CSC 2224: Parallel Computer Architecture and Programming Parallel Processing, Multicores

Prof. Gennady Pekhimenko
University of Toronto
Fall 2019

The content of this lecture is adapted from the lectures of Onur Mutlu @ CMU

Summary

- Parallelism
- Multiprocessing fundamentals
- Amdahl's Law

- Why Multicores?
  - Alternatives
  - Examples

Flynn's Taxonomy of Computers

- Mike Flynn, "Very High-Speed Computing Systems," Proc. of IEEE, 1966
- SISD: Single instruction operates on single data element
- SIMD: Single instruction operates on multiple data elements
  - Array processor
  - Vector processor
- MISD: Multiple instructions operate on single data element
  - Closest form: systolic array processor, streaming processor
- MIMD: Multiple instructions operate on multiple data elements (multiple instruction streams)
  - Multiprocessor
  - Multithreaded processor

Why Parallel Computers?

- Parallelism: Doing multiple things at a time
- Things: instructions, operations, tasks
- Main Goal: Improve performance (Execution time or task throughput)
    - Execution time of a program governed by Amdahl's Law
- Other Goals
  - Reduce power consumption
    - (4N units at freq F/4) consume less power than (N units at freq F)
    - Why?
  - Improve cost efficiency and scalability, reduce complexity
    - Harder to design a single unit that performs as well as N simpler units

Types of Parallelism & How to Exploit Them

- Instruction Level Parallelism
  - Different instructions within a stream can be executed in parallel
  - Pipelining, out-of-order execution, speculative execution, VLIW
  - Dataflow
- Data Parallelism
  - Different pieces of data can be operated on in parallel
  - SIMD: Vector processing, array processing
  - Systolic arrays, streaming processors
- Task Level Parallelism
  - Different “tasks/threads” can be executed in parallel
  - Multithreading
  - Multiprocessing (multi-core)

Task-Level Parallelism

- Partition a single problem into multiple related tasks (threads)
  - Explicitly: Parallel programming
    - Easy when tasks are natural in the problem
    - Difficult when natural task boundaries are unclear
  - Transparently/implicitly: Thread level speculation
    - Partition a single thread speculatively
- Run many independent tasks (processes) together
  - Easy when there are many processes
    - Batch simulations, different users, cloud computing
  - Does not improve the performance of a single task

Multiprocessing Fundamentals

Multiprocessor Types

- Loosely coupled multiprocessors
  - No shared global memory address space
  - Multicomputer network
    - Network-based multiprocessors
  - Usually programmed via message passing
    - Explicit calls (send, receive) for communication

Multiprocessor Types (2)

- Tightly coupled multiprocessors
  - Shared global memory address space
  - Traditional multiprocessing: symmetric multiprocessing (SMP)
    - Existing multi-core processors, multithreaded processors
  - Programming model similar to uniprocessors (i.e., multitasking uniprocessor) except
    - Operations on shared data require synchronization

Main Issues in Tightly-Coupled MP

- Shared memory synchronization
  - Locks, atomic operations
- Cache consistency
  - More commonly called cache coherence
- Ordering of memory operations
  - What should the programmer expect the hardware to provide?
- Resource sharing, contention, partitioning
- Communication: Interconnection networks
- Load imbalance

Metrics of Multiprocessors

Parallel Speedup

Time to execute the program with 1 processor

divided by

Time to execute the program with N processors

Parallel Speedup Example

- $a_4x^4 + a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0$
- Assume each operation 1 cycle, no communication cost, each op can be executed in a different processor
- How fast is this with a single processor?
  - Assume no pipelining or concurrent execution of instructions

$$R = a_4x^4 + a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0$$

Single processor : 11 operations (draw the data flow graphs)



$T_1 = 11$ cycles

Parallel Speedup Example

- $a_4x^4 + a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0$
- Assume each operation 1 cycle, no communication cost, each op can be executed in a different processor
- How fast is this with a single processor?
  - Assume no pipelining or concurrent execution of instructions
- *How fast is this with 3 processors?*

$$R = a_4x^4 + a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0$$

Three processors : T_3 (exec. time with 3 proc.)



$T_3 = \underline{5 \text{ cycles}}$

Speedup with 3 Processors

$T_3 = 5$ cycles

Speedup with 3 processors $= \frac{11}{5} = 2.2$

$\left(\frac{T_1}{T_3}\right)$

Is this a fair comparison?

