Lecture 17:
Hardware Specialization and Algorithm Specific Programming

Parallel Computing
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Energy-constrained computing
Performance and Power

\[ \text{Power} = \frac{\text{Ops}}{\text{second}} \times \frac{\text{Joules}}{\text{Op}} \]

Fixed

Specialization (fixed function) \( \Rightarrow \) better energy efficiency

What is the magnitude of improvement from specialization?
Fast Fourier transform (FFT): throughput and energy benefits of specialization

ASIC delivers same performance as one CPU core using only ~ 1/100th the power
Choosing the right tool for the job

- Energy-optimized CPU
- Throughput-oriented processor (GPU)
- Programmable DSP
- Domain Specific Accelerator
- FPGA/reconfigurable logic
- ASIC

~10X more efficient
~20X
~50X???
~100-1000X more efficient

Easiest to program
Limited domain of programmability with DSLs (e.g. DNN)
Difficult to program (making it easier is active area of research)
Not programmable + costs 10-100’s millions of dollars to design / verify / create

Credit: Pat Hanrahan for this slide design
Mapping Algorithms to Execution Resources

Dual-core processor, multi-threaded cores (4 threads/core). Two-way superscalar cores: each core can run up to two independent instructions per clock from any of its threads, provided one is scalar and the other is vector.
So You Want to Design an Accelerator for Your Algorithm

- Traditionally, you must spend years becoming an expert in VHDL or Verilog, Chisel...

- High-Level Synthesis (HLS): Vivado HLS, Intel OpenCL, and Xilinx SDAccel
  - Restricted C with pragmas
  - These tools sacrifice performance and are difficult to use

- Spatial is a high-level language for designing hardware accelerators that was designed to enable performance-oriented programmers to specify
  - Parallelism: specialized compute
  - Locality: specialized memories and data movement
Spatial-lang.org

SPATIAL
A high-level language for programming accelerators

GET STARTED  VIEW SOURCE
Spatial: DSL for Accelerator Design

- Simplify configurable accelerator design
  - Constructs to express:
    - Parallel patterns as parallel and pipelined datapaths
    - Hierarchical control
    - Explicit memory hierarchies
    - Explicit parameters
  - All parameters exposed to the compiler
  - Simple APIs to manage CPU ↔ Accelerator communication

- Allows programmers to focus on “interesting stuff”
  - Designed for performance-oriented programmers (parallelism and locality)
  - More intuitive than CUDA: dataflow instead of threads
### The Spatial Language: Memory Templates

#### Explicit memory hierarchy
Typed storage templates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>LineBuffer<a href="R,C">Int</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UInt8</td>
<td>ShiftReg<a href="R,C">UInt8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double</td>
<td>Reg[Double]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Float</td>
<td>FIFO<a href="D">Float</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Explicit transfers across memory hierarchy
Dense and sparse access

- buffer load `image(i, j:j+C)`
- buffer gather `image(a, 10)`

#### Streaming abstractions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Template</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>StreamIn[RGB]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB</td>
<td>StreamOut[RGB]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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The Spatial Language: Control Templates

Blocking/non-blocking interaction with CPU

Arbitrary state machine / loop nesting with implicit control signals

\begin{verbatim}
 FSM[Int] { s => s != DONE }{
  case STATE0 =>
    Foreach(C by 1) { j => ... }
  case STATE1 => ...
  Reduce(0)(C by 1) { i => ... }
}

Accel { ... }

Accel(*) { ... }
\end{verbatim}
The Spatial Language: Design Parameters

Spatial templates capture a variety of design parameters:

- **Explicit** parallelization factors
  
  ```
  val P = 16 (1 \rightarrow 32)
  Reduce(\emptyset)(N by 1 \text{ par } P){i =>
  data(i)
  }{(a,b) => a + b}
  ```

- **Implicit/Explicit** control schemes
  
  ```
  Stream.Foreach(\emptyset \text{ until } N){i =>
  ...
  }
  ```

- **Explicit** size parameters for stride and buffer sizes
  
  ```
  val B = 64 (64 \rightarrow 1024)
  val buffer = SRAM[Float](B)
  Foreach(N by B){i =>
  ...
  }
  ```

