

Multi-core Performance Analysis

HPC Computation

Performance Analysis

- Compiler Feedback
- HWPC Data
- Load Balance

Compiler Feedback

- Before optimizing code, it's critical to know what the compiler does to your code
 - Loop optimizations
 - Vectorization
 - Prefetching
 - ...
- Equally important to what the compiler does is what it doesn't do, and why
 - Data dependencies
 - Misplaced branches
 - Unknown loop counts
 - ...

Enabling Compiler Feedback

- **Portland Group**
 - `Minfo=all`
 - `Mneginfo`
 - `Minfo=ccff` (Common Compiler Feedback Format)
- **Cray**
 - `rm` (Fortran)
 - `hlist=m` (C/C++)
- **Intel**
 - `vec-report1`
- **Pathscale**
 - `LNO:simd_verbose=ON:vintr_verbose=ON:prefetch_verbose=ON`
- **GNU**
 - `ftree-vectorizer-verbose=1`

Compiler Feedback Examples: PGI

```
! Matrix Multiply
do k = 1, N
  do j = 1, N
    do i = 1, N
      c(i,j) = c(i,j) + &
        a(i,k)*b(k,j)
    end do
  end do
end do
```

mm:

18, Loop interchange
produces reordered loop
nest: 19,18,20

20, Generated 3
alternate loops for the
loop

Generated vector
sse code for the loop

Generated 2
prefetch instructions
for the loop

PGI CCFF Usage

```
ftn -fast -Minfo=all,ccff -Mneginfo -Mprof=ccff  
mm.F90  
pgcollect ./a.out  
pgprof ./a.out
```

CCFF in PGProf

The screenshot shows the Xming X PGProf interface. The main window displays a Fortran code snippet from a file named 'mm.F90'. The code is as follows:

```
14 real(8), intent(inout) :: C(N,N)
15 integer :: i,j,k
16
17 ! Matrix Multiply
18 do k = 1, N
19   do j = 1, N
20     do i = 1, N
21       c(i,j) = c(i,j) + &
22         a(i,k) * b(k,j)
23     end do
24   end do
25 end do
26 end subroutine mm
27
28 end module mm_mod
29
```

The performance analysis shows that line 20, which contains the innermost loop 'do i = 1, N', is the most intensive, taking 26.9 seconds, which is 100% of the time spent in this routine. The interface also provides line-level information for line 18, including intensity and loop interchange details.

Line-level information for line 18

- Intensity = $(n*(n*(n^2)))/((n*n)+((n*n)+((n*n)+(n*n))))$
- Loop interchange produces reordered loop nest: 19,18,20

Information about how file mm.F90 was compiled

The interface includes a bottom navigation bar with tabs for 'Parallelism', 'Histogram', 'Compiler Feedback', 'System Configuration', and 'Accelerator Performance'. The status bar at the bottom indicates the profile was generated on Wednesday, September 21, 2011, at 09:49:04 EDT, for the profile './pgprof.out'.

CCFF in PGProf (cont.)

The screenshot shows the PGProf interface in Xming X. The main window displays a code profile for a file named 'mm'. The code is as follows:

```
Line      mm.F90      Seconds
14      real(8), intent(inout) :: C(N,N)
15      integer :: i,j,k
16
17      ! Matrix Multiply
18      do k = 1, N
19          do j = 1, N
20              do i = 1, N
21                  c(i,j) = c(i,j) + &
22                      a(i,k) * b(k,j)
23              end do
24          end do
25      end do
26  end subroutine mm
27
28  end module mm_mod
29
```

The profile shows that line 20, which is the innermost loop, has a time of 26.9 seconds, accounting for 100% of the execution time. The interface also provides detailed information for this line:

Line-level information for line 20

1. Intensity = 0.67
2. Generated 3 alternate loops for the loop
3. Generated vector sse code for the loop
4. Generated 2 prefetch instructions for the loop

Additional information is available about how the file 'mm.F90' was compiled. The interface also includes tabs for 'Parallelism', 'Histogram', 'Compiler Feedback', 'System Configuration', and 'Accelerator Performance'. The status bar at the bottom indicates the profile was generated on Wednesday, September 21, 2011, at 09:49:04 EDT, for the profile './pgprof.out'.

