

Zorua: Enhancing Programming Ease, Portability, and Performance in GPUs by Decoupling Programming Models from Resource Management

Nandita Vijaykumar[†] Kevin Hsieh[†] Gennady Pekhimenko^{‡†} Samira Khan[§]
Ashish Shrestha[†] Saugata Ghose[†] Adwait Jog[†] Phillip B. Gibbons[†] Onur Mutlu^{§†}

[†]Carnegie Mellon University

[‡]Microsoft Research

[§]University of Virginia

[†]College of William and Mary

[§]ETH Zürich

Abstract

This paper introduces a new resource virtualization framework, Zorua, that decouples the GPU programming model from the management of key on-chip resources in hardware to enhance programming ease, portability, and performance. The application resource specification—a static specification of several parameters such as the number of threads and the scratchpad memory usage per thread block—forms a critical component of the existing GPU programming models. This specification determines the parallelism, and hence performance, of the application during execution because the corresponding on-chip hardware resources are allocated and managed purely based on this specification. This tight coupling between the software-provided resource specification and resource management in hardware leads to significant challenges in programming ease, portability, and performance, as we demonstrate in this work using real data obtained on state-of-the-art GPU systems.

Our goal in this work is to reduce the dependence of performance on the software-provided static resource specification to simultaneously alleviate the above challenges. To this end, we introduce Zorua, a new resource virtualization framework, that decouples the programmer-specified resource usage of a GPU application from the actual allocation in the on-chip hardware resources. Zorua enables this decoupling by virtualizing each resource transparently to the programmer.

The virtualization provided by Zorua builds on two key concepts—dynamic allocation of the on-chip resources, and their oversubscription using a swap space in memory. Zorua provides a holistic GPU resource virtualization strategy designed to (i) adaptively control the extent of oversubscription, and (ii) coordinate the dynamic management of multiple on-chip resources to maximize the effectiveness of virtualization. We demonstrate that by providing the illusion of more resources than physically available via controlled and coordinated virtualization, Zorua offers several important benefits: (i) **Programming Ease**. Zorua eases the burden on the programmer to provide code that is tuned to efficiently utilize the physically available on-chip resources. (ii) **Portability**. Zorua alleviates the necessity of re-tuning an application’s resource usage when porting the application across GPU generations. (iii) **Performance**. By dynamically allocating resources and carefully oversubscribing them when necessary, Zorua improves or retains the performance of applications that are already highly tuned to best utilize the resources. The holistic virtualization provided by Zorua has many other potential uses, e.g., fine-grained resource sharing among multiple kernels, low-latency preemption of GPU programs, and support for dynamic parallelism, which we describe in this paper.

1. Introduction

Modern Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) have evolved into powerful programmable machines over the last decade, offering high performance and energy efficiency for many classes of applications by concurrently executing thousands of threads. In order to execute, each thread requires several

major on-chip resources: (i) registers, (ii) scratchpad memory (if used in the program), and (iii) a thread slot in the thread scheduler that keeps all the bookkeeping information required for execution.

Today, these hardware resources are *statically* allocated to threads based on several parameters—the number of threads per thread block, register usage per thread, and scratchpad usage per block. We refer to these static application parameters as the *resource specification* of the application. This resource specification forms a critical component of modern GPU programming models (e.g., CUDA [79], OpenCL [3]). The static allocation over a fixed set of hardware resources based on the software-specified resource specification creates a *tight coupling* between the program (and the programming model) and the physical hardware resources. As a result of this tight coupling, for each application, there are only a few optimized resource specifications that maximize resource utilization. Picking a suboptimal specification leads to underutilization of resources and hence, very often, performance degradation. This leads to three key difficulties related to obtaining good performance on modern GPUs: programming ease, portability, and resource inefficiency (performance).

Programming Ease. First, the burden falls upon the programmer to optimize the resource specification. For a naive programmer, this is a very challenging task [26, 74, 82, 89, 90, 91, 103]. This is because, in addition to selecting a specification suited to an algorithm, the programmer needs to be aware of the details of the GPU architecture to fit the specification to the underlying hardware resources. This *tuning* is easy to get wrong because there are *many* highly suboptimal performance points in the specification space, and even a minor deviation from an optimized specification can lead to a drastic drop in performance due to lost parallelism. We refer to such drops as *performance cliffs*. We analyze the effect of suboptimal specifications on real systems for 20 workloads (Section 3.1), and experimentally demonstrate that changing resource specifications can produce as much as a 5× difference in performance due to the change in parallelism. Even a minimal change in the specification (and hence, the resulting allocation) of one resource can result in a significant performance cliff, degrading performance by as much as 50% (Section 3.1).

Portability. Second, different GPUs have varying quantities of each of the resources. Hence, an optimized specification on one GPU may be highly suboptimal on another. In order to determine the extent of this portability problem, we run 20 applications on three generations of NVIDIA GPUs: Fermi, Kepler, and Maxwell (Section 3.2). An example result demonstrates

that highly-tuned code for Maxwell or Kepler loses as much as 69% of its performance on Fermi. This lack of *portability* necessitates that the programmer *re-tune* the resource specification of the application for *every* new GPU generation. This problem is especially significant in virtualized environments, such as cloud or cluster computing, where the same program may run on a wide range of GPU architectures, depending on data center composition and hardware availability.

Performance. Third, for the programmer who chooses to employ software optimization tools (e.g., auto-tuners) or manually tailor the program to fit the hardware, performance is still constrained by the *fixed, static* resource specification. It is well known [31, 33, 48, 111, 112, 125, 126] that the on-chip resource requirements of a GPU application vary throughout execution. Since the program (even after auto-tuning) has to *statically* specify its *worst-case* resource requirements, severe *dynamic underutilization* of several GPU resources [31, 33, 48, 57, 111, 112] ensues, leading to sub-optimal performance (Section 3.3).

Our Goal. To address these three challenges at the same time, we propose to *decouple* an application’s resource specification from the available hardware resources by *virtualizing* all three major resources in a holistic manner. This virtualization provides the illusion of *more* resources to the GPU programmer and software than physically available, and enables the runtime system and the hardware to *dynamically* manage multiple physical resources in a manner that is transparent to the programmer, thereby alleviating dynamic underutilization.

Virtualization is a concept that has been applied to the management of hardware resources in many contexts (e.g., [7, 13, 25, 27, 38, 47, 81, 115]), providing various benefits. We believe that applying the general principle of virtualization to the management of *multiple* on-chip resources in GPUs offers the opportunity to alleviate several important challenges in modern GPU programming, which are described above. However, at the same time, effectively adding a new level of indirection to the management of multiple latency-critical GPU resources introduces several new challenges (see Section 4.1). This necessitates the design of a new mechanism to effectively address the new challenges and enable the benefits of virtualization. In this work, we introduce a new framework, *Zorua*,¹ to decouple the programmer-specified resource specification of an application from its physical on-chip hardware resource allocation by effectively virtualizing the multiple on-chip resources in GPUs.

Key Concepts. The virtualization strategy used by *Zorua* is built upon two key concepts. First, to mitigate performance cliffs when we do not have enough physical resources, we *oversubscribe* resources by a small amount at runtime, by leveraging their dynamic underutilization and maintaining a swap space (in main memory) for the extra resources required. Second, *Zorua* improves utilization by determining the runtime resource requirements of an application. It then allocates and deallocates resources dynamically, managing them (i) *independently* of each other to maximize their utilization; and (ii) in

a *coordinated* manner, to enable efficient execution of each thread with all its required resources available.

Challenges in Virtualization. Unfortunately, oversubscription means that latency-critical resources, such as registers and scratchpad, may be swapped to memory at the time of access, resulting in high overheads in performance and energy. This leads to two critical challenges in designing a framework to enable virtualization. The first challenge is to effectively determine the *extent* of virtualization, i.e., by how much each resource appears to be larger than its physical amount, such that we can minimize oversubscription while still reaping its benefits. This is difficult as the resource requirements continually vary during runtime. The second challenge is to minimize accesses to the swap space. This requires *coordination* in the virtualized management of *multiple resources*, so that enough of each resource is available on-chip when needed.

Zorua. In order to address these challenges, *Zorua* employs a hardware-software codesign that comprises three components: (i) *the compiler* annotates the program to specify the resource needs of *each phase* of the application; (ii) *a runtime system*, which we refer to as the coordinator, uses the compiler annotations to dynamically manage the virtualization of the different on-chip resources; and (iii) *the hardware* employs mapping tables to locate a virtual resource in the physically available resources or in the swap space in main memory. The coordinator plays the key role of scheduling threads *only when* the expected gain in thread-level parallelism outweighs the cost of transferring oversubscribed resources from the swap space in memory, and coordinates the oversubscription and allocation of multiple on-chip resources.

Key Results. We evaluate *Zorua* with many resource specifications for eight applications across three GPU architectures (Section 7). Our experimental results show that *Zorua* (i) reduces the range in performance for different resource specifications by 50% on average (up to 69%), by alleviating performance cliffs, and hence eases the burden on the programmer to provide optimized resource specifications, (ii) improves performance for code with optimized specification by 13% on average (up to 28%), and (iii) enhances portability by reducing the maximum porting performance loss by 55% on average (up to 73%) for three different GPU architectures. We conclude that decoupling the resource specification and resource management via virtualization significantly eases programmer burden, by alleviating the need to provide optimized specifications and enhancing portability, while still improving or retaining performance for programs that already have optimized specifications.

Other Uses. We believe that *Zorua* offers the opportunity to address several other key challenges in GPUs today, for example: (i) By providing an new level of indirection, *Zorua* provides a natural way to enable dynamic and fine-grained control over resource partitioning among *multiple GPU kernels and applications*. (ii) *Zorua* can be utilized for *low-latency pre-emption* of GPU applications, by leveraging the ability to swap in/out resources from/to memory in a transparent manner. (iv) *Zorua* provides a simple mechanism to provide dynamic resources to support other programming paradigms such as

¹Named after a Pokémon [78] with the power of illusion, able to take different shapes to adapt to different circumstances (not unlike our proposed framework).

nested parallelism, helper threads, etc. and even system-level tasks. (v) The dynamic resource management scheme in Zorua improves the energy efficiency and scalability of expensive on-chip resources (Section 8).

The main **contributions** of this work are:

- This is the first work that takes a holistic approach to decoupling a GPU application’s resource specification from its physical on-chip resource allocation via the use of virtualization. We develop a comprehensive virtualization framework that provides *controlled* and *coordinated* virtualization of *multiple* on-chip GPU resources to maximize the efficacy of virtualization.
- We show how to enable efficient oversubscription of multiple GPU resources with dynamic fine-grained allocation of resources and swapping mechanisms into/out of main memory. We provide a hardware-software cooperative framework that (i) controls the extent of oversubscription to make an effective tradeoff between higher thread-level parallelism due to virtualization versus the latency and capacity overheads of swap space usage, and (ii) coordinates the virtualization for multiple on-chip resources, transparently to the programmer.
- We demonstrate that by providing the illusion of having more resources than physically available, Zorua (i) reduces programmer burden, providing competitive performance for even suboptimal resource specifications, by reducing performance variation across different specifications and by alleviating performance cliffs; (ii) reduces performance loss when the program with its resource specification tuned for one GPU platform is ported to a different platform; and (iii) retains or enhances performance for highly-tuned code by improving resource utilization, via dynamic management of resources.

2. Background

The GPU Architecture. A GPU consists of multiple simple cores, also called *streaming multiprocessors* (SMs) in NVIDIA terminology or *compute units* (CUs) in AMD terminology. Each core contains a large register file, programmer-managed shared memory, and an L1 data cache. Each GPU core time multiplexes the execution of thousands of threads to hide long latencies due to memory accesses and ALU operations. The cores and memory controllers are connected via a crossbar and every memory controller is associated with a slice of a shared L2 cache. Every cycle, a set of threads, referred to as a *warp*, are executed in lockstep. If any warp is stalled on a long-latency operation, the scheduler swaps in a different warp for execution. Figure 1 depicts our baseline architecture with 15 SMs and 6 memory controllers. For more details on the internals of modern GPU architectures, we refer the reader to [8, 46, 60, 77].

