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## Computer is everywhere



## Class of Computers

| Feature | Personal <br> mobile device <br> (PMD) | Desktop | Server | Clusters/warehouse- <br> scale computer | Embedded |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Price of <br> system | $\$ 100-\$ 1000$ | $\$ 300-\$ 2500$ | $\$ 5000-\$ 10,000,000$ | $\$ 100,000-\$ 200,000,000$ | $\$ 10-\$ 100,000$ |
| Price of <br> micro- <br> processor | $\$ 10-\$ 100$ | $\$ 50-\$ 500$ | $\$ 200-\$ 2000$ | $\$ 50-\$ 250$ | $\$ 0.01-\$ 100$ |
| Critical <br> system <br> design <br> issues | Cost, energy, <br> media <br> performance, <br> responsiveness | Price- <br> performance, <br> energy, <br> graphics <br> performance | Throughput, <br> availability, <br> scalability, energy | Price-performance, <br> throughput, energy <br> proportionality | Price, energy, <br> application-specific <br> performance |

Figure 1.2 A summary of the five mainstream computing classes and their system characteristics. Sales in 2010 included about 1.8 billion PMDs ( $90 \%$ cell phones), 350 million desktop PCs, and 20 million servers. The total number of embedded processors sold was nearly 19 billion. In total, 6.1 billion ARM-technology based chips were shipped in 2010. Note the wide range in system price for servers and embedded systems, which go from USB keys to network routers. For servers, this range arises from the need for very large-scale multiprocessor systems for high-end transaction processing.

## Intel v.s. ARM

Number of chips sold (billions)



## IoT - ARM




## Time-line

$\square$ Mid-1800 Programmable computer

- Charles Babbage (analytical engine)
- Ada Lovelace (programmer)
$\square 1940$ sirst modern computers
- Zuse, MARK, ENIAC, ...
$\square 1960$ s Mainframe
- 1964 IBM System/360
$\square 1970$ s Minicomputer
- 1971 First microprocessor
- Graphics Xerox Alto



## Time-line

## -1980s Desktop

- 1977 Apple II
- 1981 IBM PC
-1990s PDA
$\square 2000$ s Embeded computers
$\square 2010 s$ Cloud computing
$\square 2020$ s Boundless computing
- http://anddum.com/timeline/history short.htm



## The first electronic computer



ENIAC-1946 18000 vacuum tubes, 30 ton, $150 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$,140kW
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## The first electronic computer



ENIAC-1946
18000 tubes, 30 ton, $150 \mathrm{~m}^{2}$, 140kW

The first electronic computer

## "I think there is a world market for maybe five computers." <br> -- Thomas Watson, chairman of IBM, 1943

"Computers in the future may weigh no more than 1.5 tons."
-- Popular Mechanics, forecasting the relentless march of science, 1949

## "640K ought to be enough for anybody." -- Bill Gates, 1981

ENIAC-1946<br>18000 tubes, 30 ton, 150 m$^{2}$,140kW

## The imitation game




## Alan Turing




## Interlude: Debug

In 1947, Rear Admiral Grace Murray Hopper and associates was working on Mark II, the machine was experiencing problems. An investigation showed that there was a moth trapped in a relay. The operators removed the moth and affixed it to the log. The computer had been "debugged".



## Development of Microprocessor

|  | Year | Transistors | Frequency | cores | Cache |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Intel4004 | 1971 | 2300 | 108 kHz | $" 1 "$ | None |
| Z80 | 1976 | 8500 | 2.5 MHz | 1 | None |
| Intel386 | 1985 | 280000 | 16 MHz | 1 | None |
| Intel486 | 1989 | 1185000 | $20-50 \mathrm{MHz}$ | 1 | 8 kB |
| Pentium 4 | 2000 | 44000000 | $1-2 \mathrm{GHz}$ | 1 | 256 kB |
| Nehalem | 2008 | 731000000 | $>3.6 \mathrm{GHz}$ | 4 | 8 MB |
| Sandy Bridge | 2011 | 995000000 | 3.8 GHz | $4+$ | $8+1 \mathrm{MB}$ |
| Haswell | 2013 | 1860000000 | $>3.6 \mathrm{GHz}$ | 6 | $15+1.5 \mathrm{M}$ |
| Itanium 9560 | 2012 | 3100000000 | 2.5 GHz | 8 | $32+6 \mathrm{MB}$ |



