0.006	0.016
Power(system)(W)	2.828	4.807	9.860	15.872
En. Eff.(system)(GFlops/s/W)	175.4	103.2	50.3	31.3

16-bit configurations

Config.	α	β	γ	*FMA*
LUTs	134	187	200	425
FFs	34	124	102	680
DSPs	1	1	1	1
CARRY8s	4	16	13	22
Power(PE)(W)	0.008	0.018	0.014	0.032
Power(system)(W)	2.121	3.177	3.749	7.680
En. Eff.(system)(GFlops/s/W)	56.6	37.8	32.0	15.6

32-bit configurations

Config.	α	β	γ	*FMA*
LUTs	345	1039	416	769
FFs	225	865	317	1278
DSPs	2	2	2	2
CARRY8s	12	19	37	73
Power(PE)(W)	0.019	0.058	0.023	0.066
Power(system)(W)	1.233	5.329	1.554	3.696
En. Eff.(system)(GFlops/s/W)	22.7	5.6	18.09	7.6

64-bit configurations

Config.	α	β	γ	*FMA*
LUTs	1806	11414	1668	1785
FFs	1383	8996	1089	2884
DSPs	6	6	6	10
CARRY8s	38	272	34	70
Power(PE)(W)	0.085	0.460	0.081	0.191
Power(system)(W)	1.002	13.633	0.971	2.292
En. Eff.(system)(GFlops/s/W)	6.0	0.4	6.2	2.6

DSE: Scalability of PnR designs

32×31 $posit\langle 8,1\rangle\beta$ array

64×63 $posit\langle 4,0\rangle\beta$ array

Hardware Platform Overview

- Power9 System (IBM AC922 with AlphaData 9V3 FPGA Board):
  - XCVU3P-2-FFVC1517 FPGA, UltraScale+ family.
  - AC922 POWER9 system, 40 cores (20 per socket), 2.3GHz.
- FPGA Specifications:
  - LUTs: 384k
  - Flip-Flops: 788k
  - DSP Slices: 2280
  - Block RAM: 25.3Mb
  - UltraRAM: 90Mb
- PCIe Gen4-8 lanes, 15.754 GB/s, supports CAPI2 and IBM SNAP.

IBM Power9 AC922 ; CAPI2 + VU3P.

Evaluation: Energy Efficiency VS Accuracy

Energy efficiency (top) against Accuracy (bottom)

Zoom on 16-bit: Energy Efficiency VS Accuracy

Energy eff. and Accuracy for different payload sizes.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Large Design Space Exploration

Conducting extensive design space exploration and evaluation leading to **several profiles of GEMM kernels**.

State-of-the-art Enhancement

Improving single-precision energy efficiency of FPGA GEMM accelerators by **1.86**×.

Answering Sparsity of numerical Requirements

Our accelerators achieve **240 GOps/s/W with 4 accurate** bits to **0.65 GOps/s/W with over 1000** accurate bits, serving a **broad range of applications**.

Findings

Internal **precision budgeting** against a workload **alleviates "the walls"**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Large Design Space Exploration

Conducting extensive design space exploration and evaluation leading to **several profiles of GEMM kernels**.

State-of-the-art Enhancement

Improving single-precision energy efficiency of FPGA GEMM accelerators by **1.86**×.

Answering Sparsity of numerical Requirements

Our accelerators achieve **240 GOps/s/W with 4 accurate** bits to **0.65 GOps/s/W with over 1000** accurate bits, serving a **broad range of applications**.

Findings

Internal **precision budgeting** against a workload **alleviates "the walls"**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Large Design Space Exploration

Conducting extensive design space exploration and evaluation leading to **several profiles of GEMM kernels**.

State-of-the-art Enhancement

Improving single-precision energy efficiency of FPGA GEMM accelerators by **1.86**×.

Answering Sparsity of numerical Requirements

Our accelerators achieve **240 GOps/s/W with 4 accurate** bits to **0.65 GOps/s/W with over 1000** accurate bits, serving a **broad range of applications**.

Findings

Internal **precision budgeting** against a workload **alleviates "the walls"**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Large Design Space Exploration

Conducting extensive design space exploration and evaluation leading to **several profiles of GEMM kernels**.

State-of-the-art Enhancement

Improving single-precision energy efficiency of FPGA GEMM accelerators by **1.86**×.

Answering Sparsity of numerical Requirements

Our accelerators achieve **240 GOps/s/W with 4 accurate** bits to **0.65 GOps/s/W with over 1000** accurate bits, serving a **broad range of applications**.

Findings

Internal **precision budgeting** against a workload **alleviates "the walls"**.

Discussions

Workload Discussion

The range $[-1, 1]$ does not reflect real workload conditions. Other contributions propose evaluations with **artificial** matrices in ranges like $[-10, 10]$, $[-100, 100]$, up to $[-10^8, 10^8]$.

Future Research Directions

Adopt a more **realistic** approach by bridging to software-based HPC code.

Discussions

Workload Discussion

The range $[-1, 1]$ does not reflect real workload conditions. Other contributions propose evaluations with **artificial** matrices in ranges like $[-10, 10]$, $[-100, 100]$, up to $[-10^8, 10^8]$.

Future Research Directions

Adopt a more **realistic** approach by bridging to software-based HPC code.

Current Progress

Accuracy vs. Energy Efficiency

3.1 Executive Summary

3.2 Numerically-tailored GEMMs

3.3 Bridging to real workloads

3.4 Conclusions

Open Source SW/HW Co-designed Framework

The 2 phases of the framework: right, the a priori Hardware generation flow, and left, the runtime execution flow.

