Kernel Merging for Throughput-Oriented Accelerator Generation

IMPACT'23, Workshop on Polyhedral Compilation Techniques January 16, 2023, Toulouse, France

Nicolas Derumigny, Colorado State University Inria Louis-Noël Pouchet, Colorado State University Fabrice Rastello, Inria





Colorado State University



Introduction

- Context
- Motivation
 - Overview

Context

C Code is used to design hardware accelerators

- Architecture Layout is specified in C++
 - High-Level Synthesis
 - Generates Hardware Description Langage:
 - VHDL / Verilog
- Target dedicated chips
 - FPGA (reprogrammable)
 - ASIC (fixed)
- Automatized Generation of Hardware Design
 - Specialised Accelerators (IP)
 - Target HPC applications
 - Evaluation on linear algebra and correlation
 - On par with state of the art accelerators (GEMM, FP32)
 - ScaleHLS[1]: 0.393 Op/Cycle/DSP
 - Us: 0.277 Op/Cycle/DSP



C, C++,

Finclude "fir.h"

woid fir (data_t *y, coef_t c[N], data_t x

Motivation #1

What is the area of a BLAS2 accelerator ?

- Operations to support:
 - Matrix-vector product (GEMV)
 y := alpha*A*x + beta*y
 - Triangular matrix-vector (TRMV)

y := alpha*A*x + beta*y with A triangular

- Rank 1 operation (GER)
 A := alpha*x*y' + A
- Using a juxtaposition of Fixed Functions (FF):
 - FF with Maximum Throughput: 24 DSP
 - FF with Max Sharing: 12 DSP
- Resulting design is:



- Area ~= Area_{GEMV} + Area_{TRMV} + Area_{GER}
 - No interconnect between FFs
 - No resource reuse between FFs => No sharing
- Reuse components beween FFs?
 - Maximise resource sharing between FFs
 - Create Functional Units: FU
 - BLAS 2 + BLAS 3: 6 DSP
- Proposed design:



Motivation #2

Reuse common compute patterns accross a set of applications



Overview

From common compute patterns to hardware generation

- Creation of merged Fixed-Functions
 - Functional Units
 - Polyhedral decomposition of application into kernels
 - Detection of identical operators
 - Shareable components
- Implementation of hardware FUs
 - Data routing through FUs
 - Operator are shared...
 - ...but control-flow remains kernel-specific
 - Code generation
 - Single merged/flattened loop
 - Hardware constraints
 - C specification of the compute pipeline
 - Requires HLS-specific annotations

- Integration into a real-life design
 - Compromises
 - Number of FU (~= performances) vs area
 - Supported kernels per FU vs area
 - Interconnect
 - Configuration of the accelerator
 - Data communications
 - On-accelerator data organisation
 - Scheduling kernels on FUs
 - => Need of dedicated control units

Flow of the work



Technical Details

- User Perspective
 - Automatization
 - Kernel Merging
- Structure of the accelerator
 - Profitability criteria









Automatization

- Polyhedral detection of kernels (Work-in-Progress)
 - Decomposition of loop bodies in SSA 3-address code
 - Loop fission
- Kernel merging
 - Iteration domain extension
 - Loop fusion

Generation of the accelerator

- Fixed structure
 - One main scheduling loop
 - · Flattenned version of the merged kernels loop nest
 - Variable loop bound
 - · ~ execution time of the kernel
 - Configurable number of FUs
- Compilation of the applications to the accelerator FUs
 - ASAP scheduling on the FU
 - Greedy placement
 - Longest kernels are scheduled in first

Kernel Merging

mulsv

mulmv



for j in 0..N:
for i in 0..N:
 if (j==0):
 y[i] *= beta

Kernel Merging



Kernel Merging



- Hardware constraint: a value computed by the pipeline must exit the pipeline before being used (no bypass)
- The minimal Read-after-Write distance must be greater that the pipeline latency
- In practice:
 - Ensure that the inner-most loop is synchronisation-free

Structure of the accelerator

• Fonctional Units (FU)

