

The Turbo-Charged Mapper: Fast and Optimal Mapping for Energy-efficient and Low-latency Accelerator Design

Michael Gilbert*
gilbertm@mit.edu
MIT
Cambridge, MA, USA

Vivienne Sze
sze@mit.edu
MIT
Cambridge, MA, USA

Tanner Andrusis*
andrusis@mit.edu
MIT
Cambridge, MA, USA

Joel S. Emer
emer@csail.mit.edu
MIT / Nvidia
Cambridge, MA, USA

Abstract

The energy and latency of an accelerator running a deep neural network (DNN) depend on how the computation and data movement are scheduled in the accelerator (i.e., mapping), and picking an optimal mapping is essential to achieve high-performance accelerators. However, it is challenging to find mappings that maximize accelerator performance. The space of mappings is large, and prior works cannot guarantee finding optimal mappings because they use heuristics or metaheuristics to narrow the search space.

To address this challenge, we propose the Turbo-Charged Mapper (TCM), a fast mapper that finds optimal mappings. The key to our approach is that we define a new mapping concept called *dataplacement*, which, like the prior concept of *dataflow*, allows for clear analysis and comparison of mappings. Through it, we identify opportunities to prune redundant and suboptimal mappings, reducing search space by up to 32 orders of magnitude ($10^{37} \rightarrow 10^5$).

TCM leverages these insights to perform full mapspace searches, making it the first mapper that can find optimal mappings in feasible runtime. Compared to prior mappers, TCM improves accelerator energy-delay-product by $1.2 - 6.5\times$ while simultaneously reducing mapping search time by $1000\times$ (5 hours $\rightarrow$ 17 seconds).

1 Introduction

Achieving low energy and latency with deep neural network (DNN) accelerators require various optimizations such as parallelization and using data reuse to reduce expensive data movement. These optimizations depend on the accelerator architecture, but also how computation and data movement are scheduled onto the accelerator (i.e., the *mapping* [7, 11, 21, 25, 38]). Various mapping optimizations have been proposed, and mapping proposals often open a wider space of mappings (i.e., *mapspace* [25]). For example, ZigZag [22] introduced the concept of *uneven mappings*, which expanded the space of possible data tiles kept in each memory level.

Although a wider mapspace may offer more efficient mappings and enable better-performing accelerators, the challenge for the

mapper [25], which searches for an optimal mapping¹, becomes more difficult. Current mappers must search very large space of mappings, containing as many as 10^{37} mappings². Given the infeasibility of evaluating every mapping, prior mappers [7, 22, 24, 25, 30, 38] use heuristics (e.g., only evaluate mappings that maximize buffer utilization) or metaheuristics (e.g., randomly sample different mappings), which speed up mapspace search but cannot guarantee finding an optimal mapping. This lack of guarantee leads to significant practical limitations, such as significant accelerator energy-delay-product degradations (Section 6.6) and misinforming architecture explorations (Section 7).

To address this challenge, we introduce new strategies for pruning suboptimal mappings from the mapspace. These strategies reduce search size by up to 32 orders of magnitude while guaranteeing finding an optimal mapping. These pruning strategies leverage new mapping analyses, enabled by a new concept called *dataplacement*.

A mapping comprises *dataplacement*, which we define as the choice of which tiles are kept at a given point in time in each memory level of the accelerator, alongside *tile shapes* and *dataflow*. Prior work has defined *tile shapes* as the size and number of tiles that subdivide workload data (tensors), and *dataflow* as the traversal of tiles in space/time [7, 21, 22, 25, 38]. While the mapspace we capture using *dataplacement* has been explored in ZigZag, the *dataplacement* concept we define in this paper enables a novel analysis of the impact of *dataplacement* and *dataflow* combinations on data reuse. This information lets us identify and prune suboptimal dataflows that unnecessarily refetch tiles ($10^{15} \rightarrow 1$) and tile shapes that are larger than necessary for reuse ($10^{22} \rightarrow 10^5$). Moreover, our representation of *dataplacement* allows the search to be ordered such that we explore *datapacements* before *dataflows* and *tile shapes*. This order is more efficient because there are far fewer *datapacements* (16) relative to *dataflows* (10^{15}) and *tile shapes* (10^{22}).

Finally, *dataplacement* and *dataflow* determine qualitative information about tiles (“what”, “where”, and “when”), while *tile shapes* affect only quantitative information (“how big” and “how many”).

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

*These authors contributed equally to this work
TCM is available at <to be posted after peer review.>

¹ *Optimal* means that, in the defined mapspace, there is no valid (i.e., within resource limits) mapping with superior objective metrics (e.g., energy). We also consider redundant mappings (i.e., identical metrics to an unpruned optimal mapping) to be suboptimal. While we cannot predict optimizations that will be invented in the future, our optimality guarantee applies in a superset of the mapspaces of many prior works [13, 14, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30].

² Mapping counts in the introduction are from Section 6.3, and depend on workload, architecture, and mapspace

This means that most of the modeling complexity is in dataplacement and dataflow. In fact, for a given dataplacement and dataflow, accesses, energy, and latency can be calculated using functions of simple, easy-to-reason-about operators (e.g., multiply, add, min, ceiling), which lets us reason about these functions to find tile shape choices that dominate others ($10^6\times$ reduction). After generating these simple functions, we can also evaluate them instead of running a full model to speed up the search process by $> 100\times$.

We implement these ideas in the Turbo-Charged Mapper (TCM), which fully searches the mapspace, making it the first mapper to guarantee finding optimal mappings in feasible runtime (seconds to minutes). We also compare to prior works that trade off optimality for speed [22, 25, 30], showing that, given similar runtime, this work finds mappings with 1.3 – 16,000 $\times$ lower energy-delay-product (EDP).

In summary, we make the following contributions:

- We introduce the concept of dataplacement that defines which tiles are stored in each level of the memory hierarchy. Dataplacement clearly shows the relative sizes and lifetimes of each tile in memory.
- We show how to use dataplacement to identify and prune suboptimal dataflows and tile shapes.
- We introduce *partial-tile-shape-pruning*, which, for a given dataplacement and dataflow, can identify and prune suboptimal tile shapes.
- We introduce a fast model that is compiled once for each dataplacement and dataflow, and is then 1000 $\times$ faster than prior fast models.
- We integrate these contributions into TCM, the first mapper to guarantee finding optimal mappings in feasible runtime. TCM fully searches the mapspace, pruning only suboptimal mappings.
- We demonstrate that, compared to prior mappers, TCM improves accelerator energy-delay-product by 1.2 – 6.5 $\times$ while simultaneously reducing mapping search time by 1000 $\times$ (5 hours $\rightarrow$ 17 seconds).

2 Background

2.1 Einsum Notation

We describe DNN computations (e.g., matrix multiplications, convolutions, activation functions) using the *Einsum notation*. In the Einsum notation, each multi-dimensional data is referred to as a *tensor* and its dimensions (e.g., channels in a feature map) as *ranks*. Valid coordinates in that rank (e.g., channels 0 through 2) are the *shape* of the rank³, and the shapes of ranks in a tensor are collectively referred to as the tensor’s shape.

Einsums are written like sums, but omit the sum symbol and write index expressions as subscripts. For example, consider the matrix multiplication where *rank variables* m, k , and n index into tensors A, B , and Z . Written as an Einsum, we make implicit the summation over k (in general, we sum over all variables not present in the equation’s left-hand side):

³Coordinates in all ranks in this paper start with index 0, so we specify the exclusive upper-bound as the shape. For example, shape 3 denotes $\{0, 1, 2\}$.




Figure 1: (a) An example LoopTree, the different types of nodes, and their meaning. (b) An example LoopTree with tiling.

$$\text{Sum: } Z[m, n] = \sum_k A[m, k] \times B[k, n] \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Einsum: } Z_{m,n} = A_{m,k} \times B_{k,n}$$

2.2 Mappings in LoopTree Notation

A *mapping* schedules, in space and time, a workload’s computation steps and all operations in them [9, 25, 31]. This paper represents mappings with *LoopTrees* [10, 11], which clearly show mapping choices and their consequences.

