COMP 590-154: Computer Architecture

Out-of-Order Memory Access
Dynamic Scheduling Summary

• Out-of-order execution: a performance technique

• Feature I: Dynamic scheduling (iO → OoO)
  – “Performance” piece: re-arrange insns. for high perf.
  – Decode (iO) → dispatch (iO) + issue (OoO)
  – Two algorithms: Scoreboard, Tomasulo

• Feature II: Precise state (OoO → iO)
  – “Correctness” piece: put insns. back into program order
  – Writeback (OoO) → complete (OoO) + retire (iO)
  – Two designs: P6, R10K

One remaining piece: OoO memory accesses
Executing Memory Instructions

- If $R1 \neq R7$
  - Then Load $R8$ gets correct value from cache
- If $R1 == R7$
  - Then Load $R8$ should get value from the Store
  - *But it didn’t!*
Memory Disambiguation Problem

- Ordering problem is a data-dependence violation
- Imprecise memory worse than imprecise registers

- Why can’t this happen with non-memory insts?
  - Operand specifiers in non-memory insns. are absolute
    - “R1” refers to one specific location
  - Operand specifiers in memory insns. are ambiguous
    - “R1” refers to a memory location specified by the value of R1.
    - When pointers (e.g., R1) change, so does this location
Two Problems

• Memory disambiguation on loads
  – Do earlier unexecuted stores to the same address exist?
    • Binary question: answer is yes or no

• Store-to-load forwarding problem
  – I’m a load: Which earlier store do I get my value from?
  – I’m a store: Which later load(s) do I forward my value to?
    • Non-binary question: answer is one or more insn. identifiers
Load/Store Queue (1/3)

• **Load/store queue (LSQ)**
  – Completed stores write to LSQ
  – When store retires, head of LSQ written to L1-D
  – When loads execute, access LSQ and L1-D in parallel
    • Forward from LSQ if older store with matching address
Load/Store Queue (2/3)

Almost a “real” processor diagram
### Load/Store Queue (3/3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/S</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>Addr</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Data Cache</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF048</td>
<td>41773</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0x3290 -17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF04C</td>
<td>41774</td>
<td>0x3410</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0x3300 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF054</td>
<td>41775</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>0x3410 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF060</td>
<td>41776</td>
<td>0x3418</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>0x3418 1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF840</td>
<td>41777</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF858</td>
<td>41778</td>
<td>0x3300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF85C</td>
<td>41779</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF870</td>
<td>41780</td>
<td>0x3410</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF628</td>
<td>41781</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF63C</td>
<td>41782</td>
<td>0x3300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oldest data moves to the right, and youngest data moves to the left.
In-order Memory (Policy 1/4)

- No memory reordering
- LSQ still needed for forwarded data (last slide)
- Easy to schedule

Fairly simple, but low performance
Loads OoO between Stores (Policy 2/4)

- Loads exec OoO w.r.t. each other
  - Stores block everything

Still simple, but better performance
Stores Can be Split into STA/STD

- STA: Store Address
- STD: Store Data

- Makes some designs easier
  - RS/ROB store one value
  - Stores need two (A & D)
Loads Wait for STAs Only (Policy 3/4)

- Only address is needed to disambiguate
- May be ready earlier to allow checking for violations
  - No need to wait for data

Still simple, even better performance
Loads Execute When Ready (Policy 4/4)

• Most aggressive approach
• Relies on fact that store→load forwarding is rare
• Greatest potential IPC – loads never stall

• Potential for incorrect execution
  – Need to be able to “undo” bad loads

Very complex, but high performance
Detecting Ordering Violations (1/2)

- Case 1: Older store execs before younger load
  - No problem; if same address st→ld forwarding happens
- Case 2: Older store execs after younger load
  - Store scans all younger loads
  - Address match → ordering violation
Detecting Ordering Violations (2/2)

(Load 41773 ignores broadcast because it has a lower seq #)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/S</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Seq</th>
<th>Addr</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF048</td>
<td>41773</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF04C</td>
<td>41774</td>
<td>0x3410</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF054</td>
<td>41775</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF060</td>
<td>41776</td>
<td>0x3418</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF840</td>
<td>41777</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF858</td>
<td>41778</td>
<td>0x3300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0xF85C</td>
<td>41779</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF870</td>
<td>41780</td>
<td>0x3410</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF628</td>
<td>41781</td>
<td>0x3290</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0xF63C</td>
<td>41782</td>
<td>0x3300</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Store broadcasts value, address and sequence #
(-17,0x3290,41775)

IF younger load hadn’t executed, and address matches, grab broadcasted value

(0,0x3290,41779)

Loads CAM-match on address, only care if store seq-# is lower than own seq

An instruction may be involved in more than one ordering violation

IF younger load has executed, and address matches, then ordering violation!

Must flush all later accesses after violation
Dealing with Misspeculations

• Loads are not the only thing which are wrong
  – Loads propagate wrong values to all dependents
• These must somehow be re-executed

• Easiest: flush all instructions after (and including?) the misspeculated load, and just refetch
• Load uses forwarded value
• Correct value propagated when instructions re-execute
Flush Complications

- Exactly same mispredicted branches
  - Checkpoint at every load in addition to branches
    - Very large number of checkpoints needed
  - Rollback to previous branch (which has its own checkpoint)
    - Make sure load doesn’t misspeculate on 2\textsuperscript{nd} try
    - Must redo work between the branch and the load
  - Can work with undo-list style of recovery

- Not all younger insns. are dependent on bad load
- Pipeline latency due to \texttt{refetch} is exposed
Selective Re-Execution

- Re-execute only the dependent insns.
- Ideal case w.r.t. maintaining high IPC
  - No need to re-fetch/re-dispatch/re-rename/re-execute
- Very complicated
  - Need to hunt down only data-dependent insns.
  - Some bad insns. already executed (now in ROB)
  - Some bad insns. didn’t execute yet (still in RS)
- P4 does something like this (called “replay”)
LSQ Hardware in More Detail

• Very complicated CAM logic
  – Need to quickly look up based on value
  – May find multiple values / need *age based search*

• No need for age-based search in ROB
  – Physical regs. are renamed, guarantees one writer
  – No easy way to prevent multiple stores to same address
Loads Checking for Earlier Stores

- On Load dispatch, find data from earlier Store

![Diagram showing load and store operations with address and data banks.]

- Need to adjust this so that load need not be at bottom, and LSQ can wrap-around.
- If |LSQ| is large, logic can be adapted to have log delay.
Data Forwarding

- On execute Store (STA+STD), check for later Loads

This is ugly, complicated, slow, and power hungry
Alternative Data Forwarding: Store Colors

- Each store assigned unique number (its color)
- Loads inherit the color of the most recent store

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{St Color=1} \\
&\text{Ld Color=2} \\
&\text{St Color=2} \\
&\text{Ld Color=3} \\
&\text{St Color=3} \\
&\text{Ld Color=4} \\
&\text{Ld Color=4} \\
\end{align*}
\]

If a store's color > your own:
- Ignore store broadcasts

All three loads have same color:
- only care about ordering w.r.t. stores, not other loads
Split Load Queue/Store Queue

- Stores don’t need to broadcast address to stores
- Loads don’t need to check against earlier loads