Framework: Hardware Side

- Configuration files to bitstream
- Modified FloPoCo [dDi19]
- OpenCAPI offers ≈23GBp/s with 1024-bit bus @200MHz

Automated HW generation

[dDi19] de Dinechin, "Reflections on 10 years of FloPoCo" (2019).

Framework: Software Side

Strategy:

- HPC codes rely on **BLAS calls**
- **Numpy, Pytorch**
- Intercept, cast, dispatch

Software flow

Framework: Software Side

- **User Process:**
  1. Matrix Allocation
  2. Call `gemm()`
- **Our lib:**
  3. Arithmetic cast
  4. Signal DMA properties
  5. HW address translation
  6. DMA starts

Software flow

SW Code Example

```
LD_LIBRARY_PATH=/opt/lib/our_openblas.lib  ./gemm.py
LD_LIBRARY_PATH=/opt/lib/OpenBLAS.lib  ./gemm.py
```

Calling twice the same user application (python) with our BLAS

```python
import numpy as np

m = 604
n = 303
k = 100000000

# calls dgemm
A = np.random.random((m,k))
B = np.random.random((k,n))
C = np.matmul(A, B)

# calls sgemm
A = np.random.random((m,k)).astype(np.float32)
B = np.random.random((k,n)).astype(np.float32)
C = np.matmul(A, B)
```

gemm.py: a python program calling GEMMs. No changes in the code.

Evaluation of HPC Codes: Sea Surface Height (SSH)

- Ocean circulation models
- Monitors climate changes [Bar72]
- **Precision-hungry** workload
- Alternating signs and spans over **15 orders of magnitude**
- Can be solved without hardware
- Kahan SCS, DCS [Kah65]
- Extended Software Precision [BB09])

```
for j=128 to 1: # longitude
    for i=1 to 64:  # latitude
        sum = sum + ssh(i,j)
    end
end
print(sum)  # 32.302734375
```

```
for i=64 to 1: # latitude
    for j=1 to 128: # longitude
        sum = sum + ssh(i,j)
    end
end
print(sum)  # 0.734375
```

Double-precision errors.

[Bar72] Barrick, "Remote sensing of sea state by radar" (1972).
[Kah65] Kahan, "Pracniques" (1965).
[BB09] Bailey and Borwein, "High-Precision Computation and Mathematical Physics" (2009).

Evaluation of HPC Codes: Artificial Intelligence

- GEMMs (im2col, FC, Conv)
- **Precision-resilient** workloads [Joh18]
- Accumulations of closely related values [LJZ+21]

Weights histograms Alexnet/Resnet18

[LJZ+21] Li et al., "Robustness-aware 2-bit quantization with real-time performance for neural network" (2021).

[Joh18] Johnson, "Rethinking floating point for deep learning" (2018).

Evaluation: SSH results

- **IEEE754-64-FDP** vs. **IEEE754-64/128 FMAs**
  - 64-bit format + 91-bit FDP: <ovf:30,msb:30,lsb:-30>
  - 128-bit quad-precision FMA
  - 64-bit double-precision FMA
- **10 shuffles** per chunk size
- **4 metrics**: mean, RSD, Accuracy, Accuracy cost
- The FDP maintains **reproducibility** unlike the FMA
- The FDP always exhibits **52** correct bits
  - **5x** better than quad-precision
  - **27.7x** better than double-precision
- At 200MHz, power consumptions are:
  - 0.266W for IEEE754-64
  - 0.549W for IEEE754-128
  - 0.491W for 91-bit FDP
- For the same Wattage, our FDP generates:
  - **5.6x** more correct bits than IEEE754-128
  - **15.1x** more correct bits than IEEE754-64

IEEE754-64/128 FMAs vs. [64+91]-FDP

Evaluation: SSH results

- **IEEE754-64-FDP** vs. **IEEE754-64/128 FMAs**
  - 64-bit format + 91-bit FDP: <ovf:30,msb:30,lsb:-30>
  - 128-bit quad-precision FMA
  - 64-bit double-precision FMA
- **10 shuffles** per chunk size
- **4 metrics**: mean, RSD, Accuracy, Accuracy cost
- The FDP maintains **reproducibility** unlike the FMA
- The FDP always exhibits **52** correct bits
  - **5x** better than quad-precision
  - **27.7x** better than double-precision
- At 200MHz, power consumptions are:
  - 0.266W for IEEE754-64
  - 0.549W for IEEE754-128
  - 0.491W for 91-bit FDP
- For the same Wattage, our FDP generates:
  - **5.6x** more correct bits than IEEE754-128
  - **15.1x** more correct bits than IEEE754-64

IEEE754-64/128 FMAs vs. [64+91]-FDP

Evaluation: SSH results

- **IEEE754-64-FDP** vs. **IEEE754-64/128 FMAs**
  - 64-bit format + 91-bit FDP: <ovf:30,msb:30,lsb:-30>
  - 128-bit quad-precision FMA
  - 64-bit double-precision FMA
- **10 shuffles** per chunk size
- **4 metrics**: mean, RSD, Accuracy, Accuracy cost
- The FDP maintains **reproducibility** unlike the FMA

- The FDP always exhibits **52** correct bits
  - **5x** better than quad-precision
  - **27.7x** better than double-precision

- At 200MHz, power consumptions are:
  - 0.266W for IEEE754-64
  - 0.549W for IEEE754-128
  - 0.491W for 91-bit FDP

- For the same Wattage, our FDP generates:
  - **5.6x** more correct bits than IEEE754-128
  - **15.1x** more correct bits than IEEE754-64

