### **Cooperative Execution on Heterogeneous Multi-core Systems**

**Leonel Sousa** and Aleksandar Ili ć**INESC-ID/IST TU Lisbon ID/IST,** 







### COMMODITY COMPUTERS = HETEROGENEOUS SYSTEMS

- Multi-core General-Purpose Processors (CPUS)
- Many-core Graphic Processing Units (GPUS)
- …
- Special accelerators, co-processors, FPGAS
- => HUGE COMPUTING POWER
- Not yet completely explored for **COLLABORATIVE COMPUTING**

#### HETEROGENEITY MAKES PROBLEMS MUCH MORE COMPLEX!

- Performance modeling and load balancing
- Different programming models and languages





### COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR HETEROGENEOUS **COMPUTERS**

### PERFORMANCE MODELING AND LOAD BALANCING

- State of the art for heterogeneous systems
- for CPU+GPU

CASE STUDY: 2D BATCH FAST FOURIER TRANSFORM

### CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK



# **Desktop Heterogeneous Systems**<br> **Expansive Property**

#### **MASTER -SLAVE** paradigm

- $\bullet$  CPU (Master)
	- $-$  Global execution controller
	- Access the whole global memory
- •• INTERCONNECTION BUSSES
	- Limited and asymmetric communication bandwidth
	- Potential execution bottleneck
- •UNDERLYING DEVICES (Slaves)
	- Different architectures and programming models
	- Computation performed using local memories



**technology**

from seed



# **Redefining Tasks and Primitive Jobs**



#### **TASK** – basic programming unit (coarser-grained)

- $-$  Configuration Parameters
	- Task: application and task dependency information
	- – $-$  Environment: device type, number of devices...
- Primitive Job Wrapper
	- $-$  DIVISIBLE TASK comprise several finer-grained Primitive Jobs
	- $\,$  <code>AGGLOMERATIVE</code> <code>TASK</code>  $-$  allows grouping of Primitive Jobs

#### **PRIMITIVE JOB** – minimal program portion for parallel execution

- CONFIGURATION PARAMETERS
	- $\blacksquare$  I/O and performance specifics, …
- CARRIESPER-DEVICE-TYPE IMPLEMENTATIONS
	- Vendor-specific programming models and tools
	- $-$  Specific optimization techniques

**SUPERIOR** TÉCNICO

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa



**technology**

from seed



### **Collaborative Execution Environment Collaborative Execution Environment for Heterogeneous Systems\***





#### Task Level Parallelism

– TASK SCHEDULER submits independent tasks to JOB DISPATCHER in respect to task and environment configuration parameters and current platform state from DEVICE QUERY structure

an inescid<br>Itsboa

#### Data Level Parallelism

- Primitive Jobs may be arranged into Job Queues (currently, 1D-3D grid organization) for DIVISIBLE (AGGLOMERATIVE) TASKS
- JOB DISPATCHER USES DEVICE QUERY and JOB QUEUE information to map (agglomerated) PRIMITIVE JOBS to the requested devices; then initiates and controls further execution;

– If provided, JOB DISPATCHER can be configured to perceive certain number of cores of a multi-core device as a single device



*Workshop on Advances in Parallel and Distributed Computational Models (APDCM/IPDPS 2010), April 2010.* \**Aleksandar Ilic and Leonel Sousa. "Collaborative Execution Environment for Heterogeneous Parallel Systems", In 12th* 

### **Collaborative Execution Environment Collaborative Execution Environment for Heterogeneous Systems\***





Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

SUPERIOR TÉCNICO



### CONSTANT PERFORMANCE MODELS (CPM)

- DEVICE PERFORMANCE (SPEED) : constant positive number
	- Typically represents relative speed when executing a serial benchmark of a given size
- COMPUTATION DISTRIBUTION: proportional to the speed of device

