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Current Trend

- **New Constraints**
  - 15 years of *exponential* clock rate growth has ended
- **But Moore’s Law continues!**
  - Number of transistors keep increase exponentially.
  - How do keep performance increasing at historical rates?
- **Industry Response**
  - #cores per chip doubles every 18 months *instead of* clock frequency!

*Figure courtesy of Kunle Olukotun, Lance Hammond, Herb Sutter, and Burton Smith*
Impact to NERSC

• Franklin Upgrade Option
  – Currently 19,000 dual core XT4 2.6GHz Rev-F Opterons
  – Have option to upgrade to quad-core in 2008
  – What is impact of dual-core on application performance
  – Can we use the dual-core impact to predict impact of quad-core on application performance?
  – Ultimately is the quad-core upgrade cost-effective?

• For Users
  – What are the causal factors for multi-core performance loss?
  – How to mitigate the dual-core performance impact?
  – What can we learn from micro-benchmarks and some typical scientific applications?
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### STREAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Core XT3</th>
<th>1 Core XT4</th>
<th>2 Core XT3</th>
<th>2 Core XT4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copy:</td>
<td>5137</td>
<td>8196</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>4074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale:</td>
<td>5067</td>
<td>7257</td>
<td>2348</td>
<td>4012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add:</td>
<td>4734</td>
<td>7482</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>3469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad:</td>
<td>4135</td>
<td>7464</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>3626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### STREAM Bandwidth

![STREAM Bandwidth Chart]

**Stream test name**

- **Copy**: 1 Core XT3, 1 Core XT4, 2 Core XT3, 2 Core XT4
- **Scale**: 1 Core XT3, 1 Core XT4, 2 Core XT3, 2 Core XT4
- **Add**: 1 Core XT3, 1 Core XT4, 2 Core XT3, 2 Core XT4
- **Triad**: 1 Core XT3, 1 Core XT4, 2 Core XT3, 2 Core XT4
Membench Memory Bandwidth

MEMBENCH: Cray XT3 and XT4
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Independent L2 caches
MPI latency measured with zero-size message on Jaguar:
- Single core inter-node 4.8 usec
- Dual core inter-node 6.3 usec
Effective MPI bandwidth drops to about half the rate from within a node to between two nodes with 64k message size (typical for MILC)
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MIMD QCD: MILC

- MIMD Lattice Quantum ChromoDynamics (QCD) application
- Widespread community use
  - Easy to build, no dependencies, standards conforming
  - Can be setup to run on wide-range of concurrency
- Conjugate gradient algorithm
- Physics on a 4D lattice
- Local computations are 3x3 complex matrix multiplies, with sparse (indirect) access pattern

A proton on the lattice, Courtesy www.usqcd.org
MILC on Jaguar

64 cores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Small Pages</th>
<th></th>
<th>Large Pages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Dual</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XT3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Clock Time</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained MFLOPS</td>
<td>69370</td>
<td>48402</td>
<td>67138</td>
<td>47976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Peak</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Intensity</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/TLB Miss</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/D1 Cache Miss</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/L2 Cache Miss</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XT4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Clock Time</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustained MFLOPS</td>
<td>87840</td>
<td>61482</td>
<td>85447</td>
<td>60538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Peak</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computational Intensity</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/TLB Miss</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/D1 Cache Miss</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPS/L2 Cache Miss</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Problem: 32⁴ lattice with two trajectories of five steps each.
- SSE inlined assembly with aggressive prefetching.
- Oddly, relatively little data reuse but still high computational intensity.
### MILC Dual Core Penalty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILC Version</th>
<th>Times (sec)</th>
<th>Dual Core Penalty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XT3</td>
<td>XT4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Core Orig</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Core Opt</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core Orig</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core Opt</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- > 40% dual core penalty for optimized version.
- Un-optimized version shows lower dual-core penalty.
- Optimization to make better use of memory bandwidth results in greater dual-core penalty.
## MILC XT4/XT3 Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILC Version</th>
<th>XT4/XT3 Improvement: Optimized / Original</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Core Orig</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Core Opt</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core Orig</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core Opt</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Core</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- XT4/XT3 improvement high except for single core un-optimized version.
- Single task of un-optimized version could not saturate the XT4 memory interface, thus not gaining full benefit of improved XT4 memory bandwidth.
MILC Weak Scaling

Jaguar XT4

- Un-optimized version with single core runs faster than optimized version with dual core for 1024+ cores.

