Timing predictability of GPUs: challenges and advances

The Nvidia Pascal case

Thomas Carle, Univ. Toulouse 3, IRIT TRACES group



Introduction

- Embedded Real-Time systems
 - Need for strong **timing guarantees** (WCET)
 - Measurements/probabilities vs Static Analysis
 - Microarchitectural details (HW model) + execution model (Program semantics)
 - Mature techniques for CPU targets
- Models for static WCET analysis
 - Hardware model
 - Pipeline depth, number and latency of functional units, instruction queues, etc.
 - Caches size and configuration
 - Memory hierarchy
 - Predictors, prefetchers
 - Traditionally obtained from the documentation
 - Software model
 - Control Flow Graph of the disassembled binary program

Introduction

- Graphical Processing Units: highly parallel accelerators
 - Major differences w.r.t. CPUs
 - Built for average throughput maximization (vs latency minimization)
 - Exploit parallelism to hide latencies
 - Instruction Level Parallelism
 - Data parallelism
 - Many functional units (aka CUDA Cores CCs)
 - Feed the beast: complex **memory hierarchy**
 - Handle thousands of threads:
 - Hierarchical scheduler (kernels, blocks, warps)
 - **SIMT** execution model
 - Very efficient for e.g. matrix/tensor computations
 - Embedded AI applications (e.g. autonomous vehicles)

Introduction

- Graphical Processing Units: highly parallel accelerators
 - Major differences w.r.t. CPUs
 - Built for average throughput maximization (vs latency minimization)
 - Exploit parallelism to hide latencies
 - Instruction Level Parallelism
 - Data parallelism
 - Many functional units (aka CUDA Cores CCs)
 - Feed the beast: complex **memory hierarchy**
 - Handle thousands of threads:
 - Hierarchical scheduler (kernels, blocks, warps)
 - **SIMT** execution model
 - Very efficient for e.g. matrix/tensor computations
 - Embedded AI applications (e.g. autonomous vehicles)

Can we build an accurate model to predict the timing behavior of a program running on a GPU ?

• Coarse grain vision



• Coarse grain vision

Main program written and compiled for the CPU target

- Sequential or parallel
- Makes calls to GPU functions a.k.a. kernels



• Coarse grain vision

Prog

- Main program written and compiled for the CPU target
 - Sequential or parallel
 - Makes calls to GPU functions a.k.a. kernels



CPU

Kernels written and compiled for the GPU

- Inherently parallel
- Written in C/C++ with extensions (e.g. CUDA, OpenCL, Vulkan)
- Multiple threads execute the **same code** on **different data**
 - Each thread has a unique identifier



• Entering the GPU



• Entering the GPU



10

• Entering the GPU



• Entering the GPU



• Inside a SM



• Inside a SM



• Inside a SM



• Inside a SMP



• Inside a SMP



• Inside a SMP



Nvidia Jetson TX2

- Embedded System-on-Chip
 - 6 ARM cores
 - 1 Pascal GPU
 - 2 SMs, 8 SMPs, 256 Cuda Cores
 - "Embedded GPU"
- Launched in 2016
 - Branded as go-to chip for embedded applications, including autonomous driving
 - Research results now available mostly based on reverse engineering
 - Newer models introduce new features, but built on the same base mechanisms

• Software-defined scoreboard: exploit ILP

- Upon long latency instructions, continue execution until the produced data is actually needed
- SCHI instructions + DEPBAR instructions
 - Compiler optimizations

• Warp scheduler: exploit data parallelism

- \circ $\,$ Swap the active warp when stalled
- \circ 1 per SMP
- \circ Looks for ready warps
 - Instruction buffer for each active warp
 - Contains the next instruction(s) for each warp
 - Software-defined scoreboard
- Scheduling policy is unknown
 - Allegedly Loose Round-Robin or Greedy-Then-Oldest
 - Potentially Two-level scheduler
 - Very hard to assess experimentally
 - Influences capacity to hide latency + cache contents / locality

•	Sof	tware-defined	accrobacrd: avalait II D	
	0	Upon long latend	SCHI % each instr increments SB1	I data is actually needed
	0	SCHI instructions	LD R1, [R2] % SB1 = 1	
		 Compiler o 	LD R3, [R4] % SB1 = 2	
	\\/a	rn scheduler: d	LD R5, [R6] % SB1 = 3	
	vva	Swap the active	SCHI % not relevant	
	0	Swap the active	ADD R7. R8. R9 % not dependent	
	0	1 per SMP	DEPBAR SB1 2	
	0	Looks for ready v	EMUL R1 R1 R10 % dependent on R1	
		Instruction		
		 Conta 		
		 Software-d 	DEPBAR SBI, I	
	0	Scheduling polic	FMUL R3, R3, R11 % dependent on R3	
		Allegedly L	DEPBAR SB1, 0	
		Potentially	SCHI % not relevant	
		Very hard t	FMUL R5, R5, R12 % dependent on R5	
		Influences		itv

• Software-defined scoreboard: exploit ILP

- Upon long latency instructions, continue execution until the produced data is actually needed
- SCHI instructions + DEPBAR instructions
 - Compiler optimizations

• Warp scheduler: exploit data parallelism

- \circ $\,$ Swap the active warp when stalled
- \circ 1 per SMP
- \circ Looks for ready warps
 - Instruction buffer for each active warp
 - Contains the next instruction(s) for each warp
 - Software-defined scoreboard
- Scheduling policy is unknown
 - Allegedly Loose Round-Robin or Greedy-Then-Oldest
 - Potentially Two-level scheduler
 - Very hard to assess experimentally
 - Influences capacity to hide latency + cache contents / locality

• Software-defined scoreboard: exploit ILP



Influences capacity to hide latency + cache contents / locality

- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge

- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge



- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge





- Lockstep execution inside warps
- Conditional branch => divergence within warp
 - Mask inactive threads when executing each branch in sequence, then reconverge
 - Two kinds of divergence/convergence
 - SSY/SYNC, PBK/BRK
 - SIMT stack
 - Token based (NIL, SSY, PBK)
 - Software managed => compiler



ence

n warp

branch in sequence, then reconverge

- Warp CFG requires additional edges
 - Using the SIMT semantics
 - Some may be avoided using static analyses
 - Warp1 and warp2 may not execute the same path, but all threads in each warp execute the same path

Low-level scheduling

- Still some unknowns
 - e.g. warp scheduler policy
- Complex, but can be modelled
 - Provided NVIDIA provides the implementation details
 - Hardest part: memory hierarchy and interference between warps
 - Cache contents
 - Interconnect/memory bank contentions
 - Same problems as multi-core CPUs, with larger scale

Conclusion

- Can we build an accurate model to predict the timing behavior of a program running on a GPU ?
 - Yes ! And we're working on it
 - Timing behavior of a single warp
 - Static analyses to build accurate CFG
 - Architectural model
 - Compositional approach for multiple warps
 - Same approach as for **multi-core CPUs**
 - Missing details => make hypotheses
 - What if some mechanisms are too dynamic ?
 - Build our own predictable GPU

Thanks for your attention

CAPITAL Workshop: sCalable And Precise Timing AnaLysis for multicore platforms

IRIT, Toulouse, June 13th

In-person or remote attendance

Free registration : https://www.irit.fr/TRACES/site/capital-workshop-2023/