Compiler Feedback Examples: Cray

```
18.  ib-----<          do k = 1, N
19.  ib ibr4-----<      do j = 1, N
20.  ib ibr4 Vbr4--<      do i = 1, N
21.  ib ibr4 Vbr4          c(i,j) = c(i,j) + &
22.  ib ibr4 Vbr4          a(i,k) * b(k,j)
23.  ib ibr4 Vbr4-->      end do
24.  ib ibr4----->      end do
25.  ib----->          end do
```

i - interchanged
b - blocked
r - unrolled
V - Vectorized

ftn-6007 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 18

A loop starting at line 18 was interchanged with the loop starting at line 19.

ftn-6254 ftn: VECTOR File = mm.F90, Line = 18

A loop starting at line 18 was not vectorized because a recurrence was found on "C" at line 21.

ftn-6049 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 18

A loop starting at line 18 was blocked with block size 32.

ftn-6294 ftn: VECTOR File = mm.F90, Line = 19

A loop starting at line 19 was not vectorized because a better candidate was found at line 20.

ftn-6049 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 19

A loop starting at line 19 was blocked with block size 8.

ftn-6005 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 19

A loop starting at line 19 was unrolled 4 times.

ftn-6049 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 20

A loop starting at line 20 was blocked with block size 256.

ftn-6005 ftn: SCALAR File = mm.F90, Line = 20

A loop starting at line 20 was unrolled 4 times.

ftn-6204 ftn: VECTOR File = mm.F90, Line = 20

A loop starting at line 20 was vectorized.

Compiler Feedback Examples: Pathscale

```
(mm.F90:20) Vectorization is not likely to be beneficial (try -  
LNO:simd=2 to vectorize it). Loop was not vectorized.  
(mm.F90:20) Vectorization is not likely to be beneficial (try -  
LNO:simd=2 to vectorize it). Loop was not vectorized.  
(mm.F90:20) Vectorization is not likely to be beneficial (try -  
LNO:simd=2 to vectorize it). Loop was not vectorized.  
(mm.F90:20) Vectorization is not likely to be beneficial (try -  
LNO:simd=2 to vectorize it). Loop was not vectorized.  
(mm.F90:19) Generated 40 prefetch instructions for this loop
```

=== After adding -LNO:simd=2 ===

```
(mm.F90:20) Loop has too many loop invariants. Loop was not  
vectorized.  
(mm.F90:20) LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.  
(mm.F90:20) LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.  
(mm.F90:20) LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.  
(mm.F90:19) Generated 52 prefetch instructions for this loop
```

Compiler Feedback Examples: Intel

```
mm.F90(20): (col. 9) remark: LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.
```

```
mm.F90(20): (col. 9) remark: LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.
```

```
mm.F90(20): (col. 9) remark: LOOP WAS VECTORIZED.
```

Compiler Feedback Examples: GNU

```
mm.F90:20: note: LOOP VECTORIZED.
```

```
mm.F90:11: note: vectorized 1 loops in function.
```

Gathering Runtime Performance Data

- Performance data can be gathered in numerous ways with a range of detail and intrusiveness
 - Sampling - Snapshot of data collected periodically - very light weight
 - User timers - User inserts timers at logical places - slightly heavier, very intrusive to code
 - Code instrumentation - Tool inserts instrumentation automatically into the code
- Degrees of detail
 - Sampling - high level overview, low details
 - Profiling - summation over time, more detailed
 - Tracing - record of events over time, very detailed and expensive

CrayPAT Automatic Performance Analysis (APA)

- CrayPAT provides a mechanism for guiding user experiments, known as APA
- User first makes lightweight, sample-based run
- Data from initial run is used to suggest appropriate parts of code for gathering more detailed information
 - Attempts to exclude routines that would add overhead and focus on routines that are likely to be important

Important Runtime Data

- Time spent in important routines, libraries, and loop nests
- Hardware Performance Counters (HWPC)
- Load imbalance data
- Communication
 - Time
 - Routines
 - Message sizes
- I/O Data

Sampling Output (Table 1)

Notes for table 1:

...

Table 1: Profile by Function

Samp %	Samp	Imb. Samp	Imb. Samp %	Group Function PE='HIDE'
100.0%	775	--	--	Total
94.2%	730	--	--	USER
43.4%	336	8.75	2.6%	mlwxyz
16.1%	125	6.28	4.9%	half
8.0%	62	6.25	9.5%	full
6.8%	53	1.88	3.5%	artv
4.9%	38	1.34	3.6%	bnd
3.6%	28	2.00	6.9%	currenf
2.2%	17	1.50	8.6%	bndsf
1.7%	13	1.97	13.5%	model
1.4%	11	1.53	12.2%	cfl
1.3%	10	0.75	7.0%	currenh
1.0%	8	5.28	41.9%	bndbo
1.0%	8	8.28	53.4%	bndto
5.4%	42	--	--	MPI
1.9%	15	4.62	23.9%	mpi_sendrecv
1.8%	14	16.53	55.0%	mpi_bcast
1.7%	13	5.66	30.7%	mpi_barrier