### FUNCTIONAL PERFORMANCE MODELS (FPM)

- DEVICE PERFORMANCE (SPEED) : continuous function of the problem size
	- Typically require several benchmark runs and significant amount of time for building it
- Сомритатюм Dısт<code>R</code>ı<code>BUT</code>io<code>n</code> : relies on the "functional speed" of the processor

### FPM VS. CPM

- MORE REALISTIC : integrates features of heterogeneous processor
	- Processor heterogeneity, the heterogeneity of memory structure, and the other effects (such as paging)
- MORE ACCURATE DISTRIBUTION of computation across heterogeneous devices
- –APPLICATION-CENTRIC approach characterize speed for different applications with different functions





 ${\sf Part~of~a}$  PARALLEL  ${\sf 3D}$   ${\sf FFT}$  procedure :  ${\tt H}$  =  $\it{FFT}_{1D}$  ( $\it{FFT}_{2D}$  ( ${\tt h})$  )

– Very HIGH COMMUNICATION-TO-COMPUTATION ratio

PROBLEM DEFINITION

 $-$  N<sub>in</sub> = N<sub>out</sub> = N<sub>1</sub>N<sub>2</sub>N<sub>3</sub>  $\star$  sizeof(data)

- $-$  Performance [FLOPS] :  $\text{N}_1\text{N}_2\text{N}_3$   $\star$   $\text{ log (N}_1\text{N}_2\text{N}_3)$
- $-$  N $_{2}$  = const; N $_{3}$  = const;
- $\text{N}_1$  total number of computational chunks (P<code>RIMITIVE</code> JOBS)







6/2/2010







Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa *101, 25/9/2009, 2010.*\**Lastovetsky, A., and R. Reddy, "Distributed Data Partitioning for Heterogeneous Processors Based on Partial Estimation of their Functional Performance Models", HeteroPar 2009, Netherlands, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6043, Springer, pp. 91-*



ļſ **INSTITUTO** SUPERIOR TÉCNICO

6/2/2010

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa *101, 25/9/2009, 2010.*

*Functional Performance Models", HeteroPar 2009, Netherlands, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 6043, Springer, pp. 91-*



International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications, vol. 21, issue 1: Sage, pp. 76-90, 2007 \*\**Lastovetsky, A., and R. Reddy, "Data Partitioning with a Functional Performance Model of Heterogeneous Processors",* 

Jf

**INSTITUTO SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO



International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications, vol. 21, issue 1: Sage, pp. 76-90, 2007 \*\**Lastovetsky, A., and R. Reddy, "Data Partitioning with a Functional Performance Model of Heterogeneous Processors",* 

ļſ

**SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO



International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications, vol. 21, issue 1: Sage, pp. 76-90, 2007 \*\**Lastovetsky, A., and R. Reddy, "Data Partitioning with a Functional Performance Model of Heterogeneous Processors",* 

lſ

**SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO



Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

INSTITUTO **SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO



Jf **INSTITUTO SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO

Larer Willim T2000, opinigor, pp. 0111, 2000.<br>[2] Lastovetsky, A., and R. Reddy, "Distributed Data Partitioning for Heterogeneous Processors Based on Partial Estimation of [1] *Galindo I., Almeida F., and Badía-Contelles J.M., "Dynamic Load Balancing on Dedicated Heterogeneous Systems", In EuroPVM/MPI 2008, Springer, pp. 64-74, 2008.*

6/2/20103rd ''Scheduling in Aussois'' Workshop **17** *their Functional Performance Models", HeteroPar 2009, vol. 6043, Springer, pp. 91-101, 25/9/2009, 2010*



**technology** from seed

### ONLINE PERFORMANCE MODELING

- PERFORMANCE ESTIMATION of all heterogeneous devices DURING THE EXECUTION
	- No prior knowledge on the performance of an application is available on any of the devices
	- Modeling of the overall CPU and GPU performance for different problem sizes (+ kernel-only GPU performance)

### DYNAMIC LOAD BALANCING

- OPTIMAL DISTRIBUTION OF COMPUTATIONS (PRIMITIVE JOBS)
	- Partial estimations of the performance should be built and used to decide on optimal mapping
	- Returned solution should provide load balancing within a given accuracy