- Dual core penalty higher with optimized version.
  - Un-optimized version
    - 20%, 64 cores
    - 35%, 4096 cores
  - Optimized version
    - 40%, 64 cores
    - 58%, 4906 cores
BB3D models beam-beam collisions of counter-rotating charge particle beams

Particle -in-cell method, where particles are deposited on 3D grid to calculate charge density distribution

At collision points electric/magnetic fields calculated using Vlasov-Poisson via FFT

High communication requirements:
- Global gather charge density
- Broadcast electric/magnetic fields
- Global FFT transpose
# BeamBeam3D on Jaguar

64 cores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cores</th>
<th>Times (sec)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XT3</td>
<td>XT4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Core</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core Penalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XT3</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XT4</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Problem**: 5 million particle simulation with grid resolutions of 256x256x32

- **Dual core penalty**
  - XT3: 27%
  - XT4: 32%

- **XT4/XT3 improvement**
  - Single core: 1.12
  - Dual core: 1.07
BeamBeam3D

- Best Performance on Jaguar
  - Single core XT3: 256 cores
  - Dual core XT3: 256 cores
  - Single core XT4: 512 cores
  - Dual core XT4: 128 cores

- Different balance between interconnect and computation in dual-core mode for XT4 node
  - Large load imbalance
  - Large communication increase at > 128 cores.
  - Major impact on scalability.
MILC, MILc-opt, and BeamBeam3D have higher dual core penalty on Jaguar.
- Memory intensive codes.
Performance Prediction

• Model Assumptions
  – Memory bandwidth is the only contended resource
  – Can break down execution time into portion that is stalled on shared resources (*memory bandwidth*) and portion that is stalled on non-shared resources (*everything else*)
  – Execution time spent using non-shared resources is fixed
  – Estimate time spent on memory contention from XT3 single/dual core studies
  – Estimate # bytes moved in memory-contended zone
  – Extrapolate to XT4 based on increased memory bandwidth
    • Use to validate model
  – Extrapolate to quad-core
Performance Prediction Model

Use MILC-opt XT3 time to illustrate the model

Single Core
- Other Exec Time
- Memory BW Time
- Time=160s

Dual Core
- Other Exec Time
- Memory BW Contention Time
- Time=230s
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## Cray XT3 Opteron@2.6Ghz DDR400

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Other Exec Time</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Estimated Bytes Moved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Core</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>160s</td>
<td>0.36 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>230s</td>
<td>0.36 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using actual STREAMS bandwidth data:
- MILC-opt Prediction for XT4 SC = 120s
- actual = 127s, error = -5.1%
- MILC-opt Prediction for XT4 DC = 172s
- actual = 181s, error = -4.7%

## Cray XT4 Opteron@2.6Ghz DDR2-667

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Other Exec Time</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Estimated Bytes Moved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Core</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>135s</td>
<td>0.36 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Core</td>
<td>90s</td>
<td>180s</td>
<td>0.36 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using actual STREAMS bandwidth data:
- MILC-opt Prediction for XT4 SC = 120s
- actual = 127s, error = -5.1%
- MILC-opt Prediction for XT4 DC = 172s
- actual = 181s, error = -4.7%
Predicted and Actual Time
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Performance Prediction Error

- Prediction accuracy better than 10%, except for one case.
- Relatively large prediction errors for MILC, MILC-opt, and BeamBeam3D 64-core on Jaguar XT4.
  - Communication effects not accounted for in model
  - Smaller error with BB3D 8-core
Quad Core Prediction

- Quad core penalty large if dual core penalty large.
Conclusions

- Scaling studies with single and dual core performance of MILC and BeamBeam3D on Jaguar XT3 and XT4. Dual core penalty increases with higher concurrency.

- Interesting story from MILC optimization. The aggressive optimization increases memory efficiency, and causes larger dual core penalty.

- Performance prediction model introduced. Accuracy verified with various applications using single core and dual core. Model is then used for quad core predictions.

- Disclaimer: Quad core prediction
  - Assumes no memory bandwidth improvement over dual core.
  - Ignores changes to internal cache structures of Opteron.
  - Does not take into account the micro-architectural improvements for floating point operations.
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