

Meeting with Leinwell, on Performance March 23, '58

Block Dines Wallenchi  
McSorley Blasen Kalchay  
Foss Block Cottle

New Rolling Frame

Sigma AV: - understood - can't make gods with tools we have today.  
- but we can't give up here.

U. of Ill. propose faster speeds. - probably possible.

Standard Plug-unit - frame

however IBM cannot put out AV a factor of 2 or 3 below others.  
will depart from S.C. if necessary. ~~one way or another~~ circuits  
will appear - org. machine so

(Block) Basic-Sigma Interactions

- have defined LA interaction with I bot. - some timing has not.  
instr. preparation now limited to 0.9  $\mu$ s rate. - any improvement is  
expensive. Basic with core storage Tentative 0.8 cycle 0.4 fetch.  
- several things in parallel, use 0.3 transfers 0.6 for add  
stand to improve, clocked to cores.

If index mem were faster - Transfer  $\theta$  is 0.3 anyway.

might gain 0.1 in instr. prep. rate. - would reorganize design to clock  
at 0.3.

(Steve) Core array could run faster -  
0.3 is max prep rate. may need feed - etc to pull down  
simultaneous fetch & store a possibility.

(Blau) rate can be varied.

(Kolosky) Two types of I instr.

- (1) Steady indexing rate readout time & min offset
- (2) Inv., C+Br. type total cycle.

suggest: multiple accumulators.

- going back to full words.

(Dirac) what are cost figures of putting in

(Gammel) one will lose .3 + .9 us in going to another plane to H.S. reg.  
instead of core mem next to unit.

need mem right in A.U.

- capacity 16 to 286.

cryogenic A.U. - or mem speed disappears.

(Moch) 3 in 1 concept. How would it have to be redesigned?

(1) indexing op. could be broken up & fed to L.A.  
fetch & store separately.

(Lock) an instr. mem tied directly to I&O.  
high speed =

- don't allow instr. storage except by transmit op.  
cut down compars - etc,

(1) fast writing  
(2) initial setup  
Time limit.

(Gammel) assume ~~as~~ core index, connected to I&O only built in direct bus  
to get 0.6 rate, half mem. rate 0.5 us

also assume an extra core mem based to A/U.  
is this all the needs?

Index Core 16 — now in.  
Data Storage ~~1024 words~~ 2048  
Int. Data 64 — exclude instrs.  
general Data 16384

lose homogeneity of mem. complicates Fortran, etc.

Inst. buffer req. — not necessarily in. — needs to be evaluated,  
question of buffer as Sigma only  
— code not an exact mirror of machine —

- (cont) (1) Bus Time  
(2) Indx Time  
(3) AV Time.  
(4) shaking

- changes (1) more complex logic  
with less (2) slower circ. speeds.  
reduced speed (3) slower mem.

are restrictions too severe on sped mems?  
— we should evaluate how much this loses gain?

- (d) can we build core array directly into I box?  
— is already done.

can look-ahead improve jump situation

- (e) propose we have Branch  $\leftarrow$  I Br F will be taken  
→ need Indx  $\leq 0$  and +  $\leftarrow$  I Br N will not be taken  
will look into --

- 4 -

question of Ibox indicators is Br. or, off - exception  
also or only an AV?

→. Ibox ~~all~~ should do the testing branch indicators,

looks like what about H,L,E on floating compares? also need HE, LE?

Intermediate data results

- would have to be part of lookahead

→ [one should try case where intermediate storage is in main mem.  
indices in core.

1. Purpose
2. Rolling frame
3. Sigma AV — separate path
4. Block: Basic-Sigma interaction are fairly well laid out except for some timing instr. prep rate  $0.9 \mu\text{s}$  any improvement appears to be ~~of~~  $0.3 \mu\text{s}$ .  
 $0.4 \sim 0.8 \sim$  transfer  $0.3 \mu\text{s}$  add ab  
 all uses core — several ops in parallel, clocked to core cycles.  
 going faster than  $0.3 \mu\text{s}$  not worth while as long as that is  $0.3 \mu\text{s}$   
 $0.3 \mu\text{s}$  is max prep rate with present circuit speeds; regen cycle  
 is covered by add.  
 Store from LA dictat ~~of~~ indexing rate seriously.
5. Kolsky: Two types of I Box instr.
  - (1) steady indexing rate: read-out time is important no.
  - (2) different or C + Br type total cycle is imp.  
 store from LA still does here.

### Suggestions

1. To avoid mem. refs to indices — multiple accumulators — advantage  
 disadvantage
2. another core array — lose memory locality — lookups  
 sim shows ~~of~~ 5% effect
3. ~~large~~ buffer reg, not ~~all~~ ~~all~~ needs as yet.
4. I Box should test branch ind.
5. Possibility of breaking off + on — need more indicators — lookups,  
 must not make any part instructionally slow — may have branchless later
6. read-out time of ~~mem~~ with data mem.