Revisiting the Single-Processor

Revisit T_1

Better single-processor algorithm:

$$R = a_4 x^4 + a_3 x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_1 x + a_0$$

$$R = (((a_4 x + a_3) x + a_2) x + a_1) x + a_0$$

(Horner's method)

Horner, "A new method of solving numerical equations of all orders, by continuous approximation," Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society, 1819.



$T_1 = 8$ cycles

Speedup with 3 procs. $= \frac{T_1^{best}}{T_3^{best}} = \frac{8}{5} = \underline{\underline{1.6}}$

(not 2.2)

Takeaway

- To calculate parallel speedup fairly you need to use the best known algorithm for each system with N processors

- If not, you can get superlinear speedup

Superlinear Speedup

- Can speedup be greater than P with P processing elements?
- Consider:
  - Cache effects
  - Memory effects
  - Working set
- Happens in two ways:
  - Unfair comparisons
  - Memory effects



Redundancy: How much extra work due to multiprocessing

$$R = \frac{\text{Ops with } p \text{ proc.}^{best}}{\text{Ops with 1 proc.}^{best}} = \frac{10}{8}$$

R is always ≥ 1

Efficiency: How much resource we use compared to how much resource we can get away with

$$E = \frac{1 \cdot T_1^{best}}{p \cdot T_p^{best}}$$

(tying up 1 proc for T_p time units)

(tying up p proc. for T_p time units)

$$= \frac{8}{15} \qquad \left(E = \frac{U}{R} \right)$$

Caveats of Parallelism (I)



Why the reality? (diminishing returns)

$$T_p = \alpha \cdot \frac{T_1}{p} + (1-\alpha) \cdot T_1$$

α: parallelizable part/fraction of the single-processor program

$(1-\alpha)$: non-parallelizable part

Amdahl's Law



Amdahl, "Validity of the single processor approach to achieving large scale computing capabilities," AFIPS 1967.

Amdahl's Law

- f: Parallelizable fraction of a program
- P: Number of processors

$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{1}{1 - f + \frac{f}{P}}$$

- Maximum speedup limited by serial portion: Serial bottleneck

Amdahl's Law Implication 1



Amdahl's Law Implication 2



Why the Sequential Bottleneck?



- Parallel machines have the sequential bottleneck
- Main cause: Non-parallelizable operations on data (e.g. non-parallelizable loops)

```
for ( i = 0 ; i < N; i++)
        A[i] = (A[i] + A[i-1]) / 2
```

- Single thread prepares data and spawns parallel tasks

Another Example of Sequential Bottleneck



(a)



Caveats of Parallelism (II)

- Amdahl's Law
  - f: Parallelizable fraction of a program
  - P: Number of processors

$$\text{Speedup} = \frac{1}{(1 - f) + \frac{f}{P}}$$

- Parallel portion is usually not perfectly parallel
  - Synchronization overhead (e.g., updates to shared data)
  - Load imbalance overhead (imperfect parallelization)
  - Resource sharing overhead (contention among N processors)

Bottlenecks in Parallel Portion

- Synchronization: Operations manipulating shared data cannot be parallelized
  - Locks, mutual exclusion, barrier synchronization
  - Communication: Tasks may need values from each other
- Load Imbalance: Parallel tasks may have different lengths
  - Due to imperfect parallelization or microarchitectural effects
  - Reduces speedup in parallel portion
- Resource Contention: Parallel tasks can share hardware resources, delaying each other
  - Replicating all resources (e.g., memory) expensive
  - Additional latency not present when each task runs alone

Difficulty in Parallel Programming

- Little difficulty if parallelism is natural
  - "Embarrassingly parallel" applications
  - Multimedia, physical simulation, graphics
  - Large web servers, databases?
- Big difficulty is in
  - Harder to parallelize algorithms
  - Getting parallel programs to work correctly
  - Optimizing performance in the presence of bottlenecks
- Much of **parallel computer architecture** is about
  - Designing machines that overcome the sequential and parallel bottlenecks to achieve higher performance and efficiency
  - Making programmer's job easier in writing correct and high-performance parallel programs

Parallel and Serial Bottlenecks

- How do you alleviate some of the serial and parallel bottlenecks in a multi-core processor?
- We will return to this question in future lectures
- Reading list:
  - Annavaram et al., "Mitigating Amdahl's Law Through EPI Throttling," ISCA 2005.
  - Suleman et al., "Accelerating Critical Section Execution with Asymmetric Multi-Core Architectures," ASPLOS 2009.
  - Joao et al., "Bottleneck Identification and Scheduling in Multithreaded Applications," ASPLOS 2012.
  - Ipek et al., "Core Fusion: Accommodating Software Diversity in Chip Multiprocessors," ISCA 2007.

