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Combination of hardware

- Classical CPUs
- Accelerators: GPUs
- Network card
- Data transfers

Managing it all by hand?!
- New machine with more GPUs
- New transfer possibilities
- …

→ Runtime systems
High-Performance Computing

A recent actual trend towards runtime systems & task graphs

- **Applications**
  - Submit a task graph

- **Runtime system**
  - Manages & optimizes execution
  - Copes with memory limitation
  - ...

HPC Applications
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Parallel Libraries
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High-Performance Computing

The StarPU runtime system

- **Started in 2008**
  - PhD Thesis of Cédric Augonnet
- **StarPU main core ≈ 70k lines**
- **Written in C**
- **Open Source**
  - Release under LGPL
  - Sources freely available
    - git repository and nightly tarballs
    - See https://starpu.gforge.inria.fr/
  - Open to external contributors
- **[Europar’09,CCPE’11]: > 1200 citations**
Difficulties shifted

- **Applications**
  - Decide task graph structure
  - Decide task granularity

- **Runtime system**
  - Scheduling heuristics
  - Eviction heuristics
  - ...

And debug…
Confirming performance improvements with measurements

- **Robust? Platform stability**
  - Rogue processes
  - Faulty cables
  - Software upgrades
  - Firmware upgrades

- **Repeatable? Platform availability**
  - CPU.hour allocation
  - Decommissioned platform

- **Reproducible? Different platforms**
  - Getting accounts on various systems
  - Install software stack there
High-Performance Computing

For instance, LU factorization on Hannibal machine

- Odd behavior, stable
- Old GPU, old machine
- Now decommissioned
Confirming performance improvements with simulation

• **Platform stability**
  – Deterministic execution
    → Reproducible performance, and bugs!

• **Platform availability**
  – Can run on commodity laptop
    → No need for platform reservation

• **Different platforms**
  – Sharing platform modeling
    → Predicting performance
Simulating a runtime system

- Combine emulation and simulation at task level
  - Task graph control code emulated
    - Both runtime and application main code executed unmodified
  - Task computation and data transfers simulated
    - Performance models
Simulation with SimGrid
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Simulation with SimGrid

The runtime tells SimGrid about

- Threads doing virtual sleeps corresponding to tasks
- Data transfers over the PCI bus

SimGrid manages

- Synchronization between threads, and with data transfers
- Simulated PCI bandwidth shared between data transfers
At each timestep, SimGrid determines next event to trigger
- thread sleep completion,
- or data transfer completion

And advances simulated time accordingly.
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• At each timestep, SimGrid determines next event to trigger
  - thread sleep completion,
  - or data transfer completion

• And advances simulated time accordingly
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Simulation with SimGrid

- At each timestep, SimGrid determines next event to trigger
  - thread sleep completion,
  - or data transfer completion

- And advances simulated time accordingly
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Simulation with SimGrid

- At each timestep, SimGrid determines next event to trigger
  - thread sleep completion,
  - or data transfer completion

- And advances simulated time accordingly
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Simulation with SimGrid

Result on LU factorization on Hannibal machine

Accurate until matrix too big for all data transfers to overlap
Take GPU memory limitation into account (2.5 GB)
Refining data transfers

- Improve PCI network model
  - Support direct GPU-GPU transfers
  - Generated by StarPU from measurements on target system
  - And even PCI tree from hwloc information
Refining data transfers

Result on LU factorization on Hannibal machine

- Way more accurate
- Still odd behavior beyond 66K
Pitch issue with Quadro FX5800

Tile within big matrix $\rightarrow$ pitch (LD: leading dimension)
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Pitch issue with Quadro FX5800

Tile within big matrix → pitch (LD: leading dimension)

Old QuadroFX5800 does not work well with pitch ≥ 264KB

→ Update transfer performance model accordingly
Refining data transfers

Result on LU factorization on Hannibal machine

Simulation often reveals real bugs
Results

Various system, various applications
Results

Various scheduling algorithms

(Cholesky on attila)
Execution behavior is representative
More trustworthy Continuous Integration regression testing
Research opportunities

Experimenting scheduling heuristics

- With representative & reproducible simulated results
  - Confidence

- On various target platforms
  - Different GPU models
  - Different PCI topologies
  - ...
  - Without any platform account or CPU.hour allocation
Research opportunities

Experimenting scheduling heuristics

• **With tuned platform**
  – Change GPU memory size
  – Change PCI bus speed
  – Change topology (e.g. NVLink)

• **With invented platforms**
  – Assemble existing performance models
    • Different kinds of GPUs in same system
  – Or even write some

• **Could also be used for provisioning**
  – “Does this application, with 8 V100 GPUs, needs NVLink?”
Research opportunities

Experimenting scheduling heuristics

• Ignoring data transfer costs
  − Set PCI bandwidth to infinity
  − Scheduling tasks without caring about locality, as first step

• Ignoring scheduler cost
  − No need to care about efficient implementation, as first step

• Suraj Kumar’s PhD thesis mostly in simulation
  − Scheduling improvements then confirmed with measurements
Debugging scheduling heuristics

- **Deterministic bugs**
  - Can reproduce them at will
  - Adding printfs do not change behavior

- **Breakpoint on timestamp**
  - Inspect runtime system state etc.
  - Direct link between artifact in trace and scheduling decision
Simulation of a runtime system

- **Trustworthy results**
  - Even more than actual measurements?

