

Exploring GPU Stream-Aware Message Passing using Triggered Operations

Naveen Namashivayam
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
naveen.ravi@hpe.com
Nick Radcliffe
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
nick.radcliffe@hpe.com

Krishna Kandalla
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
krishnachaitanya.kandalla@hpe.com
Larry Kaplan
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
larry.kaplan@hpe.com

Trey White
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
trey.white@hpe.com
Mark Pagel
Hewlett Packard Enterprise, USA
mark.pagel@hpe.com

arXiv:2208.04817v1 [cs.DC] 9 Aug 2022

Abstract—Modern heterogeneous supercomputing systems are comprised of compute blades that offer CPUs and GPUs. On such systems, it is essential to move data efficiently between these different compute engines across a high-speed network. While current generation scientific applications and systems software stacks are *GPU-aware*, CPU threads are still required to orchestrate data moving communication operations and inter-process synchronization operations.

A new *GPU stream-aware* MPI communication strategy called *stream-triggered (ST) communication* is explored to allow offloading both computation and communication control paths to the GPU. The proposed ST communication strategy is implemented on HPE Slingshot Interconnects over a new proprietary HPE Slingshot NIC (Slingshot 11) using the supported *triggered operations* feature. Performance of the proposed new communication strategy is evaluated using a microbenchmark kernel called Faces, based on the nearest-neighbor communication pattern in the CORAL-2 Nekbone benchmark, over a heterogeneous node architecture consisting of AMD CPUs and GPUs.

Index Terms—heterogeneous supercomputing systems, CPU, GPU, MPI, GPU-NIC Async, GPU Streams, GPU Control Processors, Control Path, Data Path

I. INTRODUCTION

CURRENT-generation scientific applications and systems-software stacks are using *GPU-aware* [30] Message Passing Interface (MPI) [20] implementations. GPU-awareness for inter-node MPI data movement using Remote Direct Memory Access (RDMA) [29, 31] allows buffers to directly move from the GPU memory to a network adapter without staging through host memory. For intra-node MPI transfers, buffer move through various Peer-to-Peer (P2P) data transfer mechanisms [27] supported by different GPU vendors.

Even with such GPU-awareness in the MPI software stack, CPU threads are still required to orchestrate the data-moving communication and inter-process synchronization operations. This requirement results in all communication and synchronization operations occurring at GPU kernel boundaries.

Fig. 1 demonstrates the sequence of events for a typical GPU-aware parallel application that relies on MPI for inter-process communication and synchronization operations. An MPI process running on the CPU **a** first synchronizes with the local GPU device to ensure completion of the compute

kernel (K1) execution. Next, it **b**, launches, progresses, and **c** completes the inter-process communication/synchronization operations. Subsequent compute kernels (K2) on the GPU are **d** launched only after the inter-process communication operations have completed. This behavior creates potentially expensive synchronization points at kernel boundaries that require the CPU to synchronize with the GPU and Network Interface Controller (NIC) devices.




Fig. 1. Illustrating sequence of events on a typical GPU-aware parallel application that relies on MPI for inter-process communication and synchronization operations.

A *GPU stream* [12] is a queue of device operations. GPU compute kernel concurrency is achieved through creating multiple concurrent streams. Operations issued on a stream get executed in the order in which these operations were issued. Also, the execution of these operations is asynchronous with respect to operations in other streams. A new *GPU stream-aware* MPI communication strategy called *stream-triggered (ST) communication* is proposed and explored to offload both the computation and communication control paths to the GPU.

The new proposed communication scheme allows the CPU to create network command descriptors with *deferred execution* semantics and append them to the NIC command queue. These command descriptors have special attributes that allow them to get *triggered* [16] at a later point in time when certain conditions are reached. In addition, the CPU also creates

control operations and appends them to the GPU stream. These operations will be executed by the GPU control processor in sequential order, relative to other operations enqueued in the GPU stream. When these control operations are executed by the GPU control processor, they act as *triggers* that initiate the execution of the previously appended network command descriptors in the NIC's command queue.

This approach also allows the GPU control processor to synchronize with the NIC to determine the successful completion of communication operations. This synchronization step involves the use of hardware counters in the NIC. Thus, ST tries to minimize the need for synchronization between the CPU and GPU.

A. Contributions of This Work

The following are the major contributions.

- 1) Propose a GPU stream-aware MPI communication strategy to offload both computation and communication control paths to the GPU;
- 2) Implement the proposed communication strategy on HPE Slingshot Interconnects exploiting the *triggered operations* feature [16] available in the new HPE Slingshot NIC (Slingshot 11) [14, 10, 18];
- 3) To demonstrate the effectiveness of the new proposed communication strategy, create a microbenchmark kernel called Faces based on the nearest-neighbor communication pattern in the CORAL-2 [1] Nekbone benchmark [6]; and
- 4) Experiment with proposed solutions on a heterogeneous system architecture with support for AMD-based CPU and GPU processors.

II. BACKGROUND

This section provides an overview of the ST communication strategy in MPI, along with the *deferred execution* features provided by the HPE Slingshot NIC (Slingshot 11) to support the proposed ST interface.

A. MPI Control and Data Paths

MPI communication operations in GPU-aware applications are typically comprised of *control paths* and *data paths*. Control paths correspond to coordination operations that occur between the application process running on the CPU, the control processor on the GPU device, application compute kernels running on the GPU device, and the NIC. Data paths refer to those operations that involve moving data between CPU-attached and GPU-attached memory regions. These data movement operations can occur within the same compute node or between different compute nodes across a high-speed network. The data paths are typically handled by the NIC (for inter-node data transfer operations) and the GPU DMA engines (for intra-node peer-to-peer data transfer operations).