Fig. 1(a) shows an example mapping as a LoopTree for the Einsum in Eq. 1. We show LoopTrees for an accelerator with two memory levels: DRAM and Global Buffer (GLB). LoopTrees consist of:

- *Loop nodes*, rectangles in the LoopTree, represent nested for loops that iterate over rank variables in the workload. Multiple loops over a rank variable imply tiling, and subscripts indicate iteration over tiles and within tiles (e.g., in Fig. 1(a), the loop over m_1 iterates over tiles, the loop over m_0 iterates within a tile, and we index with $m = m_1 M_0 + m_0$).
- *Storage nodes*, cylinders in the LoopTree, represent tensor tile storage. Each tile’s size is determined by the loops below the storage node (e.g., Fig. 1(a) and (b) show that the GLB A storage node must keep a $K_0 \times M_0$ tile). The number of tiles fetched (including refetches) is determined by the loops above the storage node (e.g., in Fig. 1(a), the A tile in GLB is fetched $M_1 K_1$ times).
- *Compute nodes*, ovals in the LoopTree, represent the computation that is performed. In this example, they represent the multiply-accumulate operations in the Einsum.

To complete the terminology:

- *Dataflow* is the relative ordering of operations, which in LoopTree notation is the loop nodes and their order.
- *Tile shapes* are the shape of tiles in each rank, which in LoopTree notation are the loop bounds.
- *Dataplacement* is the tensor tiles that are held in memory levels, which in LoopTree is the storage nodes and their order. Section 3 discusses more details.




Figure 2: Constructing a mapspace for the Einsum in Eq. 1 by choosing dataplacement, dataflow, then tile shape. The part of the mapping chosen in each step is highlighted in red. In (2) and (3), only some choices are shown; similar choices must be made for parts in ellipses.

2.3 Finding Optimal Mappings is Challenging

Finding optimal mappings requires a mapping search, as there is no known direct solver. This is because each mapping choice impacts many factors (e.g., parallelism, bandwidth utilization, capacity utilization), which affect final energy and latency.

Mapspace search is challenging because the mapspace is very large. Only a tiny fraction of the mapspace can be evaluated within a feasible runtime, even with the fastest models [7, 11, 21, 22, 25, 38]. Then, the challenge is determining which mappings out of the mapspace should be evaluated to find the best mapping possible.

2.4 The Mapspace is Large and Dataplacement Enables Pruning

Key Takeaway: Exploring the mapspace involves exploring the space of dataflows, datapacements, and tile shapes. There are orders-of-magnitude fewer datapacements, so we enable the most pruning by exploring dataplacement first.

We can construct the mapspace by making a series of decisions: picking a dataplacement, a dataflow, and then tile shapes. Fig. 2 illustrates this process. (1) We choose a dataplacement $dp \in DP$, which is the order of storage nodes and whether to include them (e.g., whether to keep tensor I in GLB). Storage nodes for different tensors can be reordered freely, but storage nodes must follow memory hierarchy order (e.g., DRAM has to be above GLB)⁴. It is also common to have only one storage node for the highest memory level (e.g., DRAM) that stores every tensor in entirety. (2) loops over every rank variable are placed between every pair of adjacent two storage nodes, and we choose a dataflow $df \in DF$, which is the choice of loop orders. (3) we choose tile shapes $ts \in TS$, which are the loop bounds. Following this process, the mapspace size is:

$$|\text{Mapspace}| = |DP| \cdot |DF| \cdot |TS| \quad (2)$$

⁴TCM can optionally relax this assumption, making the memory hierarchy constraint per-tensor (e.g., (GLB, input) storage node must go above (register, input) storage node, but may be below (register, output) storage node). This expands the mapspace, and TCM is still optimal in the larger mapspace.

The number of options varies significantly across different choices, and $|DP|$ tends to be smallest by a wide margin. The reason for this can be seen in Fig. 2; there are many more loops than storage nodes, making the spaces of loop orders and loop bounds much larger than the space of storage node orders. For example, mapping the attention matrix computation step in GPT-3 to a TPU-like architecture, $|DP| = 16$, $|DF| \approx 10^{15}$, and $|TS| \approx 10^{22}$.

Leveraging this variation, we maximize pruning potential by focusing on reducing $|DF|$ and $|TS|$. The following sections describe how we prune dataflows when given a dataplacement choice and how we prune tile shapes given dataplacement and dataflow choices. For the same example above, $|DF|_{\text{pruned}} = 1$ and $|TS|_{\text{pruned}} \approx 10^5$, representing a 32 order of magnitude pruning rate overall.

2.5 Prior Works Use Heuristics

To manage the large mapspace, prior work has proposed various heuristics [22, 25, 30] and metaheuristics [7, 19, 26, 38], but these approaches cannot guarantee finding an optimal mapping. Heuristic approaches use simple-to-evaluate rules (e.g., maximize parallelism) to narrow down which mappings to evaluate. However, these rules only capture some of the factors that determine latency and energy, and ignore important trade-offs. For example, increasing parallelism can result in more memory accesses and, when bandwidth is limited, increase latency instead.

Prior mappers also use metaheuristics such as sampling [25], genetic algorithms [19, 38], Bayesian optimization [26], simulated annealing [7], and Monte Carlo Markov chains [16]. However, while these approaches yield better-than-random results, they have no guarantee of finding the optimal mapping.

While some prior works include optimality-preserving pruning techniques for dataflows [22, 24], without prior knowledge of the dataplacement, this pruning is less effective than ours, and these works still need heuristics to search the mapspace.

Other prior works have explored a subset of the dataplacement space. ZigZag [22] first picks a dataflow, then applies a dataplacement to that dataflow. However, this procedure makes dataplacement and dataflow inextricably linked. We introduce dataplacement as a separable choice, which lets us pick dataplacement first, enabling analysis and highly effective mapspace pruning based on dataplacement.

3 Defining and Interpreting Dataplacement

Key Takeaway: Dataplacement describes how tiles are stored in memory, and dataplacement offers new insights, letting us better interpret (and prune) mappings.

First, we precisely define dataplacement, how we specify it in the LoopTree notation, and its impact on data reuse.

3.1 Understanding and Specifying Dataplacement

Dataplacement, which determines the tensor tiles present in each memory level, is represented in the LoopTree notation as storage nodes and their ordering. Existence of a storage node implies whether a tile is stored (e.g., a storage node “GLB keep A” says the GLB keeps tiles of Tensor A), and storage node order affects tile




Figure 3: (a) An example dataplacement and slots where loops may be inserted. (b) An example mapping using the dataplacement, including tile shapes and numbers of tiles fetched. Dataplacement shows the trade-off between tile size and number of tiles fetched: Storage nodes higher in the dataplacement reduce fetches, but can increase tile size.

shapes, how long tiles live (*i.e.*, their *lifetimes*), and the amount of reuse.

Fig. 3 shows how dataplacement affects tile shapes, lifetime, and reuse. Fig. 3(a) shows the dataplacement alone, while Fig. 3(b) shows a full LoopTree, which includes loops inserted into slots between storage nodes. The dataplacement enforces two invariants on the lifetime and shape of stored tiles:

Invariant 1: Storage nodes higher in the dataplacement have the same-or-longer lifetime than those lower in the dataplacement. For example, the “GLB keep A” storage node in Fig. 3(b) is alive for the iterations of all loops in slots 2, 3, and 4; while the “GLB keep Z” storage node below is only alive for loops in slot 4, and new tiles are fetched for each iteration of the loops in slots 2 and 3. This results in fewer fetches, and thus more reuse, for the “GLB keep A” storage node.

Invariant 2: Storage nodes higher in the dataplacement have the same-or-larger shape than those lower in the dataplacement. (Note that shape comparisons apply only to ranks shared between the stored tensors.) For example, “GLB keep A” storage node Fig. 3(b) stores a $K_0 \times M_0$ tile of Tensor A, while “GLB keep Z” stores a $K_0 \times 1$ tile. This invariant is again because higher storage nodes are above more loops than lower storage nodes, and in the LoopTree notation, the tile shape is the product of loop bounds of relevant loops under the storage node.

Increased lifetime and tile shape mean that higher storage nodes often have more reuse opportunities than lower storage nodes. However, only loops that have reuse opportunities will result in reuse. For example, the tile specified by “GLB keep A” reuses data across iterations of the n_0 loop, but not the k_0 loop, because each k_0 iteration accesses a different value of A.

3.2 Dataplacement Enables Mapping Insights

Dataplacement offers new insights into how mappings use memory resources to reuse data and reduce refetches. In particular, dataplacement provides a notion of *reuse priority*, which determines the relative amount of memory resources to be used to get more reuse of different tensors.