- **Implicit** memory banking and buffering schemes for parallelized access
  
  ```
  Foreach(64 \text{ par } 16){i =>
  buffer(i) // Parallel read
  }
  ```
Inner Product

Let’s build an accelerator to see how Spatial works

Code

Sketch of generated hardware
Inner Product in C

Here is inner product written in C for a CPU

```c
// Set up accumulator and memory pointers
int output = 0;
int* vec1 = (int*)malloc(N * sizeof(int));
int* vec2 = (int*)malloc(N * sizeof(int));

// Iterate through data and accumulate
for (int i = 0; i < N; i++) {
    output = output + (vec1(i) * vec2(i));
}
```
Inner Product in Spatial

// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)

// Create accelerator (instantiate hardware)
Accel {

Inner product in Spatial allows the programmer to build a hardware accelerator
• Start of code looks like C example
• Accel instantiates “for” loop in hardware
Inner Product in Spatial

// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)

// Create accelerator
Accel {
  // Allocate on-chip memories
  val tile1 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  val tile2 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
}
Inner Product in Spatial

- Spatial generates multi-step controllers
  (This Reduce controller’s final step will handle the accumulation)

```scala
// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)

// Create accelerator
Accel {
  // Allocate on-chip memories
  val tile1 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  val tile2 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  // Specify outer loop
  Reduce(output)(N by tileSize){ t =>
    // More controllers coming...
  }
}
```

```scala

// More controllers coming...

```
Inner Product in Spatial

- **Spatial generates multi-step controllers**
- **Spatial manages communication with DRAM**

```scala
// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)

// Create accelerator
Accel {
  // Allocate on-chip memories
  val tile1 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  val tile2 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  // Specify outer loop
  Reduce(output)(N by tileSize){ t =>
    // Prefetch data
    tile1 load vec1(t :: t + tileSize)
    tile2 load vec2(t :: t + tileSize)
  }
}
```

\{a, b => a + b\}
Inner Product in Spatial

- Spatial generates multi-step controllers
- Spatial manages communication with DRAM

The complete app generates a three-step control
Load → intra-tile accumulate → full accumulate

Where is the parallelism?
Inner Product in Spatial

- Spatial generates multi-step controllers
- Spatial manages communication with DRAM
- Spatial helps express hardware datapaths

// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)

// Create accelerator
Accel {
  // Allocate on-chip memories
  val tile1 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  val tile2 = SRAM[Int](tileSize)
  // Specify outer loop
  Reduce(output)(N by tileSize){ t =>
    // Prefetch data
    tile1 load vec1(t :. t + tileSize)
    tile2 load vec2(t :. t + tileSize)
    // Multiply-accumulate data
    val accum = Reg[Int](0)
    Reduce(accum)(tileSize by 1 par 2){ i =>
      tile1(i) * tile2(i)
    }{ _ + _ }
  }{ _ + _ }
}
Inner Product in Spatial

- Spatial generates multi-step controllers
- Spatial manages communication with DRAM
- Spatial helps express hardware datapaths
- Spatial makes it easy to tile

```scala
// Set up host and memory pointers
val output = ArgOut[Int]
val vec1 = DRAM[Int](N)
val vec2 = DRAM[Int](N)
val bigTileSize = 2*tileSize

// Create accelerator
Accel {
    // Allocate on-chip memories
    val tile1 = SRAM[Int](bigTileSize)
    val tile2 = SRAM[Int](bigTileSize)

    // Specify outer loop
    Reduce(output)(N by bigTileSize){ t =>
        // Prefetch data
        tile1 load vec1(t :: t + bigTileSize)
        tile2 load vec2(t :: t + bigTileSize)
    // Multiply-accumulate data
    val accum = Reg[Int](0)
    Reduce(accum)(bigTileSize by 1 par 2){ i =>
        tile1(i) * tile2(i)
    }{ _ + _ }
    }{ _ + _ }
}
```
### Inner Product in Spatial

- **Spatial generates multi-step controllers**
- **Spatial manages communication with DRAM**
- **Spatial helps express hardware datapaths**
- **Spatial makes it easy to tile**
- **Spatial lets the user manage scheduling**
  - With annotation, steps (stages) execute in pipelined fashion. “Buffering” of memories is inferred.
Controllers

