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## CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMIMARY

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Burroughs Corporation is pleased to present this report which is the result of work carried on under an extension to contract No. NAS2-9456, a preliminary study for a Numerical Aerodynamic Simulation Facility. The primary objective of this extension is to produce an optimized functional design of key elements of the candidate facility defined in the Final Report ${ }^{(1)}$ of the basic contract. This is accomplished by effort in the following tasks:

- To further develop, optimize and describe the function description of the custom hardware.
- To delineate trade-off areas between performance, reliability, availability, serviceability and programmability.
- To develop metrics and models for validation of the candidate systems performance.
- To conduct a functional simulation of the system design.
- To perform a reliability analysis of the system design.
- To develop the software specifications to include a user level high level programming language, a correspondence between the programming language and instruction set and outline the operation system requirements.

The results of this effort are presented in five separate chapters:
Chapter 2. Functional Description includes a summary of the system parameters, block diagrams, descriptions, of the major elements and the instruction set with detailed timing.

Chapter 3. Software Issues describes the extensions and restrictions on the FORTRAN language and compiler at the functional level a discussion of converting statements in extended FORTRAN into machine language and a statement regarding the operating system.

Chapter 4. Simulations presents the models, metrics and methodology for conducting the simulation along with preliminary results.

Chapter 5. Reliability includes two sections. The first presents the results of an availability analysis of the systems and the second present further discussion of the error detection, correction and control to be employed.

Chater 6. Trade-offs delineates and discusses a large number of design and operating factors for which reasonable alternatives exist.

While the information in this report is designed to stand alone it is also considered to be a supplement to the Final Report (Ref. 2) of the basic NAS2-9456 contract where appropriate, reference is made to this report rather than to unnecessarily repeat previously reported information.

In addition, it should be pointed out that certain terminology used in the previous report have been revised. The new terms are:

- Flow Model Processor (FMP). This is the portion of the system previously called the Navier-Stokes Solver (NSS).
- Processor Data Memory (PDM) was previously called Processing Element Memory (PEM)
- Processor Program Memory (PPM) was previously called Processing Flement Program Memory (PEPM)
- Execution Unit (EU), the logic portion of the array processor, formerly called Processor Element (PE).

The following sections summarize the chapters in additional detail.

### 1.2 FUNCTIONAL DESIGN

TheFMP is an array processor of 512 processors, a control unit, and 521 modules of extended memory, as described in Reference 1. The major additions found in Chapter 2, to the description of reference 1, are, first, the provision of SECDED, instead of parity-plus-retry, as the expected means of error control in the processors' memory, second, the addition of four on-line spare processors as definitely a part of the design (they are mentioned briefly as a possibility in reference 1); third, significant revisions and additions to the instruction set; fourth, the restriction of the extended memory instructions to fetching 512 words (one per processor) per instruction, (the earlier description had EM instructions fetching $512 \times \mathrm{N}$ words per instruction); and fifth, provision for special hardware for computing any floating-point variables that are not members of a vector.

Chapter 2 includes diagrams and figures of every element of the FMP.

### 1.3 SOFITWARE

The software chapter covers the FORTRAN language, to a depth necessary to cover simple test cases, discusses hand compiling, and is charged with the task of reporting on progress in defining the operating system during this contract extension. Three and only three extensions are visualized for the initial FORTRAN language. First, the DOALL construct declares to the compiler that the iterations of a particular loop can be done in any sequence, or all in parallel, without affecting the result; second, declarations of several types of use of variables are used to allocate those variables among the different types of memory; third, certain system library functions are required, because of the parallel nature of the machine, that would not be required in serial FORTRAN. None of these library functions are required for the initial benchmarks.

The operating system is extensively described in reference 1. The level of detail in that document is such that the effort of the contract extension was spent more fruitfully on language definition, compiler considerations, and hand compilation procedures. Thus, the operating system discussion in reference 1 still stands as the best description so far produced of the operating system of the FMP. No attempt has been made to update that description for this report.

### 1.4 SIMULATION

Chapter 4 discusses the separation of the simulation effort into two levels, instruction and FMP level, and the system level. Metrics for each level are discussed, and SUBROUTINE TURBDA has been selected as the metric for the simulation done in this extensionis also given. The BOSS simulator, in which our simulation is being done, is described briefly in chapter 4.

### 1.5 RELIABILITY

A detailed computer model for the reliability of the F'MP was run. The results of this model bound the availability at 96 percent being the lower limit of availability using pessimistic assumptions, and better than 99 percent availability being achieved under the most optimistic assumptions. The use of sparc processors with operating system automatic restart (assumed successful for some fraction of all attempts) produces a very significant improvement over the model that has no spare processors.

The reliability section also includes a discussion of the use of SECDED in all memory, of the process of "scrubbing" out the errors that spontaneously arise in CCD storage (DBIM), and of other error control strategems that are used in , the FiMP.

### 1.6 TRADEOFFS

Chapter 6 discusses tradeoffs in many areas. These include ease of programming versus execution efficiency, where one wishes to have most of both, word and instruction formats, error control methods versus their cost in reduced throughput, several specific design issues, relative speeds of specific blocks of the system, alternate methods of supplying the floating-point scalar capability, and other topics, with a final section on the expansibility of both the specific FIMP, once built, and the expansibility of the design from which it was built.

FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION OF NSS HARDWARE

### 2.1 INTRODUCTION

This functional description is arranged in several successive sections. First, a brief system description of the SAM that is the baseline system for FMP is given. Second, a brief list of system parameters is provided. Third, the elements of the system block diagram are each described in turn. Fourth, the instruction set of the FMPis given, together with its timings.

In all of this, it has not been felt necessary to repeat material that is found in the final report of contract NAS2-9456, except very briefly to refresh the reader's recollection. It is presumed that the reader has first read that report.

No design should be considered to be necessarily final if further investigation should show that the machine performs better with the feature modified. Chapter 6, "Tradeoffs", is a discussion of many of the features that will be studied in simulation during phase 2 (time permitting), and which are therefore likely to be modified in the direction of higher throughput if the baseline system is found wanting.

This functional description is intended to provide the base for the information input to a performance simulation of the SAM of the FMP. Some of the information, such as error correction capabilities, is included for completeness in spite of the fact that it has no apparent involvement in a performance simulation.

### 2.2 BASIC SYSTEM PARAMETERS

Most of the basic system parameters were covered in some detail in the final report Ref. l. They are summarized here along with additional information of specific interest.
2.2.1 Logic Family - ECL is the preferred logic family. Final selection of circuits for implementation at this time would only lock us into choices that will become obsolete by 1979-1980 when the design is completed. We do not wish to preclude the use of up-to-date technology in the actual design. If the final design were being implemented at this time, Fairchild's l00K series would be chosen, together with compatible memory circuits. The chip count projected for 1979-1980 is the one assigned to the baseline system. Confidence in this package count is supported in most cases by the very similar chip count, of circuit types already available in 1977 (usually ECL l00K), which are also given.
2.2.2 Clock Rate - The clock has been assigned a 40 ns period. The instruction times, given below in terms of this clock period, are compatible with the instruction times derived from a preliminary processor design using ECL l00K.
2.2.3 Cabling Methods - The same flat belts used successfully in prior projects in Burroughs for transmitting high-speed signals with fast rise time and low crosstalk will be used for most of the interunit cabels. Reference l discusses this choice.
2.2.4 Power - While a number of comments on power were included in reference 1 , certain detailed information was not. These details are provided in the following statements.

- Switching regulators will be used for the sake of efficiency. A net efficiency of $65 \%$ is expected from the total power supply.
- DBM is provided with whatever power is required to make it nonvolatile against glitches and short power outages. Since CCD is proposed for DBM, battery backup would be highly desirable.
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Figure 2-1. Grounding

- The ground return from backplane to power supply is never used as part of the path that connects one backplane ground to another backplane ground. Figure 2-1 shows the grounding arrangements expected
- Total power for the FMPis estimated (very approximately) at 250 kw , based on an average of 0.8 w for each of the 200,000 circuit packages, and $65 \%$ efficiency in the power supply. These are for the 1980 projected circuit counts.
- Every module has its signal ground tied to chassis so that' there will be no floating grounds when the modules are tested as stand-alone modules. In Figure 2-1 these ties are shown as resistors.

A requirement on power supplies employed at NASA AMES is that they must ride through the undervoltage transients produced by wind tunnel motor startup, and not pass voltage spikes. In addition, they should be reasonably respectful to the source. उGquai.a] power supply configurations. satisfy this requirement.

- Motor-generator set. Inertia enables an M-G set to ride through large transients. The inefficiency of the M-G set is multiplied into the inefficiency of the system power supplies. The advantage of an $M-G$ set is that it can be added to a system after the fact, without impacting any existing design.
- Transformerless rectifiers, like the old AC-DC radio, require a filter capacitor, which suppresses spikes, and if large enough, will ride through undervoltage transisents. The unregulated DC (about 280 v ) is distributed around the equipment and used as input to individual switching regulators. SCR rectifiers are to be avoided, since they inject noise back into the line.
- Battery back-up Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS).

Of the three schemes, the transformerless rectifier lis most efficient, and takes the least space. It also has the advantage that back-up batteries can be supplied to a selected subset of the equipment (DBM, in this case). It is also easy to make the rectification redundant. Three-phase full wave rectifiers are actually six-phase for ripple characteristics. They often need no chokes, and have wide conduction angles in the rectifier diodes.
2.2.5. Number of Processors - A key decision in the design of the FMP is the choice of the number of processors to be implemented. The design presented here is based on using the fastest processor that is consistent with the speed of memory built of $16 \mathrm{k}-\mathrm{bit}$ static RAM chips. Projecting 100 ns speed for such chips, we arrive at a 360 ns floating point multiply as being approximately in balance. A faster processor would yield increased speed only if the memory were changed to the faster 4 k -bit chips, implying a four-fold increase in the number of components in memory. Reliability, even more than cost, tells us to keep the parts count down, and therefore to design a system consistent with 16 k -bit memory chips. It takes about 512 processors, at these speeds, to yield the desired billion floating point operands per second with sufficient margin for inefficiencies.

### 2.3 OVERVIEW OF FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTION

### 2.3.1 Block Diagram

Figure 2-2 (a slightly expanded copy of Figure l-2 of the Ref. 1) shows the array processor consisting mostly of 512 processors attached by a switch, the Transposition Network, to 521 Extended Memory modules which hold the main data base of the program. Used


Figure 2-2. SAM Block Diagram
as a staging area for jobs not yet started, and as the output area for jobs in process or completed, is Data Base Memory. A Control Unit synchronizes the action and controls the transposition network and the transfers in and out on both faces of the extended memory. The controller for the Data Base Memory also accepts requests from the host processor to transfer to and from the host disk pack file system. The Data Base Memory controller resolves access conflicts to and from data base memory. The Control Unit resolves accesses to and from Extended Memory. There is also a Diagnostic Controller used for maintenance and cold starts.

Each processor is self-contained, with integer and floating-point arithmetic units, its own instruction decoder, its own program memory, and its own data memory. In addition to the 512 processors, four processors are included as on line spares to help achieve system availability requirements. The use of these on-line spare processors is discussed in Chapter Five.

### 2.3.2 Instruction Streams

As described in Ref. 1, the FMP is controlled by two instruction streams, which are created in parallel by the compiler from a single sequence of source statements. One instruction stream is being executed in the control unit; the other is being executed by all processors asynchronously of each other. Some statements in the source code result in instructions in both instruction streams. Examples are "CALL subroutine", or an arithmetic statement using an EM variable, and therefore requiring a fetch to all processors from the EM. Some of these joint instructions require that the control unit and the processors synchronize themselves. It has been observed that reference 1 does not seem to be clear in explaining synchronization, nor in explicating the means of accomplishing it. Therefore, the discussion digresses here to a detailed discussion of the synchronization mechanism.

### 2.3.3 Synchronization.

The process of synchronization occurs within instructions. It involves two signal lines which go from the control unit to all processors, namely "CUready" and "go". "CUready" is a level, "Go" is a pulse that arrives at all processors simultaneously. From each processor there are two lines, "Enabled" is a copy of the "enabled" flipflop that exists in each processor; "I got here" is a signal, a level, which is raised during the execution of some instructions.

To explain the process, consider the example of a LOADEM instruction fetching $N$ words from EM. In the control unit, the LOADEM causes the raising of the "Cuready" line as soon as the TN controls have been set to the proper value. In each processor where "enabled" is true, "I got here" is raised as soon as the processor starts executing the LOADEM instruction.

When any processor executing LOADEM sees "CUready" true, the processor sends the address through the TN to the $E M$ module that is connected to this processor. The strobe accompanying the address causes the loading of the address within the EM module.

An "all processors ready" signal, marking the time at which the last enabled processor arrives at the LOADEM instruction is created for the $C U$ (The logic creating this signal is actually contained within the fanout tree). Using $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{n}}$ as the "enable" bit of the nth processor, and $H_{n}$ as the "I got here" line of the nth processor, the "all Processors ready" signal is given by the formula

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { All-processors-ready }=\left(\mathrm{H}_{1} \text { OR } \widetilde{\mathrm{E}_{1}}\right) \text { AND }\left(\mathrm{H}_{2} \text { OR } \widehat{\mathrm{E}_{2}}\right) \text { AND } \ldots \\
& \text { AND }\left(\mathrm{H}_{512} \text { OR } \widetilde{\mathrm{E}_{512}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

There is also "any processor enabled", the OR of all the "enable" bits.

When the CU sees "all processsors ready", the CU issues, after an appropriate delay to let addresses be loaded, a series of N "read" commands to the EM module and also issues, appropriately timed with respect to the last such command, a "go" pulse to the processors. In the processor, we load $N$ words under control of the N strobes coming from EM module through the $\mathbb{T N}$. The "go" signals the end of the instruction.

As a second example, consider the instruction WAIT. Here no processor action timed to the "CUready" is required, so the CU sends no "CUready". When the CU sees the "all processors ready" signal formed from the "I got here"s and the "enable"s, it issues a "go" to all processors, who have refrained from executing their next instruction until the "go" is received.

When the processor has raised its "I got here" line, but before it has received a "go" signal, it is said to be "îwaiting". The "I got here" line is dropped upon receipt of the "go" pulse.

In addition to the above synchronization, the $C U$ also has the power to transmit commands. The commands are carried on a 4-bit-wide bus accompanied by a strobe line. Many of these commands are used in the diagnostic programs. Ref. 1, p 4-27, has a tentative list of operations called forth by these commands. Some of these commands will be conditional on the "enable" bit of the processor, some are unconditional independent of the enable bit. The only such command that is used in user-generated FORTRAN programs is the command that simultaneously loads the program counter and sets the enable bit.

The control unit's command power is exerted over all processors at once, not over individual processors. Processors that do not join in some array-wide operation avoid it by a) jumping around the operation, if it is local to each processor, b) executing certain
instructions (LOADEM, STOREM, SHIFTN) as noops conditional on the last bit of an integer register in the processor, or c) executing the $\operatorname{STOP}$ instruction, which turns off the "enable" bit until the CU reaches some point in its instruction stream that turns it back on.

There is also an interrupt line from processor to $C U$.

### 2.3.4 Starting a Run

During normal operation, all data and program for the next run will be loaded into data base memory prior to the beginning of the run. When the run starts, system software in the CU loads program from data base memory to the memory of the control unit (via extended memory). The initialization phase of the program then transfers necessary data to extended memory, and transmits the processors' program to them. These actions are automatically inserted by the compiler and the linker. With data in place in extended memory, and allocated space initialized to "invalid"V and with code files in place in control unit and processors, user execution starts.

### 2.3.5 FiMP Hardware Summary

The Flow Model Processor therefore consists of

- One Control Unit (CU) with its own memory (CUM) with optional scalar processor capability.
- 512 Processors, (plus 4 spares) each with its own Processor Data Memory (PDM) and Processor Program Memory (PPM)
- One Transposition Network
- 521 Extended Memory modules
- One Data Base Memory and Controller
- One Diagnostic Controller


#### Abstract

All of the above is shown in Figure 2-2 except for the optional scalar processor and the four spare processors. The scalar processor is an ingredient of the design which was not needed in order to successfully match the SAM to the aerodynamic flow models. Since the scalar processor was not discussed in reference 1 , further discussion thereon is found in Chapter 6.


### 2.4 INDIVIDUAL BLOCKS

Following is a brief description of each of the elements of the FMPtogether with a formatted tabulation of pertinent features and .a block diagram of each.

### 2.4.1 Description of Tables

For each element of the FMP, there is a table of characteristics given. A very short narrative description gives the intended function of the element in user programs. Source of control is identified, and the storage capabilities, both capacity and speed, are also given. Connectivity to other elements is broken down to a rather detailed level, with each group of signals that has an identifiably different function being so identified. In some. cases, such as CU to processor, signals in the same belt are identified as a different group in order to more clearly identify their use.

The table also discusses the mode of error control built into the design. Some mechanisms of error control were included in the baseline system design in the final report. Some further mechanisms of error control are proposed in Chapter 5. Th-is section represents a particular state of the design, not the final state.

Two chip counts are given. The 1979-1980 projected chip count is the one projected for the baseline system. The second chip count, using parts now existing in 1977, is given only for corroboration, to indicate the reasonableness of that projection. It also represents the chip count of the FMP if design were frozen now. There are also in some cases estimates of the power drain. All these are included only for interest. These are preliminary. They have no direct bearing on the performance evaluation simulation.
"TBD" means "to be determined".
2.4.2 Processor The array of 512 processors is charged with the task of executing the user computations in the program, namely the floating-point. operations on the problem variables.

The processor executes code contained in its own program memory, and accepts. commands from the control unit. Certain instructions (see Table 2-13) are executed in synchronism with the control unit (and hence, by implication, in synchronism with the entire array, since the control unit expects cooperation from all processors.)

The actions of the processor are delineated by the instruction set in the next section. Figure $2-3$ shows pictorially the division of the processor into and execution unit, a data memory, and a


Figure 2-3. Processor Block Diagram

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY
program memory. Figure $2-4$ is a block diagram of the logic part of the processor, showing the independent integer and floating point units, with separate register files for each. Figure $2-5$ is a diagram of the instruction fetching and overlap machinery, which is explained at length below in connection with the timing of instruction execution. The logic portion of the processor has been named the "execution unit." Table 2-1 provides data on the EU.

Connections to the processor come from the control unit and the transposition network. A byte-wide (8-bit) data path is found both from (BDCST) and to (HVST) the control unit. The synchronization signals discussed previously also come from the control unit. The 4-bit wide command path, and its strobe, also come from the control unit. The data paths to (STOREM) and from (LOADEM) the transposition network are each accompanied by a strobe. In addition, each processor is connected to backplane wiring that expresses its own number. Of the 129 processors in a cabinet, any one may be the spare processor. Suppose processor no. $N$ is the spare processor. Then the backplane number for processors 0 through $\mathrm{N}-1$ is correct, but the backplane number for processors Nl through 128 must be shifted own by one, to $N$ through 127, in order that the processors being used by the program be consecutively numbered. Therefore, there is a one-bit signal coming from the switching machinery which tells the processor whether or not to subtract 1 from its hard-wired processor number to correct for the location of the spare.

Error control within the processor consists of bounds checks, reasonableness checks, and consistency checks, as listed in Ref. 1. See Sections 6.7 and 6.8 for further checks that may be implemented but at some cost in throughput.

For justification of the 1977 component count, see appendix $E$ of volume II of reference 1.


Figure 2-4. Internal Block Diagram of EU


Figure 2-5. Instruction Fetching and Overlap OF POOR QUALITY

TABLE 2-1
EXECUTION UNIT CHARACTERISTICS

UNIT: Execution Unit (EU) No. In System: $512+4$ on-line spares
FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Function: This is the logic portion of the processor, all the processor except memory. It executes code that has been wr itten by the EMP FORTRAN compiler, including EM address computations, index calculations and floating point operations.

Source of Control; During User Program: Program stored in PPM, sync's from the CU. During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same plus CU commands

Storages; Capacity: 16 16-bit integer registers 16 48-bit floating point registers Other registers (see text)
Speed: Multiple accesses each 40 ns clock

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | No. <br> Sig | Timing | Primary Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | BDCST | From CU | 8 | byte/20ns | Receive global variables from CU |
| 3 | HVST | To CU | 8 | byte/20ns | Transmit result to CU (global) |
| 4 | LOADEM | From TN | 9 | byte/20ns | Receive data from EM |
| 4 | STOREM | To TN | 9 | byte/20ns | Transmit data to EM |
| 5 | CUinstr | From CU | 4 | TBD | Primarily for diagnostics |
| 6 | SYnc | To CU | 4 | edge | Synchronization |
| 7 | SYnc | From.CU | 4 | edge | Synchronization |
| 8 | PEno | Wired to | 9 | D.C. level | Processor 's own number |
|  |  | backplane |  |  |  |

## RELIABILITY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORIHINESS

Error Control Methods: TBD. Modulo 3 check on arithmetic is being evaluated. Error : cases are detected (see text).
Repair Methods: Replace and restart from restart point. On-line replacement (with manual pull-and-replace at a later convenience of the repairman) is very feasible.
MTBF of Unit: See Chapter 5.
Degraded Modes Available: Programs can be compiled to use less than all the processors available, thereby bypassing any failed processors. On-line switching of spare processors.

PHYSICAL
Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 100 If use 1977 parts: 160 (100K ECL etc.) (based on preliminary logic design using 100K)
Pysical Size: 1980: One large pc. sized module. 1977: Single removable module
Power Drain: 1980: 150 w 1977: 300 w


#### Abstract

2.4.3 Processor Data Memory - The processor data memory (PDM) contains work space for each processor. It is also used to hold local copies of global information, to facilitate their being fetched by the processor's program. It can be used to window data from EM. Control is from the memory address register in the processor. There are 16384 words of 55 bits, consisting of 48 bits data and 7 bits of single-error correcting, double-errordetecting code. Data address, and control connections are solely to the processor. 16 k -bit static RAM chips are used. Figure 2-6 shows some of the logic in the processor associated with the port into PDM. Table 2-2 describes major characteristics of the PDM. See sections 6.6, 6.12, 6.13 for discussion of tradeoffs in PDM design.


### 2.4.4 Processor Program Memory. Processor Program Memory (PPM)

 contains the code file from which the processor executes. It is addressed directly by the program counter. Overlay comes from the CU via the "broadcast" (BDCST) path. Except for the size of 8192 words, design is identical with that of PDM.
### 2.4.5 Control Unit (CU)

### 2.4.5.1 Basic Control Unit

The control unit, during user programs, is in charge of synchronizing the array for those instructions that require a synchronized array; it issues the "go" signal. It also handles those portions of the address computation that must be issued from a central point. The control unit executes the FMP-resident portion of the system software. It has a single shared memory (CUM) for both program and data.


Figure 2-6. PDM Logic

TABLE 2-2
CHARACTERISTICS OF PROCESSOR DAI'A MEMORY
UNIT: Processor Data Memory (PDM) No. In System: $512+4$ spares with spare processor . (formerly processing element memory PEM)

FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Function: Stores temporary variables generated by the processor during computation. Work space. Subroutine return information. Windows EM data.
Source of Control; During User Program: EU command lines
During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Storages; Capacity: 16,384 words.
Speed: 120 ns cycle

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { Sig. } \end{aligned}$ | Timing | Primary Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | data | To/from EU | 55 | static | Fetch and store data |
| 2 | address | From Eu | 16 | static | Address |
| 3 | control | From EU | 2 | edge or | Command |

## RELIABILITYY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORTHINESS

Error Control Methods: SECDED
Repair Method: Removed with entire processor. Not a separate entity.
MIBF of Unit: Dominated by control chips because of SECDED.
Degraded Modes Available: Programs compiled to less than 512 processors bypass failed 'PDM's. Error correction allows program to continue, but with reduced reliability, in single-bit failure cases. On-line switching of failed processors.

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 70
( 55 16k-bit mem +15 control)
Physical Size; 1980: Part of processor assy.
Power Drain; 1980:

If use 1977 Parts: 250
(100K ECL, etc.) ( 2204 k -bit mem. +30 control)
1977: Part of processor assy. 1977:

FROM EU


Figure 2-7. PPM Logic

TABLE 2-3
PROCESSOR PROGRAM MEMORY CHARACTERISTICS
UNIT: Processor Program Memory (PPM) No. In System: $512+4$ spares with
spare processor
FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS $\qquad$
Function: Contains program for the processor. Is loaded using the BDCST path from the CU .

Source of Control; During User Program: Processor's program counter. During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Storages; Capacity: 8,192 words
Speed: 120 ns

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | No. | Sig. | Timing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | Primary Use

## RELIABILITTY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORTHINESS

Error Control Methods: SECDED
Repair Method: Remove with entire processor. Not a separate entity.
MTBF of Unit: See Chapter 5
Degraded Modes Available: Program compiled to less than 512 processors bypass failed PPM's. Error correction allows program to continue at reduced reliability, in single bit failure cases. On-line switching of failed processors.

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection 43

- ( 28 mem +15 control)

Physical Size; 1980: Part of processor assy.
Power Drain; 1980:

If use 1977 parts: 140
(100K ECL, etc.) (110 mem + 30 control)
1977: Part of processor assy. 1977:

The control unit can also be controlled by commands from the host computer issued via the Diagnostic Controller (DC). This mode of operation is supplied for the purpose of performing diangostics.

The control unit is at once the most complex, in terms of variety of functions performed, and the most pedestrian, in terms of the demands it makes on the logic designer, of all the units in the FMP. Such hand analysis as has been done indicates that for the aerodynamic flow problems, the control unit will most of the time be waiting on the processors. One of the aims of the simulation is to find out if this statement is really true, or whether an investment in a faster control unit will pay off.

The frequency with which the $C U$ executes system software upon interrupt, in the middle of user executions, will affect the required speed of the CU . The present plan is to so allocate the tasks in the system that during normal executions no interrupts either from host or resulting from FMP code are expected.

The host initiates file-system-to-DBM transfers using its copy of the DBM allocation map and issuing I/O commands directly to the DBM controller. No FMP-resident routine is involved in the initiation or completion of these transfers. The DBM controller resolves any potential conflict between these host transfers and a CU-initiated DBM-EM transfer.

Figure 2-7 is the block diagram of a control unit built around a single bus for transferring all data to and from memory, and using this same bus for one of the register file outputs. Such a structure defeats overlap but simplifies design. If simulation were to show that a faster $C U$ is needed, a faster $C U$ would be built.
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In addition to the portion shown in Figure 2-8, the control unit also contains a section which resolves conflicts for EM between the instructions of the NSS and the needs of the DBM controller.

The control unit has four semi-independent execution stations, just as the processor has three. The degree to which the execution of the independent sections is to be overlapped is a subject for study during simulations in future work. Using the two aerodynamic flow models as benchmarks tells us that no overlap is required, therefore specifying an exact mechanism of overlap has been deferred. The four units are:

* Integer Unit
* Memory Control
* Floating Point Unit (optional, can be omitted if it is determined that so called scalar processor capability is not required for the contemplated applications. See Section 6.5)
* Interface to host and DBM controller

Instruction timing is given in the next section, 2.5. Table 2-4 lists the features of the CU .

### 2.4.5.2 Scalar Processor

Floating point scalars are an item of concern in some applications. In the baseline system, an optional design feature to handle floating-point scalars is a floating-point arithmetic capability in the control unit. For a discussion of other options for attaching scalar capability to the FMP, see section 6.16. Scalar floating point capability is not be be confused with the "scalar unit" found in some other designs. The addressing and control functions of such a "scalar unit" are included in the control unit here whether or not the floating-point option is included.

TABLE 2-4
CONTROL UNIT CHARACTERISTICS
UNIT: Control Unit: (CU) No. In System: 1
FUNCIIONAL CHARACTERISTICS:
Function: Executes the non-array portion of the FMP program. Executes the FMP resident portion of the system software.

Source of Control; During User Program: Program stream contained in Control Unit Memory During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same plus commands issued from Diagnostic Controller

Storages; Capacity: Integer Register file, perhaps 16 words, exact number to be determined by simulation. Floating point register file of 16 words.
Speed: Single-clock access to two registers per file. 40 ns clock.

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | Sig. | Timing | Primary Use |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | control | To DBM Controller | TBD | TBD | Control of DBM-EM transfers |
| 2 | return | From DBM Controller | TBD | TBD | Completion, error, EM conflict resolution |
| 3 | control | To EM | TBD | TBD | Control of EM |
| 4 | return | From EM | TBD | TBD | Monitoring, errors, interrupt |
| 5 | control | To TN | 13 | TBD | Control of TN |
| 6 | STORCU | To TN | 9 | byte/20ns | Data to be stored in EM |
| 7 | LOADCU | From TN | 9 | byte/20ns | Data fetched from EM to CU |
| 8 | Command | To Processor | 4 | TBD | Diagnostic comands to the processor |
| 9 | Sync | To Processor | 4 | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 10 | Sync | From Processor | 4 | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 11 | BDCST | To Processor | 8 | byte/20ns | Broadcast data |
| 12 | HVST | To Processor | 8 | byte/20ns | Data (such as global max) to CU |

RELIABILITY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORIHINESS
Error Control Methods: TBD
Repair Method: TBD. Repair in place; FMP is down until CU repaired
MTBF of Unit: See Chapter 5
Degraded Modes Available: None.

## PHYSICAL

| Chip Count; 1980 Projection: | 3,000 chips |
| :--- | :--- |
| (a coarse estimate) | If use 1977 parts: 4,000 chips |
| Physical Size: 1980 | 100 k EL , etc.) |
| Power Drain: 1980 | $1977:$ |

The FORTRAN language and compiler of chapter 3 makes no use of the floating-point option in the $C U$, as there was no use for it in the four codes used for benchmarking.

### 2.4.6 Control Unit Memory (CUM)

The control unit memory holds both program and data for the control unit. It is addressible only from the control unit, and sends all data into the central data bus of the control unit.

The control unitt memory is identical in electrical design and uses the same l6k-bit RAM chips as the processor memories. Its size is subject to verification via simulation. The size resulting from considerations of the flow-model matching study is 32,768 words.

The control unit memory is initially loaded from DBM at the beginning of each run using a routine which is itself resident in CUM and executes on the CU. The routine transfers data and program from DBM to CUM via EM.

Data on the control unit memory is found in Table 2-5.

### 2.4.7 Extended Memory Module

Extended memory (EM) is the "main" memory of the FMP, in that it holds the data base for the program during program execution. Temporary variables, or work space, can be held in either EM or PDM, as appropriate to the problem. All I/O to and from the FMP is to and from EM via DBM. Control of the EM is from two sources, the first is instructions executed in the $C U$, the second is the DBM controller which handles the DBM-EM transfers. In the baseline system design; the DBM-EM rate is such that the CU c̣an be given first priority into EM without losing any of the DBM-EM transfers, therefore, the $C U$ instructions have priority in the EM.

TABLE 2-5
CHARACTERISTICS OF CONTROL UNIT MEMORY
UNIT: Control Unit Memory (CUM) No. In System: 1
FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Function: Contains data local to the CU , and CU 's program. Also contains processor program as source for overlay during runs. Holds mailbox for host-FMP communication. Holds copy of DBM allocation map.

Source of Control; During User Program: CU
'During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same plus may be accessed by DC if CU not running

Storages; Capacity: 32,768 words.
Speed: 120 ns cycle

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | No. | Sig. | Timing | Primary Use |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | data | To/from CU | 55 | Static | Fetch and store data |  |
| $2:$ | address | From CU | 16 | Static | Address |  |
| 3 | command | From CU | 2 | edge or <br> static | Cormand |  |

## RELIABILITY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORIHINESS

Error Control Methods: SECDED
Repair Method: FMP is down while CUM is down. Must replace failed modules for FMP to recover.
MTBE of Unit: Dominated by control logic because of SECDED
Degraded Modes Available: Error correction allows program to continue at reduced reliability; in single-bit failure cases.

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 175 chips ( 110 men +15 control)
Physical Size; 1980: TBD
Power Drain; 1980:

If use. 1977 parts: 470
( 100 ECL , etc.) $440 \mathrm{mem}+30$ control)
1977: TBD
1977:

EM consists of 521 identical modules, which are accessed in parallel. 521 is a prime number for the sake of allowing efficient parallel fetching for all vectors of any length (with the minor exception of any vectors that happen to have elements spaced apart in memory by exactly 521).

From each EM module we need a transfer rate and access time consistent with the most economical implementation. For the baseline system, an implementation in 64 k -bit dynamic RAM was chosen, as being the most economical implementation available by 1980. The low chip count also enhances reliability. Projections say that a 64 k -bit chip will have 250 ns cycle time by that date. The 280 ns cycle time of the memory is compatible with the 140 ns per word transfer rate through the transposition network. Each word carries single- error-correction-double-error-detection code, which is generated at the source (DBM, CU, or processor) and also checked there, so that transfer paths are covered by the same error control as the contents of $E M$.

Having decided on a TN that is almost twice as fast as the EM module, it would be possible to build the EM module in two interlaced submodules, if it the streaming mode of fetching were to see much use. Section 6.10 discusses the tradeoff between implementing or not implementing this streaming mode of access. The baseline system as described in this document avoids the complexities of a design suitable for streaming, which includes among other things, a capability of incrementing the address in the EM module by nonunity increments. The chip count of table 2-6 does not include any incrementer.


Figure 2-9. EM Module

TABLE 2-6
EM MODULE CHARACTERISTICS
UNIT: EM Module
No. in System: 521
FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS $\qquad$
Function: Stores problem data base during program executions. Most nearly corresponds to "core" of conventional processor.

Source of Control; During User Program: Receives commands from CU During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Storages; Capacity: 65,536 words
Speed: Access time 200-250 ns, interlaced for $140 \mathrm{~ns} /$ word block transfer

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | No. Sig. | Timing | Primary Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LOADEM | To 1 N | 9 | byte/20ns | Fetching data to processors and CU |
| 2 | STOREM | From ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 9 | byte/20ns | Storing data from processors and CU |
| 3 | - | To DBM | 9 | full word in 400 ns | Results back to DBM |
| 4 | -- | From DBM | 9 | full word in 400 ns | Initial data (and eventually, overlay) from DBM |
| 5 | No | From backplane | 10 | D.C. level | Module's own number |
| 6 | Control | From CU | TBD | IBD | Controls EM operations |

RELIABILITY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORIHINESS
Error Control Methods: SECDED (providing acceptable error rates are demonstrated)
Repair Method: Remove and replace
MTBF of Unit: Control dominates failure modes because of SECDED.
Degraded Modes Available: Data continues to be corrected even when there is one hard error, allowing the current program to complete before repairs are undertaken.

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 86
( 55 memory +30 control)
Physical Size; 1980: One medium sized p.c. board

Power Drain: 1980

If use 1977 parts: 274
(100K ECL, etc.) (224 mem. +50 control) 1977:

1977:

Figure $2-8$ shows the EM module, including two address registers, a one-word buffer for DBM transfers, and an access path to the EM modules own number, wired into the backplane. Table 2-6 gives the data on the EM module.

