Optimizing MMM & ATLAS Library Generator

Recall: MMM miss ratios

L1 Cache Miss Ratio for Intel Pentium III

- MMM with N = 1…1300
- 16KB 32B/Block 4-way 8-byte elements



IJK version (large cache)

```
DO I = 1, N//row-major storage
  DO J = 1, N
    DO K = 1, N
      C(I,J) = C(I,J) + A(I,K)*B(K,J)
```



- Large cache scenario:
  - Matrices are small enough to fit into cache
  - Only cold misses, no capacity misses
  - Miss ratio:
    - Data size = 3 N^2
    - Each miss brings in b floating-point numbers
    - Miss ratio = 3 N^2 /b*4N^3 = 0.75/bN = 0.019 (b = 4,N=10)

IJK version (small cache)

```
DO I = 1, N
  DO J = 1, N
    DO K = 1, N
      C(I,J) = C(I,J) + A(I,K)*B(K,J)
```



- Small cache scenario:
  - Matrices are large compared to cache
    - reuse distance is not O(1) => miss
  - Cold and capacity misses
  - Miss ratio:
    - C: N^2/b misses (good temporal locality)
    - A: N^3 /b misses (good spatial locality)
    - B: N^3 misses (poor temporal and spatial locality)
    - Miss ratio → 0.25 (b+1)/b = 0.3125 (for b = 4)

MMM experiments

L1 Cache Miss Ratio for Intel Pentium III
- MMM with N = 1…1300
- 16KB 32B/Block 4-way 8-byte elements

Can we predict this?



How large can matrices be and still not suffer capacity misses?

```
DO I = 1, M
  DO J = 1, N
    DO K = 1, P
      C(I,J) = C(I,J) + A(I,K)*B(K,J)
```



- How large can these matrices be without suffering capacity misses?
  - Each iteration of outermost loop walks over entire B matrix, so all of B must be in cache
  - We walk over rows of A and successive iterations of middle loop touch same row of A, so one row of A must be in cache
  - We walk over elements of C one at a time.
  - So inequality is NP + P + 1 <= C

Check with experiment

- For our machine, capacity of L1 cache is 16KB/8 doubles = 2^{11} doubles
- If matrices are square, we must solve

  $N^2 + N + 1 = 2^{11}$

  which gives us N = 45
- This agrees well with experiment.

High-level picture of high-performance MMM code

- Block the code for each level of memory hierarchy
  - Registers
  - L1 cache
  - …..
- Choose block sizes at each level using the theory described previously
  - Useful optimization: choose block size at level L+1 to be multiple of the block size at level L

ATLAS

- Library generator for MMM and other BLAS
- Blocks only for registers and L1 cache
- Uses search to determine block sizes, rather than the analytical formulas we used
  - Search takes more time, but we do it once when library is produced
- Let us study structure of ATLAS in little more detail

Our approach

- Original ATLAS Infrastructure



- Model-Based ATLAS Infrastructure



BLAS

- Let us focus on MMM:

```
for (int i = 0; i < M; i++)
  for (int j = 0; j < N; j++)
    for (int k = 0; k < K; k++)
      C[i][j] += A[i][k]*B[k][j]
```

- Properties
  - Very good reuse: $O(N^2)$ data, $O(N^3)$ computation
  - Many optimization opportunities
    - Few "real" dependencies
  - Will run poorly on modern machines
    - Poor use of cache and registers
    - Poor use of processor pipelines

Optimizations

- Cache-level blocking (tiling)
  - Atlas blocks only for L1 cache
  - NB: L1 cache time size
- Register-level blocking
  - Important to hold array values in registers
  - MU,NU: register tile size
- Software pipelining
  - Unroll and schedule operations
  - Latency, xFetch: scheduling parameters
- Versioning
  - Dynamically decide which way to compute
- Back-end compiler optimizations
  - Scalar Optimizations
  - Instruction Scheduling

Cache-level blocking (tiling)

- Tiling in ATLAS
  - Only square tiles (NBxNBxNB)
  - Working set of tile fits in L1
  - Tiles are usually copied to continuous storage
  - Special "clean-up" code generated for boundaries
- Mini-MMM

```
for (int j = 0; j < NB; j++)
  for (int i = 0; i < NB; i++)
    for (int k = 0; k < NB; k++)
      C[i][j] += A[i][k] * B[k][j]
```

