

Compiler Optimizations for Industrial Unstructured Mesh CFD Applications on GPUs

C. Bertolli¹, A. Betts¹, N. Lorient¹, G. R. Mudalige², D. Radford³,
M. B. Giles², and P. H.J. Kelly¹

¹ Dept. of Computing, Imperial College London,

{c.bertolli,a.betts,n.lorient,p.kelly}@imperial.ac.uk

² Oxford e-Research Centre and Dept. of Mathematics, University of Oxford,
{gihan.mudalige,mike.giles}@oerc.ox.ac.uk

³ Rolls Royce Plc., David.Radford@Rolls-Royce.com

Abstract. Graphical Processing Units (GPUs) have shown acceleration factors over multicores for structured mesh-based Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD). However, the value remains unclear for dynamic and irregular applications. Our motivating example is HYDRA, an application used in production at Rolls Royce for the simulation of turbomachinery components of jet engines. In previous work we presented three optimizations: a technique able to split a highly complex loop into simpler loops, a kernel specific alternative code synthesis, and configuration parameter tuning. Using these optimizations systematically on HYDRA improves the GPU performance relative to the multicore CPU. We show how these optimizations can be automated in a compiler, through user annotations. Performance analysis of a large number of complex loops enables us to study the relationship between optimizations and the resource requirements of loops, in terms of registers and shared memory, which directly affect the loop performance.

Keywords: Computational Fluid Dynamics, Unstructured Meshes, Graphical Processing Units, Compiler

1 Introduction

Unstructured mesh (or grid) applications are widely used in Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) simulations when complex geometries are involved. They achieve a higher degree of correctness by enabling critical components of the geometry to be finely discretized.

This comes at the cost of increased difficulty in achieving high memory system utilization. In structured mesh applications, compilers can leverage the topology of the mesh which is explicit in the program structure. In contrast, in unstructured mesh applications, the mesh topology is not known at compile-time. It may include elements (e.g. triangular faces) of widely different sizes to reflect the modeller's interest in specific sections of the geometry, and consequentially

the adjacency relationship is non-uniform. To support this flexibility, implementations depend on indirections between adjacent mesh elements, which prevent many structured mesh compiler optimizations.

A typical instance of this behaviour is when a program visits all edges of the mesh and accesses data associated to vertices. To do so, it uses a *mapping* between edges and vertices, which represents the grid structure itself and expresses a non-affine access to arrays holding mesh data.

In this paper we consider a motivating example – HYDRA, an unstructured mesh finite-volume CFD application used at Rolls Royce for the simulation of inner turbomachinery components of jet engines. It consists of 50,000 lines of code, including more than 1,000 parallel loops over the mesh, and it supports the simulation of a wide range of CFD problems, including linear, non-linear and adjoint cases.


Our research aim is the acceleration of HYDRA through both strong and weak scaling, i.e. decreasing simulation times and increasing the size of the geometries modelled. For this purpose, HYDRA has been modified to use our unstructured mesh library, called OP2, which is supported by a compiler and run-time library. OP2 supports a wide range of architectures, including clusters of CPUs and GPUs. In this paper we focus on the acceleration of HYDRA on a single GPU node.

In previous work [1], we studied the performance of HYDRA on a single multicore node using MPI, against that of a single GPU node. We showed that a baseline GPU implementation, featuring only standard unstructured mesh optimizations, is not sufficient to achieve performance comparable to the execution on a single CPU. To improve this situation, we identified pathological patterns in the HYDRA code. We presented three optimizations to address those patterns: loop fission, an improved colouring strategy, and loop-specific tuning of partition size and CUDA thread block size. We applied these optimizations manually to four specific loops of HYDRA having low performance on a GPU. These results are shown in Figure 1: the execution of HYDRA on Intel Westmere and Sandy-bridge processors, using different numbers of cores using MPI, are compared to execution on an NVIDIA Fermi C2070.

In this paper we build on the experience and techniques gathered from our previous work. The described optimizations are automated in the compiler by extending the OP2 language with annotations. These are used by the programmer to signal the compiler that the optimizations can be applied to the annotated loops. This reduced significantly the compiler design complexity, as it does not need to analyze the entire user kernel code, but only the loop parameters and annotations.

