

How Amdahl's law restricts supercomputer applications and building ever bigger supercomputers

János Végh^a

^a*University of Miskolc, Hungary
Department of Mechanical Engineering and Informatics
3515 Miskolc-University Town, Hungary*

Abstract

This paper reinterprets Amdahl's law in terms of execution time and applies this simple model to supercomputing. The systematic discussion results in a quantitative measure of computational efficiency of supercomputers and supercomputing applications, explains why supercomputers have different efficiencies when using different benchmarks, and why a new supercomputer intended to be the 1st on the TOP500 list utilizes only 12 % of its processors to achieve the 4th place only. Through separating non-parallelizable contribution to fractions according to their origin, Amdahl's law enables to derive a timeline for supercomputers (quite similar to Moore's law) and describes why Amdahl's law limits the size of supercomputers. The paper validates that Amdahl's 50-years old model (with slight extension) correctly describes the performance limitations of the present supercomputers. Using some simple and reasonable assumptions, absolute performance bound of supercomputers is concluded, furthermore that serious enhancements are still necessary to achieve the exaFLOPS dream value.

Keywords: supercomputer, parallelization, performance, scaling, figure of merit, efficiency

1. Introduction

Supercomputers do have a quarter of century history for now, see TOP500.org (2016). The number of processors raised exponentially from the initial just-a-few processors, see Dongarra (1992), to several millions, see Fu et al. (2016),

Email address: J.Vegh@uni-miskolc.hu (János Végh)

and increased their computational performance (as well as electric power consumption) even more impressively. Supercomputers provide their R_{max} and R_{peak} parameters when running a benchmark using all their processors, but when needing not all available processors of a supercomputer and running programs other than benchmarks, they give not much hints for the effective computational performance for the case in question. Amdahl's law about parallelly working systems introduces serious limitations on the joint performance, so it is worth to scrutinize how Amdahl's law can assist in finding out execution time of a program as well as how it affected the operational characteristics of supercomputers.

As discussed by P. J. Denning and T.G. Lewis (2017), "*Moore's Law is one small component in an exponentially growing planetary computing ecosystem*". Using some simple assumptions, they prove that from more closely Moore's law is described by an S-curve rather than an infinite exponential. Indeed, from the many components involved one can conclude different saturation points. The fact that no more transistors can increase functionality of the present processors in a reasonable way, caused a saturation about a decade ago (and started the age of multi-cores, because density of transistors is not yet saturated). Reaching the lithographic limits forced only introducing manufacturing tricks, but reaching the size of atoms will surely cause a saturation, so the industry is about to prepare for the post-Moore era, see IEEE (2017).

Supercomputers with ever bigger computational power are planned. As shown below, Amdahl's law represents another "*small component in an exponentially growing planetary computing ecosystem*".

2. Amdahl's classic analyzis

The most commonly known and cited limitation of the parallelization speedup (see Amdahl (1967), the so called *Amdahl's law*) is based on considering the fact that some parts (P_i) of a code can be parallelized, some (S_i) must remain sequential. It was early given by Amdahl, although the formula itself was constructed later by his successors. Amdahl only wanted to draw the attention to the fact, that when putting together several single processors, and using **SPA**, the available speed gain due to using large-scale computing capabilities has a theoretical upper bound. He also mentioned that data housekeeping (non-payload calculations) causes some overhead, and that *the nature of that overhead appears to be sequential*.




Figure 1: Illustrating Amdahl’s law for idealistic and realistic cases. For legend see text.

The classic interpretation implies three¹ essential restrictions, but those restrictions are rarely mentioned (an exception: Karp and Flatt (1990)) in the textbooks on parallelization:

- the parallelized parts are of equal length in terms of execution time
- the housekeeping (controlling the parallelization, passing parameters, waiting for termination, exchanging messages, etc.) has no costs in terms of execution time
- the number of parallelizable chunks coincides with the number of available computing resources

Essentially, this is why *Amdahl’s law represents a theoretical upper limit for parallelization gain*. In Fig 1 the original process in the single-processor system comprises the sequential only parts S_i , and the parallelizable parts

¹Another essential point which was missed by both Karp and Flatt (1990) and P. J. Denning and T.G. Lewis (2017), that *the same computing model was used in all computers considered*.

P_i . One can also see that the control components C_i (not shown on the left side of the figure) are of the same nature as S_i , the non-parallelizable components. This also means that even in the idealistic case when S_i are negligible, C_i will create a bound for parallelization, *independently of their origin*.

2.1. Amdahl's case under realistic conditions

The realistic case (shown in the right side of Fig 1) is, however, that the parallelized parts are *not* of equal length (even if they contain exactly the same instructions), the hardware operation in modern processors may execute them in considerably different times; for examples see Végh et al. (2014) and Hennessy and Patterson (2007), and references cited therein; the operation of hardware accelerators inside a core; the network operation between processors; etc. One can also see that the time required to control parallelization is not negligible and varying. This represents another performance bound.

The figure also calls the attention to that the static correspondence between program chunks and processing units can be very inefficient: all assigned processing units must wait the delayed unit and also some capacity is lost if the number of computing resources exceeds the number of parallelized chunks.

It is much worse, if the number of the processing units is smaller than that of parallelized threads: the processor must organize several "rounds" for remaining threads, with all disadvantages of the duty of synchronization, see Yavits et al. (2014); David et al. (2013). Also, the longer code chunks P_i are, the higher is the chance to waste computing capacity of the processing units which already finished their task. Note that here the programmer (the person or the compiler) has to organize the job, in the spirit of *Single Processor Approach* (SPA): at some point the single processor splits the execution, transmits necessary parameters to some other processing units, starts their processing, then waits termination of the started processings. Real-life programs show sequential-parallel behavior, with variable degree of parallelization, see Yavits et al. (2014) and even apparently massively parallel algorithms change their behavior during processing, see Pingali et al. (2011). All these make Amdahl's original mode non-applicable.

