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BACKGROUND ON OCTASIC

• Founded in 1998
• Headquartered in Montreal, Canada
• 85 employees

Evolution:
• 98/00 - Design ASICs for others
• 2001 Convert to fabless model
  • **2001- 2003: VoIP Support Products (Synchronous):**
    • 2001 - Voice Packetization Engine / OCT8304
    • 2003 - Echo Cancellation Processor / OCT6100
  • **2004 – DSPs (Asynchronous) for Voice, Video, and Wireless Baseband**
    • 2008 - First Generation / OCT1010
    • 2011 - Second Generation / OCT2224
    • ...2013 - Third Generation / OCTXXXX
GENESIS OF MOVE INTO ASYNC DESIGN

• First Processor Product
  • Specialized DSP for Echo Cancellation
    • Entered the echo market 20 year late
    • Success because of unique algorithm

• Next Product – Generic DSP?
  • How to succeed?
    • Settle on highest processing efficiency – Processing Power / Power Consumption
    • 2+X improvement needed to be able to succeed and displace incumbents
  • This led us forfuitously into the asynchronous world
    • Started by removing the clock – the single greediest power culprit in synchronous designs
    • ... then tried to figure our how to make our circuits work
    • ... proceeded by trial and error until
      ...we arrived at our current async design and methodology
SET ADDITIONAL PRE-REQUIREMENTS

• Use only standard ASIC library elements
  • No custom cell
  • Ease of porting - from one silicon node to the next / from one vendor to another

• Use (as much as possible) standard CAD tools and concepts
  • To facilitate sign-off
  • To facilitate staff conversion training

• Use an architecture presenting a traditional programming view
  • S/W paradigm (same look and feel)
    • Avoid software programming model changes
      • Programming model change is an almost insurmountable barrier to product adoption
      • Allow re-use of existing S/W
      • Transparent to programmers
  • Similar single thread-performance
    • Avoid forcing to re-structure algorithms
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**Logic Elements**: States In/Out, Logic Clouds, and Delay Chains
- States are latches or flip-flops
- Logic Clouds and delay chains use combinatorial logic
- Delay chains are statically or dynamically controlled

**Timing Elements**: Pulses
- Pulses are asynchronous to each other and event (token) driven
- Timing verification is performed via standard STA (Static Analysis Tools) Tools
  - on each pulse (clock) domain: Set-up and Hold-Time
  - each pulse (clock) domain is large (there are less than 20 domains in design)
How does this maps into traditional classification of async circuits?

- Single-rail data bundled type for data transmission
  - With a worst-case delay "Bundling Signal" to latch data

- However no formal reverse ACK signal for flow control
  - Use a system of tokens to be described later

- Asynchronous Pipeline Structure: Static
  - Formal latches/FF to store data in between stages
• The 3 operand state registers are asynchronously loaded
• The instruction state register is asynchronously loaded
• When ready (input registers loaded & output register released) a launch pulse is generated
• Delay chain timing is modulated according to instruction
• Output state register is asynchronously loaded with result of instruction
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In typical synchronous design, pipelining is used to boost performance and provide Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP).

How can we convert such synchronous design into an asynchronous one?
Conversion Sync => Async:
- One way is to map each **unit functionality** into an equivalent asynchronous unit.
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• But using this methodology will slow down the unit!
Conversion Sync => Async:
- One way is to map each unit functionality into an equivalent asynchronous unit
- But using this methodology will slow down the unit!
- How can we get the performance back?
To multiply the processing power of our processor we could use multiple Exec Units (EUs) operating in parallel.

Now how can we **transparently** weave together those EUs ... ....so they behave as one processor?
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (2)

• Starting with the 8 execution units ...
Adding a non-blocking *combinatorial X-Bar switch* to:

- connect the execution units *data paths* among themselves, and
- with external resources – register file, memory, etc.
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (4)

- Adding a CPU Register File to implement a load/store processor design:
• Adding a **Data Memory Load/Store** unit
  • to be able to load/store memory data into/from the CPU (registers)
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (6)

- Adding a Program Counter Control unit including a branch predictor;
- Coupled with an Instruction Fetch & Decode Unit
  - to be able to load instructions into the execution units
• Adding **L1 Memory** accessible for:
  • Data, or
  • Code

**ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (7)**
• Background
• Asynchronous Circuits Description
• Processor Architecture and Operation (Simplified)
  • Architecture, Silicon, and ILP Implementation
  • Operation & Synchronization
• Performance Analysis
• Conclusion
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (8)

• How does this map on silicon?
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (8)

• How does it map on silicon?
• How does it map on silicon?

One execution unit

L1 Memory
72KB

ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (8)
How does it map on silicon?

Block of four (4) execution units

L1 Memory
72KB

ASYNC 2012
• How does it map on silicon?

There are indeed **16 Execution Units**, not 8 EUs in this DSP core!
ASYNC PROCESSOR ARCHITECTURE (8)

• How does it map on silicon?
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• How does it map on silicon?

- Block of four (4) execution units
- L1 Memory 72KB
- X-Bar Switch
- Register File & Processor Control Logic
- L1 Memory 72KB
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Assuming the operation of the Execution Units and resources (registers, memory, ...) are somehow synchronized, here is the flow of instructions overlap that would result in the processor; hence realizing the Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP) mechanism to boost performance.

