

Benchmark results on Knight Landing (KNL) architecture

Domenico Guida, CINECA SCAI (Bologna) Giorgio Amati, CINECA SCAI (Roma)

Roma 23/10/2017







KNL, BDW, SKL

```
Welcome to MARCONI /
*
           MARCONI-fusion @ CINECA - NeXtScale cluster - CentOS 7.2!
*
 Broadwell partition - 1512 Compute nodes with:
*
*
    - 2*18-core Intel(R) Xeon(R) E5-2697 v4 @ 2.30GHz
    - 128 GB RAM
*
*
 KNL partition - 3600 Compute nodes with:
    - 1*68-core Intel(R) Knights Landing @ 1.40GHz
*
    - 16 GB MCDRAM + 93 GB RAM
*
 SKL partition - 1512+792 nodes with:
*
    - 2*24-core Intel Xeon 8160 CPU @ 2.10GHz
*
    - 192 GB DDR4 RAM
*
*
 Intel OmniPath (100Gb/s) high-performance network
 PBSpro 13 batch scheduler
```

	A1 BDW	A2 KNL	A3 SKL
cores per node	2 x 18 @2.3 GHz	1 x 68 @1,4 GHz	2 x 24@2.1 GHz
HYPERTHREADING	No	Yes \rightarrow 272 «core»	No
MCDRAM		16 GB	
RAM per node	128 GB	93 GB	192 GB



KNL Memory Model

Cache Model Ideal for large data size (>16GB) cache blocking apps	Flat Model Maximum bandwidth for data reuse aware apps	Hybrid Model Maximum flexibility for varied workloads
64B cache lines direct-mapped	Buccaram Bage/ 16GB Up to 384 GB DRAM	Split Options ² : 8 or 12GB MCDRAM or 50/50% 8 or 4 GB MCDRAM DRAM
Hardware automatically manages the MCDRAM as a "L3 cache" between CPU and external DDR memory	Manually manage how the app uses the integrated on-package memory and external DDR for peak perf	Harness the benefits of both Cache and Flat models by segmenting the integrated on- package memory
 App and/or data set is very large and will not fit into MCDRAM Unknown or unstructured memory access behavior 	 App or portion of an app or data set that can be, or is needed to be "locked" into MCDRAM so it doesn't get flushed out 	 Need to "lock" in a relatively small portion of an app or data set via the Flat model Remaining MCDRAM can then be configured as Cache
Code transparent	User should be aware of how his code is using memory	Very advanced programming



KNL Architecture Overview x4 DMI2 to PCH



With this number of physical cores, it is important to control how OS assigns MPI jobs and OMP threads to physical cores.





AFFINITY

Processor affinity, or CPU pinning enables binding-unbinding of a process-thread to a central processing unit (CPU) or a range of CPUs, so that the process-thread will execute only on the designated CPU or CPUs rather than any CPU.

export KMP AFFINITY= ...

- none (default): the OS decides how to assign threads looking at the machine topology. (of course, OS can't really know how our code works)
- compact: <n+1>-th thread is assigned to a context as close as possible to the thread context.
- scatter: threads are distributed as evenly as possible across the entire system.
- More configurations (i.e. balanced, disabled, explicit, logical, physical) are available...

https://software.intel.com/enus/node/522691#KMP_AFFINITY_ENVIRONMENT_VARIABLE





Linpack on KNL

Floating point unit benchmark, OpenMP version, Intel build (mkl 2017)

- ✓ 5 replicas
- ✓ Double precision
- $\checkmark\,$ Reference value, not the best
- ✓ KMP_AFFINITY=scatter

	Threads	Size	TFlops
SKL	48	45′000	2.0
KNL	64	40′000	1.9
BDW	36	45′000	1.3





Stream on KNL

Memory Bandwidth benchmark:

- 64 threads, KMP_AFFINITY=scatter
- ✓ MCDRAM+DRAM: numactl -preferred 1
- ✓ MCDRAM/DRAM: numactl -membind 1/0
- ✓ Cache: no numactl

MEMORY	SIZE	Mb/sec	
MCDRAM (flat)	9 GB	413712	
MCDRAM+DRAM (flat)	23 GB	159672	
MCDRAM+DRAM(flat)	90 GB	97866	
DRAM (flat)	9 GB	82628	Deference
DRAM (flat)	23 GB	82507	BDW: 100'000
DRAM (flat)	90 GB	82685	
CACHE (cache)	9 GB	205807	
CACHE (cache)	23 GB	92714	774.
CACHE (cache)	90 GB	57882	



Technological trends

Some figures about Intel CPU evolution @CINECA (2010-2017)

- ✓ No more clock increase
- ✓ Total number of core increase \rightarrow x4 SKL, x6 KNL
- ✓ Flops/cycle ratio increase \rightarrow x8

