# Structured Grids and Sparse Matrix Vector Multiplication on the Cell Processor

**Sam Williams**
**Lawrence Berkeley National Lab**
**One Cyclotron Rd.**
**MS:50A-1148**
**Berkeley, CA 94720**
**SWWilliams@lbl.gov**

**November 1, 2006**

# Outline

- Cell Architecture
- Programming Cell
- Benchmarks & Performance
  - Stencils on Structured Grids
  - Sparse Matrix-Vector Multiplication
- Summary

# Cell Architecture

# Cell Architecture

- 3.2GHz, 9 Core SMP
  - One core is a conventional cache based PPC
  - The other 8 are local memory based SIMD processors (SPEs)
- 25.6GB/s memory bandwidth (128b @ 1.6GHz) to XDR
- 2 chip (16 SPE) SMP blades



# Memory Architectures



# SPE notes

- SIMD
- Limited dual issue
  - 1 float/ALU + 1 load/store/permute/etc… per cycle
- 4 FMA single precision datapaths, 6 cycle latency
- 1 FMA double precision datapath, 13 cycle latency
- Double precision instructions are not dual issued, and will stall all subsequent instruction issues by 7 cycles.
- 128b aligned loads/stores (local store to/from register file)
  - Must rotate to access unaligned data
  - Must permute to operate on scalar granularities

# Cell Programming

- Modified SPMD (Single Program Multiple Data)
  - Dual Program Multiple Data (control + computation)
  - Data access similar to MPI, but data is shared like pthreads
- Power core is used to:
  - Load/initialize data structures
  - Spawn SPE threads
  - Parallelize data structures
  - Pass pointers to SPEs
  - Synchronize SPE threads
  - Communicate with other processors
  - Perform other I/O operations

# Processors Evaluated

| | Cell SPE | X1E SSP | Power5 | Opteron | Itanium2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architecture | SIMD | Vector | Super Scalar | Super Scalar | VLIW |
| Frequency | 3.2 GHz | 1.13 GHz | 1.9 GHz | 2.2 GHz | 1.4 GHz |
| GFLOP/s (double) | 1.83 | 4.52 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 5.6 |
| Cores used | 8 | 4 (MSP) | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Aggregate: | | | | | |
| L2 Cache | - | 2MB | 1.9MB | 1MB | 256KB |
| L3 Cache | - | - | 36MB | - | 3MB |
| DRAM Bandwidth | 25.6 GB/s | 34 GB/s | 10+5 GB/s | 6.4 GB/s | 6.4 GB/s |
| GFLOP/s (double) | 14.6 | 18 | 7.6 | 4.4 | 5.6 |

# Stencil Operations on Structured Grids

# Stencil Operations

- Simple Example - The Heat Equation
  - $dT/dt = k\nabla^2 T$
  - Parabolic PDE on 3D discretized scalar domain
- Jacobi Style (read from current grid, write to next grid)
  - 8 FLOPs per point, typically double precision
  - Next[x,y,z] = Alpha*Current[x,y,z] +

    Beta*( Current[x-1,y,z] + Current[x+1,y,z] +

    Current[x,y-1,z] + Current[x,y+1,z] +

    Current[x,y,z-1] + Current[x,y,z+1] )
  - Doesn't exploit the FMA pipeline well
  - Basically 6 streams presented to the memory subsystem
- Explicit ghost zones bound grid



# Optimization - Planes

- Naïve approach (cacheless vector machine) is to load 5 streams and store one.
- This is 8 flops per 48 bytes
  - memory limits performance to 4.2 GFLOP/s
- A better approach is to make each DMA the size of a plane
  - cache the 3 most recent planes (z-1, z, z+1)
  - there are only two streams (one load, one store)
  - memory now limits performance to 12.8 GFLOP/s
- Still must compute on each plane after it is loaded
  - e.g. forall Current_local[x,y] update Next_local[x,y]
  - Note: computation can severely limit performance



# Optimization - Double Buffering

- Add a input stream buffer and and output stream buffer (keep 6 planes in local store)
- Two phases (transfer & compute) are now overlapped
- Thus it is possible to hide the faster of DMA transfer time and computation time



# Optimization - Cache Blocking

- Domains can be quite large (~1GB)
- A single plane, let alone 6, might not fit in the local store
- Partition domain into cache blocked slabs so that 6 cache blocked planes can fit in the local store
- Partitioning in the Y dimension maintains good spatial and temporal locality
- Has the added benefit that cache blocks are independent and thus can be parallelized across multiple SPEs
- Memory efficiency can be diminished as an intra grid ghost zone is implicitly created.



# Optimization - Register Blocking

- Instead of computing on pencils, compute on ribbons (4x2)
- Hides functional unit & local store latency
- Minimizes local store memory traffic
- Minimizes loop overhead

- May not be beneficial / noticeable for cache based machines

# Double Precision Results




- ~$256^3$ problem
- Performance model matches well with hardware
- 5-9x performance of Opteron/Itanium/Power5
- X1E ran a slight variant (beta hard coded to be 1.0, not cache blocked)

# Optimization - Temporal Blocking

- If the application allows it, perform block the outer (temporal) loop
- Only appropriate on memory bound implementations
  - Improves computational intensity
  - Cell SP or Cell with faster DP
- Simple approach
  - Overlapping trapezoids in time-space plot
  - Can be inefficient due to duplicated work
  - If performing n steps, the local store must hold 3(n+1) planes
- Time Skewing is algorithmically superior, but harder to parallelize.
- Cache Oblivious is similar but implemented recursively.



