

Performance-oriented programming on multicore-based systems, with a focus on the Cray XE6/XC30

Georg Hager^(a), Jan Treibig^(a), and Gerhard Wellein^(a,b)

^(a)HPC Services, Erlangen Regional Computing Center (RRZE)

^(b)Department for Computer Science
Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg

Cray XE6 optimization workshop, October 28-31, 2013, HLRS




**There is no alternative to knowing what is going on
between your code and the hardware**

**Without performance modeling,
optimizing code is like stumbling in the dark**



- **Basics of multicore processor and node architecture**
- **Multicore performance and tools**
 - Affinity enforcement
 - Performance counter measurements
 - Basics and best practice for performance counter profiling
- **Microbenchmarking for architectural exploration**
- **Roadblocks for scalability on multicore chips**
 - Scaling properties and typical **OpenMP** overhead
 - Bandwidth **saturation** in cache and main memory
- **Simple Performance Modeling: The Roofline model**
- **Optimal utilization of parallel resources**
 - Programming for **SIMD** parallelism
 - Programming in **ccNUMA** environments
- **Case study: The roofline model for a 3D Jacobi solver**
 - Understanding performance characteristics
 - Model-guided optimization



Multicore processor and system architecture – an overview

Performance composition

Memory organization: UMA vs. ccNUMA

Simultaneous Multi-Threading (SMT)

Data paths in HPC systems

Memory access

Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD)

Topology and programming models

There is no longer a single driving force for chip performance!



Floating Point (FP) Performance:

$$P = n_{\text{core}} * F * S * v$$

n_{core} number of cores: 8

F FP instructions per cycle: 2
(1 MULT and 1 ADD)


S FP ops / instruction: 4 (dp) / 8 (sp)
(256 Bit SIMD registers – “AVX”)

v Clock speed : 2.5 GHz

TOP500 rank 1 (1996)

$$P = 160 \text{ GF/s (dp) / 320 GF/s (sp)}$$

But: P=5 GF/s (dp) for serial, non-SIMD code




Intel Xeon
“Sandy Bridge EP” socket
4,6,8 core variants available

From UMA to ccNUMA

Basic architecture of commodity compute cluster nodes



Yesterday (2006): Dual-socket Intel “Core2” node:




Uniform Memory Architecture (UMA)

Flat memory ; symmetric MPs

But: system “anisotropy”

Today: Dual-socket Intel (Westmere) node:



Cache-coherent Non-Uniform Memory Architecture (**ccNUMA**)

HT / QPI provide scalable bandwidth at the price of ccNUMA architectures:
Where does my data finally end up?

On AMD it is even more complicated → ccNUMA within a socket!


Back to the 2-chip-per-case age

16 core AMD Interlagos – a 2x8-core ccNUMA socket




AMD: single-socket ccNUMA since Magny Cours


- 1 socket: 16-core Interlagos built from two 8-core chips
→ 2 NUMA domains
- 2 socket server
→ 4 NUMA domains



- 4 socket server: → 8 NUMA domains

- WHY? → Shared resources are hard to scale:**
2 x 2 memory channels vs. 1 x 4 memory channels per socket






- **Two 8- (integer-) core chips per socket @ 2.3 GHz (3.3 @ turbo)**
- **Separate DDR3 memory interface per chip**
 - ccNUMA on the socket!
- **Shared FP unit per pair of integer cores (“module”)**
 - 2 128bit FMA FP units
 - SSE4.2, AVX, FMA4
- **16 kB L1 data cache per core**
- **2 MB L2 cache per module**
- **8 MB L3 cache per chip (6 MB usable)**

SMT Makes a single physical core appear as two or more “logical” cores → multiple threads/processes run concurrently



■ SMT principle (2-way example):



Another flavor of "SMT"


AMD Interlagos / Bulldozer



- Up to 16 cores (8 Bulldozer modules) in a single socket
- Max. 2.6 GHz (+ Turbo Core)
- $P_{max} = (2.6 \times 8 \times 8) \text{ GF/s} = 166.4 \text{ GF/s}$


Each Bulldozer module:

- 2 "lightweight" cores
- 1 FPU: 4 MULT & 4 ADD (double precision) / cycle
- Supports AVX
- Supports FMA4




2 DDR3 (shared) memory channel > 15 GB/s

2 NUMA domains per socket



- **8 cores per socket 2.7 GHz (3.5 @ turbo)**
- **DDR3 memory interface with 4 channels per chip**
- **Two-way SMT**
- **Two 256-bit SIMD FP units**
 - SSE4.2, AVX
- **32 kB L1 data cache per core**
- **256 kB L2 cache per core**
- **20 MB L3 cache per chip**

Latency and bandwidth in modern computer environments





We care about this region today

Avoiding slow data paths is the key to most performance optimizations!

Interlude: Data transfers in a memory hierarchy




- How does data travel from memory to the CPU and back?
- Example: Array copy $A(:) = C(:)$





- **Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD)** operations allow the **concurrent execution of the same operation on “wide” registers.**
- **x86 SIMD instruction sets:**
 - SSE: register width = 128 Bit → 2 double precision floating point operands
 - AVX: register width = 256 Bit → 4 double precision floating point operands
- **Adding two registers holding double precision floating point operands**




Challenges of modern compute nodes



Heterogeneous programming
SIMD + OpenMP + MPI + CUDA, OpenCL,...


Core:
SIMD vectorization
SMT

Socket:
Parallelization
Shared Resources





- Parallel and shared resources within a shared-memory node



Parallel resources:

- Execution/SIMD units (1)
- Cores (2)
- Inner cache levels (3)
- Sockets / memory domains (4)
- Multiple accelerators (5)

Shared resources:

- Outer cache level per socket (6)
- Memory bus per socket (7)
- Intersocket link (8)
- PCIe bus(es) (9)
- Other I/O resources (10)

How does your application react to all of those details?



- **Shared-memory (intra-node)**
 - **Good old MPI** (current standard: 2.2)
 - **OpenMP** (current standard: 3.0)
 - POSIX threads
 - Intel Threading Building Blocks
 - Cilk++, OpenCL, StarSs,... you name it
- **Distributed-memory (inter-node)**
 - **MPI** (current standard: 2.2)
 - PVM (gone)
- **Hybrid**
 - **Pure MPI**
 - MPI+OpenMP
 - MPI + any shared-memory model

All models require awareness of *topology* and *affinity* issues for getting best performance out of the machine!

Parallel programming models:

Pure MPI





- Machine structure is invisible to user:

- Very simple programming model
- MPI “knows what to do”!?



- Performance issues

- Intranode vs. internode MPI
- Node/system topology



Parallel programming models:

Pure threading on the node





- **Machine structure is invisible to user**


- → Very simple programming model
- Threading SW (OpenMP, pthreads, TBB,...) should know about the details



- **Performance issues**

- Synchronization overhead
- Memory access
- Node topology





Multicore Performance and Tools

Probing node topology

- Standard tools
- `likwid-topology`

How do we figure out the node topology?



- **Topology =**

- Where in the machine does core #n reside? And do I have to remember this awkward numbering anyway?
- Which cores share which cache levels?
- Which hardware threads (“logical cores”) share a physical core?

- **Linux**

- `cat /proc/cpuinfo` is of limited use
- Core numbers may change across kernels and BIOSes even on identical hardware
- `numactl --hardware` prints ccNUMA node information
- Information on caches is harder to obtain



```
$ numactl --hardware
available: 4 nodes (0-3)
node 0 cpus: 0 1 2 3 4 5
node 0 size: 8189 MB
node 0 free: 3824 MB
node 1 cpus: 6 7 8 9 10 11
node 1 size: 8192 MB
node 1 free: 28 MB
node 2 cpus: 18 19 20 21 22 23
node 2 size: 8192 MB
node 2 free: 8036 MB
node 3 cpus: 12 13 14 15 16 17
node 3 size: 8192 MB
node 3 free: 7840 MB
```

How do we figure out the node topology?




- **LIKWID** tool suite:

Like
I
Knew
What
I'm
Doing

- Open source tool collection
(developed at RRZE):

<http://code.google.com/p/likwid>



J. Treibig, G. Hager, G. Wellein: *LIKWID: A lightweight performance-oriented tool suite for x86 multicore environments*. Accepted for PSTI2010, Sep 13-16, 2010, San Diego, CA
<http://arxiv.org/abs/1004.4431>

- **Command line tools for Linux:**

- easy to install
- works with standard linux 2.6 kernel
- simple and clear to use
- supports Intel and AMD CPU



- **Current tools:**

- **likwid-topology**: Print thread and cache topology
- **likwid-pin**: Pin threaded application without touching code
- **likwid-perfctr**: Measure performance counters
- **likwid-mpirun**: mpirun wrapper script for easy LIKWID integration
- **likwid-bench**: Low-level bandwidth benchmark generator tool
- ... some more

Output of `likwid-topology -g`

on one node of Cray XE6 "Hermit"



CPU type: AMD Interlagos processor

Hardware Thread Topology

Sockets: 2
Cores per socket: 16
Threads per core: 1

HWTThread	Thread	Core	Socket
0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0
2	0	2	0
3	0	3	0
[...]			
16	0	0	1
17	0	1	1
18	0	2	1
19	0	3	1
[...]			

