pioman: a Generic Framework for Asynchronous Progression and Multithreaded Communications

Alexandre Denis

POSTER: a Generic Framework for Asynchronous Progression and Multithreaded Communications

Alexandre DENIS
Inria Bordeaux – Sud-Ouest, France, e-mail: Alexandre.Denis@inria.fr

***Abstract*—Recent cluster architectures include dozens of cores per node, with all cores sharing the network resources. To program such architectures, hybrid models mixing MPI+threads, and in particular MPI+OpenMP are gaining popularity. This imposes new requirements on communication libraries, such as the need for `MPI_THREAD_MULTIPLE` level of multi-threading support. Moreover, the high number of cores brings new opportunities to parallelize communication libraries, so as to have proper background progression of communication and communication/computation overlap. In this paper, we present `pioman`, a generic framework to be used by MPI implementations, that brings seamless asynchronous progression of communication by opportunistically using available cores. It uses system threads and thus is composable with any runtime system used for multithreading. Through various benchmarks, we demonstrate that our `pioman`-based MPI implementation exhibits very good properties regarding overlap, progression, and multithreading, and outperforms state-of-art MPI implementations.**

I. INTRODUCTION

With the dramatic increase in the number of cores per node in clusters, communication libraries have to deal with multithreading, and may exploit cores to make communication progress. However, mixing threads and communication is not straightforward, and care must be taken to design a thread-aware communication library.

In this paper, we present `pioman`, a generic framework to be used by MPI implementations, that brings seamless asynchronous progression of communication by opportunistically using available cores. It uses system threads and thus is composable with any runtime system used for multithreading.

II. RELATED WORKS

People have studied parallelism in the communication library, and shown it may be an opportunity to hide the cost of communications [1], [2], [3], [4]. OpenMPI [5] supports `MPI_THREAD_MULTIPLE` only on TCP, and can overlap computation and communication only on the sender side on *InfiniBand*. RDMA-based MPI [6], [7] may overlap some parts of transfers thanks to the hardware. MT-MPI [8] is specific to Xeon Phi and to a given OpenMP runtime. Some solutions use multithreading to make communication progress [9] which is very restrictive. Our own previous work [10], [11] lacked genericity and was bound to the *Marcel* thread scheduler.

III. A MULTITHREADED COMMUNICATION ENGINE

Tasklets in user-space: Parallelizing network communication processing is needed for asynchronous progression and for multithreaded application having their communication actually progress in parallel. Such mechanisms are well known in Linux kernel and are known as *bottom half* since kernel 2.3.x series. They include *tasklets*, small tasks to be executed asynchronously at some time later. The kernel ensures some guarantees on concurrent operations, deadline, and on CPU placement. Tasklets opportunistically utilize available resources, and asynchronously make communication progress independently of the application execution flow.

We propose a full rewrite of `pioman` [11] using system threads (`pthread`), so as to be compatible with multithreaded applications, whatever the multithreading runtime or the compiler. Its light tasks are called *ltasks*, which are inspired from tasklets but not completely mimics their behavior since user-space and kernel-space are different contexts with different requirements. These *ltasks* need to be executed at the following *polling points*: *idle core*, for an opportunistic resource usage; *timer* to ensure guaranteed reactivity; and *explicit polling*, for a progression at least as efficient as the no-*ltask* flavor. *Idle* uses a low-priority thread, and *timer* uses a high-priority thread with sleeps.

Locality: To reduce contention, we take locality into account. Since architectures is hierarchical, *ltask* queues are hierarchical, as a tree of queues attached to entities (core, cache, socket). Tasks are submitted in the local queue. For polling, *ltasks* are dequeued and executed from the most local queue, then queues from parents are recursively dequeued up to the root. To reduce contention near the root, we perform the recursive polling on the parent queue with a frequency divided by the number of siblings, taking into account that multiple children object will contribute to the polling on their parent.

Contention-free locking scheme: Concurrent *ltask* enqueue by the communication library and *ltask* execution by another thread cause contention, depending on the locking scheme. For *lock-based* scheme (mutex, spinlock), threads compete to acquire the lock. For *lock-free* scheme, queue traversal is not possible atomically, so polling means dequeue/enqueue, and thus competes with applications threads. We propose *submission queues*: a companion queue dedicated to submission is attach to polling queues. The submission queue is lock-free; the main queue has a spinlock. Tasks from the submission queues are dequeued by polling threads before an *ltask* execution round, and enqueued in the main queue once the spinlock is already held. Readers and writers use separate structures, changes from writers are incorporated later by readers. This solution is *lock-free* for task submission, *spin-free* for polling (uses only *trylock*, no need to wait if someone else is already polling). Spinning on locks or atomics, and shared variable for writing are avoided. Contention is actually mitigated.



Fig. 1. Communication/computation overlap ratio, computation on both sides, 4 MB message.



