

#### Chapter 4

# Data-Level Parallelism (DLP) in Vector, SIMD, and GPU Architectures

#### Part 2: Advanced Vector Architectures

"We call these algorithms *data parallel* algorithms because their parallelism comes from simultaneous operations across large sets of data, rather than from multiple thread of control."

- W. Daniel Hillis and Guy L. Steele "Data Parallel Algorithms," *Comm. ACM* (1986)

"If you were plowing a field, which would you rather use, two strong oxen or 1024 chickens?"

> - Seymour Cray, Father of the Supercomputer (arguing for two powerful vector processors versus many simple processors)

#### Acknowledgements

- Thanks to many sources for slide material
  - © 1990 Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, © 2001-present Elsevier Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach by J. Hennessy & D. Patterson
  - © 1994 Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, © 2001-present Elsevier Computer Organization and Design by D. Patterson & J. Hennessy
  - © 2002 K. Asinovic & Arvind, MIT
  - © 2002 J. Kubiatowicz, University of California at Berkeley
  - © 2006, © 2010 No Starch Press for Inside the Machine by J. Stokes
  - © 2007 W.-M. Hwu & D. Kirk, University of Illinois & NVIDIA
  - © 2007-2010 J. Owens, University of California at Davis
  - © 2010 CRC Press for Introduction to Concurrency in Programming Languages by M. Sottile, T. Mattson, and C. Rasmussen
  - © 2017, IBM POWER9 Processor Architecture by Sadasivam et al., IBM
  - © 2016, © 2019 POWER9 Processor User's Manual, IBM
  - © The OpenPOWER Foundation
  - © 2022, W. Feng, Virginia Tech

# $\mathsf{DAXPY}\left(\mathsf{Y} = \underline{a} * \underline{\mathsf{X}} + \underline{\mathsf{Y}}\right)$

Assuming vectors X, Y are length 64			LD	Fo,a	;load scalar a	
				LV	V1,Rx	;load vector X
				MULTS	V2,F0,V1	;vector-scalar mult.
Scalar vs. Vector –				LV	V3,Ry	;load vector Y
				ADDV	V4,V2,V3	;add
	LD	Fo,a		SV	Ry,V4	;store the result
	ADDI	R4,Rx,#512	;last addres	s to load		
loo	p: LD MULTD	F2, 0(Rx) F2,F0, <u>F2</u>	;load X(i) ;a*X(i)		578 (2+9*64) vs. 321 (1+5*64) ops (1.8X)	
	LD ADDD	<u>F4</u> , 0(Ry) <u>F4</u> ,F2, <u>F4</u>	;load Y(i) ;a*X(i) + Y(i	i)		578 (2+9*64) vs. 6 instructions (96X)
	SD ADDI	↓ <u>F4</u> ,0(Ry) Rx,Rx,#8	;store into ` ;increment		64 operation vectors no loop overhea	
	ADDI SUB BNZ	Ry,Ry,#8 R20,R4,Rx R20,loop	;increment index to Y ;compute bound ;check if done		also 64X fewer pipeline hazards	
		• •	-			

#### **Vector Execution Time**

- Execution time depends on several factors:
  - Length of operand vectors
  - Structural hazards
  - Data dependencies
  - Pipeline depth  $\rightarrow$  start-up latency (short vs. long vectors?)
- VMIPS functional units consume one element per clock cycle
  - Execution time is approximately the vector length
- Convoy
  - Set of vector instructions that could potentially execute together

#### Vector Inefficiency

• Must wait for last element of result to be written before starting dependent instruction



#### **Vector Startup**

- Vector startup penalty
  - Functional unit latency (time thru pipeline)
  - Dead time or recovery time (time before another vector instruction can start down pipeline)



#### **Vector Execution Time**

- Execution time depends on several factors:
  - Length of operand vectors
  - Structural hazards
  - Data dependencies
  - Pipeline depth  $\rightarrow$  start-up latency (short vs. long vectors?)
- VMIPS functional units consume one element per clock cycle
  - Execution time is approximately the vector length
- Convoy
  - Set of vector instructions that could potentially execute together

#### **Dead Time and Short Vectors**



No dead time



T0, Eight lanes No dead time 100% efficiency with 8 element vectors Vector Architectures

#### Chimes

- Chime
  - Unit of time to execute one convoy (or a vector operation)
  - *m* convoys executes in *m* chimes
  - For vector length of *n*, requires *m* x *n* clock cycles
    - When does this estimation become more accurate? Less accurate?

