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Multicores for Performance and Low Power

Power consumption is one of the biggest problems for performance scaling from smartphones to cloud servers and supercomputers (“K” more than 10MW).

Power $\propto$ Frequency $\times$ Voltage$^2$

(Voltage $\propto$ Frequency)

Power $\propto$ Frequency$^3$

If Frequency is reduced to $1/4$ (Ex. 4GHz $\rightarrow$ 1GHz),

Power is reduced to $1/64$ and

Performance falls down to $1/4$.

<Multicores>

If 8 cores are integrated on a chip,

Power is still $1/8$ and

Performance becomes 2 times.
8 Core RP2 Chip Block Diagram

- **Cluster #0**
  - Core #0
  - Core #1
  - Core #2
  - Core #3

- **Cluster #1**
  - Core #4
  - Core #5
  - Core #6
  - Core #7

**Notable Components**
- LCPG: Local clock pulse generator
- PCR: Power Control Register
- CCN/BAR: Cache controller/Barrier Register
- URAM: User RAM (Distributed Shared Memory)
- On-chip system bus (SuperHyway)
- DDR2 control
- SRAM control
- DMA control
- Snoop controller 0
- Snoop controller 1
- Barrier Sync. Lines

**Additional Details**
- Core #0 to Core #7 have specific memory configurations and processors.
With 128 cores, OSCAR compiler gave us 100 times speedup against 1 core execution and 211 times speedup against 1 core using Sun (Oracle) Studio compiler.
OSCAR Parallelizing Compiler

To improve **effective performance, cost-performance and software productivity and reduce power**

**Multigrain Parallelization**
- coarse-grain parallelism among loops and subroutines, near fine grain parallelism among statements in addition to loop parallelism

**Data Localization**
- Automatic data management for distributed shared memory, cache and local memory

**Data Transfer Overlapping**
- Data transfer overlapping using Data Transfer Controllers (DMAs)

**Power Reduction**
- Reduction of consumed power by compiler control DVFS and Power gating with hardware supports.
Generation of Coarse Grain Tasks

- **Macro-tasks (MTs)**
  - Block of Pseudo Assignments (BPA): Basic Block (BB)
  - Repetition Block (RB): natural loop
  - Subroutine Block (SB): subroutine
Earliest Executable Condition Analysis for Coarse Grain Tasks (Macro-tasks)

A Macro Flow Graph

A Macro Task Graph
PRIORITY DETERMINATION IN DYNAMIC CP METHOD

Critical path length: $0.80 \times 60 + 0.20 \times 100 = 68$
# Earliest Executable Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macrotask No.</th>
<th>Earliest Executable Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 OR (1)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4)5 AND [24 OR (1)3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3 OR (2)4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 OR (4)6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2)4 OR (1)3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(8)9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8)10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>89 OR 810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1112 AND [9 OR (8)10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1113 OR 1112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(8)9 OR (8)10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Automatic processor assignment in 103.su2cor

- Using 14 processors

Coarse grain parallelization within DO400

$N_{PG}, N_{PE} = [PG, PE]$
MTG of Su2cor-LOOPS-DO400

- Coarse grain parallelism PARA_ALD = 4.3
Data-Localization: Loop Aligned Decomposition

- Decompose multiple loop (Doall and Seq) into **CARs** and **LRs** considering inter-loop data dependence.
  - Most data in **LR** can be passed through LM.
  - **LR**: Localizable Region, **CAR**: Commonly Accessed Region

```
DO I=1,33
A(I)=2*I
ENDDO

DO I=1,101
A(I)=2*I
ENDDO

DO I=1,100
B(I)=B(I-1)+A(I)+A(I+1)
ENDDO

DO I=2,100
C(I)=B(I)+B(I-1)
ENDDO
```
Data Localization

MTG

MTG after Division

A schedule for two processors
Inter-loop data dependence analysis in TLG

• Define exit-RB in TLG as Standard-Loop
• Find iterations on which a iteration of Standard-Loop is data dependent
  – e.g. \( K_{th}\) of RB3 is data-dep on \( K-1_{th}, K_{th}\) of RB2, on \( K-1_{th}, K_{th}, K+1_{th}\) of RB1

Example of TLG

C RB1(Doall)
DO I=1,101
  A(I)=2*I
ENDDO

C RB2(Doseq)
DO I=1,100
  B(I)=B(I-1)+A(I)+A(I+1)
ENDDO

C RB3(Doall)
DO I=2,100
  C(I)=B(I)+B(I-1)
ENDDO
Target Loop Group Creation and Inter-Loop Dependence Analysis

- **Target Loop Groups**
  - grouped loops that access the same array
  - baseline loop chosen for each group
    - the largest estimated time loop

- **Inter-Loop Dependency Analysis**
  - data dependencies between loops within the TLGs
  - detects relevant iterations of those loops that have dependence with the iterations of the baseline loop

```fortran
DO I=1,100
  B(I)=B(I-1)+A(I)+A(I+1)
ENDDO

DO I=1,101
  A(I)=2*I
ENDDO

DO I=2,100
  C(I)=B(I)*B(I-1)
ENDDO
```

