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## CSE2021 Computer Organization

## Instructor: Prof. Peter Lian

email: peterlian@cse.yorku.ca
tel: 416-736-2100 ext 44647
Couse Web:
https://wiki.cse.yorku.ca/course archive/2014-15/W/2021/
Schedule:

- Lectures: MW 17:30 - 1900, Room CLH A
- Labs: Lab-01 M 19:00 - 22:00, LAS 1006

Lab-02 T 19:00-22:00, LAS 1006/1004
Office hours: MW 15:00-17:00 @ LAS 1012C

## CSE2021 Computer Organization

Text book:
Computer Organization and Design
-- The Hardware/Software Interface
5th Edition
by David A. Patterson and John L. Hennessy
Morgan Kaufmann Publishers (Elsevier)
ISBN 978-0-12-4077263


## Assessment (No Makeup)

Quizzes: 20\% (5:30-5:50pm)

- Quiz 1 for Chapter 1 on Jan. 21
- Quiz 2 for Chapter 2 on Feb. 2
- Quiz 3 for Chapter 3 on Feb. 11
- Quiz 4 for Appendix on Mar. 4
- Quiz 5 for Chapter 4 Parts 1 and 2 on Apr. 1

Lab: 25\%

- 7 lab sessions
- Starts in week 4

Midterm test: 20\% on Feb. 25, 5:30-6:45pm
Final exam: 35\%

## CSE2021 Computer Organization

## Topics covered:

- Introduction
- Computer abstractions and technology
- Language of the computer: high lever language versus assembly language versus machine language
- Arithmetic for computers
- The processor



## The Computer Revolution

## Moore's Law



Source: ISSCC 2003 G. Moore "No exponential is forever, but 'forever' can be delayed"

| Moore's Law |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year of introduction | Transistors |
| 4004 | 1971 | 2,250 |
| 8008 | 1972 | 2,500 |
| 8080 | 1974 | 5,000 |
| - 8086 | 1978 | 29,000 |
| - 286 | 1982 | 120,000 |
| - $386{ }^{\text {™ }}$ | 1985 | 275,000 |
| - $486{ }^{\text {TM }}$ DX | 1989 | 1,180,000 |
| - Pentium® | 1993 | 3,100,000 |
| - Pentium II | 1997 | 7,500,000 |
| - Pentium III | 1999 | 24,000,000 |
| - Pentium 4 | 2000 | 42,000,000 |




Source: B Bell, "Bell's Law for the Birth and Death of Computer Classes", Comms of ACM, 2008

## The $1^{\text {st }}$ Generation Computer

EDSAC, University of Cambridge, UK, 1949


Source: http://www.computerhistory.org


## Future Direction

Global Consumer Electronics Device Revenues 2008-2017


[^0]Next Generation


## The Computer Revolution

Progress in computer technology

- Underpinned by Moore' s Law

Makes novel applications feasible

- Computers in automobiles
- Cell phones
- Human genome project
- World Wide Web
- Search Engines

Computers are pervasive

## Classes of Computers

## Desktop computers

- General purpose, variety of software
- Subject to cost/performance tradeoff

Server computers

- Network based
- High capacity, performance, reliability
- Range from small servers to building sized

Embedded computers

- Hidden as components of systems
- Stringent power/performance/cost constraints


## What You Will Learn

How programs are translated into the machine language

- And how the hardware executes them

The hardware/software interface
What determines program performance

- And how it can be improved

How hardware designers improve performance
What is parallel processing

## Understanding Performance

Algorithm

- Determines number of operations executed

Programming language, compiler, architecture

- Determine number of machine instructions executed per operation
Processor and memory system
- Determine how fast instructions are executed

I/O system (including OS)

- Determines how fast I/O operations are executed


## Below Your Program

## Application software

- Written in high-level language


## System software

- Compiler: translates HLL code to machine code
- Operating System: service code

Handling input/output
Managing memory and storage
Scheduling tasks \& sharing resources
Hardware

