Memory-Aware Scheduling of Tasks Sharing Data on Multiple GPUs with Dynamic Runtime Systems

Maxime Gonthier, Loris Marchal, Samuel Thibault

Memory-Aware Scheduling of Tasks Sharing Data on Multiple GPUs with Dynamic Runtime Systems

15th Scheduling for Large Scale Systems Workshop - Fréjus - Juin 2022

Maxime GONTHIER - Loris MARCHAL - Samuel THIBAULT

maxime.gonthier@ens-lyon.fr

LIP - ROMA - LaBRI - STORM

Motivation: Extract peak performances from GPUs



GPUs are fast but have a limited memory

Share the same PCI bus with limited bandwidth

ENS DE LYON de BORDEAUX

Framework: An example with 2D grid dependencies



- Independent tasks sharing data
- Limited GPU memory

Goal: minimize makespan



- Balancing tasks among GPUs → Reduce total execution time
- Ordering tasks inside each GPU → Reduce data transfers

Problem modeling

GPU_k wants to process task T

1. **Evict** selected data (possibly none) from the memory of GPU_k
2. **Load** data for T that are not yet in memory
3. **Process** T on GPU_k

Hypothesis

- Independant and homogeneous tasks
- Same size data

A bi-objective optimization problem

Objective 1: Load Balancing

$$\textit{minimize} \max_k \textit{ number of tasks allocated to } \mathrm{GPU}_k$$

Objective 2: Data Movement

Minimize the number of data loads from the main memory:

$$\#\textit{Loads}_k = \sum \textit{data load for each } T \textit{ computed on } \mathrm{GPU}_k$$

$$\textit{minimize} \sum_k \#\textit{Loads}_k$$

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Algorithms

2 schedulers from StarPU

- EAGER (our baseline)
- Deque Model Data Aware Ready (DMDAR)

1 algorithm adapted from the literature

- hMETIS

Novel algorithm

- Data-Aware Reactive Task Scheduling (DARTS)

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Dynamic scheduler of StarPU: DMDAR

Strategy

Schedule tasks so their completion time is minimal based on computation + data movement

+ **Ready** reordering heuristic on GPU_k

input : List L of tasks allocated on GPU_k
while $L \neq \emptyset$ **do**
    Search first $T \in L$ requiring the fewest data transfers
    Wait for all data in $\mathcal{D}(T)$ to be in GPU_k memory
    Start processing T
end

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Using (hyper-)graph partitioning: hMETIS



Hypergraph $\rightarrow$ Represent a data being used by different tasks
Accurately represent data sharing

Strategy

1. Apply hMETIS to create tasks subsets
2. Each subset is allocated to a GPU
3. Use the **Ready** strategy
4. Dynamic load balancing using task stealing

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



DARTS: Task flow



ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

DARTS: Strategy

Intuition: consider data locality before task allocation

Perform as many tasks as possible with the data at hand

When no more available tasks with data at hand:

- Find data $D_{optimal}$ such that the number of tasks depending on $D_{optimal}$ and on other data already in memory is maximum
- $plannedTasks_k \leftarrow$ set of unprocessed tasks depending only on $D_{optimal}$ and on other data already in memory

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

DARTS: Eviction and optimizations

Our eviction policy: LUF (Least Used in the Future)

1. If possible, evict data not useful for any task in $taskBuffer_k$ and used by a minimal number of tasks in $plannedTasks_k$
2. Otherwise, apply Belady's rule on tasks already allocated
3. Update $plannedTasks_k$

Improvements

- **3inputs**: Extension to deal with a heterogenous number of data per task
- **OPTI**: Reduce scheduling complexity by stopping the search for $D_{optimal}$ earlier

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Visualization of DARTS processing order on the tiled dense Matrix Multiplication in outer product order



ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Experimental settings

- Real Tesla V100 GPUs and simulations on Simgrid
- PCI bandwidth not limited (12000 MB/s)
- GPU memory limited to 500 $MB \rightarrow$ To better distinguish performance on small datasets

Applications

- Tiled $(1 \times n)(n \times 1)$ dense and sparse Matrix Multiplication in outer product order: $C = A \times B$
- Tiled $(n \times n)$ Gemm: $C = A \times B$
- Tiled Cholesky decomposition (without dependencies) $(A = L \times L^T)$

ENS DE LYON université de BORDEAUX

Tiled dense Matrix Multiplication in outer product order with 2 real Tesla V100 GPUs





- EAGER, hMETIS & DARTS: Pathological matrix size after the red line
- DMDAR: Conflict between prefetch and eviction
- DARTS+LUF outperforms DMDAR even with more data transfers $\rightarrow$ **DARTS is better at overlapping communication and computations**

Tiled dense Matrix Multiplication in outer product order with 4 real Tesla V100 GPUs



Cholesky decomposition with 4 real Tesla V100 GPUs



- **OPTI** reduces scheduling time which improves performance
- DMDAR suffers from a large scheduling time

Tiled Gemm with 4 Tesla V100 GPUs in simulation



Tiled sparse Matrix Multiplication in outer product order without memory limitation (32GB by GPU) with 4 real Tesla V100 GPUs



- DARTS produces a **processing order that best distributes transfers over time**
- hMETIS suffers from a significant partitioning cost

Conclusion and future work

Limiting data movements is crucial to extract the most out of GPUs

Our contribution → **DARTS+LUF, focused on data locality**

DARTS achieves very good performance because it:

- **Limits data transfers** thanks to the finding of an optimal data and an adapted eviction policy
- **Overlaps** communication and computations by distributing transfers over time
- Can be used with a **reduced complexity**

Areas for improvement

- Reduce computational complexity
- Consider tasks with dependencies
- Take inter-GPU communications into account
- Manage multiple MPI nodes

Dynamic Scheduling Strategies for Matrix Multiplication



Source: Analysis of Dynamic Scheduling Strategies for Matrix Multiplication on Heterogeneous Platforms - Marchal - Beaumont