

Memory Subsystem Performance and QuadCore Predictions

John Shalf
SDSA Team Leader
jshalf@lbl.gov

NERSC User Group Meeting
September 17, 2007

BERKELEY LAB

NERSC

Office of Science
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Memory Performance is Key

Ever-growing processor-memory performance gap



- **Total chip performance following Moore's Law**
- **Increasing concern that memory bandwidth may cap overall performance**

Concerns about Multicore

- **Memory Bandwidth Starvation**
  - ***"Multicore puts us on the wrong side of the memory wall. Will CMP ultimately be asphyxiated by the memory wall?"*** **Thomas Sterling**
  - **While true, multicore has not introduced a *new* problem**
    - **"memory wall" first described in 1994 paper by Sally McKee et al. about uniprocessors**
    - **Bandwidth gap matches historical trends FLOPs on chip doubles every 18months (just by different means)**
  - **Regardless it is a worthy concern**

CCSM3 FVCAM Performance





- FVCAM (atmospheric component of climate model) *OBVIOUSLY* correlated with memory bandwidth
- More memory bandwidth means more performance!
- So my theory is "If I move from single-core to dual-core, my performance should drop proportional to effective memory bandwidth delivered to each core!" *(right?)*

CAM on Power5+

(test our memory bandwidth theory)





- [illegible] (turn off timers for MPI operations)
- 2% performance drop (per core) when moving from 1-2 cores
- Does not meet expectations
  - Perhaps the Power5 is weird… Lets try another processor to support my theory

CAM on AMD Opteron





- 3% drop in performance going from single to dual core
  - Still not what I wanted
  - Need to find application to support my theory
  - Lets look at a broad spectrum of applications!

NERSC SSP Applications



NERSC SSP Applications





- **Still 10% drop on average when halving memory bandwidth!**
  - **#$%^&* application developers write crummy code!**
  - **Lets pick an application that *I KNOW* is memory bandwidth bound!**

Lets Try SpMV

- Perhaps full application codes are a bad example
- Lets try a kernel like SpMV
  - Should be memory bound!
  - Small kernel
- Highly optimized to maximize memory performance
  - Hand coded (sometimes in asm) by highly motivated GSRA
  - Carefully crafted prefetch
  - Exhaustive search for optimal block size
  - Auto-search for optimal blocking strategy!

For finite element problem (BCSR)
[Im, Yelick, Vuduc, 2005]



Example: Sparse Matrix * Vector

Name	Clovertown	Opteron	Cell
Chips*Cores	2*4 = 8	2*2 = 4	1*8 = 8
Architecture	4-/3-issue, SSE, OOO, caches, prefetch		2-VLIW, SIMD, local store, DMA
Clock Rate	2.3 GHz	2.2 GHz	3.2 GHz
Peak MemBW	21.3 GB/s	21.3	25.6 GB/s
SPMv MemBW			
Efficiency %			
Peak GFLOPS	75	18	15 (DP Fl. Pt.)
SPMv GFLOPS			
Efficiency %			

Example: Sparse Matrix * Vector

Name	Clovertown	Opteron	Cell
Chips*Cores	2*4 = 8	2*2 = 4	1*8 = 8
Architecture	4-/3-issue, SSE, OOO, caches, prefetch		2-VLIW, SIMD, local store, DMA
Clock Rate	2.3 GHz	2.2 GHz	3.2 GHz
Peak MemBW	21.3 GB/s	21.3	25.6 GB/s
SPMv MemBW			
Efficiency %			
Peak GFLOPS	75	18	15 (DP Fl. Pt.)
SPMv GFLOPS	1.5	1.9	3.4
Efficiency %	2%	11%	23%

Example: Sparse Matrix * Vector

Name	Clovertown	Opteron	Cell
Chips*Cores	2*4 = 8	2*2 = 4	1*8 = 8
Architecture	4-/3-issue, SSE, OOO, caches, prefetch		2-VLIW, SIMD, local store, DMA
Clock Rate	2.3 GHz	2.2 GHz	3.2 GHz
Peak MemBW	21.3 GB/s	21.3	25.6 GB/s
SPMv MemBW	7.5 GB/s	10.0	22.5 GB/s
Efficiency %	35%	47%	88%
Peak GFLOPS	75	18	15 (DP Fl. Pt.)
SPMv GFLOPS	1.5	1.9	3.4
Efficiency %	2%	11%	23%

What the is going on here!?!

