



**POLITECNICO  
DI TORINO**

Master's Degree in Electronic Engineering

Master Thesis

# Design of the frontend for LEN5, a RISC-V Out-of-Order processor

**Supervisor**

Prof. Maurizio MARTINA

**Candidate**

Marco ANDORNO

Academic year 2018-2019

## Abstract

RISC-V is a free and open source Instruction Set Architecture, which has sparked interest all over the community of computer architects, as it paves the way for a previously unseen era of extensible software and hardware design freedom. One of its main strength points is the vast modularity implemented in terms of different ISA extensions, which aim to cover a very broad range of applications. This allows designers to tailor the architecture according to their specific needs, without constraining them to support unnecessary instructions.

Being RISC-V a relatively new ISA, a limited number of cores is available at the moment, and in particular very few of them are open sourced. So the main motivation for this work is the contribution to this open source hardware community, by means of the design of an Out-of-Order RISC-V core as general purpose as possible.

The core is a 64-bit processor, supporting the G extension, which is a shorthand for the base integer (I), multiply and divide (M), floating point (F) and atomic (A) extensions. One goal of this project, which will be carried out alongside two colleagues, is to eventually include support also for the operating system, by implementing the yet unstandardized Privileged ISA, for the experimental vector extension (V) and possibly for a matrix extension to be defined from scratch. These last design choices are motivated by the lack of open source cores supporting them, and the great advantage that such vectorized computation can provide in a world where the popularity and the performance needs of artificial intelligence and machine learning are ever-growing.

Moreover, the choice of designing an out-of-order core arises mainly as all modern processors are of such kind, as it has been the best compromise to efficiently exploit instruction level parallelism for decades. The goal is to implement both instruction issue and execution to be performed Out-of-Order, because this allows the highest performance gain. This design choice, of course, comes with a series of implications that will need accurate analysis and benchmarking, possibly by keeping everything as parametric and modular as possible: branch prediction, instruction queue management, memory hierarchy and cache organization are just some examples.

The final outcome of this work will be an in-depth exploration of the design space offered by such complex architectures, to actually experience firsthand the main issues and tradeoffs designers must face and to be prepared to offer a significant contribution to the state of the art of processor design. Moreover, the common hope is for this project to serve as the basis for future in-house development of a complete RISC-V-based platform here at Politecnico di Torino. As mentioned above, the entire work will be open source and available on a GitHub repository.

# Acknowledgements

Thanks everybody!

# Contents

<b>List of Tables</b>	4
<b>List of Figures</b>	5
<b>List of Acronyms</b>	6
<b>1 Introduction</b>	7
1.1 The RISC-V ISA	8
1.1.1 Extensions	8
1.1.2 Comparison with other ISAs	10
<b>2 Improving processor performance</b>	11
2.1 Instruction-level parallelism	12
2.1.1 Multiple-issue processors	14
2.2 Dynamic scheduling	15
2.2.1 Dependencies and hazards	16
2.2.2 Scheduling techniques	17
2.3 Speculation	21
<b>3 Proposed design</b>	22
3.1 General scheme	22
3.2 PC gen stage	22
3.3 Fetch stage	22
3.3.1 Branch Prediction Unit (BPU)	22
3.3.2 Instruction cache interface	22
3.3.3 Fetch unit	22
3.4 Execution stage	22
3.4.1 Branch unit	22
<b>4 Results</b>	23
4.1 Simulation	23
4.1.1 Fetch unit	23
4.1.2 BPU	23

4.2	BPU benchmarking . . . . .	23
4.3	Synthesis results . . . . .	23
<b>5</b>	<b>Concluding remarks</b>	24
5.1	Future work . . . . .	24
	<b>Bibliography</b>	25

# List of Tables

1.1	RISC-V Instruction Set Architecture (ISA) extensions [2]	9
-----	--	---

# List of Figures

1.1	x86 instruction count over time [2, p. 3] . . . . .	9
2.1	Subscalar processor . . . . .	12
2.2	Scalar processor . . . . .	12
2.3	Multiple-issue processor with two pipelines . . . . .	14
2.4	Scoreboard structure . . . . .	18
2.5	Renaming unit . . . . .	19
2.6	FPU example architecture using Tomasulo's algorithm [3, p. 198] . .	20

