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1 Extended Abstract

Load flow computation and contingency analysis is the foundation of power system analysis. Numerical solution to load flow equations are typically computed using Newton-Raphson iteration, and the most time consuming component of the computation is the solution of a sparse linear system needed for the update each iteration. When an appropriate elimination ordering is used, direct solvers are more effective than iterative solvers. In practice these systems involve a larger number of variables (50,000 or more); however, when the sparsity is utilized effectively these systems can be solved in a modest amount of time (seconds). Despite the modest computation time for the linear solver, the number of systems that must be solved is large and current computation platforms and approaches do not yield the desired performance. Because of the relatively small granularity of the linear solver, the use of a coarse-grained parallel solver does not provide an effective means to improve performance. In this talk, it is argued that a hardware solution, implemented in FPGA, using fine-grained parallelism, provides a cost-effective means to achieve the desired performance.

Previous work [1, 2, 3] has shown that FPGA can be effectively used for floating-point intensive scientific computation. It was shown that high MFLOP rates could be achieved by utilizing multiple floating-point units,
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and FPGA could outperform PCs and workstations, running at much higher-lock rates, on dense matrix computations. The current work argues that similar benefit can be obtained for the sparse matrix computations arising in power system analysis. These conclusions are based on operation counts and system analysis for a collection of benchmark systems arising in practice.

Benchmark data indicates that between 1 and 3 percent of peak floating point performance was obtained using a state-of-the-art sparse solver (UMFPACK) running on 2.60 GHz Pentium 4. The solve time for the largest system (50,092 unknowns and 361,530 non-zero entries) was 1.39 seconds.

A pipelined floating point core was designed for the Altera Stratix family of FPGAs. An instantiation of the core on an Altera Stratix with speed rating (-5) operates at 200 MHz for addition and multiplication and 70 MHz for division. Moreover, there is sufficient room for 10 units. Assuming 100% utilization of eight FPUs, the projected performance for the FPGA implementation is 0.069 seconds, which provides a 20-fold improvement. While it is optimistic to assume perfect efficiency, hard-wired control should provide substantially better efficiency than available with a standard processor. Moreover, analysis of the LU factorization shows that the average number of updates per row throughout the factorization is 20.3, which provides sufficient parallelism to benefit from 8 FPUs. An implementation, and more detailed model, is being carried out to determine the attainable efficiency.
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Goal & Approach

- To design an embedded FPGA-based multiprocessor system to perform high speed Power Flow Analysis.
- To provide a single desktop environment to solve the entire package of Power Flow Problem (Multiprocessors on the Desktop).
- Solve Power Flow equations using Newton-Raphson, with hardware support for sparse LU.
- Tailor HW design to systems arising in Power Flow analysis.
Results

- Software solutions (sparse LU needed for Power Flow) using high-end PCs/workstations do not achieve efficient floating point performance and leave substantial room for improvement.
- High-grained parallelism will not significantly improve performance due to granularity of the computation.
- FPGA, with a much slower clock, can outperform PCs/workstations by devoting space to hardwired control, additional FP units, and utilizing fine-grained parallelism.
- Benchmarking studies show that significant performance gain is possible.
- A 10x speedup is possible using existing FPGA technology.
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Algorithm and HW/SW Partition

Data Input → Extract Data → Ybus → Jacobian Matrix → Forward Substitution → Update Jacobian matrix → NO

HOST → Data Input

HOST → Extract Data

HOST → Ybus

HOST → Jacobian Matrix

HOST → Forward Substitution

HOST → Mismatch < Accuracy → YES

HOST → Post Processing

HOST → Update Jacobian matrix

HOST → NO

HOST → Mismatch < Accuracy
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## Benchmark

- Obtain data from power systems of interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th># Bus</th>
<th>Branches/Bus</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>NNZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSSE</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2,982</td>
<td>21,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSSE</td>
<td>7,917</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>14,508</td>
<td>108,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJM</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>19,285</td>
<td>137,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PJM</td>
<td>26,829</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>50,092</td>
<td>361,530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## System Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Bus</th>
<th># Iter</th>
<th>#DIV</th>
<th>#MUL</th>
<th>#ADD</th>
<th>NNZ L+U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43,876</td>
<td>1,908,082</td>
<td>1,824,380</td>
<td>108,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,917</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>259,388</td>
<td>18,839,382</td>
<td>18,324,787</td>
<td>571,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,279</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>238,343</td>
<td>14,057,766</td>
<td>13,604,494</td>
<td>576,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,829</td>
<td></td>
<td>770,514</td>
<td>90,556,643</td>
<td>89,003,926</td>
<td>1,746,673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
System Profile

- More than 80% of rows/cols have size < 30

**ROW_SIZE**
- Std. Dev = 21.15
- Mean = 20.3
- N = 2981.00

**COL_SIZE**
- Std. Dev = 15.68
- Mean = 16.6
- N = 2981.00
Software Performance

- Software platform
  - UMFPACK
  - Pentium 4 (2.6GHz)
  - 8KB L1 Data Cache
  - Mandrake 9.2
  - gcc v3.3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Bus</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>FP Eff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>0.07 sec</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,917</td>
<td>0.37 sec</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>0.47 sec</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,829</td>
<td>1.39 sec</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hardware Model & Requirements

- Store row & column indices for non-zero entries
- Use column indices to search for pivot. Overlap pivot search and division by pivot element with row reads.
- Use multiple FPUs to do simultaneous updates (enough parallelism for 8 – 32, avg. col. size)
- Use cache to store updated rows from iteration to iteration (70% overlap, memory ≈ 400KB - largest). Can be used for prefetching.
- Total memory required ≈ 22MB (largest system)
Pivot Hardware

Read colmap → Translate to virtual → Index reject → Memory read → FP compare

Physical index

Virtual index → Column value

Pivot column

Pivot logic

Pivot index → Pivot value → Pivot
Parallel FPUs

**Single FPU**
- Data Input
  - FDIV
  - FMUL
  - FADD
- Data Output

**Multiple FPUs**
- Data Input
  - FDIV
  - FMUL
  - FMUL
  - FADD
- Data Output
Performance Model

- C program which simulates the computation (data transfer and arithmetic operations) and estimates the architecture’s performance (clock cycles and seconds).

Model Assumptions

- Sufficient internal buffers
- Cache write hits 100%
- Simple static memory allocation
- No penalty on cache write-back to SDRAM
Performance

Speedup (P4) vs. # Update Units by Matrix Size

Speedup

# Update Units

Jac2k
Jac7k
Jac10k
Jac27k
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GEPP Breakdown

Relative portion of LU Solve Time
Single Update Unit

- Pivot: 10%
- Divide: 4%
- Update: 86%

Relative portion of LU Solve Time
Quad Update Units

- Pivot: 26%
- Divide: 10%
- Update: 64%

Relative portion of LU Solve Time
16 Update Units

- Pivot: 41%
- Divide: 16%
- Update: 43%

Cycle Count
By # of Update Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pivot</td>
<td>259401</td>
<td>259401</td>
<td>259401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divide</td>
<td>96439</td>
<td>96439</td>
<td>96439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update</td>
<td>2409312</td>
<td>642662</td>
<td>248295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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