- Execute elementary operations of the applications
- Result of kernel merging
- Loop Control Logic
 - Schedule the kernels on the FUs
 - Loop Bound Generator (LBG)
 - Generates the trip count of the execution loop
 - Iteration Vector Generator (IVG)
 - Generates the values of the iteration vector
- Matrix / Vector Buffer
 - Scratchpad containing accessible data
 - Transfered to main memory before and after execution



- Degrees of freedom
 - Compute capabilities of each FU
 - Add, Mul, div, sqrt, abs, ...
 - Number of FUs

Profitability Criteria

What is the best FU topology (functionnalities/replications) ?

Maximise performance under area constraint

minimize
$$\sum_{K \in Kernels} \lceil \#calls(K) / \#FU(K) \rceil * card(\mathcal{D}_K) * IL_K$$
subject to
$$\sum_{i \in FUs} Area(FU_i) * \#FU_i < max_area$$

• With:

- Kernels the set of supported kernels
- IL_K the iteration domain of kernel old K
- \mathcal{D}_K the iteration latency of kernel K
- Instantiate FUs to match the proportion of their execution time in the input workload
 - Do not replicate FUs that account for a low part of the workload execution time

Profitability Criteria

What is the best FU topology (functionnalities/replications) ?

Maximise performance under area constraint

minimize
$$\sum_{K \in Kernels} \lceil \#calls(K) / \#FU(K) \rceil * card(\mathcal{D}_K) * IL_K$$
subject to
$$\sum_{i \in FUs} Area(FU_i) * \#FU_i < max_area$$

- Requires knowledge of FU resource consumption
- Do not take glue logic into account
 - Constant overhead
 - Does not use DSP
- Specialised for either <u>one</u> application, or <u>a family</u> of applications



Supported Primitives

- Benchmark: Linear Algebra-Generic Accelerator
 - Batching Linear Algebra Computation?
 - Benchmark: Correlation-Generic Accelerator

Supported Kernels

- Primitives extracted from
 - Linear algebra (BLAS) level 2 and 3
 - Polybench's Correlation
 - 31 different kernels supported
- Evaluation on 2 different accelerators
 - FP16 data type

	Num	Nb. of			
	$a \pm b$	a * b	a/b	FU	
BLAS	2	1	0	0	2
CORR	3	3	1	1	4

- Hardware primitives:
 - Add, mul, div, sqrt
 - Different routing/iteration spaces combination creates 31 kernels

Kernel	Description	Op.	LA-GA	CORR-GA
noop	Do nothing	None	\checkmark	\checkmark
mulmm	Matrix-matrix multiplication	\pm and \ast	\checkmark	\checkmark
mulmv	Matrix-vector multiplication	\pm and \ast	\checkmark	\checkmark
multrmm	Triangular matrix-matrix multiplication	\pm and \ast	\checkmark	
multrmv	Triangular matrix-vector multiplication	\pm and \ast	\checkmark	
mulsm	Scalar-matrix multiplication	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
multrsm	Scalar-triangular matrix multiplication	*	\checkmark	
mulsv	Scalar-vector multiplication	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
muls	Scalar-scalar multiplication	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
trm	Matrix transposition	None	\checkmark	\checkmark
addm	Matrix addition	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
addv	Vector addition	\pm	\checkmark	\checkmark
adds	Scalar addition	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
addtrm	Triangular matrix addition	±	\checkmark	
subm	Matrix subtraction	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
subcmv	Column-wise matrix subtraction	\pm	\checkmark	\checkmark
subv	Vector subtraction	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
subs	Scalar subtraction	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
pmulm	Point-wise matrix multiplication	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
pmulv	Point-wise vector multiplication	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
oprodv	Outer (vector) product	*	\checkmark	\checkmark
sqrtv	Point-wise vector square root	$\sqrt{\cdot}$		\checkmark
sqrts	Scalar square root	$\sqrt{\cdot}$		\checkmark
accsumcm	Columns-wise accumulation of a matrix	±	\checkmark	\checkmark
cutminv	Vector round to 1 low values	None	\checkmark	\checkmark
divms	Pointwise division of matrices	/		\checkmark
divvs	Pointwise division of vectors	/		\checkmark
divcmv	Point-wise division with column-wise value	/		\checkmark
set0m	Initialisation of a matrix to 0	None	\checkmark	\checkmark
setidm	Initialisation of a matrix to Id	None	\checkmark	\checkmark
setd1	Initialisation of the diagonal of a matrix to 1	None	\checkmark	\checkmark