# List of Acronyms

<b>ALU</b>	Arithmetic-Logic Unit
<b>ASIC</b>	Application Specific Integrated Circuit
<b>CDB</b>	Common Data Bus
<b>CPI</b>	Clocks Per Instruction
<b>CPU</b>	Central Processing Unit
<b>FPGA</b>	Field Programmable Gate Array
<b>FPU</b>	Floating Point Unit
<b>IC</b>	Instruction Count
<b>ILP</b>	Instruction-Level Parallelism
<b>IPC</b>	Instructions Per Clock
<b>ISA</b>	Instruction Set Architecture
<b>PC</b>	Program Counter
<b>RAW</b>	Read-After-Write
<b>VLIW</b>	Very Long Instruction Word
<b>WAR</b>	Write-After-Read
<b>WAW</b>	Write-After-Write
<b>WOE</b>	Window Of Execution



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Since their first development in the 1960s, *out-of-order* (also known as *dynamic scheduling*) microprocessors have become the main architectural paradigm used in high-performance CPUs, given their ability to hide pipeline latencies and allow for a faster program execution. Along with that, another key role in achieving high effective performance is played by the concept of *speculation* and in particular by branch prediction techniques, which improve the pipeline throughput by maintaining a constant instruction flow inside the processor.

Nowadays, almost every device of common use, from desktop computers, to laptops, to smartphones and tablets, contains some kind of out-of-order core which exploits such techniques to offer the computing power and pleasant user experience that the modern world demands. Of course, these architectural design choices come with the drawback of significant added hardware complexity, so there are still some very low power or very low cost microprocessors which do not employ them.

In order to deeply understand such complex architectures and explore the design choices that must be faced in order to achieve that final result, a very convenient way is to make use of an open-source Instruction Set Architecture (ISA), namely RISC-V, which in turn allows the design of open source hardware.

This is exactly the aim of this thesis work: to design a RISC-V core, featuring out-of-order execution and speculation to face the issues that such a project involves firsthand, and gain valuable experience in this field of computer architectures. Given its complexity, this work has been carried out by the candidate along with two other colleagues, each one developing a defined part of the core, to come up with the complete design. It is common hope for this project to also serve as the starting point for the future development of a RISC-V based platform at Politecnico di Torino, which could be used for a many different research purposes. For this reason, the entire design and its documentation will be available on a GitHub repository.

## 1.1 The RISC-V ISA

RISC-V started as a summer research project in 2010 at UC Berkeley by PhD candidates Andrew Waterman and Yunsup Lee and professors Krste Asanović and David Patterson, but soon developed into a fully featured ISA, presented several years later in Waterman’s dissertation [1].

Today the goal of RISC-V is to become a universal ISA [2], able to suit all kinds of processors, from small embedded ones to high-performance cores, from single issue in-order to superscalar out-of-order microarchitectures. Moreover, it is also designed to be implementation independent, in order to work on FPGAs, ASICs and even future technologies, and to be compatible with a large number of popular softwares and programming languages.

How RISC-V intends to achieve that is by leveraging its two main strengths: first of all it is a completely *open source* ISA, meaning that no single company has control over its development and future, and secondly it is *modular*, in the sense that the base instructions are frozen and will stay the same, while new extensions are available and will be developed to expand the capabilities of the ISA (see section 1.1.1).

RISC-V belongs to a non-profit foundation, composed by many different corporate members as well as other non-profits and academic institutions, which together aim at maintaining the stability of the ISA, evolving it when necessary and trying to make it ever more popular. For more information, refer to <https://riscv.org/>.

Add other advantages of the ISA (see Reader chapter 1)

Why  
a new  
ISA from  
scratch?

### 1.1.1 Extensions

Most ISAs are *incremental*, meaning that, in order to ensure compatibility, every new processor must implement new ISA extensions as well as all the extensions introduced in the past, which leads to an accumulation of very rarely used instructions and a subsequent waste of hardware complexity and area. A clear example of this inflation is the growth of the number of instructions in the x86 ISA (figure 1.1).

On the other hand, as stated above, RISC-V is a *modular* ISA: a small number of base instructions (called RV32I, RV64I or RV128I for 32, 64 and 128-bit processors respectively) must be implemented by all instances of RISC-V processors and are guaranteed to never change in the future, while on top of that, designers can freely choose to include support or not for each of the other optional extensions, some of which have already been frozen, while others are still in development. Table 1.1 contains a list of available extensions at the time of writing.