### 2.4.8 Fanout Tree

A series of fanout boards is supplied to provide the $C U$ to processor connection. From $C U$ to processor,s signals fan out to a final 512 destinations. From the processors, the signals are combined, so that, within the CU , a single result appears in response to 512 signals emitted by the processors. For example, the "all processors ready" signal becomes true at the clock that the last enabled processor emits "I got here". Another such signal is the 512-input OR of "enabled".

At the processor, some signals are wired per-processor directly to the last level of fanout board; others are daisy-chained to eight processors from a single signal pin on the last board. The fanout boards are pin-limited. Simple buffers with one input pin and one output pin per signal dominate the circuit count, so hex buffers, easily available today, will not be improved upon by 1979-1980.

Data on the fanout tree is in Table 2-7. The figure demonstrating the fanout tree is Figure 2-10.

### 2.4.9 Transposition Network

The transposition network allows the fully parallel, 512-wide, fetching of sets of variables that are to be processed in parallel. Up to 512 elements in one-dimensional vectors of any type can be fetched at full speed in parallel. When DOALL loops have two index variables, two-dimensional subsets of multidimentional arrays can also be fetched in parallel. For details, see Ref l, and Chapter Three.


TABLE 2-7
EANOUT TREE CHARACTERISTICS

```
UNIT: Fanout Tree, CU to Processors No. In System: I
```

FUNCITONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Function: Provides fanout for signals from $C U$ to the 512 processors; accepts signals from the 512 processors and combines them appropriately for the CU. Consists of 36 boards.

Source of Control; During User Program: No control; all passive logic. During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | No. Sig. | Timing | Primary Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | command | Erom Cu | 4 | TBD | Diagnostic |
| 2 | sync | From Cu | 4 | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 3 | syme | To CU | 4 | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 4 | BDCHT | From CU. | 8 | byte/20ns | Broadcast data |
| 5 | HVST | To CU | 8 | byte/20ns | Data to CU (such as global MAX) |
| 6 | command | To proc. 8 's | 4(x 64) | TBD | Diagnostic |
| 7 | sync | To proc. 8's | 4(x 64) | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 8 | symc | From proc. | 4(x 512) | edge | Synchronization of array |
| 9 | BDCST | To proc. 8's | 8(x 64) | byte/20ns | Broadcast data |
| 10 | HVST | From proc. 8's | $8(\mathrm{x} \mathrm{64)}$ | byte/20ns | 5l2-input OR of data from processor to CU. lst 8 -way $O R$ done on proc. wiring |

RELIABILIIY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSIWORIHINESS $\qquad$
Error Control Methods: SECDED on broadcast and harvest data. Repair Method: Remove and replace of defective boards. MI'BF of Unit: See Chapter 5. Degraded Modes Available: None

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 2,000 chips all small scale integration. Dominated by 1,504 hex buffers.
Physical Size; 1980: 32 cards of 60-80 chips each
Power Drain; 1980: 1.6 kw 1977: Same

The transposition network consists of 521 switchable data paths from EM to processor, and another 521 data paths from processor to EM. There are two lo-bit control registers, one for offset of the starting element, and one for skip distance. Since there are two sets of data paths, the first from processor to EM module, and the second from EM•module to processor, the settings of the two paths could be separately controlled. There is just one instruction that would go faster if both paths are used simultaneously with different settings, namely SHIFTN (see Table 2-10 and 2-11 for a description). SHIFTN is used in functions that operate "horizontally" across the parallelism of the array, such as global sum, global maximum, or global product. SHIFTN would also be used to implement a Fast Fourier transform on the FMP. In the aero codes used as benchmarks, there is very little use of SHIFTN, so there is no justification for having separate settings for the first and second data paths, and bidirectional data paths would serve as well.

A three-bit command register enables the following commands:

1. Enable transfers between processor and EM. The presence or absence of actual transfer is signified by the presence or absence of a signal on the strobe line that accompanies each byte-wide signal path.
2. Enable transfers between CU port and EM.
3. Enable transfers between the remaining eight paths and EM (built into the design to allow these eight ports to service the scalar processor).
4. Broadcast from selected EM module to all processors.

Table 2-8 gives the characteristics of the transposition network. Figure $2-11$ shows the barrel switches that implement it.


Figure 2-11. Transposition Network

TABLE 2-8
TRANSPOSITION NETWORK CHARACTERISTICS
UNIT: Transposition Network (TN) No. In System: 1

FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS $\qquad$
Function: Provides 521 data paths for fetching in parallel from all EM modules to all processors; provides 521 data paths for storing in parallel from all processors to 512 EM modules. Provides path from any one EM module to all processors. Provides data path to any EM module from CU, also path from any EM module to CU.

Source of Control; During User Program: Commands from cu. During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Storages; Capacity: None. Command register lo bits offset, 10 bits skip distance, about 3 bits of command. speed:

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# | Path | To or From | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { Sig. } \end{aligned}$ | Tİming | Primary Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | LOADEM | To Processor | 9(x 5l2) | 20ns/byte | Data to processor during IOADEM |
| 2 | STOREM | From Processor | 9(x 512) | byte/20ns | EM addresses and STOREM data from proc. |
| 3 | IOADCU | To CU | 9 | byte/20ns | Data to CU during IOADCU |
| 4 | STORCU | From Cu | 9 | byte/20ns | Data and address from CU. |
| 5 | -- | To EM modules | 9(x 521) | byte/20ns | Data and address to EM modules |
| 6 |  | From [PM modules | 9(x 521) | byte/20ns | Data from EM modules |
| 7 | control | From CU | 13 | TBD | Reset controls |
| 8 | spare | To TBD | 9(x 8) | byte/20ns | Reserved for scalar processor |
| 9 | spare | From TBD | 9(x 8) | byte/20ns | Reserved for scalar processor |

## RELIABILITY/REPAIRABILITY/TRUSTWORIHINESS

Error Control Methods: SECDED applied to EM word passes through TN. Detects hard failures, corrects transients.
Repair Method: TTBD
MTBF of Unit: See chapter 5
Degraded Modes Available: Some portion of the IN can be bypassed by programs that are compiled for a less-than full complement of processors. Most, however, cannot.

## PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 10,980
$(10,480$ shifter chips +500 control $)$
Physical Size; 1980: About 200 boards if 200 signals allowed per board. Is pin limited.
Power Drain: 1980: 1977:

### 2.4.10 Data Base Memory (DBM)

Data Base Memory (DBM) is the window in the computational envelope of the FMP. All jobs to be run on the FMP are staged into DBM before running both program and data, all output from the FMP is staged through the DBM. At some future time (but not with the initial operating. system) DBM could be used to back up EM for those problems whose data base is larger than EM. Control of the data base memory is from a DBM controller, which accepts commands both from the CU for transfers between DBM and EM, and from the host for transfers between DBM and the file system.

Many design options exist for the data base memory. Out of this set of options one particular design was chosen for the baseline system. This chosen design is a CCD memory built out of 256 k-chips, which are projected to be available in the 1980 period. If data base memory were to be built before the appearance of sufficiently economical CCD chips, one would use some form of parallel-head rotating magnetic storage. The design described here is based on the existence of 256 k -bit CCD chips each arranged in the form of 128 shift registers of 2,048 bits each.

With a projected shift rate of 2.5 MHz in the CCD chips, a desired transfer rate of $2.5 \mathrm{Mwd} / \mathrm{s}$ to and from EM, DBM is built 55 chips wide, for parallel emission of 55 -bit words, by 512 chips deep. The natural block size with 2,048 bits in each shift register delivering a block of 2,048 words, is adopted. There are 64 k blocks for a total of $134,217,728$ words. Error correction is a SECDED, probably the modified Hamming-plus-parity implemented by Motorola's 10,163 chip.

Since the array of CCD chips is $512 \times 55$, the DBM is constructed in a number of physical modules, say each one $64 \times 55$ chips. The repair philosophy is to pull and replace individual modules, and the degraded mode of operation would be to $r$ un with one or more modules missing, and the operating system would have to know to avoid assigning any data to that space.

There are several (probably four) block-sized buffers, which stand between the CCD storage and the host interface, in order to reduce the interference with DBM-EM transfers produced by simultaneous DMB-host transfers. They can also serve as timing buffers to the host's disk packs. See Fig. 2-12.

After the transfer of a block to or from the CCD store, the shift registers rest at the starting position until shifting is required by the refresh requirements, or until the CCD store is again addressed, whichever occurs first. Therefore, whenever there are several requests for transfer pending at once, or when they occur with sufficient frequency, the access time is essentially zero to the first word of the block. For transfers arriving at random times, far enough apart in time so as not to interfere, the average access time is given by:

$$
T_{a v}=\frac{1}{2}\left(T_{b} 2 / T_{r}\right)
$$

where $T_{b}$ is the transfer time of a single block ( 0.82 ms ) and $T_{r}$ is the time between refreshes. $T_{r}$ will be in the specification of the device, and is expected to lie between 1 ms and 10 ms . Therefore, the average access time for random data at low usage, to the first word of the block, has an upper bound which is expected to lie between 0.67 ms and 0.067 ms . As traffic increases, the access time is mostly due to interference between competing accesses, while the contribution due to delay in the memory goes to zero.


Figure 2-12. DBM Block Diagram

TABLE. 2-9
DAIA BASE MEMORY CHARACTERISTICS
UNIT: Data Base Memory (DBM) and its controller No. In System: 1
FUNCTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS
Function: In this memory, data is staged for FMP jobs not yet started, and results of FMP jobs are output from the FMP. Almost all communication between FMP and host goes through this memory, both data and program. CCD storage is postulated, although other options are available, including disk pack. Resolves host-CU conflicts.

Source of Control; During User Program: DBM-EM transfers controlled from CU, DBM-host transfers controlled from host. During System Startup and Diagnostics: Same

Storages; Capacity: $134 \times 10^{6}$ words in blocks Speed: $140 \mathrm{Mb} / \mathrm{s}$ (an easily adjustable parameter)

Connectivity to Other Elements:

| \# Path | To or From | Sig. | Timing | Primary Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - | To/from EM | 8+8 | words/40 ns | Loads EM at start of run, unloads results |
| 2 | To/from host | TBD, 2 | rate matches | Loading DBM, unloading results |
|  |  | paths <br> min | host file system |  |
| 3 control | From CU | TBD | TBD | Receives control from CU for DBM-EM transfers |
| 4 result | To Cu | TBD | TBD | -- |
| 5 ! control | From host | TBD | TBD | Receives control from host for DBM-file-system transfers |
| 6 .result | To host. | TBD | TBD | Monitoring and error cases |
|  |  |  |  | ! |

Error Control Methods: TBD. SECDED may be adequate, and will be used if so. "Scrubbing" errors arising due to refresh will be needed in CCD memories.
Repair Method: TBD.
MTBF of Unit: Domniated by controls since SECDED on memory.
Degraded Modes Available: Frror correction codes allow valid data to be fetched in spite of errors in memory. Can operate with failed modules removed.

PHYSICAL

Chip Count; 1980 Projection: 29,160 ( 28,160 mem $+1,000$ control)
Physical Size: 1980: about 150 large boards
Power Drain; 1980:

If use 1977 parts:
(100K ECL, etc.) use disk pack
1977: eight disk pack drives
1977:

As a background job, the DBM controller periodically initiates an access for the purpose of reading the contents of a block and rewriting that same block with all detectable errors corrected, since errors are spontaneously created in CCD memories at a low rate during the refresh operation. It has been conjectured that these errors are caused by cosmic ray bombardment of the CCD chips, discharging the little capacitors by temporarily ionizing the oxide. The rate of periodically initiating access can rationally be determined only after getting the vendor's specification on the number of refreshes per error. Preliminary Fairchild data, if it continues to be true, indicates that one should scrub through the entire DBM every seven minutes, or that this background task should occur at one eighth the normal bandwidth of the DBM. Therefore, this background access is initiated every 6.55 ms . Only one error-scrubbing access will be pending at a time, even if the delay in starting exceeds 6.55 ms . They are not queued.

The DBM has a number of channels into the file system of the host. The number is to be determined by simulation. Initial estimates are that two channels provide more channel capacity than needed for the aerodynamic flow models. At least two are needed for reasons of reliability. Two are assumed for the baseline system design.

No buffering is needed on the EM side beyond the one-word buffers in each EM module. The CU will guarantee the acceptance by the EM of a word coming from DBM is less than 400 ns . Likewise, when transferring from EM to DBM, the EM module has its one-word buffer loaded nominally 800 ns or more ahead of the DBM requirement, and this time will not slip by more than 400 ns from interference with array transfers.

DBM-EM transfers have priority in the EM controls: However, there is little interference with CU-initiated EM transfers. For example, when transferring from EM to DBM, one EM cycle loads 521 of the per-EM-module one-word buffers, and then waits for 208 microseconds before another EM cycle is required for the DBM transfer path.

A design decision, to be made with the aid of simulation in phase II, is whether the LOADEM and STOREM instructions should be limited to 512 words per execution, or whether they should transfer 512 x N words at a time. The description given above is concordant with a design in which LOADEM and STOREM are 512-word instructions, which are the only use made of LOADEM and STOREM in the FORTRAN compiler described in Chapter Three. In Chapter Six the implications of this choice are discussed at further length.

Use of DBM is as a staging area for jobs going into the FMP or coming out of the FMP. The hardware design also permits its use as a source for overlaying data and program into the FMP. It is possible to transfer less than a full block, but not to start any place other than the beginning of the block. A decision to make heavy use of the overlay capability would result in reevaluating the transfer rate between EM and DBM.

### 2.5 INSTRUCTION SET AND INSTRUCTION TIMING

This section lists the instruction set together with a list of numbers giving the execution times of each.

### 2.5.1 Tables

There are three tables. Table 2-10 contains the instructions and timing for the processor, of which there are 512. Table 2-11 contains instructions and timing for the control unit of the baseline system. Since no scalar unit is required for the aerodynamic equations, scalar unit timings are not specifiable on the basis of any known applicattion. Rather arbitrarily, the floating-point instructions of table $2-12$ are given the same timing as their processor counterparts. These instructions belong to the option for processing floating-point scalars in the control unit.

Instruction formats are easy to specify, and have been postponed until more difficult issues are resolved. See section 6.5.

### 2.5.2 Instruction Execution Timing

For the processor instructions there are three separate functional units involved. Each instruction has a starting time in each of the three units and an ending time or does not use that unit. The time of execution of each instruction is dependent on its time of occupancy (if any) in each of the independent execution units, namely: integer unit, floating point unit, and memory controls. The timing. is described most easily with respect to the instruction fetching process, which determines the starting time of each successive instruction. A fourth function unit, to allow EM fetches and stores to transpire in parallel with other processing, is under consideration, but has not been included in, this description.

Entries in the table have the following significance:
"No. of clock periods" is the number of clocks from when the instruction normally issues to a functional unit, to the termination of the instruction. The instruction will always have been decoded from out of the staging register for at least one clock prior to this.
"Unit busy" is of the form $n-m$, where $n$ is the number of the latest clock that previous instruction is allowed to occupy this unit, and $m$ is the last clock that this current instruction occupies this unit.

Some instructions merely stop the instruction fetching process for a while, until the control unit restarts it. The clock times given for these instructions represent the time from first decoding such an instruction in the staging register, until the start of decoding of the next instruction, under the most favorable circumstances. These instructions are in tables 2-10 and 2-11, and are WAIT, STOP, and HELP.

### 2.5.3 Instruction Fetch Timing

Timing of the instruction fetching mechanisms can be seen with respect to Figure 2-13. The next instruction is being held in a staging register. Out of the staging register is decoded the start times required for the functional units if this instruction were to start at this clock, and the time it will occupy the holding register. Out of the integer, the floating point, and the


Figure 2-13. Instruction Fetching Mechanism
memory control functional unit is decoded the ending time associated with the currently executing instruction. The "scoreboard" compares all six times. When all four comparisons say the next instruction will not interfere with current instructions, the instruction is transferred from the staging register to the one or more functional unit instruction registers. If delayed starts in other functional units are part of this instruction, the instruction is passed to the holding register to free the staging register for the next instruction.

The program counter always points to the next word in memory after the staging register contents. Thus, normally the PPM will be holding the next instruction word statically at its output lines. Only when the staging register is unloaded in less than three clocks (the PPM cycle) will the next word not appear.

A complexity is the existence of half-word and full-word instructions. Empty halves of half-word instructions carry the first half of the next instruction, so full-word instructions may only have their first half present in the staging register. The first half is sufficient to determine the timing. However, the second half will contain any memory addresses, so when a fetch from memory is involved, the second half must also be fetched. before the memory part of the operation can start.

In the baseline system, those instructions which contain a memory address (either for data or as a branch address), or a literal, are full-word 48-bit instructions. Others are 24 bits.

cLock 1


Figure 2-14. Timing Diagram

Jumps take an extra three clocks before the first instruction on the path branched-to can be started.

### 2.5.4 Example

For an example of how this works, take the sequence of instructions:

1. FETCH from memory to integer register
2. IADD reg. to reg.
3. FETCH from memory to floating point register
4. ADD from memory (indexed by integer reg.) to fl. pt. reg.
5. ADD from mem. (indexed by integer reg.) to fl. pt. reg.
6. MUL from fl. pt. reg..to fl. pt. reg.
7. IADD int. reg. to reg.
8. IADD int. reg, to reg.
9. STORE from fl. pt. reg. to mem. (indexed by int. reg.)

Figure 12-14 shows the timing diagram for this sequence, according to the previous instructions. The instructions are given by number in Figure 12-13. Each clock is 40 ns .

The entire sequence of nine instructions takes 36 clocks, or 1,440 ns. The sum of the "no. of clocks" column in the timing table, for these same instructions is 40 clocks. Overlap between functional units gained little in this example. It is expected to gain more in examples, which have a higher emphisis on computing addresses in the integer unit. In this present example, the timing would have come out the same if the holding register had not been there, if loading of the staging register were merely delayed. Simulation may tell us that the holding register gains nothing; that only the staging register is needed. Simulation during phase II will attempt to evaluate the gain given by the complexities here described. The final instruction fetching machinery will be the result of a tradeoff between simplicity and throughput.

### 2.5.5 Control Unit Timing

In the absence of a completely detailed design of the control unit, the internal structure and overlapping capabilities cannot be visualized with certainty. No overlap mechanism in the control unit is described in the table except for memory. Since there are four semi-independent instruction execution units, these times are pessimistic indeed. However, for aerodynamic flow problems used as benchmarks, the pessimistic assumption is expected not to matter. For aero flow problems, the interfering $C U$ action will be address calculations, which will be a solid swatch of instructions all for the integer unit. Thus, we postpone designing the overlap and look-ahead capabilities within the $C U$ until simulation in phase II tells us how much design effort we should spend on them.

It is assumed that memory fetches and stores will be overlapped. Fetches can be initiated before the previous instruction is started. Fetch and store are three clocks each. The fetch of the next instruction must follow the store of this one, when fetch follows store in the instruction sequence.

The diagnostic controller is not used during normal program running. It is used only for diagnostics and for system initialization when power first comes on, or for reinitializing the FMP system software.

Instruction fetching in the $C U$ is overlapped with instruction execution, but is out of the same CUM that holds the CU data. The instruction execution unit will look ahead by an amount yet to be determined.

The scalar processor is here implemented by adding floating-point capability to the control unit and the entire repertoire of floating point processor type instructions is added to the control unit instruction set. See the discussion on "Scalar Processor", in Chapter 6. These instructions are:

```
ADD, SUB, MUL, DIV, MAD, SSQ, ADDD, MULD, LT, LE, GT, GE, NEG, EQ, NE, INFL, FIX, FLOAT, INFZ, SETFL, SETZ, PAK2, ABS, UPF, and PENO (which yields either "0" or "512", to be determined)
```

A scalar capability resident in the control unit may require a faster control unit than the one described in the accompanying timing tables. The degree of speedup of the design required is a matter to be determined by simulation. Parallel operation of semi-autonomous units (as seen in the processor) is one of the ploys used to achieve increased speed, together with fast multiply algorithms and other logic speedups. A method of achieving faster CU memory operation also may be required. Several memory modules, either interlaced or dedicated to concurrent and overlappable functions, could be included in such a design. The times shown here ignore these additional design options, since they will not be needed for aero flow benchmarks.

### 2.5.6 Corresponding Times in Synchronizing Instructions

An additional detail is the relative timing of instructions that must be synchronized between CU and processors. For these instructions, execution will proceed when all enabled processors and the CU have reached the instruction. For each instruction there is a "CU lead time", $T_{L}$. The timing rules are as follows:

The "go" pulse is emitted from the control unit a time $T_{C}$ after the start of the instruction, if the "All processors ready" signal does not delay it. The "go" pulse is effective at the processors no sooner than a time $T_{p}$ after the start of the instruction in the processor. Thus, if both CU and processor arrive at this instruction at the correct time that both can execute it in the minimum time, there will be an offset of ( $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{p}}-\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ ) clocks between these two initiations. For various cooperating pairs of synchronizing instructions, Table $2-13$ gives $T_{L}\left(=T_{p}-T_{C}\right)$.

Table 2-13 contains three columns. Column 1 is the CU name of the instruction. Column 2 is the processor name of the matching instruction. Column 3 is the $C U$ lead time $T_{L}$. Negative $T_{L}$ means that the CU can arrive at the instruction $-T_{L}$ clocks after the last processor without delaying the time of the instruction past its last-processor start time. $T_{\mathrm{L}}$ values tend to be negative because the "same" clock pulse at the $C U$ and the processors is actually about 60 ns sooner at the CU . That is, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{L}}=0$ implies that the $C U$ is 60 ns ahead of the processor.

### 2.5.7 Exceptional Cases

Within the processor, all fault cases result in an interrupt to system software that is resident in the processor. It is possible to handle some interrupts without interrupting the CU. Floatingpoint out-of-range detection does not cause interrupts, but results in setting the floating-point variables into "infinity" or "infinitesimal". Any integer overflow causes an interrupt, on the theory that most integer operations are address calculations and overflow represents a faulty address. Attempting to insert a number outside the range $\pm 2^{15}-1$ into a 16 -bit integer register causes an integer interrupt; likewise executing a FIXD (doublelength integer) on a number outside the range $\pm 2^{31}-1$ results in interrupt. Any detection of error in the error-detectioncorrection logic results in processor interrupt. When the error is correctible, the interrupt'merely logs its occurrence and returns to user processing.

TABLE 2-10
PROCESSOR INSTRJJCTIONS

|  | No. | Unit Busy |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clock | Flt'g |  | Instr. |
| Description | Periods Int | Point |  |  | Mem | Length |
| :--- |


| ADD, SUB* | Floating point add/subtract. Result to fl. pt. reg. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Case 1. Reg. + Reg. to Reg. | 6 |  | 0-6 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2. Reg. + Lit. to Reg. | 6 |  | 0-6 |  | 48 |
|  | Case 3. Reg. + Mem. to Reg. | 9 | 0-1 | 3-9 | 0-3 | 48 |
| MUL* | Floating point multiply |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 1. Reg. x Reg. to Reg. | 9 |  | 0-9 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2. Reg. x Lit. to Reg. | 9 |  | 0-9 |  | 48 |
|  | Case 3. Reg. x Mem. to Reg. | 12 | 0-1 | 3-12 | 0-3 | 48 |
| DIF* | Floating point divide |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 1. Reg./Reg. | 44 |  | 0-44 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2. Reg./Lit. to Reg. | 44 |  | 0-44 |  | 48 |
|  | Case 3. Reg./Mern. to Reg. | 47 | 0-1 | 3-47 | 0-3 | 48 |
| DIVR | Same as DIV except the second operand is divided by the lst. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 1. 2 d operand in reg. not implemented |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 2. Lit./Reg. to Reg. | 44 |  | 0-44 |  | 48 |
|  | Case 3. Mem./Reg. to Reg. | 47 | 0-1 | 3-47 | 0-3 | 48 |
| MAD | Floating point add product of two operands to third operand. Result to same register in which third operand was found. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 1. Reg. x Reg. + Reg. to Feg. | 11 |  | 0-11 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2. Reg. x Lit. + Reg, to Reg. | 11 |  | 0-11 | 48 |  |
|  | Case 3. Reg. x Mem. + Reg. to Reg. | 14 | 0-1 | 3-14 | 0-3 | 48 |
| SSQ | Floating point sum of squares |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Case 2. Mem. ${ }^{2}+\mathrm{Reg} .2$ to Reg. | 24 | 0-1 | 3-24 | 0-3 | 48 |
| ADDD, SUBD | Floating point sum (or difference) of two registers is kept in double length form and kept in two successive fl. pt. reg. The exponents of the two results differ by at least 38. | 13 |  | 0-13 |  | 24 |
| MULD | Floating point multiply, with the full double length result put into two successive fl. pt. registers in the form of two normalized flt. pt. words with an exponent different of 36 or more. Inputs are from registers |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 17 |  | 0-17 |  | 24 |

*If non-rounding versions of these instructions are supplied, the nexecution times will not differ from those given for the rounding version.

TABLE 2-10 (cont.)



TABLE 2-10 (cont.)


|  | Description Per | No. Clock Periods | Int | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Busy } \\ & \text { 'g } \end{aligned}$ nt | Mem | Instr. <br> Length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SETZ | Reset infinitesimal control but, U'flow will thereafter create zeroes | 1 |  | 0-1 |  | 24 |
| PAK2 | Take two floating point registers, round the value found in each to 24 bits length, concatenate the result, store in memory. The original operands are saved as long as the third register is distinct | , | 6-7 | 0-6 | 6-9 | 48 |
| PAKI | Take two integer registers, move one to the first half, and the other to the second half of a 48 -bit word which is then stored in memory | $2$ | 0-2 | 1-4 | 1-4 | 48 |
| PAKID | Same, except that two pairs of integer registers hold 32-bit integers each, which are truncated (off left end) to 24 bit integers before packing | - <br> re rs 4 | 0-4 | 2-7 | 4-7 | 48* |
| PAKI3 | Pack three 16 -bit integer registers in a single word which is then stored to memory | $\text { y } 5$ | 0-5 | 2-8 | 5-8 | 48 |
| UPI | Move the two 24-bit halves of a word fetched from memory to the pairs of registers indicated by the two integer reg. addresses | $-$ | 3-5 | 2-4 | 0-3 | 48 |
| UPI3 | Move the three 16 -bit fields of a word fetched from memory to the three int. registers addressed. Like PAKI3, may be used to keep an index value, its increment and its limit packed into a single memory word | t | 3-6 | 2-5 | 0-3 | 48 |
| UPF | Move the 24 -bit havles of a word fetched from memory to the leading 24 bits of the two fl. pt. registers addressed, with zero fill |  | 0-1 | 2-5 | 0-3 | 48 |
| BDCST | Broadcast. Receive byte serial word from the CU and insert it into the processor. Timing varies with the destination. <br> Case 1. Fl. Pt. register <br> Case 2. Single Int. register <br> Case 3. Double (pair of) Int. reg. <br> Case 4. PEM | $\begin{aligned} & 7 \\ & 8 \\ & 9 \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7-8 \\ & 7-9 \\ & 7-9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4-7 \\ & 4-7 \\ & 4-8 \\ & 4-7 \end{aligned}$ | 6-9 | 24 24 24 48 |
| HVST | "Unbroadcast", send word to the control unit. From fl. pt. register only. | 7 |  | 4-7 |  | 24 |

TABLE 2-10 (cont.)


In all of the following $\mathbb{T N}$ instructions, an option is that the execution may be conditional on an additional integer register's last bit. Thus, participation of a given processor in a LOADEM or STOREM need not use the much slower mechanism of executing STOP followed by a subsequent turn on.

|  | Description P | No. <br> Clock <br> Periods | Int | Busy 'g nt | Mem | Instr. <br> Iength |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOADEM | Fetch 1 word from EM, address in pair of int. registers, to fl. pt. register. After first clock, test "ready" line from CU before continuing to count clocks | 13 | 0-13 | 12-13 |  | 24 |
| LOADEMM | Fetch N words from EM address in pair of int. registers, to PEM. test "CU ready" line as above. Memory cycles N times. Memory address found in int. reg. not in instruction (Note l). | $\begin{gathered} 13+ \\ 4 \mathrm{~N} \\ \text { (Note 1) } \end{gathered}$ | $0-13$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 13- \\ & 13+ \\ & 4 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | 24 |
| STOREM | Store 1 word from fl. pt. register to EM. EM address in double int. register. | $5$ | 0-2 | 1-5 |  | 24 |
| STOREMM | Store $N$ words from PEM to EM. PEM address is in integer register (Note 1) | $\text { s } \quad 5+4 N$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5-5+ \\ & 4 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| SHIFTN | Transmit one word from fl. pt. register out onto $\mathbb{T N}$ after testing "CU ready" line. After transmission, test for a new turn-on of "CU ready", and receive from the line. The time given includes the 4 clocks the PE waits while the CU sets the TN to a new setting. | 12 |  | 0-12 |  | 24 |
| EMNO | Read EM module number into the processor. Wait for "CU ready", then transmit to int. register. Delays through the wire of the PE-to-CU-to-EM-to-PE path are included | 8 | 7-8 | 6-7 |  | 24 |
| OFF | Test bit of int. reg., if ZERO, halt and reset "enable" bit | 2 | 0-1 |  |  | 24 |
| ABS | Make sign bit of fl. pt reg. positive. Case 1. Operand in fl. pt. reg. Case 2. Operand from memory | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 0-1 | $\begin{aligned} & 0-1 \\ & 2-3 \end{aligned}$ | 0-3 | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ |
| NEG | Change sign of fl. pt. reg. | 1 |  | 0-1 |  | 24 |

Note 1: These EM instructions, with a streaming of N words per instruction are included to assist in evaluating the tradeoff between allowing such an N -word streaming of data, and restricting the EM instructions to 1 word each. A number of advantages accrue to the limitation to $N=1$. All of these instructions are implemented, but, in the baseline design here presented we have limited the machine to $\mathrm{N}=1$. A design option exists to implement other N up to some large limit. See Chapter Six.

TABLE 2-11
CONTROL UNIT INSTRUCTIONS


TABLE 2-11 (cont.)

|  | Description | No. <br> CU Clocks | Memory | Instr. <br> Length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CIADI, CISB1 | Add (subtract) from register | 1 |  | 24 |
| CSHFD | Shift reg. by the shift distance (literal, or found in 2 d reg.) end-off | 1 | 24 |  |
| CSHF | Shift end-around | 1 | 24 |  |
| CSHFN | Shift numeric. If a right shift, fill the left with copies of the sign bit. If left, the shifted-off bits must all equal the retained sign bit, or integer overflow is declared. | 3 | 24 |  |
| TIOM | Transmit content of two or three registers to DBM-EM controlier | 2 | Fetch | 24 |
| CFCH | Fetch from CU memory to register | 1 | Fetch | 48 |
| CSTR | Store to CUM from register | 1 | Store | 48 |
| CIIX | Text index in register, and increment Case 1. Fall-through <br> Case 2. Jump | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 7 \end{aligned}$ | 24 |  |
| TIOH | Read or write 2 words into 48-bit hostreadable register, interrupt host | 2 | 24 |  |
| CGP, CGE | Test register against register |  |  |  |
| CLS, CLE | Case 1. Fall-through | 3 | 24 |  |
| CEQ, CNE | Case 2. Jump | 8 |  |  |
| CCALL | Enter subroutine, ignore processors | 20 | 24 |  |
| CCALLS | Enter subroutine, synch | 23 | 24 |  |
| CRET | Return from subroutine, ignore processors | 30 | 24 |  |
| CRETS | Return from subroutine, synch | 33 | 24 |  |
| UBSCST | Unconditionally force the processor to accept a stream of N words for PEM or PEPM with starting address in CU register | $6+4 N$ | Fetch during inst. | 48 |
| UBDCSTE | Same except only enabled processors are loaded | $6+4 \mathrm{~N}$ | Fetches | 48 |



TABLE 2-11 (cont.)

|  | Description | No. <br> Cu Clocks | Memory | Instr . Length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SHIFIN | Set TN setting and send "CU ready". When "all processors ready" comes back, wait l clock, set $\mathbb{N}$ to $2 \alpha$ setting, and send "go". | 8 | 24 |  |
| ema | Set $\mathbb{T N}$ setting and send "CU ready". When "all processors ready" comes back, send "read module no." to EM and "go" to processor, appropriately timed. | 6 | 24 |  |
| CGIS, CGES, CLSS, CLES, CEQS, CNES | Perform indicated test and wait for "all processors ready". Then send command to processors to load PCR to either first or second address depending on the test result. Also branch in CU if. test succeeäs. | 6 | 24 |  |
| CIIXS | Test index against liiit and wait for "all processors ready". Then jam |  |  |  |
| CILIT | 16-bit literal to int. reg. | 1 | 24 |  |
| CLITT | Transfer 32-bit literal to Cu . reg. | 2 | 48 |  |
| CALIT | Add 32-bit literal to Cu reg. | 2 | 48 |  |
| SETTN | Set $\mathbb{T N}$ controls. No synchronization or processor interaction occurs | 4 | 24 |  |
| LOOP | Wait till "all processors ready". If any are enabled issue "go". If none are enabled, jam processor PCR to new setting found in address field. Used for synchronized execution of loops whose loop control is in a processor variable, and may be data dependent per processor. | 2 | 24 |  |
| SYNCH | Wait for "all processors ready". Issue "go" | 2 | 24 |  |

TABLE 2-11 (cont.)

