



DESIGN EXPLORATION FOR NETWORK ON CHIP BASED FPGAS: 2D AND 3D TILES TO ROUTER INTERFACE

By

Alaa Salaheldin Gomaa Ibrahim

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In
Electronics and Communications Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

**DESIGN EXPLORATION FOR NETWORK ON CHIP
BASED FPGAS: 2D AND 3D TILES TO ROUTER
INTERFACE**

By

Alaa Salaheldin Gomaa Ibrahim

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

In
Electronics and Communications Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Ahmed Mohamed Soliman

Professor

Electronics and Communications
Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Dr. Hassan Mostafa

Assistant Professor

Electronics and Communications
Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

**DESIGN EXPLORATION FOR NETWORK ON CHIP
BASED FPGAS: 2D AND 3D TILES TO ROUTER
INTERFACE**

By

Alaa Salaheldin Gomaa Ibrahim

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

In
Electronics and Communications Engineering

Approved by the Examining Committee

Prof. Ahmed Mohamed Soliman (Thesis Main Advisor)
Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Mohamed Fathy Abu-Elyazeed (Internal Examiner)
Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Ahmed Hassan Kamel Madian (External Examiner)
Associate Professor, Nile University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

Engineer's Name: Alaa Salaheldin Gomaa Ibrahim
Date of Birth: 18/03/1989
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: alaa.salaheldin89@gmail.com
Phone: +201065896629
Address: 13rd Abu-Ordia st, Al Basatin,
Cairo, Egypt
Registration Date: 01/10/2012
Awarding Date: / /2019
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Electronics and Communications Engineering



Supervisors:

Prof. Dr. Ahmed Mohamed Soliman
Dr. Hassan Mostafa

Examiners:

Prof. Ahmed Mohamed Soliman (Thesis main advisor)
Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Mohamed Fathy Abu-Elyazeed (Internal examiner)
Professor, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Prof. Ahmed Hassan Kamel Madian (External examiner)
Associate Professor, Nile University

Title of Thesis:

Design Exploration for Network on Chip Based FPGAs: 2D and 3D Tiles to Router Interface

Key Words:

Network on Chip, Fields Programmable Gate Array, Router Interface

Summary:

This thesis explores how to adapt and use Networks-on-Chips for designing the next-generation FPGAs, a literature survey of existing Networks-on-Chip designs is presented. A comparative review between three NoC routers is provided it shows that increasing number of router ports affects the area, power and frequency of the network significantly. For that, the Codec is introduced to connect more tiles or modules to the network. A comparison is held between two 2D networks, with and without Codec. Finally, the effects of adding Codec to 3D-NoCs are investigated.

Disclaimer

I hereby declare that this thesis is my own original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all resources used and have cited them in the references section.

Name: Alaa Salaheldin Gomaa Date: 02/02/19

Signature:

Acknowledgments

Alhamdulillah, I praise and thank Allah for giving me the strength and courage to complete this thesis.

I would like to thank Prof. Ahmed M. Soliman and Dr. Hassan Mostafa for their help, support and patience.

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	II
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	III
LIST OF TABLES	V
LIST OF FIGURES	VI
NOMENCLATURE	VIII
ABSTRACT	IX
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. OVERVIEW AND MOTIVATION.....	1
1.2. CONTRIBUTIONS	2
1.3. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS.....	2
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. INTRODUCTION	3
2.2. FPGA vs. ASIC.....	3
2.2.1. Non-Recurring Engineering costs	3
2.2.2. Unit cost	4
2.2.3. Time to market	5
2.2.4. Scalability and configurability	5
2.2.5. Development cycle.....	5
2.2.6. Summary	6
2.3. NoC OVERVIEW	7
2.3.1. Why Choosing the NoC Approach	7
2.4. A CLOSER LOOK AT THE NoC ARCHITECTURE	11
2.4.1. Macro-Architecture view	12
2.4.1.1. Topology.....	12
2.4.1.2. Number of network nodes.....	12
2.4.1.3. Virtual channels	13
2.4.1.4. Routing algorithm and Flow control	13
2.4.1.5. Realization method	13
2.4.2. Micro-Architecture view	14
2.5. PREVIOUS WORKS.....	15
2.5.1. NOCEM	15
2.5.2. PNoC.....	16
2.5.3. Dual Crossbar Router.....	17
2.5.4. HW NoC	19
2.5.5. SOTA	20
2.5.6. CONNECT.....	21
2.5.7. Split and Merge PS	23
2.5.8. FLNR	25