As the described optimizations are composable for the same loop, the compiler is given tools to select the best combination of optimizations to be applied to each loop. We take a step forward understanding what (composition of) optimizations actually deliver better performance. By taking advantage of the large number of complex OP2 loops available in HYDRA, we can put the performance improvement due to optimizations into relation with the loop features,

Fig. 1: Comparison of HYDRA performance on single CPU and GPU. The CUDA baseline performance is based on using the same OP2 kernels in CUDA as were used in MPI. The starting point for this paper is the lower, manually-optimised performance reported in our earlier work [1]. The focus for this paper is on automating such optimisations in the OP2 compiler.



and its resource requirements for GPUs. This represents an improvement w.r.t. our previous paper, and it is the key to the design of a full-automatic optimizing compiler for unstructured mesh applications. The contributions of this paper are the following:

- We present an annotation-based scheme that allows our compiler to split complex loops over unstructured meshes in a way that optimises effective use of shared memory.
- We present performance analysis for this and other optimisations, separately and in combinations, on a wide variety of OP2 loops from a substantial application case study.
- From this experimental work we characterise the properties of loops that most impact their performance. We show how OP2’s access descriptors, in combination with quantitative compile-time metrics of shared-memory and register requirements can be used to determine where these optimisations are valid and profitable.

2 Related Work

A huge literature exists related to optimisations for unstructured grid applications, or, in more general terms, for irregular applications. Most optimizations attempt at improving data locality through mesh renumbering, with the goal of improving cache usage (e.g. [2, 3]). Our run-time library is currently able to use either PT-Scotch [4], and METIS [5]. However, the performance results shown in this paper is based on well-ordered meshes. The optimisations that we present do not require the analysis of the iteration order, and they are based on input program transformations, alternative code syntheses, and run-time tuning.

Our optimization strategy that we aim at developing shares similar goals with the work presented by Strout et al. in [6], as it introduces a framework for composing optimisations for irregular applications. Examples of such optimisations include iteration and data re-ordering, and loop tiling. The framework permits to

model the optimisations at compile-time in terms of undefined functions, which are then applied at run-time by analysing the mesh in the *inspection phase*. The result of the mesh inspection is the instantiation of the loop *execution phase*, with improved performance as a consequence of optimisations. The compiler framework allows sound composition of the undefined optimization functions, effectively providing an abstraction for composing optimizations.

A number of development projects include elegant abstractions for parallel computing on unstructured meshes using MPI. The most prominent research effort targeting intra-node parallelisation is the Liszt project [7], which has many similarities with our work. Liszt is a domain specific language for programming unstructured mesh applications, and it targets performance portability across multiple different architectures. Unlike the OP2 compiler, the Liszt compiler synthesizes stencil information by analyzing user kernels, with the aim of applying platform - specific optimizations. Performance results from a range of systems (GPU, multi-core CPU, and MPI based cluster) executing a number of applications written using Liszt have been presented in [7]. We are not aware of any industrial applications developed using Liszt.

3 The OP2 Library

In this section we give a brief description of the mesh abstraction that is exposed by OP2, and we relate it to its user interface. The reader is invited to refer to [8, 9] for a full description of the interface. A mesh is modelled as a graph and it includes a collection of interconnected sets. In a typical CFD program, the mesh includes at least the following sets: edges, vertices, and cells. A set is a programming abstraction of the OP2 library (`op_set`) and it is used to build an iteration space. To declare an `op_set`, the user is provided with the `op_decl_set` call, which requires the iteration space cardinality (or size), i.e. the number of elements in the set.

The connectivity between sets expresses the mesh topology, and it specifies how a generic element of a set maps to elements in another set. For instance, the user can specify for each edge what are the incident vertices. This translates in OP2 with the `op_map` data structure and with a call for declaring it (`op_decl_map`). The call takes as input: the domain and co-domain of the mapping (i.e. from and to sets); the arity or dimension of the mapping, i.e. the number of elements in the codomain associated to each element in the domain (this number must be homogeneous for all mapped elements); an array of indices implementing the mapping.

Mesh sets can be associated with data. A dataset associates a tuple to each element of a set, and is abstracted in OP2 through the `op_dat` data structure and declared with the `op_decl_dat` function. This function takes as input the set to which the `op_dat` is associated, the cardinality or dimension of the tuples (i.e. the number of data items associated to each set element, that must be homogeneous), and the array of tuples. For instance, an `op_dat` contains the 3D spatial coordinates for each vertex.