Fig. 2. Multi-threaded 1-byte latency: 1-to-N (left) and N-to-N (right).

IV. Evaluation

Our benchmarks are performed on a dual Xeon E5-2650@2.00GHz with IB ConnectX3 FDR. We compare our `pioman`-enabled *NewMadeleine* communication library against OpenMPI 1.7.4 and MVAPICH 2 2.0b.

Progression Benchmarks: Figure 1 reports overlap ratio with computation on both sender and receiver side. We observe that `pioman`-enabled *NewMadeleine* perfectly overlaps computation and communication as soon as the computation time equals the communication time.

Multithreaded Benchmarks: To evaluate multithreaded performance, we consider 1 sender to N receivers, N senders to N receivers, and 1 sender to 1 receiver with N computation threads. Figure 2 shows that the `pioman`-enabled *NewMadeleine* behaves well with a large number of threads, while MVAPICH 2 has its latency much more impacted by threads. OpenMPI was not considered in this benchmark since it does not support `MPI_THREAD_MULTIPLE` on IB.

Figure 3 shows that for single-threaded communication with competing computation threads, `pioman`-enabled *NewMadeleine* and MVAPICH 2 have a constant median latency, while OpenMPI has a median latency linear with the number of computing threads.

`pioman` exhibits better progression properties than state-of-the-art MPI implementations.

V. Conclusion

We have presented `pioman`, a generic framework to be used by communication libraries, that brings seamless asynchronous progression of communication. We have proposed mechanisms that make communication progress on timer events, opportunistically on idle cores, and allows explicit



Fig. 3. N threads load: 1 MB latency for 1 sending thread, 1 receiving threads, N computing threads on both sides (error bars with min/max/median).

polling. Implementation uses system threads and thus is composable with any runtime system used for multithreading. We have studied tasks concurrency and proposed two mechanisms that mitigate contention, based on locality and an original locking scheme. We have shown that `pioman` makes actually communication progress in background, thus allowing computation and communication to overlap. We have shown that it handles multithreaded load and does not collapse with massive number of threads. In future works, we plan to modify MPI applications to actually take benefit from multithreading and to overlap computation and communications on both sides. Finally, we are working on porting it to the Intel Xeon Phi.

References

[1] J. Sancho, K. Barker, D. Kerbyson, and K. Davis, "Quantifying the potential benefit of overlapping communication and computation in large-scale scientific applications," in *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*. ACM New York, NY, USA, 2006.

[2] S. Potluri, P. Lai, K. Tomko, S. Sur, Y. Cui, M. Tatineni, K. W. Schulz, W. L. Barth, A. Majumdar, and D. K. Panda, "Quantifying performance benefits of overlap using MPI-2 in a seismic modeling application," in *International Conference on Supercomputing*, ser. ICS. ACM, 2010, pp. 17–25.

[3] G. Hager, G. Schubert, T. Schoenemeyer, and G. Wellein, "Prospects for truly asynchronous communication with pure mpi and hybrid mpi/openmp on current supercomputing platforms," in *Cray Users Group Conference*, 2011.

[4] T. Hoefler and A. Lumsdaine, "Message progression in parallel computing-to thread or not to thread?" in *Cluster Computing, 2008 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 213–222.

[5] R. L. Graham, T. S. Woodall, and J. M. Squyres, "Open MPI: A Flexible High Performance MPI," in *The 6th Annual International Conference on Parallel Processing and Applied Mathematics*, 2005.

[6] S. Sur, H. Jin, L. Chai, and D. Panda, "RDMA read based rendezvous protocol for MPI over InfiniBand: design alternatives and benefits," in *Proceedings of the eleventh ACM SIGPLAN symposium on Principles and practice of parallel programming*. ACM New York, NY, USA, 2006, pp. 32–39.

[7] M. J. Rashti and A. Afsahi, "Improving communication progress and overlap in mpi rendezvous protocol over rdma-enabled interconnects," in *High Performance Computing Systems and Applications, 2008. HPCS 2008. 22nd International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 95–101.

[8] M. Si, A. J. Peña, P. Balaji, M. Takagi, and Y. Ishikawa, "Mt-mpi: Multithreaded mpi for many-core environments," in *ACM International Conference on Supercomputing (ICS)*, Jun. 2014.

[9] M. Wittmann, G. Hager, T. Zeiser, and G. Wellein, "Asynchronous mpi for the masses," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1302.4280, 2013.

[10] F. Trahay, A. Denis, O. Aumage, and R. Namyst, "Improving reactivity and communication overlap in MPI using a generic I/O manager," in *EuroPVM/MPI*, ser. LNCS, no. 4757. Springer, 2007, pp. 170–177.

[11] F. Trahay and A. Denis, "A scalable and generic task scheduling system for communication libraries," in *IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing*, New Orleans, LA, Sep. 2009.