Multicores

Moore's Law



Moore, "Cramming more components onto integrated circuits," Electronics, 1965.


Microprocessor Transistor Counts 1971-2011 & Moore's Law
Transistor count
2,600,000,000
1,000,000,000
100,000,000
10,000,000
1,000,000
100,000
10,000
2,300
1971
1980
1990
2000
2011
Date of introduction
curve shows transistor count doubling every two years
16-Core SPARC T3
Six-Core Core i7
Six-Core Xeon 7400
10-Core Xeon Westmere-EX
Dual-Core Itanium 2
8-core POWER7
Quad-core z196
AMD K10
Quad-Core Itanium Tukwila
POWER6
8-Core Xeon Nehalem-EX
Itanium 2 with 9MB cache
Six-Core Opteron 2400
AMD K10
Core i7 (Quad)
Core 2 Duo
Cell
Itanium 2
AMD K8
Barton
Atom
Pentium 4
AMD K7
AMD K6-III
AMD K6
Pentium III
Pentium II
AMD K5
Pentium
80486
80386
80286
68000
80186
8086
8088
8085
6800
6809
8080
Z80
8008
MOS 6502
4004
RCA 1802

Multi-Core

- Idea: Put multiple processors on the same die

- Technology scaling (Moore's Law) enables more transistors to be placed on the same die area
- What else could you do with the die area you dedicate to multiple processors?
  - Have a bigger, more powerful core
  - Have larger caches in the memory hierarchy
  - Simultaneous multithreading
  - Integrate platform components on chip (e.g., network interface, memory controllers)
  - …

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Bigger, more powerful single core
  - Larger superscalar issue width, larger instruction window, more execution units, large trace caches, large branch predictors, etc

+ Improves single-thread performance transparently to programmer, compiler

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Bigger, more powerful single core

  - Very difficult to design (Scalable algorithms for improving single-thread performance elusive)
  - Power hungry – many out-of-order execution structures consume significant power/area when scaled. Why?
  - Diminishing returns on performance
  - Does not significantly help memory-bound application performance (Scalable algorithms for this elusive)

Large Superscalar+OoO vs. MultiCore

- Olukotun et al., "The Case for a Single-Chip Multiprocessor," ASPLOS 1996.



Figure 2. Floorplan for the six-issue dynamic superscalar microprocessor.



Figure 3. Floorplan for the four-way single-chip multiprocessor.

Multi-Core vs. Large Superscalar+OoO

- Multi-core advantages
  - + Simpler cores more power efficient, lower complexity, easier to design and replicate, higher frequency (shorter wires, smaller structures)
  - + Higher system throughput on multiprogrammed workloads reduced context switches
  - + Higher system performance in parallel applications

Multi-Core vs. Large Superscalar+OoO

- Multi-core disadvantages
  - Requires parallel tasks/threads to improve performance (parallel programming)
  - Resource sharing can reduce single-thread performance
  - Shared hardware resources need to be managed
  - Number of pins limits data supply for increased demand

Comparison Points…

	6-way SS	4x2-way MP
# of CPUs	1	4
Degree superscalar	6	4 x 2
# of architectural registers	32int / 32fp	4 x 32int / 32fp
# of physical registers	160int / 160fp	4 x 40int / 40fp
# of integer functional units	3	4 x 1
# of floating pt. functional units	3	4 x 1
# of load/store ports	8 (one per bank)	4 x 1
BTB size	2048 entries	4 x 512 entries
Return stack size	32 entries	4 x 8 entries
Instruction issue queue size	128 entries	4 x 8 entries
I cache	32 KB, 2-way S.A.	4 x 8 KB, 2-way S.A.
D cache	32 KB, 2-way S.A.	4 x 8 KB, 2-way S.A.
L1 hit time	2 cycles (4 ns)	1 cycle (2 ns)
L1 cache interleaving	8 banks	N/A
Unified L2 cache	256 KB, 2-way S.A.	256 KB, 2-way S.A.
L2 hit time / L1 penalty	4 cycles (8 ns)	5 cycles (10 ns)
Memory latency / L2 penalty	50 cycles (100 ns)	50 cycles (100 ns)

