# Optimizing Large Scale Chemical Transport Models for Multicore Platforms

John Linford and Adrian Sandu Computational Science Laboratory Virginia Tech



# Introduction: How do we apply new technology to existing algorithms? Pros? Cons?

- Modern hardware is parallel, becoming massively parallel, becoming heterogeneous
- Parallel hardware is increasingly diverse
  - Shared and distributed memory in the same system
  - Homo-/Heterogeneous clusters of Homo-/Heterogeneous hardware
- Air quality models are computationally-intense multi-scale multi-physics models
  - Computationally-intense  $\rightarrow$  motivates parallelism
  - Multi-scale  $\rightarrow$  leverages a wide range of algorithms
  - Multi-physics  $\rightarrow$  leverages a wide range of technologies





## **Comprehensive AQMs motivate parallelization**



4/14/08

**HPCS 2008** 



Boundary 
$$\partial \Omega = \Gamma^{I} \cup \Gamma^{o} \cup \Gamma^{G}$$
  
1a.  $\frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} = -u \cdot \nabla c_{i} + \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \cdot (\rho K \nabla c_{i}) + \frac{1}{\rho} f_{i}(\rho c) + E_{i}$   
1b.  $c_{i}(t^{0}, x) = c_{i}^{0}(x)$   
1c.  $c_{i}(t, x) = c_{i}^{I}(t, x), x \in \Gamma^{I}$   
1d.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = 0, x \in \Gamma^{O}$   
1e.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = V_{i}^{dep} c_{i} - Q_{i}, x \in \Gamma^{G}$ , for all  $1 \le i \le s$ .



$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Boundary} & \partial \Omega = \Gamma^{I} \cup \Gamma^{o} \cup \Gamma^{G} \\ & \text{1a.} & \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} = -u \cdot \nabla c_{i} + \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \cdot (\rho K \nabla c_{i}) + \frac{1}{\rho} f_{i}(\rho c) + E_{i} \\ & \text{1b.} & c_{i}(t^{0}, x) = c_{i}^{0}(x) \\ & \text{1c.} & c_{i}(t, x) = c_{i}^{I}(t, x), x \in \Gamma^{I} \\ & \text{1d.} & K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = 0, \ x \in \Gamma^{O} \\ & \text{1e.} & K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = V_{i}^{dep} c_{i} - Q_{i}, \ x \in \Gamma^{G}, \ \text{for all } 1 \leq i \leq s. \end{array}$$





Boundary 
$$\partial \Omega = \Gamma^{I} \cup \Gamma^{o} \cup \Gamma^{G}$$
  
1a.  $\frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} = -u \cdot \nabla c_{i} + \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \cdot (\rho K \nabla c_{i}) + \frac{1}{\rho} f_{i}(\rho c) + E_{i}$   
1b.  $c_{i}(t^{0}, x) = c_{i}^{0}(x)$   
1c.  $c_{i}(t, x) = c_{i}^{I}(t, x), x \in \Gamma^{I}$   
1d.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = 0, x \in \Gamma^{O}$   
1e.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = V_{i}^{dep} c_{i} - Q_{i}, x \in \Gamma^{G}$ , for all  $1 \le i \le s$ .





Boundary 
$$\partial \Omega = \Gamma^{I} \cup \Gamma^{o} \cup \Gamma^{G}$$
  
1a.  $\frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial t} = -u \cdot \nabla c_{i} + \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla \cdot (\rho K \nabla c_{i}) + \frac{1}{\rho} f_{i}(\rho c) + E_{i}$   
1b.  $c_{i}(t^{0}, x) = c_{i}^{0}(x)$   
1c.  $c_{i}(t, x) = c_{i}^{I}(t, x), x \in \Gamma^{I}$   
1d.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = 0, x \in \Gamma^{O}$   
1e.  $K \frac{\partial c_{i}}{\partial n} = V_{i}^{dep} c_{i} - Q_{i}, x \in \Gamma^{G}$ , for all  $1 \le i \le s$ .





## FIXEDGRID is a prototype AQM for multicore Systems

- Simplified multi-scale atmospheric model
- Explicit time-stepping in transportation
- SAPRC'99 chemical mechanism

– 79 species, 211 reactions, stiff system

- Research code to easily compare a range of computing platforms
- Written in Fortran 90







FIXEDGRID uses dimension splitting to simplify computation and reduce round-off error

- X / Y dimension spliting reduces program complexity
- Rows / Columns explicitly discretized and solved with the same code routine
- Symmetric 2<sup>nd</sup> order time-dimension spliting reduces round-off error







### The Cell Broadband Engine is a heterogeneous CMP

- 1 Power Processor Element
  - 64-bit, dual threaded
  - Vector/SIMD extensions
- 8 Synergistic Processor Elements
  - 128-bit, single threaded
  - Vector/SIMD extensions
  - 128 128-bit registers
  - 256KB local storage
  - Optimized for 32-bit singleprecision floating point
  - Memory Flow Controller supplies asynchronous DMA
- 204.8GB Peak EIB Bandwidth