Sampling Output (Table 2)

Table 2: Profile by Group, Function, and Line

Samp %	Samp	Imb. Samp	Imb. Samp %	Group	Function	Source	Line	PE='HIDE'
100.0%	777	--	--	Total				
94.2%	732	--	--	USER				
43.4%	337	--	--	mlwxyz	ldr/mhd3d/src/mlwxyz.f			
2.1%	16	1.47	8.9%	line.39				
2.8%	22	2.25	9.7%	line.78				
1.3%	10	1.72	14.8%	line.604				
2.4%	19	0.72	3.7%	line.634				
16.1%	125	--	--	half	ldr/mhd3d/src/half.f			
5.4%	42	6.41	13.8%	line.28				
10.7%	83	5.91	6.9%	line.40				
8.0%	62	--	--	full	ldr/mhd3d/src/full.f			
8.0%	62	6.31	9.6%	line.22				
5.4%	42	--	--	MPI				
1.9%	15	4.62	23.9%	mpi_sendrecv_				
1.8%	14	16.53	55.0%	mpi_bcast				
1.7%	13	5.66	30.7%	mpi_barrier_				

CrayPAT Tracegroup (subset)

- **adios** Adaptable I/O System API
- **armci** Aggregate Remote Memory Copy
- **blas** Basic Linear Algebra subprograms
- **caf** Co-Array Fortran (Cray CCE compiler only)
- **chapel** Chapel language compile and runtime library API
- **hdf5** manages extremely large and complex data collections
- **heap** dynamic heap
- **io** includes stdio and sysio groups
- **lapack** Linear Algebra Package
- **math** POSIX.1 math functions
- **mpi** MPI
- **omp** OpenMP API and runtime library API (CCE and PGI only)
- **shmemp** SHMEM
- **upc** Unified Parallel C (Cray CCE compiler only)

For a full list, please see **man pat_build**

pat_report: Flat Profile

Table 1: Profile by Function Group and Function

Time %	Time	Imb. Time	Imb. Time %	Calls	Group	Function
						PE='HIDE'
100.0%	104.593634	--	--	22649	Total	

71.0%	74.230520	--	--	10473	MPI	

69.7%	72.905208	0.508369	0.7%	125	mpi_allreduce_	
1.0%	1.050931	0.030042	2.8%	94	mpi_alltoall_	
=====						
25.3%	26.514029	--	--	73	USER	

16.7%	17.461110	0.329532	1.9%	23	selfgravity_	
7.7%	8.078474	0.114913	1.4%	48	ffte4_	
=====						
2.5%	2.659429	--	--	435	MPI_SYNC	

2.1%	2.207467	0.768347	26.2%	172	mpi_barrier_(sync)	
=====						
1.1%	1.188998	--	--	11608	HEAP	

1.1%	1.166707	0.142473	11.1%	5235	free	
=====						

pat_report: Message Stats by Caller

Table 4: MPI Message Stats by Caller

MPI Msg Bytes	MPI Msg Count	MsgSz <16B Count	4KB<= MsgSz <64KB Count	Function Caller PE[mmm]
15138076.0	4099.4	411.6	3687.8	Total

15138028.0	4093.4	405.6	3687.8	MPI_ISEND

8080500.0	2062.5	93.8	1968.8	calc2_ MAIN_

8216000.0	3000.0	1000.0	2000.0	pe.0
8208000.0	2000.0	--	2000.0	pe.9
6160000.0	2000.0	500.0	1500.0	pe.15
=====				
6285250.0	1656.2	125.0	1531.2	calc1_ MAIN_

8216000.0	3000.0	1000.0	2000.0	pe.0
6156000.0	1500.0	--	1500.0	pe.3
6156000.0	1500.0	--	1500.0	pe.5
=====				
. . .				

Hardware Performance Counters

- All modern CPUs provide have some number of performance counters used during chip design/testing
- These counters can be read by the kernel and tools such as PAPI, CrayPAT, and others to gather runtime data about an application
- Because the CPUs have a limited number of counters, it's often necessary to make multiple runs to gather all of the performance data of interest

Types of Data

- Native Events
 - Each processor has a large set of events that can be counted
 - Names vary between architectures, manufacturers, and processor families
- PAPI Counters
 - PAPI has several counters, which map to native events so that common metrics, such as FLOP counts can be measured in a portable way
- Derived Metrics
 - Raw counter data is difficult to interpret directly, derived metrics are rates and ratios that allow easier interpretation of data
 - Example: FLOP Rate, Cache Hit/Miss Ratio, etc.