Benchmark: Linear Algebra-Generic Accelerator

Bench	Arithmetic	Execution Time (cycles)			FLOP/C/DSP			
name	expression	MS	MT	LA-GA	MS	MT	LA-GA	
SCALE	$A = \alpha \cdot A + B$	5572	2059	8258	0.368	0.497	0.165	
GEMV	$y = \alpha \cdot A \cdot x + \beta \cdot y$	4553	2126	4396	0.457	0.391	0.315	
TRMV	$y = \alpha \cdot A \cdot x + \beta \cdot y$	2339	2435	2380	0.458	0.293	0.300	
GER	$A = \alpha \cdot x \cdot y^t + A$	4738	2057	8343	0.436	0.401	0.165	
GEMM	$C = \alpha \cdot A \cdot B + \beta \cdot C$	307586	134018	274540	0.433	0.397	0.323	
TRMM	$C = \alpha \cdot A \cdot B + \beta \cdot C$	149696	155840	145516	0.458	0.293	0.314	

 Accelerator: Linear Algebra-GA



- Raw Performance similar to Max Sharing designs
- Performance-per-area similar to Max Throughput designs
 - 4/6 benchmarks
 - Cases when MS operation schedule is identical to GA
- But semi-generic!

Batching Linear Algebra Computation?

- Batching with factor 5
- Better use of the LA-GA
 - More (exploited) parallelism opportunities
 - Better occupancy of the LA-GA FUs
- Execution time comparable to MS on every benchmark

Bench	Exec. Time (cycles)				
name	MS	MT	CORR-GA		
SCALEx5	27860	10295	24726		
GEMVx5	22765	10630	21544		
TRMVx5	11695	12175	11379		
GERx5	23690	10285	41279		
GEMMx5	1537930	670090	1356136		
TRMMx5	748480	779200	711016		

Batching Linear Algebra Computation?

- Batching with factor 5
- Better use of the LA-GA
 - More (exploited) parallelism opportunities
 - Better occupancy of the LA-GA FUs
- Execution time comparable to MS on every benchmark

Bench	Exec. Time (cycles)				
name	MS	MT	CORR-GA		
SCALEx5	27860	10295	24726		
GEMVx5	22765	10630	21544		
TRMVx5	11695	12175	11379		
GERx5	23690	10285	41279		
GEMMx5	1537930	670090	1356136		
TRMMx5	748480	779200	711016		

What about other works?

Batching Linear Algebra Computation?

- Batching with factor 5
- Better use of the LA-GA
 - More (exploited) parallelism opportunities
 - Better occupancy of the LA-GA FUs
- Execution time comparable to MS on every benchmark

Bench	Exec. Time (cycles)				
name	MS	MT	CORR-GA		
SCALEx5	27860	10295	24726		
GEMVx5	22765	10630	21544		
TRMVx5	11695	12175	11379		
GERx5	23690	10285	41279		
GEMMx5	1537930	670090	1356136		
TRMMx5	748480	779200	711016		

Data Type	Implementation	OP/Cycle/DSP
INT32	ResNet-18 ScaleHLS [1]	1.343
INT32	ResNet-18 TVM-VTA [2]	0.344
INT32	LA-GA GEMM	0.646
FP32	GEMM ScaleHLS	0.393
FP32	LA-GA GEMM	0.277

LA-GA is comparable with state-ofthe art design in terms of performance-per-area (GEMM, FP32)

[1] Hanchen Ye, Cong Hao, Jianyi Cheng, Hyunmin Jeong, Jack Huang, Stephen Neuendorffer, and Deming Chen. ScaleHLS: A New Scalable High-Level Synthesis Framework on Multi-Level Intermediate Representation. In 2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA).

