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This volume contains documents and reference materials that I have compiled regarding the IBM Advanced Computing Systems ACS-1 supercomputer. These are copies of original documents dating back to the ACS project itself. Taken together, they may be sufficient to disclose many of the system architectural innovations of the ACS architecture team.

The front-matter for the archive contains a brief overview of each document, including some details regarding the document's context within the ACS project. Also included is my initial letter to Dr. Mark Smotherman of Clemson University regarding the possibilities of reconstruction of many details of the ACS-1 machine.
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## 1. "Dynamic Instruction Scheduling", February 23, 1966:

L. Conway, B. Randell, D. Rozenberg, D. Senzig

The background on this paper is as follows. Sometime in late '65, I suddenly visualized a solution to the general multi-issuance and conflict-resolution problem. I quickly compiled block diagrams and notes to capture the ideas, and during the next few days I presented these ideas in staff meetings in the architecture group. There was a rapid, very positive reaction. I was tasked to document the ideas in more detail, to incorporate one of the branching schemes then under study, and to turn the scheme into an architectural "proposal".

Since I was quite junior and had little experience with coordinating and writing ACS proposals, I worked with a number of ACS staff members, including Don Rozenberg, Brian Randell, Don Senzig and others to produce the resulting paper. There was a sense that these weren't just ordinary ideas, and we worked hard to frame the concepts in a tutorial form, so that they would be clear to team members. Brian Randell in particular came up with some wonderful articulations about the DIS schemes, in his inimitable British manner. We hoped to be able to publish the ideas openly later on.

But things then moved fast, and within a year the ideas in the paper had became the basis for, and were implemented within, a fully revised ACS-MPM architecture.

Although the original dynamic instruction scheduling ideas were mine alone, the paper was a team effort. As inventor, I was the lead author, and was followed by Brian Randell, Don Rozenberg and Don Senzig. I think Ed Sussenguth and Herb Schorr gave useful feedback too; had the paper gone on to publication they might have been included as co-authors.

The dynamic instruction scheduling paper is labeled "[DRAFT]". I believe that by late February '66, we saw this paper as a work in progress towards formal publication. The ideas were already, in parallel, being evaluated for use in the actual machine. Thus in this draft I think we stepped back from revealing thinking on exactly how the ideas might be applied in the machine, as, for example, by using dual instruction windows.

But by then we also needed a tutorial on the ideas for those outside the architecture group, such as the logic designers, to use as a reference. Thus this "draft" version of 2-23-67 was released within ACS. After that date, no further work was done on the paper. It was completely overtaken by the escalating events surrounding adoption of this scheme for use in the ACS machine. Thus the invention itself then became quite "secret".

Interestingly, the name "dynamic instruction scheduling" never really entered into the team's "lingo". Instead, the relevant structures were usually just called "instruction queues", or "instruction buffers", or "contender stacks" for short, as is seen in all the later documents. It's possible that many ACS vets won't recall the specific title of the paper. Could that perhaps explain why no one from the team has ever come forward and mentioned this work?

On the other hand, it is very likely that copies of this paper surreptitiously passed into circulation outside IBM during the late 60's and early 70 's, providing a path for transfer of this knowledge, and its name, into computer architecture circles outside of IBM.

## 2. "ACS Simulation Technique", Mar. 15, 1966: D. Rozenberg, L. Conway, R. Riekert

This paper documents the methods used to build the ACS MPM register-transfer level simulator. This paper may prove valuable by helping later analysts better understand and interpret the source code and the output results of the "MPM Timing Simulator".

The simulator was built in FORTRAN IV. Thus it is relatively easy to "read the code" that defines the workings of each module and functional unit. The simulation methods were also aimed at being fast enough to support long runs involving many, many variations of the machine architectural parameters.

The simulator was initially used to take quick looks at architectural variants, watch code passing through them, and figure out why things got blocked or didn't work as expected. Later it was used to gather data on the performance of many serious MPM variants running lots of real code, and then to "balance and tune" the emerging ACS-1 machine.

Notice the use of a "memory queue" function as the tutorial example in this paper. I believe that by this time in '66, we were already doing basic simulator implementations and evaluations of various "instruction queuing" structures and controls, as part of our explorations of dynamic instruction scheduling methods. I think we may have just simplified and then "reused" some of that code to create the example in this paper.

Don Rozenberg was lead author, I was second and Bob Riekert was third. Bob had done important work on the simulation methods at Yorktown, but didn't go west with ACS.

## 3. "Dual Arithmetic on ACS-1", May 1, 1967: T. C. Chen

This paper is an internal proposal from Tien Chi (T. C.) Chen to Jack Bertram regarding methods for implementing dual floating point arithmetic in ACS-1. It contains interesting references to dual arithmetic on the ILLIAC IV machine.

I include this paper as a good example of an ACS "proposal", though I do not recall right now the details of how this particular one turned out.

Note that the data-path register-transfer-level details of the arithmetic-functional units were an independent architectural dimension of the project that had to meet logic design/machinecycle constraints on the one hand, and bussing/pipelining/issuance-control/architectural constraints on the other.

Thus only the timings of the ACS-1's arithmetic units, and not those units' internal functional details, were modeled in the timing simulator. (An "unroller" processed assembly code input instructions to produce the input instruction stream to the timing simulator). This was in contrast to the OP fetch, Bussing, OP interlocking and issuance, SKIP, Branch and Exit functioning, etc., which were fully modeled in the timing simulator.

## 4. "Architecturally Critical Paths in the MPM", May 12, 1967: E. Sussenguth

This is an important internal memo from Ed Sussenguth to Herb Schorr that summarizes the results of detailed MPM architectural design studies during the spring of 1967. It pins down the final list of critical paths that must be insured against any performance slippage in any later design iterations.

In each particular case, the critical path functions are identified as needing to be completed within a certain number of machine cycles. Then, for each of these functions, there would have been related critical logic design exposures, wherein specific logic functions had to be completable within a machine cycle .

This memo was the result of an intense period of simulation and tradeoff studies to tune and balance the MPM mechanisms for OP fetching, Bussing, OP interlocking and issuance, SKIP, Branch and EXIT mechanisms, functional unit timings, etc.

Together with the other documents, this paper shows that the near-final form of ACS-1 machine architecture was completed and was being fine-tuned during the spring of '67; thus it supports the inference that generalized dynamic instruction scheduling must have been incorporated into the revised ACS machine architecture sometime in the latter part of '66.

The details in this memo about MPM critical paths should really help during efforts at interpreting other ACS documents, and reconstructing the MPM's architecture.

## 5. "MPM Timing Simulation", August 25, 1967 (ACS AP \#67-115) : L. Conway

This paper is a gold mine of detail on the system architecture of the ACS-1 MPM. It was originally intended as a users' manual that others could reference, in order to submit simulator input and interpret simulator output. I was sole author of this paper.

The simulator was written in FORTRAN IV (H), and ran on an IBM S/360 Mod 75 under OS/360. It operated at a rate of approximately 10 simulated instructions per second; typical programs thus ran at a rate of about 20 instructions per second.

By this date, the simulator was the de facto formal description of the structure and functions of the timing and controls of the ACS-1 MPM. All architecture team members coordinated their work with the making of modifications to the evolving versions of this simulator. Detailed functional modifications were seen to work or not, by whether they functioned as expected during simulation runs.

By the time this document was written, a lot of experience had been gained in the effects on machine performance of variations in machine parameters. In particular, it was clear by then that the 3 out of 8 issuance scheme for A-Ops was near optimal in terms of mean OPs/cycle while meeting the logic-level and machine cycle-time constraints. This paper uses that 3 out of 8 scheme in a very detailed example, including detailed timing diagrams and the corresponding simulator input and output listings.

Therefore, this paper provides a peek inside an ACS-1 MPM actually running code, enabling the reader to see how the OP fetching, Bussing, instruction scheduling, Branch and Exit functions, functional unit timings, etc., all worked together.

The paper defines and elaborates on the mnemonics of all those machine facilities, enabling readers to make detailed interpretations of timing diagrams and simulator output listings. Those mnemonics were used widely within ACS by this date, so these definitions will be helpful in interpreting other ACS documents. This paper includes a list of all instruction mnemonics, but, unfortunately, no detailed descriptions of the instructions themselves.

This manual, together with the detailed "Timing Simulator Notebook" and the "Timing Simulator Source Code Listing", provides sufficient information to possibly enable later analysts to reconstruct a running version of the ACS timing simulator.

This document, with all its details of how the ACS-1 processed instructions, may also have passed into circulation outside of IBM, and thus helped to propagate ACS architectural concepts into the computer architecture community.

## 6. MPM Architecture and Simulator Notebook, August 1967: L. Conway

This notebook contains my working documentation of the ACS-1 machine architecture, and materials regarding translation of that architecture into the MPM Timing Simulator. It contains very detailed information on the ACS-1 as of late August 1967, which was a mature point in the machine's evolution, and the design point for which important benchmarks have been described elsewhere. The notebook consists of about 120 pages of flowcharts, tables and notes, in addition to the ACS AP \#67-115 paper.

Unfortunately, these notes do not contain a description of the OP set itself, as it was documented in a separate memo that, I believe, was entitled "ACS-1 MPM Instruction Manual" (we should really try to find a copy of that one, if one still exists). However, many important details regarding the OP set, including the OP Tags, are included in these notes. A listing of the contents of this notebook is included on the following page.

Listing of contents of the Timing Simulator Notebook (draft listing, as of 1-21-99) :

059 MPM Timing Simulator, ACS AP \#67-115: Timing simulator user's guide as above.
093 A Unit Interlock Simulation: A primer based on the sort of code used in the Timing Simulator. Hardware diagrams, flowcharts and code are condensed from the actual simulator, and give the essentials of A-Interlocks for a simpler "ACS-like" machine. Also constitutes a tutorial on the micro-architecture of the A-Unit Interlocks.

103 Facility Structure:
Some details of the XFAC's, AFAC's, INBUS \#'s, OUTBUS \#'s, delays; M.E.H.'s diagrams coordinated via E.Sussenguth, dates 2-15-67 thru 7-26-67.

111 OP Decode Tags:
Contains tabulation (unary) of all decode tags for the 227 instructions, i.e., the internal claims on facilities, busses, etc., for all OPs, in a 256 by 70 table for the instruction set of April 17, 1967.

143 Various flowcharts and notes:
Definitions of simulator Common Variables; I,J indexing of A-SD's, X-SD's.
More on the decode tags, format of XBUFF and ABUFF.
Bussing of OPs to A and X Buffers.
Format of Execution Simulator output cards; Example of Output.
152 Various architectural and simulator details:
Block diagram of machine's major dynamic instruction modules.
Flow charts for key functional module routines.
"Event running times within the cycle", in 0.1 's of a machine cycle.
Stack to Register timing: key difference between A and X stack algorithms, bussing and facilities.
"Full Bypassing" timing; "No Bypassing" timing.
Common Vars, "Revised 18 May 1967", Common Vars, "Before Revision".
168 Memory timing details:
Memo to file by G. T. Paul re "MPM-BLCU Interface for Store OPS", 5-24-67, with diagrams by M.E.H., G. P., 5-17-67, revised 6-7-67.
Memory Timing Diagram; Routines re memory instructions.
Instruction fetching overview.
Handling the Back-Up Registers - overview.
M. Homan's notes re Back-Up Logic, as of about a year earlier: 7-25-66.

189 Skips, Branches and Exits:
SKIP instruction overview; Execution of EXIT instruction -overview.
BRANCH and EXIT Handling, complete details of, in a coordinated, hand-written "memo" of 3-27-67 by B. O. B. (?), along with similar memo re "old branch info" by B. O. B. dated 3-17-67, followed by detailed timing diagrams.

## 7. Timing Simulator Source Code Listings, August 1967: L. Conway

This notebook contains a set of listings of the source code for the near-final version of the ACS machine's register-transfer level timing simulator. There are about 5000 lines of FORTRAN IV (H) source code in these 100 or so pages of listings. This is probably the version of the code used to generate the examples in the ACS AP \#67-115 paper.

By mid-67, the timing simulator was the de facto formal description of the overall teamcoordinated details of the evolving ACS-1 architecture. Therefore, these listings, when taken together with the Timing Simulator Manual and the additional diagrams, flowcharts and other details in the Timing Simulator Notebook, provide a very detailed account of the ACS-1 system architecture.

## 8. "ACS Logic Design Conventions: A Guide for the Novice", Nov. 29, 67: L. Conway

On joining ACS, I found that there was no single convenient source for this information. Some of the information was not documented in any available references. Since most of the logic designers used different notations and conventions, it proved to be a time consuming and confusing process to learn the precise details of this very simple, basic material. Many of the designers related to me that they had had similar initial experiences.

At the time I made some notes for my own personal use, and later formed these notes into this memorandum in the hope that it might prove useful to newcomers to ACS. This memo may prove useful in ACS retrospectives and reconstructions by enabling more precise analysis of original ACS DRKS design records.

## 9. "A Proposed ACS Logic Simulation System", Oct. 31, 1967: L. Conway

This memo proposes an LSS to provide a means for debugging the logic design of the ACS machine. Included is a means to extract design partitions from DRKS files and run simulations on the partitions based on interface signals extracted from the equivalent partition of the system-level (MPM timing) simulator. Considerable detail in the form of block diagrams, flow-charts and calculations are included to clarify interfaces and interaction in the overall system. One requirement for such a system to work would be formal acceptance of the system-level simulator as the formal description of machine structure and functions, and forcing of logic design partitions to implement the functions of the equivalent system-level partitions. This seemed feasible at the time, since the MPM Timing Simulator had already become the de-facto formal description of the machine. This memo may provide useful insights into various practical aspects of ACS logic design and engineering at the time.

## 10. "The Computer Design Process: A Proposed Plan for ACS", Aug 6, 68: L. Conway

This memo builds on item 9, and proposes a detailed design for the overall ACS machine design process, including system architecture, logic design and engineering, physical specification and process automation, and maintenance. The thesis is that proper design of the design process is as important as proper design of the machine itself. It exploits the System-level Simulator as the overall machine specification, and discusses the overall integration and protocols for use of that simulator with the LSS, DRKS, Physical Specification and Process Automation tools. It addresses many concerns, such as the fact that design phases do not follow serially but overlap in time, that some partitions may be far along in specification while others may be quite tentative, and that later design phases constantly feedback feasibility or cost issues to earlier (higher-level) phases. This proposal was fairly widely circulated and had gained considerable support just before the project was cancelled. This memo provides useful insights into practical aspects of ACS system architecture, logic design, engineering, physical specification and process automation at the time. [Also, taken together with the other materials, all this work substantially informed my later explorations at Xerox PARC on VLSI design and implementation methodologies].

Dr. Mark Smotherman

Department of Computer Science
Box 341906
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-1906

Dear Dr. Smotherman:
When I came upon your web site identifying the IBM-ACS machine as "the First Superscalar" computer, many past events came rushing back into my mind. I had been at ACS, first at Yorktown Heights, then in Sunnyvale and then up on Sand Hill Road, during the period when the exciting architectural work was being done there.

There were publications and talks, by Herb Schorr in the early 70's and later by John Cocke and others, that hinted at the scope of the ACS innovations. But these early retrospectives lacked detail about the system's architecture and lacked a context in which to embed the ideas so as to fully convey their significance. Many computer architects sensed that amazing things had happened at ACS, but few could be sure quite what, or why it even mattered.

As modern VLSI superscalars emerged into widespread application, and details of their architectures were described, I became aware that important early ACS innovations had transferred directly into those machines. Even the early ACS name for one of those innovations, dynamic instruction scheduling, is now used by superscalar architects, and is described as such in modern computer architecture textbooks.

More than thirty years after the original work, modern superscalars now at last provide a context for understanding and appreciating the value of the early ACS innovations. For some time now, I've hoped that someone from the ACS team might step forward and point towards the sources of those concepts. However, no one has come forward.

When I read the ACS retrospective on your web site, I began thinking about why such claims haven't been made before. The sudden elimination of the project, followed by exits and transfers of the architecture team members, must have meant that few, if any, original ACS documents were saved by anyone. Thus the machine seemed to have just "vanished", and there was little material evidence on which to base any retrospectives.

It vanished almost everywhere, that is, except in a notebook, documents and computer listings that I compiled and kept stored away all these years.

Hopefully, the materials that I have saved can be used to reconstruct many details of ACS machine architecture, and more fully document the accomplishments of the ACS team. I'm interested in helping with such an effort, and in helping contact other ACS alums who might have original artifacts and personal knowledge of events there.

The years I spent at IBM-ACS were among the most intellectually exciting of my life. It was an incredible opportunity for me to be able to work with John Cocke, Herb Schorr, Fran Allen, Ed Sussenguth, Don Rozenberg and all the others upon just finishing my graduate work at Columbia. Reflections on my experiences at ACS, and the documents relating to my work there, may help you and others reconstruct the overall story.

When I joined ACS, the team was based at IBM Research in Yorktown Heights N.Y., and the effort went by the code name "Project Y". I joined in a support role to build the register-transfer timing simulator for the emerging supercomputer. In that role, I had ongoing access to almost all the team's architectural discussions and debates.

During the early phases of the project, I became fascinated with John Cocke's "open questions" about computer architecture. By an amazing stroke of luck, I hit upon a pretty good general solution to one of those questions, namely the problem of multiple issuance. The team was very democratic and open to suggestions and proposals from any member, at any level. They listened to my ideas, and then acted on them.

We initially called the resulting invention "dynamic instruction scheduling". It went on to play an important role in the overall system architecture of the ACS main processing module (MPM). Fortunately, among my documents are those describing this invention, and showing how it was exploited in the ACS-MPM. These documents are identified in an annotated list attached to this letter.

Included in the attached list are my reference notebook, the source code and a detailed user's manual for the MPM timing simulator. During 1967, the timing simulator became the de facto formal description of much of the machine's architecture. Therefore, these materials can be used to reconstruct many details of ACS machine architecture. It's even conceivable that a running timing simulator could be reconstructed someday, based on these materials.

Given the significance and impact of superscalar computers, I really do feel the need to set the story straight, namely that the ACS machine, a long forgotten "orphan", was never really dead. ACS lives on after all, as the original source of many fundamental innovations that have since passed on into modern machines.

I commend you on your efforts to reconstruct events at ACS and to document details of ACS machine architecture. The independent, detailed context that you have already established, together with my materials, should at least confirm the origins of generalized dynamic instruction scheduling. That invention is one of the coolest ideas I've hit upon. It would mean a very great deal to me for its origins in my ACS work to be acknowledged.

I'm not sure how to best proceed from here, but I do suggest that initially we try to acquire more materials, contact more ACS alums, work on a project timeline, etc., before releasing further preliminary conclusions. Also, by putting more ACS materials on a web site, we could perhaps clarify that a lot of materials do still exist, and thereby interest others in participating in reconstruction efforts.

Many of the events surrounding ACS were shaped by internal IBM politics that I and most of my colleagues were unaware of at the time. The sudden demise of the project completely stunned us. I never understood why the decision had been made that ACS must be 360 compatible. However, it was clear right away that the 360 decision meant that the ACS architectural innovations were going to be shelved.

You can imagine what the project's demise meant to those who had done the creative work there. Sure, John Cocke went on to become famous among the cognoscenti in computing. Indeed, four members of the early ACS architecture team, including John Cocke, Fran Allen, Ed Sussenguth and myself, were later elected to the National Academy of Engineering for a variety of other contributions. But imagine how much it would have meant to John and the rest of us if the ACS designs at least had been saved, and approved for later publication. Instead, almost all that wonderful work was discarded, as if it had never existed.

Since I'm not sure what sensitivities remain regarding theories about the project's cancellation, I'd like to proceed carefully when gathering information on the overall story. It is certainly important to try to contact ACS team members named in the various documents in advance of any public uses of those documents. Efforts should also be made to involve as many ACS alums as possible, so that a wider set of perspectives can be gained and a more thorough history compiled.

I really enjoyed talking with you recently about ACS. I look forward to interacting with you further on this interesting project.

Sincerely,


Lynn Conway
Professor of EECS, Emerita
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

Attachment: Annotated list of reference materials regarding the ACS-1 machine
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DYNAMIC INSTRUCTION SCHEDULING

## INTRODUCTION

- The order in which the instructions comprising a program are to be excecuted is normally assumed to be given by the order in which the instructions are held in program storage and by the sequencing control indicated by transfer and conditional transfer instructions. However a programmer, or compiler, can produce many different but equivalent vers'ions of a program merely by making minor alterations to the sequence in which instructions are placed. Normally the actual choice among these alternative sequences will be somewhat arbitrary, though careful. programing or compilation often involves an attempt to design a program whose detailed sequences are tailored to make best use of a computer's control and functional capabilities. This can be partictularly worthwhile for computers whose internal organization has been designed to attempt to overlap the use of its various functional capabilities.

Take, for example, a computer which initiates execution of instructions in strict sequence, without necessarily awaiting the completion of one instruction before execution of the next instruction, provided that the operands of the second instruction are ready, and the necessary busses and functional units are available. On such a computer the sequence (written here for convenience in a 3-address format)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{1}+R_{2} \rightarrow R_{3} \\
& R_{1} x^{\prime} R_{4} \rightarrow R_{5} \\
& R_{6}+R_{2} \rightarrow R_{7}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\ldots \quad R_{3} \times R_{6} \rightarrow R_{8}
$$

might weli be preferable to

$$
\begin{aligned}
& R_{1}+R_{2} \rightarrow R_{3} \\
& R_{6}+R_{2} \rightarrow R_{7} \\
& R_{1} \times R_{4} \rightarrow R_{5} \\
& R_{3} \times R_{6} \rightarrow R_{8}
\end{aligned}
$$

if the adder and multiplier were independent functional units.

Thus if really effective use is to be made of the internal capabilities of such a computer, careful attention must be paid to the detailed sequencing of instructions in frequently executed portions of a program. This 'scheduling' can be done by an ambitious optimizing compiler, or an extremely conscientious hand-coder. There is often, however, a difficulty in achieving really optimum sequencing by such means--that of the effects of memory interference, which if present will cause variations in the times which operands take to reach the arithmetic and control unit from storage. The effects of such memory interference will not usually be calculable in advance of program execution, particularly if the interference is caused by autonomous $1 / 0$ units using the memory. Thus there is often cause to consider the possibility of supplementing (or even replacing) the static scheduling performed by coder or compiler by dynamic scheduling performed by the computer as it executes a program. In this paper we describe a technique of dynamic scheduling permitting non-sequential instruction execution. Furthermore, the technique presented is shown to be capable of controlling the simultaneous execution of two or more instructions at a time on machines with sufficiently generous bussing and functional capabilities. In any actual computer design care would of course have to be taken to ensure that any possible gains achieved by such dynamic scheduling were not offset by the cost (both in speed and in circuits) of the extra hardware necessary to perform the scheduling.

The scheme presented uses a very general, but conceptually simple, method of controlling non-sequential instruction execution, and of identifying groups of instructions which are mutually independent and can be executed simultaneously. Brief descriptions of earlier schemes for achieving some of these aims have been given by Amdahl [1], Chen [2], and Thornton: [3].

In this section we restrict our attention to the sequencing of straight line coding comprised of instructions, the locations - of whose operands and results can be determined directly from the instructions themselves, rather than needing any address computation to be performed.

The sequence in which a series of instructions have been written implies the total effect that these instructions are intended to have when executed. Each separate instruction contributes to this total effect by performing its operations on the contents of certain registers (accumulators, index registers, indicators, etc.) and setting its results into other registers. A dynamic scheduling technique has to insure that any instructions obeyed out of sequence do not change the contents of any registers which are to be used by any instructions whose execution has been delayed temporarily.

A simple set of rules for determining if a given instruction can be obeyed out of sequence is as follows:
(i) The required busses and functional units are available.
(ii) The instruction must not use any registers which are used as result registers by instructions whose execution has been initiated but not yet completed.
(iii) The instruction must not use as result registers any registers which are used as operand registers by any preceding instructions. which have not yet been initiated.
(iv) The instruction must not use any registers (either as result or operand registers) which are used as result registers by any preceding instructions which have not yet been initiated.

Thése checks can be made in a systematic fashion using what are here called 'sequencing matrices'. Two matrices are used, namely a 'source matrix' (S) and a 'destination matrix' (D). At each cycle, when the machine is attempting to choose an instruction to be executed, rows in these matrices are set up corresponding to each of the instructions which are being considered by the scheduling machanism. (The cycle referred to above is a clock cycle, which corresponds to the maximum rate at which instructions can be initiated, and will presumably be much shorter than a storage cycle.) The elements in each row of the matrices indicate whether a given register is being used, or will be affected, by the corresponding instruction.

The element $S_{i, j}$ is set to one if the $i^{\text {th }}$ instruction uses the contents of register $j$ as an operand. The element $D_{i, j}$ is set to one if: execution of the $i^{\text {th }}$ instruction will cause the contents of register $j$ to be replaced.

Take, for example, a very simple machine with eight registers and $a^{-3}$-address format, using a scheduling mechanism that processes four instructions per cycle. A typical situation would be:

Instruction
Source Matrix
Destination Matrix


Fig. 1
Thus each row has been set up by processing the register address.fields of the corresponding instructions, and converting these addresses into unary form. However in more realistic machines the setting up of the matrix elements would not be so straightforward. Almost certainly it would involve decoding the operation code part of the instruction to determine what implied registers are used by an instruction in addition to those indicated by address fields.

In addition to the matrices, which provide a conveniently coded form of indicating the register requirements of instructions awaiting execution, a 'busy vector' (B) is used to indicate the current status of the machine registers. The length of the vector is equal to the number of registers. The element $B_{j}$ is set to one when execution of an instruction which will cause the contents of register $j$ to be replaced is initiated; it is reset to zero when the replacement has been completed.

Once the sequencing matrices and the busy vector have been set up as described, the basic algorithm for choosing an instruction to be executed can be described as follows. Starting with the top row of the matrices, each instruction is checked--instruction $i$ can be executed if:
(i) The required busses and functional units are available.
(ii) The elements of $B$ corresponding to the non-zero elements of the $i^{\text {th }}$ rows of $S$ and $D$ are zero.
(iii) The elements above row $i$ of the columns of $D$ corresponding to the non-zero elements of row $i$ of $S$ contain only zeroes.
(iv) The elements above row $i$ of the columns of $S$ and $D$ corresponding to non-zero elements of row $i$ of $D$ contain only zeroes.

Returning to the previous example, with the busy vector set up to indicate that certain registers, 3 and 6 for instance, are still to have their contents replaced, by the action of previously initiated instructions

Instruction Source Matrix Destination Matrix Busy Vectior


Fig. 2
Instruction 1 cannot be executed because of rule (ii)
Instruction 2 cannot be executed because of rules (iii) and

However instruction 3 can be executed, provided that the necessary bussing and functional capabilities are available.

Each cycle; while the scheduling mechanism is attempting to choose an instruction to initiate, a-decoding mechanism could be processing a further instruction, taken from the address in the instrūcEion store given by an instruction counter. In contrast to a conventional instruction counter, this counter does not indicate which instruction is currently being executed, but rather which instruction is next in line for processing by the scheduling mechanism. With non-șequential instruction sequencing it is not possible to have a conventional instruction counter. This can in certain circumstances be a disadvantage of the system, and is discussed further below.

At the end of a cycle, if an instruction has been chosen (it is of course possible that none of the instructions can be initiated until some of the non-zero elements of the busy vector become zero), the rows corresponding to the instruction are removed from the matrices. The remaining rows are then pushed upwards.
to fill in any gap, the bottom row of the matrix is. replenished using the instruction which has just been decoded, and the instruc-- tion counter is incremented. All is then ready for the scheduling mechanism to again scan the matrices in an attempt to choose another instruction to initiate.

In the above example, the situation at the start of the next cycle might be (assuming that registers 3 and 6 have still not had their contents replaced) as shown in Fig. 3. During this cycle the Divide instruction will be chosen for execution.
Instruction Source Matrix Destination Matrix Busy Vector


Fig. 3
In the above general description of the proposed technique for non-sequential instruction execution the discussion has been limited to the scheduling of straight-line coding composed of instructions whose register requirements can be determined immedi-. ately from inspection of the instructions. The next two sections of this paper deal with the effect of unconditional and conditional branch instructions, and with a technique for scheduling instructions which refer to indexed addresses in storage.
-.-.-There is one kind of branch instruction, namely the unconditional branch to an explicit instruction address, which can be handled very simply, without recourse to the sequencing matrices. The instruction is executed as soon as it has been decoded, causing the appropriate modification to the instruction counter which indicates the location from which the sequencing matrices are to replenished.

The other types of branch instructions, where the branch address and/or the question of whether the branch is to be taken cannot be determined directly from the instruction, but rather depend on the contents of one or more registers, cause rows to be entered into the sequencing matrices in, the usual way. However refilling of the matrices then stops until the branch instruction has been executed and any necessary modification has been made to the instruction counter. Thus once such a branch instruction has entered into the matrices, the matrices will gradually empty until the execution of the branch instruction permits refilling to begin. This means that every effort should be made to initiate execution of the branch instruction as soon as possible, and that once the branch instruction has been executed, empty rows of the matrix should be replenished as quickly as possible. Otherwise, the matrices will spend much of their time only partly full, and the chances of finding an executable instruction each cycle will be considerably reduced.

Since a scan of the matrices enables all the executable instructions to be identified, what is required is to ensure that a branch instruction is given priority over any other executable instructions. The simplest way of doing this, since there can never be any instructions in the matrices below a branch instruction, is to always choose the lowest executable instruction, whether or not this is a branch instruction. However it could be argued that this is taking unnecessary liberties with the sequencing of a program, which will cause undue complications in program debugging. The alternative is to arrange some system whereby if there is an executable branch instruction it is initiated, but that otherwise the highest executable instruction is chosen.

The second requirement, that of speedy replenishment of the matrices once a branch instruction has been executed, required decoding facilities operating in parallel on several instructions. The alternative of relying solely on the normal decoding and replenishment mechansim, which fills only one row each cycle, is unlikely to be adequate.

An 'Execute' instruction, which can be regarded as a temporary branch for the duration of a single instruction, involves only slight extensions to the above system. Filling of the matrices is
$\because$ halted once an Execute instruction has been reached, until it can be obeyed and the instruction which it specifies can be fetched
and placed in the matrices. Unless this is another Execute instruct tion, or a branch instruction, filling of the matrices can then be - resumed, starting with the instruction following the original Execute instruction.
the sequencing of storage accesses

Another area where dynamic scheduling can be of value is the sequencing of accesses interleaved storage. Such storage is characterised by the fact that access to one of the autonomous memory

- units, or of which the storage is comprised does not have to await the completion of previous accesses to other boxes. Rather, storage accesses can be made at the rate at which they can be accepted by the bussing system, provided that repeated accesses to the same box are sufficiently separated. Thus the problem of sequencing storage accesses can be regarded as having similarities to that of sequencing instructions, with boxes taking the place of registers, and 'bus slots' the place of clock cycles.

The particular box involved in a storage access is determined from the effective address of the location to which access is being made (typically a group of the least significant digits of the address is used). Such an address will normally be the result of a calculation involving the contents of one or more registers. Thus the box used by a storage access requested by a register load or store instruction cannot be determining directly by examination of the instruction, it being necessary to wait until the effective address can be calculated.

Though one can conceive of a single scheduler being used for sequencing both instructions and storage accesses, it seems more ! reasonable to have a second scheduler just for sequencing storage accesses, operating in conjunction with the instruction scheduler. The storage access scheduler could operate according to the same general principles as the instruction scheduler, using source and destination matrices $\left(S_{A}\right.$ and $D_{A}$, say), and a busy vector ( $B_{A}$ ), whose respective columns and elements correspond to the various boxes. It would receive requests for storage accesses both from the instruction scheduler, on behalf of load and store instructions, and from the instruction fetch mechanism which is used to replenish the instruction scheduler.

The instruction scheduler described above is designed on the assumption that once an instruction is removed from the matrices and issued, it no longer has any demands on the registers that it uses for its operands. Therefore, a set of buffer registers are included in the storage access scheduling mechanism to hold the contents of registers which are to be stored, until the required storage access can be initiated.

Certain constraints must be placed on the order in which storage access requests can be issued to the storage access scheduler from the instruction scheduler. For example, a store request must not be issued to the storage access scheduler before any preceding load request. Only when the boxes involved in these requests have been determined will it be possible for the storage access scheduler to
perhaps make such modifications to the sequencing of storage access requests. In fact what is necessary is for the instruction scheduler to treat the store as a single extra register. Therefore an additional column is added to the $S$ and $D$ matrices, and an element is added to the busy vector. However this extra busy vector element is not set to one unless the storage access scheduler is unable to accept any further storage access requests. All load instructions have the extra element in their row of the $S$ matrix set to one; all store instructions have the extra element in their row of the $D$ matrix set to one. The normal sequencing rules will then apply the necessary constraints to the issuing of access requests.

Figure 4 demonstrates the setting of the matrices and busy vectors of the two schedulers on a machine with 4 registers and 4 storage boxes. The instruction scheduler processes six instructions per cycle; the storage access scheduler processes four access requests per bus slot. Instructions are either 3-address format, or specify single-indexed loads and stores. The vector $B$ indicates that registers $R_{1}$ and $R_{3}$ are still involved with previously
initiated instructions, and that the storage access scheduler has capacity for further storage access requests. The storage access scheduler contains only three access requests-a load of register $R_{3}$ from address 53 in box 1 , and a store of the literal 91 (the contents of some register) in address 29 of box 2 , and a load of register $R_{1}$ from address 25 of box 3. The vector $B_{A}$ indicates that box 1 is still involved in some earlier access request.

When the instruction scheduler initiates execution of a load or store instruction the rows corresponding to the instruction are removed from the $S$ and $D$ matrices, and the $B$ vector (except for the last element, corresponding to the store) is updated in the usual way. The effective address is calculated, and it and the address of the register to be loaded or stored are transmitted to the storage access scheduler (together with the contents of the register, in the case of a store instruction). This storage access request causes the highest unoccupied row of the matrices $S_{A}$ and $D_{A}$ to be set up so as to indicate the box requirements of the request.

INSTRUCTION SCHEDULER

1. $R_{1}+R_{2} \rightarrow R_{3}$

- 2. $S\left[R_{1}+2\right] \rightarrow R_{3}$

3. $\bar{S}\left[\bar{R}_{2}-1\right] \rightarrow R_{4}$
4. $R_{2} \rightarrow S\left[R_{1}+1\right]$
5. $R_{1} \times R_{3} \rightarrow R_{1}$
6. $R_{4}-R_{1} \rightarrow R_{2}$


STORAGE ACCESS SCHEDULER


Fig: 4 Example of a 4 Register, 4 Storage Box Machine

The matrices $S_{A}$ and $D_{A}$ are scanned each bus slot time, in order to choose an access request which can be issued ahead of any preceding requests which are held up, and which does not involve a box indicated by the vector $B_{A}$ as being still involved with a previous access.' The

- corresponding to this request are removed from the matrices, the rows are pushed up to fill in the gap, and the busy vector updated. When a storage access to a box has been completed the corresponding element of $B_{A}$ is made zero once again. If this access was on behalf of a load instruction, the appropriate element of $B$ is made zero when loading of the register has been completed.

Returning to the example demonstrated in Fig. 4, the situation after one machine cycle and bus slot time is shown in Fig. 5. The third instruction, a load instruction, has been chosen for execution, the effective address specified by it has been calculated to be location 57 of box 4, and it has been issued as an access request to the storage access scheduler. Meanwhile the second storage access request has been issued, the preceding request being still blocked because the required box is still involved in an earlier access.

## INSTRUCTION SCHEDULER



| $B$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | $S$ |
| 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  |

STORAGE ACCESS SCHEDULER

1. $1: 53 \quad \mathrm{R}_{3}$
2. 3:25 $R_{1}$
3. $4: 57 \quad \mathrm{R}_{4}$
4. 



Fig. 5. The Example of Fig. 4 One Cycle and One Bus Slot Later

There are many possible variations on this scheme for sequencing storage accesses. For instance, one can dispense with extra buffer registers and continue to hold quantities in the working registers until the appropriate memory unit can be accessed. What is required to avoid unessential slowing down of the instruction scheduler is that the registers used in the calculation of the effective address be rełeased before the instruction is necessarily removed from the matrix. This introduces a new complexity. Previously an instruction was not modified in the matrices, except for its possible bubbling towards the top, until its complete removal from the matrices.

The bits in the source matrix corresponding to those components of the effective address calculation would beset to zero as soon as they are used. This at least releases those registers for use in further calculations. One might further refine interlocking on register usage so that effective address calculations were performed before the contents of the register to be loaded or stored
were available.

