

Name: Rahul Vigneshwaran KRoll number: CS28MTECH02002

(9)

1. DNNE Explorer generates hardware design: [1]

- ☒ a. Specific for a given CNN
- b. Common design for many CNNs

2. The total number of MAC operations performed by CGNet is always constant for a given CNN: [1]

- ☒ a. True
- b. False

3. How is the pruning in channel gating (CGNet) different from the weight pruning approach? [2]

→ In weight pruning we prune out weights that are below certain threshold in a static manner after training

→ In CGNet we do it dynamically on the fly based on the inputs during the training.

✓ → Weight pruning doesn't depend on input while CGNet does.

→ Channel gating is much more structured w.r.t input than weight pruning.

→ Channel gating prunes the input effectively reducing comp while weight pruning prunes trained weight.

4. Why does DNNE Explorer use a custom pipeline design for each of the few initial layers and the generic structure for the later layers? [3]

→ When checked empirically the variance of CTC for the first half is much higher compared to second half.

→ Higher CTC variance indicates the necessity for much more specialized pipeline than a generic works for all one.

3

5. CGNet uses a banked SRAM structure (splitting the weight values into small sized SRAM banks). Why CGNet needs to use it and how it helps? [3]

- ~~Doing~~
- CGNet General conv happens as $W * x$ but
CGNet conv happens like $W_p * x_p + W_n * x_n$.
- Therefore splitting the weight values into small SRAM banks help ~~increase~~ increase the reuse of the banks rather than parsing through the entire weights everytime.
- CGNet being weight stationary & dynamic in nature will exponentially increase the access cost if not for the banked SRAMs.

✓