The Programming Model - Exploiting Parallelism in GPUs. Programming models like CUDA or OpenCL allow programmers to define and invoke parallel functions, called kernels, on a GPU. Each kernel consists of a number of threads that execute in parallel on the GPU cores.




Figure 1: Baseline GPU architecture. Reproduced from [112].

Applications running on GPUs require some on-chip resources for execution. Each thread, among the hundreds or thousands executing concurrently, requires (i) registers, (ii) scratchpad memory (if used in the application), and (iii) a warpslot which includes the necessary book-keeping for execution – a slot in the thread scheduler, PC, and the SIMT stack (used to track control divergence within a warp). Programming languages like CUDA and OpenCL also provide the ability to synchronize execution of threads as well as exchange data with each other. These languages provide the abstraction of a *thread block* or *cooperative thread array* (CTA), respectively – which are a group of threads that can synchronize using barriers or fences, and share data with each other using scratchpad memory. This form of thread synchronization requires that *all* the threads within the same thread block make progress in order for *any* thread to complete execution. As a result, the on-chip resource partitioning as well as the launch for execution at any streaming multiprocessor is done at the granularity of a thread block.

The GPU architecture itself is well provisioned with these on-chip resources to support the concurrent execution of a large number of threads, and these resources can be flexibly partitioned across the application threads according to the application requirements. This flexible partitioning implies that the amount of parallelism that the GPU can support at any time depends on the per-thread block resource requirement.

The programming models, hence, also require specification of several key parameters that decide the utilization of these resources. These include (i) the number of thread blocks in the kernel compute grid, (ii) the number of threads within the thread block (which dictates the number of warp slots required per thread block), (iii) the number of registers per thread and, (iv) the scratchpad usage per thread block. These parameters are typically decided by the programmer and/or compiler. Programmers who aim to optimize code for high efficiency hand-optimize these parameters or use software tools such as autotuners [26, 29, 58, 93, 94, 101] and optimizing compilers [22, 42, 54, 71, 123, 124] to find optimized parameter specifications.

3. Motivation

The amount of parallelism that the GPU can provide for any application depends on the utilization of on-chip resources by threads within the application. As a result, suboptimal usage of these resources may lead to loss in the parallelism that can be achieved during program execution. This loss in parallelism often leads to significant degradation in performance, as GPUs primarily use fine-grained multi-threading [100, 109] to hide the long latencies during execution.

The granularity of synchronization – i.e., the number of threads in a thread block – and the amount of scratchpad memory used per thread block is determined by the programmer while adapting any algorithm or application for execution on a GPU. This choice involves a complex tradeoff between minimizing data movement, by using *larger* scratchpad memory sizes, and reducing the inefficiency of synchronizing a large number of threads, by using *smaller* scratchpad memory and thread block sizes. A similar tradeoff exists when determining the number of registers used by the application. Using *fewer* registers minimizes hardware register usage and enables higher parallelism during execution, whereas using *more* registers avoids expensive accesses to memory. The resulting application parameters – the number of registers, the amount of scratchpad memory, and the number of threads per thread block – dictate the on-chip resource requirement and hence, determine the parallelism that can be obtained for that application on any GPU.

In this section, we study the performance implications of different choices of resource specifications for GPU applications to demonstrate the key issues we aim to alleviate.

3.1. Performance Variation and Cliffs

To understand the impact of resource specifications and the resulting utilization of physical resources on GPU performance, we conduct an experiment on a Maxwell GPU system (GTX 745) with 20 GPGPU workloads from the CUDA SDK [80], Rodinia [21], GPGPU-Sim benchmarks [12], Lonestar [19], Parboil [104], and US DoE application suites [114]. We use the NVIDIA profiling tool (NVProf) [80] to determine the execution time of each application kernel. We sweep the three parameters of the specification—number of threads in a thread block, register usage per thread, and scratchpad memory usage per thread block—for each workload, and measure their impact on execution time.

Figure 2 shows a summary of variation in performance (higher is better), normalized to the slowest specification for each application, across all evaluated specification points for each application in a Tukey box plot [75]. The boxes in the box plot represent the range between the first quartile (25%) and the third quartile (75%). The whiskers extending from the boxes represent the maximum and minimum points of the distribution, or $1.5 \times$ the length of the box, whichever is smaller. Any points that lie more than $1.5 \times$ the box length beyond the box are considered to be outliers [75], and are plotted as individual points. The line in the middle of the box represents the median, while the “X” represents the average.

We can see that there is significant variation in performance across different specification points (as much as $5.51 \times$ in *SP*), proving the importance of optimized resource specifications. In some applications (e.g., *BTR*, *SLA*), few points perform well, and these points are significantly better than others, suggesting that it would be challenging for a programmer to locate these high performing specifications and obtain the best performance. Many workloads (e.g., *BH*, *DCT*, *MST*) also have higher concentrations of specifications with suboptimal performance in comparison to the best performing point, implying




Figure 2: Performance variation across specifications. Reproduced from [113].


that, without effort, it is likely that the programmer will end up with a resource specification that leads to low performance.

There are several sources for this performance variation. One important source is the loss in thread-level parallelism as a result of a suboptimal resource specification. Suboptimal specifications that are *not* tailored to fit the available physical resources lead to the underutilization of resources. This causes a drop in the number of threads that can be executed concurrently, as there are insufficient resources to support their execution. Hence, better and more balanced utilization of resources enables higher thread-level parallelism. Often, this loss in parallelism from resource underutilization manifests itself in what we refer to as a *performance cliff*, where a small deviation from an optimized specification can lead to significantly worse performance, i.e., there is very high variation in performance between two specification points that are nearby. To demonstrate the existence and analyze the behavior of performance cliffs, we examine two representative workloads more closely.


Figure 3a shows (i) how the application execution time changes; and (ii) how the corresponding number of registers, statically used, changes when the number of threads per thread block increases from 32 to 1024 threads, for *Minimum Spanning Tree (MST)* [19]. We make two observations.

First, let us focus on the execution time between 480 and 1024 threads per block. As we go from 480 to 640 threads per block, execution time gradually decreases. Within this window, the GPU can support two thread blocks running concurrently for *MST*. The execution time falls because the increase in the number of threads per block improves the overall throughput (the number of thread blocks running concurrently remains constant at two, but each thread block does more work in parallel by having more threads per block). However, the corresponding total number of registers used by the blocks also increases. At 640 threads per block, we reach the point where the total number of available registers is not large enough to support two blocks. As a result, the number of blocks executing in parallel drops from two to one, resulting in a significant increase (50%) in execution time, i.e., the *performance cliff*.²

²Prior work [118] has studied performing resource allocation at the finer warp granularity, as opposed to the coarser granularity of a thread block. As we discuss in Section 9 and demonstrate in Section 7, this does *not* solve the problem of performance cliffs.



(a) Threads/block sweep



(b) Threads/block & Registers/thread sweep

Figure 3: Performance cliffs in *Minimum Spanning Tree (MST)*. Reproduced from [113].

We see many of these cliffs earlier in the graph as well, albeit not as drastic as the one at 640 threads per block.

Second, Figure 3a shows the existence of performance cliffs when we vary *just one* system parameter—the number of threads per block. To make things more difficult for the programmer, other parameters (i.e., registers per thread or scratchpad memory per thread block) also need to be decided at the same time. Figure 3b demonstrates that performance cliffs also exist when the *number of registers per thread* is varied from 32 to 48.³ As this figure shows, performance cliffs now occur at *different points* for *different registers/thread* curves, which makes optimizing resource specification, so as to avoid these cliffs, much harder for the programmer.

Barnes-Hut (BH) is another application that exhibits very significant performance cliffs depending on the number of threads per block and registers per thread. Figure 4 plots the variation in performance with the number of threads per block when *BH* is compiled for a range of register sizes (between 24 and 48 registers per thread). We make two observations from the figure. First, similar to *MST*, we observe a significant variation in performance that manifests itself in the form of performance cliffs. Second, we observe that the points at which the performance cliffs occur change greatly depending on the number of registers assigned to each thread during compilation.

We conclude that performance cliffs are pervasive across GPU programs, and occur due to fundamental limitations of

³We note that the register usage reported by the compiler may vary from the actual runtime register usage [80], hence slightly altering the points at which cliffs occur.




Figure 4: Performance cliffs in *Barnes-Hut (BH)*. Reproduced from [113].

existing GPU hardware resource managers, where resource management is static, coarse-grained, and tightly coupled to the application resource specification. Avoiding performance cliffs by determining more optimal resource specifications is a challenging task, because the occurrence of these cliffs depends on several factors, including the application characteristics, input data, and the underlying hardware resources.

3.2. Portability

As we show in Section 3.1, tuning GPU applications to achieve good performance on a given GPU is already a challenging task. To make things worse, even after this tuning is done by the programmer for one particular GPU architecture, it has to be *redone* for every new GPU generation (due to changes in the available physical resources across generations) to ensure that good performance is retained. We demonstrate this *portability problem* by running sweeps of the three parameters of the resource specification on various workloads, on three real GPU generations: Fermi (GTX 480), Kepler (GTX 760), and Maxwell (GTX 745).

Figure 5 shows how the optimized performance points change between different GPU generations for two representative applications (*MST* and *DCT*). For every generation, results are normalized to the lowest execution time for that particular generation. As we can see in Figure 5a, the best performing points for different generations occur at *different* specifications because the application behavior changes with the variation in hardware resources. For *MST*, the *Maxwell* architecture performs best at 64 threads per block. However, the same specification point is not efficient for either of the other generations (*Fermi* and *Kepler*), producing 15% and 30% lower performance, respectively, compared to the best specification for each generation. For *DCT* (shown in Figure 5b), both *Kepler* and *Maxwell* perform best at 128 threads per block, but using the same specification for *Fermi* would lead to a 69% performance loss. Similarly, for *BH* (Figure 5c), the optimal point for *Fermi* architecture is at 96 threads per block. However, using the same configuration for the two later GPU architectures – *Kepler* and *Maxwell* could lead to very suboptimal performance results. Using the same configuration results in as much as a 34% performance loss on *Kepler*, and a 36% performance loss on *Maxwell*.

We conclude that the tight coupling between the programming model and the underlying resource management in hardware imposes a significant challenge in performance portabil-




Figure 5: Performance variation across different GPU generations (Fermi, Kepler, and Maxwell) for *MST*, *DCT*, and *BH*. Adapted from [113].

ity. To avoid suboptimal performance, an application has to be *retuned* by the programmer to find an optimized resource specification for *each* GPU generation.

3.3. Dynamic Resource Underutilization

Even when a GPU application is *perfectly* tuned for a particular GPU architecture, the on-chip resources are typically not fully utilized [10, 11, 31, 33, 34, 48, 63, 82, 92, 111, 125]. For example, it is well known that while the compiler conservatively allocates registers to hold the *maximum number* of live values throughout the execution, the number of live values at any given time is well below the maximum for large portions of application execution time. To determine the magnitude

of this *dynamic underutilization*,⁴ we conduct an experiment where we measure the dynamic usage (per epoch) of both scratchpad memory and registers for different applications with *optimized* specifications in our workload pool.

We vary the length of epochs from 500 to 4000 cycles. Figure 6 shows the results of this experiment for (i) scratchpad memory (Figure 6a) and (ii) on-chip registers (Figure 6b). We make two major observations from these figures.




Figure 6: Dynamic resource utilization for different length epochs.

First, for relatively small epochs (e.g., 500 cycles), the average utilization of resources is very low (12% for scratchpad memory and 37% for registers). Even for the largest epoch size that we analyze (4000 cycles), the utilization of scratchpad memory is still less than 50%, and the utilization of registers is less than 70%. This observation clearly suggests that there is an opportunity for a better dynamic allocation of these resources that could allow higher effective GPU parallelism.

Second, there are several noticeable applications, e.g., *cutcp*, *hw*, *tpacf*, where utilization of the scratchpad memory is always lower than 15%. This dramatic underutilization due to static resource allocation can lead to significant loss in potential performance benefits for these applications.