Indirect addressing can be handled in much the same way as branch and execute instructions. If the various levels of indirect addressing use new indexing registers, at each step then no instruction can be permitted to be executed which may result in any register modification. Unless memory read buffers are present this effectively means that indirect addressing will stop instruction initiation though matrix replenishment can proceed. If indirect addressing does not require new indexing registers but simply generates new memory store access requests then only succeeding store instructions must be inhibited until the indirect addressing chain is terminated.

The instruction scheduling method described above uses the sequencing matrices in order to detect which instructions can be obeyed out of sequence. As a byproduct it automatically detects which-instructions can be initiated simultaneously, at least in so far as register usage is concerned. Thus, given sufficient functional capabilities and sufficient busses between registers and functional units, the scheduling scheme can be used to control the simultaneous initiation of instruction execution. The matrix scanning algorithm would remain unchanged, though from a hardware point of view if not conceptually the procedure for compressing the remaining rows in the màtrices upwards to fill in any gaps becomes more complex.

We assume that the machine has number of independent functional units in addition to the memory and branch control units. Typical additional independent specialized functional units are floating point add/subtract, multiply, and divide units. We make the further assumptions that each functional unit has a buss connecting with the registers and that there is only one functional unit of each type. The complexities that arise when these assumptions are removed will be discussed below.

The requirements for simultaneous initiation of instruction execution is the addition of a bit to the busy vector for each functional unit that cannot accept operands every cycle and a column appended to the destination matrix for every functional unit.

The busy vector bit corresponding to the functional unit is turned on by the initiation of execution of an instruction in the $c$ corresponding funtional unit. The busy vector bit is turned off when the functional unit is able to accept a new operand pair.

Rule (i) of the sequencing algorithm given informally above can here be stated as: the elements of $B$ representing the functional units_must have zeros corresponding to non-zero elements in the $i^{\text {th }}$ row of $D$. The elements above row $i$ of the columns of $D$ corresponding to the non-zero elements of $D$ contain only zeros.

The operation code portion of the instruction is decoded to the extent that it is known which functional unit is going to execute the instruction. This information sets a one in the bit position whose row index corresponds to the instruction and whose column index corresponds to the functional unit.

Going back to the example used in Fig. 2 and assumming that the functional units are an add/subtractor that can accept a new pair of operands every cycle, a multiplier and a divider that cannot accept a new pair of operands every cycle; and a branch controller. we have the situation shown in Fig. 5 .

As in Fig. 2, Instruction 1 cannot be executed because of rule (ii). Instruction 2 cannot be executed because of rules (iii) and (iv). In addition Instruction 2 cannot be executed because of rule (i), i.e., because the multiplier is busy. The execution of Instructions 3 and 4 can be initiated--they violate none of the rules on register usage and the appropriate functional units are free.
---
As is done in the sequential case, at the end of the cycle, instructions that have been chosen for execution are removed from the matrix. The remaining rows are pushed up to fill in the gaps, and new instructions are inserted at the bottom of the matrix to replace those which have been initiated, and the instruction counter is incremented.

In the above example (Fig. 5) the situation during the next cycle might be as shown in Fig. 6. The instructions 1 and 2 are inhibited by the same reasons as before. Since the Busy vector bit corresponding to the Branch unit is zero (indicating no Branch instructions in the matrix) new instructions can be entered. The new instruction $3\left(R_{6}-R_{3} \rightarrow R_{3}\right)$ is inhibited by rules (ii) and (iv).

The new fourth instruction specifies a branch to the memory locations specified by the contents of register $R_{1}$ plus 71 if register $R_{2}$ contains a zero. Since all of the registers used by this instruction are free this instruction can be initiated. Since we still can have but one branch instruction in the matrix at a time no Branch column on the Destination matrix is needed though the equivalent may be needed by the replenishing mechanism. The Branch bit on the Busy Vector is needed to inhibit the matrix replenishing hardware.

In the case of the sequential control the point was made that. preference should be given to branch instructions. Here, because one can say that each functional unit is looking for work, no special priority need be given to a branch instruction.


BUSY VECTOR BRANCH

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | $x$ | $\div$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |

Fig. 5. Example of Multiple Instructions per Cycle Initiation-Cycle 1..


Fig. 6. Example of Multiple Instructions per Cycle Initiation-Cycle 2.

If more than one functional unit of a given type exists but each . has its own busses then it is necessary to add a bit to the busy vector corresponding to the new functional unit. No additional columns are added to the Destination Matrix.
-
In the discussions above it has been tacitly assumed that the functional units were completely passive since the scheduler dispenses operands to the functional units for execution. If instead one takes the approach that the functional units are active, and that the sequencing matrixes are used by the functional units to provide the necessary interlock information then the handling of multiple functional units of a given type is perhaps easier to envision. The functional unit then executes the uppermost instruction that has a one in the column of the Destination Matrix corresponding to the functional unit and has its registers free. With multiple functional units the individual functional units must in addition check the status of all life functional units.

If the number of instructions that can be initiated per cycle is restricted by the number of busses, i.e.. one has fewer busses than functional units or rows in the sequencing matrices, one can then take the approach that each instruction uses a functional unit called buss in addition to the functional unit explicitly requested by the instruction.

In this paper we have described a dynamic scheduling mechanism for providing a look-ahead capabi.lity which enables the execution - of instructions to be initiated out-of-sequence. In addition the mechanism is capable of controlling the simyltaneous initiation of two ór-more instructions.

The generality of register and functional unit interlocking provided by the mechanism may well be in excess of what is necessary for a given computer design. The modifications to suit any particular design will usually be reasonably obvious and are beyond the scope of this paper.
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## INTRODUCTION

A brief description of computer simulation of physical systems in general and the features of current simulation languages is given.

A technique is then described for simulation using FORTRAN IV, which maintains the essential features of current simulation languages with a great improvement in run times and core requirements.

This technique may be useful in the production of very large simulation programs where run times and core requirements are such that programming in existing simulation languages may not be feasible. $\because$

## SYSTEM SIMULATION

Assume that it is of interest to study the behavior of complex systems or automata. If the level of complexity is such that the number of states of the system and the possible sequences of states is very large, then a logical approach to such a study is to simulate the system using a digital computer.

Physical systems are usually described in terms of laws or logical rules relating causes and effects; i.e., a given state together with inputs to the system causes or determines the state (or the probability of selecting the state) at some future time. The "behavior" of the system is thus the sequence of states of the system during the passage of time, in response to a specific input sequence.

A computer simulation thus consists of identifying variables which determine the states of a system and the rules for future state selection (the cause and effect relation) and implementing this model with a computer program. Thus it is possible to artificially experiment with the system, and to study the sequence of states for chosen sequences of inputs; with time as an independent variable of the simulation.

In simulating a system it is necessary to perform a computation only at those times when a state or an input has changed since it is only at such times that a future change of state. can be caused. It is therefore not necessary to examine the system at regular clocked intervals. Indeed, this may be vastly more efficient, than examining a system at clocked intervals of simulated time if the time interval between changes of state varies over a wide range of values.

Thus it is found that digital simulation languages may provide the programmer with utility routines for (1) providing a means of causing at future times those effects determined by past and present system states and inputs, and (11) advancing time, as an independent variable of the simulation, to the next scheduled effect (change of state) or to the next change of the input sequence, and (lli) passing control to that subroutine which simulates the effect and which itself may cause future effects. Perhaps the best known simulation languages of this type are SIMSCRIPT and GPSS . These languages have in addition to the above features a number of utilities which (1) ease the specification of variables and events, (2) ease the writing of the simulation model description, and (3) simplify the production qf output routines.

For many purposes these additional utilities are not essential. Indeed, they may cost a high overhead in terms of core space and running time.

GPSS has eased the writing of the simulation to the point where one often cannot specify sufficiently complex tests for branching. Thus, if does not document well a complex description. SIMSCRIPT is sufficiently general but a high cost is extracted in storage and running time because it attempts to simplify the handing of variables.

So, to have a powerful simulation language or technique without all the unnecessary utility features of existing languages, it was decided to write utility routines to perform the basic simulation requirements. A decision had to be made on the language in which to write the simulator utilities routines and also the simulated system description.

If it is important to use the program listings as documentation of the model, a high level language may be necessary. Otherwise, an assembly language might give slight time and storage advantages. In either case, it is desirable to use a common language which runs under a reasonably powerful operating system.

Since in most detailed simulations, the exact model description and documentation can only reside in the simulation program listings, a high level language was chosen as the basic language.

Thus, the utility routines described in the following sections and the model descriptions are all written in FORTRAN IV which is a common high level language running under IBSYS. IBSYS is an operating system which is sufficiently powerful so as to be a valuable aid in running and debugging programs.

## THE FORTRAN IV SIMULATION ROUTINES

A general description of the simulation utility routine written in FORTRAN IV follows.

The central idea in the operation of the simulation program is the ordered placement of event notices into a calender of future events as the related cause statements are encountered. The calender is ordered according to increasing time of occurrence. When an event terminates (i.e.: the event subroutine terminates), the ordering of the calender indicates the most imminent event and its scheduled time of occurrence. Thus time can be advanced to that scheduled time and the appropriate event subroutine can be called.

A set of arrays, located in blank common, comprise the calender. An event notice consists of one element from each array with the same index. Each notice contains linking information, the scheduled time of occurrence, an indication of the event routine to be called, and three parameters, to be used by the event routine. An event notice will be said to occupy a row of the calender.

During the execution of an event routine, conditions may call for the causing of an event. This is implemented by calling utility subroutine CAUSE with the parameter set: Name of event routine being caused, the time at which the event is to occur, and zero to three parameters to be passed to the event routine. The utility subroutine CAUSE will place in the calender the appropriate event notice. An event may cause any number of events including itself to occur at a future time.

After completion of an event routine, control is returned to routine MAIN. MAIN then calls the utility TSTEP which extracts the next most imminent event from the calender, sets simulated time to the scheduled time of that event, and transfers control to the appropriate event routine. Upon completion of one event routine, control is passed to next most eminent event routine which will then have the capacity for causing additional events.

In some instances it is desirable to cancel an event which may have been scheduled for the future. To accomplish this a utility subroutine. REMOVE is included. It is called with the name of the event to be canceled as a parameter and its function is to search the calender for the first instance of an event notice having the name of the event to be canceled. That event notice is then

The routine package for any given simulation would contain MAIN, CAUSE, REMOVE, and TSTEP plus all of the event subroutines necessary for specifying the model being simulated. CAUSE, REMOVE, and TSTEP are all utility subroutines which are invariant from one simulation to another. MAIN varies from one simulation to another only in that
it is desirable to have MAIN contain common statements which include all the systems variables and initializations of system variables.

Included in COMMON are the special variables and the system

- variables. The special variables include the calender arrays; TIMEthe current value of simulated time; IPAR 1, IPAR 2, and IPAR $3-$ the parameters associated with the current event;
and ISL and ITL - pointers utilized in the calender manipulation. The system variables are those variables in terms of which the programmer describes his simulation model.

The calender consists of six single indexed arrays which are indexed by the same pointer. Thus the calender will be referred to as though it were a two dimensional array with six columns. Column 1 contains linkage for the ordering of event notices. Column 2 contains the time of occurrence while Column 3 contains the reference to the event routine. The remaining columns contain parameters to be passed to the event routine; associated with the event are two pointers - ITL which specifies the next most imminent event and ISL which specifies the row to be filled by the next call of subroutine CAUSE.

As part of the initialization in MAIN, the linkage in the calender is set up. The first row is linked to the second, the second to the third, and so forth. The link in the last row is set to zero to indicate the end of the chain. The first row of the calender is set to indicate an event with a very large value of scheduled tine. (This simplifies the calender searching in CAUSE. Finally, ITL is set to 1 and ISL is set to 2 .

To schedule an event (i.e., place an event notice in the calender) the time of occurrence, the event routine reference, and the three input parameters are stored in positions 2 through 6 of the row indexed by ISL. Following this, ISL is set equal to the value of the link in the same row. Next, column 2, the time of occurrences, is searched beginning with the row designated by ITL in the order given in column 1, the linkage column. The object of that search is to find an event row $k$ with a time of occurrence which is greater than the occurrence time of the event being scheduled. When such a row is found, the links are adjusted to schedule the new event ahead of the event in row $k$. The initial event in row 1 guarantees

Whenever TSTEP is called, position 2 is stored in the COMMON variable
$\therefore$ TIME, and positions 4,5 , and 6 are stored variables IPAR 1, IPAR 2 , and IPAR 3. In addition, the old value of position 1 goes into ITL, the old value of ITL goes into ISL, and the old value of ISL goes into position 1 . Finally, the event routine reference is used to call the appropriate event.

An example will now be given to illustrate calender manipulation. 027 Assume that the calender is in the state given in figure 1 .

## Calender



$$
I S L=7, \quad I T L=2
$$

Assume that the next encountered utility call is

CALL CAUSE (EVENT 12, 3.25, 0, 0, 0).

The result is shown is figure 2 .

| Index | Link | Time | Event Reference |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 0 | $10^{30}$ |  |
| 2 | 4 | 1.0 | Par 1 Par 2 Par 3 |
| 3 | 6 | 2.0 | Event 17 |
| 4 | 3 | 1.5 | Event 3 |
| 5 | 1 | 4.0 | Event 9 |
| 6 | 7 | 3.0 | Event 5 |
| 7 | 5 | 3.25 | Event 12 |
| 8 | 9 |  |  |

$$
I T L=2, \quad I S L=8
$$

FIGURE 2

- If the next encountered utility call is:


## CALL TSTEP

The result is given in figure 3.

| Index | Link | Time | Event Reference | Par 1 Par 2 Par 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | $10^{30}$ |  |  |
| 2 | 8 |  |  |  |
| 3 | 6 | 2.0 | Event 17 |  |
| 4 | 3 | 1.5 | Event 3 |  |
| 5 | 1 | 4.0 | Event 9 |  |
| 6 | 7 | 3.0 | Event 5 |  |
| 7 | 5 | 3.25 | Event 12 |  |
| 8 | 9 |  |  |  |

$$
I T L=4, \quad I S L=2
$$

FIGURE 3

[^0]The final subject of this section is the transfer of control to the intended event subroutine when the statement CALL TSTEP is encountered in MAIN. Two satisfactory methods have been used. The first method utilizes FORTRAN IV in a perfectly straight forward - manner and is the method to be described in this report. The other method (Method 2) has the advantage of being simpler and easier-to use than Method 1, but has the disadvantage of depending on specific characteristics of the IBM 7090/94 IBSYS compiler.

In using Method 1 a variable in a block of named common is defined for each event routine. This variable is the event reference mentioned earlier and is thought of as the event name while the event subroutine name consists of the same FORTRAN $N$ symbol prefixed with an $X$. For example, a particular simulation model might consist of the following five events. The corresponding subroutine names are also given below.

| Event Names | Subroutine Names |
| :--- | :---: |
| MOVE | $X$ MOVE |
| GENER | $X$ GENER (A) |
| DELAY | $X$ DELAY |
| PROC | $X$ PROC $(X, Y, Z)$ |
| FINIS | X FINIS |

Further, it is required that the event names be assigned unique integer values from 1 thru $N$ where $N$ is the number of events. The initialization of event names may be done in routine MAIN. The organization of MAIN could be as follows:


INTEGER, GENER, DELAY, PROC, FINIS

C SYSTEM INITIATION STATEMENTS
C CALENDER INITIALIZATION STATEMENTS

```
MOVE = 1
GENER = 2
-DELAY = 3
PROC = 4
FINIS = 5
```

C PLACE INITIAL EVENT NOTICE CALL CAUSE (MOVE, 1.0, 0, 0, 0)

1000 CALL TSTEP (NEVENT)
GO TO (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), NEVENT

1 CAL̄L X MOVE GO TO 1000

2 CALL X GENER (IPAR 1) GO TO 1000

3 CALL X DELAY GO TO 1000

4 CALL X PROC (IPAR 1, IPAR 2, IPAR 3) GO TO 1000
5. CALL X FINIS GO TO 1000

END

Thus TSTEP returns as the event reference the event number defined in the initialization of event names. The event number is then used to branch to the statement which calls the intended event subroutine.

Method 2 requires less bookkeeping on the part of the programmer. The event subroutine names are the same as the event name and are not included in COMMON. Further, the statements for entering the event subroutines are unchanged from one simulation to another as contrasted to Deck MAIN of Method 1 which must be modified whenever an event is added or deleted. However, one special variable MYSELF is located in COMMON. Its use will be developed later.

Referring to the above example, assume that it is desirable to have event MOVE cause event DELAY $T$ units of time in the future. Subroutine MOVE will contain the two following statements:

Subroutine MOVE


032

When subroutine CAUSE is entered the address associated with the parameter DELAY is the address of the entry point in subroutine DELAY... Therefore, what gets stored in column 3 of the calender is the first executable instruction in subroutine DELAY. Thus, . the event references mentioned above are the first instructions of the event subroutines. As will be apparent below, this Method 2 mechanism works because the first instruction of a subroutine is always a transfer to the prolog of the subroutine.

In deck MAIN, the subroutine selection statements are:

```
1000 MYSELF = NEVENT (ITL)
CALL TSTEP (MYSELF)
GO TO 1000
```

When statement 1000 has been executed MYSELF contains the first instruction of the event routine to be entered. Following that, subroutine TSTEP is called with the address of MYSELF as the parameter address.

The form of TSTEP is:
SUBROUTINE TSTEP (DUMMY)
-
IPAR $1=$
IPAR $2=$
IPAR $3=$
CALL DUMMY (IPAR 1, IPAR 2, IPAR 3)
RETURN
END
The address of DUMMY is, remember, the address of MYSELF. The CALL DUMMY is translated into the following instructions:

TSX MYSELF, 4
TXI 3
PZE
PZE IPAR 1
PZE IPAR 2
PZE IPAR 3

The TSX MYSELF, 4 instruction causes the control to transfer to a location in COMMON with linkage established in index register 4. As mentioned above the first instruction of a FORTRAN IV subroutine compiled by IBSYS is always of the form:

TRA Prolog
Therefore, after the TSX transfers control to the location of MYSELF, the value of MYSELF transfers contol to the prologs of the desired event without modifying the return or parameter linkage. This is precisely the desired transfer.

The variable MYSELF serves one other important function. Because FORTRAN does not allow a routine to contain an EXTERNAL statement which contains the name of that routine, event routine MOVE cannot contain a statement of the form:

CALL CAUSE (MOVE, . . . .).
However, the desired effect will be obtained using:
CALL CAUSE (MYSELF, . . . ).
The complete listings of the utilities routines required for both Method 1 and Method 2 are given in the appendices.

## EXAMPLE

An example will now be described which illustrates the details of
implementation of a system simulation in FORTRAN IV.
The system under study will be a simple computer memory queue. Suppose a computer has several independent memory boxes. We may thus queue up memory requests and each computer cycle examine the queue and the memory boxes to see if there is a request on the queue for some non-busy box. A simulation will enable us to experimentally determine such things as average time on queue, average queue length, etc., as a function of request generation rate, number of memory boxes, and the memory cycle time.

The system may be roughly described as consisting of three parts, as in the following diagram:


The generation of memory requests will be artificially modeled by forming either no request or one request per computer cycle, according to some probability, with the box number of the request chosen at random. A generated request will be placed on the queue, if there is space for it. Every cycle, the queue will be scanned for the first request for a free memory box. If one is found it will then cause the memory box to be set busy for the cycle time.

A detailed description of the simulation now follows, with the FORTRAN IV event subroutines separately listed and described.

## GENER

The simulation of the generation of requests is performed by GENER, a routine which first causes itself one cycle later and thus runs every cycle. GENER causes a request to be generated if a random number, uniformly distributed between 0 and 1 , is found to be less than the specified probability of generating one request in a cycle. If the request is to be generated, a random number is then used to select a memory box for the request. If there is room on the queue, the request is caused to arrive at the queue. 8 units of time later, at the "end" of the machine cycle. The listing of GENER follows.

## \$IBFTC GENER

SUBROUTINE XGENER
COMMON
C GENERATE MEMORY REQUEST

- C,ALL CAUSE (GENER, TIME + 1.0)

CALL RANDOM (R)
IF (R.GT. PROBI) RETURN
CALL RAṄDOM (R)
BOXNO $=(R *$ FLOAT (NBOX)) +1.0
IF (QMPNT.EQ.NQM) RETURN
INUMB $=$ INUMB +1
CALI CAUSE (QBUSY, TIME + . 8, BOXNO, INUMB)
RETURN
END

## QBUSY

The event routine QBUSY simulates the arrival of a request on the queue. This is done by incrementing the queue input pointer $Q M P N T$, and placing the instruction number and memory box number into the queue array $Q$.
\$IBFTC QBUSY
SUBROUTINE XQBUSY (BOXNO, INSTR)
COMMON
C PLACE REQUEST ON QUEUE
QMPNT $=$ QMPNT +1
Qi4 (QMPNT, 1) $=$ INSTR
QM (QMPNT, 2) $=$ BOXNO
RETURN
END

## QMCON

The simulation of the control of the queue is performed by QMCON. This event first causes itself to run again one cycle later. Then a scan pointer QMSCAN is initialized to one. The queue entry indicated by QMSCAN is then examined to see
if the indicated memory box is busy. If it is, the scan pointer is advanced and the next entry similarly examined. If the box is not busy, the memory request is issued by causing the events MBUSY and QUEMP at .8 units of time later

- (at the "end" of the cycle), and by causing the event MCYCC at a time . $8+$ CYCT later.
\$IBETC QMCON
SUBROUTINE XQMICON
COMMON
$\qquad$
C QUEUE CONTROL, SCAN QUEUE AND
C SEND OUT MEMORY REQUEST, IF POSSIBLE
CALL CAUSE (QMCON, TIME + 1.0)
QMSCAN $=1$
10 . IF (QMSCAN, GT, QMPNT) RETURN
BOXNO $=$ QM (QMSCAN, 2)
INSTR $=$ QM (QMSCAN, 1)
IF (MEMBSY (BOXNO). EQ. 1) GO TO 20
CALL CAUSE (MBUSY, TIME + .8, BOXNO, INSTR)
CALL CAUSE (QUEMP, TIME + .8, QMSCAN)
CALL CAUSE (MCYCC, TIME $+.8+$ CYCT, BOXNO)
RETURN
20 QMSCAN $=$ QMSCAN +1
IF (QMSCAN.GT. NQM) RETURN
GO TO 10
END


## MBUSY

This event sets the indicated memory box busy by placing INSTR into position BOXNO the array MEMBSY.

SIBFTC MBUSY

C PLACE REQUEST INSTR IN MEMORY BOXNO
MEMBSY (BONNO) $=$ INSTR
RETURN

- END

QUEMP
This event removes the indicated entry from the queue, "moves up" any following entries, and decrements the input pointer.
\$IBFTC QUEMP
SUBROUTINE XQUEMP (Q:ISCAN)
COMMON
C REMOVE REQUEST AT QMSCAN FROY QUEUE
$\mathrm{J}=\mathrm{NQM}-\mathrm{L}$
*DO 9 L = 1, 10
DO $7 \mathrm{~K}=$ QMSCAN, J
$7 \quad Q M(K, L)=Q M(K+1, L)$
$9 \quad$ QM. $\mathrm{NQM}, \mathrm{L})=0$
QMPNT $=$ QMPNT -1
RETURN
END
MCYCC
This event simulates the completion of the memory cycle by resetting the memory busy indicator of the specified memory box.
\$ IBFTC MCYCC
SUBROUTINE XMCYCC (BOXNO)
COMMON
C. AT MEMORY CYCLE COMPLETION, FREE BOX

MEMBSY (BOXNO) $=0$

- Included in the list of events is one called STATS which is an output routine. STATS causes itself one cycle later, and - outputsthe current system status. The run stops if a specified value of simulated time MAXT is exceeded.
\$IBFTC STATS
SUBROUTINE XSTATS


RETURN
END

## RANDOM

Random is a random number generator. The statement CALL RANDOM( $R$ ) returns $R$ to the calling routine a value between 0 and 1 with uniform distribution.

## CAUSE

CAUSE is one of the simulation utility subroutines previously specified in this report. It is called to place an event into the calender.

## TSTEP

TSTEP is one of the simulation utility subroutines previously specified in this report. It is called from MAIN to advance simulated time to that of the next event in time, and get the parameters and number of that event.

MAIN
MAIN is the first entered and "main" routine of the simulation program and performs a number of functions. First it initializes the common variables to zero. Then the run parameters are read into the appropriate common variables. The calender is then initialized with the proper linkage and starting events are
including the statement number 1000 in MAIN are the instruction - necessary to cycle thru the events in the calender.

Assume that the following COMMON and specification statements - are included in every routine described, and indicated by the statement: COMMON

COMMON TIME, IPAR 1, IPAR 2, IPAR 3, ID, ISL, ITL,
1 LINK (200), CTIME (200), NEVENT (200), KOLI (200),
2 KOL2 (200), KOL3(200), NBOX, NQM, CYCT; MAXT,
3 PROB1, QM $(32,2)$, MEMBSY $(64)$, QMPNT, INUMB
INTEGER QM,QMPNT
REAL MAXT
COMMON / NAMES / GENER, QBUSY, QMCON, MBUSY
1 QUEMP, MCYCC, STATS
INTEGER GENER, QBUSY, QMCON, QUEMP, STATS

The listing of MAIN follows.
\$IBFTC MAIN
COMMON
EQUIVALENCE (COM (1), TIME), (X, CTIMEC (1))
C MAIN INITIALIZES COMMON TO ZEROES. READS IN
C SYSTEM PARAMETERS, SETS UP THE CALENDER, INITIALIZES
C THE EVENT VALUES, PLACES STARTING EVENTS INTO THE
C CALENDER AND THEN CONTROLS THE SEQUENCING OF EVENTS
DO $101 \mathrm{I}=1,3000$
$101 \operatorname{COM}(I)=0$
READ PROBI, CYCT, NQM, NBOX, MAXT
TIME $=0.0$
DO 92 ITL $=2,199$
92 LINK (ITL) = ITL + 1
ISL $=2$
ITL $=1$
$X=1.0 \mathrm{E} 30$
GENER $=1$

$$
\because
$$

$$
\text { QBUSY }=2
$$

$$
\text { QMCON }=3
$$

$$
\text { MBUSY }=4
$$

$$
\text { - QUEMP }=5
$$

$$
\mathrm{MCYCC}=6
$$

$$
\text { STATS }=7
$$

$$
\text { CALL CAUSE (STATS, TIME }+1.0 \text { ) }
$$

$$
\text { CALL CAUSE (QMCON, TIME }+1.1 \text { ) }
$$

CALL CAUSE (GENER, TIME + l.1)

$$
1000 \text { CALL TSTEP (EVENT) }
$$

$$
\text { GO TO }(1,2,3,4,5,6,7) \text {, EVENT }
$$

1 CALL GENERGO TO 1000
2 CALL XQBUSY (IPAR 1, IPAR ..... 2)GO TO 1000
3 CALL XQMCON
GO TO 1000
4 CALL XMBUSY (IPAR 1, IPAR ..... 2)
GO TO 1000
5 CALL XQUEMP (IPAR 1)
GO TO 1000
6 CALL XMCYCC (IPAR 1)
GO TO 1000
7 CALL XSTATS
GO TO 1000
END

## REFERENCES
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2. R. Efron and G. Gordon, "A General Purpose Digital Simulator and Examples o'f its Application: Part I Description of the Simulator, " IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 3, No. 1, 22 (1964).
3. "General Purpose Systems Simulator II," Form B20-6346-1, International Business Machines Corporation.
4. B. Dimsdale and H. M. Markowitz, "A Description of the SIMSCRIPT Language," IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 3, No. 1, 57 (1964).
5. H. M. Markowitz, B. Hausner, and H. W. Karr, "SIMSCRIPT, A Simulation Programming Language," The RAND Corporation, 1963, Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Appendix A

## Listings of utility routines for Method 1



# IF(INEVENT(ITLI.FQ.EVENTI GO TO- 20 

10 LAST=NEXT
NEXT=LI!JK(Nitat)
IFINEXT.FQ.OI GO TO 30
IF(NEVENT(NEXT).NE.EVENT) GO TO 10
WE FOUVD EVENT
STIME=CTIMF.(NEXT)
$I=$ KOL 1 (NEXT)
$J=$ KOL 2 (NEXT)
$K=K O L 3($ NEXT $)$
LINK(LAST) $=$ LIVK(INEXT)
LINK (NEXT) $=$ ISL
$I S L=V E X T$
RETURN
20 continue
STIME=CTIME (NEXT)
$1=$ KOLI (NEXT)
$J=K O L ?($ NEXT $)$
$K=$ KOL 3 (NEXT)
ITL=LINK(ITL)
LINK(NEXT) =ISL
ISL=NEXT
PETURN
C- EVENT NOT PRESENT
30 CTntivue
STIME=TIME
$\mathrm{I}=0$
$J=0$
$K=0$
RETURN
END

- SURRIUTINE TSTEP(IEVENT)

COMNON TIME, IPARI,IPAR2,IPAR3,ID,ISL,ITL,
XLINK(200), CTIME(200), NEVFNT(200),KOLI(200),KOL2(200),KOL3(200)
SUBRJUTINE TO STEP EVENTS IN CALENOAR
ITL IS_LOCATION OF FIRST EVENT IN CALENOAR
ISLIS LOCATION OF FIRST AVAILROW IN CALENOAR
$I n=I T L$
[TL=LINK(ID)
$L I N K(I D)=I S L$
$I S L=10$
TIME=CTIME(ID)
IPARI =KOLI (ID)
IPAR2 = KOL2 (ID)
IPAR3 = KOL3 (ID)
IEVENT=NEVENT(ID)
RETURN
END

3

g x!puadảy

| CAUSE - EFN SCURCE STATEMENT - .IFN(S) - |
| :---: |

SURROUTINE CAUSE(IEV,T,IPI,IP2,IP3)
CONMON TIME,IPARI, IPARZ, IPAP 3, ID,MYSELF,ISL,ITL,
XLINK(2CO), CTIME (200), NEVEVT(200), KOLI(20n), KOL2(200), KOL3(200)
CAUSE ENTERS EVENTS ONTO CALENDAR
ITL IS LOCATION OF FIRST EVFNT IN CALENDAR
ISL IS LOCATION OF FIRST AVAIL ROW IN CALENCAR
NEXT=ITL
ro TO 20
C 10 lont until given tine is less than next entry in calendar 10 LAST=NEXT

NFXT=LINK(NEXT)
20 IF (T -GT. CTIME(NEXT)) GO TO 10
$I n=I S L$
$I S L=L I N K(I S L)$
LINK(ID) = VEXT
C SFE IF THIS EVENT WILL $3 E$ THE FIRST ON THE LiSt
IF INEXT.EQ. ITLIGO TO 40
$L I N K(L A S T)=10$
30 CTIME (ID) $=T$
NEVENT (ID) $=$ IEV
KOLI(ID) $=[P 1$
KOLZ(1D) $=1 P 2$
$K O L 3(I O)=1 P 3$
RETURN
$30 \mathrm{ITL}=10$
GO IO 30
END

```
                REMMIVE - EFN SOURCE STATEMENI - IFN(S) -
```- SUSiOUUTINF KEMOVE(EVENT,STIMF,I,J,K)
COMMON TIME,IPARI,IPARZ,IPAR 3,ID, MYSELF,ISL, ITL,
XLINK(200), CTIMF(200), NEVENT(200), KOLI(200), KOL2(200), KOLZ 3 (200)
INTEGER EVENT
NEXT=ITL
IF (AEVENTITLLI.GQEVENTI GO To 20
10 LAST=NEXT
NEXT=LINK(NEXT)
IFI:NEXT.EO.OI GO TO 30
IF(NEVENT(NEXT). NE EVENT) GO TO io
WE FOU:DD EVENT
STIME =CTIME (NEXT)
I = KULI(VEXT)
\(J=\) KUL \(2(\) NEXT \()\)
K=KOL 3 (NEXT)
LINK (LAST) =LIVK(NEXT)
LINK (NEXT) \(=\) ISL
ISL=, NEXT
RETURN
C EVENT IS FIRST IN LIST
20 COnfinue
STIME=CTIME(NEXT)
I = KOLI (VEXT)
\(J=K O L 2(Y E X T)\)
\(K=K O L 3(N E X T)\)
ITL=LINK(ITL)
LINK(NEXT)=ISL
ISL =NEXT
RETURN
30 COMTINUF
STIME=TIME
\(1=0\)
\(J=0\)
\(K=0\)
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE TSTEP(DUMMY)
COM:AON T.IME, IPAQI, IPAR2, IPAR 3, ID, MYSELF,ISL, ITL,
XLINK(200), C. IIME (200), VEVFNT(200), KOLI(209), KOL2(200),KOL3(200)
SUBRJUTINE TO Step EVENTS IN CALENDAR
ITL IS LOCATION OF FIRST FVENT IN CALENCAR
ISL IS LOCATION OF FIRST AVAIL ROW IN CALENDAR
\(I n=1 \mathrm{Ti}^{-}\)
ITL=LINK(ID)
\(\operatorname{LINK}(I D)=I S L\)
\(I S L=10\)
TIME=CTIME (IO)
IPARI=KOLI(ID)
IPAR2=KOL2(ID)
IPAR \(3=K O L 3(I D)\)
CALL DUMMY(IPAR1,IPAR2,IPAR3)
RETURN
END
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sublect: Dual Arithmetic on ACS-1
Reterence: S.J.C.C., 1967 and our recent conversation

то: Dr. J. E. Bertram

One of the more formidable features of the ILLIAC IV is dual arithmetic, where a pair of floating point numbers are made to interact with another pair, yielding a pair of independent results:
\[
\binom{A_{1}}{A_{2}}\binom{\phi}{\phi}\binom{B_{1}}{B_{2}} \rightarrow\binom{C_{1}}{C_{2}}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
A_{1} & \phi & B_{1} \\
A_{2} & \phi & B_{2}
\end{array}\right)
\]

The scheme is useful on the ILLIAC IV for the following reasons:
1. The 64 -bit word length is adequate for a pair of hex-floating numbers, each with 8 -bit exponent and 24 -bit hex-fraction.
2. Significant time savings can be achieved in the PE by using the already-wide data paths for dual arithmetic. There may be an extra shift cost of 2 cycles per instruction comparing with single 64 -bit operations, this extra cost is something like \(33 \%\) on floating adds ( 8 cycles rather than a possible 6) and may be more than offset in multiplies because of the shorter fractions.
3. For usual partial differential equations even 16 fraction bits may be adequate because of the sizable discretizing error. Parts of computation which call for longer lengths can be localized without serious effort.
4. Many problems do exhibit low-order parallelism exploitable by this feature. This even includes Monte Carlo computations, where the precision demand is low; radar signal analysis, and pattern analysis in general. Where parallelism is lacking, the two components in the packed word can be detached for individual attention at low timing cost.

Dr. J..E. Bertram
May 1, 1967
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Dual Arithmetic on ACS-1

With the dual arithmetic feature, the ILLIAC IV PE can claim to be an 8 -MIPS machine. Their weather program (NCAR model) by the full 4-QUAD machine is said to achieve \(600 \times 6600\), with upper and lower hemispheres treated "dually".

The proper way to counteract this claim is to install dual arithmetic ourselves. There are several difficulties:
1. The 48 -bit word length is not adequate for an independent pair of floating point numbers each with 12 -bit exponent. The fraction would have only 12 bits, small even by the most optimistic advocates of short precision arithmetic.
2. Unless one performs at a rate of two operations per cycle, the saving in time is invisible. The shifting cost would be a major handicap.
3. Excessive hardware to achieve dual arithmetic is more likely on a pipeline machine, where the "fixed-time duration" requirement is compounded by a "uniform flush rate" requirement.
4. The operation code repertoire is already near the 256 "limit".

I would like to advocate a limited form of dual arithmetic in which one exponent is shared by two fractions. This "block-normalization" philosophy is quite acceptable for partial differential equations and matrix computations (Cf. discussions in an earlier memo to file, "Mixed floating add operations" by T. C. Chen, dated March 14, 1967). The following advantages of the new dual arithmetic are apparent, many are unique to the block normalizing format.
1. Parallel comparison shifting with one single shifter.
2. Parallel add with one 48-bit adder (with, however, added extra sign detection, overflow detection, and perhaps extra partial recomplementation features).
3. Parallel post-shifting (normalizing usually just one of the fractions).

Dr. J. E. Bertram
May 1, 1967
Page 3

\section*{Dual Arithmetic on ACS-1}
4. Parallel multiply (with added hardware blocking of carries).
5. Only one exponent handling mechanism is needed.
6. TWO OPERATIONS PER CYCLE PER UNIT.
(It is suspected that the ILLIAC IV dual operations will turn out to be "block normalized" also, to reduce the circuit count.)

