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Abstract—This paper explores a computer architecture, where part of the instruction set architecture (ISA) is implemented on small highly-integrated field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs). It has already been demonstrated that small FPGAs inside a general-purpose processor (CPU) can be used effectively to implement custom instructions and, in some cases, approach accelerator-level of performance. Our proposed architecture goes one step further to directly address some related challenges for high-end CPUs, where such highly-integrated FPGAs would have the highest impact, including access to the memory hierarchy with the highest bandwidth available. The main contribution is the introduction of the “FPGA-extended modified Harvard architecture” model to enable context-switching between processes with a different distribution of instructions without modifying the applications. The cycle-approximate evaluation of a dynamically reconfigurable core shows promising results for multi-processing, approaching the performance to an equivalent core with all enabled instructions, and better performance than when featuring a fixed subset of the supported instructions.
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I. INTRODUCTION

There has been enormous progress around traditional software on today’s CPUs. This has led to easier development through high-quality libraries and debug tools, as well as relatively mature programming models and verification routines. Additionally, a variety of software and hardware abstractions have enabled portability of code, such as with virtual memory and cache hierarchies, and enabled more effortless increase in performance, such as through instruction-level parallelism.

However, general purpose processors leave a lot to be desired in terms of performance, hence the increase in use of computation offloading to specialised processors. These include graphics processing units (GPUs), field-programmable gate arrays (FPGAs) and even purposely build silicon in the form of application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs).

One consideration in today’s hardware specialisation technologies is the fact that they are mostly based on the non-uniform memory-access model (NUMA). Large off-chip memories are found in the majority of today’s high-end FPGA offerings, resulting in power-hungry and expensive setups, as well as in limitations in programming models, and complicating deployment and data movement.

While promising technologies like wide Single-Instruction Multiple-Data (SIMD) instructions [15] in CPUs could be considered an attempt to close the gap between specialised and general purpose computing [8], this gap is wider than it has ever been. This is because of the increased need for highly customised architectures in trending workloads [24], whose functionality could not be efficiently expressed with a fixed general purpose ISA and microarchitecture.

The modified Harvard architecture is the most common computer architecture in today’s systems. It is similar to the Von Neumann architecture, in the sense that the higher-levels of the cache hierarchy share the same memory address space. The original Harvard architecture distinguished between an instruction address space and a data address space [27]. With the modified Harvard architecture this feature is reminiscent in the caches closer to the cores [13], which helps with modern micro-architectural features such as pipelining.

In this paper, we adapt the modified Harvard architecture to introduce FPGA-based instruction implementations in general purpose systems. In contrast to related work, this goes beyond embedded or specialised processors, and introduces multi-processing, operating systems and fine-grain reconfiguration in the form of standardised instruction extensions. One of the novelties in our work could be considered the study on a very-fine level of reconfiguration, concerning ratified instruction extensions, already adopted by software and compilers. A feasibility study shows promising performance for supporting reconfigurable extensions on-demand, especially when having adequately fast FPGA reconfiguration technologies and with slight modification to the operating system’s scheduler.

The list of contributions goes as follows:

1) The “FPGA-extended modified Harvard Architecture”, a novel computer architecture to introduce FPGAs working as custom instructions, enabling context-switching and other advanced concepts for higher-end applications
2) A comprehensive evaluation of fine-grain reconfiguration at the instruction-level in a benchmark suite. This is done in an environment where there is competition for two extensions, but no space for both.
3) Related insights such as with regards to multi-processing and the impact of the reconfiguration time and the operating system’s scheduler properties.

The rest of the paper first introduces the challenges for FPGA-based acceleration from system’s architecture perspective (section II), the related work (section III) and our proposed architecture solution (section IV). Then, the evaluation methodology is presented as a separate section (V) from the evaluation (section VI), and finally there are the suggested future work and conclusions (sections VII and VIII).
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II. CHALLENGES

The research on FPGAs implementing custom instructions can be considered as an attempt to overcome a series of challenges in current systems that use discrete FPGAs (section II-A). This work also tries to address some of the challenges found in existing work in this research topic (section II-B).

