

# Applying Timetags for Program Dependency Enforcement in a Large-scale Distributed Microarchitecture

A. Khalafi, D.A. Morano, D.R. Kaeli  
Northeastern University  
akhalafi, dmorano, kaeli@ece.neu.edu

A.K. Uht  
University of Rhode Island  
uht@ele.uri.edu

## Abstract

We discuss a means by which a large distributed and scalable microarchitecture can be controlled in a distributed way using *time tags*. Time tags serve as the basic ordering enforcement mechanism when large numbers of instructions are executing concurrently and are also spatially distributed on silicon or multi-chip modules. They enable the management of the architected program order as it executes. The design, use and management of time tags will be discussed. We also provide simulation data showing how a modestly large and microarchitecturally distributed machine performs using the time tag based design approach described.

## 1 Introduction

A number of studies into the limits of instruction level parallelism (ILP) have been promising in that they have shown that there is parallelism within typical programs [3, 6, 12]. Unfortunately, most of this fine-grained parallelism spans several basic blocks and the relatively small instruction fetch windows of existing processor designs cannot span the program instruction space necessary to begin to exploit this parallelism. A large number of instructions need to be fetched each cycle and executed concurrently in order to expose this ILP. A fundamental challenge is how to find this parallelism and then allow execution to occur out of order while still maintaining the architectural program order that is required for proper program execution. We need to find this ILP at runtime; we need to enable the hardware to find, schedule, and otherwise manage possible control and data independent instructions.

A large, distributed, microarchitecture, capable of executing hundreds of instructions concurrently is needed in order to exploit the fine-grained parallelism present in sequential programs. A barrier encountered when realizing a large-scale microarchitectures is the competition for centralized machine resources. These resources often include the physical register file (including both architectural as well as renaming registers), register renaming logic, and the reorder buffer. Other resources that are often centralized in conventional microarchitectures are the execution units, though they do not present the same challenges for maintaining correct program order as those resources that are associated with the architected registers and the dependencies (control, register, and memory) that arise from the instructions themselves. The use of centralized resources greatly hinders the scalability of any microarchitecture implementation.

We present a microarchitecture that is able to scale to large sizes through the elimination of most conventional centralized microarchitectural components. We are proposing to use time tags to maintain and enforce correct program order for all flow dependencies whether they be registers, memory values, or instruction control-flow predicates. A description of the general microarchitecture assumed in this paper is presented in [13]. In this paper we focus our attention on the design of time tags and their associated operations.

Section 2 will discuss a basic distributed microarchitecture that achieves the above goals and how time tags are defined and used to coordinate its execution flow. Section 3 presents a small set of simulation results that demonstrate the power of using time tags for dependency enforcement. Section 4 discusses some of the differences between our envisioned microarchitecture and existing schemes. Section 5 summarizes the current contributions.

## 2 Distributed Microarchitecture Using Time Tags

In order to achieve high IPC in single-threaded, branch-dominated program codes, many instructions need to be decoded and executed in parallel. We desire that the span of instructions that might be executed in parallel be on the order of at least tens and possibly hundreds or thousands. Unfortunately, having a large numbers of instructions in flight simultaneously places an enormous burden on access to the physical register file (or files, if they are partitioned in some way [5]), the architected register mapping function, and the reorder buffer needed for management of the final committed program order.

Some significant features of the microarchitecture in view are that it can be used to implement any ISA (most importantly the major existing ones), and is scalable in terms of the numbers of basic building block components that can be used while at the same time provide constant length buses regardless of machine size. The primary feature of the microarchitecture that we focus on is its use of time tags for dependency enforcement, but it has some other unusual features as well. The present microarchitecture is also designed to be able to execute more than one path of a program simultaneously and also employs execution-time predication of all instructions that are in flight. This is predication at the microarchitectural level and not related to architected predication that is present in new ISAs like iA-64 [4]. Those ISAs that have architected predication can also be implemented on this microarchitecture even though there would still be the microarchitectural predication present. In the subsections below we describe a number of key elements of the microarchitecture in order to understand where and how time tags are used.