Fig. 2: Example of user kernel and OP2 `op_par_loop`. The access descriptors (`op_arg`) enable the OP2 compiler to generate code that decouples the kernel from the access into the mesh - and which fully-characterises the dependence and access pattern. The first line is an annotation extension which we will describe in Section 4.

```

@op_inc_id(v1Data, v2Data)
void incrVertices (double * eData, double * v1Data, double * v2Data)
{
    ...
    *v1Data += t;
    *v2Data += t;
}

op_par_loop ( incrVertices, edges,
             op_arg_dat ( edgeData, -1, OP_ID, OP_READ),
             op_arg_dat ( vertData, 0, edges2Verts, OP_INC),
             op_arg_dat ( vertData, 1, edges2Verts, OP_INC));

```

In OP2, computation is expressed through parallel loops, applying user-programmed kernels. An example of a user kernel, which reads data associated to an edge and modifies the data associated with the two connected vertices, is illustrated in Figure 2. We also show the related `op_par_loop` call, expressing the application of the user kernel to all edges. The first two arguments of the `op_par_loop` are the user kernel and the iteration set. Then, the user is required to specify how datasets are accessed to instantiate actual arguments for the user kernel. For this purpose, the `op_par_loop` takes as input further arguments (called `op_args`), one for each parameter of the user kernel. For each `op_arg`, the user specifies:

- The dataset, or `op_dat`, from which the actual argument is to be retrieved (first parameter).
- If the dataset is associated with the iteration set (edges in Figure 2), then no indirection is necessary. In this case the second and third parameters assume the values `-1` and `OP_ID`. For a given iteration, the dataset is accessed *directly* using the iteration identifier.
- If the dataset is associated to a set different from the iteration set, then an `op_map` is needed. The third parameter is a reference to the `op_map` to be used to translate iteration set identifiers to `op_dat` associated set identifiers. The second parameter is an integer specifying which mapped element is to be considered. For instance, for the mapping from edges to vertices the user has to specify 0 or 1, to address the first or second vertex associated to each edge.
- The access modality: read (`OP_READ`), write (`OP_WRITE`), increment (`OP_INC`), read and write (`OP_RW`). The user kernel must reflect the access modality expressed for the `op_par_loop` parameters.

This information is called access descriptor and it exposes to the OP2 compiler the loop data access pattern. For the sake of the understanding of this paper, it is important to notice that an access descriptor implicitly contains information

related to the cardinality of the involved `op_dat` and the arity of the `op_map` used (if any). This information is extracted by the compiler by analysing `op_dat` declarations, and can be used to compute the memory requirements for a specific iteration of an `op_par_loop`.

To maximise parallelism for `op_par_loops`, OP2 assumes that the loop iteration ordering does not influence the final result. Some combinations of access descriptors, i.e. when indirectly modifying a dataset, might incur data races if not properly controlled. The OP2 implementation guarantees data race avoidance when incrementing (OP_INC) a dataset accessed indirectly. For all other cases (OP_WRITE, OP_RW) it is responsibility of the user to express parallelism control by constructing and, if necessary, partitioning the mesh to ensure no conflicts exist.

3.1 Compiler and Run-Time Support

The current implementation of OP2 is a source-to-source translator, that maps a program using OP2 to multiple target languages, such as CUDA, OpenMP, OpenCL and MPI. OP2 also includes a run-time library which performs standard unstructured mesh optimizations, such as mesh partitioning and coloring (see below). We give a description of the CUDA implementation of OP2.

For GPUs, the size of the mesh is constrained to be small enough to fit entirely within the GPU's device memory. This means that for non-distributed memory implementations (i.e. single node back-ends) data transfer only happens at the time of data declaration, and when collecting results at the end of the computation. For CUDA, the compiler parallelizes an `op_par_loop` by partitioning its iteration set and assigning each partition to a Streaming Multiprocessor (SM)⁴. In this section we discuss two main features of the implementation: coalescing memory accesses and a coloring strategy to prevent data races. The implementation distinguishes between `op_par_loops` that use at least one `op_map`, called indirect loops, and those that do not use indirections, called direct loops.

For direct `op_par_loops`, we partition the iteration set in chunks of the same size, and each thread in a CUDA thread block works on at most $\lceil \frac{n}{m} \rceil$ elements of the partition, where m and n are the sizes of the thread block and partition, respectively. Observe that this execution model is sufficient to avoid data races because, by definition, none of the data is accessed indirectly and therefore each thread can only update data belonging to its iteration set elements. The main concern is to avoid non-coalesced accesses into device memory. This is achieved by staging data between device memory and the shared memory, in two stages. (1) Before the user kernel executes, any dataset read whose cardinality per set element exceeds one is brought into the shared memory. The rationale behind this is that unary data will be loaded into a register during execution through a coalesced transfer, thus it does not benefit from pre-loading. (2) After the user kernel is complete, any dataset written is moved back from shared into device memory. It is clear that this simple mechanism is not always optimal, since register pressure can force memory accesses to device memory.