Socket 0: (0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15)

Socket 1: (16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31)

Cache Topology

Level: 1
Size: 16 kB

Cache groups: (0) (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11) (12) (13)
(14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23) (24) (25) (26) (27) (28)
(29) (30) (31)

Output of likwid-topology continued



```
-----  
Level:  2  
Size:   2 MB  
Cache groups:  ( 0 1 ) ( 2 3 ) ( 4 5 ) ( 6 7 ) ( 8 9 ) ( 10 11 ) ( 12 13 ) ( 14 15 ) ( 16 17 ) ( 18  
19 ) ( 20 21 ) ( 22 23 ) ( 24 25 ) ( 26 27 ) ( 28 29 ) ( 30 31 )  
-----
```

```
Level:  3  
Size:   6 MB  
Cache groups:  ( 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 ) ( 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 ) ( 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 ) ( 24 25 26  
27 28 29 30 31 )  
-----
```

```
*****  
NUMA Topology  
*****  
NUMA domains: 4  
-----
```

```
Domain 0:  
Processors:  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Memory: 7837.25 MB free of total 8191.62 MB  
-----
```

```
Domain 1:  
Processors:  8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15  
Memory: 7860.02 MB free of total 8192 MB  
-----
```

```
Domain 2:  
Processors:  16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23  
Memory: 7847.39 MB free of total 8192 MB  
-----
```

```
Domain 3:  
Processors:  24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31  
Memory: 7785.02 MB free of total 8192 MB  
-----
```

Output of likwid-topology continued




Graphical:

Socket 0:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB
2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB
6MB								6MB							

Socket 1:




16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB	16kB
2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB	2MB
6MB								6MB							



Enforcing thread/process-core affinity under the Linux OS

- **Standard tools and OS affinity facilities
under program control**
- **likwid-pin**
- **aprun (Cray)**

Example: STREAM benchmark on 12-core Intel Westmere: Anarchy vs. thread pinning



There are several reasons for caring about affinity:

- Eliminating performance variation
- Making use of architectural features
- Avoiding resource contention



Overview

- `taskset [OPTIONS] [MASK | -c LIST] \
[PID | command [args]...]`
- **taskset binds processes/threads to a set of CPUs. Examples:**


```
taskset 0x0006 ./a.out  
taskset -c 4 33187  
mpirun -np 2 taskset -c 0,2 ./a.out # doesn't always work
```
- **Processes/threads can still move within the set!**
- **Alternative: let process/thread bind itself by executing syscall**

```
#include <sched.h>  
int sched_setaffinity(pid_t pid, unsigned int len,  
                     unsigned long *mask);
```
- **Disadvantage: which CPUs should you bind to on a non-exclusive machine?**
- **Still of value on multicore/multisocket cluster nodes, UMA or ccNUMA**



- **Complementary tool:** `numactl`

Example: `numactl --physcpubind=0,1,2,3 command [args]`

Bind process to specified physical core numbers

Example: `numactl --cpunodebind=1 command [args]`

Bind process to specified ccNUMA node(s)

- **Many more options (e.g., interleave memory across nodes)**
 - → see section on ccNUMA optimization
- **Diagnostic command (see earlier):**
`numactl --hardware`
- **Again, this is not suitable for a shared machine**



- **Highly OS-dependent system calls**

- But available on all systems

Linux: `sched_setaffinity()`, PLPA (see below) → `hwloc`

Solaris: `processor_bind()`

Windows: `SetThreadAffinityMask()`

...

- **Support for “semi-automatic” pinning in some compilers/environments**


- Intel compilers > V9.1 (`KMP_AFFINITY` environment variable)
- PGI, Pathscale, GNU
- SGI Altix `dp1ace` (works with logical CPU numbers!)
- Generic Linux: `taskset`, `numactl`, `likwid-pin` (see below)

- **Affinity awareness in MPI libraries**

- SGI MPT
- OpenMPI
- Intel MPI
- ...

Example for program controlled affinity: Using PLPA under Linux!

SKIPPED





- Pins processes and threads to specific cores **without touching code**
- Directly supports pthreads, gcc OpenMP, Intel OpenMP
- Based on combination of wrapper tool together with overloaded pthread library → **binary must be dynamically linked!**
- Can also be used as a superior **replacement for taskset**
- Supports **logical core numbering** within a node and within an existing CPU set
 - Useful for running inside CPU sets defined by someone else, e.g., the MPI start mechanism or a batch system
- **Usage examples:**
 - `likwid-pin -c 0,2,4-6 ./myApp parameters`
 - `likwid-pin -c S0:0-3 ./myApp parameters`



- Running the STREAM benchmark with likwid-pin:

```
$ export OMP_NUM_THREADS=4
$ likwid-pin -s 0x1 -c 0,1,4,5 ./stream
[likwid-pin] Main PID -> core 0 - OK
-----
Double precision appears to have 16 digits of accuracy
Assuming 8 bytes per DOUBLE PRECISION word
-----
[... some STREAM output omitted ...]
The *best* time for each test is used
*EXCLUDING* the first and last iterations
[pthread wrapper] PIN_MASK: 0->1 1->4 2->5
[pthread wrapper] SKIP MASK: 0x1
[pthread wrapper 0] Notice: Using libpthread.so.0
    threadid 1073809728 -> SKIP
[pthread wrapper 1] Notice: Using libpthread.so.0
    threadid 1078008128 -> core 1 - OK
[pthread wrapper 2] Notice: Using libpthread.so.0
    threadid 1082206528 -> core 4 - OK
[pthread wrapper 3] Notice: Using libpthread.so.0
    threadid 1086404928 -> core 5 - OK
[... rest of STREAM output omitted ...]
```


Main PID always pinned

Skip shepherd thread

Pin all spawned threads in turn



- Core numbering may vary from system to system even with identical hardware
 - Likwid-topology delivers this information, which can then be fed into likwid-pin
- Alternatively, likwid-pin can abstract this variation and provide a purely **logical** numbering (**physical cores first**)




- Across all cores in the node:
`OMP_NUM_THREADS=8 likwid-pin -c N:0-7 ./a.out`
- Across the cores in each socket and across sockets in each node:
`OMP_NUM_THREADS=8 likwid-pin -c S0:0-3@S1:0-3 ./a.out`




Possible unit prefixes


N node




S socket



M NUMA domain




C outer level cache group





- **See Cray workshop slides**
- **aprun supports only physical core numbering**
 - This is OK since the cores are always numbered consecutively on Crays
 - Use `-ss` switch to restrict allocation to local NUMA domain (see later for more on ccNUMA)
 - Use `-d $OMP_NUM_THREADS` or similar for MPI+OMP hybrid code
- **See later on how using multiple cores per module/chip/socket affects performance**



Multicore performance tools: Probing performance behavior

likwid-perfctr



1. **Runtime profile / Call graph (gprof)**
2. **Instrument those parts which consume a significant part of runtime**
3. **Find performance signatures**

Possible signatures:

- **Bandwidth saturation**
- **Instruction throughput limitation (real or language-induced)**
- **Latency impact (irregular data access, high branch ratio)**
- **Load imbalance**
- **ccNUMA issues (data access across ccNUMA domains)**
- **Pathologic cases (false cacheline sharing, expensive operations)**



- How do we find out about the performance properties and requirements of a parallel code?
 - Profiling via advanced tools is often overkill
- A coarse overview is often sufficient
 - **likwid-perfctr** (similar to “perfex” on IRIX, “hpmcount” on AIX, “lipfpm” on Linux/Altix)
 - Simple end-to-end measurement of hardware performance metrics
 - “Marker” API for starting/stopping counters
 - Multiple measurement region support
 - Preconfigured and extensible metric groups, list with **likwid-perfctr -a**



BRANCH: Branch prediction miss rate/ratio
CACHE: Data cache miss rate/ratio
CLOCK: Clock of cores
DATA: Load to store ratio
FLOPS_DP: Double Precision MFlops/s
FLOPS_SP: Single Precision MFlops/s
FLOPS_X87: X87 MFlops/s
L2: L2 cache bandwidth in MBytes/s
L2CACHE: L2 cache miss rate/ratio
L3: L3 cache bandwidth in MBytes/s
L3CACHE: L3 cache miss rate/ratio
MEM: Main memory bandwidth in MBytes/s
TLB: TLB miss rate/ratio



```
$ env OMP_NUM_THREADS=4 likwid-perfctr -C N:0-3 -g FLOPS_DP ./stream.exe
```

```
-----
CPU type:      Intel Core Lynnfield processor
CPU clock:    2.93 GHz
-----
```

```
Measuring group FLOPS_DP
```

```
YOUR PROGRAM OUTPUT
```