IEEE754-64/128 FMAs vs. [64+91]-FDP

Evaluation: SSH results

- **IEEE754-64-FDP** vs. **IEEE754-64/128 FMAs**
  - 64-bit format + 91-bit FDP: <ovf:30,msb:30,lsb:-30>
  - 128-bit quad-precision FMA
  - 64-bit double-precision FMA
- **10 shuffles** per chunk size
- **4 metrics**: mean, RSD, Accuracy, Accuracy cost
- The FDP maintains **reproducibility** unlike the FMA

- The FDP always exhibits **52** correct bits
  - **5x** better than quad-precision
  - **27.7x** better than double-precision

- At 200MHz, power consumptions are:
  - 0.266W for IEEE754-64
  - 0.549W for IEEE754-128
  - 0.491W for 91-bit FDP

- For the same Wattage, our FDP generates:
  - **5.6x** more correct bits than IEEE754-128
  - **15.1x** more correct bits than IEEE754-64

IEEE754-64/128 FMAs vs. [64+91]-FDP

Evaluation: SSH results

- **IEEE754-64-FDP** vs. **IEEE754-64/128 FMAs**
  - 64-bit format + 91-bit FDP: <ovf:30,msb:30,lsb:-30>
  - 128-bit quad-precision FMA
  - 64-bit double-precision FMA
- **10 shuffles** per chunk size
- **4 metrics**: mean, RSD, Accuracy, Accuracy cost
- The FDP maintains **reproducibility** unlike the FMA

- The FDP always exhibits **52** correct bits
  - **5x** better than quad-precision
  - **27.7x** better than double-precision

- At 200MHz, power consumptions are:
  - 0.266W for IEEE754-64
  - 0.549W for IEEE754-128
  - 0.491W for 91-bit FDP

- For the same Wattage, our FDP generates:
  - **5.6x** more correct bits than IEEE754-128
  - **15.1x** more correct bits than IEEE754-64

IEEE754-64/128 FMAs vs. [64+91]-FDP

Evaluation: AI results

- **Pytorch code without any changes**
- Top1/5 scores and **"score costs"**

- Evaluated models:
  - ResNet18
  - ResNet34
  - ResNet50
  - DenseNet121
  - DenseNet169
  - VGG11_BN
- Evaluated datasets:
  - CIFAR10
  - ImageNet
- Evaluated computer formats:
  - IEEE754-32
  - BrainFloat16
- 27 accumulators and conventional FMA
- A total of **384** combinations

Top1/5 scores/costs across different models/formats/datasets/accumulators

Evaluation: AI results

- **Pytorch code without any changes**
- Top1/5 scores and **"score costs"**

- Evaluated models:
  - ResNet18
  - ResNet34
  - ResNet50
  - DenseNet121
  - DenseNet169
  - VGG11_BN
- Evaluated datasets:
  - CIFAR10
  - ImageNet
- Evaluated computer formats:
  - IEEE754-32
  - BrainFloat16
- 27 accumulators and conventional FMA
- A total of **384** combinations

Top1/5 scores/costs across different models/formats/datasets/accumulators

Evaluation: AI results

- **Pytorch code without any changes**
- Top1/5 scores and **"score costs"**

- Evaluated models:
  - ResNet18
  - ResNet34
  - ResNet50
  - DenseNet121
  - DenseNet169
  - VGG11_BN
- Evaluated datasets:
  - CIFAR10
  - ImageNet
- Evaluated computer formats:
  - IEEE754-32
  - BrainFloat16
- 27 accumulators and conventional FMA
- A total of **384** combinations

Top1/5 scores/costs across different models/formats/datasets/accumulators

Evaluation: AI results

- **Pytorch code without any changes**
- Top1/5 scores and **"score costs"**

- Evaluated models:
  - ResNet18
  - ResNet34
  - ResNet50
  - DenseNet121
  - DenseNet169
  - VGG11_BN
- Evaluated datasets:
  - CIFAR10
  - ImageNet
- Evaluated computer formats:
  - IEEE754-32
  - BrainFloat16
- 27 accumulators and conventional FMA
- A total of **384** combinations

Top1/5 scores/costs across different models/formats/datasets/accumulators

Evaluation: AI results

- **Pytorch code without any changes**
- Top1/5 scores and **"score costs"**

- Evaluated models:
  - ResNet18
  - ResNet34
  - ResNet50
  - DenseNet121
  - DenseNet169
  - VGG11_BN
- Evaluated datasets:
  - CIFAR10
  - ImageNet
- Evaluated computer formats:
  - IEEE754-32
  - BrainFloat16
- 27 accumulators and conventional FMA
- A total of **384** combinations

Top1/5 scores/costs across different models/formats/datasets/accumulators

A zoom on the LSB case

The impact of lowering number of LSBs on Top1/5 scores and score costs.

A zoom on the LSB + densenet121 + ImageNet case

The impact of lowering number of LSBs on Top1/5 scores and score costs.

Evaluation: AI results

Top1 scores VS. Energy cost of inferencing validation set

Zoom on ImageNet + Resnet50

Test Set Inference Cost VS. Top1 Score.

Zoom on ImageNet + Resnet50

Test Set Inference Cost VS. Top1 Score.

Zoom on ImageNet + Resnet50

Test Set Inference Cost VS. Top1 Score.

Zoom on ImageNet + Resnet50

Test Set Inference Cost VS. Top1 Score.

Zoom on ImageNet + Resnet50

Graphical Superiority

Graphically, it always exists one **FDP** to the left (indicating lower energy) and are never below (ensuring equal or greater accuracy) conventional FMAs, **highlighting their superior performance**

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Open-Source Framework

A **bridge** from user applications to silicon, focusing on **tailored arithmetic** solutions.