# Temporal Blocking Results




- Cell is computationally bound in double precision (no benefit in temporal blocking, so only cache blocked shown)
- Cache machines show the average of 4 steps of time skewing

# Temporal Blocking Results (2)




- **Temporal blocking on Cell was implemented in single precision (four step average)**
- **Others still use double precision**

# Sparse Matrix-Vector Multiplication

# Sparse Matrix Vector Multiplication

- Most of the matrix entries are zeros, thus the non zero entries are sparsely distributed
- Dense methods compute on all the data, sparse methods only compute the nonzeros (as only they compute to the result)
- Can be used for unstructured grid problems
- Issues
  - Like DGEMM, can exploit a FMA well
  - Very low computational intensity (1 FMA for every 12+ bytes)
  - Non FP instructions can dominate
  - Can be very irregular
  - Row lengths can be unique and very short



# Compressed Sparse Row

- Compressed Sparse Row (CSR) is the standard format
  - Array of nonzero values
  - Array of corresponding column for each nonzero value
  - Array of row starts containing index (in the above arrays) of first nonzero in the row

# Optimization - Double Buffer Nonzeros

- Computation and Communication are approximately equally expensive
- While operating on the current set of nonzeros, load the next (~1K nonzero buffers)
- Need complex (thought) code to stop and restart a row between buffers
- Can nearly double performance

# Optimization - SIMDization

- Row Padding
  - Pad rows to the nearest multiple of 128b
  - Might requires O(N) explicit zeros
  - Loop overhead still present
  - Generally works better in double precision
- BCSR
  - Nonzeros are grouped into dense r x c blocks(sub matrices)
  - O(nnz) explicit zeros are added
  - Choose r&c so that it meshes well with 128b registers
  - Performance can hurt especially in DP as computing on zeros is very wasteful
  - Can hide latency and amortize loop overhead

# Optimization - Cache Blocked Vectors

- Doubleword DMA gathers from DRAM can be expensive
- Cache block source and destination vectors
- Finite LS, so what's the best aspect ratio?
- DMA large blocks into local store
- Gather operations into local store
  - ISA vs. memory subsystem inefficiencies
  - Exploits temporal and spatial locality within the SPE
- In effect, the sparse matrix is explicitly blocked into submatrices, and we can skip, or otherwise optimize empty submatrices



- Indices are now relative to the cache block
  - half words
  - reduces memory traffic by 16%

# Optimization - Load Balancing

- Potentially irregular problem
- Load imbalance can severely hurt performance
- Partitioning by rows is clearly insufficient
- Partitioning by nonzeros is inefficient when the matrix has few but highly variable nonzeros per row.



- Define a cost function of number of row starts and number of nonzeros.
- Determine the parameters via static timing analysis or tuning.

# Other Approaches

- BeBop / OSKI on the Itanium2 & Opteron
  - uses BCSR
  - auto tunes for optimal r x c blocking
  - Cell implementation is similar
- Cray's routines on the X1E
  - Report best of CSRP, Segmented Scan & Jagged Diagonal

# Benchmark Matrices

#06 - FEM Crystal



N=14K, NNZ=490K

#09 - 3D Tube



N=45K, NNZ=1.6M

#17 - FEM



N=22K, NNZ=1M

#36 - CFD



N=75K, NNZ=325K

#18 - Circuit



N=17K, NNZ=125K

#25 - Financial



N=74K, NNZ=335K

#27 - NASA



N=36K, NNZ=180K

#15 - PDE



N=40K, NNZ=1.6M

#28 - Vibroacoustic



N=12K, NNZ=177K

#40 - Linear Programming



N=31K, NNZ=1M

# Double Precision SpMV Performance




**Notes:**

- few nonzeros per row severely limited performance on CFD
- BCSR was clearly exploited on the first 2
- 3-8x faster than Opteron/Itanium

# Double Precision SpMV Performance (2)




**Notes:**

- few nonzeros per row (hurts a lot)
- Not structured as well as previous set
- 4-6x faster than Opteron/Itanium

# Double Precision SpMV Performance (3)




**Notes:**

- many nonzeros per row
- Load imbalance hurt cell's performance by as much as 20%
- 5-7x faster than Opteron/Itanium

# Conclusions

# Conclusions

- Cell performance is far more predictable than conventional OOO machines
- Even in double precision, it obtains much better performance on a surprising variety of codes.
- Cell can eliminate unneeded memory traffic, hide memory latency, and thus achieves a much higher percentage of memory bandwidth.

- Instruction set can be very inefficient for poorly SIMDizable or misaligned codes.
- Loop overheads can heavily dominate performance.

- Programming model could be streamlined

# Acknowledgments


- This work is a collaboration with the following LBNL/FTG members:
  - John Shalf, Lenny Oliker, Shoaib Kamil, Parry Husbands, Kaushik Datta and Kathy Yelick
- Additional thanks to
  - Joe Gebis and David Patterson
- X1E FFT numbers provided by:
  - Bracy Elton, and Adrian Tate
- Cell access provided by IBM

# Questions?