2.2. Factors affecting parallelism

Usually, Amdahl's law is expressed with the formula

$$S^{-1} = (1 - \alpha) + \alpha/k \quad (1)$$

where k is the number of parallelized code fragments, α is the ratio of the parallelizable part to total, S is the measurable speedup. The assumption can be visualized that (assuming many processors) in α fraction of the running time processors are processing data, in $(1-\alpha)$ fraction they are waiting (all but one). That is α describes how much, in average, the processors are utilized. Having those data, the resulting speedup can be estimated.

A general misconception (introduced by followers of Amdahl) is to assume that Amdahl's law is valid for software only and that α contains something like ratio of numbers of the corresponding instructions. Actually, *Amdahl's law is valid for any partly parallelizable activity (including computer unrelated ones) and α is given as the ratio of the time spent with parallelizable activity to total time.*

For a system under test, where α is not *a priori* known, one can derive from the measurable speedup S an *effective parallelization* factor as

$$\alpha_{eff} = \frac{k}{k-1} \frac{S-1}{S} \quad (2)$$

Obviously, this is not more than α expressed in terms of S and k from Equ. (1). So, for the classical case, $\alpha = \alpha_{eff}$; which simply means that in *ideal* case the actually measurable effective parallelization achieves the theoretically possible one. In other words, α describes a system the *architecture* of which is completely known, while α_{eff} characterizes a system the *performance* of which is known from experiments. Again in other words, α is the *theoretical upper limit*, which can hardly be achieved, while α_{eff} is the *experimental actual value*, which describes the complex architecture and the actual conditions.

α_{eff} can then be used to refer back to Amdahl's classical assumption even in the realistic case when parallelized chunks have different lengths and the overhead to organize parallelization is not negligible. Speedup S can be measured and α_{eff} can be utilized to characterize the measurement setup and conditions, how much from the theoretically possible maximum parallelization is realized.

Note that in the case of real tasks a kind of Sequential/Parallel Execution Model, see Yavits et al. (2014), shall be applied, which cannot use the simple picture reflected by α , but α_{eff} gives a good merit of degree of parallelization




Figure 2: Behavior of the effective parallelization α_{eff} in function of overhead ratio (compared to parallelizable payload execution length) and ratio of sequential part (compared to total sequential execution time).

for duration of execution of the process on the given hardware configuration, and can be compared to results of technology-dependent parametrized formulas. Numerically $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ equals with the f value, established theoretically by Karp and Flatt (1990). In the case of supercomputer HW, it can measure what fraction of running time spend processors with non-payload activity.

2.3. Applying α_{eff} to Amdahl's model

With our notations, in the classical Amdahl case on the left side in Fig. 1

$$S = \frac{\sum_i S_i + \sum_i P_i}{\sum_i S_i + \max_i P_i} = 2 \quad (3)$$

and

$$\alpha = \alpha_{eff} = \frac{\sum_i P_i}{\sum_i S_i + \sum_i P_i} = 3/4 \quad (4)$$

Now we can compare effective parallelizations in the two cases shown in Fig. 1. In the realistical case $S = 10/7$, which results in

$$\alpha_{eff} = \frac{3 \cdot 10/7 - 1}{2 \cdot 10/7} = 0.45 \quad (5)$$

The overhead and the different duration of the parallelized parts reduced the effective parallelization drastically compared to the theoretically achievable

value. Fig 2 gives a feeling on the effect of computer system behaviour on effective parallelization. The middle region (marked by balls) is mentioned by Amdahl as typical range of overhead. The asterisk in the figure shows the "working point" corresponding to the values used in Fig 1.

One can see that effective parallelization drops quickly with both increasing overhead and sequential parts of the program. This fact draws the attention to the idea that *through decreasing either the control time or the sequential-only fraction of the code (or both), and utilizing the otherwise wasted processing capacity, a serious gain in the effective parallelization can be reached.*

3. Efficiency of parallelization

The distinguished constituent in Amdahl's classic analysis is parallelizable payload fraction α , all the rest (including wait time, communication, system contribution and any other non-payload activity) goes into the "sequential-only" fraction according to this extremely simple model.

When using several processors, one of them makes the sequential-only calculation, the others are waiting (use the same amount of time). So, when calculating the speedup, one calculates

$$S = \frac{(1 - \alpha) + \alpha}{(1 - \alpha) + \alpha/k} = \frac{k}{k(1 - \alpha) + \alpha} \quad (6)$$

hence the *efficiency*² (how speedup scales with the number of processors)

$$E = \frac{S}{k} = \frac{1}{k(1 - \alpha) + \alpha} \quad (7)$$

The importance of producing more efficient parallelization manifests from the very beginnings, see Table 1. It could be observed that supercomputers having an order of magnitude higher number of processors should have an order of magnitude lower value of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ to produce reasonable efficiency. Ironically enough, the higher number of cores is accompanied with lower efficiency, but at the same time, with better $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ value. It looks like

²This quantity is almost exclusively used to describe computing performance of multi-processor systems. In the case of supercomputers, $\frac{R_{max}}{R_{peak}}$ is provided, which is identical with E




Figure 3: Dependence of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ on architectural solution of supercomputer in 2000 and 2016. Data derived using the *HPL* benchmark

they did seriously consider Amdahl’s very reasonable conclusion:” *the effort expended on achieving high parallel processing rates is wasted unless it is accompanied by achievements in sequential processing rates of very nearly the same magnitude*” Amdahl (1967). The one (Intel Delta) which did not enhance architecture, had tragically low efficiency.

4. Applying α_{eff} to supercomputers

Comparing supercomputers having different architectures, processors, manufacturers, number of processors, technological age, etc. is not easy at all. In order to make different *architectures* comparable, with as low distortion as possible, the same benchmark program **HPL** is used to qualify different supercomputers, since the beginning of supercomputer era. The distortion caused by the measurement device (the benchmark program) cannot be eliminated, but using the same benchmark causes the same distortion, so at least makes makes performance of different supercomputers comparable.

It should be noticed (see Equ. (7)) that $\frac{1}{E}$ is a linear function of the number of processors, and its slope equals to $(1 - \alpha_{\Delta})$. This can be used to quantize how changes affecting any of the contributions to the non-parallelizable part influence α_{eff} . The numerical value calculated in this way is quite near to the value calculated using Equ. (2), and so it is not displayed in the figures.