Figure 1.1. x86 instruction count over time [2, p. 3]

Name	Description
I	Base integer instruction set, including arithmetic and logic instructions, jump, branch and control transfer instructions and some miscellaneous general management ones.
M	Integer multiplication and division extension.
A	Atomic extension for atomic memory operations, for process synchronization.
F	Single-precision floating point extension.
D	Double-precision floating point extension.
G	Shorthand for all the previous ones. LEN5 supports the RV64G ISA.
Q	Quad-precision floating point extension.
L	Decimal floating point extension.
C	Compressed instructions extension.
B	Bit manipulation extension.
J	Dynamically translated languages extension.
T	Transactional memory extension.
P	Packed-SIMD extension.
V	Vector extension.
N	User-level interrupts extension.
H	Hypervisor extension.

Table 1.1. RISC-V ISA extensions [2]

### 1.1.2 Comparison with other ISAs

Arguably the two most popular ISAs at the present time are Intel x86 and ARM, which are dominant in the desktop/laptop computers and smartphones/tablets markets respectively. The first significant difference between them and RISC-V is that they are *proprietary* ISAs, which means that whoever wants to design a processor based on such instruction sets is obliged to the payment of the required royalties. On the other hand, RISC-V is free for everyone.

For what concerns the microarchitectural standpoint, another major difference resides in the organization of the internal registers. First of all, RISC-V has 32 of them, twice as much as ARM has, and four times as much as x86. A higher number of registers greatly simplifies assembly language programming and compiler writing. Moreover, the first of those registers, register `x0`, is hardwired to zero, which allows for a significant reduction in instruction count, as many instructions present in other ISAs, which do not have a zero register, can be synthesized using RV instructions with `x0` as an operand. As an example, RISC-V does not need a separate instruction in order to branch if the value of a register is zero: this operation can be obtained with the `beq` (branch if equal) instruction using `x0` as the second operand. The Program Counter (PC) in the RISC-V ISA is a separate register, and that prevents any instruction from being able to modify it and thus become a branch instruction, as is the case of the ARM ISA, reducing the complexity of the branch prediction hardware and avoiding the loss of one general purpose register.

By keeping simplicity in mind, RISC-V does not provide direct support for byte or half-word integer computation, which can be carried out using separate shift instructions, as they are not critical in terms of efficiency and energy consumption, as are for instance reduced-size memory accesses [2, p. 20]. In addition, multiplication and division are not present in the base ISA (they are comprised in the M extension), and that means that a full software stack can run even without them, which helps reduce the size of embedded chips where such operations are not needed.

Other instructions that the designers of RISC-V chose not to include are, among others, stack instructions, as the stack pointer is one of the general purpose registers and so is accessed as any other register, delayed load, as it is deemed as useless in modern deeply pipelined processors, and finally delayed branch and condition code instructions, which complicate the dependencies checking in out-of-order processors [2, p. 21].

It is quite clear that who conceived the RISC-V ISA adopted a philosophy of keeping it simple and that *less is more*, by targeted choices made by learning from the work achieved in the previous decades.

## Chapter 2

# Improving processor performance

The performance of a processor is defined by the the time it takes to execute a program. This time span, called *CPU time*, can be expressed as:

$$\text{CPU time} = \frac{\text{Seconds}}{\text{Program}} = \frac{\text{Clock cycles}}{\text{Program}} \cdot T_{ck}$$

where  $T_{ck}$  is the clock period.

The first term can be decomposed further by computing the total number of instructions inside a program, called *Instruction Count* (IC), which is known given the assembly code of the program. From this figure and the total number of clock cycles, the average number of *Clocks Per Instruction* (CPI)<sup>1</sup> can be derived. By factoring in these quantities, the final expression of CPU time is as follows [3, p. 53]:

$$\text{CPU time} = \text{IC} \cdot \text{CPI} \cdot T_{ck} \quad (2.1)$$

Equation (2.1) shows that the processor performance is directly and equally dependent on three factors:

- Clock period, which depends mainly on the implementation technology and the microarchitectural choices (e.g. pipeline depth).
- IC, which is determined for the most part by the ISA (see section 1.1.2) and compiler technology.
- CPI, which is dependant on both the ISA and the architecture.