Event	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3
INSTR_RETIRED_ANY	1.97463e+08	2.31001e+08	2.30963e+08	2.31885e+08
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_CORE	9.56999e+08	9.58401e+08	9.58637e+08	9.57338e+08
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_PACKED	4.00294e+07	3.08927e+07	3.08866e+07	3.08904e+07
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_SCALAR	882	0	0	0
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_SINGLE_PRECISION	0	0	0	0
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_DOUBLE_PRECISION	4.00303e+07	3.08927e+07	3.08866e+07	3.08904e+07

Always measured

Configured metrics (this group)

Metric	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3
Runtime [s]	0.326242	0.32672	0.326801	0.326358
CPI	4.84647	4.14891	4.15061	4.12849
DP MFlops/s (DP assumed)	245.399	189.108	189.024	189.304
Packed MUOPS/s	122.698	94.554	94.5121	94.6519
Scalar MUOPS/s	0.00270351	0	0	0
SP MUOPS/s	0	0	0	0
DP MUOPS/s	122.701	94.554	94.5121	94.6519

Derived metrics



Things to look at (in roughly this order)

- **Load balance** (flops, instructions, BW)
- **In-socket memory BW saturation**
- **Shared cache BW saturation**
- **Flop/s, loads and stores per flop metrics**
- **SIMD** vectorization
- **CPI** metric
- **# of instructions, branches, mispredicted branches**

Caveats

- **Load imbalance may not show in CPI or # of instructions**
 - **Spin loops** in OpenMP barriers/MPI blocking calls
 - Looking at “top” or the Windows Task Manager does not tell you anything useful
- **In-socket performance saturation may have various reasons**
- **Cache miss metrics are overrated**
 - If I really know my code, I can often *calculate* the misses
 - Runtime and resource utilization is much more important



- Instructions retired / CPI may not be a good indication of useful workload – at least for numerical / FP intensive codes....
- Floating Point Operations Executed** is often a better indicator
- Waiting / “Spinning”** in barrier generates a high instruction count

Event	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5
INSTR_RETIRED_ANY	2.10045e+10	1.90983e+10	1.729e+10	1.60898e+10	1.67958e+10	1.84689e+10
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_CORE	1.82569e+10	1.81203e+10	1.81802e+10	1.82084e+10	1.82334e+10	1.82484e+10
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_REF	1.66053e+10	1.6473e+10	1.65274e+10	1.65531e+10	1.65758e+10	1.65894e+10
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_PACKED	2.77016e+08	7.83476e+08	1.39355e+09	1.94365e+09	2.38059e+09	2.85981e+09
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_SCALAR	1.70802e+08	2.64065e+08	2.23153e+08	2.60835e+08	2.30434e+08	2.07293e+08
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_SINGLE_PRECISION	19	0	0	0	0	0
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_DOUBLE_PRECISION	4.47818e+08	1.04754e+09	1.61671e+09	2.20448e+09	2.61102e+09	3.0671e+09

```
!$OMP PARALLEL DO
```

```
DO I = 1, N
```

```
DO J = 1, I
```

```
  x(I) = x(I) + A(J,I) * y(J)
```

```
ENDDO
```

```
ENDDO
```

```
!$OMP END PARALLEL DO
```

Metric	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5
Runtime [s]	6.84594	6.79471	6.81716	6.82773	6.83711	6.84274
Clock [MHz]	2932.07	2933.51	2933.51	2933.51	2933.51	2933.51
CPI	0.869191	0.948789	1.05148	1.13167	1.08559	0.988061
DP MFlops/s	109.192	275.833	453.48	624.893	751.96	892.857



```
env OMP_NUM_THREADS=6 likwid-perfctr -C S0:0-5 -g FLOPS_DP ./a.out
```

Event	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5
INSTR_RETIRED_ANY	1.83124e+10	1.74784e+10	1.68453e+10	1.66794e+10	1.76685e+10	1.91736e+10
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_CORE	2.24797e+10	2.23789e+10	2.23802e+10	2.23808e+10	2.23799e+10	2.23805e+10
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_REF	2.04416e+10	2.03445e+10	2.03456e+10	2.03462e+10	2.03453e+10	2.03459e+10
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_PACKED	3.45348e+09	3.43035e+09	3.37573e+09	3.39272e+09	3.26132e+09	3.2377e+09
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_FP_SCALAR	2.93108e+07	3.06063e+07	2.9704e+07	2.96507e+07	2.41141e+07	2.37397e+07
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_SINGLE_PRECISION	19	0	0	0	0	0
FP_COMP_OPS_EXE_SSE_DOUBLE_PRECISION	3.48279e+09	3.46096e+09	3.40543e+09	3.42237e+09	3.28543e+09	3.26144e+09

Higher CPI but
better performance

Metric	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5
Runtime [s]	8.42938	8.39157	8.39206	8.3923	8.39193	8.39218
Clock [MHz]	2932.73	2933.5	2933.51	2933.51	2933.51	2933.51
CPI	1.22757	1.28037	1.32857	1.34182	1.26666	1.16726
DP MFlops/s	850.727	845.212	831.703	835.865	802.952	797.113
Packed MUOPS/s	423.566	420.729	414.03	416.114	399.997	397.101
Scalar MUOPS/s	3.59494	3.75383	3.64317	3.63663	2.95757	2.91165
SP MUOPS/s	2.33033e-06	0	0	0	0	0
DP MUOPS/s	427.161	424.483	417.673	419.751	402.955	400.013

```
!$OMP PARALLEL DO
```

```
DO I = 1, N
```

```
DO J = 1, N
```

```
  x(I) = x(I) + A(J,I) * y(J)
```

```
ENDDO
```

```
ENDDO
```

```
!$OMP END PARALLEL DO
```

Detecting latency-bound codes

Example: graph and tree data structures



Metric	Red-Black tree	Optimized data structure
Instructions retired	1.34268e+11	1.28581e+11
CPI	9.0176	0.71887
L3-MEM data volume [GB]	301	3.22
TLB misses	3.71447e+09	4077
Branch rate	36%	8.5%
Branch mispredicted ratio	7.8%	0.0000013%
Memory bandwidth [GB/s]	10.5	1.1

Useful likwid-perfctr groups: L3, L3CACHE, MEM, TLB, BRANCH


High CPI, near perfect scaling if using SMT threads (Intel).

Note: Latency bound code can still produce significant aggregated bandwidth.



- The **object-oriented programming** paradigm implements functionality resulting in many calls to small functions
- The ability of the compiler to inline functions (**and still generate the best possible machine code**) is limited
- Frequent pattern with complex C++ codes

- **Symptoms:**
 - Low (“good”) **CPI**
 - Low resource utilization (Flops/s, bandwidth)
 - Orders of magnitude more general purpose than arithmetic floating point instructions
 - High branch rate
- **Solution:**
 - Use **basic data types** and **plain arrays** in compute intensive loops
 - Use plain **C-like** code
 - Keep things simple – **do not obstruct the compiler’s view on the code**



Microbenchmarking for architectural exploration

The vector triad

Serial, throughput, and parallel benchmarks



Simple streaming benchmark:


```
double precision, dimension(N) :: A,B,C,D
A=1.d0; B=A; C=A; D=A
```


```
do j=1,NITER
  do i=1,N
    A(i) = B(i) + C(i) * D(i)
  enddo
  if(.something.that.is.never.true.) then
    call dummy(A,B,C,D)
  endif
enddo
```

Prevents smarty-pants compilers from doing “clever” stuff

- Report performance for different N
- Choose NITER so that accurate time measurement is possible
- **This kernel is limited by data transfer performance for all memory levels on all current architectures!**

A(:) = B(:) + C(:) * D(:) on one Sandy Bridge core (3 GHz)







- Every core runs its own, independent triad benchmark

```
double precision, dimension(:), allocatable :: A,B,C,D
```

```
!$OMP PARALLEL private(i,j,A,B,C,D)
```

```
allocate(A(1:N),B(1:N),C(1:N),D(1:N))
```

```
A=1.d0; B=A; C=A; D=A
```

```
do j=1,NITER
```

```
  do i=1,N
```

```
    A(i) = B(i) + C(i) * D(i)
```

```
  enddo
```

```
  if(.something.that.is.never.true.) then
```

```
    call dummy(A,B,C,D)
```



```
  endif
```

```
enddo
```

```
!$OMP END PARALLEL
```

- → pure hardware probing, no impact from OpenMP overhead

Throughput vector triad on Sandy Bridge socket (3 GHz)



Scalable BW in L1, L2, L3 cache

Saturation effect in memory



- OpenMP work sharing in the benchmark loop

```
double precision, dimension(:), allocatable :: A,B,C,D
```

```
allocate(A(1:N),B(1:N),C(1:N),D(1:N))
```

```
A=1.d0; B=A; C=A; D=A
```

```
!$OMP PARALLEL private(i,j)
```

```
do j=1,NITER
```

```
!$OMP DO
```

```
do i=1,N
```

```
    A(i) = B(i) + C(i) * D(i)
```

```
enddo
```

```
!$OMP END DO
```

Implicit barrier

```
    if(.something.that.is.never.true.) then
```


```
        call dummy(A,B,C,D)
```


```
    endif
```

```
enddo
```

```
!$OMP END PARALLEL
```

OpenMP vector triad on Sandy Bridge socket (3 GHz)





OpenMP performance issues on multicore

Synchronization (barrier) overhead

Welcome to the multi-/many-core era

Synchronization of threads may be expensive!