Figure 4: The Top500 supercomputer parallelization efficiency. The $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ parameter for the past 25 years and the (by R_{max}) first 25 computers. Data derived using the **HPL** benchmark.

Table 1: Performance of Various Computers Using Standard Linear Equations (*HPL*) Software at the beginning of the supercomputer age

Computer Model	N proc	Efficiency	$1 - \alpha_{eff}$
Cray Y-MP C90	16	0.69	2.995E-02
NEC SX-3	2	0.91	9.890E-02
Cray Y-MP/8	8	0.87	2.135E-02
Fujitsu AP 1000	512	0.29	4.791E-03
IBM 3090/600S VF	6	0.94	1.277E-02
Intel Delta	512	0.03	6.327E-02
Alliant FX/2800-200	14	0.79	2.045E-02
NCUBE/2	1024	0.12	7.168E-03
Convex C3240	4	0.95	1.754E-02
Parsytec FT-400	400	0.55	2.051E-03

4.1. Architecture

α_{eff} can also be utilized during supercomputer building, measuring execution times of the benchmark program using two different number of processors. One can estimate value of α_{Δ} even for the intermediate regions, i.e. without knowing the execution time on a single processor (from technical reasons, it is the usual case for supercomputers). From the value of α_{Δ} the efficiency of the planned supercomputer can be calculated³, and so from a handful of processors one can find out if the supercomputer under construction will beat the No. 1 in TOP500.org (2016). It would be reasonable to consider the experience: ”*Virtually every practicing computer architect knows Amdahl’s Law. Despite this, we almost all occasionally expend tremendous effort optimizing some feature before we measure its usage. Only when the overall speedup is disappointing do we recall that we should have measured first before we spent so much effort enhancing it!*” Hennessy and Patterson (2007)

4.2. Supercomputer timeline

In supercomputers, the ”(apparently) sequential part” is technically of different origin – and as will be shown below, can be separated to contributions of different nature –, but has the same effect on $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ in the frame

³This of course assumes that α_{eff} is independent of the number of processors, which seems to be valid at this level of approximation.




Figure 5: The trend of development of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ in the past 25 years, based on the first three (by R_{max}) and the first (by $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$) supercomputers in the year in question. Data derived using the **HPL** benchmark.

of the classic model. To scrutinize a possible dependency of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ on time, data covering 25 years of "supercomputer age", see TOP500.org (2016), has been analyzed. The ratio of data R_{max} and R_{peak} provided E , and using Equ. (7), $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ has been calculated in function of time and ranking, see Fig. 4. It looks like $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ changes in an exponential-like way, both with time and with ranking in a given year.

In Fig. 5 $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ values for the top 3 supercomputers (ranked by R_{max}) are displayed in function of time. The figure also contains diagram of the best (ranked by $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$) computer in the year, which confirms that high computing performance strongly correlates with efficiency of parallelization. Both methods lead to the same trend: the two regression lines shown in the figure are calculated for the #1 by R_{Max} and by $(1 - \alpha)$, respectively. It looks like this development path (independently of technology, manufacturer, number and type of processors, etc.) shows a semi-logarithmic behavior over a quarter century. It is able to forecast expected behavior of performance in the coming years, in the same way as Moore observation does for single processors.

One might think it is another appearance of Moore's law. However, consider that when calculating $\frac{R_{Max}}{R_{Peak}}$, single-processor performance (clock frequency and component density, etc.) consequences of the Moore-observation are removed. What remains: how perfectly single-processors can work together.

For the first look it might be surprising to look for any dependency of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ on year of construction. Consider, however, that *it represents the non-parallelizable fraction of execution time*, and the need for higher performance requires to increase the number of processors comprised. The key is Eq. (7): R_{Peak} increases linearly with k , and efficiency decreases according to $\frac{1}{k(1-\alpha_{eff})}$. Supercomputers need a large number of processors, so the only way to put them together in an efficient and economic way, is to decrease $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$. Moore's law assures that in the same year a very similar **SPA** technology is used by all manufacturers, so that computers from different manufacturers can be compared. Amdahl's law assures, that the only way to build many-processor system with higher R_{Max} from the same single-processor components, is to reduce $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$.

The architectural solution does not play a very important role here. As Fig. 3 depicts, both major architectural technologies result $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ in the same order of magnitude, and $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ raises with ranking of the computer,




Figure 6: Correlation of ranking and α_{eff} , derived using *HPL* and *HPCG*.

so some other factors may decide on ranking.

4.3. Benchmarking supercomputers

Benchmarks, utilized to derive numerical parameters for supercomputers, are specialized programs, which run on the **HW/OS** environment provided by supercomputer under test. One can use benchmarks for different goals. Two typical fields of utilization: to describe the environment the supercomputer application runs in, and to guess how quickly an application will run on a given supercomputer.

To understand operation of benchmarking, one needs to extend Amdahl's original model in such a way, that non-parallelizable (i.e. apparently sequential) part comprises contributions from **HW**, **OS**, **SW**⁴ and propagation time (**PT**). Among this, **SW** represents what was assumed by Amdahl as the total sequential fraction. As will be demonstrated in the discussion below, *in the age of Amdahl, other contributions could be neglected compared to SW contribution*. Notice the different nature of the contributions. They have only one common feature: *they all consume time*.

Obviously, the (apparently) sequential fraction $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ cannot distinguish between (at least apparently) sequential processing time contributions of different origin, even the **SW** (including **OS**) and **HW** contributions cannot be separated. Similarly, it cannot be taken for sure that those contribution sum up linearly. As long as computer components are in proximity

⁴This separation cannot be strict: for example Fu et al. (2016) utilizes 256+4 cores, where 4 cores assist system functionality at processor level, see Dongarra (2016).

in range mm , contribution by **PT** can be neglected. Real-life supercomputer applications and the ones used for benchmarking differ very much in their contribution to the non-parallelizable fraction. Different benchmarks provide different contributions to the non-parallelizable fraction of the execution time, so comparing results derived using different benchmarks shall be done with maximum care. *Since the efficiency depends heavily on the number of cores, different configurations shall be compared using the same benchmark and same number of processors (or same R_{Peak}).* Statements like *”the benchmark results for the **HPCG** benchmark reached only 0.3% of peak performance, which shows weaknesses of the architecture with slow memory and modest interconnect performance”*, see US Government NSA and DOE (2016), clearly show that **HPC** people are not aware of that in the case of having about two orders of magnitude higher number of processors *Amdahl’s law itself restricts performance* as experienced. Utilizing benchmarks without considering this restriction would result in absolutely different rankings, both for **HPL** and **HPCG** benchmarks.