There are still some problems. With exponent unaltered, the fraction length is only 17 bits + sign, adequate only for very limited computations such as the weather problem and radar signal analysis. A better deal might be the format
\[
\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{EF}_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~F}_{2} \quad \text { or } \quad \mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{EF}_{1} ; \mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{2}
\]
with
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 1 \text { bit for } S_{1}, \\
& 8 \text { bits for } E, \\
& 19 \text { bits for } F_{1} \text {; } \\
& 1 \text { bit for } S_{2}, \\
& 19 \text { bits for } F_{2} ;
\end{aligned}
\]
which will have roughly the same fraction capacity as the hex-fraction of 24 bits.

There ought to be a reasonably full dual-instruction set, including packing and unpacking (but perhaps no pipelined divide). I feel dual arithmetic to be more useful than double multiply and double divide, and am again advocating their removal to make room for the dual instructions.


Tien Chi Chen

TCC:va
cc: Dr. G. M. Amdahl
Mr. G. F. Nielsen
Mr. R. E. Pickett

Dr. H. Schorr
Dr. E. H. Sussenguth SADL
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subject: Architecturally Critical Paths in the MPM

Reference:

Dr. H. Schorr

Attached is a list of critical timing paths within the MPM from an architectural point of view. Degradation in any of these paths would have a major detrimental effect on overall MPM performance. By overall is meant a global effect, rather than a local effect such as slippage in divider performance. - Of the twelve points noted, those involving the contender stacks and interlocking are by far the most critical.


EHS:slb
cc: SADL

\section*{IBM CONFIDENTIAL}
I. Effective address path: (7 cycle path)
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { ea generation (three input add) } & 1 \\
\text { bus to BLCU } & 1 / 2 \\
\text { BLCU interference resolution } & 1 \\
\text { storage delay including bussing } & 3 \\
\text { BLCU decision per tag entry } & 1 \\
\text { bus to MPM } & 1 / 2 \\
\text { internal MPM bus to functional unit } & 0
\end{array}
\]

\section*{II. By-pass from functional unit output to input (0 cycle path)}
1. Full bypassing is eminently desirable.
2. If specialized bypassing is necessary the following groupings are the most important:
add to add
add to mpy
mpy to add
mpy to mpy
add to cmp
mpy to cmp
mixed mpy to d. p. add
d. p. add to d. p. add
integer add (with respect to carry register)
shift to shift
shift to logic
logic to shift
logic to logic
shift to cmp
logic to cmp
index add to ea add
index add to cmp
cmp to branch/skip control
III. A-unit interlock control

When an instruction satisfies its interlock constraints, it must be logically removed from contention so that other instructions dependent on it (because of destination-source interlocks or bus conflict interlocks, for example) can start execution on the next cycle.
IV. 'X-unit interlock control

When an X-contender stack position is vacated, it is refilled with another instruction so that the new instruction can be interlocked and vacated on the next cycle.

The X-unit register data is bussed to the functional units simultaneously with the interlock determination. If the interlocks fail, the functional unit action is logically stopped in such a way that it can restart on the next cycle. (In particular, a unit with a pipeline rate of 2 or more, must not be "busy" working on the illegitimate data.)
V. Instruction start-up path (3 cycle path in X-unit)

Storage bus to IB's IB to dispatch register Dispatch to contender Contender to functional unit

0 (bypass to dispatcher?)
1
1
1 (2 in A-unit)
VI. Effective branch address path

The worst case timing situation occurs when an EXIT has been detected (in the \(X\)-dispatch registers) and the BRANCH instruction has not been executed (is in the X-contender stack).

The computation path is:
interlock tests on BRANCH
compute eba, successful/unsuccessful
test top DO table entry:
if DO entry is correct:
next instructions to dispatchers cycle 3
if DO entry is incorrect: correct DO table next instructions to dispatchers
cycle 1
cycle 2
cycle 3
cycle 4
VII. DO Table alteration

On each cycle both A- and X-pointers can be moved, an old entry be deleted, and a new entry be accepted.
VIII. DO table control of instruction flow

The table entries indicate the number of cycles required to validate DO table entries and permit movement of new instructions to dispatch registers.
\begin{tabular}{|l||c|c|c|}
\hline & if top DO entry is & correct & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{ incorrect } \\
\hline if required instructions in & IB & IB & storage \\
\hline unsuccessful branch exit & 1 & 2 & \(1+\) access \\
successful branch exit & 1 & 2 & \(1+\) access \\
no exit (normal sequence) & 1 & \(2^{*}\) & \(1+\) access* \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
*pathological case (hence unimportant)
IX. Next-fetch mechanism

On each cycle the next-fetch mechanism must search IB addresses, send an address to BLCU, search PSC registers, increment its contents by 8 , and accept an override signal from the branch control.
X. Computation dependent SKIPs

The following sequence of instructions illustrates the problem
\(A^{3} \leqslant a n y A\) instruction
\(C_{2} \leqslant A^{3} \geq A^{10}\)
SKIP if \(\mathrm{C}_{2}\) or \(\mathrm{C}_{30}\)
* any A instruction

The data/control sequence is end of computation (A-unit) result to compare unit (A-unit) cycle 1 compare result to condition bit condition bits to skip test unit cycle 2 compute skip condition (X-unit) skip condition to A-unit interlocks start bussing on NOP the *-ed op (A-unit) cycle 4
\[
057
\]

The sequence noted (A-unit compare, SKIP, * on A-op) is probably the worst case as the path involves \(A\)-to- \(X\) and \(X\)-to- \(A\) communication and is a relatively frequent occurrence in code. The dual sequences are:
(X-cmp,SK, * on A): X-unit skew should alleviate this (X-cmp, SK, * on X): no inter-unit paths (but important in X-unit)
(A-cmp, SK, * on X): one inter-unit path, of less programming significance
XI. Computation dependent branches

A discussion similar to VIII obtains. An illustrative sequence is:
\(A^{3} \leftarrow\) any \(A\) instruction
\(C_{2} \leftarrow A^{3} \geq A^{10}\)
BRANCH if \(\mathrm{C}_{2}\) or \(\mathrm{C}_{30}\)
EXIT
XII. Functional unit performance

The current performance of the functional units are noted below
Floating point, 48-bit \(A D D \quad 3 / 1\) and \(4 / 1\)
MPY \(3 / 1\)
DIV \(10 / 7\) or \(10 / 8\)
CMP \(1 / 1\)
Floating point, 96 -bit ADD \(4 / 1\)
MPY \(5 / 3\)
DIV 17/14
CMP \(\quad 1 / 1\) (maybe 2/1)
MPY \(3 / 1\)
DIV \(10 / 7\)
Integer
Index integers

Shift, logic, moves
(A and X) \(1 / 1\)
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\section*{INTRODUCTION}

This memo describes the programs which perform MPM timing simulation. It is primarily a "users manual" for these programs.

Two programs, the Unroller and the Timing Simulator, are run consecutively in order to time the MPM's execution of a user's input program.

The Unroller program accepts an ACS assembly language program and control information concerning branch and skip execution, and "unrolls" the program to produce a trace of the instructions executed by the MPM when running the program. The trace is the sequence of instructions along with their addresses, register fields, and certain other information.

The Timing Simulator then operates on the trace of instructions executed by the MPM and produces timing charts indicating the timing of the activities initiated by these instructions in the various hardware components of the MPM.

The following diagram illustrates the functions and relationships of these two programs.


In the following sections of the memo, these programs are separately described with examples given illustrating preparation of input and interpretation of output.

The job running procedures for using the programs is described, and the MPM ops currently implemented in the Timing Simulator are listed.

Since the programs are currently undergoing changes, the current and planned changes are described to assist users in their planning.

Criticisms and suggestions from potential users are welcome and will be helpful in making the Timing Simulator useful to ACS.

THE UNROLLER PROGRAM (Prog. by J. Novicki, CSC)

The Unroller program produces the input trace to the Timing Simulator -from an ACS assembly code program plus control information.

In the past an Execution Simulator, which performed a detailed simulation of the execution of an input program, was used to generate the instruction trace. It was found to be inconvenient to use an execution simulator for this purpose because that requires the accurate programming of all the tests and computations which determine the desired path of execution through the program. It often proved to be difficult and time consuming to write a correctly executing program even though the path to be followed was easily described.

The Unroller program was written to solve this problem. Given an ACS assembly language program, explicit indicators are placed on the branch and skip instructions of the program to determine the path of instruction execution. For example a branch op might be followed by ( \(3 \mathrm{BEGIN}, *\) ) to indicate that the first three times the branch is executed it is successful with the branch being to the instruction labelled BEGIN, and the fourth time the branch is executed it is unsuccessful.

This program and control information is processed by the Unroller to yield the trace of instructions executed, which may then be used as input to the Timing Simulator.

\section*{Input Language, Card Input Format}

Input cards may contain a label, an op code and operands. The Branch and Skip instructions may contain additional control information. A free form format is used with no fixed starting columns for each of these fields but with certain delimiter restrictions. An asterisk in column 1 indicates a comment card.

Label: A label can be up to 8 characters maximum and must start with one of the characters \(A\) through \(Z\) or \(\$\). A label can contain no imbeded blanks and must be terminated by a delimiting colon.

Op Code: An op code can be up to 6 characters long with no embedded blanks. It may be immediately followed by an asterisk to indicate the skip flag. At least one blank column must be between the op code and its operand fields.

Operands: The operand fields can contain information for the \(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}\), and \(h\) fields of the instruction. Two fields must be separated by a comma and a missing field will be indicated by two consecutive commas. The first blank column terminates the operand fields. The \(i, j\), and k fields may be one of the following formats:
(i) Idd
(ii) dd
where "L" is the letter A for Arithmetic Register or the letter X for Index Register or the letter \(C\) for Condition Register or the letter S for Special Register. "dd" is a decimal number from 00 to 31 (leading 0 may be omitted). The \(h\) field may contain a symbolic label or a decimal number (up to 5 digits).

Branch Parameters: A string of control parameters may be listed after a branch instruction to determine the path of instruction sequencing. The parameters indicate if the branch is successful or unsuccessful for each time it is executed. The branch parameter information must begin with a left parenthesis and end with a right parenthesis and contains no imbedded blanks. Two parameters in the list must be separated by a comma. The parameter format is:
(i) dL for a successful branch
(ii) d* for an unsuccessful branch
where \(d\) is an optional digit indicating the number of times the branch is successful or unsuccessful, \(L\) is the symbolic label of the instruction branched to, and \(*\) is an indicator for an unsuccessful branch. For example, if we have the instruction
\[
\mathrm{BEQ} \mathrm{C} 1, \mathrm{C} 2, \mathrm{X} 4 \text { (3ABC, *, XY) }
\]
the program would be expanded to reflect the branch execution as follows:
(i) first three executions of branch are successful and branch is to instruction labelled ABC
(ii) fourth execution of branch is unsuccessful
(iii) fifth execution of branch is successful - to XY

Skip Parameters: A string of control parameters may be listed after a skip instruction to determine the effect of that instruction on the sequence of skip states. The parameters indicate whether the skip is taken or not taken each time it is executed. The parameter string
has the same format as the branch parameter string with any dummy label serving to indicate that the skip is taken, an * indicating the skip is not taken. For example, if we have

SKøR C1, C2 (2*, LABEL, *)
the Unroller would set the skip state in the trace to reflect the execution of the skip as follows:
(i) first two times skip is executed it is not taken
(ii) third time skip is executed it is taken
(iii) fourth time skip is executed it is not taken

\section*{Output of Unroller}

Corresponding to the sequence of execution of the instructions of the input program the Unroller produces the standard input trace for the Timing Simulator: a card deck which is described in detail in Section 2. One card is produced for each instruction executed. The card contains the op, i, j, k, h fields, branch and skip states, instruction and data reference addresses and certain other fields.

The Unroller also lists the input program and output trace. Certain diagnostic messages may be listed:
(i) Too many input cards (300 maximum)
(ii) Operand Field error
(iii) Error on following card (i. e. label information error)
(iv) Op code on next card not implemented

Example: On the following page are the listings of a simple input program deck and the trace deck produced by the Unroller from that input deck. Note that the branch parameter list specifies branch successful two times then branch unsuccessful. Thus we make 3 passes through the loop. The branch and skip states in the trace (see trace format Section 2) reflect the branch and skip execution. Note: the OP "STOP" terminates unrolling, and the pseudo op "END" marks the end of the unroller input deck.

EXAMPLE: UNROLLER INPUT DECK \(\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots\)


CORRESPONDING UNROLLER OUTPUT DECK


IHE TIMING SIMULATOR (Prog. by L. Conway, J. F. Parsons)

For the purpose of MPM hardware or program evaluation we may need detailed timing of the execution of a program by the MPM. The MPM is sufficiently complex that hand-timing of all but trivial programs is a very tedious process. The Timing Simulator is a program written to perform this timing by simulating in complete detail the hardware controls of the MPM.

The Timing Simulator is written in FORTRAN IV ( H ) and runs on a S/360 under OS, requiring an \(H\) level machine. The simulation technique is similar to SIMSCRIPT but uses simpler utility routines which are written in FORTRAN. Reference 1 provides a complete description of the simulation technique.

The level of hardware modelling performed by the Timer is best described as being an "architectural" level. Individual hardware triggers are included when they serve an individual control function, but buses, registers, etc., are modelled as logical entities rather than simulated to the bit level. Thus the timer does not model the detailed engineering implementation of the MPM. It does model all control algorithms in all sections of the MPM, to accurately simulate the timing of instruction execution by the MPM.

The Timer currently operates on a MOD 75 at a rate of approximately 10 simulated machine cycles per second. Typical programs are thus simulated at a rate of 20 inst . sec .

A detailed description of either the Timing Simulator program or the MPM model simulated is beyond the scope of this memo. Users may assume that the program reflects the latest specification of the MPM. This model is documented at an architectural level in Reference 3 and other similar references soon to be issued. Those who are familiar with the hardware design of the MPM and have specific questions about the details of the simulation model should contact the author.

The remainder of this section on the Timer is concerned with the practical problems of preparing input and interpreting the output timing charts.

The input to the timer is a "trace" of the instructions actually executed by the program to be timed. The trace consists of the sequence of instructions executed along with certain control information. This input is prepared by running an ACS assembly code program through the Unroller program (see Section 1).

Certain job controlling cards including a specification of the hardware parameters for the run are added to the trace deck to form the input deck.
-The output of the Timer is a series of timing charts which illustrate the activities initiated by the instructions of the input program trace in the various hardware components of the MPM as a function of time.

A detailed description of the input and output formats and output interpretation is given on the following pages. Examples are given which follow the paths of individual instructions through the various sections of the MPM as a function of time.

\section*{Timing Simulator Input Preparation}

Input Trace Cards: The Unroller program is used to produce the input trace card decks for the Timing Simulator. An ACS assembly code program is run on the Unroller and a trace deck is produced as output. Refer to Section 1 for information on this program. The trace deck produced by the Unroller is an instruction by instruction record of those instructions actually executed by the program to be timed. Each instruction of the trace is present on a separate card. The format of these cards is specified in Fig. 2-1.

Timer Input Deck Format: Each program to be timed is formed into one deck beginning with a machine parameter card, followed by the trace cards for the program, and ending with a card containing 999 in cols 55, 56, 57 (a "STดP" card). A number of such input decks may be stacked and timed during one execution of the Timer. An example of this stacked job deck structure is illustrated in Fig. 2-2.

Parameter Card: The first card of each input program deck is a parameter card which specifies certain MPM hardware parameter values and certain parameters for the running of the job (maximum simulated time, etc.). These parameters are the following:

JOBNAME: Up to six characters identifying program
NABUF, NATEST, NAG \(\varnothing\) : The number of A Buffers, the number tested each cycle for OP issuance, the maximum number of OP which may be issued for execution each cycle from the \(A\) Buffers (A Contending Stack).
NXBUF, NXTEST, NXG \(\varnothing\) : Similarly for X unit Contending Stack.

NQBUF, NQTEST, NQG \(\quad\) : Similarly for Data Memory Queue.
NB \(\varnothing X\) : Number of memory boms.
NBBUF, NSBUF: Number of Exit History Table positions, number of Skip Table positions.
\(N \not \subset \emptyset \mathrm{~T}\) : Number of \(D \varnothing\) Table positions.
NøPSC: Number of PSC registers.
NDBUS: Number of Dispatcher Buses.
NADSP: Maximum number of OPS which may be dispatched to the A Buffer per cycle.
NXDSP: Similarly for X dispatching.
MXTIME: Run control parameter. Maximum simulated time allowed for run (in machine cycles). Run terminated if this time is exceeded.
MEMDLY: Memory Delay Time. See example of arithmetic load G7 on page 2-13 for exact definition.
ØUTLVL: One of four output levels may be chosen. Level 0 is most detailed, Level 3 is least detailed (and fastest cunning). Level 1 is normally used and is level shown in the examples at the end of this section.
FSTADD: Starting address of the input program.
Fig. 2-3 specifies the format of the parameter card. Minimum, typical, and maximum values of the parameters are given. The TYP values represent the "most likely" values of the hardware parameters.

There are other machine parameters not controlled by the pararneter card which may be easily varied by changing certain initialization tables in the Timer. An example of this is the busing and facility characteristics in the \(A\) and \(X\) execution units. These structures are listed in the output for each run (see output portion of this section). If changes in these machine parameters are desired for a particular timing study, contact the author.

\section*{Figure 2-1. Timer Input Track Card Format}
COLS
1. Instruction Address ..... 2-6
2. Op Code Mnemonic (left justified) ..... 8-14
3. I (Dec) ..... 16-17
4. J (Dec) ..... 19-20
5. K (Dec) ..... 22-23
6. H (Dec) ..... 26-30
7. Branch Successful bit. Indicates result of ..... 35
branch op. Applies from and including branchop to and including EXIT op.
8. Skip Flagged ops bit. Indicates skip state. ..... 36 Applies to op after skip to and including next skip
9. Skip Flag ..... 37
10. Effective address accessed (LOAD/STORE) ..... 41-45
11. Address of next instruction to be executed ..... 48-52
12. Numeric Op Code ..... 55-57
13. Long \(O p=2\), Short \(O p=1\) ..... 60
Figure 2-2. Timer Input Deck Format

Example: Two PROGRAMS PR \(\varnothing G 1\) and TEST to be timed:


Figure 2-3. The Parameter Card Format
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline PARAMETER & MIN & TYP & MAX & COLS \\
\hline J \(\varnothing\) BNAME & & & & 1-6 \\
\hline NABUF & 1 & 8 & 12 & 9-10 \\
\hline NATEST & 1 & 8 & NABUF & 11-12 \\
\hline NAG \(\varnothing\) & 1 & 3 & 3 & 13-14 \\
\hline NXBUF & 1 & 3 & 12 & 15-16 \\
\hline NXTEST & 1 & 3 & NXBUF & 17-18 \\
\hline NXG \(\varnothing\) & 1 & 3 & 3 & 19-20 \\
\hline NQBUF & 1 & 8 & 16 & 21-22 \\
\hline NQTEST & 1 & 8 & 16 & 23-24 \\
\hline NQG \(\varnothing\) & 1 & 2 & \(N B \varnothing X\) & 25-26 \\
\hline \(N B \emptyset X\) & 1 & 8 & 16 & 27-28 \\
\hline NBBUF & 1 & 3 & 8 & 29-30 \\
\hline NSBUF & 1 & 4 & 8 & 31-32 \\
\hline NøDดT & 1 & 6 & 16 & 33-34 \\
\hline NøPSC & 0 & 8 & 8 & 35-36 \\
\hline NDBUS & 1 & 2 & 2 & 37-38 \\
\hline NADSP & 1 & 4 & NABUF & 39-40 \\
\hline NXDSP & 1 & 3 & NXBUF & . \(41-42\) \\
\hline MXTIME & & 300.0 & & 60-66 (F7. 1) \\
\hline MEMDLY & 2.0 & 5.0 & & 68-71 (F4.1) \\
\hline ¢UTLVL & 0 & 1 & 3 & 73-74 \\
\hline FSTADD & 0 & 0 & & 76-80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Timing Simulator Output Interpretation}

For each input job, a deck headed by a parameter card and terminated by a 999 card, an output listing is produced of the following form:
(i) The first page lists the job name and all parameters of the run including the busing and facility structure.
(ii) This is followed by a listing of those input trace instructions operated upon by the MPM during the first 100 simulated cycles of time.
(iii) This is followed by a listing of timing charts indicating the activities initiated by those instructions of (ii) during the first 100 simulated cycles.
(iv) Items (ii) and (iii) are repeated for successive 100 cycle periods till the run stops or is terminated by MXTIME.

\section*{Figure 2-4. Overall Form of Output Listings}


We will now examine the general characteristics of these three components of the output. A sample output listing is included at the end of the section for reference while studying these general descriptions.
- Some specific examples will then be developed which illustrate the progression of instruction activity through the different sections of the MPM. These examples are referenced by markers on the sample output listings.

Parameters of Run: This page lists the job name, date and time of run, and the MPM hardware parameters for the run. Many of these parameters are those specified on the input parameter card, described earlier in this section. The A and X unit busing and facility structures are printed for reference in a table with the following entries:
1. The abbreviated name of the facility (FA1 = floating adder 1 ).
2. The Rep Time of the facility - the number of cycles an operation keeps the facility busy.
3. The Delay Time of the facility - the number of cycles the facility requires to perform operation.
4. INBUS - the numbers assigned indicate which facilities share a common inkus.
5. BOX - the numbers assigned show which facilities share circuitry and cannot be simultaneously busy.
6. OUTBUS - the numbers indicate which facilities share a common outbus.

Input Program Trace: For each block of 100 cycles of simulated time the Timer prints the instructions of the input trace which have been operated upon by the MPM during that time. This is used to reference the timing charts for that period of time. The input program trace printed is a copy of the input cards with five fields added:
(i) Time markers are placed indicating the time (approx.) that the instruction entered an IB.
(ii) A letter is assigned to each instruction by decoding the instruction address MOD 26. This letter is then used as the marker for that instruction in the timing charts.
(iii), (iv) Bits are set indicating whether the op is to be dispatched to the A unit, \(X\) unit or both.
(v) The number of the \(\mathbb{I B}\) into which the instruction was fetched. This along with (i) will locate the instruction marker's first appearance on the timing charis (in a dispatch register).

The Timing Charts: A set of timing charts are produced for each 100 cycle period of simulated time. The general form of these charts is as follows:


TTME
The time axis has markers every cycle and number indicating 10, \(20, \ldots, 90\) cycle points in the 100 cycle period. The time of the period is listed at the top of the page (ex.: STMULATED TTME \(=300\) TO 399).

The machine facilities included in the timing charts are identified as follows:

DSPX1, DSPX2, DAPPA1, DSPA2: These are the dispatch registers X1, X2, A1, A2. The IB number and DO table entry are listed which correspond to the contents of the dispatch register. The eight 24-bit instruction fields are shown for each register with markers indicating which instructions of the input trace are currently present.

BRANCH CONTROLS: These are hardware triggers controlling the branching process. ER1, ER2, ER3, BE1, BE2, BE3, ET1, ET2, ET3 are the exit resolved, branch executed, and exit taken entries in the Exit History Table (EHT). BRXP, BRAP are the \(X\) and A pointers to the EHT. The description of the other listed controls is beyond the scope of this introductory memo.

SKIP CONTROLS: Skip state triggers with SKXP, SKAP; the X and \(A\) unit pointers to the triggers.

A BUFFER, X BUFFER: These are the \(A\) and \(X\) unit contender stacks where ops are tested for interlocks before issuance to the functional units. This is the point where ops may be issued out of order if the appropriate interlocks are satisfied. The instruction occupancy of the buffer positions is indicated by markers.

A FACILITIES, X FACILITIES: These are the various functional units such as adders, multipliers, shifters, logic units, etc.

The instruction markers are placed in a facility position for that period of time during which the instruction actually has the facility busy for interlocking purposes. Note that an op keeps a facility busy for a number of cycles equal to the REP TIME of that facility.

MEMORY QUEUE (D): The data memory queue. This is the queue which holds data loads and stores after issuance from the contender stacks and before issuance to memory. This queue roughly approximates the timing effects of the BLCU with no paging activity. If appropriate interlocks are satisfied the requests may go out of order. An instruction is indicated by its marker.

MEMORY QUEUE (I): Instruction fetch memory queue. This queue holds the instruction fetch requests prior to issuance to memory. The markers are the IB destination number of the fetch. Four markers are placed corresponding to the four pieces of one request. When all have been issued a new set may enter.

MEMORY: Here we can observe the relative timing of loads, stores and instruction fetches as their markers indicate busy memory BOMS. The marker for an instruction is placed on the second of the two cycles that the op is activating the BOM--noting that the memory BOM REP TIME is one cycle.

A REGS BUSY: When an OP is issued from the A contender stack to a functional unit, the A destination register of the \(O P\) is marked busy with the OP marker. This is used to interlock the issuance of other OPS in the contender stack (which use that destination register) until the result arrives at the register ( or is available for bypassing to the input of another facility).

ABU REGS BUSY: The A Back-Up Registers are the destination registers for \(A\) loads and \(X\) to \(A\) moves (instructions issued from the \(X\) unit contender stack). At the time of issuance the op marker is placed in the ABU REGS BUSY position corresponding to the op destination and remains till the load or move is completed.

X REGS BUSY: The busy bits for the X Registers, similar to the A REGS BUSY described above.

Example of Timing Simulator Output
At the end of this section is a copy of the output listing for a typical run of the Timing Simulator. The parameter page is followed by 3 pages listing the input trace for the first 100 cycle period of time. Then 4 pages are listed containing the timing charts for the first 100 cycles.

The program being timed is a version of Crout Reduction. In this case the MPM is active for only 58 simulated machine cycles--a starting transient is followed by three passes through the inner loop of the program.

The interpretation of the timing charts can be somewhat complex. In this memo only a few simple illustrative examples are given which follow the paths of certain instructions of the sample program through the various sections of the machine.

A thorough knowledge of the MPM hardware controls and considerable practice are necessary for a complete interpretation of the timing charts. However, certain subsets of the charts may be studied with a detailed knowledge of only that section of the MPM. For example, someone interested in compiler scheduling of instructions could focus his attention on the performance of his input programs in the A and X BUFFERS and \(A\) and \(X\) FACILITIES, observing the effects of various schedulings on the timing through these units. A knowledge of the interlocking rules of the contender stacks and of the busing and facility structure would be sufficient to get a start at this.

Certain simple observations may yield useful measures of MPM performance on the input program. The overall time of the run is easily determined. It is given as the upper time limit on the last set of pages listing timing charts for the run. In our example this overall run time is 58 cycles. Another measure which is often useful is the time taken to execute a program loop. If the input program is of the type
which repetitively executes a loop, the loop pattern will be obvious in the A and X FACILITY busy markers on the timing charts. This is because a given op has the same marker symbol each time the loop is executed (the marker is determined by the instruction address).
- Thus the loop time is found by measuring from marker to similar marker in the A FACILITIES for example. In our sample output we find that the MPM executes the program loop 3 times in the FLOATING MULITPLIER between cycle 33 and cycle 52. The pattern has not yet settled down to a repetitive one in the example, but the loop time is seen to be approximately 8 cycles.

Some detailed examples follow. Refer to the sample listings at the end of this section.

Instruction Fetching: At time \(\doteq 1\) an instruction fetch request to fill IB(1) has been placed on the MEMORY QUEUE (I). It is issued to MEMORY in the next cycle and (after some busing time) we observe at time \(=4\) that MEMORY BOMS 1, 2, 3, 4 are busy servicing this request. The fetched instruction is then bused to \(I B(1)\) (not indicated in output). At time \(=8\) we observe that DSPX1 and DSPA1 have been loaded from \(I B(1)\). The instructions which were fetched are seen to be A, C, E, G, which are \(X\) OPS and in DSPX1, and \(G\) which is an \(A\) OP and in DSPA1.

Notice that instruction fetching occurs up to time \(=33\). After this time the loop has been contained in the IB's and no further instruction fetching is required to run the problem.

Multiply Instruction E37: At time \(=37\) we find the instruction MN 13, 5 , 6 , which is marked by an " \(E\) ", in the instruction trace section of the output.

Let us follow the activity of this instruction through the MPM. We observe from the trace that \(E\) was fetched into \(I B(8)\). . At time \(=38\) we notice that \(\operatorname{IB}(8) \rightarrow\) DSPA2 and we find E in DSPA2(1). At time \(=38\) only two positions are free in the A BUFFER so the OPS \(X\) and \(Y\) in DSPA1 move to the A BUFFER at time \(=39\) but \(E\) remains in the dispatchers, moving up to DSPA1(1).

At time \(=39\), the \(A\) BUFFER has two free positions so at time \(=40\) instruction \(E\) along with \(F\) are bused to the \(A\) BUFFER. We find \(E\) in A BUFFER (4) at a time \(=40\).

Now at time \(=40\) another multiply instruction, \(P\), is present in the A BUFFER and ahead of E. This multiply, interlocking E, is issued the next cycle while E remains present at time \(=41\) in A BUFFER (3). At this time there are no ops ahead of it in the buffer which interlock
- it so it is issued for execution and is not present in A BUFFER at time \(=\) 42. Notice that A REG BUSY (13) goes on with the marker E at time \(=\) 42 to interlock any OPS following E which use A REG (13) as a source or destination.

The multiplier FM under A FACILITIES is found busy with E at cycle time \(=43\) (one cycle of busing required from A BUFFER to A FACILITIES). Then at time \(=44\) the A REG BUSY (13) is no longer marked by E indicating that the result of \(E\) will be available (for bypassing) at the output of the multiplier at cycle time \(=46\). Note that the delay time of the FM is 3 cycles, the multiply E taking cycles \(43,44,45\), with the result actually back at register 13 at cycle 47. But the multiplier is only "busy" with E for one cycle (the REP TIME of FM) so the multiplier could handle a new op every cycle. The timing of the busing and multiplication are illustrated in Fig. 2-5, for the specific example instruction E37.

\section*{Figure 2-5. Timing of Example Instruction E37}


Arithmetic Load Instruction G7: At time \(=7\) we find the instruction LAT 9, 0, 31, 136 which is marked by a " \(G\) ", in the instruction trace section of the output. We observe from the trace that \(G\) was fetched into \(\operatorname{IB}(1)\). It is both an \(A O P\) and an XOP and will be dispatched to
- both units.

At time \(=8\), we observe from the timing charts that \(\mathrm{IB}(1) \rightarrow\) DSPX1, \(\operatorname{IB}(1) \rightarrow\) DSPA1. At that time \(G\) is present in DSPX1(7), DSPX1(8), and in DSPA1(7), DSPA1(8). G is a long OP and takes two of the 24bit positions in the dispatchers.

Let us follow the A unit activity of G first. We note that at time \(=8\) - \(G\) is the first AOP to enter the dispatchers and thus it is bused to the A BUFFER the next cycle. At time \(=9\) we find \(G\) in A BUFFER (1). This part of \(G\) is a "replace" operation and is issued the next cycle, causing A REG BUSY (9) (the destination of the load) to be marked busy with a \(G\) at time \(=10\). This sets the "front" register busy waiting for the "back-up" register to be loaded by the X-unit.

Now let us follow the \(X\) unit activity of G. 'Since three other X OPS precede \(G\) in DSPX1 at time \(=8\), and at most 3 ops may be dispatched to the X BUFFER per cycle, G remains in DSPX1 at time \(=9\). At time \(=10\) it is bused to X BUFFER (2), for it is the next op to be dispatched to the X BUFFER and both \(A\) and \(C\) leave the \(X\) BUFFER at time \(=10\) allowing G to enter.

We now find that \(G\) remains in the \(X\) BUFFER through time \(=16\). This is because it uses X REG (31) as an index and X REG (31) is busy through time \(=15\) waiting for a load to arrive.

At time \(=16 \mathrm{G}\) finally satisfies the contender stack interlocks and at time \(=17\) its execution is initiated by (i) starting effective address computation in X FACILITTY EA1, (ii) placing an entry in the MEMORY QUEUE (D), (iii) marking the ABU REG BUSY (9) with G. The queue entry waits on the queue another cycle for the effective address to arrive, and then is issued to memory. We note that at time \(=21\), MEMORY (1) is marked busy with G, and at time \(=23\) the busy bits on ABU (9) and A(9) are turned off indicating that the load has arrived at \(A B U\) (9) and then moved immediately to the waiting \(A(9)\).

The detailed timing of this memory activity is illustrated in Fig. 2-6.

Figure 2-6. Timing of Memory Activity of Example G7


INPUT PRCGRAM FOR THIS RUN \(=C R-F S\)
IINE/DATE OF RUN \(=4 D 72 C B F E\) CO67194F

Machine parameters fur this run ———


MNEER OF PSC REGS \(=8\)
NUNEER DISP BUSES \(=2\)
MAX A OPS DSP/CYCLE \(=4 \quad\) MAX \(X\) OPS CSP/CYCLE \(=4\)
\begin{tabular}{llllllllllll} 
A EACILITIES - & FA1 & FA2 & FM & FD & IA & IM & ID & C & L & S \\
REP IIME & \(=\) & 1 & 1 & 1 & 7 & 1 & 2 & 10 & 1 & 1 & 1. \\
DELAY IIME & \(=\) & 3 & 4 & 3 & 9 & 2 & 5 & 15 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
INBLS & \(=\) & 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
BOX & \(=\) & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\
OUTBUS & \(=\) & 2 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 6 & 1 & 3
\end{tabular}



TIME \(=22.00\)
TIME \(=23.00\)
TIME \(=24.00\)
IIME \(=25.00\)
TIME \(=26.00\)
TIME \(=27.00\)
\(\qquad\)
082

(. \(\mathrm{NE}=29.00\)

TIME \(=30.00\)
TIME \(=31.00\)
IIME \(=32.00\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline U & 72 & AXK & 3. & & 0 & 2 & 100 & 3 & 74 & 76 & 210 & A \\
\hline W & 74 & AXK & 2 & 2 & 0 & 60 & 100 & 90 & 76 & 76 & 210 & A \\
\hline \(Y\) & 76 & EXIT & c & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.00 & 0 & 41 & 199 & 111 & A \\
\hline P & 41 & MN & 11 & 9 & 10 & 0 & 000 & 0 & 42 & 178 & 101 & A \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TINE \(=33.00\)
TIME \(=34.00\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Q & 42 & LAT & 9 & 0 & 5 & 196 & 000 & 376 & 44 & 15 & 211 & 6 \\
\hline S & 44 & LAT & 10 & 0 & 3 & 8.0 & 000 & 86 & 46 & 15 & 211 & 6 \\
\hline U & 46 & AXK & 5 & 5 & 0 & 60 & 000 & 150 & 48 & 76 & 210 & 6 \\
\hline 0 & & & & & & & & & & & & \\
\hline d & 48 & MN & 12 & 7 & 8 & 0 & 0 CO & 0 & 49 & 178 & 101 & 7 \\
\hline \(x\) & 49 & LAT & 7 & 0 & 2 & 196 & 000 & 376 & 51 & 15 & 211 & 7 \\
\hline 2 & 51 & LAT & 8 & 0 & 4 & 80 & 000 & 86 & 53 & 15 & 211 & 7 \\
\hline 0 & 53 & CGEX & 1 & 1 & 5 & 0 & 000 & 990 & 54 & 87 & 110 & 7 \\
\hline C & 54 & BAND & 1 & 1 & 0 & 41 & 100 & 881 & 50 & 139 & 210 & 7 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

TIME \(=36.00\)
TINE \(=37.00\)


TIME \(=39.00\)
IINE \(=40.00\)
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrrrrrrr}
U & 72 & AXK & 3 & 3 & 0 & 2 & 100 & 5 & 74 & 76 & 210 & A \\
W & 74 & AXK & 2 & 2 & 0 & 60 & 100 & 150 & 76 & 76 & 210 & A \\
Y & 76 & EXIT & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 100 & 0 & 41 & 199 & 111 & A \\
P & 41 & MN & 1.1 & 9 & 10 & 0 & 000 & 0 & 42 & 178 & 101 & A
\end{tabular}
\(\operatorname{TIME}=41.00\)
TINE \(=42.00\)
IIME \(=43.00\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Q & 42 & LAT & 9 & 0 & 5 & 196 & 000 & 496 & 44 & 15 & 211 & 6 \\
\hline -S & 44 & LAT & 10 & 0 & 3 & 8.0 & 0 CO & 90 & 46 & 15 & 211 & 6 \\
\hline U & 46 & AXK & 5 & 5 & 0 & 60 & 000 & 210 & 48 & 76 & 210 & 6 \\
\hline 1 & 48 & MN & 12 & 7 & 8 & 0 & \(0 C O\) & 0 & 49 & 178 & 101 & 7 \\
\hline X & 49 & LAT & 7 & 0 & 2 & 196 & 0 CO & 496 & 51 & 15 & 211 & 7 \\
\hline 2 & 51 & LAT & 8 & 0 & 4 & 80 & 000 & 90 & 53 & 15 & 211 & 7 \\
\hline B & 53 & CGEX & 1 & 1 & 5 & 0 & 000 & 1050 & 54 & 87 & 110 & 7 \\
\hline 6 & 54 & BAND & 1 & 1 & 0 & 41 & 100 & 881 & 56 & 139 & 210 & 7 \\
\hline \[
\overline{00}
\] & 56 & MN & 13 & 5 & 6 & 0 & 100 & 210 & 57 & 178 & 101 & 8 \\
\hline F & 57 & LAT & 5 & 0 & 5 & 136 & 100 & 556 & 59 & 15 & 211 & 8 \\
\hline H & 59 & LAT & 6 & 0 & 3 & 82 & 100 & 92 & 61 & 15 & 211 & 8 \\
\hline J & 61 & \(A N\) & 2 & 12 & 2 & 0 & 100 & 150 & 62 & 166 & 101 & 8 \\
\hline K & 62 & AN & 1 & 11 & 1 & 0 & 100 & 840 & 63 & 166 & 101 & 8 \\
\hline \(L\) & 63 & MN & 14 & 3 & 4 & 0 & 100 & 10 & 64 & 178 & 101 & 8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}






\section*{CURRENT JOB RUNNING PROCEDURES}

This section describes the procedures to be followed in order to use
- the timing simulation program. These procedures are to be completely revised and expanded in the near future so that the programs may be stored on disk at the MOD 75 comp lab and users may submit runs directly at the comp lab (see Section 5).

