# Performance of an MPI-IO implementation nce of an MPI-IO implen<br>using third-party transfer using third-party transfer<br>Richard Hedges, Terry Jones, John May, Kim Yates

Parallel I/O Project

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

rkyates@llnl.gov

This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under contract number W-7405-Eng-48.

### Goals of this work

- Give users access to HPSS files via the MPI-IO interface.
	- Portability: common standard vs. HPSS-specific API
	- { Ease of use: familiar MPI datatypes, no explicit threads
- · Efficient implementation: low overhead.
- Efficient implementation: low overhead.<br>● Improve on HPSS performance for some access patterns.
	- fficient implementation: low overhead.<br>nprove on HPSS performance for some access pa<br>— Can profit from MPI-IO's collective operations

# Summary of HPSS

- Summary or HFSS<br>• Fast, large hierarchical archives (disks and tapes).  $\begin{aligned} & \textbf{Summary of HPSS} \\\\ \bullet \text{ Fast, large hierarchical archives (disks and tapes)} \\\\ \bullet \text{ Allows } m \times n \text{ parallelism with 3rd-party transfer} \end{aligned}$
- 
- Allows  $m \times n$  parallelism with 3rd-party transfer<br>• For high-performance parallel I/O, uses explicit multithreading and nonstandard interface (hpss\_WriteList and hpss\_ReadList).

### Summary of MPI-IO

- Bummary or ivir 1-10<br>• Became official part of MPI-2 message-passing standard, 1997. ● Became official part of MPI-2 message-pass<br>● Writes are like sends, reads are like receives.
- 
- became omcial part of ivir i-∠ message-passin<br>• Writes are like sends, reads are like receives.<br>• Designed to allow optimizaton of parallel I/O: esigned to allow optimizaton of paralle<br>— Collective read and write operations.
	-
	- ( Collective read and write operations.<br>( MPI "derived types" describe data layout.
	- ${}-$  Blocking and nonblocking transfers.
	- MPI "derived types" describe data layout.<br>— Blocking and nonblocking transfers.<br>— Performance "hints" from user, don't alter semantics.
	- Biocking and nonbiockin<br>— Performance "hints" fro<br>— Wide variety of features.
- Wide variety of features.<br>• Takes a major effort to implement fully.

# Methodology

- Methodology<br>• Measure performance under various system and application parameters. ● Measure perforn<br>● Verify efficiency.
- 
- Verify efficiency.<br>● True concurrent aggregate performance: earliest start to latest end time. ● True concurrent aggregate performar<br>● Each data point is average of 5 runs.
- 
- Each data point is average of 5 runs.<br>● For writes, overwrite an existing file.
- In the tests reported here, files are small ( $\leq$  256 MB)  $\begin{aligned} \text{a the tests reported here, files are small }(&\leq 25 \text{)} \ - \text{ Only because test programs were inflexible.} \end{aligned}$ 
	- ${\rm Im}\epsilon$  the tests reported nere, mes are sman  $(\geq 2.4)$ <br>— Only because test programs were inflexible<br>— But HPSS doesn't do any caching anyway.
	-
- − But HPSS doesn't do any caching anyway.<br>• Configured system to perform well for large transfers (e.g., 8 MB stripe unit).

Testbed (old, small, gone, to be replaced soon)



 $\epsilon$ each with 4 112-MHz PowerPC 604 p<br>• Four HIPPI cards and crossbar switch.

- 
- Four HIPPI cards and crossbar switch.<br>● 2 MaxStrat Gen5XLs, configured as 4 RAIDs. ● 2 MaxStrat Gen5XLs, configured as 4 RA<br>● Hardware throughput limit is 207 MB/sec
- )<br>Hardware throughput limit is 207 MB/s<br>(4 HIPPI adapters  $\times$  51.8 MB/s each).

Varying chunk size



Collective read & write for varying chunk sizes.<br>
(stripe factor = 8, number of processes = 16, file size = 256 MB)

Configured this system to have 8 MB stripe unit.

For chunks  $< 8MB$ , HPSS uses TCP/IP instead of IPI.





Best performance: <sup>197</sup> MB/s read, <sup>173</sup> MB/s write (207 MB/s hard limit) (32 procs, 8-way stripe, 8MB chunks)

#### Overlapping I/O and computation

 $\textbf{Overlapping I/O and co:}$   $\textbf{Tested with } t_{compute}=t_{i/o} \ = \ 2.5 \ \textbf{sec}$ 

Tested with  $t_{compute} = t_{i/o} = 2.5$  sec<br>Total time using blocking i/o = 5.0 sec

Total time using blocking i/o = 5.0 sec<br>Total time using nonblocking i/o = 3.1 sec (62% of blocking i/o)

 $\rm{Total\ time\ using\ nonblocking\ i/o\ =\ 3.1\ sec\ (629)}$  Using 4 client processes, 4-way striping, 16 MB chunks. Using 4 client processes, 4-way striping, 16 MB chı<br>When there is more than 1 MPI process on a node,

When there is more than 1 MPI process on a node,<br>thread contention reduced performance.

## Future work

- Track future versions of HPSS.
- Track future versions of HPSS.<br>● Further analyze and improve performance urther analyze and improve performand<br>— Larger, faster testbed installed soon.
	- ${\bf P}$  Larger, faster testbed installed soon.<br>  ${\bf P}$  Performance in production use.
	-

# Conclusions

- Successful, complete implementation of MPI-IO API.
- Successful, complete implementation of MPI-IO A<br>● Efficient use of HPSS parallel transfer capabilities.
- Efficient use of HPSS parallel transfer capabilities.<br>● Working on enhancements to improve on HPSS performance. ● Working on enhancements to improve on HPSS <sub>|</sub><br>● Will soon be exposed to rigors of production use.
- 

### Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Linda Stanberry (current principal designer/programmer), Acknowledgements<br>thanks to Linda Stanberry (current principal designer/pro<br>Elsie Pierce and Jeanne Martin (erstwhile team members), thanks to Linda Stanberry (current principal designer/p<br>Isie Pierce and Jeanne Martin (erstwhile team member<br>the entire HPSS team, and many sytem administrators Elsie Pierce and Jeanne Martin (erstwhile team members),<br>the entire HPSS team, and many sytem administrators<br>for their help over the years.