## The Cell memory model has "interesting features"

- SPEs must use DMA to access main memory
  - Data must be "correctly" aligned
  - Minimum transfer size is 16 bytes
  - Data must be contiguous
  - Data should be 128-byte aligned
- SPEs have only 256K of local storage (~8,000 doubles)
- PS3 reserves two SPEs
- PS3 has less memory than CBE blade







# We produced four versions of FIXEDGRID

- 1. Translated Fortran to C
- 2. Moved computational cores to the SPEs
- 3. Optimized SPE code
- 4. Implemented scalable strided main-memory access method

	Ver. 1	Ver. 2	Ver. 3	Ver. 4
0	2638			
1		3965.45	1271.25	1118.95
2		2095.02	771.30	632.94
3		1430.63	678.99	490.58
4		1137.48	658.42	423.19
5		988.32	643.89	389.89
6		928.20	646.30	375.96

Runtime in seconds for 1000 x 700 grid points





# FIXEDGRID Version 1: Baseline

- No Fortran compiler in CBE SDK 2.2
  - SDK 3.0 includes a modified version of XL Fortran
- Automatic Fortran → C translation is available, (i.e. f2c) but we did it by hand
  - Improve source code readability
  - Refactor code to better fit the execution model
- Translation "rules of thumb:"
  - parameter  $\rightarrow$  #define
  - using module  $\rightarrow$  #include
  - Fortran array syntax  $\rightarrow$  C macros (when possible)
- Long, tedious, bug-prone, not recommended for real-world codes (approx. 38 work hours, ~2,000 lines)



# FIXEDGRID Version 2: Parallelized baseline

- Offloaded the main computational cores: discretize() and advec\_diff()
- Implemented generic data types for passing arguments to the SPUs
- Implemented tiny 32-bit communication library for PPU / SPU communication
  - Send/receive to/from SPUs
  - Broadcast to SPUs
  - Synchronize PPU with one/all SPUs



4/14/08



#### SPEs copy matrix rows directly from main memory







#### PPU buffers transposed columns in main memory





4/14/08

HPCS 2008



#### 800.00% 700.00% 600.00% Column discretization 500.00% bounded by array copy 400.00% 300.00% 200.00% 100.00% 0.00% 0 1 2 5 6 4 3000 → Linear Speedup 2500 2000 1500 Scalability limited by 1000 memory bottleneck 500 0 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Wall clock Array Copy Row Discret. Col. Discret. Virginia 4/14/08 **HPCS 2008** 17 Tech

#### Reordering matrix column data is a severe bottleneck

# FIXEDGRID Version 3: Optimized SPU code

Optimization	Runtime Reduction	
Double-buffered DMA	23%	
Vectorization and SPU intrinsics	18%	
Loop unrolling and branch prediction	8%	

**HPCS 2008** 

Mem[0, BSIZE) → Buffer[0]

Mem [BSIZE, 2\*BSIZE) → Buffer[1]

for i in 0, 1, 2, ... MATRIX\_SIZE / BSIZE **b** = **i** mod 2

Process Buffer[b]

4/14/08

Buffer[b]  $\rightarrow$  Mem[i\*BSIZE, (i+1)\*BSIZE)

Mem[(i+2)\*BSIZE, (i+3)\*BSIZE) → Buffer[b]

end

Tech

Virginia

Fetch, process and write any remaining buffer

vector double sum\_d; vector double vec1\_d = {buff[i], buff[i+1]}; vector double vec2\_d = {buff[i+2], buff[i+3]}; sum\_d = spu\_add(vec1\_d, vec2\_d);



#### FIXEDGRID Version 4: Scalable non-contiguous DMA

- Use DMA lists to reduce overhead for multiple consecutive transfers
- Minimum transfer size is 16 bytes, so transfer two double precision variables
- Columns arrived interleaved into SPE local storage



### Scalable strided DMA requires O(n) overhead storage

- DMA lists reside in SPE local storage
- List of pairs of 64-bit address lower bits and transfer lengths
- One DMA list element is required for each 16 byte transfer

```
typedef struct {
  union {
    unsigned int all 32;
    struct {
       unsigned nbytes: 31;
       unsigned stall: 1;
       } bits;
    } size;
  unsigned int ea_low;
} dma list elem t;
```





#### FIXEDGRID performs exceptionally well on the Cell



### We parallelized FIXEDGRID Version 1 with OpenMP

- Trivial to implement, less than 4 hours, ~50 lines of code
- Test platform: dual Intel Quad-Core Xeon shared-memory workstation







#### FIXEDGRID scales well on a homogeneous system



# Conclusions

- Heterogeneous accelerated CMPs can significantly improve the performance of largescale chemical transport models
- Porting a small Fortran code to CBE was nontrivial. Porting larger codes would be impractically difficult without better tools.
- Hardware support for non-contiguous memory access in CBE should be considered.
- Alternate matrix storage formats should be considered for accelerated CMPs with limited main-memory access from accelerators











HPCS 2008

