Accelerating the Implicit Integration of Stiff Chemical Systems with Emerging Multi-core Technologies

John C. Linford[†] John Michalakes[‡] Manish Vachharajani[§] Adrian Sandu[†]

IMAGe TOY 2009 8/19/09 Workshop 2

† Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Department of Computer Science, Blacksburg VA
 ‡ National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder CO
 § University of Colorado at Boulder, Boulder CO

Outline

- Introduction and motivation
- The Kinetics Pre-Processor (KPP)
 - Rosenbrock solver
- Emerging multi-core architectures
 - Cell Broadband Engine Architecture (CBEA)
 - NVIDIA GTX 200 Architecture
 - Intel Quad-core Xeon 5400 series
- Case Study: RADM2 chemical mechanism from WRF/Chem
- Future Work
 - Multi-core KPP
 - Accelerated function offloading

GOAL: A "crossplatform" multi-core integrator for chemical kinetics

Chemical Kinetics Models

- Air Quality
 - WRF/Chem
 - CMAQ
 - STEM
- Wildfire
 WRF/Fire





x distance from projection center (km)



- Climate Change
 - GEOS/Chem







Chemical kinetics dominate computational time









The Kinetics Pre-Processor (KPP)







- Generates C, Fortran or MATLAB code to compute:
 - the time-evolution of chemical species,
 - the Jacobian,
 - the Hessian, etc.
- Includes a library of widely-used solvers
 - Rosenbrock
 - Runge-Kutta, etc.
- Used by several models
 - WRF/Chem
 - GEOS/Chem
 - STEM



The KPP-generated n-stage Rosenbrock solver for chemical kinetics

- Sparse implementation
- Trades precision for speed when reasonable
- Typically outperforms backwards differentiation formulas (SMVGEAR)
- The Jacobian is generally inseparable
 - the solver itself cannot be parallelized,
 - but certain operations are highly parallel

Initialize k(t, y) from starting concentrations and meteorology (ρ, t, q, p) Initialize time variables $t \leftarrow t_{start}, h \leftarrow 0.1 \times (t_{end} - t_{start})$ While $t \leq t_{end}$ $Fcn_0 \leftarrow Fcn \leftarrow f(t, y)$

$$Jac_0 \leftarrow J(t,y)$$

 $G \leftarrow LU_DECOMP(\frac{1}{h\gamma} - Jac_0)$
For $s \leftarrow 1,2,...,n$

Compute $Stage_{s}$ from *Fcn* and $Stage_{1...(s-1)}$

Solve for $Stage_s$ implicitly using G

Update k(t,y) with meteorology (ρ, t, q, p)

Update Fcn from $Stage_{1...s}$

Compute Y_{new} from $Stage_{1...s}$

Compute error term E

If $E \ge \delta$ then discard iteration, reduce *h*, restart Otherwise, $t \leftarrow t + h$ and proceed to next step

Finish: Result in Y_{new}

Peak performance of multi-core architectures

Gigaflops	PowerXCell 8i	Cell B.E.	Tesla C1060	Xeon 5400 Series
Single (per watt)	230.4 (2.5)	230.4 (2.5)	933.0 (3.95)	48.0 (0.53)
Double (per watt)	115.2 (1.25)	21.03 (0.22)	76.0 (0.38)	48.0 (0.53)
Max for 200 watts	460.8	460.8	933.0	96.0



7

8/19/0



Intel Quad-core Xeon 5400 series: a generalpurpose, widely-available multi-core architecture



- 5400 series "Harpertown"
 - General-purpose x86 cores
 - Intel 64 architecture
 - SSE4 Extensions
 - Program with OpenMP, MPI, pthreads, etc.
 - 48 gigaflops peak
 - 0.53 per watt



Cell Broadband Engine CPU Architecture (CBEA): a heterogeneous high-performance architecture



- PowerXCell 8i
 - I dual-thread PowerPC
 - 8 accelerators (SPEs)
 - 128-bit vector processor
 - 256KB software-controlled local storage
 - DMA engine (MFC)
 - Element Interconnect Bus
 - 204.8GB/second
 - 230.5 SP gigaflops
 - 2.5 per watt
 - 115.25 DP gigaflops
 - 1.25 per watt

8/19/(



NVIDIA GTX 200 GPGPU: a versatile floating-point accelerator architecture



- NVIDIA Tesla C1060
 - 4GB GDDR3 RAM
 - o 30 multiprocessors, each with:
 - 8 SP cores
 - 1 shared DP unit
 - 16kb shared memory
 - 16kb register file
 - 933 SP gigaflops
 - 3.95 per watt
 - 76 DP gigaflops
 - 0.76 per watt
- Programmed with CUDA
 - C/C++ extension
 - NVIDIA proprietary
 - Architecture abstracted

8/19

Let's compare these architectures...

	Quad-core Xeon	CBEA	GTX 200
# threads	4	10	Thousands
Heterogeneity	None	On-chip	Host/device
SIMD cardinality	4	4	32 (warp size)
Per-core memory	3-6MB	256KB	16KB
# address spaces	1	2	2
# memory types	1	2	6
Mem. hierarcy ctl.	Fully implicit	Fully explicit	Mixed
Data alignment	Optional	Required	Encouraged

- Leverage SIMD ISAs with different cardinalities
- Track data movement across multiple address spaces
- Use each type of memory to best effect
- Avoid inefficient access patterns



Case study: RADM2 from WRF/Chem

- 59 species, 156 reactions
- ~15KB of data per grid cell
- 3-stage KPP-generated Rosenbrock integrator
- See http://ruc.fsl.noaa.gov/wrf/WG11/radm2.htm

