



# iPIM: Programmable In-Memory Image Processing Accelerator Using Near-Bank Architecture

#### **Peng Gu\*1**, Xinfeng Xie\*1, Yufei Ding<sup>1</sup> Guoyang Chen<sup>2</sup>, Weifeng Zhang<sup>2</sup>, Dimin Niu<sup>2</sup>, Yuan Xie<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Santa Barbara

<sup>2</sup>Alibaba Group



\*co-primary first authors



# Image Processing: Application Scenarios



https://www.surrey.ac.uk/centre-vision-speech-signal-processing/research/m-lab-biomedical-imaging-and-processing https://clarklabs.org/terrset/idrisi-image-processing/



# Image Processing: Application Scenarios



<u>https://www.surrey.ac.uk/centre-vision-speech-signal-processing/research/m-lab-biomedical-imaging-and-processing</u> <u>https://clarklabs.org/terrset/idrisi-image-processing/</u>





- Image Processing algorithms consist of pipeline stages that are both wide and heterogeneous
  - Each stage is wide Example: Image Blur



Image blur filter



- Image Processing algorithms consist of pipeline stages that are both wide and heterogeneous
  - Each stage is *wide* Example: Image Blur



3

parallelism





- Image Processing algorithms consist of pipeline stages that are both wide and heterogeneous
  - Overall pipelines are *heterogeneous* Example: Local Laplacian Filter







 Image Processing Algorithms consist of pipeline stages that are both wide and heterogeneous

Image processing workloads have high memory bandwidth demand:

- Software: low temporal reuse due to
  - (1) low arithmetic density
  - (2) difficulty of pipeline fusion
- Hardware: on-chip cache cannot hold all intermediate data





### Motivation Data: Memory Bandwidth Bottleneck

- On average: **57.55%** memory utilization v.s. **3.43%** ALU utilization
  - Benchmark: single-stage / multi-stage kernels
  - Configuration: Halide toolchain on a Tesla V100 GPU







#### Motivation Data: Memory Bandwidth Bottleneck









### Motivation Data: Memory Bandwidth Bottleneck

Pipeline optimization does not change memory-bound behavior of image processing workloads on GPU







**GPU provides the highest memory bandwidth**: High Bandwidth Memory (HBM) provides large bandwidth by 3D die-stacking technology



Vertical interconnect: Through Silicon Vias (TSVs)



Memory bandwidth wall: memory bandwidth cannot scale with computation throughput

- Off-chip I/O (Interposer Interconnects)
- TSV I/O



- Raw memory bandwidth = (the number of I/Os) X (data rate)
  - Increasing the number of I/Os is difficult under tight area budget
    - Limited off-chip pins
    - TSVs already consumes ~18.8%
       DRAM die area for the current HBM2





- Raw memory bandwidth = (the number of I/Os) X (data rate)
  - Increasing data rate will have signal integrity issues and increase power consumption as well







# Summary

- Image processing is important in many application domains
- GPU suffers from memory bandwidth bottleneck:
  - Software: image processing pipelines are wide and heterogeneous
  - Hardware: GPU has bandwidth scaling challenges

How to design a programmable image processing accelerator to provide more memory bandwidth?





# 3D-Stacking Processing-in-memory (PIM) Architecture

- Key idea:
  - Integrate computation logic closer to physical memory in order to increase memory bandwidth and reduce data movement energy

GPU + 3D memory





![](_page_16_Picture_0.jpeg)

# 3D-Stacking Processing-in-memory (PIM) Architecture

- Key idea:
  - Integrate computation logic closer to physical memory in order to increase memory bandwidth and reduce data movement energy

![](_page_16_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

# 3D-Stacking Processing-in-memory (PIM) Architecture

- Key idea:
  - Integrate computation logic closer to physical memory in order to increase memory bandwidth and reduce data movement energy

![](_page_17_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### memory access patterns

![](_page_18_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_5.jpeg)

Lightweight programmable architecture for image processing domain

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_4.jpeg)

Bank bingle Bank bingle Bank bingle bingic bingle b Concise yet powerful Instruction Set Architecture (ISA)

Lightweight programmable architecture for image processing domain

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

End-to-end software support:

- Programming interface
- Compiler optimization

Concise yet powerful Instruction Set Architecture (ISA)