Traditionally, hardware designers analyze reuse by looking at the dataflow, inferring how tensor tiles are reused based on the order of operations. A dataflow-centric analysis (*e.g.*, categorizing dataflows by stationarity [8, 9, 31]) would look at all loops that exist between any two memory levels. For example, in Fig. 3, the DRAM-GLB dataflow is based on the uppermost four loops (between the DRAM storage node and the lowest GLB storage node), and the dataflow is *B*-stationary because the innermost of these loops, the m_0 loop, repeatedly accesses the same elements of $B[k, n]$. Therefore, we can store and reuse $B[k, n]$ for multiple iterations.

Analyzing mapping through the lens of dataplacement offers two new insights. First, the dataplacement shows clearly which tiles are kept in the memory longer and the relative shape of the tiles. For example, in Fig. 3, the dataplacement implies that the tile of $A[m, k]$ is kept in GLB for longer and has a larger shape, followed by tiles of $B[k, n]$ and $Z[m, n]$ in order. Second, as a corollary, the dataplacement shows the *relative* priority of tensors. In our example, $A[m, k]$ has the highest reuse priority, followed by $B[k, n]$ and $Z[m, n]$.

Reuse priority provides an intuition for the benefits of the ability to specify a storage node for each tensor (also referred to as *uneven mappings* [22]), which have been shown to reduce energy and latency [11, 22]. Works that focused only on dataflow and implicitly assume a dataplacement (often placing storage nodes for all tensors at the same place) [24, 25, 38], missed this optimization because they only reuse the tensor(s) that are kept stationary for a given dataflow. For example, in Fig. 3, placing storage nodes for $A[m, k]$ at the same level as $GLB : Z[m, n]$ eliminates all reuse of A.

Because it provides both a clear way to interpret mappings and a richer space to explore, dataplacement is important to our understanding of mapping.

4 Speeding Up Mapping Using Dataplacement

Key Takeaway: Using dataplacement, we identify multiple opportunities to prune the mapspace by orders of magnitude. These opportunities come because dataplacement tells us which tiles are stored in each memory level, so we can prune mappings that redundantly re-fetch tiles, store too-large tiles, or lead to identical tile movement as an already-explored mapping.

We show how dataplacement lets us identify and prune many dataflows, loops, and tile shapes that are guaranteed to be worse-than or equal-to the optimal choices. Then, we show how we can use dataplacement to speed up the model.

4.1 Redundant Dataflow Pruning

Key Takeaway: Many mappings vary in compute order but lead to identical tile movement. These are redundant and can be pruned.

Knowing dataplacement, we can reduce the number of mappings to evaluate by identifying redundant dataflows.

Many dataflows are redundant and do not need to be evaluated. In general, dataflows that differ only in the order of loops between the same storage nodes result in exactly the same tile shapes and data movement. For example, in Fig. 3(b), permuting the top two loops would not change tile shapes or the number of fetches. Thus,

we do not need to explore orders of loops that are not separated by storage nodes.

This pruning represents significant improvement over prior dataflow explorations [22, 25], which explore all loop orders instead of exploring only non-redundant dataflows for each dataplacement. There are fewer storage nodes than loops (≤ 3 storage nodes per memory level, versus 3 – 7 loops), leading to far fewer storage node orders than loop orders (less than 10^3 versus more than 10^7). Because there are few non-redundant dataflows for each dataplacement, we reduce the number of choices we must explore significantly.

The one exception to this pruning rule is if the rank variable is part of an expression in the index (e.g., p in a convolution $Z_p = A_{p+r} \times W_r$), sometimes referred to as a *partially relevant* rank variable [22]. In such cases, a loop over p directly under a storage node for A allows only a line buffer to be held in storage for A , which reduces memory requirements [2, 9, 11, 22, 25]. Such optimization is only applied to the loop directly under the storage node. Thus, when such rank variables exist, we explore loop orders that leads to a unique partially-relevant loop beneath applicable storage nodes (e.g., for $Z_p = A_{p+r} \times W_r$, for each $A_{p,r}$ storage node, there is a choice to put the p loop highest or the r loop highest).

4.2 Non-Helpful Loop Pruning

Key Takeaway: Many mappings do not help tile movement, but cost increased tile movement or tile size. These are suboptimal and can be pruned.

Knowing dataplacement, we can identify and remove loops that have no benefit but cost more data movement and/or larger memory requirements.

For example, in Fig. 4, the uppermost n_2 loop is not helpful because it increases refetches of A without additional benefit. Each iteration of the n_2 loop accesses the *same* tile of $A[m, k]$. Therefore, there is a reuse opportunity for $A[m, k]$. If we remove the loop (equivalent to setting $N_2 = 1$), we get more $A[m, k]$ reuse and reduce the number of $A[m, k]$ tiles fetched from DRAM without increasing memory requirements.

The lowermost n_0 loop is not helpful because it increases $B[k, n]$ tile size (larger memory requirement) without additional benefit. Each iteration of the n_0 loop accesses a different element $B[k, n]$, which means that there is no reuse opportunity. Therefore, keeping multiple n_0 in GLB results in a larger tile, but does not reduce the amount of data fetched from DRAM. If we remove the n_0 loop, we reduce the $B[k, n]$ tile size without increasing data movement.

In summary, we can remove loops that do not index into the tensor in the storage node below or do index into the tensor in the storage node above (see Table 1).

This analysis significantly decreases the number of loops to consider. In matrix multiplications, the number of loops per storage node goes $3 \rightarrow 1$. For more complex workloads, the reduction is greater (e.g., $6 \rightarrow 2$ per storage node in our GPT-3 [6] experiments). Since the number of tile shapes (ways to factorize workload shape to loop bounds) and dataflows (orders of loops) increases exponentially with the number of loops, this pruning dramatically decreases mapspace size.




Figure 4: A mapping with non-helpful loops. Notice that the n_2 and n_0 loops both have costs (more fetches, more tile size) but no benefits (lower fetches, lower tile size). The n_1 loop is strictly better than either. Loop pruning will eliminate the n_2 and n_0 loops while keeping the n_1 loop.

Reuse tensor above	Reuse tensor below	Pruned?
Yes	No	No
No	*	Yes
*	Yes	Yes

Table 1: Rules to prune a loop based on whether it reuses the tensor in the storage node above/below it. Asterisk (*) means any.

We note that ZigZag [22] includes similar observations on helpful and non-helpful loops, calling it the Loop Relevance Principle (LRP). Our analysis on whether a loop is helpful matches ZigZag’s. The difference is that ZigZag uses this analysis to prune datapacements (create a dataflow (loop nodes) first; only insert storage nodes such that the surrounding loops are helpful), while we use it to prune loops (create a dataplacement (storage nodes) first; only insert helpful loops). Pruning loops is much more effective as it reduces the dataflow and tile shape space, which is much larger than the dataplacement space ($10^{10} - 10^{25}$ versus $10 - 1000$).

4.3 Partial Tile Shape Pruning

Key Takeaway: For a given dataplacement, the model reduces to simple expressions for the size and number of fetches of each tile. We can analyze these expressions to do additional pruning.

Hardware performance models, even analytical ones, generally involve complex calculations, but we can simplify the model and conduct trade-off analysis if we fix certain design choices. For example, while it would be difficult to write a single expression that calculates DRAM accesses for arbitrary mappings, the number of DRAM accesses by Tensor B elements in Fig. 3 and the GLB usage of A are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DRAM Accesses}_B &= M_1 \cdot K \cdot N \\ \text{GLB Usage}_A &= M_0 \cdot K_0 \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In fact, given dataflow and dataplacement, we can generate expressions for the usage and accesses to every memory level, as well as final metrics such as energy and latency.

Using these expressions, we can identify and prune suboptimal mappings even before knowing all the tile shapes. A partially-chosen set of tile shapes can be pruned if we can show that it will result in worse metrics regardless of future tile shape choices (e.g., the tile shape along a dimension may so severely underutilize an array of computation units that it results in high latency regardless of the tile shape along other dimensions). Finding such pruning candidates requires complex analysis, which is described in Section 5.4.

4.4 Speeding Up Modeling via Currying

Key Takeaway: For a given dataplacement, the model reduces to simple expressions for the size and number of fetches of each tile. We can avoid long-running model calls by evaluating these expressions instead.

Explicit dataplacement also enables much faster modeling runtime. We can compute the mathematical expressions as in the previous section first for a combination of dataflow and dataplacement. Then, we use those expressions to explore various tile shapes, which is now much faster because it only involves numerical substitutions and arithmetic operations. In other words, we separate the model such that the input can be given one at a time (i.e., we *curry* the model). Moreover, each mathematical expression can be used for the entire tile shape exploration. Thus, we trade off the slightly more expensive symbolic analysis of the impact of dataplacement and dataflow to obtain a faster model that we can reuse for all tile shapes.