2.5.9.	RROCN	28
2.6.	COMPARATIVE REVIEW	30
2.6.1.	Comparison workflow.....	30
2.6.2.	Frequency.....	30
2.6.3.	LUTs usage	32
2.6.4.	Registers usage.....	34
2.7.	SUMMARY AND FUTURE WORK	36
CHAPTER 3 : CODEC, TILES TO ROUTER INTERFACE		39
3.1.	INTRODUCTION	39
3.2.	MODELING AND SIMULATION	40
3.2.1.	Simulation results.....	42
3.3.	IMPLEMENTATION AND NETWORK SYNTHESIS	42
3.3.1.	The Codec module	42
3.3.2.	Network configurations.....	43
3.4.	COMPARISON RESULTS	43
3.4.1.	Frequency.....	44
3.4.2.	Logic utilization	45
3.4.3.	Power consumption.....	47
3.5.	SUMMARY	49
CHAPTER 4 3D-NOC DESIGN EXPLORATION WITH CODEC		51
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	51
4.2.	3D-NoC IN LITERATURE	51
4.3.	3D-NOCET AS AN EXPLORATION TOOL.....	52
4.3.1.	Introduction.....	52
4.3.2.	Tool updates	53
4.4.	COMPARISON SETUP AND RESULTS FOR FULL-MESH TOPOLOGY	54
4.4.1.	Logic utilization	55
4.4.1.1.	Vertical complexity.....	55
4.4.1.2.	Network complexity.....	56
4.4.2.	Frequency.....	58
4.4.2.1.	Vertical complexity.....	58
4.4.2.2.	Network complexity.....	58
4.4.3.	Power consumption.....	59
4.4.3.1.	Vertical complexity.....	59
4.4.3.2.	Network complexity.....	60
4.5.	COMPARISON SETUP AND RESULTS FOR RING TOPOLOGY	61
4.5.1.	Logic and memory utilization	61
4.5.2.	Power consumption.....	63
4.6.	SUMMARY	65
CHAPTER 5 SUMMARY AND PROPOSED FUTURE WORK.....		67
REFERENCES		69

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Area, Power and Operating frequency cost [10]	10
Table 2.2: PNoC router Implementation Results [15].....	17
Table 2.3: Configurable Router for Embedded NoC synthesis results for FPGA and ASIC [16]	19
Table 2.4: Synthesis Results for CONNECT and SOTA Mesh Network [18]	22
Table 2.5: Map & Post-PAR report for Split-Merge and CONNECT on XC6VLX240T- 1 [19]	24
Table 2.6: FLNR performance and area comparison with some previous NoC routers [20]	28
Table 3.1: Simulink models comparison	42
Table 3.2: Network B CpR and TpC configurations	43