As detailed in Fig. 1, applications typically experience expensive synchronization points, and an application process running on the CPU is closely involved in the progress of control paths.

Fig. 2 includes a high-level description of the proposed new ST communication strategy. This strategy enables a GPU-aware application to offload control paths to underlying implementation and hardware components.

B. Stream Triggered Communication Overview

A parallel application using the ST strategy continues to manage compute kernels on the GPU via existing mechanisms. In addition, the ST strategy allows an application process running on the CPU to define a set of GPU stream based MPI communication operations. The new proposed MPI operations are detailed in Section III.

These communication operations can be scheduled for execution at a later point in time. More importantly, in addition to offering a deferred execution model, the ST strategy enables the GPU control processor (GPU CP) to be closely involved in the control paths associated with MPI communication operations. Along with managing compute kernels defined by the application, the GPU CP coordinates with the NIC to manage the control paths of MPI communication operations. This design minimizes the need for the application process running on the CPU to drive the control paths of MPI communication operations.

As shown in the Fig. 2, an application process running on the CPU enqueues GPU kernel K1 to the GPU stream, triggered ST-based MPI operations to the NIC, the corresponding trigger operations to the GPU stream, and GPU kernel K2 to the same stream. In Fig. 2, the enqueue operations from the CPU are represented via dashed arrows, and the actual executions of various operations from the GPU Control Processor are represented as solid arrows.




Fig. 2. Illustrating the sequence of events on a parallel application that uses ST MPI execution for inter-process communication and synchronization.

- 1 The GPU CP launches K1 and 2 waits for it to complete. Once K1 completes, 3 the GPU CP triggers the execution of MPI operations and 4 waits for these operations to finish. Next, 5 the GPU CP launches K2.

Thus, an application process running on the CPU enqueues operations to the NIC command queue and GPU stream, but the CPU is not directly involved in the control paths of MPI communication operations and subsequent kernel launch and

tear-down operations. The CPU also does not directly wait for MPI communication operations to complete. The GPU CP manages the control paths, and this potentially eliminates the expensive synchronization points between an application process and its GPU device.

C. Slingshot 11 Triggered Operations using Libfabric Deferred Work Queues

Triggered operations [16] supported by Slingshot 11 are the key hardware features required for implementing the proposed ST MPI communication scheme. They are exposed using the deferred work queue (DWQ) [3] features in the Libfabric [23] SW stack. DWQ allows an application to enqueue a list of operation with deferred execution semantics. Each DWQ descriptor is comprised of a DMA descriptor, a trigger counter object, a completion counter object, and a trigger threshold value.

When the MPI implementation submits a DWQ send operation to the NIC command queue, this operation is not executed by the NIC immediately. The operation gets executed when the associated trigger counter object in the DWQ operation reaches a required threshold value. The GPU CP is responsible for performing this update. Similarly, the completion of the DWQ operation is monitored by the GPU CP using the completion counter object which can be used for performing synchronizations or execute other enqueued DWQ operations.

The current generation Slingshot 11 NIC provides support for the following DWQ operations: (1) tagged and untagged sends, (2) one-sided RMA operations, and (3) fetching and non-fetching atomic operations. Missing DWQ features required by the MPI ST semantics, like the tagged and untagged receive operations, are emulated with an internal asynchronous progress thread per MPI process.

The trigger and completion counter NIC objects can be mapped to GPU CP accessible memory pointers for the GPU CP to directly access these NIC counter objects.

D. Stream Memory Operations

GPU stream memory operations are used to support the proposed ST communication operations. Specifically, they are used to update and monitor the trigger and completion counter objects specified in Section. II-C. There are two common stream memory operations supported by different GPU vendors: (1) *writeValue* and (2) *waitValue*.

A *writeValue* operation enqueues a write command to the GPU stream, and the write operation is performed only after all earlier commands to this stream have completed execution. A *waitValue* operation enqueues a wait command to the GPU stream. All operations enqueued on this stream after the wait command will not be executed until the defined wait condition is satisfied.

The function prototypes of the *hipStreamWriteValue64* and *hipStreamWaitValue64* operations on the AMD HIP runtime [5] are shown in Fig. 3. For brevity, similar stream memory operations available in the NVIDIA CUDA runtime [2] are not shown.

```
hipError_t hipStreamWriteValue64(
    hipStream_t stream, void* ptr, int64_t val);

hipError_t hipStreamWaitValue64(
    hipStream_t stream, void* ptr, int64_t val,
    uint64_t mask, unsigned int flags);
```

Fig. 3. Function prototypes for AMD HIP stream memory operations.

E. Mapping Stream Memory and SS11 DWQ Operations

The *writeValue* and *waitValue* operations are used by mapping the trigger and completion counter objects to GPU accessible memory pointers. In brief, the GPU CP using the enqueued *writeValue* operation writes to the trigger counter object based on the threshold value. This write operation acts as a trigger for the previously enqueued DWQ(Section II-C) operation to be executed. Similarly, the GPU CP using the enqueued *waitValue* operation monitors the completion counter object associated with the DWQ operation to wait for its completion.

III. PROPOSED ST MPI INTERFACE

This section provides a brief description of the proposed MPI operations to support the ST communication strategy. The proposed ST MPI operations follow semantics similar to the point-to-point (P2P) two-sided messaging. These ST operations are used to explore the potential performance of the new communication strategy with minimal network resource utilization. Also, these proposed operations are designed to be used incrementally within existing MPI applications.