---

<sup>1</sup>Sometimes, also the inverse figure can be used, that is *Instructions Per Clock* (IPC).

The goal is then to minimize each of these terms, but it is evident that none of these parameters can be modified without affecting the others, as many design choices influence many of them.

## 2.1 Instruction-level parallelism

Earliest processors executed instructions one at a time, fetching a new one only after the previous has finished, leading to a number of clock cycles per instruction greater than one, and in particular equal to the number of stages an instruction must get through. These processors, where  $CPI > 1$ , are called *subscalar*. To illustrate the situation, in the example of the classic 5-stage RISC pipeline (fetch, decode, execute, memory access, write back), a subscalar processor would execute three consecutive instructions as shown in figure 2.1, taking a total of 15 clock cycles.




Figure 2.1. Subscalar processor

Starting from the mid 80s, processor architects introduced *pipelining* to improve performance by overlapping the execution of different instructions. This overlap means that at any given point in time there can be multiple instructions running in different stages of the processor, that is *in parallel*, hence the term *Instruction-Level Parallelism* (ILP), which is a fundamental concept in developing techniques to enhance processor performance. For the same example of figure 2.1, a pipelined processor could theoretically achieve a CPI of 1, executing one instruction for each clock cycle (see figure 2.2). Processors of this kind are called *scalar*.




Figure 2.2. Scalar processor

In practice however, data and control dependencies between successive instructions could cause hazards and force the pipeline to stall, causing CPI to rise once again at values greater than one. There are mainly three types of hazards that can take place in a pipelined processor:

- **Structural hazards** arise when a hardware block is needed by two or more instructions at the same point in time. For instance, if a processor features only one memory block for both instructions and data, then two different instructions executing in the fetch and memory access stages could generate a structural hazard when trying to read from memory. Such hazards can either be easily solved (e.g. separate instruction and data memory in this example) or are known and accepted by the designers, given the limited hardware available.
- **Data hazards** in a simple pipelined processor occur when there is a *data dependence* between instructions, that is one instruction needs to read a value that provided by a previous instruction. For example, in

```
add    x1, x2, x3
sub    x4, x5, x1
```

the `sub` instruction needs the value of register `x1` in the decode stage, but the previous `add` has not yet reached the write back stage and a data hazard is generated.

- **Control hazards** arise in the case of conditional flow changing instructions, such as branches, that prevent following instructions to be fetched until the new direction is resolved.

The real CPI a pipelined processor can achieve is then given by the sum of the ideal CPI and all the delays introduced by pipeline stalls caused by hazards [3, p. 168]:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{CPI} &= \text{Ideal CPI} + \text{Structural stalls} + \text{Data hazard stalls} + \text{Control stalls} \\ &= 1 + \text{Structural stalls} + \text{Data hazard stalls} + \text{Control stalls} > 1 \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

Those hazards become more frequent and more expensive to manage the more pipeline stages are introduced and that is a clear example of a tradeoff between two factors of the performance equation (2.1): a deeper pipeline shortens the critical path and thus reduces the clock period, but at the same time it increases the CPI. That is the reason why designers at some point had to find other architectural solutions to improve performance.

### 2.1.1 Multiple-issue processors

A processor featuring a single execution pipeline can only achieve a theoretical CPI of 1, but by duplicating the pipeline to include multiple execution units more than one instruction per clock cycle could be delivered. That is the idea that lies behind *multiple-issue* processors, that exploit ILP by executing independent instructions on separate execution pipelines.

Instructions that can be issued independently to the different pipelines are selected among a so called *basic block*, that is a sequence of instructions comprised between single entry and exit points (i.e. with no branches or jumps in between). Recalling the examples of the previous section, figure 2.3 shows the execution scheme for a multiple issue processor.