## Outline
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$\square$
$\square$
$\square$
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# The art of designing computers is based on engineering principles and quantitative performance evaluation 



## Computer abstraction levels

| $\begin{aligned} & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & \sum_{0}^{0} \\ & \sum_{0}^{2} \\ & i n \end{aligned}$ |  |  | olication |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Assembler | Operating System |  |  |
|  | Linker | Loader | Scheduler | Device Drivers |
| Instruction Set Architecture (Interface SW/HW) |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \frac{0}{\sqrt[0]{0}} \\ \frac{\sum_{0}^{0}}{\substack{0}} \\ \frac{\pi}{0} \end{gathered}$ | Processor |  | Memory | I/O System |
|  | Datapath \& Control Design |  |  |  |
|  | Digital Logic Design |  |  |  |
|  | Circuit Design |  |  |  |
|  | Physical (IC Layout) Design |  |  |  |

## Computer Architecture

Computer architecture is a set of disciplines that describe the functionality, organization and implementation of computer systems.
-ISA: Instruction-set architecture
$\square$ Computer orginization: micro architecture
$\square$ Specific implementation


## ISA

An instruction set architecture (ISA) is the interface between the computer's software and hardware and also can be viewed as the programmer's view of the machine.

MIPS32 Add Immediate Instruction

| 001000 | 00001 | 00010 | $\mathbf{0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OP Code | Addr 1 | Addr 2 | Immedian value |

Equivalent mnemonic:


## Microarchitecture

Microarchitecture is the way a given instruction set architecture (ISA) is implemented on a processor.


## Microarchitecture

Microarchitecture is the way a given instruction set architecture (ISA) is implemented on a processor.


Intel Care 2 Architecture

## Microarchitecture

## ARM ${ }^{\circledR}$ Cortex $^{\circledR}$-A72

ARM CoreSight ${ }^{\text {™ }}$ Multicore Debug and Trace


128-bit AMBA ${ }^{\oplus} 4$ ACE or AMBA 5 CHI Coherent Bus Interface

## Implementation



## The role of computer architecture?

Make design decisions across the interface between hardware and software in order to meet functional and performance goals.


## Why computer architecture?

$\square$ Understand how to evaluate and choose

- What do we mean "one computer is faster than another"?
- How can Gene Amdahl help you decide which enhancement is the best?
- Is a larger cache better than higher clock frequency?
- Why is pipelining faster than combinational circuits?
- Different levels of caches - why?
$\square$ Design your own specialized architecture
- Embedded special purpose processors
$\square$ Axis Communications/Ericsson/Nokia/ARM/SAAB -...
$\square$ Write better program


## What computer architecture?

## $\square$ Design and analysis

- ISA
- Orgnization (microarchitecture)
- Implementation
$\square$ To meet requirements of
- Functionality (application, standards...)
- Price
- Performance
- Power
- Reliability
- Dependability
- Compatability
..


## What affect computer architecture?

Technology

Software


## X86 Architecture



## Architecture change due to new applications



## Architecture change due to new applications




## Outline
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## $\square$ This Course

$\square$
$\square$
$\square$


## Course Objectives

## After this course, you will...

$\square$ Have a thorough knowledge about the design principles for modern computer systems
$\square$ Have an understanding of the relations between

- The design of the instruction set of a processor
- The microarchitecture of a processor
$\square$ Be able to evaluate design alternatives towards design goals using quantitative evaluation methods
$\square$ Side effects...
- Better digital IC designer
- Better understanding of compiler, operating system, highperformance programming


