# Software development strategy in the TREX Center of Excellence

Anthony Scemama<sup>1</sup>, Claudia Filippi<sup>2</sup> 18/06/2020



<sup>1</sup>Lab. Chimie et Physique Quantiques, IRSAMC, UPS/CNRS, Toulouse (France) <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Science and Technology, University of Twente (Netherlands)

Disclaimer: Currently in the process of signing the Grant Agreement with the EU

## Exascale

### The supercomputing race

#### Worldwide technological competition

- 1997 : Teraflops/s<sup>1</sup>
- 2008 : Petaflops/s
- 2020? : Exaflops/s



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>flops/s: floating point operations per second

### The supercomputing race

#### Worldwide technological competition

- 1997 : Teraflops/s<sup>1</sup>
- 2008 : Petaflops/s
- 2020? : Exaflops/s



- Expected increase of computational power is exponential
- Moore's Law is ending
- Technological breakthrough needed (quantum computing?)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>flops/s: floating point operations per second

#### Worldwide technological competition

- 1997 : Terascale : Distributed parallelism
- 2008 : Petascale : Multi-core chips or accelerators
- 2020? : Exascale : Hybrid architectures are inevitable

#### Worldwide technological competition

- 1997 : Terascale : Distributed parallelism
- 2008 : Petascale : Multi-core chips or accelerators
- 2020? : Exascale : Hybrid architectures are inevitable

#### Peak flops/s improved by $1000 \times$ . What about

- Memory capacity per core?
- Memory bandwidth? latency?
- I/O bandwidth? latency?
- Network bandwidth? latency?

### Example: $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$ on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017)

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017)

### **Computational power**

- 24 cores
- 2.5 GHz =  $2.5 \, 10^9$  cycles/s
- Fused multiply-add (FMA) : 2 flops/FMA
- 512 bit vectors :  $\times 8$  flops in double precision
- $24 \times 2.5 \, 10^9 \times 8 \times 2 = 960$  Gflops/s

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017)

### Computational power

- 24 cores
- 2.5 GHz =  $2.5 \, 10^9$  cycles/s
- Fused multiply-add (FMA) : 2 flops/FMA
- 512 bit vectors :  $\times 8$  flops in double precision
- $24 \times 2.5 \, 10^9 \times 8 \times 2 = 960$  Gflops/s

### Memory bandwidth

- 2666 MHz =  $2.666 \, 10^9$  cycles/second
- 8 bytes / cycle
- 6 memory channels
- $2.66610^9 \times 6 \times 8 = 128 \text{ GB/s}$

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017) Peak performance requires an arithmetic intensity of (960 Gflops/s) / (128 GB/s) = 7.5 flops/byte Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017) Peak performance requires an arithmetic intensity of (960 Gflops/s) / (128 GB/s) = 7.5 flops/byte

 $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$ 

- 2 flops
- 3 loads + 1 store :  $4 \times 8 = 32$  bytes
- Arithmetic intensity : 2/32 = 0.0625 flops/byte

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on Intel Xeon 8168 (2017) Peak performance requires an arithmetic intensity of (960 Gflops/s) / (128 GB/s) = 7.5 flops/byte

 $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$ 

- 2 flops
- 3 loads + 1 store :  $4 \times 8 = 32$  bytes
- Arithmetic intensity : 2/32 = 0.0625 flops/byte

0.8% of the peak is expected for this loop, if streamed from memory.

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on an Nvidia A100 GPU (2020) A100 GPU

- 9.7 Tflops/s
- 1.555 TB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity on GPU: (9.7 Tflops/s) / (1.555 TB/s) = 6.2 flops/byte

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on an Nvidia A100 GPU (2020) A100 GPU

- 9.7 Tflops/s
- 1.555 TB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity on GPU: (9.7 Tflops/s) / (1.555 TB/s) = 6.2 flops/byte

1.0% of the peak is expected for this loop, but  $1555/128 \sim 12 \times$  faster than a single CPU.

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on an Nvidia A100 GPU (2020) A100 GPU

- 9.7 Tflops/s
- 1.555 TB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity on GPU: (9.7 Tflops/s) / (1.555 TB/s) = 6.2 flops/byte
- PCle : 64GB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity from RAM: (97 Gflops/s) / (64 GB/s) = 151.5 flops/byte (!)

1.0% of the peak is expected for this loop, but 1555/128  $\sim$  12 $\times$  faster than a single CPU.

Example:  $z(i) = a(i) + b(i) \times c(i)$  on an Nvidia A100 GPU (2020) A100 GPU

- 9.7 Tflops/s
- 1.555 TB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity on GPU: (9.7 Tflops/s) / (1.555 TB/s) = 6.2 flops/byte
- PCle : 64GB/s
- Required arithmetic intensity from RAM: (97 Gflops/s) / (64 GB/s) = 151.5 flops/byte (!)