- Every “loop” in Spatial is a controller (key parallel abstraction)
- **Controller** - Hardware counters whose values control **datapaths** or other controllers
- Controller hierarchy
  - **Inner Controller** - Datapath: consisting of *only* primitive nodes
    - arithmetic, if-then/mux, memory-access, etc.
  - **Outer Controller** - Other controllers

```plaintext
Foreach(N by 1) { i => // Outer controller
    Foreach(M by 1) { j => mem(i,j) = i+j } // Inner controller
    Foreach(P by 1) { j => if (j == 0) ... = mem(i,j) } // Inner controller
}
```
Controller Performance

The execution time of a single controller is:

\[ T = II \times (iters - 1) + L \]

- \( T \) = Cycles per execution
- \( II \) = Initiation interval
- \( iters \) = Number of iterations
- \( L \) = Latency of the datapath elements

However, \( II \) and \( L \) have slightly different meanings depending on a controller’s level (inner vs outer)
Inner Controllers

Inner controllers always execute iterations in a pipelined (overlapped) manner.

**Initiation interval (II):** the length of the longest cycle in dataflow graph.

**Latency (L):** the longest path from the loop iterators to the final node.

\[ T = \text{II} \times (\text{iter} \times -1) + \text{L} \]

```scala
Foreach(N by 1, M by 1, P by 1, Q by 1){
  (i, j, p, q) =>
  val sum = i + j + p + q
  val next = reg.value ^ sum
  reg := mux(q == 0, reg.value, next)
}
```
Inner Controller Parallelization

Parallelization of inner controllers results in vectorization of the counter chain and duplication of the dataflow graph.

Abstraction: parallel
Implementation: vectors

Foreach(N by i par 1){ i => ... }

Foreach(N by i par 2){ i => ... }

Increase parallelization
Outer Controllers

Initiation interval and latency for outer (parent) controllers depends on their “schedule,” which we will introduce next.

We will refer to these properties as “effective” initiation interval and “effective” latency

\[ T = II_{eff} \times (iter_{s} - 1) + L_{eff} \]
Scheduling Outer Controllers

There are four major schedules for outer controllers:

- **Sequential** – No overlapping of inner (child) controllers
- **Pipelined** – Coarse-grained overlapping of inner (child) controllers
- **Stream** – Data-driven execution of inner (child) controllers
- **Fork-Join** – Parallel execution of all inner (child) controllers
A Look at Schedules

Sequential:
```java
Foreach(...) { i =>
    sram load dram
    Foreach(M by 1) { j => sram2(j) = sram(j) * j }
    dram store sram2
}
```

Pipelined:
```java
Foreach(...) { i =>
    sram load dram
    Foreach(M by 1) { j => sram2(j) = sram(j) * j }
    dram2 store sram2
}
```

Stream:
```java
Foreach(...) { i =>
    fifoIn load dram
    Foreach(M by 1) { j => fifoOut.enq(fifoIn.deq() * j) }
    dram2 store fifoOut
}
```
A Closer Look at Schedules

Sequential.
Foreach(...){
  i =>
  sram load dram
  Foreach(M by 1){ j => sram2(j) = sram(j) * j }
  dram store sram2
}

Pipelined.
Foreach(...){
  i =>
  sram load dram
  Foreach(M by 1){ j => sram2(j) = sram(j) * j }
  dram2 store sram2
}

Stream.
Foreach(...){
  i =>
  fifoIn load dram
  Foreach(M by 1){ j => fifoOut.enq(fifoIn.deq() * j) }
  dram2 store fifoOut
}

When the pipeline is full, it is in steady-state and the longest stage determines II.

When an intermediate FIFO is full, the producer stage is stalled.