### 2.1 Active Stations and Execution Window

To address contention problems encountered with centralized machine resources, we have extended the idea of the reservation station [11] to provide the basic building block for a distributed microarchitecture. The idea of the reservation station is extended to forward execution results to other spatially separated and distributed reservation stations rather than looping the results back to a common instruction dispatch unit and update logic for the architected register file. We also extend the idea of the reservation station to allow for multiple executions (re-executions) of the same instruction in the station. We will keep an instruction in the station until it is retired (either committed or squashed). We call our adaptation of the reservation station an *Active Station* (AS).

Rather than lay our Active Stations out in silicon simply next to the functional units that will execute the instructions dispatched to them, we will lay them out in a two dimensional grid whereby sequentially dispatched instructions (in program order) are assigned to sequential ASes down a column of the two dimensional grid of ASes. Active stations are grouped together (spatially) so that execution resources can be shared among them. Some instruction execution functions such as floating point calculations are too costly in hardware to not be shared (statistically multiplexed) among several instructions that may be in flight at the same time. The execution resource that is associated with a group of active stations is termed a *Processing Element* (PE). One or more processing elements may be associated with each group of active stations. A group of active stations that share one or more processing elements is termed a *Sharing Group* (SG). Since the ASes and PEs that make up a sharing group are close to each other in silicon, the interconnections between them may be more extensive than that which is possible in the whole of the execution window. The two dimensional grid of ASes, along with their interspersed execution units (PEs), is called the *Execution*



the time tag integer and the row component occupies the remaining space.

For illustrative purposes, we usually assign time tags, starting with the value zero, to active stations starting at the upper left corner of the two dimensional grid of active stations and proceed to assign incremented time tags first down the left-most column and continuing down the next column to its right until all active stations are numbered.

Similarly to the conventional reservation station, operand results are broadcast forward for use by waiting instructions. With active stations, all operands that are forwarded after the execution of an instruction are also tagged with the time tag value of the active station that generated the updated operand. This tag will be used by subsequent active stations to determine if the operand should be *snarfed*<sup>1</sup> as an input operand. Snarfed operands generally triggers the associated instruction to execute or re-execute.

Essentially all values within the execution window are tagged with time tags. Since our microarchitecture can also allow for the concurrent execution of multiple speculative paths of the current program, we also introduce a path identifier (path ID). A path ID identifies the current path that an active station is executing an instruction for. We allow for multiple speculative execution paths to exist within the execution window simultaneously. Not all applicable microarchitectures may use multiple speculative execution paths but we plan for that case anyway. Path IDs are numbered from zero to one minus the total number of possible paths. Path IDs are assigned to all operands in the execution window along with time tags.

The microarchitecture that we have devised requires the forwarding of three types of operands. These are: register operands, memory operands, and instruction predicate operands. Register and memory operands are identical to those of conventional microarchitectures but the predicate operand is something that is not as generally used or understood in existing conventional machines and is therefore described a bit further. Our predicate operand is a single bit register that we associate with each instruction and which is used to predicate its execution. It is not an architected register of the ISA ; in that case it would be a regular register operand in our microarchitecture and not what we refer to as a predicate operand at all. All of these operands are tagged with time tags and path IDs that were associated with the active stations that produced them. The information broadcast from an AS to subsequent ASes in future program ordered time is referred to as a *transaction*, and generally consists of :

- the type of the transaction
- a path ID
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the identifier of the architected operand
- the actual data value for this operand

More details on transactions for register, memory, and predicate forward operations is presented in a later section. This above information is typical of all transactions that convey operand values into future program ordered time.

Figure 2 shows the registers inside an active station for one of its input operands. The *time-tag*, *address*, and *value* registers are reloaded with new values on each snarf, while the *path* and *AS time-tag* are only loaded when an instruction is dispatched to the active station. The operand shown is typical for source registers, a source memory operand, or an instruction execution predicate register. In the case of a register operand being forwarded, the identifier of the operand is the address of the architected register. For example if the architected register in question is **r6** then the identifier of that operand would be the value 6. If the operand being forwarded is a memory operand, then the identifier of the operand is simply its architected address (either a 32-bit address or a 64-bit address depending on the machine ISA). If the operand is a predicate, then the identifier might be an internally derived value depending on the predication implementation.