Figure 2.3. Multiple-issue processor with two pipelines

Two main different approaches exist to multiple issue processors:

- **Very Long Instruction Word (VLIW)** processors, also known as *static* multiple-issue, rely on software to discover ILP chances at compile time, thus avoiding increased hardware complexity. The compiler groups instructions that can be executed in parallel in a single long packet-like instruction (hence the name VLIW), that is then split and issued to the different execution units at run time. Despite many efforts, however, such static techniques reveal efficient only for specific applications presenting a high level of data parallelism [3, p. 168], mainly because the compiler software needs a perfect knowledge of the underlying architecture in order to efficiently exploit ILP.
- **Superscalar** processors, also known as *dynamic* multiple-issue, on the other



hand, rely on dedicated hardware to exploit ILP at run time. Instructions belonging to a basic block are inserted into a Window Of Execution (WOE), from where instruction that can run in parallel thanks to no data dependence are selected and issued to the respective following pipeline stages. This dynamic approach has been shown to work better than a static one, at the cost of a significant hardware complexity overhead.

Multiple-issue processors can achieve a CPI lower than 1 (usually expressed at this point as Instructions Per Clock (IPC), greater than 1) thanks to duplicate hardware units that also lower the impact of structural hazards, but they are nonetheless subject to data and control hazards. Instructions belonging to the same basic block are very likely to depend upon one another, as they are part of the same piece of program, and as such the amount of ILP in contiguous instructions of a basic block is usually very small, leading to a low usage of the additional pipelines, and that is the reason why allowing multiple issues is not very useful by itself, but is almost always paired with the techniques analyzed in the next section.

## 2.2 Dynamic scheduling

All the processors seen in the previous sections adopted a so called *static scheduling* of the pipeline, meaning that instructions are issued and executed along the pipe strictly in program order. To really extract the benefits of ILP, however, all modern high-end processor employ a *dynamically scheduled* pipeline, that can execute instructions out of order with respect to the assembled program. As an example consider the following code:

```
add    x1,x2,x3
sub     x5,x1,x4
mul     x12,x18,x19
```

In a classic 5-stage statically scheduled pipeline, instructions are executed in-order, and that means that the `mul` instruction cannot begin execution until the data dependence between `add` and `sub` is resolved by stalling the pipeline, as the execution takes place in program order. By using dynamic scheduling, on the other hand, if there are no structural hazards (and we can safely assume that that is the case, as the multiplier is likely to be a separate block from the ALU), the `mul` can be executed and maybe even completed before the `sub`. Instructions are then still issued in-order to the execution stage from the window of execution, but they can begin and complete execution out-of-order. Of course, the semantics of the program still have to be ensured and, as such, instruction *commit*, that is the actual update of registers and memory, is always performed in-order.

Dynamic scheduling is almost always used in conjunction with superscalar processors, because the advantages given by the out-of-order execution and the availability of multiple functional units go hand in hand. This combination offers several

strengths compared to static scheduling or VLIW processors [3, p. 192]. For instance, it allows compiled code to run in an efficient way on different microarchitectures, as the pipeline can manage itself and exploit ILP without needing the help of the compiler. Moreover, it can handle cases where dependencies cannot be found at compile time, such as memory operations or dynamic branches. But the most important advantage of all is that an out-of-order processor is able to mask the effect of unpredictable delays in the pipeline by executing later instructions without stalling. Remember that cache misses can easily take hundreds of clock cycles to resolve, which would turn into hundreds of wasted cycles in an in-order processor, but are instead taken advantage of to carry out unrelated tasks in an out-of-order one.

In order to do so, the WOE acts as a buffer between the fetch stages (called *frontend*) and the execution and commit stages (called *backend*), that hopefully always contains enough instructions to ensure a constant flow to the functional units, even when earlier instructions are waiting for some event. This is obviously possible only if the frontend is able to maintain a high enough bandwidth of fetched instructions to the WOE.

### 2.2.1 Dependencies and hazards

Out-of-order processors are subject to all the dependencies listed in section 2.1, but due to the reordering of instructions, other hazards can arise from so called *name dependencies*. In this context, a useful taxonomy to categorize such hazards is defined<sup>2</sup>. Let  $D(i)$  be the *domain* and  $R(i)$  be the *range* of instruction  $i$ , meaning respectively the registers or memory locations read and written by instruction  $i$ , and consider two instructions  $i$  and  $j$ , with  $j$  following  $i$  in the program order. Then, there are three possible kinds of data hazards:

- **Read-After-Write (RAW)** hazards are the only true data hazards arising from a data dependence and occur, as seen previously, when instruction  $j$  is trying to read a piece of data before  $i$  writes it, leading to a wrong value read by  $j$ , as in the following example:

```
add    x1, x2, x3
sub    x4, x5, x1
```

More formally, RAW hazards occur if:

$$R(i) \cap D(j) \neq \emptyset$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Structural and control hazards are not considered here, as they are the same as in an in-order processor.

