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Abstract—Flexibility at hardware level is the main driving force behind adaptive systems whose aim is to realise microarchitecture deconfiguration ‘online’. This feature allows the software/hardware stack to tolerate drastic changes of the workload in data centres. With emerge of FPGA reconfigurability this technology is becoming a mainstream computing paradigm. Adaptivity is usually accompanied by the high-level tools to facilitate multi-dimensional space exploration. An essential aspect in this space is memory orchestration where on-chip and off-chip memory distribution significantly influences the architecture in coping with the critical spatial and timing constraints, e.g. Place & Route.

This paper proposes a memory smart technique for a particular class of adaptive systems: Elastic Circuits which enjoy slack elasticity at fine level of granularity. We explore retiming of a set of popular benchmarks via investigating the memory distribution within and among accelerators. The area, performance and power patterns are adopted by our high-level synthesis framework, with respect to the behaviour of the input descriptions, to improve the quality of the synthesised elastic circuits.

Index Terms—Hardware Acceleration, High-level Synthesis, CAD, Adaptive Systems, Elastic Circuits.

I. INTRODUCTION

Elasticity has emerged as a property that implies flexibility in adapting resources, communication or timing in different areas of computer architecture. Elasticity in cloud computing is usually devoted to the resource management capability by the cloud services which are tolerant against changes in the user inquiries; On the other hand it is used by neuroscientists to refer to plasticity in the brain which leads to dynamic structural changes between neural clusters when learning a new skill [1]. Elasticity in digital circuits follows the same concept and particularly is referred to the flexibility against environmental dynamics such as temperature or process variation which may violate timing of the functional units in a circuit [2].

There are always costs associated with implementing elasticity which may vary based on several factors. For instance, in cloud computing an advanced protocol is necessary to determine the user response times and, accordingly, reschedule the routing and resource allocation. Similarly, in digital circuits handshake protocols are leveraged to realise elasticity which requires special control circuitry to realise the interlocks between stages. Additional circuitry may impose a prohibitive impact on power and performance. Therefore elasticity has to be inserted with careful consideration to minimise the unnecessary costs. De-Elastisation [6] is proposed to remove elasticity ‘selectively’ from the design by establishing rigid synchronous blocks which may run at different frequencies. By forming coarse synchronous islands the available fine grained adaptivity is sacrificed. Therefore a clustering approach would be necessary to trade off the cost of adaptivity at different levels of granularity.

Elastic dataflow circuits have been proposed to address the performance overhead of control-driven circuits through concurrency and meanwhile offer a distributed control mechanism which scales effectively and allows local optimisations, such as re-synthesis, to take place. The channel-based (aka CSP-based) class of these circuits enjoys a property known as slack elasticity which allows retiming and recycling of these circuits without breaking their functionality. In other words any degree of pipelining, including compile-time transformations, can be explored in this regard. At system level, varying the available slack gives us the chance to look at different flavours of memories and consider transforming them to each other to exploit the existing potentials. The concept of smart memories and adaptive memory-based architectures have been studied in depth [3].

In this paper we exploit slack elasticity to refine the system architecture automatically with regard to the energy budget or performance constraints. Memory types are considered interchangeably via retiming without affecting the functionality (Figure 1). Unlike Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling our proposed technique is applicable at a fine level of granularity, therefore it is able to handle the power/performance trade-off more effectively.
The organization of the paper is as follows: Section 2 presents our high-level dataflow architectural model and following that Section 3 formulates the design constraints based on our high-level CSP model. Section 4 proposes our methodology including a motivation example and our retiming technique. Afterwards, experimental results are given in Section 5. Finally, conclusions and future work ahead are drawn in Section 6.

II. ARCHITECTURAL MODEL: ELASTIC DATAFLOWS

eTeak [7] is a dataflow synthesis framework whose features can be grouped into communication and computation domains. From the communication perspective eTeak networks are synthesised in a syntax-directed compilation manner from a CSP-like language called Balsa. Point-to-point communication between computation blocks at hardware level is formed by the primitives of the language, including channels and processes. The networks are ‘slack elastic’ which means the communication channels are capable of storing any degree of tokens.