### **COMMUNICATION AWARENESS**

- $-$  MODELING THE BANDWIDTH for interconnection busses DURING THE EXECUTION
	- To select problem sizes that maximize the interconnection bandwidth
	- The algorithm should be aware of asymmetric bandwidth for Host-To-Device and Device-To-Host transfers

#### CPU+GPU ARCHITECTURAL SPECIFICS

- Make use of ENVIRONMENT-SPECIFIC FUNCTIONS to ease performance modeling
	- Asynchronous transfers and CUDA streams to overlap communication with computation
	- Be aware of diverse capabilities of different devices, but also for devices of the same type (e.g. GT200 vs. Fermi)



### **Case Study:**  $\overline{\phantom{a} \phantom{a} \phantom{a}}$  **Case Study:**  $\overline{\phantom{a} \phantom{a} \phantom{a}}$  **Case Study: Building Full Performance Models**



FULL PERFORMANCE MODELS:

### PER-DEVICE REAL **PERFORMANCE**

- Experimentally obtained using CPU+ GPU platform specifics (*Pageable/Pinned Memory*)
- Exhaustive search on the full range of problem sizes
- High cost of building it !!!



#### 

#### Load (Nin = Nout)

-CPU (1 Core) - GPU (Pageable) - GPU (Pinned)



Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa



**INSTITUTO SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO

700

600

500

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (1)**

and **inescid**<br>Itsboa



#### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (2)** and **inescid**<br>Itsboa Performance Metric**Initialization** Approximation **Iffer Iteration**  $\textcircled{1}$  All the <code>P</code> computational units execute  $\text{N}_1/\text{p}$ 700 2D FFT Batches **in parallel**  $n_i = N_1/p$ , 1≤i≤p 600 ② IF (device is GPU) AND (task is Divisible 500 and Agglomerative) THEN go to 3 ELSE go to 4 400 **MFLOPS** ③ Split given computational load into streams 300 and use asynchronous transfers to overlap communication with computation 200 100  $\theta$ H P B B B H F B B B B B F P B 59959999988888888 **ដ ឯ** 33 29 兕 - 33 55 CPU (1 Core) - GPU (Pageable) - GPU (Pinned)



6/2/2010

#### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (3) and inescid**<br>Hisboa Performance Metric**Initialization**  $Approximation$   $\Box$ **Streaming**

- $-$  S∪в<code>DIVIDE</code>  $\rm n_i$  computational chunks using DIV2 <code>STRATEGY</code>
	- No prior knowledge on the performance of an application!
	- The next stream has half the load of a previous stream
	- Algorithm may continue splitting the workload until the last stream is assigned with load equal to 1
- –BANDWIDTH-AWARE DIV2 STRATEGY
	- Interconnection bandwidth is a subject to the amount of data that should be transferred and not to the application-specific demands
	- Run small pre-calibration tests for HOST-T O-DEVICE AND DEVICE-TO-HOST transfers
	- Tests can be stopped when saturation points are detected, or when transfers reach desired value (e.g. 60% of its theoretical)
	- $\,$  CASE STUDY:  $\,$ n $^{\text{min\_size}} \,$  = 4  $\,$



1  $\,$  All the  $\rm P$  computational units execute  $\rm N_1/p$ 2D FFT Batches **in parallel**

 $n_i = N_1/p$ , 1≤i≤p

- 2 IF (device is GPU) AND (task is Divisible and Agglomerative) THEN go to 3 ELSE go to 4
- ③ Split given computational load into streams and use asynchronous transfers to overlap communication with computation



# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (4)**

<sup>≫</sup>\ inescid<br>|tsboa



Ifi INSTITUTO<br>SUPERIOR<br>TÈCNICO

6/2/2010



Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

INSTITUTO **SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO

#### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (6)** <sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa Performance MetricApproximation **I**<sub>2</sub> Initialization1 Traditional approach: **Performance** of each 700 device is **model**ed as a **constant**Perf $_{\mathrm{i}}$ (x) = Perf $_{\mathrm{i}}$ (N $_{\mathrm{1}}$ /p), 1≤i≤p 600 ② GPU-specific Modeling: Using the obtained 500 values from streaming execution – *HostToDevice* Bandwidth 400 **MFLOPS** 300 HostToDevice Bandwidth [MB/s] 2585 2580 200 2575 2570 2565 100 2560 2555  $\theta$ 2550  $-$ 55533333533 16  $32$ 64 128 -CPU (1 Core) GPU (Pageable) -+CPU Model (1 Core) -+GPU Model (Streamed) GPU(Pinned)



6/2/2010

#### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (7)** <sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa Performance MetricApproximation **I**<sub>2</sub> Initialization1 Traditional approach: **Performance** of each 700 device is **model**ed as a **constant**Perf $_{\mathrm{i}}$ (x) = Perf $_{\mathrm{i}}$ (N $_{\mathrm{1}}$ /p), 1≤i≤p 600 ② GPU-specific Modeling: Using the obtained 500 values from streaming execution – *HostToDevice* Bandwidth 400 **MFLOPS**  *DeviceToHost* Bandwidth–300 HostToDevice Bandwidth [MB/s] 2585 2580 200 2575 **DeviceToHost Bandwidth [MB/s]** 2570 2565 3210 100 2560 3200 2555 3190  $\theta$ 2550 3180  $-$ 16  $\overline{3}$ 3170 3160 -CPU (1 Core) GPU (Pageable) GPU(Pinned) 3150 3140  $\overline{A}$  $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$ 16  $32$ 64 128 Ilfi Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa INSTITUTO **SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO 3rd ''Scheduling in Aussois'' Workshop **26**6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (8)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa



6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (9)**

and **inescid**<br>Itsboa



6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (10)**





# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (11)**

<sup>≫</sup>\ inescid<br>¦tsboa





Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (12)**

**Initialization** 

1 Draw Upper U and Lower L lines through the following points:  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(N_1/p, max_i {Perf_i(N_1/p)} )$ 

Approximation **Iteration** 

and **inescid**<br>Itsboa

 $(0, 0)$ ,  $(N_1/p, min_1$ {Perf<sub>i</sub> $(N_1/p)$ })

2 Let  $x_i^{(0)}$  and  $x_i^{(L)}$  be the intersections with Perf<sub>i</sub> $(x)$ IF exists  $\mathrm{x_i}$ (L)− $\mathrm{x_i}$ (U)≥1 THEN go to 3

- ELSE go to 5
- 3 Bisect the angle between  $\mathbb U$  and  $\mathbb L$  by the line  $\mathbb M,$  and calculate intersections  $\boldsymbol{\mathrm{x_i}}$   $\text{M}$
- 4 IF  $\Sigma_\texttt{i}$   $\text{x}_\texttt{i}$  (M)  $\leq$   $\text{N}_\texttt{1}$ THEN U=M ELSE L=M REPEAT 2
- ⑤ Employ **streaming strategy** on the calculated workload value



Performance Metric

D. ₩ 앜

700

600

500

400

300

200

100

 $\Omega$ 

CPU (1 Core)

**MFLOPS** 

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

[Streamed Values]

೫ ನ

품 S. . S

22  $\overline{z}$ 

GPU (Pageable) - GPU(Pinned) - CPU Model (1 Core) - △ GPU Model

8855886558

GPU Model (Streamed)

#### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (13) and inescid**<br>Hisboa Performance MetricApproximation  $\Box$  Iteration Initialization