A. MPI Queues for P2P ST

MPPIX_Queue is a new data object created to support ST MPI operations using P2P messaging semantics. The proposed *MPPIX_Queue* object allows users to map a user-defined GPU stream handle to the MPI runtime, and it enables batching of operations¹. *MPPIX_Create_queue* and *MPPIX_Free_queue* are the two new MPI operations to create and destroy an MPI queue object, respectively. The function prototypes of these operations are provided in Fig. 4. These are local operations performed without interaction with any other process.

```
int MPPIX_Create_queue(IN void *stream,
                      OUT MPPIX_Queue *queue);
int MPPIX_Free_queue(IN MPPIX_Queue queue);
```

Fig. 4. Function prototypes for creating and destroying *MPPIX_Queue* objects.

The *MPPIX_Create_queue* operation creates a new *MPPIX_Queue* object, with the GPU stream handle passed by the user as input. Similarly, the *MPPIX_Free_queue* allows the implementation to release an already created *MPPIX_Queue* object. Note that the free operation is used only to release

¹Batching of operations allows users to trigger execution of multiple enqueued MPI operations using a single trigger operation. Extracting deferred semantics on enqueued operations and triggering those deferred operations are provided as part of the proposed functions in Section III-B.

any internal resource maintained by the queue object, and it is the responsibility of the users to wait for any associated ST operation to complete before freeing the queue object.

B. MPI Enqueue Operations for P2P ST

Set of enqueue operations, *MPIX_Enqueue_send* and *MPIX_Enqueue_rcv*, introduced in this section performs the actual GPU stream-based data movement operations. Along with these enqueue operations, *MPIX_Enqueue_start* and *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operations are introduced to trigger and wait for completion of the enqueued data movement operations, respectively. The function prototypes of these operations are provided in Fig. 5 and their semantics are enumerated below.

```

int MPiX_Enqueue_send(const void *buf,
int count, MPI_Datatype datatype, int dest,
int tag, MPI_Comm comm, MPiX_Queue queue,
MPI_Request *request);

int MPiX_Enqueue_rcv(void *buf, int count,
MPI_Datatype datatype, int source, int tag,
MPI_Comm comm, MPiX_Queue queue,
MPI_Request *request);

int MPiX_Enqueue_start(const MPiX_Queue queue);
int MPiX_Enqueue_wait(const MPiX_Queue queue);

```

Fig. 5. Function prototypes for enqueueing P2P ST communication.

- 1) All proposed new ST-based MPI communication operations are enqueued to a particular *MPIX_Queue* object, and these operations are executed in FIFO order. Execution of these operations is asynchronous with respect to the host process running on the CPU.
- 2) *MPIX_Enqueue_send* and *MPIX_Enqueue_rcv* are examples of ST MPI communication operations. These operations create internal communication descriptors that correspond to MPI data-movement operations, and these descriptors are enqueued into the *MPIX_Queue* object.
- 3) The *MPIX_Enqueue_start* function allows an application process to specify when the enqueued stream-based MPI communication operations must be executed by the GPU CP. All previously enqueued stream-based MPI communication operations on the *MPIX_Queue* object are executed in batch by a single start operation. It is not necessary to create a start operation per enqueued stream-based MPI communication operation. A stream memory *writeValue* is enqueued internally as part of the enqueue start operation.
- 4) Similarly, *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* allows an application process to define when the GPU CP must wait for the completion of all previously executed stream-based communication operations, and a stream memory *waitValue* operation is enqueued internally as part of this operation.

1) ST Execution Sequence: Fig. 6 demonstrates a sequence of ST operations executed in a simple MPI application. The first queue in Fig. 6 shows the sequence of operations executed by the application process executing on the CPU, while the second and third queues show the list of enqueued operations in the *MPIX_Queue* object and the corresponding GPU device stream, respectively.




Fig. 6. Illustrating a sequence of ST MPI operations and their execution.

The application process directly enqueues the device kernels (D1 and D2) to be executed by the GPU stream. The *MPIX_Queue* object is not relevant in the execution of compute kernels that are offloaded to the GPU.

When an application process calls *MPIX_Enqueue_send* (S1, S2) and *MPIX_Enqueue_rcv* (R1, R2) operations, they are enqueued in the *MPIX_Queue* object. The *MPIX_Enqueue_send* and *MPIX_Enqueue_rcv* operations return immediately. The enqueue operations create the necessary communication descriptors for executing the ST send and receive operations in a deferred manner.

MPIX_Enqueue_start internally enqueues a *writeValue* operation to the specified GPU stream. The execution of the *writeValue* operation enqueued as part of *T1: MPiX_Enqueue_start* triggers the execution of S1 and R1. Similarly, the execution of the *writeValue* operation enqueued as part of *T2: MPiX_Enqueue_start* triggers the execution of S2 and R2.

When the ST completion operations (W1 and W2) are called by the application process using the *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operations, the MPI implementation enqueues these operations into the *MPIX_Queue* object, and the *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operations return immediately. For each *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operation, the MPI implementation also enqueues a *waitValue* operation to the corresponding GPU stream. The wait operation allows the GPU CP to wait for all previously started stream-based MPI communication operations to complete before working on other enqueued stream-based MPI operations and device compute kernels.