5 The Turbo-Charged Mapper (TCM)

Key Takeaway: TCM iteratively follows an *enumerate-prune* strategy, repeatedly pruning as it generates dataplacement, then dataflow, then tile shape choices. This lets TCM prune the search space by many orders of magnitude, making it tractable to fully search the remainder and find the optimal mapping.

In this section, we describe the Turbo-Charged Mapper (TCM), which implements the ideas in Section 3. TCM, shown in Fig. 5 is the first to output optimal mappings in a feasible runtime.

Optimal mappings are guaranteed because TCM only prunes choices that are known to be suboptimal. Meanwhile, when exploring at a given step, it explores every possible choice that may be optimal (i.e., it does not miss anything).

TCM includes four key steps:

- **Make dataplacement choices.** This is equivalent to making every possible ordering of storage nodes in the LoopTree. This step outputs a partial mapping (*pmapping*), which is a mapping with only some attributes specified.
- **Make dataflow choices for each dataplacement choice.** This step reduces mapspace size by only generating Pareto-optimal dataflows.
- **Make a tile-shape-only model,** which fixes dataflow and dataplacement to take only tile shapes as input.




Figure 5: Overview of TCM. Each mapper process (in blue) is explained in detail in the sections in parentheses.

- **Explore tile shapes.** This uses the tile-shape-only model. As it chooses tile shapes, it prunes known-suboptimal choices to keep the search size tractable.

The four steps are detailed in the following subsections.

5.1 Making Dataplacement Choices

TCM explores all dataplacement choices, which involves making and ordering storage nodes. Making storage nodes means that we decide, for each memory level and tensor, whether to keep a tile of the tensor in the memory level (i.e., whether the storage node exists). TCM generates all possible combinations of storage nodes (except those that are not supported by the hardware). Then, for each combination, TCM generates all possible hardware-supported storage node orders. Storage order must also obey the hardware memory hierarchy, meaning that we can not have the $L1 : A[m, k]$ storage node higher than the $L2 : A[m, k]$ storage node, else the mapping would use $L1$ as a backing store for $L2$.

Users may constrain the dataplacement as well. This may be useful if a memory is used to store a particular tensor (e.g., Weight-Buffer can only hold weights).

5.2 Making Pareto-Optimal Dataflows

For each dataplacement choice, TCM explores all non-redundant dataflow choices. We first explore ordering of the loops in each slot, then all combinations of per-slot choices.

Between any two storage nodes, we determine the set of loops over rank variables that would be beneficial to insert between any two storage nodes using the principles discussed in Section 4.2. We then partition the rank variable (e.g., $n \rightarrow n_0 n_1$) and insert a loop between the two storage nodes. In cases where there is no lower storage node (i.e., below the last storage node, above the compute node), we omit the reuse-tensor-below check. In cases where the upper storage node is the outermost backing storage (e.g., DRAM) we omit the reuse-tensor-above check since loops may not be placed above this backing storage. Given the set of loops between storage nodes, we explore choices of which loop is directly

under the storage node above, and we choose a canonical order (e.g., alphabetical) for the rest of the loops because the order does not matter (see Section 4.1).

5.3 Making the Tile-Shape-Only Model

Like prior work [22, 25, 30], our model takes in workload, architecture, and mapping specifications as inputs to calculate overall energy and latency. However, our model is much faster for mapping search because it performs the most time-intensive modeling work (analyzing a particular dataplacement and dataflow) a handful of times (tens to hundreds), sharing this effort across all mappings that have the same dataplacement and dataflow (thousands to millions).

To achieve this speed, our model is *curried*, meaning we first give the model dataplacement and dataflow, and it outputs a *tile-shape-only model* that only needs tile shapes as input:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TileShapeOnlyModel} &= \text{FullModel}(\text{dataplacement}, \text{dataflow}) \\ \text{Results} &= \text{TileShapeOnlyModel}(\text{tile shapes}) \end{aligned}$$

The tile-shape-only model is simpler and faster than a full model, as it omits the complexity of dataplacement and dataflow analysis. In fact, the tile-shape-only model can calculate energy, latency, or usage of any on-chip resource using simple sum-of-products and max expressions. Given a dataplacement and dataflow, we calculate the tile size and number of accesses for Storage s with the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TileSize}(s) &= \prod_{l \in \text{Indexing Loops Below } s} l.\text{bound} \\ \text{TilesFetched}(s) &= \prod_{l \in \text{Loops Above } s} l.\text{bound} \\ \text{AccessesToAbove}(s) &= \text{TileSize}(s) \cdot \text{TilesFetched}(s) \quad (4) \\ \text{Usage}(m) &= \sum_{s \in \text{Storage}(m)} \text{TileSize}(s) \\ \text{Energy}(m) &= \sum_{s \in \text{Storage}(m)} \text{Accesses}(m) \cdot \text{AccessEnergy}(m) \\ \text{Latency}(m) &= \text{Accesses}(m) / \text{Bandwidth}(m) \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we calculate compute latency and energy, then aggregate across components:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Latency}_{\text{Compute}} &= \text{Computes} / \text{UtilizedComputeUnits} \\ \text{Energy}_{\text{Compute}} &= \text{Computes} \cdot \text{PerComputeEnergy} \\ \text{Latency} &= \max \left(\max_{m \in \text{memories}} \text{Latency}(m), \text{Latency}_{\text{Compute}} \right) \\ \text{Energy} &= \text{ComputeEnergy} + \sum_{m \in \text{memories}} \text{Energy}(m) \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

This model is like other analytical models [13, 25]. The expressions here are computed symbolically, forming the tile-shape-only model, which accepts numerical tile shapes to generate numerical latency and energy values. Then, complex calculations (such as finding all loops above a given storage node) resolve to simple variable substitutions.

Finally, the model we discussed is simplified for clarity; TCM’s model supports many other optimizations, including those not

supported in prior work [22, 25]. These optimizations can also be modeled as sum-of-product and max expressions⁵.

5.4 Exploring Tile Shapes

After choosing dataplacement and dataflow, we must explore tile shapes. Concretely, we must choose numerical values for $\text{TileShapes} = \{b_1, \dots, b_n\}$, where each b_i is a loop bound in the mapping for which we must provide a numerical value. Because each b_i has many choices, and the full space scales exponentially with the number of loops, the full space is very large (up to more than 10^{10} choices).

To address this exponential growth, we explore loop bound values for one loop at a time, starting from the innermost loops,⁶ and prune our tile shape choices as we make them (i.e., we want to prune *partial tile shapes*). With full tile shapes, it is straightforward to detect whether one set of tile shapes is better than another: we can simply call the model, $\text{TileShapeOnlyModel}(b_1, \dots, b_n)$, compare the results, and prune the worse choice. However, partial tile shapes cannot be evaluated with the model, so we create a different *pruning criteria* for partial tile shapes.

5.4.1 Pruning Criteria for Partial Tile Shapes. We generate the pruning criteria from the optimization objectives (e.g., latency or energy), but each criterion can be evaluated using information within the partial tile shapes. Moreover, each criterion is marked as “minimize,” “maximize,” or “cannot compare.” A choice of partial shapes is better than another choice if it is better in all “maximize” and “minimize” criteria (lower in all “minimize” criterion and higher in all “maximize” criterion) and exactly matches in all “cannot compare” criteria.

To describe how we generate our pruning criteria, suppose we are in the middle of the exploration, and we have generated all loop bounds for loops $\{k_1, \dots, k_m\}$, but not for loops $\{u_1, \dots, u_p\}$ (the known and unknown loop bounds respectively). Before choosing another loop to explore, we prune the choices we have generated (i.e., the values for loops k_i). Since we cannot fully evaluate the model without numerical values for u_i , we create various criteria C_i , which are dependent only on known tile shapes, $C_i = C_i(k_1, \dots, k_m)$.

We create criteria by applying rewrite rules to the $\text{TileShapeOnlyModel}$ as starting criteria (one criterion for latency, one for energy, and one for usage of every resource). The most common rule is *partitioning* a criterion. For example, suppose we want to minimize GLB usage by tiles of tensors A and B .

$$\text{GLB Usage} = \text{TileSize}(A) + \text{TileSize}(B) = k_0 + u_0 u_1 \quad (7)$$

The value of k_0 is known, while u_0, u_1 are unknown and independent of k_0 (we know the tile size of A but not B). Then GLB usage is minimized if we minimize both A tile size (k_0) and B tile size ($u_0 u_1$). So, we partition the GLB usage expression into two criteria, one for each term, to be minimized.