This scheme effectively eliminates the need for rename registers or other speculative registers as part of the reorder buffer. The whole of the microarchitecture thus provides for the full renaming of all operands,

---

<sup>1</sup>snarfing entails snooping address/data buses, and when the desired address value is detected, the associated data value is read



way) from the bottom right-most active station to the top left-most active station. This is needed because assignment of time tags (as discussed so far) is not going to remain static during the actual operation of the machine. As columns of ASes retire and new instructions are dispatched to free columns, all of the time tags in the execution window are decremented by an amount equal to the numbers of ASes in a column. This corresponds to decrementing the column part of each time tag in the whole of the execution window by one. The decrementing of all time tags occurs when a column of instructions (in the ASes) is retired. Newly dispatched instructions will take on time tag values corresponding to the right-most column of ASes. The oldest column becomes the newest column. Since columns are connected by a toroidal network in the execution window, this corresponds to a sort of logical shift of the columns along the ring formed by the interconnection network. This operation of the machine is thus termed a *shift* and is associated with both a new column of instructions being dispatched as well as the decrementing of the column part of all of the time tags in the machine.

Although only a single set of forwarding buses and forwarding units are shown in Figure 1, the present work actually used three separate sets of buses. One set of buses were used for each of the three types of operands (register, memory, predicate) that are handling in the present microarchitecture. Further, different forwarding units were also used for each of the different operand types. Many variations for the nature and arrangement of forwarding interconnections is possible and several have been explored. One such arrangement was used in the results presented later.

## 2.4 Operand Forwarding Strategies and Bus Transactions

Although we have so far described the operand forwarding mechanism in simple terms as being the broadcasting of operands to those ASes with higher valued time tags, there are some additional details that need to be addressed for a correctly working forwarding solution. These details also differ depending on whether operands for register, memory, or predicates need to be forwarded. There are many possible strategies for forwarding of operands (and of operands of differing types). We now briefly outline three such strategies. One of these is suitable for registers. Another is suitable for registers or memory operands. The third is oriented for the forwarding of predicates. These three strategies are termed *relay forwarding*, *nullify forwarding*, and *predicate forwarding* respectively. In general, each forwarding strategy employs bus transactions of one or more types to implement its complete forwarding solution. The particulars of these transactions are described for each of the forwarding strategies.

### 2.4.1 Relay Forwarding

This forwarding strategy is quite simple but is also entirely adequate for the forwarding of register operands. In this strategy, when a new register operand needs to be forwarded from an active station, the standard operand information, as previously described in general, is packaged up into what is termed a *register store* transaction. This transaction type consists of :

- a transaction ID of *register-store*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the register address
- the value of the register

A request is made to arbitrate for an outgoing forwarding bus and this transaction is placed on the bus when it becomes available.

When the instruction associated with an active station gets a new input operand, it will re-execute producing a new output operand. In this forwarding strategy, the new output operand is both stored locally

within the active station itself and is sent out on the outgoing forwarding buses to subsequent (higher time-tag valued) active stations. The previous value of the instruction's output operand is also snooped as if it was an input operand and is also stored locally within the active station. It should also be noted that if the enabling execution predicate for the current instruction changes, either from being enabled to disabled or visa versa, a new output operand is forwarded. If the instruction predicate changes from disabled to enabled, the output operand that was computed by the instruction is forwarded. If the instruction predicate changes from enabled to disabled, the previous value of the output operand (before being changed due to the instruction execution) is forwarded. That previous value is available to the active station because it gets snooped as if it was an additional input. Newly forwarded operands will always superseded any previously forwarded operands. With this strategy, instructions that are located in the program ordered future will eventually always get the correct value that will end up being the committed value if the current instruction ends up being committed itself (ends up being predicated to execute). This is an elegant forwarding strategy and the simplest of the forwarding strategies investigated so far, and is a reasonable choice for the handling of register operands. The inclusion of the time tag in the transaction is the key element that allows for the correct ordering of dependencies in the committed program.