To use the timing simulator at the present time:
(i) Write the assembly code input program for the Unroller (Section 1).
(ii) Prepare the machine parameter card required for the Timer input deck (Section 2).
(iii) Submit these items to L. Conway, Room 203, Extension 252.

TABLE OF IMPLEMENTED INSTRUCTIONS

The table on the following pages lists the ACS-1 instruction set op - -codes and indicates (with an X) if a given op is implemented in the Timing Simulator.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline OP & & OP & & OP & & OP & \\
\hline - ACH & X & CEQXK & X & EQA & X & LD & \\
\hline ACL & X & CGED & & EQC & X & LDA & \\
\hline ADN & & CGEI & X & EQX & X & LDH & \\
\hline ADR & & CGEN & X & EXIT & X & LDHAA & \\
\hline ADU & & CGEX & X & EXITA & X & LDHBA & \\
\hline AI & X & CGEXK & X & EXITL & X & LDHCA & \\
\hline AN & X & CMEQD & & EXITP & & LDHDA & \\
\hline ANDA & X & CMEQN & X & & & LL & X \\
\hline ANDC & X & CMGED & & & & LMA & \\
\hline ANDX & X & CMGEN & X & FAFA & X & LMS & \\
\hline AR & X & CNTAA & X & FAFC & X & LMX & \\
\hline AU & X & CNTAX & X & FAFX & X & LR & X \\
\hline AX & X & CNTDA & X & FOFA & X & LX & X \\
\hline AXC & X & CNTDX & X & FOFC & X & LXA & \\
\hline AXK & X & CNTT & X & FOFX & X & LXC & \\
\hline & & CUGEI & X & & & LXCA & \\
\hline & & CUGEX & X & & & LXH & X \\
\hline BAND & X & CUGEXK & X & Hio & & & \\
\hline BEQ & X & CVF & X & & & & \\
\hline BFAF & X & CVI & X & & & MAX & \\
\hline BFOF & X & CVN & X & IC & & MCX & X \\
\hline BOR & X & CVS & X & IDA & & MDN & \\
\hline BTAF & X & & & IFA & X & MDR & \\
\hline BTOF & X & & & IFX & X & MDU & \\
\hline BU & & DDN & & IFZA & X & MI & X \\
\hline BXOR & X & DDR & & IFZX & X & MKL & X \\
\hline & & DI & X & IR & & MKP & \\
\hline & & DMI & & ITUMA & & MKR & X \\
\hline CBA & X & DNIN & & ITUMP. & & MLC & X \\
\hline CBMA & & DMR & & IVIB & & MLX & X \\
\hline CBMX & & DN & X & & & MIMI & \\
\hline CBX & X & DR & X & LA & X & MMN & \\
\hline CEQD & & DRX & X & LAA & & MMU & \\
\hline CEQI & X & DRXK & X & LAH & X & MN & X \\
\hline CEQN & X & DX & X & LAT & X & MOT & \\
\hline CEQX & X & DXK & X & LATH & X & MR & X \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\section*{PLANNED MODIFICATIONS}

Certain modifications to the simulation programs are now being made or are planned for the near future. These are briefly described below to assist users in their planning. Updates to this memo will be issued as these changes are included in the programs.

\section*{Unroller Changes}

The control specification facilities will be extended.

\section*{Timing Simulator Changes}
(i) Additional OPS will be implemented.
(ii) New output features and options will be added.

Job Running Procedure Changes
Currently jobs must be submitted to L. Conway who will handle the processing of the jobs. Two separate programs must be run consecutively to process one timing simulation. This results in a rather long overall turn-around time. To improve on this, the two programs will be merged, with the trace temporarily stored in core or on disk and automatically passed between them.

Also, the program will be placed on disk at the MOD 75 comp lab. The running of jobs will then be handled directly by the user, who will submit the assembly code input deck, parameter card, and appropriate JCL cards to call for the timing simulator.

These changes will greatly reduce over-all tum-around time and allow a much greater number of users to be served than is now possible.

A UNIT INTLK SIMULATION:

ENCLOSED IS A SAMPLE OF THE SORT OF CODE USED IN THE TIMING SIMULATOR. THE CODE IS CONDENSED FROM ACTUAL SIMULATOR CODE AND DESCRIBES THE BARE ESSENTIALS OF THE A UNIT INTLKS OF A PASSIBLE MACHINE DESIGN SIMiLAR TO ASS. IT SHOULD SERVE AS A GUIDE TO HOW ONE MIGHT CADE A SIMULATION. IT DOES NOT DESCRIDE THE INTLKS COMPLETELY NOR IS THE MODEL USED MEANT TO REALLY MODEL ASS.

ENCLOSED ARE:
SKETCH OF THE "HARDWARE" ARRAYS PL
SIMPLIFIED FLOWCHART OF XACAN PL
SIMPLIFIED FLOWCHART OF XAEMP PS
CODE (COMMENTED) FDR BACON P P
CODE (COMMENTED) FOR KEMP PG
ACTUAL A UNIT FAC, BUS TABLES PB
SKETCH OF A UNIT FAC., BUSES PG
\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\mathcal{L} & \\
\text { FEB } 151968 & 093 \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text { L. Conway } \\
\text { Archives }
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]


SUBRUTINE MACON: SIMPLIFIED FLOWEMART
THIS COUTNESCANS THE STACK FOR OPS WHICH GAN GB - lie. PASS ALL INTLK TEST. IT MARKS SUCH OP "GO" AND SETS CERTAIN BUSY AND SHIFT CEN PATTERNS.


SUBROUTINE XAEMP: SIMPLIFIED FLOWCHART:

This routine sCans stack for opswhieh CAN GO. IT ISSUES OPS BY SETTLE APPROPRIATE WAITNG SITS AND REMUUING OP ARUM THE STACK

The routine also resets waiting bits when shift cells indicate outbussing to resisters. Then shifts the shift cells.


SUBROUTINE XAC \(\phi N\)
C \(/\) MM \(\$ N-\)－
CALL CAUSE（AC\＆N，TIME＋ \(1.0,0,0,0\) ）
CALL CAUSE（AEMP，TIME \(+0.8,0,0,0\) ）
\(D \phi \perp I=1,8\)
1 AG申（I）＝0
\[
N G \phi=0
\]

C．SCAN THE A CONTENDER STACK FOR INS＝ 1 TO 8 TO FIND OPS
C．WHICH CAN GO－MARK THEM WITH AG\＆（INS）\(=1\) ．
D¢ 100 INS \(=1,8\) ．
IF（AFULL（INS）．EQ．0）G\＄T\＄100
IF（INS．EQ．1）\(G \oplus T \downarrow 21\)
INSMI＝INS－1
C TEST THE SOURCE－DEST INTERLOCKS
D中 \(20 I=1\) ，INSMI
D\＆ 20 REG \(=1\) ，NAREGS
IF（ \((A S \not \subset R\)（ \(N N S, R E G\) ）．EQ． 1 ）．AND，（ADEST（I，REG）．EQ．1））\(G \not \subset T \neq 100\) IF（ \((A D E S T(1 N S, R E G) . E Q .1)\) ．AND．（ASAR（I，REG）．EQ．1））G\＆ \(7 \neq 100\) IF（（ADEST（INS，REG）．EQ．1），AND．（ADEST（I，REG）．EQ．1））G\＄T\％ 100
20 C\＆NTINUE
21 C円NINGE
C TEST WAITING BIT INTERLOCK
\[
\text { DP } 22 \text { REG = I, NAREGS }
\]

IF（（AS円R（INS，REG）．EQ．1）．AND．（ABUSY（REG）．EQ．1））GФTゆ 100
IF（ \((A D E S T(I N S, R E G)\) ．EQ．J）．AND．（ABUSY（REG）．EQ．1））G\＆\(T \phi 100\)
22 C\＆NTNVE
C FIND．FACILITY USED BY OP（INS）
\(D \phi 25\) FAd \(=1\) ，NAFAC
IF（AFAC（INS，FAC）．NE．0）\(G \neq T \neq 26\)
25 CONTINUE
26 CONTINVE
C SEE IF INBUS REA＇D iY FAC IS BUFY
\[
\text { INBUS }=A F, B U S \text { (FAC) }
\]

IF（AIBBSY（INBUS）．EQ．I）GP．TN100
\(C\) SEE IF FACILITY BOX REQ．D IS BUSY
\[
\begin{aligned}
& B \varnothing X=A B \varnothing X(F A C) \\
& I F(A B X B S Y(B A X) \cdot E Q .1) G \& T \phi 100
\end{aligned}
\]
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C TEST FAC BUSY REQUIEMONTS AGAINST SWIFT CELL CONTENTS
C WHICH INDICATE BUSY CONDITIONS SET BY PRIOR OPS.
\(D \phi 30 T=I, N S L \varnothing T\)
IF(( AFSL申T (FAC, T) EG. 1 ). AND. (AFACSC (FAC, T) E EG.1)) \(6 \neq T \phi 100\)
30. CPNTINUE

C TEST F\&R PUTBUS CONFLICTS BY COMPARING BUS/TIME READ
\(C\) AGAINST CONTENTS OF SHIFT CELLS
```

\&BUS = AFYBUS (FAC)
DELAY = AFDLY (FAC)
IF (( AфBUS (INS,pBUS).NE.O).AND. (ABUSSC( DBUS,DELAY).NE.O))
X G\$T\phi 100

```
\(C\) IF REACH THIS POINT, ALL TESTS PASSED, AND OP CAN \(6 \phi\)
C SO MARK GO, AND SET APPROP. PATTERNS UN SHIFT CELLS.
\[
A, B B S Y(1 \sim B \cup S)=1
\]
\[
A B \times B s y(\text { in Bus })=1
\]

Dp \(32 T=1\) NSL\&T
\[
\text { IF (AFSLøT }(F A C, T) \cdot E Q, 0) \text { AFACSC }(F A C, T)=1
\]

32 C\&NTINUE
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ABUSSC ( BUS, DELAY) }=\text { AфBUS (INS, } \varnothing 8 U S) \\
& A G \varnothing(I N S)=1 \\
& N G \varnothing=N G \phi+1 \\
& I F(N G \varnothing . E Q . N A G \varnothing) \text { RETURN }
\end{aligned}
\]

100 CoNTINUE
RETURN
END

SUBROUTINE XAEMP
COMMoN－－
C THIS RoUTINE FIRST SCANS THE A CYNTENDER STACK FIR C． CPS MARKED GQ．IT ISSUES THE OPS BY SETTING THE \(C\) WAITING BITS AND REMOUNT THE OP FROM THE STACK．
\(D \phi 100\) INS \(=1,8\)
5 IF（AGr（INS）．EQ．O）G中T中 100
C． DP（INS）GoES－FIRST SET REQ WAITING BITS
Db 10 REG＝I，NARES
IF（ ADEST（INS，REG）．NE．1） \(6 \varnothing\) T 10
ABUSY（REG）\(=1\)
10 CONTINUE
C NOW REMOVE THE OP FROM THE STACK AND BUBBLE UP STACK．
\[
A_{1 N P T}=A_{1 N P T}-1
\]

IF（INS．EQ．8）G\＆Tめ 31
\(D \phi 30 I=1 N S, 7\)
\(A \subset \phi(I)=A \subset \phi(I+1)\)
\(\operatorname{AFULL}(I)=\operatorname{AFULL}(I+1)\)
\(D \phi 25 \mathrm{~J}=1,25\)
\(25 \operatorname{ABUFF}(J, J)=\operatorname{ABUFF}(I+1, J)\)
\(0 \phi 2 G J=1\) ，NARES
\[
A S \phi R(I, J)=A S \phi R(I+I, J)
\]

26 ADUST \((I, J)=\operatorname{ADEST}(I+1, J)\)
\(D \otimes 27\) FAC \(=1\) ，NAFAC
27 AFAR（ \(I, F A C\) ）\(=\operatorname{AFAC}(I+1, F A C)\)
DP 28 BUS＝！NABUS
\(28 \operatorname{ApBUS}(I, B \cup S)=A \phi B \cup S(I+1, B \cup S)\)
30 continue
31 A \(\mathcal{O}(8)=0\)
AFULL（8）\(=0\)
Db \(125 \quad J=1,25\)
125 \(\operatorname{ABUFF}(8,3)=A B\)
\(D \varnothing 126 J=1, N A R E G S\)
\(\operatorname{ADEST}(8,5)=0\)
126 AS\＆R \((8,5)=0\)
099
L．Conway Archives
\(D \varnothing 127\) FAC=1,NAFAC
127 AFAC \((8, F A C)=0\)
\(D \phi 128 \quad B U S=1, N A B U S\)
\(128 \quad \operatorname{AqBUS}(8, B \cup S)=0\)
\(64 . T \neq 5\)
100 C 1 NTINUE
C
C THE NEXT FUNETI甘N OF THE RQUTINE IS TX CQNTRWL THE
C WAITING BITS-RESET WHEN INDICATED SV SHIFT CELL
C. ENTRIES THEN SHIFT THE SHIFT CELLS.
\(D \phi 210\) BUS \(=1\), NABUS
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DEST }=A B U S S C(B U S ; 1) \\
& \text { ABUSY (DEST) }=0
\end{aligned}
\]

210 CXNTINUE
C NOW SMIFT THE SHIFT CELSS
\[
D \phi \quad 299 \quad I=1,10
\]
\[
A B \times 85 Y(5)=0^{\circ}
\]

299 AIBSSY (I) \(=0\)
\[
S L \not \subset T M 1=N S L \varnothing T-1
\]
\(D \phi 301 J=1,10\)
Dø 300 SLףT \(=1, S L \varnothing T M 1\)
300 ABUSSC ( J,SLهT) = ABussc ( \(5, S L \phi T+1)\)
301 ABUSSC ( \(J, N S L \psi T)=0\)
\(D \phi 3035=1, N A F A C\)
D \(\phi 302 S L \phi T=1, S L \phi T M L\)
302 AFACSC(J,SLpT) 3 AFACSC \((J, S L \phi T+1)\)
303 AFASSC \((J, N S L P T)=0\)
RETURN
END

\section*{A FACILITIES, BUSES}



AFDLY \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 3 & 4 & 3 & 9 & 2 & 5 & 15 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
AFIBUS \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 2 & 1 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Af申sus \begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 2 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 6 & 1 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

101


\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline \(8 /<\) & 9 & 5 & 5 & \(h\) & \(\varepsilon\) & 2 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}\(\quad-x \phi 8 x\)
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline 8 & 0 & 4 & 2 & 2 & \(\varepsilon\) & \(\tau\) & 9 & 5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}\(\quad\) s \(08 \phi \rightarrow x\)


-stiun loua!tounf 110 of
s-snqu: llb amasst sfollfigs snqui o \(\mathrm{N}: 2 f \circ \mathrm{~N}\)
\[
\text { sヨsng's s311171) } x
\]


A FACILITIES, BUSES
\(A F \overrightarrow{A C} \quad\)\begin{tabular}{c|cccccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}







C MMM \(\phi N / T A G S / D(256,70)\) (17 ARRLLGT бPSET)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{3 STMZ [ 12345678910111213141617181920}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{34 STMZA}} \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{36} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{37} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|r|}{38 MXA X X X} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{39 MAX} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{40 MKL \(X X X\)} \\
\hline & 41 & MKR & \(\times \times\) & \(x\) & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|r|}{42 MLX \(X\) - 4 -} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{43 MXS} \\
\hline & 44 & MSX & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{45 MSXZ} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{3 46 MXS¢} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|l|}{47 MXC X \(\times\). \(\quad \times \times\)} \\
\hline & 48 & MCX & \(x\) & & & & & \\
\hline & 49 & MLC & \(\times \times\) & & \(x\) & & \(x\) & \\
\hline & 50 & MRC & \(\times \times\) & & X & & X & \\
\hline & 51 & \(M \times P\) & & & & & & \\
\hline & 52 & MKP & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{53} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{54} \\
\hline \multicolumn{9}{|c|}{55} \\
\hline & 56 & AN & X & \(x\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & & \\
\hline & 57 & \(A D N\) & & & & & & \\
\hline & 58 & AR & \(x\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & & \\
\hline & 59 & ADR & & & & & & \\
\hline & 60 & Au & \(x\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & & \\
\hline & 61 & ADU & & & & & & \\
\hline & 62 & \(S N\) & \(x\) & - & \(x\) & \(x\) & & - \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\ldots\)} & 63 & SDN & & & & & & \\
\hline & 64 & \(S R\) & \(x\) & \(x\) & X & \(x\) & & 112 \\
\hline & & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}





\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline & 225 & PRUSE \\
\hline & 226 & PI \\
\hline & 227 & SCAN \\
\hline & 228 & SUC \\
\hline & 229 & SVR \\
\hline & 230 & IC \\
\hline & 231 & IR \\
\hline & 232 & \\
\hline & 233 & \\
\hline & 234 & \\
\hline & 235 & SI¢ \\
\hline & 236 & HI¢ \\
\hline & 237 & TCH \\
\hline 3 & 238 & MTX \\
\hline & 239 & MXT \\
\hline & 240 & MZT \\
\hline & 241 & MỌT \\
\hline & 242 & I TUMA \\
\hline & 243 & ItUMP \\
\hline & 244 & IDA \\
\hline & 245 & LDA \\
\hline & 246 & LDHAA \\
\hline & 247 & LDHEA \\
\hline & 248 & LDMCA \\
\hline & 249 & LDHDA \\
\hline & 250 & STDHA \\
\hline & 251 & STDHEA \\
\hline & 252 & Stuhca \\
\hline & 253 & STDHDA \\
\hline & 254 & \\
\hline \(\bigcirc\) & 255 & \\
\hline & 256 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\(2122 \quad 232425 \quad 262728293031323334353637383940\)

\section*{65 SDR}

\section*{66 SU}
\[
x
\]

67 SDU
68 MN
\[
x
\]

69 MDN
70 MR
\(x\)
71 MDR
72 MU
\[
x
\]

73 MDU
74 MMN
75 MMU
76 DN
\[
x
\]

77 DDN
78 DR \(x\)
79 DDR
80 DMN
81 DMR
82 RND
83 SPF
84 SNF
\[
\hat{x}
\]

85 CVS
86 CVF
87
88
89 AI
90 SI
91 MI
92 MMI
93 DI
9H DMT
1) 95 ACL

96 SCL
\[
x
\]
\(x\)
\(2122232425262728293031323334353637383940\)





225 PAUSE 226 PI 227 SCAN 228 SVC 229 SVR 230 IC 231 IR 232 233
234 235 SID 236 HI¢ 237 TCH 238 MTX 239 MXT 240 MZT
241 M 242 ITUMA 243 ITUMP
244 IDA
245 LDA
246 LDHAA
247 LDHEA
248 LDHEA
249 LDHDA
250 STDHOR
251 STDHBA
252 smbea
253 STDHDA
254
A 255
256 126

\section*{(X UNIT FACILITY USEAGE)}

\section*{EAI EARLSMDXAC}

414243444546474849505152535455
1 LXH
22
2 LX
22
3 LXA
4 STXH 22
5 STX
22
6 STXA
7 LXC
8 LXCA
9 LAH 22
10 LA 22
11 LAA
12 STAH 22
13 STA 22
14 STAA
15 LDH
16 LD
17 STDH
18 STD
19 LATH 22
20 LAT 22
21 STATH 22
22 STAT 22
23 LL 22
24 LR 22
25 STL 22
26 STR 22
27 LMX
28 STMX
29 LMA
30 STMA
*) 31 LMS
32 STMS

\section*{EAIEAZLS M D XACS}

414243444546474849 So 5152535455
33 STMZ
34 STMZA3536
37
38 MXA ..... 1
39 MAX
40 MKL
41 MKR
42 MLX
1
43 MXS
44 MSX
45 MSXZ ..... 1
48 MCX
49 MLC
50 MRC
51 MXP
52 MKP
5354
55
56 AN
57 ADN
58 AR59 ADR
60 AU
61 ADU
\(62 S N\)
- 63 SDN
64 SR

\section*{EAIEAZLS M D XAC}

\section*{414243444546474849 So \(\$ 1\) 52 535455}
65 SDR
66 ..... SU
67 SDU
68 MN
\(69 M D N\)70 MR71 MDR
72 MU
73 MDU
74 MMN
75 MMU
76 DN
77 DDN
78 DR79 DDR
80 DMN
81 DMR
82 RND
83 SPF
84 SNF
85 CVS
86 CVF878889 AI
90 ..... SI
91 MI
92 MMI
93 DI
94 DMI
795 ACL.
96 SCL
\(41424344454647484950 \cdot 5152535455\)

\(\qquad\)

414243444546474849505152535455
129 CMEED
130 CMEQD
131 CGEI
132 CEQI
133 CUGEI
134 CGEX
135 CEQX
136 CUGEX
137 CGEXK
138 CEQXK139 CUGEXK1
140 C.BR
141 CBMA
) \(142 C B X\) ..... 1
143 CBMX
144
145
146
147 SHA
148 SHX1
149 SHAC
150 SHXG1
151 SHD
152. SHDX
153 SHDC
15\% SHDXC
155 SWA
156 swx ..... 1
157 IFA1
7) 159 IFEA 160 IFZX ..... 1

> EAIEAZLSMDXACS

\section*{414243444546474849505152535455}

161 SIA
162 SIX
163 SIAC
164 SIXC
165 SID
166 SIDC
167
168
169
170 ANDA
171 TAFA
172 FAFA
173 क̧RA
3 174 \(\quad 1 \phi F A\)
175 F\&FA
176 EQA
\(177 \times\) X 178 A
178 AND \(X\)
179 TAFX
180 FAFX
181 कR \(x\)
182 TकFX
183 FकFX
\(184 E Q X\)
185 X \(\phi R X\)
186 ANDS
187 TAFC
188 FAFC
189 ФRC
180 TMFC.
191 FQFC 192. EQC

1

1

> EAI EARLS MD XAC S
41424344.45464748495051525354541
\(193 \times \not \subset R C\)
194 CNTT195 CNTAA196 CNTDA197 CNTAX
198 CNTDX1
199
200201
202 BAND ..... 1
203 BTAF ..... 1
204 BFAF ..... 1
205 BøR ..... 1
206 BTøF ..... 1
207 BF \(\varnothing F\) ..... 1
208 \(B E Q\) ..... 1
209 BX中R ..... 1
210 Bu
211 EXIT
2.12 EXITL
213 EXITA1
214 EXITP
215 SKAND
216 SKTAF
217 SKfaF
218 SKゆR
219 SKTpF
2．2．0 SKF的F
221 SKEQ
222 Sкхфண
？ 223 IVIB
224 Nक？133

414243444546474849505152535455
225 PAUSE
226 PI
227 SCAN
228 SVC
229 SVR
230 IC
231 IR
232
233
234
235 SIФ
236 HI \(\phi\)
2.37 TCH
) 238 MTX 239 MXT
240 MZT
241 M 4 T
242 ITUMA
243 ITUMP
244 IDA
245 LDA
246 LDHAA
247 LDHRA
248 LDHCA
249 LDHBA
250 STDHOA
251 STDHBA
252 stDrica
253 STDHDA254
1) 255
256

\section*{(A UNIT FACILITY USEACE)}

0
\begin{tabular}{cl}
1 & \(L X H\) \\
2 & \(L X\) \\
3 & \(L X A\) \\
4 & \(S T X H\) \\
5 & \(S T X\) \\
6 & \(S T X A\) \\
7 & \(L X C\) \\
8 & \(L X C A\) \\
9 & \(L A H\) \\
10 & \(L A\) \\
11 & \(L A A\) \\
12 & STAH \\
13 & STA \\
14 & STAA \\
15 & \(L D H\) \\
16 & \(L D\) \\
17 & \(S T D H\) \\
18 & \(S T D\) \\
19 & \(L A T H\) \\
20 & \(L A T\) \\
21 & STATH \\
22 & \(S T A T\) \\
23 & \(L L\) \\
24 & \(L R\) \\
25 & \(S T L\) \\
26 & \(S T R\) \\
27 & \(L M X\) \\
28 & \(S T M X\) \\
29 & \(L M A\) \\
30 & \(S T M A\) \\
31 & \(L M S\) \\
32 & \(S T M S\)
\end{tabular}

FAI FAL FM FD IA IM ID C \(L\)

565758596061626364656667686970

FAI FAZ FM FD JA IM ID \(C L S\)

\section*{565758596061626364656667686970}

33 STMZ
34 STMZA
35
36
37
38. MXA

39 MAX
40 MKL
41 MKR
42 MLX
43 MXS
44 MSX
45 MSXZ
\(46 M X S \phi\)
\(47 M X C\)
48 MCX
49 MLC
50 MRC
\(51 \quad M X P\)
52 MKP
53
54
55
56 AN 22
57 ADN
58 AR 22
59 ADR
60 AU 22
61 ADU
\(62 S N \quad 22\)
63 SDN
64 SR 22




```

FAI FAZFMFD IA JM JD C L S

```
\(5657585960616263646566 \quad 6768 \quad 6970\)

97 ACH
98 SCH
99 SPI
100 SNI
101 CVN
102 CVI 103
104
105
106. AX

107 SX
108 MX
109 DRX
110 DX
\(111 R X\)
112 AXC
113 AXK
114 MXK
115 DRXK
116 DXK
117 RXK
118 SPX
119 SNX
120
121
122
123 CGEN
124 CEQN
125 GEED
126 CEQD
127 CMGEN
128 CMEQN

1
1
1
1

129 CMEED
130 CMEQD
131 CGEI
132 CEQI
133 CUGEI
134. CGEX

135 CEQX
136 CUGEX
137 CGEXK
138 CERXK
139 CUGEXK
140 CBA
141 CBMA
) \(142 \quad C B X\)
143 CBMX
144
145
146
147 SHA
148 SHX
149 SHAC , 1
150 SHXC
151 SHD
152. SHDX

153 SHDC
154 SHDXC
155 SWA
156 swX
157 IFA
1
158 IFX
ค 159 IFZA 1
160. IFZX
? 159 IFZA 1
\(\begin{array}{rl}\text { A } \\ 191 & F Q F C \\ & E Q C\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{rl}\text { A } \\ 191 & F Q F C \\ 192 & E Q C\end{array}\)

FAI FAZFMFD IA IM IM C LS

\section*{565758596061626364656667686970}

161 SIA
162 SIX
163 SIAC
164 SIXC
165 SID
166 SIDC
167
168
169
170 ANDA
171 TAFA
172 FAFA
\(173 \phi R R\)
174 TøFA
175 F申FA
176 EQA
\(177 \times \varnothing\) 人A
178 ANDX
179 TAFX
180 FAFX
181 QRX
182 T \(\bar{F} F X\)
183 FpFX
184 EQX
185 KकRX
186 ANDC
187 TAFC
188 FAFC
189 कRC
190 TめFC

FAI FAZ FM FD JA JM ID C L S

565758596061626364656667686970
193 XDRC
194 CNTT 1
195 CNTAA 1
196 CNTDA 1
197 CNTAX
198 CNTDX 199
200
201
202. BAND

203 BTAF
204 BFAF
205 B¢R
\(3 \begin{array}{ll}206 & B T \phi F \\ 207 & B F \phi F\end{array}\)
208 BEQ
209 BXфR
210 BU
211 EXIT
212 EXITL
213 EXITA
214 EXITP
215 SKAND
216 SKTAF
217 SKfaF
218 SK 6 R
219 SKTpF
220 SKFCF
221 SKER
222 SK×pR
ค 223 IVIB
224 N \(\phi\)

565758596061626364656667686970
\begin{tabular}{ll}
225 & PAUSE \\
226 & PI \\
227 & SCAN \\
228 & SVC \\
229 & SVR \\
230 & IC \\
231 & IR \\
232 & \\
233 & \\
234 & \\
235 & SJФ \\
236 & HI \(\varnothing\) \\
237 & TCH \\
238 & MTX \\
239 & MXT \\
240 & MZT \\
241 & MQT \\
242 & ITUMA \\
243 & ITUMP \\
244 & IDA \\
245 & LDA \\
246 & LDHAA \\
247 & LDHAA \\
248 & LDHCA \\
249 & LDHDA \\
250 & STDHAA \\
251 & STDHBA \\
252 & STDHCA \\
253 & STDHDA \\
254 & \\
255 & \\
256 &
\end{tabular}
\[
142
\]

C MMMQN/RLS/VARIABLES

NAREGS
NABUS
AFULL(12)
\(A G \varnothing(12) \quad X F \cup L(12)\)
\(N A G \phi \quad N X G \phi\)
NATEST
NABUF
ABUSYZ
ABUSy(200)
ABUFF \((12,100) \quad X B \cup F F(12,100)\)
\(A S Q R(12,200) \times S O R(12,200)\)
\(\operatorname{ADEST}(12,200) \times \operatorname{DEST}(12,200)\)
\(\operatorname{AFAC}(12,10) \quad X F A C(12,10)\)
\(A F A C S C(4,10,20) \times \operatorname{FACSC}(4,10,20)\)
\(A B \cup S S C(4,10,20) \times \operatorname{BuSSC}(4,10,20)\)
ALBBSY (10) \(\times 13 B 5 Y(10)\)
AфBUS \((12,10)\) X申BVS \((12,10)\)
AFSL \(\mid T(10,20)\) XFSL \(\psi T(10,20)\)
AFIBUS (10) XFIBUS \((10)\)
AF \(\$\) BUS (10) XF\&BUS (10)
AFDLY (10) XFDLY (10)
NAFAC NXFAC
NSL\&T
Q \((16,16)\)
\(\operatorname{SDBA}(32,2)\)
NQBuF
NQTEST
NQG \(\%\)
QINPT
MEMDLY
MEM\&RY(16)
NBQX
MXTIME
©UTLVL
\(I Q(4,16)\)
LQNGBR
SR(8), ST(8)
SKAP,SKXP
NSBUF
* A, \(X\) SOURCE-DEST REGS(etc.)

H \(A, X\) I OR \(\varnothing\) BUSES (MAX)
FULL TRIGGER DN BUFF POSNS.
GQ TRIGGER .. . . ."
MAX H \(X\) ISSUE PER CYCLE
\# \(A, X\) POSNS TESTED:"
\# A, \(X\) BUFFER PASNS
DUMMY \(0^{\text {th }}\) REG BUSY TRIGGER
AREGY XREG WAITING TRIGGRSS
A BUFFER, X BUFFER
SOURCE TAGS FOR AREGS, \(X\) REGS
DEST
FACIVITES USED BY \(A, X\) \(X P\) in BuH \(A, X\) FACILTY SLOT BUSY SHIFT CELLS
A, \(X\) OUTBUS BUSY SMIFT CELLS.
\(A, x\) INBUS BUSY VECTXR
\(A, X\) QUTBUS DEST FQR \(\varnothing P\) INBUFF.
SLIT BUSYPATTERN FOR \(A, \times\) FACS
IN BUS FOR A, X.FACS.
OUTBUS 11111.11
DELAY 41141.
* A, \(X\) FACS

MAY TIME SLOT USED IN SMIFJ CAUS
The memory queve
A STORE PATM BUFFER
* of \(Q\) posins in mogl

II of \(Q\) Posnis testas for go
* max \(Q\) Porn's go/Cycle
\(Q\) INPUT POINTER
Q TO REG MEMORY DELAY MEMORY BOXES (BUSY)
\# MEMbRy B\&MS
MAX. RUN TIME. SEE MAIN OUTPUT LEVEL CODE. SEE STATS
INST MEM QUEVE
ISSUFD LONO ORANEH TA,GOER 143
SKIP RES., SKIP TAKEN
1. Conway

SKIP X,A POINTER Archives
\# skip ring positions

COMMDN/RLS/VARIAGLES (CONT)

APASS(200) , XPASS(200)
甲UT (2)
\(J \phi B(6)\)
SST申P
MEMANT (16)
\(A B \not \subset X(10), x \& \sigma_{x}(10)\)
\(\mathrm{ABXPSY}^{(10)}, \times 8 \times \mathrm{PSY}(10)\)

THE REGISTER PASS BITS (BU TPFRONT)
time/DATE
ChARACTERS IDENT CURRENT J ISB
STpP CONDITIXN TRIGEER
CNT. QUTST. MEM. REQS. FHR STUP COND.
A, \(X\) FAC BOXX NUMBER TAGLES A, X FAC BOX BUSY TRIGGERS

INDEXING \(A S \varnothing R(I, J)\), \(\operatorname{ADEST}(I, J), \operatorname{ABUSY}(I, J)\) i.e. A-soureer-destinations:
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
J=1 & : A(0) \\
J=32 & : A(3 i) \\
J=33 & : X B(0) \\
J=64 & \vdots B(31) \\
J=65 & : C B(0) \\
J=88 & : C B(23)
\end{array}
\]

INDEXING \(X S \phi R(I, J), X D E S T(I, J), X B U S Y(I, J)\) i.e. \(X\) - sources-destimations:
)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
J=1 & A B(0) \\
J=32 & : \\
J=33 & A B(31) \\
J=64: & X(0) \\
J=65: & X(31) \\
J=88: & C(31) \\
J=89 & \text { ST } 1 \\
J=90 & :
\end{array}
\]

The Decode Table \(D(256,50)\)

EPS AND TAGS AS IN OLD MPM SIMPRGGRAM DEC\&DE TABLE. 198 ФPS.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& D(I, J) \\
& \bar{J}=\frac{1}{2} \quad \begin{array}{lll}
2 & \text { operation }
\end{array} \\
& -3 \text { B } 3 \text { " " " } \\
& \text { A(I) = source } \\
& A(5)=\text { DEST } \\
& A(I+1)=\text { source } \\
& A(I+1)=\text { DEST } \\
& A(J)=\text { source } \\
& A(J)=D E S T \\
& A(J+1)=\text { source } \\
& A(k)=\text { source } \\
& A(k+1)=\text { source } \\
& X B(I)=D E S T \\
& X B(J)=D E S T \\
& C B(I)=\text { DEST } \\
& X(I)=\text { source } \\
& X(I)=\text { DEST } \\
& X(I+1)=\text { source } \\
& X(T+1)=\text { DEST } \\
& x(J)=\text { Soure } \\
& x(5)=\text { DEST } \\
& x(k)=\text { source } \\
& A B(I)=D E S T \\
& C(I)=\text { s申urde } \\
& C(I)=\text { DEST } \\
& C(J)=\text { Sourde } \\
& \text { STQRAGE = source } \\
& \text { STQRAGE = DEST } \\
& \text { ILLEGAL } \varnothing P \text { TAG }
\end{aligned}
\]


FORMAT OF XBUFF, ABUFF
XBUFF \((12,100)\), ABUFF \((12,100)\)
XBUFF ( XiNPT, J), ABUFF (AiNPT, J)


THE \(\phi \perp-\phi 3\) INTERFACE

I BUSING OF OPS TO AuX BUFFERS:
SUBJECT TU. \# OF A OR \(X\) OPS IN IS's AVAILABLE FOR DISPATCHING TO A OR \(X\) BUFFERS, \(\phi \perp\) WANTS TO BUS UP TO NA \(\Phi P S\), NXOPS PER CYCLE TO \(\phi 3\) (DEPENDING ON \# BUSES IN MODEL).

WE simul. this // Action sequentially:


QL EXAMINES INPUT POINTERS TO SEE IF
AINPT \(>\) NABUF, XINPT \(>\) NXBUF. IF NOT, IT CAN PLAGE A OR \(X\) OP IN BUS OR KBUS AND CALL BUST DA, BUS T \(T\) X SUBRoUTINE TA BUS OP T\& ASUPF, OR BUFF. IT THEN CYCLES THRU THIS PROC. AGAIN TILsIT FILLS BUFFERS, RUNS OUT OF OPS, OR EXCEEDS ITS LIMITS. NAOPS, NXOPS.

