Scientific Computing Performance and Efficiency in Climate Models

Sandra Schröder, <u>Michael Kuhn</u>, Nathanael Hübbe, Julian Kunkel, Timo Minartz, Petra Nerge, Florens Wasserfall, Thomas Ludwig

> Scientific Computing Department of Informatics University of Hamburg

2012-02-17





Outline



2 Climate Models and Optimizations



Our Group's Research

- Research Group Scientific Computing, University of Hamburg, located at the German Climate Computing Center (DKRZ)
- High Performance Computing, with a focus on climate research
- Communication between climate researchers and computer scientists

Performance and Efficiency

- Performance analysis of climate models is necessary
- Climate researchers' view: interested in results, optimizations might influence their accuracy
- Computer scientists' view: make the best use of the available memory and processor resources
- Many tools are available that can help finding potential bottlenecks

Analysis of a Climate Model

- Climate models are a good example for number crunching applications
 - Challenging in terms of parallelization, I/O and optimization
- Analysis of GETM:
 - General Estuarine Transport Model
 - Visualizing and analysing communication and I/O patterns with HDTrace
 - Analysis of code segments with gprof
- Test environment:
 - GETM v2.0
 - Testcase: box_cartesian
 - MPICH2 v1.4
 - NFS

Analysis of a Climate Model - box_cartesian

- Contains a little box with a parabolic bottom topography
- Calculation domain:
 - Equi-distant plane grid
 - 100 × 30 grid points
 - Grid spacing: dx = 1000 m, dy = 1000 m
 - Period: 24 h, timestep: 10 s



Figure: Topography of box_cartesian.

High-Level Optimizations

High-Level Analysis

- Making a rough estimate of the performance and efficiency of the climate model
- Includes the analysis of I/O patterns and communication within all processes of a parallel program
- Analysis with Sunshot
 - Tool for inspecting the communication between several processes in parallel programs
 - Also supports the visualization of NetCDF functions and underlying I/O system calls



Figure: Timelines of four processes in Sunshot. Dominating functions are synchronisation (nf90_sync) and asynchronous communication (WAIT_ALL).

High-Level Optimizations

Large number of nf90_sync calls

- Nearly 96% of the whole I/O
- Total runtime with synchronization: 115 s
- Total runtime without synchronization: 35 s
- MPI_WAITALL accounts for 85% of the duration of MPI communications
 - Asynchronous communication in MPI
 - We have to
 - Get to know communication patterns in GETM better
 - Discuss *if* and *how* the asynchronous communication can be handled more efficiently

Low-Level Optimizations

- Many sequences for optimizations were found with gprof
- Example: multiple calculations in a loop
- For each point (i,j) all quotients A(i,j)/B(i,j) are calculated four times
- One solution: performing every calculation only once and buffering the results
- Typical time-memory tradeoff

Low-Level Optimizations

```
do j=jmin, jmax
  do i=imin, imax
    D(i, j) = A(i, j) / B(i, j)
  end do
end do
do j=jmin,jmax
  do i=imin, imax
    C(i,j)=1/4*(D(i ,j )&
                +D(i+1,j)&
                +D(i ,j-1)&
                +D(i+1, j-1))
  end do
end do
```

Summary and Outlook

- Analysis tools are useful to detect performance problems of (parallel) scientific applications
- Performance analysis of the climate model GETM with Sunshot and gprof
- Optimizations presented here are only a fraction of all the potential ones
- Meetings with GETM developers for information exchange between computer scientists and climate researchers
- To do: modify GETM to use ADIOS
 - ADaptable IO System
 - Simplified API for I/O operations
 - How can this affect I/O performance in GETM?