Inter-Loop dependence
Decomposition of RBs in TLG

- Decompose GCIR into $\text{DGCIR}^p (1 \leq p \leq n)$
  - $n$: (multiple) number of PCs, $\text{DGCIR}$: Decomposed GCIR
- Generate CAR on which $\text{DGCIR}^p$ & $\text{DGCIR}^{p+1}$ are data-dep.
- Generate LR on which $\text{DGCIR}^p$ is data-dep.
Automatic Parallelization of Still Image Encoding Using JPEG-XR for the Next Generation Cameras and Drinkable Inner Camera

TILEPro64

Speed-ups on TILEPro64 Manycore

55 times speedup with 64 cores against 1 core
Speedups of MATLAB/Simulink Image Processing on Various 4core Multicores

(Intel Xeon, ARM Cortex A15 and Renesas SH4A)

Road Tracking, Image Compression : [http://www.mathworks.co.jp/jp/help/vision/examples](http://www.mathworks.co.jp/jp/help/vision/examples)
Parallel Processing of Face Detection on Manycore, Highend and PC Server

OSCAR compiler gives us 11.55 times speedup for 16 cores against 1 core on SR16000 Power7 highend server.
Data Localization: Loop Aligned Decomposition

- Decomposed loop into LRs and CARs
  - LR (Localizable Region): Data can be passed through LDM
  - CAR (Commonly Accessed Region): Data transfers are required among processors

Single dimension Decomposition

Multi-dimension Decomposition
Adjustable Blocks

- Handling a suitable block size for each application
  - different from a fixed block size in cache
  - each block can be divided into smaller blocks with integer divisible size to handle small arrays and scalars

![Diagram of block levels](image-url)
Multi-dimensional Template Arrays for Improving Readability

- a mapping technique for arrays with varying dimensions
  - each block on LDM corresponds to multiple empty arrays with varying dimensions
  - these arrays have an additional dimension to store the corresponding block number
    - TA[Block#][] for single dimension
    - TA[Block#][][] for double dimension
    - TA[Block#][][] for triple dimension
    - ...
- LDM are represented as a one dimensional array
  - without Template Arrays, multi-dimensional arrays have complex index calculations
    - A[i][j][k] -> TA[offset + i’ * L + j’ * M + k’]
  - Template Arrays provide readability
    - A[i][j][k] -> TA[Block#][i’][j’][k’]
Block Replacement Policy

- Compiler Control Memory block Replacement
  - using live, dead and reuse information of each variable from the scheduled result
  - different from LRU in cache that does not use data dependence information

- Block Eviction Priority Policy
  1. (Dead) Variables that will not be accessed later in the program
  2. Variables that are accessed only by other processor cores
  3. Variables that will be later accessed by the current processor core
  4. Variables that will immediately be accessed by the current processor core
Code Compaction by Strip Mining

- Previous approach produces duplicate code
  - generates multiple copies of the loop body which leads to code bloat
- Proposed method adopts code compaction
  - based on strip mining
  - multi-dimensional loop can be restructured

Diagram:

```
for (i = 0; i < 16; i++)
    for (j = 0; j < 64; j++)
        a[i][j] = i + j;
```

```
for (i = 0; i < 15; i++)
    for (j = 0; j < 63; j++)
        b[i][j] = a[i][j] + a[i+1][j+1];
```

```
for (ii = 0; ii < 15; ii+=8)
    for (jj = 0; jj < 63; jj+=32)
        for (i = ii; i < min(15,ii+8+1); i++)
            for (j = jj; j < min(63,jj+32+1); j++)
                a[i][j] = i + j;
    for (i = ii; i < min(15,ii+8); i++)
        for (j = jj; j < min(63,jj+32); j++)
            b[i][j] = a[i][j] + a[i+1][j+1];
```
Evaluation Environment

- Implemented on the OSCAR compiler

- Tested on RP2
  - SH4A with 600MHz processor based
  - 8 core homogeneous multicore processor
  - each processor core has 16KB LDM with a 1 clock cycle latency
  - equipped with 128MB DDR2 off-chip CSM (Central Shared Memory) with a 55 clock cycle latency

Architecture of the RP2 Multicore Pro
Applications for Evaluation

- Sequential C Applications
  - Example code in explanation of code compaction
  - AACenc (provided by Renesas Technology)
    - AAC encoder, input: a 30 second audio file
  - Mpeg2enc (part of the MediaBench benchmark suite)
    - MPEG2 encoder, input: a 30 frame video with a resolution of 352 by 256 pixels
  - SPEC95 Tomcatv
    - loop fusion and variable renaming were applied
  - SPEC95 Swim
    - loop distribution and loop peeling were performed
Speedups by the Proposed Local Memory Management Compared with Utilizing Shared Memory on Benchmarks Application using RP2

20.12 times speedup for 8cores execution using local memory against sequential execution using off-chip shared memory of RP2 for the AACenc
Conclusions

- This talk introduced automatic cache and local memory management method using data localization with hierarchical loop aligned decomposition, adjustable block tailored for each application, and block replace considering block reuse distance.
- The local memory management method was implemented on the OSCAR parallelization compiler.
- The performance on the RP2 8 core multicore gave us
  - for example,
    - 20.12 times speedup on 8cores using local memory against sequential execution using off-chip shared memory for the AAC encoder though the 8 core execution using shared memory gave us 7.14 times speedup.
    - 11.30 times speedup on 8cores execution using local memory against sequential execution using off-chip shared memory for the SPEC95 swim though the 8 core execution using shared memory gave us 7.40 times speedup.