**Time (instruction cycles)**

- **I1**: add r4, r3, r9
- **I2**: sub r7, r4, #0x01
- **I3**: orr r4, r3, #0x01
- **I4**: add r7, r7, r3, lsl r5
- **I5**: ldr r9, r7, r2
- **I6**: sub r7, r4, #0x01
- **I7**: sub r2, r4, #0x47

**EU0**

**EU1**

**EU2**

**EU3**

**EU4**

**EU5**

**EU6-EU15**

**Time (pico-seconds)**

- **Decode Instr.**
- **Load Reg.**
- **Write Output Reg.**
- **Fetch Instr.**
- **Execute Instr.**
- **Memory access**
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Assuming the operation of the Execution Units and resources (registers, memory, …) are somehow synchronized, here is the flow of instructions overlap that would result in the processor; hence realizing the Instruction Level Parallelism (ILP) mechanism to boost performance.

**BTW did you notice the instructions?**

- Hey this is not a DSP!
- This is an ARM processor!

**Time (instruction cycles)**

1: `add r4,r3, r9`  
   `EU0`  
   `R3,R9`  
   `R4`  
   `EU5`  
   `R4`  
   `EU1`  
   `R7`  
   `EU2`  
   `R3`  
   `EU3`  
   `R3,R5`  
   `EU4`  
   `R2`  
   `EU5`  
   `R7`  
   `EU4`  
   `M`  

**Time (pico-seconds)**

- Decode Instr.
- Load Reg.
- Write Output Reg.
- Fetch Instr.
- Execute Instr.
- Memory access
Note: Dependencies are no different than in the case of synchronous pipelined processors. However in the event of a pipeline stall, no dynamic power is consumed.

This time it is a DSP!

= Fetch Instr.  = Execute Instr.  = Memory access
• Background
• Asynchronous Circuits Description
• **Processor Architecture and Operation** (Simplified)
  • Architecture, Silicon, and ILP Implementation
  • Operation & Synchronization
• Performance Analysis
• Conclusion
This is an alternate simplified processor block diagram:

- the execution units (EUs) are mapped in a ring like fashion
- the EUs have access to common resources:
  - Register File
  - Data Memory
  - Code Memory
  - X-Bar
  - PC Control Logic
- a synchronization mechanism is needed to arbitrate and avoid conflicts in the access of the EUs to the common resources
In contrast with a synchronous processor which is generally centrally controlled, this asynchronous processor has a fully distributed control system:

- Control is exercised individually by each Execution Unit (EU)

- Control tokens are passed asynchronously among the EUs in a ring fashion to synchronize accesses to common resources and avoid conflicts

- In the simplified model discussed herein, six (6) tokens are used:
  - Instruction Fetch Token
  - Register Read Token
  - Launch Execution Token (X-Bar, Reg Ready)
  - No Mis-Prediction Token (PC & Write Commit)
  - Data Memory Token (Rd or Wr)
  - Register Write Token
Asynchronous control tokens are used to control and synchronize the overall operation of the processor.

- Control tokens are passed from one EU to the next in a ring fashion.
- When a token is owned by an EU it can use it to request services (via Req pulses).
- When a service request is sent and a certain time has elapsed and certain conditions are met, or when the EU does not need the token (resource) the token is passed to the next EU.
- On start up or after a flush (wrongly predicted branch), all tokens are assigned to the same EU.
Asynchronous SoC Portion:
- 24 async DSP Cores

All other modules in the SoC including the external interfaces are all synchronous:
- not power critical
- bought IP blocks
- ease of interface
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• The C6472® is a mature device so fairly accurate data is available for area, power consumption, and processing capability*;
• The C64+® core area is ~8.1mm² (estimate);
Texas Instruments (TI) is the leading DSP vendor in the industry; TI literature claims the C6472® is the most power efficient high-performance DSP in the market. It features 6 ea C64+® cores; The C6472® is implemented in the same silicon technology as one of our DSP so it provides a reasonably fair benchmark*; The C6472® is a mature device so fairly accurate data is available for area, power consumption, and processing capability*; The C64+® core area is ~8.1mm² (estimate); Octasic’s Opus2 core is 2.28mm²; Ratio of area: ~3.5

*It is understood that any such data and comparison is never totally accurate and can be subject to many interpretations. The data is therefore provided for discussion only.
COMPARISON – POWER EFFICIENCY

Efficiency (MMACS / mW)

MMACS

TI C64+® core used in TI most power efficient high-performance C6472® DSP device

( all in 90nm for comparison purpose)
It is understood that any such data and comparison is never totally accurate and can be subject to many interpretations. The data is therefore provided for discussion only.

**Opus2:** 3X Power Efficient and 1.7X Area Efficient as TI C6472 core (@ TI best power efficiency operating point)

**TI C64+® core used in TI most power efficient high-performance C6472® DSP device**
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COMPARISON – POWER EFFICIENCY

*It is understood that any such data and comparison is never totally accurate and can be subject to many interpretations. The data is therefore provided for discussion only.

Opus2: 3X Power Efficient and 1.7X Area Efficient as TI C6472 core (@ TI best power efficiency operating point)

Opus3: 3X Power Efficient and 3X Area Efficient as TI C6472® core (@ TI best power efficiency point)

TI C64+® core used in TI most power efficient high-performance C6472® DSP device

( all in 90nm for comparison purpose)
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CONCLUSION

• Asynchronous technology does work!
  • not only in the universities and labs, but
  • in real-life commercial products used by people worldwide

• Asynchronous technology can be quite advantageous!
  • area efficiency wise,
    ....but more importantly...
  • power efficiency wise
    • in the DSP processor market: ~3X more
      than equivalent synchronous products
  • same for other processors and datapath engines

Thank you!
Michel Laurence
michel.laurence@octasic.com
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...powered by an OCT2224 Async DSP