For indirect `op_par_loops`, we chose a different strategy, where we distinguish between `op_dats` accessed directly or indirectly. Indirectly accessed `op_dats` are staged between device and shared memory. The data can be scattered in the device memory because of mappings, even if proper renumbering algorithms are used to minimise the dispersion of data and to build clusters of coalesced data. For contiguous regions, memory accesses are coalesced. The stage in phase coalesces device memory data into shared memory locations mapping successive memory addresses into successive thread identifiers. In this way, the shared memory accesses are naturally coalesced. Directly accessed `op_dats` are instead left in device memory. This reduces the shared memory requirements for the CUDA kernel and relies on the L1 cache.

Additionally to memory access coalescing, for indirect `op_par_loops` gaining good performance is somewhat restricted by the need to avoid data races between threads. That is, allowing threads to operate on distinct elements of the iteration set does not guarantee an absence of data dependencies due to indirect accesses, as previously discussed. The implementation is based on *coloring* the iteration set in an inter- and intra-partition fashion to resolve this issue. The inter-partition coloring is used to avoid conflicts between the data shared at partition boundaries. Since the library ensures partitions with the same color do not share elements retrieved through a mapping, these can proceed in parallel. Intra-partition coloring is needed to prevent threads in the same thread block from data race conflicts.

4 Optimizations

An application programmer writing an `op_par_loop` is insulated from the details of the implementation on the back-end architectures which OP2 supports. As such, there is no restrictions on how many `op_sets`, `op_maps` and `op_dats` are used in the loop, their size or access pattern on data. Thus, given specific back-end hardware, the OP2 code transformation framework needs to take into consideration not only how an `op_par_loop` can be optimized (e.g. parallelized), but also the limitations of the underlying hardware that degrade performance. This is a key issue that we encountered when utilizing OP2 for accelerating HYDRA.

For example consider the EDGECON loop which is representative of the key loops that make up over 90% of the runtime in HYDRA. EDGECON computes the gradient contribution on edges, by iterating over edges accessing datasets associated to both edges and vertices (using a mapping from edges to vertices). The input of the loop include both indirectly and directly accessed `op_dats`. Each iteration of the loop accesses directly 24 bytes (1 `op_dat`), and indirectly a total of 544 bytes (10 `op_dats`). Of these, two `op_dats` are accessed indirectly and incremented, and their total size is 384 bytes per iteration. As these incremented `op_dats` are allocated to shared memory and local thread variables, they represent a main source of shared memory and register pressure. The elemental user kernel is made of 102 double precision floating point operations, and about 200 integer operations. The PGI compiler reports the use of 41 registers per thread, which

is larger than the 31 available for double precision on the NVIDIA C2070 GPU. The largest iteration size available for execution is 64, which requires 34KB of shared memory (a Fermi GPU supports 48KB).

From this analysis it can be noted that the loop suffers from two main issues when mapped to a GPU. Firstly, as the partition size is small, the available parallelism within each SM is limited. To improve this, shared-memory requirements need to be reduced. For instance, to employ partitions of 128 iterations, we need to fit all indirectly accessed arguments into shared memory. When the iterations in a same partition do not share any data (i.e. in the worst case), this requires a partition with 64 iterations to use no more than 24KB in shared memory, as the shared memory requirements roughly double with the partition size. Conversely, an effect of high shared memory requirements is a poor CUDA block occupancy. Secondly, the registers required for each iteration are more than the maximum available on a Fermi GPU. This hardware resource shortage prevents the dynamic SM scheduler to allocate all 32 threads per warp.

4.1 Compiler Support for Loop Fission

Loop fission is an effective mean to address the high register pressure and high shared memory requirements exhibited in the EDGECON loop. Splitting a loop manually requires the developer to analyze the kernel for valid splitting points and to explicitly refactor the kernel to pass data across sub-kernels. This task is tedious and error-prone.

The EDGECON loop follows a widely used loop scheme in unstructured mesh CFD that is illustrated in Figure 2. It iterates over edges of the mesh (line 9) and increments two arguments through an indirection (lines 11 and 12). The user kernel typically computes a unique contribution value on a local function variable (i.e., τ), which is then used to apply the increment through the indirection to the two vertices of the edge (lines 5 and 6). This scheme is widely used in HYDRA by all performance - critical loops, which account for the 90% of execution time. It also exists in a few variants: for example, one vertex data value is incremented while the other is unchanged or decremented.