Transparent Integration

Seamlessly integrates **without code modification**, agnostic of underlying hardware.

Enhancing State-of-the-Art

Improves **energy efficiency and accuracy** across **drastically diverse HPC applications**.

Findings

System-wise Arithmetic and numerically-tailored solutions alleviate the power wall (A), and the concern of workload sparsity (B).

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Open-Source Framework

A **bridge** from user applications to silicon, focusing on **tailored arithmetic** solutions.

Transparent Integration

Seamlessly integrates **without code modification**, agnostic of underlying hardware.

Enhancing State-of-the-Art

Improves **energy efficiency and accuracy** across **drastically diverse HPC applications**.

Findings

System-wise Arithmetic and numerically-tailored solutions alleviate the power wall (A), and the concern of workload sparsity (B).

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Open-Source Framework

A **bridge** from user applications to silicon, focusing on **tailored arithmetic** solutions.

Transparent Integration

Seamlessly integrates **without code modification**, agnostic of underlying hardware.

Enhancing State-of-the-Art

Improves **energy efficiency and accuracy** across **drastically diverse HPC applications**.

Findings

System-wise Arithmetic and numerically-tailored solutions alleviate the power wall (A), and the concern of workload sparsity (B).

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

Open-Source Framework

A **bridge** from user applications to silicon, focusing on **tailored arithmetic** solutions.

Transparent Integration

Seamlessly integrates **without code modification**, agnostic of underlying hardware.

Enhancing State-of-the-Art

Improves **energy efficiency and accuracy** across **drastically diverse HPC applications**.

Findings

System-wise Arithmetic and numerically-tailored solutions alleviate the power wall (A), and the concern of workload sparsity (B).

Current Progress

"Divisions in Vector Processing: Leveraging Opportunities from a Paradigm Shift"

Latency vs. Parallelism

4.1 Executive Summary

4.2 Algorithmic Contribution

4.3 Results

4.4 Conclusions

Executive Summary: Vector Processing Revival

Opportunity 1: Vector Processing

Resurgence of **vector processing** exemplified by the **RISC-V "V"** extension. **Enhance Data-level parallelism (DLP)** by trading **space and time** implementations.

Opportunity 2: Open Source Silicon

The momentum in **open-source silicon community** facilitates **tape-outs in academia**.

Algorithmic Contribution: Division Algorithm

Less famous operation but useful: **N-body simulation**; proposal: **muliple slower, area/power-efficient** units.

Open ASIC Flow Contribution

Custom Open ASIC flow for **extensive design space exploration** to characterize the divisions.

Executive Summary: Vector Processing Revival

Opportunity 1: Vector Processing

Resurgence of **vector processing** exemplified by the **RISC-V "V"** extension. **Enhance Data-level parallelism (DLP)** by trading **space and time** implementations.

Opportunity 2: Open Source Silicon

The momentum in **open-source silicon community** facilitates **tape-outs in academia**.

Algorithmic Contribution: Division Algorithm

Less famous operation but useful: **N-body simulation**; proposal: **muliple slower, area/power-efficient** units.

Open ASIC Flow Contribution

Custom Open ASIC flow for **extensive design space exploration** to characterize the divisions.

Executive Summary: Vector Processing Revival

Opportunity 1: Vector Processing

Resurgence of **vector processing** exemplified by the **RISC-V "V"** extension. **Enhance Data-level parallelism (DLP)** by trading **space and time** implementations.

Opportunity 2: Open Source Silicon

The momentum in **open-source silicon community** facilitates **tape-outs in academia**.

Algorithmic Contribution: Division Algorithm

Less famous operation but useful: **N-body simulation**; proposal: **muliple slower, area/power-efficient** units.

Open ASIC Flow Contribution

Custom Open ASIC flow for **extensive design space exploration** to characterize the divisions.

Executive Summary: Vector Processing Revival

Opportunity 1: Vector Processing

Resurgence of **vector processing** exemplified by the **RISC-V "V"** extension. **Enhance Data-level parallelism (DLP)** by trading **space and time** implementations.

Opportunity 2: Open Source Silicon

The momentum in **open-source silicon community** facilitates **tape-outs in academia**.

Algorithmic Contribution: Division Algorithm

Less famous operation but useful: **N-body simulation**; proposal: **muliple slower, area/power-efficient** units.

Open ASIC Flow Contribution

Custom Open ASIC flow for **extensive design space exploration** to characterize the divisions.

Current Progress

Latency vs. Parallelism

4.1 Executive Summary

4.2 Algorithmic Contribution

4.3 Results

4.4 Conclusions

Algorithmic Proposal

Baseline, n the mantissa size:

- Non-branching with a single n-bit adder.
- n iteration.

Non-restoring division circuit

Algorithmic Proposal

Baseline, n the mantissa size:

- Non-branching with a single n-bit adder.
- n iteration.