In summary, we conclude that existing static on-chip resource allocation in GPUs can lead to significant resource

⁴ Underutilization of registers occurs in two major forms—*static*, where registers are unallocated throughout execution [10, 11, 32, 34, 63, 92, 111, 118], and *dynamic*, where utilization of the registers drops during runtime as a result of early completion of warps [118], short register lifetimes [31, 33, 48] and long-latency operations [31, 33]. We do not tackle underutilization from long-latency operations (such as memory accesses) in this paper, and leave the exploration of alleviating this type of underutilization to future work.

underutilization that can lead to suboptimal performance and energy waste.

3.4. Our Goal

As we see above, the tight coupling between the resource specification and hardware resource allocation, and the resulting heavy dependence of performance on the resource specification, creates a number of challenges. In this work, our goal is to alleviate these challenges by providing a mechanism that can (i) ease the burden on the programmer by ensuring reasonable performance, *regardless of the resource specification*, by successfully avoiding performance cliffs, while retaining performance for code with optimized specification; (ii) enhance portability by minimizing the variation in performance for optimized specifications across different GPU generations; and (iii) maximize dynamic resource utilization even in highly optimized code to further improve performance. We make two key observations from our studies above to help us achieve this goal.

Observation 1: Bottleneck Resources. We find that performance cliffs occur when the amount of any resource required by an application exceeds the physically available amount of that resource. This resource becomes a *bottleneck*, and limits the amount of parallelism that the GPU can support. If it were possible to provide the application with a *small additional amount* of the bottleneck resource, the application can see a significant increase in parallelism and thus avoid the performance cliff.

Observation 2: Underutilized Resources. As discussed in Section 3.3, there is significant underutilization of resources at runtime. These underutilized resources could be employed to support more parallelism at runtime, and thereby alleviate the aforementioned challenges.

We use these two observations to drive our resource virtualization solution, which we describe next.

4. Zorua: Our Approach

In this work, we design Zorua, a framework that provides the illusion of more GPU resources than physically available by decoupling the resource specification from its allocation in the hardware resources. We introduce a new level of indirection by virtualizing the on-chip resources to allow the hardware to manage resources transparently to the programmer.

The virtualization provided by Zorua builds upon two *key concepts* to leverage the aforementioned observations. First, when there are insufficient physical resources, we aim to provide the illusion of the required amount by *oversubscribing* the required resource. We perform this oversubscription by leveraging the dynamic underutilization as much as possible, or by spilling to a swap space in memory. This oversubscription essentially enables the illusion of more resources than what is available (physically and statically), and supports the concurrent execution of more threads. Performance cliffs are mitigated by providing enough additional resources to avoid drastic drops in parallelism. Second, to enable efficient oversubscription by leveraging underutilization, we dynamically allocate and deallocate physical resources depending on the

requirements of the application during execution. We manage the virtualization of each resource *independently* of other resources to maximize its runtime utilization.

Figure 7 depicts the high-level overview of the virtualization provided by Zorua. The *virtual space* refers to the *illusion* of the quantity of available resources. The *physical space* refers to the *actual* hardware resources (specific to the GPU architecture), and the *swap space* refers to the resources that do not fit in the physical space and hence are *spilled* to other physical locations. For the register file and scratchpad memory, the swap space is mapped to global memory space in the memory hierarchy. For threads, only those that are mapped to the physical space are available for scheduling and execution at any given time. If a thread is mapped to the swap space, its state (i.e., the PC and the SIMT stack) is saved in memory. Resources in the virtual space can be freely re-mapped between the physical and swap spaces to maintain the illusion of the virtual space resources.




Figure 7: High-level overview of Zorua. Reproduced from [113].

In the baseline architecture, the thread-level parallelism that can be supported, and hence the throughput obtained from the GPU, depends on the quantity of *physical resources*. With the virtualization enabled by Zorua, the parallelism that can be supported now depends on the quantity of *virtual resources* (and how their mapping into the physical and swap spaces is managed). Hence, the size of the virtual space for each resource plays the key role of determining the parallelism that can be exploited. Increasing the virtual space size enables higher parallelism, but leads to higher swap space usage. It is critical to minimize accesses to the swap space to avoid the latency overhead and capacity/bandwidth contention associated with accessing the memory hierarchy.

In light of this, there are two key challenges that need to be addressed to effectively virtualize on-chip resources in GPUs. We now discuss these challenges and provide an overview of how we address them.

4.1. Challenges in Virtualization

Challenge 1: Controlling the Extent of Oversubscription. A key challenge is to determine the *extent* of oversubscription, or the size of the virtual space for each resource. As discussed above, increasing the size of the virtual space enables more parallelism. Unfortunately, it could also result in more spilling of resources to the swap space. Finding the tradeoff between more parallelism and less overhead is challenging, because the dynamic resource requirements of each thread tend to significantly fluctuate throughout execution. As a result, the

size of the virtual space for each resource needs to be *continuously* tuned to allow the virtualization to adapt to the runtime requirements of the program.

Challenge 2: Control and Coordination of Multiple Resources. Another critical challenge is to efficiently map the continuously varying virtual resource space to the physical and swap spaces. This is important for two reasons. First, it is critical to minimize accesses to the swap space. Accessing the swap space for the register file or scratchpad involves expensive accesses to global memory, due to the added latency and contention. Also, only those threads that are mapped to the physical space are available to the warp scheduler for selection. Second, each thread requires multiple resources for execution. It is critical to *coordinate* the allocation and mapping of these different resources to ensure that an executing thread has *all* the required resources allocated to it, while minimizing accesses to the swap space. Thus, an effective virtualization framework must coordinate the allocation of *multiple* on-chip resources.

4.2. Key Ideas of Our Design

To solve these challenges, Zorua employs two key ideas. First, we leverage the software (the compiler) to provide annotations with information regarding the resource requirements of each *phase* of the application. This information enables the framework to make intelligent dynamic decisions, with respect to both the size of the virtual space and the allocation/deallocation of resources (Section 4.2.1).

Second, we use an adaptive runtime system to control the allocation of resources in the virtual space and their mapping to the physical/swap spaces. This allows us to (i) dynamically alter the size of the virtual space to change the extent of oversubscription; and (ii) continuously coordinate the allocation of multiple on-chip resources and the mapping between their virtual and physical/swap spaces, depending on the varying runtime requirements of each thread (Section 4.2.2).

4.2.1. Leveraging Software Annotations of Phase Characteristics. We observe that the runtime variation in resource requirements (Section 3.3) typically occurs at the granularity of *phases* of a few tens of instructions. This variation occurs because different parts of kernels perform different operations that require different resources. For example, loops that primarily load/store data from/to scratchpad memory tend to be less register heavy. Sections of code that perform specific computations (e.g., matrix transformation, graph manipulation), can either be register heavy or primarily operate out of scratchpad. Often, scratchpad memory is used for only short intervals [125], e.g., when data exchange between threads is required, such as for a reduction operation.

Figure 8 depicts a few example phases from the *NQU* (*N-Queens Solver*) [23] kernel. *NQU* is a scratchpad-heavy application, but it does not use the scratchpad at all during the initial computation phase. During its second phase, it performs its primary computation out of the scratchpad, using as much as 4224B. During its last phase, the scratchpad is used only for reducing results, which requires only 384B. There is also significant variation in the maximum number of live registers in the different phases.




Figure 8: Example phases from *NQU*. Reproduced from [113].




Figure 9: Example phases from *DCT*

Another example of phase variation from the *DCT* (*Discrete Fourier Transform*) kernel is depicted in Figure 9. *DCT* is both register and scratchpad-intensive. The scratchpad memory usage does not vary in this kernel. However, the register usage significantly varies – the register usage increases by 2X in the second and third phase in comparison with the first and fourth phase.

In order to capture both the resource requirements as well as their variation over time, we partition the program into a number of *phases*. A phase is a sequence of instructions with sufficiently different resource requirements than adjacent phases. Barrier or fence operations also indicate a change in requirements for a different reason—threads that are waiting at a barrier do not immediately require the thread slot that they are holding. We interpret barriers and fences as phase boundaries since they potentially alter the utilization of their thread slots. The compiler inserts special instructions called *phase specifiers* to mark the start of a new phase. Each phase specifier contains information regarding the resource requirements of the next phase. Section 5.7 provides more detail on the semantics of phases and phase specifiers.

A phase forms the basic unit for resource allocation and deallocation, as well as for making oversubscription decisions. It offers a finer granularity than an *entire thread* to make such decisions. The phase specifiers provide information on the *future resource usage* of the thread at a phase boundary. This enables (i) preemptively controlling the extent of oversubscription at runtime, and (ii) dynamically allocating and deallocating resources at phase boundaries to maximize utilization of the physical resources.

4.2.2. Control with an Adaptive Runtime System. Phase specifiers provide information to make oversubscription and

allocation/deallocation decisions. However, we still need a way to make decisions on the extent of oversubscription and appropriately allocate resources at runtime. To this end, we use an adaptive runtime system, which we refer to as the *coordinator*. Figure 10 presents an overview of the coordinator.




Figure 10: Overview of the coordinator. Reproduced from [113].

The virtual space enables the illusion of a larger amount of each of the resources than what is physically available, to adapt to different application requirements. This illusion enables higher thread-level parallelism than what can be achieved with solely the fixed, physically available resources, by allowing more threads to execute concurrently. The size of the virtual space at a given time determines this parallelism, and those threads that are effectively executed in parallel are referred to as *active threads*. All active threads have thread slots allocated to them in the virtual space (and hence can be executed), but some of them may not be mapped to the physical space at a given time. As discussed previously, the resource requirements of each application continuously change during execution. To adapt to these runtime changes, the coordinator leverages information from the phase specifiers to make decisions on oversubscription. The coordinator makes these decisions at every phase boundary and thereby controls the size of the virtual space for each resource (see Section 5.2).

To enforce the determined extent of oversubscription, the coordinator allocates all the required resources (in the virtual space) for only a *subset* of threads from the active threads. Only these dynamically selected threads, referred to as *schedulable threads*, are available to the warp scheduler and compute units for execution. The coordinator, hence, dynamically partitions the active threads into *schedulable threads* and the *pending threads*. Each thread is swapped between *schedulable* and *pending* states, depending on the availability of resources in the virtual space. Selecting only a subset of threads to execute at any time ensures that the determined size of the virtual space is not exceeded for any resource, and helps coordinate the allocation and mapping of multiple on-chip resources to minimize expensive data transfers between the physical and swap spaces (discussed in Section 5).

4.3. Overview of Zorua

In summary, to effectively address the challenges in virtualization by leveraging the above ideas in design, Zorua employs a software-hardware codesign that comprises three components: (i) *The compiler* annotates the program by adding special instructions (*phase specifiers*) to partition it into *phases* and to specify the resource needs of each phase of the ap-

plication. (ii) *The coordinator*, a hardware-based adaptive runtime system, uses the compiler annotations to dynamically allocate/deallocate resources for each thread at phase boundaries. The coordinator plays the key role of continuously controlling the extent of the oversubscription (and hence the size of the virtual space) at each phase boundary. (iii) *Hardware virtualization support* includes a mapping table for each resource to locate each virtual resource in either the physical space or the swap space in main memory, and the machinery to swap resources between the physical and swap spaces.

5. Zorua: Detailed Mechanism

We now detail the operation and implementation of the various components of the Zorua framework.

5.1. Key Components in Hardware

Zorua has two key hardware components: (i) the *coordinator* that contains queues to buffer the *pending threads* and control logic to make oversubscription and resource management decisions, and (ii) *resource mapping tables* to map each of the resources to their corresponding physical or swap spaces.

Figure 11 presents an overview of the hardware components that are added to each SM. The coordinator interfaces with the thread block scheduler (1) to schedule new blocks onto an SM. It also interfaces with the warp schedulers by providing a list of *schedulable warps* (7).⁵ The resource mapping tables are accessible by the coordinator and the compute units. We present a detailed walkthrough of the operation of Zorua and then discuss its individual components in more detail.




Figure 11: Overview of Zorua in hardware. Reproduced from [113].

5.2. Detailed Walkthrough

The coordinator is called into action by three events: (i) a new thread block is scheduled at the SM for execution, (ii) a warp undergoes a phase change, or (iii) a warp or a thread block reaches the end of execution. Between these events, the coordinator performs no action and execution proceeds as usual. We now walk through the sequence of actions performed by the coordinator for each type of event.