!\$OMP PARALLEL ...

...

!\$OMP BARRIER

!\$OMP DO

...

!\$OMP ENDDO

!\$OMP END PARALLEL

Threads are synchronized at **explicit** AND **implicit** barriers. These are a main source of overhead in OpenMP programs.

Determine costs via modified OpenMP
Microbenchmarks testcase (epcc)

On x86 systems there is no hardware support for synchronization!

- Next slide: Test **OpenMP** Barrier performance...
- for different compilers
- and different topologies:
 - shared cache
 - shared socket
 - between sockets
- and different thread counts
 - 2 threads
 - full domain (chip, socket, node)

Thread synchronization overhead on Interlagos

Barrier overhead in CPU cycles



2 Threads	Cray 8.03	GCC 4.6.2	PGI 11.8	Intel 12.1.3
Shared L2	258	3995	1503	128623
Shared L3	698	2853	1076	128611
Same socket	879	2785	1297	128695
Other socket	940	2740 / 4222	1284 / 1325	128718



Intel compiler barrier very expensive on Interlagos

OpenMP & Cray compiler 

Full domain	Cray 8.03	GCC 4.6.2	PGI 11.8	Intel 12.1.3
Shared L3	2272	27916	5981	151939
Socket	3783	49947	7479	163561
Node	7663	167646	9526	178892

Thread synchronization overhead on SandyBridge-EP

Barrier overhead in CPU cycles



2 Threads	Intel 13.1.0	GCC 4.7.0	GCC 4.6.1
Shared L3	384	5242	4616
SMT threads	2509	3726	3399
Other socket	1375	5959	4909




Gcc still not very competitive

Intel compiler



Full domain	Intel 13.1.0	GCC 4.7.0	GCC 4.6.1
Socket	1497	14546	14418
Node	3401	34667	29788
Node SMT	6881	59038	58898



Simple performance modeling: The Roofline Model



1. P_{\max} = **Applicable peak performance** of a loop, assuming that data comes from L1 cache
2. I = **Computational intensity** (“work” per byte transferred) over the slowest data path utilized (“the bottleneck”)
 - Code balance $B_C = I^{-1}$
3. b_S = **Applicable peak bandwidth** of the slowest data path utilized

Expected performance:

$$P = \min(P_{\max}, I \cdot b_S)$$

¹ W. Schönauer: [Scientific Supercomputing: Architecture and Use of Shared and Distributed Memory Parallel Computers](#). (2000)


² S. Williams: [Auto-tuning Performance on Multicore Computers](#). UCB Technical Report No. UCB/EECS-2008-164. PhD thesis (2008)

A simple Roofline example



Example: `do i=1,N; s=s+a(i); enddo`

in double precision on hypothetical 3 GHz CPU, 4-way SIMD, N large






Plain scalar code, no SIMD

```
LOAD r1.0 ← 0
i ← 1
loop:
  LOAD r2.0 ← a(i)
  ADD r1.0 ← r1.0+r2.0
  ++i →? loop
result ← r1.0
```

ADD pipes utilization:




→ 1/16 of ADD peak



Scalar code, 4-way unrolling

```
LOAD r1.0 ← 0
LOAD r2.0 ← 0
LOAD r3.0 ← 0
LOAD r4.0 ← 0
i ← 1
loop:
  LOAD r5.0 ← a(i)
  LOAD r6.0 ← a(i+1)
  LOAD r7.0 ← a(i+2)
  LOAD r8.0 ← a(i+3)
  ADD r1.0 ← r1.0+r5.0
  ADD r2.0 ← r2.0+r6.0
  ADD r3.0 ← r3.0+r7.0
  ADD r4.0 ← r4.0+r8.0
  i+=4 →? loop
result ← r1.0+r2.0+r3.0+r4.0
```

ADD pipes utilization:



→ 1/4 of ADD peak



SIMD-vectorized, 4-way unrolled

```
LOAD [r1.0, ..., r1.3] ← [0, 0]
```

```
LOAD [r2.0, ..., r2.3] ← [0, 0]
```

```
LOAD [r3.0, ..., r3.3] ← [0, 0]
```

```
LOAD [r4.0, ..., r4.3] ← [0, 0]
```

```
i ← 1
```

```
loop:
```

```
LOAD [r5.0, ..., r5.3] ← [a(i), ..., a(i+3)]
```

```
LOAD [r6.0, ..., r6.3] ← [a(i+4), ..., a(i+7)]
```

```
LOAD [r7.0, ..., r7.3] ← [a(i+8), ..., a(i+11)]
```

```
LOAD [r8.0, ..., r8.3] ← [a(i+12), ..., a(i+15)]
```

```
ADD r1 ← r1+r5
```

```
ADD r2 ← r2+r6
```


```
ADD r3 ← r3+r7
```

```
ADD r4 ← r4+r8
```

```
i+=16 →? loop
```

```
result ← r1.0+r1.1+...+r4.2+r4.3
```


ADD pipes utilization:





... on the example of

```
do i=1,N; s=s+a(i); enddo
```





Example: Vector triad $A(:) = B(:) + C(:) * D(:)$ on 2.3 GHz Interlagos

- $b_S = 34 \text{ GB/s}$
- $B_c = (4+1) \text{ Words} / 2 \text{ Flops} = 2.5 \text{ W/F}$ (including write allocate)
→ $I = 0.4 \text{ F/W} = 0.05 \text{ F/B}$

Lightspeed:

$$I \cdot b_S = 1.7 \text{ GF/s (1.2 \% of peak performance)}$$




- **The balance metric formalism is based on some (crucial) assumptions:**
 - There is a clear concept of “work” vs. “traffic”
 - “work” = flops, updates, iterations...
 - “traffic” = required data to do “work”
 - **Attainable bandwidth of code = input parameter!** Determine effective bandwidth via simple streaming benchmarks to model more complex kernels and applications
 - **Data transfer and core execution overlap perfectly!**
 - **Slowest data path is modeled only;** all others are assumed to be infinitely fast
 - If data transfer is the limiting factor, the **bandwidth** of the slowest data path can be **utilized to 100%** (“saturation”)
 - Latency effects are ignored, i.e. **perfect streaming mode**




Bandwidth-bound (simple case)

- Accurate traffic calculation (write-allocate, strided access, ...)
- Practical \neq theoretical BW limits
- **Erratic access patterns**



Core-bound (may be complex)


- **Multiple bottlenecks:** LD/ST, arithmetic, pipelines, SIMD, execution ports
- See next slide...






Multiple bottlenecks:


- L1 Icache bandwidth
- Decode/retirement throughput
- Port contention (direct or indirect)
- Arithmetic pipeline stalls (dependencies)
- Overall pipeline stalls (branching)
- L1 Dcache bandwidth (LD/ST throughput)
- Scalar vs. SIMD execution
- ...
- Register pressure
- Alignment issues





- **Saturation effects** in multicore chips are not explained
 - Reason: “saturation assumption”
 - Cache line transfers and core execution do sometimes not overlap perfectly
 - Only increased “pressure” on the memory interface can saturate the bus
→ need more cores!
- **ECM model** gives more insight (see later)






Optimal utilization of parallel resources

Hardware-software interaction

SIMD parallelism

Computer Architecture

The evil of hardware optimizations



Flexible, but optimization is hard!



**Architect's view:
Make the common case fast !**




EDSAC 1949

Provide improvements for **relevant** software
What are the **technical** opportunities?
Economical concerns
Multi-way **special purpose**



What is your relevant aspect of the architecture?



ENIAC 1948

Hardware- Software Co-Design?

From algorithm to execution



The machine view:

ISA (Machine code)



**Reality:
Algorithm**



Programming language



Hardware = Black Box



1. **Instruction execution**

This is the primary resource of the processor. All efforts in hardware design are targeted towards increasing the instruction throughput.

2. **Data transfer bandwidth**


Data transfers are a consequence of instruction execution and therefore a secondary resource. Maximum bandwidth is determined by the request rate of executed instructions and technical limitations (bus width, speed).

Real machine: Processors are imperfect and have technical limitations. This results in hazards preventing to fully exploit the elementary resources.