Lightweight programmable architecture for image processing domain

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Key Contributions

• iPIM: A decoupled control-execution architecture

![](_page_22_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Key Contributions

- Lightweight programmable arch: A decoupled control-execution architecture
- Flexible ISA support: Single-Instruction-Multiple-Bank (SIMB) ISA

![](_page_23_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Key Contributions

- Lightweight programmable arch: A decoupled control-execution architecture
- Flexible ISA support: Single-Instruction-Multiple-Bank (SIMB) ISA
- End-to-end compilation flow: Halide-iPIM

![](_page_24_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

# iPIM: High-level Arch Design Overview

- 3D-stacking, near-bank processing-in-memory architecture
- Hierarchical design with good scalability
  - Cube Vault Process Group (PG) Process Engine (PE)
  - A Process Engine (PE) contains a DRAM bank and simple logic components

![](_page_25_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_26_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_27_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_28_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_29_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_30_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_30_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Key idea: Decoupled Control-Execution Architecture
  - Front-end (complex logic) control components of the core are placed on the base logic die;
  - Back-end (simple logic and memory-intensive) execution components are placed on the DRAM dies.

![](_page_31_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_2.jpeg)

• Enable massive bank-level concurrent execution to exploit data parallelism

**Example:** load data from the DRAM bank to the local data register file (DataRF)

Massive bank-level concurrent execution

![](_page_32_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

- Enable massive bank-level concurrent execution to exploit data parallelism
- SIMD interface to exploit abundant bank-level bandwidth

Example: load data from the DRAM bank to the local data register file (DataRF)

![](_page_33_Figure_7.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Picture_2.jpeg)

• Predicate execution (*simb\_mask*) to allow divergent bank-level accesses / computations

![](_page_34_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

• Support indirect addressing in image processing domain

Example: access pixel[xi, offset+yi]

cal_arf	op	dst_arf	src_arf1	src_arf2	simb_mask
---------	----	---------	----------	----------	-----------

![](_page_35_Figure_7.jpeg)

Perform: dram\_address = xi + (offset+yi)\*img\_width

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Picture_2.jpeg)

• Support indirect addressing in image processing domain

Example: access pixel[xi, offset+yi]

![](_page_36_Figure_6.jpeg)

Access local DRAM bank using dram\_address stored in AddrRF

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Picture_2.jpeg)

- SIMB ISA also supports:
  - Data-dependent calculation
    - mov\_drf / mov\_arf
  - Remote data access from different vaults / cubes
    - rd\_vsm / wr\_vsm / req
  - Control flow instructions
    - jump / cjump / calc\_crf / seti\_crf
  - Synchronization mechanism
    - Sync
- Please refer to the paper for more details

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_2.jpeg)

# End-to-end compilation support: Halide-iPIM

- Halide
  - A domain specific programming language and toolchain for image processing
  - It decouples the algorithm descriptions and the schedules to hardware mapping

	// Algorithm Func blurx(x, y) = (in(x - 1, y) + in(x, y) + in(x + 1, y)) / 3.0f; Func out(x, y) = (blurx(x, y - 1) + blurx(x, y) + blurx(x, y + 1)) / 3.0f;
<b>Example</b> : image blur	<pre>// Schedule for iPIM out.compute_root()    .ipim_tile(x, y, xi, yi, 8, 8)    .load_pgsm(xi, yi)    .vectorize(xi, 4);</pre>

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_39_Picture_2.jpeg)

# End-to-end compilation support: Halide-iPIM

• Halide

- An domain specific programming language and toolchain for image processing
- It decouples the algorithm descriptions and the schedules to hardware mapping
- Halide-iPIM
  - We extend Halide frontend to support customized schedules for iPIM
  - We leverage existing Halide schedules for pipeline fusion and vectorization on iPIM

![](_page_39_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_40_Picture_2.jpeg)

# End-to-end compilation support: Halide-iPIM

• Halide

- An domain specific programming language and toolchain for image processing
- It decouples the algorithm descriptions and the schedules to hardware mapping
- Halide-iPIM
  - We extend Halide frontend to support customized schedules for iPIM
  - We leverage existing Halide schedules for pipeline fusion and vectorization on iPIM
  - We develop three backend optimizations for iPIM

![](_page_40_Figure_11.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Halide-iPIM: Frontend Schedules

- Two new schedule primitives:
  - ipim\_tile()
    - distribute data into different banks

