Reducing Checkpoint Size in PlasComCM with Lossy Compression

14th Annual Workshop on Charm++ and its Applications

Jon Calhoun¹, Franck Cappello^{1,2}, Luke Olson¹, and Marc Snir^{1,2}, Sheng Di²

¹University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign ²Argonne National Labatory

19 April 2016

Data Movement Problem

On current systems, computation is essentially free compared to time and energy required for data transfers.

What do we do with these *free* CPU cycles?



[Keckler 2011]



Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

Checkpoint Restart in Charm++

Native checkpoint restart

- partner nodes
- permanent storage



Although checkpointing to a partner node is much faster, checkpointing to permanent storage is still needed.

Let's look at improving checkpointing to the parallel filesystem.



Lossless compression?

Scheme	Transformation Applied	Algorithm	Compression Ratio
FPC [8]	not used	it first predicts values sequentially using two predic- tors (FCM and DFCM), and subsequently selects the closer predicted value to the actual Lastly, it XORs the selected predicted value with the actual value, and leading.zero compresses the result.	1.02x~1.96x
ISOBAR [30]	divide byte-columns into compressible and incompressibles	apply zlib, bzlib2, (fpzip, FPC) on all compressible (af- ter discarding noisy byte-columns). zlib is the main com- pression algorithm; others are for comparison purposes	1.12x~1.48x
PRIMACY [31]	frequency based permutation of ID values	apply zlib on transformed data	1.13x~2.16x
ALACRITY [19]	split floating-point values into sign, exponent, and significands	unique-value encoding of the most significant bytes (as- suming high-order bytes (sign and exponents) are easy to compress); low-order bytes are compressed using ISO- BAR	1.19x~1.58x
CC [6]	XOR on Δ of neighboring data point in the same iteration	apply zero-filled run length encoding	up to 2.13x
IOFSL [36]	not used	integration of LZO, bzip2, zlib within the I/O forward- ing layer	$\sim 1.9 x$
Binary Masking [5]	bit masking (XOR)	apply zlib on bit masked data in order to partially de- creases the entropy level	1.11x~1.33x
MCRENGINE [18]	variable merging in the same group	apply parallel gzip on the merged variables across pro- cesses	up to 1.18x

Table 1. Comparison of lossless compression schemes.

[Son et al. 2014]



- Standard compression schemes not designed for floating-point
- Lossless floating-point schemes provide small compression factors

Scheme	Transformation Applied	Algorithm	Compression Ratio
FPC [8]	not used	it first predicts values sequentially using two predic- tors (FCM and DFCM), and subsequently selects the closer predicted value to the actual. Lastly, it XORs the selected predicted value with the actual value, and leading.zero compresses the result.	1.02x~1.96x
ISOBAR [30]	divide byte-columns into compressible and incompressibles	apply zlib, bzlib2, (fpzip, FPC) on all compressible (af- ter discarding noisy byte-columns). zlib is the main com- pression algorithm; others are for comparison purposes	1.12x~1.48x
PRIMACY [31]	frequency based permutation of ID values	apply zlib on transformed data	1.13x~2.16x
ALACRITY [19]	split floating-point values into sign, exponent, and significands	unique-value encoding of the most significant bytes (as- suming high-order bytes (sign and exponents) are easy to compress); low-order bytes are compressed using ISO- BAR	1.19x~1.58x
CC [6]	XOR on Δ of neighboring data point in the same iteration	apply zero-filled run length encoding	up to 2.13x
IOFSL [36]	not used	integration of LZO, bzip2, zlib within the I/O forward- ing layer	$\sim 1.9 x$
Binary Masking [5]	bit masking (XOR)	apply zlib on bit masked data in order to partially de- creases the entropy level	1.11x~1.33x
MCRENGINE [18]	variable merging in the same group	apply parallel gzip on the merged variables across pro- cesses	up to 1.18x

Table 1	1.	Comparison	of	lossless	compression	schemes.
---------	----	------------	----	----------	-------------	----------

[Son et al. 2014]

Lossy Compression



Figure 4. CDF of Compression Ratios (note that SSEM, NUMARCK and ISABELA do not respect specified error bound as shown in Figure 5)

High compression ratios with lossy compression [Di and Cappello 2016]

Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

Reducing Checkpoint Size in PlasComCM with Lossy Compression

Can applications be restarted from a lossy checkpoint?

Whenever you use floating-point values you have already embraced various amounts of error

- Floating-point arithmic alread suffers from error due to roundoff.
- Numerical methods used to solve PDEs and ODEs are only accurate to the order of the method.



Many lossy compression schemes allow you to specify an error bound (e.g. relative, absolute).

- How should I evaluate this error?
- Is this error detrimental?



Evaluation

Accuracy of numerical methods is expressed as $\mathcal{O}(h^p)$.

Restrict lossy compression error tolerance to be less than truncation error, then error added by lossy compression is *hidden* in the simulation.

Let's first look at a 1-D heat and a 1-D advection equation to understand what happend to simple PDEs.

Setup:

- Lossy Compressor: SZ-0.5.5 [Di and Cappello 2016]
- Data vectors 64-bit floating-point
- Checkpoint PDE state variables

1-D Heat Equation Error Evolution



Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

1-D Heat Error Evolution



1-D Advection Equation Error Evolution



Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

Reducing Checkpoint Size in PlasComCM with Lossy Compression

1-D Advection Error Evolution



XPACC PlasComCM

PlasComCM

- coupled multipysics code
- Checkpoint restart accomplished by AMPI

Setup:

- Navier-stokes flow past cylinder problem
- $h_x = h_y = 0.0015$
- Checkpoint every 5000 iterations to $1e^{-14}$



PlasComCM Compression Factor



PlasComCM Timings



Simulation

Simulation

Error





Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

What is the compression error tolerance $1e^{-?}$

Simulation

Lossy Compressed Simulation





Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

What is the compression error tolerance $1e^{-2}$

Simulation

Lossy Compressed Simulation





Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu

Conclusion and Future Work

Lossy compression can effectively reduce the size of a checkpoint without affecting the negatively solution

Currently only applicable to file system checkpoints

Need to discuss with users to determine acceptable error tolerance

Investigate other applications and inputs to gain further insight

Further leverage application properties when compressing



Acknowledgments

• This work was sponsored by the Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant FA9550-12-1-0478.





Any questions?



Jon Calhoun jccalho2@illinois.edu