Thread Block: Execution Start. When a thread block is scheduled onto an SM for execution (1), the coordinator first buffers it. The primary decision that the coordinator makes

⁵We use an additional bit in each warp slots to indicate to the scheduler whether the warp is schedulable.

is to determine whether or not to make each thread available to the scheduler for execution. The granularity at which the coordinator makes decisions is that of a warp, as threads are scheduled for execution at the granularity of a warp (hence we use *thread slot* and *warp slot* interchangeably). Each warp requires three resources: a thread slot, registers, and potentially scratchpad. The amount of resources required is determined by the phase specifier (Section 5.7) at the start of execution, which is placed by the compiler into the code. The coordinator must supply each warp with *all* its required resources in either the physical or swap space before presenting it to the warp scheduler for execution.

To ensure that each warp is furnished with its resources and to coordinate potential oversubscription for each resource, the coordinator has three queues—*thread/barrier*, *scratchpad*, and *register queues*. The three queues together essentially house the *pending threads*. Each warp must traverse each queue (② ③ ④), as described next, before becoming eligible to be scheduled for execution. The coordinator allows a warp to traverse a queue when (a) it has enough of the corresponding resource available in the physical space, or (b) it has an insufficient resources in the physical space, but has decided to oversubscribe and allocate the resource in the swap space. The total size of the resource allocated in the physical and swap spaces cannot exceed the determined virtual space size. The coordinator determines the availability of resources in the physical space using the mapping tables (see Section 5.5). If there is an insufficient amount of a resource in the physical space, the coordinator needs to decide whether or not to increase the virtual space size for that particular resource by oversubscribing and using swap space. We describe the decision algorithm in Section 5.4. If the warp cannot traverse *all* queues, it is left waiting in the first (*thread/barrier*) queue until the next coordinator event. Once a warp has traversed *all* the queues, the coordinator acquires all the resources required for the warp’s execution (⑤). The corresponding mapping tables for each resource is updated (⑥) to assign resources to the warp, as described in Section 5.5.

Warp: Phase Change. At each phase change (⑧), the warp is removed from the list of schedulable warps and is returned to the coordinator to acquire/release its resources. Based on the information in its phase specifier, the coordinator releases the resources that are no longer live and hence are no longer required (⑨). The coordinator updates the mapping tables to free these resources (⑩). The warp is then placed into a specific queue, depending on which live resources it retained from the previous phase and which new resources it requires. The warp then attempts to traverse the remaining queues (② ③ ④), as described above. A warp that undergoes a phase change as a result of a barrier instruction is queued in the *thread/barrier queue* (②) until all warps in the same thread block reach the barrier.

Thread Block/Warp: Execution End. When a warp completes execution, it is returned to the coordinator to release any resources it is holding. Scratchpad is released only when the entire thread block completes execution. When the coor-

dinator has free warp slots for a new thread block, it requests the thread block scheduler (①) for a new block.

Every Coordinator Event. At any event, the coordinator attempts to find resources for warps waiting at the queues, to enable them to execute. Each warp in each queue (starting from the *register queue*) is checked for the availability of the required resources. If the coordinator is able to allocate resources in the physical or swap space without exceeding the determined size of virtual space, the warp is allowed to traverse the queue.

5.3. Benefits of Our Design

Decoupling the Warp Scheduler and Mapping Tables from the Coordinator. Decoupling the warp scheduler from the coordinator enables Zorua to use any scheduling algorithm over the schedulable warps to enhance performance. One case when this is useful is when increasing parallelism degrades performance by increasing cache miss rate or causing memory contention [55, 56, 88]. Our decoupled design allows this challenge to be addressed independently from the coordinator using more intelligent scheduling algorithms [8, 56, 77, 88] and cache management schemes [8, 69, 70, 119]. Furthermore, decoupling the mapping tables from the coordinator allows easy integration of any implementation of the mapping tables that may improve efficiency for each resource.

Coordinating Oversubscription for Multiple Resources. The queues help ensure that a warp is allocated *all* resources in the virtual space before execution. They (i) ensure an ordering in resource allocation to avoid deadlocks, and (ii) enforce priorities between resources. In our evaluated approach, we use the following order of priorities: threads, scratchpad, and registers. We prioritize scratchpad over registers, as scratchpad is shared by all warps in a block and hence has a higher value by enabling more warps to execute. We prioritize threads over scratchpad, as it is wasteful to allow warps stalled at a barrier to acquire other resources—other warps that are still progressing towards the barrier may be starved of the resource they need. Furthermore, managing each resource independently allows different oversubscription policies for each resource and enables fine-grained control over the size of the virtual space for that resource.

Flexible Oversubscription. Zorua’s design can flexibly enable/disable swap space usage, as the dynamic fine-grained management of resources is independent of the swap space. Hence, in cases where the application is well-tuned to utilize the available resources, swap space usage can be disabled or minimized, and Zorua can still improve performance by reducing dynamic underutilization of resources. Furthermore, different oversubscription algorithms can be flexibly employed to manage the size of the virtual space for each resource (independently or cooperatively). These algorithms can be designed for different purposes, e.g., minimizing swap space usage, improving fairness in a multikernel setting, reducing energy, etc. In Section 5.4, we describe an example algorithm to improve performance by making a good tradeoff between improving parallelism and reducing swap space usage.

Avoiding Deadlocks. A resource allocation deadlock could happen if resources are distributed among too many threads, such that *no* single thread is able to obtain enough necessary resources for execution. Allocating resources using *multiple* ordered queues helps avoid deadlocks in resource allocation in three ways. First, new resources are allocated to a warp only once the warp has traversed *all* of the queues. This ensures that resources are not wastefully allocated to warps that will be stalled anyway. Second, a warp is allocated resources based on how many resources it already has, i.e. how many queues it has already traversed. Warps that already hold multiple live resources are prioritized in allocating new resources over warps that do *not* hold any resources. Finally, if there are insufficient resources to maintain a minimal level of parallelism (e.g., 20% of SM occupancy in our evaluation), the coordinator handles this rare case by simply oversubscribing resources to ensure that there is no deadlock in allocation.

Managing More Resources. Our design also allows flexibly adding more resources to be managed by the virtualization framework, for example, thread block slots. Virtualizing a new resource with Zorua simply requires adding a new queue to the coordinator and a new mapping table to manage the virtual to physical mapping.

5.4. Oversubscription Decisions

Leveraging Phase Specifiers. Zorua leverages the information provided by phase specifiers (Section 5.7) to make oversubscription decisions for each phase. For each resource, the coordinator checks whether allocating the requested quantity according to the phase specifier would cause the total swap space to exceed an *oversubscription threshold*, or o_thresh . This threshold essentially dynamically sets the size of the virtual space for each resource. The coordinator allows oversubscription for each resource only within its threshold. o_thresh is dynamically determined to adapt to the characteristics of the workload, and to ensure good performance by achieving a good tradeoff between the overhead of oversubscription and the benefits gained from parallelism.

Determining the Oversubscription Threshold. In order to make the above tradeoff, we use two architectural statistics: (i) idle time at the cores, c_idle , as an indicator for potential performance benefits from parallelism; and (ii) memory idle time (the idle cycles when all threads are stalled waiting for data from memory or the memory pipeline), c_mem , as an indicator of a saturated memory subsystem that is unlikely to benefit from more parallelism.⁶ We use Algorithm 1 to determine o_thresh at runtime. Every *epoch*, the change in c_mem is compared with the change in c_idle . If the increase in c_mem is greater, this indicates an increase in pressure on the memory subsystem, suggesting both lesser benefit from parallelism and higher overhead from oversubscription. In this case, we reduce o_thresh . On the other hand, if the increase in c_idle is higher, this is indicative of more idleness in the pipelines, and higher potential performance from parallelism and oversubscription. We increase o_thresh in this case,

⁶This is similar to the approach taken by prior work [55] to estimate the performance benefits of increasing parallelism.

to allow more oversubscription and enable more parallelism. Table 1 describes the variables used in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Determining the oversubscription threshold

```

1:  $o\_thresh = o\_default$  ▷ Initialize threshold
2: for each epoch do
3:    $c\_idle\_delta = (c\_idle - c\_idle\_prev)$  ▷ Determine the change in  $c\_idle$  and  $c\_mem$  from the previous epoch
4:    $c\_mem\_delta = (c\_mem - c\_mem\_prev)$ 
5:   if  $(c\_idle\_delta - c\_mem\_delta) > c\_delta\_thresh$  then ▷ Indicates more idleness and potential for benefits from parallelism
6:      $o\_thresh + = o\_thresh\_step$ 
7:   end if
8:   if  $(c\_mem\_delta - c\_idle\_delta) > c\_delta\_thresh$  then ▷ Traffic in memory is likely to outweigh any parallelism benefit
9:      $o\_thresh - = o\_thresh\_step$ 
10:  end if
11: end for

```

Variable	Description
o_thresh	oversubscription threshold (dynamically determined)
$o_default$	initial value for o_thresh , (experimentally determined to be 10% of total physical resource)
c_idle	core cycles when no threads are issued to the core (but the pipeline is not stalled) [55]
c_mem	core cycles when all warps are waiting for data from memory or stalled at the memory pipeline
$*_prev$	the above statistics for the previous epoch
c_delta_thresh	threshold to produce change in o_thresh (experimentally determined to be 16)
o_thresh_step	increment/decrement to o_thresh , experimentally determined to be 4% of the total physical resource
$epoch$	interval in core cycles to change o_thresh (experimentally determined to be 2048)

Table 1: Variables for oversubscription

5.5. Virtualizing On-chip Resources

A resource can be in either the physical space, in which case it is mapped to the physical on-chip resource, or the swap space, in which case it can be found in the memory hierarchy. Thus, a resource is effectively virtualized, and we need to track the mapping between the virtual and physical/swap spaces. We use a *mapping table* for each resource to determine (i) whether the resource is in the physical or swap space, and (ii) the location of the resource within the physical on-chip hardware. The compute units access these mapping tables before accessing the real resources. An access to a resource that is mapped to the swap space is converted to a global memory access that is addressed by the logical resource ID and warp/block ID (and a base register for the swap space of the resource). In addition to the mapping tables, we use two registers per resource to track the amount of the resource that is (i) free to be used in physical space, and (ii) mapped in swap space. These two counters enable the coordinator to make oversubscription decisions (Section 5.4). We now go into more detail on virtualized resources in Zorua.⁷

⁷Our implementation of a virtualized resource aims to minimize complexity. This implementation is largely orthogonal to the framework itself, and one can envision other implementations (e.g., [48, 125, 126]) for different resources.

5.5.1. Virtualizing Registers and Scratchpad Memory. In order to minimize the overhead of large mapping tables, we map registers and scratchpad at the granularity of a *set*. The size of a set is configurable by the architect—we use $4 \times \text{warp_size}$ ⁸ for the register mapping table, and 1KB for scratchpad. Figure 12 depicts the tables for the registers and scratchpad. The register mapping table is indexed by the warp ID and the logical register set number ($\text{logical_register_number} / \text{register_set_size}$). The scratchpad mapping table is indexed by the block ID and the logical scratchpad set number ($\text{logical_scratchpad_address} / \text{scratchpad_set_size}$). Each entry in the mapping table contains the physical address of the register/scratchpad content in the physical register file or scratchpad. The valid bit indicates whether the logical entry is mapped to the physical space or the swap space. With 64 logical warps and 16 logical thread blocks (see Section 6.1), the register mapping table takes 1.125 KB ($64 \times 16 \times 9$ bits, or 0.87% of the register file) and the scratchpad mapping table takes 672 B ($16 \times 48 \times 7$ bits, or 1.3% of the scratchpad).