A ‘token’ is a high-level abstraction of data and control signal. This feature enables modification at the level of pipelining over the channels without affecting the behaviour of the circuit. From the computational perspective the network is built based on the macro-module style [8] with separate ‘go’ and ‘done’ activation/termination signals. These modules are chained in sequence or parallel according to source level directives. The macro-module architecture contributes to a distributed control mechanism where the datapath and the corresponding control are enclosed within a macro-module. Accordingly, modules are controlled locally through handshaking, thus, whenever data become available, computation can start. This concept has already been introduced in dataflow systems. Based on this, data-dependent computation becomes possible which means that independent data streaming can exist within a module, which can significantly influence the performance of the circuit. In addition, it allows the tool to perform functional decomposition over a module and define new boundaries.

Explicit buffering is needed to decouple one component from another and to introduce the desired degree of token storage to enable the circuit to function. The buffering can also allow more transforming synthesis methods (e.g. retiming) to increase circuit parallelism.

eTeak primitives are the same as any regular dataflow architecture. The following describes each briefly:

- Steer (S) – Chooses an output path based on the input control value attached to data. Steers are inferred wherever an if/else or case statement is used. Each parametrised output independently matches the conditions of input and it acts like a data-dependent demultiplexer.
- Fork (F) – A parameterisable component which can carry any number of bits from input to outputs. It brings concurrency to the circuit by activating two or more macro-modules at the same time or supplying them with data.
- Merge (M) – Input on one of the input ports is multiplexed towards the output based on first-come-first-served policy; thus, the inputs must be mutually exclusive. Merge is also parameterisable, which means that it can function as a data or control multiplexer.
- Join (J) – Synchronizes and concatenates data inputs. A two-way join of n and 0 bits can be used as a conjunction of data and control.
- Variable (V) – Permanent data storage. A variable in the eTeak dataflow network has a single write port and multiple, parameterisable read ports. The reads and writes are distinguished and put into separate stages. Variables allow complicated control activity without incurring the cost of always moving data along with control around a circuit. ‘wg/wd’ and ‘rg/rd’ (go/done) pairs make all writes data initiated and control token completed, all reads control token initiated and data delivery terminated. The variable can be considered as a multi-bit register in which a read from it means assigning the contents of the register to the output wire. Similarly a write to a variable could be translated as assigning the current value of the input wire to the register.
- Operator (O) – The only components which can manipulate data. Inputs are formed into a single word. All data transforming operations are done within this component, including verifying a condition or other operations.
- Initial (I) – This component holds and initial value and can insert values such as activation into the network. When a top-level module is generated to start over and over (within the loop structure) a ‘go’ signal may not exist. In that case I initializes the activation at each round.
- Buffer (B) – Data storage and channel decoupling. Buffers provide storage for valid and empty tokens and they are the only components that initiate and take an active part in handshaking; all other components are “transparent” to the handshaking. A buffer may input and store a new token (valid or empty) from its predecessor if its successor buffer has input and stored the token which it was previously holding.
- Arbiter (A) – It takes a number of input channels, and gives a single output channel, forwarding on any data from input channels to the output channel, fairly choosing between concurrent accesses. This component could be used as a memory or a bus arbiter to control several master accesses. If the masters are clocked at the same speed then arbiters could be implemented as synchronous arbiters (TeakM) otherwise they should be realised as asynchronous arbiters. Note that implementation wise they are different as the asynchronous ones are following a full-interlocked 4-phase return-to-zero protocol, whilst the synchronous set is following the synchronous elastic protocol (SELF) which is a forward interleaved protocol \[4\] but both inherit elastcity.
III. Problem Formulation

In this section, we formulate the retiming approach in terms of area, power and performance in the context of dataflow architectures of eTeak. In this regard, basic CSP-based macro-modules are exploited to describe our formulations.