Table 1. Key characteristics of the two microarchitectures

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Bigger caches

  + Improves single-thread performance transparently to programmer, compiler
  + Simple to design

  - Diminishing single-thread performance returns from cache size. Why?
  - Multiple levels complicate memory hierarchy

Cache vs. Core



Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: (Simultaneous) Multithreading
  - + Exploits thread-level parallelism (just like multi-core)
  - + Good single-thread performance with SMT
  - + No need to have an entire core for another thread
  - + Parallel performance aided by tight sharing of caches

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: (Simultaneous) Multithreading
  - Scalability is limited: need bigger register files, larger issue width (and associated costs) to have many threads □? complex with many threads
  - Parallel performance limited by shared fetch bandwidth
  - Extensive resource sharing at the pipeline and memory system reduces both single-thread and parallel application performance

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Integrate platform components on chip instead

  + Speeds up many system functions (e.g., network interface cards, Ethernet controller, memory controller, I/O controller)

  - Not all applications benefit (e.g., CPU intensive code sections)

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Traditional symmetric multiprocessors

  + Smaller die size (for the same processing core)
  + More memory bandwidth (no pin bottleneck)
  + Fewer shared resources □ less contention between threads

Why Multi-Core?

- Alternative: Traditional symmetric multiprocessors

  - Long latencies between cores (need to go off chip) → shared data accesses limit performance → parallel application scalability is limited
  - Worse resource efficiency due to less sharing → worse power/energy efficiency

Why Multi-Core?

- Other alternatives?
  - Clustering?
  - Dataflow? EDGE?
  - Vector processors (SIMD)?
  - Integrating DRAM on chip?
  - Reconfigurable logic? (general purpose?)

Review next week

- "Exploiting ILP, TLP, and DLP with the polymorphous TRIPS architecture", K. Sankaralingam, ISCA 2003.

Summary: Multi-Core Alternatives

- Bigger, more powerful single core
- Bigger caches
- (Simultaneous) multithreading
- Integrate platform components on chip instead
- More scalable superscalar, out-of-order engines
- Traditional symmetric multiprocessors
- And more!

Multicore Examples

Multiple Cores on Chip

- Simpler and lower power than a single large core
- Large scale parallelism on chip



AMD Barcelona
4 cores



Intel Core i7
8 cores



IBM Cell BE
8+1 cores



IBM POWER7
8 cores



Sun Niagara II
8 cores



Nvidia Fermi
448 “cores”



Intel SCC
48 cores, networked



Tilera TILE Gx
100 cores, networked

With Multiple Cores on Chip

- What we want:
  - N times the performance with N times the cores when we parallelize an application on N cores

- What we get:
  - Amdahl's Law (serial bottleneck)
  - Bottlenecks in the parallel portion

The Problem: Serialized Code Sections

- Many parallel programs cannot be parallelized completely
- Causes of serialized code sections
  - Sequential portions (Amdahl's "serial part")
  - Critical sections
  - Barriers
  - Limiter stages in pipelined programs
- Serialized code sections
  - Reduce performance
  - Limit scalability
  - Waste energy

Demands in Different Code Sections

- What we want:
- In a serialized code section one powerful “large” core
- In a parallel code section many wimpy “small” cores
- These two conflict with each other:
  - If you have a single powerful core, you cannot have many cores
  - A small core is much more energy and area efficient than a large core

“Large” vs. “Small” Cores



- *Out-of-order*
- *Wide fetch e.g. 4-wide*
- *Deeper pipeline*
- *Aggressive branch predictor (e.g. hybrid)*
- *Multiple functional units*
- *Trace cache*
- *Memory dependence speculation*

- *In-order*
- *Narrow Fetch e.g. 2-wide*
- *Shallow pipeline*
- *Simple branch predictor (e.g. Gshare)*
- *Few functional units*

Large Cores are power inefficient:
e.g., 2x performance for 4x area (power)

Meet Small: Sun Niagara (UltraSPARC T1)

- Kongetira et al., "Niagara: A 32-Way Multithreaded SPARC Processor," IEEE Micro 2005.



Niagara Core

- 4-way fine-grain multithreaded, 6-stage, dual-issue in-order
- Round robin thread selection (unless cache miss)
- Shared FP unit among cores



Niagara Design Point

Table 1. Commercial server applications.