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: ASIC NRE and mask costs for different technology nodes [3]	4
Figure 2.2: Unit cost for FPGA vs. ASIC [4]	4
Figure 2.3: Typical development cycle for FPGA and ASIC [5]	6
Figure 2.4: Comparison summary for FPGA vs. ASIC [6]	7
Figure 2.5: Basic architecture of an FPGA [7]	8
Figure 2.6: Basic NoC architecture for a mesh topology [8]	9
Figure 2.7: Relative wire delay in ASIC implementation [9]	10
Figure 2.8: High-level overview of the NoC research exploration [11]	11
Figure 2.9: A sixteen node NoC in a 4x4 Mesh topology [12]	12
Figure 2.10: SOTA router architecture [13]	14
Figure 2.11: FPGA routing and logic power consumption [14]	15
Figure 2.12: PNoC router block diagram [15]	16
Figure 2.13: Configurable Router for Embedded NoC block diagram [16]	18
Figure 2.14: Configurable Router for Embedded NoC FPGA resource utilization breakdown [16]	19
Figure 2.15: Hard and Soft NI Shell [17]	20
Figure 2.16: SOTA architecture [13]	21
Figure 2.17: CONNECT router architecture [18]	22
Figure 2.18: Split-Merge architecture [19]	23
Figure 2.19: Packet Format of CONNECT Network [19]	24
Figure 2.20: Packet Format of Split-Merge Network [19]	24
Figure 2.21: Cycle comparison between CONNECT and Split-Merge on uniform random traffic on an 8x8 mesh with eight flit packets [19]	25
Figure 2.22: FLNR packet format [20]	26
Figure 2.23: FLNR block diagram [20]	26
Figure 2.24: Synthesis results for FLNR [20]	27
Figure 2.25: FLNR performance and area comparison with previous routers [20]	28
Figure 2.26: RRCON router block diagram [24]	29
Figure 2.27: RRCON crossbar architecture [24]	29
Figure 2.28: Frequency vs. buffer depth	31
Figure 2.29: Frequency vs. data width	32
Figure 2.30: Frequency vs. VCs	32
Figure 2.31: LUTs utilization vs. buffer depth	33
Figure 2.32: LUTs utilization vs. data width	33
Figure 2.33: LUTs utilization vs. VCs	34
Figure 2.34: Registers utilization vs. buffer depth	35
Figure 2.35: Registers utilization vs. data width	35
Figure 2.36: Registers utilization vs. VCs	36
Figure 3.1: Metal layers in modern ASIC devices [9]	39
Figure 3.2: 6-port router in network A	40
Figure 3.3: 3-port router in network B	41
Figure 3.4: Router core of a 3-port router	41
Figure 3.5: Codec Simulink model	42
Figure 3.6: Maximum operating frequency comparison between network A and network B with 1CpR	44

Figure 3.7: Maximum operating frequency comparison between different network B configurations	45
Figure 3.8: Logic utilization comparison between network A and network B with 1CpR	46
Figure 3.9: Logic utilization comparison between different network B configurations	47
Figure 3.10: Power consumption comparison between network A and network B with 1CpR.....	48
Figure 3.11: Power consumption comparison between different network B configurations	48
Figure 4.1: 3D-NOCET GUI without modification	53
Figure 4.2: Updated 3D-NOCET	54
Figure 4.3: LUTs utilization for different numbers of Tiers	55
Figure 4.4: Registers utilization for different numbers of Tiers.....	56
Figure 4.5: LUTs utilization for different numbers of Tiles per Tier.....	57
Figure 4.6: Registers utilization for different numbers of Tiles per Tier	57
Figure 4.7: Maximum operating frequency for different numbers of Tiers	58
Figure 4.8: Maximum operating frequency for different numbers of Tiles per Tier	59
Figure 4.9: Power consumption for different numbers of Tiers	60
Figure 4.10: Power consumption for different numbers of Tiles per Tier	61
Figure 4.11: LUTs utilization for Ring.....	62
Figure 4.12: LUTs utilization for RingWithCodec	62
Figure 4.13: Memory utilization for Ring	63
Figure 4.14: Memory utilization for RingWithCodec	63
Figure 4.15: Power consumption for Ring	64
Figure 4.16: Power consumption for RingWithCodec	64

Nomenclature

ASIC	Application Specific Integrated Circuits
BRAM	Block RAM
BSV	Bluespec System Verilog
CLB	Configurable Logic Blocks
DOR	Dimension Ordered Routing
DRAM	Distributed RAM
DSP	Digital Signal Processing
FF	Flip Flop
FPGA	Field Programmable Gate Arrays
IP	Intellectual Property
LUT	Look Up Table
NI	Network Interface
NoC	Network on Chip
NRE	Non Recurring Engineering
PAR	Place and Route
PCF	Physical Constraints File
PDR	Partial Dynamic Reconfiguration
QoS	Quality of Service
RLOC	Relative Location Constraints
SAMQ	Statically Allocated Multi Queue
SoC	Systems on Chip
VC	Virtual Channel

Abstract

Due to the continuous demand for larger and more powerful chips, new blocks are added contentiously to System on Chips (SoCs), such as embedded processors, digital signal processors (DSPs), peripheral interfaces and embedded memory blocks. As the system complexity increases, the negative impact of its routing fabric increases as well. Bus-based and point-to-point interconnects become bottlenecks as they are unable to meet the system requirements. In general, they are not suitable for large systems as their performance degrades when used to connect many blocks. In addition, these interconnects normally include very long wires (global wires) to connect all parts of the chip and these global wires contribute heavily to the increased area and power consumption of the routing fabric.