- Processor, memory, I/O controllers


## Levels of Program Code

High-level language

- Level of abstraction closer to problem domain
- Provides for productivity and portability
Assembly language
- Textual representation of instructions
Hardware representation
- Binary digits (bits)
- Encoded instructions and data



## Components of a Computer



Same components for all kinds of computer

- Desktop, server, embedded
Input/output includes
- User-interface devices

Display, keyboard, mouse

- Storage devices

Hard disk, CD/DVD, flash

- Network adapters

For communicating with other computers


## Opening the Box



## Inside the Processor (CPU)

Datapath: performs operations on data
Control: sequences datapath, memory, ...
Cache memory

- Small fast SRAM memory for immediate access to data



## Abstractions

The BG Picture
Abstraction helps us deal with complexity

- Hide lower-level detail

Instruction set architecture (ISA)

- The hardware/software interface

Application binary interface

- The ISA plus system software interface
- Implementation
- The details underlying and interface


## A Safe Place for Data

Volatile main memory

- Loses instructions and data when power off

Non-volatile secondary memory

- Magnetic disk
- Flash memory
- Optical disk (CDROM, DVD)



## Networks

Communication and resource sharing
Local area network (LAN): Ethernet

- Within a building

Wide area network (WAN: the Internet
Wireless network: WiFi, Bluetooth


## Technology Trends

Electronics technology continues to evolve

- Increased capacity and performance
- Reduced cost


| Year | Technology | Relative performance/cost |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1951 | Vacuum tube | 1 |
| 1965 | Transistor | 35 |
| 1975 | Integrated circuit (IC) | 900 |
| 1995 | Very large scale IC (VLSI) | $2,400,000$ |
| 2005 | Ultra large scale IC | $6,200,000,000$ |

## Defining Performance

Which airplane has the best performance?


## Response Time and Throughput

Response time (execution time)

- How long it takes to do a task
- Important to computer users

Throughput (bandwidth)

- Total amount of work done per unit time
- Important to server, data center

Different performance metrics are needed to benchmark different systems.
Single application is not sufficient to measure the performance of computers

## Response Time vs. Throughput

How are response time and throughput affected by

- Replacing the processor with a faster version?
- Adding more processors?

We will focus on response time by now.

## Relative Performance

Define Performance $=1 /($ Execution Time $)$
" $X$ is $n$ time faster than $Y$ "
Performance $_{X} /$ Performance $_{Y}$
$=$ Execution time $_{\mathrm{Y}} /$ Execution time $_{\mathrm{X}}=n$
Example: time taken to run a program

- 10s on A, 15s on B
- Execution Time ${ }_{B}$ / Execution Time ${ }_{A}$ $=15 \mathrm{~s} / 10 \mathrm{~s}=1.5$
- So $A$ is 1.5 times faster than B


## Measuring Execution Time

Elapsed time

- Total response time, including all aspects

Processing, I/O, OS overhead, idle time

- Determines system performance

CPU time

- Time spent processing a given job

Discounts I/O time, other jobs' shares

- Comprises user CPU time and system CPU time
Different programs are affected differently by CPU and system performance