Because this scheme is critical and opens up a natural splitting point between the contribution computation and the *dispatch* to the vertices, we extended the OP2 abstractions with annotations to categorize kernels. Using these, developers can drive the OP2 compiler as depicted in Figure 2 (line 1). We extended the OP2 compiler to leverage annotated code with automatic OP2 to OP2 loop splitting. Our transformation replaces the original loop with three loops, depicted in Figure 3, with equivalent semantics.

- The first loop computes the contributions for each edge and stores them into a new `op_dat` associated to edges (lines 14-16). The kernel code is obtained from the original kernel by moving the argument corresponding to the second vertex data to a local variable (line 3). In doing so, the second increment no longer has any effect and can be safely eliminated by the compiler.
- The second and third loops iterate over edges and apply the increment, passed in the new `op_dat`, to the vertices (lines 17-22). The corresponding

Fig. 3: Source to source loop fission of the example shown in Figure 2.

```
void incrVerticesAlt (double * eData, double * v1Data)
{
    double v2Data [1];
    ...
    *v1Data += t;
    *v2Data += t;
}

void incrVerticesCpy (double * e, double * v)
{
    *v += *eData;
}

op_par_loop ( incrVerticesAlt, edges,
              op_arg_dat ( edgeData, -1, OP_ID, OP_READ),
              op_arg_dat ( incrVerticesTemp, -1, OP_ID, OP_WRITE));
op_par_loop ( incrVerticesCpy, edges,
              op_arg_dat ( incrVerticesTemp, -1, OP_ID, OP_READ),
              op_arg_dat ( vertData, 0, edges2Verts, OP_INC));
op_par_loop ( incrVerticesCpy, edges,
              op_arg_dat ( incrVerticesTemp, -1, OP_ID, OP_READ),
              op_arg_dat ( vertData, 1, edges2Verts, OP_INC));
```

kernel code (lines 9-12) is generated according to the kernel annotation and the types of the vertex data.

This distribution of one loop into three allows the number of `op_args` to be reduced for each loop w.r.t. the original loop. For the first loop, it also transforms two indirect `op_arg` accesses into a single directly accessed `op_arg`. As directly accessed `op_args` for indirect loops are not staged into shared memory, this reduces the shared memory requirements for the first loop. The increment loops are generally simpler loops, with a smaller number of input parameters and small kernels, and can be thus easily accelerated.

4.2 Alternative Coloring Schemes

In Section 3 we showed that OP2 guarantees absence of data races by using a two-level coloring technique. The optimization presented here provides an alternative strategy for intra-partition coloring. In the current OP2 implementation the following scheme is applied. First, the user kernel is evaluated for all iterations in the partition. The parallelism degree for this stage is the minimum between the number of iterations in the partition, and the number of threads in the CUDA block. In this phase, the increment contributions are not applied directly to the `op_dat` in shared memory, to prevent data races between threads, but local *private* thread variables are used to store the increments. There is one such variable for each thread and for each incremented `op_dat`. After executing the user kernel, the increments are applied to the shared memory by following colors. This strategy maximizes the parallelism when evaluating the user kernel, at the cost of a larger register pressure due to the additional thread private variables.

An alternative to this is to program threads to compute and apply the increments to shared memory when executing the user kernel. The user kernel is passed a shared memory address, instead of private thread variable references.

To prevent data races while executing the user kernel, the thread execution must follow colors. This reduces the amount of total parallelism when evaluating the kernel, but it also reduces the register requirements due to the eliminated private variables. The implementation of this alternative strategy is confined to the CUDA kernels synthesized for OP2 loops. This behavior can be selected by the user through annotations on the loop, similar to the ones used for fission. However, this is a short term solution, and we aim at understanding when this alternative synthesis actually delivers better performance. In Section 5 we discuss how this can be deduced by combining information from access descriptors and CUDA compiler reports.

4.3 Tuning Partition and Thread Block Size

The final optimization that we extensively applied to HYDRA loops is the tuning of the partition and thread block size. These two parameters are inter-dependent: the partition size is the number of iterations that are mapped to the same SM, while the thread block size is the number of threads that are used in the CUDA program to execute the iterations.

Both the partition and thread block size represent an upper bound on the amount of parallelism that can be achieved by a SM when executing a partition. The execution consists in the following phases, as discussed in Section 3: *(i)* stage in of input data from device to shared memory, one `op_dat` at time; *(ii)* execution of the user kernel; *(iii)* stage out from shared to device memory, one `op_dat` at time. While when executing the user kernel the maximum parallelism achievable is equal to the number of iterations in the partition, in the staging phases the parallelism is limited by the number of elements to be staged, multiplied by the `op_dat` cardinality. With no data re-use, this is equal to the partition size multiplied by the cardinality of the `op_dat`. Using a larger CUDA thread block size permits more parallelism in the staging phases, without losing the coalescing property.

