In this assignment, you will finally design a pipelined implementation of a processor to execute your 9-bit ISA. At a minimum, your design will have a program counter (PC) and fetch unit, an ALU, memory, and some internal storage. The ALU, internal storage, and fetch unit should not be significantly changed from the previous labs. The CPU design will execute the programs you wrote (hopefully correctly) for Lab 1.

Some things to keep in mind for this lab:

- Again, the highest level of the design should be schematic. Each of the modules in the top-level schematic can be either implemented in verilog or further schematics. The highest-level schematic should mostly be functional elements (register file, alu, memory, etc.), wires/buses, pipeline latches, etc.
- I want you to have two counters: one that counts dynamic instructions and one that counts dynamic cycles to execute the program. Both start when the first instruction is fetched (ie, at the init signal), and stop counting when the last instruction (halt) completes. The cycle counter is easy. The dynamic instruction counter should count instructions that go through a late pipeline stage, so that it does not count flushed instructions, and it should be able to distinguish between real instructions and bubbles.
- In the questions for the lab report, I am no longer looking for you to convince me that your design is wonderful (unless it is), but rather I am looking at how effectively you critique/understand your own design.
- Remember that it is your responsibility to convince us that your CPU works, not our responsibility to figure that out ourselves. Providing sufficient and clear results and information is crucial.
- There are several opportunities to increase your performance in this lab, but you should probably set priorities. Get things working first, then add features that improve CPI (reduce data hazards and control hazards) after.
- Demonstrating correct pipelined behavior (in a clear manner) of running code is not a trivial thing. Think a bit about the presentation of your timing diagrams.
- Generating a cycle time – This is what we have been calling the “critical path” of your design. You can get it from the Timequest Timing Analyzer’s Slow Model Fmax Report. Include whichever report you use to establish the cycle time in your final report.

**What you turn in:**

- A review of your ISA.
- Schematics or verilog of all circuits you designed (including those presented in labs 2 and 3), hierarchically organized.
- A timing diagram for each program demonstrating correct operation and other important data. It should at a minimum show intermediate results being generated (e.g., intermediate results for the multiply operation, the count in prog 2 incrementing after comparing the 1s/0s, …), the cycle and instruction counters, the PC. It need not show the whole execution of the program, but certainly the beginning and end (with final results going out to memory) and
some execution of the main loop. It, once again, should be heavily annotated so we can figure out what is going on. You should make an effort to highlight interesting pipeline behavior (e.g., data and control hazards).

- The assembly and machine code for your three programs.
- The Place & Route Report or Static Timing Report.
- Answers to the following questions:

1. Have you made any changes to your ISA from lab 1? What were they? Why did you make them?
2. Explain how you deal with all relevant data hazards.
3. Explain how you deal with all relevant branch hazards.
4. What are your dynamic instruction counts for program 1? program 2? program 3?
5. What are your cycle counts for program 1? program 2? program 3?
6. What is your CPI for each program? What did you do to reduce CPI? What’s the biggest remaining CPI limiter? How would you reduce CPI further?
7. What could you have done differently to better optimize for dynamic instruction count?
8. How successful were you at optimizing for ease of pipelined design? Give examples. What could you have done differently?
9. How successful were you at optimizing for low cycle time? What could you have done better?
10. If you were to make a deeper pipeline, what would you change? Would performance be better or worse?
11. How easy/difficult would it be to extend your design to a superscalar implementation? Give examples.
12. What is the cycle time of your machine? Which pipeline stage is the bottleneck of your design? What do you think would be the cycle time if you eliminated that bottleneck (i.e., what is the second longest stage)?
13. What is the total execution time for each of the three programs?
14. Which would be easiest to improve in your design, IC, CPI, or CT? Why?

**The inputs**

You will use the same input for all three programs. The inputs are specified in the files on Piazza.