Field programmable gate arrays (FPGAs) are like SoCs, new blocks and components are continuously added to their architecture in order to meet the increased demand of today's applications. With the increased number of components, the interconnect fabric starts gradually to use Network on Chips (NoCs) to overcome the problems of conventional point-to-point and bus-based interconnects. NoC consists of a network of routers connected with short links, for an FPGA block or tile to connect to another one, it only has to send its data to the nearest router instead of using global wires.

A review for several NoC designs is provided to get an idea about the current research state in this topic. The review is conducted in the context of contributions, architecture, implementation and future work. Then a comparison is held between three NoC routers to analyze the effect of changing the number of Virtual Channels (VCs), flit data width and buffer depth on the consumed area (LUTs and registers) and operating frequency. The comparison shows that the NoC architecture affects the area and maximum operating frequency of the system significantly.

As a result of the mentioned comparison, it is found that one drawback of using NoC is that increasing the router port count affects the area, power and frequency of the system significantly. In order to overcome this problem and to make the NoC approach useful in designing the next generation of FPGAs, a concentrator module or a Codec is proposed to connect between routers and multiple Tiles (FPGA basic building block). Codec reduces the effect of increasing tile count on the area, power and frequency of the routing network.

In order to evaluate the effect of using Codec, a comparison is held between two networks with the same topology and size, one uses routers only and the other uses routers and Codec modules. The comparison is held in the context of area, power and maximum operating frequency. The comparison results show that the area of the Codec network is only 15% compared to the routers only network, its power consumption is 50% less, and operates with 2.5x higher frequency.

Finally, as the three-dimensional integrated circuits technology (3D-IC) is increasingly adopted to cop up with the application demands, the effect of adding Codec to 3D-NoC systems is also investigated.

Chapter 1 : Introduction

1.1. Overview and Motivation

FPGAs (Field Programmable Gate Arrays) are used increasingly in today's applications because of their low development cost, fast design cycle, configurability and short time to market. On the other hand, ASICs (Application Specific Integrated Circuits) have long design cycle, poor configurability and require high development effort. These strong points of the FPGA made it an appropriate candidate for most research and industry applications. However, these advantages come at a significant cost in delay, area and power consumption caused mostly by their programmable routing fabric.

An FPGA mainly consists of three components. Processing elements (PEs), storage elements (SEs) and a complex programmable routing fabric. PEs are programmable logic blocks that perform logic calculations, for example, look-up tables (LUTs) with a fixed configuration of logic gates. SEs are memory blocks placed across the chip area; they are used to store data or algorithm states. The programmable routing fabric is a massive network of wires, multiplexers and bus-based interconnects; all used to connect PEs, SEs and IPs (Intellectual Property cores).

Due to the continuous demand for more powerful and larger chips, new blocks are added to the FPGA architecture, such as Digital Signal Processing (DSP) blocks and embedded processors. As the system complexity increases, the negative impact of the routing fabric increases as well. Bus-based interconnects, such as ARM's AMBA [1] and IBM's CoreConnect [2], become bottlenecks since they are unable to meet the system requirements. In general, they are not suitable for large systems as their performance degrades if used to connect many blocks. In addition, these interconnects include very long wires (global wires) that connect all parts of the chip, these global wires contribute heavily to the increased area and power consumption of the routing fabric.

Network on Chip (NoC) comes as a promising solution for the conventional interconnects problems. NoC has the benefits of independent implementation and optimization of nodes, simplified and customized architecture per application, support for multiple topologies and options, reduced area and power consumption, scalability and increased operating frequency.

Using the NoC approach instead of depending on long interconnect wires solves the conventional interconnect problems because NoC uses high-speed optimized lanes to transfer packets between the routers, and these routers interface with the main application blocks through a configurable number of input/output ports solving most of the problems introduced by long and medium-size routing wires.

Correspondingly, the NoC approach is the right choice as an interconnect fabric for the next generation FPGA. On the other hand, the problems of integrating NoC into the FPGA architecture should be investigated and solved which has been addressed in this research work.