- Cannot find data to support my conclusion!
  - And it was a good conclusion!
  - Theory was proved conclusively by correlation to memory bandwidth shown on slide #1!
- Correlations do not guarantee causality
  - Consumption of memory bandwidth limited by ability to tolerate latency!
  - Vendors sized memory bandwidth to match what processor core could consume (2nd order effect manufactured a correlation)

Short Diversion about Latency Hiding

- Little's Law: bandwidth * latency = concurrency
  - bandwidth * latency = #outstanding_memory_fetches
- For Power5+ single-core (theoretical):
  - 120ns * 25 Gigabytes/sec
  - 3000 bytes of data in flight (375 DP operands)
  - 23.4 cache lines (very close to 24 RCQ depth on Power5)
  - 375 operands must be in flight to balance Little's Law!
    - But I only have only 32 FP registers
    - Even with OOO, only ~100 FP shadow registers, and instruction reordering window is only ~100
    - Means, must depend on prefetch (375 operand prefetch depth)
- Various ways to manipulate memory fetch concurrency
  - 2x memory bandwidth: Need 6000 bytes/flight
  - 2x cores: Each only needs 1500 bytes/flight
  - 2 threads/core: Each needs 750 bytes/flight
  - 128 slower cores/threads?: 24 bytes in flight (3 DP words)
  - Vectors *(not SIMD!):* 64-128 words per vec load (1024 bytes)
  - Software Controlled Memory: multi-kilobytes/DMA (eg. Cell, ViVA)
- Need mem queue depth performance counter!

STREAM

	1 Core XT3	1 Core XT4	2 Core XT3	2 Core XT4
Copy:	5137	8196	2345	4074
Scale:	5067	7257	2348	4012
Add:	4734	7482	2309	3469
Triad:	4135	7464	2310	3626



Membench



Membench results for XT3 and XT4 indicate primary source of contention is memory bandwidth (no signs of resource contention when data fits on-chip).

Estimating Quad-Core Performance

- **Assumptions**
  - Memory bandwidth is the only contended resource
  - Can break down execution time into portion that is stalled on shared resources (*memory bandwidth*) and portion that is stalled on non-shared resources (*everything else*)
  - Estimate time spent on memory contention from XT3 single/dual core studies
  - Estimate # bytes moved in memory-contended zone
  - Extrapolate to XT4 based on increased memory bandwidth
    - Use to validate model
  - Extrapolate to quad-core

Estimating Quad-Core Performance

Cray XT3 Opteron@2.6Ghz DDR400



Execution Time

Estimating Quad-Core Performance

Cray XT3 Opteron@2.6Ghz DDR400



Estimating Quad-Core Performance



Estimating Quad-Core Performance



Error

MILC Prediction for XT4 SC=134s

actual = 127s

error = 5%

MILC Prediction for XT4 DC = 178s

actual = 181s

error = 1.5%

Testing the Performance Model



- **Reasonably accurate prediction of XT4 performance by plugging XT3 data into the analytic model**

Memory Contention



"Other" may include *anything* that isn't memory bandwidth) (eg. latency stalls, Integer or FP arithmetic, I/O.)

Refining Model for FLOPs

- Opteron Quad-core enhanced FPU
  - Each core has 2x the FLOP rate/cycle of the dual-core Rev. F implementation
  - Need to take into account how much performance may improve with 2x improvement in FLOP rate
- Approach
  - Count # flops performed per core
  - Estimate max total execution time spent in FLOPs assuming no overlap with other operations by dividing by peak flop rate on current FPU
  - Project for 2x faster FPU by halving that contribution to the overall exec time
- Result is the *maximum* possible improvement that could be derived from 2x FPU rate improvement

Contribution of FLOPs to exec time for NERSC SSP apps



Contribution of FLOPs to exec time for NERSC SSP apps



Cut FP contribution in half for 2x faster FPU.

Quad Core Prediction



- **Conclusion: between 1.7x and 2.0x sustained performance improvement on NERSC SSP applications if we move from dual-core to quad-core**
  - **This is less than half the 4x peak performance improvement (but who cares about peak?)**
  - **But nearly 2x improvement is pretty good nonetheless (it matches the Moore's law lithography improvement)**
  - **All of these conclusions are contingent on availability of 2.6GHz quad-core delivery**

Conclusions for Quadcore Performance Estimation

- Application codes see modest impact from move to dual-core (10.3% avg)
  - Exception is MILC, which is more dependent on memory bandwidth due to aggressive use of prefetch
  - Indicates most application performance bounded by other bottlenecks (memory latency stalls for instance)
- Most of the time is spent in "other" category
  - Could be integer address arithmetic
  - Could also be stalled on memory latency (could not launch enough concurrent memory requests to balance Little's Law.
  - Could be Floating point performance
- Next generation x86 processors will double the FP execution rate
  - How much of "other" is FLOPs?