A. Current CPU and FPGA systems

One design decision is defining a selection of instructions that would be more beneficial to include as part of the instruction set architecture (ISA). With a fixed ISA, vendors can select a subset of instructions, such as with the modularity of RISC-V [2], or design custom instructions for specialised applications. For general purpose computing it is difficult to predict what the most appropriate instructions will be. For instance, some applications may be ephemeral, as with some neural network models or cryptocurrencies, for which specialised hardware becomes obsolete faster.

From the perspective of hardware complexity, supporting a high-number of instructions is expensive, but may be necessary for widening the applicability of general purpose processors. For example, Intel’s AVX2 and AVX-512 include thousands of instructions [15], and RISC-V’s unratified vector extension hundreds [1]. The related implementation complexity, such as with AVX-512, is associated with a decrease in operating frequency and power efficiency, and area increase [9], [12]. Additionally, AVX-512 is suboptimal for certain workloads, and a serial code could increase performance and scalability in such cases [9]. Also given the increased need for core miniaturisation for easier parallelisation and increased power efficiency, expanding the ISA can be considered harmful.

In the context of FPGAs as accelerators, one of the most limiting bottlenecks to performance is the bandwidth to main memory [20]. For example, even with one of Intel’s Xeon+FPGA prototypes, although the FPGA is directly connected to the memory controller it only achieves 20 GB/s [4]. The memory hierarchy tends to always favour CPU performance, hence the presence of expensive off-chip memories in high-end FPGA boards. This heterogeneity is considered to impact FPGA development, as well as to increase the cost and deployment of FPGAs in the datacenter [21].

B. FPGAs implementing custom instructions

The basic limitation of the related work on FPGA-based instructions is their focus on embedded and/or heterogeneous systems, with no notion for multi-processing, context-switching and advanced micro-architectural features. The use of eFPGAs has many practical applications in embedded systems [3], [16], but there is currently no computer architecture to “hide” reconfiguration from traditional software.

One challenge in the existing methods of introducing eFPGAs as custom instructions is the need for manual intervention for reconfiguration. Although the recommended procedures to develop and load bitstreams can be well documented, deviating from conventional software development could be detrimental for achieving a wider adoption [3].

By initially focusing on highly-customised instructions and more complex accelerators, there is less opportunity for modern processors to gradually adopt small reconfigurable regions as part of their core. For instance, more complex logic tends to yield high resource utilisation, as well as a low maximal operating frequency. Larger designs also occupy more fabric area, and this is reflected in configuration time [23], which is problematic for CPUs.

III. RELATED WORK

With respect to using FPGAs to implement CPU instructions, there is literature based on a more practical approach. Such works provided important insights that inspired this research, but being based on existing technologies, they inherit some of the challenges of section II.

Ordaz et. al presented soft-NEON [17], an FPGA-based implementation of a custom vector extension for Xilinx Zynq embedded platform. It demonstrated a speedup of over 2.8 times for some custom kernels, but is mostly limited by the platform limitations related to the communication between the ARM cores and the FPGA. The same authors elaborated on an approach to highly couple a shared SIMD engine between multiple RISC-V cores [18]. It leverages Xilinx’ partial reconfiguration to accelerate custom kernels on the embedded FPGA, and the general focus is on the implementation, rather than elaborating on a general purpose computer architecture.

There are also works focusing on embedded FPGA (eFPGA) fabrication. FABulous [16] is an open-source framework for integrating FPGAs into an ASIC. One of its applications is for the implementation of embedded FPGAs (eFPGAs), also for the purposes of extending hardened cores. A RISC-V SoC with eFPGAs is presented as a use case, which is extended as a separate study with FlexBex [11]. The custom instruction usage is limited to specialised kernels, and concepts like context-switching are not studied.