### 2.4.2 Nullify Forwarding

There are limitations to the applicability of the previously discussed forwarding strategy (relay forwarding). That strategy depends upon the fact that the address of the architected operand does not change during the life time of the instruction while it is in an active station. For example, the architected addresses for register operands do not change for instructions. If the instruction takes as an input operand a register *r6*, for example, the address of the operand never changes for this particular instruction (it stays *6*). This property is not generally true of memory operands. The difficulty with memory operands is that many memory related instructions determine the address of a memory operand value from an input register operand of the same instruction. Since we allow for instructions to execute and re-execute on entirely speculative operand values, the values of input register operands can be of essentially any value (including a wildly incorrect value) and thus the address of a memory operand can also change during the time that the instruction is in flight within the active station. This presents a problem for the correct enforcement of memory operands, and dependencies among them, in the entire program. If we examine the case of a memory store instruction, when it re-executes acquiring a new memory store value, the address of that memory store may also have changed ! We cannot simply forward the new memory operand (address and value) as with the relay forwarding strategy above. The reason is that we would not be superseding the previous memory operand that we forwarded previously that quite likely had a different architected address. Rather, we need some way to cancel the effect of any previously forwarded memory operands. This present forwarding strategy does just that.

In this strategy, memory operands that need to be forwarded employ a similar transaction as above for registers (described in the context of relay forwarding) but would instead have a transaction ID of *memory-store* and would include the memory operand address and its value (along with the path and time-tag information). However, when an instruction either re-executes or its enabling predicate changes to being disabled, a different type of forwarding transaction is sent out. This new type of transaction is termed a *nullify transaction* and has the property of nullifying the effect of a previous store transaction to the same architected operand address. This transaction type consists of :

- a transaction ID of *memory-nullify*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the memory operand address
- the value of the memory operand

When this transaction is snooped by subsequent ASes, for those ASes that have a memory operand as an input (that would be for instructions that load memory values in one way or another), a search is made for

a match of an existing memory operand as usual. If a match is detected, the time-tag of that particular memory operand is set to a state such that any future *memory store* transaction, regardless of its time-tag value, will be accepted. Further, on reception of this *memory nullify* transaction, a request is sent backwards in program order for a memory operand with the desired memory address. The transaction that represents a request for a memory operand would consist of :

- a transaction ID of *memory-request*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the memory operand address

Of course, the memory address for the operand desired needs to be in the transaction but it is not as obvious why the originating AS's time tag is also included. In some interconnection fabrics, the time tag is included in backwading requests to limit the scope of the travel of the transaction through the execution window. This same scope-limiting function is usually performed for forward going transactions as well. When the request is sent backwards in program order, previous ASes or the memory unit itself will eventually snoop the request and respond with another *memory store* transaction. As discussed, this forwarding strategy is very useful for memory operands but it can also be used for register operands with appropriate changes to the applicable transaction elements. Again, the inclusion of a time tag value is what allows for proper operand dependencies in the committed program.

### 2.4.3 Predicate Forwarding

There are several ways in which instructions can be predicated in the microarchitecture. These predication mechanisms are not elaborated on in this paper but two such mechanisms can be found in documents by Uht et al [13] and Morano [7]. For microarchitectures that predicate all program instructions within the microarchitecture itself (not visible at the ISA level of abstraction), predicate register values are essentially operands that need to be computed, evaluated, and forwarded much like register or memory operands. Each instruction computes its own enabling predicate by snooping for and snarfing predicate operands that are forwarded to it from previous instructions from the program ordered past. Depending on the particular predication mechanism used, relay forwarding (described above) may be a suitable (if not good) choice for handling the forwarding of predicate operands. However, some predication mechanisms need additional transaction types (besides a base store transaction) to effect a full solution. The predication mechanism described by Morano in [7] requires three transactions to fully implement. That mechanism was employed for the data generated and presented in a following section, and the transactions for that mechanism are briefly described here.

This predication strategy requires two store-type transactions rather than just one. These two transactions are similar to other operand store transactions (like for register or memory operands) but the second of these holds two values rather than just one. The first of these is the *region predicate store* transaction and consists of :

- a transaction ID of *region-predicate-store*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the region predicate value

This transaction is very analogous to a register or memory store but instead is used to forward a single bit value (the current *region predicate* for instructions following the AS that forwarded the transaction). A region predicate is a single bit that determines the execution status (enabled or disabled) for instructions that lie beyond the not-taken output path of a conditional branch. This particular transaction could be forwarded by either a conditional branch or by an instruction that was not a control-flow-change instruction. In the case of a non-control-flow-change instruction, the only predicate value that makes sense to forward is its own enabling predicate and so only one value needs to be forwarded.