- NB: Optimization parameter



Register-level blocking

- Micro-MMM
  - A: MUx1
  - B: 1xNU
  - C: MUxNU
  - MUxNU+MU+NU registers
- Unroll loops by MU, NU, and KU
- Mini-MMM with Micro-MMM inside

```
for (int j = 0; j < NB; j += NU)
  for (int i = 0; i < NB; i += MU)
    load C[i..i+MU-1, j..j+NU-1] into registers
    for (int k = 0; k < NB; k++)
      load A[i..i+MU-1,k] into registers
      load B[k,j..j+NU-1] into registers
      multiply A's and B's and add to C's
    store C[i..i+MU-1, j..j+NU-1]
```

KU times

- Special clean-up code required if NB is not a multiple of MU,NU,KU
- MU, NU, KU: optimization parameters



Scheduling

- FMA Present?
- Schedule Computation
  - Using Latency
- Schedule Memory Operations
  - Using IFetch, NFetch,FFetch



- Latency, xFetch: optimization parameters

Search Strategy

- Multi-dimensional optimization problem:
  - Independent parameters: NB,MU,NU,KU,…
  - Dependent variable: MFlops
  - Function from parameters to variables is given implicitly; can be evaluated repeatedly
- One optimization strategy: orthogonal line search
  - Optimize along one dimension at a time, using reference values for parameters not yet optimized
  - Not guaranteed to find optimal point, but might come close

Find Best NB

- Search in following range
  - 16 <= NB <= 80
  - NB^2 <= L1Size
- In this search, use simple estimates for other parameters
  - (eg) KU: Test each candidate for
    - Full K unrolling (KU = NB)
    - No K unrolling (KU = 1)

Model-based optimization

- Original ATLAS Infrastructure



- Model-Based ATLAS Infrastructure



Modeling for Optimization Parameters

- Optimization parameters
  - NB
    - Hierarchy of Models (later)
  - MU, NU
    - $MU * NU + MU + NU + Latency \leq NR$
  - KU
    - maximize subject to L1 Instruction Cache
  - Latency
    - $\lceil (L_* + 1)/2 \rceil$
  - MulAdd
    - hardware parameter
  - xFetch
    - set to 2

Largest NB for no capacity/conflict misses

- If tiles are copied into contiguous memory, condition for only cold misses:
  - $3*NB^2$ <= L1Size



Largest NB for no capacity misses

- MMM:

```
for (int j = 0; j < N; j++)
  for (int i = 0; j < N; j++)
    for (int k = 0; k < N; k++)
      c[i][j] += a[i][k] * b[k][j]
```

- Cache model:
  - Fully associative
  - Line size 1 Word
  - Optimal Replacement
- Bottom line:
  $NB^2+NB+1<C$
  - One full matrix
  - One row / column
  - One element



Summary: Modeling for Tile Size (NB)

- Models of increasing complexity
  - $3*NB^2 \le C$
    - Whole work-set fits in L1
  - $NB^2 + NB + 1 \le C$
    - Fully Associative
    - Optimal Replacement
    - Line Size: 1 word
  - $\left\lceil \frac{NB^2}{B} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{NB}{B} \right\rceil + 1 \le \frac{C}{B}$ or $\left\lceil \frac{NB^2}{B} \right\rceil + NB + 1 \le \frac{C}{B}$
    - Line Size > 1 word
  - $\left\lceil \frac{NB^2}{B} \right\rceil + 2\left\lceil \frac{NB}{B} \right\rceil + \left(\left\lceil \frac{NB}{B} \right\rceil + 1\right) \le \frac{C}{B}$ or $\left\lceil \frac{NB^2}{B} \right\rceil + 3NB + 1 \le \frac{C}{B}$
    - LRU Replacement



Summary of model



Experiments

- Ten modern architectures
- Model did well on
  - •RISC architectures
  - •UltraSparc: did better
- Model did not do as well on
  - •Itanium
  - •CISC architectures
- Substantial gap between ATLAS CGw/S and ATLAS Unleashed on some architectures



Some sensitivity graphs for Alpha 21264



Eliminating performance gaps

- Think globally, search locally
- Gap between model-based optimization and empirical optimization can be eliminated by
  - Local search:
    - for small performance gaps
    - in neighborhood of model-predicted values
  - Model refinement:
    - for large performance gaps
    - must be done manually
    - (future) machine learning: learn new models automatically
- Model-based optimization and empirical optimization are not in conflict