## Book Recommendation

## -Computer Architecture - A Quantitative Approach

- Hennessy, Patterson
- $5^{\text {th }}$ Edition




## Course Content \& Schedule


$\square$ Overview
$\square$ Instruction set architecture
$\square$ Pipeline
$\square$ Memory System
$\square$ Storage System
$\square \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{Os}$
$\square$ Embedded \& application specific processing

## Teachers

## - Lecture

- Liang Liu, Assistant Professor
- Email: liang.liu@eit.Ith.se
- Room: E2342
- Homepage: http://www.eit.|th.se/staff/Liang.Liu
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## Teachers

## - Lecture

- Liang Liu, Assistant Professor
- Email: liang.liu@eit.Ith.se
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## $\square$ Teaching Assistants

- Michal Stala


## $\square$ Invited Lectures

TOTAL SMARTPHONE CHIPSET SHIPMENT :2014



## Lectures and Labs

$\square$ Lectures (10)

- Tuesday : 13:15-15:00 E:1406
- Thursday: 08:15-10:00 E:1406
- Covers design principles and analysis methodology
- Read the literature before each lecture
- Does not cover all of the literature
- Ask many questions!
$\square$ Labs (4)
- Tuesday: 08:15-12:00 E:4118-E:4119
- Friday: 08:15-12:00 E:4118-E:4119
- 2 students/group
- Read manual and literature before the lab
- Do Home Assignments before lab (or be sent home)
- Experiment and discuss with assistants
- Understand what you have done (or FAIL the exam)
- Finish Lab before DEADLINE



## Examination (Written)

$\square$ Anonymous exam
$\square$ Pass all labs to be able to attend written exam $\square$ Five problems

- Highly lab related
- Problem solving
- Descriptive nature


## Questions?



## Outline
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## $\square$ Trends
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## Moore's Law

The experts look ahead

Cramming more components onto integrated circuits

With unit cost falling as the number of components per circuit rises, by 1975 economics may dictate squeezing as many as $\mathbf{6 5 , 0 0 0}$ components on a single silicon chip

By Gordon E. Moore
Drrector, Research and Dovolopmort Laboratorioes
division of Fairchild Camera and Instrument Corp.
division of Fairctilid Camera and instrument Corp.

$\square$ Electronics, Apr. 19, 1965 Gordon Moore (co-founder of Intel) described a doubling every year in the number of components per integrated circuit



## Moore's Law

Moore reformulates to a doubling every 2 years. (1975) Interview 2000:
"...change the doubling time again... to maybe four or five years."


Gordon Moore Co-founder of Intel

ca. 1 billion transistors in 2007


## Performance of Microprocessor



## Performance of Car Compared

| Improve rate computers | Car speed | Car fuel economy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 160 km/h | $9 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{l}$ |
| $35 \%$ | 3216 km/h | $181 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{l}$ |
| 50 \% | 31136 km/h | 1751 km/l |
| uld drop to 25 | S \$ per car. |  |

Bill Gates: "if GM had kept up with the technology like the computer industry has, we would all be driving $\$ 25.00$ cars that got $\mathbf{1 , 0 0 0}$ miles to the gallon."

If automobile speed had increased at the same speed as clock frequency, you could now drive from San Francisco to New York in about 13 seconds!

## Performance of Car Compared

## In response to Bill's comments, General Motors issued a press release stating:

If GM had developed technology like Microsoft; we would all be driving cars with the following characteristics:

1. For no reason whatsoever, your car would crash twice a day.
2. Every time they repainted the lines in the road, you would have to buy a new car.
3. Occasionally your car would die on the freeway for no reason. You would have to pull over to the side of the road, close all of the windows, shut off the car, restart it, and reopen the windows before you could continue.
For some reason you would simply accept this.
4. Occasionally, executing a maneuver such as a left turn would cause your car to shut down and refuse to restart, in which case you would have to reinstall the engine. 5. Only one person at a time could use the car unless you bought 'CarNT', but then you would have to buy more seats.
5. The airbag system would ask, "are you sure?" before deploying.
6. Occasionally, for no reason whatsoever, your car would lock you out and refuse to let you in until you simultaneously lifted the door handle, turned the key and grabbed hold of the radio antenna.
7. Every time GM introduced a new car, car buyers would have to learn to drive all over again because none of the controls would operate in the same manner as the old che.