⁵Supported optimizations include separated and/or combined read/write bandwidths, varied read and write costs for each tensor, varied quantization for each tensor, additional components such as networks and processing stages (e.g., quantization), heterogeneous compute units (e.g., choose between a MAC array and a scalar engine), and more complex network communication topologies (e.g., multicast and reduction networks).

⁶At each iteration, we explore options for the loop that will remove the most unknowns from objective formulas. This leads to greater pruning because fewer unknowns means that we can perform fewer partitions of objective functions and Pareto prune with fewer criteria.

However, not all criteria need to be considered, and we can apply another rule: *dropping symbols*. In our example, the criterion u_0u_1 is independent of k_0 and only involves symbols with unknown values. At this point in the exploration, we can ignore u_0u_1 because we are only pruning choices for k_0 . In general, we partition formulas until they are small enough to either evaluate or drop. We can partition minimizations, maximizations, sums, and products.

Sometimes, there are tile shape interactions that must be included in the criteria we evaluate. For example, if we have enumerated tile shape choices for loop *for* x_i in $[0, X_i)$ but not the next-outermost loop of the same rank variable *for* x_{i+1} in $[0, X_{i+1})$, then choices for X_i constrain future choices of X_{i+1} because X_iX_{i+1} must evenly divide X . In such cases, we include X_i as a “cannot compare” criterion such that each X_i choice yields a different set of X_{i+1} choices.

Finally, while not listed here for conciseness, there are simple rewrite rules for simplifying expressions such as algebraic simplifications (e.g., $\frac{k_1k_2}{k_1} = k_2$) and dropping constants (e.g., minimizing $5x$ is equivalent to minimizing x).

5.5 Why TCM is Optimal

TCM finds optimal mappings because it (1) explores every non-pruned mapping and (2) ensures all pruning is optimality-preserving.

To ensure pruning is optimality-preserving, we look at each pruning strategy employed:

- **Loop Pruning:** We eliminate a loop, and thus any mappings including that loop, because we know that placing the loop somewhere else would yield the same or better memory usage and accesses to every memory level. Therefore, we know that there exists a better mapping in our mapspace (that same mapping with the loop placed elsewhere).
- **Dataflow Pruning:** We avoid exploring a dataflow if and only if another explored dataflow is identical in every possible mapping statistic.
- **Partial Tile Shape Pruning:** We prune a set of tile shape choices if and only if another set of tile shape choices is Pareto-better in all of memory accesses, memory usage, latency, and energy, and would yield the same options for future choices.

Since no pruning strategy eliminates a potentially-optimal mapping, TCM keeps all Pareto-optimal mappings. While we cannot predict optimizations that will be invented in the future, our optimality guarantee applies in a superset of the mapspaces of many prior works [13, 14, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30].

6 Evaluation

Key Takeaway: TCM prunes the search space by many orders of magnitude to quickly find optimal mappings. Prior works are unable to find optimal mappings even given orders-of-magnitude more runtime.

This section shows that TCM finds the optimal mapping within a feasible runtime. Because TCM always includes choices that can lead to optimal mappings in the searched space, the best mapping found by TCM is optimal. Our first result shows that the pruning and model currying we propose speeds up the exploration enough that TCM finishes within a feasible runtime (e.g., approximately 17 seconds for GPT-3 6.7B). Then, we compare TCM to prior works,

showing that the mapping found by TCM has significantly lower EDP (geomean 2.1 $\times$) given equal runtime budget, and still meaningfully lower EDP (geomean 1.2 $\times$) even when prior mappers are allowed 1000 $\times$ the runtime.

6.1 Experiment Setup

TCM supports user-configurable hardware and workload configurations. We use two workloads and two hardware configurations.

6.1.1 Workloads. Workloads used are GPT-3 6.7B [6] and MobileNetV3 [12]. GPT-3 workload includes one decoder layer, including embedding, multi-headed self-attention, and feedforward layers. We label the Einsums as follows.

- Q, K, V: the query, key, and value projection in GPT-3.
- Z: the output projection in GPT-3.
- QK, AV: multi-head attention computation in GPT-3.
- FFA, FFB: feedforward layer in GPT-3.
- P: pointwise convolution in MobileNetV3.
- D: depthwise convolution in MobileNetV3.

6.1.2 Architecture. GPT-3 workloads are run on a TPU-V4i-like [17, 18] datacenter accelerator, and MobileNetV3 workloads are run on an NVDLA-like [1, 23] edge accelerator. TPU-V4i configuration is taken from the papers, and includes compute energy, access energy of each memory level, and bandwidths of each memory level (including DRAM). It includes a 128MB global buffer and four PEs. Each PE has a 4MB local buffer and a 128×128 array of MACs and registers (holding one weight value each). The array multicasts inputs on one dimension and reduces outputs on the other.

The NVDLA-like configuration is taken from public data [1]. Access energy and bandwidths are modeled using HWComponents [5, 32, 37]. It includes a 64kb global buffer and a 32×192 MAC array that reuses inputs along the 32-long dimension and reduces outputs along the 192-long dimension.

6.2 Validated Model

The hardware model is based on the validated LoopTree [11] model and component energies are modeled with HWComponents [3, 5, 37]. We validate our model against LoopTree, Timeloop, and CiMLoop [5, 11, 25] and it yields identical results.

Additionally, our open-source release includes additional models, including five fabricated [15, 20, 29, 33–36] and four simulated [4, 27, 28, 39] chips. Each of these chips is verified under a range of workloads and operating conditions (e.g., varied supply voltage) and match energy, area, and latency within 10% of published data. Information on these models can be found in [5].

6.3 TCM Prunes by Orders-Of-Magnitude

Here, we show how each of our optimizations affects the number of mappings that must be evaluated. We show results for GPT-3 6.7B prefill with batch 64 and sequence length 65,536. MobileNetV3 is shown with batch 64.

Table 2 shows the total number of mappings, the number of unpruned mappings that must be evaluated by TCM, and the reduction. Across Einsums, the mapspace size varies (10^{23} – 10^{37}) because the number of ranks and the shape of tensors vary. But even for

Workload	Einsum	# Mappings (orders of magnitude)		
		Total	Non-Pruned	Reduction
GPT-3	V, K, Q, Z	36	7	29
	QK, AV	37	6	30
	FFA, FFB	30	7	22
MobileNetV3	D0	28	5	24
	D1, D2	30	5	25
	P0	21	4	17
	P1, P2	23	4	19

Table 2: Number of total and non-pruned mappings that must be evaluated by TCM. Einsums with the same results are on the same row. (e.g., Einsums V, K, Q, and Z each have 10^{36} mappings before pruning and 10^7 mappings after). Pruning rate (reduction) increases with larger mapspaces, making the number of non-pruned mappings always tractable.




Figure 6: Search size reduction by each of our optimizations. The Y axis is multiplicative and cumulative. For example, the first bar shows that for Einsum V, Tile Shape Pruning reduces search size by ~ 9 orders of magnitude, Tile Shape and Dataflow Pruning together reduce search size by ~ 28 orders of magnitude, and all three together reduce search size by ~ 29 orders of magnitude. All optimizations are essential to make this exploration feasible as each reduces search size by orders of magnitude.

the largest mapspace, TCM produces a tractable number of non-pruned mappings to evaluate (at most 10^7 mappings). In fact, across all Einsums, the pruning rate varies between 10^{19} – 10^{30} , generally increasing as the size of the mapspace increases.

To show how TCM achieves these pruning rates, Fig. 6 breaks down mapspace size reductions into Tile Shape Pruning, Dataflow Pruning, and Partial Tile Shape Pruning. We can see that Dataflow Pruning is most effective, followed by Tile Shape Pruning, and finally Partial Tile Shape Pruning. All three are essential to make mapspace exploration feasible; the weakest, Partial-Tile-Shape pruning, still reduces search size by up to seven orders of magnitude.

6.4 Pruning Rate Increases in Larger Mapspaces

As mapspace size increases, pruning rate increases as well, making TCM effective for exploring even extremely large mapspaces. To show why, Fig. 7 shows how the mapspace size and pruned mapspace size scale for the TPU-v4i-like accelerator running matrix multiplication workload with varied-size matrices and with additional ranks.