- **Write-After-Read (WAR)** hazards arise from the name dependence called *anti-dependence*, that occurs when instruction  $j$  writes the same location that  $i$  reads, causing  $i$  to read the wrong value if  $j$  is executed first, as in:

```
add    x1, x2, x3
mul    x2, x5, x6
```

More formally, WAR hazards occur if:

$$D(i) \cap R(j) \neq \emptyset$$

- **Write-After-Write (WAW)** hazards arise from the name dependence called *output dependence*, that occurs when instructions  $i$  and  $j$  write their outputs on the same storage locations, leaving the final wrong value written by  $i$ , if  $j$  is executed first, like in the following:

```
add    x1, x2, x3
mul    x1, x5, x6
```

More formally, WAW hazards occur if:

$$R(i) \cap R(j) \neq \emptyset$$

It is hopefully clear that WAR and WAW hazards occur only in dynamically scheduled processors where instruction order can be rearranged and that the dependencies that cause them are called name dependencies, because it is only a matter of storage location used and not an issue with the correct outcome of the program. In the examples above, if the `mul` instruction could (temporarily) write its output on a different register, until the `add` completes, then the semantics of the program would be respected and the hazards resolved without stalling. That is the idea that lies behind *register renaming*, which is the technique used in out-of-order processors at the decode stage to detect and solve WAR and WAW hazards by converting the architectural registers that instructions refer to to different physical registers hidden to the programmer and compiler.

## 2.2.2 Scheduling techniques

Out-of-order execution needs dedicated hardware to select instructions inside the WOE and detect and prevent hazards. For this purpose, several schemes and algorithms exist, among which are *scoreboarding* and *Tomasulo's algorithm* that are described in the following.

## Scoreboarding

Scoreboarding is a centralized scheduling technique first introduced in the CDC 6600 in the 60s [4] and still widely used today. The algorithm provides the following stages for each instruction after the decoding:

- **Issue:** instructions stall in this stage until there are no structural hazards and all the output dependencies with previously issued instructions are resolved, to avoid WAW hazards.
- **Read operands:** instructions can proceed when their operands are available, resolving RAW hazards, in an out-of-order fashion.
- **Execute:** operands are passed to the functional units that perform the requested operations.
- **Write result:** the write back operation is stalled until all earlier instructions that are anti-dependent have read the previous value, resolving WAR hazards.

Each of these stages can take an arbitrary number of cycles, thus, in order to control the progress of all instructions, a set of three data structures is used as shown in figure 2.4. The first one is the *instruction status* table, that keeps track of which

<i>Instruction status:</i>				<i>Read Exec Write</i>			
Instruction	<i>j</i>	<i>k</i>		<i>Issue</i>	<i>Oper</i>	<i>Comp</i>	<i>Result</i>
LD	F6	34+	R2				
LD	F2	45+	R3				
MULTD	F0	F2	F4				
SUBD	F8	F6	F2				
DIVD	F10	F0	F6				
ADDD	F6	F8	F2				

<i>Functional unit status:</i>				<i>dest</i>	<i>S1</i>	<i>S2</i>	<i>FU</i>	<i>FU</i>	<i>Fj?</i>	<i>Fk?</i>
<i>Time</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Busy</i>	<i>Op</i>	<i>Fi</i>	<i>Fj</i>	<i>Fk</i>	<i>Qj</i>	<i>Qk</i>	<i>Rj</i>	<i>Rk</i>
	Integer	No								
	Mult1	No								
	Mult2	No								
	Add	No								
	Divide	No								

<i>Register result status:</i>				<i>F0</i>	<i>F2</i>	<i>F4</i>	<i>F6</i>	<i>F8</i>	<i>F10</i>	<i>F12</i>	...	<i>F30</i>
Clock												
<i>FU</i>												

Figure 2.4. Scoreboard structure

of the four stages each instruction is currently in. Then, there is the *functional unit status* table, which has nine fields for each functional unit, indicating if that unit is busy, what operation it has to perform, the destination register, the source operands registers, the functional units that will produce the operands and two

flags indicating when those operands are ready. Finally, the *register result status* table indicates for each register which functional unit will write its result to it.