If the goal is to characterize the supercomputer’s **HW+OS** system itself, a benchmark program should distort **HW+OS** contribution as little as possible, i.e. **SW** contribution must be much lower than **HW+OS** contribution. In the case of supercomputers, benchmark **HPL** is used for this goal since the beginning of the supercomputer age. The mathematical behavior of **HPL** enables to minimize **SW** contribution. The **HW+OS** contribution can also be lowered in such a way, as designers of Sunway do: they use 256+4 cores per processors, and 4 cores are dedicated to assist **OS** functionality, see Dongarra (2016), thus reducing the duty of **OS** to deal with cores by two orders of magnitude. In this way the resulting non-parallelizable fraction can be attributed mostly to **HW+OS** implementation.

If the goal is to estimate the expectable behavior of an application, the benchmark program should imitate the structure of the application; i.e. to augment artificially the non-parallelizable fraction of the application to the amount typical in most supercomputer applications. In the case of supercomputers, a couple of years ago **HPCG** benchmark has been introduced for this goal, since *”HPCG is designed to exercise computational and data access patterns that more closely match a different and broad set of important applications, and to give incentive to computer system designers to invest in capabilities that will have impact on the collective performance of these applications”*, see HPCG Benchmark (2016). However, its utilization can be misleading: *the ranking is only valid for the **HPCG** application, and only*

utilizing that number of processors. This analysis reveals why supercomputer have two different rankings, see IEEE Spectrum (2017), based on two different benchmarks: actually, α_{eff}^{SW} also contributes, so actually there are as many efficiencies (and rankings) as many benchmarks.

4.4. Validating the α_{eff} model for supercomputers

To validate the α_{eff} model for supercomputers, one can compare parameters and ranking derived using the **HPL** and **HPCG**, see HPCG Benchmark (2016) benchmarks, see Table 2. For the items in the table **HW/OS** environment (and so: the corresponding contributions to the non-parallelizable time) is the same, the difference is caused by benchmark program structure. The differences in efficiency values delivered by the two benchmarks clearly show that efficiency differs by two orders of magnitude. The $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ values give the explanation: *the non-parallelizable fractions are 2-3 orders of magnitude higher when measured using **HPCG** than when using **HPL***. It simply demonstrates a benchmarking artefact: an improper benchmark is used.

This helps to understand supercomputer development timeline: in **HPL** approach, all contributions are decreased as much as possible. In **HPCG** approach the **SW** contribution dominates: (all values $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPCG})$ are nearly equal, except those where $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPL})$ is an order of magnitude higher because of the high **HW** contribution), and actually, the rest can be neglected. According to Equ. (7), the increased $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ value causes considerable differences in the efficiency. For example, efficiencies of 'Cori' and 'Oakforest' differ by less than 10 % when measured using **HPL** and by more than 100 % when measured using **HPCG**.

Benchmarks for a given supercomputer provide different R_{Max} , depending on value of $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{SW})$ of the benchmark. Fig. 7 displays some typical results, using Taihulight as an example. (For other supercomputers the graphs are similar, except that the same R_{Peak} is produced using processors with different single-processor performance, and so because of the different number of processors, the efficiency also changes.) Bubbles on the figure mark positions of measured R_{Max} values, when using *HPL* and *HPCG* benchmarks, for *Taihulight* and *K computer*, respectively. As noted above, in the case of **HPCG** contribution of **SW** "pulls down" the payload performance much stronger in the case of *Taihulight* having much smaller $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPL})$, than in the case of *K computer*.

As shown, building even bigger supercomputers has only sense for **HPL** class applications. **HPCG** class applications enjoy just marginally better

R_{Max} of Taihulight supercomputer in function of R_{Peak} with different benchmarks




Figure 7: R_{Max} performance in function of peak performance R_{Peak} , at different $1 - \alpha_{eff}()$ values.

Computer Model Top500 2017	HPL			HPCG		
	Efficiency	$(1 - \alpha_{eff})$	Rank	Efficiency	$(1 - \alpha_{eff})$	Rank
TaihuLight	0.742	3.273E-08	1	0.003	3.121e-5	4
Tianhe-2	0.617	1.991E-07	2	0.011	2.882e-5	2
Titan	0.649	9.656E-07	4	0.012	1.469e-4	7
Sequoia	0.853	1.096E-07	5	0.016	3.910e-5	6
Cori	0.503	1.590E-06	6	0.013	1.220e-4	5
Oakforest	0.544	1.507E-06	7	0.028	6.092e-5	3
K computer	0.932	1.040E-07	8	0.053	2.534e-5	1
Mira	0.853	2.191E-07	9	0.017	7.353e-5	10
Trinity	0.731	1.221E-06	10	0.016	2.043e-4	8

Table 2: Comparing **HPL** and **HPCG** benchmark results of some TOP10 supercomputers

payload performance than they would do on the same architecture equipped with an order of magnitude less processors. Fig. 7 also helps to find out the optimum size of supercomputer for a specific application.

In the light of this discussion, *results derived utilizing **HPCG** as benchmark program give no direct information about hardware/software environment of the supercomputer*: the contribution due to program structure (the measuring device) is at least two orders of magnitude higher than the contribution due to the **HW/SW** system (the device under test). The roles are exchanged, and so the provided 'ranking' is the result of a kind of round-off effects, see the lack of correlation between the two rankings in Table 2 and also in Fig. 6. (BTW: $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ strongly correlates with ranking, both for **HPL** and **HPCG**.)