Earlier research also focused on using FPGAs as a functional unit. Garp [14] targets embedded processors without multi-processing support, but it introduces the idea of combining a bitstream alongside the process binary. It does not make FPGAs transparent, as it requires configuration instructions. DISC [26] is an earlier work that elaborates on reconfiguration in a similar context. Its instruction decoder is similar to the proposed instruction disambiguator in the sense that it uses a caching approach. Though, but it is not a general-purpose computer architecture, as the processor has a separate ISA from the host processor. On a similar note, Chimamera [28] provides a reconfigurable array to dynamically load FPGA-based instruction implementations. This is somewhat reminiscent of the proposed bitstream cache, but does not support context-switching and also focuses on custom instructions for software compiled with a specialised compiler. Later, architectures like CCA [10] and RISPP [7] aimed to improve the adaptability of embedded systems by providing a set of specialized functional units that can be dynamically selected at run-time. The latter does not involve FPGAs but it is similar in the reconfiguration granularity of instructions.
Simodense [21] is a RISC-V softcore that allows specialisation with custom SIMD instructions of custom pipeline lengths. Although this framework is targeted for exploring FPGAs as instructions [19], it does not elaborate on system architecture. Applications run bare metal and assume FPGA configuration beforehand for the sake of instruction exploration. Another fundamental difference from our study is that the custom instructions in this work are relatively complex, where our focus includes simpler instructions, such as those found in RISC-V extensions [2] for miniaturising future CPU cores.

IV. Solution

This section presents the proposed solution, the “FPGA-extended modified Harvard Architecture”. Figure 1 introduces the proposed computer architecture in high-level with respect to the memory hierarchy. With a reference point the computing core namely “reconfigurable core”, there are three distinct caches at level 1; the bitstream cache, the instruction cache and the data cache. When compared to the original modified Harvard architecture, the proposed solution adds a separate bitstream cache at level 1, to provide bitstreams for FPGA-instructions after an instruction opcode is ready.

The instruction disambiguator unit is an integral part of this architecture and is depicted in figure 2. On instruction decode there is a request to this unit to see if there is an instruction implementation for the requested instruction. It operates as a small fully-associative cache and uses opcodes (plus any additional fields for defining functions) as tags to determine the bitstream locations. On an opcode miss it requests the instruction bitstream from the bitstream cache, while on a hit it multiplexes the operands to the appropriate slot.

The separate bitstream cache can increase the performance of the reconfigurable core. First, similarly to today’s modified Harvard architecture, the separated instruction and data caches are still connected to a unified cache, allowing easier simultaneous memory accesses for pipelining the instructions. Since the instruction disambiguator unit assumes that an instruction opcode is ready, the bitstream fetch phase can be placed subsequently to the instruction decode pipeline stage in heavily-pipelined processors. Second, the bitstream cache is separate to allow different dimensions or speeds than the rest of the caches, such as with wider blocks to facilitate the increased data width to carry bitstreams, as opposed to instructions. Thus, separating the bitstream cache relates more to the implementation efficiency, as the aforementioned high-level functionality could be done without a separate bitstream cache.

This architecture enables the applications to be agnostic of the reconfiguration aspect. An operating system can provide the basic ISA extensions (or part of them) in bitstream(s), and the hardware should be able to dynamically fetch the necessary bitstreams on demand. Sharing the same virtual or physical address space for the bitstreams provides the facility to keep bitstreams in software binaries, so that they can provide custom instruction extensions alongside their data segment for acceleration potential.

An alternative approach would be to use context-switching as a facility to swap the FPGA's contents, which is reminiscent of context-switching for partial reconfiguration [23]. However, the proposed FPGA-extended architecture enables high reuse of common FPGA-based instructions by the software, including any provided by the ISA specification. This prevents unnecessary reconfiguration of the reconfigurable areas. Using a customised context-switching routine to swap all reconfigurable units would be unnecessarily expensive. Keeping the multi-process functionality in mind, the proposed architecture keeps the software-based context-switching process mostly unaltered, while providing acceleration potential for existing software.