The original scoreboarding algorithm did not include register renaming and so WAW and WAR hazards could potentially cause the pipeline to stall in the issue and write result stages respectively. For this reason, register renaming can still be implemented, but it must be carried out in the issue stage, by a dedicated renaming unit, like the one shown in figure 2.5, based on the one included in the MIPS 10000. The *rename table* keeps track of the mapping between architectural and physical




Figure 2.5. Renaming unit

registers, to maintain correct value references, while the *register free list* contains the names of all available physical registers to be used for renaming. As this unit renames two instructions in parallel, it has to check for RAW hazards between them, and in case there is one, rename the second instruction with the newly assigned physical registers to the other one.

Using this scheme, also known as *explicit* register renaming, WAW and WAR hazards are completely avoided as early as an instruction is decoded and issued, meaning that no further checks must be performed in the later stages of the algorithm.

### Tomasulo's algorithm

Invented by Robert Tomasulo for the IBM 360/91 Floating Point Unit (FPU), this algorithm offers a different approach to dynamic scheduling, by adopting a *distributed* control instead of a centralized one, as present in scoreboarding. This idea

is based around the concept of *reservation stations*, which are buffers placed in front of each functional unit, including load and store units, to store instruction operands. A generic architecture based on Tomasulo's approach is shown in figure 2.6.




Figure 2.6. FPU example architecture using Tomasulo's algorithm [3, p. 198]

Each reservation station contains several fields providing similar information with respect to functional unit status data structure used in scoreboarding: which operation to perform, the reservation stations from which the source operands will come, the value of the operands and the busy status. The key difference with scoreboarding is, however, that the results of the functional units are broadcast to the register file as well as to all the reservation stations through a Common Data Bus (CDB), while the scoreboarding technique only writes results to registers. This, in turn, provides the great advantage of allowing *implicit* register renaming at each reservation station, because register names are discarded when an instruction is issued to a reservation station, as operands will come from another reservation station or from the CDB as soon as they become available. Moreover, if multiple instructions are waiting on the same result, they can all be started simultaneously when such result arrives because of the presence of multiple reservation stations,

while on the other hand, using scoreboarding, they would wait in turn for the register file bus to be free, possibly wasting clock cycles [3, p. 201].

In the end, the steps that each instruction must get through are similar to the one in scoreboarding, but the actions performed are different:

- **Issue:** instructions are fetched in-order from the issue queue stall in this stage until there is a matching reservation station available (no structural hazards) and then are issued to the reservation station with implicit renaming.
- **Execute:** the CDB is monitored until all operands are available (avoid RAW hazards), at which point the functional unit executes the instruction.
- **Write result:** as soon as an operation completes, the result is written on the CDB and from there to the register file and reservation stations.

## 2.3 Speculation

---

Insert  
table at  
p.219

## Chapter 3

# Proposed design

### 3.1 General scheme

### 3.2 PC gen stage

### 3.3 Fetch stage

#### 3.3.1 Branch Prediction Unit (BPU)

#### 3.3.2 Instruction cache interface

#### 3.3.3 Fetch unit

### 3.4 Execution stage

#### 3.4.1 Branch unit



# Chapter 4

## Results

### 4.1 Simulation

#### 4.1.1 Fetch unit

#### 4.1.2 BPU

### 4.2 BPU benchmarking

### 4.3 Synthesis results

## Chapter 5

# Concluding remarks

### 5.1 Future work

# Bibliography

- [1] Waterman A., *Design of the RISC-V Instruction Set Architecture*, PhD diss., Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California at Berkeley, 2016, UCB/EECS-2016-1.
- [2] Patterson D., Waterman A., *The RISC-V Reader: An Open Architecture Atlas*, First edition, Strawberry Canyon, 2017.
- [3] Hennessy J., Patterson D., *Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach*, Sixth edition, Morgan Kaufmann, 2017.
- [4] Thornton J., “Parallel operation in the control data 6600”, *Proceedings of the October 27–29, 1964, fall joint computer conference, part II: very high speed computer systems*, vol. 26, pp. 33-40, 1965.
- [5] Mittal S., “A Survey of Techniques for Dynamic Branch Prediction”, *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2019.