As a general rule, larger partition size, constrained by the shared memory size, is always to be preferred to provide more parallelism to the SM. However, the optimal block size depends on the size of the `op_dats` and the kind of access. Section 5 studies the relation between multiple loops with different access descriptors and the optimal block size.

5 Experiments

In this section we show the results of performance analysis of the optimizations described in the previous section applied to several loops in HYDRA. The simulation used is a standard CFD test problem used for validation of correctness and performance called NASA Rotor 37, that models a blade of a turbomachinery component. In our tests we replicate the blade twice to set up a mesh size including: 2.5M edges, 860K vertices, and 54K wall edges. The simulation solves the Navier-Stokes equation to evaluate the flow through one passage of the two

NASA Rotor 37 blades and it is the same application used in the performance graph of Section 1. In previous tests, we also used a larger mesh, including 4 NASA Rotor 37 blades, and we obtained similar performance results of the case used here, scaled by a factor of 2.

The configuration of HYDRA required for this simulation uses 33 `op_par_loops` some of which are extremely complex. In our tests, we used an NVIDIA Fermi C2070 including 14 SMs (i.e. 448 CUDA cores), 6 GB of main memory and 48/16 KB of shared memory and L1 cache, respectively. The full simulation runs for tens of minutes, but we limited performance analysis to 30 time steps to reduce the total performance analysis time. To compile the CUDA code generated by the OP2 compiler we used the PGI Fortran CUDA compiler version 12.2, with CUDA 4.0, and the NVIDIA CUDA compiler version 4.0.17. The optimization options are, respectively, `-O4` and `-O3`. The experiments focus on the effects of optimizations on all loops involved in the simulation. For each loop, there are a limited number of optimizations that can be applied, and that can be composed together. We analyze the performance of each loop when applying the optimizations individually, and in all their possible compositions. The aim of these experiments is to put into relation:

- The features of an `op_par_loop` in terms of its input arguments including: the type and cardinality (or dimension) of the related `op_dat` ; the arity (or dimension) of the related `op_map`, if used.
- The GPU resource requirements, in terms of the number of registers needed for each thread and the shared memory size required given a specific partition size.
- The performance in terms of execution time for the CUDA kernel section.

The optimization space exploration in this paper is straightforward as tests for different loops are independent: the applied optimizations do not imply to combine different loops. However, for other optimizations, like loop fusion that we discussed for OP2 programs in [10], this might not be true. The resulting more complex and larger optimization space can be explored by using heuristics, as in [11].

5.1 Fission, Block Tuning and Coloring

A number of OP2 loops in NASA Rotor 37 can be subject to all the three optimizations discussed in the previous section. For space reasons, we study the following relevant loops: accumulation of contributions on edges (ACCU), gradient contribution on edges (EDGECON), viscous flux calculation (VFLUX), inviscid flux calculation (IFLUX), viscous wall flux calculation (WFFLUX), and summation of near wall edge contributions (SUMWALLS). The first five loops adhere to the requirements of the fission optimization, by incrementing equivalent amounts to two `op_dat`s. The last one has only a single incremented `op_dat`, but we used it as an experiment to understand if loop fission is increasing its performance. This explores the general idea that smaller kernels are always better parallelized on a GPU than larger ones.

Fig. 4: Performance results for optimisations




Table 1 illustrates the main features of the loops, by inspecting their access descriptors. All loops feature an average to large number of input op_dats, each with a large cardinality, resulting in a large amount of shared memory required to execute each iteration. The first four loops iterate over the largest mesh set (edges), while the last two iterate on the wall edge set that is two orders of magnitudes smaller. This is reflected in the average performance of the loops, as we detail below.

The size of the input data for each iteration can be used to define the maximum permitted partition size that a loop can use. As a partition is mapped to a single streaming multiprocessor (SM), all iteration data for that partition must fit into shared memory, i.e. into 48KB on the C2070 GPU. Assuming pessimistically that no data re-use is achieved in a partition, we can compute the partition size at compile-time. The run-time profiling of OP2, which analyses the mesh, computes the average data re-use, and with these results, the kernel configuration can be tuned to maximize the partition size.

Figure 4 shows the results of applying each optimization to the described loops. Table 2 shows the resource requirements for each loop when applying different optimization schemes. For each optimization, we always choose the maximum partition size achievable or the one delivering better performance. For all cases, except the block tuning optimizations, the CUDA thread block size is equal to the partition size: this assigns one thread per iteration.