Unrolling Proposal:

- Serial addition of k bits
- $k \in [1; n]$
- Reduces a **power hungry** section
- Reduces the **area**
- Introduces slowdown

Non-restoring division circuit

Algorithm Finite State Machine

FSM baseline Non-restoring

FSM modified Non-restoring

Floating-Point Integration

Three cumulative contributions:

- Dual branch baseline
- Slower Slow Path **SSP**
- Slower Fast Path **SFP**
- Slower All Path **SAP**

Baseline

Floating-Point Integration

Three cumulative contributions:

- Dual branch baseline
- Slower Slow Path **SSP**
- Slower Fast Path **SFP**
- Slower All Path **SAP**

SSP

Floating-Point Integration

Three cumulative contributions:

- Dual branch baseline
- Slower Slow Path **SSP**
- Slower Fast Path **SFP**
- Slower All Path **SAP**

SFP

Floating-Point Integration

Three cumulative contributions:

- Dual branch baseline
- Slower Slow Path **SSP**
- Slower Fast Path **SFP**
- Slower All Path **SAP**

SAP

DSE Size Consideration

- (n_e, n_m) baseline adder sizes
- (k_e, k_m) serial adder sizes
- $S_{\mathsf{SSP}}, S_{\mathsf{SFP}}$, and S_{SAP} the experiment sets
- $|S_{\mathsf{SSP}}|, |S_{\mathsf{SFP}}|$, and $|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}|$, their cardinalities.

$$|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}| = n_m \cdot \left(n_e + 1 - \min_{k_e \in [1, n_e]} \left\{ k_e \geq \left\lceil \frac{n_e}{n_m \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n_m}{k_m} \right\rceil} \right\rceil \right\} \right)$$

Example: IEEE754 single-precision

One entry point from Arithmetic dimension: the argmin cancels out and $|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}| = n_m \cdot n_e = 8 \times 23 = 184$.

DSE Size Consideration

- (n_e, n_m) baseline adder sizes
- (k_e, k_m) serial adder sizes
- $S_{\mathsf{SSP}}, S_{\mathsf{SFP}}$, and S_{SAP} the experiment sets
- $|S_{\mathsf{SSP}}|, |S_{\mathsf{SFP}}|$, and $|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}|$, their cardinalities.

$$|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}| = n_m \cdot \left(n_e + 1 - \min_{k_e \in [1, n_e]} \left\{ k_e \geq \left\lceil \frac{n_e}{n_m \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n_m}{k_m} \right\rceil} \right\rceil \right\} \right)$$

Example: IEEE754 single-precision

One entry point from Arithmetic dimension: the argmin cancels out and $|S_{\mathsf{SAP}}| = n_m \cdot n_e = 8 \times 23 = 184$.

DSE Size Consideration

11 Float Formats

IEEE754QP with parameters $(n_e = 15, n_m = 112)$, **IEEE754DP** with parameters $(n_e = 11, n_m = 52)$, **IEEE754SP** with parameters $(n_e = 8, n_m = 23)$, **IEEE754HP** with parameters $(n_e = 5, n_m = 10)$, **BrainFloat16** with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 7)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{64}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 9, n_m = 59)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{32}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 27)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{16}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 7, n_m = 9)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{8}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 6, n_m = 3)$, **E5M2** with $(n_e = 5, n_m = 2)$, and **E4M3** with $(n_e = 4, n_m = 3)$. Totalling in **11** evaluated floats.

Functional Specifications

A total of **227** SSP designs.

Performance Specifications

Combined with 5 PDKs (ranging from 180 nm to 7 nm), culminating in **1135** chips to evaluate.

DSE Size Consideration

11 Float Formats

IEEE754QP with parameters $(n_e = 15, n_m = 112)$, **IEEE754DP** with parameters $(n_e = 11, n_m = 52)$, **IEEE754SP** with parameters $(n_e = 8, n_m = 23)$, **IEEE754HP** with parameters $(n_e = 5, n_m = 10)$, **BrainFloat16** with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 7)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{64}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 9, n_m = 59)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{32}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 27)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{16}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 7, n_m = 9)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{8}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 6, n_m = 3)$, **E5M2** with $(n_e = 5, n_m = 2)$, and **E4M3** with $(n_e = 4, n_m = 3)$. Totalling in **11** evaluated floats.

Functional Specifications

A total of **227** SSP designs.

Performance Specifications

Combined with 5 PDKs (ranging from 180 nm to 7 nm), culminating in **1135** chips to evaluate.

DSE Size Consideration

11 Float Formats

IEEE754QP with parameters $(n_e = 15, n_m = 112)$, **IEEE754DP** with parameters $(n_e = 11, n_m = 52)$, **IEEE754SP** with parameters $(n_e = 8, n_m = 23)$, **IEEE754HP** with parameters $(n_e = 5, n_m = 10)$, **BrainFloat16** with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 7)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{64}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 9, n_m = 59)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{32}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 8, n_m = 27)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{16}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 7, n_m = 9)$, **Posit**$\langle \mathbf{8}, \mathbf{2} \rangle$ with $(n_e = 6, n_m = 3)$, **E5M2** with $(n_e = 5, n_m = 2)$, and **E4M3** with $(n_e = 4, n_m = 3)$. Totalling in **11** evaluated floats.

Functional Specifications

A total of **227** SSP designs.

Performance Specifications

Combined with 5 PDKs (ranging from 180 nm to 7 nm), culminating in **1135** chips to evaluate.

SUF: SUperset Framework, a grafted approach to ASIC

	asap7	nangate45	sky130hd	sky130hs	gf180
Baseline					
Power (W)	1.12e-14	2.09e-13	5.45e-13	1.08e-12	1.55e-07
Area (m^2)	6.58e-10	7.98e-09	3.34e-08	4.59e-08	1.98e-07
Cell count	1990	1183	1831	1651	1699
Design 1					
Power (W)	6.58e-15	8.46e-14	1.37e-13	8.13e-13	1.47e-07
Area (m^2)	7.56e-10	3.40e-09	1.67e-08	2.33e-08	1.08e-07
Cell count	1086	630	916	972	1057
Design 2					
Power (W)	6.44e-14	1.91e-13	5.45e-13	1.10e-12	1.85e-07
Area (m^2)	6.44e-10	7.65e-09	3.28e-08	4.37e-08	1.90e-07
Cell count	1968	1148	1823	1693	1654

Current Progress

Latency vs. Parallelism

4.1 Executive Summary

4.2 Algorithmic Contribution

4.3 Results

4.4 Conclusions

Results: SSP Latency VS. Power and Area

Latency vs. Area

Latency vs. Power

Results: Latency vs. metrics zoom on ASAP7

ASAP7 Latency vs. Area and Power.