INTERFACE: AINPT: BUFF INPUT POINTER
XINPT : \(X{ }^{\prime \prime} \quad " \quad\).

NABUF: \(\ddagger\) OF A BUFFERS
NXBUF : \(\because \cdots x \quad \cdots \quad 149\)
ABUS (50): THE A BUS \(\begin{aligned} & \text { L. Conway } \\ & \text { archives }\end{aligned}\)
X BUS (50): " \(\times\)
BUSTPA: SUBR.TO BUS ABUSTO ABUFF
BUST \(\phi:\) : " " " \(\times\) " \(" \times\) "

\section*{FORMAT OF EXEC-SIM OUTPUT CARDS}




BL \(\varnothing C K\) DIAGRAM OF BUST \(\varnothing A\) (BUSTDX)
(BUS OP TO ABUFF. DECODE OP TAGS)

ENTER
MOVE OP FROM ABUS TV ABUFF (AINPT)
decode source-dejt interlock tals
from tac table
REMOVE TAGS POR ZERD REZISTRRS
DELODE FAC ILITY USE TAGS

FqR FAC USED, GET qBUS IMPLIED \& SCAN ADEST FOR IST DEST.
PLALE THIS IN ADBUS ( \(I, \phi B U S\) ).
CON TINVE SCAN of Detts. If Find Anymiter assume of has Dyuble deit \% PLACE SELOND DEST IN \(A \not \subset B U I(I, \phi B U S+1)\)


BL \(\Phi C K\) DIAGRAM \(\Phi F A C \Phi N\) (XCФN)
(SCAN FझR IST NAGФ QF NATEST WHICHCAN G \(\phi\) )
0


(Sdx क9 24+ 2nssi)


BLQCK DIAGRAM OF ARET (XRET)

USES COUS SHIFT CELL TV RET BUS
T\& DESTS THOSE WITICH ARE DUE. TMEN MIFTS THE SHIFL CEILS.

RESET BUIT VELTORS, MANDLING BUREOS
\(D \phi \times I=1,10\)
\[
\text { DEST }=\operatorname{ABUSSC}(t, I, 1)
\]
\(c\)
IF DEST NOT AU, G\& HANDLE NORMAUY
IF (XBUPS (DEST. NE. 1) \(6 \phi\) TD \(Y\)
\(c\) DEST IS XBU. SEE IF COPRES XREG IS BUSY.
C IFSD, RETURN DEST TV IT. aTH CRWISEJUST
\(C\) SET XBU BUST.
IF (XBUSY(DEST).EQ. 1) 6申T申Z
HBUFUL (DEST) =1
\(6 \phi \pi \phi x\)
\(z \quad\) XBUSY (DEST) \(=0\)
\(y \quad\) ABVSY (DEST) \(=0\)
C\&NTINVE

AS FIN OF RERET DEST, MA1
WAVE TO INCWDE OTHER EKEC
ACTVITY HERE

\section*{THE EVENT RUNNING TIMES WITHN THE CYCLE:}


STACK TD REG TIMING

0
KEY DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
\(A\) and \(X\) Stack Algorithm and busing, facilitres.
\(X\) overlaps intlk \(y\) infusing to get results at reg at earliest time. Does not antĩipote result arrival for Bracence of not \(\rho p\).

A has imbuing cycle. It does anticipate arrival at reg by 1 cycle so next op can (if dep) intik and go during lest exes cycle of prev. op.

Effect: \(X\) gets results to registers one code earlier then A but troy rep the same on dog ups with some timings.
(3)

FULL BYPASSING



CфMMфN / RLS/(continued)

\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)

C申MMфN/RLS/ Revised MAY 181967



CøMMøN/RLS/ (continued)




Bussing with \(\operatorname{SEP} *, \div\) SEP * +1
4 BUSSES

(2)
(5)

(3)

(10)

(9)
(8)


CHANGES:
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AFIBUS }(3)=4 \\
& \operatorname{AFIBUS}(4)=3 \\
& \operatorname{AFIBUS}(6)=3 \\
& \operatorname{AFIBUS}(7)=4 \\
& \text { AFIBUS }(10)=4 \\
& \operatorname{AFABUS}(6)=3
\end{aligned}
\]
\begin{tabular}{lllllllllll} 
AFAC & 1 & 2 & 3 & -4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
\hline ISUS & 2 & 1 & 4 & 3 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 2 & 4
\end{tabular}

Subject:
MPM-BLCU Interface for Store Ops

Reference: Conversation with Mr. G. T. Paul, Mr. R. J. Robelen and Mr. J. R. Wierzbicki

\section*{File}

It is desired to associate the Request Stack \(_{1}\) with the ea buss \({ }_{1}\) and the Request Stack \({ }_{2}\) with the ea buss \({ }_{2}\). Additionally, index type stores will ship 24 bit data words to Request Stack \({ }_{1}\) on X DATA BUS 1 and to Request Stack \({ }_{2}\) on X DATA \(\mathrm{BUS}_{2}\). These busses are associated with and energized at the same time as their corresponding ea busses. See diagram in Figure 1 for X unit, Figure 2 for the BLCU Request Stacks.

The situation of interest occurs with A unit type stores. The STO effective addresses are processed in the X unit initially. Store addresses are presented to the BLCU Data Request Stacks in strict order. Ea buss \({ }_{1}\), ea buss 2 or both ea buss \({ }_{1}\) and ea buss, may be selected. When both are selected, the first store will be on buss \({ }_{1}\). A STO. BUS First-In-FirstOut column is filled in order with the names ( 1 and/or 2) of the ea busses used to transmit the effective addresses to their corresponding Request Stacks. At the end of the \(X\) unit interlock cycle the \(A\) unit interlock cycle may respond to the particular store initiated by the \(X\) unit. Where the A store address arrives at its corresponding Data Request. Stack, it is assigned a slot in that particular stack and that slot name is placed in either the REQ1 or REQ2 First-In-First-Out column.

File Page 2 May 24, 1967 Meanwhile, the A unit instructions in contention examine the top two entries in the STO BUS column for validity. One or two stores are allowed to "go" if the entries are valid and the other standard interlocks are satisfied. The first store takes the buss designated by the name at the top of the STO. BUS buss column; the second store would take the next name in the column if it is different from the top name. Our current thinking is that two uninterlocked stores can "go" in the A unit if they are in adjacent contender positions. For this reason if three stores in a row are in contention and the store buss columin is as follows:
\(\qquad\)

File
Page 3
May 24, 1967
entries of the REQ1 or REQ2 column. Because two storeds occupy both busses, only the top entry of each REQ column may be interrogated. The top entry is removed from the appropriate column when the data is entered into the named buffer.
G. T. Paul







Parameters: \(N Q B U F\) total tillable \(Q\) Pos's
c \()\)
NQTEST \# Porn's tested for \(G \phi\)
\(N Q G \phi \quad \# \phi P S \max G \phi /\) CyCLE
(Probable values: \(N Q B U F=N Q T E S T=N Q G \phi=8\) )
TIme delay \(Q\) to reg = memdly



SUBRQUTINEXQCDN
(RUNS AT I)
C ALGORITHM. LGADS QUT \(\triangle F\) QRDER WITH BOM INTLK STORES IN ARDER
CALL EAUSE (QCQN, TME \(1.0,0,0,0)\)
\[
\left.N_{N G}^{A}=O \text { ESE QEMP; TME }+0.8 ; 0,0,0\right)
\]
\(D \phi \perp I=1, N Q B U F\)
\(1 Q(I, 16)=0\)
D\$ 100 INS \(=1, N Q T E S T\)
\(I F(Q(I, 8) . E Q \cdot 0) \in \phi T \phi 100\)
IF (INS.EQ.1) \(6 \Phi T \phi 11\)
INSMI = INS-1
\(D \varnothing+0 I=1, I N S M 1\)
C
IF PREV INS T SAME \(B \phi M\), \(N \varnothing G \phi\).
IF \((Q(I, 6), E Q . Q(I N S, 6)) \quad G \neq T \phi 100\)
(f carins, 5) wainl
c
\[
\frac{\text { IF ST中RE AND PREV NQOQ STQRE, N中 } 6 \phi}{\text { IF }((Q(I, 3) \cdot E Q \cdot h) \cdot A N D \cdot(Q(I, 16) \cdot E Q \cdot O)) 6 \phi T \phi 100}
\]
to cPnTINUE
\(c\)
IF STDRE AND DATANDT AVAIL, NøG 6
 MARK \(\sigma_{\phi}\)
\(Q(1\) NS, 16) \(=1\)
\[
N \sigma \phi=N G \phi+1
\]

IF (NG\&.GT.NQG\&) RGTURN
100 CDNTINVE
RETURN
END

SUBRDUTINE XQEMP

Dф 100 INS \(=1, N Q B U F\)
\(5 \operatorname{IF}(Q(\) INS，16）．EQ．O） \(6 \Phi T P 100\) IF（Q（INS，8）．EQ．O）6\＆T申 100
\(c\) ISSVE INS TD MEMORY
\[
\begin{aligned}
& 8 \Psi M=Q(1 N S, 6) \\
& D E S T=Q(1 N S, 15) \\
& A=Q(1 N S, 4) \\
& X=Q(1 N S, 5) \\
& L=Q(1 N S, 1)
\end{aligned}
\]

CALL（AUSE（MBUSY，TIME＋MEMDLY－Z．0，B中M，L，O）
CALL CAUSE（MFREE，TMETMEMULY－1．0，BPM，0，0） IF LPAD，CAUSE DEST LYAD IN MEMDLYCYCLEJ
IF（ \(Q\)（INS，2）．EQ． 1 ）CALL CAUSE（ LDAAD，TMEAMEMDLY，DEST，\(A, X\) ）
C REMPVE INSFRAM \(Q\)
QinPT \(=\operatorname{QinPT}-1\)
－）
\[
\begin{aligned}
& M=N Q B U F-1 \\
& I F(1 N S \cdot E Q \cdot N Q B U F) \\
& D \phi 30 I=1 N S, M \\
& D \phi 30 J=1,16 \\
& Q(I, J)=Q(I+1, J)
\end{aligned}
\]
\[
I F(I N S, E Q \cdot N Q B U F) \sigma_{\phi} T \phi 31
\]

30．GNTINVE
\(31^{\circ}\) C\＆NTNVE
Dゅ \(32 J=1,16\)
\[
Q(N Q B \cup F, J)=0
\]

32 C口NJNVE
\(G \notin T \phi 5\)
100 CONTNVE
RETURN
END

ENTRY XMBUSY
\[
\begin{aligned}
& B \phi M=I P A R 1 \\
& L=I P A R Z \\
& M E M \phi R Y(B \phi M)=L \\
& R \in T V R N
\end{aligned}
\]

C
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ENTRY XMFREE } \\
& \text { B円M = IPARL } \\
& \text { MEM\&RY }(B \varnothing M)=0 \\
& \text { RETRN }
\end{aligned}
\]

C
ENTRY XLФAD
DEST = IPARI
IF (ABUPS (DEST).NE. 1) 6申T\$ 9
IF ( \(A B \cup S Y\) (DEST).EQ.1) \(6 \phi T \neq 8\)
\(A B \cup F \cup L(D E S T)=1\)
RETURN
8 ABUSY (DEST) \(=0\)
9 XBUSY (DEST) \(=0\)
RETURN
\(C\)
ENTRY XEAV
\[
\begin{aligned}
& D \phi ~ 10 I=1, N Q B U F \\
& J F(Q(I, 8) \cdot E Q \cdot 1) 6 \phi T \phi 10 \\
& Q(I, 8)=1 \\
& R E T R N
\end{aligned}
\]
lo CqNTLNUE
\[
A=1
\]
\[
B=20000
\]
\[
c=101
\]

CACL TRQUBLI \((A, B, C)\)
RENRN
C

IN XAC \(X N\)
（）
C —－－TEST FOR SPER DPS HERE－－－－
C．IF STPRE A TEST AUAIL OF INBUS（STORE GUS） IF AVAIL，SET BUSY．IFNNT，GO Jo 100
IF（ADEST（INS＇，89）NE．I） \(6 \varnothing T \phi 27\)
IF（A1BBSY（3）．EQ．1） 64 T 100
AIBBSY（3）\(=1\)
27 G中NTPNGE
IN XAEMP
C－－TEST FOR SPLC OPS HERE ————
C IF STOQE A SHIP DATA TO B
B
\[
\text { IF (ADEST(INS, 89).NE.1) Gף T\$ } 7
\]
\[
\text { IF }(S D B A(1,2) \cdot N E \cdot 1) G \phi T \phi 2
\]
\(C\) NY STA WAITING．SET PATA IN SDBA
\(D \phi \quad 3 \quad I=1,32\)
\[
\text { IF }(\operatorname{SDSA}(3,1) \cdot E Q \cdot 1) G \neq T \neq 3
\]
\[
5 D B A(I, 1)=1
\]

3．chntinue 6\＆T\＄7
C STA WAINNG．DATA TPQ，SHIFT DBA
2 gntane
\[
\begin{aligned}
& D_{\phi} 4 \quad I=1,31 \\
& \operatorname{SDSA}(I, t)=\operatorname{SDCA}(I+1,1) \\
& 4 \operatorname{SDBA}(I, 2)=\operatorname{SDBA}(I+1,2) \\
& \operatorname{SDBA}(32,1)=0 \\
& S D B A(32,2)=0 \\
& \text { D中 } 50 \text { INS }=1, N Q B U F \\
& \text { IF ( } Q \text { (INS, 3).NE.I) 60 To SO } \\
& \text { IF (Q (INS, 4). NE.1) GPTK50 } \\
& \text { IF (Q (1NS, 9).EQ.L) GOTVSO } \\
& Q(N S, 9)=1 \\
& \text { G\& TV } 7
\end{aligned}
\]

SO CONTINUE
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \angle \phi_{1} \phi \theta \\
& 0=\left(2 \phi^{\prime} 2 \varepsilon\right) \forall \delta \mathbb{S} \\
& 0=\left(r^{\prime} 2 \varepsilon\right) \forall 8<S
\end{aligned}
\]

6＜1
\[
\left(s^{\prime} 1+I\right) \forall 8 ه s=\left(f^{\prime} I\right) \forall 80 s \text { 0S }
\]
\[
z^{\prime} \prime=P 0 S p C
\]
\[
1 \varepsilon^{\prime} \prime= \pm 05 \phi 0
\]





 sDgy N 1＝9ヨy 8 申థ

\[
T=\left(\varepsilon^{\prime} N\right) D \quad\left(T \cdot \infty=\left(6 s^{\prime} S N^{\prime}\right) \pm S 3 \Delta x\right) \Rightarrow 1
\]
\[
1=\left(2^{\prime} N_{1}\right) 0 \quad\left(T \cdot \theta \exists \cdot\left(68^{\prime} S N 1\right) 2 \phi s x\right) \Rightarrow I
\]

\[
\left.\Gamma=\left(S^{\prime} N 1\right) 0 \quad\left(T \cdot 3 N \cdot\left(h^{\prime} N I\right)\right\rangle\right) \neq 1
\]
\[
\left(4^{\prime} 3 \text { NI }\right) \operatorname{ygn} 0 x=\left(H^{\prime} N^{\prime}\right) \theta
\]


\(\qquad\) 1




> 马nヨロOtict dims \(517=1\)
> \(\rightarrow 234580\) 2385 20d cs31-

6 CPNTINVE
DATA NAT AVAIL. SET FIRST FRIE WAIT BIT
\(D \phi \quad 4 \quad I=1,31\)
IF (SDBA (I, 2).EQ. 1) GPT申 4
SDBA \((I, 2)=1\)
\(6 \phi T \phi 7\)
4 cPNTNUE
\[
A=1
\]
\[
B=20000
\]
\[
c=102
\]

CALLTRQUBL \((A, B, C)\)
1 ceqntinue


ICNORE STURACE AS DEST IF (REG.EQ. 89) G\&T\$10
IN XXRET
\(c\) 1GNOREFLIS BUSES CL
\[
\text { IF ((BUS-EQ.5).DR. (BUS.EQ.6)) G\& TO } 10
\]
(T'I)
 \(0=(2 \vec{\eta})+\left(l^{\prime}\right) \operatorname{toas} \mathrm{A} 0\) \(I=(T ' T)\) egcs fI

H2CS \(+ \pm 145\)

Goos da tings to o un nucte tas 1 \(T=\left(11^{\prime}\right)\) Uses \(f\) !

IQ(16) 16): INSTRUCTION FETCHING:

I. Interfac with \(\phi\) 1: IFADD, IFDSI, IFRTN IFADD = INS FETR ADDRESS. IEDSTE 13 DEST ANO WILL BE Non zaro if valld reast rresent at and of ciclelis Resct ontzkiy regit). (FRTN \(\Rightarrow\) PLAEE DET MELE ON COMPLETION OF FULL INST RETCH.
II. QC\&N After \(D Q\) runs, run IQ. Compare 4 intik against \(G \varnothing\) DATA REQ BOMS. ISsue up to \(4 b y\) marking GO.
III. QEMP After DQ issue, run IQ isisue. CAuse MBUSY, MFREE AT APRROP. TIMES w.th \(L=+\). REMNV OP issued. If last op issued, cause RTN at aperop time to place sest into IFRTN. (see bolow-filling)
II RTN Event to set DEST = IPAR1
IFRTN = DEST

I Filling of IQ: IN QEMP: AFter QEmp empties I \(Q\), examine interface to see if regst present. If so, and if IQ empty, place request in IQ expanoing aooresses and beco.oing B фMs sething letter, etc. Then zero incoming interface.

HANDLING THE BACK -UP REGISTERS
1. DP ISSUANCE: ISSUANCE OF OP wHOSE DEST HAS NQ BACK-UP IS UNCMANGED. i.E. ISSUE LA in \(x\) has \(A B U A S\) DEST, Thus desthal no back-up and hand ling is normal. However if DEST has a back-up, such as for AREPL, check if batk-upis full. If not, normal handing. If si, dent setrecsusy, but set BuFull \(=0\) \& Bußusy \(=0\) (corresp.to move of Back-yp to FRONT.

2. DATM ARRIVES AT A DEST:


\title{
 \\ 
}

\[
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 5 & 5 & x \\
\hline
\end{array}(002) 1530 x
\end{aligned}
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 5 & 00 & \(0 X\) & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}\((002) 1530 甘\)



Bubusy
BUFULL
REGBUSY
replace

wait fur hil uses
To FINISH
i.e.


ARR of BATA

\[
\rightarrow \begin{aligned}
& \text { COADAINX } \\
& \left(\begin{array}{l}
\text { TREAT AS ANY } \\
\text { OP WITH BU } \\
\text { AS DEST }
\end{array}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]

Bace up Registus
BU Pusy
BuFfull
Pass

\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { vigu Pimo -r rogune egor (2 } \\
& \text { goor mang foinn gemor nip ( } 1
\end{aligned}
\]
ancod

)

Busy, Full, Pass

 hame deity 000 poasios
at Ref mberol : all 5 sta rn
\(\hat{\imath}\) tom midis \(R-2\) en, persia


SKIP EXECUTION

I INTLK: One skip at a time. Execute in order with respect to all starred ops, skips.
i.e. use skip op the, SKIP FLAG TUG as mutual interlocks. ND SKIP CAN PASS FLAGGED DPS, NO FLAGGED DPS MAY PASS A SKIP, SKIPS IN ORDER.
interlock on conditions available.
\(X:\) intlk on shit avail ( \(N E X T\) SR \(=0\) )
\(A\) : INTLK ON SHT RES\&LVED (NEXT SR =1)
II EXECUTION:
X: PLACE SR,STOTST; INCR X PAINTER
A: CLEAR \(S R, S T\); INCR A POINTER

All Starred ops: IF No preceding skip ops on scan:
(i) IF \(S T=1\), N \(\phi P\) and mark \(G \phi\) THE STARRED \(\phi\) (is (. 1 )
(ii) IF \(S T=0\), REmOVE SKIP FLAG AT END OF CYCLE (SCAN)

EXECUTIoN \(\varnothing F\) EXIT INSTRUCTIONS
(AaXUNITS)

I Intlk \(+G \phi\) : Exits one at a time And IN ORDER 2. DO TMIS WITH SPECIAL INTLK BIT IN X(A) BUFF FOR EXITS WHICH INTLKS ALL CODE BELOW. EXITS INTLK ON ANY BRANCHES ABOVE. INTLK ON ER. INTLK ON IVORMAL S, BUS, fac.

II EXECUTION: (i) AT END OF . 1 SCAN CHECK FOR ANY NめGD EXITS IN STACK. IF ANY, SET \(X\) HOLD F (AHOLDT) TO ONE. OTHERWISE ER \(\varnothing\)
(ii) ALSO AT END OF . 1 SCAN, CHECK FOR GQ EXIT WITH ET. IF ANY, SET XFRCT (AFRCT) To ONE. OTHERWISE ZERo.
(iii) If \(\overline{E T}\) execution prof by merely GOING AT END of cycle. Thus intlk on oPS BELOW IS GeNE AT NOT CYCLE
(iv) IF ET, N \(\phi P\) AND MARK \(\sigma \varnothing\) AT AND OF. I SCAN ALL oPS BELAU EXIT.
I. BRANCH INST INTR
A. All Bos Inst's Have Common Dest
B. ALL BIS INST's USE COMMON OUT (RETURN) BUS (TOEHT)

Long Bus
Contender Stack

LONG BIs
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|} 
INTR \& BUS & \(A_{D D}\) \\
\hline TEST GOND & EBA
\end{tabular}

SHORT BOB
- If. Long Bos Is Unsuccessful Short Bor Could Be Started One Cycle Sooner.
- With The Proper Selection of Branch Results, Up tu Three Bus's Could Be Executed Per Cycle, (Must Maintain ORDER, CONDITIONAL Intis's)
II. EXIT INST INTK
A. All Exits Inst's Have Common Source (EAt)

III SPECIAL INTK
A, All Code Below An Exit Flag Is Int kid.
IV EXIT EXECUTION
A. Contender

1

\(\sum E \times 1 T\) HIstory TABLE
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline\(E_{R}\) & \(B_{E}\) & \(E_{T}\) & \(E B A\) \\
\hline & & & \\
& & & \\
& & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(E_{R}=E_{\text {Pit }}\) RESOLVED
\(B_{E}=\) Branch \(^{\text {Executed }}\)
\(E_{T}=E_{\text {KIT }}\) TAKEN
\(E_{B A}=\) Low ORUER 3 BIts OF The Effective Branch ADDRESS.

II Definitions:
1) BOSC \(=[\overline{\text { CONTENDER EXIT }} \wedge\) (DIST BOL AHEAD OF 1 IT EXIT DIST EXIT \(Y\) Any Contender Bos)] v [Contender Exit a Any 3 CONTENDER BIS AHEAD OF I ST CONTENDER EXIT]
2) XEP EXit Passed To \(X\) Unit Dispatchers \(=\) See flow-Chart
3) BNOP -


and

\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { one Ros co per cycte } \\
\text { crc } 1
\end{gathered}
\]

\(\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Bos (Cononom }) \\ K \text { Fras }=0\end{array}\right\} \operatorname{ser}\) Ent
\(\operatorname{Bos}\) (uncomanor)



Nots: Smmen of Ext her
 Inmes Ebh Vatr.

 Uas Smesmen.

\[
600
\]

)

\[
E_{R} E_{T}
\]

BRANCH TIMING
\begin{tabular}{c|c|c|c|c|c|} 
& cyc 1 & cyc2 & cyc 3 & Cyc 4 & cyc 5 \\
\hline & & & &
\end{tabular}
\[
C_{A S E} I
\]

Branch Resolved (Taken) Before Exit Is found


DIS CODE \(\rightarrow\) CONT.

CASE II


Handling
A. IB Bus
1. Any Exit on 1 ST Buy Stop 2N1 Bus
2. Allow \(1^{5 I}\) Bus Xfer To Dispatcher (HoLD) Further Bus Xfér
B. DISPATCHER (exit pres. tres-lvo2)
1.: IF No CONTENDER EXIT:
\(A_{2} E_{R} \bar{E}_{T}-R_{S T} \quad 15\) EXIT IN EACH DIST (ONLY ONE Disp Can Have Exit)
B. If No \(2^{N P}\) isp. Exit -Release Bust fer Hold
2. \(E_{R} \cdot E_{T}\)
A. Reset 1 SI Exit \(\frac{1}{q}\) All CODE Below
B. Mask \(1^{\text {sI }}\) Exit it All CODE Below From Dispatcher Bubble-Up
C. Release Bus Xfer Hold (Cant force Bus Xfer Because All Code Above Exit Mat Not have Rercuto Contender Stack)
- C. Contender
1. INTK 1 \(\frac{\text { ET }}{1}\) ALL CODE BELOW IF \(\overline{E_{R}}\)

Always Intr \(2^{20}\) Exit \& All CODE Below
2. \(E_{R} E_{T}\)
A. Reset \(1{ }^{5 T}\) Exit \(\frac{1}{2}\) All Code Below
B. Mask 155 Exit \(\%\) All CODE BeLow FROM. CONTENTICN
C. FORCE BUS XFER ( \(1^{\text {sI }} \div 2^{\prime N}\) Bus)
D. Prevent Disp Bubrle-Up Code From Entering Contender
3. \(E_{R} \bar{E}_{T}\) STAT
A. RESET I IT Exit
B. Release Int on all Code between 1 sT \(2{ }^{N D}\) EXIT ( \(2^{N P} E_{X I T}\) WIL Become 1 SI ON NEXT CYCLE)
C. If No Lisp Exit Or \(2{ }^{N D}\) Contender Exit Release Bus Xfer Hold

 ayovor çayog x－y nこHi HDEWW LNOT


 （2，



वO1Dヨ人 ゆNILHM Dヨd \(x\)

 \(x \operatorname{Has} x\) OL ssind dhaxeve Honoatl


 H－1M SQ7ヨu Xa HOIHW LSOW SdO XVW
xtillopsed mou \(\quad S \exists J \forall 7 d \exists y\)
\(r \sin t / \Omega\)


202
\[
!<2
\]

Fotro y fo yo rum
בirno-x
 5impor
\[
\left.\mathscr{V}+\frac{1}{g} x-f\right\}
\]
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { frof } f \leftarrow 1+r \\
& \text { fromg } f \text { pron }
\end{aligned}
\]

nucy
\[
"\} \operatorname{arcf} f+1+r \quad \text { yno rlypus rigy }
\]
dit 2 men

\[
\begin{aligned}
& x_{1}^{2 y y}
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{hexadecimal arithmetic}

ADDITION TABLE



\section*{Appendix D. Powers of Two Table}
```

                2n}n\quad\mp@subsup{2}{}{-n
                    1- 0}1.
            2
            4
            16- 4 0.062 5*
            32 5 0.031 25.
            64 6 0.015625
            128 7 0.007 8125 ;
            256-8 0.003 906 25
            512 9 0.001953125
            1024 10 0.000 976 5625
            2048 11 0.000488281'25
            4096-12 0.000244140625
            8192 13 0.000122 070 3125
            16384 14 0.000 061035156 25
            32768 15 0.000 030 517 578 125
                65 536-16 0.000 015 258789 0625
                131072 17 0.000 007 629 394 531.25
                262144 18 0.000003814697265625
                524288 19 0.000 001907 348632 8125
                1048576-20 0.000 000 953 674 31640625
                2097152 21 0.000 000476 837 158 203 125
                4194304 22 0.0000002384185791015625
                8388608 23 0.000000119209 289 550 781 25
            16777 216~24 0.0000000596046447%% 300 625
            33554432 25 0.000 000 029.802 322 3&r 6.5 3125
            67108864 26 0.000000014901 161 19%847655 25
            134217728 27 0.000000 007450580596 923 828 125
    268435456-28 0.000000003725 290 2984619140625
        536870912 29 0.003 000001 862645149230 95703125
    1073741824 30 气.3%\& 000000 931 322574615478515625
2147483648 31 <.उぃ000000465661287 307 7392578125
4294967 296- 32 ث.000 000 000 232830643653869628906 25
8589 934592 33 0.000000000116415 321 826 934 814453125
17179869184 34 0.000000000058 2076609134674072265625
34 359738368 35 0.000000000029103 830456733703613 28125

```

PROG S,Ze \(=370,000 \mathrm{Byk}\)
(1) Reluse PRo6 To 500×3ै: + will easily yreld \(=30000\) Byty
(2) Manc TAGS 1 byte instrad.f 1/2 wior :
will y itll \(266 \times 70 / 2=89606\) with some frog problems
(3) MAKE QBVF ibyt sustum of \(1 / 2\) word. This will this sume experimantiy but yiells:
\[
35800 / 2=179006, \mathrm{tss}
\]

TOTAL POSS REDVETON OY COMMON
\[
\text { REDUCTION }=56,860 \text { Bytes }
\]

\section*{Appendix E. Hexadecimal-Decimal Conversion Table}

The table in this appendix provides for direct conversion of decimal and hexadecimal numbers in these ranges:
Hexadecmal.
000 to FFF
0000 to 4095

For numbers outside the range of the table, add the following values to the table figures:
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
hexadecimial & decimal \\
1000 & 4096 \\
2000 & 8192 \\
3000 & 12288
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
hexaidecimal & decimal \\
4000 & 16384 \\
5000 & 20484 \\
6000 & 24576 \\
7000 & 28672 \\
8000 & 32768 \\
9000 & 36864 \\
A000 & 40960 \\
B000 & 45056 \\
C000 & 49152 \\
D000 & 53248 \\
E000 & 57344 \\
F000 & 61440
\end{tabular}








































































































COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME = MAIN,OPT=02,LINECNT=50, SOURCE,EBCDIC, NOLIST,DECK,LOAD,MAP, NOEDIT, NOID




Common PHAS 1
DOTL - Pointor to firet entry of DO toble
Dosh - pointor to next avaibilde entry - if equal to pork than talle is full
IBCR - varitlle ksed \(t_{0}\) point to entory in IB's

SKXV, sKXC, SKXS, \(\}\) variblles for skip coutral - not needed in Plomse I
SKAV. SKAC, SKAS,
cyel - count of cyeles tend of Prumpe
KY - condition eode indienting poth thirn exception voutunes (see table for ky )
sy - unroible indienting \(x\) eatry (231) or A eutry (193) for fatch on Sevrech routive
PTR - varisille oef for pointor to OP tulle ared for duipataling OPS
\(x x\) - indientor shomin storrape iequest wors made thic aych
\(x_{1} \mathrm{C}\) - \(\quad X\) instruction counter - indiextos exret modoress of op leancing disp.
arc - A instruction counter - indiexites exact oddress of op lemuniq disp.
ASA - IB odeness for seurch routine - set hatore entercing SGARCH

DPA - foren- unvinulle and contwine addrees for matol with suldress oin ceronds

DOT - varoidle indienting beafth of DO riblee - annch set to \(C\)
XICR - holding aros for xie to kepit curvent for dispontcher
AICR - holRing aree for Aic to knpit current for dispont oher
PTJ - 3 pointers within OP aren faim formoring IB's. to dis pitel positions
PTK

AEXT - trajper set to proparly . \(\quad . \quad\). \(\quad . \quad . \quad \cdots \quad . \quad\) from \(A\)

DO TABLE ENTRIES MAX a \(\phi\) controlbed Ly DOT-usurily set to 6
por \(=\) = first entry DOSL \(=\) next avaidolle DOCL current lenal
DOIB - 2 - pointer to FB trikle entry essigued to thes level
DOST - 2- leqiuninq pointer of first instraction in IB (zero unless bomedode intor)
DOAP - 2 - curvant point er for A-Ops (ovely used in DISP) - coutrains IB added anem in \(X\)-Disf

LDEV - 1 - whinon- Thin lame is uxlid
\(\angle D D V\) - 1 - - The dater for this IB is in OPareas
LDCKD - 1 - . The Bidkress is checleed for proper sequance
LDSER - 1 - " "this IB is out of sequence - due to Granch eyit or PSC function
LDAW -1 - - A-Disp working on this lawel
LDAF - 1 - - A.Disp fivishe mith this lemel
LDXW - ' - , X-Disp wortainom this lanel
LDxF - 1 - - X Disp finciluD with this level
\(x\)-DISP \(=\) DO entries 17,18
\(A\)-Disp \(=\) Do entries \(19,2 \phi\)
I13 entries - 12
IBA - address (muleiple of eight) of duter assiqual this IB
LIBU - this IB unlid
LIBW-storge fetch im progress. turud ff when eitel coupleted
Hist Talle is a pushimp nith oldest IB cindiertes by top entry \& latest hy lactiom eutry.




\begin{tabular}{ll} 
\\
\hline & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
\\
\hline & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\(\qquad\)


\(\qquad\)
\(\qquad\)

41 CONTINUE
IF (BNOP.EQ.O) GOTO 23
NCTX \(=\) NCTX-1
OP(PTR+16)=0
GOTO 30
C
45 CONTINUE
IF (ERTBRXP).EQ.O) GOTO 23
\(0 P(P T R+20)=0\)
IF ILOAF(DOCL).NE. O) GOTO 23
XEX=1
XEXS=OP(PTR+9)
XEXB \(=\mathrm{OP}(P T R+13)\)
XEXA=DOAP(DOCL)
GOTO 23
\begin{tabular}{l}
\(C\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
ISN 0132 \\
ISN 0133 \\
& \(C\) \\
& \(C\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

130 CONTINUE
\(\stackrel{C}{C}\)
811 CONTINUE
C
\(C\) ARITH OP FLOW
C
C MOVE A-OPS TO STACK FROM DISP
C
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
ISN 0135 & & DOCL \(=19\) \\
ISN 0136 & & AIC=AICR \\
ISN 0137 & 211 & CONTINUE
\end{tabular}
\(\longrightarrow-\)












ADDRESS NOT IN IB'S - GET NEXT AVAILABLE IB
ADDRESS NOT IN IB'S - GET NEXT AVAILABLE IB
\[
\text { IRCL }=H I S T(1)
\]
DO \(202 \mathrm{I}=1,11\)
HIST(I) \(=\) HIST(I +1\()\)

REDUEST instruction fetch

-
\(-\operatorname{IBV}(13 C L)=1\)
IBW(I3CL)=5
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { ISN } 0144 & \text { LIRN }(1 B C L)=5 \\ \text { ISN } 0145 & \text { IRA IBCLI }=A S A / 8 * 8-4\end{array}\)
ISN \(0147 \quad\) PBUF(1) \(=A S A\)
ISN \(0149 \quad c\)
PBDF( \()=1\) lac
PBUF (3) \(=\) DOCL
ISN 0150 20S CONTINUE
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
ISN \(\cap 152\) & \(x x=1\) \\
NFA \(=1\) BAIIRCL
\end{tabular} ISN \(0155 \quad\) IF (LDXWIDCL
LOOV(OJCL)=0
LDEV(DOCL)=1
DOSL=DOCL
203 CONTINUE
COSL=0ns
IF (DOSL-GT.DOT) OASL=1
IF (DNSL.EP.OCTL) GOTO 204
LDEV (DOSLI=0
204 CONTINUE
DOSL \(=\) DOCL +1
IF (DOSL.GT.00T) DOSL=1
RFTURN
205 continue
\(K Y=15\)
GOTO 2000
210 CONTINUE
IF ILIBV(I).EQ.0) GOTO 201
IF ILDXWIDOCLI.OR.LDAWIDOCL)) GOTO 215

\section*{L. Conway
Archives}



\begin{tabular}{rll} 
ISN 0317 & 1003 & \(K=K+25\) \\
ISN 0318 & 1004 & CONT
\end{tabular}

5
PH1121)=0
IF (LDEV(19).EQ.01 GOTO 1006
(F (LDAF (19). NE.Ol GOTO 1006
PH1 (21) \(=\) LETR(DOIB(19) +1\()\)
ISN 0318

PH1 (22)=LETR(DOST(19)+1)
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { ISN } 0325 & \text { PHI(22) } \\ \text { ISN } 0326 & K=360 \text { ) }\end{array}\)
\(001005 \mathrm{~J}=23,30 \quad 2 \mathrm{Cl}\)

