

FFT in the Exascale: Performance Bottlenecks and Solutions

FFT in the Exascale: Opportunities and Challenges

by

Hari Subramoni

The Ohio State University

E-mail: subramoni.1@osu.edu

http://www.cse.ohio-state.edu/~subramon

Introduction and Motivation, and Challenges

- FFT's are critical components of several HPC applications and kernels
 - PSDNS, P3DFFT
- FFT's are typically communication intensive operations
 - Use All-to-all communication (MPI_Alltoall or MPI_Alltoallv)
- Performance of FFT's determine performance of applications relying on it
- Several factors impact the performance
 - What communication primitive is being used MPI_Alltoall or MPI_Alltoallv?
 - What is the message size being used for communication small or large?
 - Is there an attempt to overlap of computation and communication?
 - Who progresses the communication?

Can communication runtimes/middleware and applications/kernels be codesigned with these factors in mind to deliver scalable performance on emerging Exascale systems?

MPI_Alltoall or MPI_Alltoallv?

- Choice of primitives has a significant impact on communication performance
- Semantics of primitive limits the ability of communication runtime to perform optimized communication



Use "padding" and make use of MPI_Alltoall instead of MPI_Alltoallv

Overlap of Computation and Communication

- Concept simple and benefits obvious
 - Devil is in the details!
- Who progresses communication ???
- Different methods available for progress
 - Application progresses
 - MPI_Test / MPI_Probe / MPI_Iprobe
 - LibNBC (Hoefler et al.)
 - Separate software-based progress entity
 - One thread per process
 - LibNBC (Hoefler et al.)
 - MPICH (MPICH Team @ ANL)
 - One process per node (Functional Partitioning)
 - Hoefler et al., Nomura et al., Schneider et al., Kandalla et al.
 - Dedicated hardware progress engines
 - eg: CORE-Direct & SHARP from Mellanox
 - Venkata et al., Kandalla et al.

Problem Space for Designing NBCs





Problem Space for Designing NBCs (Cont.)



CORE-Direct/Generic HCA-based Offload Switch-based Offload

Comparison of Communication Progress Schemes

Metric	Application; LibNBC/MPICH	FP/ Threads	HCA Offload	Switch Offload
Communication Latency	Good	Good	Good	Good
Computation/Communication Overlap	Poor	Good	Good	Good
Network Scalability	Good	Good	Fair	Good
Availability of Cores for Compute	Poor	Fair	Good	Good

Performance of P3DFFT Kernel



- Weak scaling experiments;
 problem size increases with job
 size
- HCA-Offloaded scheme delivers 19% improvement over Default @ 8,192 procs
 - Stampede@TACC (Sandybridge + IB FDR)
 - 512 nodes, 16 processes per node

Designing Non-Blocking Personalized Collectives with Near Perfect Overlap for RDMA-Enabled Clusters, H. Subramoni, A. Awan, K. Hamidouche, D. Pekurovsky, A. Venkatesh, S. Chakraborty, K. Tomko, and D. K. Panda, ISC '15, Jul 2015

ISC'18

Thank You!

subramon@cse.ohio-state.edu



Network-Based Computing Laboratory <u>http://nowlab.cse.ohio-state.edu/</u>



The High-Performance MPI/PGAS Project <u>http://mvapich.cse.ohio-state.edu/</u>



High-Performance Big Data

The High-Performance Big Data Project http://hibd.cse.ohio-state.edu/



The High-Performance Deep Learning Project <u>http://hidl.cse.ohio-state.edu/</u>

Network Based Computing Laboratory