When an intermediate FIFO is empty, the consumer stage is starved.
Spatial vs. Chisel (HDL)

```scala
val output = ArgOut[Float]
val vectorA = DRAM[Float](N)
val vectorB = DRAM[Float](N)

Accel {
  Reduce(output)(N by B){ i =>
    val tileA = SRAM[Float](B)
    val tileB = SRAM[Float](B)
    val acc = Reg[Float]

    tileA load vectorA(i :: i+B)
    tileB load vectorB(i :: i+B)

    Reduce(acc)(B by 1){ j =>
      tileA(j) * tileB(j)
      }{a, b => a + b}
  }
}
```

Spatial: ~30 lines

Chisel: ~3200 lines
Spatial Question

- Spatial programmer’s responsibility
  - Specifying algorithm as a hierarchy of controllers
  - Specifying memory hierarchy of algorithm
  - Explicit data movement
  - Picking tiling factors, parallelism and scheduling

- Spatial systems responsibility
  - Banking and buffering of memories to maximize perf and minimize resources
  - Hardware generation for target platform (FPGA, CGRA, ASIC)
  - Performance debugging feedback
The execution time equation and schedules are important, but understanding the controller hierarchy and how to optimize the execution time of the hierarchy is the key to designing good accelerators

Let’s talk about performance debugging
Performance Debugging with Timing Diagrams

We want to minimize the execution time of the **Parent Sequential Controller**

The controller timing diagram looks like this:
Performance Debugging

We want to minimize the execution time of the Parent Sequential Controller

\[ T_{\text{parent}} = II_{\text{eff}} \times (\text{iters} - 1) + L_{\text{eff}} \]
Performance Debugging

We want to minimize the execution time of the Parent Sequential Controller

\[ T_{\text{parent}} = II_{\text{eff}} \times (\text{iters} - 1) + L_{\text{eff}} \]

\[ \text{iters} = \frac{Q}{TS} \]

\[ II_{\text{eff}} = L_{\text{eff}} = \sum T_{\text{child}} \]
Performance Debugging with Controller Hierarchy

The controller hierarchy is a more concise way to understand performance. Spatial compiler **automatically** generates the hierarchy for your application.

```plaintext
1: Sequential.Foreach(Q by TS){ i =>
2:   Foreach(N by 1){ j => /* Primitives */ }
3:   Pipe.Foreach(M by 1){ j => /* Controllers */ }
4:   Stream.Foreach(P by 1) { j => /* Controllers */ }
}
```

**Line numbers** link controllers back to source code.

**Static properties** (II and L for inner controllers) are reported immediately.
Controller Hierarchy Performance Debugging

The controller hierarchy is a more concise way to understand performance. Spatial **automatically** generates these trees for your application.

```
1: Sequential.Foreach(Q by TS){ i =>
2:   Foreach(N by 1){ j => /* Primitives */ }
3:   Pipe.Foreach(M by 1){ j => /* Controllers */ }
4:   Stream.Foreach(P by 1) { j => /* Controllers */ }
}
```

Actual $T$ and iteration counts are automatically collected and overlaid after execution.
Controller Hierarchy Performance Debugging