CPU (codename)	Clock Frequency	Number of core	Flops /cycle (DP)	Peak Perf. (DP)
Xeon E5645 (Westmere)	2.4 GHz	2x6	4	115 GFlops
Xeon E5-2687W0 (Sandy Bridge)	3.1 GHz	2x8	8	396 GFlops
Xeon E5-2670v2 (Ivy Bridge)	2.5 GHz	2x10	8	400 GFlops
Xeon E5-2630v3 (Hashwell)	2.4 GHz	2x8	16 (AVX-256bit)	614 GFlops
Xeon E5-2697v4 (Broadwell)	2.3 GHz	2x18	16 (AVX-256bit)	1325 GFlops
Xean Phi (Knights Landing)	1.4 Ghz	1x68	32 (AVX-512bit)	3046 GFlops
Xeon Platinum (Skylake)	2.1 GHz	2x24	32 (AVX-512bit)	3225 GFlops





How to exploit performance

- Today single core performance is not an issue
- Multi-core CPU performance is the main issue
- Serial performance tends to be meaningless
- Single node/CPU is a meaningful figure
- To exploit CPU performance it is mandatory
 - ✓ Parallelism \rightarrow factor 4 in about 10 years
 - \checkmark Vectorization \rightarrow factor 8 in about 10 years

This is the actual HPC evolution: if you are not ready to implement these issue you'll never reach the claimed performance!!!!





Always check for vectorization

- ✓ KNL FPU → 512bit wide → 8 DP Flop
- No vectorization means:
- $\checkmark\,$ a possible decrease of a factor 8 using double precision
- $\checkmark\,$ a possible decrease of a factor 16 using single precision

Example (3D CFD code, Higher is better):

- With vectorization on: 850 Mlups
- With vectorization off: 165 Mlups

Always check vectorization level with

- -qopt-report-phase=vec (*.oprpt file are generated)
- -qnovec





KNL is backward compatible with BDW but

- ✓ BDW FPU \rightarrow 256bit wide
- ✓ KNL FPU \rightarrow 512bit wide
- ✓ SKL FPU \rightarrow 512bit wide

If you don't recompile your code you can loose a factor 2 in performance (if the code can be vectorized)

Example running on KNL (3D CFD code, Higher is better):

- With KNL-compiled code: 850 MLups
- With BDW-compiled code: 447 MLups

Marconi front-end node are BDW based!!!





Performance (for OpenMP application) are really sensible to affinity.

Example (3D CFD code, Higher is better):

- KMP_AFFINITY=scatter: 850 Mlups
- KMP_AFFINITY=balanced: 761 Mlups
- KMP_AFFINITY=compact: 151 Mlups

Gain/Loss can be really sensible: always play with affinity





Size matters, check which is the best size/problem for your application...

Example (3D CFD code, 2 task, 32threads, scatter):

- 128^3 → 345 Mlups
- 192^3 → 472 Mlups
- 256^3 → 535 Mlups
- 384^3 → 610 Mlups
- 512^3 → 676 Mlups
- 768^3 → 437 Mlups





Hints #5.1

- CFD code
- Writing time (sec.) on disc: formatted vs. unformatted
- BDW vs KNL
- They share the same filesystem

	size	BDW	KNL	Ratio
formatted	211 MB	58″	468″	8.0
binary	1200 MB	1.20″	1.25″	-

- General issues:
 - ✓ Always: avoid formatted output
 - $\checkmark\,$ It is even worst on KNL





Hints #5.2

- Another CFD code
- Reading time (sec.) formatted data from disk
- BDW vs KNL
- They share the same filesystem

	size	BDW	KNL	Ratio
formatted	3.0 GB	292″	1597"	5.5

- General issues:
 - ✓ Always: avoid formatted output
 - ✓ Parallel I/O could help (see also Hint #4)





exploit MCDRAM effect

Example (3D CFD code):

- Only MCDRAM (<16 GB) : 850 Mlups
- Only DRAM (<16 GB): 372 Mlups
- MCDRAM+DRAM (20 GB): 757 Mlups
- Only DRAM (20 GB): 355 Mlups
- Cache: 523

Results are application/size dependent...





NEMO GLOB16 benchmark

- A very high resolution version of the NEMO ocean model developed at CMCC
 - ✓ Fully MPI (scalability)
 - Highly vectorized (key_vectopt_loop) preprocessing keywords to enhance loop-level vectorization
 - XIOS2 server for efficient/scalable parallel I/O of huge files (model's output, diagnostic,...)
 - $\checkmark\,$ Parallel efficiency up to 19968 cores







- Highly vectorized (FORCE_VECTORIZATION pre-processing keywords to enhance loop-level vectorization)
- Regional Greece_small benchmark (serial, only 1 thread)
 - ✓ With vectorization on: 1340 sec. (solver)
 - ✓ With vectorization off: 1883 sec. (solver)

Comment about vectorization:

be careful with compiler options, as they may interact with vectorization: -fpe0 vs simd directive?

remark #15326: simd loop was not vectorized: implied FP exception model prevents vectorization. Consider changing compiler flags and/or directives in the source to enable fast FP model and to mask FP exceptions

remark #15552: loop was not vectorized with "simd" Always check vectorization level with •-qopt-report-phase=vec (*.oprpt file are generated)





SPECFEM3D_GLOBE benchmark/2

- Multiple threads scaling: Fully OpenMP (1 MPI process)
- Regional_Greece_small benchmark (up to 128 OpenMP threads)
- Very good scaling up to 64 cores
- **KMP_AFFINITY** equal to scatter must be used!