Benchmark	Application category	Instruction-level parallelism	Thread-level parallelism	Working set	Data sharing
Web99	Web server	Low	High	Large	Low
JBB	Java application server	Low	High	Large	Medium
TPC-C	Transaction processing	Low	High	Large	High
SAP-2T	Enterprise resource planning	Medium	High	Medium	Medium
SAP-3T	Enterprise resource planning	Low	High	Large	High
TPC-H	Decision support system	High	High	Large	Medium



Meet Small: Sun Niagara II (UltraSPARC T2)



- 8 SPARC cores, 8 threads/core. 8 stages. 16 KB I$ per Core. 8 KB D$ per Core. FP, Graphics, Crypto, units per Core.
- 4 MB Shared L2, 8 banks, 16-way set associative.
- 4 dual-channel FBDIMM memory controllers.
- X8 PCI-Express @ 2.5 Gb/s.
- Two 10G Ethernet ports @ 3.125 Gb/s.

Meet Small, but Larger: Sun ROCK

- Chaudhry et al., "Simultaneous Speculative Threading: A Novel Pipeline Architecture Implemented in Sun's ROCK Processor," ISCA 2009
- Goals:
  - Maximize throughput when threads are available
  - Boost single-thread performance when threads are not available and on cache misses
- Ideas:
  - Runahead on a cache miss ? ahead thread executes miss-independent instructions, behind thread executes dependent instructions
  - Branch prediction (gshare)

Sun ROCK



- 16 cores, 2 threads per core (fewer threads than Niagara 2)
- 4 cores share a 32KB instruction cache
- 2 cores share a 32KB data cache
- 2MB L2 cache (smaller than Niagara 2)

More Powerful Cores in Sun ROCK



Figure 9: Commercial Performance.

Meet Large: IBM POWER4

- Tendler et al., "POWER4 system microarchitecture," IBM J R&D, 2002.

- Another symmetric multi-core chip…
- But, fewer and more powerful cores





IBM POWER4

- 2 cores, out-of-order execution
- 100-entry instruction window in each core
- 8-wide instruction fetch, issue, execute
- Large, local+global hybrid branch predictor
- 1.5MB, 8-way L2 cache
- Aggressive stream based prefetching

IBM POWER5

- Kalla et al., "IBM Power5 Chip: A Dual-Core Multithreaded Processor," IEEE Micro 2004.



Figure 4. Power5 instruction data flow (BXU = branch execution unit and CRL = condition register logical execution unit).

Large, but Smaller: IBM POWER6

- Le et al., "IBM POWER6 microarchitecture," IBM J R&D, 2007.

- 2 cores, in order, high frequency (4.7 GHz)
- 8 wide fetch
- Simultaneous multithreading in each core
- Runahead execution in each core
  - Similar to Sun ROCK



Many More…

- Wimpy nodes: Tilera
- Asymmetric multicores
- DVFS

Computer Architecture Today

- Today is a very exciting time to study computer architecture
- Industry is in a large paradigm shift (to multi-core, hardware acceleration and beyond) – many different potential system designs possible
- Many difficult problems *caused by* the shift
  - Power/energy constraints multi-core?, accelerators?
  - Complexity of design multi-core?
  - Difficulties in technology scaling new technologies?
  - Memory wall/gap
  - Reliability wall/issues
  - Programmability wall/problem single-core?

Computer Architecture Today (2)

- These problems affect all parts of the computing stack – if we do not change the way we design systems



Computer Architecture Today (3)

- You can revolutionize the way computers are built, if you understand both the hardware and the software
- You can invent new paradigms for computation, communication, and storage
- Recommended book: Kuhn, "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" (1962)
  - Pre-paradigm science: no clear consensus in the field
  - Normal science: dominant theory used to explain things (business as usual); exceptions considered anomalies
  - Revolutionary science: underlying assumptions re-examined

… but, first …

- Let’s understand the fundamentals…

- You can change the world only if you understand it well enough…
  - Especially the past and present dominant paradigms
  - And, their advantages and shortcomings -- tradeoffs

CSC 2224: Parallel Computer Architecture and Programming Parallel Processing, Multicores

Prof. Gennady Pekhimenko
University of Toronto
Fall 2019

The content of this lecture is adapted from the lectures of Onur Mutlu @ CMU

Asymmetric Multi-Core

Asymmetric Chip Multiprocessor (ACMP)



"Tile-Large" "Tile-Small" ACMP

- Provide one large core and many small cores

+ Accelerate serial part using the large core (2 units)
+ Execute parallel part on small cores and large core for high throughput (12+2 units)