2) Non-blocking ST Semantics: The proposed enqueue operations are non-blocking with respect to the application host process. The non-blocking semantics of the proposed enqueue operations eliminates the expensive synchronization

```

MPIX_Queue queue;
hipStream_t stream;

/* create a GPU stream object and use it to create an MPiX_Queue object */
hipStreamCreateWithFlags(&stream, hipStreamNonBlocking);
MPIX_Create_queue(MPI_COMM_WORLD_DUP, (void *)stream, &queue);

if (my_rank == 0) {
    launch_device_compute_kernel(src_buf1, src_buf2, src_buf3, src_buf4, stream);

    MPIX_Enqueue_send(src_buf1, SIZE, MPI_INT, 1, 123, queue, &sreq[0]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_send(src_buf2, SIZE, MPI_INT, 1, 126, queue, &sreq[1]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_send(src_buf3, SIZE, MPI_INT, 1, 125, queue, &sreq[2]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_send(src_buf4, SIZE, MPI_INT, 1, 124, queue, &sreq[3]);

    MPIX_Enqueue_start(queue); /* Enqueue_start enables triggering of all prior send ops */
    MPIX_Enqueue_wait(queue); /* wait blocks only the current GPU stream */
} else if (my_rank == 1) {
    MPIX_Enqueue_recv(dst_buf1, SIZE, MPI_INT, 0, 123, queue, &rreq[0]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_recv(dst_buf2, SIZE, MPI_INT, 0, 126, queue, &rreq[1]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_recv(dst_buf3, SIZE, MPI_INT, 0, 125, queue, &rreq[2]);
    MPIX_Enqueue_recv(dst_buf4, SIZE, MPI_INT, 0, 124, queue, &rreq[3]);

    MPIX_Enqueue_start(queue);
    MPIX_Enqueue_wait(queue);

    launch_device_compute_kernel(dst_buf1, dst_buf2, dst_buf3, dst_buf4, stream);
}
hipStreamSynchronize(stream); /* wait for all operations on stream to complete */

MPIX_Free_queue(queue);
hipStreamDestroy(stream);

```

Fig. 7. Example for batched ST communication operation. Illustrate using a single *MPIX_Enqueue_start* operation to trigger the execution of multiple ST send and receive operations.

points between an application process and its GPU device. The summary of the non-blocking semantics of the new proposed operations is as follows.

- 1) All ST enqueue operations return after enqueueing them into the *MPIX_Queue* object. The execution of these operations is deferred until the GPU CP triggers the execution using the enqueued *writeValue* operation as part of the *MPIX_Enqueue_start*.
- 2) Once enqueued, the GPU device kernels can make changes to these buffers until the execution of the GPU stream memory write operations in stream order.
- 3) An application process can synchronize with the GPU device to identify the completion of previously enqueued stream operations. This is in addition to the *waitValue* operation enqueued as part of the *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operation. When a process enqueues a *waitValue* operation, it is not synchronizing with the GPU. Instead a wait command is enqueued that gets executed by the GPU CP.
- 4) An application process can also call *MPI_Wait* or *MPI_Waitall* to ensure the completion of ST communication operations and perform any related cleanup activities. These host-based synchronization operations have blocking semantics for an application process.

C. ST Usage Model

This section provides a simple example in Fig. 7 to show the usage of the proposed ST operations. In this example, each process creates an *MPIX_Queue* object on a given GPU device stream. The MPI process with *my_rank* value 0 in *MPI_COMM_WORLD_DUP* first launches a compute kernel to the GPU. Since the kernel launch operation is non-blocking, this process can return immediately to enqueue further stream-based send operations to the *MPIX_Queue* and the corresponding GPU stream objects. This process next calls *MPIX_Enqueue_start*, which appends the *writeValue* to the corresponding GPU stream. Finally, this process calls *MPIX_Enqueue_wait*, which appends a *waitValue* to the GPU stream. Similarly, the MPI process with *my_rank* value 1 on *MPI_COMM_WORLD_DUP* performs matching receive operations on the same communicator by calling *MPIX_Enqueue_recv*, *MPIX_Enqueue_start*, and *MPIX_Enqueue_wait* operations on the specified GPU stream.

In this example, for the MPI process with *my_rank* value 0, the enqueued stream-based sends are guaranteed to be executed only after the completion of the device kernel execution. The host process enqueues the kernel and the stream-based sends and start operations on a given stream handle and returns

immediately. It is the GPU CP that executes these operations in FIFO order.

Similarly, for the MPI process with *my_rank* value 1, the enqueued wait operation guarantees that the device kernel is not executed until the enqueued stream-based receive operations have completed execution. This also ensures that the *dst_buf* memory regions contain the result of the stream-based receive operations for the subsequent GPU kernel enqueued for execution.

D. ST Extended Usage

This section enumerates the extended usage semantics of the proposed ST operations:

- 1) The proposed MPI enqueue operations are fully compatible with existing MPI P2P communication operations. For example, as long as the message matching requirements are satisfied, the proposed API allows the use of existing *MPI_Irecv* along with the *MPIX_Enqueue_send*.
- 2) The proposed ST operations do not support wildcarding. Usage of *MPI_ANY_SOURCE* and *MPI_ANY_TAG* is restricted.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

This section provides a brief overview of the MPI implementation details in supporting the proposed ST-based MPI communication operations. Implementation details are divided into two different sections, providing an overview of the inter-node and intra-node implementations.

A. Inter-node ST MPI Implementation

Inter-node ST send operations are executed using the triggered operations supported by Slingshot 11. This feature is exposed using the DWQ features supported in Libfabric interface.

When the *MPIX_Queue* object is created using the *MPIX_Create_queue* operation, each MPI process opens two Libfabric counters that are associated with hardware counters in the Slingshot 11 NIC. This implementation uses one hardware counter as the trigger counter and the other as the completion counter for all ST-based send and receive operations enqueued on this *MPIX_Queue* object.

1) Inter-node ST MPI Send Implementation: During *MPIX_Enqueue_send* operation, a DWQ-based send operation with the hardware counters associated with the corresponding *MPIX_Queue* object is created. Appropriate trigger threshold values are set per enqueued send operation. As per the supported semantics of the DWQ operations, these enqueued send operations are not executed immediately. They wait for the trigger condition on the associated hardware trigger counter to be satisfied.