In the case of a conditional branch instruction, there are two possible output predicates that can be in view. One is for the not-taken output path from the branch. The other is for the taken output path. In order to forward both values for these instructions, to program ordered future, a second store transaction type (mentioned previously) is used. This transaction consists of :

- a transaction ID of *branch-target-predicate-store*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the branch target instruction address
- the region predicate value
- the branch target predicate value

This is identical to the previous *region predicate store* transaction but also includes the instruction address for the target of the conditional branch (the *taken* address) and the single bit predicate governing the execution status for instructions following the target of the conditional branch in program ordered future.

Finally, for the predication mechanism employed in the present work, a third transaction is used to invalidate a previously forwarded branch target predicate. This transaction is a *branch target invalidation* and consists of :

- a transaction ID of *branch-target-invalidiation*
- the path ID on which this instruction is executing
- the time tag of the originating active station
- the branch target instruction address
- the time tag of the branch target predicate to be invalidated

This is similar to other such invalidation transactions in that when it is snooped by ASes in the program ordered future, a search is made for some state (in this case some predicate register state) that matches the given transaction criteria. The inclusion of the second time tag in this transaction allows for certain efficiencies that are particular to the predication mechanism described.

For predicate forwarding, as we have seen for register and memory forwarding, time tags play the vital role in identifying and preserving the ordering of all operands. In many ways, all operands (whether they be registers, memory, or execution predicates) require the use of time tags to determine the relative ordering of events in a microarchitecture that otherwise lets all instructions execute and re-execute wildly out of order in real time with respect to each other.

### 3 Simulation Results

Using an execution-driven simulator, we ran SpecInt-2000 and SpecInt-95 programs on our time-tagged microarchitecture. Our goal here was to evaluate the instruction per clock (IPC) that was possible using the microarchitecture. Ten benchmark programs were used in all. Seven programs are from the SpecInt-2000 suite and three are from the SpecInt-95 suite. These programs were chosen in order to get a variety of execution behaviors. The microarchitecture simulated supports the MIPS-1 ISA (big endian), with some MIPS-2 instructions also supported in order to accommodate code residing in the SGI system libraries which use them. All programs were compiled using the vendor SGI compiler on the SGI IRIX 6.4 operating system. Programs were compiled with standard optimization (-O) for primarily the MIPS-1 ISA (-mips1). The first 600 million instructions of all programs were executed. Data were only gathered after the execution of the first 100 million instructions (a total of 500 million). The default features of the machine simulated are given in Table 1. The data in Table 2 contain IPC results for a range of machine sizes. The size of a machine is basically characterized by three parameters that form the *geometry* of the machine and these are shown across the top of Table 2. The three parameters (making up a single machine geometry) consist of the tuple: the number of sharing groups rows, the number of active station rows per sharing group, and

Table 1: *General machine characteristics.* These machine parameters are used for all simulations as the default except where one of these parameters may be varied.

L0 cache size	32 words
L1 I/D cache access latency	1 clock
L1 I/D cache size	64 KBytes
L1 I/D block size	32 bytes
L1 I/D organization	2-way set associative
L2 cache access latency	10 clocks
L2 cache size	2 MBytes
L2 block size	32 bytes
L2 organization	direct mapped
main memory access latency	100 clocks
forwarding unit minimum latency (all)	1 clock
forwarding-bus latency (all)	1 clock
number of register forwarding buses	2
number of predicate forwarding buses	2
number of memory buses	1
branch predictor	PAg
	1024 PBHT entries
	4096 GPHT entries
	saturating 2-bit counter