## Does not Apply to All

$\square$ Processing power doubles every 18 months
$\square$ Memory size doubles every 18 months
$\square$ Disk capacity doubles every 18 months
$\square$ Disk positioning rate (seek \& rotate) doubles every ten years!
$\square$ Speed of DRAM and disk improves a few \% per year



## Moore's Law: power density




## Heating (power) is a issue

## TECHNOLOGY

## Qualcomm Snapdragon 820 Faces Heating Problems: Report

Qualcomm might run into more trouble, after reports surfaced that the next-gen Snapdragon chipset has overheating issues

- Huawei uses in-house Kirin processors in its flagship devices.
- LG is said to be working on its own in-house ARM processors.
- Samsung covers its high-end needs on its own.
- HTC and Sony are turning to MediaTek in low- and mid-range devices.
- Many Chinese vendors use MediaTek processors in value devices, and some like Meizu use MT chips in flagships.
- MediaTek is introducing increasingly powerful SoCs that can end up in even more flagship designs.

Technology | Mon Jul 20, 2015 6:46pm EDT

## Qualcomm preparing to lay off several thousand employees: tech website

## Outline
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$\square$
$\square$
$\square$

## $\square$ Performance

ㅁ


## What is Performance?

| Plane | DC to Paris | Speed |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Boeing 747 | 6.5 h | $980 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |
| Concorde | 3 h | $2160 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ |

$\square$ Time to complete a task ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{exe}}$ )

- Execution time, response time, latency
$\square$ Task per day, hour...
- Total amount of tasks for given time
- Thoughput, bandwidth
$\square$ Speed of Concorde vs Boeing 747
$\square$ Throughput of Boeing 747 vs Concorde



## Performance

$$
\operatorname{Performance}(X)=\frac{1}{T_{\text {exe }}(X)}
$$

" $X$ is $n$ times faster than $Y$ " means:

$$
\frac{T_{\text {exe }}(Y)}{T_{\text {exe }}(X)}=\frac{\operatorname{Performance}(X)}{\operatorname{Performance}(Y)}=n
$$

## How to define execution time?

## Performance



MIPS = millions of instructions per second MFLOPS = millions of FP operations per second

## Program to evaluate performance

$\square$ Real programs: e.g. TeX, spice, SPEC benchmarks, ...
$\square$ Kernels - small, key pieces of real applications
$\square$ Toy programs - sort, prime number generation

- Something 100 -line programs
$\square$ Synthetic benchmarks - "The average program"
- Fake programs to mathc the behaviour of real applications
- Real programs are the only true measurement objects
$\square$ SPEC benchmarks will be used here (plus some toy programs)
- Real programs modified to be portable and ti minimize the effect of IO


## SPEC: Standard Performance Evaluation Corporation

## http://www.spec.org/

$\square$ First round 1989

- 10 programs yielding a single number "SPECMarks"
$\square$ CPU92
- SPECint92-6 integer programs
- SPECfp92-14 floating point programs
- Compiler flags unlimited
$\square$ CPU95
- New set of programs, SPECint95, SPECfp95
- Single compiler flag setting for all programs: SPECint_base95,
- SPECfp_base95
$\square$ CPU2000
- CPU2006
$\square$ Lots of other performance test



## Which Computer is Faster?

| Execution time |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Computer | A | B | C |
| Program P1 | 1 | 10 | 20 |
| Program P2 | 1000 | 100 | 20 |
| Total time | 1001 | 110 | 40 |

$\square A$ is 10 times faster than $B$ for $P 1$
$\square B$ is 10 times faster than $A$ for P2
$\square A$ and $B$ are faster than $C$ for P1
$\square C$ is faster than $A$ and $B$ if both $P 1$ and $P 2$ are run

## Which Computer is Faster?

| Execution time |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Computer | A | B | C |
| Program P1 | 1 | 10 | 20 |
| Program P2 | 1000 | 100 | 20 |
| Total time | 1001 | 110 | 40 |