With *MPIX_Enqueue_start* operation, a trigger event using the *writeValue* operation is created to satisfy the trigger condition. The write operation to the associated hardware counter from the *writeValue* operation acts as a trigger to any previously enqueued triggered operations.

2) Inter-node ST MPI Receive Implementation: The implementation of the *MPIX_Enqueue_rcv* operation is similar to the *MPIX_Enqueue_send* operation. But the main difference is that, as the Slingshot 11 NIC does not provide support for triggered receives, the deferred execution semantics of the triggered receives are emulated using an asynchronous progress thread running on the CPU. The progress thread monitors the associated hardware trigger and completion counter, and interprets their state to decide when to execute the enqueued receive operation and wait for its completion.

While the inter-node send operations are fully offloaded to the network, the deferred execution semantics of the inter-node receive operations are emulated using a progress thread.

B. Intra-node ST MPI Implementation

For both intra-node ST-based send and receive operations, there are no known peer-to-peer options available to provide the required deferred work semantics (specifically the MPI messaging matching [22, 25, 19, 21] required as part of the message passing semantics). As mentioned in Section IV-A2, where the inter-node ST-based receive operations are emulated using a progress thread, all intra-node ST-based send and receive operations are also emulated using the same progress thread.

It is to note that the described implementation is possible, as the proposed ST operations do not support wildcarding with *MPI_ANY_SOURCE* and *MPI_ANY_TAG* options. With this semantic, both inter-node and intra-node ST traffic are easily separable. And, the progress thread-based emulation would allow the asynchronous progress thread to get involved in the message matching and data movement operations by monitoring the memory buffer updated by the stream memory operations mentioned in Section II-D. While the progress thread handles the control path for the intra-node operations, the GPU vendor supported DMA engines are used for the data paths of these operations.

V. PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In this section, the Faces microbenchmark is used to evaluate the performance of the proposed ST-based MPI P2P communication operations.

A. Application Overview

The Faces microbenchmark is based on the nearest-neighbor communication pattern from the CORAL-2 [1] Nektone [6] benchmark. The timed loop in Faces performs the following operations in the baseline HIP implementation.

- 1) Pre-post non-blocking MPI receives from up to 26 neighbors;
- 2) Launch kernels to copy into contiguous MPI buffers from faces, edges, and corners of spectral elements on the surface of the 3D local block, all in GPU memory;
- 3) Initiate non-blocking MPI sends to all neighbors;
- 4) Launch a kernel to perform the sum operation of all faces of spectral elements that are inside the local block;
- 5) Wait to receive messages from neighbors; and

- 6) Launch kernels to add the received messages to the faces, edges, and corners of spectral elements on the surface of the local block.

Faces has three nested loops that perform the following operations.

- 1) *Outer loop*: Allocate MPI buffers, run loops, and de-allocate MPI buffers;
- 2) *Middle loop*: Initialize the values of the spectral elements and run the inner loop; and
- 3) *Inner loop*: Run the communication steps listed above and accumulate the wall-clock runtime.

Faces confirms correct results by comparing against a reference CPU-only implementation.

B. Test Details

For this ST performance analysis, the baseline HIP implementation of the Faces microbenchmark is compared against the ST modified variant of the same. The baseline HIP implementation uses GPU-attached memory regions and attempts to overlap MPI communication with computation for the inner domain.

The ST implementation of Faces replaces *MPI_Isend* calls with *MPIX_Enqueue_send* calls followed by *MPIX_Enqueue_start*. These changes eliminate the need for host-device synchronization before the sends. The implementation also replaces the synchronous call to *MPI_Waitall* for the sends with the host-asynchronous call *MPIX_Enqueue_wait*.

For receive operations, Faces can use standard *MPI_Irecv* operations with appropriate buffer management techniques, or it can use the proposed ST receive operations, *MPIX_Enqueue_recv*. For this study, the modified version of Faces uses standard *MPI_Irecv* operations with double buffering techniques. This is an intentional implementation choice because the current Slingshot 11 NIC does not support deferred receive operations. Pre-posting the receive operations eliminates the need for MPI's progress threads to respond to the trigger event (from *hipStreamWriteValue64*) and post the receive descriptor to the NIC. Thus, the receive side of the Faces implementation uses standard *MPI_Irecv* calls.

For all tests, the following loop configurations were used: 10 outer loop \times 100 middle loop \times 100 inner loop. 5 different runs of the different variants of the tests were performed, and the average of the results are reported in this analysis.

C. Initial Performance Evaluation

The results of 1D Faces runs using the baseline and ST variants are reported in this section. A $64 \times 1 \times 1$ (1D) MPI distribution is used for the analysis. This test uses 64 application processes (MPI ranks) distributed across 8 heterogeneous nodes, with 8 ranks per node. On each node, a one-to-one mapping between MPI rank and GPU devices is enforced. On each node, 8 GPU devices (4 sockets) are attached to a single CPU. The heterogeneous node architecture is similar to the node architecture available in the Frontier exascale supercomputer [4].

Fig. 8 represents the results of the analysis. It shows the average, minimum, and maximum overall execution time of the Faces microbenchmark, comparing the baseline version against the modified ST variant.




Fig. 8. Faces execution time in seconds for the baseline and ST variants of the benchmark (8 nodes with 8 MPI processes per node, $64 \times 1 \times 1$ 1D configuration).