A. Area Model

In the dataflow circuits of eTeak, cell area is estimated using two main factors: the number of components Join, Fork, Steer, Merge and the Memory argument which includes a) Storage where data (or instructions) are resident in the design, b) Variables which are essentially the primitives of the eTeak network and c) Buffers which are distributed across the network in form of FIFOs. The retiming technique proposed in this paper considers transforming, resizing, moving or inserting memories whilst preserving the number of components in the circuit.

\[ CellArea \propto Comp + Mem \quad (1) \]

B. Power Model

The dynamic and static power of our dataflow circuits can be modelled using the following equations:

\[ Power_{dynamic} \propto A \cdot f \cdot C \cdot V_{DD}^2 \quad (2) \]

where \( \frac{1}{2} \leq A \leq 1 \) as in our elastic controllers are latch based and hence level sensitive. \( f, C, \) and \( V \) are clock frequency, switched capacitance, and supply voltage, respectively.

\[ Power_{static} \propto I_{leak} \cdot V_{DD} \quad (3) \]

Note that \( I_{leak} \) factor is proportional to the size of the circuit which is represented as \( CellArea \). Therefore the larger the occupied silicon the higher \( Power_{static} \) dissipation. Intuitively speaking, replacing the large always-on memory blocks with smaller distributed memories across the circuit should contribute to the overall static power of the system.

C. Performance Model

An intuitive understanding of the technique can be obtained by analysing the high-level macromodule model shown in Figure 2 which is a dataflow realisation of the expression \( C1 \odot (C2 \cdot C3) \odot C4 \) in the Balsa language; where \( C2 \) and \( C3 \) are specified as parallel computations and are merged with \( C4 \). \( C1 \) is also considered in sequence with the rest. Each computation could represent a simple arithmetic unit or a complicated module, depending on the design's abstraction level.

Fig. 2: an eTeak macro-module consist of primitive components. Data and control propagate together in a macro-module. The go/done signals determine activation and termination.

Each computation could represent a simple arithmetic unit or a complicated module, depending on the design’s abstraction level.

IV. Methodology: Power/Performance Exploration

A. Motivational Example

Memory distribution and orchestration in a dataflow circuit has considerable effects on area/power/performance. Moreover proper buffering is necessary to ensure deadlock and starvation freedom. The loop structures in the circuit require enough buffering for a lead token to move forward and leave space for the next one. In the eTeak synthesis flow, no buffering is introduced initially. This helps the designers to explore the different buffering policies.

In this regard, the most simple strategy is to buffer every link. In our 1-safe models this guarantees deadlock freedom but the overhead would be dominant. Alternative approach is to map networks onto a directed graph without caring about the component types, then a depth-first-search technique is exploited to identify the back-edges to indicate cycles (loops). Buffers are inserted in the proceeding and succeeding links. Based on the topology of the circuit, some extra buffers may be added. This approach has no insight of the circuit and performs the same strategy. We have discovered that by having a high-level notion of the description, a more efficient strategy could be employed.

Figure 3 shows a Balsa implementation of a Polynomial evaluation algorithm wherein the While loop (lines 6 – 16) iterates for degree times. Within the loop the for construct keeps receiving coefficients via channels (three in this example) and writes out the calculated value into addRes channel.
The edges in the graph represent the following constraints: granularity. This implicitly transforms every variable within the consumer has consumed it. dataflow, the producer should produce the next data only after it has produced. Also when there is a backward loop in the PAC constraint on \((u,v)\) represents a WAR or RAW constraint. The Polynomial evaluation algorithm which can be executed with arbitrary degree of coefficients.

**C. Deploying Buffers**

By having the information from the dependency graph and the eTeak ‘not-buffered’ network of components, two phases are considered for this part of the algorithm: 1) Mark the potential links for buffering (extracted from the dependency graph) 2) Retime the buffered links based on the next component and buffer the desired links. Note that our approach is optimized to avoid inserting multiple buffers in the same link.

1) Phase1: Marking the potential links for buffering: For each dependency in the graph, based on the source and destination nodes, a different marking policy is used. The source nodes are channels or variables and destination nodes could vary as explained above. In case of a variable, the first link to be marked is the link after the Read portion of it. For channels, it is the link after associated with its consumer. The next link to be marked is based on the destination node type. As a whole rule it could be considered as the link after the production which its definition varies in different types.