Description

| No. |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CU |  | Instr. |
| Clocks | Memory | Iength |


| $\mathrm{BDCST}$ | Wait for "all processors ready", then transmit byte-serial word and "go". <br> Case 1: Word comes from CU register <br> Case 2. Word comes from CuM | 5 5 | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \\ & \text { Fetch } \end{aligned}$ | 48 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HVST | Wait for "all processors ready" then transmit "go", receive 48-bit word (If PE is transmitting an integer, later bytes may be empty except for the check bits) | 9 | 24 |  |
| CAND, COR | Logic combination of two CU words, result to register. <br> Case 1. Both operands in registers or lit. <br> Case 2. One operand from CuM | 2 .2 | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ \text { Fetch } \end{gathered}$ | 48 |
| CNOT | Bit complement of CU register | 2 | 24 |  |
| CIMP | A and not B. Logic <br> Case 1. Both operands register or literal <br> Case 2. One operand from CUM | 2 2 | $\begin{gathered} 24 \\ \text { Fetch } \end{gathered}$ | 48 |
| MOVE | Register-to-register move | 1 | 24 |  |
| CBIT, CBITS | Jump if any bit of register, ANDed with 2 nd register or literal is ON | 6 | 24 |  |
| Note 1: Th to assist restricting limitation design her implement | se EM instructions, with a streaming of N wor evaluating the tradeoff between allowing suc the EM instructions to 1 word each. A number to $\mathrm{N}=1$. All of these instructions are impleme presented we have limited the machine to $\mathrm{N}=1$. her $N$ up to some large limit. See Chapter Si |  | tion ar reaming accure the bas ion exi |  |

TABLE 2-12
FLOATING POINT SCALAR INSTRUCTIONS

|  | Description | Clocks | Menory | Instr. Length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADD, SUB | Case 1. Reg, or lit. + reg. to reg. <br> Case 2. Reg. + mem. to reg. | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Fetch | $\begin{aligned} & 24 \text { (48 if lit.) } \\ & 48 \end{aligned}$ |
| MUE | Case 1. Reg. x reg. or lit. to reg. | 9 |  | 24 (48 if lit.) |
|  | Case 2. Reg. $x$ mem. to reg. | 9 | Fetch | $48$ |
| DIV | Case 1. Reg. or reg./lit to reg. | 44 |  | 24 (48 if lit.) |
|  | Case 2. Reg./mem. to reg. | 44 | Fetch | 48 |
| DIVR | same as DIV with operands reversed, Case 2 only. | 44 | Fetch | 148 |
| MAD | Case 1. Reg. x reg, or lit. + reg. to reg. | 11 |  | 24 (48 if lit) |
| SSQ | Case 1. Reg. $2+$ Reg. ${ }^{2}$ to reg. | 21 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2. Mem. $2+$ reg. 2 to reg. | 21 | Fetch | 48 |
| ADDD | Floating point double length addition | 13 |  | 24 |
| MULD | Floating point double length multiply capability (single length inputs) | 17 |  | 24 |
| LT, LE, GT, $\mathrm{GE}, \mathrm{EQ}, \mathrm{NE}$, INEY, INFL | Tests on floating point registers | 2 |  | 48 if fall thru |
|  |  | 4 |  | if jump |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FIX, FLOAT | - Convert data type | 4 |  | 24 |
| INFX | Convert infinitesimal to zero | 1 | 24 |  |
| SETEL, SETZ | Set response to underflow to infintesimal or zero | 1 |  | 24 |
| PAK2 | Pack two truncated fl. pt. words in mem. word. | 6 | Store | 48 |
| UPF | Unpack two truncated fl. pt. words | 2 | Fetch | 48 |
| PENO | Load CU register with predetermined lit. | 1 | 24 |  |
| . ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Supplied only to permit symmetry with processors' code stream. |  |  |  |
| ABS | Take absolute value, |  |  |  |
|  | Case 1./ reg./ | 1 |  | 24 |
|  | Case 2./mem./ | 1 | Fetch | 48 |
| NEG | Change Sign | 1 |  | 24 |

TABLE 2-13
OFFSET TIMES OF PROCESSOR-CU SYNCHRONIZED INSTRUCTIONS

| CU İNSTRUCTION OR ACTION | PROCESSOR INSTRUCIION | $T_{\text {L }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| Interrupt | HELP | -3 |
| LOADEM | LOADEM | 1 |
| STOREM | STOREM | 1 |
| SHIFTN | SHIFTTN | 3 |
| EMNO | EMNO | 1 |
| BDCAST | BDCAST | -3 |
| HVST | HVST | -3 |
| SYNC | WAIT | -3 |
| CGIS, OGES; CLSS | WAIT | -3 |
| CLES, CEQS, CNES, |  | -3 |
| CTIXS, CJUMPS |  |  |
| CBITS |  | -3 |
| CCALLS | STOP or WAIT | -3 |
| CREIS | STOP or WAIT | -3 |
| LOOP | WAIT |  |

Ref. 1. Burroughs Corporation, "Final Report, Numerical Aerodynamic Simulation Facility, Preliminary Study", Dec. 1977.

## CHAPTER 3

## SOFTWARE ISSUES

### 3.1 EXTENDED FORTRAN FOR THE FMP

### 3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes the extensions and restrictions on the FMP FORTRAN language and compiler at the functional level. The overall functional view of this piece of software is stated below, and is sketched in Figure 3-1.

1. NSS FORTRAN will be as compatible with ANSI FORTRAN (X3J3/90) and B7800 FORTRAN as the architecture permits. Differences from these standards will be indicated in this document and in detail in the later detailed design specification.
2. The compilation process will be performed on the B7800 front end and will produce code to be executed on the FMP system.
3. FMP FORTRAN will have array operations designed to allow the explicit expression of parallel operations available with the architecture.
4. The compiler will be designed in a modular fashion with an internal representation between components which is identical so that addition modules can be added if desired. The components as envisioned at this time are:
a. A parser
b. A preliminary optimizer which performs standard serial optimization techniques.
c. A secondary optimizer which may reorder code to obtain maximum overlap of functional units.


Figure 3-1. FIMP Compiler Components
d. A code generator
e. A source regenerator which will regenerate serial FORTRAN as a method of enhancing portability and providing the user with a programming tool during the early phases of using the machine.
3.1.2 Functional Objectives of Language Development

In the development of the FMP language and the FMP compiler the following goals were set which are listed below:

1. Allow the user to access features of the machine in a simple straight forward manner.
2. Add a small number of extensions which are general in nature rather than a host of specific cases.
3. As much as is possible keep both the syntax and semantics of the extensions isolated from those employed in serial FORTRAN constructs.
4. Provide easily understood and recognizable constructs which yields programs which the user can understand and recognize without translation back to serial constructs.

### 3.1.3 Major Extensions to FORTRAN

There are only two primary extensions to the ANSI FORTRAN. All other additions and restrictions to the language follow from these primary extensions. The two consist of a modification to the normal set of non-executable specification statements and the addition of a parallel construct.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY,

The modifications in the specification statements are made to allow the user to control the memory allocation to maximize efficient utilization of the machine. These memory resident specifications allow the user to explicity control the allocation of his data among the Control Unit Memory (CUM), the Extended Memory (EM), and Processor Memory (PM). The second construct is a parallel construct put in the language to aid the user in obtaining a simple way in which to express the parallel aspects of his problem. With both constructs equivalences can be made to ANSI FORTRAN so that a serial FORTRAN can be regenerated.

### 3.1.4 Specification Statements

The modifications to FORTRAN will permit the following specifications:

1. DIMENSION
2. EXTENDED
3. LOCAL
4. GLOBAL

For the present the following statements will be disallowed:

1. EQUIVALENCE
2. COMMON (Blank or named)
3.1.4.1 The DIMENSION statement retains its ANSI FORTRAN meaning! The DIMENSION statement is used to specify the sumbolic names and dimension specifications (extents) of arrays.
3.1.4.2 The EXTENDED specification statement declares that the variables specified in the statement are resident in the Extended Memory. The form of declaration is:
```
EXTENDED /cb/ nlist (, /cb/ nlist).....
```

or
EXTENDED nlist
where cb is an extended block name
nlist is a list of variable names or array declarators. Only one appearance of a symbolic name as a variable name or array declarator is permitted in all such a symbolic name as a variable name or array declarator is permitted in all suchlists in a program unit. The ellipses represent repetition.

This construct is similar to blank COMMON in the sense that exectimon of a RETURN or END statement never causes these quantities to become undefined. (See Specification FORTRAN X3J3/90 page 8-3)
3.1.4.3 The LOCAL specification statement declares that the variables specified in the statement are resident in Processor Memory. The form of the declaration is:

LOCAL /cb/ nlist (, /cb/, nlist).....
or
LOCAL nlist
where cb and mist are defined as above.

This construct is similar to named COMMON in FORTRAN in the sense that execution of a RETURN or END may cause the quantities to be undefined. Note however that execution of a RETURN or END 'within a subprogram will not cause entries to become undetermined in a LOCAL block that appears in the subprogram and appears in at least one other program unit that is referencing it either directly or indirectly. (See Specification FORTRAN X3J3/90 page 15-15)
3.1.4.4 The GLOBAL specification statement declares that variables specified in the statement are controlled by the Control Unit and are broadcast automatically to the Processor Memory on Program initiation or if they modified during the execution of a program. The form of the declaration is:

GLOBAL /cb/ nlist (, /cb/ nlist).....
or
GLOBAL nlist
where cb and nlist are defined as above.

### 3.1.5 The Parallel Construct

The executable DOALL construct is a control statement provided to permit concurrent execution of segments of a program.

The DOALL statement is used in conjunction with a terminal statement ENDDO to form together a loop called the DOALL loop. The form of these two statements is

DOALE, $I=I_{1}, I_{2}\left(, I_{3}\right)\left(; J=J_{1}, J_{2}\left(, J_{3}\right)\right)\left(; K=K_{1}, K_{2}\left(; K_{3}\right)\right)$

ENDDO

I is the name of an integer variable. $I_{1}, I_{2}, I_{3}$ are each integers.
3.1.5.l Range of a DOALL loop. The range of a DOALL loop consists of all executable statements that appear following the DOALL statement including the terminal ENDDO statement.

No additional DOALL statements may occur within the range of a DOALL.

If a DO statement appears within the range of a DOALI statement it must be fully contained within the range of the DOALL statement.

If a arithmetic or logical IF statement occurs within a DOALH statement, it may not transfer control out of the range of the DOALL statement. Transfer into the range of a DOALL is prohibited.
3.1.5.2 Active and inactive DOALL-loops. A DOALL loop is either active or inactive. Initially inactive, a DOAL工 becomes active only when its DOALL statement is executed.

Once active, the DOALL-loop becomes inactive only when the iteration count (3.1.5.4) for each of its increment parameters becomes zero.

Execution of a FUNCTION reference or a CALL statement that appears in the range of a DOALL statement does not cause the DOALL to become inactive. Note specification of an alternative return specifier outside the range of the DOALI is disallowed.
3.1.5.3 Incrementation Parameters. Specified in the DOALL statement are at least one set of parameters which are to control the execution of the statements within the range of the DOALE loop. These are called the incrementation parameter set and there may be a total of three sets of them. Each parameter set consists of three (four) integers known as the DOALL variable, the initial parameter, the terminal parameter, and (the increment parameter).
3.1.5.4 Referencing the DOALL varıable within the DOALL loop. References to the DOALL variable, $I$, (J) or (K) within the DOALL-loop is permitted for the following references:

1. Any reference to array subscripts for arrays declared to be in Extended Memory, however, the DOALL variable may not reference outside the declared array.
2. Any reference to the value of the DOALL variable within an expression of an IF statement if control is not transferred beyond the range.
3. The DOALL variable may be used in the evaluation of an assignment statement, however, not to form forbidden array reference.

The utilization of the DOALL variable is specifically prohibited for the following:

1. Any reference to array subscripts for variables declared to be LOCAL or which appear in a DIMENSION statement either explicitly or implicitly.
2. The DOALL variable may not be reassigned within the range of the DOALL-loop except by the DOALL statement.
3. Transfer of control into the range of a DOALL-loop is prohibited.
3.1.5.5 Execution of the DOALL construct. The effect of executing a DO-ALI-loop construct is to execute all body statements, those following after the DOALL statement and preceding the ENDDO statement, in a serial fashion for those determined incrementation parameters set in the DOALL statement. The initial parameter $M_{1}$ the terminal parameter $\mathrm{M}_{2}$, and the incrementation parameter $\mathrm{M}_{3}$ are determined for each incrementation set, $I_{1}, I_{2}, I_{3}$. This determines the allowable values of the DOALL variables $I(J$ and $K$ ) equal to $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{I}}$.

The DOALL variable $I$ with its $N_{I}$ allowed values is paired with the first allowed variable of J. Next the DOAL工 variable of $I$ with its $N_{I}$ allowed values is paired with the second allowed variable of J. This continues until all possible combinations occur. The total number of combinations is:

```
\(N_{\text {I }}\) for a single DOALL-loop incrementation set
\(N_{T}\) * \(N_{J}\) for a double DOALL-loop incrementation set
\(N_{I} * N_{J} * N_{K}\) for a triple DOALL-loop incrementation set
```

Hence the body statements are executed in serial fashion for each given set of DOALL variables allowed, either I, I\& J, or I, J, \& K in a strictly parallel sense.


#### Abstract

3.1.6 Subroutines \& Procedures as Program Subunits (to be resolved in Phase II)


### 3.1.7 Other Constructs

3.1.7.1 ASSIGN Statement. The ASSIGN statement has been dropped as a possible candidate for a FMP extension. It was found that the access to Extended Memory could be handled by simple compiler algorithms through the EXTENDED declaration. It was found that in complex control structures the programmer was more likely to make mistakes and cause ARRAY bound errors than if the compiler was to perform all the necessary accessing. Some details of this will be shown in later examples. (See 3.2.2.2 discussion and Fig. 3.4).
3.1.7.2 I/O. AIl I/O for NSS FORTRAN must be performed on variables assigned to Extended or Control Unit Memory. If variables in Processor Memory are referenced in an I/O statement a syntactical error will result.

### 3.1.8 Examples of Constructs in FMP FORTRAN

3.1.8.1 VALID Triply Nested DOALL-Loop

```
EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
DOALL, I = 2, 99; J = 2, 99; K = 2, 99
RR=1.0/Q(I, J+1, K-1)
R1 = Q(I+l, J, K) - Q(I-l, J, K)
R2 = Q(I, J, K+l) - Q(I, J, K-I)
S(I, J, K) = RR * R1 * R2
ENDDO;
```

2. INVALID
```
EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
DIMENSION R1(100), R2(100)
DOALL, I = 2, 99; J = 2, 99; K = 2, 99
RR = 1.0/Q(I, J+1, K-1)
RI
R2
S(I, J, K) = RR * R RI (I-1) * R R (I+1)
ENDDO;
```

This construct is invalid because the arrays $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ declared in the DIMENSION statement are referenced by the DOALL variable I. If it is necessary to so reference the arrays $R_{1}$ and $R_{2}$ arrays the doubly nested DOALL construct should be used (See 3.1,8.2).
3. VALID

EXTENDED $Q(100,100,100), S(100,100,100)$

DOALL, $I=25,50,2 ; J=1,99 ; K=2,100$
$R R=1.0 / Q(I, J+1, K-1)$

IF (I. GT. 30) GO TO I
$R_{1}=Q(I+1, J, K)-Q(I-1, J, K)$
$S(I, J, K)=R R * R_{I}$
GO TO 2
$1 R_{1}=Q(I-1, J, K)-Q(I+1, J, K)$
$S(I, J, K)=R R * R_{1}$
2 CONTINUE
ENDDO;
4. INVALID

EXTENDED $Q(100,100,100), S(100,100,100)$
DOALL, $I=25,50,2 ; J=1,99 ; K=2,100$
$R R=1.0 / Q(I, J+1, K-1)$
IF (I. GT. 30) GO TO 1
$R_{1}=Q(I+1, J, K)-Q(I-1, J, K)$
$S(I, J, K)=R R * R_{1}$

ENDDO;
1 CONTINUE

This DOALL-loop construct is invalid because it transfers control out of the range of the DOALL.
5. INVALID

```
        EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
        DIMENSION R
        GLOBAL JL, K
        DOALL J=2, JL; K=2, K
        R1 (I) = 6.7
        If (J 30) GO TO 3
        If (K 30) GO TO 4
        DO I I = 2, 99
        RR = 1.0/Q(I, J, K)
        GO TO 5
3 RR = 1.0/Q(I, J-1, K)
        GO TO 5
4 RR = I.0/Q(I, J, K-I)
5 R R (I) = Q(I+1, J, K) - Q(I-I, J, K)
    R2(I) = Q(I, J, K+1) - Q(I, J, K-1)
    S(I, J, K) = RR * R (I-1) * R R (I+l)
l CONTINUE
        ENDDO;
```

ANSI FORTRAN specifically prohibits transfer of control from outside a DO-loop to into the body statements of a Do-loop.
3.1.8.2 Doubly Nested Loops

1. VALID
```
EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
DIMENSION R R (100), R
DOALL, J=2, 99; K=2, 99
R1
DO
RR=1.0/Q(I, J+1, K-1)
R1
R2
S(I, J, K) = RR * R R (I-1) * R R (I+I)
I CONTINUE
ENDDO; This is the correct syntax for handling the
problem in Example 2. (3.1.8.1)
```

2. VALID
```
EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
DIMENSION R}\mp@subsup{R}{1}{(100), R2(100)
GLOBAL J
DOALL, J=2, J_L; K=2, K
R
DO II = 2,99
If (J.GT.30) GO TO 3
If (K.LT.30) GO TO 4
RR=1.0/Q(I, J, K)
GO TO 5
3 RR=1.0/Q(J, J-1, K)
GO TO 5
```

4 RR $1.0 / Q(I, J, K-I)$
$5 R_{1}(I)=Q(I+1, J, K)-Q(I-1, J, K)$
$R_{2}(I)=Q(I, J, K+1)-Q(I, J, K-1)$
$S(I, J, K)=R R * R_{1}(I-1) * R_{2}(I+1)$
1 CONTINUE
ENDDO;
3.1.8.3 Use of the LOCAL Construct

1. VALID

EXTENDED $Q(100,100,100), S(100,100,100)$
LOCAL RI(100, $\mathrm{R}_{2}(100)$, CONST
GLOBAL JL, JK)
DOALL, $\mathrm{J}=1, \mathrm{JL} ; \mathrm{K}=1, \mathrm{KL}$
$R(1)=6.0$
$R(100)=10.0$
DO 1 I $=2$, 99
$R R=1.0 / Q(I, J, K)$
$R_{1}(I)=Q(I+1, J, K)-Q(I-1, J, K)$
$R_{2}(I)=Q(I, J, K+l)-Q(I, J, K-1)$
CALL TEST (I)
$S(I, J, K)=R R * R(I-1) * R_{2}(I+1) * C O N S T$
1 CONTINUE
ENDDO;

SUBROUTINE TEST(I)
LOCAL R1(100), R2(100), CONST
IF (Rl(I). GT. R2(I)) CONST=R1(I)
RETURN
END
2. INVALID

```
        EXTENDED Q(100, 100, 100), S(100, 100, 100)
    LOCAL R (100), R2(100)
    GLOBAL JL, JK
    DOALL, J=1,JL; K=1,KL
    R(l) = 6.0
    R(100) = 10.0
    DO 1 I = 2, 99
    RR=1.0/Q(I, J, K)
    R1
    R2}(I)=Q(I, J, K+L) - Q(I, J, K-1)
CALL TEST(I)
S(I,J,K) = RR*R1(I-1)*R2(I+I)*CONST
l CONTINUE
ENDDO;
```

Using the identical SUBROUTINE TEST above would cause an undefined reference to CONST because the LOCAL declaration does not contain. the variable CONST. Naturally, TEST could have been defined with two parameters I and CONST. which would have been valid.

### 3.2 HAND COMPILATION FOR SAM

### 3.2.1 Overview

The methodology of hand compilation for the SAM will be described through a series of examples each of which will be transformed in a series of stages from original FORTRAN to ASSEMBLER CODE. References will be made to Appendix (A) which discusses preliminary compiler alogrithms for setting the transposition network.

In each example the following code steps will be taken:

## 1. Or.iginal NASA-AMES FORTRAN

2. Extended FORTRAN for SAM
3. Compiler output including code reorganization (written in a Pseudo FORTRAN
4. Compile output showing Transposition Network and Memory Module computations (again in a pseudo FORTRAN or META ASSEMBLER)
5. ASSEMBLER CODE

The example chosen from the Explicit Code was the SUBROUTINE TURBDA because it demonstrates the ability of SAM to operate in a concurrent manner and provides a vehicle for demonstrating the compiler's ability to handle control statements through a "mimicking" technique and also provides an example of why it is felt that an ASSIGN statement could cause programmer error. The second example is the major LOOPS of the SUBROUTINE STEP including the subroutine calls and the called SUBROUTINES BTRI and XXM. One loop (DO 20) will be discussed in detail while the other two (DO 30) and (DO 40) will show the differences in the transposition network settings and the memory module accesses for the different memory accessing. (DO30 \& DO40 discussion to be supplied later).

### 3.2.2 SUBROUTINE TURBDA

### 3.2.2.1 Original Code and SAM Extended FORTRAN

In Figure 3-2 the original NASA-AMES version of the SUBROUTINE is shown. The FMP Extended FORTRAN as written by the programmer is given in Figure 3.3. In both cases the common declarations were. modified slightly to remove extraneous variables from this specific example. As you will note, the programmer wrote a two dimensional DOALL-loop with a serial inner DO loop. Because there is no data depending on $I$ it could have been written as a three dimensional DOALL.

### 3.2.2.2 Preliminary Code Analysis

Figure 3-4 shows the preliminary compiler code analysis. Within the DO 1 loop the compiler determines what array elements stored in Extended Memory must be fetched through the $\operatorname{Tr}$ ansposition Network. For a given I, J, K, EI(I, J, K) must be fetched. However, only for $J=1$ must the element $E I(I, J+1, K$ ) and for $K=1$ must the element EI(I, J, $K+1$ ). The compiler will be capable of recognizing these accesses to extended memory and will "mimic" the branch structure. It also will be able with this mirroring of the original structure be able to access only the requisite elements' and prohibit out of bounds access of the array even if those elements are not subsequently used. This protection is even more critically necessary when accesses occur in the negative sense rather than the positive one as in this example.

```
SUBROUTINE TURBDA
COMMON/Al2/ RHOW(31,31,31),E(31,31,31),El(31,31,31)
COMMON/A5/ IL,JL,KL,CV
COMMON/A6/ RMUL(31,31,31)
CVI=1./CV
DO 1 K=1,KL
DO 1 J=1,JL
DO 1 I=1,IL
TEMP=ABS(EI(I,J,K))*CVI
IF(K.EQ.1) TEMP=.5*ABS(EI(I,J,1)+BI(I,J,2))*CV1
IF(J.EQ.1) TEMP=.5*ABS(EI(I,1,R)+EI(I,2,K))*CVI
RMUL(I,J,K)=2.207E-08*SQRT(TEMP**3)/TEMP+198.6)
l CONTINUE
RETURN
END
```

Figure 3-2. Original NASA-AMES FORTRAN

```
    SDBROUTINE TURBDA
    EXTENDED/A12/ RHOW(31,31,31),E(31,31,31),El(31,31,31)
    GLOBAL/A5/ IL,JL,KL,CV
    EXTENDED/A6/ RMUL(31,31,31)
    CVI=1./CV
    DOALL, J=1,JL;R=1,RL
    DO 1 1=1,IL
    TEMP=ABS(EI(I,J,K))*CV1
    IF(R.EQ.1) TEMP=.5*ABS(EI(I,J,1)+EI(I,J,2))*CVI
    IF(J.EQ.1) TEMP=.5*ABS(EI(I,1,K)+EI(I,2,R))*CV1
    RMUL(I,J,K)=2.270E-08*SQRT(TEMP**3)/TEMP+198.6)
l CONTINUE
    ENDDO;
    RETURN
    END
```

Figure 3-3. Extended FORTRAN for SAM

```
    SUBROUTINE TURBDA
    ExTENDED EI(31,31,31),RMUL(31,31,31)
    GLOBAL CV,JL,RL,IL
    DOALL, J=1,JL;R=1,KL
    CV1 = 1.0/CV
    DO 1 Iml,IL
    El =EI(I,J,K)
    FOR(J,NEQ.1) null fetch next line
    E2 =EI(I,J+1,K)
    FOR(K.NEQ.l) nuld fetch next line
    E3 =EI(I,J,R+1)
    IF(J.EQ.1) GO TO 3
    IF(R.EQ.1) GO TO 2
    TEMP=ABS(E1 )*CV1
    GO TO 4
2 TEMP= 0.5*ABS(El+E3 )*CV1
    GO TO 4
    TEMP=0.5*ABS(E1 + E2 )*CV1
    RMUL(I,J,K) = 2.270E-08*SQRT(TEMP**3)/(TEMP+198.6)
    CONTINUE
    ENDDO
    RETORN
    END
Note: The expression "Null fetch next line" implies that the transposition network will be set to fetch all the elements for EI(I,J+1,K) for given I. However only those for which \(J=1\) will in fact be passed from Extended Memory to the processors.
```

Figure 3-4. Compiler Code Analysis

As one can see in this example all processors for which $J \neq 1 \& K \neq 1$ all execute TEMP=ABS(El*CV1. All processors for which $J=1$ (including $K=1$ ) compute $T E M P=0.5^{*} A B S(E 1+E 2) * C V 1$. All processors for which $K=1$ and $J=1$ form TEMP=0.5*ABS(El+E3)* CVI. These three cases occur for a given $I$ concurrently.

### 3.2.2.3 Computer Programmatic Transformations Including Transposition Network Calculations

Figure 3-5 shows the Control Unit and Processor Element code streams in a FORTRAN like language or META ASSEMBLER. The compiler recognizing the two dimensional DOALL on $J, K$, which are the second and third indices of Extended arrays EI and RMUL and calculates the number of cycles to be performed (the DO 10 loop)

$$
\text { i.e. NMAX }=\frac{(\text { ISECONDSIZE*THIRDSIZE }+ \text { Nprocessors-1) }}{\text { Nprocessors }}
$$

$=(\underline{31 * 31+512-1})=2$
512

Similiarly the compiler recognizes that ISKIP=IFIRSTSIZE=31. Note that all accesses to EI and RMUL are of type 1 as described in Appendix A.

| CU INSTRUCTIONS | PE INSTRUCTIONS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ENTER TURBDA | 1 |  | ENTER TURBDA |
|  | 2 |  | CV1 $=1.0 / \mathrm{CV}$ |
|  | 3 |  | DO $10 \mathrm{~N}=1,2$ |
| $I V V=512 * N-512$ | 4 |  | IVV $=512$ * -512 |
|  | 5 |  | IV = IVV+PENO |
|  | 6 |  | KMI $=1 \mathrm{~V} / 31$ |
|  | 7 |  | $\mathrm{K}=\mathrm{KM} 1+1$ |
|  | 8 |  | $J=1 V-\mathrm{KMI} * 31+1$ |
| IN $=$ IVV*31 | 9 |  | IN= IV*31 |
| $I A 01=1 B S E T+I N$ | 10 |  | IA01 $=$ IBSEI+IN |
| IA $12=1 A \emptyset 1+31$ | 11 |  | IA02- IA¢1+31 |
| IA¢ $3=I A \varnothing+961$ | 12 |  | IA03 $=1 A 09+961$ |
| IA® $4=I B S R M+I N$ | 13 |  | IA04 $=$ IBSRM + IN |
| DO 1 I=1, IL | 14 |  | DO $1 \mathrm{I}=1$, IL |
| II=I-1 | 15 |  | II=I-1 |
| OFFSETI=MOD (IAØ1+II,521) | 16 |  | MADDI $=($ IA@1 $+I I) / 521$ |
|  | 17 | SYNCH |  |
|  | 18 |  | POR (J.NE.1) MODE=0 |
| OFFSET2=MOD (IAØ1+II,521) | 19 |  | MADD2 $=(1 A 02+I I) / 521$ |
|  | 20 | SYNCE |  |
|  | 21 |  | FOR (K.NE.1) MODE=0 |
| OFFSET3=MOD (IA@ $3+I I, 521$ ) | 22 |  | MADD $3=($ IAf0 $3+I I) / 521$ |
|  | 23 | SYNCH |  |
|  | 24 |  | IF (J.GT,JL) GO TO 8 |
|  | 25 |  | IF (K.GT, KL) GO TO 8 |
|  | 26 |  | IF (J.EQ.1) GO TO 2 |
|  | 27 |  | IF (K.EQ.1) GO TO 3 |
|  | 28 |  | TEMP $=$ ABS (E1)*CV1 |
|  | 29 |  | GO TO 4 |
|  | 30 |  | 2 TEMP $=0.5 *$ ABS ( $\mathrm{El}+\mathrm{E} 3) * \mathrm{CV1}$ |
|  | 31 |  | GO TO 4 |
|  | 32 |  | 3 TEMP $=0.5$ ( $\mathrm{ABS}(\mathrm{El}+\mathrm{E} 2)$ * CV1 |
|  | 33 |  | $4 \mathrm{R}=2.270 \mathrm{E}-08 *$ TEMP |
|  | 34 |  | *SQRT (TEMP) /(TEMP+198.6) |
| OFFSET4 $=\mathrm{MOD}(\mathrm{IAD} 4+\mathrm{II}, 521)$ | 35 |  | MADD4 $=($ IA $04+I I) / 52 I$ |
|  | 36 |  | 8 CONTINUE |
|  | 37 | SYNCH |  |
| 1 Continue | 38 |  | 1 Continue |
| 10 Continue | 39 |  | 10 CONTINUE |
| EXIT | 40 |  | EXIT |

Note: The Expression Mode $\neq 0$ is merely a device used to imply that for those values of the variable not equal to 1 fetches through the Transposition Network do not occur.

Figure 3-5. Compiler Output with Transposition Calculations

On entering the subroutine (line 1) of Figure 3.5 each processing element calculates CVl (line 2). Loop 10 is then initiated which represents the number of times the array must be cycled as mentioned above (line 3). Next IVV is calculated which represents the number of processors that have been utilized to that cycle number. Obviously the compiler does not perform 512*N-512 but rather start from zero and increment by 512, however, FORTRAN usage was utilized here. The processing elements then perform a number of calculations (line 4-line 8). IV=IVV+IPENO represents the address in $J, K$ space that each processing element has. From that number its $J$ and $K$ value is determined (line 7 and line 8 ). KM1 (line 6) which represents the $K$ value minus 1 which is used in the $J$ calculation is calculated separately.

Lines 10 thru 13 represent address calcuations. For the control unit one is calculating the address of the array element which is to. go into processing element $\emptyset$ for each transposition network setting, i.e. THE OFFSET. The processing element it is performing , and address calculation on the specific array element. This is why line 9 has different determinations for IN. Lines 10 thru 13 are address calculations for $E I(I, J, K)$ (line lo.) $E I(I, J+1, K)$ (line 11), EI(I,J,K+I) (line 12) and RMUL(I,J,K) (line l3). Note line 10 and 13 start from the base address IBSET of EI and IBSRM of RMUL. The $C U$ instructions are computing the address calculation for the array element which is to go to processor $=\emptyset$ while the processors are calculating the address of the array element to go to Processor $=$ IPENO.

Note all these index computations are performed only for the outer loop. They do not occur for the inner DOlI=1,IL loop (line 14).

Next the $I$ index is decremented by 1 (line 15), again a FORTRAN antifact, which would not occur in the ASSEMBLER code but this is FORTRAN. The memory module address, MADDl (line 16) is computed in the processing element while the offset, IFSETl (line li6) is computed by the mod function in the control unit. The array and the control unit now SYNCHRONIZE. In a similar fashion in the offset and memory module address are calculated for each of the next two array access and synchronized accordingly (lines 18 thru 28). Note that for (J.NE.1) (line.18) a mode bit is set which turns off the array fetch. Similarily for (K.NE.l) (line 2l).

The next step the compiler takes is to skip computations for those values of $J$ between $J L+1$ and 31 , the value declared for the array in the EXTENDED declaration (line 24.). This is the way the preliminary compiler is going to handle the one dimensional vector length/declared extent problem at this juncture. Alternative algorithm are known; however teaching the algorithms and subsequent hand compilation would require Burroughs more effort than the possible machine performance degradation that might occur. during simulation. For (K.GT.KL) a similar branch is performed (line 25). Note that 8 CONTINUE must be above the next synchronization point. Next the branches for sections of code which will be computed for (J.EQ.l), ((K.EQ.l). AND (J.NEQ.1)) and for ail other $J$ and $K$ values less than $J L$ and $K L$. (lines 26 thru 32) All processors except those that have J or $K$ values greater than JL or KL then process lines $(33,34)$. The OFFSET calculation for RMUL is then made in the Control Unit and the Memory Module address in the processors (line 35). Synchronization occurs and the transfer of RMUL ( $I, J, K$ ) from Processor to Extended. Memory occurs. Lines 14 to 37 are looped until IL is reached and then the second cycle, line 3 to 38 are executed before the subroutine is EXITed.

Earlier it was mentioned that this piece of code could have been executed as a three dimensional DOALL loop. As can now be seen, this would probably not be advantageous in terms of performance for two reasons. First, due to the branches on $J$ and $K$ (lines 24 thru 27) each processor would have to perform the index calculations of lines 6, 7, and 8 for all 1 values if one did a 3-D DOALL-loop. Second, since IL<31 one only needs to execute this loop with the preliminary compiler IL times with a 2-D DOALE-loop. In a 3-D DOALL loops I would have to be computed and a branch similar to lines 24 and 25 would also have to be made. At this time this appears less efficient in highly branched code and where the array fit is good - i.e., on cycle l, all 512 processors are utilized while in cycle $2,88 \%$ of the processors are utilized. If the array size were instead $E I(25,25,25)$ then $100 \%$ would be used on cycle 1 while only $1 \geqq 3$ or $22 \%$ would be used on cycle 2 . With a 3-D DOALL one would have 31 cycles of which 30 would be $100 \%$ busy and 1 cycle of $50 \%$ busy. In that case the additional indexing computations would be masked in the total execution time.

### 3.2.2.4 Assembler Code for TURBDA

This code is shown in Figures 3-6 and 3-7.

| $\llcorner$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | IGEHT | CU-IMFLIEIT TUFEECA |
| 1601 | Codeseg |  |
| 1603 | EHT | START |
| 1003 STAFT | CILIT | CFI. |
| 1604 | CILIT | 6 EFO 1 |
| 1005 LE | CTI: | CR1.CF2.LL |
| 1108 | 5 SHFH | CF3,CP1.-4 |
| 160.7 | GMOLL | GFE,CRE, 3 |
| 1608 | CFETCH | CES.IL |
| 1069 | CILIT | 6 F 7.1 |
| 1610 Li | GTis | (FF.CFE, L |
| 1011 | C IACILL | CFSTCFSIESEII |
| 1612 | - Indin | CFO,CFO.CFS |
| 1013 | Mnose1 | CFG |
| 1614 | CILIT | CR16.31 |
| 10.15 | LOADEM | EF9, CR10 |
| 1018 | CIFDDL | CFG,CREIESEIE |
| 1617 | GIFDDR | ER9,6FPCFG |
| 1018 | mousel | CR9 |
| 1019 | LOADEME | ERG, CFIC |
| 100 | 5 IFADL | CPG,CRE, CSEIS |
| 1621 | CIfalif | EFG, GR -LRG |
| 15 Cz | M00521 | CF: |
| 162 | LOADEME | CRG, 0 E16 |
| 16 | GIFDEIL | CRG, 6 RG,IESRM |
| 15.25 | CIfildF | CRG, CPF, 6 FG |
| 1026 | Mouse 1 | ERG |
| 1927 | 5 TOPEM | E.FG. R10 |
| 10.88 | JUMP | L1 ${ }^{\text {4 }}$ |
| 1029 L | NUMP | L3 |
| 1630 L | RETURN |  |
| 16.31 | EHCI |  |

Figure 3-6. Handcompiled Control Unit Code Subroutine TURBDA


## Figure 3-7. Handcompiled Execution Unit Code Subroutine TURBDA

### 3.2.3 SUBROUTINE STEP (LOOP DO 20)

The next portion of code to be examined is STEP (loop DO 20) which includes CALLS to BTRI and XXM. A number of Figures have been made of the code and they are listed below with a brief description.

Figure 3-8 The original NASA-AMES FORTRAN of Subroutine STEP.