Adopting **HPCG** as benchmark enables hardware designers to utilize less expensive (and at the same time: less performable) architectural solutions, and the resulting **HW** will not be able to run **HPL** benchmark at some reasonable speed and/or efficiency, because in that case the relatively high **HW** contribution will dominate. The same statement from another point of view: *"Designing a system for good **HPL** performance can actually lead to design choices that are wrong for the real application mix, or add unnecessary components or complexity to the system"* Dongarra (2017). *In the case of **HPCG**, however, an order of magnitude higher **OS** contribution or **HW** contribution make no difference, and this benchmark does not honour developments in this direction, so the development of supercomputers will follow a different path when directed by **HPCG** as benchmark. Developing technol-*

ogy directed by **HPCG** leads quickly and surely to dead-end street for high number of processors, see Fig. 7, especially if Exascale **HPC** is targeted.

The typical efficiency of TOP supercomputers is about 1 % for benchmark **HPCG**. This means that supercomputers running application of class **HPCG** make about 3-4 days payload work in a year. As discussed above, contribution α_{eff}^{SW} is very different for different real-world applications, and because of this, **HPCG** provides no real hints for the performance (**HPL** provides even less: it describes **HW+OS**). Measuring, however, $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ and looking at graphs in Fig. 10 enables one to find the optimum R_{Peak} for optimum performance/price. At this point knowing values of contributions α_{eff}^{HW+OS} and α_{eff}^{SW} would be a real advantage. At least approximately, the first one describes the supercomputer, and the second one the application.

Just note that some dedicated measurements would enable to provide better estimations for the contributions: making several dry (i.e. using the correct time but making no action) system handling calls the slope of the (by the present model, linear) dependency of $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ on the number of system calls would provide the contribution of **OS**, while the intercept delivers the (**HW+SW**) fraction. Through changing the payload execution time, the **SW** contribution can similarly be estimated, which finally enables to estimate also **HW** contribution, which would be a real merit of **HW**.

4.5. Applications

In the case of benchmark programs $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ is much lower, than in the case of real-life programs. (Amdahl (1967) estimated the non-parallelizable part to be above 20 %), i.e. about 2-3 orders of magnitude higher than even that of the **HPCG** benchmark⁵. Because of this, *efficiency of real-life programs decreases even more strongly with number of processors, so it is really worth to consider how many processors will provide optimum performance/price.*

Supercomputer applications must be tuned to be scalable with number of processors. For this goal α_{eff} can be utilized excellently. Before and after some change in the program structure the execution time can be measured using two different number of processors, and from those times α_{eff} can be derived. On the other side, using $\frac{R_{Max}}{R_{Peak}}$ of a particular supercomputer

⁵Just recall that the goal of **HPCG** is to provide a benchmark which behaves akin a typical **HPC** application, rather than to characterize the supercomputer **HW+OS** system.

(identical with E in Equ. (7)) one can conclude efficiency (i.e. execution time) of a particular application using that supercomputer. Practically this would be the goal of utilizing **HPCG**.

5. Bounds on computing growth

"The nature of this overhead (in parallelism) appears to be sequential so that it is unlikely to be amenable to parallel processing techniques. Overhead alone would then place an upper limit on throughput . . . , even if the housekeeping were done in a separate processor Amdahl (1967).

5.1. A new exponential law of computing growth?

In a recently published paper P. J. Denning and T.G. Lewis (2017) have pointed out that in real systems the curves like Moore's law describing component density (so, maybe also the development of α_{eff} with time, see Fig. 5), will sooner or later saturate. Their analysis reveals that the exponential nature of the growth is the result of an interplay of many factors, and also that such growth is better described by a "logistic curve" which saturates after reaching some point.

Moore's law is formulated for several dependencies. In that case a saturation point already reached: since cca. 2005 no more transistors can be added to a **CPU** in a reasonable way. For *number of transistors in a chip* Moore's law still persists, but not any more for *number of transistors in a processor*. Similar turning point was experienced with the manufacturing technology (lithographic size) and is expected to occur with the atomic nature of technological materials. The saturation value, however, is not yet known and is different for the different reasons.

5.2. Limitations of building larger supercomputers

Fig. 5 shows up a behavior very similar to that of Moore's law, (it looks like that $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ decreases year-by-year by a factor of cca. 1.5). Some reasons can also be seen why also this behavior is not without limitations. Using some reasonable assumptions about the different contributions to the non-parallelizable fraction mentioned above, their order of magnitude can be estimated, and also some saturation values can be forecasted. It is interesting to note that in the *"Summary Report of the Advanced Scientific Computing Advisory Committee (ASCAC) Subcommittee"*, see US Department of Energy (2010), *the feasibility of building supercomputers of arbitrary size* (in the




Figure 8: Trend of development of average value of $(\frac{R_{Max}}{R_{Peak}})$ in the past 25 years, calculated for the first 25 supercomputers in the year in question. Data derived using the **HPL** benchmark.




Figure 9: Comparing efficiencies of selected TOP10 (as of 2017 July) supercomputers in function of their peak performance R_{Peak} , for **HPL** and **HPCG** benchmarks. The actual R_{Peak} values are denoted by a bubble.

sense whether any physical law or computer science principle restricts the achievable computing throughput) *remained out of scope*. Quite similarly, the European Union’s Action Plan, see European Commission (2016), assumes no limitations, rather that ”*With a differentiated strategy and sufficient investment and political will, Europe can be a global player in **HPC***”.

For calculating bounds based on our extended model data published by Dongarra (2016) are used. The 13,298 seconds benchmark runtime on the 1.45 GHz processors means $2 * 10^{13}$ clock periods. The absolutely necessary non-parallelizable activity is to start and stop the calculation. If starting and stopping a zero-sized supercomputer without **OS** could be done in 2 clock periods, then the absolute limit for $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ would be 10^{-13} .

If one considers a cca. 100 meter sized computer having 1 GHz cores, the signal round trip time is cca. 10^{-6} seconds, or 10^3 clock periods, and a network message can be estimated to be of length 10^{-5} seconds (including operating time of HW), or 10^4 clock periods. So, the absolute limit for $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ of a computer with realistic size, but no operating system is 10^{-9} .

