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IDI Cluster: Clustis

- Description of clustis: 1.46 GHz AMD processors, 2 GB RAM, 40 GB drives

- Use OpenPBS batch system (PBS implementation)

- Classification of nodes:
  - clustis: master node
  - node01-node08: interactive use
  - node09-node40: batch use

- Several queues of different priorities:
  - privileged users
  - guest users
  - sif80bi users
• Documentation

• `qmpirun` script:
  
  – Usual MPI invocation:
    `mpirun -np 4 program`
  
  – To use batch system:
    `qmpirun -np 4 program`
  
  – Output saved in `program.out` and `program.err`
  
  – Creates and submits shell script for batch system
  
  – Cleans itself up when finished

• `mpirun` modified to support OpenPBS

  **Itanium cluster**

• Two IA-64 nodes and master

• Setup OpenPBS and `qmpirun` script as for clustis
Profiling Tools: Vampir

- Produced by Pallas GmbH in Cologne and Dortmund
- Easiest to use: wrappers for mpicc, mpiCC, mpif90
- Simple, effective design: static libraries
- Shows individual MPI calls during a timeslice
- Shows aggregate statistics in varying levels of detail
- Expensive: 75 000 Kroner for clustis
Profiling Tools: Paradyn

- Written at University of Wisconsin
- Difficult to use: non-intuitive GUI interface
- Complex design: run-time code-patching
- Shows even more data than Vampir
- Does not work in batch environments
- Impossible to compile
- Inexpensive: Free
Profiling Tools: Jumpshot

- Written at various universities and research centres in USA

- Comes with MPICH

- Simple design: static libraries

- Has years of testing and works well

- Limited data: no aggregate statistics

- Also free
Porting Fortran 90 Code

- Compilers not standard-compliant

- Most compilers don’t fully support standard and exceed the standard

- This step took the longest in the project

- SGI compiler
  - SGI supercomputers used for scientific computing
  - Scientists and mathematicians like Fortran
  - Hence, SGI writes a Fortran 90 compiler that produces very optimized code
  - Code originally written on SGI
Intel compilers

• NAGWare (NTNU site-licensed)
  – Compiler produces faulty code in array reshaping code
  – Debugger segfaults
  – NAGWare acknowledges bug, recommends upgrading (£££!)

• Intel
  – Intel also produces supercomputers
  – Good compiler, but strictly standard-conformant
  – My code has some obsolete Fortran 77 syntax
  – Free!
• Portland Group (Bergen and Linköping)
  – Compiler mishandles 3D-array reshape calls
  – Successfully rewrote this as a series of 2D-array reshape calls
  – Sometimes segfaulsts

• No GNU Fortran 90 compiler yet
Getting MPICH to work with Fortran 90

- Simple mapping in C between function/variable names and symbol names in object files (foo() = foo)

- Fortran 90 compilers sometimes add one underscore and sometimes add two (foo() = foo_ or foo__)

- MPICH configure script is supposed to handle this, but doesn’t work

- Since Fortran 90 is mostly used for scientific computing, the Portland Group provides a custom configure script, which does work
• Porting
  
  – Used Portland Group compiler
  
  – Joakim Hove and Knut Petter assisted me in correcting many errors
  
  – Most of the errors were in extraneous portions of the code and could be commented out.

  – By comparing the code with standard-compliant code and a bit of guesswork, I managed to get all of the necessary modules to compile without error
Profiling: Systems

- Cluster in Bergen: $32 \times$ dual 1.26 GHz Pentium IIIs
  100 Megabit network

- Cluster in Linköping: $33 \times 900$ MHz Pentium IIIs
  100 Megabit and SCI (full-duplex Gigabit) networks

- Supercomputer (embla): $512 \times 600$ MHz MIPS processors

- Did not use Clustis
Description of Program

- Simulation of behaviour of subatomic particles in near absolute-zero temperatures under an electromagnetic field

- Three-dimensional parallelopiped divided between processes

- One thousand iterations. Each iteration has a separate communication and a computation phase

- Initial hypothesis:
  - Cluster better for small number of processes (faster processors)
  - Supercomputer better for large number of processes (faster interconnect network)
Analysis of Problem Size

- Number of messages passed is proportional to the internal surface areas

- Amount of computation proportional to the volume

- I expected the program to perform better *per-unit-volume* with larger problem sizes
Profiling Results: Speedup

In this test, the problem size is constant and the number of processes used varies.
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Profiling Results: Speedup

Observations:

- Unexpectedly, the supercomputer outperforms the clusters for a small number of processes
  - SGI compiler produces more optimized code
  - MIPS CPUs have larger caches

- With a large number of processors, the two clusters’ performance is approximately equal
Profiling Results: Scaleup

In this test, the problem size is grown in proportion to the number of processes. In other words, the problem size per process is kept constant.
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Profiling Results: Scaleup

Observations:

- The clusters fare much better in this test

- The Bergen cluster’s performance is within 20% of the supercomputer’s

- The Linköping cluster’s performance is within 80% of the supercomputer’s

- This is a more real-world test, since the amount of work per process is a reasonable amount.

- All the systems exhibit better speedup than in previous test
Profiling Results: Conclusions

- Clusters perform quite well, considering their cost

- Middle ground: clusters with proprietary Gigabit networks

- Could not get SCI (Gigabit) network to work
MPI Broadcast w/ Multicast

- Broadcast

- With Unicast (TCP/IP) is $O(\log_2 n)$

- With Multicast is $O(1)$

- But Multicast uses UDP, which is unreliable
Reliability protocol

- Sending Process
- Original Messages
- Receiving Process
- Acknowledgments
- Retransmitted Messages
- Reliability Daemon
Results

Sending 2000 600-byte messages from single source

Sending 2000 600-byte messages from all sources