



703308 VO High-Performance Computing WS2021/2022

Domain Decomposition and Load Balancing

Philipp Gschwandtner

Overview

- ▶ domain decomposition
- ▶ load (im)balance
- ▶ “Tales from the Proseminar”

Motivation (Load Balancing)

- ▶ Monte Carlo π
 - ▶ amount of work per rank depends only on number of samples
- ▶ 2D heat stencil
 - ▶ amount of work per rank depends only on number of elements


```
...  
int localSamples = samples/numRanks  
...
```

```
...  
int localN = problemSize/numRanks  
...
```

Motivation cont'd (Load Balancing)


▶ Monte Carlo π

- amount of work per rank depends only on number of samples



▶ 2D heat stencil

- amount of work per rank depends only on number of elements




Motivation cont'd (Load Balancing)


- ▶ this is called “balanced load” or “load balance”
 - ▶ all the ranks have the same amount of work
 - ▶ easily achieved, as any sub-domains of equal size entail same amount of work, no matter in which part of your domain
 - ▶ only true for a subset of realistic applications
- ▶ there's also “unbalanced load” or “load imbalance”
 - ▶ ranks do not have the same amount of work
 - ▶ either the sizes of sub-domains per rank vary, or their entailed amount of work
 - ▶ happens all the time for realistic use cases

Motivation cont'd (Load Balancing)


- ▶ particle (“lagrangian”) simulation
 - ▶ no fixed grid
 - ▶ particles can move inside the domain
 - ▶ particle distribution affects workload



Motivation cont'd (Load Balancing)



$$\begin{aligned}t_{\text{cpu}} &= 4 \\t_{\text{wall}} &= 1\end{aligned}$$




$$\begin{aligned}t_{\text{cpu}} &= 4 \\t_{\text{wall}} &= 1.2\end{aligned}$$

Motivation cont'd (Domain Decomposition)

▶ Monte Carlo π


- ▶ distributes samples among ranks
- ▶ no communication except at the end
- ▶ also called “embarrassingly parallel”



- Rank 0
- Rank 1
- Rank 2
- Rank 3

▶ 2D heat stencil

- ▶ distributes grid cells among ranks
- ▶ ghost cell exchange required at borders!



Domain Decomposition

Domain Decomposition

- ▶ discretize the problem space
 - ▶ grid cells, particles, samples, ...
- ▶ split the workload among the given number of ranks
 - ▶ also reduces the memory footprint
- ▶ goal: minimizing overhead, meaning:
 - ▶ minimize load imbalance (differences in workload per processing entity)
 - ▶ minimize amount of data to be transferred
 - ▶ minimize number of discrete communication steps (c.f. neighbor exchange!)

The Bad News

- ▶ MPI does not offer domain decomposition
 - ▶ sure, there's MPI_Scatter() & alike
 - ▶ but it's only the underlying tool
- ▶ you need to take care of this yourself
 - ▶ or better yet, use a library

Cost of a Point-to-point Message

- ▶ $t = \text{latency} + \frac{\text{message size}}{\text{bandwidth}}$
- ▶ note: simplistic view, actual cost depends on
 - ▶ underlying protocols (eager, rendezvous, ...), dependent on size of data, MPI send mode, etc.
 - ▶ additional data copies required
- ▶ latency and bandwidth are fixed properties of the hardware topology
 - ▶ note: rank-core mappings, link aggregation, etc...
- ▶ message size (and their number) is what we can influence
- ▶ can be easily computed for simple, regular decompositions

3D Heat Stencil Example: Slabs


$$c_{1D}(L, N) = \\ L \cdot L \cdot w \cdot 2 = 2wL^2$$

L : size per dimension

N : number of ranks

w : amount of data per element


- ▶ pro: easy to implement
- ▶ con: communication volume does not decrease when increasing N



3D Heat Stencil Example: Poles

$$c_{2D}(L, N) = L \cdot \frac{L}{\sqrt{N}} \cdot w \cdot (2 + 2) = \frac{4wL^2}{\sqrt{N}}$$


- ▶ pro: communication volume does decrease with increasing N
- ▶ con: surface-to-volume ratio also increases with N
 - ▶ communication grows disproportionately fast compared to computation




3D Heat Stencil Example: Cubes

$$c_{3D}(L, N) = \frac{L}{\sqrt[3]{N}} \cdot \frac{L}{\sqrt[3]{N}} \cdot w \cdot (2 + 2 + 2) = \frac{6wL^2}{(\sqrt[3]{N})^2}$$



- ▶ pro: communication volume also decreases with increasing N
- ▶ con: still surface-to-volume-ratio issue
- ▶ but also further increase in number of messages, latency might be an issue



Comparing Communication Volumes





Non-rectangular Domain Decomposition



10x10 2D Heat Stencil Decomposition Variants

- ▶ 25 cells per rank, line-wise
 - ▶ 60 of 100 are at sub-domain border
 - ▶ worst per-rank communication vs. computation ratio is 20/25!
- ▶ 25 cells per rank, 2D blocks
 - ▶ 36 of 100 are at sub-domain border
 - ▶ worst per-rank communication vs. computation ratio is 9/25



Domain Decomposition Considerations

- ▶ How much data will have to be transferred?
 - ▶ more data requires more bandwidth & larger buffers
- ▶ In how many messages do I need to transfer the data?
 - ▶ additional messages means additional latency, buffer, and management overhead
- ▶ What's the cache efficiency of the decomposition?
 - ▶ might only be an implementation issue, e.g. matrices can be transposed (rows vs. columns)
- ▶ How complicated is the implementation?
 - ▶ usual trade-off: e.g. 50% readability decrease for 2% performance increase?