V. Evaluation Methodology

Our evaluation is based on cycle-accurate and cycle-approximate simulations. A RISC-V softcore is extended with additional functionality to simultaneously support all instructions in our experiment, but also with a facility to inject artificial latency to study the performance effects of the proposed computer architecture. The general idea is to abstract the bitstream implementation and reconfiguration to focus on its potential impact in software performance without narrowing down its scope to a particular current or future reconfiguration technology.

A. Simulated Hardware

For evaluating of our proposal, an open-source FPGA-optimised softcore [21] is extended, that originally supported
the RV32IM specification, where the “RV32I” part is the base 32-bit integer instruction set, and “M” is the extension for integer multiplication and division [2]. The instructions of the latter extension occupy 4 (non-blocking) cycles of latency [21].

The instruction slot disambiguator unit is added to the softcore as a means to evaluate the hardware aspect of our solution, even though it only processes opcodes and adds latency when there is an instruction slot miss. All required instructions pre-exist on the softcore. The instruction opcodes are first being resolved through the instruction cache, and the instruction slot disambiguator here works as an L0 instruction cache that uses opcodes as tags and adds latency on opcode misses. The opcodes are encoded internally using a look-up table according to what subset of instructions we would like to consider as part of the same slot. For example, it would make sense to unify the main logic of integer addition with integer subtraction due to the high amounts of shared logic in the same way traditional ALUs can share the full-adders for subtraction.

Essentially, this module is only used to provide cycle-approximate results based on adding “artificial” latency, representing the potential overheads from fully following the proposed FPGA-extended modified Harvard architecture. The amount of added latency on slot misses is customisable to approach covering a wider range of possible reconfiguration technologies, and includes both the latencies of reconfiguration and implementation of the bitstream cache. Apart from generality, one crucial reason for not following current partial reconfiguration technologies is that they may be too slow for our purposes, and exploring fast reconfigurability of smaller FPGAs is part of our ongoing and future work. The proposed FPGA-extended modified Harvard architecture is aimed at high-end CPUs with their hardened logic operating at a frequency of one order of magnitude higher. Hence optimising for an entirely FPGA-based solution would shift the focus of this evaluation.

Another modification is the addition of the RISC-V “Zicsr” control and status register instructions [25]. This is done to enable access to certain control and status registers (CSRs) related to the use of a real operating system. Specifically, we add a subset of RISC-V’s CSRs (mstatus, mie, mcause, mepc and mtvec), which was the minimum subset that was required to support FreeRTOS by using machine-level privileges, at least under FreeRTOS v202112 and GCC 10.1.0 at the time of writing. Timer interrupts are also now enabled through the addition of the machine-level memory-mapped registers mt ime and mt imecmp, in order to support context switching.

Finally, the support of the “F” is added, which is RISC-V’s standard extension for single-precision floating-point [2]. This is done in order to increase the competitiveness among the available instruction subsets, especially when featuring applications that benefit from such an extension. The logic of the “F” extension is added in Verilog for the simpler instructions (comparison, move, load/store and sign-extend), occupying a single cycle per instruction. Separate modules for addition, multiplication, division and conversion are linked to Xilinx floating-point operator IPs for using DSPs in FPGA-based implementation. In simulation, the corresponding signals are handled by code in C++ using Verilator, and their pipeline length is set to 6 cycles. The fused multiply-add instructions are implemented with the aforementioned behavioural instantiations, yielding a total latency of 12 cycles.

The resulting codebase is synthesisable and also passed all benchmark-based test cases (see subsection V-C) on a Xilinx Zynq UltraScale+ FPGA, though we opted to use Verilog simulations instead. This is for convenience, as the resulting framework ran relatively fast in simulation. Additionally, the memory space required for the benchmark suite is less than this softcore’s cache, hence studying the interaction with a real DRAM was not considered of value in this evaluation.