## Measuring Execution Time

## Unix command "time" can be used to

 determine the elapsed time and CPU time```
Peters-MacBook=Pro:~ peterlians help time
ine: time [-p] PIPELINE
    Execute PIPELINE and print a summary of the real time, user CPU time,
    and systen CPU time spent executing PIPELINE when it terminates.
    The return status is the return status of PIPELINE. The ' }-p\mathrm{ ' option
    prints the tining summary in a slightly different fornat. This uses
    the value of the TIMEFORMAT variable as the output format.
tines: times
    Print the accumulated user and system times for processes run from
    the shell.
Peters-MacBook-Pro:~ peterlians time ls
\begin{tabular}{lllll} 
?endobj? & Desktop & Dropbox & Music & stream? \\
?endobj?12 & Documents & Library & Pictures &
\end{tabular}
endobj?13 Downloads Movies Public
real Bn0.003s
user Bn0.001s
sys 8ne.0e2s
Peters-MacBook-Pro:~ peterlians [
```


## CPU Clocking

Operation of digital hardware governed by a constant-rate clock


Clock period: duration of a clock cycle

- e.g., 250ps $=0.25 n s=250 \times 10^{-12} \mathrm{~s}$

Clock frequency (rate): cycles per second

- e.g., $4.0 \mathrm{GHz}=4000 \mathrm{MHz}=4.0 \times 10^{9} \mathrm{~Hz}$


## CPU Time

CPU Time $=$ CPU Clock Cycles $\times$ Clock Cycle Time

$$
=\frac{\text { CPU Clock Cycles }}{\text { Clock Rate }}
$$

Performance improved by

- Reducing number of clock cycles
- Increasing clock rate
- Hardware designer must often trade off clock rate against cycle count


## CPU Time Example

Computer A: 2GHz clock, 10s CPU time
Designing Computer B

- Aim for 6s CPU time
- Can do faster clock, but causes $1.2 \times$ clock cycles of A

How fast must Computer B clock be?

Clock Cycles $_{\mathrm{A}}=$ CPU Time ${ }_{\mathrm{A}} \times$ Clock Rate $_{\mathrm{A}}$

$$
=10 \mathrm{~s} \times 2 \mathrm{GHz}=20 \times 10^{9}
$$

Clock Rate $_{\mathrm{B}}=\frac{1.2 \times 20 \times 10^{9}}{6 \mathrm{~s}}=\frac{24 \times 10^{9}}{6 \mathrm{~s}}=4 \mathrm{GHz}$

## Instruction Performance

Clock Cycles $=$ Instruction Count $\times$ Ave Cycles per Instruction
CPU Time $=$ Instruction Count $\times \mathrm{CPI} \times$ Clock Cycle Time

$$
=\frac{\text { Instruction Count } \times \mathrm{CPI}}{\text { Clock Rate }}
$$

Instruction Count: no. of instruction for a program

- Determined by program, Instruction Set Architecture (ISA) and compiler
Average cycles per instruction (CPI)
- Determined by CPU hardware
- If different instructions have different CPI

Average CPI affected by instruction mix

## CPI Example

Computer A: Cycle Time $=250 \mathrm{ps}, \mathrm{CPI}=2.0$
Computer B: Cycle Time $=500 \mathrm{ps}, \mathrm{CPI}=1.2$
Same ISA
Which is faster, and by how much?

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { CPU Time }_{\mathrm{A}} & =\text { Instruction Count } \times \mathrm{CPI}_{\mathrm{A}} \times \text { Cycle Time }_{\mathrm{A}} \\
& =\mathrm{I} \times 2.0 \times 250 \mathrm{ps}=1 \times 500 \mathrm{ps} \longleftarrow \mathrm{~A} \text { A faster.. } \\
\text { CPU Time }_{\mathrm{B}} & =\text { Instruction Count } \times \mathrm{CPI}_{\mathrm{B}} \times \text { Cycle Time }_{\mathrm{B}} \\
& =1 \times 1.2 \times 500 \mathrm{ps}=1 \times 600 \mathrm{ps}
\end{aligned}
$$

By how much?

## CPI in More Detail

If different instruction classes take different numbers of cycles

Clock Cycles $=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\right.$ CPI $_{\mathrm{i}} \times{\left.\text { Instruction } \text { Count }_{i}\right)}$ )
Weighted average CPI
