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Note

- This talk is focus on *inference* stage of deep learning workload
- But* these DL compilers should also applied to *training*
Hardware for Deep Learning

- **Heterogenous hardware:**
  - Need to optimize workload for different hardware.

- **Layered Memory Hierarchy:**
  - Complex scheduling space

- **Parallel Compute Primitives**
  - SIMD
  - SIMT
  - Intrinsics
Software for Deep Learning

Declarative DAG of High-Level Operators

Early-Binding to Compute

Mixed Memory & Compute Requirement

\texttt{volta\_scudnn\_winograd\_1 28x128\_ldg1\_ldg4\_relu\_til e148t\_nt\_v1}
Software for Deep Learning

Mixed Memory & Compute Requirement
Reality -> Problem Statement

**Reality**

1. Everyone knows how Convolution works. Few can implement fast convolution in CUDA.
2. DL Framework *depends* on hand-tuned kernel implementation for specific hardware, by experts.
3. Researcher can’t create efficient new operators. Whiteboard <-> Physical Operator.

**Problem Statement**

1. For a given operator, express it in a simple language that **abstract away the complexity of hardware**.
2. For a given operator, we want to automatically optimize it for **different hardware**.
3. For any new operator, we want to easily find an efficient implementation **without thinking about hardware** at all.
Problem Statement

(1) Abstract away the complexity of hardware.
(2) Automatically optimize for different hardware.
(3) New operator without thinking about hardware at all.

System Proposed

- Halide
- TVM
- Tensor Comprehension (TC)
Resnet(
  Conv2D...
  BatchNorm...
)

DAG Optimization:
- Operator Fusion
- No-op Elimination

Operator Optimization:
  Transform loop nested program to high performance code
Problem Statement

(1) Abstract away the complexity of hardware.
(2) Automatically optimize for different hardware.
(3) New operator without thinking about hardware at all.

System Proposed

- **Halide**
- **TVM**
- **Tensor Comprehension (TC)**
Halide: Compiling Image Processing Pipelines

Key Innovation:
- Decouples \textit{algorithm from the compute}
- \textit{So we can express operator in a simple language}
Halide: Compiling Image Processing Pipelines

Key Innovation:
- Decouples *algorithm from the compute*
- User only needs to provide the algorithm, and optionally the schedule.

**Input: Algorithm**

```plaintext
blurx(x,y) = in(x-1,y) + in(x,y) + in(x+1,y)
out(x,y) = blurx(x,y-1) + blurx(x,y) + blurx(x,y+1)
```

**Input: Schedule**

```
blurx: split x by 4 -> x₀, x₁
      vectorize: x₁
      store at out. x₀
      compute at out. y₁
out:    split x by 4 -> x₀, x₁
       split y by 4 -> y₀, y₁
       reorder: y₀, x₀, y₁, x₁
       parallelize: y₀
       vectorize: x₁
```
Halide: Compiling Image Processing Pipelines

Key Innovation:
- Decouples *algorithm from the compute*
- User only needs to provide the algorithm

Auto-tuner can select the optimal “schedule”
- How to split the axis?
- How to vectorize?

```
Input: Algorithm
blur(x, y) = in(x-1, y) + in(x, y) + in(x+1, y)
out(x, y) = blur(x, y-1) + blur(x, y) + blur(x, y+1)
```

```
Input: Schedule
blur(x): split x by 4 -> x_0, x_1
        vectorize: x_1
        store at out.x_0
        compute at out.x_1
out: split x by 4 -> x_0, x_1
    split y by 4 -> y_0, y_1
    reorder: y_0, x_0, y_1, x_1
    parallelize: y_0
    vectorize: x_1
```
Halide: Compiling Image Processing Pipelines

Key Innovation:
- Decouples **algorithm from the compute**
- User only needs to provide the algorithm

Auto-tuner can select the optimal “schedule”
- How to split the axis?
- How to vectorize?
Halide: Compiling Image Processing Pipelines

Key Innovation:
- Decouples **algorithm from the compute**
- User only needs to provide the algorithm

Auto-tuner can select the optimal “schedule”
- How to split the axis?
- How to vectorize?
Halide DSL

- Functional Language
- Embed in C++
- Much Simpler than writing threaded or CUDA program
- Downside:
  - Still requires domain experts to tune it
  - Not built for Deep Learning
  - TC: Assume infinite input range, cannot be optimized for fixed ops.
  - TVM: No special memory scope; no custom hardware intrinsics

```c
Func blur_3x3(Func input) {
    Func blur_x, blur_y;
    Var x, y, xi, yi;

    // The algorithm - no storage or order
    blur_x(x, y) = (input(x-1, y) + input(x, y) + input(x+1, y))/3;
    blur_y(x, y) = (blur_x(x, y-1) + blur_x(x, y) + blur_x(x, y+1))/3;

    // The schedule - defines order, locality; implies storage
    blur_y.tile(x, y, xi, yi, 256, 32)
       .vectorize(xi, 8).parallel(y);
    blur_x.compute_at(blur_y, x).vectorize(x, 8);

    return blur_y;
}
```
Problem Statement

(1) Abstract away the complexity of hardware.