Results: SAP Area Efficiency

Experiment:

- Latency VS. Parallelism
- **Performance line**
- Baseline: Non-Serial Non-Restoring
- E.g. 2× slower ⇒ 2× smaller ⇒ 2× more units

Results: SAP Area Efficiency

Experiment:

- Latency VS. Parallelism
- **Performance line**
- Baseline: Non-Serial Non-Restoring
- E.g. 2× slower ⇒ 2× smaller ⇒ 2× more units

Results:

- **Improved Area Efficiency:** 9.40%.
- **Area gain at Slowdown 2:** $2.32\times$.
- **Area gain at Slowdown 3:** $3.12\times$.
- **No Gains from** $4\times$ **Slowdown.**

Results: SAP Power Efficiency

Experiment: baseline budget is **power**.

Results:

- **Improved Power Efficiency:** 68.66%.
- **Best Power gain:** 61.28×.
- **Power gain at Slowdown 2:** 5.14×.
- **Power gain at Slowdown 3:** 8.03×.

Results: Area and Power zooms on ASAP7

How many more units in ASAP7 for Area and Power budgets.

Results: Combining Power and Area

- **Power Density:** W/m^2.
- **Efficent Thermal Management.**
- **Ensure cooling of many smaller units.**

SAP Power Density Efficiency

Results: Power density zoom on ASAP7

How many more units in ASAP7 for Power Density budgets.

Current Progress

Latency vs. Parallelism

4.1 Executive Summary

4.2 Algorithmic Contribution

4.3 Results

4.4 Conclusions

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

1135 chips

Our SUF ASIC flow provides insights on **1135** division algorithms.

Vector Processing

Exhibition and enchancement of **Data-Level-Parallelism** with more slower and smaller units.

Improved Efficiencies

Our units show **improved area, power, and power density** gains.

Power Wall and Dark Silicon

Matching the paradigm of vector processing up to the execution unit **answers the dark silicon concern**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

1135 chips

Our SUF ASIC flow provides insights on **1135** division algorithms.

Vector Processing

Exhibition and enchancement of **Data-Level-Parallelism** with more slower and smaller units.

Improved Efficiencies

Our units show **improved area, power, and power density** gains.

Power Wall and Dark Silicon

Matching the paradigm of vector processing up to the execution unit **answers the dark silicon concern**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

1135 chips

Our SUF ASIC flow provides insights on **1135** division algorithms.

Vector Processing

Exhibition and enchancement of **Data-Level-Parallelism** with more slower and smaller units.

Improved Efficiencies

Our units show **improved area, power, and power density** gains.

Power Wall and Dark Silicon

Matching the paradigm of vector processing up to the execution unit **answers the dark silicon concern**.

Summary of Insights and Key Contributions

1135 chips

Our SUF ASIC flow provides insights on **1135** division algorithms.

Vector Processing

Exhibition and enchancement of **Data-Level-Parallelism** with more slower and smaller units.

Improved Efficiencies

Our units show **improved area, power, and power density** gains.

Power Wall and Dark Silicon

Matching the paradigm of vector processing up to the execution unit **answers the dark silicon concern**.

Agenda

Marenostrum et ego

Presentation Context

Accuracy vs. Energy Efficiency

Latency vs. Parallelism

Closing

Conclusions

First Contribution

Provided early insight in an **HPC environment** of an emerging floating-point format: **Posits**.

Second Contribution

Ensured **fairness** between formats comparison and provided a **generator of accelerated GEMM** kernels focused on **arithmetic**.

Third Contribution

Connected **silicon layout** to **HPC software**. Systematic enchancement **accuracy and energy** consumption for **distinct HPC codes**.

Last Contribution

Revisited **Circuitry** for floating-point **division** motivated by modern opportunities: **Vector Processing** and **Open Silicon**.

Conclusions

First Contribution

Provided early insight in an **HPC environment** of an emerging floating-point format: **Posits**.

Second Contribution

Ensured **fairness** between formats comparison and provided a **generator of accelerated GEMM** kernels focused on **arithmetic**.

Third Contribution

Connected **silicon layout** to **HPC software**. Systematic enchancement **accuracy and energy** consumption for **distinct HPC codes**.

Last Contribution

Revisited **Circuitry** for floating-point **division** motivated by modern opportunities: **Vector Processing** and **Open Silicon**.

Conclusions

First Contribution

Provided early insight in an **HPC environment** of an emerging floating-point format: **Posits**.

Second Contribution

Ensured **fairness** between formats comparison and provided a **generator of accelerated GEMM** kernels focused on **arithmetic**.

Third Contribution

Connected **silicon layout** to **HPC software**. Systematic enchancement **accuracy and energy** consumption for **distinct HPC codes**.

Last Contribution

Revisited **Circuitry** for floating-point **division** motivated by modern opportunities: **Vector Processing** and **Open Silicon**.

Conclusions

First Contribution

Provided early insight in an **HPC environment** of an emerging floating-point format: **Posits**.

Second Contribution

Ensured **fairness** between formats comparison and provided a **generator of accelerated GEMM** kernels focused on **arithmetic**.

