

Reliable Architectures

Joel Emer Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory Massachusetts Institute of Technology





Transistor Device

• Secondary source of upsets: alpha particles from packaging



Cosmic Rays Come From Deep Space



• Neutron flux is higher in higher altitudes

3x - 5x increase in Denver at 5,000 feet

100x increase in airplanes at 30,000+ feet



CSALL

Physical Solutions are hard

- Shielding?
 - No practical absorbent (e.g., approximately > 10 ft of concrete)
 - unlike Alpha particles
- Technology solution: SOI?
 - Partially-depleted SOI of some help, effect on logic unclear
 - Fully-depleted SOI may help, but is challenging to manufacture
- Circuit level solution?
 - Radiation hardened circuits can provide 10x improvement with significant penalty in performance, area, cost
 - 2-4x improvement may be possible with less penalty







- Primary creates periodic checkpoints
- Backup restarts from checkpoint on mismatch





- Fujitsu SPARC in 130 nm technology (ISSCC 2003)
 - 80% of 200k latches protected with parity
 - versus very few latches protected in commodity microprocessors





Metrics

- Interval-based
 - MTTF = Mean Time to Failure
 - MTTR = Mean Time to Repair
 - MTBF = Mean Time Between Failures = MTTF + MTTR
 - Availability = MTTF / MTBF
- Rate-based
 - FIT = Failure in Time = 1 failure in a billion hours
 - 1 year MTTF = 10⁹ / (24 * 365) FIT = 114,155 FIT
 - SER FIT = SDC FIT + DUE FIT

Hypothetical Example

Cache: 0 FIT

- + IQ: 100K FIT
- + FU: 58K FIT

Total of 158K FIT

I mage removed due to copyright restrictions.



Cosmic Ray Strikes: Evidence & Reaction

- Publicly disclosed incidence
 - Error logs in large servers, E. Normand, "Single Event Upset at Ground Level," IEEE Trans. on Nucl Sci, Vol. 43, No. 6, Dec 1996.
 - Sun Microsystems found cosmic ray strikes on L2 cache with defective error protection caused Sun's flagship servers to crash, R. Baumann, IRPS Tutorial on SER, 2000.
 - Cypress Semiconductor reported in 2004 a single soft error brought a billion-dollar automotive factory to a halt once a month, Zielger & Puchner, "SER – History, Trends, and Challenges," Cypress, 2004.





Architectural Vulnerability Factor (AVF)

AVF_{bit} = Probability Bit Matters

of Visible Errors # of Bit Flips from Particle Strikes

FIT_{bit}= intrinsic FIT_{bit} * AVF_{bit}



Architectural Vulnerability Factor Does a bit matter?

- Branch Predictor
 - Doesn't matter at all (AVF = 0%)
- Program Counter
 - Almost always matters (AVF ~ 100%)



+ Naturally characterizes all logical structures



- ACE path requires only a subset of values to flow correctly through the program's data flow graph (and the machine)
- Anything else (un-ACE path) can be derated away



Most bits of an un-ACE instruction do not affect program output



T = 1

Vulnerability of a structure

AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state



$$ACE\% = 2/4$$



AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state

T = 2



$$ACE\% = 1/4$$



AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state

T = 3



$$ACE\% = 0/4$$



AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state

T = 4



$$ACE\% = 3/4$$



AVF = fraction of cycles a bit contains ACE state



Average number of ACE bits in a cycle

Total number of bits in the structure



Little's Law for ACEs



 $N_{ace} = T_{ace} \times L_{ace}$

 $AVF = \frac{N_{ace}}{N_{total}}$



Computing AVF

Approach is conservative

Assume every bit is ACE unless proven otherwise

- Data Analysis using a Performance Model – Prove that data held in a structure is un-ACE
- Timing Analysis using a Performance Model – Tracks the time this data spent in the structure



Dynamic Instruction Breakdown





Mapping ACE & un-ACE Instructions to the Instruction Queue





ACE Lifetime Analysis (1) (e.g., write-through data cache)

• Idle is unACE



- Assuming all time intervals are equal
- For 3/5 of the lifetime the bit is valid
- Gives a measure of the structure's utilization
 - Number of useful bits
 - Amount of time useful bits are resident in structure
 - Valid for a particular trace







ACE percentage = AVF = 29%



DUE AVF of Instruction Queue with Parity





Sources of False DUE in an Instruction Queue

- Instructions with uncommitted results
 - -e.g., wrong-path, predicated-false
 - solution: π (possibly incorrect) bit till commit
- Instruction types neutral to errors
 - e.g., no-ops, prefetches, branch predict hints
 - solution: anti- π bit
- Dynamically dead instructions
 - instructions whose results will not be used in future
 - solution: π bit beyond commit



• Problem: not enough information at issue



At commit point, declare error only if not wrong-path instruction and π bit is set



On issue, if the anti- π bit is set, then do not set the π bit



- Declare the error on reading R1, if π bit is set
- If R1 isn't read (i.e., dynamically dead), then no False DUE
- π bit can be used in caches & main memory ...