- **Playground for scheduling research**
  - Reproducibility
  - Various testcases
  - Progressive exposition of theory to practice

- **Not discussed today**
  - MPI support
  - Irregular kernel modeling

http://starpu.gforge.inria.fr/
Perspectives

Task graph market
- Collecting application cases
- Tools to assemble synthetic systems

Refined CPU kernel modeling
- Cache effects between tasks
  - Scheduling decision thus has impact
  - Germán Ceballos PhD
- NUMA systems
  - Isolation of cache / PCI bus effect
  - Idriss Daoudi PhD
[AugonnetPhD11] [ArrasPhD15] [RossignonPhD15] [SergentPhD16] [KumarPhD17] [LionPhD]

- ANR ProHMPT’09, MEDIAGPU’10, FP3C’10, SONGS’12, SOLHAR’13
- IPL HAC-SPECIS’16, HPC-BigData’18
- EU PEPPHER’10, EXA2PRO’18
- Rapid Hi-BOX’13
- MORSE associate-team
- Used by AL4SAN, Chameleon, ExaGeoStat, FLUSEPA, HiCMA, hmat, KSVD, MAGMA, MaPHyS, MOAO, PaStiX, QDWH, qr_mumps, ScalFMM, SCHNAPS, SignalPU, SkePU, STARS-H
Performance models - MultiLinear

- Theoretical complexity of BLAS GEQRT

\[ T_{\text{GEQRT}} = a + 2b(NB^2 \times MB) - 2c(NB^3 \times BK) + \frac{4d}{3}NB^3 \]

- Can tune a, b, c, d with linear regression

- Why these NB^2xMB, NB^3xBK and NB^3 parameters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>GEQRT Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$-2.49 \times 10^1 \ (-2.83 \times 10^1, -2.14 \times 10^1)$ ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB^2 x MB</td>
<td>$5.49 \times 10^{-7} \ (5.46 \times 10^{-7}, 5.51 \times 10^{-7})$ ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB^3 x BK</td>
<td>$-5.52 \times 10^{-7} \ (-5.57 \times 10^{-7}, -5.48 \times 10^{-7})$ ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB^3</td>
<td>$1.50 \times 10^{-5} \ (1.30 \times 10^{-5}, 1.70 \times 10^{-5})$ ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Observations    | 493                        |
| R²              | 0.999                      |

*Note:*  
*p<0.1;  **p<0.05;  ***p<0.01

- Works well with regular kernels
Performance models - ScalFMM

- Initial attempt with direct parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel</td>
<td>7.73 × 10^1</td>
<td>(7.32 × 10^1, 8.14 × 10^1)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NbCells</td>
<td>1.52 × 10^2</td>
<td>(1.46 × 10^2, 1.59 × 10^2)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntervalSize</td>
<td>-5.55 × 10^-1</td>
<td>(-6.65 × 10^-1, -4.45 × 10^-1)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel^2</td>
<td>-6.73</td>
<td>(-7.10, -6.37)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NbCells^2</td>
<td>-6.08 × 10^-3</td>
<td>(-7.94 × 10^-3, -4.21 × 10^-3)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IntervalSize^2</td>
<td>-3.63 × 10^-12</td>
<td>(-6.36 × 10^-12, -9.04 × 10^-13)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel × NbCells</td>
<td>-4.68</td>
<td>(-5.88, -3.48)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel × IntervalSize</td>
<td>6.24 × 10^-2</td>
<td>(5.02 × 10^-2, 7.46 × 10^-2)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NbCells × IntervalSize</td>
<td>1.81 × 10^-4</td>
<td>(1.39 × 10^-4, 2.24 × 10^-4)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel × NbCells × IntervalSize</td>
<td>-2.08 × 10^-5</td>
<td>(-2.55 × 10^-5, -1.61 × 10^-5)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.27 × 10^2</td>
<td>(-2.40 × 10^2, -2.14 × 10^2)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations: 4,987
R^2: 0.906

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Performance models - ScalFMM

- Introduce NbInteraction parameter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TreeLevel</td>
<td>$9.10 \times 10^2$ (8.46 \times 10^2, 9.74 \times 10^2)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NbCells</td>
<td>5.34 (5.17, 5.50)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NbInteractions</td>
<td>$8.59 \times 10^{-1}$ (8.58 \times 10^{-1}, 8.60 \times 10^{-1})</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$-7.09$ (-7.50, -6.67)</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations 4,987  
$R^2$ 0.999  

Note: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Performance models - ScalFMM
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