

# A Circuit Level Implementation of an Adaptive Issue Queue for Power-Aware Microprocessors

Alper Buyuktosunoglu, David Albonesi  
University of Rochester  
Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Rochester, NY  
buyuktos@ece.rochester.edu

Stanley Schuster, David Brooks  
Pradip Bose, Peter Cook  
IBM T. J. Watson Research Center  
Yorktown Heights, NY

## ABSTRACT

Increasing power dissipation has become a major constraint for future performance gains in the design of microprocessors. In this paper, we present the circuit design of an issue queue for a superscalar processor that leverages transmission gate insertion to provide dynamic low-cost configurability of size and speed. A novel circuit structure dynamically gathers statistics of issue queue activity over intervals of instruction execution. These statistics are then used to change the size of an issue queue organization on-the-fly to improve issue queue energy and performance. When applied to a fixed, full-size issue queue structure, the result is up to a 70% reduction in energy dissipation. The complexity of the additional circuitry to achieve this result is almost negligible. Furthermore, self-timed techniques embedded in the adaptive scheme can provide a 56% decrease in cycle time of the CAM array read of the issue queue when we change the adaptive issue queue size from 32 entries (largest possible) to 8 entries (smallest possible in our design).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The out-of-order issue queue structure is a major contributor to the overall power consumption in a modern superscalar processor, like the Alpha 21264 and Mips R10000 [9, 15]. It also requires the use of complex control logic in determining and selecting the ready instructions. Such complexity, besides adding to the overall power consumption, also complicates the verification task. Recent work by Gonzalez et al. [6, 8] has addressed these problems, by proposing design schemes that reduce either the control logic complexity [6] or the power [8] without significantly impacting the IPC (instruction per cycle) performance. In [6], the authors propose and evaluate two different schemes. In the first approach, the complexity of the issue logic is reduced by having a separate *ready queue* which only holds instructions with operands that are determined to be fully available at decode time. Thus, instructions can be issued *in-order* from

this *ready queue* at reduced complexity, without any associative lookup. A separate *first-use* table is used to hold instructions, indexed by unavailable operand register specifiers. Only those instructions that are the first-time consumers of these pending operands are stored in this table. Instructions which are deeper in the dependence chain simply stall or are handled separately through a separate issue queue. The dependence link information connecting multiple instances of the same instruction in the *first-use* table is updated after each instruction execution is completed. At the same time, if a given instruction is deemed to be *ready* it is moved to the in-order ready queue. Since none of the new structures require associative lookups or run-time dependence analysis, and yet, instructions are able to migrate to the ready queue as soon as their operands become available, this scheme significantly reduces the complexity of the issue logic.

The second approach relies on static scheduling. Here, the main issue queue only holds instructions with pre-determined availability times of their source operands. Since the queue entries are time-ordered (due to known availabilities), the issue logic can use simple, in-order semantics. Instructions with operands which have unknown availability times are held in a separate *wait queue* and get moved to the main issue queue only when those times become definite. In both approaches described in [6], the emphasis is on reduction of the complexity of the issue control logic. The added (or augmented) support structures in these schemes may actually cause an increase of power, in spite of the simplicity and elegance of the control logic. In [8], the main focus is on power reduction. The issue queue is designed to be a circular queue structure, with head and tail pointers, and the effective size is dynamically adapted to fit the ILP (Instruction Level Parallelism) content of the workload during different periods of execution.

The work in [8] leverages previous work [1, 2] in dynamically sizing the issue queue. In both [6] and [8], the authors show that the IPC loss is very small with the suggested modifications to the issue queue structure and logic. Also, in [8], the authors use a trace-driven power-performance simulator (based on the model by Cai [5]) to report substantial power savings on dynamic queue sizing. However, a detailed circuit-level design and simulation of the proposed implementations are not reported in [6] or [8]. Without such analysis, it is difficult to gauge the cycle-time impact or the

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work or personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

GLSVLSI 2001, West Lafayette, Indiana, USA  
© ACM 2001 1-58113-351-0/00/03...\$5.00

extra power/complexity of the augmented design.

In our work, we propose a new adaptive issue queue organization and we evaluate the power savings and the logic overhead through actual circuit-level implementations and their simulation. This work was done as a part of a research project targeted to explore power-saving opportunities in future, high-end processor development within IBM. Our scheme is simpler than that reported in [6, 8] in that it does not introduce any new data storage or access structure (like the first-use table or the wait queue in [6]). Rather, it proposes to use an existing framework, like the CAM/RAM structure commonly used in the design of issue queues [10]. However, the effective size of the issue queue is dynamically adapted to fit the workload demands. This aspect of the design is conceptually similar to the method proposed in [8] but our control logic is quite different.