Third Contribution

Connected **silicon layout** to **HPC software**. Systematic enchancement **accuracy and energy** consumption for **distinct HPC codes**.

Last Contribution

Revisited **Circuitry** for floating-point **division** motivated by modern opportunities: **Vector Processing** and **Open Silicon**.

Dissemination: Publications

- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "A Generator of Numerically-Tailored and High-Throughput Accelerators for Batched GEMMs," in 2022 IEEE 30th Annual International Symposium on Field-Programmable Custom Computing Machines (FCCM), May 2022, pp. 1–10. *doi: 10.1109/FCCM53951.2022.9786164*
- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "An Open-Source Framework for Efficient Numerically-Tailored Computations," in 2023 33rd International Conference on Field-Programmable Logic and Applications (FPL), Sep. 2023, pp. 19–26. *doi: 10.1109/FPL60245.2023.00011*
- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "The Grafted Superset Approach: Bridging Python to Silicon with Asynchronous Compilation and Beyond" in 2024 4th Workshop on Open-Source Design Automation (OSDA), hosted at DATE, March 25, 2024, at Palacio De Congresos Valencia, Spain. *Available online soon.*
- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "LLMMMM: Large Language Models Matrix-Matrix Multiplications Characterization on Open Silicon" in 2024 11th BSCSymposium, May 2024, *Available online soon.*
- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "Open-Source GEMM Hardware Kernels Generator: Toward Numerically-Tailored Computations" in 2023 10th BSCSymposium, May 2023, *Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.18328*
- **L. Ledoux** and M. Casas, "Accelerating DL inference with (Open)CAPI and posit numbers," in OpenPOWER summit 2019, Lyon, France: linux foundation, Oct. 2019. *Available: https://hal.science/hal-04094850*

Open Source Thesis: Reproducibility and Collaborations

- **OSFNTC:** Implementation of the Open-Source Framework for Numerically-Tailored Computations. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/OSFNTC*
- **Teras and Wrapped_teras:** Code and GDS files for the Systolic Array with posits<8,0> on the SkyWater shuttle. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/teras*, *https://github.com/Bynaryman/wrapped_teras*.
- **POF (Posit Operator Framework):** Suite for developing and testing posit-based arithmetic operations. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/POF*
- **SUF (Superset Framework):** Enhances ASIC flow by adding asynchronous parallelism. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/SUF*
- **3lnn (Three-Layer Neural Network):** Neural network topology and pre-trained weights in posit format. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/mnist-3lnn*
- **Flopoco / Virtex FPGA family:** Pipeline tool for arithmetic operators used in FPGA design. *Commit:* *https://gitlab.com/flopoco/flopoco/-/commit/0e0db94d2c5dc1084d477b9cb9b8b34d1a23a9e1*
- **VH2V:** VHDL to Verilog translator optimized for arithmetic operations. *Available:* *https://github.com/Bynaryman/vh2v*

Is that Ada indicating the repositories' URL?

Thank You

Absolute and Relative Errors

Error Analysis and Formulas

$$\text{Absolute Error} = |R_{\text{exact}} - R|$$

$$\text{Relative Error} = \frac{|R_{\text{exact}} - R|}{|R_{\text{exact}}|}$$

	Absolute Error	**Relative Error**
FMA	1.46044921875	0.0311 (3.11%)
Kulisch	0	0

Background: Posit representations

$posit\ \langle 7, 2 \rangle.$

Background: Posit representations

$posit\,\langle 4, 0\rangle$.

Background: Posit representations

$posit\,\langle 4, 1\rangle$.

CSA with RCA

CSA followed by RCA with critical path in red.

Background: Posit Decoding Example

Posit Encoding Formula

Given a posit number x, it can be decoded using the formula:

$$x = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{when } 0\ldots0 \\ \pm\infty & \text{when } 10\ldots0 \\ (-1)^s \times \text{useed}^k \times 2^e \times \left(1 + \frac{f_{m-1}\cdots f_0}{2^m}\right) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Example: posit<5,1> Ob00101

- $k = -1$ (because 1 run-bit (0) followed by the r bit (1))
- $x = (-1)^0 \times (2^{2^1})^{-1} \times 2^0 \times \left(1 + \frac{1}{2^1}\right)$
- $x = 1 \times \frac{1}{4} \times 1 \times \frac{3}{2}$
- $x = \frac{3}{8}$

Methodology Overview

Parallel Approach

We adopt a **parallel approach**, combining a **bottom-up** methodology for the arithmetic part with a **horizontal** strategy for HPC integration.

Neuron $\langle N, es \rangle$ Variations: 3 Posit Implementations

Quire / Exact

FMA unit, mimicking IEEE754.

Bottom-Up Development: Fully Connected (FC) Layer

System layout on XC7020 Arty board.

Detailed neural network layers.

Data aggregation of 20 neurons.

Horizontal Development: PCI-e Performance & Integrity

Integration schematic on Power9: testing **data integrity** and **performance** in a pioneering environment. From **loopback** to **neural network**.

MLP Example

Input Layer $\in \mathbb{R}^{11}$ Hidden Layer $\in \mathbb{R}^{12}$ Hidden Layer $\in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ Output Layer $\in \mathbb{R}^{3}$

Posit MLP in a small FPGA

The 2 layers in brown and green of a posit MLP in Arty7020.

Elaborated Positron

Vivado schematic of an elaborated neuron with posits.

Quire critical path using fast carry chain

Routed view of an MLP hidden layer, with an accumulator carry chain highlighted.