CPI $=\frac{\text { Clock Cycles }}{\text { Instruction Count }}=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\right.$ CPI $\left._{\mathrm{i}} \times \frac{\text { Instruction Count }}{\text { Instruction Count }}\right)$

Relative frequency

## CPI Example

Alternative compiled program using instructions in classes A, B, C

| Class | A | B | C |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CPI for class | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| IC in program 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| IC in program 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 |

Program 1: IC = 5

- Clock Cycles
$=2 \times 1+1 \times 2+2 \times 3$
$=10$
- Avg. CPI = 10/5 = 2.0

Program 2: IC = 6

- Clock Cycles $=4 \times 1+1 \times 2+1 \times 3$ $=9$
- Avg. CPI = 9/6 = 1.5


## Performance Summary

The BIC picture
CPU Time $=\frac{\text { Instructions }}{\text { Program }} \times \frac{\text { Clock cycles }}{\text { Instruction }} \times \frac{\text { Seconds }}{\text { Clock cycle }}$

## Performance depends on

- Algorithm: affects IC, possibly CPI
- Programming language: affects IC, CPI
- Compiler: affects IC, CPI
- Instruction set architecture: affects IC, CPI, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}}$


## SPEC CPU Benchmark

Programs used to measure performance

- Supposedly typical of actual workload

Standard Performance Evaluation Corp (SPEC)

- Develops benchmarks for CPU, I/O, Web, ...

SPEC CPU2006

- Elapsed time to execute a selection of programs Negligible I/O, so focuses on CPU performance
- Normalize relative to reference machine
- Summarize as geometric mean of performance ratios CINT2006 (integer) and CFP2006 (floating-point)


## CINT2006 for Opteron X4 2356

| Name | Description | IC $\times 10^{9}$ | CPI | Tc (ns) | Exec time | Ref time | SPECratio |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| perl | Interpreted string processing | 2,118 | 0.75 | 0.40 | 637 | 9,777 | 15.3 |
| bzip2 | Block-sorting compression | 2,389 | 0.85 | 0.40 | 817 | 9,650 | 11.8 |
| gcc | GNU C Compiler | 1,050 | 1.72 | 0.47 | 24 | 8,050 | 11.1 |
| mcf | Combinatorial optimization | 336 | 10.00 | 0.40 | 1,345 | 9,120 | 6.8 |
| go | Go game (AI) | 1,658 | 1.09 | 0.40 | 721 | 10,490 | 14.6 |
| hmmer | Search gene sequence | 2,783 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 890 | 9,330 | 10.5 |
| sjeng | Chess game (AI) | 2,176 | 0.96 | 0.48 | 37 | 12,100 | 14.5 |
| libquantum | Quantum computer simulation | 1,623 | 1.61 | 0.40 | 1,047 | 20,720 | 19.8 |
| h264avc | Video compression | 3,102 | 0.80 | 0.40 | 993 | 22,130 | 22.3 |
| omnetpp | Discrete event simulation | 587 | 2.94 | 0.40 | 690 | 6,250 | 9.1 |
| astar | Games/path finding | 1,082 | 1.79 | 0.40 | 773 | 7,020 | 9.1 |
| xalancbmk | XML parsing | 1,058 | 2.70 | 0.40 | 1,143 | 6,900 | 6.0 |
| Geometric mean |  |  |  |  |  | 11.7 |  |

## SPEC Power Benchmark

Power consumption of server at different workload levels

- Performance: ssj_ops/sec
- Power: Watts (Joules/sec)

Overall ssj_ops per Watt $=\left(\sum_{i=0}^{10}\right.$ ssj_ops $\left._{i}\right) /\left(\sum_{i=0}^{10}\right.$ power $\left._{i}\right)$

## SPECpower_ssj2008 for X4

| Target Load \% | Performance (ssj_ops/sec) | Average Power (Watts) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100 \%$ | 231,867 | 295 |
| $90 \%$ | 211,282 | 286 |
| $80 \%$ | 185,803 | 275 |
| $70 \%$ | 163,427 | 265 |
| $60 \%$ | 140,160 | 256 |
| $50 \%$ | 118,324 | 246 |
| $40 \%$ | 920,35 | 233 |
| $30 \%$ | 70,500 | 222 |
| $20 \%$ | 47,126 | 206 |
| $10 \%$ | 23,066 | 180 |
| $0 \%$ | 0 | 141 |