### Chaining

- Sequences with read-after-write dependency hazards can be in the same convoy via chaining
- Chaining
  - Allows a vector operation to start as soon as the individual elements of its vector source operand become available

#### Vector Chaining

- Vector version of register bypassing
  - Introduced with Cray 1



#### Vector Chaining

• Without chaining, must wait for last element of result to be written before starting dependent instruction



• With chaining, can start dependent instruction as soon as first result appears



#### Unchained vs. Chained



• Timing diagram for a sequence of dependent vector operations ADDV and MULV

#### Example

LV	V1,Rx
MULVS.D	V2,V1,F0
LV	V3,Ry
ADDVV.D	V4,V2,V3
SV	Ry,V4

;load vector X
;vector-scalar multiply
;load vector Y
;add two vectors
;store the sum

#### Convoys:

1	LV	MULVS.D
2	LV	ADDVV.D
3	SV	

3 chimes, 2 FP ops per result, cycles per FLOP = 1.5 For 64 element vectors, requires 64 x 3 = 192 clock cycles

#### Convoy Time

- Show the time that each convoy can begin and the total # of cycles needed.
- Vector Start-Up Overhead

Unit	Start-up overhead (cycles)
Load and store unit	12
Multiply unit	7
Add unit	6

• Answer in terms of convoys, vector length *n*, and no convoy overlap

Convoy	Starting time	First-result time	Last-result time
1. LV	0	12	11 + <i>n</i>
2. MULVS.D LV	12 + <i>n</i>	12 + n + 12	23 + 2n
3. ADDV.D	24 + 2n	24 + 2n + 6	29 + 3 <i>n</i>
4. SV	30 + 3n	30 + 3n + 12	41 + 4 <i>n</i>

#### Convoy Time vs. Chime Approx

- How does the time compare to the chime approximation for a vector of length 64?
  - Tricky Question: When is the vector sequence actually done?
  - The total time is given by the time until the last vector instruction in the last convoy completes. This is an approximation, and the start-up time of the last vector instruction may be seen in some sequences and not in others.
  - For simplicity, we always include it. The time per result for a vector of length 64 is 4 + (42/64) = 4.65 clock cycles, while the chime approximation would be 4. The execution time with start- up overhead is 1.16 times higher.

# Challenges

- Start-up time
  - Latency of vector functional unit
  - Assume the same as Cray-1
    - Floating-point add => 6 clock cycles
    - Floating-point multiply => 7 clock cycles
    - Floating-point divide => 20 clock cycles
    - Vector load => 12 clock cycles
- Improvemeants
  - > 1 element per clock cycle
  - Non-64 wide vectors
  - IF statements in vector code
  - Memory system optimizations to support vector processors
  - Multiple dimensional matrices
  - Sparse matrices
  - Programming a vector computer

#### Multiple Lanes

- Element *n* of vector register A is "hardwired" to element *n* of vector register B
  - Allows for multiple hardware lanes



Advantages? Disadvantages?

# Vector Instructions with Multiple Lanes and Chaining

• Can overlap execution of multiple vector instructions



#### Vector Length Register

- Vector length not known at compile time?
- Use Vector Length Register (VLR) <= max vector length
- Use strip mining for vectors over the maximum length:



#### Vector Mask Registers

 Consider the following code snippet for (i = 0; i < 64; i=i+1) if (X[i] != 0) X[i] = X[i] - Y[i];

This loop cannot normally be vectorized because of the conditional.

• Use vector mask register to "disable" elements

	0	
LV	V1,Rx	;load vector X into V1
LV	V2,Ry	;load vector Y
L.D	F0,#0	;load FP zero into F0
SNEVS.D	V1,F0	;sets VM(i) to 1 if V1(i)!=F0
SUBVV.D	V1,V1,V2	;subtract under vector mask
SV	Rx,V1	;store the result in X

GFLOPS rate decreases!

#### **Memory Banks**

- Memory system must be designed to support high bandwidth for vector loads and stores
- Spread accesses across multiple banks
  - Control bank addresses independently
  - Load or store non-sequential words
  - Support multiple vector processors sharing the same memory

#### • Example:

- 32 processors, each generating 4 loads and 2 stores/cycle
- Processor cycle time is 2.167 ns, SRAM cycle time is 15 ns
- How many memory banks needed?