Empirical Study of Power Consumption of x86-64 Instruction Decoder

Mikael Hirki, Zhonghong Ou, Kashif Nizam Khan, Jukka K. Nurminen, Tapio Niemi



Aalto University School of Science







Study the differences between ARM vs Intel in terms of energy consumption

Occurrent Commonly cited difference : Instruction Set (RISC vs CISC)

• Goal: Investigate whether x86-64 processors consume more energy because of their complex instruction set





How can we measure the energy consumption of instruction decoders?



Methodology

• Using micro-benchmarks that specifically trigger the instruction decoders by exceeding the capacity of the decoded instruction cache

Intel's RAPL (Running Average Power Limit) Micro-op cache



Intel RAPL



https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/intel-power-governor



Intel Haswell pipeline





Instruction decoder benchmarks

D += A[j] + B[j] C[j];

D += (A[j] << 3) * (A[j] << 4) * ((B[j] << 2) * 5 + 1);

Simple arithmetic operations Float and integer data types Arrays or registers • Uses L1 or L2 caches • Uses loop unrolling to increase the code size



Loop unrolling

Original loop for(int j=0;j<n;j++) D += A[i] + B[i] * C[i]

Idea: Trigger the instruction decoders by using a big unroll count for a single loop

```
Unrolled loop
for(int j=0; j<n; j+=256)
D += A[i] + B[i] * C[i]
D += A[i+1] + B[i+1] * C[i+1]
  . . .
```

D += A[i + 255] + B[i + 255] * C[i + 255]}



Advantages of Loop unrolling

Increases performance Opportunities to find instruction level parallelism

What we do: manually unroll the loop up to 2048 times Increases the code size Triggers instruction decoder

in power consumption can be attributed to instruction decoding pipeline



Idea: If the loop is still executed in the same time as before, the observed difference





Evaluation - Power consumption vs. Code Size





Evaluation - Power consumption vs. Code Size





Power Modeling

Event name:	Descriptio
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED.THREAD_P	The numb
UOPS_ISSUED.ANY	The numb
IDQ.MITE_UOPS	The numb
MEM_LOAD_UOPS_RETIRED.L1_HIT	The numb
L2_RQSTS.REFERENCES	The numb

$$P_{\text{package}} = 6.05 + \frac{\text{cycles}}{\text{second}} \times 1.63 \times 10^{-9} + \frac{\mu \text{ops issued}}{\text{second}} \times 2.15 \times 10^{-10} + \frac{\mu \text{ops decoded}}{\text{second}} \times 1.40 \times 10^{-10} + \frac{11 \text{ hits}}{\text{second}} \times 4.35 \times 10^{-10} + \frac{12 \text{ references}}{\text{second}} \times 4.05 \times 10^{-9}$$

on:

- ber of clock cycles for each core.
- ber of micro-ops issued to the execution units.
- ber of micro-ops produced by the instruction decoders. ber of hits in the L1 data cache.
- ber requests to the L2 cache (including L2 prefetchers).





Evaluation- Power consumption breakdown

Uncore static 12% 44%

Normal case

Cores static 44%

L2 & L3 cache dynamic 22%

L1 cache dynamic 9%

Instruction decoders 3%

Micro-op Execution 10%



Evaluation- Power consumption breakdown

Cores static 47%

Extreme case

Micro-op Execution 22% Uncore static 13%

L1 cache dynamic 8%

Instruction decoders 10%





The x86-64 instruction decoders consume relatively little power

Instruction decoder consumes 3% - 10% of the processor package power The instruction set is not a significant drawback compared to ARM We plan to port our benchmark to ARM platforms

Microbenchmark code

https://github.com/mhirki/idq-bench2





Green Big Data Project overview

Overall Research Focus

Energy efficiency analysis in High Performance Scientific Computing

- Port IgProf to 64-bit ARM
- Energy profiler module
- Techniques and tools for measuring energy efficiency
- Intel RAPL(Running Average Power Limit) evaluation







Questions?