Goals for optimization:


1. **Map your work to an instruction mix with highest throughput using the most effective instructions.**
2. **Reduce data volume over slow data paths fully utilizing available bandwidth.**
3. **Avoid possible hazards/overhead which prevent reaching goals one and two.**



Coding for
Single Instruction Multiple Data-processing



- **Single Instruction Multiple Data (SIMD)** operations allow the **concurrent execution of the same operation on “wide” registers.**
- **x86 SIMD instruction sets:**
 - SSE: register width = 128 Bit → 2 double precision floating point operands
 - AVX: register width = 256 Bit → 4 double precision floating point operands
- **Adding two registers holding double precision floating point operands**





- Steps (**done by the compiler**) for “SIMD processing”

```
for(int i=0; i<n;i++)  
    C[i]=A[i]+B[i];
```

“Loop unrolling”

```
for(int i=0; i<n;i+=4){  
    C[i]  =A[i]  +B[i];  
    C[i+1]=A[i+1]+B[i+1];  
    C[i+2]=A[i+2]+B[i+2];  
    C[i+3]=A[i+3]+B[i+3];  
    //remainder loop omitted
```

Load 256 Bits starting from address of A[i] to register R0

Add the corresponding 64 Bit entries in R0 and R1 and store the 4 results to R2

Store R2 (256 Bit) to address starting at C[i]

LABEL1:

```
VLOAD R0 ← A[i]  
VLOAD R1 ← B[i]  
V64ADD[R0,R1] → R2  
VSTORE R2 → C[i]  
i ← i+4  
i < (n-4)? JMP LABEL1  
//remainder loop omitted
```



- **No SIMD-processing for loops with data dependencies**

```
for(int i=0; i<n; i++)  
    A[i]=A[i-1]*s;
```

- **“Pointer aliasing” may prevent compiler from SIMD-processing**

```
void scale_shift(double *A, double *B, double *C, int n) {  
    for(int i=0; i<n; ++i)  
        C[i] = A[i] + B[i];  
}
```


- C/C++ allows that $A \rightarrow \&C[-1]$ and $B \rightarrow \&C[-2]$
→ $C[i] = C[i-1] + C[i-2]$: **dependency** → **No SIMD-processing**
- If no “Pointer aliasing” is used, tell it to the compiler, e.g. use `-fno-alias` switch for Intel compiler → **SIMD-processing**



- SIMD processing of a vector norm

```
s=0.0;
for(int i=0; i<n; i++)
    s = s + A[i]*A[i];
```

Data dependency on *s* must be resolved for SIMD-processing




```
s0=0.0;
s1=0.0;
s2=0.0;
s3=0.0;
for(int i=0; i<n; i+=4){
    s0 = s0 + A[i] * A[i];
    s1 = s1 + A[i+1] * A[i+1];
    s2 = s2 + A[i+2] * A[i+2];
    s3 = s3 + A[i+3] * A[i+3];
}
//remainder omitted
s=s0+s1+s2+s3
```

R0 *R1* *R2*

Compiler does transformation –
if programmer allows it to do so!
(-O3 instead of -O1)

```
...
V64MULT (R1, R2) → R1
V64ADD (R0, R1) → R0
...
```



Reading x86 assembly code



- **Get the assembler code (Intel compiler):**
`icc -S -O3 -xHost triad.c -o triad.s`
- **Disassemble Executable:**
`objdump -d ./cacheBench | less`
- **Things to check for:**
 - Is the code vectorized? Search for pd/ps suffix.
`mulpd, addpd, vaddpd, vmulpd`
 - Is the data loaded with 16 byte moves?
`movapd, movaps, vmovupd`
 - For memory-bound code: Search for nontemporal stores:
`movntpd, movntps`

The x86 ISA is documented in:

Intel Software Development Manual (SDM) 2A and 2B
AMD64 Architecture Programmer's Manual Vol. 1-5



- Instructions have 0 to 2 operands
- Operands can be registers, memory references or immediates
- Opcodes (binary representation of instructions) vary from 1 to 17 bytes
- There are two syntax forms: **Intel (left)** and **AT&T (right)**
- Addressing Mode: **BASE + INDEX * SCALE + DISPLACEMENT**
- **C:** $A[i]$ equivalent to $*(A+i)$ (a pointer has a type: $A+i*8$)

```
movaps [rdi + rax*8+48], xmm3
add rax, 8
js 1b
```

```
movaps    %xmm4, 48(%rdi,%rax,8)
addq     $8, %rax
js      ..B1.4
```

```
401b9f: 0f 29 5c c7 30
401ba4: 48 83 c0 08
401ba8: 78 a6
```

```
movaps %xmm3,0x30(%rdi,%rax,8)
add $0x8,%rax
js 401b50 <triad_asm+0x4b>
```



16 general Purpose Registers (**64bit**):

`rax, rbx, rcx, rdx, rsi, rdi, rsp, rbp, r8-r15`

alias with eight 32 bit register set:

`eax, ebx, ecx, edx, esi, edi, esp, ebp`

Floating Point **SIMD** Registers:

`xmm0-xmm15` SSE (128bit) alias with 256bit registers

`ymm0-ymm15` AVX (256bit)

SIMD instructions are distinguished by:

AVX (VEX) prefix: `v`

Operation: `mul, add, mov`

Modifier: non temporal (`nt`), unaligned (`u`), aligned (`a`), high (`h`)

Data type: single (`s`), double (`d`)



- Regulations how functions are called on binary level
- Differs between 32 bit / 64 bit and Operating Systems

x86-64 on Linux:

- **Integer or address** parameters are passed in the order :
`rdi, rsi, rdx, rcx, r8, r9`
- **Floating Point** parameters are passed in the order `xmm0-xmm7`
- **Registers which must be preserved across function calls:**
`rbx, rbp, r12-r15`
- **Return values** are passed in `rax/rdx` and `xmm0/xmm1`

Case Study: summation



```
float sum = 0.0;
```

```
for (int j=0; j<size; j++){  
    sum += data[j];  
}
```

To get object code use
`objdump -d` on object file or
executable or compile with `-S`

Instruction code:

```
401d08:  f3 0f 58 04 82  
401d0d:  48 83 c0 01  
401d11:  39 c7  
401d13:  77 f3
```

```
addss  (%rdx,%rax,4),%xmm0  
add    $0x1,%rax  
cmp    %eax,%edi  
ja     401d08
```

Instruction
address

Opcodes

Assembly
code

Summation code variants



```
1:
addss xmm0, [rsi + rax * 4]
add    rax, 1
cmp    eax,edi
js 1b
```

3 cycles add
pipeline
latency

Unrolling with sub sums to break up
register dependency

```
1:
addps xmm0, [rsi + rax * 4]
addps xmm1, [rsi + rax * 4 + 16]
addps xmm2, [rsi + rax * 4 + 32]
addps xmm3, [rsi + rax * 4 + 48]
add    rax, 16
cmp    eax,edi
js 1b
```



SSE SIMD vectorization

```
1:
addss xmm0, [rsi + rax * 4]
addss xmm1, [rsi + rax * 4 + 4]
addss xmm2, [rsi + rax * 4 + 8]
addss xmm3, [rsi + rax * 4 + 12]
add    rax, 4
cmp    eax,edi
js 1b
```

SIMD-processing – Sequential



SIMD influences instruction execution in the core – other bottlenecks stay the same!



Execution	Cache	Memory
48		
16	4	4
4		

SIMD-processing – Full chip (all cores)

Influence of SMT




Bandwidth saturation is the primary performance **limitation** on the chip level!

Full scaling using SMT due to bubbles in pipeline


Conclusion: If the code saturates the bottleneck, all variants are acceptable!

All variants saturate the memory bandwidth

8 threads on physical cores



16 threads using SMT





- The compiler does it for you (aliasing, alignment, language)
- Compiler directives (**pragmas**)
- Alternative **programming models** for compute kernels (OpenCL, ispc)
- Intrinsic (restricted to C/C++)
- Implement directly in assembler

To use **intrinsics** the following headers are available. To enable instruction sets often additional flags are necessary:

- `xmmintrin.h` (SSE)
- `pmmmintrin.h` (SSE2)
- `immintrin.h` (AVX)

- `x86intrin.h` (all instruction set extensions)
- See next slide for an example

Example: array summation using C intrinsics



```
__m128 sum0, sum1, sum2, sum3;
__m128 t0, t1, t2, t3;
float scalar_sum;
sum0 =  _mm_setzero_ps();
sum1 =  _mm_setzero_ps();
sum2 =  _mm_setzero_ps();
sum3 =  _mm_setzero_ps();
```

```
sum0 =  _mm_add_ps(sum0, sum1);
sum0 =  _mm_add_ps(sum0, sum2);
sum0 =  _mm_add_ps(sum0, sum3);
sum0 =  _mm_hadd_ps(sum0, sum0);
sum0 =  _mm_hadd_ps(sum0, sum0);

_mm_store_ss(&scalar_sum, sum0);
```

```
for (int j=0; j<size; j+=16){
    t0 =  _mm_loadu_ps(data+j);
    t1 =  _mm_loadu_ps(data+j+4);
    t2 =  _mm_loadu_ps(data+j+8);
    t3 =  _mm_loadu_ps(data+j+12);
    sum0 =  _mm_add_ps(sum0, t0);
    sum1 =  _mm_add_ps(sum1, t1);
    sum2 =  _mm_add_ps(sum2, t2);
    sum3 =  _mm_add_ps(sum3, t3);
}
```

