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Overdecomposition

• Decompose the work units & data units into many more pieces than execution units
  – Cores/Nodes/..

• Not so hard: we do decomposition anyway
Migratibility

• Allow these work and data units to be migratable at runtime
  – i.e. the programmer or runtime, can move them

• Consequences for the app-developer
  – Communication must now be addressed to logical units with global names, not to physical processors
  – But this is a good thing

• Consequences for RTS
  – Must keep track of where each unit is
  – Naming and location management
Asynchrony: Message-Driven Execution

• You have multiple units on each processor
• They address each other via logical names
• Message-driven execution:
  – Let the work-unit that happens to have data ("message") available for it execute next
  – Let the RTS select among ready work units
  – Programmer should not specify what executes next, but can influence it via priorities
Charm++: Object-based overdecomposition

- Multiple “indexed collections” of C++ objects
- Indices can be multi-dimensional and/or sparse
- Programmer expresses communication between objects – with no reference to processors: A[i].foo(…)

System implementation

User View
Message-driven Execution

Processor 1
- Scheduler
- Message Queue

Processor 2
- Scheduler
- Message Queue

A[..].foo(…)

Diagram illustrating message-driven execution with two processors, each having a scheduler and a message queue. The message `A[..].foo(…)` is transmitted between the processors.
Empowering the RTS

Adaptive Runtime System

- Introspection
- Adaptivity
- Asynchrony
- Overdecomposition
- Migratability

- The Adaptive RTS can:
  - Dynamically balance loads
  - Optimize communication:
    - Spread over time, async collectives
  - Automatic latency tolerance
  - Prefetch data with almost perfect predictability
Charm++ RTS

**XARTS**

**WUDUs**: Indexed collection, Migratable threads, Scalable sections (sub-communicators), Location services

Data-driven **scheduler**, user-level threads, priority queues

**Fault tolerance** protocols

**Load balancers**: intra-node, inter-node, Power-aware, Thermal-aware, Topo-aware

**Communication Libs** (Collectives/persistence)

**LRTS**: m/c specific implementations: (start-up, communication, virtual mem. management)

**Scalable Tools**
Analysis, Debugging
ARGO
An Exascale Operating System and Runtime
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Key Areas of Innovation:

- **NodeOS/R**
  - Core-specialization permits multiple, concurrent kernels

- **Lightweight Concurrency**
  - Embed fine-grained tasks and lightweight threads into OS for massive parallelism

- **Backplane**
  - Event, Control, and Performance backplanes to support global optimizations

- **Global View**
  - “Enclave” abstraction to allow global optimization of power, resilience, perf.

$9.7M ASCR DOE
3 year project, launched Aug 2013
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ChaNGa: Parallel Gravity

- Collaborative project (NSF)
  - with Tom Quinn, Univ. of Washington
- Gravity, gas dynamics
- Barnes–Hut tree codes
  - Oct tree is natural decomp
  - Geometry has better aspect ratios, so you “open” up fewer nodes
  - But is not used because it leads to bad load balance
  - Assumption: one-to-one map between sub-trees and PEs
  - Binary trees are considered better load balanced

Evolution of Universe and Galaxy Formation

With Charm++: Use Oct-Tree, and let Charm++ map subtrees to processors
ChaNGa: Cosmology Simulation

- Tree: Represents particle distribution
- TreePiece: object/charles containing particles

Collaboration with Tom Quinn UW
ChaNGa: Optimized Performance

- Asynchronous, highly overlapped, phases
- Requests for remote data overlapped with local computations
ChaNGa: a recent result
Clustered Dataset – Dwarf

- Highly clustered
- Maximum request per processor: > 30K

- Idle time due to message delays
- Also, load imbalances: solved by Hierarchical balancers
Solution: Replication

- Replicate tree nodes to distribute requests
- Requester randomly selects a replica
Replication Impact

- Replication distributes requests
- Maximum request reduced from 30K to 4.5K
- Gravity time reduced from 2.4 s to 1.7 s, on 8k
Multiple time-stepping!

- Our scientist collaborators suggest an algorithmic optimization:
  - Don’t move slow-moving particles every step
    - i.e. don’t calculate forces on them either
  - In fact, make many (say 5) categories (rungs) of particles based on their velocities
  - Rung sequence (with 5 rungs)
    - 4 3 4 2 4 3 4 1 4 3 4 2 4 3 4 0
    - Rung 0: all particles, Rung 4: fastest-moving particles
  - Each tree-piece object now presents a different load when different “rungs” are being calculated
Multiple time-stepping!