Example: image blur

// Algorithm Func blurx(x, y) = (in(x - 1, y) + in(x, y) + in(x + 1, y)) / 3.0f; Func out(x, y) = (blurx(x, y - 1) + blurx(x, y) + blurx(x, y + 1)) / 3.0f;

// Schedule for iPIM
out.compute\_root()
.ipim\_tile(x, y, xi, yi, 8, 8)
.load\_pgsm(xi, yi)
.vectorize(xi, 4);

![](_page_41_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Halide-iPIM: Frontend Schedules

- Two new schedule primitives:
  - load\_pgsm()
    - Utilize the scratchpad of a processing group (PG)

Example: image blur

// Algorithm Func blurx(x, y) = (in(x - 1, y) + in(x, y) + in(x + 1, y)) / 3.0f; Func out(x, y) = (blurx(x, y - 1) + blurx(x, y) + blurx(x, y + 1)) / 3.0f;

```
// Schedule for iPIM
out.compute_root()
.ipim_tile(x, y, xi, yi, 8, 8)
.load_pgsm(xi, yi)
.vectorize(xi, 4);
```

#### load\_pgsm(xi, yi)

![](_page_42_Figure_11.jpeg)

Non-overlapping

- Overlapping (Halo)
- Working Set (Current Stage)
- Working Set (Next Stage)

![](_page_43_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_2.jpeg)

## Halide-iPIM: Frontend Schedules

- Leverage existing schedule primitives:
  - compute\_root()
    - Specify pipeline fusing
  - vectorize()
    - Align data to improve utilization of SIMD units

#### Example: image blur

```
// Algorithm

Func blurx(x, y) = (in(x - 1, y) + in(x, y)

+ in(x + 1, y)) / 3.0f;

Func out(x, y) = (blurx(x, y - 1) + blurx(x, y)

+ blurx(x, y + 1)) / 3.0f;
```

```
// Schedule for iPIM
out.compute_root()
.ipim_tile(x, y, xi, yi, 8, 8)
.load_pgsm(xi, yi)
.vectorize(xi, 4);
```

![](_page_44_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_44_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Halide-iPIM: Backend Optimizations
- Optimization objectives:

![](_page_44_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_45_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_49_Picture_2.jpeg)

# Evaluations

![](_page_50_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_50_Figure_3.jpeg)

Area overhead of added components per DRAM die: 10.71%

• Conservatively assume 2x area overhead in DRAM process

Area of control logic on base die: 0.92mm<sup>2</sup> (fits in 3.5mm<sup>2</sup> extra area per vault)

![](_page_51_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_51_Picture_2.jpeg)

## iPIM (Near-bank Arch) v.s. GPU

![](_page_51_Figure_4.jpeg)

79.49% average energy saving

![](_page_52_Picture_0.jpeg)

### iPIM (Near-bank Arch) v.s. Process-on-base-die

![](_page_52_Figure_4.jpeg)

Compared to process-on-base-die solution, iPIM achives:

- 3.61x average speedup
- 56.71% average energy saving

![](_page_53_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_53_Picture_2.jpeg)

54

## Effectiveness of iPIM Compiler Optimizations

![](_page_53_Figure_4.jpeg)

opt: Apply all 3 optimizations
baseline1: No optimizations
baseline2: No register allocation optimization
baseline3: No instruction reordering
baseline4: No memory ordering enforcement

All three compiler backend optimizations together provide 3.19x speedup compared to unoptimized program

Instruction reordering is most effective: maximize instruction level parallelism

![](_page_54_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Picture_2.jpeg)

### iPIM Key Takeaways:

- Lightweight programmable arch: A decoupled control-execution architecture
- Flexible ISA support: Single-Instruction-Multiple-Bank (SIMB) ISA
- End-to-end compilation flow: Halide-iPIM
- Evaluation results:
  - 11.02x speedup and 79.49% energy savings over state-of-the-art GPU accelerator
  - 3.61x speedup and 56.71% energy savings over the process-on-base-die solution
  - Overall compiler optimizations provide 3.19x speedup over unoptimized baseline

![](_page_55_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_2.jpeg)

# iPIM: Programmable In-Memory Image Processing Accelerator Using Near-Bank Architecture

# Thank you! Q&A

![](_page_55_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_55_Picture_7.jpeg)