Figure 12: Mapping Tables

5.5.2. Virtualizing Thread Slots. Each SM is provisioned with a fixed number of *warp slots*, which determine the number of warps that are considered for execution every cycle by the warp scheduler. In order to oversubscribe warp slots, we need to save the state of each warp in memory before remapping the physical slot to another warp. This state includes the bookkeeping required for execution, i.e., the warp’s PC (program counter) and the SIMT stack, which holds divergence information for each executing warp. The thread slot mapping table records whether each warp is mapped to a physical slot or swap space. The table is indexed by the logical warp ID, and stores the address of the physical warp slot that contains the warp. In our baseline design with 64 logical warps, this mapping table takes 56 B (64×7 bits).

5.6. Handling Resource Spills

If the coordinator has oversubscribed any resource, it is possible that the resource can be found either (i) on-chip (in the physical space) or (ii) in the swap space in the memory hierarchy. As described above, the location of any virtual resource is determined by the mapping table for each resource. If the resource is found on-chip, the mapping table provides the physical location in the register file and scratchpad memory. If the resource is in the swap space, the access to that resource is converted to a global memory load that is addressed either by the (i) thread block ID and logical register/scratchpad

set, in the case of registers or scratchpad memory; or (ii) logical warp ID, in the case of warp slots. The oversubscribed resource is typically found in the L1/L2 cache but in the worst case, could be in memory. When the coordinator chooses to oversubscribe any resource beyond what is available on-chip, the least frequently accessed resource set is spilled to the memory hierarchy using a simple store operation.

5.7. Supporting Phases and Phase Specifiers

Identifying phases. The compiler partitions each application into phases based on the liveness of registers and scratchpad memory. To avoid changing phases too often, the compiler uses thresholds to determine phase boundaries. In our evaluation, we define a new phase boundary when there is (i) a 25% change in the number of live registers or live scratchpad content, and (ii) a minimum of 10 instructions since the last phase boundary. To simplify hardware design, the compiler draws phase boundaries only where there is no control divergence.⁹

Once the compiler partitions the application into phases, it inserts instructions—*phase specifiers*—to specify the beginning of each new phase and convey information to the framework on the number of registers and scratchpad memory required for each phase. As described in Section 4.2.1, a barrier or a fence instruction also implies a phase change, but the compiler does not insert a phase specifier for it as the resource requirement does not change.

Phase Specifiers. The phase specifier instruction contains fields to specify (i) the number of live registers and (ii) the amount of scratchpad memory in bytes, both for the next phase. Figure 13 describes the fields in the phase specifier instruction. The instruction decoder sends this information to the coordinator along with the phase change event. The coordinator keeps this information in the corresponding warp slot.




Figure 13: Phase Specifier

5.8. Role of the Compiler and Programmer

The compiler plays an important role, annotating the code with phase specifiers to convey information to the coordinator regarding the resource requirements of each phase. The compiler, however, does *not* alter the size of each thread block or the scratchpad memory usage of the program. The resource specification provided by the programmer (either manually or via auto-tuners) is retained to guarantee correctness. For registers, the compiler follows the default policy or uses directives as specified by the user. One could envision more powerful, efficient resource allocation with a programming model that does *not* require *any* resource specification and/or compiler policies/auto-tuners that are *cognizant* of the virtualized resources.

⁹The phase boundaries for the applications in our pool easily fit this restriction, but the framework can be extended to support control divergence if needed.

⁸We track registers at the granularity of a warp.

5.9. Implications to the Programming Model and Software Optimization

Zorua offers several new opportunities and implications in enhancing the programming model and software optimizations (via libraries, autotuners, optimizing compilers, etc.) which we briefly describe below. We leave these ideas for exploration in future work.

5.9.1. Flexible programming models for GPUs and heterogeneous systems. State-of-the-art high-level programming languages and models still assume a fixed amount of on-chip resources and hence, with the help of the compiler or the runtime system, are required to find *static* resource specifications to fit the application to the desired GPU. Zorua, by itself, also still requires the programmer to specify resource specifications to ensure correctness—albeit they are not required to be highly optimized for a given architecture. However, by providing a flexible but dynamically-controlled view of the on-chip hardware resources, Zorua changes the abstraction of the on-chip resources that is offered to the programmer and software. This offers the opportunity to rethink resource management in GPUs from the ground up. One could envision more powerful resource allocation and better programmability with programming models that do *not* require static resource specification, leaving the compiler/runtime system and the underlying virtualized framework to completely handle *all* forms of on-chip resource allocation, unconstrained by the fixed physical resources in a specific GPU, entirely at runtime. This is especially significant in future systems that are likely to support a wide range of compute engines and accelerators, making it important to be able to write high-level code that can be partitioned easily, efficiently, and at a fine granularity across any accelerator, *without* statically tuning any code segment to run efficiently on the GPU.

5.9.2. Virtualization-aware compilation and autotuning. Zorua changes the contract between the hardware and software to provide a more powerful resource abstraction (in the software) that is *flexible and dynamic*, by pushing some more functionality into the hardware, which can more easily react to the runtime resource requirements of the running program. We can re-imagine compilers and autotuners to be more intelligent, leveraging this new abstraction and, hence the virtualization, to deliver more efficient and high-performing code optimizations that are *not* possible with the fixed and static abstractions of today. They could, for example, *leverage* the oversubscription and dynamic management that Zorua provides to tune the code to more aggressively use resources that are underutilized at runtime. As we demonstrate in this work, static optimizations are limited by the fixed view of the resources that is available to the program today. Compilation frameworks that are cognizant of the *dynamic* allocation/deallocation of resources provided by Zorua could make more efficient use of the available resources.

5.9.3. Reduced optimization space. Programs written for applications in machine learning, computer graphics, computer vision, etc., typically follow the *stream* programming paradigm, where the code is decomposed into many *stages*

in an *execution pipeline*. Each stage processes only a part of the input data in a pipelined fashion to make better use of the caches. A key challenge in writing complex pipelined code is finding *execution schedules* (i.e., how the work should be partitioned across stages) and optimizations that perform best for *each* pipeline stage from a prohibitively large space of potential solutions. This requires complex tuning algorithms or profiling runs that are both computationally intensive and time-consuming. The search for optimized specifications has to be done when there is a change in input data or in the underlying architecture. By pushing some of the resource management functionality to the hardware, Zorua reduces this search space for optimized specifications by making it less sensitive to the wide space of resource specifications.

6. Methodology

6.1. System Modeling and Configuration

We model the Zorua framework with GPGPU-Sim 3.2.2 [12]. Table 2 summarizes the major parameters. Except for the portability results, all results are obtained using the Fermi configuration. We use GPUWattch [67] to model the GPU power consumption. We faithfully model the overheads of the Zorua framework, including an additional 2-cycle penalty for accessing each mapping table, and the overhead of memory accesses for swap space accesses (modeled as a part of the memory system). We model the energy overhead of mapping table accesses as SRAM accesses in GPUWattch.

System Overview	15 SMs, 32 threads/warp, 6 memory channels
Shader Core Config	1.4 GHz, GTO scheduler [88], 2 schedulers per SM
Warps/SM	Fermi: 48; Kepler/Maxwell: 64
Registers	Fermi: 32768; Kepler/Maxwell: 65536
Scratchpad	Fermi/Kepler: 48KB; Maxwell: 64KB
On-chip Cache	L1: 32KB, 4 ways; L2: 768KB, 16 ways
Interconnect	1 crossbar/direction (15 SMs, 6 MCs), 1.4 GHz
Memory Model	177.4 GB/s BW, 6 memory controllers (MCs), FR-FCFS scheduling, 16 banks/MC

Table 2: Major parameters of the simulated systems

6.2. Evaluated Applications and Metrics

We evaluate a number of applications from the Lonestar suite [19], GPGPU-Sim benchmarks [12], and CUDA SDK [80], whose resource specifications (the number of registers, the amount of scratchpad memory, and/or the number of threads per thread block) are parameterizable. Table 3 shows the applications and the evaluated parameter ranges. For each application, we make sure the amount of work done is the same for all specifications. The performance metric we use is the execution time of the GPU kernels in the evaluated applications.

7. Evaluation

We evaluate the effectiveness of Zorua by studying three different mechanisms: (i) *Baseline*, the baseline GPU that schedules kernels and manages resources at the thread block level; (ii) *WLM* (Warp Level Management), a state-of-the-art mechanism for GPUs to schedule kernels and manage registers

Name (Abbreviation)	(R: Register, S: Scratchpad, T: Thread block) Range
Barnes-Hut (BH) [19]	R:28-44 × T:128-1024
Discrete Cosine Transform (DCT) [80]	R:20-40 × T: 64-512
Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) [19]	R:28-44 × T: 256-1024
Reduction (RD) [80]	R:16-24 × T:64-1024
N-Queens Solver (NQU) [23] [12]	S:10496-47232 (T:64-288)
Scan Large Array (SLA) [80]	R:24-36 × T:128-1024
Scalar Product (SP) [80]	S:2048-8192 × T:128-512
Single-Source Shortest Path (SSSP) [19]	R:16-36 × T:256-1024

Table 3: Summary of evaluated applications

at the warp level [118]; and (iii) *Zorua*. For our evaluations, we run each application on 8–65 (36 on average) different resource specifications (the ranges are in Table 3).

7.1. Effect on Performance Variation and Cliffs

We first examine how *Zorua* alleviates the high variation in performance by reducing the impact of resource specifications on resource utilization. Figure 14 presents a Tukey box plot [75] (see Section 3 for a description of the presented box plot), illustrating the performance distribution (higher is better) for each application (for all different application resource specifications we evaluated), normalized to the slowest Baseline operating point for that application. We make two major observations.




Figure 14: Normalized performance distribution. Reproduced from [113].

First, we find that *Zorua* significantly reduces the *performance range* across all evaluated resource specifications. Averaged across all of our applications, the worst resource specification for Baseline achieves 96.6% lower performance than the best performing resource specification. For WLM [118], this performance range reduces only slightly, to 88.3%. With *Zorua*, the performance range drops significantly, to 48.2%. We see drops in the performance range for *all* applications except *SSSP*. With *SSSP*, the range is already small to begin with (23.8% in Baseline), and *Zorua* exploits the dynamic underutilization, which improves performance but also adds a small amount of variation.

Second, while *Zorua* reduces the performance range, it also preserves or improves performance of the best performing points. As we examine in more detail in Section 7.2, the reduction in performance range occurs as a result of improved performance mainly at the lower end of the distribution.

To gain insight into how *Zorua* reduces the performance range and improves performance for the worst performing points, we analyze how it reduces performance cliffs. With *Zorua*, we ideally want to *eliminate* the cliffs we observed in

Section 3.1. We study the tradeoff between resource specification and execution time for three representative applications: *DCT* (Figure 15a), *MST* (Figure 15b), and *NQU* (Figure 15c). For all three figures, we normalize execution time to the *best* execution time under Baseline. Two observations are in order.




Figure 15: Effect on performance cliffs. Reproduced from [113].

First, *Zorua* successfully mitigates the performance cliffs that occur in Baseline. For example, *DCT* and *MST* are both sensitive to the thread block size, as shown in Figures 15a and 15b, respectively. We have circled the locations at which cliffs exist in Baseline. Unlike Baseline, *Zorua* maintains more steady execution times across the number of threads per block, employing oversubscription to overcome the loss in parallelism due to insufficient on-chip resources. We see similar results across all of our applications.

Second, we observe that while WLM [118] can reduce some of the cliffs by mitigating the impact of large block sizes, many cliffs still exist under WLM (e.g., *NQU* in Figure 15c). This cliff in *NQU* occurs as a result of insufficient scratchpad memory, which cannot be handled by warp-level management. Similarly, the cliffs for *MST* (Figure 15b) also persist with WLM because *MST* has a lot of barrier operations, and the additional warps scheduled by WLM ultimately stall, waiting for other warps within the same block to acquire resources. We find that, with oversubscription, *Zorua* is able to smooth out those cliffs that WLM is unable to eliminate.

Overall, we conclude that *Zorua* (i) reduces the performance variation across resource specification points, so that performance depends less on the specification provided by the programmer; and (ii) can alleviate the performance cliffs experienced by GPU applications.