## 2. CHARACTERISTICS OF A CONVENTIONAL ISSUE QUEUE

The purpose of the issue queue is to receive instructions from the dispatch stage and forward *ready instructions* to the execution units. An instruction is ready to issue when the data needed by its source operands and the functional unit are available or will be available by the time the instruction is ready to read the operands, prior to execution. The operations performed by a typical CAM/RAM based issue queue design is illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Operations performed by the issue queue and their dependencies

Many superscalar microprocessors, such as the Alpha 21264 [9] and Mips R10000 [15] use a distributed issue queue structure, which may include separate queues for integer and floating point operations. For instance in the Alpha 21264 [14], the issue queue is implemented as flip-flop latch-based FIFO queues with a *compaction* strategy, i.e., every cycle, the instructions in the queue are shifted to fill up any *holes* created due to prior-cycle issues. This makes efficient use of the queue resource, while also simplifying the wake-up and selection control logic. However, compaction entails shifting instructions around in the queue every cycle and depending on the instruction word width may therefore be a source of considerable power consumption. Studies have shown that overall performance is largely independent of what selection policy is used (oldest first, position based, etc.) [4]. As such, the compaction strategy may not be best suited for low power operation; nor is it critical to achieving good performance. So, in this research project, an initial decision was made to avoid compaction. Even if this means that the

select arbitration must be performed over a window size of the entire queue, this is still a small price to pay compared to shifting multiple queue entries each cycle.

Due to the above considerations, a decision was made to use a RAM/CAM based solution [10]. Intuitively, a RAM/CAM would be inherently lower power due to its smaller area and because it naturally supports a *non-compaction* strategy. The RAM/CAM structure forms the core of our issue queue design. The op-code, destination register specifier, and other instruction fields (such as the instruction tag) are stored in the RAM. The source tags are stored in the CAM and are compared to the result tags from the execution stage every cycle. Once all source operands are available, the instruction is ready to issue provided its functional unit is available. The tag comparisons performed by the CAM and the checks to verify that all operands are available constitute the *wakeup* part of the issue unit operation. While potentially consuming less power than a flip-flop based solution, the decision of using a RAM/CAM structure for the issue queue is not without its drawbacks. CAM and RAM structures are in fact inherently power hungry as they need to precharge and discharge internal high capacitance lines and nodes for every operation. The CAM needs to perform tag matching operations every cycle. This involves driving and clearing high capacitance tag-lines, and also precharging and discharging high capacitance matchline nodes every cycle. Similarly, the RAM also needs to charge and discharge its bitlines for every read operation. Our research on low-power issue queue designs was focused on two aspects: (a) Innovating new circuit structures, which reduce power consumption in the basic CAM/RAM structure; and (b) Dynamic adaptation of the effective CAM/RAM structure by exploiting workload variability. This paper describes the work done on the second aspect. However, dynamic queue sizing can degrade CPI performance as well. Part of the design challenge faced in this work was to ensure that the overall design choices do not impact performance significantly, while ensuring a substantial power reduction.

Non-adaptive designs (like the R10000 and Alpha 21264) use fixed-size resources and a fixed functionality across all program runs. The choices are made to achieve best overall performance over a range of applications. However, an individual application whose requirements are not well matched to this particular hardware organization may exhibit poor performance. Even a single application run may exhibit enough variability that causes uneven use of the chip resources during different phases. Adaptive design ideas (e.g., [1]) exploit the workload variability to dynamically adapt the machine resources to match the program characteristics. As shown in [1], such ideas can be used to increase overall performance by exploiting reduced access latencies in dynamically resized resources.

Non-adaptive designs are inherently power-inefficient as well. A fixed queue will waste power unnecessarily in the entries that are not in use. Figure 2 shows utilization data for one of the queue resources within a high performance processor core when simulating the SPECint95 benchmarks. From this figure, we see that the upper 9 entries contribute to 80% of the valid entry count. Dynamic queue sizing clearly has the potential of achieving significant power reduction as




Figure 2: Histogram of valid entries for an integer queue averaged over SPECint95

other research has demonstrated as well [2, 8]. One option to save power is to clock-gate each issue queue entry on a cycle by cycle basis. However, clock gating alone does not address some of the largest components of the issue queue power such as the CAM taglines, the RAM/CAM precharge logic, and RAM/CAM bitlines. So a scheme which allows shutting down the queue in *chunks* based on usage reductions to address these other power components can produce significant additional power savings over clock gating. This idea forms the basis of the design described in this paper.

