Performance of Cluster-enabled OpenMP for the SCASH Software Distributed Shared Memory System

Yoshinori Ojima$^1$)  
Mitsuhisa Sato$^1$)  
Hiroshi Harada$^2$)  
Yutaka Ishikawa$^3$)

1) Information Science and Electronics, University of Tsukuba  
2) Hewlett-Packard Japan, Ltd  
3) The University of Tokyo
Overview

- Background, objective
- Software DSM system SCASH
- Omni/SCASH: OpenMP implementation for Software DSM
- Comparison of the basic performance of Myrinet and Ethernet
- Performance evaluation, Discussion
- Conclusion, future work
Background

• PC Cluster became a popular parallel computing platform.

• Distributed memory programming
  – Message passing library (MPI, PVM)
  – Programming cost is large

• Shared memory programming
  – Programmers can parallelize easily with OpenMP
  – Programming cost is small

Omni/ SCASH : OpenMP for Software Distributed Shared Memory (DSM) System
This is cluster-enabled OpenMP
The objectives of research

- To evaluate performance of Omni/SCASH
- To investigate the performance factor depending on the communication performance of networks
- To investigate the problem of using a commodity network (Ethernet) as well as Myrinet
Software DSM System SCASH

- A Software DSM System as a part of SCore cluster-system software
- Uses PM communication library, implemented as user level library
- Per page-basis (using kernel page-faults)
- Two page consistency protocols
  - invalidate and update
- Eager Release Consistency (ERC) memory model with multiple writer protocol (diff)
- Consistency maintenance communication at synchronization point
Omni/SCASH
• OpenMP Compiler for SCASH
  – It translates OpenMP programs to multi-threaded programs linked to SCASH runtime library

OpenMP
All variables are shared by default
No explicit shared memory allocation

“shmemp” memory model
All variables declared statically in global scope are private.
The shared address space must be allocated by a library function at runtime.
Transformation for “shmem” model

- OpenMP compiler for “shmem” memory model
  - Detects references to a shared data object
  - Rewrite it to the references to the objects which are allocated in shared address space at runtime.
  - A global variable declaration
    \[ \text{double } x; \]
    \[ \text{double } a[100]; \]
    \[
    \ldots \\
    \text{a[10]} = x;
    \]
    \[ \text{double } \_G\_x; \]
    \[ \text{double } \_G\_a; \]
    \[
    \ldots \\
    \text{(_G\_a)[10]} = (*\_G\_x);
    \]
    \[
    \ldots \\
    \text{static } \_G\_DATA\_INIT(){
    \text{\_shm\_data\_init(&\_G\_x,8,0);} \\
    \text{\_shm\_data\_init(&\_G\_a,800,0);} \\
    \}
    \]
Extension of Omni/SCASH to OpenMP

- In Software DSMs, the allocation of pages to home nodes greater affects performance
- OpenMP
  - doesn't provide facilities for specifying how data is to be arranged within the memory space
  - there are no loop scheduling methods to define the way in which data is passed between iterations

Extension to OpenMP
An example of the extension

- Data mapping directive

```c
double a[100][200];
#pragma omni mapping(a[block][*])
```

- Loop scheduling clause, “affinity”

```c
#pragma omp for schedule(affinity,a[i][*])
for(i = 1; i < 99; i++)
    for(j = 0; j < 200; j++)
        a[i][j] = ...;
```
Comparison of basic performance of network
Basic performance of network

• Comparison of basic communication performance of Ethernet and Myrinet
  – Page transmission cost
  – Overhead of barrier operation

• Measurement condition
  – programs are parallelized with OpenMP
  – 1 processor per node is used
Evaluation platform

- PC cluster “COSMO”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU</th>
<th>PentiumII Xeon 450MHz (4-way SMP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2 Cache</td>
<td>1MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>2GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>800Mbps Myrinet, 100base-TX Ethernet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>Linux Kernel 2.4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCore</td>
<td>version 5.0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compiler</td>
<td>gcc 2.96 (Optimize option –O4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Page transmission cost

- One dimensional array of 32KB (8 pages)
- Master thread writes to every element in an array which is followed by a barrier point
- At the barrier point, modified data is copied back to their home nodes.
- Execution time from the beginning of the array write operation to completion of barrier operation

![Diagram showing master thread writing to an array and then copying modified data back to home nodes.]
Myrinet: ~0.24ms/page
Ethernet: ~0.7ms/page

Overhead of barrier operation

Gap for one step is page transmission cost
Overhead of barrier operation

- Two-dimensional array of 256KB (8 pages * 8) is allocated in shared memory space.
- It is mapped with block distribution.
- Slave threads read every element mapped to master thread which is followed by a barrier point.
- At the barrier point, no consistency maintenance communication occurs.
Barrier : from beginning to completion of barrier operation

No-barrier : from beginning to completion of read operation

Overhead of Barrier operation

Myrinet : ~0.7ms
Ethernet : ~9ms

Barrier : from beginning to completion of barrier operation
No-barrier : from beginning to completion of read operation
Performance Evaluation
Performance Evaluation

- **laplace**
  - A simple Laplace equation solver using a Jacobi 5-point stencil operation
  - Written in C
  - Two versions
    - Parallelized with OpenMP (OpenMP version)
    - Written using SCASH library (SCASH version)
  - The array size is $1024 \times 1024$ (double precision)
  - The number of iteration is 50

- **NPB EP**
  - Fortran, parallelized with OpenMP (by RWC), Class A

- **NPB BT, SP**
  - Fortran, parallelized with OpenMP, Class A
  - Affinity scheduling
Myrinet : ~13.3 times with 16 processors
Ethernet : ~3.0 times
Myrinet: ~13.3 times with 16 processors
Ethernet: ~3.0 times
Application of affinity scheduling

- Laplace (OpenMP version)

A mismatch exists between the alignment of data and loops

The number of page faults increases

affinity scheduling to match alignment of data and loops
Performance improvement with affinity scheduling (Ethernet)

Improvement by ~10%
Performance improvement with affinity scheduling (Ethernet)

Improvement by ~10%
Myrinet : ~11.6 times
Ethernet : ~7.2 times
Myrinet : ~6.2 times
Ethernet : no speedup
Myrinet: ~9.5 times
Ethernet: ~3.4 times
Summary

• We evaluated performance of Omni/SCASH
  – Good performance was achieved with Myrinet
  – With Ethernet, the overhead of barrier operation was very large

• For ethernet-based cluster:
  – Applications with small communication are suitable for Ethernet
  – When using Omni/SCASH, we have to carefully optimize communication in applications
Future work

• More detailed analysis on:
  – performance difference of Ethernet and Myrinet
  – overhead of barrier operation with Ethernet

• Re-design Omni/SCASH for Ethernet

• To improve locality, we are currently designing first touch page allocation facility

• Performance tuning tools to make performance tuning easier
  – Performance counters, profiler