1.0% of the peak is expected for this loop, but 1555/128  $\sim$  12 $\times$  faster than a single CPU.

Streaming from memory is slower than on CPU

QMC is known to be "easily scalable".

QMC is known to be "easily scalable".

• Scalable : YES

We can trivially run many trajetories in parallel

• Easily : NO!

QMC is known to be "easily scalable".

• Scalable : YES

We can trivially run many trajetories in parallel

• Easily : NO!

For *exascale simulations*, we need to be massively parallel *and* efficient.

### A few words on Quantum Monte Carlo

#### Efficiency

- Small systems  $\equiv$  small matrices  $\implies$  *low arithmetic intensity*
- Very large systems ⇒ linear-scaling algorithms ⇒ very low arithmetic intensity by nature

#### Parallelism within a trajectory

- DMC trajectories need to be *ergodic*, and one trajectory is *sequential* by nature
- One trajectory performs  ${\sim}10\text{M}{-}100\text{M}$  steps  $\Longrightarrow$  one step  ${\sim}$  1 millisecond

Exploiting parallelism improve the efficiency is difficult

Software development

- Progress in quantum chemistry may require codes with new ideas/algorithms
- New ideas/algorithms are implemented by physicists/chemists
- Exascale machines will be horribly complex

Is it reasonable to ask physicists/chemists to write codes for exascale machines?

### No: Proof

#### Vector addition (from https://github.com/jeffhammond/dpcpp-tutorial)

```
std::vector<float> h_X(length,xval);
std::vector<float> h Y(length,vval);
std::vector<float> h_Z(length,zval);
trv {
    svcl::gueue g(svcl::default selector{});
    const float A(aval);
    svcl::buffer<float.1> d X { h X.data(), svcl::range<1>(h X.size()) };
    sycl::buffer<float,1> d_Y { h_Y.data(), sycl::range<1>(h_Y.size()) };
    svcl::buffer<float.1> d Z { h Z.data(), svcl::range<1>(h Z.size()) };
    q.submit([&](sycl::handler& h) {
        auto X = d X.template get access<sycl::access::mode::read>(h);
        auto Y = d Y.template get access<svcl::access::mode::read>(h);
        auto Z = d Z.template get access<svcl::access::mode::read write>(h);
        h.parallel for<class nstream>( svcl::range<1>{length}. [=] (svcl::id<1> it) {
            const int i = it[0];
            Z[i] += A * X[i] + Y[i];
        3);
      });
      q.wait();
catch (sycl::exception & e) {
    std::cout << e.what() << std::endl;</pre>
    return 1:
```



std::vector<float> h\_X(length,xval);

https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mad\_scientist\_transparent\_background.svg

### The dream

A compiler<sup>2</sup> that can read an average researcher's code and transform it into highly efficient code on an exascale machine.



<sup>2</sup>Wikipedia: A compiler is a computer program that translates computer code written in one programming language (the source language) into another language (the target language)

Reality



https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mad\_scientist\_transparent\_background.svg

 $\ldots$  so let's use ''NI'' and add a human layer between the machine and the researchers : a bio-compiler



https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Mad\_scientist\_transparent\_background.svg

 $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$ 

- $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$
- 2. Agree on a standardized API with scientists and HPC experts

- $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$
- 2. Agree on a standardized API with scientists and HPC experts
- 3. Let the library handle data movement between different kernels

- $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$
- 2. Agree on a standardized API with scientists and HPC experts
- 3. Let the library handle data movement between different kernels
- 4. Scientists propose a reference simple implementation

- $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$
- 2. Agree on a standardized API with scientists and HPC experts
- 3. Let the library handle data movement between different kernels
- 4. Scientists propose a reference simple implementation
- 5. HPC experts *bio-compile* it in high-performance implementations

- $1. \ \mbox{Identify the common kernels in the QMC codes of TREX}$
- 2. Agree on a standardized API with scientists and HPC experts
- 3. Let the library handle data movement between different kernels
- 4. Scientists propose a reference simple implementation
- 5. HPC experts *bio-compile* it in high-performance implementations
- 6. Integrate the library in TREX codes

### A very old and successful practice

- BLAS/Lapack (Linear Algebra)
- MPI (Communication)
- FFTW (Fourier transforms)
- OpenMP (shared-memory parallelism)
- OpenGL (3D graphics)
- MPEG (Audio/Video encoding/decoding)
- Video game rendering engines
- :

#### For scientists

- We don't impose a programming language
- Codes will not die with a change of architecture

#### Separation of concerns

- Scientists will never have to manipulate low-level HPC code
- HPC experts will not be required to be experts in theoretical physics

"*QMC can scale easily*" assumes that one can efficiently compute one trajectory.

Using efficiently the hardware to accelerate the realization of one trajectory is the challenge that will be taken by QMCkl to enable easy scalability.