2) Phase 2: retiming and buffering based on the marked links: In this phase, each marked link is taken and the next component in the network is checked, based on the upcoming component the strategy is different. In case of a join, two choices of buffering could be considered, buffering all the inputs (including the marked link) or retime it to the output which is considered in our algorithm. The other components are considered either based on their unique properties and the impacts on area/power/performance.

For the top level networks without a go signal, the links before and after the I component should be buffered as well. This makes sure that the initialization cycle that helps the circuit start over has enough buffering for the tokens to progress. In Synchronous Elastic circuits (not asynchronous) extra buffering of merges/steers may be needed for balancing the data and control.

**V. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS**

### A. Benchmarks

Our approach targets accelerators especially iterative algorithms with data dependent loops and lots of data dependencies. We tested implementations of the followings as benchmarks:

1) **ELGCD**: The Euclids GCD solver which derives the greatest common divisor of the inputs.

2) **POLY**: The Polynomial evaluation algorithm which can be executed with arbitrary degree of coefficients.

3) **SMUL**: A set of signed multiplications on signed inputs.
TABLE I: The metrics associated with every application for both Synchronous Elastic and Asynchronous (pure Elastic) implementations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application/Approach</th>
<th>No. of Teak Comps</th>
<th>No. of links</th>
<th>No. of Buffers/SE</th>
<th>Buffer Reduction (SE)/%</th>
<th>No. of Buffers/AS</th>
<th>Buffer Reduction (AS)/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/Simple</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/loop</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33.87 %</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.93 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/PAC</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43.54 %</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82.26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/Simple</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/loop</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>27.60 %</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45.83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/PAC</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44.79 %</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>85.33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/Simple</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/loop</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>33.33 %</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>35.09 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/PAC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.93 %</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85.96 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: The Experimental Results for Asynchronous (Pure Elastic) implementations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>No. of Buffers</th>
<th>Throughput [MBit/s]</th>
<th>Latency1 (ps)</th>
<th>Latency2 (ps)</th>
<th>Dynamic Power (uW)</th>
<th>Leakage Power (uW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/simple</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>881000</td>
<td>1729000</td>
<td>12.1689</td>
<td>32.2589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/loop</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>705000</td>
<td>1306900</td>
<td>14.6304</td>
<td>25.1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELGCD/PAC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>634000</td>
<td>1225000</td>
<td>13.939</td>
<td>21.3084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/simple</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>675000</td>
<td>1499000</td>
<td>12.5316</td>
<td>50.3335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/loop</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>616000</td>
<td>1361000</td>
<td>13.3248</td>
<td>43.0839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMUL/PAC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>671000</td>
<td>1318000</td>
<td>10.4344</td>
<td>35.8966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/simple</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3047000</td>
<td>50078000</td>
<td>12.5376</td>
<td>100.0439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/loop</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2795000</td>
<td>48020000</td>
<td>12.2293</td>
<td>73.5797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLY/PAC</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2914000</td>
<td>47620000</td>
<td>12.0182</td>
<td>71.8703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4: The comparison results for the approaches in Synchronous Elastic ElGcd benchmark

Fig. 5: The comparison results for the approaches in Synchronous Elastic POLY benchmark

B. Experimental Setup

The benchmarks are implemented in the Balsa language and synthesised using eTeak. Both Asynchronous and Synchronous Elastic implementations of the benchmarks are studied. For each benchmark three different buffering policies are considered: (i) **Simple policy**: It buffers all the links in the dataflow, which gains the shortest local cycle time in the asynchronous designs and, of course, shortest critical path in the synchronous domain. This policy is exhaustive and imposes significant overhead. (ii) **loop policy**: the classic asynchronous method where every loop in the design is buffered blindly to avoid deadlocks. (iii) **PAC policy**: The proposed methodology in this work.

