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## Motivations

- Enables the creation of large FPGAs, beyond manufacturing limit, composed of smaller dice
- Largest 2.5D FPGA at 28nm (XC7V2000T): 1954k LEs
- Largest standard FPGA at 28nm (XCE7VX980T): 979k LEs
- Largest 2.5D FPGA at 20nm (XCVU440): 4407k LEs
- Enables integration of heterogeneous dice
- Better yield $\rightarrow$ lower cost


## Die Yield example
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## Die Yield example



- For a defect density of $1 / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ and $1.5 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}$ dice, on a 12 inch wafer:
- Die yield: 22\%, avg working dice: 107
- Average working systems: 26.75
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## Interposer challenges

- Reduced connectivity:
- Connection to interposer made by microbumps
- Increased delay:
- Increased wirelength and microbump capacitance
- Virtex-7 XC7V2000T:
- $280 \times 210$ total vertical wires
- $280 \times 48$ wires crossing the interposer
- $\sim 23 \%$ of the wires cross the interposer
- $\sim 1 n s$ extra delay to cross
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- CAD flow for interposer-based FPGAs
- Limited connectivity between dice: impact on circuit routability?
- Interposer delay: impact on circuit speed?
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## Models overview

- Used VTR flow as the base
- Modified VPR to target/model interposer-based FPGAs
- Required changes to placement, routing and timing analysis
- Parameters added:
- Number of cuts
- \% wires cut
- Delay added by interposer
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## Number of cuts

- Models the number of dice on the FPGA
- Cuts are equally spaced vertically
- 1 cut $\rightarrow 2$ dice, 3 cuts $\rightarrow$ 4 dice
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## $\%$ wires cut \& Increased delay

- \% wires cut:
- Models reduced connectivity between dice
- \% of wires which are removed between dice
- Increased delay:
- Models larger delay to cross the interposer
- A reasonable value is $1 n s$
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## Required changes

- Changed routing resource graph
- Changed delays of appropriate edges
- Removed some edges
- Now router automatically adapts to the interposer
- Timing analysis also adapts automatically
- Placer needs to change to:
- Reduce nets crossing interposer
- Minimize critical path crossings of interposer
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## Placement: Timing cost

- Timing_Cost $=\sum_{\forall i, j \subset c i r c u i t} \operatorname{delay}\left(\Delta x_{i j}, \Delta y_{i j}\right) \times$ criticality $(i, j)$
- Need to update estimate of best case routing delay
- extra_delay $(i, j)=$ times_crossed $(i, j) \times$ delay_increase
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## Placement: Wiring cost

- wiring_cost $_{\text {orig }}=$
$\sum_{n=1}^{N_{n e t s}} q(n) \times\left[\frac{b b_{x}(n)}{\text { avg_chanx_W(n)}}+\frac{b b_{y}(n)}{\text { avg_chany_W(n) }}\right]$
- wiring_cost $=$ wiring_costorig + cut_cost
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## Tested wiring costs

- cut_cost $=\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ N_{n} \\ n}} C^{\prime} \times$ times_crossed $(n)$
- cut_cost $=\sum_{n=1}^{N_{n}=1} C^{\prime} \times b b H e i g h t(n)$
- cut_cost $=\sum_{n=1}^{N_{\text {nets }}} C^{\prime} \times b b H e i g h t(i) \times$ times_crossed $(n)$
- Smoother cost function guides gradual progress

Cut costs:


- Green: 4
- Black: 3
- Blue: 0
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## Experiment conditions

- Architecture file from VTR 7.0, 40 nm area and delay
- Unidirectional wires with length 4
- 10 fracturable 6-LUTs per logic block
- 32kb RAM blocks, reconfigurable DSP blocks
- Experiments ran with the eight largest circuits from VTR, ranging from 9.1 k to 153 k primitives
- Results are the geometric mean over all circuits
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## Routability vs. Interposer Wiring Bandwidth

Minimum channel width vs $\%$ wires cut
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Delay increase $=1$ ns and number of cuts $=3$
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- Very poor routability after $80 \%$ wires cut, routability dominated by interposer bandwidth
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## Routability vs. Interposer Wiring Bandwidth

Minimum channel width vs geometric mean of the number of wires crossing the interposer


- Interposer wires dominate within-die minW

Delay increase $=1 \mathrm{~ns}$ and number of cuts $=3$
(4 dice)

## Circuit speed vs interposer delay

- Interposer delay has a large impact on speed
- Critical path crosses interposer multiple times
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- Number of interposer wires has little effect on circuit speed
- Number of dice has a significant impact on speed

Increased delay $=1 \mathrm{~ns}$
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## Conclusion

- New cost function improves area-delay by $20 \%$
- No drastic impact when interposer provides only $40 \%$ of intra-die routing capacity
- Routability is dominated by interposer below $40 \%$ of within-die routing capacity
- Critical path strongly impacted by interposer delay
- Circuit delay affected by number of dice, but not by routing capacity
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## Future work

Interposer wires are scarce...

- Investigate different switch structures for wires crossing the interposer
- Investigate alternative CAD flows, such as adding a partitioning step before placement

Bigger circuits (Titan benchmarks)

## Thank you! <br> Questions?

andre.hahn@usp.br

## Extra slides

## Placer routability cost enhancement results

| Term | minW | crit_path(ns) | Area-delay |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| None | 124.6 | 9.8 | 1227 |
| \# of crossings only | 122.9 | 9.4 | 1157 |
| Height only | 112.7 | 9.8 | 1109 |
| Crossings + height | 107.3 | 9.3 | 996 |

Best performance for each term.

## Constant sweep



## Circuit characteristics

| Circuit | \# in | \# out | \#6-LUTs | \#FFs | \#Mults | \#Mem |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| bgm | 257 | 32 | 30089 | 5362 | 11 | 0 |
| LU8PEEng | 114 | 102 | 21954 | 6630 | 8 | 9 |
| LU32PEEng | 114 | 102 | 75530 | 20898 | 32 | 9 |
| mcml | 36 | 33 | 99700 | 53736 | 30 | 10 |
| mkDelayWorker32B | 511 | 553 | 5580 | 2491 | 0 | 9 |
| stereovision0 | 157 | 197 | 11462 | 13405 | 0 | 0 |
| stereovision1 | 133 | 197 | 11462 | 13405 | 152 | 0 |
| stereovision2 | 149 | 182 | 29849 | 18416 | 564 | 0 |