### 3. ADAPTIVE ISSUE QUEUE DESIGN

In this section, we discuss the adaptive issue queue design in detail. First, we describe the high-level structure of the queue. Then, we present partitioning of the CAM/RAM array and the self-timed sense amplifier design. Finally, we discuss the shutdown logic that is employed to configure the adaptive issue queue at run-time.

#### 3.1 High-Level Structure

Our approach to issue queue power savings is to dynamically shut down and re-enable entire blocks of the queue. Shutting down blocks rather than individual entries achieves a more coarse-grained precharge gating. A high-level mechanism monitors the activity of the issue queue over a period of execution called the cycle window and gathers statistics using hardware counters (discussed in section 3.3). At the end of the cycle window, the decision logic enables the appropriate control signals to disable and enable queue blocks. A very simple mechanism for the decision logic in pseudocode is listed below.

```

if (present_IPC < factor * last_IPC)
    increase_size;
else if (counter < threshold_1)
    decrease_size;
else if (counter < threshold_2)
    retain_current_size;
else increase_size;

```

At the end of the cycle window, there are four possible actions. The issue queue size is ramped up to next larger queue size of the current one if the present IPC is a factor lower than the last IPC during the last cycle window.

This guarding mechanism attempts to limit the performance loss of adaptation. Otherwise, depending on the comparison of counter values with certain threshold values the decision logic may do the following: i) increase issue queue size by enabling higher order entries ii) retain the current size, or iii) decrease the size by disabling the highest order entries. Note that a simple NOR of all the active instructions in a chunk ensures that all entries are issued before the chunk is disabled.

#### 3.2 Partitioning of the RAM/CAM Array and Self-Timed Sense Amplifiers

The proposed adaptive CAM/RAM structure is illustrated in Figure 3. The effective sizes of the individual arrays can




Figure 3: Adaptive CAM/RAM structure

be changed at run-time by adjusting the enable inputs that control the transmission gates. For our circuit-level implementation and simulation study, a 32-entry issue queue is assumed which is partitioned into four 8-entry chunks. For the taglines, a separate scheme is employed in order to avoid a cycle time impact. A global tag-line is traversed through the CAM array and its local tag-lines are enabled/disabled depending on the control inputs. The sense amplifiers and precharge logic are located at the bottom of both arrays. Another feature of the design is that these CAM and RAM structures are implemented as self-timed blocks. The timing of the structure is performed via an extra dummy bitline within the datapath of CAM/RAM structures, which has the same layout as the real bitlines. A logic zero is stored in every dummy cell. A reading operation of the selected cell creates a logical one to zero transition on the dummy bitline that controls the set input of the sense amplifier. (Note that the dummy bitline is precharged each cycle as with the other bitlines.) This work assumes a latching sense amplifier that is able to operate with inputs near V<sub>dd</sub> as shown in Figure 3. When the set input is high, a small voltage difference from the memory cell passes through the NMOS pass gates of the sense amplifier. When the set signal goes low, the cross-coupled devices amplify this difference to a full rail signal as the pass gates turn off.

Figure 4 shows data from CAM read simulations. In this simulation, the issue queue size is changed from 32 entries

down to 8 entries successively and the data is read correspondingly. (The third, fourth and fifth signals from the top of Figure 4 correspond to en3, en2 and en1 signals, respectively, in Figure 3.) The sixth signal waveform from the top of the figure shows the variation in latencies. When the issue queue size is 8, a faster access time is achieved because of the 24 disabled entries. The self-timed sense amplifier structure takes advantage of this feature by employing the dummy bitline to allow faster operation, i.e., the dummy bitline enables the sense amplifiers at the exact time the data becomes available. Simulations show that one may achieve up to a 56% decrease in the cycle time of the CAM array read by this method. Therefore, downsizing to a smaller number of entries results in a faster issue queue cycle time and saves energy, similar to prior work related to adaptive cache designs [3, 11].