On average, the ST variant of the Faces execution is around 10% slower than the baseline version. In the remainder of the performance analysis sections, the performance impact of the various components in the ST design is investigated. Multiple intra-node and inter-node tests are used to understand the various factors contributing to the performance overheads measured in this multi-node analysis.

D. Impact of Progress Threads

To understand the impact of progress thread usage in the ST implementation, the Faces microbenchmark is tested on a single node. For this analysis, the 1D distribution of application processes is $8 \times 1 \times 1$.

All eight MPI ranks are collocated on a single node, with each MPI rank using a different GPU on the node. Fig. 9 represents the results of the analysis.




Fig. 9. Faces execution time in seconds for the baseline and ST variants of the benchmark (1 node with 8 MPI processes per node, $8 \times 1 \times 1$ 1D configuration).

With the $8 \times 1 \times 1$ 1D configuration and all ranks placed on a single node, MPI messaging operations for the baseline version involve the use of *ROCr* [9] (user-mode API interfaces and libraries necessary for the host applications to launch compute kernels on AMD GPU devices) IPC (Inter-Process Communication) for large payloads and a non-temporal memcpy implementation for small payloads. While the data transfers for the ST variant also incur similar intra-node transfers, a progress thread is employed to perform these operations to

satisfy the ST deferred execution semantics. The details of the progress thread usage in the ST implementation design are described in Section IV-B.

On average, the ST variant of the Faces execution is around 4% slower than the baseline version. This is observed even with a dedicated hardware thread on the AMD CPU for each MPI progress thread. This demonstrates the negative impact of using a progress thread per MPI process to emulate the triggered operation semantics to implement the ST semantics.

E. Impact of Network Offload

To understand the impact of using HPE Slingshot 11 hardware-based deferred execution operations in the ST implementation, the Faces microbenchmark is tested across 8 nodes with 1 MPI rank per node. For this analysis, the 1D distribution of the ranks is $8 \times 1 \times 1$. On each node, a given MPI rank uses a single GPU device, and the Slingshot 11 NIC is co-located on the same GPU module. Fig. 10 represents the results of this analysis.




Fig. 10. Faces execution time in seconds for the baseline and ST variants of the benchmark (8 nodes with 1 MPI processes per node, $8 \times 1 \times 1$ 1D configuration).

With the $8 \times 1 \times 1$ 1D configuration and a single MPI rank per node, all MPI messaging operations for the baseline version involve inter-node data transfers through the HPE Slingshot-11 network. While the data transfers for the ST variant also incur similar inter-node data transfers, HPE Slingshot 11 hardware-based deferred send operations and hardware counters are employed to perform these operations to satisfy the ST semantics. The details of the implementation are provided in Section IV-A1.

In this test, on average the ST variant shows similar performance to the baseline Faces variant. This shows that offloading significant components of the ST operations to the HPE Slingshot 11 NIC offers better performance when compared to the use of a progress thread per MPI process to implement the intra-node ST operations. To confirm this, the Faces benchmark is run with a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ 3D distribution. The 3D distribution increases the number of MPI messages generated per rank and the number of target ranks per process. The number of MPI ranks and the number of nodes used for this test stays the same; only the Faces distribution is changed for this analysis. The results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 11.




Fig. 11. Faces execution time in seconds for the baseline and ST variants of the benchmarks (8 nodes with 1 MPI processes per node, $2 \times 2 \times 2$ 3D configuration).

With the change in Faces distribution, the performance clearly shows the benefit of using NIC offloading for the ST implementation. On average, the ST variant of the Faces execution as shown in Fig. 10 is around 4% better than the baseline version. This experiment demonstrates the benefits of using hardware-based deferred execution operations in the HPE Slingshot 11 NIC to implement ST operations.

Even though the HPE Slingshot 11 NIC offers hardware support for deferred execution operations and completion counters, there are scenarios where the MPI implementation relies on the progress thread for inter-node ST operations. However, the number of CPU cycles required to mitigate some of the missing hardware capabilities is much smaller when compared to those needed for the intra-node ST implementation. Specifically, CPU cycles are needed for emulating deferred receives and for handling completion counter updates in specific inter-node scenarios, such as the rendezvous protocol. The NIC handles the entire progression of the rendezvous protocol and the data movement operations. In summary, hardware capabilities in the HPE Slingshot 11 NIC can offer performance benefits for inter-node ST operations, even though the current implementation requires CPU cycles for some scenarios.

F. Impact of Tuned Stream Memory Operations

In this test, the impact of using HIP stream memory operations as described in Section II-D is analyzed. For this test, the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ 3D distribution of Faces execution as described in Section V-E is extended.

Here 8 MPI ranks are distributed across 8 nodes, with 1 MPI rank per node and each rank uses a single GPU. The $2 \times 2 \times 2$ 3D distribution is employed to show the real benefits of the ST implementation.

As described in Section V-E, the ST implementation that uses the HIP stream memory operation (*hipStreamWriteValue64* and *hipStreamWaitValue64*) shows 4% better performance when compared to the baseline version. The performance improvements are attributed to the use of HPE Slingshot 11 hardware-based deferred execution operations in the ST inter-node data transfer implementation.

For this test, the HIP stream memory operations are swapped with hand-coded shaders that perform a set of oper-

ations to satisfy the semantics of the *hipStreamWriteValue64* and *hipStreamWaitValue64* operations. The ST-shader variants of Faces show the best performance when compared to the baseline, as well as the regular ST variant with HIP stream memory operations. The results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 12. The ST-shader version shows 8% better performance than the baseline version.




Fig. 12. Faces execution time in seconds for the baseline, ST variant with HIP stream memory operations, and ST implementation with hand-coded shader kernels (8 nodes with 1 MPI rank per node using $2 \times 2 \times 2$ 3D configuration).