As matrix size increases (see Fig. 7, left), the number of tile shapes increases because there are more possible tile shapes. However, after pruning, the number of mappings increases at a much slower rate. This is for two reasons. First, loop pruning, in removing loops, eliminates more tile shape options because it removes the possible bounds for those loops. Then, partial tile shape pruning eliminates more tile shapes early on, because more tile shapes tend to be invalid or suboptimal. The one decrease in the plot—when moving from a matrix size of 2^{11} to 2^{12} —occurs when the matrices become too large to fit in the TPU-v4i local buffers, and partial tile shape pruning quickly prunes these invalid tile shapes early on.

As the number of ranks increases (right half of Fig. 7), the number of mappings increases as the number of loop orders increases. Each additional loop multiplies the number of dataflows (as the number of loop orders increases with the factorial of the number of elements in a set). However, this growth is entirely prevented by Dataflow Pruning, because we explore datapacements, not loop orders.

6.5 TCM’s Fast Model Yields 400× Speedup

Here, we show how the curried model affects overall runtime. We test GPT-3 Einsum QK, showing the runtime of TCM while using three different models:

- **Full (Python):** Our model without currying. This model is a basic, non-optimized Python model.
- **Full (C++):** An optimized C++ Timeloop [25] model.




Figure 7: Mapspace size scaling, with and without pruning, for matrix multiplies on a TPU-v4i-like accelerator. (Left) Mapspace size scaling with matrix size, with three total ranks (M , N , and K). (Right) Mapspace size scaling with the number of ranks, with matrix dimensions $M = N = K = 16384$ and additional size-1 ranks added to the weight tensor. As mapspace expands, pruning becomes more effective, keeping search size tractable even for very large mapspaces.




Figure 8: (Left) Model speed comparison. The curried model reduces runtime by 40× and 400× versus full Python and C++ implementations, respectively. (Right) Runtime breakdown with the curried model. The curried model is very fast, and the overall runtime is dominated by other parts of the mapper.

- **Curried:** Our two-step curried model, written in Python. It is first partially evaluated only with dataflow and dataplacement (16 times), then is partially evaluated (2M times) with tile shapes.

Fig. 8 shows the runtime of the full TCM while using each model for all evaluations. We see that the curried model is significantly faster than the C++ and Python models, reducing runtime by 40× and 400×, respectively.

Fig. 8 shows the runtime breakdown; with currying, the model is fast enough that runtime is suboptimal by making pruning criteria (Section 5.4) and pruning mappings. Partial evaluation of the model for each dataplacement and dataflow, occurring 16 times in this experiment, consumes < 5% of the runtime. Finally, the tile-shape-only model, which has been partially evaluated (going from thousands of lines of Python to a handful of sum-of-product and max expressions), consumed < 0.1% of runtime, despite being called two million times.

6.6 TCM Is Optimal in Seconds; Prior Works Fail to Find Optimal in Hours

In this subsection, we compare against prior mappers. We run GPT-3 6.7B Einsum QK on TPU-V4i-like with batch size 64 and sequence length 65,536. We compare to the following mappers:

- **Timeloop** [25] is a commonly used prior mapper that uses random sampling to explore the mapspace.
- **Timeloop+Hint** reflects a common use case of Timeloop, in which users define mapspace constraints to speed up mapping. We implement a common constraint: the mapping must spatially utilize the full MAC arrays.
- **LOMA**, integrated into the ZigZag [22] framework, first creates tile shapes, then explores dataflows and datapacements for these shapes. LOMA constrains mappings to fully utilize PEs and MACs (like Timeloop+Hint).

We note that the full-utilization constraints in Timeloop+Hint and LOMA are not guaranteed to be optimal (e.g., would yield only invalid mappings if the MAC array is very large and needs tiles too

Runtime	Best EDP (normalized) found			
	t_0	$10 \times t_0$	$100 \times t_0$	$1000 \times t_0$
Timeloop	16444	1126	116	6.48
Timeloop+Hint	3.81	1.41	1.41	1.12
LOMA	1.28	1.28	1.28	1.21
TCM	1	Completed		

Table 3: EDP comparison of TCM and prior mappers given various runtimes (lower is better). TCM finds an optimal mapping in $t_0 = 17$ seconds. Prior mappers fail to find an optimal mapping even when given 1000× the runtime (5 hours).

large for the local buffer). However, in this particular case, these constraints preserve the known optimal mapping (found by TCM).

We first run TCM to completion (~ 17 seconds). We run Timeloop given various timeouts and report the best mapping found. LOMA results are generated by varying LOMA’s LPF setting (described in [30]), which constrains tile shape choices to reduce runtime. We report the best mapping found by LOMA in the most comprehensive mapspace (highest LPF setting) that finishes within each time limit. Because LOMA is single-threaded, for fairness, we also only use one thread for TCM and Timeloop (both of which can parallelize).

Table 3 compared the best EDP found. Within TCM’s runtime (t_0), all baselines are far from optimal. Timeloop, which samples randomly, has a very high EDP because of severe underutilization of the MAC array (tile shapes that perfectly utilize the array shape are rare). Timeloop+Hint has significantly better EDP, but still picks poor dataflows and tile shapes, often increasing energy and/or latency with excessive off-chip fetches. LOMA quickly achieves a fair EDP (1.28× optimal) because it includes additional heuristics (always fully utilize spatial units, optimize accesses for one level at a time); however, it improves only marginally with more runtime.

We note that TCM also guarantees optimality, while Timeloop and LOMA can only do so with full exploration of the mapspace (which would require an infeasible $> 10^{20} \times$ additional runtime).

6.7 TCM Mappings And Hardware Tradeoffs

To show the tradeoffs to consider in creating an optimal mapping and why TCM can find them quickly, Fig. 9 shows the optimal mapping found for GPT3-6.7B [6] running on TPU-V4i-like with batch size 64 and sequence length 65,536. We show mappings for Einsums Q and QK , annotating the goals of the mapper at each level.

Looking at these mappings, we can make multiple observations:

- There are many tradeoffs to consider. TCM simultaneously balances the reuse of every tensor at every memory level, often doing things like bypassing memory levels to further reduce memory usage and the memory access energy.
- Tradeoffs change across different Einsums. Notice that the mapping for Einsum Q keeps two tensors in GLB and balances reuse of both tensors using spatial loops, while the mapping for Einsum QK keeps only one tensor in GLB. Meanwhile, notice that the mapping for Q puts the batch b loop all the way at the bottom to leverage WQ reuse at multiple levels, while the mapping for QK puts the batch loop all the




Figure 9: (Left) Mapping for Einsum Q , and (Right) Mapping for Einsum QK , annotated with the goals the mapper is attempting to accomplish at each level. Memory levels are DRAM (omitted), global buffer (GLB), local buffer (LLB), and reg. S-for denotes spatial loops. Notice that there are many tradeoffs to consider, including capturing reuse to minimize refetches, fully utilizing spatial units, and ensuring that no memories are overprovisioned.

way at the top because this Einsum has no reuse opportunity across b iterations.

- Tradeoffs interact with one another across multiple memory levels. Notice the $m0$ loop on the bottom of the mapping for Q . We’d get maximum WQ reuse in reg if this loop bound was larger; however, that would limit the m available for spatial parallelism at the PE level, and also increase the tile size of I and Q that must be stored in the LLB.

7 Case Study: TCM For Optimizing Architectures

Key Takeaway: TCM enables lower-EDP accelerators and accurately informs design space explorations, while prior works misinform design space explorations because mapper limitations make their results unclear.

To show the usefulness of TCM, we perform a design space exploration. This reflects a common goal for architecture designers; we would like to test many configurations of an accelerator and model how it will perform executing a benchmark.

In this exploration, we vary the size of the TPU global buffer between 64kB and 16MB while running the GPT3-6.7B [6] workload on TPU-V4i-like with batch size 64 and sequence length 65,536. We also change the local buffer size to 16kB and, to yield more interesting mappings to explore, enable new dataplacement options, including letting any tensor bypass the global buffer and local buffer.

We compare TCM, Timeloop+Hint [25], and LOMA [22, 30]. Timeloop without a hint is omitted, as its outputs are both far from optimal and too noisy to be used to inform a design space exploration. To ensure that the baselines return reasonable results, we give them 10× the runtime of TCM.




Figure 10: TCM accurately informs design space explorations, while prior works do not because mapper limitations hide the effect of architecture changes.