# threads	Solver time	Speed-up
1	1340″	-
2	695″	1.92
4	348″	3.85
8	177″	7.57
16	91″	14.7
32	48″	27.9
64	28″	47.8
128	26″	51.5





SPECFEM3D_GLOBE benchmark/3

- Intranode scaling: Fully hybrid (MPI+OpenMP)
- Regional_Greece_small benchmark (varying number of MPI processes and OpenMP threads)
- \checkmark Very good intranode scaling
- \checkmark Best result achieved using both MPI processes and OpenMP threads
- ✓ KMP_AFFINITY=scatter must be used!

Solver time	Task/Threads		
95	16x1	Solver time	Task/Threads
49	16x2	342"	4x1
26	16x4	180''	4x2
24	16x8	91"	4x4
		48''	4x8
Solver time	Task/Threads	25″	4x16
30	64x1	22′′	4x32
22	64x2		





Molecular Dynamics codes

Gromacs

Kir3.1 potassium channel:

365K atoms, 300K, PME, Cut-off=1.2nm

BDW	KNL (64 * 2 threads)	KNL (64 * 4 threads)
6,197 ns/day	5,8 ns/day	5,4 ns/day

Amber

Cellulose, NVT, Cut-off=0.8 nm, 400K atoms

BDW	KNL (68 *1 thread)
4,15 ns/day	5,8 ns/day





Molecular Dynamics codes

NAMD

Apoa1, NPT ensemble, PME, Cut-off = 1.2 nm, 92K atoms

BDW	KNL
(36 task*1 thread)	(68 task *1 thread)
1,33 ns/day	1,54 ns/day

Considerations:

Not all the codes can exploit hyper-threading on KNL (at least in their original versions).

In some cases the use of hyper-threading can improve performances of a code, in some cases it can not.





OpenFoam

99444

3D Lid Driven Cavity Flow, size: 200^3 pure MPI

	Nodes	Task per node	Total time (s)
KNL	1	64	853
	1	128	777
	2	64	489
	2	128	462
	4	64	267
	4	128	386
	8	64	161

Nodes	Task per node	Total time (s)
1	32	1433
2	32	654
4	32	279

BDW



OpenFoam

3D Lid Driven Cavity Flow, size: 300^3, pure MPI

	Nodes	Task per node	Total time (s)
KNL	4	64	1202
	4	128	1370
	8	64	669
	8	128	1958
	16	64	387

	Nodes	Task per node	Total time (s)
BDW	4	32	1875
	8	32	837
	16	32	384





QuantumEspresso

Tests performed to verify strong scaling. QE is a hybrid code, using MPI as well as OpenMP threads. For all tests, KMP_AFFINITY=scatter has been used.

Next slides focus on computing performance vs:

- ✓ Number of cores
- ✓ Power consumption

For each of the three cases, results are compared to BDW





QuantumEspresso

W256 QE-CP Benchmark







QuantumEspresso

W256 QE-CP Benchmark





Scalability: speed-up

CFD Kinetic code (Lattice Boltzmann) Scalability for 1200*600*200 grid









Scalability: scale-up

CFD Kinetic code (Lattice Boltzmann) scalability ✓ From 36'000'000 (1 node) to 7'760'000'000 (216 nodes) grid-points







Useful links

 MARCONI User Guide: https://wiki.ugov.it/confluence/display/SCAIUS/UG3.1%3A+MARCONI+UserGuide

Intel Xeon-Phi Guide (and benchmarks):

https://www.aspsys.com/images/solutions/linux-clustersolutions/knights-landing-clusters/xeon-phi-knl-marketing-guide.pdf

Guide to vectorization:

- https://wiki.ugov.it/confluence/display/SCAIUS/How+to+Improve+Code+Vecto rization
- ✓ https://hpc-

forge.cineca.it/files/ScuolaCalcoloParallelo_WebDAV/public/anno-2017/26th_Summer_School_on_Parallel_Computing/Roma/VECT ORIZATION-slides.pdf

For any kind of support, please refer to <u>superc@cineca.it</u> : your request will be assigned to someone who can understand your **CINECA** problem and give you support.



Acknowledgments

- The User Support team (<u>superc@cineca.it</u>)
- ✓ Vittorio Ruggiero
- ✓ Piero Lanucara
- ✓ Mariella Ippolito

