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Introduction
Motivation

• FPGAs are becoming more popular in HPC/Cloud
  ◦ Largely due to advancement of HLS/OpenCL and high power efficiency

• Large body of work has been dedicated to application optimizations

• Optimizations mostly focused on kernel-level optimizations
  ◦ Minimizing loop initiation interval, reducing area usage, and maximizing parallelism

• External memory and controller largely overlooked
  ◦ Very crucial on FPGAs due to low byte/FLOP ratio
Contributions

- Open-source highly-configurable memory bandwidth benchmark
  - Sequential access + 1D blocking + 1.5D/2.5D overlapped blocking

- Analysis of effect of multiple parameters on memory bandwidth
  - Blocking type, number of Input/Output arrays, vector size, interleaving, etc.

- Reference points to show what can be expected

- Outline deficiencies in compiler and memory controller/interface
  - Provide work-arounds in some cases
Methodology
Benchmark Suite

- OpenCL-based
- 3 blocking classes
- 5 array configurations
  - R1W0, R1W1, R2W1, R3W1, R2W2
- NDRange and Single Work-item
  - Also versions with channel between memory read and write

![Diagram of benchmark suite](image)
Hardware and Software

• Nallatech 385A
  ◦ Arria 10 GX 1150
  ◦ 2x DDR4 @2133 MHz => 34.128 GB/s
  ◦ Memory controller @266 MHz
  ◦ AOC 18.1.2 + Quartus 17.1.2 + BSP 17.1

• Tesla K20X and V100 SXM2
  ◦ GDDR5 @249.6 GB/s and HBM2 @ 897.0 GB/s
  ◦ CUDA 10.0
Benchmark Settings

• Array sizes of 1 GiB
  ◦ Total memory usage of 4 GiB

• Block size of 1024 for 1D/1.5D and $256 \times 256$ for 2.5D on FPGA
  ◦ No direct effect on performance

• Block size is individually tuned for GPUs

• “float” datatype

• Quartus hack to allow control over kernel frequency
  ◦ Use fixed kernel frequency (same value as memory controller)
Scope

- Not limited to the FPGA/compiler version used
  - Many experiments repeated on other versions of compiler
  - Many experiments repeated on Stratix V
- Performance trends were the same
  - Only some differences in measured performance
- Performance trends likely apply to all existing versions of the compiler
- Performance trends likely also apply to Stratix 10 with DDR memory
Results
No Blocking – Vector Size

- Performance should saturate at $\text{vector\_size} = \frac{32}{\text{num\_buff}}$
  - R1W0 stops at 16 => performance does not scale with interleaving
  - R1W1 does not saturate at either 16 or 32
  - Other cases do not scale beyond 16 without saturating memory bandwidth
No Blocking – Interleaving disabled

- Performance is always the same or higher with interleaving disabled
- R1W1 @16 nearly saturates the memory bandwidth (32.6 vs. 34.1 GB/s)
  - R2W2 does not saturate @8 but nearly saturates @16
    - Double required vector size => higher area and lower power efficiency
- Other configs do not achieve over 85% of bandwidth
  - Work-around: Use array of structs to merge buffers with same memory access pattern
No Blocking – Single Work-item

- No noticeable performance difference
  - Neither of programming models are preferred with respect to memory performance
No Blocking – Channelized NDRRange

Channelized

- No performance difference is expected
  - Channel only increases pipeline depth

- Small improvements are observed for more than two array
  - The channel probably improves memory stall absorption

Standard
No Blocking – Channelized Single Work-item

- Performance loss in multiple cases
  - Up to 20% loss for R1W1

- Happens with or without interleaving, other compiler versions, Stratix V
  - This is a performance bug in the compiler => replicated by intel
  - Affects multi-kernel designs with separate memory access and compute, incl. systolic array
  - Work-around: Use NDRange for memory access kernel in multi-kernel designs
No Blocking – Operating Frequency @ Vector 8

- Performance increases linearly until peak but decreases after that
- Seed and $F_{\text{max}}$ sweeping can be used to increase frequency and go up the positive slope
- Our $F_{\text{max}}$ hack can be used to decrease frequency and go up the negative slope
FPGA: No Blocking – Padding for R1W1

- Memory controller is incapable of access realignment
  - Up to 50% performance can be lost with unaligned memory accesses
  - Performance loss gets smaller with oversubscription; e.g. @32 is unaffected by alignment

- Required alignment is equal vector length; e.g. @16 => 512-bit alignment
GPU: No Blocking – Padding

- Small variations are also observed on GPUs with alignment
- Alignment size is fixed and 256 bits
- GDDR seems to be less susceptible compared to HBM
- Maximum performance loss is 13% << 50% on Intel FPGAs
FPGA: 1D Blocking – Overlapping for R1W1

- Overlap size % vector size = 0  =>  full alignment and maximum efficiency
- Overlap size % vector size ≠ 0  =>  unaligned accesses and loss of performance
GPU: 1D Blocking – Overlapping for R1W1

- Performances *increases* with bigger overlapping
  - GPU cache absorbs redundant accesses

- If redundant accesses are ignored
  - V100: Similar pattern as FPGA
  - K20X: Loses cache efficiency as overlap size gets larger
FPGA: 1D Blocking – Overlapping and Padding
R1W1 with vector size 16

- Pad arrays to improve alignment
  - Proposed in our previous work at FPGA’18

- Full alignment with padding if overlap size % (vector size / 2) = 0

- Improvements also in other cases if padding size = overlap size % vector size
  - Still a far cry from bandwidth efficiency on GPUs without padding
FPGA: 1.5D and 2.5D Blocking
R1W1 with vector size 16

- Performance pattern is the same as 1D blocking
  - Blocking type has little effect on memory performance
  - Main factor is access alignment

- Overlap size might not be configurable and padding might not be enough to fix alignment
  - Only solution would be to improve the memory controller
Conclusion

• For maximum bandwidth efficiency very strict array requirements should be met
  ◦ In typical cases we might not achieve over 70% of the peak memory bandwidth

• The memory controller is very sensitive to memory access alignment
  ◦ Up to 50% of memory performance can be lost due to unaligned accesses

• Padding is useful to improve memory alignment in specific cases
  ◦ The only universal solution is modifying the memory controller

Benchmark source code:
https://github.com/zohourih/FPGAMemBench