Figure 3-9 SAM Extended FORTRAN for Subroutine STEP
Figure 3-10 A comparison file of Figures $3-8$ and $3-9$ showing R(Replacements), I(Insertions) - (Deletions)
Figure 3-11 Preliminary Compiler Code Reorganization for Súbroutine STEP
Figure 3-12 A comparison of the Figures 3-9 and 3-12
Figure 3-13 Compiler programatic transformations including Transposition Network Settings for Control Unit Subroutine STEP
Figure 3-14 Same as above for Processor - Subroutine STEP
Figure 3-15 Implicit/Steppiece NSS3CU Assembler Code

Figure 3-16 Implicit/Steppiece NSS3PE Assembler. Code

Additionally the SUBROUTINES BTRI and XXM are examined. The related Figures are:

Figure 3-17 Original NASA-AMES Code for Subroutine BTRI
Figure 3-18 SAM Extended FORTRAN for Subroutine BTRI
Figure 3-19 Comparison of Figures 3-17 and 3-18
Figure 3-20 Original NASA-AMES Code for Subroutine XXM
Figure 3-21 A modified version of xxml which will produce improved performance on the CDC7600 and SAM

Figure 3-22 SAM Extended FORTRAN for SUBROUTINE xXMI
Figure 3-23 Comparison of Figures 3-21 and 3-22

ORIGINAL PAGE IS
OF POOR QUALITY


Figure 3-8. Original Piece of Subroutine STEP


Figure 3-8. Original Piece of Subroutine STEP (Cont)

```
134107
194300
184400
184507
184609
188400
194800
l
195200
l
$185609
188300
188400
188509
188305
183900
189000
```



```
18930?
18940
199501
13950
139504
189535
$8960今
189700
19990n
19000J
190200
190400
190600
19.0300
190900
190900
C
SUBE DUTINE STRD
        GLDBAL/BASE/NMAX, JMAX-SMAX,LMAX,JM,KM,LN,GAMMA,T,AMI,SMU,FSN:CH
```



```
        2,RM, CNBR,PI, INY ISC,LAMIN N,NP
        GLOBAL/GEO/NB1.NB?,RFRINT:RNAX,XR,XMAX, DRAD.DXC
        GLOBAL/READ/IREAD, IKRIT *NGRI
        GLOgAL/VIS/RE,DR,QHUE,?K
        EXIENDEJNVARS/Q(720;3);6)
        EXIENOENNNAR1/X(720;30);Y(72C;30),Z(720,3))
        LEVEL 2,OPS,X,Y;Z
        CINTROLICOUNT/NC;AC1;界(60,5,5),C(50,5,5),0(60,5,5),F(6n,5)
    C
```



```
        C8}=\frac{1}{GA++2**RM
        GAMZL=K2-GGAMMA
C
            KL=(L-1)*ND+K
            INCLUNE XXMI (K,L,',JMAX)
            0. 12 J=1, JMAX
            01=0(KL, J,1)
            C2=2(KL,J,2)
            03 =0 (KL;3; 3)
            04=0(kL;J,4)
            Ri=x\times(J,1) *HDX
```



```
C
    RR= 1./AD
```



```
        V =0Y*RRR
```



```
        UU = U*R1+V*R?+H*R3
        CL=GAMI*UT*RF
        C2 = O5*RR*GAM4A
        CJ=C2-C1
        C4=R4+UU
        C5=GAMI*UU
        CG=GGMN*V
        C7=GAMI**
```



```
        $191800
        19190.
    192100
*
```



Figure 3-9. Identical Piece of Subroutine STEP in SAM Extended FORTRAN (Cont)
3.2.3.1 Sam Extended FORTRAN for SUBROUTINE STEP (LOOP DO 20).

Figure $3-10$ shows the changes made in the original NASA-AMES program to produce SAM Extended FORTRAN. As can be seen, the greatest number of changes occur in the declarations. Only the named COMMON blocks, VARS, VARø, and VARl need to be put in Extended Memory. Note for simplicity in accessing the last two extents on the $S$ and $Q$ matrices were interchanged.

The Named Common Blocks VAR3 and BTRID are put in LOCAL Memory. It should be noted that in another portion of the program, SUBROUTINE METOUT, the arrays $X X, Y Y$, and $Z Z$ are written out after the subroutine calls. This would not be permitted and an additional copy to Extended Memory Arrays, say XXI, YYl, and ZZI would be needed. Also, the $P$ array is used in a variety of ways including an EQUIVALENCE statement in other portions of the code. However, for this specific portion of the code the $P$ array is not accessed in any way and so for convenience was left in LOCAL for the example. Copies of all data in GLOBAL memory are assumed to be in Processor Memory.

The only other changes to the program were the replacement of the DO 20 loops with the two dimensional DOALL loop (and ENDDO statement) and the replacement of the CALL statement in line 1897øø to an INCLUDE since the PROCEDURE XXMI has Extended Memory References. (Further discussion of this will be supplied later.)

| 1 | R 118420) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | R 134400 |
| 3 | $R 134503$ |
| 4 | R 184600 |
| 5 | R 184703 |
| 6 | R 18480$)$ |
| 7 | R 184909 |
| 8 | R 19500 ) |
| 9 | R 19510) |
| 10 | R 135307 |
| 11 | R 18540 \% |
| 12 | R 13860 n |
| 13 | 198707 |
| 14 | R 189407 |
| 15 | F 198409 |

GLDEAL/BASE/ NAAX, JMAX,KMAX,LMAX,JM, KM,LM, उAMNA,GAFI,SML,FSMACF
2. RM, CNBR,PI,IVVISC. LAMIN.NP
GLOBAL/GEO/NBI, NQ2, FFRONT, PMAX,XR, XYAX,ORAS, -XC
GLORAL YREAS/IREAO, I \&RIT, ASRI
GLOBAL/VIS/RE. PR, RMLESRK
$E X T E N D E D / V A R S ' G(720,39,6)$
$E X T E N D E D / V A R O ' S(720,30,5)$


LOCAL BTRID/AC 60,5,
BOALL, K=2,KM: $=2, L H$
INCLUDE XXMI(C,L,I, IMAX)

Figure 3-10. Comparison of Uriginal and SAM Extended FORTRAN - Subroutine STEP
3.2.3.2 Preliminary Code Analysis and Code Reorganization for STEP.

Figure 3-11 shows the preliminary code reorganization that would be performed by the compiler. The DO loop variables in line 1945øø. have been modified so that they now read DO $25 \mathrm{~J}=2$, JMAX-I. This was done so that the initial and terminal values are composed of literals or Global variables that would exist both in Processor and Central Memory.

The code only accesses the arrays $Q$ and $S$ from Extended Memory. The accessing of the $Q$ array is shown in lines 189501-189505 and in lines 194501-194510. The notation for this data movement from Extended Memory to Processor Memory is with the FORTRAN statement Ql=Q(KL, J, 1). (This notation is used for clarity and is not meant to be an implied ASSIGN statement.) The accessing of $Q(K L$, $J-1,6$ ) is only necessary of $J=2$ for the other values exist in Processor Memory, hence, the IF test and branch at line 194501. Since the DO 25 loop exists in both the Processor and Control Unit Code the execution pattern is:

1. Set $J=2$
2. Synch for fetch $\mathrm{Q}(\mathrm{KL}, 2,6)$
3. Synch for fetch $Q(K L, 1,6)$
4. Synch for fetch $Q\left(\mathrm{KL}_{\mathrm{L}}, 3,6\right)$
5. Set $J=3$
6. Synch for fetch $Q(K L, 4,6)(2$ and 3 already in Processor Memory)
7. Set $J=4$
8. Synch for fetch $Q(K L, 5,6)$ ( 3 and 4 already in Processor Memory)

IHPLICIT/STEPPIECENSSI (12/22/77)


Figure 3-11. Preliminary Compiler Code Reorganization Subroutine STEP


Figure 3-11. Preliminary Compiler Code Reorganization Subroutine STEP (Cont)

In SUBROUTINE TURBDA br anches on the DOALI variable were demonstrated. This example demonstrates branching capability in fetching on inner nested DO loop variables.

Finally the fetching and storing of the array $S$ is shown in lines 194901-194905 and 198301-198305. Because of the notation chosen, i.e., $S i=S(K L, J, i)$ the statements were removed from the $D O$ LOOP (23) on $N$. This is not a requirement. An array, say NS with subscripts could have been declared, with a simple DIMENSION statement.

Figure $3-12$ shows the lines of code that have been replaced ( $R$ ), inserted (I), or deleted (-).
3.2.3.3 Programmatic Transformations by the Compiler and Transposition Network Calculations for STEP Portion

Figure 3-13 and 3-14 shows explicitly the address calculations for setting the Transposition Network Offset (3-13) and the Memory Module address (3-14) for each access from Extended Memory.

Considering the Control Unit Code first in a line by line basis:

188600 Hidden loop N has 2 cycles
188601 Calculation of \# of PE's used to that cycle
188601 Address of $Q(I V V+1,1,1)$ in memory which is in $P E \#=\varnothing$. i.e., on cycle 1 the address of $Q(1,1,1)$ is equal to the base address of $Q$ in memory. On cycle 2 the address of $Q(513,1,1)$ is the base address of $Q$ plus 512.

188602 Address of $Q(I V V+1,1,2)$ is 42,600 greater than Q (IVV+1,1,1)

188603 - 188639 Similar other calculations for $S$ and $Q$


Figure 3-12. Comparison of SAIM Extended FORTRAN and Compiler Reorganized Code - Subroutine STEP

00134091 00194072 0012400 00184005 00184006 00184007 00184100 00184300 0013440. 0 C18450 00194700 00134800 00134900 00185009 00125100 0018520 n 00195300 00135400 00185500 00183200 00193300 0018940 00188500 0018
0018
0 0018863 0018863 001396 001863 00188636 0018363
0018863 0018853 00183640 0018864 .00188642 0011864 .00188645 0018864 00138648 00158649 00188650
0018851 00188300
00139900
0 00197000 00139200 00139404
00199405 00129406 00139407
00189408 00189408
00189409 00139410 $0018941 \frac{1}{2}$ 00189413 00199414 00139415

C the compiler yill have det ermined the numeer of cy-les C OF THE HIDDEN LOOP
C ALSO THAT ISKIP=1
C ALSO THAT ISKIP=1
SURROUIINE ST-P GLOBAL/BASE/NMAX, JMAX,SMAX,LMAX, JN, KM,LMPGAMM: PAMI,SML,FSNACF
1

2 RH, CNER,PI, INVISC, LAMI N, NP
GLDBALIGEONBI, NB?, RFRJNT,RYAX, XR.XHAX. DRAD. OXC
GLOBAL/READ/IREAD,IHRIT, NGRI
GLDBAL $\mathcal{V}$ IS/REPPR.RMUE,?K
EXIENDED NARSIO (720,30.6)
EXIENDED NARI/Xe720;30) YY



$3(60,5,5), C(60,5,5), 0(60,5,5), F\left(6^{2}, 5\right)$

IVV $512 * N=512$
$1001=18 S D 1+I V$
$14001=18 S 01+$ IVV
$18002=1 A 001+42600$
$14003=1 A 002+42000$
IAOQ $3=1 A 022+42600$
$2+4200$
$1 A 004=14023+42600$
$1 A 004=1 A 023+42600$
$1006=1 A 095+4260$
$1026=1 A 095+42650$
$10 S 1=18 S 51+14 V$
$1 A O S L=I A O S 1+42600$
$1 A O S Z=1 A 0 S 1+42600$
IADS $3=1 A O S 2+42600$
IAOS
I AOS
IAOS IAOS
I
IAOS $5=14054+42600$
$40 X M=18 S x^{+}+1 V y-1$

IAOXP $=$ IESX
IAOXMN
IBSX
IVV
IV
IADX MN = ISSX +IVV-ND
IAOXPN= IBSX +IVV+ND.
IAOYM
IBSY
IAOYM = IBSY +IVV-1.
IAOYP $=$ IPSY + IVY +
IAOYMN = IBSY +IVY-ND
IAOYPN= IBSY +IVY+ND
$I A O Z M=I B S Z+I V V-1$
$I A O Z P=18 S Z+I V V+1$
IAOZMN $=18 S Z+I V V-N C$
IAOZPN $=18 S Z+I V V+N D$
C ${ }_{\text {C***FILTRX }}$
$c$
$\mathrm{KL}=(\mathrm{L}-1)=\mathrm{ND}+\mathrm{K}$
$J=(J=1) \star \frac{1}{7} 20$

SYNCH
IFSETXM $=$ MOD( (IAOXM+JJ) 521 )
IFSETXP $=$ MOD( (IAOXP $+J J), 521)$
IFSETXMN $=$ MOD ( (IAOXMN + JJ).5 (21)
IFSETXPN= MOD((IAOXPN + JJ),521)

Figure 3-13. Control Unit Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler)


[^0]

Figure 3-13. Control Unit Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler ) (Cont)


Figure 3-14. Processor Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler)

18950
15950
197900
139900
190000
190105
199421
199422
199421
199422
19943
139433
189434
18945
$1994 う 5$
199426
199426
179427
189428
197428
139428
139437
109431
19943
109431
18943
18943
$1938 \%$
19930
199405
19947 E
19947 E
189407
189407
199408
18904
199408
$1894{ }^{2} 9$
189417
189419
189411
18941
13941
189414
189415
199416
189417
199418
189419
139420
18943
18945
19945
1894
1894
1994
1994
19945
18945
13945
1394
1894
1894
19.0200
190300
190400

```
    09 10J = = 1,jmax
    JJ=(J-1)*720
    MADDOG = (IAOO6+JJ)/5?1
MADDXM = (IAOXM+JJ)/5?1
MADDXP = (IAOXP+JJ)/5?1
MADDXMN= (IAOXHN +JJ)P521
MADDXPN= [IAOXPN +JJ3'521
MADDYM = (IAOYM+JJ)/5?1
MADDYP = (IAOYP+JJ)/5?1
MADDYMN= (IAOYMN +JJ)P521
MADDYPN = (IAOYPN +JJ)/521
MADOZM = (IAOZM+JJ)/5?1
MADDZP = {1AOZP+JJ\/5?\:
MADDZMN = (IAOZMN +JJ)'521
HADDZPN= (IAOZPN +JJ)'521
```



```
    XK =(XP-XM)*DYZ
    ZK =(ZP-ZM)*OY, 
```



```
    l
    M. (J,1) = (YK*ZL-Z K*YL)*RJ
    XX(J,2) =(ZK*XL-XK*ZL):RJJ
    XX(J,4)= -OHEGA*(Z(KL, J)*XX(J.2)-Y(KL,J)**Y(J,`))
    CONTINUE
    OD 12 J= 1. JMAX
    JJ=J-1 ( MADDQ1 = (IAOQ 1+JJ)/521
SYNCH
SYNCH
    M4DDQ2 = (1AOQ2+JJ)/521
    MADDQ3 = (IA0Q3+JJ)/5?1
MADDQ4 = (IAO24+JJ)/521
```



```
    R1 =xX(J,1, *HDD
    R1 =xX(J,1)**DX
    R1
C
C
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
SYNCH
1 0
    H (F)
        IF((K.LT. 2).OR.(K.GT.(M).OR.(L.LT.Z).OR(L.'T.LM SS TR 10
    RJ = O(KLL&G;J)
SYNCH
SYNCH
```


## 

```
R
* AMATRX
    RR= 1.10
```



Figure 3-14. Processor Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler) (Cont)


Figure 3-14. Processor Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler) (Cont)

| 188640 | Since the PROCEDURE XXM1 has been INCLUDED it is necesary to perform address calculations for the $X$, $Y, Z$ arrays. In a similar fashion IAøXM represents the address of $X(K L-1, J)$ or rather $X(\varnothing 1)$ on cycle 1 and $x(511,1)$ on cycle 2 . It appears that at this juncture that one is accessing outside of array bounds. Note that in the original FORTRAN (Figure $3-6$ ) the $L$ and $K$ loops go from 2 to $L M$ and KM respectively while the hidden $N$ loop of this Figure does not indicate this. Line 189433 of Figure 3-12 is an IF branch meant to indicate that the code will not be executed. In fact a transposition network calculation will be made for $P E \#=0$ on an address one less than the base address in order to calculate the OFFSET. However, because of the K,L calculations done in the PE code those specific accesses are not performed. i.e., for this case those PE's whose $K$ or E value is less than 2 or greater than KM or LM will not perform the computation. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 18850 Similar computations for X(KL+ND,J) etc. with J always set equal to 1 . |
| 189405 | First inner J loop which has been included from procedure XXMI. |
| $189407-$ | 189432 Synchronizations and OFFSET computations by MOD (Address,521) |
|  | 19440 DO 12 loop with attended accesses of $Q$ matrix values 1-5. |

> 194500-197000 DO 25 loop with the fetches to $Q(K L, J, 6)$, $Q(K L, J=1,6)$ and $Q(K L, J+1), 6)$. For simplicity additional computations were not made in the $N$ loop initiation to specify an OAøQ6P(plus) + IA $Q Q 6$ (minus) equivalent to the $J+1$ and $J-1$ but rather left the addition and subtraction to be done in the MOD function expressions of line 194527 and 194523 . This would infact be inefficient as it would be performed for each J. The IF branch spanning $194503-194527$ has been explained in 3.2 .3 .2 .
> $197800-198310$ DO 21 loop
> 198400 End of DO 20 loop - The cycle loop

In an early analogous manner the Processor Element Code is generated. In this case however each processor performs a calculation to determine relative address as a function of cycle and PE\#.
188602 Calculation of relative address
188604 Calculation of $L$ value
188606 Calculation of $K$ value
$188607-188628$ Calculation of array addresses in Extended
Memory

189405-189461 DO 10 loop included from XXMl procedure. Note as the $J$ index increases the array address increases by 720. Also line 189433 indicates the "noncomputation" for undesirable K and $L$ values
189500-194400 DO 12 loop
194500-197000 DO 25 loop
197700 CALL BTRI a SUBROUTINE in the normal FORTRAN sense. Its modification into SAM Extended FORTRAN is shown in Figure 3-21 to be few indeed. (A branch around BTRI should be explicitly shown similar to line 189433)

197800-198311 DO 21 loop
198400 End of N loop for number of cycles

### 3.2.3.4 Assembler Code for STEP

To be supplied in Phase II

### 3.2.3.5 Subroutine BTRI - SAM Extended FORTRAN

As can be seen in Figure 3-19 the comparision of the original FORTRAN (Figure 3-17) and the SAM Extended FORTRAN (Figure 3-18) only one change had to be made in the code. This was the LOCAL declaration for Named COMMON/BTRID/. Since no extended variables are fetched or stored in this piece of code it runs entirely internal to the processor as written.

### 3.2.3.6 SUBROUTINE XXM and XXMI.

It was noted in examining the IMPLICIT code that the majority of calls to the SUBROUTINE XXM occurred in loops whose initial and terminal members precluded taking the branches which occurred in this code. (Lines 245800, 245900, 247500, and 247600.) Since this reduces the performance of the whole code on both the CDC7600 and on SAM the code was modified into two SUBROUTINES. One, XXM, to be used when the calling loop had initial and terminal values and XXM1 for those calling loops in which $K$ never equal to 1 or KMAX and $L$ never equal to 1 or LMAX. See Figures 3-20 and 3-21.

Figure 3-22 shows XXM1 written in SAM Extended FORTRAN and 3-23 shows the differences.

Since this code was brought into STEP via the INCLUDE statement, further discussion is not necessary.

```
42200
142400
.42500
    4
    42207
    4430%
    43103
    43300
    44300
    43509
    43700
44902
144002
44100
14420%
44307
4 4 5 0 7
4460
4470%
4490n
4500%
4510
442200
4540%
4560
45900
4600%
46005
44610J
46300
46409
46500
46600
4680n
46900
46900
47000
47209
4730%
47500
4760
477800
47909
48100
48200
48300
4340n
48600
48300
48800
49000
```

```
            SUBROUTINE RTRI(ILA,IUA)
```

```
            SUBROUTINE RTRI(ILA,IUA)
```




```
                    IL=ILA
```

                    IL=ILA
    c
c
M
M
MNSERTLUUEC
MNSERTLUUEC
L1=1, (8, (1L,1),1)
L1=1, (8, (1L,1),1)
M12=8(1,1,1,2)*L11

```
        M12=8(1,1,1,2)*L11
```






```
        U15=8(11;1;5)+L11
```

        U15=8(11;1;5)+L11
        L31=BCIL;3;1)
        L31=BCIL;3;1)
        LS2=8(IL,3;2)-L31*U12
    ```
        LS2=8(IL,3;2)-L31*U12
```




```
        N24=(1L;2;4)-L21*U14)*L22
```

        N24=(1L;2;4)-L21*U14)*L22
        L42=8(15 4;2)-L41*U12
        L42=8(15 4;2)-L41*U12
        {43=81[{4;2)-41*U1,
    ```
        {43=81[{4;2)-41*U1,
```








```
            51=8(1L.5,1)
```

            51=8(1L.5,1)
            52=8(1L;5;2)-L51*U12
            52=8(1L;5;2)-L51*U12
            L54=8(1)
    ```
            L54=8(1)
```






```
c
```

```
c
```




```
            02=L22*(FITL.2
```

            02=L22*(FITL.2
            D3=L 33*(F(1:;3)-L21*01), [32*02)
            D3=L 33*(F(1:;3)-L21*01), [32*02)
            04=[44*(FITL;4)-L44*01-L42*) =-143*J3)
    ```
            04=[44*(FITL;4)-L44*01-L42*) =-143*J3)
```




```
    M
```

    M
            F(1L:5)=05-145*05
            F(1L:5)=05-145*05
            F(I1:4)=04-N45*05
            F(I1:4)=04-N45*05
            *)
            *)
    c

```
c
```




```
    0012 M=1,5 (1,4)
```

    0012 M=1,5 (1,4)
            01=L11**(1L,1,4)
    ```
            01=L11**(1L,1,4)
```




```
            *)
```

            *)
            B(1);5;M)
            B(1);5;M)
            M
            M
            B(IL;3;M) = D3-434*B(I, ; 4,M)=U35*05
            B(IL;3;M) = D3-434*B(I, ; 4,M)=U35*05
            M()
            M()
            00 13 1 =15.1E
            00 13 1 =15.1E
            COMPUIE BPRIYE*EIGR
            COMPUIE BPRIYE*EIGR
            00 14 N=1,5
            00 14 N=1,5
            *)
            *)
            COMPUTE B PRIME
            COMPUTE B PRIME
            00 11 N=1,5
            00 11 N=1,5
    11
    11
    c

```
c
```

Figure 3-17. Original FORTRAN - Subroutine BTRI

```
49200
49400
49600
49700
49900
$50000
50200
504000
50500
$0700
50907
5110
S1207
S140]
$1600
+51900
51000
52300
S240
$270त
52300
$300
$53200
l
$53600
5390n
54000
54200
$544409
'154500
'54600
$44800
55000
5100 <
c
l
```

Figure 3-17. Original FORTRAN - Subroutine BTRI (Cont)

```
$ 
    L53=H(5; 3) -L51*U1 3-L5; 2* U23-L53*U34
```



```
    O1=L11+F(I,1)
    D2=L22*(FIT:2)-L21*01)
    D2=L22*(F(1;2)-L21*D1)
    03=L33*(F(1; 3)-L31*D1- 32*D2)
    \,
    \varepsilon
    F(I,5)=05
    F
    F(I;2)=D2-U2 3*F(I;3)-U2 4*F(IT;4)-UN5**D (I,4)-U15*D5
    I=IU
    :9 DO,19,N=1,5
```



```
        If (I.GT:IL)GOTO2?
        RETURN
        END
```

Figure 3-17. Original FORTRAN - Subroutine BTRI (Cont)

```
42200
42300
42400
42500
42500
42600
42800
42900
3000
3200
33400
43600
4}460
43700
43900
44100
44300
44400
.44600
44700
44800
44900
45100
45200
45300
4550%
4560?
45700
45800
4 6 0 0 0
4 6 1 0 0
46200
46300
46500
46600
46700
46809
46900
47000
47200
47300
47400
    SUEF OUTINE BTRI(ILA,IUA)
COMMDN/BTRID/A(60,5,5), $(50,5,5),C(-0,5,5),0(60.5,5),F(60,5)
    OIMENSIONH(S,F)
    REAL
        IL=ILA
        IS=IL+1
IF=IU-
    \NSERTLUDEC
```



```
        1222=1*(B(1L,2:2)-121*)12)
        U13=B(IL,1, 2)*L11
        U14 = = B(IL, 1; 4)*L11
        U15=8(IL,*1;5)
        {31=8(IL;3;1)
        U23=(BiIL;2;3)-L21*U13)*(22
        423=(8(11, B, 3)-L21*U13) *(22
        U24=(B(IL;2;4)-L21*U14)*L年年
        U25= (B (IL,2,5
        L42=B(IL;4;2)-141*U12
        L43=日(IL;4;3)-L4 41*U13--42*U? ?
```



```
        44*1.*( 日f 1:;4;4)-U14**41-U24*(42-U3
        U35=(B(IL; 3;5)-L31*U15*L S2*U <5)*L 33
        LSI=B(IL,5,1)
        L52=8(IL;5;2)-L51*U12
        L54=B(IIC;5;4)-L51*U14--52*U2 4-L53*U34
        U45=(B(IL*4;5)-(41*U15-L42*U25-14 3*U 35)*L44
        L55=1*)(Bi IL,5,5;)-L51*J15-L5**U25-L53*U35-L54*J.5)
    C COMPUTE LITTLERS
        01=L11 *F(IL,1)
        D2=L22*(F(IL.2)-L21*D1)
        O 3=L.33*(FIIT;3)-2 31*01-L 32*R2)
        04=L44*(F(IL;4)-241*01-L42*0 =-143*0?)
        O5=L55*(FIIL;5)-L51*DI-L52*DE-L.53*) 3-L54*IA)
    C
        F(ITL;5)=05
        F(IL;3)=D3-U {24FF(IL,4):U35*DS
        F(IL;2)=D2-U23*F(IT;3)-U24*F(IL;4)-U25*05
        F(IL;1)=01-U12*F(IL,2)-U13*F(IL,3)-U14*F(IL,4)-v5*O5
    C COHPUTE C PRIME FOR FIRST RIK
        CgHP12H=1,5 IME F
        02=122*(C(1i,2*N)-121*)1)
        03=[33*(C:IL;3;&)-L{1*) 1-L 32*D?)
        04=L44*(C(1L;4;*)-L41*)1-L42**DZ-L43*D2)
        B(IL;5;M)=05
        B(IL,3,M)=03-U34*B(I, 4,M)-435*Dj
```




```
        COHPUTEISPPRIME*BIGR
            DO 14 N= 1.5
```



```
C COMPUTE B PRIME
            00 11 N=1,5
    11 H(N,M)=B(I,N,N)-A(I,N,I)*B(I-1,1,N)-A(I,N,2)*R(I-1,Z,M)-A(I,N,? **
    #
C
    INSERTLLDEC AGAIK
```

Figure 3－18．SAM Extended FORTRAN Subroutine BTRI


Figure 3-18. SAM Extended FORTRAN Subroutine BTRI (Cont)


Figure 3-18. SAM Extended FORTRAN Subroutine BTRI (Cont)

Figure 3-19. Comparison of Original FORTRAN and SAM Extended FORTRAN - Subroutine BTRI

SUBGOUTINE XXY(H,LA,JII,JZA)
SUBGOUTINE XXY(H,LA,JII,JZA)


1,OX1,DY1,DZ1,ND,NO2,= V(5),FD(5),H0,AL?,GO, [NEGA,HOX,HCY,HCZ
1,OX1,DY1,DZ1,ND,NO2,= V(5),FD(5),H0,AL?,GO, [NEGA,HOX,HCY,HCZ
2,RM,CNBR,PI,ITR,INVISC,LANIN,NP,INTI,INTR,INTZ
2,RM,CNBR,PI,ITR,INVISC,LANIN,NP,INTI,INTR,INTZ
COMMON/GEJ/NG1, NOD,RFRJNT, R`AX,XROXMAX,OGAOD,DXC         COMMON/GEJ/NG1, NOD,RFRJNT, R`AX,XROXMAX,OGAOD,DXC
COMYON/READ/IREAD.INRIT,NNRI
COMYON/READ/IREAD.INRIT,NNRI
CONYON/VIS/RE,BR,RMUE;
CONYON/VIS/RE,BR,RMUE;
COMMON/VARO/S(7?O,5,33)
COMMON/VARO/S(7?O,5,33)
COMYCN/YAR1/X(720,30);'(7T20,20),T(T?0,3)`)         COMYCN/YAR1/X(720,30);'(7T20,20),T(T?0,3)`)
LEVEL 2,0.S,X,Y,I
LEVEL 2,0.S,X,Y,I
COMMON/COJNT/NC.NF1
COMMON/COJNT/NC.NF1
C C XI METRICS FORMES, FOR A K,L LINE IN 」
C C XI METRICS FORMES, FOR A K,L LINE IN 」
SYMMETPY
SYMMETPY
K=MA
K=MA
J1=31A
J1=31A
KL = (L-1)*NO+K
KL = (L-1)*NO+K
IF(K.EQ.i)
IF(K.EQ.i)


M,
M,
MK
MK
5n CONTINUE
5n CONTINUE


YK =(-3,*YY(KL,J)+4:*Y:KL+1,J)=Y(KL+2,J))*2NT
YK =(-3,*YY(KL,J)+4:*Y:KL+1,J)=Y(KL+2,J))*2NT
1 CONTINUE
1 CONTINUE
72
72
CONTINUE
CONTINUE
l
l
YL = (r(KL+ND;J)-Y(KL-VD;J))*NZ?
YL = (r(KL+ND;J)-Y(KL-VD;J))*NZ?






GOTTOGO
GOTTOGO




CONTINUE
CONTINUE
= (YK*ZL-2K*YL}*RJ
= (YK*ZL-2K*YL}*RJ
Xx(J, 2) ={(ZK*XLSKK*ZL)*R
Xx(J, 2) ={(ZK*XLSKK*ZL)*R
XX(J,4)= -OMEGA*(Z(KL,J)*XX(J,ح)-Y(KL,J)*XY(J,:))
XX(J,4)= -OMEGA*(Z(KL,J)*XX(J,ح)-Y(KL,J)*XY(J,:))
O CONTINUE
O CONTINUE
Evo
Evo

Figure 3-20. Original FORTRAN - Subroutine XXM


Figure 3-21. Modified Version of Subroutine XXM1 for Improved Performance on Serial or Parallel Machine


Figure 3-22. SAM Extended FORTRAN for Subroutine XXMI

|  |  | $R$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 2 | $R$ | 243200 |
| 2 | $R$ | 243309 |
| 3 | $R$ | 243500 |
| 4 | $R$ | 243600 |
| 5 | $R$ | 243700 |
| 6 | $R$ | 24300 |
| $?$ | $R$ | 243907 |
| 8 | $R$ | 244000 |
| 9 | $R$ | 244100 |
| 10 | $R$ | 244207 |
| 11 | $R$ | 24400 |
| 12 | $R$ | $24450 ?$ |

```
PROCEDURT XXM: N,LA,JIA,JPA)
GLDBAL/BASE/NYAX. JMAX, KMAX,LMAX, JY, KH,LM,GAMMA,GAMI,SML,FSUACH
2. RH,CNER,PIPIVVISCPLANIN,NP
GLOOAL/GEO/NSI, NS 2, FFRONT, RYAX, XR, XMAX=ORA?. OXC
```



```
GLOBAL/VIS/RE, PR, RMUE;RK
EXTENDEONVARSO O \(720,30,6)\)
EXTENDEDVARO S \(720,30,5)\)
```



```
GONTRLICOUNNNC;NCI;DY
```

Figure 3-23. Comparison of Modified FORTRAN and SAM Extended
FORTRAN for Subroutine XXIM1
3.2.4 Subroutine STEP (Loop DO 30 \& DO 40)

The arrays $Q$ and $S$ which have been declared to exist in Extended Memory have the following extents

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q(720,30,6) \\
& S(720,30,5)
\end{aligned}
$$

A partitioning in effect of the first extent of 720 into 2 parts occurs at run time with the variable ND. The first index then has an extent $N D$ and the second index has an extent equal to LMAX. This means that if ND*LMAX 720 certain memory locations are not utilized. This causes some degradation in performance for the SAM in all three access modes.

Each of the three types of accesses of the Q \& S arrays which are required by the DO 20, DO 30 and DO 40 loops in SUBROUTINE STEP will be discussed. Because of a complex first order linear recurrence the index $J$ in the DO 20 loop must be done serially while the $K \& I$ indices are parallel (see example below). Similarly for the DO 30 loop $K$ is the serial index while J\&L are the parallel ones. For $D O 40 \mathrm{~L}$ is the serial index and $K \& K$ the parallel ones.

An example of the structure of the program is given below.