We need to use, however, an operating system. If one considers context change with its consumed 10^4 cycles, the absolute limit is cca. 10^{-9} , on a zero-sized supercomputer. *In addition, millions of cores must be manipulated through the system call, which contribution increases linearly with the number of cores and contribution from **OS** can be dominant at high number of cores.* This is why designers of Sunway dedicated 4 cores per processor Fu et al. (2016) to reduce this dependence by two orders of magnitude. As discussed, the application itself produces some non-payload activity, which can be assumed also to be at least in the range of 10^4 - 10^5 clock cycles.

It is probably a realistic estimation, that contributions of **HW**, **OS**, **PT** and **SW** (the application itself) can sum up to at least 10^5 clock cycles, resulting in a 10^{-8} absolute limit for $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$. Although it is a very rough estimation, it is worth to compare it to the value $3.3 * 10^{-8}$, calculated from data published by Dongarra (2016) for the Taihulight supercomputer, see Fu et al. (2016), (and also shown in Fig. 5).

As it is known from textbooks, according to Amdahl’s law, the available maximum speedup (the apparent computing throughput) is given by $\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$, i.e. for the derived limiting value is about 10^8 . This should be multiplied with the computing throughput of a typical processor used in supercomputers, typically 10 Gflop/s . This results in 10^{18} flop/s , i.e. about the ”dream limit”, targeted by several supercomputer building teams. To increase this product, either the single-processor performance must be increased or $(1 - \alpha)$

decreased, or both. In the case of benchmark **HPCG** $\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$ is in the order of magnitude 10^{-5} (see Table 2), and correspondingly the upper limit for computing throughput is 0.001 Eflop/s. This means that for the "broad set of important applications" HPCG Benchmark (2016) the "dream limit" cannot be achieved at all, and even for the much less broad set of applications of class **HPL** it is questionable.

5.3. A new experimental evidence

A nice evidence was provided by the new supercomputer appearing in the 2017 November list, that the theoretical bound achieved. As it could be guessed, the constructors bought 20M processors to build the new #1 supercomputer, with *nominal* performance $R_{Max} = 229 P\text{flop}/s$, twice more than that of Taihulight. The provided benchmark data ($E = 0.679$ and $R_{Max} = 19.136 P\text{flop}/s$, measured using 2.4M cores only), however, qualified them to catch the 4th position only. If they could keep the same efficiency and would use all cores, they should have $R_{Max} = 155.3 P\text{flop}/s$, a new world record. It is a big question, if "The system's 19,860,000 cores represent the highest level of concurrency ever recorded on the TOP500 rankings of supercomputers", see TOP500 (2017), why did they participate in the race with using only 12 % of the cores. Why they did not want to be the #1?

The analysis above gives the answer: even if we assume that effective parallelism will not be worse due to the higher number of processors, the efficiency would drop to $E_{10M} = 0.21$, and this efficiency would drop out from the average value cca. 0.73 calculated for the TOP25 supercomputers, see Fig. 8. Even with this low efficiency, $R_{Max} = 48 P\text{flop}/s$ could be produced, qualifying them to catch the 2nd position. However, increasing the number of cores increases the looping delay and causes to increase magnitude of value of $(1 - \alpha_{eff,10M})$. The measurement conditions are not known, so the amount of increase can only be guessed. If $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ would increase by a factor of 2, Gyoukou could take position 3 with $E_{10M} = 0.116$ and $R_{Max} = 26.56 P\text{flop}/s$. If it would increase by a factor of 5, Gyoukou could take position 10 with $E_{10M} = 0.05$ and $R_{Max} = 11.45 P\text{flop}/s$. If it would increase by a factor of 8, Gyoukou could take position 14 with $E_{10M} = 0.032$ and $R_{Max} = 7.38 P\text{flop}/s$.

As discussed, $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPCG})$ is about two orders higher than $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPL})$. Since values $(1 - \alpha_{eff}^{HPL})$ are nearly the same for Tianhe-2 (MilkyWay-2) in the 2nd position and Gyoukou in the 4th position, and also the number of processors are approximately the same, one can assume $(1 - \alpha_{eff,2.4M}^{HPCG}) =$

TOP500 rank 2017	Computer Model	N proc in 2017	$(1 - \alpha_{eff})$	Efficiency at 1 exaFLOPS	$(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ at 1 exaFLOPS
1	TaihuLight	10649600	3.273E-08	0.265	4.11E-09
2	Tianhe-2	3120000	1.991E-07	0.081	1.09E-08
3	Piz Daint	361760	8.094E-07	0.080	2.05E-08
4	Titan	560640	9.656E-07	0.048	2.62E-08
5	Sequoia	1572864	1.096E-07	0.105	2.21E-09
6	Cori	622336	1.590E-06	0.027	4.43E-08
7	Oakforest-PACS	556104	1.507E-06	0.029	3.75E-08
8	K computer	705024	1.040E-07	0.133	1.17E-09
9	Mira	786432	2.191E-07	0.055	2.21E-09
10	Trinity	301056	1.221E-06	0.029	1.35E-08

Table 3: $\frac{R_{Peak}}{R_{Max}}$ of present TOP10 supercomputer architectures upgraded with more cores to provide 1 exaFLOPS, or the $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ to be achieved to keep their present efficiency. Data are derived using the **HPL** benchmark.

$3 * 10^{-5}$ for Gyoukou. Using assumptions similar to the ones used for **HPL**, $E^{10M} = 0.0017$, $R_{Max}^{HPCG,10M} = 0.39 Pflor/s$. Oakforest at the 9th position also has $R_{Max}^{HPCG,0.56M} = 0.385 Pflor/s$, i.e. nearly the same payload performance, but using only 35 times less processors or 9 times less nominal performance. That is: less is more, because of Amdahl’s law.