- Load (for the same object) changes across rungs
  - Yet, there is persistence within the same rung!
  - So, specialized phase-aware balancers were developed
Multi-stepping tradeoff

- Parallel efficiency is lower, but performance is improved significantly

![Graph showing single and multi stepping tradeoff](image-url)
NAMD: Biomolecular Simulations

• Collaboration with K. Schulten
• With over 50,000 registered users
• Scaled to most top US supercomputers
• In production use on supercomputers and clusters and desktops
• Gordon Bell award in 2002

Recent success: Determination of the structure of HIV capsid by researchers including Prof Schulten
92,000 atom system, on 500+ nodes (16k cores)

2ms total

A snapshot of optimization in progress. Not the final result

Overlapped steps, as a result of asynchrony
Timeline of ApoA1 on Power7 PERCS

230us
NAMD: Strong Scaling

- HIV Capsid was a 64 million atom simulation, including explicit water atoms
- Most biophysics systems of interests are 10M atoms or less... maybe 100M
- Strong scaling desired to billions of steps
Enhancing Asynchrony in NAMD

• Charm++ reductions are non-blocking
  – So, you *can* do other work while reduction is progressing through the system

• Synchronization:
  – NAMD, when used with a barostat (NPT ensemble), needs pressure from the current step to rescale volume
  – So, no other work was performed during reduction

• Enhancing asynchrony:
  – For strong scaling, the algebra was reworked to use the results of the reduction one step later
  – Overlapped reduction with an entire force computation step
  – 10% performance improvement on 16k **nodes** on Titan
NAMD strong scaling on Titan Cray XK7, Blue Waters Cray XE6, and Mira IBM Blue Gene/Q for 21M and 224M atom benchmarks.
Episimdemics

• Simulation of spread of contagion
  – Code by Madhav Marathe, Keith Bisset, .. Vtech
  – Original was in MPI
• Converted to Charm++
  – Benefits: asynchronous reductions improved performance considerably
Simulating contagion over dynamic networks

EpiSimdemics\(^1\)

- Agent-based
- Realistic population data
- Intervention\(^2\)
- Co-evolving network, behavior and policy\(^2\)

\(P = 1 - \exp(t \cdot \log(1 - I \cdot S))\)
- \(t\): duration of co-presence
- \(I\): infectivity
- \(S\): susceptibility

---

\(^1\)C. Barrett et al., “EpiSimdemics: An Efficient Algorithm for Simulating the Spread of Infectious Disease over Large Realistic Social Networks,” SC08

\(^2\)K. Bisset et al., “Modeling Interaction Between Individuals, Social Networks and Public Policy to Support Public Health Epidemiology,” WSC09.
### Load distribution (Vulcan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>ZC</th>
<th>GP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.755 s)</td>
<td>(1.583 s)</td>
<td>(1.222 s)</td>
<td>(0.438 s)</td>
<td>(0.369 s)</td>
<td>(0.368 s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **splitLoc**: no peak in location computation
- **Z-splitLoc**: no load balance
- **GP**: shorter person phase
- **ZC-splitLoc**: similar perf. w/ GP-splitLoc

- Blue: person computation
- Red: receiver’s msg handling
- Orange: location computation

X-axis: Time  
Y-axis: Processor

Timeline of an iteration from sampled subset of 332 cores of total 4K using Michigan data on Vulcan.
Figure 10. The synchronization cost using `contribute()` and QD method takes at most 4.23% of the total execution time while the MPI synchronization cost linearly increases up to 14.5% as the number of PEs used increases for simulating Arkansas population.
Strong scaling performance with the largest data set

- Contiguous US population data
- **XE6**: the largest scale (352K cores)
- **BG/Q**: good scaling up to 128K cores
- Strong scaling helps timely reaction to pandemic
Using Charm++ virtualization, we can efficiently scale small (32 molecule) systems to thousands of processors.
Topology Aware Mapping of Objects
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Improvements by topological aware mapping of computation to processors

The simulation of the left panel, maps computational work to processors taking the network connectivity into account while the right panel simulation does not. The “black” or idle time processors spent waiting for computational work to arrive on processors is significantly reduced at left. (256waters, 70R, on BG/L 4096 cores)