the total number of columns respectively. All machines simulated also contained two forwarding buses for register operands, two forwarding buses for predicates, and one forwarding bus for memory operands. All forwarding buses incur a bus transfer delay of 1 clock. Further, each forwarding unit encountered (different for different machine sizes) has a minimum latency of 1 clock. All simulated machines, regardless of size, have forwarding buses that span eight sharing groups. This illustrates how the bus length can be constant with respect to the machine size thus allowing for physical scalability of the machine. The number of sharing group rows times the number of active stations per sharing group is the total number of active station rows in a configuration. The product of all three numbers gives the total number of ASes in the machine and therefor the number of instructions that may be in flight simultaneously (having possibly speculatively executed already). Generally, as the number of active stations increases, the resulting IPCs also increase, but there are diminishing returns. A significant IPC gain is achieved, for example, when increasing the size of the machine from the 8-4-8 geometry (256 ASes) to the 8-8-8 geometry (512 ASs). This is an increase in IPC of approximately 17.8% on the harmonic mean across all benchmarks. However, doubling the number of active stations again (the number of instructions in flight in the e-window simultaneously) to 1024 with the 16-8-8 machine geometry, the harmonic mean IPC only increases by about 3.4%. Even an alternative geometry (the 8-16-8 geometry) also having 1024 ASs gives a harmonic mean IPC of 4.96, an increase of approximately 5.6% over the 8-8-8 geometry. Comparing the 8-16-8 geometry with the 16-8-8 geometry (both having 1024 ASes), the results from each are fairly similar with the 8-16-8 geometry edging out the 16-8-8 when all benchmarks are considered. However, for some benchmarks (like GCC and VORTEX) the IPC are lower with the 8-16-8 geometry. This suggests that there is little benefit in just increasing the number of active station rows per sharing group after some point (16 in the present) case since contention for the single common processing logic starts to limit performance. With the current state of this microarchitecture research, the best tradeoff of resources and IPC results would appear to be with the machine geometry of 8-8-8. This consists of 512 ASs and the associated bus interconnects between them. Without the use of time tags as an operand dependency enforcing mechanism, it is not clear how this arrangement could otherwise be implemented in current or near-term process technologies due to interconnection and contention problems

Table 2: *Benchmark IPC results for various machine sizes.* Different machine sizes are characterized by their geometries consisting of the three-number entries along the top of the table: SG rows per column, AS rows per SG, and SG columns.

config	8-4-8	8-4-12	12-4-8	8-8-8	8-12-8	8-16-8	16-8-8	32-8-8
bzip2	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.9	5.2	5.5	4.9	5.1
compress	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.7	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9
crafty	3.7	3.8	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.4
gcc	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.6
go	4.1	4.6	4.7	5.1	5.5	5.4	5.3	6.0
gzip	4.8	5.0	5.2	6.1	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.5
jpeg	6.2	7.2	7.8	9.5	12.3	13.1	12.0	12.3
mcf	3.5	3.5	3.6	4.3	4.7	5.3	4.5	5.0
parser	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.4
vortex	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.6	4.9	5.1
H-MEAN	3.8	4.2	4.3	4.7	4.9	5.06	4.9	5.2

that would arise.

A better look at the potential of this microarchitecture is presented by the IPC data in Table 3. Some of the configurations presented previously, in Table 2, are repeated but this time they were executed with a relaxed assumption about the branch prediction accuracy guiding the fetching and dispatching of instructions into the e-window. In this data set, 100% branch prediction accuracy was assumed in an attempt to see what might be possible with this general microarchitectural approach as research continues to make possible i-fetch improvements. In this IPC data, results continue to improve up through the 32-8-8 machine geometry. Any realization of a machine with this number of speculative instructions in flight (2048 in this case) is clearly not feasible given current operand enforcement methods like a reorder buffer. Contention for access to it would be too great given current and foreseeable silicon limitations.

## 4 Related Approaches

The Warp Engine [2] used time tags; however their implementation is cumbersome, utilizing floating point numbers and machine wide parameter updating. The Metaflow Architecture discusses the idea of *delayed scheduling* to obtain moderate gains in ILP [9]. By developing a microarchitecture based around active stations and the use of time tags to coordinate and enforce correct program order, we eliminate the need for the severe contention present on either register scoreboards [10] or the architected register files associated with the use of reservation stations [1].

In those microarchitectures that perform speculative execution, there is also the need to access the reorder buffer, which becomes quite problematic as the number of instructions being speculatively executed concurrently grows [8]. Whether speculative instruction operand results are stored in data registers within the reorder buffer or if the results are stored in extra physical registers that hold both architected and temporary values, the contention for the centralized resource is the same. In our microarchitecture, the set of active stations form a giant reorder buffer. The registers that make up a reorder buffer in a conventional microarchitecture are not eliminated entirely in the sense that we store the same speculative information in a distributed way in each active station. Similarly, although the need for centralized rename registers is eliminated, we are effectively storing the rename registers along with the decoded instructions inside each active station.