7.2. Effect on Performance

As Figure 14 shows, *Zorua* either retains or improves the best performing point for each application, compared to the Baseline. *Zorua* improves the best performing point for each application by 12.8% on average, and by as much as 27.8% (for *DCT*). This improvement comes from the improved parallelism obtained by exploiting the dynamic underutilization of resources, which exists *even for optimized specifications*. Applications such as *SP* and *SLA* have little dynamic underutilization, and hence do not show any performance improvement. *NQU* does have significant dynamic underutilization, but *Zorua* does not improve the best performing point as the overhead of oversubscription outweighs the benefit, and *Zorua* dynamically chooses not to oversubscribe. We conclude that even for many specifications that are optimized to fit the hardware resources, *Zorua* is able to further improve performance.

We also note that, in addition to reducing performance variation and improving performance for optimized points,

Zorua improves performance by 25.2% on average for all resource specifications across all evaluated applications.

7.3. Effect on Portability

As we describe in Section 3.2, performance cliffs often behave differently across different GPU architectures, and can significantly shift the best performing resource specification point. We study how Zorua can ease the burden of performance tuning if an application has been already tuned for one GPU model, and is later ported to another GPU. To understand this, we define a new metric, *porting performance loss*, that quantifies the performance impact of porting an application without re-tuning it. To calculate this, we first normalize the execution time of each specification point to the execution time of the best performing specification point. We then pick a source GPU architecture (i.e., the architecture that the GPU was tuned for) and a target GPU architecture (i.e., the architecture that the code will run on), and find the point-to-point drop in performance for all points whose performance on the source GPU comes within 5% of the performance at the best performing specification point.¹⁰

Figure 16 shows the *maximum* porting performance loss for each application, across any two pairings of our three simulated GPU architectures (Fermi, Kepler, and Maxwell). We find that Zorua greatly reduces the maximum porting performance loss that occurs under both Baseline and WLM for all but one of our applications. On average, the maximum porting performance loss is 52.7% for Baseline, 51.0% for WLM, and only 23.9% for Zorua.




Figure 16: Maximum porting performance loss. Reproduced from [113].

Notably, Zorua delivers significant improvements in portability for applications that previously suffered greatly when ported to another GPU, such as *DCT* and *MST*. For both of these applications, the performance variation differs so much between GPU architectures that, despite tuning the application on the source GPU to be within 5% of the best achievable performance, their performance on the target GPU is often more than twice as slow as the best achievable performance on the target platform. Zorua significantly lowers this porting performance loss down to 28.1% for *DCT* and 36.1% for *MST*. We also observe that for *BH*, Zorua actually increases the porting performance loss slightly with respect to the Baseline. This is because for Baseline, there are only two points that perform within the 5% margin for our metric, whereas with Zorua, we have five points that fall in that range. Despite this, the

¹⁰We include any point within 5% of the best performance as there are often multiple points close to the best point, and the programmer may choose any of them.

increase in porting performance loss for *BH* is low, deviating only 7.0% from the best performance.

To take a closer look into the portability benefits of Zorua, we run experiments to obtain the performance sensitivity curves for each application using different GPU architectures. Figures 17 and 18 depict the execution time curves while sweeping a single resource specification for *NQU* and *DCT* for the three evaluated GPU architectures – Fermi, Kepler, and Maxwell. We make two major observations from the figures.




Figure 17: Impact on portability (NQU)




Figure 18: Impact on portability (DCT)

First, Zorua significantly alleviates the presence of performance cliffs and reduces the performance variation across all three evaluated architectures, thereby reducing the impact of both resource specification and underlying architecture on the resulting performance curve. In comparison, WLM is unable to make a significant impact on the performance variations and the cliffs remain for all the evaluated architectures.

Second, by reducing the performance variation across all three GPU generations, Zorua significantly reduces the *porting performance loss*, i.e., the loss in performance when code optimized for one GPU generation is run on another (as highlighted within the figures).

We conclude that Zorua enhances portability of applications by reducing the impact of a change in the hardware resources for a given resource specification. For applications that have already been tuned on one platform, Zorua significantly lowers the penalty of not re-tuning for another platform, allowing programmers to save development time.

7.4. A Deeper Look: Benefits & Overheads

To take a deeper look into how Zorua is able to provide the above benefits, in Figure 19, we show the number of *schedulable warps* (i.e., warps that are available to be scheduled by the warp scheduler at any given time excluding warps waiting at a barrier), averaged across all of specification points. On average, Zorua increases the number of schedulable warps by 32.8%, significantly more than WLM (8.1%), which is constrained by the fixed amount of available resources. We conclude that by oversubscribing and dynamically managing resources, Zorua is able to improve thread-level parallelism, and hence performance.

We also find that the overheads due to resource swapping and contention do not significantly impact the performance of Zorua. Figure 20 depicts resource hit rates for each application,




Figure 19: Effect on schedulable warps. Reproduced from [113].

i.e., the fraction of all resource accesses that were found on-chip as opposed to making a potentially expensive off-chip access. The oversubscription mechanism (directed by the coordinator) is able to keep resource hit rates very high, with an average hit rate of 98.9% for the register file and 99.6% for scratchpad memory.




Figure 20: Virtual resource hit rate in Zorua

Figure 21 shows the average reduction in total system energy consumption of WLM and Zorua over Baseline for each application (averaged across the individual energy consumption over Baseline for each evaluated specification point). We observe that Zorua reduces the total energy consumption across all of our applications, except for *NQU* (which has a small increase of 3%). Overall, Zorua provides a mean energy reduction of 7.6%, up to 20.5% for *DCT*.¹¹ We conclude that Zorua is an energy-efficient virtualization framework for GPUs.




Figure 21: Effect on energy consumption. Reproduced from [113].

We estimate the die area overhead of Zorua with CACTI 6.5 [117], using the same 40nm process node as the GTX 480, which our system closely models. We include all the overheads from the coordinator and the resource mapping tables (Section 5). The total area overhead is 0.735 mm^2 for all 15 SMs, which is only 0.134% of the die area of the GTX 480.

8. Other Applications

By providing the illusion of more resources than physically available, Zorua provides the opportunity to help address other important challenges in GPU computing today. We discuss several such opportunities in this section.

¹¹We note that the energy consumption can be reduced further by appropriately optimizing the oversubscription algorithm. We leave this exploration to future work.

8.1. Resource Sharing in Multi-Kernel or Multi-Programmed Environments

Executing multiple kernels or applications within the same SM can improve resource utilization and efficiency [9, 10, 11, 37, 53, 82, 116, 129]. Hence, providing support to enable fine-grained sharing and partitioning of resources is critical for future GPU systems. This is especially true in environments where multiple different applications may be consolidated on the same GPU, e.g. in clouds or clusters. By providing a flexible view of each of the resources, Zorua provides a natural way to enable dynamic and fine-grained control over resource partitioning and allocation among multiple kernels. Specifically, Zorua provides several key benefits for enabling better performance and efficiency in multi-kernel/multi-program environments. First, selecting the optimal resource specification for an application is challenging in virtualized environments (e.g., clouds), as it is unclear which other applications may be running alongside it. Zorua can improve efficiency in resource utilization *irrespective* of the application specifications and of other kernels that may be executing on the same SM. Second, Zorua manages the different resources independently and at a fine granularity, using a dynamic runtime system (the coordinator). This enables the maximization of resource utilization, while providing the ability to control the partitioning of resources at runtime to provide QoS, fairness, etc., by leveraging the coordinator. Third, Zorua enables oversubscription of the different resources. This obviates the need to alter the application specifications [82, 129] in order to ensure there are sufficient resources to co-schedule kernels on the same SM, and hence enables concurrent kernel execution transparently to the programmer.

8.2. Preemptive Multitasking

A key challenge in enabling true multiprogramming in GPUs is enabling rapid preemption of kernels [83, 107, 116]. Context switching on GPUs incurs a very high latency and overhead, as a result of the large amount of register file and scratchpad state that needs to be saved before a new kernel can be executed. Saving state at a very coarse granularity (e.g., the entire SM state) leads to very high preemption latencies. Prior work proposes context minimization [76, 83] or context switching at the granularity of a thread block [116] to improve response time during preemption. Zorua enables fine-grained management and oversubscription of on-chip resources. It can be naturally extended to enable quick preemption of a task via intelligent management of the swap space and the mapping tables (complementary to approaches taken by prior work [76, 83]).

8.3. Support for Other Parallel Programming Paradigms

The fixed static resource allocation for each thread in modern GPU architectures requires statically dictating the resource usage for the program throughout its execution. Other forms of parallel execution that are *dynamic* (e.g., Cilk [15], staged execution [49, 50, 106]) require more flexible allocation of resources at runtime, and are hence more challenging to enable. Examples of this include *nested parallelism* [65], where

a kernel can dynamically spawn new kernels or thread blocks, and *helper threads* [111] to utilize idle resource at runtime to perform different optimizations or background tasks in parallel. Zorua makes it easy to enable these paradigms by providing on-demand dynamic allocation of resources. Irrespective of whether threads in the programming model are created statically or dynamically, Zorua allows allocation of the required resources on the fly to support the execution of these threads. The resources are simply deallocated when they are no longer required. Zorua also enables *heterogeneous* allocation of resources – i.e., allocating different amounts of resources to different threads. The current resource allocation model, in line with a GPU’s SIMT architecture, treats all threads the same and allocates the same amount of resources. Zorua makes it easier to support execution paradigms where each concurrently-running thread executes different code at the same time, hence requiring different resources. This includes helper threads, multiprogrammed execution, nested parallelism, etc. Hence, with Zorua, applications are no longer limited by a GPU’s fixed SIMT model which only supports a fixed, statically-determined number of homogeneous threads as a result of the resource management mechanisms that exist today.

8.4. Energy Efficiency and Scalability

To support massive parallelism, on-chip resources are a precious and critical resource. However, these resources *cannot* grow arbitrarily large as GPUs continue to be area-limited and on-chip memory tends to be extremely power hungry and area intensive [2, 31, 32, 48, 92, 126]. Furthermore, complex thread schedulers that can select a thread for execution from an increasingly large thread pool are required in order to support an arbitrarily large number of warp slots. Zorua enables using smaller register files, scratchpad memory and less complex or fewer thread schedulers to save power and area while still retaining or improving parallelism.

8.5. Error Tolerance and Reliability

The indirection offered by Zorua, along with the dynamic management of resources, could also enable better reliability and simpler solutions towards error tolerance in the on-chip resources. The virtualization framework trivially allows remapping resources with hard or soft faults such that no virtual resource is mapped to a faulty physical resource. Unlike in the baseline case, faulty resources would not impact the number of the resources seen by the thread scheduler while scheduling threads for execution. A few unavailable faulty registers, warp slots, etc., could significantly reduce the number of the threads that are scheduled concurrently (i.e., the runtime parallelism).

8.6. Support for System-Level Tasks on GPUs

As GPUs become increasingly general purpose, a key requirement is better integration with the CPU operating system, and with complex distributed software systems such as those employed for large-scale distributed machine learning [1, 44] or graph processing [5, 73]. If GPUs are architected to be first-class compute engines, rather than the slave devices they

are today, they can be programmed and utilized in the same manner as a modern CPU. This integration requires the GPU execution model to support system-level tasks like interrupts, exceptions, etc. and more generally provide support for access to distributed file systems, disk I/O, or network communication. Support for these tasks and execution models require dynamic provisioning of resources for execution of system-level code. Zorua provides a building block to enable this.

8.7. Applicability to General Resource Management in Accelerators

Zorua uses a program *phase* as the granularity for managing resources. This allows handling resources across phases *dynamically*, while leveraging *static* information regarding resource requirements from the software by inserting annotations at phase boundaries. Future work could potentially investigate the applicability of the same approach to manage resources and parallelism in *other* accelerators (e.g., processing-in-memory accelerators [4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 35, 39, 43, 45, 59, 61, 72, 84, 85, 96, 97, 98, 99, 102, 128] or direct-memory access engines [20, 64, 95]) that require efficient dynamic management of large amounts of particular critical resources.

9. Related Work

To our knowledge, this is the first work to propose a holistic framework to decouple a GPU application’s resource specification from its physical on-chip resource allocation by virtualizing multiple on-chip resources. This enables the illusion of more resources than what physically exists to the programmer, while the hardware resources are managed at runtime by employing a swap space (in main memory), transparently to the programmer. We design a new hardware/software cooperative framework to effectively virtualize multiple on-chip GPU resources in a controlled and coordinated manner, thus enabling many benefits of virtualization in GPUs.