```
DO 20 L=2,LM
DO 20 K=2,KM
DO 18 J=1, JMAX
ORIGINAL PaGe is
OF POOR QUALITY \(K L=(L-1) * N D+K\) \(R R=1.0 / Q(K L, J, 6)\)
```

(plus many other statements including a complex first order recurrence in J)

This is a Case I access as described in Appendix A. The ISKIP=ND. For ease in handing this generality of splitting the first extent it is assumed that $720 / \mathrm{ND}$ is integral with value ND. The number of cycles necessary to access the L's and J's is equal to

No. of Cycles $=(\mathrm{LD} * 30+512-1) / 512$

For the specific case given in the benchmark where ND is equal to 15 then LD is equal to 48 and the No. of cycles equal to 3 .

On cycle 1 one is accessing all L's from 1 to LD and J's from 1 to 10 and for the llth $J$ one is accessing L's from 1 to 32. This is done for each $K$ from $l$ to ND. Figure $3-26$ maps this accessing of indices from Extended Memory into the processors.

The last loop, the DO 40 Loop has the L index as the serial index for the recurrence relation and the $K \& J$ indices as the parallel ones. The structure is

DO $40 \mathrm{~J}=2$, JM
DO $40 \mathrm{~K}-2$, KM
DO 38 L1, LMAX
LK $=(\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{l}) * \mathrm{ND}+\mathrm{K}$
$R R=1.0 / Q(K L, J, \dot{6})$
(plus many other statements including a first order inear recurrence in $L$ )

38 CONTINUE
40 CONTINUE

This can be considered to be a Case II or Case $V$ accessing pattern as discussed in Appendix A. Since the accessing of $Q \& S$ is identical a "semi smart" compiler can chose which of the two cases it wishes to consider this. I.e., $Q(K L, J, 6)$ can really be represented as $Q(K, L, J, 6)$ with $K$ varying from 1 to $N D, L$ from 1 to LMAX and with J varying from 1 to 30 . Since both J\&K are totally parallel and all access to Q\&S are in the same sense of $K, L, J$ the "semi smart" compiler can pick which way to do it. In this case because ND is unknown at run time it would pick Case II.

The memory layout is shown in Figure 3-24. The accessing pattern is described in Appendix $A$ as being of Type 3. This means that the SAM will access 512 elements of the $Q$ array at one time for $J=1$, then 512 for $J=2$ etc., until $J=30$. This would mean all $K^{\prime} s$ would be accessed from 1 to ND up to an $L$ value $L$ (last) such that 512 values are accessed.

For example if $N D=10$ then $52 I$ values would be accessed each for $K$ values 1 to 10 except for $L=52$ which would only access $K=1 \& K=2$.

On the next complete cycle those remaining $K$ and $L$ values would be accessed up to a maximum of 720. Figure 3-25 shows thus.

As can be seen this could be inefficient if ND*MMA $<512$ and these parameters were set at run time. A more efficient procedure could be worked out which would have the same flexibility, either by recompiling with compile time parameters or else with more efficient coding to permit compaction of the $Q$ array (see Appendix C).

The next loop DO 30 has the $K$ index as the serial index for the recurrence relation. Its structure is

DO $30 \mathrm{~J}-2, \mathrm{JM}$
DO $30 \mathrm{~L}=2 ; \mathrm{LM}$
DO $28 \mathrm{Kl}, \mathrm{KMAX}$
$K L-(L-I)$ AND $+K$
$R R=1.0 / Q(K L, J, \sigma)$
(plus many other statements including a fir ORIGINAL PAGE IS recurrence relation on $K$ )

28 CONTINUE
30 CONTINUE


| L=1 | L=2 | $\mathrm{L}=3$ | $L=L M A X$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{K}=1 \rightarrow \mathrm{ND}$ | $\mathrm{K}=1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{ND}$ | $\mathrm{K}=1 \rightarrow \mathrm{ND}$ | $K=1 \rightarrow N D$ |
| 504721 |  |  | 505440 |

Figure 3-24. Memory Layout for Q Array


Figure 3-25. Processor Index Values as a Function of Cycle D.O: 20 Loop Subroutine STEP ( $\mathrm{ND}=10$ )


Figure 3-26. Processor Index Values as a Function of Cycle DO 30 Loop Subroutine STEP ( $\mathrm{ND}=15$ )

Figure 3-27 shows how the indices will appear in the various processors. This case requires subiterations of the cycles as on page A-10. The number of cycles is equal to ( $N D * 30+512-1$ )/512 which for an $N D$ of 10 means only one cycle. ISKIP $=720$.

### 3.2.5 Functions and Macros)

Functions on the EMP will include not only the mathematical intrinsics, such as ARCTAN, LN, EXT, and SQRT which are expected of any compiler, but also a family of functions that are brought about because of the parallel nature of the FMP.

## Math Intrinsics

Math intrinsics (ARTAN, LN, EXP, SQRT) are well understood. Some will be in-line code, some are subroutine calls. All execute locally to the processor. Since there is nothing new or different for the FMP, we need not digress to discuss them at this point.

## Global Intrinsics

A form of intrinsic function seen in a parallel language, for which there is no analog in a serial machine, is that function which operates across the declared parallelsim. A global sum is the sum of all the elements specified by all the instances of the index set of the DOALL. A global maximum is the largest element across the entire DOALL.

To reduce compiler complexity, and to eliminate user programmers' doubts as to whether parallel operation has been achieved as a result of compiler analysis, global intrinsics will be supplied.


Figure 3-27. Processor Index Values as a Function of Cycle DO 40 Loop Subroutine STEP (ND=10)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=0.0 \\
& \text { DO } 1 \mathrm{~J}=1,1000 \\
& A=A+B(J)
\end{aligned}
$$

I. CONTINUE

## the language will allow:

```
DOALL, J=1,100
```

$A=\operatorname{GLOBALSUM}(B(J))$

ENDDO

The global operations will presumably include all of the following. Assume that we are inside a DOALL loop expressed as DOALL, J=JSTART,JEND.


An extension of the global operation is the formation of a parallel linear recurrence in nine $\left(=\log _{2} 512\right)$ steps as demonstrated by Shyh-Ching Chen in his doctor's thesis at the J . of Ill. In Fortran, consider

DO $1 \mathrm{~J}=1,1000$
$A(J+1)=B(J) * A(J)+C(J)$
1 CONTINUE

This takes 1000 steps, each with one multiply, and one add. A parallel algorithm exists that produces the same result in 10 steps. The parallel algorithm can easily be implemented on the FMP.

With the inclusion of the parallel linear recurrence as a function in the language, the programmer has two ways of writing his linear recurrences. For example, given the serial FORTRAN

DO $1 \mathrm{~J}=1 . \mathrm{r} 1000$
DO $1 \mathrm{~K}=1,1000$
$A(J, K+1)=A(J, K) * B(J, K)+C(J, K)$
1 CONTINUE
there are two ways to write it in FMP FORTRAN given that the order of nesting the loops is irrelevant otherwise. Namely:

DOALL, J=1,1000
DO $1 \mathrm{~K}=1,1000$
$A(J, K+1)=A(J, K) * B(J, K)+C(J, K)$
1 CONTINUE
ENDDO

Method II:

DOALL, $K=1,1000$
DO $1, \mathrm{~J}=1,1000$
$A(J, K+1)=\operatorname{RECURRENCE}(A(J, K) * B(J, K)+C(J, K))$

- 1 CONTINUE

ENDDO

Method I, which executes the recurrence. serially in an inner loop, runs about nine times as fast as method II, which executes each one of the recurrences in parallel across each value of $J$ in turn. That is, method I is 512 times as fast as a serial machine, while method II is 57 times faster than a single serial processor. The RECURRENCE function is included only for those cases where method I is not an available option.

## CHAPTER 4

## SİMULATION

## 4. 1 SIMULATION GOALS

The simulation effort during this extension of the feasibility study has two distinct goals. The first is the requirement of the statement-of-work for this extension that a simulation of the FMP be prepared, and at least one simulation run. The second, is to get a head start on those simulations needed for phase II, and described in Chapter 6 as the mechanism for settling various trade-offs. The statement of work also calls for the selection of "metrics", that is, selected portions of the benchmark programs to be.used as inputs to the simulations to measure the performance of the projected FMP.

Detailed instruction by instruction timing of code execution in CU and EU is necessary to ensure that the required throughput can be achieved. The design of major system components must be specified in sufficient detail to provide structure, logic, and timing parameters for system simulation. This information is in Chapter 2.

Compilerffunctioning, including FORTRAN extensions for the FMP, are also needed and are found in Chapter 3. Hand compilation methods must be specified. In the case of the current extension, a single metric, subroutine TURBDA, has been selected and hand compiled for this purpose. Further definition of hand compilation is needed for phase II. In particular, how much compiler sophistication
will be achieved in the first version affects hand compilation, and this is still a subject for discussion. At this time it is best to make conservative assumptions, again in order to reduce the element of risk in the simulated system performance predictions.

The design details and design choices outlined above have been made definite though at this time for the first of the detailed simulations which are required to establish confidence in the feasibility and throughput capability of the SAM architecture. Any or all of the details may be changed as a result of further study or the availability of more advanced components. Of course, all such changes would be supported by simulation studies to maintain or increase confidence in the correctness of the system design.

## 4. 2 SELECTION OF METRICS

It is Burroughs understanding that the final selection of metrics will be the Government's. Metric selection is a function of the architecture that is to be measured. For example, in a conventional serial uni-processor, the distinction between "serial" and "parallel" streams of code is irrelevant, and should have no bearing. With parallel processors such as the two designs being proposed for the FMP (NAS2-9456 and NAS2-9457 final reports) the arrangement of data in memory affects the efficiency of parallelism, and metrics should be selected such that all "directions" of access of that data are rapresented. What is important is that the metrics selected be "representative", both with
respect to the operations being performed by the target architecture, and the codes that will be run on the FMP. Some "representative" of every kind of code that the FMP will run is wanted, but the results should be weighted according to the expected frequency of each "kind. " "Kind" refers to the sort of interaction with the architecture that is represented, whether parallelism is two dimensional or one-dimensional, the direction of accessing, presence or absence of branches in inner loops, and so on; all the things that may have an affect on the way the selected architectures behaves.

The metric that has been selected as the one that shall be used in the single simulation that will be run during the extension of the contract is SUBROUTINE TURBDA. Like most of both the implicit and explicit codes, it exhibits a great deal of parallelism, but with some operations conditional on subscript, so that different things are being done at different subscripts. It thus tests the architecture's ability to do different things at different grid points. It includes fetches from, and stores to, the program's data base (in extended memory), exercising the data transfer paths from the program data base to the processing resource proper. It contains sufficient arithmetic manipulation to exercise that aspect of the FMP (although probably less than a "typical" subroutine). It contains significant.amounts of index computation both on loop controls and on subscripts. For the FMP design of Reference 1, it exercises the synchronization, which is an essential feature of that design.

## 4. 3 SIMULATION MODELS

The NASF system simulation modeling will be done at three levels of detail, with results from a detailed model being used to determine parameter values for the next higher level model.

The most detailed level of modeling is the instruction timing model for CU and processors. For example, the model for the processor has as resources the PDM, PPIM, instruction registers and decoding, multipliers, adders, data and index registers, etc., corresponding to the detailed processor design. A metric for this model is a sample code sequence generated by hand compilation of' a FORTRAN section typical of the Navier-Stokes codes. Each instruction is modeled by a sequence of tasks, each requiring one or more of the resources, and executing for the specified number of clocks. Instruction fetch and decode is such a task sequence and the extent of overlap with instruction execution is modeled. Similarly, the extent to which instructions can overlap is modeled by the use of queueing for resources, or by logic tests, in exact correspondence with the processor design. The output reports from running this model can be used to determine parameters for the next level model. An important performance factor to be determined is the extent to which the address calculations for $E M$ accesses can be interlaced with, and overlapped by the floating point calculations. The next level of simulation will be the flow model processor, including the CU, processor, EM, and DBM. The interactions to be measured are the CU and processor code execution times (previously determined), and
data transfers between EM and DBM. The metric will be a sequence of code executions and data transfers approximating the main body of computation in a Navier-Stokes code. The results will show the throughput performance of the FMP, together with the utilizations of EM and CU, which interface with DBM and the rest of the system.

When we wrote the simulation model, we found that the instruction level model needed to include the interaction between CU and EU, combining the first and second levels. The lowest level simulation model therefore is detailed to the instruction level, but includes CU, a number of processors, and access and dața transmission timing of the Extended Memory and Transposition Network. Simulation of a number of selected code sections on this model will provide the parameters required to model the execution of complete jobs and sequences of jobs through the Facility.

The overall system model will include the host, File Memory, Data Base Memory and their interfaces with each other and CU and EM. The metrics; will be presumed scenarios of.user requests for NSS jobs. The sequence of scheduling, initialization, NSS operation, and output will be modeled: Important functions to be modeled are data base and program transfers from File. Memory to DBM to EM, CUM, and PDM, allocation of DBM space, the . ; sequence of FIMP operations, including data and program input, computation,' snapshot and data outputs, and changeover to the next job. Only the FMP
scheduling and control load on the host will be modeled; the amount of host capacity available for other necessary work can be measured, or the host can be loaded to any desired level by undefined "background" jobs and the effect on NASF throughput measured.

The overall simulation effort will have two functions: first to support the validity of the SAM architecture by modeling all essential system functions and interfaces in sufficient detail and demonstrating proper function of the model, and second to show the throughput capability of the system for aerodynamic simulation jobs by tracing the throughput step-by-step from the instruction level to the user interface.

Simulations will be written in Burroughs Operational System Simulator (BOSS) a discrete-events simulator whose input language is the flow-graph of the process being simulated. The instruction level simulation of Section 4.5 is written. in BOSS, the second and third level simulations of Phase II will be written in BOSS. In Phase II, the instruction-level simulator may be rewritten in ALGOL, since substantial improvement in simulation execution time is expected.

### 4.4 BOSS SIMULATOR'

The BOSS simulator was used for the simulations because of the relative ease of modeling with BOSS and the short time available. Special timing simulator programs for $E U$ and $C U$ code execution probably could have been completed in. three months. Simulations at different levels of detail will be used to get performance predictions ranging from the EU instruction execution to the user interface level.

A discrete events simulator, such as BOSS, models the activity of a system as a definite sequence of states. The model changes state only at discrete points, called events, which occur at definite instants of time. Every event can be predicted at the occurrence of some prior event, and the new state of the system model resulting from each event can be completely determined from that event and the prior state. In practice the event prediction and state change calculations are often probabalistic, because the real system is too complex to be modeled in full detail. The state variables of the model are mostly binary logic variables such as busy/not busy or happened/not happened, and processing of an event involves the accessing of state tables and evaluation of binary decision functions. Arithmetic operations rarely occur except in the evaluation of continuous probability functions where they are used in the binary decisions or in predicting the times of future events.

The BOSS simulator program runs on a B 6700 or B 7700 Burroughs computer. It is a general purpose discrete events simulator, with emphasis on ease of modeling and efficiency in execution, in exchange for some restrictions on the size and generality of models. BOSS has been used by the Federal and Special Systems Group at Paoli mainly for simulating the hardware and software functions of data processing systems, and improvements and enhancements over several years have made it especially useful for this purpose.

In a BOSS simulation the element of model activity is a TASK. A task is characterized by its requirement for resources and by the algorithm specified for predicting its execution time. A task is initiated upon completion of its ! predecessor requirement, which is usually a logical combination (AND or OR) of one or more prior task endings. The task may wait in queue until the required' resources are available; the selected resource units are then made busy for the execution time. At the task ending event, resources are released, queues are served, and the predecessor requirements of any successor tasks are • updated. Several kinds of test-and-branch constructs are available to cause conditional selection of one out two or more successor tasks.

The direct interaction of tasks is restricted to structures of tasks grouped together and called PROCESSES. When a process is initiated, one or more "starting tasks" within it are initiated without predecessors, and the activity within it passes from tasks to task until such time as there is no further task activity, when that active version of the process ends. Except for competition for resources, and certain special constructs, there is no interaction between the active tasks in separate active processes.

The static structure of a BOSS model is described by the structures of the tasks and their interactions within processes and by the numbers and kinds of resources available. The dynamic state of activity is described by the states of activity of processes and tasks. Every task is a member of some process, and there is no activity in the system model until some process is initiated.

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALIIT

Initiation of processes at specified times corresponds to external loads causing activity in the system. Processes can also be initiated as subroutines, or by task endings in other processes. Many processes can be active concurrently, including multiple but distinct and independent versions of the same process. Similarly, within a process, many tasks may be active in parallel, including* multiple independent versions of the same task. Thus, it is easy to model a highly parallel system with many concurrent activities, including cases where many of the parallel activities are very similar in structure.

The basic BOSS structure described above is sometimes inadequate or inconvenient for modeling some parts of the system. Therefore, there is available a superposed structure of local and global variables upon which arithmetic operations can be performed at task endings. These variables can be addressed directly or indirectly, and their values can be used to control ' branching at task endings or to modify the resource requirement or execution time of specified tasks. This extension permits a certain amount of programming of capabilities not available in the basic BOSS structure. In this way, for example, the activity in one process can be influenced by actions occurring in another process.

Figure 4-1 shows graphically the process of implementing and debugging simulations in BOSS, showing the various steps that the simulation programmer and the BOSS simulator go through in achieving the final resuil.


Figure 4-1. Flow of Simulation

### 4.5 SIIMULATION MODEL FOR THE CURRENT STUDY

The overall structure of the model is shown in Figure 4-2. The Control Unit and Processor models are driven by code files prepared by hand compilation of a selected FORTRAN code segment. All the operators of CU and EU are modeled in detail so that any code may be simulated. Additional operators '. may be easily added if needed. Conditional branching cannot be modeled in complete detail since the model is a timing model, and does not simulate the processing of data. Such branches are therefore modeled by specifying the number of times one path is taken for each time the other is taken. The count can be specified probalistically. For most branches this will do well enough: The cases where branching depends on the Processor Number, will be handled by a later extension.

The Control Unit model includes its processor, a single memory (CUM), and seven of the control functions interacting with the processor EU's, as shown. Any desired number of processors can be modeled, but the number actually used will be small (4 to 10) to avoid excessive machine time to run the simulations. Details of instruction overlap in the CU are not modeled; instruction execution times are not allowed to overlap, but CUM data fetches or stores can overlap this execution time of prior or following instructions. A data fetch of one instruction must come after a data store (if any) of the preceding instruction ${ }_{6}$ : In case of contention for CUM by program fetches, the data accesses have priority, but do not abort program fetches already in progress. The program look-ahead stack has a capacity of four code segments, which is two memory words for opcode formats using 24-bit segments.


Figure 4-2. Structure of Model

Each Processor consists of an Execution Unit (EU) and separate program and data memories (PPM and PDM). The EU is modeled in some detail in order to properly simulate instruction overlap, as shown in Figure 4-3. The operation is as follows:
4. 5. 1 Program Fetch. The Program Counter (PCR) addresses the next instruction, which is available at PPM three clocks after the address is available: As soon as a full word of program stack is empty, the next code word is read to the stack from PPIM, and PCR is incremented. When a branch occurs, the program stack is emptied and the new code word is available three clocks after the new $P C R$ is set.
4.5.2 Scoreboard. Each instruction records in the scoreboard the times. at which it will release each resource that it will use. The next instruction must wait in stack until-all resources that is will need will be available when needed. The Scoreboard and Decoding are modeled logically, but not as nesources for which there could be queueing.
4. 5. 3 Holding Registers. If any resource is required at a time later than instruction start, that instruction must wait in the corresponding Holding Register. If that Holding Register is tied up by the previous instruction, then the current instruction must wait, even though it could otherwise start.


Figure 4-3. Execution Unit Model
4. 5.4 Integer Processing, Floating Point Processing, PDM (IP, FP, DM $)$. These are modeled as resources, although the Scoreboard should assure that there will be no queueing for them. The utilization of these resources will give information about the efficiency of overlap and the fraction of elapsed time that the FP is in use.
4. 5. 5 Synchronizing Controls. The timing of synchronizing controls is assumed to take 3 clocks for a round trip from CU to EU and back to CU. This is modeled as no delay from CU to EU since the control signal arrives at the same time as the corresponding clock pulse from the central clock. The 3 clocks delay is then all in the return path from EU to CU. The actions of the Synchronizing Controls are as follows:
4. 5. 5. 1 READY. The CU raises the ready at the proper time in synchronized instructions where the EU's must wait for CU action before proceeding (LOADEM, STOREIM). Any EU which reaches such an instruction before CU waits for the READY level. CU will wait for (IGH and $\overline{E N}$ ) and then turn off the READY level.
4.5.5.2 (IGH + EN). This is level equivalent to a logic function generated as follows: When an enabled (EN) EU comes to the proper point in a synchronized instruction it raises the output line corresponding to I Got Here (IGH). This, same level is raised all the time an EU is disabled ( $\overline{\mathrm{EN}}$ ), hence (IGH $+\overline{\mathrm{EN}}$ ). IGH is turned off by GO from CU. The (IGH + EN) lines for all EU's are ANDed at the $C U$ to procude its (IGH $+\overline{E N}$ ) input. In the model this logic function is performed by maintaining separate counts of the number of EU's enabled (\#EN) and in the I Got Here state (\#IGH). (IGH + EN) is true when \#EN = \#IGH.
4.5.5.3 EN. EN is ture when \#EN=0 (no EU's are enabled).
4.5. 5. 4 GO. When (IGH + EN) becomes true at the CU, it raises the GO level for one clock. All enabled CU's, on receipt of this signal, turn off the IGH level and continue the instruction in which they were waiting.
4.5.5.5 Wait GO. When CU sends this signal (one clock), all enabled EU'S enter the IGH state (waiting for GO) in place of the next instruction start. The current instruction is or will be finished. .
4.5.5.6 Disable. When CU sends this signal (one clock), all enabled EU's enter the disabled ( $\overline{\mathrm{EN})}$ state in place of the next instruction start. The current instruction is or will be finished.
4.5.6 Extended Memory and Transposition Network. The EM and TN are not modeled as resources that may be busy; thus it is assumed that during execution of CU-EU code, the EM is never in use for DBM transfers. The EM access time and data transmission time through TN are properly modeled in the execution time of the LOADEM and STOREM instructions.
4.5.7 Code Simulated. The hand-compiled TURBDA assembly codes are given in Table 4-1 and 4-2, together with an assembly coded SQRT, which is a simplified version omitting the tests and branches for negative argument and for negative exponent.
4.5.7.1 Processor Code. The large amount of integer computation at the beginning of each pass through the TURBDA loop would give a low utilization of the Floating Point unit, were not for the large block of FP calculation in

Table 4-1. TURBDA Processor Code Simulated by Model


|  | (rCALL not simulated) |  | IGT (No Branch) |  | L1 | JUMP L3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FL |  | IĖQL (No Branch) |  |  | (Jump to L3) |
|  | Fílvm |  | IEQL, L20 |  | L4 | STOP |
|  | rL |  | (Jump to L20) |  |  |  |
|  | IL |  | FFEETCH |  | SQRT | IUPK3 |
| L3 | ITIX, L4 (Drop through 2 times, then exit to L4) |  | FABS FMUL | Never |  | IADDi |
|  | ISHL |  | FSTORE | Executed |  | IANDL |
| , | IPNO |  | IJUMP, L40 |  |  | ISUB |
|  | IADD | L20 | FFETCH |  |  | IADD1 |
|  | IDIVI |  | FFETCH |  |  | IANDL |
|  | ISTORE |  | FADD |  |  | ISUB |
|  | IMULL |  | FABS |  |  | ISHL |
|  | IFETCH |  | FMULL |  |  | IADD |
|  | IL |  | FMUL̇ |  |  | IADDL |
| L14 | ITIX, L1 (Drop through 20 times, |  | FSTCORE | . |  | IPAK3 |
|  | then exit to L1) |  | JUMP, L40 |  |  | FADD |
|  | IADDL |  | (Jump to L40) |  |  | FNEG |
|  | ID52i | L30 | FFETCH |  |  | FL |
|  | LOADEM |  | FFETCH |  |  | FMUL |
|  | IADDL |  | FADD |  |  | FMAD |
|  | IḊ521 |  | FABS | Never |  | FMUL |
|  | IL |  | FMULLL |  |  | FMUL |
|  | IFETCH |  | FMUL |  |  | FMAD |
|  | IEQL (No Branch) |  | FSTORE |  |  | FMUL |
|  | IL | L40 | $\dot{F} L$ |  |  | FMU̇L |
| L100 | LOADEM |  | FFETCH |  |  | FMAD |
|  | IADDL |  | FMUL |  |  | FMU̇L |
|  | ID521 |  | ENTER SQRT |  |  | FMUL |
|  | IL |  | FMUUL |  |  | FMAD |
|  | IFETCH |  | FL |  |  | FMUL |
|  | IEQL (No Branch) |  | FȦDD |  |  | FNEG |
|  | IL |  | Fidiv |  |  | FMUL |
| L200 | LOADEM |  | IADDM |  |  | IRETURN |
|  | IFETCH |  | ID521 |  |  |  |
|  | IGT (No Branch) |  | STOREM |  |  |  |
|  | IFETCH |  | JUMP L14 |  |  |  |
|  | IFETCH |  | (Jump L14) |  |  |  |

the SQRT routine which is called once per loop. ICALL and IRETURN are $\cdot$ both estimated at 23 clocks, which may be pessimistie and considerably reduces the FP utilization of SQRT. In an inner loop such as this, SWRT should probably be written in-line, since it will occupy no more than 20-30 words, and about 50 clocks are saved.

Note that the outer loop, starting at L3, is executed twice, and each time the inner loop, starting at L14, is executed 20 times. This is a sufficiently large sample of code execution to give valid statistics. Within the inner loop, in the actual code, each EU will execute one of three branches, depending on the index states. In the simulation, only the branch starting at L20 (the longest of the three) is executed. The other two are never executed, as indicated.

In the actual code, two of the LOADEM's are conditional (LOADEMC). However, only the EM address and EM data input are conditional, the timing being the same, so the simulator makes no distinction.
4. 5. 7. 2 Control Unit Code. The Control Unit code of Table 4-2 begins with LOOP, because the model starts with all EU's waiting for GO. When (IG + EN) is true, LOOP causes both CU and EU's to branch to specified addresses by the LOOP instruction, and this is a convenient way to get the simulator to jump to the desired addresses in the simulated code files.

Table 4-2. . TURBDA Control Unit Code' Simulated