Punchline: Overdecomposition into Migratable Objects created the degree of freedom needed for flexible mapping
OpenAtom Performance Sampler

Ongoing work on:
K-points

OpenAtom running WATER 256M 70Ry on various platforms

![Graph showing performance of OpenAtom running WATER 256M 70Ry on various platforms.](image-url)
# MiniApps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mini-App</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Max cores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMR</td>
<td>Overdecomposition, Custom array index, Message priorities, Load Balancing, Checkpoint restart</td>
<td>BG/Q</td>
<td>131,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LeanMD</td>
<td>Overdecomposition, Load Balancing, Checkpoint restart, Power awareness</td>
<td>BG/P BG/Q</td>
<td>131,072 32,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes–Hut (n-body)</td>
<td>Overdecomposition, Message priorities, Load Balancing</td>
<td>Blue Waters</td>
<td>16,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LULESH 2.02</td>
<td>AMPI, Over-decomposition, Load Balancing</td>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDES</td>
<td>Overdecomposition, Message priorities, TRAM</td>
<td>Stampede</td>
<td>4,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# More MiniApps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mini-App</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Max cores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1D FFT</td>
<td>Interoperable with MPI</td>
<td>BG/P</td>
<td>65,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BG/Q</td>
<td>16,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Access</td>
<td>TRAM</td>
<td>BG/P</td>
<td>131,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BG/Q</td>
<td>16,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dense LU</td>
<td>SDAG</td>
<td>XT5</td>
<td>8,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sparse Triangular Solver</td>
<td>SDAG</td>
<td>BG/P</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTC</td>
<td>SDAG</td>
<td>BG/Q</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Waters</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where are Exascale Issues?

• I didn’t bring up exascale at all so far..
  – Overdecomposition, migratability, asynchrony were needed on yesterday’s machines too
  – And the app community has been using them
  – But:
    • On *some* of the applications, and maybe without a common general-purpose RTS

• The same concepts help at exascale
  – Not just help, they are necessary, and adequate
  – As long as the RTS capabilities are improved

• We have to apply overdecomposition to all (most) apps
A message of this talk

Intelligent, introspective, Adaptive Runtime Systems, developed for handling application’s dynamic variability, already have features that can deal with challenges posed by exascale hardware.
Fault Tolerance in Charm++/AMPI

• Four approaches available:
  – Disk-based checkpoint/restart
  – In-memory double checkpoint w auto. restart
  – Proactive object migration
  – Message-logging: scalable fault tolerance

• Common Features:
  – Easy checkpoint: migrate-to-disk
  – Based on dynamic runtime capabilities
  – Use of object-migration
  – Can be used in concert with load-balancing schemes

Demo at Tech Marketplace
Extensions to fault recovery

• Based on the same over-decomposition ideas
  – Use NVRAM instead of DRAM for checkpoints
    • Non-blocking variants
    • [Cluster 2012] Xiang Ni et al.
  – Replica-based soft-and-hard-error handling
    • As a “gold-standard” to optimize against
Saving Cooling Energy

- Easy: increase A/C setting
  - But: some cores may get too hot
- So, reduce frequency if temperature is high (DVFS)
  - Independently for each chip
- *But*, this creates a load imbalance!
- No problem, we can handle that:
  - Migrate objects away from the slowed-down processors
  - Balance load using an existing strategy
  - Strategies take speed of processors into account
- Implemented in experimental version
  - SC 2011 paper, IEEE TC paper
- Several new power/energy-related strategies
  - PASA ‘12: Exploiting differential sensitivities of code segments to frequency change
PARM: Power Aware Resource Manager

- Charm++ RTS facilitates malleable jobs
- PARM can improve throughput under a fixed power budget using:
  - overprovisioning (adding more nodes than conventional data center)
  - RAPL (capping power consumption of nodes)
  - Job malleability and moldability
Summary

- Charm++ embodies an adaptive, introspective runtime system
- Many applications have been developed using it:
  - NAMD, ChaNGa, Episimdemics, OpenAtom, ...
  - Many miniApps, and third-party apps
- Adaptivity developed for apps is useful for addressing exascale challenges:
  - Resilience, power/temperature optimizations, ..

More info on Charm++:
http://charm.cs.illinois.edu
Including the miniApps

Overdecomposition  Asynchrony  Migratability
A recently published book surveys seven major applications developed using Charm++

More info on Charm++:
http://charm.cs.illinois.edu
Including the miniApps