The analysis of the results shows:

- Splitting a loop improves both shared memory and register pressure, and should thus be applied extensively. In some cases, it also permits larger partition sizes to be achieved, thus improving available parallelism.

	ACCU	EDGECON	VFLUX	IFLUX	WFFLUX	SUMWALLS
iteration set	edges	edges	edges	edges	wall edges	wall edges
op_arg_dat numb. (ind.)	13 (12)	11 (10)	19 (18)	9 (8)	15 (12)	8 (5)
op_arg_dat size (bytes)	712	568	776	296	628	228
Size of incr. (bytes)	200	288	96	96	96	48

Table 1: Loop properties resulting from access descriptor analysis for loops which can be subject to fission and alternative coloring.

- For split loops, the alternative coloring strategy delivers slightly better performance in nearly all cases. This is related to a reduction in the average number of colors for split loops. If applied to original loops, this strategy can deliver significantly worse performance, when associated with a larger number of intra-partition colors. Thus, it should only be used in tandem with splitting.
- Block and partition tuning improves the performance for all loops, both split and original ones, and should be applied extensively.

As highlighted, the alternative coloring strategy does not necessarily reduce register usage, but it sometimes increases it slightly. This is somewhat unexpected, and we believe that it is related to the way in which the low-level CUDA compiler treats different control-flow organizations.

As expected, loop fission is improving performance by a large factor, even when the user kernel includes a relatively small number of floating point operations. Also, the choice of the alternative coloring strategy should be taken when register requirements are actually reduced. We can do this by synthesizing the two versions at OP2 compile-time, with and without alternative coloring strategy, and by choosing the best one by looking at the register requirements for the two kernels as reported by the low-level compiler.

5.2 Tuning Partition and Block Size

The final optimisation involves the tuning of seven loops of NASA Rotor 37. These loops are generically small, in terms of number of input op_dats and kernel size, and their contribution to the total performance is much lower than the six loops discussed above. However, our goal is to understand what is the best configuration of these two parameters. Table 3 shows the results, including the configuration parameter values and the obtained performance. In the table, we can notice that the first four loops obtain higher performance with the largest achievable partition and block sizes (512), while the remaining three loops perform better with a lower value (128). This can be explained by analysing the access descriptors. All loops take as input a number of op_dats between 4 and 6, but only the first four loops have all input data accessed through indirection. The remaining three loops only access a single input through an indirection, while the remaining op_dats are accessed directly.

(a) Register Usage					(b) Shared Memory Usage		
Loop	Baseline, Block	Color	Split (+block)	Split + Color (+block)	Loop	Baseline, Color, Block	Split (all compounds)
ACCU	63	63	63, 28, 28	63, 18, 23	ACCU	43	36, 25, 25
EDGE.C	41	46	37, 32, 32	37, 34, 34	EDGE.C	34	20, 24, 24
VFLUX	63	63	63, 27, 31	63, 29, 34	VFLUX	47	41, 6, 6
IFLUX	63	63	63, 28, 29	63, 29, 32	IFLUX	34	22, 6, 6
WFFLUX	63	63	63, 28, 28	63, 18, 18	WFFLUX	36	30, 12, 12
SUMW.	37	41	34, 28	34, 15	SUMW.	24	18, 6

Table 2: Resource usage for OP2 optimizations.

As described in Section 3, indirect `op_dats` are staged into shared memory for indirect loops, while directly accessed data is left in device memory. The block size parameters strongly influences the staging performance. As the first four loops spend more time in staging data than the remaining three loops, the block size increase plays a dominant role in the performance of the loops. Also, the number of data items to be staged directly depends on the number of data values per mesh element and the partition size. The first four loops have either a larger partition size, or input `op_dats` with larger dimension, and can thus benefit of larger block sizes.

5.3 Discussion

The analysis of the performance results shown in this section led us to the following conclusion which can be adopted as a general optimization strategy in the compiler:

- A main source of performance degradation on GPUs for OP2 loops are small partition sizes. This is a consequence of having a large number of `op_dats` which sum up to a large number of input data for each iteration, resulting in larger shared memory requirements. This condition - having larger shared memory requirements - can be checked at compile-time by inspecting the access descriptors. The compiler addresses this issue by splitting the loops which have been annotated by the user.
- When a loop is split, the resulting loops can be further optimized if the alternative coloring strategy actually reduces the number of registers needed per thread. This can be achieved at compile-time by first generating two versions, each using a different coloring strategy, and then choosing the best version by feeding the OP2 run-time with register pressure information returned by the CUDA compiler.
- Once the partition size is optimized, a loop exposes sufficient parallelism inside its partitions. However, the real parallelism that can be obtained on a GPU depends on the resource constraints of each thread, in terms of register requirements. This requirement directly influences the warp allocation strategy for the SM dynamic scheduler: if each thread requires a large number of registers, then a smaller number of threads can be allocated in the same warp. This condition must be checked also for loops with relatively small input `op_dats`, but with high register pressure. For this kind of loop, splitting and the alternative coloring strategy can be applied to reduce register pressure.