How do you use T and iteration counts effectively?

```plaintext
1: Sequential.Foreach(Q by TS){ i => 
2:   Foreach(N by 1){ j => /* Primitives */ } 
3:   Pipe.Foreach(M by 1){ j => /* Controllers */ } 
4:   Stream.Foreach(P by 1) { j => /* Controllers */ } 
}```
Performance Debugging

One of the most basic tools for improving performance is parallelization, which decreases the iters of a controller.

\[ T = II \ast (\text{iters} - 1) + L \]

Parallelization with Spatial's programming model has different meanings for inner and outer controllers.
Optimization Example

- The programmer can use parallelization and controller schedule directives to explore the tradeoff between resource utilization and performance.
- Let’s revisit our inner product accelerator.
Inner Product Optimization Example

We will track resource utilization and performance as we tune these parameters:
- Outer controller schedule (Reduce)
- ParOut
- ParIn
Inner Product Controller Hierarchy

The baseline implementation is ParIn=1, ParOut=1, and schedule=Sequential

Our instrumented controller tree will look like this.
Optimization Goal

- Understand impact on
  - execution time (cycles)
  - logic resources (arithmetic nodes)
  - memory resources (bytes)
By optimizing the code, we can improve execution time by ~7x

The best design increases logic by ~6x and memory by ~4x
Sequential vs. Pipelined

- Scheduling the outer controller as a Pipelined controller, rather than a Sequential controller, yields some performance improvement.
- There is an increase in memory utilization due to buffering between stages.
- There is no logic increase since we are not changing the datapaths.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ParIn</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ParOut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sched</td>
<td>Seq</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Sequential vs. Pipelined

- Understanding how the performance debugger maps to timing diagrams explains this performance boost from pipelining
  - Color corresponds to iteration in diagrams
- For the Sequential case, $I_{eff} \approx \sum T_c$
- For the Pipelined case, $I_{eff} \approx \max(T_c)$

$$T = I_{eff} \times (iters - 1) + L_{eff}$$
Inner Parallelization

- There was a performance improvement from ParIn=1 to ParIn=2
  - Improved bottleneck of the pipeline

- From ParIn=2 to ParIn=4, we consume more logic but did not see much speedup
  - Inner reduce is no longer the bottleneck
Inner Parallelization

- The performance debugger explains what happened
- The bottleneck stage improves as a result of this parallelization
- There is still a small performance improvement for ParI=4 because $II_{eff} \approx \max(T_c)$ decreases a bit

\[ T = II_{eff} \times (\text{iters} - 1) + L_{eff} \]
Outer Parallelization

- There is a performance improvement from ParOut=1 to ParOut=2 since we are increasing the off-chip data bandwidth by using more DMA channels
  - Increased both logic and memory since we duplicate the entire accelerator

- From ParOut=2 to ParOut=4, the app becomes memory-bound
  - Change increases resource utilization without improving performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ParIn</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ParOut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sched</td>
<td>Seq</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
<td>Pipe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outer Parallelization

- The Reduce and Sum Operation stages are statically scheduled.
- The DRAM Transfers stages compete for the DRAM and execute when DRAM returns data.
- When ParOut doubles, Pipe.Reduce runs for half as many iterations.
  - T does not change because the DRAM Transfers stages run for twice as long.
- This indicates that the DRAM has enough bandwidth to support ParOut=2 but not ParOut=4.

```
ParOut = 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAM Transfers</th>
<th>Reduce (i)</th>
<th>Sum Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T = 70, iters =</td>
<td>T = 37, iters =</td>
<td>T = 7, iters =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ParOut = 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRAM Transfers</th>
<th>Reduce (i)</th>
<th>Sum Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T = 140, iters =</td>
<td>T = 37, iters =</td>
<td>T = 7, iters =</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```
Performance vs. Resources

- The best design has the shortest execution time and uses the fewest resources
- Scale back some parallelization factors to get a better design
- By optimizing the code, we can improve execution time by ~7x
  - The best design increases logic by ~6x and memory by ~4x
Spatial GDA Design Space Exploration

- **Valid design point**
- **Invalid design point**
- **Pareto-optimal (ALMs/cycles) design**
- **Synthesized pareto design point**

Space for GDA spans four orders of magnitude

Performance limited by available BRAMs
Accelerator Design Summary

- Significant energy efficiency improvements from specialized accelerators (100x–1000x)
- Designing an accelerator is a tradeoff between performance and resource utilization
  - Parallelism
  - Locality
- It requires the programmer to have insight into the application
  - Where is the bottleneck
  - Is the implementation compute or memory-bound
- Spatial helps you understand the trade-off between performance and resource utilization
  - Allows rapid exploration of your algorithm
  - Enables high-level accelerator design
- ~7x performance improvement for the simple inner product acceleration
TensorFlow to FPGA

Dataflow graph of domain-specific operators

Hierarchical dataflow graph of parallel patterns

Hierarchical dataflow graph of tiled pipelines

Memory hierarchy

Memory and compute units

Control information
Outer Controller Parallelization

Parallelization of **outer controllers** results in duplication of all child controllers and insertion of synchronization controllers (**ForkJoin**).

Each duplicate child receives only one lane of the parent counter chain.

```
Pipe.Foreach(Q by 1 par 1) { i =>
    Stream.Foreach(M by 1) { j => ... }
    Pipe.Foreach(M by 1) { k => ... }
}

Pipe.Foreach(Q by 1 par 2) { i =>
    Stream.Foreach(M by 1) { j => ... }
    Pipe.Foreach(M by 1) { k => ... }
}
```