Table 3: *Benchmark IPC results for various machine sizes when assuming 100% branch prediction accuracy guiding i-fetch.* Different machine sizes are characterized by their geometries consisting of the three-number entries along the top of the table: SG rows per column, AS rows per SG, and SG columns.

config	8-4-8	8-8-8	16-8-8	32-8-8
bzip2	9.0	12.4	15.5	16.3
compress	8.1	12.2	16.2	17.6
crafty	6.1	9.3	14.7	21.7
gcc	7.1	12.3	17.3	21.2
go	9.0	12.3	17.3	21.2
gzip	7.6	10.0	11.2	11.5
jpeg	9.2	14.4	18.7	20.2
mcf	6.1	8.2	10.1	12.0
parser	7.3	10.9	14.6	17.0
vortex	6.4	10.1	15.2	21.7
H-MEAN	7.3	10.8	13.3	16.9

## 5 Summary

We have presented a new microarchitecture that uses time tags to coordinate and enforce program order on a very large scale and with a large degree of rampart out-of-order execution. The scheme presented allows for the execution of instructions with entirely speculated source operands, and it properly handles cases when these operands are speculative register, memory, or execution predicate values. The use of time tags allows for a degree of out-of-order execution that is not easily enforceable using any other mechanism due to either routing congestion or access contention problems. The use of the time tags therefor allow for scalability of our microarchitecture to sizes that can allow for hundreds of instructions (or more) to execute concurrently. Our results indicate that this general approach appears to be quite promising as compared with the existing more conventional microarchitectural approaches. Some work on larger machine configurations has already suggested that achieving IPC numbers in the 10s on general integer sequentially-oriented program codes is possible.

## References

- [1] Anderson D., Sparacio F. and Tomasulo F. The IBM/360 Model 91: Machine Philosophy and Instruction Handling. *IBM Journal*, 11(1):8–24, Jan. 1967.
- [2] Cleary J.G, Pearson M.W and Kinawi H. The Architecture of an Optimistic CPU: The Warp Engine. In *Proc. of the HICSS*, pages 163–172, Jan. 1995.
- [3] Gonzalez J. and Gonzalez A. Limits on Instruction-Level Parallelism with Data Speculation. Technical Report UPC-DAC-1997-34, UPC, Barcelona Spain, 1997.
- [4] Intel. *Intel Itanium2 Processor Reference Manual for Software Development and Optimization*, June 2002.
- [5] Jiser J., Carr S. and Sweany P. Global register partitioning. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques*, New York, NY, October 2000. IEEE Press.
- [6] Lam M.S. and Wilson R.P. Limits of Control Flow on Parallelism. In *Proc. of ISCA-19*, pages 46–57. ACM, May 1992.
- [7] Morano D.A. Execution-time Instruction Predication. Technical Report TR 032002-0100, Dept. of ECE, URI, Mar 2002.
- [8] Palacharla S., Jouppi N.P. and Smith J.E. Complexity-Effective Superscalar Processors. In *ISCA-24*, pages 206–218, 1997.

- [9] Popescu V., Schultz M., Spracklen J., Gibson G., Lightner B. and Isaman D. The Metaflow architecture. *IEEE Micro*, 11(3):10–13, 63–73, 1991.
- [10] Thornton J.E. Parallel Operation in the Control Data 6600. In *Proc. of the AFIPS*, volume 26, pages 33–40, 1964.
- [11] Tomasulo R.M. An Efficient Algorithm for Exploiting Multiple Arithmetic Units. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 11(1):25–33, Jan 1967.
- [12] Uht A. K. and Sindagi V. Disjoint Eager Execution: An Optimal Form of Speculative Execution. In *Proc. MICRO-28*, pages 313–325. ACM, Nov 1995.
- [13] Uht A.K., Morano D.A., Khalafi A., de Alba M., Wenisch T., Ashouei M., and Kaeli D. IPC in the 10’s via Resource Flow Computing with Levo. Technical Report TR 092001-001, Dept. of ECE, URI, Sept 2001.