```
        LOOP
        CL
        CL
L3 . CTIX, L4 (Drop through 2 times, then Branch L4)
        CSHFN
        CMULL
        CFETCH
        CL
L14 CTIX, L1 (Drop through 20 times, then Branch L1)
        CADDL
        CADD
        CMMD521
        CL
        LOADEM
        CADDL
        CADD
        CMD521
        LOADEM
        CADDL
        CADD
        CMD521
        LOADEM
        CADDL
        CADD
        CMD521
        STOREM
        CJUMP, L14 (Jump to L14)
L1 CJUMP; L3 (Jump to L3)
L4 CRETURN
END SIMULATION
```

The only synchronization instructions in this code sample (aside from LOOP) are the three LOADEIM's and the STOREM.

The CU and its synchrnoizing action are simulated in some detail to determine two things:
(1) How much do processors wait at sync points for other processors to catch up?
!
(2) Do processors ever wait at sync points for CU to catch up, and if so, how much?

## 4. 6 SIMULATION RESULTS

The simulation runs were made with a model having the Control Unit and four processors. The code driving the model was the TURBDA code shown in Tables 4-1 and 4-2, except that the outer loop was reduced to one iteration, and the inner loop to 10 , in order to reduce machine time for these first trial runs. Under these conditions the simulation indicates that the abbreviated TURBDA runs 4600 clocks on 184 microseconds assuming a-25-megahertz clock. The full size TURBDA with two iterations in the outer loop and 31 in the inner loop would run aboưt six times as long, or 1100 microseconds ( 27,600 clocks). The parallelism is $31 \times 31=961$, compared with 1024 possible in two iterations; so, the efficiency of array use is 93.8 percent in this case.

In the simulated TURBDA run, each processor performs 281 floating point operations lasting a total of 2407 clocks, for an average of 8.6 clocks per FLOP. The elapsed time of 4600 clocks yields an effective throughput of 1.53 MFFLOPS
per processor. The array throughput would then be 782 MFLOPS , or 733 at 93. 8 percent array efficiency for the $31 \times 31 \times 31$ problem. As expected for TURBDA, these rates are considerably lower than 1000 MFLOPS. This reduced throughput has three causes:
(1). There are 40 EM accesses with the 281 floating point ops, or a ratio of only 7 to 1 . The EM accesses themselves do not cause appreciable delay, but the integer operations required to calculate the EM addresses do cause delay.
(2) The floating point operations of TURBDA contain more than the normal proportion of multiplies and divides, raising the average duration from the nominal 7: 3 clocks to 8.6 clocks per floating . point operation.
(3) The function $\operatorname{SQRT}$ wàs simulated as a subroutine, with entry and return operators. . It is likely that the compiler will put simple functions like SQRT in line. If so, the total time would be only nine tenths that shown, for an 11 percent increase in measured throughput.

Some other conclusions of interest are:
(1) Control Unit processing causes essentially no delay (less than 0.5 percent of the total time)
(2) Extended memory accesses occupy 11.5 percent of the time, including all synchronizing delays.
(3) Program fetches cause little or no delay. The model does not measure such delays exactly, and should be modified to do so. Program memory is in use 42 percent.
(4) The utilization of the integer unit is 47 percent, data memory 10 percent and floating point unit 58 percent, for a total of 115 percent, indicating the approximate degree of overlap.
(5) The inner loop takes 450 clocks, of which 197 are in the SQRT routine. Two thirds of the floating point operations are in the SQRT routine.

Figure 4-4 is an example of one of the output tables of one of the simulation runs. The unit types represent various system resources as indicated by the row headings typed in on the left. In some cases the resource is used for internal control purposes in the model and does not represent a real system component, so is unlabelled. Some of the resources represent logic levels and signals such as $\overline{R E A D Y}, \overline{G O}, I G H+E N, E N=0$. A processor or CU waiting for such a level or signal is modeled as queueing for the resource, which is created to represent the presence of the level or signal.

UNIT JIILIZATION STATISTICS

|  | UN IT TYPE |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { UNIT } \\ \text { ID } \end{array}$ | TOTAL | $\cdots \mathrm{Cl}$ | RRCENT | OF ACT | Ve tim | － FREP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | numb | USED | del ta | total | delta | total | TOTAL |
|  | cum | 24 | 3 | 173 | 11.27 | 11.27 | $0: 00$ | 0.00 | 88.73 |
|  | CUPROC | 25 | 4 | 233 | $9 \varepsilon .89$ | 98.89 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.11 |
|  | CPSTAK | 20 | 5 | 171 | 11.86 | 11.86 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 88.14 |
|  | ＂ | 20 | 6 | 173 | 11.40 | 11.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 88.10 |
|  | ＂ | 20 | 7 | 171 | 11.92 | 11.92 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 88.08 |
|  |  | 19 ． | 8 | 170 | 11.62 | 11.62 | 0.00 | c． 00 | 88.38 |
|  | －－－ | 23 ＊ | 9 | 1 | c． 07 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99.93 |
|  |  | 28 | 10 | 186 | C． 91 | 0.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99.69 |
|  | $\overline{\text { READY }}$ | 15 | 1.1 | 240 | c． 87 | 0.87 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 99.13 |
|  | （IGH $\overline{\text { G0 }}$ | 17 | 12 | 246 | C． 00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100.00 |
|  | （IGH＋EN） | 21 | 13 | 82 | C：00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | $100.00^{\circ}$ |
|  | \＃EN＝0 | 26 | 14 | 1 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100．CO |
|  | IU | 3 | 15 | 506 | 47.01 | 47.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 52.59 |
|  | FPU | 4 | 16 | 364 | 57.74 | 57.74 | 0.00 | 6.00 | 42.26 |
|  | PDM | 5 | 17 | 154 | 5.97 | 9.97 | 0.00 | c． 00 | 90.63 |
|  | PPM | 7 | 18 | 1348 | 42.37 | 42.37 | 0.00 | C． 00 | 57.63 |
| 家 | HOLD $\}$ | 8 | 19 | 1 | 6.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 100．c0 |
| 82 | REGIS－$\left.{ }_{\text {TERS }}\right\}$ | ${ }^{9}$ | 20 | 53 | 5．60 | 9．60 | 0.00 | C． 00 | 90.40 |
| 近 |  |  | 21 | 52 | 1 C .18 | 10.18 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 89.82 |
| S | QUEUED | 13 | 22 | 558 | 77.55 | 77.55 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 22.45 |
| C | PPSTAK | 12 | 23 | 862 | 35.50 | 35.50 | 0.00 | c． 00 | 64.50 |
| 易 | ＂ | ． 12 | 24 | 862 | 35.53 | 35.53 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 64.47 |
|  |  | 12 | 25 | 860 | 4C． 69 | 40.69 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 59．31 |

Figure 4－4．Sample of Simulation Output

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents two major aspects of the NASF reliability and trustworthiness; (1) an availability prediction of the FMP and (2) further development of the error detection and correction techniques to the various FMP elements. These topics are covered in sections 2 and 3 of this chapter, respectively.

The system availability design goal for the B7800 host system and the Flow Model Processor (FMP) is 90 percent or better. Also, it is desired that the probability of success for completing runs of ten minutes and one hour be equal to or greater than 98 percent and 90 percent, respectively, The following is the conventional. formula for computing availability

$$
A=\frac{M U^{\prime} T}{M U T+M D T}
$$

where,

$$
\begin{aligned}
A & =\text { Availability } \\
\text { MUT } & =\text { Mean Up Time } \\
\text { MDT } & =\text { Mean Down Time. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Up time is the duration during which the system is continuously up. Down time is the interval between up times. It can be seen that a system MUT $=9$ hours or longer combined with a system MDF $=$ l hour or less satisfies the availability goal. These values also satisfy the desired reliability, or probability of success, as evidenced by the following formula

$$
R(t)=e^{-t / S M U T}
$$

where,
$R(t)=$ The probability of successfully completing a run as a function of $t$
$t=$ Duration of the run (hours)
SMUT $=$ System Mean Up Time (hours)

### 5.2 AVAILABILITY PREDICTION

The following methods were employed in preparing the FMP availability predictions discussed below.

- Standard component part failure rates were predicted using the reliability stress analysis prediction method of MIL-HDBK217.B.
- Potential improvements in reliability through the use of Single Bit Error Detection and Correction and Double Bit Error Detection (SECDED) in the FMP memories, fanout tree, and transposition network were analyzed using a mathematical model developed specifically for the proposed design of these elements.
- System Reliability, Availability, and Maintainability (RAM) characteristics were analyzed using Program DESIGN, which was developed by the Burroughs Corporation to aid in designing fault-tolerant- computer systems.

MIL-HDBK-217B is used extensively throughout the electronics industry to predict the failure rates of electronic component parts. Since the prediction methods of MIL-HDBK-217B are quite detailed and documentation describing these methods is readily available, only the general aspects of component part failure rate predictions are discussed in this report.

Appendix $B$ contains a description of the SECDED mathematical model, including the underlying assumptions associated with the development of this technique. A similar description of the mathematical model employed in Program DESIGN is in preparation.

### 5.2.1 OVERVIEW

The proposed Flow Model Processor (FMP) design will be implemented using state-of-the-art technology of today and currently proposed state-of-the-art technology for the time frame during which manufacturing of the FMP will be initiated. Obviously, accurate reliability projections for some of the LSI component parts required to implement the proposed machine are difficult at this point in time. Likewise, projections with respect to gains in reliability through the use of techniques such as Single Bit Error Detection and Correction and Double Bit Error Detection (SECDED) can only be hypothesized based on assumed failure modes until the design is completed, built, and tested.

Recognizing that the above and additional considerations must be seriously addressed to ensure meeting the specified system availability requirements of 90 percent, an analysis has been conducted to bound the potential availability of the current FMP design. Both optimistic and conservative points of view have been considered for those conditions which can not be accurately projected at this point in time. In addition, sensitivity analyses have been conducted within the upper and lower projected availability bounds to determine where design attention must be concentrated in order to achieve the stated availability requirement and reap the greatest reliability and availability gains for the effort expended.

The results of this preliminary availability analysis serves two purposes. First, the analysis shows specific failure, recovery, and repair time reliability and maintainability estimates at the subsystem, module, and component part levels that are consistent with overall system availability of 90 percent and MTBF of 9 hours or better. Second, the analysis numerically bounds achievable Mean-Up-Time (MUT), Mean-Down-Time (MDT) and Availability estimates within the broad range of reasonably optimistic and pessimistic assumptions.

The following paragraph summarizes the results of this preliminary availability and the rationale for the assumptions made. As the FMP design progresses, the availability analysis will be iterated. to further refine specific reliability and maintainability estimates to narrow the bounds of uncertainty associated with these preliminary projections.

### 5.2.2 Summary of Results

The first step in this analysis was to develop an overall Availability block diagram of the FMP (Figure 5-1). The estimated parts counts for all major elements, considering the types of component parts currently envisioned, were then prepared. For standard component, parts, failure rates were predicted using the reliability stress analysis prediction method of MIL-HDBK-217B. Consideration was then given to the failure rates of large memory packages (l6K, $64 \mathrm{~K}, 256 \mathrm{~K}$ ) of the future. It was hypothesized that the best that could be expected in terms of reliability is achieving failure rates equivalent to those achievable today for 4 K memory packages (approximately 0.1 Failures Per Million Hours (FPMH)). The worst reliability that one could expect to encounter was judged to be equivalent to the series failure rate build up for the number of 4 K parts required to make up the larger memory packages; i.e. for $16 \mathrm{~K}: ~ 0.4 \mathrm{FPMH}$, for $64 \mathrm{~K}: 1.6 \mathrm{FPMH}$, and for 256K: 6.4 FPMH . Using these component part failure rates for each of the major elements provided the upper and lower bounds with respect to projected device reliability.


Figure 5-1. Availability Block Diagram of the FMP

Next, a mathematical model was developed to study the potential improvements from SECDED. Using this model, it was found that gains could vary from a lower bound factor of 2 to upper bound factors of 164 for $16 \mathrm{~K}, 327$ for 64 K , and 653 for 256 K memory packages.

Finally, redundancy was considered. In this case, the ability to automatically detect, isolate, and decommit failed elements without noticeable interruption was investigated. As an upper bound on reliability, perfect recovery was considered. The lower bound was established for a situation where no recovery without interruption could be achieved. In this portion of the analysis, both permanent type failures which require a repair action and intermittent type failures which only require a recovery action were factored into the computations.

Using the previously discussed upper and lower bound values, it was determined that the design potential availability for the currently proposed FMP is:

* Upper Bound: $A_{F M P}=0.9995$ (see Figure 5-2)
* Lower Bound: $A_{\text {FMP }}=0.9554$ (see Figure 5-3)

Both these optimistic and conservative forecasts indicate a high degree of confidence in the ability of the proposed design to meet the overall system availability requirement of 90 percent. Using the above upper and lower bound availabilities for the FMP, it can be shown that the required availability of the 87800 host system to meet the 90 percent system availability is:

* $A_{B 7800}=.9004$ for the Upper Bound FMP Requirement
* $A_{B 7800}=.9420$ for the Lower. Bound FMP Requirement

The above required availability values for the $B 7800$ host system are currently being exceded by Burroughs B7700 systems operating in the field today. Since the B7800 system is expected to be even more reliable and maintainable than currently available B7700 systems, the overall system availability requirement for the FMP and the 87800 host system appears to be reasonable and achievable.

The data used to obtain these results are presented and discussed in the following sections.

### 5.2.3 THE BOUNDS OF FMP AVAILABILITY

This section shows the bounds of the failure rates of all packages and subsystems. The bounds of MUT (Mean-Up-Time), MDT (Mean-Down-Time) and availability of the FMP are the highlights. The failure rate of the system is significantly reduced with judicious design and the following factors:

1. A ground-based benign environment, where there is nearly zero environmental stress with optimum engineering operation and maintenance
2. Use of high quality parts, MIL-M-385i10, class B level commercial parts being strongly suggested
3. On-line processor spares
4. Error correction techniques, including SECDED.
5. Adequate maintainability, as reflected in time to repair.

### 5.2.3.1 PACKKAGE FAILURE RATES

The circuit packages are the basic elements in the FMP and accompanying the reliability of the FMP is a function of the failure rates of these packages. As mentioned in the previous section; the failure rates of digital circuit packages are predicted with the guidelines of MIL-HDBK-217B. Table 5-1 shows the predicted failure rates and the operating environmental conditions of the
control or logic packages used in the FMP. For the memory packages, the lower bound of those failure rates is 0.1 FPMH. The assumed upper bound of the failure rate of an m-bit memory package ( $m>4,000$ ), denoted as $\lambda_{m}$, may be computed with the following formula; representing the failure rate of the same memory built of 4k-bit parts.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{\mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{m} \times \frac{\text { UPPERBOUND F.R. FOR } 4 \mathrm{~K} \text { MEMORY } \mathrm{FPMH}}{4 \mathrm{~K} \text { BIT }} \\
& \lambda_{\mathrm{m}}=\mathrm{m} \times \frac{1}{4,000} \mathrm{FPMH}=\mathrm{M} \times 2.5 \times 10^{-5} \mathrm{FMPH}
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 5.2 shows the upper bounds of the failure rates of a variety of memory packages.

### 5.2.3.2 THE FAILURE RATES AND MTBF OF SUBSYSTEMS

A subsystem contains the packages listed in Tables 5-1 and 5-2. The failure rates of the subsystems of the FMP are predicted by parts count method. The memory subsystems failure rates are modified by the SECDED reilability improvement factor which is defined as the ratio of the subsystem MTBF with SECDED to that without SECDED. The factor is discussed in detail in appendix B. It can vary from two to six hundred and more, depending on the size of the memory package. Table 5-3 presents the list of the packages, the failure rates and MTBF of the control or data processing subsystems. Table 5-4 and 5-5 show the bounds of the failure rate and MTBF's of the memory subsystems. The upper (lower) bounds of the failure rates (MTBF's) are predicted with the SECDED reliability improvement factor of two and the failure rates of the memory packages at their upper bounds. The lower (upper) bounds of the failure rates (MTBF's) are generated when the SECDED improvement factors are at their upper limits and the failure rates of the memory packages are on their lower bounds.

Table 5-1. The Predicted Failure Rates of the Control or Logic Packages

| PARE | Numeer | *PART DESCRIPTICN | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TENF*EAV*QLAL*SYAAT*INDIVIDUAL. FA* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | 0001 | ECL CONTROL-SSI-I | DIG | 4 | 16 | 45 | GE | 8 | 1 | 0.00622 |
| 100 C | 0002 | ECL CONTROL-SSI-II | DIE | 6 | 16 | 45 | GE | B | 1 | 0.00778 |
| 1000 | 0003 | ECE CONTROL-SSI-III | DIE | 15 | 16 | 45 | GE | 8 | 1 | 0. $\mathrm{C} 13 \mathrm{C7}$ |
| 1000 | 0004 | ECL CONTROL-SSI-IV | 016 | 22 | 16 | 45 | GE | B | 1 | 0.01633 |
| 100 C | COOS | ECL CONTROL-NSI | DIG | 4 C | 16 | 60 | GE | B | 1 | 0.06082 |
| 100 C | C006 | ECL CONTROL-LSI | DI6 | 130 | 16 | 60 | GE | 8 | 1 | 0.13000 |

Table 5-2. The Upper Bounds of the Failure Rates of Memory Packages

|  | PARI | NUKBEF | *PAFI DESCRIPIICN | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TEMF*EAV*QUAL* OUANT*INCIVIOUAL FF** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00 | 2000 | 0001 | MOS 16K RAM | GAM 16000 | 22 | 60 | $G B$ | B | 1 | 0.4000 C |
| 为 | 2000 | cco 2 | MOS 64 K RAF | RAM 64000 | 22 | 60 | $G B$ | B | 1 | 1.600cc |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { OH } \\ & \text { 另 } \end{aligned}$ | 2000 | c003 | MOS 256K RAM | RAM $\mathbf{2 5 6 0 0 0}$ | 22 | 60 | $G B$ | $B$ | 1. | 6.40000 |

Table 5－3．The Predicted－Failure Rates and MTBFs of the Control Subsystems

LEvEL 1 designation：pe

| rt number | ON | ＊TYPE＊G／T／B＊PINS＊TEMP＊ENV＊QUAL＊QUANT＊INDIVIDUAL FF＊ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL FR* } \\ & 12.99982 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10000006 | ECL COM Trol－ls i |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MTEF＝ 76924.16 12．9998 FAILURES PER MILLION HOURS

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION：－U


MTEF $=13549.15 \quad 73.2647$ FALLURES DER MILLION HGURS
LEVEL 1 DESIGVATION：FOT ，dig．既

| PART | NUMEER | ＊PART DESCRIPTICN |  |  |  |  |  |  | A $\mathrm{T}^{\text {\％}}$ | JAL $=R *$ | TOTAL FR＊ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | 0072 | ECL こONTROL－SSI－II | J | 6 | 16 | 45 | G？ | 9 | 2000 | 0.00778 | 5.555 | MTEF＝64287．32 15．5552 FAILUQES PER MILLIONHOURS

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION：IN

| PART NUMEEF | ＊PART DESCRIPTION | ＊TY\％ |  |  |  |  |  | UANT | UAL FR＊ | TOTAL－FR＊ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 COS 4 | ECL CONTROL－SSI－IV | 万IG | 22 | 16 | 45 | 58 | B | 10480 | 0.01633 | 171.12779 | MTEF $=\quad 5843.59 \quad 171.1278$ FAILURES PER MILLION YOURS

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATIDN：TNC

| Part number | ＊PART DESCRIPTIUN | ＊TY＊E＊G／T／9＊PINS＊T＊MP＊ENV＊QUAL＊GUANT＊INOIVIDUAL FR＊ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FR＊ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10000021 | ECL CONTRJL－SSI－I | －IG | 4 | ： 6 | 45 | GB | ？ | 500 | 0．00622 | 3.11011 |

MTEF＝ $321532.40 \quad 3.111$ FAILURES PER MILLION HJURS
LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION：FM－C

| PaRT NUMBER | ＊PART DESCRIPTION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TOTAL FR* } \\ 0.39214 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100＇C COS 3 | ECL COVTROL－SSI－III | 0 O6 | 15 | 15 | 45 | G3 | R | 30 | 0.01307 |  | MTEF $=2550138.28 \quad 0.3921$ FAILURES DER MILLION HOURS LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION：CEM－C



Table 5-4. The Lower (Upper) Bounds of the Failure Rates (MTBF) of the Memory Subsystems

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION: PEM

| PART NUHBER | *PART DESCRIPTION | * $\mathrm{TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TEAP*ENY*QUAL} \mathrm{*} \mathrm{QUAAT*INDIVIDUAL} \mathrm{FR*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FR* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10000001 | ECL CONTRQL -SS $\mathbf{T} \mathbf{- I}$ | DIG 4 | 16 | 45 | GB | B | 15 | 0.00622 | 0.09330 |
| 2000000 | MOS 16K RAM |  |  |  | $G B$ | 0 |  |  |  | MTBF= $7884153.75 \quad 0.1268$ FAILURES PER MILLION HOURS

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION: PEPM

| PART NUMBER | EPART DESCRIPIION | *TYPE*G/T/B |  |  | ENV |  |  | L FR* | TAL FR* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20000001 | MOS 16K RAM | RAM 16000 | 22 | ¢0 | $G B$ | B | 28 | 0.00061 | 0.01707 |
| 10000001 | ECL CONTROL-SSI-I | DIG 4 | 16 | 45 | G日. | B | 15 | 0.00622 | 0.09330 |

MTEF $=9060039.53 \quad 0.1104$ FAILURES PER MILLION HOURS
LEVEL 1 DESIGNAIICN: ClN

| Paft | MLMBEG | *FAFI DESCRIPTIGN | *TY゙E*G/T/B*PINS*TEMF*EAV*QUAL* GLAAT*INCIVICUAL FF* |  |  |  |  |  | TAL Ff** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2CCC | CCO1 | MCS 16K RAF | FAY 16COC. 22 | 60 | GB | B | 55 | $0 . C 00 \in 1$ | C.03353 |

MIEF= $25 \varepsilon 2 C 925.34$ G.C3 35 FAILLFES FEf MILLION HOUFS

LEVEL 1 CESIGNAIICN: EN-M


MEf= 59651634.45 C. $61 \in 8$ FAILUFES PEF MILLOA HCLFS


MTEF=1LE757793-48 C.COE4 FALLUFES FEF MLLION HGUFS

Table 5-5. The Upper (Lower) Bounds of the Failure Rates (MTBF) of the Memory Subsystems.

LEVEL 1 DESIGNATION: PEM

| PART | number | EPART OESCRIPTION | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TEMP*ENV*QUAL*GUANT*INDIVIDUAL FR* |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TOTAL FR* } \\ 0.09330 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1000 | 0001 | ECL CONTROL-SS I-I | DIG 4 | 16 | 45 | GB | B | 15 | 0.00622 |  |
| 2000 | 0001 | MOS 16 K RAM | RAR 16000 | 22 | 0 | GR | R | 55 | 0.20000 | 11.00000 |
| MTBF. $=90144.48$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEVEL 1 designation: PEPM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PART | NUMBER | *part description | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TENP*ENV*QUAL*QUART*INDIVIDUAL FR* |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FR* |
| 2000 | 0001 | MOS 16 K RAM | RAM 16000 | 22 | 60 |  |  | 28 | 0.20000 | 5.60000 |
| 1000 | 0001 | ECL CDNTROL-SSI-I | 0164 | 16 | 45 | 68 | B | 15 | 0.00622 | 0.09330 |
|  | HTEF $=$ | 175644.96 5.6933 | faillures per mí | LION | hou |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEVEL 1 designation: CUn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paft | numbef | *part description | *TYPE*G/T/8*PINS*TEMP*ENV*QUAL*GUAAT*INCIVICUAL FF* |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FF* |
| 2 COC | ccol | MOS 16 K RAM | fak 16000 | 22 | 60 |  | B | 55 | 0.20000 | 11.00000 |
|  | H1Ef $=$ | S0S09.0S 11.c000 | fallures per m | Llio | HOU |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 cesignation: em-m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PARI | nlabef | *part oescription | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*JEMF*EAV*QLAL*GLAAT*INDIVIDUAL FR* |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FR* |
| 2000 | CCO2 | NOS 64 K RAM | RAM 64000 | 22 | 6,0 |  | P. | 55 | $0.8000 ¢$ | 44.0C.000 |
|  | -TEF= | 22727.27 44.COCO | failures fer mither | Llio | Hot |  |  |  |  |  |
| level ! oesignation: cer-m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PAFI | numbef | apafit description | *TYPE*G/T/B*PINS*TEMP*EAV*QUAL*GUANT*INDIVIDUAL FR* |  |  |  |  |  |  | TOTAL FR* |
| 200 C | CCO3 | KOS 256 K RAK | RAH 256000 | 22 | 60 |  | $B$ | 55 | 3.20000 | 176.00000 |
|  | HTEF= | 5681.82 176.0000 | failures fer p | Llio |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The legends of these and following tables are defined as:

```
TYPE - Integrated circuit type
G/T/B - Number of gates, or of transistors, or of bits
TEMP - Junction temperature predicted with MIL-HDBK-217B
ENV - Environment (GB - ground-based benign or standard office
    environment)
QUAL - quality/screening level (B-MIL-M-385l0, class B).
QUANT - not lis'ted in table 5-1 or 5-2
INDİVIDUAL FR - individual faiure rate (per million hours)
```

Some of the other terminology in these and following tables and figures is as follows. Mnemonics representing elements of the FMP are the same as those shown in Figure 5-1, such as "FOT" for "fanout tree" or "INC" for the "control portion of the transposition network". "MRT" has been used for "mean down time"; the programmer was thinking that all down time was repair time. "RE" recovery efficiency is the fraction of the time that a retry is successful. For example, for a single bit failure in memory covered by SECDED, RE is 1.000. For a catastrophic "sing.le point" failure, RE is 0.000. "Single point" identifies those portions of the system where a failure at a single point disables the system.

### 5.2.3.3. AVAILABILITY OF THE FMP

The major task of this section is to assess the bounds of MUT, and availability using the program DESIGN. Using the program we can thoroughly investigate critical factors pertinent to the failure, repair, and recovery processes. As required, the following determinants of system interruption and downtime have been included:.

# * Permanent and Intermittent Hardware Failure and Repair Rates <br> * System Automatic Slecovery Features <br> * System Manual Recovery Rates 

Sufficient data have been collected for design new systems successfully. With these data and all informations from the previous sections, the program provides an output with all salient input data and analytical results. The computer printouts used designations matching those on the block diagram of Figure 5-1. Corresponding to Table 5-4, Figure 5-2 shows a print-output which points out the upper bounds of MUT, and availability of the FMP are 1,032 hours, 0.43 hours, and .9995 , respectively, as the MTBF of the hard failure is the same as the MTBF of the intermittent failure. Similarly corresponding to Table 5-4, Figure 5-3 presents an output which shows the lower bounds of MUT and availability are 3.5 hours and .9554 respectively, when the MTBF of the hard failure is ten times of the intermittent failure.

### 5.2.3.4 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Since some factors shown in the previous sections are uncertain, and the failure rates of the memory packages are unknown, a sensitivity analysis has been made to study how those factors affect MUT, MDT, and availability of the FMP. Here we perform an experiment with respect to all the factors. In the experiment, some wide range varieties are considered, as in the following:

1. Two levels of the failure rates of the memory packages, namely the upper bounds and the lower bounds as shown in Section 2.1


Figure 5-2. Print Output of the Upper Bounds of MUT, MRT and Availability of the FMP


Figure 5-3. Printout Output of the Lower Bounds of MUT and Availability of the FMP
2. Two levels of SECDED improvement factors, taking "two" as the lower bound level while the upper level corresponding to the upper limit of different memory packages stated in Section 2.2
3. The ratio between the MTBT of intermittent failure to the MTBT of permanent failure are 1,5 and 10.
4. The recovery efficiencies are chosen from $70 \%$ to $100 \%$ with $10 \%$ increment.

The results are summarized in Table 5-6. From the results we learn the availability changing only from 96.13 to $99.96 \%$ is not. significantly affected by those factors. If the memory packages are of a low reliability level and SECDED improvement factors are low, MUT and MDT are affected slightly by them. On the other hand, if the memory packages are highly reliable and SECDED improvement factor is large, the MUT is increased by $200 \%$ to $300 \%$ and the MDT is decreased by $25 \%$ to $30 \%$ as the ratio between the MTBF for permanent failures (MTBF(P)') and the MTPF for intermittent failures (MTBF(I)) changes from 1 to 5. Under the same conditions the MUT increases very rapidly as the recovery efficiency is close to $100 \%$. Finally.it can be pointed out that the MUT is significantly affected by the reliability quality of the memory packages as expected.

### 5.3 ERROR DETECTION AND CORRECTION

### 5.3.1 Error Control Coverage.

In the baseline system there are a number of mechanisms for error detection and correction. These include error detection and correction on all memories, with sufficiently powerful codes to guarantee uncorrected error rates lower than a specified requirement, and undetected error rates below an even lower required rate.

Table 5-6. Sensitivity Analysis of the MUT, , MRT and Availability of the FMP

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { RUN } \\ & \text { siq. } \end{aligned}$ | PACKAGE FAILURE RATE | Reliabillty Taprovement Factor | MTBF (P) | RECOVERY EFFICIENCY (Z): | MUT | - MDT | AVAILABILITY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $.1 \mathrm{f} / \mathrm{Mh}$ | * | 1 | 70 | 194.3 | .16 | . 9992 |
| 2 | - | * | 1 | 80 | 263.9 | . 18 | . 9993 |
| 3 | . | * | 1. | 90 | 411.4 | .23 | . 9994 |
| 4 | " | " | 1 | 100 | 1032.1 | . 40 | . 9995 |
| 5 | n | n | 5 | 70 | 68.5 | . 12 | . 9982 |
| 6 | " | " | 5 | 80 | 95.0 | .13 | . 9986 |
| 7 | \# | " | 5 | 90 | 155.1 | .15 | . 9990 |
| 8 | " | * | 5 | 100 | 421.5 | . 23 | . $9994^{-}$ |
| 9 | " | n | 10 | 70 | $37.8{ }^{\circ}$ | . 11 | . 9971 |
| 10 | " | " | 10 | 80 | 52.7 | .12 | . 9974 |
| 11 | * | " | 10. | 90 | 87.1 | .13 | . 9985 |
| 12 | * | * | 10 | 100 | 249.2 | . 18 | . 9993 |
| 13 | " | 2 | 1 | 70 | 109.1 | . 18 | . 9984 |
| 14 | * | 2 | 1 | 80 | 135.3 | . 20 | . 9985 |
| 15 | " | 2 | 1 | 90 | '178.2 | . 23 | . 9987 |
| 16 | " | 2 | 1 | 100 | 260.9 . | . 29 | . 9989 |
| 17 | * | 2 | 5 | 70 | 52.1 | . 14 | . 9974 |
| 18 | - ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 2 | 5 | 80 | 68.9 | . 15 | . 9978 |
| 19 | $\cdots$ | 2 | 5 | 90 | 101.7 | . 17 | . 9983 |
| - 20 | " | 2 | 5 | 100 | 194.0 | . 24 | . 9988 |
| 21 | * | 2 ' | 10 | 70 | 27.9 | . 12 | . 9957 |
| - 22 | $\cdots$ | 2 | 10 | 80 | 37.8 | . 13 | . 9966 |
| $\bigcirc 23$ | $\cdots$ | 2 | 10 | 90 | 60.0 | .14 | . 9976 |
| 24 | " | 2 | 10 | 100 | 145.4 | . 21 | . 9986 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALIFY

The mechanisms fall into three classes. First, there are errors such that immediate correction is done, even if there is a single hard error in the machine. Error correction in memory is such. Second, there are errors that are detected immediately when they occur. Third, there is a repertoire of checks which is intended to detect as many as possible of those errors not detected immediately. For example, memory words are initialized to "invalid". As long as a substantial amount of memory is in the "invalid" state, there is a substantial chance of detecting a memory addressing error because of the "invalid" word fetched in response.

Table 5-7 shows the pecentage of the total chips in the FMP that are covered by each made of error correction. There are approximately ninety-eight thousand chips (49\% of the machine) that have error correction capabilities applied to them in the baseline system. These are the memory chips. In addition there are about twelve thousand additional chips that are involved in data transfer paths of sufficient parallelism that the addition of error-correcting check bits in parallel would represent a modest ( $20 \%$ to $40 \%$ ) increase in parts count. There are one hundred eightteen thousand chips in the baseline system that have immediate error detection. This includes all the memory chips plus the transposition network which has the EM error detection code on all data passed through it and parity on microcode ROMs. We could add about nine thousand chips to this total by putting a modulo-3. check digit on all arithmetic units and adding parity or SECDED to the parallel path from $C U$ to processors. Additional chips would be required by such additional error detection.

Table 5-7. Error Control Methods and Applicability
Table 5-7. Error Control Methods and Applicability

| UNIT | Error Control Methods Available at Reasonable Redundancy |  |  | Error Control Methods Obscure |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Chips | Error Detection | Error Correction | No. Chips | Comments |
| PE | 7k arith | mod-3 check digit for arith. parity on microcode. | Retry on error(?) | 34k non-arith. | (Note 2) |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PDM/ } \\ & \text { PPM } \end{aligned}$ | 38 k mem. | yes (Note 1). <br> SECDED will work. | Yes (Note 1). SECDED will work. | 14 k control | Many errors will be address errors, also |
| TN | 10k | EM's SECDED catches hard errors(Note 1) | Under investigation | --- | --- |
| EH | 31k mem | SECDED or better if needed. Note 1 | SECDED or better if needed. Note 1 | 16k control | Note 2 |
| Fanout | 2K in parallel paths | Can add parity | Can ada SECDED at $25 \%$ | lk single. signal | Note 2 |
| CJ | \% mem. | Same as PDM | Same as PDM | 3k | Random logic Note 2 |
| DC |  |  |  | 1k | DC not used during user program |
| DBM | 29k mem. | SECDED or stronger : Note 1. | SECDED or stronger code. Scrubbing of errors. Note 1. | $2 k$ control | Note 2 |
| possibl | $127 k$ | 127k chips have error detectible at same clock that. error occurs | 120k chips have error correctible even if hard failure exists | 71 k | Dominated by PE logic, and memory controls. 4l\% of NSS. |
| TOTAL 118 k as per baseline$\qquad$ |  | 118k chips have error detectible at same clock that error occurs | 108k chips have error correctible even if hard failure exists | 80k | Dominated by PE logic, and memory controls. 45\% of NSS. |

Note 1. This error detection/corcection is included in the baseline system as described in the final report.

Note 2. Consistency checks, initialization to ${ }^{\text {winvalidn }}$, confidence tests, etc. are designed to forestall any error from going undetected for too long. Undetécted transient failures are the primary concern.

### 5.3.2 Improvements over Reference 1

Reference 1 lists a large number of reasonableness checks that attempt to monitor the errors in that $40 \%$ to $44 \%$ of the FMP for which direct error correction and error detection cannot be implemented simply. These include tests for "invalid", the code to which memory is initialized. These include a check for illegal opcodes, or memory addresses out of bounds, including bounds checks on index calculations. Unnormalized numbers should never be fetched. for a floating point operation. The list goes on. All of these are helpful. None, obviously, gives absolute protection.

Three items should be added to the design of reference $l$ in the area of error detection and correction. These follow.
5.3.2.1. On-line Processor Spares. An on-line spare processor is extremely effective in eliminating repair time, or postponing actual repair until convenient. Appendix $C$ describes the implementation in detail. One spare per cabinet is provided.
5.3.2.2. Error Detection, Error Correction in PDM, PPM, and CUM. These memories, whose memory chips account for $19 \%$ of all the circuit packages in the FMP, are to be provided with error correction. The final report seems to have obscured this requirement by laying stress on an error correction method which quite possibly may not work. Likewise, error detection for uncorrectible errors is to be provided. SECDED is being provided in the baseline system, as of this report.
5.3.2.3. Error Correction in the Transposition Network. The error correction code of the EM provides error detection against hard failures in the transposition network and error correction against single transient failures. This is included already in the baseline system design, even though reference 1 failed to emphasize it. It is possible to provide a TN design which corrects for single hard errors in the TN, just as SECDED corrects for single hard errors in memory. The best code for this purpose has yet to be determined. One design adds three signals to the already nine-wide $T N$ path. Four Hamming check bits are applied to the eight data bits in each byte. The OR of all twelve bits can serve instead of the strobe, since all parities are odd. The byte-correcting code is in effect concatenated with the SECDED code used in EM, so no overall parity is needed for error detection; the SECDED takes care of that.

### 5.3.3 Duplexed Computation

For an almost $100 \%$ check on the computation, one can repeat the user program, using a different set of 512 processors for the second run. Using the processor switching of Appendix $C$, one can run the problem first with the spare at the right end, and then second with the spare at the left end. If the answers agree, the answer is presumably free of any hardware error. Note that this method is simpler, from a hardware implementation point of view, than operating the processors in pairs which shadow each other, but, like having pairs of processors do the same computation, it also cuts the throughput in half.

### 5.3.4 Hard Error Tolerance

The habitual use of confidence and diagnostic checks, together with all the above error detection, assures that a hard failure cannot remain undetected for long in the FMP. Repair time is, essentially zero for failures in that $82 \%$ of the chips in the FMP, where either error correction ailows the FMP to continue to run in spite of the error, or processor switching switches in a spare processor while the bad processor is removed and replaced at leisure. For the remaining $18 \%$ of the components, repair is needed before the FMP can continue to run. Thus, detection of hard failure is more than adequately done and availability is aided by having $82 \%$ of the failures associated with "zero" repair time, or postponable repair.

### 5.3.5 Transients

$60 \%$ of the packages, if involved in some transient error, will produce effects that are immediately detected and usually corrected, leaving $40 \%$ not covered. Obviously, it is better to include tests that have some chance of detecting error than not to have such tests. However, it is difficult to guarantee that all transient errors will be caught before the run ends for 99.9\% of the runs. Even if we add mod-3 check digits in arithmetic, and parity in the CU-to-processor fanout tree, $36 \%$ of the packages remain in this category. The part of the machine where detection of transient error is less than perfect consists of the memory control and proecessor logic, primarily not the arithmetic portion of the processor, bưt instruction decoding, register addressing, shifting, and miscellaneous logic.

The main defense against transient error is, and always has been, proper electrical and logic design. Wiring rules, noise budgets. crosstalk calculations, maximum delay calculations, and so on, are all part of the design.

## CHAPTER 6

## TRADEOFFS DELINEATED

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

The design of the FMP will result from tradeoffs among a number of factors

* Performance
* Reliability
* Availability
* Programmability
* Spectrum of Applications
* Cost
* Schedule
* Risk

The first four factors are explicitly mentioned in the statement of work for the extension to this study contract. The fifth, the spectrum of applications for which the FMP is' to be designed, is mentioned here as it has a direct bearing on the results of some of the tradeoffs. For example, a scalar processor would probably not be included if the applications were strictly limited to aerodyriamic flow and meterological problems. Yet the scalar processor will be necessary for some other applications and will interfere only slightly with the other desiderata.

Programmability covers two distinct aspects. First, is the system one with which the compiler writer can successfully contend? Second, is the system presented to the user, including its FORTRAN, an easy one?

Following are short discussions of specific issues where the result i's a trade between factors. In many cases, simulation using test cases taken from the intended spectrum of applications is the appropriate tool to resolve the tradeoffs.

### 6.2 LANGUAGE DEFINITION

A part of the language definition in the extended FORTRAN to be used for the FMP in an exercise of trading off throughput vs. programmability. Proper language design finds some point where almost the maximum throughput of the machine can be applied to the desired spectrum of applications with little difficulity from language restrictions or awkard constructs. That is, the language restrictions necessary to ensure throughput do not interfere much with one's ability to write programs for the selected set of applications.

However, we note that programmability for all applications will interfere greatly with throughput, and that absolute maximum throughput for all applications is likely to require a depth of analysis beyond that feasible in the compiler.

### 6.3 MATCHING THE COMPILER AND THE INSTRUCTION SET

Hardware capabilities that are unused by the compiler are a waste of money and represent a flaw in the design. Capabilities in the language, that would be commonly and frequently used, for which the hardware provides no convenient way for the compiler to implement, result in awkward and inefficient code, and are also a flaw. However, the hardware, once specified, is not likely to
have its instruction set expanded much during the life of the machine, while the compiler presumably will continue to evolve during that same period. Therefore, it is the capabilities of that eventual hoped-for compiler, not the simplicity of the first one, against which the instruction set is to be judged. An example is the loading of PPM conditional on the "enable" bit. Our first compiler has no use for such a conditional capability. However, the capability costs almost nothing, since loading memory must be conditional on "enable" anyway, while the capability allows a type of concurrency between processors which we expect to be useful in the long run.

### 6.4 WORD FORMAT

In reference 1 , a word format of 1 bit sign, 8 bits exponent, and 39 bits fraction part is suggested as ideal for the FMP. The BSP uses 1 bit sign, 11 bits exponent, and 36 bits fraction. The format with 7 bits exponent was determined as adequate for the Navier-stokes application. The BSP format was arrived at after judging the precision and range requirments of a wide variety of applications. Thus, the BSP word format is more likely to be suitable for a wider variety of applications, some of which will require the additional range on the exponent, while the requirement of 10 decimal digits precision for the Navier-Stokes equations will be satisfied with either format.

Therefore, for the purpose of being adaptable to a wider range of applications, and not incidentally, for the additional purpose of being format-compatible with an existing commercial product, it is proposed to standarize on a word format containing 1 bit sign, 11 bits exponent, and 36 bits fraction part.

### 6.5 INSTRUCTION FORMATS

There is a well-known tradeoff between code file size and ease of decoding the individual instruction. For example, a full-length address field in the instruction allows the use of absolute addresses where appropriate, whereas if the instruction has a short address field, it must always be with respect to some base address held in the hardware.

In the present instance, a variation which we wish to test by simulation, during phase II, is the use of 32 -bit and 16 -bit instructions. The 16 -bit instruction has room for only two register addresses; the 24 -bit instruction contains three. Therefore the use of 16 -bit formats will speed up instruction fetching while interfering with the optimization of the use of registers in the processor. According to one example tested, the instruction fetching is already faster than arithmetic execution, and 24 -bit instructions will be preferred.

### 6.6 SECDED

Rigid requirements were set up for main memory in the FMP, consisting of PDM, PDP, and CUM. Less than one bit in $10^{16}$ is to be in error uncorrected, and less than one bit in $10^{18}$ is to be undetected. To satisfy these requirements, a single-errorcorrection, double-error-detection code is proposed. However, at this writing the actual error rates and failure mechanisms of the memory chips to be used are unknown. When these error rates and failure mechanisms become known, the SECDED should be reevaluated to make sure that it is neither too weak to cope with the error rates actually occurring, nor an overkill causing unnecessary cost. Since SECDED may permit the scheduling of repair while the system continues to run in degraded mode, it produces savings in maintenance cost while improving availability. The memory chips would have to be unbelievably reliable before SECDED did not pay for itself.

### 6.7 TRUSTWORTHINESS VS. THROUGHPUT

In considering error correction and detection, we credit the FMP, not with the total number of right answers it produces, but with the amount of answers that a rational user can use with confidence. One approach to trading off error correction and detection against raw throughput is to maximize this effective throughput. With no error correction at all, it is determined that most answers are probably wrong, and the effective throughput is practically zero, even though reams of so-called answers might be coming off the printer. With triple redundancy and voting on every element in the system, the throughput would be a fraction of the raw throughput with no error correction, but the answers would be very trustworthy. Somewhere between these extremes is an optimum. As explained in the last part of section five, the existing baseline system design has sufficient error detection that there is little chance for a hard error to go undetected for long. A more severe problem for the FMP is the defense against transient errors.

In the baseline system design described in reference $1,54 \%$ of the packages in the system have single error correction, so that any single error produced in these packages is corrected during the run, which continues to produce correct answers. 11\% of the packages have immediate detection of any errors in them, so the run terminates immediately if errors occur in them. The other $35 \%$ of the packages are covered by a variety of error checks, which are intended.to eventually detect any errors. However, the detection is indirect and not immediate, and some transient errors will remain undetected.

If we apply additional error checks, throughput is reduced, but trustworthiness of the results is improved. Figure 6-1 is an oversimplified graphical representation of the effect. At some reasonable amount of error control circuitry, the effective throughput is maximized. Using. $f$ to represent the fraction of the total hardware devoted to error control (assuming total hardware remains constant), we can plot $T_{0}$, the "raw" throughput, equal to the number of inches in the pile of printout per. hour, and $T$, the effective throughput which is the amount of useful answers produced. To decreases with $f$. In fact, $T_{O}$ decreases faster than linearly with $f$, since ( $1-f$ ) of the hardware is devoted to produc:ing useful output, and the fraction $f$ that checks for errors can only interfere. We can write:

$$
T=\left(T_{0} \times(1-f)\right) / G(f)
$$

The function $G(f)$ can only increase with $f$, for any rational deṣign.

Finding the form of the funtion $G(f)$ is probably not feasible. What can be done, however, is to estimate the effect on the detected and undetected error rates for any particular proposed error detection/correction technique, together with its effect on parts count or raw throughput. Each proposed error control mechanism costs a certain percentage of the equipment, has a certain throughput reduction associated with it, and catches some percentage of otherwise uncaught errors.

As an example, consider the addition of modulo 3 check digit to arithmetic computation. Generating the check digit takes almost as much additional logic as is already in the adders being checked. Thus, adding $7 \%$ to the chip count of the machine catches almost all errors occurring in what is now about 7\% of the machine. In addition, the $7 \%$ new packages create errors of their own, which will usually be detected as arithmetic errors, so they do not add to the undetected error rate, but do create false alarms.

Is a $7 \%$ false alarm rate added to the rate of detected error, a $7 \%$ increase in parts count and power, plus the throughput reduction due to the extra clocks used for checking, a fair price to pay for the $\mathrm{x} \%$ decrease in the rate of undetected error? When the actual percentages are determined, perhaps the question can be answered.

### 6.8 Parity within Processors

Data transfers within the processor have been designed on the expectation that the reliability and accuracy of digital operations in logic circuits can be made as perfect as desired at the design stage, using worst-case design. Whatever the error requirements, careful design can ensure that the performance exceeds them.

Parity checks on inter-register transfers could be implemented, including transfer to the memory address registers. Such parity checks will add about five chips to the processor logic for each parity check required. Four parity checkers, or twenty chips, may be needed. In addition, one clock, for the parity checking, will be added to many operations, including most of the operations that are now one clock long. Although no careful study of the situation has yet been done, it is apparent that parity checking internal to the processor will add $20 \%$ to the component count of the PE, will add errors of its own, and will degrade raw throughput significantly, while failing to check any of the processor logic operations, only the transfers.

### 6.9 INSTRUCTION FETCHING MECHANISM

In section two, the equipment description, a particular scheme for overlapping the execution of noninterfering instructions, and for doing some anticipatory instruction fetching was described. This scheme has not been validated in simulation to see how well it


Figure 6-1. Throughput vs. Error Detection
works in real program streams as emitted by the compiler. Simulation studies to determine how simple an instruction fetching and overlap mechanism we can have and 'still maintain throughput would be desirable. Fortunately, most of the processor design details are independent of these decisions.
6.10 LOADEM AND STOREM BLOCK FETCHING

The baseline system as described in Chapter Two of this report omits from the LOADEM and STOREM instructions the ability to stream $N$ words out of each $E M$ module in parallel for a total of 512 N words per instruction. Initial work on handcompiling from FORTRAN source for the NSS indicates that almost all fetching from EM is with $N=1$. (Example: SUBROUTINE TURBDA, See Ch. 3) If this turns out to be true in general, the block fetching capability is not worth the complexities it costs. Simulation, using test cases taken from real code, with multiple-word fetches allowed and disallowed, can be used to evaluate the effect on throughput. If N greater than 1 is necessary, the following changes to the baseline system of Chapter Two are seen:

* Rearrangement of data on DBM-EM transfers is required, as described in the final report, so that, for $N>1$, data in EM.along the index in which streaming is taking place are all found in the same EM module. Rearrangement is neither needed or desirable when $N=1$.
* The requirement for rearrangement of data disallows most equivalencing on EM arrays, a restriction on normal FORTRAN that need not be imposed if $N=1$.
* EM module design becomes more complicated. To keep up with the $T N$ streaming rate, the EM module is divided into two
submodules, as a side effect making the SECDED code less effective. A need to increment the EM address per word while streaming also adds complexity, especially since the increment is a large integer, not unity.
* There is additional compiler complexity.

Enforcing the restriction that $N$ must be 1 thus enhances reliability and availability, while simplifying compiler and operating system, and having an undetermined effect on throughput.

### 6.11 OVERLAPPABLE EM ACCESS

A fourth instruction execution station could be added to the processor which would handle the EM access independently of the integer and floating point units at the expense of requiring two units contending for PDM, namely this EM unit, and the previously identified memory control. Having issued an EM fetch to this unit, no fetches from PDM would be allowed.

The amount of increased overlap obtainable is dependent on the compiler's being able to insert the EM fetches ahead of the place where the data is required. In some of the loops in the benchmark programs, this requires the insertion of the EM accesses for the next iteration inside the current interation. 'The question to be answered by a tradeoff study is whether the increased compiler complexity required to exploit such an addition to the design produces enough increased throughput to be worth the difference.

### 6.12 SINGLE PROCESSOR MEMORY

Processor memory is separated into two separate memories for the sake of increased throughput. Data fetching and instruction fetching go on in parallel. Furthermore, no conflict resolution between fetching program and data need be implemented. The traditional way of getting interlace between two memory modules in a single memory system is to make module number the least significant bit of the address. This particular method would not work in the processor, since data is fairly random, and program steps, although sequential, are interspersed with data fetches and stores. Thus, the two-memory design of the baseline system achieves better interlacing than the traditional scheme. However, it has, the drawback that program and data memory is not interchangeable; a program just over 8192 words cannot overflow into data memory, and similarly for data. '

An alternate design for the processor memory is as follows. Two modules of 16384 words each are used to form a single homogeneous address space. Module number is the most significant bit. The compiler assigns all program addresses to the upper module and all data addresses to the lower module, except that, if either module is full, the other module can be used.

The alternate design achieves just as good interlace of memory accesses as does the baseline system. When memory sizes are exceeded by either data or program but not by both together, the penalty is a slight slowdown, not an inability to run. Memory controls are slightly more complex, since program and data accesses will interfere whenever either overflows its normal half of the memory.

### 6.13 PROCESSOR PROGRAM MEMORY SIZE, CONTROL UNIT MEMORY SIZE

The processor program memory ( 8 k words) was chosen to adequately hold the aerodynamic flow model programs. Overlay of code from CuM is easy and quick, and allows PPM to be smaller than the entire code file. However; PPM should be large enough so that overlay is not so frequent as to interfere with throughput.

An overlay capability can be provided so that program can overlay into CUM from DMB, via a buffer area in EM. Since such overlay is not needed for the flow model, it was not proposed as part of the initial capabilities of the operating system.

For a different spectrum of applications, larger code files and different sequences of execution may be encountered. Hence, the code storage capabilities of the FMP may have to be reevaluated i.f there is a change in the spectrum of applications.

### 6.14 EXTENDED MEMORY SPEED, TRANSPOSITION NETWORK SPEED

The baseline system extended memory is constructed.of 64k-bit RAM chips, operated at the fastest reasonable cycle time available at the time the FMP is constructed. It was projected for the baseline systern that the cycle time would be on the order of 200 to 250 ns for the chip, and that therefore a cycle time for the EM module of 280 ns was appropriate.

If the 64 k -bit chip is in fact significantly faster than that, EM would be designed faster to match the chips. But, to go.faster than allowed by the 64 k - bit chips will require the use of 16 k -bit RAM chips, a four-fold increase in memory chip count from 28,655 chips to 114,620 , a $43 \%$ increase in the chip count in the FMP and a distinctly adverse effect on availability and cost.

The point to be determined by the tradeoff is whether to increase in throughput from using $16 k-b i t$ chips is worth the extra cost, additional failures, and extra power of using $16 k$-bit chips in the EM modules.

The results of this tradeoff will be a function of how much computation is accomplished per fetch from extended memory, which is very dependent on the specified spectrum of applications. It was clear that for the aerodynamic flow problems, and almost certainly for the meterological problems also, that the 64 k -bit chips will have more speed than needed. It also appears (according to the Electronic Times of November 7), that actual 64 k -bit chips will be faster than those postulated for the baseline system. Simulation, using inputs that represent the entire spread of intended applications, is the appropriate tool for investigating this tradeoff.
',
The $T N$ speed and design will have to be adjusted to match the EM speed. Thus, the revision in $\mathbb{T N}$ design will also have to be factored into the tradeoff. An EM made faster by using l6k-bit chips is partially self-defeating, since the wire lengths from EM to processor, now about 40 feet, will get significantly longer when the EM quadruples in physical size.

### 6.15 CONTROL UNIT SPEED

The speed of the control unit, including the implementation of specific instructions such as DIV 521, DIV 512, and MOD 521 that are needed for specific $C U$ actions (in this case, calculating EM address and $T N$ settings), is best determined by simulation using test cases that cover the entire spectrum of applications. A very fast MOD 521 instruction has been described by C. R.Vora in U.S. patent $3,980,874$. Since there is only one control unit in the
entire array, the optimum CU design is clearly that one that almost never interferes with throughput. On thè other hand, a too fast and hence unnecessairly complex CU will have adverse effects on reliability and availability, and possibly will also make the compiler design more complex if some of the complexities require cooperation from the compiler to be effective. This optimum $C U$. design is a function of the spectrum of applications.

### 6.16 SCALAR PROCESSOR

### 6.16.1 Dependency on Spectrum of Applications

The FMP has been described as an array of 512 processors and a control unit. The control unit concerns itself with synchronization, some address calculation, and loop control. All floating point arithmetic is done in the array. Aerodynamic flow models are well calculated on this machine. However, there, are other applications, which do not have sufficient parallelism almost everywhere in the algorithm to be efficiently computed on this machine. If it is desired to broaden the spectrum of applications of the FMP, it is desirable, for some applications, to furnish a scalar processor to take over those portions of the floating-point calculation where most of the processors are idle waiting for a few to complete calculations. The term "scalar Processor", as used here, refers.strictly to floating point scalar computations. Loop control and other program execution control where a single decision controls the processing of the entire array has been accomplished, on other architectures, by the "scalar processor" portion of the equipment. These functions are included as an essential part of the control unit, and in so far as they are scalar, the control unit is a scalar processor, whether or not specific equipment for handling floating point scalars is supplied.

An evaluation of which applications are going to require the addition of a scalar processor for efficient mapping onto the. FMP has not been made. It is suspected that the mieteorology applications are like the aero flow models and will not require a scalar processor. Whether a scalar processor is desirable, and which of the several options mentioned below for including a scalar processor in the design, is a function of the intended set of applications, and can therefore be defined properly only when NASA defines the amount and kind of extensibility of scope that is desired for the FMP. The baseline system as described includes the third of the three design options below.
6.16.2 Simple Scalar Processor The simplest recipe. for providing a scalar processor capability in the FMP is simply to provide a faster, more powerful processor for processor number 0. The first processor is the one that will be assigned to vectors of length one; and which will be executing processor code when the compiler can find no parallelism. Thus, without doing anything special to the compiler, we gain some scalar capability by simply making the first processor a faster one. During parallel swatches of code, this processor cooperates with the others, and the program does not know that it is different. Those swatches of code where 512 processors are idle take much less time because the first processor has been made faster. When short swatches of scalar and vector code alternate, overlapping of scalar and vector operations occurs.
6.16.3 Added Processor The simple system does not give the scalar processor any particular speedup for accessing EM. It does not give the scalar processor any. faster way of handling those actions that require cooperation with the control unit. At the expense of complicating the compiler, we can add scalar processor hardware that is separately programmed, and which can subsume some of the control unit functions for scalar processing.

Suppose we provide a separate, and different processor, which has, its own access to extended memory, and which is designed to execute a more nearly independent code stream than that of the 512 processors in the array. Figure 6-2 shows a block diagram of the FMP with such a scalar processor represented. Langauge extensions and programming methods for using such a capability will have to be defined.

Extended memory is "core" for the FMP. The amount of accessing into extended memory by the scalar processor may be such that extended memory speed will be a bottleneck for those applications that make extensive use of the scalar processor capability. Hence, for some range of applications, a faster extended memory (and hence one with fewer bits per chip), must be provided. Using l6k-bit chips instead of 64 k -bit chips, for more 5 m speed, increases from 29,176 memory chips to 116,704 memory chips, an increase of $44 \%$ of the package count of the entire NSS.

The added processor has LOADEM and STOREM instructions in its instruction stream which do not require the cooperation of the Cu , merely contend with it for access to the extended memory. The synchronization between the added processor and the $C U$ is thereby reduced, while requiring the compiler to determine when synchronization is required for correct execution of the program. Scalar processing and vector processor on the same data must be done in the correct order.
6.16.4 Enhanced Control Unit It has been suggested that scalar processor capability can be achieved by adding floating point instructions to the control unit. This also may imply that the control unit be speeded up from its no-scalar-processor design so it has the free time to perform as a scalar processor. The discussions about accessing EM apply to this option as well as they apply to the previous one.


Figure 6-2. Added Scalar Processor
6.16.5 Recommendation Simulation of various programs across the entire spectrum of applications is recommended as a means of determining which of the several recipes for providing a scalar processor is to be adopted, if any. The budget for compiler writing is also to be consulted, since the separate processor requires additional decisions on the compiler's part, as well as additional language extensions perbaps.

### 6.17 MARGINAL CHECKING

A strategy for weeding out incipient failures in electronic equipment is to vary some parameter up and down from its nominal value, measure the margins, and determine when those margins are deteriorating, and what the faulure mode is at which they fail. The parameter being varied can be supply voltage, clock frequency, temperature, or anything else that appears to affect operation. It has been determined that marginal checking is useless for worst-case designed digital circuits. However, as noted in the final report, LSI cannot be worst-case designed in the conventional sense, and marginal checking may be valuable for weeding out those low-margin. LSI packages that have a higher than normal transient error rate:

### 6.18 COMPONENT TECHNOLOGY

The speed of any given system architecture is ultimately limited by the performance of the circuit from which it is assembled. The final component choice for the FMP will weigh carefully the trade off of speed (and power) consideration against the risk and cost. The inital procurement cost of a more advanced technology providing more desirable performance is easily measured. It is
usually shown that the initial cost of more advanced circuit are easily justified in overall system performance improvements. (Thus reducing the cost per operation.) However, the risk in selecting a more advanced and higher performance circuit invariably may be considerable, with potential for affecting the . production of system being built in a number of ways: .

* The delivery may be slow due to low yields.
* Failure rates may be higher than anticipated.
* The performance characteristics of devices made in production may be degraded from the original developmental samples and design goals.
* Low usage may discourage development of second sources, and result in continued elevated prices.
* Unforeseen application problems discovered only during system checkout could require redesign or retrofit.
,
It would be very desirable from a system performance point of view to be able to use the fastest circuits possible. However, the possible risks that accompany this choice make it imperative that a very careful tradeoff analysis be conducted given the choice of a mature, slow (but adequate) speed technology and an advanced faster speed technology.


### 6.19 EXPANSABILITY

By expansibility we mean generalizability and expandability. The NASF design has many features allowing an upward compatible second copy, as well as features allowing the upgrading of the NASF itself. This section lists some of the areas in which expansibility is found.
6.19.1 Address Sizes The address sizes are uniformly larger than the memories they address, allowing the memories to be replaced by larger ones.

Data Base Memory holds 134 million words (27 and is addressed by the control unit whose register size is 32 bits.

Extended memory holds 34 million words (just over $2{ }^{25}$ ) and is addressed by processor (32-bit integers) and control unit (32 bits).

Control unit memory holds 32 k words ( $2^{15}$ ) and is addressed by the control unit whose integers are 32 bits long. Care ixobl be exercised not to insert l6-bit address register that cannot be expanded.

Processor data memory holds 16 k words ( $2^{14}$ ) and has a l6-bit address. A four-times expansion of PDM is thus permitted.

Processor program memory holds 8 k words ( $2^{13}$ ) and has a 16-bit address.

Uugrades by replacing the memories with larger ones are therefore very feasible.
6.19.2 Transfer Rates There are a number of options for increasing the transfer rates between portions of the FMP. Many of these are discussed in other paragraphs in this section, and clearly, new transfer rates could be chosen for any new design, depending on the results of tradeoff studies. As a retrofit, the easiest area to increase transfer rates is in the DBM-EM transfers. This is fortunate , since if some virtual memory scheme is implemented, this is the area of the baseline design that may have to be improved. Each EM module has a one-word buffer, so no EM changes at all are required for increased transfer rates, just increased parallelism is the accessing of these buffers. The DBM would have to be reconfigured for increased parallelism, assuming that current projections about CCD shift rates are correct.
6.19.3 Memory Size The address space allows increased memory size. The need for increased memory size could arise from a number of causes. CuM is required to hold enough program (both. CU. and array processor program) to keep the array busy for a reasonable amount of the time between program overlays from DBM. Thus, complex programs may require increased CuM size.

PDM size is the result of the requirement for temporary variables, and sometimes, for buffering data fetched from EM. The required PDM size is therefore applications-dependent. We believe that the aerodynamic flow problem requires a larger-than-typical PDM, and that larger PDM's are unlikely. However, the expansion opportunity is there.

PPM, on the other hand, must hold enough program to keep the processors busy for a reasonable time between overlays from CuM. For problems, like the aerodynamic model, where there is an inner loop, this implies that at least the inner loop be contained within the PPM. Overlay from CUM is fast, and this will allow reasonable efficiency even when this is not true.

DBM, the window in the compitational envelope, must be large enough to hold results from the last job, space for the current job, and the objects being assembled for the next. job. If job sizes are to grow, expandability of the DBM is a requirement.
6.19.4 Upgrades via Software Upgrading capability, by adding features to the software, can be accomplished without any hardware changes. The initial software is configured around the areodynamic flow model requirements. A number of features, not required by the aerodynamic flow models, can be added to handle a broader range of requirements, including:

* Windowing of data for executing jobs whose files exceed the size of EM.
* Language extensions, including such things as subscripted subscripts, linear recurrences on the parallel subscript, and so on.
* Vectorizer, to analyze nonparallel FORTRAN and produce FMP FORTRAN for operation on the parallel machine.
* Multiprogramming capability on the FMP. Proper implementation of multiprogramming may require hardware additions as well.


## APPENDIX A

Preliminary Compiler Algorithms for Setting the Transposition Network

Definition of the FORTRAN extensions and restrictions for the NASF requires rigorous definition of the algorithms for setting the SKIP and OFFSET of the transposition network and matching them closely to the FORTRAN constructs.

The issues to be addressed in this memo are:

1. Matching of FORTRAN DOPARALLEL to EM accessing.
2. Requirements for multiple accessing within a DOPARALLEL construct.
3. Optimization of accessing for single access types.

As a preliminary step in addressing these issues a more complete definition of the DOPARALLEL statement needs to be formulated. The DOPARALLEL statement cannot be nested for this results in possible programmer error. Rather the DOPARALLEL statement is defined to have multiple increment sets.
i.e. DOPARALLEL J=J1,J2,J3; K=K1,K2,K3 ...

$$
\text { where } \quad \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{J} 1=\text { initial value most rapidly varying index } \\
& \\
& \mathrm{J} 2=\text { final value most rapidly varying index } \\
& \mathrm{J} 3=\text { skip distance most rapidly varying index } \\
& \mathrm{K} 1=\text { initial value next most rapidly varying index } \\
& \mathrm{K} 2=\text { final value next most rapidly varying index } \\
& \mathrm{K} 3=\text { skip distance next most rapidly varying index } \\
& \\
& (. . .) \text { ellipses indicates further increment sets }
\end{aligned}
$$

1. Matching Fortran DOPARALLEL to Extended Memory Accessing

Since the entire set of multidimensional DOPARALLEL statements is difficult to discuss', the specific example of three dimensional accessing with a 2 dimensional DOPARALLEL and a single dimensional inner loop will be described in detail. For this three dimensional case there are 6 possible access patterns for any given array corresponding to the possible permutation of the indices.

| $A(I, J, K)$ | Case I. |
| :--- | :--- |
| $A(K, I, J)$ | Case II |
| $A(J, K, I)$ | Case III |
| $A(I, K, J)$ | Case IV |
| $A(J, I, K)$ | Case V |
| $A(K, J, I)$ | Case VI |

It is necessary for the compiler to determine the SKIP distance and the OFFSET of the transposition network for any of these accesses for the given DOPARALLEL construct. i.e.,