Fig. 10 shows the energy-area-delay-product (EADP) of the accelerator at each global buffer size. We can see that TCM produces a smooth curve, with a clear minimum in the range of 512kB-1MB.

The baselines, however, tell different and misleading stories. Timeloop+Hint reports that the best EADP can be found at a global 16MB global buffer size (16% off optimal) while LOMA reports that the best global buffer size is 4MB (6% off optimal).

Moreover, both baselines obscure the impact of this architecture decision because their results are a result of mapper limitations, not architecture changes. Timeloop+Hint steadily improves as global buffer size increases because it becomes easier to find valid mappings. Meanwhile, LOMA fails to find valid mappings for global buffer sizes less than 1MB and produces far-from-optimal mappings for other global buffer sizes. This is because, rather than performing a comprehensive search, LOMA forces full spatial utilization then optimizes one memory level at a time. This leads to the optimizer picking large tiles that overwhelm the global buffer.

Fig. 11 shows the energy breakdown of the accelerator at small (64kB), optimal (1MB), and large (16MB) global buffer sizes. To make differences clearer, we omit large unavoidable costs of performing MAC operations and writeback of the output tensor QK to DRAM (which TCM does only once). Note that these costs dominate overall energy overall delta can be seen Fig. 10.

We can see different effects taking place at each global buffer size. For the small global buffer, TCM cannot capture all reuse at the GLB level and must tile, leading to tensor Q being refetched many times from DRAM. Increasing global buffer size to the optimal level lets TCM capture additional reuse and reduce the amount of Q tiling. However, the larger global buffer now has higher K energy because larger memories consume more energy to access. As the global buffer size and access energy increase further, this trend continues, with higher global buffer K energy and lower DRAM Q energy.

Notice that the optimal global buffer size is *not* big enough to capture all reuse; rather it balances a large global buffer to reduce DRAM fetches and a small global buffer to reduce access energy. The sweet spot will change for different workloads, architectures, and technologies, so it is critical to have a mapper that can effectively identify the optimal tradeoff.




Figure 11: TCM balances the energy of multiple memory levels to yield low-energy accelerators. The optimal design uses a moderately-sized global buffer to reduce DRAM accesses while costing moderate global buffer access energy. To make differences clearer, we omit irreducible costs of MACs and writeback of the output tensor QK to DRAM (which TCM does only once), noting that Fig. 10 includes all components.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown the important new concept of *data-placement*, which, alongside dataflow and tile shapes, provides a clear way to understand and analyze mappings. Defining and decoupling dataplacement lets us perform new mapping analyses, letting us identify and prune suboptimal choices and create a much more efficient curried model. We show that these improvements make it possible, for the first time, to fully explore mapspaces and find optimal mappings, yielding better accelerator energy, throughput, and latency.

References

- [1] [n. d.]. *NVIDIA Deep Learning Accelerator*. <http://nvidia.org/primer.html>
- [2] Manoj Alwani, Han Chen, Michael Ferdman, and Peter Milder. 2016. Fused-layer CNN accelerators. In *2016 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MICRO.2016.7783725>
- [3] Tanner Andrusis. [n. d.]. *HWComponents*. <https://github.com/Accelergy-Project/hwcomponents>
- [4] Tanner Andrusis, Joel S. Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2023. RAELLA: Reforming the Arithmetic for Efficient, Low-Resolution, and Low-Loss Analog PIM: No Retraining Required!. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Orlando, FL, USA) (ISCA '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 27, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579371.3589062>
- [5] Tanner Andrusis, Joel S. Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2024. CiMLoop: A Flexible, Accurate, and Fast Compute-In-Memory Modeling Tool. In *2024 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. 10–23. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPASS61541.2024.00012>
- [6] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Chris Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. Language Models are Few-Shot Learners. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, Vol. 33. Curran Associates, Inc., 1877–1901. <https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfc4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html>
- [7] Jingwei Cai, Yuchen Wei, Zuocong Wu, Sen Peng, and Kaisheng Ma. 2023. Inter-Layer Scheduling Space Definition and Exploration for Tiled Accelerators. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Orlando, FL, USA) (ISCA '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 13, 17 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579371.3589048>
- [8] Yu-Hsin Chen, Joel Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2016. Eyeriss: A Spatial Architecture for Energy-Efficient Dataflow for Convolutional Neural Networks. In *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 367–379. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2016.40>
- [9] Chen, Yu-Hsin and Krishna, Tushar and Emer, Joel and Sze, Vivienne. 2016. Eyeriss: An Energy-Efficient Reconfigurable Accelerator for Deep Convolutional Neural Networks. In *IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference, ISSCC 2016, Digest of Technical Papers*. 262–263.
- [10] Michael Gilbert. 2023. *LoopTree: Enabling Systematic and Flexible Exploration of Fused-layer Dataflow Accelerators*. PhD thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA.
- [11] Michael Gilbert, Yunnan Nellie Wu, Joel S. Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2024. LoopTree: Exploring the Fused-Layer Dataflow Accelerator Design Space. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Artificial Intelligence* 1, 1 (2024), 97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TCASAI.2024.3461716>
- [12] Andrew Howard, Mark Sandler, Bo Chen, Weijun Wang, Liang-Chieh Chen, Mingxing Tan, Grace Chu, Vijay Vasudevan, Yukun Zhu, Ruoming Pang, Hartwig Adam, and Quoc Le. 2019. Searching for MobileNetV3. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*. 1314–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2019.00140>
- [13] Qijing Huang, Minwoo Kang, Grace Dinh, Thomas Norell, Aravind Kalaiah, James Demmel, John Wawrzyniak, and Yakun Sophia Shao. 2021. CoSA: Scheduling by Constrained Optimization for Spatial Accelerators. In *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 554–566. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA52012.2021.00050>
- [14] Qijing Huang, Po-An Tsai, Joel S. Emer, and Angshuman Parashar. 2024. Mind the Gap: Attainable Data Movement and Operational Intensity Bounds for Tensor Algorithms. In *2024 ACM/IEEE 51st Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA59077.2024.00021>
- [15] Hongyang Jia, Hossein Valavi, Yinqi Tang, Jintao Zhang, and Naveen Verma. 2020. A Programmable Heterogeneous Microprocessor Based on Bit-Scalable In-Memory Computing. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* 55, 9 (2020), 2609–2621. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSSC.2020.2987714>
- [16] Zhihao Jia, Matei Zaharia, and Alex Aiken. 2019. Beyond Data and Model Parallelism for Deep Neural Networks. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, A. Talwalkar, V. Smith, and M. Zaharia (Eds.), Vol. 1. 1–13. https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper_files/paper/2019/file/b422680f3db0986ddd7f8f126baaf0a-Paper.pdf
- [17] Norman P. Jouppi, Doe Hyun Yoon, Matthew Ashcraft, Mark Gottscho, Thomas B. Jablin, George Kurian, James Laudon, Sheng Li, Peter Ma, Xiaoyu Ma, Thomas Norrie, Nishant Patil, Sushma Prasad, Cliff Young, Zongwei Zhou, and David Patterson. 2021. Ten Lessons From Three Generations Shaped Google’s TPUv4: Industrial Product. In *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA52012.2021.00010>
- [18] Norman P. Jouppi, Cliff Young, Nishant Patil, David Patterson, Gaurav Agrawal, Raminder Bajwa, Sarah Bates, Suresh Bhatia, Nan Boden, Al Borchers, Rick Boyle, Pierre-luc Cantin, Clifford Chao, Chris Clark, Jeremy Coriell, Mike Daley, Matt Dau, Jeffrey Dean, Ben Gelb, Tara Vazir Ghaemmaghami, Rajendra Gottipati, William Gulland, Robert Hagmann, C. Richard Ho, Doug Hogberg, John Hu, Robert Hundt, Dan Hurt, Julian Ibarz, Aaron Jaffey, Alek Jaworski, Alexander Kaplan, Harshit Khaitan, Daniel Killebrew, Andy Koch, Naveen Kumar, Steve Lacy, James Laudon, James Law, Diemthu Le, Chris Leary, Zhuyuan Liu, Kyle Lucke, Alan Lundin, Gordon MacKean, Adriana Maggiore, Maire Mahony, Kieran Miller, Rahul Nagarajan, Ravi Narayanaswami, Ray Ni, Kathy Nix, Thomas Norrie, Mark Omernick, Narayana Penukonda, Andy Phelps, Jonathan Ross, Matt Ross, Amir Salek, Emad Samadiani, Chris Severn, Gregory Sizikov, Matthew Snelham, Jed Souter, Dan Steinberg, Andy Swing, Mercedes Tan, Gregory Thorson, Bo Tian, Horia Toma, Erick Tuttle, Vijay Vasudevan, Richard Walter, Walter Wang, Eric Wilcox, and Doe Hyun Yoon. 2017. In-datacenter performance analysis of a tensor processing unit. In *2017 ACM/IEEE 44th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3079856.3080246>
- [19] Sheng-Chun Kao and Tushar Krishna. 2020. GAMMA: Automating the HW Mapping of DNN Models on Accelerators via Genetic Algorithm. In *2020 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*. 1–9.
- [20] Hyunjoon Kim, Taegyeon Yoo, Tony Tae-Hyoung Kim, and Bongjin Kim. 2021. Colonnade: A Reconfigurable SRAM-Based Digital Bit-Serial Compute-In-Memory Macro for Processing Neural Networks. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* 56, 7 (2021), 2221–2233. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSSC.2021.3061508>
- [21] Hyoukjun Kwon, Prasantha Chatarasi, Vivek Sarkar, Tushar Krishna, Michael Pellauer, and Angshuman Parashar. 2020. MAESTRO: A Data-Centric Approach to Understand Reuse, Performance, and Hardware Cost of DNN Mappings. *IEEE Micro* 40, 3 (2020), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1109/MM.2020.2985963>
- [22] Linyan Mei, Pouya Houshmand, Vikram Jain, Sebastian Giraldo, and Marian Verhelst. 2021. ZigZag: Enlarging Joint Architecture-Mapping Design Space Exploration for DNN Accelerators. *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 70, 8 (2021), 1160–1174. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TC.2021.3059962>
- [23] NVIDIA. 2025. *NVIDIA DGX B200*. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/dgx-b200/> Accessed: August 1, 2025.
- [24] MohammadHossein Olyaiy, Christopher Ng, Alexandra Sasha Fedorova, and Mieszko Lis. 2023. Sunstone: A Scalable and Versatile Scheduler for Mapping Tensor Algebra on Spatial Accelerators. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. 259–271. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPASS57527.2023.00033>

