Don't Forget the Memory: Automatic Block RAM Modelling, Optimization, and Architecture Exploration

S. Yazdanshenas, K. Tatsumura^{*}, and V. Betz University of Toronto, Canada ^{*}Toshiba Corporation, Japan











BRAM growing in importance

- Many applications (search engine, CNNs, ...) BRAM-intensive
- Can't fully utilize FPGA's computation capacity without on-chip memory



BRAM's Evolution

- Memory-richness growth
- Organization changes



The Key Point

- BRAMs can't be neglected!
 - ~25% of area
 - Should respond to application demands
- Need BRAM models
 - How efficient is an architecture?
 - What's the best architecture?



BRAM design is Difficult

- BRAM design is challenging!
 - Analog nature of some components



BRAM design is Difficult

- BRAM design is challenging!
 - Analog nature of some components
 - Variability of memory cells



BRAM design is Difficult

- BRAM design is challenging!
 - Analog nature of some components
 - Variability of memory cells
 - Custom layout style
 - Significant FPGA-specific peripheral circuitry

Hand design of each candidate BRAM infeasible



Use existing tools?

BRAM design is Different

CACTI underestimates area



BRAM design is Different

Also underestimates read energy



BRAM design is Different

Overestimates operating frequency



Emerging Memory Technologies

- Model promising emerging memory technologies
 - Magnetic Tunnel Junction (MTJ)
 - Phase Change Memory (PCM)
 - Resistive RAM (RRAM)
- Ideal: model any technology with SPICE support



BRAM Design Tool

What do we need?



COFFE: Logic & Routing



C. Chiasson et al. "COFFE: Fully-Automated Transistor Sizing for FPGAs," FPT 2013

18

COFFE BRAM Flow



19































34




2-Bank MTJ-Based BRAM



Simulation In Context: SRAM Precharge



Simulation In Context: SRAM Precharge



39

Simulation In Context: SRAM Precharge



40

Variation changes SRAM cell read/write currents significantly

- Variation changes SRAM cell read/write currents significantly
- Using the nominal memory cell will be inaccurate
 - BRAM energy will be underestimated
 - BRAM frequency will be overestimated

- Variation changes SRAM cell read/write currents significantly
- Using the nominal memory cell will be inaccurate
 - BRAM energy will be underestimated
 - BRAM frequency will be overestimated
- Don't have the Spice model for the worst-case cell!

- Variation changes SRAM cell read/write currents significantly
- Using the nominal memory cell will be inaccurate
 - BRAM energy will be underestimated
 - BRAM frequency will be overestimated
- We don't have the Spice model for the worst-case cell!
- Use Monte Carlo simulation to find distribution of cell properties

Monte Carlo Simulation: Worst-case Cell



K. Tatsumura et al."High Density, Low Energy, Magnetic Tunnel Junction Based Block RAMs for Memory-Rich FPGAs," FPT 2016









Validation and Results

Area Validation



51

SRAM-based BRAM Area Breakdown

- SRAM area dominates for large BRAMs
- Smaller BRAMs: other components relevant



Area: MTJ vs. SRAM

- MTJ is more area-efficient
- It gets increasingly more efficient with BRAM size



Frequency validation

- Reasonable alignment with commercial data
- Less guardband
- No aggressive banking



54

Operating Frequency: MTJ vs. SRAM

- SRAM is faster
- The gap narrows with increasing size



Simulation Results: Energy



56

SRAM-based BRAM Narrow Mode

- FPGA RAM configurable
- Often used in narrower modes
- Energy mostly unaffected



Energy Per Bit: MTJ vs. SRAM

- MTJs are more efficient with large BRAM
- MTJ narrow mode more efficient



Worst-Case Cell Modeling Crucial

- Use nominal memory cell?
 - Underestimates area and energy
 - Gets more severe with increasing memory size

BRAM Capacity (Kbit)	Change in Delay	Change in Energy per bit
8	-21%	-9%
16	-19%	-6%
32	-27%	-15%
64	-22%	-9%
128	-30%	-20%
256	-42%	-29%

Architecture Exploration: RAM-Mapping Flow

- BRAM models generated by COFFE can be used in architecture exploration
- Area-oriented RAM mapping
 - 69 industrial circuits
 - Used in development of Stratix V memory architecture
 - We have partial data:
 - Number of logic blocks used
 - Number, Sizes, and types of Logical RAMs
 - Gradually excluding less-memory-rich circuits

SRAM-based BRAM

- 16K always the best
- Stratix V-like



MTJ-based BRAM

- MTJ always saves area
- The best architecture changes
 - 32k or 64k best



- Nine VTR benchmark circuits with memory
- MTJ vs. SRAM
- Architecture Parameters
 - 32kb BRAM, every 8 columns
 - MTJ BRAM is smaller \rightarrow get more 2.3x more RAM blocks per column
 - Ten 6-luts per logic block

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%
								71

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%
Architecture Exploration: VTR

Changes by switching to MTJ-based BRAMs:

Circuit	RAM/LUT Ratio	Block Area	Routing Area	Total Area	Block Delay	Routing Delay	Total Delay	Area-delay Product
mcml	1%	-11%	0	-5%	5%	-19%	-6%	-10%
LU32PEEng	7%	-14%	9%	-2%	9%	-6%	0	-1%
LU8PEEng	6%	-13%	4%	-5%	-4%	9%	3%	-2%
ch_intrinsics	2%	-15%	-2%	-10%	-1%	6%	3%	-7%
mkDelayWorker32B	24%	-32%	-47%	-41%	60%	-40%	3%	-39%
mkPktMerge	198%	-57%	-48%	-53%	141%	-34%	12%	-47%
mkSMAdapter4B	8%	-16%	0	-10%	92%	-32%	9%	-2%
or1200	2%	-5%	-4%	0	1%	-7%	-2%	-3%
raygentop	1%	-3%	2%	-1%	9%	-17%	-4%	-5%
boundtop	1%	-3%	1%	-1%	8%	-5%	0	-2%
Geometric Mean	4%	-19%	-11%	-15%	25%	-16%	2%	-14%

Conclusion

- First transistor sizing tool capable of BRAM modeling
 - SRAM-based
 - MTJ-based
- Simulation results align well with available commercial data
- COFFE now enables BRAM architecture exploration!
 - RAM-Mapping
 - VTR