This analysis shows the need for further tuning the HIP stream memory operations to suite the need for ST MPI operations.

G. Performance Inference

In brief, performance analysis comparing the baseline and ST variants of the Faces microbenchmark determines the following.

- 1) On average, experiments with the ST variant of Faces with multiple nodes and multiple processes per node show a significant drop in performance when compared to the baseline variant of Faces. Specifically, an 8-node experiment with 8 MPI processes per node experiment shows a 10% drop in overall performance when using the ST implementation. This drop in performance is attributed to the use of progress threads to emulate the deferred execution semantics needed for intra-node data transfers.
- 2) Running the ST variant of the Faces benchmark across multiple nodes with a single application process per node shows performance improvements when compared to the baseline variant of Faces. Specifically, an 8-node experiment with the ST version of Faces with one MPI rank per node shows 4% improvement in overall Faces execution time. This performance improvement can be attributed to the use of hardware capabilities in the HPE Slingshot 11 NIC in the ST implementation.
- 3) While the performance benefit from exploiting the hardware-based deferred execution is an interesting data point, not all applications can limit the amount of intra-node communication to mimic the layout that provides performance benefits. For the baseline implementation, nearest-neighbor codes benefit from rank ordering that puts communicating neighbors on the same compute

nodes. But for ST, a rank order that keeps neighbors on separate nodes shows a greater improvement over the standard implementation, but the absolute performance relative to node-localized orders is likely lower. Further study of this space may be appropriate.

- 4) The 4% performance improvement while using HPE Slingshot 11 deferred execution operations can be improved to 8% by employing hand-coded shader kernels replacing the HIP stream memory operations, *hipStreamWriteValue64* and *hipStreamWaitValue64*. This shows the need for further performance tuning of targeted stream memory operations.

VI. RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, little research has been performed to explore options for introducing GPU stream-awareness into message-passing programming models with deferred execution semantics [16]. The triggered operations functionality supported by the HPE Slingshot NIC (Slingshot 11) is unique in allowing users to enqueue communication events into the NIC command queue but defer their execution until a trigger event is observed. Based on our understanding, this is the first research to explore the usage of a deferred execution programming model to introduce GPU stream-awareness in MPI.

There is other related research exploring different hardware options to introduce GPU stream-awareness in different programming models. Agostini et al. explores the basic building blocks required for offloading communication control logic in GPU accelerated applications into the GPU device. Similarly to our research, they have explored hardware offload capabilities using NVIDIA GPUDirect Async [8] and InfiniBand Connect-IB network adapters[11]. The *libgdsync*[7] library was created as part of this research.

Oden et al. and Daoud et al. explore the possibilities of GPUs handling the communication and control paths by hosting the verbs layer [11] in the GPU. Similarly, Hsu et al. and Hamidouche and LeBeane explore the options to host the GPU centric communication on the GPU using the OpenSHMEM programming model[13]. This research [28, 17, 26, 24] is mostly done using the NVIDIA Infiniband Host Channel Adapter.

We conclude that the proposed GPU stream-aware MPI operations with deferred execution semantics have a potential for performance benefits. Specifically, the use of hardware offloaded deferred execution operations can benefit in implementing the proposed MPI operations. The missing peer-to-peer intra-node data transfer support needs similar offload mechanism for exploiting full performance benefit from the proposed MPI operations.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this work, a new communication strategy called *stream-triggered communication* is proposed to introduce GPU stream-awareness in MPI 2-sided point-to-point communication operations. The proposed strategy allows an application

to offload both the *control* and *data* paths to the underlying implementation and hardware components, and it avoids an active CPU-GPU synchronization at the GPU compute kernel boundaries.

The implementation of the proposed ST-based MPI operations shows that offloading the inter-node ST-based MPI operations using the triggered operations feature supported in NICs like HPE Slingshot 11 has shown performance benefits. Conversely, the usage of progress threads for the intra-node communication to emulate the required deferred execution semantics is detrimental to performance. With available systems, it is not yet possible for us to efficiently implement intra-node two-sided MPI operations with the ST semantics without a progress thread. The intra-node implementation requires a progress thread per MPI process to perform the MPI message matching for intra-node communication operations.

Further analysis is required to identify options to fully offload the ST communication semantics to the NIC hardware to get the maximum performance benefits from new interfaces.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND DISCLAIMER

We would like to thank the HPE MPI (Steve Oyanagi and Arm Patinyasakdikul) and HPE Libfabric (Ian Ziemba and Charles Fossen) developers involved in providing the basic features required to implement and evaluate the proposed MPI stream-aware communication strategy. Also, we would like to thank Duncan Roweth and Keith Underwood for reviewing our work and providing suggestions for further improvements. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of associated organizations.