- –STREAMING STRATEGY
	- Results obtained using DIV2 STRATEGY consider application characterization (e.g. communication-to-computation ratio)
	- Workload size for the next stream should be chosen in order to OVERLAP TRANSFERS WITH COMPUTATION in the previous stream
- –BANDWIDTH-AWARE STREAMING STRATEGY
	- $\,$  Reuses the MINIMAL WORKLOAD SIZE FROM DIV $2$  STRATEGY (obtained via HOST-T O-DEVICE and DEVICE-T O-HOST tests)
		- F  $(n^{curr} \ge n^{min\_size})$  3 Bisect the angle between U and L by the  $\textsf{IF}\>$  (n<sup>curr</sup> > n<sup>min\_size</sup>) THEN use strategy (cont. overlapping) **ELSE** restart strategy on n<sup>curr</sup> load
	- $-$  In case that load drops under  $n^{\min}\text{--size}$ , strategy is restarted on remaining load entity of the control of th
- 1 Draw Upper U and Lower L lines through the following points:
	- $(0, 0)$ ,  $(N_1/p, max_1 \{Perf_1(N_1/p)\})$

**Streaming** 

- $(0, 0)$ ,  $(N_1/p, min_1\{Perf_1(N_1/p)\})$
- 2 Let  $x_i^{(0)}$  and  $x_i^{(L)}$  be the intersections with Perf<sub>i</sub> $(x)$ IF exists  $\mathrm{x_i}$ (L)− $\mathrm{x_i}$ (U)≥1 THEN go to 3 ELSE go to 5
- line  $\mathbb M,$  and calculate intersections  $\boldsymbol{\mathrm{x_i}}$   $\text{M}$
- 4 IF  $\Sigma_\texttt{i}$   $\text{x}_\texttt{i}$  (M)  $\leq$   $\text{N}_\texttt{1}$ THEN U=M  $FI$  SF  $I=M$ REPEAT 2
- ⑤ Employ **streaming strategy** on the calculated workload value





6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (15)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>¦tsboa





### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (16)**

and **inescid**<br>Itsboa



Ilfi **INSTITUTO SUPERIOR**<br>TÉCNICO

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

6/2/2010

### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (17)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa

![](_page_35_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_3.jpeg)

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

6/2/2010

### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (18)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (19)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_3.jpeg)

## **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (20)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa

![](_page_38_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_3.jpeg)

## **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (21)**

<sup>≫</sup>inescid<br>Itsboa

![](_page_39_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_3.jpeg)

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

6/2/2010

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (22)**

<sup>≫</sup>\ inescid<br>|tsboa

![](_page_40_Picture_186.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_3.jpeg)

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (23)**

![](_page_41_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_3.jpeg)

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Figure 10 and Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (24)**

![](_page_42_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_3.jpeg)

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (25)**

<sup>≫</sup>\ inescid<br>|tsboa

![](_page_43_Picture_135.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_3.jpeg)

# **Case Study: Performance Modeling Case Study: Performance Modeling in CPU + GPU Environment (26)**

<sup>≫</sup>\ inescid<br>|tsboa

![](_page_44_Picture_135.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_1.jpeg)

COLLABORATIVE ENVIRONMENT FOR HETEROGENEOUS COMPUTERS

### TRADITIONAL APPROACHES FOR PERFORMANCE MODELING

- Approximate the performance using number of points equal to the number of iterations
- In this case, **3 POINTS** per each device

### PRESENTED APPROACH FOR PERFORMANCE MODELING

- Models the performance using **MORE THAN 30 POINTS**, in this case
- **COMMUNICATION-AWARE** schedules in respect to limited and asymmetric interconnection bandwidth
- Employs **S**TREAMING STRATEGIES to overlap communication with computation across devices
- **BUILDS SEVERAL** PER-DEVICE **MODELS** AT THE SAME TIME
	- $-$  Overall Performance for each device + STREAMING GPU PERFORMANCE
	- $-$  HosтToDevice Bandwidth Modeling
	- DEvicEToHosт Bandwidтн Modeling
	- GPU KERNEL PERFORMANCE Modeling

![](_page_45_Picture_15.jpeg)

Instituto de Engenharia de Sistemas e Computadores Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Lisboa

**technology**

from seed

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)