

## Blog Export: c0t0d0s0.org, http://www.c0t0d0s0.org/

Saturday, March 30, 2013

### Comparisons

I would like to add a comment to the SPARC T5 launch. There are some news outlets that are buying into this per core performance thing that was introduced by a certain blogger working at IBM.

In the very same blog i've read the best argument, why this is total nonsense. Insisting that your computer is better or faster because of the per-core performance is like insisting that a 300hp V6 motor in your car is more powerful than a 550hp V12 motor in another car.

Posted by Joerg Moellenkamp in English, Oracle, Technology at 12:13

Per-core performance is not the best CPU metric, but it is one of the figures that has to be calculated into the overall CPU performance rating.. and this is the point where Sun/Oracle's marketing tried to fool their audience when they introduced the T series CPUs.

Suddenly, every task was lightweight and perfectly scalable and threaded.. and the overall performance ratings in the whitepapers presented by the presales engineers was more or less "core clock \* number of virtual cores".

As far as single-thread performance goes, especially with a compiler that knows how to use the large SPARC caches, our old V880s still vastly outran the T5440s.

If you really want to get the performance that the T series can offer, you need to adapt your software accordingly.. and that's a point that is only rarely mentioned. All the Sun sales droids I've seen until now claimed "Just throw your existing software on the new Txxxx and it will be ten times as fast!" - and that's why I hate sales folk.

Anonymous on Apr 1 2013, 13:20

All the world has been using the per-core performance since the introduction of multi-core chips. Every company uses a per-core license rules in order to license their software. Based on this, Oracle sparc processors are still behind Power and Intel processors. Very few customers in the world requires a system with more than 64 cores. The only reason I can see that Oracle is shifting the strategy to per-chip performance is because there is nothing else to do. It is sad. Sparc and Solaris used to be very good, but Sun forgot to keep research in the solution and, therefore, stop development and stop in time.

Anonymous on Apr 3 2013, 01:56

I assume you are perfectly aware of the fact the core factor makes a large difference.

Anonymous on Apr 3 2013, 17:54

Well that all depends every Tech company pulls out its BS Bag when marketing Dell, HP, Apple, Sun and even small companies like sea micro.

Dont forget the scale do the 300HP cars use less fuel per HP? If so maybe they can complete more laps for less fuel so therefore you could buy more.

Dependent on the workload... How about Oracle just push out the 128bit CPU or just go straight to 256.

I agree with Woo compilers are king unless people start getting to know ASM again.

Fernando

I am sure that there would be many web servers that would love to fork() and then get the crypto chip... Intel says no...

Anonymous on Apr 8 2013, 13:46

IBM reasons like this:

IBM has faster cores (true) => IBM has faster cpus (false)

I dont get it. Oracle claims to have the worlds fastest CPUs, not worlds fastest cores. Why is IBM trying to claim they have faster cpus because they have faster cores?

IBM POWER6 did not do much work for every GHz, Sun T2+ did much more work for every GHz. And still Sun did not claimed:

Sun does more work per GHz (true) => Sun has faster cpus (not always true)

Anonymous on Apr 9 2013, 11:07