Highlighting the Performance Diversity of Analytical Queries using VOILA

Tim Gubner

Peter Boncz



The X86 space has been quiet lately ...

Meanwhile ...





Meanwhile ...





Why?

Better, more cost-effective

- Money does matter
- Optimized chip:
 - License almost-ready chip layout
 - Add specific accelerators
 - Send to some fab
 - Receive semi-custom tailored chip

OR

Political/Risk mitigation

- Money **does not** matter
- Independence of US and Intel/AMD
 - Trade wars, sanctions
 - Production/delivery issues

This Work

- Should we optimize for X86?
- Did performance characteristics change?
- Is there performance diversity?

- Is common wisdom (still) valid?
 - ARM is slow^{*}
 - Data-centric outperforms Vectorized on computational workloads[^]
 - V outperforms DC on data-access-heavy workloads[^]

* Coffee conversation with senior researcher at CWI

[^] Kersten et al. Everything you always wanted to know about compiled and vectorized queries but were afraid to ask. VLDB 2018 ⁶

THE TRUTH IS OUT THERE

What we did

Ported VOILA-based synthesis framework[^] to:

- ARM (M1, Graviton 1, Graviton 2)
- PowerPC (PPC8, PPC9)
- X86 (Skylake-X, 8275C, Epyc)

Ran:

- Micro benchmarks (Computation, scalability, control-flow & memory-heavy)
- Macro benchmarks (TPC-H Q1, 3, 6, 9)

^ Gubner, Boncz. Charting the Design Space of Query Execution using VOILA. VLDB 2021. Thursday Aug 19, R51, around 14:30

Control-Flow: To Branch, or not to Branch?



Scalability: Does scalable Code scale?

Hardware	Time/Item in ns (slowdown) on given DOP N					
	Т	N=1	T/8	T/4	T/2	T
X86 Skylake-X	24	0.08	0.08 (1.0×)	0.09 (1.1×)	0.09 (1.2×)	0.12 (1.5×)
X86 8275CL	96	0.08	0.08 (1.0×)	$0.10~(1.4 \times)$	$0.17~(2.3 \times)$	0.18 (2.3×)
X86 Epyc	96	0.08	0.08 (1.0×)	$0.08~(1.0 \times)$	$0.12 (1.5 \times)$	0.17 (2.3×)
ARM Graviton 1	16	0.34	0.34 (1.0×)	0.36 (1.1×)	$0.35~(1.0 \times)$	0.38 (1.1×)
ARM Graviton 2	64	0.20	0.20 (1.0×)	0.20 (1.0×)	$0.20 (1.0 \times)$	0.20 (1.0×)
ARM M1	8	0.07	is $N = 1$	$0.08~(1.1 \times)$	$0.08~(1.1 \times)$	0.12 (1.7×)
PPC Power8	128	0.26	0.38 (1.4×)	0.68 (2.6×)	1.27 (4.8×)	1.38 (5.2×)
PPC Power9	128	0.19	0.27 (1.4×)	$0.52(2.7\times)$	0.95 (5.0×)	1.04 (5.4×)

Is Vectorization better for Joins?

	Best Flavor Name best (ms)		
X86 Skylake-X	vec(1024),3,1	173	
X86 8275CL	vec(512),3,2	176	
X86 Epyc	scalar,4,16	134	
ARM Graviton 1	scalar,0,1	412	
ARM Graviton 2	vec(1024),0,1	101	
ARM M1	vec(1024),4,1	228	
PPC Power8	vec(512),2,1	488	
PPC Power9	scalar,3,1	317	

Best Flavor on TPC-H

	Q1	Q3	Q6	Q9
X86 Skylake-X	scalar,0,1	vec(2048),3,1	vec(1024),3,1	vec(1024),2,1
X86 8275CL	scalar,2,1	scalar,3,8	vec(512),4,1	scalar,2,32
Х86 Ерус	scalar,2,1	vec(256),1,1	vec(1024),2,1	vec(512),0,1
ARM Graviton 1	scalar,0,1	vec(512),0,1	scalar,4,1	vec(256),0,1
ARM Graviton 2	scalar,2,1	scalar,0,1	vec(2048),2,1	vec(512),0,1
ARM M1	scalar,0,1	vec(2048),2,1	scalar,3,1	vec(1024),2,1
PPC Power8	scalar,0,1	vec(1024),2,1	vec(256),0,1	scalar,2,2
PPC Power9	scalar,3,1	vec(512),0,1	vec(256),2,1	scalar,2,8

Is ARM slow (overall)?

	ļ (Q1	Q3		
	x100	hyper	x100	hyper	
Runtime (milliseconds)					
X86 Skylake-X	79	54	261	282	
X86 8275CL	93	84	480	397	
Х86 Ерус	81	65	241	238	
ARM Graviton 1	188	107	447	447	
ARM Graviton 2	42	29	162	158	
ARM M1	216	86	313	440	
PPC Power8	404	384	1094	1132	
PPC Power9	239	225	645	631	

"Bang for the Buck"

	$\frac{\$}{\text{hour}}$	Cents per real core hour	Q9 (ms)	1M × Q9 (\$)
X86 Skylake-X (price est.)	1.3392	5.6	228	84
X86 8275CL	0.9122	1.9	232	59
X86 Epyc	0.9122	1.9	193	49
ARM Graviton 1	0.0788	0.5	720	16
ARM Graviton 2	0.7024	1.1	95	19

Takeaways

- ARM is slow?
- V outperforms DC on data-access?
- DC outperforms V on computation?
- Branching outperforms data-dependency?
- Scalable programs scale?

Not anymore (faster, cheaper) Sometimes Yes Sometimes Sometimes

Performance diversity is real: adapt or perish.

The best days of X86 are over.