```
EMARRAY A(IFIRST, ISECOND, ITHIRD)
DOPARALLEL J=1, JLIM; K=1, KLIM
DO l I=1 ILIM
    S(i) = Access Case (i)
```

1 Continue
ENDDO; ENDDO.

The equa'tions for setting the Transposition Network (SKIP and OFFSET) are given in Tables lA through 1C. Table lD provides a table for determining index parameters. It is assumed, of course, that the array has been laid out in memory in the FORTRAN sense.

To clarify these equations a complete example is worked out in detail in Figures l-7. The chosen array; $A(5,3,7)$ has extents less than the number of memory modules (ll) and processing elements (10) in a manner similar to that of the NASF problems.

Equations for
Transition Network OFFSET Calculations

```
Given Quantities
    N = Number of processors
    M = Number of memory modules
    IA\emptyset = Base address of array having index parameters f\emptyset, J\varnothing, K\emptyset
    IFIRST = extent of first parameter in array
    ISECOND = extent of second parameter in array
    ITHIRD = extent of third parameter in array
Determined Quantities from Figure 1
    ICLIM = Total number of cycles
    IDEL = Skip distance associated with I parameter
    JDEL = Skip distance associated with J parameter
    KDEL = Skip distance associated with K parameter
    ILIM = Array extent assciated with I parameter
    JLIM = Array extent associated with J parameter
    KLIM = Array extent associated with K parameter
Defined quantities
    IC = cycle number
    NN = subiteration number
    Kl = (N*(IC-1))/(JLIM) + K\emptyset = least rapidly varying index*
    Jl = (N*(IC-1) - (K-K\emptyset) * JLIM + J\emptyset = most rapidly varying index*
    IA\emptyset\emptyset = IA\varnothing + (J-J\emptyset)*JDEL + (K-K\emptyset)*KDEL
```

Transposition Setting SKIP distance = JDEL

```
*Jl, Kl values for processing element \(\varnothing\)
    lst subiteration
```

Table la
-OFFSET Calculation for Transposition Network (Subiteration = 1)
for given I value
$\operatorname{IADD}(I C, 1)=\operatorname{IA} \varnothing \varnothing+(I-I \varnothing) * \operatorname{IDEL}($ address of first element to be fetched)
$\operatorname{OFFSET}(I C, 1)=(\operatorname{IADD}(I C, 1)) \operatorname{MOD}(M)$
-OFFSET Calculation for Transposition Network (all other subiterations*)
for given I value
$\operatorname{IADD}(I C, N N)=I A \varnothing+(I-I \varnothing) * I D E L+(K I-K \varnothing+N N-1) * K D E L$ (address of first element to be fetched on this iteration)
$\operatorname{IP}(I C, N N)=(N N-1) * J L I M-J I+J \varnothing$ (processor that needs to obtain this first element on this iteration)
OFFSET $(I C, N N)=(\operatorname{IADD}(I C, N N)-I P(I C, N N) * J D E L) M O D(M)$
*Subiterations $2<N N \leq N X$
where $N X=\frac{2 N+I+(J L I M-J 1)}{N}+1 \quad N X=i+\frac{N+J 1-1}{\text { Jum }}$

If (NN.EQ.NX). AND (K(NN).EQ.KLIM) further subiterations do not need to be performed. $K(N N)$ is the $K$ index value of the lst element of the NNth subiteration.

Table IB

Parameter Assignments for Arbitrary Array Extents and Number of Processors

| CASE | ILIM | JLTM | KLIM | IDEL | JDEL | KDEL | ICLIM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{1}{(I, J, K)}$ | JFIRST | ISECOND | ITHT R | 1 | IFIRST | IFIRST* ISECOND | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (ISECOND*ITHIRD } \\ & +\mathrm{N}-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 \\ & (\mathrm{~K}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{~J}) \end{aligned}$ | ISECOND | ITHIRD | ISECOND <br> I. FIRST | IFIRST | IFIRST* ISECOND | 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { (IFIRST* ITHIRD) } \\ +N-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & (J, K, I) \end{aligned}$ | TTHIRD | IFIRST | ISECOND | IFIRST* ISECOND | 1 | IFIRST | $\begin{gathered} \text { (IFIRST* ISECOND } \\ +\mathrm{N}-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4 \\ & I, K, J .) \end{aligned}$ | IFIRST | ITHIRD | ISECOND | 1 | IFIRST* ISECOND | ISECOND | $\begin{gathered} (\text { ISECOND* ITHIRD } \\ +\mathrm{N}-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 5 \\ & (U, I, K) \end{aligned}$ | ISECOND | IFIRST | ITHIRD | IFIRST | 1 | IFIRST* ISECOND | $\begin{gathered} \text { (IEIRST* ITHIRD) } \\ +\mathrm{N}-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & K, J, I) \end{aligned}$ | ITHIRD | ISECOND | ITHIRD | IFIRST* ISECOND | IFIRST | I | $\begin{gathered} \text { (IFIRST* ISECOND } \\ +\mathrm{N}-1) / \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ |

EM ARRAY A(IFIRST, ISECOND, ITHIRD)
Number of Processors $=\mathrm{N}$
Table IK
ORIGINAL PAGE POOR QUALITY

```
    Index Value Determination
TEMP = IADD(IC,NN) - IA\varnothing) - (I-1)*JDEL
```

| Case | TEMP | J | K | IVAL | JVAL | KVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | NO | J | K | I | J | K |
| 2 | YES | TEMP/JDEL+1 | $\begin{aligned} & (\text { TEMP- }(J-1) * J D E L) \\ & / \text { KDEL }+1 \end{aligned}$ | K | I | J |
| 3 | NO | J | K | J | K | I |
| 4 | YES | TEMP/JDEL +1 | $\begin{aligned} & (\text { TEMP- }(J-1) * J D E L) \\ & / \text { KDEL }+1 \end{aligned}$ | I | K | J |
| 5 | YES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TEMP-(K-1)*KDEL) } \\ & \quad / \text { JDEL }+1 \end{aligned}$ | TEMP/KDEL+1 | J | I | K |
| 6 | YES | TEMP/JDEL+1 | $\begin{aligned} & (\text { TEMP- }(J-1) * J D E L) \\ & / K D E L+1 \end{aligned}$ | K | J | I |

Table 1D

Figure l details the memory layout, assuming an arbitrary starting point for the first element. The remaining Figures show the six possible cases.

Utilizing the equations of Table 1 one can determine all the parameters and the.SKIP and OFFSET for any case. For example taking CASE II (since it is more complex with access $A(K, I, J))$ the parameters are:

Given Quantities (Table lA)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{N}=10 \\
& \mathrm{M}=11 \\
& \text { IA } \varnothing=19 \\
& \text { IFIRST=5 } \\
& \text { ISECOND=3 } \\
& \text { ITHIRD=7 }
\end{aligned}
$$

Determined quantitites (Table 1C)

```
ICLIM = (IFIRST*ITHIRD+N-1)/N (5*7+10-1)/10 = 4
IDEL=5
JDEL=15
KDEL=1
ILIM=5
JLIM=7
KLIM=3
#\emptyset, Ј\varnothing, K\varnothing=1
```

Assume that one wishes to determine the SKIP and OFFSET and subsequently the IVAL, JVAL \& KVAL of the indices for the second cycle, second subiteration, inner loop index number 3 - i.e. transposition setting \#l2

Defined Quantities (Table 1A)

```
IC=2
```

$\mathrm{NN}=2$
$\mathrm{I}=3$

Memory Layout for Array $A(5,3,7)$

|  | 11 | 337 | 347 | 537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10 | 217 | 317 | 417 | 517 | 127 | 227 | 327 | 427 | 527 | 137 | 237 |
|  | 9 | 126 | 226 | 326 | 426 | 526 | 136 | 236 | 336 | 436 | 536 | 117 |
|  | 8 | 525 | 135 | 235 | 335 | 435 | 535. | 116 | 216 | 316 | 416 | 516 |
| Address | 7 | 434 | 534 | 115 | 215 | 315 | 415. | 515 | 125 | 225 | 325 | 425 |
| within | 6 | 314 | 414 | 514. | 124 | 224 | 324 | 424 | 524 | 134 | 234 | 334 |
| Memory | 5 | 223 | 323 | 423 | 523 | 133 | 233 | 333 | 433 | 533 | 144 | 214 |
|  | 4 | 132 | 232 | 332 | 432 | 532 | 113 | 213 | 313 | 413 | 513 | 123 |
|  | 3 | 531 | 112 | 212 | 312 | 412 | 512 | 122 | 222 | 322 | 422 | 522 |
|  | 2 | 411 | 511 | 121 | 221 | 321 | 421 | 521 | 131 | 231 | 331 | 431 |
|  | 1 | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | $x$ | 111 | 211 ' | 311 |
|  | 0 | x | x | x | x | x | x | X | x | x | x | x |
|  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10. |

No. Memory Modules $=11$
No. Processing Elements $=10$

Absolute address Aø = 19
Memory Module No. M\# = $8=$ (19) MOD 11
Address in MOdule A\# $=1=(19)$ DIV 11

Address of any element AE\# = Address A(L1, L2, L3) - $A \not \subset+(L 1-1)+5 x(L 2-1)+5 \times 3(L 3-1)$

Figure 1

## Case I

EMARRAY A $(5,3,7)$
DOPARALLEL $\mathrm{J}=1,3$; $\mathrm{K}=1,7$
DO $1 \mathrm{I}=1,5$
Sl $=A(I, J, K)$
1 CONTINUE
ENDDO
ENDDO

$$
\text { SKIP }=\text { JDEL }=5
$$

| Settin |  | Sub |  |  |  | NUMBE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number | Cycle | Iteration | OFFSET | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | ADD |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 111 | 121 | 131 | 112 | 122 | 132 | 113 | 123 | 133 | 114 | 19 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 211 | 221 | 231 | 212 | 222 | 232 | 213 | 223 | 233 | 214 | 20 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 311 | 321 | 331 | 312 | 322 | 332 | 313 | 323 | 333 | 314 | 21 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 411 | 421 | 431 | 412 | 422 | 432 | 413 | 423 | 433 | 414 | 22 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 511 | 521 | 531 | 512 | 522 | 532 | 513 | 523 | 533 | 514 | 23 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 124 | 134 | 115 | 125 | 135 | 116 | 126 | 136 | 117 | 127 | 69 |
| 7 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 224 | 234 | 215 | 225 | 235 | 216 | 226 | 236 | 217 | 227 | 70 |
| 8 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 324 | 334 | 315 | 325 | 335 | 316 | 326 | 336 | 317 | 327 | 71 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 424 | 434 | 415 | 425 | 435 | 416 | 4.26 | 436 | 417 | 427 | 72 |
| 10 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 524 | 534 | 515 | 525 | 535 | 516 | 526 | 536 | 517 | 527 | 73 |
| 11 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119 |
| 12 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 237 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 |
| 13 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 337 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 121 |
| 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 437 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 122 |
| 15 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123 |

Figure 2

EM ARRAY A $(5,3,7)$
DOPARALLEL $\mathrm{J}=1,7$; $\mathrm{K}=1,5$
DO 1 I $=1,3$
$\mathrm{S} 2=\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{J})$

1. CONTINUE
$\vdots$ uNDO
SKIP $=$ JOEL $=15$


Figure 3

## Case III

EM ARRAY A $(5,3,7)$
DOPARALLELL $\mathrm{J}=1,5$; $\mathrm{K}=1,3$
DO $1 \mathrm{I}=1,7$
$\mathrm{S} 3=\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{J}, \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{I})$
1 CONTINUE
ENDDO

- ENDDO

$$
\text { SKIP }=\text { JDEL }=1
$$



Figure 4
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## Case IV

| EM ARRAY A $(5,3,7)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOPARALLEL $\mathrm{J}=1,7$ \% $\mathrm{K}=1,3$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DÓ $1 \mathrm{I}=1,5$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{S4}=\mathrm{A}(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{J})$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $1^{\prime}$ CONTINUE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I ENDDO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| . ENDDO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\text { SKIP }=\text { JDEL }=15$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ! |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Setting |  | Sub |  |  |  |  | PEM | Num | ber |  |  |  |  |  | gned |
| Number | Cycle | Iter | OFFSET | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3. | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | ADD | PE\# |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 111 | 112 | 113 | 114 | 115 | 116 | 117 |  |  |  | 19 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 121 | 122 | 123 | 24 | 7 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | $21]$ | 212 | 213 | 21.4 | 215 | 216 | 217 |  |  |  | 20 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 221 | 222 | 223 | 25 | 7. |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 311 | 312 | 313 | 314 | 315 | 316 | 317 |  |  |  | 21 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 321 | 322 | 3.23 | 26 | 7 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 411 | 412. | 413 | 414 | 415 | 416 | 417 |  |  |  | 22 | 0 |
| 8 | 1 | 2 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 421 | 422 | 423 | 27 | 7 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 511 | 512 | 513 | 514 | 515 | 516 |  |  |  |  | 23 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 521 | 522 | . 523 | 28 | 7 |
| I1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | [124] | 125 | 126 | 127 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 69 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  | [3] | 132 | 133 | 134 | 135 | 136 | 29 | 4 |
| 13 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 224 | 225 | 226 | 227 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 70 | 0 |
| 14 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 23] | 232 | 233 | 234 | 235 | 236 | 30 | 4 |
| 15 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 324 | 325 | 326 | 327 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 | 0 |
| 16 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 333 | 332 | 333 | 334 | 335 | 336 | 31 | 4 |
| 17 | 21 | 1 | 6 | 424 | 425 | 426 | 427 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 72 | 0 |
| 18 | 2 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 433 | 432 | 433 | 434 | 435 | 436 | 32 | 4 |
| 19 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 524 | 525 | 526 | 527 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.3 | 0 |
| 2.0 | 2 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  | 1 | 531 | 532 | 533 | 534 | 535 | 536 | 33 | 4 |
| 21 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 137 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119 | 0 |
| 22 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 237 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 120 | 0 |
| 23. | 3 | 1 | 0 | 337 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 121 | 0 |
| 24 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 43.7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 122 | 0 |
| 25 | 3 | 1 | . 2 | 537 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123 | 0 |

Figure 5

## Case V

EM ARRAY A(5,3,7)
DOPARALLEL $\mathrm{J}=1,5$; $\mathrm{K}=7$
DO 1 I $=1,5$

1 CONTINUE
ENDDO
ENDDO

$$
\text { SKIP }=\text { JDEL }=1
$$

| Setting | Sub Cycle Iter |  | OFFSET 0 |  | 1 | $\begin{array}{cccc}  & \text { PEW } & \text { Number } \\ 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Assigned |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number |  |  | ADD | PE\# |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 8 | [1] | 211 | 31 | 114 |  | 511 |  |  |  |  | 19 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | [112 | 212 | 312 | 412 | 512 | 34 | 5 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | $12]$ | 221 | 32 | 214 | 421 | 521 |  |  |  |  | 24 | 0 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 122 | 222 | 322 | 422 | 522 | 39 | 5 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 131 | 231 | 33 | 314 | 431 | 531 |  |  |  |  | 44 | 0 |
| 6 | 1. | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 132 | 232 | 332 | 432 | 532 | 59 | 5 |
| 7 | 2 | 1 | 5 | [113 | 21 | 31 | 13 | 413 | 513 |  |  |  |  | 49 | 0 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 114 | 214 | 314 | 414 | 514 | 69 | 5 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 123 | 223 | 32 | 23 | 423 | 523 |  |  |  |  | 54 | 0 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 124 | 224 | 324 | 424 | 524 | 69 | 5 |
| 11 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 133 | 23 | 33 | 334 | 433 | 533 |  |  |  |  | 59 | 0 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 134] | 234 | 334 | 434 | 534 | 69 | 5 |
| 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 115 | 215 | 31 | 15 | 415 | 515 |  |  |  |  | 79 | 0 |
| 14 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 116 | 216 | 316 | 416 | 516 | 94 | 5 |
| 15 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 125 | 225 | 32 | 25 | 425 | 525 |  |  |  |  | 84 | 0 |
| 16 | 3 | 2 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | (126) | 226 | 326 | 426 | 526 | 99 | 5 |
| 17 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 135 | 235 | 33 | 35 | 435 | 535 |  |  |  |  | 89 | 0 |
| 18 | 3 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 136 | 236 | 336 | 436 | 536 | 104 | 5 |
| 19 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 117 | 217 | 31 | 17 | 417 | 517 |  |  |  |  | 109 | 0 |
| 20 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 127 | 227 | 32 | 27 | 427. | 527 |  |  |  |  | 114 | 0 |
| $\underline{21}$ | 4 | 1 | 9 | 137 | 237 | 33 | 374 | 437 | 537 |  |  |  |  | 119 | 0 |

Figure 6

EM ARRAY A $(5,3,7)$
DOPARALLEL $J=1,3 ; K=1,5$
DO $1 \mathrm{I}=1,7$
$S 6^{\circ}=A(K, J, I)$
I CONTINUE
ENDDO
ENDDO

$$
\text { SKIP }=\text { JDEL }=5
$$

Setting Sub PEM Number Assigned


| i |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 111 121131 |  |  |  | 19 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |  | 211 | 221 | 231 | 20 | 3 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  | 311 321331 | 21 | 6 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 10 |  | - |  | [41] | 22 | 9 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | [112 122132 |  |  |  | 34 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 9 |  | 212 | 222 | 232 | 35 | 3 |
| 7 | 1 | 3 | 6 |  |  |  | 312 322332 | 36 | 6 |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  | 412 | 37 | 9 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 113123133 |  |  |  | 49 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 213 | 223 | 233 | 50 | 3 |
| 11 | 1 | 3 | 10 |  |  |  | 313323333 | 51 | 6 |
| 12 | 1 | 4 | 7 |  |  |  | 413 | 52 | 9 |
| . 13 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 114124134 |  |  |  | 64 | 0 |
| 14 | 1 | 2 | 6 |  | 214 | 224 | 234 | 65 | 3 |
| 15 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  | [314 324334 | 66 | 6. |
| 16 | 1 | 4 | 0 |  |  |  | 414. | 67 | 9 |
| 17. | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1151.25135 |  |  |  | 79 | 0 |
| 18 | 1 | 2 | 10 |  | 215 | 225 | 235 | 80 | 3 |
| 19. | 1 | 3 | 7 |  |  |  | 315325335 | 81 | 6 |
| 20 | 1 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  | 415 | 82 | 9 |
| 21. | 1 | 1 | 6 | [116126136 |  |  |  | 94 | 0 |
| 22 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 216 | 226 | 236 | 95 | 3 |
| . 23 | 1 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 316 326336 | 96 | 6 |
| 24 | 1 | 4 | - 8 |  |  |  | 416 | 97 | 9 |
| 25 | 1 | 1 | 10 | [117 127137 |  |  |  | 109 | 0 |
| 26 | 1 | 2 | 7 |  | 217 | 22.7 | 237 | 110 | - 3 |
| 2,7 | 1 | 3 | 4 |  |  |  | [317] 327337 | 111 | 6 |
| 28 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  | 41.7 | - 112 | 9 |
| 29 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 1421431 |  |  |  | 27 | 0 |
| 30 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 511 | 521 | 531 |  | 23. | 2 |
| 31 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 422432 |  |  |  | 42 | 0 |
| 32 | 2 | 2 | 6 | -512 | 522 | 532 |  | 38 | 2 |
| 33 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 423433 |  |  |  | 57 | 0 |
| 34 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 513. | 523 | 533 |  | 53 | 2 |
| 35 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 424434 |  |  |  | 72 | 0 |
| 36 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 51514 | 524 | 532 | OF POOR QUATITY | 68 | 2 |
| 37 | 2 | 1. | 10 | 425435 |  |  | OF POOR WUp! | 87 | 0 |
| 38 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 515 | 525 | 535 |  | 83 | 2 |
| 39 | 2 | 1 | 3 | [426) 436 |  |  |  | 102 | 0 |
| 40 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 516 | 526 | 536 |  | 98 | 2 |
| 41 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 427437 |  |  |  | 117 | 0 |
| 42 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 517 | 527 | 53.7 |  | 113. | 2 |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{KI}=(10+1) / 7+1=2 \\
& \mathrm{~J}=10-1 * 7+1=4 \\
& \text { SKIP=JDEL }=15
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the OFFSET calculation equation for $N N=2$ in Table $1 B$ one obtains

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{IADD}(2,2) & =19+(3-1) * 5(2-1+2-1) * 1 \\
& =19+10+2=31 \\
\operatorname{IP}(2,2) & =(2-1) * 7-4+1=4 \\
\operatorname{OFFSET}(2,2) & =(\operatorname{IADD}(2,2)-\operatorname{IP}(2,2) * 15) \operatorname{MOD}  \tag{li}\\
& =(31-4 * 15) \operatorname{MOD}(11) \\
& =(-29) \operatorname{MOD}(11)=4
\end{align*}
$$

This OFFSET calculation may appear strange at first glance. SInce one wishes this element to be produced in processing element 4 one needs to determine what the "virtual" address of the array element would have been to put an element into processing element $\varnothing$.


Mode bits for PE's \#0,1,2,3 will produce null fetches.

Having now determined the SKIP and the OFFSET one may wish to determine the specific indices of the element. This is done by means of Table lD.

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
\text { Temp } & =(31-19)-(3-1) * 5 \\
& =12-10=2
\end{array}\right\} \begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{J}=2 / 15+1=1 \\
& \mathrm{~K}=(2-(1-1) * 15) / 1+1=3 \\
& \mathrm{~A}(\mathrm{IVAL}, \mathrm{JVAL}, \mathrm{KVAL})=A(K, I, J)=A(3,3,1)
\end{aligned}
$$

In a similar fashion one can determine the SKIP and OFFSET for any setting number for any of the six possible cases. Additionally Table II gives a listing of a computer program which performs these computations.* Representative output is given in the appendix for the set of cases listed below.
IAD

|  | Mem Mod | \#PEs | IFIRST | ISECOND | ITHIRD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 7 |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 8 |
| 27 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 8 |

2. Requirements for Multiple Accessing within DOPARALLEL Construct:

The compiler will recognize if a variety of access types occur within a given DOPARALLEL and will modify the basic access algorithm. For example given
*Note this is a very preliminary algorithm and should not be considered "proven" software in any sense.