	<i>Loop₁</i>	<i>Loop₂</i>	<i>Loop₃</i>	<i>Loop₄</i>	<i>Loop₅</i>	<i>Loop₆</i>	<i>Loop₇</i>
Part. and Block size	(64,64)	(64,64)	(64,64)	(64,64)	(64,64)	(64,64)	(64,64)
Perf. (millisec.)	15.70	41.94	19.58	35.30	9.53	6.13	7.46
Part. and Block size	(64,512)	(128,512)	(256,512)	(256,512)	(128,128)	(128,128)	(128,128)
Perf. (millisec.)	11.52	14.67	8.66	18.99	8.68	5.44	6.64

Table 3: Partition and block tuning for seven indirect loops.

6 Conclusion

In this paper we have demonstrated and evaluated the effect of applying three optimizations for unstructured mesh programs to a wide number of HYDRA loops. The optimizations were introduced in a previous paper and: (1) permit transforming the input OP2 program to optimize shared memory requirements; (2) provide a kernel-tailored code synthesis minimizing register requirements; (3) tune configuration parameters for optimize data staging for each loop.

We have shown how these three optimizations can be automatically implemented by the compiler by extending the OP2 language with loop annotations. This reduces significantly the compiler complexity, as it does not need analysing the user kernels associated to each loop.

Finally, in the experiment section we presented a full performance analysis showing the optimization effects on the performance of the loops, and on their resource requirements. This enabled us to derive a general optimization strategy for the compiler, based on the composition of the described optimizations.

References

1. Bertolli, C., Betts, A., Mudalige, G.R., Lorient, N., Radford, D., Ham, D., Giles, M.B., Kelly, P.H.J.: Manycore performance optimization for industrial-scale unstructured-mesh CFD. In: Submitted for review at Supercomputing 2012
2. Han, H., Tseng, C.W.: A comparison of locality transformations for irregular codes. In: 5th Intl' Workshop on Languages, Compilers, and Run-Time Systems for Scalable Computers, Springer (2000) 70–84
3. Burgess, D.A., Giles, M.B.: Renumbering unstructured grids to improve the performance of codes on hierarchical memory machines. *Adv. Eng. Softw.* **28**(3) (April 1997) 189–201
4. Chevalier, C., Pellegrini, F.: PT-Scotch: A tool for efficient parallel graph ordering. *Parallel Comput.* **34**(6-8) (July 2008) 318–331
5. Karypis, G., Kumar, V.: A fast and high quality multilevel scheme for partitioning irregular graphs. *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* **20**(1) (December 1998) 359–392
6. Strout, M.M., Carter, L., Ferrante, J.: Compile-time composition of run-time data and iteration reorderings. In: *Procs. of the PLDI '03.* (June 2003)
7. DeVito, Z., Joubert, N., Palacios, F., Oakley, S., Medina, M., Barrientos, M., Elsen, E., Ham, F., Aiken, A., Duraisamy, K., Darve, E., Alonso, J., Hanrahan, P.: Liszt: a domain specific language for building portable mesh-based PDE solvers. In: *Procs. SC'11, New York, NY, USA, ACM* (2011) 9:1–9:12
8. Giles, M.B.: OP2 User's Manual (April 2012) <http://people.maths.ox.ac.uk/gilesm/op2/user.pdf>.
9. Giles, M.B., Mudalige, G.R., Sharif, Z., Markall, G., Kelly, P.H.: Performance analysis and optimization of the OP2 framework on many-core architectures. *The Computer Journal* **55**(2) (2012) 168–180
10. Bertolli, C., Betts, A., Mudalige, G.R., Giles, M.B., Kelly, P.H.J.: Mesh independent loop fusion for unstructured mesh applications. In: *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Computing Frontiers, Cagliari, Italy* (May 2012)
11. Dubach, C., Jones, T.M., O'Boyle, M.F.: Exploring and predicting the architecture/optimising compiler co-design space. In: *Procs. of the CASES '08, ACM* (2008) 31–40