| Overall sum | $1,283,590$ | 2,605 |
| $\sum$ ssj_ops $\sum$ power |  | 493 |

## Power Trends



## The Thermal Crisis

What happens when the CPU cooler is removed?

www.tomshardware.de www.tomshardware.com

## Power Trends



In CMOS IC technology
Power $=$ Capacitive load $\times$ Voltage $^{2} \times$ Frequency

## Reducing Power

## Suppose a new CPU has

- $85 \%$ of capacitive load of old CPU
- $15 \%$ voltage and $15 \%$ frequency reduction
$\frac{P_{\text {new }}}{P_{\text {old }}}=\frac{C_{\text {old }} \times 0.85 \times\left(V_{\text {old }} \times 0.85\right)^{2} \times F_{\text {old }} \times 0.85}{\mathrm{C}_{\text {old }} \times \mathrm{V}_{\text {old }}{ }^{2} \times \mathrm{F}_{\text {old }}}=0.85^{4}=0.52$
The power wall
- We can't reduce voltage further
- We can't remove more heat

How else can we improve performance?

## Uniprocessor Performance



## Multiprocessors

## Multicore microprocessors

- More than one processor per chip

Requires explicitly parallel programming

- Compare with instruction level parallelism

Hardware executes multiple instructions at once
Hidden from the programmer

- Hard to do

Programming for performance
Load balancing
Optimizing communication and synchronization

## Pitfall: Amdahl’s Law

Improving an aspect of a computer and expecting a proportional improvement in overall performance

$$
\mathrm{T}_{\text {improved }}=\frac{\mathrm{T}_{\text {affected }}}{\text { improvement factor }}+\mathrm{T}_{\text {unaffected }}
$$

Example: multiply accounts for $80 \mathrm{~s} / 100$ s

- How much improvement in multiply performance to get $5 \times$ overall?

$$
20=\frac{80}{n}+20 \quad \text { - Can't be done! }
$$

Corollary: make the common case fast

## Fallacy: Low Power at Idle

Look back at X4 power benchmark

- At 100\% load: 295W
- At 50\% load: 246W (83\%)
- At 10\% load: 180W (61\%)

Google data center

- Mostly operates at $10 \%$ - $50 \%$ load
- At $100 \%$ load less than $1 \%$ of the time

Consider designing processors to make power proportional to load

## Importance of Standby Power

Of the $\$ 250$ billion spent globally each year powering computers,
about $85 \%$ of that energy is simply wasted idling.


Pulling the plug on standby power study in Francefound that stand by power accounted for $7 \%$ of total residential consumption. ruther stuales nave sunce come thilar conclusions in other de lands, Australia and Japan. Some estimates putthe proportion of consumption due to standby power as high aş $13 \%$

$\qquad$ of which ic cim wowh The wasted energy, in other words, is equivalent to the output of 18 typical power stations.

Source: Economist, August 11, 2010

## Pitfall: MIPS as a Performance Metric

MIPS: Millions of Instructions Per Second

- Doesn' t account for

Differences in ISAs between computers
Differences in complexity between instructions
MIPS $=\frac{\text { Instruction count }}{\text { Execution time } \times 10^{6}}$
$=\frac{\text { Instruction count }}{\frac{\text { Instruction count } \times \mathrm{CPI}}{\text { Clock rate }} \times 10^{6}}=\frac{\text { Clock rate }}{\mathrm{CPI} \times 10^{6}}$

- CPI varies between programs on a given CPU


## Concluding Remarks

Cost/performance is improving

- Due to underlying technology development

Hierarchical layers of abstraction

- In both hardware and software

Instruction set architecture

- The hardware/software interface

Execution time: the best performance measure

## Power is a limiting factor

- Use parallelism to improve performance


[^0]:    Source: http://www.dvd-and-beyond.com/display-article.php?article=1891

