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Motivation

- MPI is the *de facto* standard for HPC
- InfiniBand growing in popularity
  - Particularly on large-scale clusters
  - June 2005 Top500: 3% of machines
  - November 2007 Top500: 24% of machines
- Clusters growing in size
  - Thunderbird, 4,500 node InfiniBand
InfiniBand (IB) Architecture

- **Queue Pair concept (QP)**
  - Send a message by posting work to a queue
  - Post receive buffers to a queue for use by hardware

- **Completion Queue**
  - Signals local send completion
  - Returns receive buffers filled with data

- **Shared Receive Queue**
  - Multiple QPs share a single receive queue
  - Reduces network resources
Reliable Connection (RC) Transport

- Traditional approach for MPI communication over InfiniBand
- Point-to-point connections
- Send/receive and RDMA semantics
- One queue pair per connection
  - Out-of-band handshake required to establish
- Memory requirements scale with number of connections
  - Memory buffer requirements reduced by using shared receive queue
Unreliable Datagram Transport

- Requires software (MPI) reliability protocol
  - Memory-to-Memory, not HCA-to-HCA
- Message size limited to network MTU
  - 2 kilobytes on current hardware
- Connectionless model
  - No setup overhead
  - One QP can communicate with any peer
  - Except for address information, memory requirement is constant
Open MPI Modular Component Architecture

- Framework consists of many components
- Component is instantiated into modules
PML Components

- **OB1**
  - Implements MPI point-to-point semantics
  - Fragmentation and scheduling of messages
  - Optimized for performance in common use

- **Data Reliability (DR)**
  - Extends OB1 with network fault tolerance
    - Message reliability protocol
    - Data checksumming
Byte Transport Layer (BTL)

- Components are interconnect specific
  - TCP, shmem, GM, OpenIB, uDAPL, et. al.

- Send/Receive Semantics
  - PML fragments, not MPI messages

- RDMA Put/Get Semantics
  - Optional – not always supported!
Byte Transport Layer (BTL)

- Entirely Asynchronous
  - Blocking is not allowed
  - Progress made via polling

- Lazy connection establishment
  - Point-to-point connections established as needed

- Option to multiplex physical interfaces in one module, or to provide many modules

- No MPI semantics
  - Simple, peer-to-peer data transfer operations
UD BTL Implementation

- RDMA not supported
- Use with DR PML
- Receiver buffer management
  - Messages dropped if no buffers available
  - Allocate a large, static pool
  - No flow control in current design
Queue Pair Striping

- Splitting sends across multiple queue pairs increases bandwidth
- Receive buffers still posted to one QP
Results

- LLNL Atlas
  - 1,152 quad dual-core (8 core) nodes
  - InfiniBand DDR network
- Open MPI trunk r16080
  - Code publicly available since June 2007
- UD results with both DR and OB1
  - Compare DR reliability overhead
- RC with and without Shared Receive Queue
NetPIPE Latency

![Graph showing latency results for different OpenIB configurations.](image-url)
Allconn Benchmark

- Each MPI process sends a 0-byte message to every other process
  - Done in a ring-like fashion to balance load

- Measures time required to establish connections between all peers
  - For connection-oriented networks, at least
  - UD should only reflect time required to send messages – no establishment overhead
Allconn Startup Overhead

![Graph showing the startup overhead for different processes. The x-axis represents the number of processes, ranging from 128 to 1024. The y-axis represents the time in seconds, ranging from 0.0001 to 100. The graph includes lines for UD, RC, SRQ, and RC, each with different markers and line styles.]
Allconn Memory Overhead

![Graph showing memory overhead for different processes. The graph plots Size (KiB) on the y-axis and Processes on the x-axis. Different lines represent different overhead types: UD, RC, SRQ, and RC. The size increases with the number of processes.](image-url)
SMG2000 Solver

![Bar chart showing the performance of different protocols (UD/OB1, UD/DR, OpenIB, OpenIB/SRQ) for SMG2000 Solver Phase (s) across different process counts (P=216, P=512, P=1000, P=1728, P=2744, P=4096).]
SMG2000 Solver Memory

The graph shows the memory usage of the SMG2000 Solver in KiB for different configurations of P (216, 512, 1000, 1728, 2744, 4096) and different communication protocols. The protocols include UD/OB1, UD/DR, OpenIB, and OpenIB/SRQ. The memory usage increases with higher values of P for all protocols.
Conclusion

- UD is an excellent alternative to RC
  - Significantly reduced memory requirements
    - More memory for the application
  - Minimal startup/initialization overhead
    - Helps with job turnaround on large, busy systems
  - Advantage increases as scale increases
    - Clusters will continue to increase in size

- DR-based reliability incurs penalty
  - Minimal some some applications (ABINIT), significant for others (SMG2000)
Future Work

- Optimized reliability protocol in the BTL
  - Initial implementation working right now
  - Much lower latency impact
  - Bandwidth optimization in progress

- Improved flow control & buffer management
  - Hard problem
Flow Control Problems

- Lossy Network
  - No guarantee flow control signals are received
  - Probabilistic approaches are required

- Abstraction barrier
  - PML hides packet loss from BTL
  - Message storms are expected by PML, not BTL

- Throttling mechanisms
  - Limited ability to control message rate

- Who do we notify when congestion occurs?
Flow Control Solutions

- Use throttle signals instead of absolute credit counts
- Maintain a moving average of receive completion rate
- Enable/disable endpoint striping to throttle message rate
- Use multicast to send throttle signals
  - All peers receive information
  - Scalable?