Possibly the Two Most Important Considerations

- ▶ Your domain cannot be decomposed efficiently?
 - ▶ change your algorithm
- ▶ Your data structure cannot be decomposed efficiently?
 - ▶ change your implementation
- ▶ Consider those before you start coding!




Load Imbalance



Load Imbalance


- ▶ refers to the phenomenon of not all ranks finishing their work at the same time
 - ▶ leads to ranks waiting on others
 - ▶ unnecessarily increases wall time
 - ▶ ...



Static vs. Dynamic Load Imbalance

- ▶ **static load imbalance**
 - ▶ caused by initial conditions, e.g.
 - ▶ mountains vs. plains
 - ▶ ocean shore vs. open sea
 - ▶ remainder in integer division
 - ▶ does not change during application execution
 - ▶ mitigation usually incurs no runtime overhead after initial setup
- ▶ **dynamic load imbalance**
 - ▶ caused by application data
 - ▶ moving particles (e.g. galaxy clusters)
 - ▶ partial availability of sensor data
 - ▶ convergence of iterative algorithms
 - ▶ does change during application execution
 - ▶ requires rebalancing (e.g. at fixed intervals, when reaching limits, ...)
 - ▶ definitely can incur runtime overhead


Dynamic Load Imbalance: Binary Star System



The Bad News Reloaded

- ▶ MPI does not offer load balancing
 - ▶ yes, there's `MPI_Scatterv()` & alike
 - ▶ but it's only the underlying tool
- ▶ you need to take care of this yourself
 - ▶ or better yet, use a library

Recap: Space Weather Prediction (Particle-in-Cell)




Space Weather Prediction cont'd



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=piehWYdIOQA>


Particle-in-Cell

- ▶ charged particles move through a grid of cells representing an electromagnetic field
 - ▶ the field exerts a force on the particles
 - ▶ the particle movement affects the field
 - ▶ e.g. electrons, protons, or alpha particles hitting Earth's magnetosphere




Particle-in-Cell Use Case: Uniform

- ▶ static load balance: particles uniformly distributed across domain
- ▶ dynamic load balance: particle positions almost constant




Particle-in-Cell Use Case: Cluster

- ▶ static load imbalance: particles non-uniformly distributed across domain
- ▶ dynamic load balance: particle positions almost constant




Particle-in-Cell Use Case: Explosion

- ▶ static load imbalance: particles non-uniformly distributed across domain
- ▶ dynamic load imbalance: particle positions changes drastically





Particle-in-Cell Use Case: Beam

- ▶ static load imbalance: particles non-uniformly distributed across domain
- ▶ dynamic load imbalance: particle positions changes drastically
- ▶ extreme case for testing load-balancing algorithms
 - ▶ but could be real, e.g. beam of electrons




iPIC3D Comparison, Strong Scaling, 1M Particles, LCC2



Detecting Load Imbalance with Tools

- ▶ screenshot on the right shows Intel Trace Analyzer
 - ▶ miniFE benchmark of Sandia National Labs
 - ▶ work shared between CPU (lines 1, 4, 7 and 12) and Xeon Phi accelerators
 - ▶ blue bars are application work
 - ▶ red bars are MPI synchronization
- ▶ Xeon Phis are waiting 50% of the time for the CPUs!



Dealing with Load Imbalance

- ▶ quantify the amount of work of domain sub-ranges
 - ▶ e.g. heat stencil: `num_elements = end_index - start_index`
 - ▶ often requires meta data for more complex data structures
- ▶ choose a domain decomposition that allows
 - ▶ to split the workload between the given number of ranks in even shares
 - ▶ if required, rebalance the workload during runtime
 - ▶ in many domains also known as “adaptive refinement”
- ▶ trade-off in case of black box problems
 - ▶ many chunks: easy to balance load but increased management overhead
 - ▶ few chunks: little overhead, but difficult to balance load
 - ▶ note: decomposition itself is also overhead!