- Arithmetic mean of execution time: $\frac{\sum T_{i}}{n}$ or weighted execution time $\frac{\sum W_{i} * T_{i}}{n}$
- Normalized execution time $R_{i}$ (SPECRatio) is handy for comparing performance $R_{i}=\frac{\left(T_{\text {exe }}\right)_{\text {RefComputer }}}{\left(T_{\text {exe }}\right)_{i}}$
- Use geometric mean for normalized execution time: $\sqrt[n]{\Pi R_{i}}$ (independent of running times of the individual programs)
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## Quantitative Principles

## $\square$ This is intro to design and analysis

- Take advantage of parallelism
$\square$ ILP, DLP, TLP, ...
- Principle of locality
$\square 90 \%$ of execution time in only $10 \%$ of the code
- Focus on the common case
$\square$ In makeing a design trade-off, favor the frquent case ove the infrequent case
- Amdahl's Law
$\square$ The performance improvement gained from uisng faster mode is limited by the fraction of the time the faster mode can be used
- The Processor Performance Equation


## Amdahl's Law

Enhancement $E$ accelerates a fraction $F$ of a program by a factor $S$


Speedup due to enhancement E :
$\operatorname{Speedup}(E)=\frac{T_{\text {exe }}(\text { without } E)}{T_{\text {exe }}(\text { with } E)}=\frac{\text { Performance }(\text { with } E)}{\text { Performance }(\text { without } E)}$
$T_{\text {exe }}($ with $E)=T_{\text {exe }}($ without $E) *[(1-F)+F / S]$
$\operatorname{Speedup}(E)=\frac{T_{\text {exe }}(\text { without } E)}{T_{\text {exe }}(\text { with } E)}=\frac{1}{(1-F)+F / S}$
Best you could ever hope to do:

$$
\text { Speedup }_{\text {maximum }}=\frac{1}{\left(1-\text { Fraction }_{\text {enhanced }}\right)}
$$

## Amdahl's Law: example

$\square$ New CPU is 10 times faster!
$\square 60 \%$ for I/O which remains almost the same...

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Speedup }_{\text {overall }} & =\frac{1}{\left(1-\text { Fraction }_{\text {enhanced }}\right)+\frac{\text { Fraction }_{\text {enhanced }}}{\text { Speedup }_{\text {enhanced }}}} \\
& =\frac{1}{(1-0.4)+\frac{0.4}{10}}=\frac{1}{0.64}=1.56
\end{aligned}
$$

Apparently, its human nature to be attracted by 10X faster, vs. keeping in perspective its just 1.6X faster

## Amdahl's Law: example

Amdahl's Law


## Aspect of CPU performance

CPUtime $=$ Execution time $=$ seconds/program =


|  | IC | CPI | $T_{C}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Program | X |  |  |
| Compiler | X | (X) |  |
| Instr. Set | X | X |  |
| Organization |  | X | X |
| Technology |  |  | X |

## Instructions are not created equally

"Average Cycles per Instruction"

CPI ${ }_{o p}=$ Cycles per Instruction of type op
$I C_{o p}=$ Number of executed instructions of type op

$$
\text { CPUtime }=T_{c} * \sum\left(C P I_{o p} * I C_{o p}\right)
$$

"Instruction frequency"

$$
\overline{C P I}=\sum\left(C P I_{o p} * F_{o p}\right) \text { where } F_{o p}=I C_{o p} / I C
$$

## Average CPI: example

| Op | $F_{o p}$ | $C P I_{o p}$ | $F_{o p} * C P I_{o p}$ | \% time |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ALU | $50 \%$ | 1 | 0.5 | $(33 \%)$ |
| Load | $20 \%$ | 2 | 0.4 | $(27 \%)$ |
| Store | $10 \%$ | 2 | 0.2 | $(13 \%)$ |
| Branch | $20 \%$ | 2 | 0.4 | $(27 \%)$ |

$\overline{C P I} \quad=\quad 1.5$

Invest resources where time is spent!