REFERENCES

- [1] CORAL-2 Benchmarks Summary. <https://asc.llnl.gov/coral-2-benchmarks>.
- [2] CUDA Stream Memory Operations. https://docs.nvidia.com/cuda/cuda-driver-api/group__CUDA__MEMOP.html.
- [3] Libfabric Deferred Work Queue. https://ofiwg.github.io/libfabric/v1.9.1/man/ofi_trigger.3.html.
- [4] Frontier, ORNL's Exascale Supercomputer. <https://www.olcf.ornl.gov/frontier/>.
- [5] HIP Stream Memory Operations. https://github.com/ROCm-Developer-Tools/HIP/blob/develop/docs/markdown/hip_programming_guide.md#hip-stream-memory-operations.
- [6] CORAL-2 Benchmarks Summary - Nekbone. https://asc.llnl.gov/sites/asc/files/2020-06/Nekbone_Summary_v2.3.4.1.pdf.
- [7] NVIDIA GPUDirect libgdsync. <https://github.com/gpudirect/libgdsync>.
- [8] NVIDIA GPUDirect family. <https://developer.nvidia.com/gpudirect>.
- [9] AMD ROCr-Runtime Manpage and Guide. https://rocm-docs.amd.com/en/latest/Installation_Guide/ROCr-Runtime.html.
- [10] HPE Slingshot Interconnect. <https://www.hpe.com/in/en/compute/hpc/slingshot-interconnect.html>.
- [11] IB Verbs RDMA programming guide. <https://docs.nvidia.com/networking/display/RDMAAwareProgrammingv17/RDMA+Aware+Networks+Programming+User+Manual>.
- [12] NVIDIA CUDA C/C++ Streams and Concurrency. <http://on-demand.gputechconf.com/gtc-express/2011/presentations/StreamsAndConcurrencyWebinar.pdf>, 2013.
- [13] OpenSHMEM standard version-1.4. http://openshmem.org/site/sites/default/site_files/OpenSHMEM-1.4.pdf, 2017.
- [14] Cray's Slingshot Interconnect is at the Heart of HPE's HPC and AI Ambitions. <https://tinyurl.com/22rt7utz>, 2022.
- [15] E. Agostini, D. Rossetti, and S. Potluri. Offloading Communication Control Logic in GPU Accelerated Applications. In *2017 17th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGRID)*, pages 248–257, 2017. doi: 10.1109/CCGRID.2017.29.
- [16] B. W. Barrett, R. Brightwell, K. S. Hemmert, K. B. Wheeler, and K. D. Underwood. Using Triggered Operations to Offload Rendezvous Messages. In *Proceedings of the 18th European MPI Users' Group Conference on Recent Advances in the Message Passing Interface*, EuroMPI'11, 2011.
- [17] F. Daoud, A. Watad, and M. Silberstein. GPUrdma: GPU-Side Library for High Performance Networking from GPU Kernels. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Runtime and Operating Systems for Supercomputers*, ROSS '16. Association for Computing Machinery, 2016. ISBN 9781450343879.
- [18] D. De Sensi, S. Di Girolamo, K. H. McMahon, D. Roweth, and T. Hoefler. An In-Depth Analysis of the Slingshot Interconnect. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2020.
- [19] K. Ferreira, R. E. Grant, M. J. Levenhagen, S. Levy, and T. Groves. Hardware MPI message matching: Insights into MPI matching behavior to inform design: Hardware MPI message matching. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, 32, 2019.
- [20] M. P. Forum. MPI: A Message-Passing Interface Standard. Technical report, 1994.
- [21] S. M. Ghazimirsaeed, R. E. Grant, and A. Afsahi. A Dedicated Message Matching Mechanism for Collective Communications. In *Proceedings of the 47th International Conference on Parallel Processing Companion*, ICPP '18. Association for Computing Machinery, 2018.
- [22] T. Groves, N. Ravichandrasekaran, B. Cook, N. Keen, D. Trebotich, N. J. Wright, B. Alverson, D. Roweth, and K. Underwood. Not all applications have boring communication patterns: Profiling message matching with BMM. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, jun 2021. URL <https://doi.org/10.1002/2Fcpe.6380>.

- [23] P. Grun, S. Hefty, S. Sur, D. Goodell, R. D. Russell, H. Pritchard, and J. M. Squyres. A Brief Introduction to the OpenFabrics Interfaces - A New Network API for Maximizing High Performance Application Efficiency. Aug 2015.
- [24] K. Hamidouche and M. LeBeane. *GPU INITiated OPenSHMEM: Correct and Efficient Intra-Kernel Networking for DGPUs*. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
- [25] K. S. Hemmert, K. D. Underwood, and A. Rodrigues. An architecture to perform NIC based MPI matching. In *2007 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing*, 2007. doi: 10.1109/CLUSTER.2007.4629234.
- [26] C.-H. Hsu, N. Imam, A. Langer, S. Potluri, and C. J. Newburn. An Initial Assessment of NVSHMEM for High Performance Computing. In *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (IPDPSW)*, 2020. doi: 10.1109/IPDPSW50202.2020.00104.
- [27] K. V. Manian, A. A. Ammar, A. Ruhela, C.-H. Chu, H. Subramoni, and D. K. Panda. Characterizing CUDA Unified Memory (UM)-Aware MPI Designs on Modern GPU Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on General Purpose Processing Using GPUs, GPGPU '19*, 2019.
- [28] L. Oden, H. Fröning, and F.-J. Pfreundt. Infiniband-Verbs on GPU: A Case Study of Controlling an Infiniband Network Device from the GPU. In *2014 IEEE International Parallel Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops*, 2014. doi: 10.1109/IPDPSW.2014.111.
- [29] S. Potluri, K. Hamidouche, A. Venkatesh, D. Bureddy, and D. K. Panda. Efficient Inter-node MPI Communication Using GPUDirect RDMA for InfiniBand Clusters with NVIDIA GPUs. In *2013 42nd International Conference on Parallel Processing*, 2013.
- [30] H. Wang, S. Potluri, M. Luo, A. K. Singh, S. Sur, and D. K. Panda. MVAPICH2-GPU: optimized GPU to GPU communication for InfiniBand clusters. *Computer Science - Research and Development*, 26, 2011.
- [31] H. Wang, S. Potluri, D. Bureddy, C. Rosales, and D. K. Panda. GPU-Aware MPI on RDMA-Enabled Clusters: Design, Implementation and Evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 25, 2014.