This analyzis provokes the question: *how much is it realistic to plan building even larger **SPA** supercomputers?*

5.4. Forecasts for exaFLOPS supercomputers

From TOP500 data R_{Max} values in function of R_{Peak} can be calculated, see Fig. 9 (i.e. virtually the number of processors is changed for the different configurations). Since the efficiency values differ by orders of magnitude, the behavior of efficiencies changes drastically between the two benchmarks. The reported (measured) efficiency values are marked by bubbles on the figures.

The pre-last column of Table 3 displays the $\frac{R_{Max}}{R_{Peak}}$ value for the first ten (as of 2017 July) supercomputers on the TOP500 list, if they were upgraded with more cores to provide 1 exaFLOPS. (For the trend of **HPL** efficiency see Fig. 8. Probably, there is not much sense to build supercomputers with efficiency below one percent, but the fact that benchmark **HPCG** is accepted as a new metric for ranking supercomputer systems, seems to contradict to it.)

Fig. 9 also underlines importance of benchmarking: benchmark **HPCG**

R_{Max} of Top10 Supercomputers for benchmark *HPL*




Figure 10: R_{Max} performance of selected TOP10 (as of 2017 July) supercomputers in function of their peak performance R_{Peak} , for the **HPL** benchmark. The actual R_{Peak} values are denoted by a bubble.

produces not only drastically lower efficiency values, the nature of efficiency also changes: while on the left side increasing R_{Peak} by two orders of magnitude triggers *less* than two orders of magnitude decrease in efficiency, on the right side the efficiency decreases *more* than two orders of magnitude. Similarly to the case shown in Table 1: putting more processors in an architecture, without making efforts for enhancing α_{eff} results in tragically low efficiency.

Fig. 10 shows absolute computing performance R_{Max} for some of TOP10 supercomputers. When calculating the diagram lines, virtually the number of processors were varied. The actual value is denoted by a bubble. As expected, R_{Max} for Taihulight seems to saturate around .35 exaFLOPS, for the rest of supercomputers at much lower values.

One can also calculate from reverting Equ. (7) what enhancement in $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ would be necessary for those configurations to achieve 1 exaFLOPS and at the same time to keep their present $\frac{R_{Peak}}{R_{Max}}$, keep their present efficiency, see the last column of Table 3. For deriving the results, benchmark **HPL** was assumed. As from Fig. 8 can be concluded, for future supercomputers achieving $\frac{R_{Max}}{R_{Peak}}$ around 0.73 can be expected⁶, the development will have to target reducing $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$.

In the light of the analysis above the primary candidates to deliver 1 exaFLOPS are the supercomputers which are able to produce presently $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$ around 10^{-8} . To achieve considerably lower $(1 - \alpha_{eff})$, all contributions mentioned in our model must be considerably lowered. The physical size (mainly due to need of cooling) can hardly be decreased, although 3D arrangements can help also here. The present layering of computing stack requires context change, starting(preparing)/stopping an application is inevitable and the linearly increasing contribution of **OS** due to the large number of cores must be eliminated. Lowering only one of these contributions is useless. *That is, at least the physical size (speed of the light) really puts an upper bound to supercomputers performance.*

At least if utilizing Single Processor Approach persist. Shall we also prepare for a post-Amdahl era? As Markov (2014) pointed out, in computing the limitations are also limited. This holds also for supercomputing: with introducing cooperating processors, see Végh (2016) and reasonable layering, see J. Végh (2017), the landscape changes drastically.

⁶Provided that **HPL** benchmark will not be replaced by **HPCG**

5.5. *Is perfectness the common reason?*

The number of similarities between the present law depicted in Fig. 5 and Moore’s law suggests to find some common reason. An interesting idea is that in both cases a kind of ”*perfectness*” is approached. The goal to be achieved in the case of Moore’s law is infinitesimally small component size, in the case of parallelization infinitesimally small non-parallelizable part. Both dependencies show exponential behavior, and as presented, both of them will behave (sooner or later) as a logistic curve. These laws are able to forecast the expected behavior of performance in the coming years, and serious consideration must be given to their scope of validity.

6. Conclusion

The paper validated that Amdahl’s 50-years old model (with slight extension) correctly describes operation of parallelized computing systems, provided that the meaning of terms used in the model are properly interpreted. Originally, Amdahl’s law was interpreted for **SW** contribution only, corresponding to that-time stage of technology: compared to the contribution of **SW** to the non-parallelizable fraction of the model, the rest of contributions were negligible. The development of technology (including different kinds of accelerators, appearance of networked communication inside and among chips, need for cooperation of several processors in forms of grids, **MCPs** and supercomputers, etc.) lead to forgetting this universal law.

The law has been reformulated, now explicitly giving time dimension to the terms. It was also emphasized, that – as suggested originally by Amdahl – all contributions which are not parallelizable, will appear as (at least apparently) sequential fraction. Although those latter contributions are not summed up linearly (some sequential contributions may be partly parallel with each other), these two main classes of contributions can serve as a proper base for understanding parallelism in modern computer systems.

The case of analyzing load balancing compiler, see Vég h and Molnár (2017), is closest to the original assumptions of Amdahl. Contribution of **SW** is in the order of several percents, **HW** does not contribute too much at those low number of cores, and **OS** makes contribution which is low and not separable from that of **SW**.

In the case of analyzing communication inside chip Végő and Molnár (2017) a mixture of **HW**, **SW** and **OS** and propagation delay time contributes to the non-parallelizable fraction. The latter one is not really significant inside chip, but might even be dominant if analyzing systems connected through some kind of network, with all subtleties of networks. Here even non-parallelizable contributions are distributed among communicating cores, and because of this, resulting non-parallelizable fraction is one order of magnitude lower than in the previous case.