We briefly discuss prior work related to different aspects of our proposal: (i) virtualization of resources, (ii) improving programming ease and portability, and (iii) more efficient management of on-chip resources.

Virtualization of Resources. *Virtualization* [25, 27, 38, 47] is a concept designed to provide the illusion, to the software and programmer, of more resources than what truly exists in physical hardware. It has been applied to the management of hardware resources in many different contexts [7, 13, 25, 27, 38, 47, 81, 115], with virtual memory [14, 27, 47] being one of the oldest forms of virtualization that is commonly used in high-performance processors today. Abstraction of hardware resources and use of a level of indirection in their management leads to many benefits, including improved utilization, programmability, portability, isolation, protection, sharing, and oversubscription.

In this work, we apply the general principle of virtualization to the management of multiple on-chip resources in modern GPUs. Virtualization of on-chip resources offers the opportunity to alleviate many different challenges in modern GPUs. However, in this context, effectively adding a level of indirection introduces new challenges, necessitating the design of

a new virtualization strategy. There are two key challenges. First, we need to dynamically determine the *extent* of the virtualization to reach an effective tradeoff between improved parallelism due to oversubscription and the latency/capacity overheads of swap space usage. Second, we need to coordinate the virtualization of *multiple* latency-critical on-chip resources. To our knowledge, this is the first work to propose a holistic software-hardware cooperative approach to virtualizing multiple on-chip resources in a controlled and coordinated manner that addresses these challenges, enabling the different benefits provided by virtualization in modern GPUs.

Prior works propose to virtualize a specific on-chip resource for specific benefits, mostly in the CPU context. For example, in CPUs, the concept of virtualized registers was first used in the IBM 360 [7] and DEC PDP-10 [13] architectures to allow logical registers to be mapped to either fast yet expensive physical registers, or slow and cheap memory. More recent works [81, 121, 122], propose to virtualize registers to increase the effective register file size to much larger register counts. This increases the number of thread contexts that can be supported in a multi-threaded processor [81], or reduces register spills and fills [121, 122]. Other works propose to virtualize on-chip resources in CPUs (e.g., [18, 24, 30, 36, 127]). In GPUs, Jeon et al. [48] propose to virtualize the register file by dynamically allocating and deallocating physical registers to enable more parallelism with smaller, more power-efficient physical register files. Concurrent to this work, Yoon et al. [126] propose an approach to virtualize thread slots to increase thread-level parallelism. These works propose specific virtualization mechanisms for a single resource for specific benefits. None of these works provide a cohesive virtualization mechanism for *multiple* on-chip GPU resources in a controlled and coordinated manner, which forms a key contribution of our MICRO 2016 work.

Enhancing Programming Ease and Portability. There is a large body of work that aims to improve programmability and portability of modern GPU applications using software tools, such as auto-tuners [26, 29, 58, 93, 94, 101], optimizing compilers [22, 42, 54, 71, 123, 124], and high-level programming languages and runtimes [28, 40, 87, 110]. These tools tackle a multitude of optimization challenges, and have been demonstrated to be very effective in generating high-performance portable code. They can also be used to tune the resource specification. However, there are several shortcomings in these approaches. First, these tools often require profiling runs [22, 26, 94, 101, 123, 124] on the GPU to determine the best performing resource specifications. These runs have to be repeated for each new input set and GPU generation. Second, software-based approaches still require significant programmer effort to write code in a manner that can be exploited by these approaches to optimize the resource specifications. Third, selecting the best performing resource specifications statically using software tools is a challenging task in virtualized environments (e.g., cloud computing, data centers), where it is unclear which kernels may be run together on the same SM or where it is not known, a priori, which GPU generation the application may execute on. Finally,

software tools assume a fixed amount of available resources. This leads to runtime underutilization due to static allocation of resources, which cannot be addressed by these tools.

In contrast, the programmability and portability benefits provided by Zorua require no programmer effort in optimizing resource specifications. Furthermore, these autotuners and compilers can be used in conjunction with Zorua to further improve performance.

Efficient Resource Management. Prior works aim to improve parallelism by increasing resource utilization using hardware-based [8, 9, 34, 48, 51, 52, 64, 66, 77, 86, 108, 118, 125], software-based [37, 41, 62, 68, 82, 120, 125] and hardware-software cooperative [10, 11, 49, 92, 105, 106, 111] approaches. Among these works, the closest to ours are [48, 126] (discussed earlier), [125] and [118]. These approaches propose efficient techniques to dynamically manage a single resource, and can be used along with Zorua to improve resource efficiency further. Yang et al. [125] aim to maximize utilization of the scratchpad with software techniques, and by dynamically allocating/deallocating scratchpad memory. Xiang et al. [118] propose to improve resource utilization by scheduling threads at the finer granularity of a warp rather than a thread block. This approach can help alleviate performance cliffs, but not in the presence of synchronization or scratchpad memory, nor does it address the dynamic underutilization within a thread during runtime. We quantitatively compare to this approach in Section 7 and demonstrate Zorua’s benefits over it.

Other works leverage resource underutilization to improve energy efficiency [2, 31, 32, 33, 48] or perform other useful work [63, 111]. These works are complementary to Zorua.

10. Conclusion

We propose Zorua, a new framework that decouples the application resource specification from the allocation in the physical hardware resources (i.e., registers, scratchpad memory, and thread slots) in GPUs. Zorua encompasses a holistic virtualization strategy to effectively virtualize multiple latency-critical on-chip resources in a controlled and coordinated manner. We demonstrate that by providing the illusion of more resources than physically available, via dynamic management of resources and the judicious use of a swap space in main memory, Zorua enhances *(i) programming ease* (by reducing the performance penalty of suboptimal resource specification), *(ii) portability* (by reducing the impact of different hardware configurations), and *(iii) performance* for code with an optimized resource specification (by leveraging dynamic underutilization of resources). We conclude that Zorua is an effective, holistic virtualization framework for GPUs. We believe that the indirection provided by Zorua’s virtualization mechanism makes it a generic framework that can address other challenges in modern GPUs. For example, Zorua can enable fine-grained resource sharing and partitioning among multiple kernels/applications, as well as low-latency preemption of GPU programs. We hope that future work explores these promising directions, building on the insights and the framework developed in this paper.

Acknowledgments

We thank the reviewers and our shepherd for their valuable suggestions. We thank the members of the SAFARI group for their feedback and the stimulating research environment they provide. Special thanks to Vivek Seshadri, Kathryn McKinley, Steve Keckler, Evgeny Bolotin, and Mike O'Connor for their feedback during various stages of this project. We acknowledge the support of our industrial partners: Facebook, Google, IBM, Intel, Microsoft, NVIDIA, Qualcomm, Samsung, and VMware. This research was partially supported by NSF (grant 1409723), the Intel Science and Technology Center for Cloud Computing, and the Semiconductor Research Corporation.

References

- [1] M. Abadi et al. TensorFlow: A System for Large-Scale Machine Learning. In *OSDI*, 2016.
- [2] M. Abdel-Majeed et al. Warped Register File: A Power Efficient Register File for GPGPUs. In *HPCA*, 2013.
- [3] Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. AMD Accelerated Parallel Processing OpenCL Programming Guide, 2011.
- [4] J. Ahn et al. PIM-Enabled Instructions: A Low-Overhead, Locality-Aware Processing-in-Memory Architecture. In *ISCA*, 2015.
- [5] J. Ahn et al. A scalable processing-in-memory accelerator for parallel graph processing. In *ISCA*, 2015.
- [6] B. Akin et al. Data Reorganization in Memory Using 3D-Stacked DRAM. In *ISCA*, 2015.
- [7] G. M. Amdahl et al. Architecture of the IBM System/360. *IBM JRD*, 1964.
- [8] R. Ausavarungnirun et al. Exploiting Inter-Warp Heterogeneity to Improve GPGPU Performance. *PACT*, 2015.
- [9] R. Ausavarungnirun et al. Staged Memory Scheduling: Achieving High Performance and Scalability in Heterogeneous Systems. In *ISCA*, 2012.
- [10] R. Ausavarungnirun et al. Mosaic: A GPU Memory Manager with Application-Transparent Support for Multiple Page Sizes. *MICRO*, 2017.
- [11] R. Ausavarungnirun et al. MASK: Redesigning the GPU Memory Hierarchy to Support Multi-Application Concurrency. *ASPLOS*, 2018.
- [12] A. Bakhoda et al. Analyzing CUDA Workloads Using a Detailed GPU Simulator. In *ISPASS*, 2009.
- [13] C. G. Bell et al. The Evolution of the DEC System 10. *CACM*, 1978.
- [14] A. Bensoussan et al. The Multics Virtual Memory. In *SOSP*, 1969.
- [15] R. D. Blumofe et al. Cilk: An Efficient Multithreaded Runtime System. In *ASPLOS*, 1995.
- [16] A. Boroumand et al. LazyPIM: An Efficient Cache Coherence Mechanism for Processing-in-Memory. *CAL*, 2016.
- [17] A. Boroumand et al. Google Workloads for Consumer Devices: Mitigating Data Movement Bottlenecks. In *ASPLOS*, 2018.
- [18] E. Brekelbaum et al. Hierarchical Scheduling Windows. In *MICRO*, 2002.
- [19] M. Burtscher et al. A quantitative study of irregular programs on GPUs. In *IISWC*, 2012.
- [20] K. K. Chang et al. Low-Cost Inter-Linked Subarrays (LISA): Enabling Fast Inter-Subarray Data Movement in DRAM. In *HPCA*, 2016.
- [21] S. Che et al. Rodinia: A Benchmark Suite for Heterogeneous Computing. In *IISWC*, 2009.
- [22] G. Chen et al. PORPLE: An extensible optimizer for portable data placement on GPU. In *MICRO*, 2014.
- [23] P. Chen. N-Queens Solver. <http://forums.nvidia.com/index.php?showtopic=76893>, 2008.
- [24] H. Cook et al. Virtual local stores: Enabling software-managed memory hierarchies in mainstream computing environments. Technical Report UCB/EECS-2009-131, University of California, Berkeley, EECS Dept., 2009.
- [25] R. J. Creasy. The Origin of the VM/370 Time-sharing System. *IBM JRD*, 1981.
- [26] A. Davidson et al. Toward Techniques for Auto-Tuning GPU Algorithms. In *Applied Parallel and Scientific Computing*. Springer, 2010.
- [27] P. J. Denning. Virtual memory. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 1970.
- [28] R. Dolbeau et al. HMPP: A hybrid multi-core parallel programming environment. In *GPGPU*, 2007.
- [29] Y. Dotsenko et al. Auto-tuning of Fast Fourier Transform on Graphics Processors. *PPoPP*, 2011.
- [30] M. Erez et al. Spills, Fills, and Kills - An Architecture for Reducing Register-Memory Traffic. Technical Report TR-23, Stanford Univ., Concurrent VLSI Architecture Group, 2000.
- [31] M. Gebhart et al. A Compile-time Managed Multi-level Register File Hierarchy. In *MICRO*, 2011.
- [32] M. Gebhart et al. Energy-efficient Mechanisms for Managing Thread Context in Throughput Processors. In *ISCA*, 2011.
- [33] M. Gebhart et al. A hierarchical thread scheduler and register file for energy-efficient throughput processors. *TOCS*, 2012.
- [34] M. Gebhart et al. Unifying Primary Cache, Scratch, and Register File Memories in a Throughput Processor. In *MICRO*, 2012.
- [35] S. Ghose et al. Enabling the Adoption of Processing-in-Memory: Challenges, Mechanisms, Future Research Directions. arxiv:1802.00320 [cs.AR], 2018.
- [36] A. Gonzalez et al. Virtual-physical registers. In *HPCA*, 1998.
- [37] C. Gregg et al. Fine-grained resource sharing for concurrent GPGPU kernels. In *HotPar*, 2012.
- [38] P. H. Gum. System/370 Extended Architecture: Facilities for Virtual Machines. *IBM JRD*, 1983.
- [39] Q. Guo et al. 3D-Stacked Memory-Side Acceleration: Accelerator and System Design. In *WoNDP*, 2014.
- [40] T. D. Han et al. hiCUDA: High-Level GPGPU Programming. *TPDS*, 2011.
- [41] A. B. Hayes et al. Unified On-chip Memory Allocation for SIMT Architecture. In *ICS*, 2014.
- [42] A. H. Hormati et al. Sponge: Portable Stream Programming on Graphics Engines. In *ASPLOS*, 2011.
- [43] K. Hsieh et al. Accelerating Pointer Chasing in 3D-Stacked Memory: Challenges, Mechanisms, Evaluation. In *ICCD*, 2016.
- [44] K. Hsieh et al. Gaia: Geo-Distributed Machine Learning Approaching LAN Speeds. In *NSDI*, 2016.
- [45] K. Hsieh et al. Transparent Offloading and Mapping (TOM): Enabling Programmer-Transparent Near-Data Processing in GPU Systems. In *ISCA*, 2016.
- [46] J. L. Hennessy and D. A. Patterson. *Computer Architecture, A Quantitative Approach*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2010.
- [47] B. Jacob et al. Virtual memory in contemporary microprocessors. *IEEE Micro*, 1998.
- [48] H. Jeon et al. GPU register file virtualization. In *MICRO*, 2015.
- [49] J. A. Joao et al. Bottleneck Identification and Scheduling in Multithreaded Applications. In *ASPLOS*, 2012.
- [50] J. A. Joao et al. Utility-based Acceleration of Multithreaded Applications on Asymmetric CMPs. In *ISCA*, 2013.
- [51] A. Jog et al. Orchestrated Scheduling and Prefetching for GPGPUs. In *ISCA*, 2013.
- [52] A. Jog et al. OWL: Cooperative Thread Array Aware Scheduling Techniques for Improving GPGPU Performance. In *ASPLOS*, 2013.
- [53] A. Jog et al. Application-aware Memory System for Fair and Efficient Execution of Concurrent GPGPU Applications. In *GPGPU*, 2014.
- [54] J. C. Juega et al. Adaptive Mapping and Parameter Selection Scheme to Improve Automatic Code Generation for GPUs. In *CGO*, 2014.
- [55] O. Kayiran et al. Neither More Nor Less: Optimizing Thread-level Parallelism for GPGPUs. In *PACT*, 2013.
- [56] O. Kayiran et al. Managing GPU Concurrency in Heterogeneous Architectures. In *MICRO*, 2014.
- [57] O. Kayiran et al. μ C-States: Fine-grained GPU Datapath Power Management. In *PACT*, 2016.
- [58] M. Khan et al. A Script-based Autotuning Compiler System to Generate High-performance CUDA Code. *TACO*, 2013.
- [59] J. S. Kim et al. GRIM-Filter: Fast Seed Location Filtering in DNA Read Mapping Using Processing-in-Memory Technologies. *BMC Genomics*, 2018.
- [60] D. B. Kirk and W. W. Hwu. *Programming Massively Parallel Processors: A Hands-on Approach*. Morgan Kaufmann, 2010.
- [61] P. M. Kogge. EXECUBE—A New Architecture for Scaleable MPPs. In *ICPP*, 1994.
- [62] R. Komuravelli et al. Stash: Have your scratchpad and cache it too. In *ISCA*, 2015.
- [63] N. B. Lakshminarayana et al. Spare register aware prefetching for graph algorithms on GPUs. In *HPCA*, 2014.
- [64] D. Lee et al. Decoupled Direct Memory Access: Isolating CPU and IO Traffic by Leveraging a Dual-data-port DRAM. In *PACT*, 2015.
- [65] H. Lee et al. Locality-aware Mapping of Nested Parallel Patterns on GPUs. In *MICRO*, 2014.
- [66] M. Lee et al. Improving GPGPU resource utilization through alternative thread block scheduling. In *HPCA*, 2014.
- [67] J. Leng et al. GPUWattch: Enabling Energy Optimizations in GPGPUs. In *ISCA*, 2013.
- [68] C. Li et al. Automatic data placement into GPU on-chip memory resources. In *CGO*, 2015.
- [69] C. Li et al. Locality-driven dynamic GPU cache bypassing. In *ICS*, 2015.
- [70] D. Li et al. Priority-based cache allocation in throughput processors. In *HPCA*, 2015.
- [71] Y. Liu et al. A cross-input adaptive framework for GPU program optimizations. In *IPDPS*, 2009.
- [72] Z. Liu et al. Concurrent Data Structures for Near-Memory Computing. *SPAA*, 2017.