(2) Automatically optimize for different hardware.

(3) New operator without thinking about hardware at all.

System Proposed

- Halide
- TVM
- Tensor Comprehension (TC)
TVM: An automated End-to-End Optimizing Compiler for Deep Learning
TVM DSL

Very similar to Halide

- Specify the algorithm
- Specify the schedule
TVM DSL

Use tile, split, reduce, etc to transform the loop nested program into a complex schedules. To
- Optimize data locality
- Minimize memory conflict
- Optimize for device cache
- Optimize for latency hiding
- Note that Halide doesn’t have these
(1) TVM allows read and write to special memory scope
(2) TVM can hook into hardware instructions
(3) TVM can optimize for pipeline parallelism via reordering
TVM’s DSL + Autotuner enables it to target many devices

In TVM, you can templatize your schedule and let autotuner find the optimal configuration for a group of devices.
TVM produces high performance operators for different hardware

Figure 14: GPU end-to-end evaluation for TVM, MXNet, Tensorflow, and Tensorflow XLA. Tested on the NVIDIA Titan X.
TVM produces high performance operators for different hardware

Embedded CPU

Figure 16: ARM A53 end-to-end evaluation of TVM and TFLite.
TVM produces high performance operators for different hardware.
TVM’s Auto-tuner uses ML techniques

- Parametrized the AST
- Use Gradient Boost Tree (GBT) to optimize a “rank loss” to predict the relative order of program runtime

encourages the model to predict cost accurately. On the other hand, as we care only about the relative order of program run times rather than their absolute values in the selection process, we can instead use the following rank loss function [6]:

\[
\sum_{i,j} \log(1 + e^{-\text{sign}(c_i - c_j)(\hat{f}(x_i) - \hat{f}(x_j))}).
\]  (2)
TVM’s Auto-tuner uses ML techniques

Figure 4: Statistical cost model vs. genetic algorithm (GA) and random search (Random) evaluated on NVIDIA TITAN X. ’Number of trials’ corresponds to number of evaluations on the real hardware. We also conducted two hardware evaluations per trial in Random ×2 and GA ×2. Both the GBT- and TreeGRU-based models converged faster and achieved better results than the black-box baselines.
TVM: Summary

- What is the problem that is being solved?
  - Optimize operator for many different devices
- What are the metrics of success?
  - Performance improvement
- What are the key innovations over prior work?
  - Versatile DSL
  - Powerful Auto-tuner
- What are the key results?
  - Significant speedup across different devices
- What are some of the limitations and how might this work be improved?
  - Auto-tuning take forever, cannot be JIT compiled
  - Extremely large scheduling space, maybe RL based, learned cost model?
- How might this work have long term impact?
  - In production use.
Problem Statement

(1) Abstract away the complexity of hardware.
(2) Automatically optimize for different hardware.
(3) New operator without thinking about hardware at all.

System Proposed

- Halide
- TVM
- Tensor Comprehension (TC)
TC: From whiteboard to machine code

TC’s DSL is extremely simple. Algorithm only.

```python
def sgemm(float a, float b,
          float(N,M) A, float(M,K) B) → (C) {
    C(i,j) = b * C(i,j)  # initialization
    C(i,j) += a * A(i,k) * B(k,j)  # accumulation
}
```

Figure 1: Tensor Comprehension for the `sgemm` BLAS

TC resembles the **whiteboard mathematical model** of a deep neural network and makes it easy to reason about, communicate, and to manually alter the computations and storage/computation tradeoffs.
TC: Targeted Audience

- Rapid prototyping new operators for researchers
- Provide comparable performance than manual tuning
- It’s embedded inside PyTorch, Caffe2

```python
def mm(float(M,K) A, float(K,N) B) -> (C) {
    C(m,n) += A(m,kk) * B(kk,n)
}
```