Gathering HWPC Data

- PAPI
 - A portable API, developed at the University of Tennessee for reading HWPC
 - User must explicitly insert API calls to gather and interpret the data
- Tools
 - Most performance tools are able to gather HWPC data with little to no code modification
 - Generally able to display data in an understandable manner

PAT_RT_HWPC=1 (Summary with TLB)

PAPI_TLB_DM Data translation lookaside buffer misses
 PAPI_L1_DCA Level 1 data cache accesses
 PAPI_FP_OPS Floating point operations
 DC_MISS Data Cache Miss
 User_Cycles Virtual Cycles

=====

USER

Time%		98.3%		
Time		4.434402	secs	
Imb.Time		--	secs	
Imb.Time%		--		
Calls	0.001M/sec	4500.0	calls	
PAPI_L1_DCM	14.820M/sec	65712197	misses	
PAPI_TLB_DM	0.902M/sec	3998928	misses	
PAPI_L1_DCA	333.331M/sec	1477996162	refs	
PAPI_FP_OPS	445.571M/sec	1975672594	ops	
User time (approx)	4.434	secs	11971868993	cycles 100.0%Time
Average Time per Call			0.000985	sec
CrayPat Overhead : Time	0.1%			
HW FP Ops / User time	445.571M/sec	1975672594	ops	4.1%peak (DP)
HW FP Ops / WCT	445.533M/sec			
Computational intensity	0.17 ops/cycle	1.34	ops/ref	
MFLOPS (aggregate)	1782.28M/sec			
TLB utilization	369.60 refs/miss	0.722	avg uses	
D1 cache hit,miss ratios	95.6% hits	4.4%	misses	
D1 cache utilization (misses)	22.49 refs/miss	2.811	avg hits	

=====

PAT_RT_HWPC=1

Flat profile data

Hard counts

Derived metrics

PAT_RT_HWPC=2 (L1 and L2 Metrics)

```
=====
USER
-----
Time%                               98.3%
Time                               4.436808 secs
Imb.Time                           -- secs
Imb.Time%                           --
Calls                               0.001M/sec      4500.0 calls
DATA_CACHE_REFILLS:
  L2_MODIFIED:L2_OWNED:
  L2_EXCLUSIVE:L2_SHARED           9.821M/sec      43567825 fills
DATA_CACHE_REFILLS_FROM_SYSTEM:
  ALL                               24.743M/sec     109771658 fills
PAPI_L1_DCM                         14.824M/sec     65765949 misses
PAPI_L1_DCA                         332.960M/sec    1477145402 refs
User time (approx)                  4.436 secs     11978286133 cycles  100.0%Time
Average Time per Call                0.000986 sec
CrayPat Overhead : Time              0.1%
D1 cache hit,miss ratios            95.5% hits      4.5% misses
D1 cache utilization (misses)       22.46 refs/miss  2.808 avg hits
D1 cache utilization (refills)      9.63 refs/refill 1.204 avg uses
D2 cache hit,miss ratio             28.4% hits      71.6% misses
D1+D2 cache hit,miss ratio          96.8% hits      3.2% misses
D1+D2 cache utilization              31.38 refs/miss  3.922 avg hits
System to D1 refill                 24.743M/sec     109771658 lines
System to D1 bandwidth              1510.217MB/sec  7025386144 bytes
D2 to D1 bandwidth                  599.398MB/sec  2788340816 bytes
=====
```

PAT_RT_HWPC=5 (Floating point mix)

```
=====
USER
-----
Time%                98.4%
Time                 4.426552 secs
Imb.Time             -- secs
Imb.Time%            --
Calls                0.001M/sec      4500.0 calls
RETIRED_MMX_AND_FP_INSTRUCTIONS:
  PACKED_SSE_AND_SSE2 454.860M/sec  2013339518 instr
  PAPI_FML_INS        156.443M/sec  692459506 ops
  PAPI_FAD_INS        289.908M/sec  1283213088 ops
  PAPI_FDV_INS        7.418M/sec   32834786 ops
  User time (approx)  4.426 secs  11950955381 cycles  100.0%Time
  Average Time per Call 0.000984 sec
  CrayPat Overhead : Time 0.1%
  HW FP Ops / Cycles 0.17 ops/cycle
  HW FP Ops / User time 446.351M/sec 1975672594 ops 4.1%peak(DP)
  HW FP Ops / WCT 446.323M/sec
  FP Multiply / FP Ops 35.0%
  FP Add / FP Ops 65.0%
  MFLOPS (aggregate) 1785.40M/sec
=====
```