When analyzing supercomputers having largely different number of processors, the real nature of of Amdahl's law can be studied and understood. In that case both the propagation delay (dozens of meters instead of several microns) and the number of processors (millions rather than dozens) is bigger, by several orders on magnitude, than in the case of "normal" systems. Using the excellent public database TOP500.org (2016), the assumptions of the model could be thoroughly tested. At the beginning of the supercomputer age, **SW** dominated the non-parallelizable fraction. The need for producing ever more effective assemblies of ever more processors directed the development in such a way that *all* contributions had to be minimized to achieve reasonable efficiency. This method of development covered that the initially dominant **SW** gradually gave place for the other contributions. Although utilizing very sophisticated methods of **HW** and **SW** engineering enabled to reduce nearly all contributions (and in principle further improvements are possible), the propagation delay is limited by speed of the light: finite physical size of components and their energy dissipation. Because of this, until technology changes, the maximum performance of supercomputers cannot break this theoretical barrier.

One can really conclude that *Amdahl's law is really a very basic law of computer science and if its underlying model also considers the propagation delay, it correctly describes all experiences and issues of parallel operations, including the cutting edge supercomputing systems.* The model provides surprisingly good numerical values for all published performance data, although dedicated measurements are needed to pinpoint role, size and interaction of components in the suggested model.

Results about forecasting parameters of future supercomputers are especially important. Amdahl's law, using model extended as described above, correctly forecasts performance limitations, both of supercomputer applications and of supercomputer architecture itself. Using that model, the absolute performance bound of supercomputers was concluded, furthermore it

was pointed out that serious enhancements are still necessary to achieve the exaFLOPS dream value. *One should notice again, as was also emphasized by Amdahl: conclusions and calculations are only valid for computers built in SPA.* Introducing new computing principles (or at least using less restrictive interpretation of the classic ones) may invalidate the contents of this chapter and open a new chapter of computing.

Acknowledgements

Project no. 125547 has been implemented with the support provided from the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund of Hungary, financed under the K funding scheme.

References

References

- Amdahl, G. M., 1967. Validity of the Single Processor Approach to Achieving Large-Scale Computing Capabilities. In: AFIPS Conference Proceedings. Vol. 30. pp. 483–485.
- David, T., Guerraoui, R., Trigonakis, V., 2013. Everything you always wanted to know about synchronization but were afraid to ask. In: Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (SOSP '13). pp. 33–48.
- Dongarra, J., 1992. Performance of Various Computers Using Standard Linear Equations Software. Tech. Rep. TN 37996-1301, Computer Science Dept., Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Dongarra, J., June 2016. Report on the Sunway TaihuLight System. Tech. Rep. Tech Report UT-EECS-16-742, University of Tennessee Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science.
- Dongarra, J., 2017. The Global Race for Exascale High Performance Computing. http://ec.europa.eu/newsroom/document.cfm?doc_id=45647.
- European Commission, 2016. Implementation of the Action Plan for the European High-Performance Computing strategy. [ImplementationoftheActionPlanfortheEuropeanHigh-PerformanceComputingstrategy](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/ip16_1111).

Fu, H., Liao, J., Yang, J., Wang, L., Song, Z., Huang, X., Yang, C., Xue, W., Liu, F., Qiao, F., Zhao, W., Yin, X., Hou, C., Zhang, C., Ge, W., Zhang, J., Wang, Y., Zhou, C., Yang, G., 2016. The Sunway TaihuLight supercomputer: system and applications. *Science China Information Sciences* 59 (7), 1–16.

URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11432-016-5588-7>

Hennessy, J. L., Patterson, D. A., 2007. *Computer Architecture: A Quantitative Approach*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers.

HPCG Benchmark, 2016. HPCG Benchmark.
<http://www.hpcg-benchmark.org/>.

IEEE, July 2017. Architectures for the Post-Moore Era.
<https://www.computer.org/micro/2016/09/12/architectures-for-the-post-moore-era->

IEEE Spectrum, 2017. Two Different Top500 Supercomputing Benchmarks Show Two Different Top Supercomputers.
<https://spectrum.ieee.org/tech-talk/computing/hardware/two-different-top500-supercomputers>

J. Végh, 2017. Do we need cross layering activities or reasonable layering in computing systems? *IEEE Design & Test*, submitted.

Karp, A. H., Flatt, H. P., May 1990. Measuring Parallel Processor Performance. *Commun. ACM* 33 (5), 539–543.
URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/78607.78614>

Markov, I., 2014. Limits on fundamental limits to computation. *Nature* 512, 147–154,
http://download.nap.edu/cart/download.cgi?&record_id=12980.

P. J. Denning and T.G. Lewis, Jan. 2017. Exponential Laws of Computing Growth. *Communications of the ACM*, 54–65.

Pingali, K., Nguyen, D., Kulkarni, M., Burtscher, M., Hassaan, M. A., Kaleem, R., Lee, T.-H., Lenharth, A., Manevich, R., Méndez-Lojo, M., Proutzos, D., Sui, X., Jun. 2011. The Tao of Parallelism in Algorithms. *SIGPLAN Not.* 46 (6), 12–25.
URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1993316.1993501>

TOP500, 2017. November 2017 list of supercomputers.
<https://www.top500.org/lists/2017/11/>.

TOP500.org, 2016. The top 500 supercomputers.
<https://www.top500.org/>.

US Department of Energy, 2010. The Opportunities and Challenges of Exascale Computing.
https://science.energy.gov/~media/ascr/ascac/pdf/reports/Exascale_subcommittee_

US Government NSA and DOE, December 2016. A Report from the NSA-DOE Technical Meeting on High Performance Computing.
https://www.nitrd.gov/nitrdgroups/images/b/b4/NSA_DOE_HPC_TechMeetingReport.pdf.

Végh, J., jul 2016. EMPAthY86: A cycle accurate simulator for Explicitly Many-Processor Approach (EMPA) computer.
URL <https://github.com/jvegh/EMPAthY86>

Végh, J., Bagoly, Z., Kicsák, A., Molnár, P., 2014. An alternative implementation for accelerating some functions of operating system. In: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Software Engineering and Applications (ICSOFT-EA-2014). pp. 150–155.

Végh, J., Molnár, P., 2017. How to measure perfectness of parallelization in hardware/software systems. In: 18th Internat. Carpathian Control Conf. ICC. p. paper 121.

Yavits, L., Morad, A., Ginosar, R., 2014. The effect of communication and synchronization on Amdahl's law in multicore systems. *Parallel Computing* 40 (1), 1–16.