IF (OP \((K+17)\).EQ. O) GOTO 1005
PHI \(J\) I \(=0 \mathrm{P}(K+23)\)
IF \((0 P(K+15)\). EQ. 1\()\) GOTO 1005
\(\frac{\text { IF }(O P(K+15), E Q .1) \text { GOTO } 1005}{\text { PH } 1(J+1)=P H(1)}\) \(025=k+25\)
1026 CONTINU
\(\mathrm{PH} 1(33)=\mathrm{PH} 1(31\)
PHI(31)=?
IF (LDFV(20).EQ.0) GOTO 1008
IF (LDAF (20).NE.O) GOTO 1008
PHI(31)=LETR(DOIR(20) +1)
PHI 31\()=\operatorname{LETR}(D O I P(20)+1)\)
PH1 32\()=\operatorname{LETR}(\operatorname{DOST}(20)+1)\)
PH1 (32) \(=\operatorname{LETR}(\operatorname{DOST}(20)+1)\)
\(K=3900\)
\(091007 \mathrm{~J}=33,40\)
IF \((\cap P(K+17) . E O .0)\) GOTO 1007
\(\mathrm{PH} 1(J)=0 \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{K}+73)\)
IF \((O P(k+15) . F 0.1)\) GOTO 1007
PHI(J+1)=PHl(J)
\(\mathrm{PH} 1(41)=0\)
0n \(1009 \mathrm{~J}=1,1\) ?
PHI \((J+40)=\operatorname{LETR}(H I S T(J)+1)\)
1 OOQ CTNTINUE
PH1 (54) =LETR (DOTL+1)
OHI (55)=LETR(OOSL+1)
DO \(1910 \mathrm{~J}=1, \mathrm{DOT}\)
IF (LDEV (J).NE.O) PHI(J+56)=LETR(DOIB(J)+1)
COVTIN:JE
PBUF (8) \(=K Y\)
\(K Y=0\)
\(\mathrm{J}=6 \mathrm{6}\)

\(\operatorname{PHI}(J+2)=\operatorname{LETR}(\operatorname{PRUF}(3)+1)\)
PHI \((J+4)=\operatorname{LETP}(\) PRUF \((4)+1)\)
PHl \((J+5)=\operatorname{LETR}(\operatorname{PBUF}(8)+1)\)
\(J=71\)
DO LOL2 \(1=1,9\)
IF ILPSV(I) \({ }^{9}\) PHI \((\downarrow+1)=\operatorname{LETR}(38)\)
1012 CONTINUE
\(J=89\)


\section*{1. Conway Arcnives}

\begin{tabular}{lll} 
& & \\
\hline & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}









 \(08 \cdot N=1\) ot 00
1．：／XNV78r \(\forall 1 \nabla 0\)
NNI＊N 2 ＊Y ヨЭヨINI
（r）2＊\(\forall \exists 9 \exists 1 N \mathrm{I}\) IIJI7dWI
010109 （XNY79؟ 2000 NSI
9000 NS I

000 NS I
G000 NSI
\(\$ 000\) NS I
\(\varepsilon 000\) NS I 2000 NSI


LEVEL 14 (1 JUN 67)
COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME = MAIN, OPT=00,LINECNT=56,SOURCE,EBCDIC,NOLIST,NODECK,LOAD,MAP, NOEDIT, ID, XREF

ISN 0002 ISN 0005 ISN 0006

ISN 0007
I SN 0008 I SN 0009 I SN 0009 ISN 0011
ISN 0013 ISN 0014 I SN 0015 ISN 0017 ISN 0018 ISN 0019 ISN 0020 ISN 0021 ISN 0022 I SN 0024 \(\begin{array}{ll}\text { I SN } & 0025 \\ \text { I SN } & 0026\end{array}\) ISN 0027 ISN 0028 ISN 0029 ISN 0031
ISN 0032
I SN 0032
ISN 0034

SUBROUT INE ANIJK (JANS)
IMPLICIT INTEGER*2(J)
INTEGER*2 JANS
DATA JZERO/'O'
COMMON /AREA2/ JNB(36), JOPCDE (6,256), JSIOB (256),
*JITYPE (256), JEXITF (300)
COMMON/AREA4/JN(80), I, IJ
COMMON/AREA4/JN(8)
DIMENSION JANS(2)
IJ \(\mathrm{J}=2\)
DO \(10^{2} L=1,26\)
IF IJN(I) \(\quad\) EQQ. JNB(L)) GO TO 40
10 CONTINUE
\(15 \mathrm{DO} 20 \mathrm{~L}=27.36\) IF (JN(I).EQ. JNB(L)) GO TO 25
20 CONTINUE
IJ \(=1\)
RETURN
\(\mathrm{I}=1\)
\(\mathrm{I}=\mathbf{I}+\mathbf{I}\)
\(\mathrm{DO} 30 \mathrm{~L}=27,36\)
OO \(30 L=27,36\)
IF (JN(I) .EQ. JNB(L)) GO TO 35
30 CONTINUE
JANS(1) = JZERO
JANS \((2)=\mathrm{JN}(I-1)\) RETURN
35 JANS (1) \(=\) JN (I-1) JANS(2) \(=\mathrm{JN}(1)\)
\(\mathrm{I}=\mathrm{I}+\mathrm{I}\)
RETURN
40 I \(=I+1\) Gid TO 15
END


\section*{COMPILER OPYIONS - NAME = MALN,OPL=OO,LINECNI=50, SOURCE,EBCDIC,NOLISI,DECK, LOAD,MAP, NOEOIL, NOIO}

\(\times\) T07(256), \(01(256)\) (209(256)
\(X 107(256), T 08(256), T 09(256), T 10(256), T 11(256), T 12(256), T 13(256)\), \(X T 14(256), T 15(256), T 16(256), T 17(256), T 18(256), T 19(256), T 20(256) ;\)
\(X T 21(256), T 22(256), T 23(256), T 24(256), T 25(256), T 26(256), T 27(256) ;\) \(X \frac{T 21(256), T 22(256), T 23(256), T 24(256), T 25(256), T 26(256), T 27(256),}{X} T 28(256), T 29(256), T 3(256), T 31(256), T 32(256), T 33(256), T 34(256)\), \(X T 28(256), T 29(256), T 30(256), T 31(256), T 32(256), T 33(256), T 34(256)\),
\(X T 35(256), T 36(256), T 37(256), T 38(256), T 39(256), T 40(256), T 41(256)\), \(x \mathrm{~T} 42(256), \mathrm{T} 43(256), \mathrm{T} 44(256), \mathrm{T} 45(256), \mathrm{T} 46(256), \mathrm{T} 47(256), \mathrm{T} 48(256)\),
X T49(256), T50(256), T51(256), 152(256), T53(256), T54(256), T55(256),
\(X T 56(256), T 57(256), T 58(256), T 59(256), T 60(256), T 61(256), T 62(256)\),
\(X\) T63(256), T64(256), T65(256), T66(256), T671256), T68(256), T69(256),
\(\times\) T70(256)
DATA TO1/1, \(1,0,1,1,3 * 0,1,1,0,1,1,5 * 0,8 * 1,11 * 0,1,0,3 * 1,4 * 0,4 * 1\),
X \(55 * 0,14 * 1,3 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,10 * 1,0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,0,1\),
Y \(0,1,0,1,13 * 0,16 * 1,3 * 0,1,1,3 * 0,8 * 1,0,3 * 1,0,8 * 1,0,1,32 * 01\)
DATA TO2/8*0,1,1,0,1,1,5*0,8*1,11*0,1,0,1,1,7*0,1,1,5*0,1,0,1,0,
\(\mathrm{X} 1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,0,0,1,0,1,4 * 0,4 * 1,0,0,3 * 1,0,1,0,8 * 1\),
\(\gamma 20 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,3 * 1,6 * 0,1,6 * 0,1,0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1\),
\(Z 6 * 0,8 * 1,16 * 0,3 * 1,14 * 0,3 * 1,0,8 * 1,0,1,32 * 0 /\)
DATA T03/201*0,8*1;47*01
DATA T04/11*0,1,1,7*0,1,1,0,0,1,1,122*0,1,5*0,1,0,1,5*0,1,93*0/
DAIA \(105 / 8 * 0,1,1,8 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,13 * 0,1,0,1,1,14 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0\)
\(X 1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,3 * 0,1,0,1,4 * 0,4 * 1,0,0,3 * 1,0,1,0,8 * 1,44 * 0\)
\(Y 1,0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,6 * 0,8 * 1,16 * 0,3 * 1,60 * 01\)
DATA TO6/256*0/
OATA TO7/256*01
DATA TO8 \(148 * 0,1,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,3 * 0,1,0\),
\(x 1,4 * 0,4 * 1,0,0,3 * 1,0,1,0,8 * 1,20 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,3 * 1,6 * 0,1,6 * 0\),
Y \(1,7 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,8 * 0,8 * 1,16 * 0,3 * 1,60 * 0 /\)
DATA \(109 / 154 * 0,1,101 * 01\)
DATA T10/256*0/
DATA T11 \(155 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,3 * 0,1,0,1,10 * 0\),
\(\mathrm{X} 3 * 1,0,1,0,4 * 1,24 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,3 * 1,6 * 0,1,6 * 0,1,9 * 0,1,0,1,0\),
Y 1,8*0,8*1,17*0,2*1,60*0)
DATA 112/256*0)
ISN 0017 DATA T13/256*07
ISN 0018 DATA T14/256*0
ISN 0019
DATA T15/48*0
DATA \(15 / 48 * 0,1,1,72 * 0,1,1,0,0,1,1,0,0,3 * 1,6 * 0,1,116 * 01\)
ISN 0020
DATA T \(16 / 3 * 0,1,1,42 * 0,1,101 * 0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,5 * 0,1,92 * 0 /\)
DATA TT7/1, \(1,39 * 0,1,5 * 0,1,57 * 0,14 * 1,28 * 0,1,0,1,5 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0\),
\(\mathrm{X} 1,0,1,13 * 0,8 * 1,11 * 0,1,1,13 * 0,1,1,43 * 01\)
ISN 0022
ISN 0023
DATA T18/256*07
DATA T19/108*0,1,5*0,1,141*0/
DATA \(\mathrm{T} 20 / 1,1,0,1,1,3 * 0,1,1,0,1,1,5 * 0,8 * 1,11 * 0,1,8 * 0,1,58 * 0,14 * 1\),
\(\times 14 * 0,6 * 1,0,0,1,5 * 0,1,7 * 0,1,0,1,0,1,0,1,15 * 0,8 * 1,11 * 0,1,1,14 * 0\),

\section*{255}
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COMPILER ORTIONS - NAME = MAIV,OPI=O2, LINECNT=5O, SOURCE,EBCOIC,NOLIST,DECK, LOAO,MAP,NOEDIT,NOLD.



IF(AFULI(INS).EQ.0) GO TO 100
IF(INS.EQ. I) GO TO 21
DG 11 REG \(=1\), NAREGS
Il OESPY(REG) SURESY(REG) +ASOR(INS-1,REG)
INSML=INS-1
DO: \(20 \quad I=1\), Insm
COUE BELOW
M, I4I.EU.II GO TO 100
PKEV SKIP INTLKS ALL STARRED CODE BELOW
in ? 2 Prg=1, NAREGS


It (REG.EV. \(\delta\) Y) GO TO 22
- 22 CUNTINUE FINO FAL USED

If (AFAC (INS,FAC).NE.O) GO TO 26 25 CONTINUE.

NO FAC USED. ISSUE OP







COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME \(=\) MAIN, OPT \(=02, L I N E C N T=50\), SOURCE,EBCDIC, NOLIST,DECK, LOAD, MAP, NOEDIT, NDID
 SHIFTS THE SHIFT CELLS
ISN 0023
DO \(99 I=1,10\)
ISN 0023 99 A1BBSYTI \(=0\)
ISN 0024
ISN 0025 ISN 0025
ISN 0026 ISN 0026
ISN 0027

SLOTML \(=\) NSLOT -1
\(00 \quad 101 \quad \mathrm{~J}=1,10^{\circ}\)
\(00101 \quad J=1,10\)
DO 100 SLOT=1, SLOTMI
ISN 0028
I SN 0029
ISN 0030
ISN 0031
ISN 0032
ISN 0033
ISN 0034
ISN 0035
ISN 0036
ISN 0036
ISN 0037
ISN 0038
I SN 0039
ISN 0040
ISN 0041
ISN 0042
ISN 0043
ISN 0044
ISN 0045
ABUSSC \((1, J, S L O T)=A B U S S C(1, J, S L O T+1)\)
ABUSSC \((2, J, S L O T)=A B U S S C(2, J, S L O T+1)\)
100 CONTINUE
ABUSSC \((1, J, N S L O T)=0\)
ABUSSC \((2, j, N S L O T)=0\)
ABUSSC \((3, \mathrm{~J}, \mathrm{NSLOT})=0\)
101 CONTINLE
DO \(103 \mathrm{~J}=1\), NAFAC
DO 102 SLOT=1,SLOTM1
\(\operatorname{AFACSC}(1, J, S L O T)=A F A C S C(1, J, S L O T+1)\)
\(\operatorname{AFACSC}(2, J, S L O T)=A F A C S C(2, J, S L O T+1)\)
102 CONTINUE
AFACSC \((2, J, N S L O T)=0\)
AFACSC \((2, J, N S L O T)=0\)
103 CONTINUE
RETURN
END






```

)

```
```

)

```


```

                    DO 120 FAC=1,NXFAC
    ```
                    DO 120 FAC=1,NXFAC
            XFAC(I,FAC)=D(OP,FAC+40)
            XFAC(I,FAC)=D(OP,FAC+40)
            IF(XFAC(I,FAC).EQ.O) GO TO 120
            IF(XFAC(I,FAC).EQ.O) GO TO 120
            OBUS=XFOBUS (FAC)
            OBUS=XFOBUS (FAC)
            DO 125 DEST=1,NXREGS
            DO 125 DEST=1,NXREGS
                IF(XDESTTI,DEST).NE.OT GO 10 126
                IF(XDESTTI,DEST).NE.OT GO 10 126
    125 CONTINUE
    125 CONTINUE
    GO TO 120
    GO TO 120
    26 XOBUS(I OBUSI=OEST
    26 XOBUS(I OBUSI=OEST
                                CHECK FOR DOUBLE DEST IF SO, PLACE ON ADJ BUS
                                CHECK FOR DOUBLE DEST IF SO, PLACE ON ADJ BUS
                        DESTPI=DEST +1
                        DESTPI=DEST +1
                IF(DESTPI.GT.NXREGS) GO T0 120
                IF(DESTPI.GT.NXREGS) GO T0 120
                DO 127 DEST2=DESTP1,NXREGS
                DO 127 DEST2=DESTP1,NXREGS
            IF(XDESTII,DEST2).NE.OT GO TO 128
            IF(XDESTII,DEST2).NE.OT GO TO 128
    127 CONTINUE
    127 CONTINUE
                            GO TO 120
                            GO TO 120
                            28 XOBUS(I,OBUS+1)=DEST2
                            28 XOBUS(I,OBUS+1)=DEST2
    120 CONTINUE
    120 CONTINUE
    C
```

    C
    ```


```

; ISN 0154

```
```

; ISN 0154

```


```

    ISN 0157 999 FORMATI21H ERRUR - - - OP TYPE ,I3,14H, INSTRUCTION,AI,
    ```
```

    ISN 0157 999 FORMATI21H ERRUR - - - OP TYPE ,I3,14H, INSTRUCTION,AI,
    ```






COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME = MAIN,OPT \(=02\), LINECNT \(=50\), SOURCE, EBCDIC, NOLISI,DECK, LDAO, MAP, NOEDIT, NOID.






Current MPM-MQ interface:
\(C\) Varrables: \(Q(1,16)\)
\(\operatorname{SDSA}(32,2)\)
nasuF
natest
NaGO
Qinpt
Memoly
Memory (16)
NBOX
\(I Q(4,16)\)
MEMCNT C(6) (STOR CONDN)
Auent-cauntion


Xeon test for availebirity of \(Q\) space, as
one of the interituss.
XEMP If GO \(4 / 5\), Placeon the interfuce
ACYN STRRE A - KITE IN DRDRR, NTLLK ON IUS
AEMP PLACE DMA ON intexfać
289
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\[
291
\]
Archives

SN 0024
ISN 0026 ISN 0027 ISN 0028 ISN 0029
SN 0030 SN 0031

ISN 0032
ISN 0033
ISN 0034 SN 0035

ISN 0036
ISN 0037
ISN 0038
ISN 0040
SN 0041
SN 0042
SN 0042
SN 0043
SN 0044
SN 0045
SN 0046 ISN 0047

I SN 0048

IfiAPASSIDESTI.NE. 01 GO 108
ABUFUL (DEST) \(=1\)
\(A B U S Y(D E S T)=0\)
APASS \((\) DEST \()=0\)
XBUSY(OEST \()=0\)
RETURN
C
ENTRY XRTN
DESI = IPARI
IFRTN=DEST
RETURN
C.

ENTRY XEAV
\(0010 \mathrm{I}=1\), NQBUF
IF (Q1I,8),EQ.1) GO TO 10
\(Q(1,8)=1\)
RETURN
10 CONTINUE
\(A=1\)
\(B=20000\)
\(C=101\)
CALL TROUBL ( \(A, B, C)\)
RETURN
END
c

\section*{292}
L. Conway
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COMPILER OPIIONS - NAME \(=\) MAIN,OPT \(=00, L I N E C N T=50\), SOURCE, EBCDIC, NOLIST,DECK, LOAD,MAP, NOEDIT, NOID

SUBROUTINE XSTATS
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ISN 0002 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{SUBROUTINE XSTATS} \\
\hline ISN 0003 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{IMPLICIT INTEGER*2(A-2)} \\
\hline ISN 0004 & common & TIME, & IPAR1, & IPAR2, & IPAR3, \\
\hline & A AINPT, & NABUF, & ABUS(50), & XINPT, & NXBUF, \\
\hline & B xbus(50), & - IFADD, & IFDST, & IFRTN, & BRXP, \\
\hline & C BRAP, & ER(8), & BE(8), & ET(8), & NBBUF, \\
\hline & D AHOLDT, & XHOLDT, & AFRCT, & XFRCT, & BOSC, \\
\hline & E BNOP. & X \(E P\), & AEP, & PH1(100), & PRINT, \\
\hline & F FSTADD, & NODOT, & NOPSC, & NDBUS, & NADSP, \\
\hline & G NXDSP & & & & \\
\hline ISN 0005 & COMMON/RLS/ & FIRST, & NAREGS, & NXREGS, & NABUS, \\
\hline & A NXBUS, & STATS, & ACON, & XCON, & AEMP, \\
\hline & B XEMP, & mXO, & afull (12), & XFULL(12), & AGO(12) \\
\hline & C XG0(12), & Nago, & NXGO, & NATEST, & NXIEST, \\
\hline & D NAFAC, & NXFAC, & ABUSYZ, & ABUSY(200), & XBUSYZ, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

E XBUSY(200), ABUFF 112,100\()\); XBUFF 112,100\()\), ASOR(12,200)
F XSOR(12,200), ADEST(12,200),XDEST(12,200), AFAC(12,15),
G XFAC(12,15), AFACSC \(14,15,20)\), ARET, XFACSC( \(4,15,20)\), XRET,
H ABUSSC \((4,10,20), \operatorname{AIBBSY}(10), X B U S S C(4,10,20), X I B B S Y(10), X F I B U S(15)\),
I AOBUS(12,10), XOBUS (12,10), AFSLOT (15,20), XFSLOT(15,20), AFIBUS (15),
J AFOLY(15), XFDLY(15), AFOBUS(15), XFOBUS(15), NSLOT,
K ABUPSZ; ABUPS(200), XBUPS(200), ABUFUL(200), XBUFUL(2001,

\section*{LQ(16,16),} M QINPT, N LOAD, OMXTIME, MEMOLY, MEMORY(16), Q APASS(200), XPASS(200),
R MEMCNT(16), ABOX(15), ABXBSY(10), XBOX(15), XBXBSY(10)
ISN 0006

COMMON/RLS/ LASI
INTEGER CUT
REAL MEMLLY, MXTIME
REAL TIME
REAL TIME
COMMON/OBUF/SPH1(80,100), SABUFF(12,100), SXBUFF(12,100),
A SAREG(32,100), SXREG 132,100\(),\) SABREG \((32,100)\), SCBITTR4,100),
B SCBBIT \((24,100), \operatorname{SAFAC}(15,100), \operatorname{SXFAC}(15,100), \operatorname{SO}(16,100)\),
C SMEM(16,100),S1Q(4,100),SB(34,100),SS(10,100)
DIMENSIUN BBIZ
EQUIVALENCE(BB(1),SPHI(1,1))
DIMENSION XMN(10),AMN(10)
DIMENSION BSYMI68), SSYM(20)
DATA SSYM/4OHSR 1SR 2SR 3SR \(4 S R\) 5SR 6SR 7SR 8SKXPSKAP/
DATA BSYM/136HER IER 2ER 3ER 4ER 5ER GER 7ER \(8 B E\) IBE 2BE \(3 B E 4 B E 5\)
ABE GBE TBE GET IET 2ET 3ET पET SET GET TET BBRXPBRAPXHLTAHLTXFCTAF
BCIXEP AEP BOSCBNGP/
DATA XMN/2OHEAEALS M O XAC SP,
DATA AMN/2OHFAFAFMFDIAIMIDC L \(\mathrm{S} /\)
DATA BLNK/2H,
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
& \begin{tabular}{l} 
OUTPUT LEVELS AS FOLLOWS \\
OUTLVL=0
\end{tabular} & FULL DEBUG INCLUDED \\
& OUTLVL=1 & CYC/CYC INCLUDED \\
OUTLVL=2 & FULL 100 CYC INCLUDED \\
& OUTLVL=3 & MIN 100 CYC INCLUDED \\
& FIRSI TIME THRU, BLANK THE OUTPUT
\end{tabular}

\section*{ABNORM=0}

IFITIME.GT. 0.01 GO TO 60
\begin{tabular}{rr} 
ISN 0021 & \\
ISN 0022 \\
\hline ISN 0024 & \\
ISN 0025 & \\
\hline ISN 0026 & \\
ISN 0027 & \\
& \\
& \(C\) \\
& \(C\) \\
& \(C\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline ISN 0028 & \\
\hline ISN 0030 & \\
\hline ISN 0031 & \\
\hline ISN 0032 & \\
\hline ISN 0033 & \\
\hline ISN 0034 & \\
\hline ISN 0036 & \\
\hline & C \\
\hline & C \\
\hline & C \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(50 \mathrm{BE}(I N D E X)=\) BLNK
50 BEI INDEX
CALL CAUSE(STATS,TIME+1.0,0,0,0)


OUTPUT PER CYCLE IF OUTLVL LE 1
IFCOUTLVL.GT. I) GO TO 100 WRITE(6,1000)TIME
100 CONTINUE

\section*{ITIME=TIME}
\(J T=M O D(1 T I M E, 100)+1\)
IF(JT.NE. 1 ) GO TO 2050
IFITIME.EQ.0.01 GO TO 2050

\(\begin{array}{r}\text { ISN } 0038 \\ \text { ISN } 0039 \\ \hline\end{array}\)
2500 CUNTINUE
ITIME \(=T I M E\)
BTIME=ITIME-MOD (ITIME, 100)
IF (MOD (ITIME,100). EQ.0) BYIME=ITIME-100
FTIME= ITIME-I
CALL TMTU(DUT(1))
WRITE(6,2610) BTIME,FTIME, (JOB(I), I=1,6), OUT(1), OUT(2)
WRITE \((6,2611)\)
IF(OUTLVL.EQ.3) GO TO 888
OUIPUT DISP REG AND PHI
WRITE (6, 2630)
WRITE \((6,2640)(5 P H 1(1, T), T=1,100)\)
WRITE \((6,2641)(S P H 1(2, T), T=1,100)\)
\(00 \quad 90 \quad I=1,8\)
\(\mathrm{J}=\mathrm{I}+2\)
90 WRITE \((6,2022) I,(\operatorname{SPH}(J, T), T=1,100), I\)
WR I TE \((6,2630)\)
WRITE \((6,2643)(\) SPH1 (11, T), \(T=1,100)\)
WRITE \((6,2641)(S P H 1(12, T), T=1,100)\)
\(00 \quad 91 \quad \mathrm{I}=1,8\)
0091
\(J=1+12\)
1 WRITE(6, 2622)I, (SPH1 (J,T), \(I=1,100), I\)
WRITE \((6,2630)\)
WRITE \((6,2644)(S P H 1(21, T), T=1,100)\)

WRITE 6,2641\()(\operatorname{SPH}(22, T), T=L, 100)\)
ISN 0064
DO \(92 \quad I=1,8\)
\(J=1+22\)
92 WRITE(6, 2622)I, (SPHI \((J, T), T=1,100), I\)
WRITE 6,2630 )
WRITE( 6,2645\()(S \operatorname{SHI}(31, T), T=1,100)\)
WRITE(6,2641)(SPHI(32,T), \(T=1,100)\)
DO \(93 \mathrm{I}=1,8\)
\(\mathrm{J}=\mathrm{I}+32\)
WRIIE 6,2622\() 1,(S P H 1(J, T), T=1,100), I\)
WRITE 6,26301
WRITE 6,2646\()(\operatorname{SPHI}(41, T), T=1,100)\)
D0 \(941=42,80\)
\begin{tabular}{rrr} 
ISN 0074 & WRITE \((6,2646)(S P H I(41, T), T=1,100)\) \\
ISN 0075 & DO \(941=42,80\) \\
ISN 0076 & 94 & WRITE 6,2642\()(S P H I(I, T), I=1,100)\)
\end{tabular}
I=

6,2630)
WRITE(6,2637)BSYM(1), BSYM(2), (SB(1,T),T \(=1,100\)
DO \(104 \mathrm{~J}=1,17,8\)
SN 0081 \(\quad\) DO \(104 \mathrm{~J}=1,17,8\)
ISN 0086
ISN 0087
ISN 0088

IF(1.EQ.1) G0 TO 104
WRITE(6,2638) BSYM(2*1-1) BSYM(2*1) (SB(I,T), T=1,100)
104 CONTINUE
DO \(103 \quad \mathrm{I}=25,34\)


```

        J=0
        WRITE(6,2628) J,I SCBIT(I,T),T=1,100),J
    ```
        00 115 I=2.24
        \(\mathrm{J}=1-1\)
    ISN 0160
        115 WRITE \((6,2622) \mathrm{J},(\operatorname{SCBIT}(I, T), T=1,100), \mathrm{J}\)
                        DUTPUT CBU BITS BUSY
\(-15 N 0161\)
        WRITE \((6,2630)\)
        \(\mathrm{J}=0\)
            \(=1\)
            WRITE 6,2629\() \mathrm{J},(\) SCBBIT \((I, T), T=1,100), \mathrm{J}\)
            \(00116 \quad 1=2,24\)
            ISN 0162
            ISN 0163
            ISN 0164
            ISN 0165
            ISN 0166
        116 WRITE \((6,2622) \mathrm{J},(S C B B I T T 1, T), T=1,100), \mathrm{J}\)
            C
        WRITE(6,2630)
        889 CONTINUE
        DO 2550 INDEX \(=1,35800\)
        2550 BB (INDEX)=BLNK
                        If ABNORMAL TERMINATION,I.E. ENTERED AT FINIS,
                            WRITE OUT OBUF, CALL TROUBL, THEN STOP.
        IF(ABNORM.EQ.O) GO TO 7777
        \(A=1\)
        \(B=20000\)
        \(B=20000\)
\(C=7777\)
        CALL TROUBL (A,B,C)
        CALL
        ENTRY FINIS
        \(A B N O R M=1\)
    GO TO 2500
0

            IF(SSTOP.EQ.I) RETURN
        2050 CONTINUE
                            CYCLE=JT
                            CYCLE \(=J T\)
SALL SOBUF(CYCLE)
            - TEST FOR STOP CONDITION
            IF(PHI(100). EQ.O) RETURN
            DO \(200 \quad \mathrm{I}=1\), NABUF
            IF(ABUFF(I,I).NE.O) RETURN
            200 CONTINUE
                            DO 201 I =1, NXBUF
                            IF(XBUFF(I,1).NE.O) RETURN
    297
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\(\qquad\)
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COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME \(=\) MAIN, OPT \(=02\), LINECNT \(=50\), SOURCE, EBCDIC, NOLIST,DECK, LOAD, MAP, NOEDIT, NOID ISN 0003
ISN 0004


SUBROUTINE STOBUF(CYCLE)
IMPLICIT INTEGER*2(A-Z)
COMMON TIME,

300





ISN 0076 I SN 0078 I SN 0080 ISN 0081

IF (XBUFF(I,13).EQ.0) 60 TO 20
IF(IXBUFF(INS,13).EQ.1).OR.(XBUFF(INS,9).EQ.1)) GO TO 100

\section*{20 CONTINUE}

21 CONTINUE
IF EXIT, INTLK AGAINST PREV BRANCHES AND ER
IF(XBUFF(INS,14).NE.1) GO TO 28
IF \((E R(B R X P) . N E .1)\) GO TO 100
IF(INS.EQ.1) GO TO 129
DO \(128 \mathrm{I}=1\), INSM1
IF(XBUFF(I,12).EQ.1) GO TO 100
128 CONTINUE
C EXIT PART OF OP GOES, MARK GO EXIT.
XBUFF(INS,15)=1
28 CONTINUE
OO 22 REG=1,NXREGS
IF ( \((X S O R 1\) INS,REG).EQ.1). AND. (DESBSY(REG).NE.OII GO TO 100
IF ( \((X D E S T(I N S, R E G) . E Q .1)\).AND. (DESBSY(REG).NE.O)) GO TO 100
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { IF ((XDEST (INS,REG).EQ.1).AND.(DESBSY(REG).NE.O)) GO } 10 & 100 \\ \text { IF ( } X D E S T(I N S, R E G) . E Q .1) . A N D .(S O R B S Y(R E G) . N E . O)) ~ G O ~ T O ~ & 100\end{array}\)
22 CONTINUE
FIND FAC USED
DO 25 FAC \(=1\), NXFAC
IF(XFAC(INS,FAC).NE.O) GO TO 26
25 CONTINUF
FAC=0 NO FAC USED. ISSUE OP
6 CONTINUE

C IF L/S TEST AVAIL OF QUEUE
IF( \(X\) SOR(INS, 89).NE.1).AND.(XDEST (INS,89).NE.1)) GO TO 27
IFC(XSER
SPET
\(Q P T=Q 1 N P T+Q G O\)
IF(QPT.GT.NQBUF) GOTO 100
27 CONTINUE
C
IF BRANCH, INTLK AGAINST PREV BRANCHES AND EHT AVAIL
IF(XBUFF(INS, 12).NE. 11 GO TO 29
IF (ER(BRXP).EQ. 1 ) GO TO 100
IF ( \((\times B U F F(I N S, 5)\).EQ.0). AND. (LONGBR.NE.O) GO TO 100
IF(INS.EQ.1) GO TH 231
\(1 F(I N S . E Q .1) G O\)
\(D O 230 \quad \mathrm{I}=1\), INSM1
IF(XBUFF(I,12).EQ.1) GOTO 100
230 CONTINUE
231 SPEC=1
29 CINTINUE
PREV NOGO STARRED OPS;SHT AVAILABLE
IF(XBUFF(INS,13). NE.1) GO TO 132
IF(SR(SKXP).EQ.1) GO IO 100
IFIINS.EQ. 11 GO TO 131


XIBBSY(INBUS) \(=\)
\(X B X B S Y(B O X)=1\)
XBUFFI = XBUFF (INS, 1\()\)
IF(XFSLOTIFAC,T).EQ.O) GO TO 32
\(X F A C S C(1, F A C, T)=1\)
XBUF

XBUSSC( 1 , DBUS, DELAY) \(=\) XOBUS(INS,OBUS
XBUSSC \((3,0 B U S, D E L A Y)=X B U F F(I N S, 2)\)
IF (XOBUS(INS, GRUS+1).EQ.01 GO TO 95
IF (IIBUSt1). IT. NXBUS) GO TO 95
\(X B U S S C(1, D B U S+1\), DELAY \()=X O B U S(I N S, O B U S+1)\)
XBUSSC \((2, O B U S+1, D E L A Y)=X B U F F(I N S, 1)\)
601095
\(c\)
SPEC ROUTINE TO HANDLE MULT IDENT FAC INTLK
NO INBUS CONFLICTS IN \(x\)
IF(XBXBSY(BOX).EQ.1) GO TO 60







LEVEL 5 DEC 66 DATE YS/360 FORTRAN H 6TE 6710.06 .47


ISN 0073
X1B35Y(1)=0
9 XIBOSY(I)=0
ISN 0075
SLOTML=NSLOT-

\section*{ISN 0076}
\(00101 \quad \mathrm{~J}=1.10\)
00100 SLOT \(=1\), SLOTMI
ISN 0077
XBUSSC \((1, J, S L O T)=X B U S S C(1, J, S L O T+1)\)
XbUSSC \((2, J, S L O T)=X B U S S C(2, d, S L G T+1)\)
XGUSSC \((3, J, S L O T)=X B U S S C(3, J, S L O T+1)\)
10U CUNTINUE
xbUSSC(1,J,NSLOT)=0
XUUSSC \((2, J, N S L O T)=0\)
XBUSSC(3,J,NSLOT)=0
101 LUNTINUE
DCi \(1 \cup 3 \mathrm{~J}=1\), NXFAC
DU 102 SLOT \(=1\), SLUTM1
\(X F A C S C(1, J, S L O T)=X F A C S C(1, J, S L C T+1)\)
\(X F A C S C(2, j+S L U T)=X F A C S C(2, J, S L O T+1)\)
1 UZ CUNTINUE
XFACSC \((1, J, N S L O T)=0\)
XrACSC \((2, J, N S L O T)=0\)
03 GUNPINUE.
RETURN
```