Figure 11: Build execution engine

```python
import torch
A = torch.randn(3,4)
B = torch.randn(4,5)
C = ee.mm(A, B)
```

Figure 12: JIT compile, tune, or hit the compilation cache, then run
TC: Polyhedral Optimization Replaces User Defined Schedule
TC: Polyhedral Optimization Replaces User Defined Schedule

Polyhedral scheduling, optimizes for (outer) loop parallelism and locality + hand tuned affine scheduling heuristic

```
def sgemm(float a, float b, float(M,N) A, float(N,K) B) -> (C) {
    C(i,j) = b * C(i,j) # initialization
    C(i,j) += a * A(i,k) * B(k,j) # accumulation
}
```

Domain

\[
\begin{align*}
    &\{ (i,j) \mid 0 \leq i < N \land 0 \leq j < K \} \\
    &\{ (i,j,k) \mid 0 \leq i < N \land 0 \leq j < K \land 0 \leq k < M \}
\end{align*}
\]

Band

\[
\begin{align*}
    &\{ (i,j) \rightarrow (32 i/32, 32 j/32) \} \\
    &\{ (i,j,k) \rightarrow (32 i/32, 32 j/32) \}
\end{align*}
\]

Sequence

Filter \{ (i,j) \}

Band \{ (i,j) \rightarrow (i \mod 32, j \mod 32) \}

Filter \{ (i,j,k) \}

Band \{ (i,j,k) \rightarrow (32 i/32, 32 j/32) \}

Band \{ (i,j,k) \rightarrow (k \mod 32) \}

Band \{ (i,j,k0) \rightarrow (i \mod 32, j \mod 32) \}

(d) fused, tiled and sunk
TC: Polyhedral Transformation + Mapping

- Given a program in loop nested form, automatically, by formulating the problem as *integer linear program*, optimize for outer loop parallelism and data locality.

Original Program

Transformed Program

- (a) original polyhedron $A \bar{x} \geq \bar{c}$

- (b) usual transformation $(AT^{-1}) \bar{y} \geq \bar{c}$
TC: Polyhedral Transformation + Mapping

Map GPU compute and memory resources to the newly transformed program.
TC: Mapping requires hyperparameters

tc::IslKernelOptions::makeDefaultMappingOptions()
  .tile({4, 32})
  .mapToThreads({1, 32})
  .mapToBlocks({100, 100})
  .useSharedMemory(true)
  .usePrivateMemory(true)
  .unrollCopyShared(true)
  .unrollGpuTile(true)
  .unroll(1024)
TC: Use Genetic Algorithm to Find Best Config

1. three parents are selected probabilistically based on their fitness, the higher the fitness the higher the selection chance;
2. each “gene”, which corresponds to one tuning parameter, of the new candidate is randomly selected from the parents.
TC: Performance

Pascal GPU Benchmarks

- Caffe2+CUBLAS
- ATen+CUBLAS
- TC (manual)
- TC (autotune)

Speedup (more is better)

1LUT  2LUT  MLP1  C3   MLP3  TMM  TBMM  GCOV
TC: Summary

1. What is the problem that is being solved?
   1. Create optimized operator from simple tensor operation
2. What are the metrics of success?
   1. Speedup and ease of use
3. What are the key innovations over prior work?
   1. Use Polyhedral optimization techniques to automatically come up with the schedule
4. What are the key results?
   1. Up to 4x speedup in certain kernel
5. What are some of the limitations and how might this work be improved?
   1. Only for tensor operation, one tensor operation per kernel.
   2. E.g. We can’t express Winograd convolution
6. How might this work have long term impact?
   1. Shown the potential of polyhedral optimization
Discussion

**Architecture:**
- “GPU is too slow for deep neural nets, we should build FPGA”
- Is TPU a step in the right direction? Considering low utilization, low memory throughput, etc.

**Machine Learning:**
- TVM only considered very basic ML techniques, any chance for RL?
- Do you think these kind of problem (intractable scheduling space) is well suited for machine learning?

**Your Questions...**
Backup Slides
Quick Background on GPU

- SM: Streaming Multi-processors
- Each Block is assigned to a SM
- Each SM executes a group of 32 threads (warp) in lock steps
- Free context switch within SM among warps -> latency hiding
Future Research Direction

- Compilers are great at Ahead of Time scheduling, what about Just-In-Time scheduling?
- Any way we can share GPU in predictable way and maximize utilization for DNN inference?
- Can we optimize for “fitness” of the kernel when it’s executed along with other kernels instead of its latency?
Performance Comparison: TVM vs TC