B. Software – Operating System

With respect to the software, an operating system was needed to provide the multi-processing capability. The selected operating system is FreeRTOS [5], a real-time operating system. This provided a minimal framework allowing easier focus on the impact of the task scheduler. More accurately, according to its original creator Richard Barry, FreeRTOS can be seen as a multi-threading library [6]. Thus, a single binary is obtained, containing both FreeRTOS task scheduler and the benchmarks as threads. This is run as a bare-metal application adopted by softcore, in simulation (or on a real FPGA), to study the effects of context switching under our proposal.

One of the modifications to the pre-existing FreeRTOS RISC-V portability code was to include the 32 floating-point registers as part of the context-switching routines. This is done so that the correct state is also conserved for benchmarks that utilise instructions from the “F” extension, after timer interrupts and traps through the operating system’s scheduler.

C. Software – Benchmarks

The benchmark suite is Embench [22], providing a rather comprehensive selection of benchmarks with different attributes of interest (such as compute or memory-intensive). The Embench benchmark suite was ported for use in our evaluation infrastructure, and each benchmark was made to run as a thread instead of a process. This required some additional modification, such as in the beebs library of embench, that was originally supposed to streamline some common library functions with diverse implementations, but was not designed for multiple callers. Any local data are now passed as pointers into the beeb functions, such as for generating random numbers deterministically under a consistent seed, and for managing a localised heap memory.

Originally, only one of the benchmarks (minver) used a single-precision floating point arithmetic. Thus, four more (wikisort, st, nbody and cubic) that used double-precision operations are modified to use single precision to facilitate the purposes of this study. This also involved appending the letter “f” to any calls of the math.h libraries sqrt, fabs, pow, cos, acos and atan. The pre-defined verification step is modified to comply with the appropriate values when using less precision
by obtaining results from a modern laptop core (AMD Ryzen), hence the reported numerical values should not be used as a reference for other purposes. The benchmarks are compiled with the \texttt{-O3}, \texttt{-ffast-math} and \texttt{-fno-schedule-insns} flags.

The distribution of unique instructions per benchmark after compiling with both “F” and “M” (RV32IMF) is visualised in figure 3. One the x-axis there are the benchmarks, and on the y-axis value is their unique instruction count, as read by the \texttt{objdump} instruction (the benchmarks beyond \texttt{crc32} use the same instructions). A basic observation from this visualisation is how the five floating-point benchmarks differ according to their use of floating-point instructions, and how “universal” the rest of the instruction set is.

D. Reconfigurable slot granularity

With respect to the size and complexity of the reconfigurable regions, we explore three compartmentalisation scenarios, representing different logic granularities starting from the finest:

1) One slot per instruction, 8 slots: In this scenario, each reconfigurable slot fits exactly one instruction from “F” or “M”. This may be less representative for simple instructions, such as with floating-point addition (\texttt{fadd.s}) and subtraction (\texttt{fsub.s}) that can share their adders, but it is included for the sake of completeness.

2) One slot per instruction group, 4 slots: This scenario groups instructions into single reconfigurable regions according to their logic similarity. There are 3 groups for the “M” extension \{\texttt{mul, muth, mulhsu, mulhu}\}, \{\texttt{div, divu}\}, \{\texttt{rem, remu}\}, 7 groups for the “F” extension \{\texttt{fadd.s, fsb.s}, \texttt{fmul.s}\}, \{\texttt{fdiv.s}\}, \{\texttt{fsgn.j.s, fsgnj.s, fsgnjx.s, fmin.s, fmax.s, fl.s, fsl.s, feq.s}\}, \{\texttt{fsqrt.s}\}, \{\texttt{fcvt.w.s, fcvt.wu.s, fcvt.s.w, fcvt.s.wu}\}, \{\texttt{fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s}, \texttt{fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s}, \texttt{fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s, fmsub.s}\}, totalling 10 groups.