Every design is technology mapped using eTeak’s rich backend. The 90nm technology node is used in our experiments. All of the datapath components are re-synthesised and tech mapped using Synopsys’ Design Compiler and used in the eTeak networks; Two different data sets are fed into the designs for a certain amount of time. Note that the datapath
components (like adders) are combinatorial logic and impose a long critical path. However this dose not affect our retiming methodology as we focus on channles and variables. For asynchronous circuits, the throughput is determined by measuring the average cycle time of the circuit. The cycle time is the delay between producing consecutive results in the repeated operation. Throughput is defined as the number of results spitted out in a certain period of time. Both the asynchronous and synchronous elastic dataflow circuits show a data-dependent behaviour with different input data sets. In the synchronous elastic circuits ‘clock’ is introduced which unlike the asynchronous designs is defined based on the worst-case cycle time (aka critical path). A range of clock frequencies has been tested for synchronous elastic circuits. The buffering policies vary the number of buffers on WAR/RAW/PAC links whilst the overall structure remains almost the same. Therefore, reducing the number of buffers has direct impact on area.

C. Results and Discussion

Table II depicts the metrics associated with each application. Number of teak components is the same in different implementations of each benchmark. However the implementation details of the components change when moving from the asynchronous to the synchronous elastic domain as the protocol changes from 4-phase return-to-zero to a forward-interlocked protocol. The buffer reduction rates compared to Simple policy are illustrated in the table. It could be observed that the PAC methodology reduces the number of buffers up to nearly 72% in synchronous elastic and up to nearly 86% in asynchronous circuits compared to simple policy. The improvement against Loop is 57% and 78% in synchronous elastic and asynchronous circuits, respectively.

Table III presents the results in the asynchronous domain. The leakage power is reduced by 35% which is the impact of decreasing the size of the circuit. This has consequences on throughput which is expectable as the asynchronous circuits benefit from over buffering as it shortens the cycle time in average. The second input data set has higher latency. Therefore the latency is reduced compared to both loop and simple policies. A slight decrease in POLY and SMUL is observed which is negligible.

Figure 4 demonstrates the combo results associated with the synchronous elastic ElGcd. (a) shows the impact of the clock frequency (\(\delta\)) in different buffering approaches where the cycle time (\(\gamma\)) varies in different buffering policies. It can be seen that the throughput (\(\theta = Tp\)) is higher in PAC (figure 4a-throughput) compared to its Loop and Simple counterparts. Note that in the synchronous elastic circuits with Simple buffering over clocking the circuit results in lower latency (figure 4a-latency) however the produced results are approximately correct as the critical path delay is violated. This does not affect functionality as long as the control bits enclosed in data are safe.

In general PAC results in lower latency. By reducing the number of elastic buffers the overall latency decreases. The leakage power in Figure 4b-Dynamic which is proportional to area is decreased while reducing the number of buffers across the selected policies. Dynamic power in Figure 4b-Leakage increases linearly as the clock frequency increases. The penalty of increasing throughput and decreasing the leakage power in PAC is reasonable when considering the performance/power factor against the other policies.

In POLY (figures 5) and MUL (Figure 6) the PAC impact on performance is at least twice higher than GCD. PAC attempts to decompose the shared memories (variables) and replace them with buffers (communication memories). Although all of the considered descriptions the number of variables are equal, their utilisation by the explicit control varies. For instance, in GCD variables are within a While-loop which exerts limitation on the decomposition performed by PAC. Whilst in POLY and MUL variables are regularly distributed and accesses are less control dominant which makes PAC more effective.

VI. Conclusion

We introduced an automatic retiming technique which refines the CSP based dataflow accelerators of eTeak via buffer resizing/insertion to meet application’s power, area or performance constraints. Our experiments demonstrate how different memory arrangements across the design could impact the clock frequency and, consequently, the throughput and power consumption.

The slack elastic nature of the CSP dataflows allows us to explore different degrees of pipelining without affecting the functionality. By separating functionality from timing we demonstrate that most of the compiler-level transformations are applicable at later phases where timing takes place.

As future work, we exploit this technique to investigate architectural scaling in the FPGA domain where compile and synthesis takes so long. It is extremely necessary to leverage flexible architectures that satisfy constraints with minimal structural changes such as varying the FIFO depths or changing the degree of pipelining.
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