```
    SSET LIST
    FFESET FREE
FILE S=COMPILER/DATA,LNIT=DISK,FECORD=14,BLECKING=30
FILE 6=FILEG,LNIT=PRINTER
```



DIMENSICN IADD $(10,10), I P(10,10), \operatorname{ISET}(10,10)$


REAC(5,100) ITYPE, IAO,M, A, IFIFST, ISECND. ITHIRC, KO, JO
WRITE $6,1.11$ ). ITYPE,IA $O, M ; N$ IFIRST, ISECNC,ITHIFDPK O; JO


1


ICEL $=1$ IFIRST
$3 C E L E=1 F I R S I$
ICIIM = ISECNF ITECNC
(ISECNL*ITHIFD*N-1)/(N)
ILIM = IFECND
KLIM = IFIRST
$2 \quad \mathrm{GCTO}_{1} 8$


```
            KLIHO
                IFIRST
    3 ICEL=IFIRST*ISECNC
    MCEL = IFIRST
    ICLIM=(IFIRST*ISECND *N-I)/(N)
    JLIM= IFIRST
    ILIM = ITHIKD
    KLIM = ISECND
4
    60T0.8
                8
                IFIR.ST. I SEC.NC.
                IFIRSI
                    (ISECNC*ITHIFO&N-1)/(N)
                    ITHIFD
    ILIM=1HHIGD
    KLIM_ ISECND
    IDEL = IF IRST
    KEEL = IFLIRST*ISECNC
    ICLIM= (IFIRSIIITHIRD+N-1)/(N)
    JLIM= IFIRST
    ILIM= ISECND
    KLIM=ITHIFD
    G GCTO.8
    JCEL = IFIRST
    KCEL = IFIRST*ISECNC
    ICELIM=IFIRST*ISECNC
    MLIM= ISECND
    KLIM= IFIRST
    GOTO 
    7 HGIYE(6,101)
    O1 FORMAT(2X, YOL HAYEAN ERFOF IN ITYFE')
    GCTO &O
    8 HFITE(6,112) IDEL, JOEL,KDEL,ICLIM,JLIM,ILIM
    WRITE(6,114)
onmomonn
        START OF CYCLE LOOP
    *************************************************************
    DO10 IC = 1;ICLIM
    MVV=NN*(IC-1)
    K1= K
    j=(IVV)-(K-1)*(JLIM) * J0
    J1=J
    IAOO=IAO*(J-1)*JCEL+(K-1)*KKDEL
    HRIT'E(6,113) IC,IVN,J,K
mmanmamos
    START OF INNERMOST LCOP INCEX ---I---
    OO20 I = I=ILIM
    IADO(IC,1)= IACO +(I-1)*IDEL
    IP(IC,I]=0
C
    SUBITEGATICN LCOPS
    DO 30 NN=1,N
    N2=NN-1
    IF (NN-EG.1) GOTC 9
    IADO(IC,NN.) =IAO+(I-1)&ICEL + (K1-1+N2)*KDEL
    IP(IC,NN)=N2.NALIM-JI+1
    CONTINUE
    HRITE(6,100) IC,NN,IA CD(IC,NN), IP (IC,NN)
    IF(IP(IC,NA).GT-A-1) GO IC 20
    ISET(IC,NN)=(IADC(IC,NN)-IP(IC,NN) \JCEL)
```




DOPARALLEL J=1, JLIM; K=1, KLIM
DOO $1 \mathrm{I}=1$, ILIM
$S l=A(I, K, J) * A(K, I, J)$
1 Continue
ENDDO: ENDDO
it is obviously required that for a given $J, K$ pair that a specific processing element must receive both of them. If one considers the previous example and determines the assigned processing element for

```
Type I A(3,2,5) PE# 3
Type II A(2,3,5) PE#I
```

But this is wrong. Both of these accesses must go to the same processing element. The solution to this apparent dilema is to expand the array size at compile time by "squaring" it if one of these type accesses occurs, anywhere in the program, i.e. given the array $A(5,3,7)$ with extents $5,3,7$
one expands it to square by increasing all extents to the largest one, i.e., 7 and accessing the array as though it were of size A $(7,7,7)$.

Thls is demonstrated in detail in Figure $8 A \& B$ for all 6 accessing patterns. The I index, the innermost, is not iterated for each. cycle. As is obvious one obtains the correct $J, K$ pair in each processing element as is required. The appendix contains the examples listed below.
IAQ Mem MOX

| \#PES | IFIRST | ISECOND | ITHIRD |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 27 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 19 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

## P.E. Number

| Case I | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( $I, J, K$ ) | $i 11$        <br> $i 27$ $i 31$ $i-41$ $i 51$ $i 61$ $i 71$ il2 i 22 <br> i 32        <br> $i 42$ $i 52$ $i 62$ $i 72$ $i 13$ $i 23$ $i 33$ $i 43$ <br> $i 53$ $i 63$       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | -66 | 17 | i1 | i27 | $i 37$ | i-47 | 57 |  | 177 |  |

(i indices $6 \& 7$ also suppressed)

Case II
( $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{J}$ )

(i indices $4,5,6 \& 7$ also suppressed)

Case III
( $J, K, I$ )

| $11 i$ | $21 i$ | $31 i$ | $41 i$ | $51 i$ | $61 i$ | $71 i$ | $12 i$ | $22 i$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $42 i$ | $52 i$ | $62 i$ | $72 i$ | $13 i$ | $23 i$ | $33 i$ | $43 i$ | $53 i$ |
| $63 i$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $73 i$ | $14 i$ | $24 i$ | $34 i$ | $44 i$ | $54 i$ | $64 i$ | $74 i$ | $15 i$ |
| $35 i$ | $45 i$ | $55 i$ | $65 i$ | $75 i$ | $16 i$ | $-26 i$ | $-36 i$ | $46 i$ |
| $66 i$ | $76 i$ | $17 i$ | $27 i$ | $37 i$ | $47 i$ | $57 i$ | $67 i$ | $77 i$ |

(no i indices suppressed)

Specific Examples $(i, 2,3)=\bigcirc$.
(i, 2,1 )



[^1]Figure 8A
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3. Optimization of accessing for Single Access Type •

If a single type of access occurs within a DOPARALLEL construct and is one of the less favorable ones then the compiler will reverse the order of the DOPARALLEL construct. Case I and ITT are already optional. Case IV and VI would be inverted, i.e., the construct would be DOPARALLEL $K=1$, KLIM; $J=1$, JLIM.

Cases III and $V$ would reamin as written with a warning to the user.

Appendix A
Normal Accessing

ITYPE．IAO MEMOC \＃PES IFIRST I＇SECONO ITHIRO KO JC $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}1 & 19 & 11 & 1 \mathrm{C} & 5 & 3 & 7 & 7 & 1\end{array}$
 OF POOR QUALITY

| $\begin{array}{r} \text { TDEL } \\ 5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} J D E L \\ 15 \end{array}$ |  | $\mathrm{CEL}_{1} \mathrm{ICl}$ | $\begin{aligned} & M \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{7}{\mathrm{JLIM}}$ | ILI |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUM | cycle |  | UEITER |  | FSET | I VAL | JVAL | KVAL |  |  |
| 1 | $\frac{1}{1}$ |  | 1. |  | ${ }_{8} 8$ | IVA | JVAL | Kral |  |  |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | 1 |  | $\stackrel{2}{1}$ |  | $\stackrel{2}{2}$ | $?$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{1}$ |  |  |
| 4 | 1 |  | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  | ${ }_{8}^{2}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| 4 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | ？ | $\frac{1}{1}$ |  |  |
| 6 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| 7 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 |  |  |
| ${ }_{8}^{8}$ | 2 |  | $\underline{1}$ |  |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 10 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 4 | 3 | ； | 4 |  |  |
| 11 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 9 | 2 | 3 | 4 |  |  |
| 12 | 2 |  | c |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| 13 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 |  |  |
| 15 | $\frac{3}{3}$ |  | ¢ |  | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 15 | 3 |  | 1 |  | \％ | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 17 | 3 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  |  |
| 18 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 5 | ？ | 1 |  |  |
| 8 | 3 3 |  | 1 |  | 0 | 3 | $⿳ 亠 ⿻ 了 一 一 𠃌$ | $?$ |  |  |
| E1 | 3 |  | 3 |  | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |
| $\stackrel{22}{23}$ | 4 |  | 1 |  | 9 | 5 | 1 | $\frac{1}{3}$ |  |  |
| 23 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| 24 | 4 |  | 1 |  | $\varepsilon$ | 5 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| ITYPE | IAO M | MEMOD | \＃PES |  | IFIRST | ISEC | ONC | ITHIFD | K0 | J¢ |
| 3 | 19 | 11 | 1 C |  | 5 | 3 |  | 7 | 1 |  |


| IDEL | JDEL | KCEL ICLIM | ILIM | ILI． |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |



```
ITYPE IAO MEMOD #PES IFIRST ISECOND ITHIRD KO JC
```

    \(\begin{array}{rrrrrr}\text { IDELL } & \text { JDEL } \\ 15 & \text { KCEL ICLIM } & \text { JLIM } & \text { ILIM } \\ 7 & 5 & 5\end{array}\)
    


| ITYPE IAO MEMOD \#PES | IFIRST | ISECOND ITHIRD KO | JC |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 19 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 1 |

IDEL JOEL ${ }_{5} \times \mathrm{KOEL}_{1}$ ICLIM $\underset{2}{ }$ JLIM ILIM


ITYPE IAO MEMCD \#PES IFIRST ISECCNE ITHIR[ KO JO
$\begin{array}{llll}1 & 19 & 11 & 10\end{array}$
9
5
6
1
IDEL 1
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ITYPE IAO MEMED \#PES IFIRST ISECCNE ITHIRE KO dJ

| 4 | 19 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |




| ITYPE IAO MEMCO | IPES | IFIRST | ISECGNL | ITHIRO | KO | JO |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 19 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 1 |

IDEL $\quad$ JOEL KDEL ICLIM $\quad$ ILIM $\quad$ ILIM

| NUM | crcte | SUbitef | OFFSET | I VAL | JVAL | KVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | - 1 | 8 |  |  | K ${ }_{1}^{1}$ |
| 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 |
| 4 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 9 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 1 | $\frac{3}{3}$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 |
| 19 | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 10 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 10 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 5 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 13 |  |  | 8 | 2 | 2 |  |
| 14 | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ${ }_{0}$ | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 16 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| 17 | 2 | 1 | 4 |  | 4 | 2 |
| 18 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 1. | 4 | 3 |
| 19 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 20 | 2 | 2 | 5 |  | 5 | 3 |
| 21 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 22 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| 23 | 3 | 1 | 10 | $\underline{3}$ | 2 | $\underline{3}$ |
| 24 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 25 | 3 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 8 | $\frac{2}{1}$ | $\frac{3}{3}$ | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 26 | 3 3 | 2 | 0 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 3 | 4 |
| 28 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 4 |
| 29 | 3 3 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 4 | 3 | 5 | $\frac{3}{4}$ |
| 31 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 32 | 4 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 3 6 | 1 | $\frac{1}{1}$ | 4 |
| 33 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| 34 | 4 | 2 | 4 |  | 2 | 5 |
| 35 | 4 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 10 | 4 | $\frac{3}{3}$ | 4 5 |
| 37 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 38 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 39 | 4 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ${ }_{9}$ |  | 5 | 4 |
| 41 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 42 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 43 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 5 |
| 44 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 45 | 5 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| 47 | 5 | 1 | $10^{4}$ | 5 | 4 | 5 |
| 48 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 6 |
| 49 | 5 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 8 | 5. | 5 | 5 |
| 50 | 5 | 1 | 7 | $\frac{1}{6}$ | 1 | 6 |
| 52 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 6 |
| 54 | 6 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 6 |
| 55 | 6 |  | 10 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
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ItYpe IAO memod ipes Ififst isecono ithird ko je $\begin{array}{lllllllll}2 & 19 & 11 & 10 & 6 & 2 & 8 & 1 & 1\end{array}$

ICEL $\quad$ JDEL $\quad$ KDEL ICLIM $\quad$ JLIM $\quad$ ILIM

| NUM | CYCLE | SUEITER | OFFSET | IVAL | JV AL | KVAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | SUEI | ${ }^{8}$ | 1 |  | 1 |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | 1 | 2 | $\frac{1}{3}$ | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | 2 | ? | 3 |
| 9 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 10 | 3 | $\hat{2}$ | 7 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 11 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 12 | 3 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 |
| 13 | 4 | 1 | 6 |  | 1 | 7 |
| 14 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 15 | 4 |  |  |  | 2 | ? |
| 15 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 5 | ? | 1 |
| 18 | 5 | 1 | \% | 6 | 2 | 1 |

ORIGINAL PAGE IS OF POOR QUALITY

ITYPE IAO MEMOD \#FES IFIRST ISECOND ITHIRD KO JC $\begin{array}{lllllllll}3 & 19 & 11 & 10 & 6 & 2 & 8 & 1 & 1\end{array}$

IOEL $\frac{12}{2}$ JDEL KDEL ${ }_{6}$ ICLIM. JLIM ILIN


| ITYPE | IAO MEMOD | \#PES | IFIRST | ISECOND | ITHIPD | KO | JC |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 19 | 11 | 1 C | 6 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 |



| ITYPE | IA.O MEMOD | \#FES | IFIRST | ISECONC | ITHIRD | KO | JC |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 19 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 |






ITYPE. IAO MEMOD $\operatorname{FFES}$ IFIFST ISECOND ITHIED K.? JC $\begin{array}{llllllll}2 & 27 & 13 & 11 & 6 & 2 & 8 & 1\end{array}$

IDEL JOEL KDEL ICLIM JLIM ILI:
IDEL JOEL KDEL ICLIM JLIM ILI:

| NUM | CYCLE | SUEITER | OFFSET | I VAL | JV AL | $K$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | $1{ }^{1}$ | 1 | 1 |  |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 17 | 1 |  |  |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | $\cdots$ |  |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1 |  |
| 6 | 2 | 2 | $\stackrel{8}{5}$ | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 8 | 2 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 9 | 3 | 1 | $\cdot 10$ | - 3 | 1 |  |
| 10 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 1 |  |
| 12 | 3 | $\frac{1}{1}$ | $\frac{2}{3}$ | 3 | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 13 | 3 | $\frac{1}{2}$ | 12 | 4 | $=$ |  |
| 14 | 3 | 3 | $\varepsilon$ |  | $?$ |  |
| 15 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 |  |
| $1{ }_{17}$ | 4 | 1 | 1c | - $\quad 6$ | $\frac{1}{2}$ |  |
| 15 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 3 |  |
| 19 $\frac{19}{} 0$ | 5 | 1 | ${ }_{8}^{2}$ | 6 6 | 1 |  |


| ITYPE | IAO MEMOL | IPES | IFIFST | ISECOND | ITHIRC | KO | U |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 27 | 13 | 11 | $E$ | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 |


| 12 | JDEL | KDEL ICLIM | JLIM | ILIM |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |




| ITYPE | IAO MEMOC | HFES | IFIFST | ISECOND | ITHIRJ | KO | JC |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 27 | 13 | 11 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 |



Appendix B
Extended or Squared Accessing

| ITYPE | IAO | memoc | 4 PES | IFIRST | ISECONE | ITHIED | KC | $\therefore$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 27 | 13 | 11 | $\epsilon$ | 2 | 8 | 1 |  |

IDEL JOEL KDEL ICLIM JLIM ${ }_{2}$ ILI:
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```
ITYPE IAO MEMCD #PES IFIRST ISECCNE ITHIRD KO JS
    1 19 11 10
                                3
                                -3
                                3
                            3
                            1


ITYPE IAO MEMCO \#PES IFIRST. ISECCNE ITHIRE KC Jo
\begin{tabular}{lllllllll}
3 & 19 & 11 & 10 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}

IDEL JOEL KOEL ICLIM JLIM ILIM

\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE IAO MENCD & FPES & IFIRST & ISECCNL & ITHIRC & KO & JO. \\
4 & 19 & 11. & 10 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}

IDEL JDEL KDEL \(\frac{1}{3}\) ICLIM JLIM ILIM \(\quad\).


\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO MEMOO & \#PES & IFIRST & ISECENO & ITHIRD & KO & JC \\
1 & 19 & 11 & 10 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}
ICEL JDEL KDEL ICLIM JLIM \begin{tabular}{l} 
ILIM \\
5
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NUM & cycle & SUEITER & OFFSET & IVAL & JVAL & KVAL \\
\hline \(\frac{1}{2}\) & 1 & 1 & 8 & & & \\
\hline 3 & 1 & 1 & 10 & & 1 & \\
\hline 4 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 4 & 1 & \\
\hline 5 & 1 & 1 & 1 & , & 1 & \\
\hline 6 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & \\
\hline 7 & 2 & 1 & 4 & & \(1 \frac{1}{1}\) & \\
\hline \({ }_{9}\) & 2 & 1 & ¢ & 4 & & 2 \\
\hline 10 & 2 & 1 & 7 & 5 & 1 & \\
\hline 1 ! & 3 & 1 & 9 & 1 & 1 & \\
\hline 12 & 3
3 & \(\frac{1}{1}\) & \({ }^{1} \mathrm{C}\) & 2 & \(\frac{1}{1}\) & 5 \\
\hline 14 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & \\
\hline 15 & 3 & 1 & 2 & 5 & 1 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO MEMOL \#PES & IFIFST & ISECONO & ITHIRC & KO & JK \\
2 & 19 & 11 & 16 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO MEMOC & IPES & IFIRST & ISECOND & ITHIRD & KO & JC \\
5 & 19 & 11 & 10 & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ITYPE & IAO & memad & \#PES & IFIRST & \(15 E C O N D\) & ITHIFD & Ko & \(J C\) \\
\hline 6 & 19 & 11 & 1 C & 5 & 5 & 5 & 1 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO MEMOC & IPES & IFIRST & ISECOND & ITHIRD & KO & JC \\
1 & 27 & 13 & 11 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}

ICEL JOEL \(\quad\) KCEL \(\begin{array}{rlrrr}36 & \text { ICLIM } & \text { JLIM } & \text { ILIM } \\ 6\end{array}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NUM & CYCLE & SUEITER & OFFSET & IVAL & JVAL & & kival \\
\hline \(\frac{1}{2}\) & \(\frac{1}{1}\) & \({ }_{1}^{1}\) & \({ }_{\frac{1}{2}}\) & & & & , \\
\hline \(\frac{1}{3}\) & 1 & 1 & 3 & 3 & 1 & & \\
\hline 4 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 1 & & \\
\hline 5 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 5 & 1 & & \\
\hline 6 & \(\frac{1}{2}\) & 1 & \(\varepsilon\) & 6 & 1 & & \\
\hline 7 & 2 & & & & & & 2 \\
\hline 8 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & + 6 & & \(?\) \\
\hline 9 & 2 & 1. & 4 & 3 & 6 & & 2 \\
\hline 10 & 2 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 6 & & 2 \\
\hline 11 & 2 & 1 & 6 & 5 & 6 & & \(?\) \\
\hline 13 & \(\frac{3}{3}\) & 1 & 7 & 6 & 5 & & 2 \\
\hline 14 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 5 & & 4 \\
\hline 15 & 3 & 1 & 5 & 3 & 5 & & \\
\hline 16 & 3 & 1 & & 4 & 5 & & 4 \\
\hline 17 & 3 & 1 & ? & 5 & 5 & & \\
\hline 18 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 6 & 4 & & 4 \\
\hline 20 & 4 & 1 & 5 & 2 & 4 & & \\
\hline 21 & 4 & 1 & & 3 & 4 & & 6 \\
\hline 22 & 4 & 1 & 7 & 4 & 4 & & 6 \\
\hline 23 & 4 & \(\frac{1}{1}\) & \(\stackrel{8}{9}\) & 5 & 4 & & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO NEMOD & \#PES & IFIRST & ISECONC & ITHIRD & KO & JC \\
2 & 27 & 13 & 11 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 3
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ITYPE & IAO & membe & \#PES & IFIRST & ISECENC & ITHIRD & K0 & JC \\
\hline 3 & 27 & 13 & 11 & \(\epsilon\) & 6 & 6 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
IDEL JDEL KDEL ICLIM JLIM ILIM
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline NUM & CYCLE & SUEITER & OFFSET & IVAL & JVAL & KVAL \\
\hline 1 & 1 & SUEI 1 & \({ }_{1}\) & & & \\
\hline \(\frac{2}{3}\) & 1 & 1 & 11 & 1 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline 4 & 1 & 1 & 5 & & 1 & \\
\hline 5 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 & \\
\hline & 1 & 1 & 12 & 1 & 1 & \\
\hline 7 & 2 & 1 & 12 & 6 & 2 & \\
\hline 8 & 2 & 1 & 9 & 6 & 2 & \\
\hline 9 & 2 & 1 & 6 & 6 & 2 & \\
\hline 10 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 6 & ? & 4 \\
\hline 11 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 6 & 2 & \\
\hline 12 & \(\frac{2}{3}\) & 1 & \(1{ }^{1}\) & 6 & 2 & \\
\hline 13 & 3 & 1 & 1 C & & 4 & \\
\hline 14 & 3 & 1 & 7 & 5 & 4 & \\
\hline 15 & 3 & 1 & 4 & 5 & 4 & \\
\hline 17 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 5 & 4 & \\
\hline 18 & 3 & 1 & \(1 \cdot \frac{1}{8}\) & 5 & 4 & \\
\hline 19 & 4 & 1 & \(\varepsilon\) & 4 & 5 & \\
\hline 20 & 4 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 6 & \\
\hline 21 & 4 & 1 & 2 & 4 & 6 & 4 \\
\hline 21
23 & 4 & 1 & 12 & 4 & 6 & 4
5 \\
\hline 24 & 4 & 1 & \(\varepsilon\) & 4 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rcccccccc} 
ITYPE & IAO MEMOD & \#PES & IFIRST. & ISECOND & ITHIRD & KO & JC \\
4 & 27 & 13 & 11 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 1
\end{tabular}







.
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\section*{APPENDIX B \\ SECDED RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT MODELS}

\section*{B. 1 INTRODUCTION}

The reliability of a computing system can be significantly improved by employing single bit error correction and double bit error detection (SECDED) technology, which is thus used by the FMP to increase its reliability.

The report presents a model of reliability improvement assessment of a module operated with SECDED. It can be easily embedded in the system reliability prediction model. The final result is shown in a mathematical expression. The bounds of the reliability and the improvement factor are studied. A computer program coded on FORTRAN is also developed and validated, with double precision computation.
B. 2 MODEL

There are \(n\) chips in a module; a chip has \(m\) bits. A word which consists of \(n\) bits can be stored in this module by addressing each bit to a different chip. Without SECDED a bit failure induces the chip failure and the module failure as well. Assume the time to failure of a bit is exponential distributed, then the time to failure of a chip and that of a module are also exponential distributed.

In some cases, a bit hard failure could cause a chip failure with probability (1-S). We call it a catastrophic bit failure. Otherwise a bit failure is called non-catastrophic bit failure with probability S. Assuming the MTBF of the chip as a time unit, we have that the \(\mathbb{M T B F}\) of a bit is \(m\) time units and the bit failure rate is \(1 / \mathrm{m}\). The MTBF and the failure rate of a module are \(1 / \mathrm{n}\) and \(n\) respectively. The expected time between (i-1)th and ith bit failure, the expected time to ith bit failure, the probability of no two-bit failure in one word and the probability of two-bit failure in one word are stated in Table B-1. The module fails at the ith bit failure only when there is neither catastrophic failure nor two-bit failure in the same word before the ith bit failure, but there is a catastrophic failure or two-bit failure in the same word when the ith bit failure occurs. Since the transient and catastrophic failures of a module at the ith bit failure are mutually exclusive, the MTBF of a module with SECDED is given by
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{MTBF}_{m}=(1-S)\left\{\frac{1}{n}+\frac{m}{m n-1}\right\} \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left\{\left[\sum_{k=1}^{i} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}\right]\left[\prod_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{n(m-(k-1))}{m n-(k-1)}\right] S^{(i-1)}\left[(1-S)+\frac{\operatorname{Sn}(i-1)}{m n-(i-1)}\right]\right\} \\
& +S^{m}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}\right]\left[\prod_{k=1}^{m} \frac{n(m-(k-1))}{m n-1}\right]
\end{aligned}
\]

Table B-1. Expected Timeș and Probabilities
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & ith bit failure & 1 & 2 & -- & i-1 & i & -- & m & m+1 \\
\hline & Expected time between the ( \(\mathbf{i}-1\) )th and ith bit failure & \(\frac{\mathrm{m}}{\mathrm{mn}}\) & \[
\frac{m}{m n-1}
\] & & \[
\frac{m}{m n-(i-2)}
\] & \[
\frac{m}{m n-(i-1)}
\] & & \[
\frac{m}{m n-(m-1)}
\] & \[
\frac{m}{m n-m}
\] \\
\hline & Expected time to the ith bit failure & \(\frac{m}{m n}\) & \(\frac{m}{m n-1}\) & & \[
\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}
\] & \[
\sum_{k=1}^{i} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}
\] & & \[
\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}
\] & \[
\sum_{k=1}^{m+1} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1-}
\] \\
\hline & & & \[
+\frac{m}{m n}
\] & & & & & & \\
\hline & Prob. of the ith bit failure being non-catastrophic failure & S & S & & S & S & & S & - S \\
\hline \(\bigcirc\) & Prob. of the ith bit failure being catastrophic failure & 1-S & 1-S & & 1-S & 1-S & & 1-S & 1-S \\
\hline  & Prob. of no. two bit failure in one word & 1 & \[
\frac{n(m-1)}{m n-1}
\] & & \[
\frac{n(m-(i-2))}{m n-(i-2)}
\] & \[
\frac{n(m-(i-1))}{m n \cdot(i-1)}
\] & & \[
\frac{n-1}{m n-(m-1)}
\] & 0 \\
\hline 色 & Prob. ot two bit failure in one word & 0 & \[
\frac{n-1}{m n-1}
\] & & \[
\frac{\mathrm{n}-(\mathrm{i}-2)}{\mathrm{mn}-(\mathrm{i}-2)}
\] & \[
\frac{n) i-1)}{m n \cdot(i-1)}
\] & & \[
\frac{n(m-1)}{m n-(m-1)}
\] & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

From the above expression, the reliability improvement factor can be shown as n. \(\operatorname{MTBF}_{\mathrm{m}}\). When \(\mathrm{S}=1\), we have the upper bound of the factor and \(\mathrm{MTBF}_{\mathrm{m}}\). As \(S=0\), we have the lower bound of the factor and \(M T B F_{m}\), if \(m\) is large enough the lower bound of the factor is 2 .

If the expected time between the (i+1)th and ith failure is fixed as \(n\) time units the expected time to the ith bit failure is \(i \cdot n\). The \(\mathbb{M T B F}\) of a module with SECDED is given by:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{MTBF}_{\mathrm{m}}=(1-\mathrm{S}) \frac{2}{n} \\
& +\sum_{i=2}^{m}\left\{\frac{i}{n}\left[\prod_{k=1}^{i-1} \frac{n(m-(k-1))}{m n-(k-1)}\right] s^{(i-1)}\left[(1-S)+\frac{S n(i-1)}{m n-(i-1)}\right]\right\} \\
& +S^{m} \frac{m}{n}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{m}{m n-(k-1)}\right]
\end{aligned}
\]

Similarly as \(S=1\) or 0 , we have the upper bound or the lower bound of the factor and \(\mathbb{N T B F}_{\mathrm{m}}\), respectively. When m is large enough the difference between the \(\mathrm{MTBF}_{\mathrm{m}}\) 's of the two models is negligible and so is that between the factors. The program for computing the reliability improvement factor are given in the Table B-2.


\section*{APPENDIX C}

\section*{SPARE PROCESSOR}

\section*{INTRODUCTION}

In Chapter 5, the reliability and availability calculations make use of the swi tching of spare processors. This appendix presents the method of switching in more detail, to support the claims made in Chapter 5. First, a discussion of the hardware that needs to be added to support the switching, and second, the implications for processor number are given.

\section*{SWITCHING}

Figure C-1 shows a switching network, which amounts to one additional level of logic at the processor side of the transposition network. This network therefore increases the depth of the transposition network from ten levels to eleven levels of logic. Switching is electronic, under software control. The spare processor can occur at any location from processor 0 to processor 128 in the cabinet. Figure \(\mathrm{C}-1\) shows the first cabinet; the others are similar.

No switching is needed in the connections to and from the control unit. All outputs from the control unit to processors are broadcast to all processors; the inputs from processors to CU are either ANDed together with a 512 -way AND, or ORed together with a 512 -way OR in the fanout boards. The fanout

board needs appropriate input from the spare processor to form the correct, 512-way result. For example, in forming "all processors ready", or in forming "any processor enabled", the correct result will be achieved by having the spare processor's "enable" bit in the FALSE state.

\section*{PROCESSOR NUMBER}

The PNO.instruction produces processor numbers from 0 through 511 in the 512 processors that are switched into the system, independently of which ones are spare. Each processor in the cabinet has wired into its backplane a number from 0 through 128. Each cabinet has a number ( \(0,1,2\), or 3 ) set by a switch at the cabinet İanout board. If it were not for the spare processor, the cabinet number would be concatenated with the hard-wired number in the backplane to form the processor number. As it is, processors above the spare processor subtract 1 from their hard-wired number before concatenating it with the cabinet number to form the programmatic processor number as part of the PNO instruction. Thus, there are ten poles on each switch shown in Figure C-1. The eight data lines plus one strobe make nine poles for transposition network use, plus this bit for the PNO instruction to use in calculating the processor number.

\section*{SETTING THE SPARE PROCESSOR SWITCH}

The setting of the spare processor switch is done only at a time when the array has halted. Switching is controlled from the diagnostic controller in response to commands from the host. Hence, the FMP programs are never aware of
which processor is spare, and as explained above, the FMP programs will always have an FiMP of 512 processors, numbered from 0 through 511 , on which to run.```


[^0]:    Figure 3-13. Control Unit Code for SAM - Subroutine STEP (META Assembler) (Cont)

[^1]:    *I index indicated by $i$, assuming iteration deleted elements indicate null fetches