3) One slot per extension, 1 slot: This scenario involves one slot and causes a slot reconfiguration on every use of an instruction of the other extension. For “M” and “F” this may not be representative, but can be generalised for applications competing for their own larger instruction accelerators.

The goal is to emulate an environment where the CPU has no space for implementing both extensions, and the workload exhibits competitiveness between a limited number of instruction slots. In order to simplify the design space and avoid overspecialising through ISA research and custom instructions, this study is restricted to the “fixed” RISC-V extensions “M” and “F”.

VI. Evaluation

The evaluation section is split into three sections. First, section VI-A evaluates the acceleration potential for the benchmark selection for our proposed reconfiguration approach, and provides a classification of the benchmark selection which becomes useful for the next sections. Second, section VI-B evaluates the three scenarios for the slot granularity (as introduced in section V-D) under single benchmarks that were found to benefit from both “F” and “M” extensions. Third, section VI-C studies our approach in a multi-program environment, where additional software properties also affect the performance.

A. Benchmark classification based on a fixed specification

In order to understand the impact of the studied extensions on the performance of our benchmark selection, they are first run individually. There are four binaries/runs for each benchmark, one for each of the following specifications: RV32I, RV32IF, RV32IM and RV32IMF. The underlying softcore actually supports the superset RV32IMF and can also run all binaries with the subsets RV32I, RV32IF and RV32IM. This is to indicate the contribution of each extension to each benchmark’s performance. When a useful instruction is absent from the specification of the compiler, it is replaced by a sub-optimal pre-defined routine, as specified by the corresponding application binary interface (ABI). This initial experiment is useful for both design space exploration of cores with a fixed subset, as well as our use case with novel CPUs featuring the proposed reconfiguration approach.

Figure 4 shows the first set of simulation results. One observation is how helpful an instruction extension can be, with benchmarks like minver reducing from 2106M to 77M cycles (27.5x speedup) by the introduction of “F” to RV32I. As shown in the figure, Embench is rather diverse both in terms of runtime as well as with respect to the impact of
the extensions. Some benchmarks including sglib-combined, slre and statemate seem to be insensitive to the extension, denoting a limited or no use of the additional instructions. Others are only improved by one extension, such as matmult-int for “M” (4.6x speedup), which does multiplication only on integers, while others seem to be improved by both “M” and “F” like wikisort, with a collective speedup of 2.9x for RV32IMF. Note that Embench uses the provided operating frequency in MHz ($f_{clk}=150$ MHz) to multiply the number of iterations per benchmark as means to normalisation.

B. Single benchmark

For the evaluation of the proposed architecture under single benchmarks, we select the later class from the classification of the previous section (“improved by both F and M”). This is done to focus on workloads where there is demand for both instruction extensions, before introducing multi-processing. Additionally, this section provides thorougher experiments for all reconfiguration granularity scenarios of section V-D, and is also used to narrow down the well-performing configurations before introducing the effects of an operating system.

In the first benchmark experiment with simulated reconfigurability, there three indicative series for the bitstream miss latency from the instruction slot disambiguator. These are 10-cycle, a 50-cycle and a 250-cycle latencies representing both future reconfiguration technologies that approach a latency closer to that of CPU instructions, and slower which could be achievable with more traditional partial reconfiguration techniques, at least for such instructions of relatively low complexity.