- [73] Y. Low et al. Distributed GraphLab: A Framework for Machine Learning and Data Mining in the Cloud. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, April 2012.
- [74] J. Matela et al. Low GPU occupancy approach to fast arithmetic coding in JPEG2000. In *MEMICS*, 2011.
- [75] R. McGill et al. Variations of box plots. *The American Statistician*, 1978.
- [76] J. Menon et al. iGPU: Exception Support and Speculative Execution on GPUs. *ISCA*, 2012.
- [77] V. Narasiman et al. Improving GPU Performance via Large Warps and Two-level Warp Scheduling. In *MICRO*, 2011.
- [78] Nintendo/Creatures Inc./GAME FREAK inc. Pokémon. <http://www.pokemon.com/us/>.
- [79] NVIDIA Corp. CUDA.
- [80] NVIDIA Corp. CUDA C/C++ SDK Code Samples, 2011.
- [81] D. W. Oehmke et al. How to Fake 1000 Registers. In *MICRO*, 2005.
- [82] S. Pai et al. Improving GPGPU concurrency with elastic kernels. In *ASPLOS*, 2013.
- [83] J. Park et al. Chimera: Collaborative Preemption for Multitasking on a Shared GPU. In *ASPLOS*, 2015.
- [84] D. Patterson et al. A Case for Intelligent RAM. *IEEE Micro*, 1997.
- [85] A. Pattanaik et al. Scheduling Techniques for GPU Architectures with Processing-in-Memory Capabilities. In *PACT*, 2016.
- [86] G. Pekhimenko et al. Toggle-Aware Compression for GPUs. In *HPCA*, 2016.
- [87] J. Ragan-Kelley et al. Halide: a language and compiler for optimizing parallelism, locality, and recomputation in image processing pipelines. In *PLDI*, 2013.
- [88] T. Rogers et al. Cache-Conscious Wavefront Scheduling. In *MICRO*, 2012.
- [89] S. Ryoo et al. Optimization Principles and Application Performance Evaluation of a Multithreaded GPU Using CUDA. In *PPoPP*, 2008.
- [90] S. Ryoo et al. Program optimization carving for GPU computing. *JPDC*, 2008.
- [91] S. Ryoo et al. Program Optimization Space Pruning for a Multithreaded GPU. In *CGO*, 2008.
- [92] M. Sadrosadati et al. LTRF: Enabling High-Capacity Register Files for GPUs via Hardware/Software Cooperative Register Prefetching. In *ASPLOS*, 2018.
- [93] K. Sato et al. Automatic Tuning of CUDA Execution Parameters for Stencil Processing. In *Software Automatic Tuning: From Concepts to State-of-the-Art Results*. Springer-Verlag, 2010.
- [94] C. A. Schaefer et al. Atune-IL: An instrumentation language for auto-tuning parallel applications. In *Euro-Par*, 2009.
- [95] V. Seshadri et al. RowClone: Fast and Energy-efficient In-DRAM Bulk Data Copy and Initialization. In *MICRO*, 2013.
- [96] V. Seshadri et al. Fast Bulk Bitwise AND and OR in DRAM. *CAL*, 2015.
- [97] V. Seshadri et al. Ambit: In-memory Accelerator for Bulk Bitwise Operations Using Commodity DRAM Technology. In *MICRO*, 2017.
- [98] V. Seshadri and O. Mutlu. Simple Operations in Memory to Reduce Data Movement. In *Advances in Computers, Volume 106*. Academic Press, 2017.
- [99] D. E. Shaw et al. The NON-VON Database Machine: A Brief Overview. *IEEE Database Eng. Bull.*, 1981.
- [100] B. Smith. A Pipelined, Shared Resource MIMD Computer. In *ICPP*, 1978.
- [101] K. Spafford et al. Maestro: Data Orchestration and Tuning for OpenCL Devices. In *Euro-Par*, 2010.
- [102] H. S. Stone. A Logic-in-Memory Computer. *IEEE TC*, 1970.
- [103] J. A. Stratton et al. Algorithm and data optimization techniques for scaling to massively threaded systems. *IEEE Computer*, 2012.
- [104] J. A. Stratton et al. Parboil: A Revised Benchmark Suite for Scientific and Commercial Throughput Computing. Technical Report IMPACT-12-01, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IMPACT Research Group, 2012.
- [105] M. A. Suleman et al. Accelerating Critical Section Execution with Asymmetric Multi-core Architectures. In *ASPLOS*, 2009.
- [106] M. A. Suleman et al. Data Marshaling for Multi-core Architectures. In *ISCA*, 2010.
- [107] I. Tanasic et al. Enabling Preemptive Multiprogramming on GPUs. In *ISCA*, 2014.
- [108] D. Tarjan et al. On Demand Register Allocation and Deallocation for a Multithreaded Processor, 2011. U.S. Patent Application 20110161616.
- [109] J. E. Thornton. Parallel Operation in the Control Data 6600. In *AFIPS FJCC*, 1964.
- [110] Sain-Zee Ueng et al. CUDA-Lite: Reducing GPU Programming Complexity. In *LCPC*, 2008.
- [111] N. Vijaykumar et al. A Case for Core-Assisted Bottleneck Acceleration in GPUs: Enabling Flexible Data Compression with Assist Warps. In *ISCA*, 2015.
- [112] N. Vijaykumar et al. A Framework for Accelerating Bottlenecks in GPU Execution with Assist Warps. *Advances in GPU Research and Practices, Elsevier*, 2016.
- [113] N. Vijaykumar et al. Zorua: A Holistic Approach to Resource Virtualization in GPUs. In *MICRO*, 2016.
- [114] O. Villa et al. Scaling the Power Wall: A Path to Exascale. In *SC*, 2014.
- [115] C. A. Waldspurger. Memory Resource Management in VMware ESX Server. In *OSDI*, 2002.
- [116] Z. Wang et al. Simultaneous Multikernel GPU: Multi-tasking Throughput Processors via Fine-Grained Sharing. In *HPCA*, 2016.
- [117] S. Wilton et al. CACTI: An enhanced cache access and cycle time model. *JSSC*, 1996.
- [118] P. Xiang et al. Warp-level divergence in GPUs: Characterization, impact, and mitigation. In *HPCA*, 2014.
- [119] X. Xie et al. Coordinated static and dynamic cache bypassing for GPUs. In *HPCA*, 2015.
- [120] X. Xie et al. Enabling coordinated register allocation and thread-level parallelism optimization for GPUs. In *MICRO*, 2015.
- [121] J. Yan et al. Virtual Registers: Reducing Register Pressure Without Enlarging the Register File. In *HIPEAC*, 2007.
- [122] J. Yan et al. Exploiting Virtual Registers to Reduce Pressure on Real Registers. *TACO*, 2008.
- [123] Y. Yang et al. A GPGPU Compiler for Memory Optimization and Parallelism Management. In *PLDI*, 2010.
- [124] Y. Yang et al. A Unified Optimizing Compiler Framework for Different GPGPU Architectures. *TACO*, 2012.
- [125] Y. Yang et al. Shared memory multiplexing: a novel way to improve GPGPU throughput. In *PACT*, 2012.
- [126] M. Yoon et al. Virtual Thread: Maximizing Thread-Level Parallelism beyond GPU Scheduling Limit. In *ISCA*, 2016.
- [127] J. Zalamea et al. Two-level Hierarchical Register File Organization for VLIW Processors. In *MICRO*, 2000.
- [128] D. Zhang et al. TOP-PIM: Throughput-oriented Programmable Processing in Memory. In *HPDC*, 2014.
- [129] J. Zhong et al. Kernelet: High-throughput GPU kernel executions with dynamic slicing and scheduling. *TPDS*, 2014.