[2] Thierry Moreau, Tianqi Chen, Luis Vega, Jared Roesch, Eddie Yan, Lianmin Zheng, Josh Fromm, Ziheng Jiang, Luis Ceze, Carlos Guestrin. A hardware–software blueprint for flexible deep learning specialization. IEEE Micro (2019)

Benchmark: Correlation-Generic Accelerator

Bench	Arithmetic	Execution Time (cycles)			FLOP/C/DSP		
name	expression	MS	MT	CORR-GA	MS	MT	CORR-GA
CENTER	$X_{ij}^C = X_{ij} - (\sum_{i'} X_{i'j})/n$	8343	4166	12480	0.495	0.495	0.055
STDDEV	$\sigma_i^X = \sqrt{\sum_i (X_i^C)^2/n}$	16691	8370	29053	0.247	0.247	0.047
CENTER-REDUCE-DIV	$X_{ij}^{CR} = \left(X_{ij} - \sum_{i'} X_{i'j}\right) / (\sigma_j^X \cdot \sqrt{n})$	20935	10486	33352	0.247	0.164	0.052
CORR	$(X^{CR})^t \cdot X^{CR}$	291221	144614	303763	0.468	0.314	0.150
CORRx3	$3 \times \text{CORR}$	873663	433842	320603	0.468	0.314	0.425

 Accelerator: CORR-GA



- Raw Performance lower than Max Sharing designs on CORR subexpressions
 - Dedicated accelerators
 - Sub-optimality in the choice of kernels
- Performance similar Max Sharing for CORR
 - Dominated by the matrix multiplication
 - Better than MT on batched Correlation
- Still semi-generic!

Final Words

Limitations

Future Work

Conclusion

Limitations

- Interconnect size
 - Op/LUT and Op/FF are 2 to 20x off dedicated accelerators
 - Due to
 - Organisation of the on-chip buffer
 - Scheduling on the FUs
- Fixed matrix size
 - Implementation limitation: the Iteration Vector Generator and the Loop Bound Generator use a constant size
 - Matrix / vector size could be send as part of the accelerator configuration
- Data reuse
 - Possible optimisation: Loop-invariants values are currenty fetched from the accelerator buffer each cycle
- Vectorisation of the FUs
 - BRAM limitation: only 2 load/store operations per cycle are possible
- DSP repartition
 - FMA are implemented as a mul-add sequence: only matrix-matrix or matrix-vector max their usage
 - Work in progress!

Future Work

Support BLAS 1 primitives

- Support reductions in the inner-most loop
 - Temporary buffer for loop-carried accumulation
 - Hardware-compliante schedule
 - · Stalls of the execution pipeline

Reduce DSP/operation

- Use of "floating point" Vivado primitives
 - Heavier interfaces (AXIStream)
 - FP16 FMA using only one DSP
 - Basic hardware unit for any FU using add/sub/mul

- Formalisation of the kernel detection algorithm
 - Transformation of the loop bodies to 3-address code
 - Loop fission
 - Legality of the operation
- Caracterisation of the supported applications
 - Any combination of the accelerated kernels can be accelerated

Conclusion

- Generation of a programmable accelerator
 - For a family of applications
 - Focused on performance-per-area
- Relying on polyhedral kernel merging
 - Iteration domain extension
 - Loop fusion
 - Custom Functional Units generation
- Performance in par with dedicated designs
 - Evaluation on Linear Algebra (BLAS2-3) and Correlation
 - Batching favors performance-per-area
 - **Op/Cycle/DSP** comparable to state-of-the-art designs
- Improved version of the Generic Accelerator under submission



~40 opened (junior) tenured positions each year

- ~40 opened (junior) tenured positions each year
- Senior positions, hundreds of post-docs, ...