Dealing with Load Imbalance cont'd

- ▶ **reactive**
 - ▶ monitor system state (introduces overhead!)
 - ▶ when load imbalance is detected, try to mitigate
- ▶ **predictive**
 - ▶ build a load imbalance model
 - ▶ query the model for the state of the system in the near future
 - ▶ shift the workload before load imbalance occurs
- ▶ **huge (!) amount of research dedicated to this field**
 - ▶ a) find approaches of mitigating load imbalance
 - ▶ b) find ways of doing this automatically without user intervention (holy grail)

Dealing with Load Imbalance: Static Case


- ▶ static
 - ▶ first choose smart domain decomposition depending on predicted workload
 - ▶ then just execute as normal

- ▶ example on the right: quadtree
 - ▶ more work → smaller subregions
 - ▶ 3D version: octree
 - ▶ called “Bounding Volume Hierarchies”




Dealing with Load Imbalance: Dynamic Case

- ▶ **dynamic**
 - ▶ some form of repeated balancing required, e.g.
 - ▶ at certain intervals
 - ▶ when reaching certain thresholds




Insight into Research: Load Balancing in AllScale



Dealing with Load Imbalance: Domain-specific Knowledge

- ▶ if present, use domain-specific knowledge about the problem
 - ▶ e.g. structured problem with a workload gradient depending on an index


```
for(int i = 0; i < N; ++i) {  
    for(int j = 0; j < i; ++j) {  
        ...  
    }  
}
```



Further Means of Load Balancing

- ▶ use “smart” work assignment strategies instead of smart domain decomposition
 - ▶ assign small chunks of work in round robin fashion or in random order
 - ▶ c.f. OpenMP’s loop scheduling strategies)
 - ▶ assign small chunks using space-filling curves, diffusion models, etc...
 - ▶ remember tradeoff between balanced load and overheads
- ▶ configure hardware
 - ▶ change CPU clock frequencies, e.g. slow down cores with little work
 - ▶ switch off hardware, e.g. cores that finished early
 - ▶ doesn’t reduce wall time but saves power and energy
- ▶ biggest issue of all: which strategy to select for which problem...

Space-filling Curves (Hilbert)



Additional Reasons for Load Balancing

- ▶ external load caused by other users
 - ▶ not only on the CPUs, consider e.g. network or I/O
- ▶ heterogeneous systems
 - ▶ e.g. decide how to split work between CPUs and GPUs
- ▶ dynamic availability of additional resources
 - ▶ c.f. cloud computing



Tales from the Proseminar



Tales from the Proseminar

- ▶ Which code version is faster?

```
#define NDIMS 3

int foo(int a) {
    for(int i = 0; i < NDIMS; ++i) {
        a *= a;
    }
    return a;
}
```

```
int foo(int a) {
    a*= a;
    a*= a;
    a*= a;
    return a;
}
```

Tales from the Proseminar cont'd

- ▶ Both versions compiled with gcc 11.2 with -O0

A	Left:	x86-64 gcc 11.2 -DVERSION=0...	Assembly	Right:	x86-64 gcc 11.2 -DVERSION=1...	Assembly
1	foo(int):			1	foo(int):	
2		push rbp		2		push rbp
3		mov rbp, rsp		3		mov rbp, rsp
4		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-20], edi		4+		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-4], edi
5		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-4], 0		5+		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-4]
6		jmp .L2				
7	.L3:			6		imul eax, eax
8		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-20]		7+		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-4], eax
9		imul eax, eax		8+		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-4]
10		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-20], eax		9+		imul eax, eax
11		add DWORD PTR [rbp-4], 1		10+		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-4], eax
12	.L2:			11+		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-4]
13		cmp DWORD PTR [rbp-4], 2		12+		imul eax, eax
14		jle .L3		13+		mov DWORD PTR [rbp-4], eax
15		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-20]		14+		mov eax, DWORD PTR [rbp-4]
16		pop rbp		15		pop rbp
17		ret		16		ret

Tales from the Proseminar cont'd

- ▶ Both versions compiled with gcc 11.2 with -O1
 - ▶ See for yourself: <https://godbolt.org/z/s3b4Wv68d>

A	Left: x86-64 gcc 11.2 -DVERSION=0..	Assembly	Right: x86-64 gcc 11.2 -DVERSION=1..	Assembly
1	foo(int):		1	foo(int):
2	mov eax, edi		2	mov eax, edi
3	imul eax, edi		3	imul eax, edi
4	imul eax, eax		4	imul eax, eax
5	imul eax, eax		5	imul eax, eax
6	ret		6	ret

Summary

- ▶ domain decomposition
 - ▶ means of controlling communication overhead
- ▶ load (im)balance
 - ▶ static: split the workload evenly among ranks
 - ▶ dynamic: continuously rebalance as required
- ▶ “Tales from the Proseminar”
 - ▶ compiler-based loop unrolling

Image Sources

- ▶ Binary Star System video: courtesy of Ralf Kissmann & David Huber, University of Innsbruck
- ▶ Space Weather Prediction: <https://twitter.com/maven2mars/status/984440044659159040>
- ▶ Intel Trace Analyzer: <https://software.intel.com/en-us/articles/understanding-mpi-load-imbalance-with-intel-trace-analyzer-and-collector>