PAT_RT_HWPC=12 (QC Vectorization)

=====

USER

Time%		98.3%	
Time		4.434163	secs
Imb.Time		--	secs
Imb.Time%		--	
Calls	0.001M/sec	4500.0	calls
RETIRE_SSE_OPERATIONS:			
SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:			
SINGLE_MUL_OPS		0	ops
RETIRE_SSE_OPERATIONS:			
DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:			
DOUBLE_MUL_OPS	225.224M/sec	998097162	ops
RETIRE_SSE_OPERATIONS:			
SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:			
SINGLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE		0	ops
RETIRE_SSE_OPERATIONS:			
DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:			
DOUBLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE	445.818M/sec	1975672594	ops
User time (approx)	4.432 secs	11965243964	cycles 99.9%Time
Average Time per Call		0.000985	sec
CrayPat Overhead : Time	0.1%		

=====

Vectorization Example

```
=====
USER / calc2_
-----
Time%                28.2%
Time                 0.600875 secs
Imb.Time             0.069872 secs
Imb.Time%            11.9%
Calls                864.9 /sec      500.0 calls
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  SINGLE_MUL_OPS      0 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  DOUBLE_MUL_OPS      369.139M/sec  213408500 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  SINGLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE 0 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  DOUBLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE 369.139M/sec  213408500 ops
User time (approx)   0.578 secs  1271875000 cycles  96.2%Time
```

When compiled with vectorization:

```
=====
USER / calc2_
-----
Time%                24.3%
Time                 0.485654 secs
Imb.Time             0.146551 secs
Imb.Time%            26.4%
Calls                0.001M/sec     500.0 calls
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  SINGLE_MUL_OPS      0 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  DOUBLE_MUL_OPS      208.641M/sec  103016531 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  SINGLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  SINGLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE 0 ops
RETIREd SSE OPERATIONS:
  DOUBLE_ADD_SUB_OPS:
  DOUBLE_MUL_OPS:OP_TYPE 415.628M/sec  205216531 ops
User time (approx)   0.494 secs  1135625000 cycles  100.0%Time
```

Derived Metrics: Computational Intensity

- **What:** Computational intensity is the ratio of arithmetic to memory operations
 - $\text{FLOPS}/(\text{Loads} + \text{Stores})$
- **Why:** Memory transactions are very expensive in comparison to FLOPs, low computational intensity means that the ALUs are waiting for data
- **Interpretation:** Higher is better
 - **Poor:** < 0.5 FLOPs/reference
 - **So-so:** ~ 1.0 FLOPs/reference
 - **Good:** > 1.0 FLOPs/reference

Derived Metrics: Cache Hit Ratios

- **What:** The ratio of hits to misses for a given cache level.
 - Cache Hits/Cache Misses
- **Why:** Cache accesses are significantly faster than memory accesses, ideally once a cache line is loaded it will be reused.
- **Interpretation:** Higher is better
 - **Poor:** < 90%
 - **So-so:** 90% - 95%
 - **Good:** >95%
 - Different levels of cache may have slightly different thresholds, but these are rough guidelines.

Derived Metrics: FLOP Rates

- **What:** Ratio of floating point operations to time.
 - Rate: FLOPs/time
 - Percentage: $(\text{FLOPs/time}) / (\text{Peak FLOP/s})$
 - Caution: Every processor family reports flops differently. Is a 128b, packed multiply 1 FLOP, 2 64-bit FLOPs, or 4 32-bit FLOPs?
- **Why:** Measures how efficiently the code uses the floating point units
- **Interpretation:**
 - While there is value in measuring % of peak, many people put too much emphasis in obtaining a very high % of peak.
 - In reality time to solution or a domain-specific rate (ie. Simulated years/day, Particles/second, etc.) is a better metric.
 - If you do measure flop rates, 10-20% is typically quite good.
 - Few codes get very high % of peak
 - Most codes run happily below 10%

Derived Metrics: **Vectorization**

- **What:** Ratio of vector/packed floating point operation to scalar/unpacked operations
 - This is can be tricky to measure, due to differences in the way CPUs report FLOPs.
 - Example: (FLOPs when compiled with vectorization) / (FLOPs when compiled without vectorization)
- **Why:** All mainstream CPUs are moving to longer vectors (SSE -> AVX -> ??)
- **Interpretation:** Higher is better.

Other Derived Metrics

- Depending on architecture, other metrics that may be of interest
 - Balance of Adds to Multiplies
 - % FMA instructions
 - TLB Utilization