$---\quad-1$

```

PRESERVES . 1 VALUES UF VAKIUUS RUS CUNTKOL TRIGGERS

ULKA \(=E K\) ( SKAP)
OBEX \(=\) BE ( \(B R X P\) )
ODEA=BE (BRAP)
GLTX=ET(BKXP)
\(1 \in T A=E T(D R A P)\)
UCRXP=bisXP
CUSAN=ERAP
UXEP=XEP
UAFP=AF,
BeNJP= EidUP
ESTABLISH AND SAVE TRUF BOSC CUNOITIUN
\(805=0\)
C. \(\times 15=0\)
(i) \(\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{C}=0\)
\(0 i, j 00 \quad 1=1, n \times 30 \mathrm{r}\)

IF (XUUFF ( 1,14 ). NE. 1 ) GO TO 300
Ir(LeUS.EQ.1) LEOSC=1
S.EXII=1

6010301
300 CUNTINUE
sul cunifinue
UBUSC=0
IF ( (CEXIT.EQ.O) .ANO. ( (BOSC.EQ.1).UR.(CBOS.EQ.1)) OBOSC \(=1\)

\section*{315}

\section*{1. Conway Archives}


COMPILER OPTIONS - NAME = MAIN,OPT=02,LINECNT=50,SOURCE,EBCDIC,NOLIST,DECK,LOAD,MAP,NOEDIT,NOID


ISN 0028
SN 0028 ISN 0029 ISN 0030 SN 0031 ISN 0032
ISN 0033
ISN 0034
I SN 0035
ISN 0036
ISN 0037 ISN 0038 ISN 0039

528 CONT INUE
GO 10529
527 CONTINUE
L=K
WRIIE(6,550)L, (SAV(J), J=K,K9)
529 CONTINUF
RETURN
100 FORMAT (7H TIME \(=, F 8.2\) )
101 FORMAT (7H CODE \(=, 18\) )
550 FORMAT (1X I6. 8(2X I8, 4X))
3333 FORMAT \(119 H\) TIME/DATE OF RUN \(=, 2(1 \times 28)\)
END


) INPUT PROGRAM FOR THIS RUN \(=\) MM-MS
TIME/DATE OF RUN = 5A63CE76 0067271F

TACHITHE PARRIAETERS FUR THIS PUN - - -
INUMBER OF A BUFFERS = 8 (4)NUABER OF \(X\) BUFFERS \(=82\) (7)NUMBER OF \(Q B U F F E R S=8\)
NUMRER A OPS TESTED \(=16\) (5)NUMEER \(\times\) GPS TESTED \(=12\) (8)NUMBER Q OPS TESTED \(=8\)
MAX A BPS ISS/CYCLE \(=12\) (6)MAX \(X\) OPS ISS/CYCLE \(=3\) - 9 MAX Q OFS ISS/CYCLE \(=2\)
3) AINI:HUA Q-MEM DELAY \(=5.0\)
) NUMBER OF BOIS = \(\quad 8\)
1) BER BRANCH REGS \(=3\) (12)NUMFEQ OF SKIP REGS \(=4\) (13)SIZE OF OD TABLE \(=6\)

ZNUSBER OF PSC REGS \(=-2\)
5)NUMBER DISP BUSES =(x)

2 MAX A ORS DSP/CYCLE \(=\frac{\text { K (7)MAX } \times \text { OPS OSP/CYCLE }}{3}=\)



Figure 2-3. The Parameter Card Format

0
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline PARAMETER & MIN & TYP & MAX & COLS \\
\hline (0) J \(¢\) BNAME & & & & 1-6 \\
\hline (1) NABUF & 1. & 8 & 12 & 9-10 \\
\hline (2) NATEST & 1 & 8 & NABUF & 11-12 \\
\hline (3) NAG \(\varnothing\) & 1 & 3 & 3 & 13-14 \\
\hline (4) NXBUF & 1 & 3 & 12 & 15-16 \\
\hline (5) NXTEST & 1 & 3 & NXBUF & 17-18 \\
\hline (6) \(N X G \varnothing\) & 1 & 3 & 3 & 19-20 \\
\hline (7) NQBUF & 1 & 8 & 16 & .21-22 \\
\hline (8) NQTEST & 1 & 8 & 16 & 23-24 \\
\hline (9) NQGØ & 1 & 2 & NB¢X & 25-26 \\
\hline (10) \(\mathrm{NB} \varnothing \mathrm{X}\) & 1 & 8 & 16 & 27-28 \\
\hline (11) NBBUF & 1 & 3 & 8 & 29-30 \\
\hline (12) NSBUF & 1 & 4 & 8 & 31-32 \\
\hline (13) \(N \not \subset D \emptyset T\) & 1 & 6 & 16 & 33-34 \\
\hline (14) NØPSC & 0 & 8 & 8 & 35-36 \\
\hline (15) NDBUS & 1 & 2 & 2 & 37-38 \\
\hline (6) NADSP & 1 & 4 & NABUF & 39-40 \\
\hline (17) NXDSP & 1 & 3 & NXBUF & 41-42 \\
\hline (19) MXTIME & & 300.0 & & 60-66 (F7.1) \\
\hline (8) MEMDLY & 2.0 & 5.0 & & 68-71 (F4.1) \\
\hline ¢UTLVL & 0 & 1 & -3 & 73-74 \\
\hline - FSTADD & 0 & 0 & \%: & 76-80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline &  &  &  &  \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{3} \\
\hline & & & & \({ }^{\text {® }}\) \\
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{)} & & & PAGE 003 & \\
\hline & I SN 0068 & DO \(10 \quad 1=1,10\) & & \(\stackrel{\square}{5}\) \\
\hline & ISN 0069 & 10 AFSLOT \((1,3)=1\) & & \(\stackrel{5}{9}\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{} & 1 SN 0070 & DO \(9 \mathrm{~J}=4,9\) & & \(\angle 0\) \\
\hline & 1 SN 0071 & \(9 \mathrm{AFSLOT}(4, \mathrm{~J})=1\) & & 8 \\
\hline & ISN 0072 & \(\operatorname{AFSLOT}(6,4)=1\) & & 6 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3} & ISN 0073 & DO \(8 \mathrm{~J}=4,12\) & & 013 \\
\hline & I SN 0074 & \(8 \operatorname{AFSLOT}(7, J)=1\) & & 11 \\
\hline & ISN 0075 & AFOLY(1)=3 & & 21 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & 1 SN 0076 & \(\operatorname{AFDLY}(2)=4\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0077 & AFDLY(3) \(=3\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0078 & \(\operatorname{AFDLY}(4)=9\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & ISN 0079 & \(\overline{A F D L Y}(5)=2\) & & \(\bigcirc\) \\
\hline & ISN 0080 & AFULY 6 ) \(=5\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0081 & AFDLY \((7)=15\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & 1 SN 0082 & AFOLY 8 ) \(=1\) & & 3 \\
\hline & ISN 0083 & AFDLY 9 ) \(=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0084 & AFDLY(10) \(=1\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3} & ISN 0085 & AFIBUS(1)=2 & & \% \\
\hline & ISN 0086 & \(\operatorname{AFIBUS}(2)=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0087 & \(\operatorname{AFIBUS}(3)=3\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & ISN 0088 & AFIBUS (4) \(=1\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0089 & \(\triangle F I B U S(5)=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0090 & \(A F I B U S(6)=2\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & ISN 0091 & \(A F[\operatorname{CUS} 17)=2\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0092 & \(\operatorname{AFIBUS}(8)=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0093 & AFIBUS (9) \(=2\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3} & I SN 0094 & AFIBUS (10) \(=3\) & & \(6{ }^{3}\) \\
\hline & I SN 0095 & \(\triangle F O B U S(1)=2\) & & \\
\hline & I SN 0096 & AFOBUS (2) \(=1\) & & \({ }^{\frac{2}{2}}\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{3} & ISN 0097 & \(\operatorname{AFOBUS}(3)=4\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0098 & \(\operatorname{AFOBUS}(4)=3\) & & \({ }_{1}^{1}\) \\
\hline & ISN 0099 & AFOBUS (5) \(=2\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{)} & ISN 0100
ISN 0101 & \(\operatorname{AFOBUS}(6)=4\)
\(\operatorname{AFOBUS}(7)=4\) & & \(\bigcirc\) \\
\hline & ISN 0102 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AFOBUS }(7)=4 \\
& \text { AFOBUS }(8)=6
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3} & ISN 0103 & \(A F O B U S(9)=1\) & & 9 \\
\hline & ISN 0104 & AFOBUS (10) \(=3\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0105 & \(A B O X(1)=1\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{3} & ISN 0106 & \(A B C X(2)=2\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN \(01 C 7\)
ISN O108 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& A B O X(3)=3 \\
& \operatorname{ABOX}(4)=4
\end{aligned}
\] & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{3} & ISN 0109 & A \(30 \times(5)=2\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0110 & \(A B O \times(6)=4\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0111 & \(A B O \times(7)=4\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{)} & 1 SN 0112 & \(A B O X(8)=5\) & & 0 \\
\hline & ISN 0113 & \(\operatorname{ABOX}(9)=6\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0114 & \(A B O \times(10)=7\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0115 & NXBUS=10 INITI & & - \\
\hline 12 & ISN 0115 & NXBUS \(=10\) & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{3} & ISN 0117 & \(0011 \mathrm{I}=1,9\) & & 3 \\
\hline & ISN 0118 & \(11 \mathrm{XFSLOT}(1,2)=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0119 & \(\operatorname{XFSLOT}(5,3)=1\) & & \\
\hline & ISN 0120 & \(0012 \quad 1=3,9\) & & 0 \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline \()\) & 1 & ay & & 0 \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

subject: Cover Letter for Preliminary Distribution of Logical Design Memorandum

\section*{Reference:}
to: Mr. S. F. Anderson
Mr. B. O. Beebe
Dr. C. V. Freiman
Mr. M. E. Homan
Mr. B. J. Mooney

Mr. R. J. Robelen
Dr. H. Schorr
Dr. E. H. Sussenguth
Mr. W. P. Wissick

A memorandum describing basic ACS logical design conventions is enclosed.

On joining ACS engineering, I found that there was no single convenient source of this information. Some of the information was not documented in any available references.

Since most of the designers use different notations and conventions, it proved to be a surprisingly time consuming and confusing process to learn the precise details of this very simple basic material. Many of the designers related to me that they had had similar initial experiences.

At that time I made some notes for my own personal use. I have since formed these into a memorandum in the hope that it might prove useful to other newcomers to ACS engineering. It might also be useful to members of other ACS departments.

If you have any comments, criticisms, or discover any errors needing correction, please contact me about them. I will then be able to get the memorandum into shape so that it might be useful during the coming expansion of Dept. 988.
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This memorandum describes the various rules and conventions for ACS logical design. The material presented is elementary in nature, but is basic to all ACS logical design.

A description is given of the logical functions of the ACS circuits available to the designer and of the various rules governing the use of these circuits in logical design. A number of different notations are in current use for writing the logical equations for these circuits and for drawing the diagrams of logical circuitry. Some of these different notations are illustrated and explained. Elementary logical design--the transformation from equations to circuits--is briefly described.

If we were designing in AND-OR logic with few restrictions, this memorandum would be unnecessary. However, we are usually designing with NOR-NOR or NOR-OR logic. The physical properties of the circuits force a number of restrictions in addition to simple fan-in and fan-out rules. The fact that designs"eventually input a Design Record Keeping System (DRKS) has produced additional conventions and design notation.

These factors have led different designers to use different conventions for writing logical equations and drawing logic circuit diagrams, and to use different logical design techniques. It is true that at the time designs are input into DRKS, they all will be described in the same formal system. However, up to that time most designs will exist in the form of equations and diagrams in the "shorthand" of the originating designer. The newcomer may therefore become confused when attempting to decipher the designs of different engineers until he fully understands the fundamentals from which their different "shorthand" techniques originated.

These fundamentals are presented in this memorandum in the hope that they may assist the newcomer to ACS engineering in his first design efforts and serve as a reference for those outside of engineering who may wish to study some particular logical design in detail.

The newcomer should also study the listed references before undertaking any serious design. This memorandum was formulated from these references, but does not attempt to cover many important topics contained in them. Of particular importance is the information on circuit delays in the ACS Circuit Manual and information on wiring rules in both the ACS Circuit Manual and the ACS Packaging Manual. The DRKS User's Manual specifies the final form in which designs are to be placed.

\section*{The ACS Logical Circuits:}

This section describes the logical functions of the circuits and connections available to the ACS logical designer. Truth tables and equations are given describing the logical functions. The various conventions, restrictions, and limitations of each circuit are listed.

The truth tables use 0 and 1 as symbols, and these are related to the actual physical voltages in the circuits as follows: 1 symbolizes positive (or ground), and 0 symbolizes negative voltages.

\section*{The Current Switch:}

\[
\begin{aligned}
& X=\bar{A} \cdot \bar{B} \\
& Y=A+B
\end{aligned}
\]

Note the significance of the positions in the circuit symbol of the outputs \(X\) and \(Y\). The top output \(X\) is the NOR of the inputs, and is often called the "out of phase" output. The bottom output \(Y\) is the OR of the inputs and is often called the "in phase" output. Note that \(Y=\bar{X}\).

Fan-in: Current switch inputs are outputs of emitter followers or emitter follower dot circuits (see description of e.f. dot later in this section). The maximum number of inputs for a given current switch is a function of the maximum fan-in of those e.f. dot circuits forming the inputs. This function is as follows:


For example, if the e.f. dots feeding a current switch had no more than two inputs each, then the current switch would have a maximum fan-in of 12. However if one of the e.f. dots had a fan-in of five, then the current switch would have a maximum fan-in of five.

Fan-out: The outputs always pass through emitter followers. The fan-out is thus determined by the fan-out of the emitter followers. The maximum fan-out of the emitter follower (emitter follower dot) is 12 . See emitter follower dot description later in this section.

\section*{The Orthogonal Collector Dot:}


The orthogonal collector dot is the connection of collector outputs of current switches (the in phase outputs) before passing through an emītter follower. This connection performs the AND function--with the important restriction that no two of the inputs may be simultaneously negative. This is called the orthogonality restriction. In the above three input case the restriction requires that: \(A \cdot B+A \cdot C+B \cdot C=1\).

The ultimate physical restriction is somewhat weaker than the stated logical orthogonality restriction. A maximum time of . 5 ns of nonorthogonality is allowed, which covers variations in signal delays. See Reference 1, Page 2.

Fan-in: \(\leq 5\)
Fan-out: See fan-out for current switch. Same description applies here.

The Emitter Follower Dot:

\[
X=A+B
\]

The emitter follower dot circuit is the "dotting" or connection of current switch outputs A and B after their emitter followers. The function performed is OR with no restrictions except fan-in and fan-out. Note that we might have a line connected to an e.f. dot which came from an emitter follower which followed a collector dot.

Fan-in: \(\leq 5\)
Fan-out: \(\leq 12\) (try for \(\leq 8\) )

Note: The meaning of "dot" in orthogonal collector dot and emitter follower dot is that the inputs are actually wired or connected together. Thus the O. C. Dot and E.F. Dot are not circuit elements, but are connections of wires which perform particular logical functions on the signals carried by those wires due to their locations in the circuitry (see Reference 1).

Therefore we cannot think of applying the same input to two separate dots. For example, the following diagram is incorrect for it shows \(B\) as an input to two separate E.F. Dots, treating these dots as independent circuit elements and expecting that \(X=A+B\) and \(Y=B+C\) :


Since the E.F. Dot is merely a connection of the inputs, the only possible interpretation of the E.F. Dot of A, B, C is that they are all wired together as follows:


Most beginning logical designers will have had considerable experience in design using AND, OR, and COMPLEMENT "gates" as circuit elements. It is natural for the designer to write logical equations for such designs using AND, OR, and COMPLEMENT logical operators. The primary content of switching theory consists of operations on logical functions expressed using these operators.

However in ACS the actual logic circuit implementation of a design is usually in NOR-NOR or NOR-OR logic.

It turns out that the usual OR-AND or AND-OR formulations of logic equations can be easily transformed and converted directly to the corresponding NOR-NOR or NOR-OR circuitry (see Section 5 for these techniques).

Therefore, for convenience most ACS designers express logical functions using OR, AND, and COMPLEMENT logical operators. The usual minimization techniques of switching theory may then be applied to these formulations before transformation into the final NOR-NOR or NOR-OR form (the circuit diagram itself).

The following different symbols for the logical operators are currently in use by different ACS designers:
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\operatorname{AND}(A, B):\) & \(=A \cdot B=A B=A \wedge B\) \\
\(\operatorname{OR}(A, B):\) & \(=A+B=A \vee B\) \\
\(\operatorname{NOT}(A):\) & \(=\bar{A}=A^{\prime}=-A\)
\end{tabular}

These variations in basic operator symbols from one designer to another should cause the newcomer no confusion.

There is one practice, stemming from the ultimate NOR-NOR or NOR-OR implementation of logical functions, which will definitely cause the newcomer confusion if it is not fully understood. It is a common practice in ACS to use two different symbols for complement in the same logic equations. Thus we may see both \(\bar{A}\) and \(-A\), or perhaps even \(-\bar{A}\) in some equation. The reason some designers use both forms derives from the inversion of variables when using NOR-OR logic. One symbol is usually reserved for true logical complements and the other symbol (usually - ) is used to mark variables or expressions which are complemented because they are at an intermediate point in the logic (see Section 5).

It is easy for the newcomer to think that -A must mean something other than \(\bar{A}\), perhaps having something to do with negative voltages. This happens easily because some designers also mark uncomplemented variables with + in some cases (using the symbol V for OR).

However, remember that -A is equivalent (logically) to \(\overline{\mathrm{A}}\), and that +A is equivalent (logically) to A. Some designers might argue otherwise, but that is because they have attached some additional heuristic values to these different symbols for complement in order to aid their design efforts. Thus, any difference between -A and \(\overline{\mathrm{A}}\) is only a heuristic difference, not a logical difference.

For example, the following equations all equate X with the same logical function of \(\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}\) :
\[
\begin{aligned}
\bar{X} & =\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{~B} \cdot \overline{\mathrm{C}} \\
-\mathrm{X} & =\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{~B} \cdot \overline{\mathrm{C}} \\
+\mathrm{X} & =-(\mathrm{A} \cdot \mathrm{~B} \cdot \overline{\mathrm{C}})
\end{aligned}
\]

After gaining some experience with NOR-NOR and NOR-OR circuit implementations of logical functions, the newcomer may find that it aids him in his design efforts to use \(\pm\) symbols in addition to the usual complement symbol.

It is not necessary.to use these extra symbols and the corresponding heuristic techniques. They may assist those designers who prefer to design in an informal manner. One may, alternatively, design in a formal manner without ever using heuristics. However, all ACS designers should know about the techniques used by other designers and the resulting additional notation so that successful communication is possible between different designers.

\section*{Logic Circuit Diagram Conventions}

A number of different conventions are in current use for drawing logic circuitry composed of ACS circuits. Different designers may use different symbols for the basic circuits. Some designers indicate emitter followers while others do not.

Two methods are shown below which serve to illustrate some of the possible variations in circuit diagram techniques. The two methods differ primarily in the way in which the orthogonal collector dot is symbolized. When the O. C.D. is symbolized by a labelled block, it is not necessary to indicate emitter follower positions. However, if only a simple dot is used to symbolize O.C.D., then it is necessary to show emitter follower positions (symbol: \(\diamond\) ) in order to avoid confusing O.C.D. with emitter follower dot.


\section*{338}

Ex. (iii)

\[
\begin{aligned}
& A=\bar{A}_{1} \cdot \bar{A}_{2} \cdot \bar{A}_{3} \\
& B=\bar{B}_{1} \cdot \bar{B}_{2} \\
& D=D_{1}+D_{2} \\
& E==E_{1}+E_{2}+E_{3} \\
& C=D \cdot E \\
& X=A+B+C=A+B+D \cdot E \\
& X=\bar{A}_{1} \cdot \bar{A}_{2} \cdot \bar{A}_{3}+\bar{B}_{1} \cdot \bar{B}_{2}+\left(D_{1}+D_{2}\right) \cdot\left(E_{1}+E_{2}+E_{3}\right)
\end{aligned}
\]

In the examples shown above, the basic symbols for the current switch are all the same. Sometimes, however, designers will place a letter inside the current switch symbol to indicate the logical function that it performs. This practice may lead to considerable confusion for the newcomer for two reasons: (i) different function names are often used for the current switch by the same'designer, (ii) the output phase of the switch to which the name refers is usually assumed to be obvious and is not explicitly indicated. Let us study these conventions in some detail to avoid confusion.


For the current switch shown, the output \(Y\) equals the \(O R\) of the inputs \(A, B\) :
\[
Y=A+B
\]

Suppose we complement both sides of the equation to yield:
\[
\overline{\mathrm{Y}}=\overline{\mathrm{A}} \cdot \overline{\mathrm{~B}}
\]

We thus find that the complement of \(Y\) equals the AND of the complements of A, B. Now, even though this equation expresses \(Y\) as the same function of A, B, many designers call this the "MINUS AND" function. Thus one may see different current switches in the same circuit diagram labelled in both of the following ways:


These circuit symbols both stand for current switches and both perform exactly the same logical function on their inputs. Some designers choose to view them differently depending on whether or not complemented variables appear as inputs. This is another heuristic aid to the designer. Clearly it is not necessary to view the circuit element in these two different ways. It is just that some designers find that this technique assists them in their design efforts. Note that the output phase in the above examples to which the function name applies is found to be the "in"phase. This is not explicitly indicated, but is "obvious" because of the known function of the switch. This sort of duplicate naming can be carried further if desired. For example:

A
B


Here we have named the function as "MINUS AND INVERT." The meaning is that the output X is the complement of the MINUS AND function.

This duplicate naming of functions may sometimes be applied to the other circuit connections. The emitter follower dot performs an OR function and so may also be thought of as performing the "MINUS AND." The orthogonal collector dot performs the AND function and so may be thought of as performing a "MINUS OR" function.

It is important to note that "MINUS AND" and "MINUS OR" are not equivalent to the logical functions NAND and NOR. It is unfortunate that the use of MINUS (-) here conflicts with our previous definition of (-) as equivalent to complement. One might therefore be led to believe that MINUS AND (-A) is equivalent to \(\overline{\mathrm{AND}}\) (and thus equivalent to NAND), which it is not.
"MINUS AND" and "MINUS OR" may best be viewed by the beginner as merely other names for OR and AND, used by some designers for their heuristic value when circuit input variables are in complemented form.

There is another circuit diagram symbol which the newcomer will occasionally see and which is bound to confuse him. This is the "wedge" symbol appended to certain circuit block inputs/outputs. Wedges might be found on a current switch symbol as follows:


These wedges have no functional meaning to the logical designer. They do not change the identity or function of the circuit element. The wedges are normally produced by the DRKS system and automatically affixed to the circuit blocks appearing on the DRKS sheets. The wedges appear to be used primarily by CE's who service the hardware. Wedges appear mainly on the MACRO circuit blocks defined and used in DRKS. To quote Reference 3, Section 2.2.8.5:
"Wedges will be printed in the edge of box print position for all input or output lines that are in the "down" signal condition when the logic block function is being performed. The designer need not draw these wedges on his diagram. They will be automatically inserted by DRKS, according to the block definition in the macro file, when the sheet is printed."
In other words, given a circuit block performing some logical functioñ as stated by a logical equation, DRKS affixes wedges to those input and output lines which must be down (0; negative) when both sides of the equation are TRUE (1).

Examples: note that although both examples use the same circuit, the wedge placement is different. This is because wedge placement depends on the statement of the function of the circuit. If we complement both sides of the equation defining the circuit, then the wedge placement changes.
(i) Current Switch as an "OR"


When both sides of the equation are TRUE (1), then \(Y\) must equal 1, neither \(A\) nor \(B\) must equal 0 , and since \(X=\bar{Y}\), then \(X\) must equal 0 .
(ii) Current Switch as a "MINUS AND":


When both sides of the equation are TRUE (1), then \(Y\) must equal 0 , A must equal 0, B must equal 0 , and since \(X=\bar{Y}\), then \(X\) must equal 1.

Now, even though the wedges have no functional meaning, some designers may attach them to the circuit blocks in their circuit diagrams. This is especially true when MACRO circuit blocks are used. A reason for this is that the wedges can be used as a memory aid in locating particular inputs and outputs on the MACRO blocks which have many input/output lines. But remember that there is no additional information contained in the wedges. DRKS can produce them automatically when given the function of the block.

\section*{Elementary Loogic Design}

Logic design in ACS, and in any case where implementation will be made in real circuitry, is essentially an iterative procedure consisting of making a design, then testing that design against technological restrictions, then redesigning and retesting until a valid design is found.

First the logical functions to be implemented in the design are formulated in a set of logical equations. Then the set of equations is operated upon to minimize the logic according to some selected criteria such as number of circuits and/or number of circuit levels. Note that the minimization may be performed on the equations (which use AND, OR, NOT operators) even though the final implementation may be in NOR-NOR, or NOR-OR logic (see Reference 4, page 101).

Next, the minimized equations are examined to determine if all circuit restrictions are satisfied. These restrictions, such as fan-in and fan-out, can be checked while the design is still in the form of logical equations.

If the restrictions are not satisfied, we must iterate by going back and perhaps reformulating the equations and minimizing again, until equations are found which satisfy the restrictions.

At this point we can convert the equations directly into a logical circuit implementation. Descriptions of procedures, both formal and heuristic, for performing these conversions follow later in this section.

Now, if the design specification is beyond the preliminary stage and unlikely to be changed, then the circuitry must be checked against all the many and complex wiring and packaging rules. If the design cannot be wired or packaged as is, then additions or changes may have to be made, or perhaps another entire design iteration may be required.

Implementing Logic Equations in ACS Circuitry:
With a little experience a designer can directly sketch out the logic circuitry to implement some logical function. This is particularly easy to do if AND OR or OR-AND logic circuits are used. For these cases the designer can place the equation for a function in "sum of products" or "product of sums" form and transform directly to a circuit diagram.
In the ACS technology, however, we have available only a restricted form of AND circuit (the orthogonal collector dot; inputs must be orthogonal). Thus OR-AND logic is seldom used. Instead, we normally use NOR-NOR or NOR-OR logic.

The beginner should therefore learn the transformations for quickly and automatically drawing the circuit diagrams for NOR-NOR and NOR-OR logic implementing a logical function. This material is covered in detail in Reference 4, pages 94-102. A summary is presented here for reference:

Let us draw the logic circuitry to implement the function
\[
f=(a+b)(b+\bar{d})(a+c)=a b+b c+a \bar{d}
\]

Ex. (i): NOR-NOR logic circuit implementation:
( 2 circuit levels: current switch to current switch)
Step 1: Express function in product of sums form:
\[
f=(a+b)(b+\bar{d})(a+c)
\]

Step 2: Let \(\operatorname{NOR}(a, b)=(\overline{a+b})\). Transform the equation to NOR-NOR form by simply replacing all OR, AND operators with NOR operators, leaving the variables in the original order and form:
\[
f=\operatorname{NOR}(\operatorname{NOR}(a, b), \operatorname{NOR}(b, \bar{d}), \operatorname{NOR}(a, c))
\]

Step 3: Draw the logic circuit diagram directly from the equation in Step 2.


Clearly we may proceed directly from Step 1 to Step 3. The NORNOR logic uses the same connections of circuits to implement a function as does OR-AND logic. We merely replace all OR and AND circuits with NOR circuits

EX. (ii): NOR-OR logic circuit implementation:
(1 circuit level: current switch to E. F. Dot)
Step 1: Express function in sum of products form:
\[
f=a b+b c+a \bar{d}
\]

Step 2: Transform the equation to NOR-OR form by complementing each variable and replacing the AND operators with NOR operators:
\[
\mathrm{f}=\operatorname{NOR}(\overline{\mathrm{a}}, \overline{\mathrm{~b}})+\operatorname{NOR}(\overline{\mathrm{b}}, \overline{\mathrm{c}})+\operatorname{NOR}(\overline{\mathrm{a}}, \mathrm{~d})
\]

Step 3: Draw the logic circuit diagram directly from the equation in Step 2:


Here also we see that it is easy to proceed directly to Step 3 from Step 1. The NOR-OR logic uses the same connections of circuits to implement a function as does AND-OR logic. We merely replace the AND circuits with NOR circuits and use the complementary inputs.

\section*{Heuristic Design Techniques:}

The extensive use of the NOR-OR logic has caused the evolution of many heuristic design practices, including the use of two different symbols for complementation and the duplicate naming of the logical function performed by the current switch.

To clarify all the points developed in this memorandum concerning heuristic design techniques, let us implement the same function \(f\) of the preceding examples in NOR-OR logic using one of the heuristic techniques rather than the formal, automatic procedure just described.

Suppose we have available as inputs both phases of a, b, c, d, i. e., \(\pm \mathrm{a}, \pm \mathrm{b}, \pm \mathrm{c}, \pm \mathrm{d}\) and wish to form \(\mathrm{f}=\mathrm{ab}+\mathrm{bc}+\mathrm{ad}\).

Using minus (-) inputs we can use "MINUS AND INVERT" circuits to obtain the terms \(a b, b c\), and \(a \bar{d}\). Then we can use the emitter follower dot to OR these terms.


Clearly this is the same circuit as that developed in the preceding formal NOR-OR example. However, here the designer is thinking directly in terms of pseudo AND-OR logic by renaming the functions of his circuit elements and making a sequence of appropriate complementations.

The beginner is warned not to attempt to imitate such techniques at first. The heuristic techniques, used by the novice as though they were formal methods, will prove far more unwieldy and confusing than the previously illustrated formal techniques. The novice using these heuristics will put a great deal of effort into the essentially trivial process of forming circuit diagrams from logic equations.

When the time comes that the designer has a good "feeling for" NOR-NOR, NOR-OR logic design, he may then find that some of the existing heuristic techniques are useful. Experienced ACS designers can sometimes find "tricky" implementations using these techniques which have less delay or lower circuit count than those derived by formal approaches. This occurs especially when both the O. C. Dot and E.F. Dot are used in the implementation.
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\section*{Intróduction}

This memorandum describes a proposed ACS Logic Simulation System(LSS). This system has been only tentatively defined. The purpose of this memorandum is to set down the current thinking and stimulate some feedback from potential users, potential implementers, and other critics on the feasibility and utility of such a system and on the practical details of its implementation and use.

The purpose of the proposed LSS is to provide a mechanism for aiding the debugging of the logical design of the ACS-1. The logical designer may know that for a given section of logic circuitry a certain set of inputs should produce a particular set of outputs (for a given initial internal state) according to the "system level" description of the design which he implemented in the logic circuitry. The LSS will provide a means of inserting the circuit inputs into a logic simulator which simulates the action of the circuitry on these signals and then compares the resulting output with the output expected by the designer. Any mismatches would indicate a logical design error in the circuit (see fig. 1)

A group in Poughkeepsie can provide ACS with a package of programs capable of performing the logic simulation. The ACS designer would provide input to these programs indicating the particular partition of the machine to be simulated and the input-output lines on the interface of this partition. The programs would use this input to extract from the DRKS files the detailed description of the logic of the partition selected. The designer would then need to apply a sequence of inputs to the logic simulator corresponding to a proper sequence of input-output line signals at the interface of the partition. The programs would simulate the logic operating on the input signals and mark any mismatches in the logic output and expected output. The designer would then use these mismatches to debug his logic design.
A major obstacle to the practical application of this proposed system is the difficulty of generating the I/O signals at the partition interface. It does not appear to be at all practical, or even feasible, for the logic designers to generate by hand all the correct test patterns necessary to "moderately" debug all the partitions of the machine.

A method has been proposed to solve this problem by providing a programmed means of automatically generating these interface I/O signals. A detailed timing simulator now exists for the MPM (ref. 3). This simulator times the activity of all MPM hardware, as described at a system level, during the execution of an input program.
\[
349
\]

Now, suppose we wish to use the ISS to study and debug a particularpartition of the MPM. We could carefully define the interface of that partition and rewrite the appropriate sections of the timing simulator such that (i) the same interface existed in the timer as in the logic circuitry, (ii) the same "system" level description is used in the timer to describe the partition that was used to formulate the logical design of the partition, (iii) provide for output to suitable files of the timing simulator interface signals during each simulated cycle of execution.

The timer thus modified could become a practical source of the I/O signals needed to drive the LSS. The timer would have to accurately reflect the MPM only at and within the interface of the partition to be studied. Any errors in this system description would be discovered early in the debugging process. After this phase, many selected programs could be run on the timer to yield as many interface signal sets as are necessary to debug the logic design of the partition to the required level (see fig. 2).

The timer could also assist the designer of the partition in his efforts to find a particular bug when the LSS indicates a mismatch in outputs. The timing charts produced by the timer will give a concise picture of the state of the machine at a system level in the region of time surrounding and including the cycle in which the bug occurred. This may help to determine if the bug is at the level of system specification or logic circuit implementation. Both the timer and LSS can provide the states of specified triggers within the partition and a comparison of these can aid the designer in debugging.

In the following sections of this memorandum some of the details of this proposed LSS system are described and questions are raised which must be answered before any serious development of the system can begin.

The main point to keep in mind is that there are two levels of simulation involved in this scheme -- the detailed simulation of the logic circuitry of a design and the system level simulation of the same design. This two level simulation technique for debugging logic circuitry was originally proposed to ACS in August, 1966 by G. T. Paul. The technique now appears to be feasible because of the availability of an adequate logic simulator and ACS experience with the current timing simulator.

Comments and criticisms are invited, especially on questions concerning the feasibility of the system, its utility to the ACS logic designers, its cost relative to any alternative systems, and the various practical problem of its implementation and use.

\section*{FIG1. THE BASIC IDEA OF LSS:}

APPIY SAME INPUT TO BOTH LEVELS OF SIMULATION.
AND COMPARE OUTPUTS. IF DUTPUTS ARE DIFFERENT THEN ERROR EXISTS IN LOGIC DESIGN.


FIG 2. AUTOMATIC GENERATION OF SYSTEM LEVEL INPUT/OUTPUT, LOGIC SIMULATOR INPUT: SYSTEM GEVEL EESIGN IS IMBEDDED IN SYSTEM LEVEL SIMULATION OF ENTIRE MACHINE. WHEN THIS sIMULATOR RUNS WE AUTOMATICALY GENERATE (ANE SAVE) THE I/O RT THE DESIGN INTERFACE WE MAY LATER APPLY THESE INPUTS TO THE LOGIC SIMULATOR FOR THE SAME DESIGN ANE COMPARE THE LOGIC OUTPUTS WITH THE SYSTEM LEVEL OUTPUTS.


\section*{The LSS Programs}

In this section the programs forming the ISS are identified and described. The relationships between the various programs and the designers input and output to the system is described. This specification was developed from information contained in ref. 1 and the notion of using the timing simulator to drive the LSS. This specification is very tentative in nature.

The simulation of the logic of a portion of the ACS-1 machine operating on a sequence of inputs may be viewed as occurring in three distinct phases within LSS.

The first phase is the selection of the specific partition of the machine to be studied and the specification of the I/O interface for this partition. The designer will specify the partition and interface in a card input deck. This deck is used by the LSS to extract the detailed information describing the logic circuitry of the partition from the DRKS files and DRKS rules. The program performing this extraction is termed the Simulation Interface Program (SIP), and is to be written by the Poughkeepsie people.

The next phase of the LSS simulation is the generation of a sequence of interface signals for the selected partition. This is done by running ACS program on the modified timing simulator. Once the designer has assisted in forming the proper timing simulator specification for his partition, the production of these interface signals requires no more effort by him. Many programs exist which run on the timer. The designer would merely select those programs which might best be applied to debugging his particular section of the machine. An addition must be made to the existing timing simulator to extract and file the proper interface signals during each cycle of simulated time. Let us call this the interface signal file generator. This program would be written here at ACS.

The final phase of the LSS run is to perform the logic simulation itself. This is done by a program to be called TALES, which is to be developed by the Poughkeepsie group. The interface signal files produced by the timer-interface file generator programs are processed by a reformatting program called TAMIP (also to be written by Poughkeepsie) and then input the TALES logic simulator. The TALES simulator uses the logic files formed by the SIP program to perform the proper logical functions on the input signals to yield interface output signals for each simulated cycle. If the logic simulator output signals differ from the expected output signals produced by the timing simulator, an output listing to this effect will be produced and certain information printed to assist the designer in finding the cause of the mismatch.

In figure 3 the functions of the three phases of LSS are illustrated by flowcharting the relations between the designer's input, the various LSS programs, the DRKS files, and the various LSS internal files.

\section*{FIG 3. THE ACS LOGIC SIMULATION SYSTEM}
I. SELECT PARTITION OF MPM:

II. GENERATE PARTITION INTERFACE SIGNALS:

III. SIMULATE LOGIC OF SELECTED PARTITION:


\section*{Possible Procedures for Use}

So far we have examined the overall functions of the LSS and identified the component programs and files. All of this is very tentative. In this section let us explore some of the many different possibilities which exist for organizing and using the LSS system, and identify those areas which are only tentatively defined and need to be worked on.

Many questions and alternative approaches are outlined which must be resolved before the system can be considered feasible, useful, and economical. Criticism on these specific questions from everyone concerned is needed to formulate the answers to these questions.

Most of these questions center on the organization and management of the system, i.e., what technical form should the system have in order to be usable by the designer? For example, how do we partition the machine, how large or small should the partitions be, and how do we select the interfaces? How should the designers specify the system level description of their partition?
(i) Partitioning the MPM: How large or small should a partition be? From an organizational and system simulator point of view, the larger the better. If a partition is too large, however, the designers may have a difficult time in debugging the logic. This problem might be eased by placing certain triggers internal to a partition in the set of outputs the designer can check. If the partitions are too small and thus many in number, we will have difficulty in managing the study--there will be too many interfaces, and some of them may be inconvenient to specify at the system level.

It seems undesirable to have a single partition so large or so chosen that two different design groups design sections of the partition. The utility of the LSS system is increased by having formal interfaces between the various groups of designers, to allow a successful segmentation of the design. It is natural that the interfaces between design groups would also be interfaces in the system level simulator in LSS.

An approach to choosing partition size might be the following: choose the partitions as large as is possible subject to the following constraints, (i) the boundaries of the various design groups, (ii) the maximum amount of logic which the logic simulator will handle. It is likely that the second limit will usually be met first. This raises the question of whether the logic simulator (TALES)
can handle a large enough partition for the LSS to be practical. This question is quantitatively studied (section 4) later in this memorandum, and the answer currently appears to be yes.
(ii) Selecting the Interface: Suppose we wish to formulate a partition of the MPM whose approximate size and boundaries are known. We face the problem of selecting the exact interface that is to exist between this partition and the rest of the machine. This is the problem of selecting an interface which is reasonable both in the logic and in the system level of description. The problems involved in doing this do not appear to be serious if the partition is large, for then certain natural boundaries (the phases) within the MPM may be chosen as interfaces. If the partitions must be very small and many in number, we will have serious problems for the system level description as a whole will become much more detailed and unmanageable. We might not be able to simulate on a cycle by cycle basis, but have to generate and check interface signals at many different times within a machine cycle.
(iii) Describing a Partition: In order to correctly generate the interface signals for a given partition, the timing simulator must accurately reflect the system level description of that partition. An important question to be answered is how is the detailed system level description of a partition to be formed, in what language, and by whom? There is a wide range of possibilities.

Method (a). The designers could give a verbal, nonformal description of their partition to a programmer who would formalize the description by writing the code which performs the system level simulation. This is probably not adequate because it would be too difficult to maintain the description. The designers would have no direct link to the formal description when they desired to make a change.

Method (b). The designers could produce a "semi-formal" description of their partition by creating a combination of flow charts, diagrams, and written description which attempted to document as accurately as possible (outside a formal language) all the details of their design. A programmer could use documents of this type as a direct basis for his coding of the system level simulation. This at least solves the problem of maintenance of the program. A change in a flow chart could fairly easily point to the necessary corresponding change in the simulator code. Even with this method, serious problems arise (even more serious if using Method (a)). Since the designers would not themselves have a complete, formal description at a system level of the thing they have designed, many errors are bound to occur in the system description--errors which would be difficult to debug.

Method (c). We might go a step further in the specification of a partition by the designers and require that they help formulate and have access to a complete, formal description of their partition at the system level. This could be done by having the designers partitipate actively in the production of the formal description. The obvious choice of a language for formal description is the simulation language used in the timing simulation program. This language is an "elementary form" of "Simscript, " and is written in FORTRAN (see ref. 4).

The designers could produce the flow charts, etc., as in Method (b), but then assist in the production of the system simulation code to the extent that they would fully understand and be able to modify (with programming assistance) the system level description.

The system simulation code would then be the formal description for the designer. It would be easy for the designer to introduce changes into the formal description.

Method (d). We can go one step further and require that the designers independently produce a formal system description of their partitions in some language common to all the design groups. This is a goal to strive for in later design efforts. It seems impractical at the present time, however, because of (1) the time required to educate the designers in some formal language, (2) the even greater time required for them to gain "programing" experience--the experience needed to use the language to describe their design at the proper system level. Most logic designers probably conceptualize their design not as a system description being implemented in some logic circuitry, but as the logic circuit implementation itself. That this is likely is indicated by the current lack of detailed system descriptions within engineering and the current wealth of logic circuit diagrams.

Considering the methods (a), (b), (c) and (d) outlined above, it would appear that the most useful and feasible method for currently producing the necessary system level descriptions for the INS is Method (c).
(iv) Selecting the Partition in the Logic: When we have selected and described a partition at the system level, we face the problem of selecting the same partition at the logic circuit level. The description of the logic circuits is formal and is contained in the DRKS files. The Poughkeepsie group will write the SIP program which actually extracts the logic design of a partition and forms the file to input the logic simulator.

The designer's input to specify the logic to be selected by the SIP program has been tentatively defined in reference 1 . There will have to be a study by all concerned to produce a specification of the SIP input conventions. Once the procedures for use of the LSS system have been defined, it would be desirable to specify input conventions for SIP which are the simplest possible in nature which meet the needs of the LSS. The smaller and simpler the interface between ACS designers and Poughkeepsie programs the better.
(v) Sequence of Partitions to be Studied: An important property of the proposed LSS using the existing timing simulator as a starting point in the system level description is that the debugging of one partition may proceed independently of that of another partition. We can thus choose a sequence of partitions to be debugged which corresponds to the schedule of design of the partitions.