Figure 6 presents the results of this experiment. The y-axes are the speedups/slowdowns over when running with a fixed specification with both “M” and “F” (RV32IMF). There is also the ”max(IM,IF)” series, which represents the maximum performance between the fixed specifications RV32IM and RV32IF. This is done to see whether the latency overhead of the reconfigurable approach can still yield a competitive

1 All series regard slowdowns, but the term speedup is kept for consistency with past conventions.
As can be seen by overviewing the results, the most important factor for performance seems to be the reconfiguration latency, at least here where there is frequent interchange between instructions of different extensions. The behaviour between the selection of the reconfiguration granularity scenarios seem to be relatively similar with regards to the slowdowns when varying the reconfiguration latency. The worst scenario is the third (one slot per extension), with its 10-cycle average at 55% the speed of RV32IMF, being closer to the 250-cycle of the first scenario (one slot per instruction) at 52% than the first and second’s 10-cycle at over 90% of RV32IMF performance. This expected as an instruction miss on the disambiguator will cause the entire extension to be evicted for replacing it with the extension of the requested instruction.

The best performing scenario is the first, but this also relates to the number of slots. For example, if a benchmark only uses signed multiplication and not unsigned, the multiplication operation would still take exactly one slot in scenarios 1 and 2. Given that the scenario 2 is more representative (see section V-D), the rest of the study only considers scenario 2 and variations, though such design choices would also relate to the logic complexity of individual instructions in such future systems.

One observation when selecting scenario 2 with a 50-cycle latency can approach selecting the best extension per benchmark \((\text{max}(\text{IM}, \text{IF}) \text{ series})\) with an average performance of around 71% of RV32IMF. It also exceeds its performance in benchmarks like \text{st} and \text{wikisort}, where the use of “F” instructions is used more sporadically. Over a fixed baseline, when considering both the benchmarks classes “improved by both F and M” and “improved by M” (latter not in figure 6), the scenario 2 with a 50-cycle latency is 2.46x, 1.4x and 3.62x faster than RV32IF, RV32IM and RV32I respectively.

Of course, for each workload there could be a detailed curve with smaller latency intervals than the indicative 10, 50 and 250 values here. However, searching for a specific point where the approach is still meaningful would be of less significance, as this would relate more directly to the core and FPGA specification, such as with the instruction issue width, and there is already a level of abstraction in this number.

### C. Multiple benchmarks

This part of the evaluation studies the effects of multiprocessing with the help of an operating system (FreeRTOS). A periodic interrupt is set by its task scheduler, responsible for context-switching. Each task is a benchmark, and the FreeRTOS scheduler enforces a round-robin priority between the tasks. A pair of benchmarks are run through two independent infinite loops, and once one of them finishes its predefined number of iterations, the operating system terminates.

Following the benchmark classification of section VI-A, the benchmark category that is not improved by “F” or “M” ("insensitive") is not considered. The studied pairs are combinations between two of the five benchmarks that are improved by “F” and “M” (totalling \(\binom{5}{2} = 10\)) and combinations between one from the latter category with one from the eight benchmarks that are only improved by “M” (totalling \(5 \times 8 = 40\)). The remaining combinations are omitted because they do not compete for slots, such as with pairs of benchmarks that are only improved by “M”, as all the reconfiguration scenarios allow the entire “M” to fit inside the slots, and “M” is a relatively small extension.

Figure 7 presents the results of this experiment under scenario 2 with a 50-cycle latency from the single-program experiments (“one slot per instruction group, 4 slots”), as well as with variations of it for a different number of slots (2 and 8). The latter variations are added to elaborate on the slot interaction with this multi-program case, as the competitiveness between the slots is increased. The y-axes are the average speedup for each of the paired benchmarks when compared to the runtime of RV32IMF

\(^2\)There are a few outliers in the RV32IM series, obtaining a speedup greater than 1 over RV32IMF. All these points contain \text{wikisort}, for which the compiler heuristics lead to an increased performance when run as a thread in FreeRTOS, and some variation is expected (only overestimating RV32IM performance). There was a similar situation with the \text{nettle-sha256} benchmark, where the “F” extension doubled the runtime, with an identified cause being the \text{schedule-insns} flag from the -O3 optimisation level, and was disabled.
increase due to the additional instructions coming from the interrupt handler of the operating system. However, due to the different instruction distributions amongst the benchmarks, this also increases the instruction slot misses, hence the 20K-cycle versions improve the speedup of the reconfigurable approaches when compared to the same baseline. For instance, the average speedup of 4-slot series improves from 0.62 to 0.71 (i.e. from 38% to 29% slowdown) for the top selection of pairs, and from 0.82 to 0.9 for the benchmark combinations on the bottom of the figure.