V

RADM2 on Intel Quad-core Xeon



RADM2 on the CBEA: scalar master-worker





Vectorized n-stage Rosenbrock solver

Byte 0 (MSB)	Byte 1	Byte 2	Byte 3	Byte 4	Byte 5	Byte 6	Byte 7	Byte 8	Byte 9	Byte 10	Byte 11	Byte 12	Byte 13	Byte 14	Byte 15 (LSB)
doubleword 0					doubleword 1										
word 0 word 1				word 2 word 3											
halfw	ord 0	halfw	ord 1	halfw	halfword 2 halfword 3		halfword 4 halfword 5		halfword 6		halfword 7				
char 0	char 1	char 2	char 3	char 4	char 5	char 6	char 7	char 8	char9	char 10	char 11	char 12	char 13	char 14	char 15

Vectorized n-stage Rosenbrock solver

Vector element 1	Vector element 2					
Initialize $k(t,y)$ from starting concentrations and meteorology (ρ, t, q, p)	Initialize $k(t,y)$ from starting concentrations and meteorology (ρ, t, q, p)					
Initialize time variables $t \leftarrow t_{start}$, $h \leftarrow 0.1 \times (t_{end} - t_{start})$	Initialize time variables $t \leftarrow t_{start}$, $h \leftarrow 0.1 \times (t_{end} - t_{start})$					
While $t \le t_{end}$	While $t \le t_{end}$					
$Fcn_0 \leftarrow Fcn \leftarrow f(t,y)$	$Fcn_0 \leftarrow Fcn \leftarrow f(t,y)$					
$Jac_0 \leftarrow J(t, y)$	$Jac_0 \leftarrow J(t,y)$					
$\rightarrow G \leftarrow LU_DECOMP(\frac{1}{hy} - Jac_0)$	$\rightarrow G \leftarrow LU_DECOMP(\frac{1}{hv} - Jac_0)$					
For $s \leftarrow 1, 2, \dots, n$	For $s \leftarrow 1, 2, \dots, n$					
Compute $Stage_{s}$ from <i>Fcn</i> and $Stage_{1(s-1)}$	Compute $Stage_s$ from Fcn and $Stage_{1(s-1)}$					
Solve for $Stage_s$ implicitly using G	Solve for $Stage_s$ implicitly using G					
Update $k(t,y)$ with meteorology (ρ, t, q, p)	Update $k(t,y)$ with meteorology (ρ, t, q, p)					
Update <i>Fcn</i> from <i>Stage</i> _{1s}	Update <i>Fcn</i> from <i>Stage</i> _{1s}					
Compute Y_{new} from $Stage_{1s}$	Compute Y_{new} from $Stage_{1s}$					
Compute error term E	Compute error term <i>E</i>					
If $E \ge \delta$ then discard iteration, reduce <i>h</i> , restart	If $E \ge \delta$ then discard iteration, reduce <i>h</i> , restart					
Otherwise, $t \leftarrow t + h$ and proceed to next step	Otherwise, $t \leftarrow t + h$ and proceed to next step					
Finish : Result in Y_{new}	Finish : Result in Y_{new}					

Vectorized n-stage Rosenbrock solver

Initialize k(t, y) from starting concentrations and meteorology (ρ, t, q, p) Initialize time variables $t \leftarrow t_{start}$, $h \leftarrow 0.1 \times (t_{end} - t_{start})$ While $t \le t_{end}$ $Fcn_0 \leftarrow Fcn \leftarrow f(t,y)$ $J\mathrm{ac}_0 \leftarrow J(t,y)$ $G \leftarrow LU_DECOMP(\frac{1}{h\gamma} - Jac_0)$ For $s \leftarrow 1, 2, ..., n$ Compute $Stage_s$ from *Fcn* and $Stage_{1...(s-1)}$ Solve for $Stage_s$ implicitly using G Update k(t,y) with meteorology (ρ, t, q, p) Update *Fcn* from *Stage*_{1...s} Compute Y_{new} from $Stage_{1...s}$ Compute error term $E = \max(E_1, E_2, \dots, E_{\nu n})$ -If $E \ge \delta$ then discard iteration, reduce h, restart Otherwise, $t \leftarrow t + h$ and proceed to next step Finish: Result in Y_{new}



RADM2 on the CBEA: vector master-worker





RADM2 on the CBEA: Future work

- Only one PPE thread. Three unused hardware threads!
- No dynamic branch prediction.
- Store constant data in only one local store.
- Use intrinsic operations whenever possible.



RADM2 on CUDA: one-thread-per-cell

- The GPU device is a coprocessor to the CPU host.
- The device runs many lightweight *threads*.
- Threads execute kernels.
- Threads are grouped into *blocks*.
- Blocks are aggregated into a grid.
- Blocks are processed as SIMD groups of threads called warps.





RADM2 on CUDA: one-kernel implementation



2.2x faster than serial Fortran







Performance: WRF/Chem RADM2 mechanism

27

Summary analysis and comparison

PowerXCell 8i (CBEA)

© Explicitly-managed memory hierarchy and "large" on-chip memory results in good performance.

- The lack of high-level language features, mature tools, and support make the CBEA hard to program.
- A good understanding of the CBEA is required.

Small on-chip memory and high memory latency results in disappointing performance.

Tesla C1060 (GTX 280)

- © CUDA makes GPGPU programming easy and intuitive.
- © A good understanding of the GTX 200 architecture is strongly encouraged.

Future Work

Multi-core KPP

- Find common features and describe them to the code generation routines
 - Instruction cardinality
 - Memory access patterns
- Use solvers from RADM2 case study as a generic template
- Already can do SAPRC...

Accelerated function offloading

• IBM Dynamic Application Virtualization (DAV)

http://www.mmm.ucar.edu/wrf/WG2/GPU/Chem.htm