Background

- Most of today’s state-of-the-art ML workloads use SPMD model
  - The limits are being pushed and developers have to resort to pipelining
  - Desire to better support computational sparsity
- Accelerators are becoming more heterogeneous
  - Giving exclusive access to homogeneous “islands” of compute is expensive
  - Pushing researchers towards MPMD computations
- Development of foundation models is getting more popular
  - They could allow a number of researchers to fine-tune the same shared model
Prior distributed ML systems

- **Multi-controller architectures**
  - For example PyTorch, Jax, and recent configurations of TensorFlow
  - Small communication costs
  - Makes pipelining or exploitation of computational sparsity hard
  - Typically assumes exclusive ownership of resources

- **Single-controller systems**
  - For example TensorFlow v1
  - Very general distributed dataflow model
  - Dispatch latency over DCN (data center network)
  - TF v1 is over-specialized for a single island of accelerators
  - Hard to achieve cross-host coordination
Pathways

- Adopts a single-controller model
  - Allows exploitation of computational sparsity and heterogeneity
  - Enables cluster management systems and better resource sharing
- Uses asynchronous dispatch
  - Matches the performance of multi-controller systems
- Supports scheduling with first-class support for gangs of SPMD computations
- Uses a sharded dataflow system
Architecture
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Coordination

- Each client program is
  - Assigned virtual devices
  - Converted to Pathways IR not containing device location information
  - This Pathways IR is progressively lowered to a low level representation including device locations

- Cross-host coordination using the DCN achieved via Plaque
  - Supports sparse data exchanges along sharded edges
  - Sends critical messages with low latency
  - Batches messages to the same host when high throughput required
Gang-scheduled dynamic dispatch

- Gang scheduling required for SPMD on shared set of accelerators
- Each island has its own centralized scheduler
- Plaque does the following:
  - enqueues local compiled functions at each accelerator, with buffer futures as inputs
  - enqueues network sends for the buffer futures output by function executions
  - communicates with the scheduler to find a consistent order of executions across the island
Parallel asynchronous dispatch

(a) Sequential dispatch

(b) Parallel dispatch
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Aggregate throughput of concurrent programs
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Large scale model performance

- Numerical results on Pathways same as on JAX and TF running on their native systems
- Throughput of running a Transformer model with an Encoder-Decoder architecture matches JAX’s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Params</th>
<th>TPU cores</th>
<th>JAX</th>
<th>Pathways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T5-Base</td>
<td>270M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>618k</td>
<td>618k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-Large</td>
<td>770M</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90.4k</td>
<td>90.4k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-3B</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>282.8k</td>
<td>282.8k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5-11B</td>
<td>11B</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>84.8k</td>
<td>84.8k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Large scale model performance

- Training transformer-based language model with a Decoder-only architecture
  - Tested for different number of stages (S) and micro-batches (M)
- Pipelined matches SPMD
- Same throughput when cores partitioned into islands
- Throughput scales linearly with number of cores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model configuration</th>
<th>TPU cores</th>
<th>PATHWAYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model-parallel (SPMD)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>125.7k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelining, S=4, M=16</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>133.7k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelining, S=8, M=32</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>132.7k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelining, S=16, M=64</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131.4k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelining, S=16, M=64</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>507.8k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Impact

- **PaLM (Pathways Language Model)**
  - 540-billion parameter, dense decoder-only Transformer model trained with Pathways
- **Minerva**
  - Built on top of PaLM
- **PaLM 2**
- **All of these models are closed**
Opinion

- Seems promising, many large models developed on it already
- Focuses on TPUs not GPUs
- All models using it are closed, relies on Plaque which is closed-source too
- Evaluation of robustness? What if HBM not enough?
Discussion