One observation when combining the benchmarks of the same class (figure 7 top) is that the reconfigurable approach remains at the similar levels of performance degradation as with the last section (single-program). For instance, the average speedup for the 4-slot with 50-cycle reconfiguration and a 20K-cycle timer is 0.71, while last section’s corresponding average was also around 0.71.

From figure 7 (bottom right) we can see that the potential of reconfiguration is relatively higher when combining benchmarks with different extension preferences. The average speedup over RV32IMF for the 2-slot, 4-slot and 8-slot approaches is 0.62, 0.9 and 0.94 respectively, under 20K-cycle interrupts.

The general observation is that the proposed reconfigurable approach can be more well-rounded than fixed extensions, as for example, RV32IF performs significantly better than RV32IM in the pairs figure 7 left, but this is reversed for the pairs of the right part. When considering all 50 of the aforementioned benchmark combinations for 20K cycle interrupts, the 4-slot version is 3.39x, 1.48x and 2.04x faster on average when compared to RV32I, RV32IM and RV32IF respectively, at an average of 0.82x the performance of RV32IMF. The reconfigurable approach also has relatively less variation between its performance with different benchmark combinations. Finally, fine-tuning the operating system’s scheduler parameters is deemed a necessary but relatively cheap additional step to take advantage of the acceleration potential of the proposed architecture.

VII. FUTURE WORK
Future work involves developing novel FPGA architectures to allow fast parallel reconfiguration as well as for fast operation for use in this context. This could also elaborate on the design of the bitstream cache, such as with its datapath width requirements for achieving certain reconfiguration latency goals. Such studies could further explore the trade-offs between logic complexity, area and power consumptions for reconfiguration at the instruction level.

The distinction between threads and processes in our work can be insignificant, and this is especially true at this stage where we assume and validate that each benchmark accesses its own independent memory region. An appropriate future work would also be to finalise the definition of processes to
also include instruction extension bitstreams in their binaries for a precise evaluation in a more mature platform.

This work only used the RISC-V ‘‘M’’ and ‘‘F’’ as a case study, but would be desirable to also consider a wider selection of extensions, as well as more specialised instructions. With regards to the software toolchain, compilers could be extended with basic high-level synthesis (HLS)-equivalent functionality for preparing instruction extensions on-the-fly as an additional optimisation step.

Finally, future research is needed for supporting internal states in FPGA-based instructions, which can complicate context-switching, programming models, hardware-based predication and other aspects found in today’s general-purpose computing. Internal states inside instructions are not necessary for the approach to operate, but may be necessary for reaching accelerator-level of performance in CPUs. This is because “internalising” computation could be seen as one of main techniques FPGAs use to outperform CPUs in specific areas.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The FPGA-extended modified Harvard architecture model can be used to transparently fetch standardised ISA extensions or custom instructions through the computers memory hierarchy. The disambiguator unit works as an L0 cache for the instruction slots and requests and multiplexes the bitstreams and instructions to reconfigurable regions. The evaluation showed promising results, surpassing the performance of the core with a single fixed extension when the total reconfiguration latency is adequately low. The operating system in such computers is more likely to benefit from longer times between context-switches to compensate for the reconfiguration time. Finally, further research is desirable to develop faster reconfigurable FPGAs, especially for smaller regions to implement instructions. Fast reconfiguration and high operating frequencies could make CPU+FPGA-hybrids appropriate not only for standalone accelerators and accelerated instructions, but also for miniaturising CPU cores and expanding their ISA extensions similarly to statically or dynamically linking software libraries.
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