



# Reliable Decentralized Architectures

Andrea Pellegrini, Biruk Mammo, Valeria Bertacco – University of Michigan



Theme 5 – Robust Design

TASK 5.2 Fully decentralized architectures

## 1. Motivation

**Traditional CMP**

- Rigidly connected hardware modules
- Centralized control logic
- Single points of failure

Traditional CMP degrades poorly as fault rates increase  
... **won't survive high fault rates expected at future technology nodes**

## 2. Decentralized architectures

- Sea of redundant HW modules
  - Fine-grained redundancy
- Decentralized control logic
  - Scheduling units schedule execution to HW modules
  - No single points of failure
- Redundant homogeneous interconnect
  - Loosely coupled HW modules
  - Well defined communication interfaces

Examples:

- StageNet [Micro08]
- WaveScalar [Micro03]
- Viper [ISCA12]

## 3. Reliable distributed architecture: Cobra

- ISA defines set of **services** needed by instructions
- Program is partitioned into instruction **bundles**
- HW modules **perform services** needed by bundles
- Virtual pipelines** formed at runtime
  - HW modules independently **propose to service** bundles
  - Bundle Scheduling Units (BSUs) **assign modules** to bundles and coordinate execution

Bundles typically terminate with control instructions

## 4. Cobra execution model

Bundle 1: 4013c3: add %al, [%ebx]

Bundle 2: 4013c8: or %al, %bl

| BSU ID | PC     | NPC    | Fetch | Reg | Exec | WB |
|--------|--------|--------|-------|-----|------|----|
| 1      | 4013c3 | 4013c8 | F0    | R1  | E0   | W0 |

module assignments => the virtual pipeline

## 5. Optimizations

- Localized HW configuration
  - Reduces instruction execution latency
  - Minimizes interconnect traffic
- HW configuration transferring
  - Reduces traffic to set up the system
  - Preserves data locality
- Thread-aware cache design
  - Enforces memory access order
  - Enables fast, distributed data caches

## 6. Performance improvements

- For multi-programmed workloads, optimizations give a performance advantage to Cobra over earlier solutions
- 8x better performance than Viper at 16 processes, only 34.7% slower than an area-equivalent CMP**

## 7. Resiliency

- Fault detection
  - Redundant execution
  - Symptom-based detection
  - Online testing
- Hardware reconfiguration
  - Disable faulty modules \*
- System state restoration
  - Architectural state and memory restored to previous safe checkpoint

\* System can function as long as there is at least one fault-free HW module per service and at least two BSUs

## 8. Fault diagnosis overheads

- Cobra modules tested periodically in 20M cycle intervals
- The avg. performance hit of periodic tests is less than 5% – a 3x improvement over a regular core**

## 9. Resiliency results

- Modeled and simulated using gem5, with SPEC CPU2006
  - CMP: 4 OoO cores, 12 stage pipeline, 128 entry ROB, 32k D\$ & I\$
  - Cobra: 13 services, 5 HW module types (4-16 copies each)
- Beyond 3 faults, Cobra outperforms an area-equivalent CMP of 4 cores**