Example: array summation from intrinsics, instruction code



```
14: 0f 57 c9      xorps  %xmm1,%xmm1
17: 31 c0         xor    %eax,%eax
19: 0f 28 d1      movaps %xmm1,%xmm2
1c: 0f 28 c1      movaps %xmm1,%xmm0
1f: 0f 28 d9      movaps %xmm1,%xmm3
22: 66 0f 1f 44 00 00  nopw  0x0(%rax,%rax,1)
28: 0f 10 3e      movups (%rsi),%xmm7
2b: 0f 10 76 10   movups 0x10(%rsi),%xmm6
2f: 0f 10 6e 20   movups 0x20(%rsi),%xmm5
33: 0f 10 66 30   movups 0x30(%rsi),%xmm4
37: 83 c0 10      add    $0x10,%eax
3a: 48 83 c6 40   add    $0x40,%rsi
3e: 0f 58 df      addps  %xmm7,%xmm3
41: 0f 58 c6      addps  %xmm6,%xmm0
44: 0f 58 d5      addps  %xmm5,%xmm2
47: 0f 58 cc      addps  %xmm4,%xmm1
4a: 39 c7         cmp    %eax,%edi
4c: 77 da         ja     28 <compute_sum_SSE+0x18>
4e: 0f 58 c3      addps  %xmm3,%xmm0
51: 0f 58 c2      addps  %xmm2,%xmm0
54: 0f 58 c1      addps  %xmm1,%xmm0
57: f2 0f 7c c0   haddps %xmm0,%xmm0
5b: f2 0f 7c c0   haddps %xmm0,%xmm0
5f: c3          retq
```

Loop body



- **Intel compiler will try to use SIMD instructions when enabled to do so**
 - “Poor man’s vector computing”
 - Compiler will emit messages about vectorized loops:

```
plain.c(11): (col. 9) remark: LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.
```
 - Use option `-vec_report3` to get full compiler output about which loops were vectorized and which were not and why (data dependencies!)
 - Some obstructions will prevent the compiler from applying vectorization even if it is possible
- **You can use source code directives to provide more information to the compiler**



- **The compiler will vectorize starting with `-O2`.**
- **To enable specific SIMD extensions use the `-x` option:**
 - **`-xSSE2`** vectorize for SSE2 capable machines

Available SIMD extensions:

`SSE2`, `SSE3`, `SSSE3`, `SSE4.1`, `SSE4.2`, `AVX`

- **`-xAVX`** on Sandy Bridge processors

Recommend option:

- **`-xHost`** will optimize for the architecture you compile on

On AMD Opteron: use plain `-O3` as the `-x` options may involve CPU type checks.



- **Controlling non-temporal stores**

- `-opt-streaming-stores` **always|auto|never**

always use NT stores, assume application is memory bound (use with caution!)

auto compiler decides when to use NT stores

never do not use NT stores unless activated by source code directive



1. **Countable**
2. **Single entry and single exit**
3. **Straight line code**
4. **No function calls (exception intrinsic math functions)**

Better performance with:

1. **Simple inner loops with unit stride**
2. **Minimize indirect addressing**
3. **Align data structures (SSE 16 bytes, AVX 32 bytes)**
4. **In C use the restrict keyword for pointers to rule out aliasing**

Obstacles for vectorization:

- **Non-contiguous memory access**
- **Data dependencies**



- Fine-grained control of loop vectorization
- Use `!DEC$` (Fortran) or `#pragma` (C/C++) sentinel to start a compiler directive
- `#pragma vector always`
vectorize even if it seems inefficient (hint!)
- `#pragma novector`
do not vectorize even if possible
- `#pragma vector nontemporal`
use NT stores when allowed (i.e. alignment conditions are met)
- `#pragma vector aligned`
specifies that all array accesses are aligned to 16-byte boundaries
(**DANGEROUS!** You must not lie about this!)



- Starting with Intel Compiler 12.0 the `simd` pragma is available
- `#pragma simd` enforces vectorization where the other pragmas fail
- Prerequisites:
 - Countable loop
 - Innermost loop
 - Must conform to for-loop style of OpenMP worksharing constructs
- There are additional clauses: `reduction`, `vectorlength`, `private`
- Refer to the compiler manual for further details
- **NOTE:** Using the `#pragma simd` the compiler may generate incorrect code if the loop violates the vectorization rules!

```
#pragma simd reduction(+:x)
for (int i=0; i<n; i++) {
    x = x + A[i];
}
```




▪ **Alignment issues**

- Alignment of arrays in SSE calculations should be on 16-byte boundaries to allow packed loads and NT stores (**for Intel processors**)
 - **AMD has a scalar nontemporal store instruction**
- Otherwise the compiler will revert to unaligned loads and not use NT stores – even if you say **vector nontemporal**
- How is manual alignment accomplished?

▪ **Dynamic allocation of aligned memory** (**align = alignment boundary**):

```
#define _XOPEN_SOURCE 600
#include <stdlib.h>

int posix_memalign(void **ptr,
                  size_t align,
                  size_t size);
```



Efficient parallel programming on ccNUMA nodes

Performance characteristics of ccNUMA nodes

First touch placement policy

C++ issues


ccNUMA locality and dynamic scheduling

ccNUMA locality beyond first touch



■ ccNUMA:

- Whole memory is **transparently accessible** by all processors
 - but **physically distributed**
 - with **varying bandwidth and latency**
 - and **potential contention** (shared memory paths)
- **How do we make sure that memory access is always as "local" and "distributed" as possible?**



- Page placement is implemented in units of OS pages (often 4kB, possibly more)



Cray XE6 Interlagos node

4 chips, two sockets, 8 threads per ccNUMA domain



- **ccNUMA map: Bandwidth penalties for remote access**

- Run 8 threads per ccNUMA domain (1 chip)
- Place memory in different domain → 4x4 combinations
- STREAM triad benchmark using nontemporal stores





- **numactl** can influence the way a binary maps its memory pages:

```
numactl --membind=<nodes> a.out      # map pages only on <nodes>
      --preferred=<node> a.out      # map pages on <node>
                                       # and others if <node> is full
      --interleave=<nodes> a.out    # map pages round robin across
                                       # all <nodes>
```

- **Examples:**

```
env OMP_NUM_THREADS=2 numactl --membind=0 --cpunodebind=1 ./stream
```

```
env OMP_NUM_THREADS=4 numactl --interleave=0-3 \  
    likwid-pin -c N:0,4,8,12 ./stream
```

- **But what is the default without numactl?**



- "Golden Rule" of ccNUMA:

A memory page gets mapped into the local memory of the processor that first touches it!

- Except if there is not enough local memory available
- This might be a problem, see later
- **Caveat: "touch" means "write", not "allocate"**
- **Example:**

```
double *huge = (double*)malloc(N*sizeof(double));
```

```
for(i=0; i<N; i++) // or i+=PAGE_SIZE  
    huge[i] = 0.0;
```

Memory not mapped here yet

Mapping takes place here


- **It is sufficient to touch a single item to map the entire page**



- Most simple case: explicit initialization

```
integer,parameter :: N=10000000
double precision A(N), B(N)
```

```
A=0.d0
```



```
!$OMP parallel do
do i = 1, N
  B(i) = function ( A(i) )
end do
!$OMP end parallel do
```

```
integer,parameter :: N=10000000
double precision A(N),B(N)
```

```
!$OMP parallel
!$OMP do schedule(static)
```

```
do i = 1, N
```

```
  A(i)=0.d0
```

```
end do
```

```
!$OMP end do
```

```
...
```

```
!$OMP do schedule(static)
```

```
do i = 1, N
```

```
  B(i) = function ( A(i) )
```

```
end do
```

```
!$OMP end do
```

```
!$OMP end parallel
```





- Sometimes initialization is not so obvious: I/O cannot be easily parallelized, so “localize” arrays before I/O

```
integer,parameter :: N=10000000
double precision A(N), B(N)
```

```
READ(1000) A
```



```
!$OMP parallel do
do i = 1, N
    B(i) = function ( A(i) )
end do
!$OMP end parallel do
```

```
integer,parameter :: N=10000000
double precision A(N),B(N)
```

```
!$OMP parallel
!$OMP do schedule(static)
```

```
do i = 1, N
    A(i)=0.d0
```

```
end do
```

```
!$OMP end do
```

```
!$OMP single
```

```
READ(1000) A
```

```
!$OMP end single
```

```
!$OMP do schedule(static)
```

```
do i = 1, N
```

```
    B(i) = function ( A(i) )
```

```
end do
```

```
!$OMP end do
```

```
!$OMP end parallel
```





- **Required condition: OpenMP loop schedule of initialization must be the same as in all computational loops**
 - Only choice: **static!** Specify **explicitly** on all NUMA-sensitive loops, just to be sure...
 - Imposes some constraints on possible optimizations (e.g. load balancing)
 - Presupposes that all **worksharing loops** with the **same loop length** have the **same thread-chunk mapping**
 - Guaranteed by OpenMP 3.0 only for loops in the same enclosing parallel region and static schedule
 - **In practice, it works** with any compiler even across regions
 - If **dynamic scheduling/tasking** is unavoidable, more advanced methods may be in order
- **How about global objects?**
 - Better not use them
 - If communication vs. computation is favorable, might consider **properly placed copies** of global data
 - In C++, **STL allocators** provide an elegant solution (see hidden slides)