Bottom-Up Development: Verification Methodology

- Bit-to-bit verification vectors are generated and verified using high-level languages supporting posit semantics.
- Source and sink methodology for robust testing.
- PSLSE allows full system emulation of PCIe bursts using identical C code on x86 and Power machines.

Source and sink methodology for module verification, showcasing input generation and output validation.

Bottom-Up Development: Verification Methodology

- Bit-to-bit verification vectors are generated and verified using high-level languages supporting posit semantics.
- Source and sink methodology for robust testing.
- PSLSE allows full system emulation of PCIe bursts using identical C code on x86 and Power machines.

Source and sink methodology for module verification, showcasing input generation and output validation.

Bottom-Up Development: Verification Methodology

- Bit-to-bit verification vectors are generated and verified using high-level languages supporting posit semantics.
- Source and sink methodology for robust testing.
- PSLSE allows full system emulation of PCIe bursts using identical C code on x86 and Power machines.

Source and sink methodology for module verification, showcasing input generation and output validation.

FC Layer Development: Vivado GUI Integration

System layout on XC7020 Arty board.

Detailed neural network layers.

FPS Calculation and Example Configuration

- Frames per Second (FPS) is a throughput metric in the context of image processing
- let n be bitwidth, c occupancy ratio

$$\text{FPS}(n, c) \approx \frac{12 \times c \times 10^9}{784 \times \frac{n}{8}}$$

- Example features 16 MLPS of 8-bit posit
- one quarter of the link is utilized
- Example FPS = $FPS(8, 0.25) \approx 3.8 \times 10^6$

16 MLPs on VU3P FPGA, utilizing 25% of bandwidth.

FPS Calculation and Example Configuration

- Frames per Second (FPS) is a throughput metric in the context of image processing
- let n be bitwidth, c occupancy ratio

$$\text{FPS}(n, c) \approx \frac{12 \times c \times 10^9}{784 \times \frac{n}{8}}$$

- Example features 16 MLPS of 8-bit posit
- one quarter of the link is utilized
- Example FPS = $FPS(8, 0.25) \approx 3.8 \times 10^6$

16 MLPs on VU3P FPGA, utilizing 25% of bandwidth.

FPS Calculation and Example Configuration

- Frames per Second (FPS) is a throughput metric in the context of image processing
- let n be bitwidth, c occupancy ratio

$$\text{FPS}(n, c) \approx \frac{12 \times c \times 10^9}{784 \times \frac{n}{8}}$$

- Example features 16 MLPS of 8-bit posit
- one quarter of the link is utilized
- Example FPS = $FPS(8, 0.25) \approx 3.8 \times 10^6$

16 MLPs on VU3P FPGA, utilizing 25% of bandwidth.

Systolic Array Generator: Half Speed Sink Down (HSSD)

- **Scaling:** Local connectivity minimizes global routing.
- **Performance:** Stalling-free output and batch processing of independent GEMMs.

batch processing using HSSD.

Evaluation: Throughput and Performance

Measured vs. theoretical Throughput

Measured vs. theoretical Performances

Evaluation: HSSD impact

- Payload of 1GB.
- Sweep p the "Common dimension" in $A_{m\times p} \times B_{p\times n} = C_{m\times n}$.
- **HSSD saturates** the link for all sizes

HSSD impact for 2^{30} Bytes payload across dimension sizes (p).

Evaluation: HSSD impact

- Payload of 1GB.
- Sweep p the "Common dimension" in $A_{m\times p} \times B_{p\times n} = C_{m\times n}$.
- **HSSD saturates** the link for all sizes

HSSD impact for 2^{30} Bytes payload across dimension sizes (p).

Output-Stationary Systolic Array

Weight-Stationary Systolic Array

Multi-Project Waffer Tapeout

Recent Re-evaluation on smaller FP formats on ASIC

SA 8x8 e4m3 rulers congestion heatmap

Placement with eletrostatic field of 64x64 ; <1mm2 e4m3

Raytracing top view SA 4x3 posit<8,0>

CAPI backpressure design

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

A photo of barrio de Santa cruz.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 1.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 2.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 3.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 4.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 5.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 6.

Any code works without modification: Santa Cruz case

Deepdream iteration 7.

Division Algorithm Contribtion: 32/3 5-bit

32 divided by 3 on 5-bit.

Division Algorithm Contribtion: 112/-72 6-bit (log scale)

112 divided by -72 on 6-bit.

Division Algorithm Contribtion: 132/36 8-bit

Posit Division layouts: scaled

Posit64 Non-Restoring division: baseline (left) and 2-bit serial adder (right).

Posit Division layouts: not scaled

Posit64 Non-Restoring division: baseline (right) and 2-bit serial adder (left).

Posit Division layouts: scaled and heatmap

Posit64 Non-Restoring division: baseline (left) and 2-bit serial adder (right).

SAP results against IEEE754: Area, 32-bit

Area efficiency of SAP designs against ieee754-32 across PDKs.

SAP results against IEEE754: Area, 64-bit

Area efficiency of SAP designs against ieee754-64 across PDKs.

SAP results against IEEE754: Area, 64-bit, log scale

Area efficiency of SAP designs against ieee754-64 across PDKs (log scale).

SAP results against IEEE754: Power, 32-bit

Power efficiency of SAP designs against ieee754-32 across PDKs.

SAP results against IEEE754: Power, 64-bit

Power efficiency of SAP designs against ieee754-64 across PDKs.

GDS example: ASAP7

ASAP7 div. routed layout.

GDS example: NanGate45

NanGate45 div. routed layout.

GDS example: Sky130HD

SkyWater130 High Density div routed layout.

GDS example: GF180

GlobalFoundries div routed layout.