We could have chosen not to use the timer, but to apply Method (d) of the previous section and develop a formal and accurate system level description of the whole machine. Let us examine some of the problems within this scheme and thus learn the advantages of using the timer.

Suppose the machine could be divided into four partitions:


We could have the designers write the programs described \(A, B\), \(C\), and \(D\) and then run these as an accurate timing simulator, obtaining input and output signals at the interfaces.

The problem with this is that the system level programs must all exist and be reasonably debugged before the whole system level simulation will run. Of course the individual partition programs could be run separately to yield partition outputs for a given set of partition inputs. But this does not solve the original problem affecting the feasibility of logic simulation--the difficulty of generating by hand all the input-output patterns. It only half solves the problem.

Another difficulty with this approach is that we would be heavily committed to whatever techniques were chosen to implement Method (d).

Clearly we do not need to face these problems and uncertainties. The existing timing simulator can be used to circumvent them as follows:

We chose for LSS debugging the first partition whose design is "completed." Suppose this is partition A.


We already have a working, debugged timing simulator which simulates an approximation to the whole MPM. We write and place into the timer (replacing existing code) the the description of partition \(A\) at the system level. Now the remainder of the timer serves as a dummy machine which can properly interact with partition \(A\) once the system description of \(A\) is debugged. Now we may not get exactly the same feedback from the dummy portion of the machine that we would get from the eventual real machine, but this does not matter. We will get valid feedback which will properly drive partition A. We will automatically get both inputs and outputs of A every cycle while the simulated machine runs an input program.

This allows a considerable degree of freedom in the planning of the debugging process. We may debug the partitions independently and in sequence if we so desire. It is likely that the various partitions will be ready for debugging at different times. We could schedule the debugging to correspond to these design schedules. We would not be committed to the first procedures chosen to debug the first available partition. If a method proves unsatisfactory on the first partition, we can modify our procedures for handling later partitions.

By using this method we can proceed only as far as we choose in applying LSS to debugging the logic. We do not need to determine in advance how much of the logic is to be debugged this way. Some sections of the machine may remain in dummy (original timing simulator) form. Some sections of logic such as functional units (adders, multipliers) clearly can have their logic simulator inputoutput signals formed by hand or by special programs of much simpler form than system level simulators.

Note that the timing simulator can eventually become an exact system level simulator of the whole machine if that end is desired. This method does not preclude that possibility. Indeed, this method offers a practical means of achieving that end in a step by step approach rather than attempting it directly.
(vi) Debugging a Partition: How does the designer use LSS to uncover bugs in the logic design? Let us consider various procedures which might help in the debugging process.

An important consideration in the debugging of a partition is the selection of some appropriate input programs for the system simulator. We wish to run programs on the timer which exercise as fully as possible the system logic of the partition under study, in order to debug that partition as fully and efficiently as possible. This selection process is yet to be developed.

A question which arises here is how far should the debugging of a partition proceed using LSS. This is a function of input program choice, the available computer time and manpower available for debugging. This question must be studied fully in order to estimate the performance of the LSS system compared to its cost.

An important potential function of LSS which must be explored and developed is that of providing the designer with information to assist his debugging effort in addition to the mere indication of an output mismatch.

One possibility, easily implemented, is to make available to the designer the timing charts produced by the timing simulator (see ref, 3) for the LSS run under study. It has proven possible, with some practice, for individuals to use the timing charts to follow completely the system level functioning of the MPM. The designer would thus have available to him a concise description of the states and functioning of the whole machine in the region of time surrounding and including the cycle in which a bug was found in his partition.

Another possibility is to have the timer and the logic simulator both provide as output the contents of important registers and triggers within a partition in addition to those on the partition interface. This would be especially important if the partition is a large one. Of course we would have to have the timer quantities behave exactly as the logic circuits in order for this to work. This might provide a practical way of allowing large partition size, yet
feasible debugging. As an example, suppose a large section of phase 1 of the MPM is to be contained in one partition. It would be very useful in the debugging process if the designer had access to the values of such things as NFA, HISTORY TABLE, DO TABLE, etc., in both levels of simulation (i.e., as "interface output quantities"). Usually these important internal quantities of a partition could be easily made to function exactly the same at both simulation levels.
(vii) Other Modes of Use: During the specification and development of the LSS system we must identify and meet the requirements for any other possible uses of the system and its components.

An example of this is the need to allow manual insertion of interface signals into the Poughkeepsie programs in order to perform the debugging of isolated sections of design for which manual signal insertion is adequate. Examples of such design areas where manual or special program generation of the interface signals is possible are functional units such as adders, multipliers, dividers, etc.

Another function the system might perform is the generation of files suitable for hardware debugging at a later time.

\section*{Requirements for Development}

The hardware, software, computer time and personnel required to develop, use and maintain the LSS system must be estimated to determine if the system is feasible and economical.

It has been determined that the ACS Mod. 75 computer will have adequate hardware for both the Poughkeepsie programs and the ACS timer-interface signal generator program.

Yet to be explored are possible work schedules, documentation requirements, and forms of communication needed between ACS and Poughkeepsie. It appears possible for the LSS development to proceed without altering engineering design schedules, if a proper scheme of development is chosen. Of course the time required for the designers to specify the system descriptions of their design areas will add to the design schedule time, but it appears likely that this system description will be necessary whether LSS is implemented or not. The requirements for maintenance of the system are yet to be determined. These depend on the role the designers play in specifying and maintaining the specifications of their partitions.

There are two important considerations which strongly affect the feasibility and economics of LSS. These are the computer time required to simulate and the memory requirements of simulation (determines maximum partition size).

Reference 2 indicates that a few seconds of Mod. 75 time would be required for the TALES program to perform the logic simulation of one machine cycle for the largest partition it could handle. The ACS system level simulation of the whole machine will run at a rate of approximately 10 to 15 machine cycles/second on the Mod. 75.

Thus it appears likely that the feasibility of LSS is not innpacted by the computer time requirements. The required time is down in the range where the human time and effort in debugging the results would probably be a stronger limitation than available machine time. Of course these machine time requirements could be heavy ones and thus it is very important that the logic simulator (TALES) be made as efficient as possible, for the running of TALES will probably be the major cost of LSS.

Let us now consider the question of memory requirements and their determination of the maximum partition size.
P. Shivdasani has formulated the following study of this question, based on verbal communications with the Poughkeepsie group. His result of 56 K ACS circuits as the maximum partition size indicates that we can choose partitions large enough for LSS to be practical (see section 3(i)).
(i) Storage capacity, \(S\), in \(K\) bytes, required to run the logic simulator is
\[
S=98+2 L(10+\text { avg. fan-in }+ \text { avg. fan-out })
\]
where \(L=\#\) of nets to be simulated (in thousands)
Also the fan-out from a block (macro, U. L. or dot) is
\[
=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\text { source }_{i} \cdot \text { load }_{i}\right) \leq 31
\]
\begin{tabular}{l} 
Thus \\
\(\qquad\)\begin{tabular}{l|l}
\hline macro \begin{tabular}{l}
10 loads \\
\hline
\end{tabular}\(\frac{10}{10}\) & source 1 \\
2
\end{tabular}\(\quad\) fan-out \(=30\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Another 200 K bytes must be allowed for the worst case op. system.
There is also an absolute limit of 32 K on L due to the present simulation programs.

Thus if we assume
\[
\begin{aligned}
L & =32 \\
\text { fan-out } & =31 \\
\text { fan-in } & =15
\end{aligned}
\]

We have \(S=3882 \mathrm{~K}\) bytes which will easily be handled by the two LCS's ACS has on order.
(ii) Nets:

A net is defined as a logic source feeding any number of sinks. Thus in U. L. representation each U. L. block leading to a dot is a net.


It is important, then to try and define as many macros as possible.
(iii) Assume 32 K nets as maximum partition. Find equivalent in ACS circuits.
a) Let \(X\) be the number of circuits corresponding to these nets.
b) Assume \(80 \%\) of the circuits can be represented in macros and the remaining \(20 \%\) need a unit logic representation in DRKS.
c) Also assume each macro contains 5 circuits and has two source outputs.

Then nets due to macros \(=\left(\frac{.8 X}{5}\right) 2\)
d) Assume an average dot of 4 in U. L. Then we have 5 nets for every 4 circuits.

Or nets due to U.L. \(=\left(\frac{-2 X}{4}\right) 5\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1.6 X}{5}+\frac{X}{4}=32,000 \\
& \text { or } X=\frac{32,000}{.57}=56 \mathrm{~K} \text { circuits }
\end{aligned}
\]
(iv). DRKS does not handle macros made up of U. L. blocks from different portions of the same chip, let alone different chips. So if a high number of U. L. blocks is being dotted externally, the above capability will be desirable to keep the net count down.

\section*{Page 4-5}

\section*{Additional Benefits of LSS}

There are some additional benefits which might result from implementing the proposed LSS system.

The formal specification of the machine at a system level would give the various design groups a chance to uncover many system level design errors before the logic itself is tested for bugs.

This formal system level description would be useful to many others in ACS.

Of course this description would have to be maintained by the designers to reflect all design changes. If maintained and the timing simulator reflects the description accurately, then the LSS could be used later to generate the interface signals for hardware circuit debugging.

Also, an accurate timing simulator would be very useful to the compiler and system programmers and to any ACS customers who wish to optimize hand code.

\author{
TO: L. Conway \\ Dept. 988 \\ IBM - ACS \\ 2800 Sand Hill Road \\ Menlo Park, California
}
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\section*{INTRODUCTION}

For many years, computer designers have proposed the use of various levels of simulation for design specification, verification and evaluation. Simulation and automation have been applied to some phases of the design process in a number of past projects.
At the present time, in ACS, we feel that we have sufficient practical experience in system simulation and design automation to propose a workable system plan for the whole computer design process.

This plan has as its key element the specification of the systemlevel design in a high-level simulator. All following phases of design are viewed as implementations of this system specification.

Details of this plan are presented including initial design studies using timing simulation, design specification in a high-level simulator, logic design verification by comparing two levels of simulation, design automation and finally, hardware checkout and maintenance.

Design automation eliminates routine human effort in the later design phases. Simulation allows creative human effort where it is important--in the initial system level planning and evaluation. Rather than being merely a sideline in the design process, simulation can be and should be viewed as the natural medium of expression of the computer designer. A designer who can quickly generate working models of his ideas can get the feedback necessary for real design improvements. Adequate programming tools are now available to the designer for this purpose.

This memorandum presents a brief description of all the phases and components of the design process as it might exist in ACS. Much of this material is well established practice, and thus the memorandum could serve as an introductory tutorial document on this subject.
The purpose of this memorandum is to make certain specific suggestions concerning important aspects of the planning, implementation and operation of the total design process. The most important of these suggestions are
(i) The careful planning of the design process itself is as necessary for success of the project as is the careful planning of the computer design. The design process should be planned as one integrated system. If the separate phases are planned by different groups of people, the result will be an ineffective overall plan with serious difficulties at the interfaces of the phases.
(ii) The plans produced should be carefully documented and maintained and made available to all designers. A common terminology would then develop for all the many design phases, simulation and design automation programs, design languages, etc., and better understanding and communication would develop across design group boundaries.
(iii) It is strongly urged that the output of the Architecture department be a formal, high-level description of the computer in the form of a running simulator of the system architecture. This simulator would have to be maintained and modified as the design proceeded into later phases. This simulator would, in effect, be the design of the machine with all later phases viewed as implementations of the design. The use of a high-level language for this description is emphasized to insure that the system description be readable and intelligible to all designers. With the design formalized at a high level the prediction of performance, modification, debugging and general understanding of the design would be greatly simplified and improved. Many of the essential functions in the total design process proposed in this memorandum are completely dependent upon the existence of this high-level system architecture simulator.
(iv) The design should be carefully "partitioned" at the earliest possible point in the design process (i.e., in Architecture) into functional segments that will be manageable by later design groups. Although it may be possible for a small group of people to design and comprehend the entire computer at the architectural level, it is not possible at later levels of design. The computer must be divided or partitioned among a number of groups of logic designers. If this partitioning is done in architecture along functional lines, the interfaces between partitions can be kept narrow and simple. These interfaces must be formally specified
in the high-level simulator and maintained throughout later phases of design.

The design process described in this memorandum, including the above suggestions and the many programs implementing the process, is not just a speculation as to what might be a good way to do things in the distant future. There is considerable practical experience within ACS with the various components of the process.

\section*{THE OVERALL DESIGN PROCESS}

Let us now identify and define the fundamental stages of the overall design process. Then in the following sections of the memorandum each stage will be described in some detail.

The design and production of the computer passes through four rather distinct stages. The stages are identified by their final production of a "formal description" of the computer in a particular "language." The output of one stage is the input to the succeeding stage. Each stage of the process may be thought of as implementing or redescribing the design of the prior stage in a lower level language.

These stages are as follows (see Figure 1 for a visualization of the process):

System Architecture: This is the planning of the structure and function of the computer system, developed from a consideration of predicted market conditions and technology. The plan is developed to the level of detail of system description such that the complete function of the system is specified. The formal description produced by the architecture group would be a running system level simulation program written in a high-level language. The design would be carefully partitioned along functional lines into formally specified partitions with fairly narrow interfaces between them. The architectural design would consist of ( \(i\) ) variables and arrays in the high-level language symbolizing the various registers and control latches of the machine, and (ii) algorithms in the language expressing the functioning of the control latches and the flow of data between registers and functional units on a cycle to cycle basis.

Logic Design and Engineering: The logic designers and engineers implement the structure and function of the architectural design in the logic circuitry and physical package of the chosen technology. The logic designer identifies and implements all the latches specified in the architectural design and designs combinational logic circuitry to connect the latches and implement the algorithms of the architectural design. This logic design must then be mapped onto real physical circuitry. This involves the selection of a circuit chip on which a given logic circuit is to be found, and the placement of that chip on a particular MCM on a board. The interconnections between all such chips, MCM's and boards must be specified. The output of

Each stage produces a partitioned description of the machine design in a formal language. Each stage implements the design of the preceding stage in a lower level language, with the design then containing more detail but performing the same function. The partitions can pass thru the process independently.

SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE: Produces the system level description of the machine: a system simulation program:


LOGIC DESIGN AND ENGINEERING: Produces the logic design and circuit placement and interconnections, specified in the DRKS language:


DESIGN AUTOMATION: Produces the physical files, a complete physical specification of the machine including wiring, bonding.


PROCESS AUTOMATION: Produces the wired circuit boards composing the computer:
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this design phase is a formal specification of the logic design, placement, and interconnections in the input language to the Design Record Keeping System (DRKS), which stores the design in a set of computer files. An alternative logic description language is now in development.

Design Automation: - In the design automation phase a set of computer programs operate upon the design filed in DRKS to produce as output a complete physical description of the computer: This is done on a board by board basis. Note that in the DRKS system the various pads which must be interconnected to form a net are specified. However the actual route of wiring to connect these points is not. This wiring of all the nets on a board is computed by a wiring program. The pattern for bonding the wires to the pads is completed, and terminating resistors are assigned. The result of this design automation phase is a set of computer files which contain the complete physical description of all the boards of which the computer is composed.

Process Automation: We now have a complete physical description of all the boards. But how do we actually wire a board; what sequence of wire placements should we make? We must compute an orderly and feasible sequence of wire placements to be made by wiring machinery. The process automation programs operate on the physical files to produce a set of tapes which drive the wiring machinery tirrough the proper sequence of operations to wire the boards of the computer. The output of this phase is the physical computer itself.

We are now ready to study the design process in more detail. Figure 2 is a flow chart of the stages of the design process which indicates the various computer programs used at each stage and the interaction of the various stages. This flow chart serves as a basis for the detailed descriptions of each stage which follow in the later sections of this memorandum.


\section*{SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE}

The function of the system architecture phase of design is to produce a system-level specification of the machine. In the design process as described in this memorandum this specification is to be in the form of a running system simulation program.

Tentative System Design: The development of a system design which effectively meets cost and performance requirements calls for considerable experimentation with tentative system designs. The design will thus pass through these tentative, experimental phases until the experiments indicate that it is satisfactory. Then the design can be completely placed into a formal description.

Now, how can one experiment with a tentative computer design? It turns out that this is well established in ACS--by using a timing simulation program. See Reference 2 for a description of a past timing simulation ef fort, and Reference 1 for the simulation technique used in that effort.

The timing simulator is written at essentially the same level of description as the later system-level simulator and using the same simulation technique. However, it can be simpler and quicker to write because it does not require a data flow. Only the timing of control operations is relevant to timing simulation. The input to the timing simulator is the stream of instructions to be processed by the simulated computer, and the output of the simulator is a chart of the activities in the various machine registers, initiated by the instructions being processed, as a function of time. The detailed model of the proposed control structure can thus be tested quite accurately to predict performance and uncover design bottlenecks.

In order for timing simulation to really interact with and affect the system design, the simulator must be running while the system design is in development. This is only possible if
(i) The system architects really want a simulator, believe in its value, and help in its production.
(ii) The timing simulator is written in a high-level language: This will make algorithm production and documentation much easier than would assembly coding. Also, the timing simulator would be consistent with and a basis for the later system simulator.
(iii) The architects participate in its writing.

If the simulator writer(s) must form all the detailed algorithms specifying a tentative design, then the simulator will lag the design by many months, perhaps 4 to 6 months. However, if the architects specify their tentative design in detail, then the coding of these designs would be a far simpler process and might lag specification by only one or two months.

This simulator should be partitioned along the same lines as the machine and interfaces identified early in the design processes. Then the separate partitions could be designed independently with unspecified partitions modeled in the simulator by dummy subroutines which roughly approximate the function of those partitions. In this way the entire machine can be simulated as early as possible even though some sections are not completely designed. Studies can then be made on those sections which have been designed.

Formal System Desig: When timing simulation experiments indicate that the system design is satisfactory and unlikely to change greatly, the construction of a complete system simulator describing that design can begin.

The design will already have been partitioned. Engineers from the logic design groups assigned to implement these partitions could work along with the architects to write the system simulator. This simulator must be carried uniformly to the latch level of detail in order to be useful in later stages of design. The engineers could see that this requirement is met and that all algorithms specified for latch to latch operations in one cycle could probably be implemented in combinatorial logic without breaking the machine cycle.

There is experience in ACS with this sort of simulation, where a number of engineers write the program rather than having a simulation programmer do it. See Reference 4.

Note that this production of the system level design by both architects and engineers blurs the traditional boundary between the two functions. Both groups of designers work on the system level design, but from different orientations.

When the system description is complete, it can be run as a simulator and the design debugged at this level by running many actual programs on the "computer." As the later stages of design are completed,

much information will be fed back to the architectural stage and force revisions in the system description. For example, many algorithms will not turn out to be realizable in logic in one cycle, and will have to be respecified, changing the system description. This system description must be accurately maintained if the design process as described in this memo is to function properly.

The availability of an accurate, maintained system level simulator will result in:
(i) Accurate performance prediction--potential users, compiler writers, etc., can run code on this simulator and predict machine performance and optimize their programs.
(ii) The logic design of the machine will proceed directly from the high-level description and thus will progress more rapidly and with better communication between design groups working on different partitions.
(iii) An effective logic simulation can be performed to compare the logic design of a partition with the system specification of that partition. The system level simulator can produce the input/output signals on the partition interface which can then be used to "drive" the logic simulator. More will be said about this very important logic simulation later in this memorandum.
(iv) Accurate system simulation plus accurate logic simulation will make possible the implementation of a very effective maintenance plan. This will be described later in this memo. See also Reference 6.

The significance and importance of the system level simulator cannot be overemphasized. It must be produced and maintained for the proposed scheme to work. The higher the level at which a design is formally specified, the easier it is for everyone involved to fully understand the design, experiment with it, and change and debug that design.

This system level simulator should really be viewed as "the machine." All later design and automation of design and manufacture should be viewed as implementations of the system design.

\section*{LOGIC DESIGN AND ENGINEERING}

This stage of the design process produces an implementation of the structure and function of the architectural design in the logic circuitry and physical package of the chosen technology.

In a manner similar to the system design, the logic design and engineering pass through two phases: (i) a tentative phase where attempts are made at implementation, often resulting in revisions being made in the system design, and (ii) a formal phase where the formal description of the logic and physical placement is produced.

Tentative Logic Design: When a partition of the system has completed tentative system design and is ready to be formalized in the system level simulator, then the tentative logic design of that partition may begin. The tentative logic design is the attempt at implementation of the system partition in logic circuitry and package. These early attempts will fail because many of the system algorithms will not be realizable in one machine cycle of logic. A strong interaction must exist between those persons producing the formal system specification and the logic designers. The tentative logic design efforts must feed back enough information such that the formal system description will have most of the algorithms checked for feasibility of implementation in logic and package without breaking the machine cycle time. For this reason it is suggested that at least one of the logic designers who works on the tentative logic design of a partition also work along with the architect for that partition and participate in the formation of the system level description. In this way the partition of the system will not only reflect architectural requirements, but will be implementable, as described, in logic.

These early, tentative logic design and placement efforts will probably be specified nonformally. The designs at this stage are traditionally sketched out as logic circuit diagrams on "yellow sheets." Rough approximations of circuit placement can be made, and then estimates of delays and circuit counts can be generated. These estimates will be fed back, and perhaps modify the system design and/or the logic design.

Formal Logic Design and Placement: When tentative logic design studies have produced sufficient feedback to finalize the system design, then the formal logic design and placement can begin. The formal logic design must implement in logic circuitry the function of the system design. The behavior of a partition of the machine, as seen at its interfaces, must be the same at both levels of design, system and logic.

There are two aspects to this implementation of the system design: the implementation of the system function in logic circuitry and the mapping of that circuit design onto real hardware.

Currently the logic design phase is done by the designer with no computer assistance. The mapping of the logic design onto hardware and the placement of the different levels of hardware may be done in part, or perhaps entirely by computer orograms.

The mapping or partitioning of logic circuitry onto hardware and-the placement of levels of hardware involves the following levels: logic circuitry maps onto circuit chips, circuit chips are placed on MCM's, and MCM's are placed on the board.

There are a number of possible techniques that might be used to accomplish the placement which involve varying amounts of computer assistance to the designer. Some methods being considered for ACS use are
(i) In current use is a method where the designer must partition the logic onto chips by hand, and then a sequence of computer programs places the chips on MCM's on the board.
(ii) In development is a placement system which will require that the designer merely partition the logic among MCM's. The selection of chips, assignment of logic to chips and placement of chips on MCM's on the board would be accomplished by computer programs. See Reference 5 which summarizes Dr. U. Kodres' work in this area.
- (iii) It may eventually be possible to have the partitioning of logic among MCM's be automated also, thus automating the entire partitioning and placement process. Mr. R. Goldberg is working on this partitioning algorithm. Also, Research has developed a program, ALMS, which may be applicable.

These three placement schemes are summarized in the flow charts in Figure 3.

\section*{FIG.3. POSSIBLE PLACEMENT TECHNIQUES:}


Formal Description of Logic Design/Placement: The output of the formal logic design and placement is a formal description of the design at this level. The language in which this description may be placed is the DRKS input language. DRKS is the design record keeping system which files the logic design and placement information.

An unfortunate aspect of the DRKS language is that it imposes a totally arbitrary level of partitioning on the design description: the ALD sheet (logic diagram sheet). The design is input to DRKS by drawing logic diagrams on sheets of a fixed size and then describing the drawing by statements in the DRKS language.

This partitioning onto sheets is usually too fine to correspond to any useful design partition. The designers' partition of the machine and even various functional entities within that partition will contain logic circuitry requiring many, many \(A L D\) sheets to describe. The language used to input DRKS is awkward to use, and describes the sheets rather than the logic directly. The statements of the language are usually formulated by someone other than the designer, who merely sketches the sheets.

It is strongly suggested that an alternative Logic Description Language (LDL) be developed and used so that the designer can more easily specify his togic design in a formal language. In this way the processing and understanding of the logic designs might be improved greatly. Dr. J. Cocke has proposed a tentative version of such a language. Dr. R. Love, Mr. P. Shivdasani and I are now working on completing the specification of this language.

An important reason for the use of sheets as the formal logic design description has been the traditional use of these sheets by CE's who maintain the hardware. As we shall see later in this memorandum (Section 6), the importance of the sheets may be reduced because their use by CE's can be minimized by using improved maintenance methods.

If the ALD sheet were needed, perhaps in some central maintenance facility, a form of ALD sheet could be generated by program from the design files formed from LDL input. Thus there is no real reason for requiring that the design be specified by sheets initially.

Another development which might really de-emphasize the importance of ALD's is the possible use of prototype sheets. This plan involves the use of a very limited total number of chip-types. Each chip would be described by a prototype sheet. There would thus be only a limited number of possible sheet types. These could be stored as macros in a file. A design would be described by program statements
indicating the interconnection of such chips. No actual sheet input would be necessary as the sheet would be implied by chip type. Thus the logic could easily be described by a simple form of LDL. Appropriate ALD sheets could be very easily generated by program on those rare occasịons when someone really needed to look at them.

Logic Simulation: When the logic design of a partition of the machine has been completed and formally described, it is very desirable to verify that the logic design correctly implements the architectural specification of the partition before going any further into the design automation and process automation phases. An error found at this stage will be much easier to correct than if found later on.

This verification of the logic design is performed using a logic simulation program. A partition of the design can be simulated on this program. Input signals are supplied at its interface and the logic simulator produces the output signals at the interface.

The major problem in this sort of logic simulation is the generation of test cases of interface input signals and expected output signals. The generation of a large enough set of such signals to moderately debug a partition of logic would be a very costly process if done manually. It would probably be possible to generate only a rather small number of such tests.

There is a solution to this problem. If the system level simulator and logic description of a partition are really different levels of description of the same entity, then they should behave the same at the partition interface. Thus it would be possible to run a program on the system level simulator and store all the I/O signals on a partition's interface while the program is running. Then these signals could be used to input and compare against the logic of the partition when it runs on the logic simulator. In this way many tests could be automatically generated. The tests would be consistent over the whole machine; if we debugged the logic of all partitions on a given program, then when we put all partitions together later, they might all function properly together when running that program.

This idea of using two levels of simulation to debug the logic design has been extensively studied and described in an earlier memorandum. See Reference 3.

Figures 4 and 5 graphically portray the idea of a Logic Simulation System (LSS) using two simulators: a system simulator which provides input/output signals for the partition which runs on a logic simulator.

\section*{FIG4. THE BASIC IDEA OF LSS:}

RPPIY SRME INPUT TO BOTH LEVELS OF SIMULATION. AND COMPARE OUTPUTS IF OUTPUTS ARE DIFFERENT THEN ERROR EXISTS IN LOGIC DESIGN.


\title{
FIG5. AUTOMATIC GENERATION OF SYSTEM LEVEL INPUT/OUTPUT, LOGIC SIMULATOR INPUT: SYSTEM LEVEL EESIGN IS IMBEDDED IN SYSTEM LEVEL SIMULATION OF ENTIRE MAEMINE. WHEN THIS SIMULATOR RUNS WF AUTOMATICAUY GENEAATE (AMS SAVE) THE I/O RT TME DESIEN INTEKFAEE. WE MAY LATER RPRLY THESE INPUTS TO THE LOGIC SIMILLATOA FOR THE SAME DESIGN ANE COMPARE THE LOGIC OUTPUTS WITH TME SYSTEM LEUEL OUTPUTS.
}


Suppose we now have a verified logic design along with physical placement information resident in the DRKS files. There is still a long way to go before the machine can actually be constructed. The remainder of the design process is completely automated, however.
The steps in the design automation process are as follows (greatly simplified):
(i) The records describing the logic design and placement for a board are selected from the DRKS files.
(ii) The nets on the board must now be wired. This involves determining the best path for wiring together the points of a net subject to the wiring rule constraints. For example, given that points A, B, C, D, E must be wired together we must decide whether to wire as in (a), (b) or some other way.
(a)

(b)

(iii) When the wiring has been calculated for the nets, we must assign the location of terminating rasistors for the nets.
(iv) Suppose we have wired A, B, C, D, E, F, G together as follows:
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We must now decide how to bond the wires on each pad of the net. In the above example, D would be bonded as follows:


The actual DA programming becomes somewhat involved because a situation may arise in the later stages of processing which cannot yield a solution, and this will have to be fed back to the earlier phases and a new pass made through the DA programs.

After the cesign automation is completed, we have in a "physical file" the complete physical specification of the boards of the machine.

At this point we have sufficient information to perform delay calculations to determine the circuit and wiring delays in various paths through the machine. Computer programs can be written to perform these calculations. Excessive delays will necessitate design changes.. This raises an interesting point: We have proposed four formal specification levels for the design. Thus, we can envision four levels of design simulation: system, logic, "A-C" logic including delays, and finally actual running hardware.

Unfortunately, the "A-C" logic simulation, including physical delays, is not really feasible for a machine of the size we are designing. Even the usual logic simulation must be partitioned, and the AC logic simulation includes much more detail. So all we can do at this level is delay calculations on paths through the hardware. It is of theoretical interest however to note that with sufficient machine power a simulation at the physical level could be performed and make this stage of the proposed process similar to the preceding stages in the use of simulation to verify the desion.

The phase in the design process which results in the production of actual hardware is the process automation phase. After appropriate reformatting, the information in the physical file describing a board is input to the process automation programs. These programs produce as output the tapes which drive the wiring machinery which actually constructs the boards of the computer.

Now, how can the boards (or MCM's) produced by the process automation be debugged? Even if the design at the system level and logic design level is error free, defects or errors may have been introduced in the manufacture or wiring of the circuitry.

It is possible to partially debug the hardware in an economical manner by using the two levels of simulators to generate test signals.

The signals could be generated as follows: The system simulator can produce input signals for the logic simulator while running a particular program. This would be done for the logic simulation. of the partition of the machine which contains the hardware to be tested (usually the hardware would be a small subset of a partition). All of the signals internal to the partition are generated during the logic simulation. Thus the signals at the interface of the hardware to be tested could be extracted, and filed, while running the logic simulator.

Of course this method of debugging is only partial. Not all possible input-output test patterns would be generated for the hardware. However, this is a very special form of partial debugging: the same program could be run on the system simulator to generate tests for all hardware components. Thus, although only partially debugged, the hardware will run that particular program when it is all put together.

The key point to note is that the partial debugging is uniform over the whole machine. Of course many programs could be run--the number depending on the economics of the situation. Diagnostic programs could be used for this hardware test generation. Then the machine, when constructed, would run the diagnostics to isolate residual hardware errors under normal maintenance procedures.

Note that if each piece of hardware were very thoroughly, but not completely, debugged with traditional methods, there would be no assurance that any program would run when the pieces were put. together.

Thus, the partial, but uniform, test generation could be a very economical method of quickly getting hardware to the point where it will run at least some programs when integrated into the whole machine.

This could serve as a basis for planning the bring-up of the machine.

\section*{MAINTENANCE}

The design process is not completed with the wiring and construction of the computer. A bring-up of the computer must be accomplished and the machine must be maintained. Bring-up may uncover design errors at any of the stages of design. In addition to the correction of hardware failures, maintenance will involve the installation of engineering changes. Thus, both of these activities involve cycling back through the design process and both are strongly tied into the network of simulation and automation programs used in the design process.

At this time the bring-up process has not been completely defined. However, a complete maintenance procedure has been defined by Dr. D. G. Keehn (See Reference 6). This plan will be briefly described here to indicate how it depends upon the simulation programs. Some leads to ways of planning bring-up might be uncovered in this maintenance plan. The scheme functions as follows:
(a) Diagnostic programs running on the ACS computer detect an error. The program causing the error is identified.
(b) The error producing diagnostic program is repeated on both the ACS computer and on the system architecture simulator running on a smaller diagnostic computer. The ACS computer's latches are logged out each cycle and compared to the latches of the simulator. The failing latch and cycle of failure are identified.
(c) A traceback program is run on the diagnostic computer, operating on the logic files, to find all latches which could set/reset the failing latch in one cycle. This is the latch tree of the failing latch.
(d) All scopeable points in the logic of the selected latch tree are found from the design files and output by another program running on the diagnostic computer.
(e) The logic of the latch tree is extracted from the design files. A logic simulation of the latch tree is performed for the cycles of interest: the cycle preceding failure and the failing cycle. The scopeable point values are output for these cycles.
(f) A technician can now scope the ACS machine at the appropriate points and compare the values with the above values for the cycles of interest. This will isolate the point of error.
(g) The technician then decides what unit of hardware to pull and replace in order to correct the failure.

There are some very interesting operational characteristics in this maintenance plan:
(i) The diagnostic computer can be physically distant from the ACS machine being repaired with communication between the two locations handled by teleproce ssing. Thus, one central diagnostic computer and maintenance system could maintain several ACS machines in the field.
(ii) The person repairing the machine in the field need not be a \(\cdot C E\) in the usual sense. He could be a technician instead, for no knowledge of the functioning of computer logic would be required to perform repair work.
(iii) Because of (ii), it is clear that the distribution of ALD sheets to many CE's in the field would not be necessary. The significance of these sheets is thus greatly reduced.

This particular maintenance plan has significant advantages over previous plans. These advantages are bought at a price: dependence on the existence of accurate system architecture and logic simulators.

\section*{CONCLUSIONS}

We have now covered all the phases of the design process in some detail. For the sake of simplicity and brevity, the presentation has treated these phases as separate activities which follow each other in a serial manner.

The actual design situation is obviously far more complex and requires careful planning, scheduling and management of human and machine resources. There are three factors in the process (not fully developed in this initial memorandum) which lead to this additional complexity:
(i) Design phases do not follow serially, but overlap in time. For example, the tentative logic design may be proceeding while the formal system specification is still in process.
(ii) There is a relative independence of the design of different - partitions. We might be far along in the design process on one partition of the machine, but only experimenting at the system level with another partition.
(iii) There is consistent feedback (as indicated in Figure 2) from later phases of design to earlier phases. Very often the design at a given phase cannot be feasibly or economically implemented at a later stage and must be modified.

Therefore this basic plan for the design process must be made considerably more detailed and account for these additional complexities before it is really a working plan for the process.

This elaboration of the plan will have to await the feedback produced by this memorandum.

In conclusion, it is felt that the suggestions proposed in this memorandum, especially the fundamental uses of the system simulation program, can lead to a workable system plan for the whole computer design process if they are properly elaborated and detailed.

A key factor in reaching this conclusion is the existence of practical experience within ACS in the separate phases of the plan.

It is hoped that this memorandum will stimulate discussion and new ideas on this subject. Your comments and criticisms concerning the various suggestions made herein are welcomed by the author.```
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