- [25] Angshuman Parashar, Priyanka Raina, Yakun Sophia Shao, Yu-Hsin Chen, Victor A. Ying, Anurag Mukkara, Rangharajan Venkatesan, Bruce Khailany, Stephen W. Keckler, and Joel Emer. 2019. Timeloop: A Systematic Approach to DNN Accelerator Evaluation. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on Performance Analysis of Systems and Software (ISPASS)*. 304–315. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISPASS.2019.00042>
- [26] Chirag Sakhuja, Zhan Shi, and Calvin Lin. 2023. Leveraging Domain Information for the Efficient Automated Design of Deep Learning Accelerators. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*. 287–301. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA56546.2023.10071095>
- [27] Ali Shafiee, Anirban Nag, Naveen Muralimanoahar, Rajeev Balasubramonian, John Paul Strachan, Miao Hu, R. Stanley Williams, and Vivek Srikumar. 2016. ISAAC: A Convolutional Neural Network Accelerator with In-Situ Analog Arithmetic in Crossbars. In *2016 ACM/IEEE 43rd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2016.12>
- [28] Kyle Shiflett, Avinash Karanth, Razvan Bunescu, and Ahmedouri. 2021. Al-bireo: energy-efficient acceleration of convolutional neural networks via silicon photonics. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Virtual Event, Spain) (ISCA '21)*. IEEE Press, 860–873. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA52012.2021.00072>
- [29] Mahmut E. Sinangil, Burak Erbagci, Rawan Naous, Kerem Akarvardar, Dar Sun, Win-San Khwa, Hung-Jen Liao, Yih Wang, and Jonathan Chang. 2021. A 7-nm Compute-in-Memory SRAM Macro Supporting Multi-Bit Input, Weight and Output and Achieving 351 TOPS/W and 372.4 GOPS. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* 56, 1 (2021), 188–198. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSSC.2020.3031290>
- [30] Arne Symons, Linyan Mei, and Marian Verhelst. 2021. LOMA: Fast Auto-Scheduling on DNN Accelerators through Loop-Order-based Memory Allocation. In *2021 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence Circuits and Systems (AICAS)*. 1–4. <https://doi.org/10.1109/AICAS51828.2021.9458493>
- [31] Vivienne Sze, Yu-Hsin Chen, Tien-Ju Yang, and Joel S. Emer. 2020. Efficient Processing of Deep Neural Networks. *Synthesis Lectures on Computer Architecture* 15, 2 (2020), 1–341. <https://doi.org/10.2200/S01004ED1V01Y202004CAC050> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.2200/S01004ED1V01Y202004CAC050>
- [32] Shyamkumar Thoziyoor, Jung Ho Ahn, Matteo Monchiero, Jay B. Brockman, and Norman P. Jouppi. 2008. A Comprehensive Memory Modeling Tool and Its Application to the Design and Analysis of Future Memory Hierarchies. In *2008 International Symposium on Computer Architecture*. 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISCA.2008.16>
- [33] Weier Wan, Rajkumar Kubendran, S. Burc Eryilmaz, Wenqiang Zhang, Yan Liao, Dabin Wu, Stephen Deiss, Bin Gao, Priyanka Raina, Siddharth Joshi, Huaqiang Wu, Gert Cauwenberghs, and H.-S. Philip Wong. 2020. 33.1 A 74 TMACS/W CMOS-RRAM Neurosynaptic Core with Dynamically Reconfigurable Dataflow and In-situ Transposable Weights for Probabilistic Graphical Models. In *2020 IEEE International Solid-State Circuits Conference - (ISSCC)*. 498–500. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISSCC19947.2020.9062979>
- [34] Weier Wan, Rajkumar Kubendran, Clemens Schaefer, Sukru Burc Eryilmaz, Wenqiang Zhang, Dabin Wu, Stephen Deiss, Priyanka Raina, He Qian, Bin Gao, Siddharth Joshi, Huaqiang Wu, H.-S. Philip Wong, and Gert Cauwenberghs. 2022. A compute-in-memory chip based on resistive random-access memory. *Nature* 608, 7923 (Aug. 2022), 504–512. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04992-8> Number: 7923 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [35] Hechen Wang, Renzhi Liu, Richard Dorrance, Deepak Dasalukunte, Dan Lake, and Brent Carlton. 2023. A Charge Domain SRAM Compute-in-Memory Macro With C-2C Ladder-Based 8-Bit MAC Unit in 22-nm FinFET Process for Edge Inference. *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* 58, 4 (2023), 1037–1050. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSSC.2022.3232601>
- [36] Hechen Wang, Renzhi Liu, Richard Dorrance, Deepak Dasalukunte, Xiaosen Liu, Dan Lake, Brent Carlton, and May Wu. 2022. A 32.2 TOPS/W SRAM Compute-in-Memory Macro Employing a Linear 8-bit C-2C Ladder for Charge Domain Computation in 22nm for Edge Inference. In *2022 IEEE Symposium on VLSI Technology and Circuits (VLSI Technology and Circuits)*. 36–37. <https://doi.org/10.1109/VLSITechnologyandCirc46769.2022.9830322>
- [37] Yannan Nellie Wu, Joel S. Emer, and Vivienne Sze. 2019. Accelerger: An Architecture-Level Energy Estimation Methodology for Accelerator Designs. In *2019 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Computer-Aided Design (ICCAD)*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCAD45719.2019.8942149>
- [38] Size Zheng, Siyuan Chen, Siyuan Gao, Liancheng Jia, Guangyu Sun, Runsheng Wang, and Yun Liang. 2023. TileFlow: A Framework for Modeling Fusion Dataflow via Tree-Based Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (<conf-loc>, <city>Toronto</city>, <state>ON</state>, <country>Canada</country>, </conf-loc>)* (MICRO '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1271–1288. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3613424.3623792>
- [39] Zhizhen Zhong, Mingran Yang, Jay Lang, Christian Williams, Liam Kronman, Alexander Sludds, Homa Esfahanizadeh, Dirk Englund, and Manya Ghobadi. 2023. Lightning: A Reconfigurable Photonic-Electronic SmartNIC for Fast and Energy-Efficient Inference. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM 2023 Conference* (New York, NY, USA) (ACM SIGCOMM '23). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 452–472. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3603269.3604821>