Figure 4: Adaptive CAM array read simulation results

Combining this variable latency issue queue design with a synchronous pipeline stage is not straightforward. The main problem is to avoid synchronization failure (metastable state). One technique to prevent synchronization failures is a stoppable clock [12]. A sense amplifier following the dummy line generates a Done signal for the issue queue. This signal causes the synchronous circuit's clock to stop when the synchronous stage is not able to receive or communicate new data. Another alternative is to integrate the design with self-timed execution units, although synchronization must still be performed after the execute stage. The discussion of synchronization is beyond the scope of this paper, but several schemes are discussed in the literature [7, 12, 13].

### 3.3 Shutdown Logic

Figure 5 illustrates the high-level operation of the shutdown logic. It consists of bias logic at the first stage followed by the statistics process&storage stage. The activity information is first filtered by the bias logic and then it is fed to the process&storage stage where the information is fed to counters. At the end of the cycle window, this data passes through the decision logic to generate the corresponding control inputs.




Figure 5: High-level structure of shutdown logic and logic table for bias logic

The 32-entry issue queue is partitioned into 8-entry chunks that are separately monitored for activity. The bias logic block monitors the activity of the issue queue in 4-entry chunks. This scheme is employed to decrease the fan-in of the bias logic. The bias logic simply gathers the activity information over four entries and averages them over each cycle. The activity state of each instruction may be inferred from the *ready flag* of that particular queue entry. One particular state of interest is when exactly half of the entries in the monitored chunk are active. One alternative is to statically choose either active or not active in this particular case. Another approach is to dynamically change this choice by making use of an extra logic signal variable. (See Adaptive Bias Logic in Figure 5.)

The statistics process&storage stage, which is shown in Figure 6, is comprised of two different parts. The detection logic




Figure 6: Statistics process and storage stage for shutdown logic

provides the value that will be added to the final counter. It gathers the number of active chunks from the bias logic outputs and then generates a certain value (e.g., if there are

two active 8-entry chunks, the detection logic will generate binary two to add to the final counter). The second part, which is the most power hungry, is the flip-flop and adder pair (forming the counter). Each cycle, this counter is incremented by the number of active clusters (8 entry chunks). In this figure one can also see the function of the detection logic. The zeros in the inputs correspond to the non-active clusters and the ones to active clusters. The result section shows which value in binary should be added. For 32 entries, two of these detection circuits and a small three-bit adder are required to produce the counter input. One of the detection logic units covers the upper 16 entries and the other one covers the bottom 16 entries.

A primary goal in designing the shutdown logic is not to add too much overhead to the conventional design in terms of transistor count and energy dissipation. Table 1 shows the complexity of the shutdown logic in terms of transistor count. From this table it is clear that the extra logic adds only a small amount of complexity to the overall issue queue. AS/X [16] simulations show that this extra circuitry dissipates 3% of the energy dissipated by the whole CAM/RAM structure on average.

#### 4. CIRCUIT SIMULATION RESULTS

Figure 7 shows the energy savings (from AS/X simulations) achieved with an adaptive RAM array. (Note that in this figure only positive energy savings numbers are presented.) There are several possible energy/performance tradeoff points depending on the transistor width of the transmission gates. A larger transistor width results in less cycle time impact, although more energy is dissipated. The cycle time impact of the additional circuitry did not affect the overall target frequency of the processor across all cases. (This was true also for the CAM structure.) By going down to 0.39 $\mu$ m transistor width, one can obtain an energy savings of up to 44%. These numbers are inferred from the energy dissipation corresponding to one read operation of a 32-entry conventional RAM array and that of various alternatives of the adaptive RAM array. (The size of the queue is varied over the value points: 8, 16, 24 and 32.) An interesting feature of the adaptive design is that it achieves energy savings even with 32 entries enabled. This is because the transmission gates in the adaptive design reduce the signal swing therefore resulting in less energy dissipation. The adaptive RAM array delay values are illustrated in Figure 8 for various numbers of enabled entries and transmission gate transistor widths.

The adaptive CAM array energy and delay values are presented in Figure 9 and Figure 10, respectively, for various numbers of enabled entries and transmission gate transistor widths. These values account for the additional circuitry that generates the final request signal for each entry (input to the arbiter logic). With this structure, a 75% savings in energy dissipation is achieved by downsizing from 32 entries to 8 entries. Furthermore, the cycle time of the CAM array read is reduced by 56%. It should be noted that a 32 entry conventional CAM structure consumes roughly the same amount of energy as the adaptive CAM array with 32 entries. Because the CAM array dissipates ten times more energy than the RAM array (using 2.34 $\mu$ m transmission gate transistor width) a 75% energy savings in the CAM array corresponds to a 70% overall issue queue energy sav-




Figure 7: Adaptive RAM array energy savings




Figure 8: Adaptive RAM array delay values

ings (shutdown logic overhead is included).