Small performance gap: Alpha 21264

ATLAS CGw/S:
mini-MMM: 1300 MFlops
NB = 72
(MU,NU) = (4,4)
ATLAS Model
mini-MMM: 1200 MFlops
NB = 84
(MU,NU) = (4,4)



- Local search
  - •Around model-predicted NB
  - •Hill-climbing not useful
  - •Search interval:[NB-lcm(MU,NU),NB+lcm(MU,NU)]
- •Local search for MU,NU
  - •Hill-climbing OK

Large performance gap: Itanium



MMM Performance



Performance of mini-MMM
- ATLAS CGw/S: 4000 MFlops
- ATLAS Model: 1800 MFlops

Problem with NB value
ATLAS Model: 30
ATLAS CGw/S: 80 (search space max)

Local search will not solve problem.



NB Sensitivity

Itanium diagnosis and solution

- Memory hierarchy
  - L1 data cache: 16 KB
  - L2 cache: 256 KB
  - L3 cache: 3 MB
- Diagnosis:
  - Model tiles for L1 cache
  - On Itanium, FP values not cached in L1 cache!
  - Performance gap goes away if we model for L2 cache (NB = 105)
  - Obtain even better performance if we model for L3 cache (NB = 360, 4.6 GFlops)
- Problem:
  - Tiling for L2 or L3 may be better than tiling for L1
  - How do we determine which cache level to tile for??
- Our solution: model refinement + a little search
  - Determine tile sizes for all cache levels
  - Choose between them empirically

Large performance gap: Opteron





MMM Performance

Performance of mini-MMM
- ATLAS CGw/S: 2072 MFlops
- ATLAS Model: 1282 MFlops

Key differences in parameter values:MU/NU
- ATLAS CGw/S: (6,1)
- ATLAS Model: (2,1)



MU,NU Sensitivity

Opteron diagnosis and solution

- Opteron characteristics
  - Small number of logical registers
  - Out-of-order issue
  - Register renaming
- For such processors, it is better to
  - let hardware take care of scheduling dependent instructions,
  - use logical registers to implement a bigger register tile.
- x86 has 8 logical registers
  - → register tiles must be of the form (x,1) or (1,x)

Refined model

- **Estimating** FMA:
  Use the machine parameter FMA
- **Estimating** L_s:

$$L_s = \left\lceil \frac{L_s \times |ALU_{FP}| + 1}{2} \right\rceil$$

- **Estimating** M_U **and** N_U:

$$M_U \times N_U + N_U + M_U + L_s \leq N_R$$

1) $M_U, N_U \leftarrow u$.
2) Solve constraint for u.
3) $M_U \leftarrow \max(u, 1)$.
4) Solve constraint for N_U.
5) $N_U \leftarrow \max(N_U, 1)$.
6) If $M_U < N_U$ then swap M_U and N_U.
7) **Refined Model:** If $N_U = 1$ then
   - $M_U \leftarrow N_R - 2$
   - $N_U \leftarrow 1$
   - $FMA \leftarrow 1$

- **Estimating** N_R:

$$\left\lceil \frac{N_R^2}{B_1} \right\rceil + 3\left\lceil \frac{N_R \times N_U}{B_1} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{M_U}{B_1} \right\rceil \times N_U \leq \frac{C_1}{B_1}$$

Trim N_R, to make it a multiple of M_U, N_U, and 2.

- **Estimating** K_U:
  Choose K_U as the maximum value for which mini-MMM fits in the L1 instruction cache. Trim K_U to make it divide N_R evenly.
- **Estimating** F_F, I_F, **and** N_F:

$$F_F = 0, I_F = 2, N_F = 2$$

Bottom line

• Refined model is not complex.
• Refined model by itself eliminates most performance gaps.
• Local search eliminates all performance gaps.



Future Directions

- Repeat study with FFTW/SPIRAL
  - Uses search to choose between algorithms
- Feed insights back into compilers
  - Build a linear algebra compiler for generating high-performance code for dense linear algebra codes
    - Start from high-level algorithmic descriptions
    - Use restructuring compiler technology
    - Part IBM PERCS Project
  - Generalize to other problem domains