- If your code is cache-bound, you might not notice any locality problems
- Otherwise, bad locality **limits scalability at very low CPU numbers (whenever a node boundary is crossed)**
 - If the code makes good use of the memory interface
 - But there may also be a general problem in your code...
- **Consider using performance counters**
 - **LIKWID-perfctr** can be used to measure nonlocal memory accesses
 - Example for Intel Nehalem (Core i7):

```
env OMP_NUM_THREADS=8 likwid-perfctr -g MEM -C N:0-7 ./a.out
```

Using performance counters for diagnosing bad ccNUMA access locality



Intel Nehalem EP node:

Uncore events only counted once per socket

Event	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5
INSTR_RETIRED_ANY	5.20725e+08	5.24793e+08	5.21547e+08	5.23717e+08	5.28269e+08	5.29083e+08
CPU_CLK_UNHALTED_CORE	1.90447e+09	1.90599e+09	1.90619e+09	1.90673e+09	1.90583e+09	1.90746e+09
UNC_QMC_NORMAL_READS_ANY	8.17606e+07	0	0	0	8.07797e+07	0
UNC_QMC_WRITES_FULL_ANY	5.53837e+07	0	0	0	5.51052e+07	0
UNC_QHL_REQUESTS_REMOTE_READS	6.84504e+07	0	0	0	6.8107e+07	0
UNC_QHL_REQUESTS_LOCAL_READS	6.82751e+07	0	0	0	6.76274e+07	0

RDTSC timing: 0.827196 s

Metric	core 0	core 1	core 2	core 3	core 4	core 5	core 6	core 7
Runtime [s]	0.714167	0.714733	0.71481	0.715013	0.714673	0.715286	0.71486	0.71515
CPI	3.65735	3.63188	3.65488	3.64076	3.60768	3.60521	3.59613	3.60184
Memory bandwidth [MBytes/s]	10610.8	0	0	0	10513.4	0	0	0
Remote Read BW [MBytes/s]	5296	0	0	0	5269.43	0	0	0

Half of read BW comes from other socket!

If all fails...



- Even if all placement rules have been carefully observed, you may still see nonlocal memory traffic. Reasons?
 - Program has **erratic access patterns** → may still achieve some access parallelism (see later)
 - OS has filled memory with **buffer cache data**:


```
# numactl --hardware      # idle node!  
available: 2 nodes (0-1)  
node 0 size: 2047 MB  
node 0 free: 906 MB  
node 1 size: 1935 MB  
node 1 free: 1798 MB
```

```
top - 14:18:25 up 92 days,  6:07,  2 users,  load average: 0.00, 0.02, 0.00  
Mem:   4065564k total, 1149400k used, 2716164k free,   43388k buffers  
Swap:  2104504k total,   2656k used, 2101848k free,  1038412k cached
```



- **OS uses part of main memory for disk buffer (FS) cache**

- If FS cache fills part of memory, apps will probably allocate from foreign domains
- → non-local access!
- “sync” is not sufficient to drop buffer cache blocks



- **Remedies**

- Drop FS cache pages after user job has run (admin’s job)
 - seems to be automatic after aprun has finished on Crays
- User can run “sweeper” code that allocates and touches all physical memory before starting the real application
- numactl tool or aprun can force local allocation (where applicable)
- Linux: There is no way to limit the buffer cache size in standard kernels




Real-world example: ccNUMA and the Linux buffer cache

Benchmark:

1. Write a file of some size from LD0 to disk
2. Perform bandwidth benchmark using all cores in LD0 and maximum memory available in LD0

Result: By default, Buffer cache is given priority over local page placement

→ restrict to local domain if possible!





- Sometimes access patterns are just not nicely grouped into contiguous chunks:

```
double precision :: r, a(M)
!$OMP parallel do private(r)
do i=1,N
  call RANDOM_NUMBER(r)
  ind = int(r * M) + 1
  res(i) = res(i) + a(ind)
enddo
!OMP end parallel do
```

- Or you have to use tasking/dynamic scheduling:

```
!$OMP parallel
!$OMP single
do i=1,N
  call RANDOM_NUMBER(r)
  if(r.le.0.5d0) then
!$OMP task
    call do_work_with(p(i))
!$OMP end task
  endif
enddo
!$OMP end single
!$OMP end parallel
```

- In both cases page placement cannot easily be fixed for perfect parallel access



- Worth a try: **Interleave memory across ccNUMA domains** to get at least some parallel access

- Explicit placement:

```
!$OMP parallel do schedule(static,512)  
do i=1,M  
  a(i) = ...  
enddo  
!$OMP end parallel do
```

Observe page alignment of array to get proper placement!

- Using global control via `numactl`:

```
numactl --interleave=0-3 ./a.out
```

This is for **all** memory, not just the problematic arrays!


- Fine-grained program-controlled placement via **libnuma (Linux)** using, e.g., `numa_alloc_interleaved_subset()`, `numa_alloc_interleaved()` and others


The curse and blessing of interleaved placement:

OpenMP STREAM on a Cray XE6 Interlagos node



- **Parallel init:** Correct parallel initialization
- **LD0:** Force data into LD0 via `numactl -m 0`
- **Interleaved:** `numactl --interleave <LD range>`





Case study: A 3D Jacobi smoother

The basics in two dimensions

Roofline performance analysis and modeling



- Laplace equation in 2D: $\Delta\Phi = 0$
- **Solve** with Dirichlet boundary conditions using Jacobi iteration scheme:

```

double precision, dimension(0:imax+1,0:kmax+1,0:1) :: phi
integer :: t0,t1
t0 = 0 ; t1 = 1
do it = 1,itmax      ! choose suitable number of sweeps
  do k = 1,kmax
    do i = 1,imax
      ! four flops, one store, four loads
      phi(i,k,t1) = ( phi(i+1,k,t0) + phi(i-1,k,t0)
                    + phi(i,k+1,t0) + phi(i,k-1,t0) ) * 0.25
    enddo
  enddo
  ! swap arrays
  i = t0 ; t0=t1 ; t1=i
enddo

```

Reuse when computing
phi(i+2,k,t1)


Naive balance (incl. write allocate):

phi(:, :, t0): 3 LD +
phi(:, :, t1): 1 ST+ 1LD

→ $B_C = 5 W / 4 \text{ FLOPs} = 1.25 W / F$

WRITE ALLOCATE:
LD + ST phi(i, k, t1)

- Modern cache subsystems may further reduce memory traffic
 - “layer conditions”



If cache is large enough to hold at least 2 rows (shaded region): Each $\text{phi}(:, :, t_0)$ is loaded once from main memory and re-used 3 times from cache:

$$\text{phi}(:, :, t_0): 1 \text{ LD} + \text{phi}(:, :, t_1): 1 \text{ ST} + 1 \text{ LD} \\ \rightarrow B_C = 3W / 4F = 0.75W / F$$

If cache is too small to hold one row:

$$\text{phi}(:, :, t_0): 2 \text{ LD} + \text{phi}(:, :, t_1): 1 \text{ ST} + 1 \text{ LD} \\ \rightarrow B_C = 5W / 4F = 1.25W / F$$



- **Alternative implementation (“Macho FLOP version”)**

```
do k = 1, kmax
  do i = 1, imax
    phi(i, k, t1) = 0.25 * phi(i+1, k, t0) + 0.25 * phi(i-1, k, t0)
                  + 0.25 * phi(i, k+1, t0) + 0.25 * phi(i, k-1, t0)
  enddo
enddo
```

- **MFlops/sec increases by 7/4 but time to solution remains the same**
- **Better metric (for many iterative stencil schemes):
Lattice Site Updates per Second (LUPs/sec)**

2D Jacobi example: Compute LUPs/sec metric via

$$P[\text{LUPs/s}] = \frac{i_{t_{\max}} \cdot i_{\max} \cdot k_{\max}}{T_{\text{wall}}}$$



- 3D sweep:

```
do k=1,kmax
  do j=1,jmax
    do i=1,imax
      phi(i,j,k,t1) = 1/6. * (phi(i-1,j,k,t0)+phi(i+1,j,k,t0) &
        + phi(i,j-1,k,t0)+phi(i,j+1,k,t0) &
        + phi(i,j,k-1,t0)+phi(i,j,k+1,t0))
    enddo
  enddo
enddo
```


- Best case balance: 1 LD phi(i,j,k+1,t0)
 1 ST + 1 write allocate phi(i,j,k,t1)
 6 flops

→ $B_C = 0.5 \text{ W/F (24 bytes/LUP)}$

- No 2-layer condition but 2 rows fit: $B_C = 5/6 \text{ W/F (40 bytes/LUP)}$
- Worst case (2 rows do not fit): $B_C = 7/6 \text{ W/F (56 bytes/LUP)}$

3D Jacobi solver

Performance of vanilla code on one Interlagos chip (8 cores)






- We have **made sense** of the **memory-bound performance vs. problem size**
 - “Layer conditions” lead to **predictions of code balance**
 - Achievable memory bandwidth is input parameter

- **The model works only if the bandwidth is “saturated”**
 - In-cache modeling is more involved


- **Optimization == reducing the code balance by code transformations**
 - See below



Data access optimizations

Case study: Optimizing the 3D Jacobi solver


Remember the 3D Jacobi solver on Interlagos?