Figure 9: Adaptive CAM array energy values

Issue Queue Number of Entries	Transistor Counts Issue Queue	Transistor Counts Shutdown Logic	Complexity of Shutdown Logic
16	28820	802	2.8%
32	57108	1054	1.8%
64	113716	1736	1.5%
128	227092	2530	1.1%

Table 1: Complexity of shutdown logic in terms of transistor count




Figure 10: Adaptive CAM array delay values

## 5. CONCLUSION

We examine the power saving potential of an adaptive, out-of-order issue queue structure. We propose an implementation that divides the issue queue into separate chunks, connected via transmission gates. These gates are controlled by signals which determine whether a particular chunk is to be disabled to reduce the effective queue size. The queue size control signals are derived from counters that keep track of the *active state* of each queue entry on a cycle-by-cycle basis. After a (programmable) cycle window, the decision to resize the queue can be made based on the activity profile monitored. The major contribution of this work is a detailed, circuit-level implementation backed by (AS/X) simulation-based analysis to quantify the net power savings that can be achieved by various levels of queue size reduction.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to thank John Wellman, Prabhakar Kudva, Victor Zyuban and Hans Jacobson for many interesting discussions and helpful hints.

## 7. REFERENCES

- [1] D. H. Albonesi. Dynamic IPC/Clock Rate Optimization. Proc. ISCA-25, pp. 282-292, June/July 1998.
- [2] D. H. Albonesi. The Inherent Energy Efficiency of Complexity-Adaptive Processors. Proc. ISCA Workshop on Power-Driven Microarchitecture, June 1998.
- [3] R. Balasubramonian, D.H. Albonesi, A. Buyuktosunoglu, and S. Dwarkadas. Memory Hierarchy Reconfiguration for Energy and Performance in General-Purpose Processor Architectures. 33rd International Symposium on Microarchitecture, pp. 245-257, December 2000.
- [4] M. Butler and Y.N. Patt. An investigation of the performance of various dynamic scheduling techniques. Proc. ISCA-92, pp. 1-9.
- [5] G. Cai. Architectural level power/performance optimization and dynamic power estimation. Proc. of the Cool Chips Tutorial, in conjunction with Micro-32, 1999.
- [6] R. Canal and A. Gonzalez. A low-complexity issue logic. Proc. ACM Int'l. Conference on Supercomputing (ICS), pp. 327-335, Santa Fe, N.M., June 2000.
- [7] D. M. Chapiro. Globally-Asynchronous Locally-Synchronous systems. PhD thesis, Stanford University, October 1984.
- [8] D. Folegnani and A. Gonzalez. Reducing the power consumption of the issue logic. Proc. ISCA Workshop on Complexity-Effective Design, June 2000.
- [9] R. Kessler. The Alpha 21264 microprocessor. IEEE Micro, 19(2): 24-36, March/April 1999.
- [10] S. Palacharla, N. P. Jouppi and J. E. Smith. Complexity-effective superscalar processors. Proc. ISCA-97, pp. 206-218, June 1997.
- [11] M. D. Powell, S.H. Yang, B. Falsafi, K. Roy, T. N. Vijaykumar. Gated-Vdd: A Circuit Technique to Reduce Leakage in Deep-Submicron Cache Memories. ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Low Power Electronics and Design (ISLPED), 2000.
- [12] C. L. Seitz. System Timing. In Carver A. Mead and Lynn A. Conway, editors, Introduction to VLSI Systems, chapter 7, Addison-Wesley, 1980.
- [13] A. Sjogren and C. Myers. Interfacing synchronous and asynchronous modules within a high-speed pipeline. Proceedings of the 17th Conference on Advanced Research in VLSI, September 1997.
- [14] K. Wilcox and S. Manne. Alpha Processors: A history of power issues and a look to the future. Proc. of the Cool Chips Tutorial, in conjunction with Micro-32, 1999.
- [15] K. Yeager. The Mips R10000 superscalar microprocessor. IEEE Micro, 16(2): 28-41, April 1996.
- [16] AS/X User's Guide. IBM Corporation, New York, 1996.