Assumptions:

- cache can hold 32 elements (16 for each array)
- Cache line size is 4 elements
- Perfect eviction strategy for source array




This element is needed for three more updates; but 29 updates happen before this element is used for the last time



Assumptions:


- cache can hold 32 elements (16 for each array)
- Cache line size is 4 elements
- Perfect eviction strategy for source array



This element is needed for three more updates but has been evicted




- divide system into blocks
- update block after block
- same performance as if three complete rows of the systems fit into cache





- **Spatial blocking reorders traversal of data to account for the data update rule of the code**
- **Elements stay sufficiently long in cache to be fully reused**
- **Spatial blocking improves temporal locality!**
(Continuous access in inner loop ensures spatial locality)



This element remains in cache until it is fully used (only 6 updates happen before last use of this element)



Implementation:

```
do ioffset=1,imax,iblock
  do joffset=1,jmax,jblock
    do k=1,kmax
      do j=joffset, min(jmax,joffset+jblock-1)
        do i=ioffset, min(imax,ioffset+iblock-1)
          phi(i,j,k,t1) = ( phi(i-1,j,k,t0)+phi(i+1,j,k,t0)
                        + ... + phi(i,j,k-1,t0)+phi(i,j,k+1,t0) )/6.d0
        enddo
      enddo
    enddo
  enddo
enddo
```

Diagram annotations:


- A yellow box labeled "loop over i-blocks" has a line pointing to the `do ioffset=1,imax,iblock` line.
- A yellow box labeled "loop over j-blocks" has a line pointing to the `do joffset=1,jmax,jblock` line.

Guidelines:

- Blocking of inner loop levels (traversing continuously through main memory)
- **Blocking sizes** large enough to fulfill “**layer condition**”
- Cache size is a hard limit!
- Blocking loops may have some impact on ccNUMA page placement

3D Jacobi solver (problem size 400^3)

Blocking different loop levels (8 cores Interlagos)



3D Jacobi solver (problem size 400^3)

Calculating the optimal block size (8 cores Interlagos)




- Interlagos chip: **aggregate L2 size of 8 MB (say 4 MB to be safe)**
- **Static OpenMP scheduling \rightarrow 0.5 MB cache per core**
- **Layer condition with j-loop blocking:**

2 layers of size $N \times b_j$ must fit into the cache

$\rightarrow 2 \cdot N \cdot b_j \cdot 8 \text{ byte} < 0.5 \text{ MB}$

$\rightarrow b_j < 78$





- **Intel x86:** NT stores are **packed SIMD** stores with **16-byte aligned** address
 - Sometimes hard to apply
- **AMD x86:** **Scalar NT** stores **without alignment** restrictions available
- **Options for using NT stores**
 - Let the compiler decide → unreliable
 - Use compiler options
 - Intel: `-opt-streaming-stores never|always|auto`
 - Use compiler directives
 - Intel: `!DIR$ vector [non]temporal`
 - Cray: `!DIR$ LOOP_INFO cache[_nt](...)`
- **Compiler must be able to “prove” that the use of SIMD and NT stores is “safe”!**
 - “**line update kernel**” concept: Make critical loop its own subroutine



- **Line update kernel (separate compilation unit or `-fno-inline`):**


```
subroutine jacobi_line(d,s,top,bottom,front,back,n)
  integer :: n,i,start
  double precision, dimension(*) :: d,s,top,bottom,front,back
  double precision, parameter :: oos=1.d0/6.d0
  !DIR$ LOOP_INFO cache_nt(d)
  do i=2,n-1
    d(i) = oos*(s(i-1)+s(i+1)+top(i)+bottom(i)+front(i)+back(i))
  enddo
end subroutine
```

- **Main loop:**

```
do joffset=1,jmax,jblock
  do k=1,kmax
    do j=joffset, min(jmax,joffset+jblock-1)
      call jacobi_line(phi(1,j,k,t1),phi(1,j,k,t0),phi(1,j,k-1,t0), &
        phi(1,j,k+1,t0),phi(1,j-1,k,t0),phi(1,j+1,k,t0)
        ,size)
    enddo
  enddo
enddo
```


3D Jacobi solver

Spatial blocking + nontemporal stores





- **“What part of the data comes from where”** is a crucial question
- **Avoiding slow data paths == re-establishing the layer condition**
- **Improved code showed the speedup predicted by the model**
- **Optimal blocking factor can be predicted**
 - Be guided by the cache size the layer condition
 - No need for exhaustive scan of “optimization space”




**Case study:
OpenMP-parallel sparse matrix-vector
multiplication**

**A simple (but sometimes not-so-simple)
example for bandwidth-bound code and
saturation effects in memory**


Sparse matrix-vector multiply (spMVM)




- Key ingredient in some matrix diagonalization algorithms
 - Lanczos, Davidson, Jacobi-Davidson
- Important for sparse solvers (CG,...)
- **Store only N_{nz} nonzero elements** of matrix and RHS, LHS vectors with N_r (number of matrix rows) entries
- **“Sparse”**: $N_{nz} \sim N_r$



CRS matrix storage scheme



- `val[]` stores all the nonzeros (length N_{nz})
- `col_idx[]` stores the column index of each nonzero (length N_{nz})
- `row_ptr[]` stores the starting index of each new row in `val[]` (length: N_r)



Case study: Sparse matrix-vector multiply



- Important kernel in many applications (matrix diagonalization, solving linear systems)
- **Strongly memory-bound for large data sets**
 - Streaming + partially indirect access:

```
!$OMP parallel do
do i = 1, Nr
  do j = row_ptr(i), row_ptr(i+1) - 1
    c(i) = c(i) + val(j) * b(col_idx(j))
  enddo
enddo
!$OMP end parallel do
```


- Usually many spMVMs required to solve a problem
- **Following slides: Performance data on one 24-core AMD Magny Cours node**



- **Data storage format is crucial for performance properties**
 - Most useful general format: Compressed Row Storage (**CRS**)
 - SpMVM is **easily parallelizable** in shared and distributed memory

- **For large problems, spMVM is inevitably memory-bound**
 - **Intra-LD saturation effect** on modern multicores
- **Problem for Roofline**
 - Possibly erratic (non-streaming) access
 - Memory BW saturates @ lower value than with simple benchmarks

- **MPI-parallel spMVM is often communication-bound**





- **Sparse MVM in double precision w/ CRS data storage:**

```

do i = 1, Nr
  do j = row_ptr(i), row_ptr(i+1) - 1
    C(i) = C(i) + val(j) * B(col_idx(j))
  enddo
enddo
    
```

- **DP CRS comp. intensity**

- κ quantifies extra traffic for loading RHS more than once

$$\begin{aligned}
 I_{\text{CRS}} &= \frac{2}{12 + 24/N_{\text{nzr}} + \kappa} \frac{\text{Flops}}{\text{Byte}} \\
 &= \left(6 + \frac{12}{N_{\text{nzr}}} + \frac{\kappa}{2} \right)^{-1} \frac{\text{Flops}}{\text{Byte}}
 \end{aligned}$$

- Predicted Performance = $b_S \cdot I_{\text{CRS}}$
- Determine κ by measuring performance and actual memory bandwidth
- **“If the model does not work we can still learn something from deviations”**


G. Schubert, H. Fehske, G. Hager, and G. Wellein: Hybrid-parallel sparse matrix-vector multiplication with explicit communication overlap on current multicore-based systems. *Parallel Processing Letters* 21(3), 339-358 (2011). DOI: [10.1142/S0129626411000254](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0129626411000254), Preprint: [arXiv:1106.5908](https://arxiv.org/abs/1106.5908)

Application: Sparse matrix-vector multiply


Strong scaling on one XE6 Magny-Cours node



Case 1: Large matrix



**Intrsocket
bandwidth
bottleneck**



Application: Sparse matrix-vector multiply


Strong scaling on one XE6 Magny-Cours node



Case 2: Medium size



Intrasocket bandwidth bottleneck






Case 3: Small size



No bandwidth bottleneck



Parallelization overhead dominates



- spMVM shows **“typical” bandwidth-bound** scaling behavior
- **Roofline is good for a first shot at modeling**
- **Deviations are to be expected**
 - Erratic RHS access
 - Saturation bandwidth is lower than the maximum
- **Deviations can be used to learn more about the code execution**
 - How much excess memory traffic is generated from the indirect access?



**There is no alternative to knowing what is going on
between your code and the hardware**

**Without performance modeling,
optimizing code is like stumbling in the dark**