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- Regional HPC Center
- Serving academic and industry users from western NY
- 8,000 Cores Academic Cluster, 3,456 Cores Industry Cluster
- 500 active users and 200 PI
- 106 millions cores hours delivered during 2016-2017 academic year
A Tool for HPC System Management

- **XDMoD: XD Metrics on Demand**
  - HPC resources usage and performance monitoring and analysis
  - On demand, responsive, access to job accounting data
  - NSF funded analytics framework developed for XSEDE
  - [http://xdmod.ccr.buffalo.edu/](http://xdmod.ccr.buffalo.edu/)

- **Comprehensive Framework for HPC Management**
  - Support for several resource managers (Slurm, PBS, LSF, SGE)
  - Utilization metrics across multiple dimensions
  - Measure QoS of HPC Infrastructure (App Kernels)
  - Job-level performance data

- **Open XDMoD*: Open Source version for HPC Centers**
  - 100+ academic & industrial installations worldwide

- Utilized for Blue Waters Workload Analysis
- Currently Carrying out “XSEDE” Workload Analysis
Effect of Node Sharing

• Under node sharing several jobs are allowed to be executed on the same node.
• Jobs have dedicated cores.

• There are computational tasks which cannot efficiently use all of the cores available on a node
  • serial applications
  • poorly scalable parallel software
  • small problem sizes
  • Time imbalanced embarrassingly parallel tasks such as parameter sweeps

But how does it affect the application performance?
The effect of node sharing on application performance is small. 

- 2% 0% 2% 4% 6% 8% 10% 12%

**Single Core**

- GAMESS
- NWChem
- NAMD
- Graph500
- HPCC
- IOR

**Single Socket**

What is the overall effect on the whole system?

Will it actually increase throughput?

To have a quantitative answer we need a workflow simulator!

Simakov et al., 2016. *Proceedings of the XSEDE16.*
Slurm Workload Manager

- Slurm is an open-source resource manager for HPC
- It provides high configurability for inhomogeneous resources and job scheduling
- It is used on large range of HPC resources from small to very large systems.

Which configuration is best for particular needs?
Slurm Simulator

• Why do We Need Slurm Simulator?
  • To check Slurm configuration prior it deployment
  • Finding most optimal parameters for Slurm
  • Modeling of future systems

• Workflow Simulators:
  • Bricks, SimGrid, Simbatch, GridSim and Alea, Maui and Moab Scheduler

• Slurm Simulators:
  • Original version developed by Alejandro Lucero
  • Later improved by Trofinoff and Benini

  • Works only for very small systems and Slurm Version is outdates.
Making Slurm Simulator from Slurm

- Started from latest stable Slurm Release
- Minimized number of processes
- Slurm Controller performs simulation
- Serialize Slurm Controller

User Commands: `squeue`, `sbatch`, etc.

Job Trace File

Slurm Controller

Slurm DB

Slurm Daemon, Running on each Managed Resource

Time

```
MS  Sleep 60  MS  Sleep 60  MS  Sleep 60  MS  Sleep 60  W  MS  Sleep 60  MS
120 BF  Sleep 120 BF  Sleep 120
```
Serialization of Slurm Controller

**Simulator Main Loop**

- Main Priority Based Scheduler
- Backfill Scheduler
- Submit New Jobs
- Terminate Running Jobs which Exceeded their Planned Wall Time
- Slurm DB Synchronization
- Increment time if applicable

**Serialized Slurm Controller**

- In real Slurm scheduling is efficiently serial due to thread locks
- Due to lacking of threads locks, compilation with optimization flags on and with assert functions off, the backfill scheduler is about **10 times faster in simulation mode**

**Simulating time –Scaled real-time with time stepping**

- Shifted real time in most places
- Shifted and scaled real time in backfill scheduler
- Time increment (30-60 seconds) in case of no events
Simulating Workflows with Slurm Simulator

- **RSlurmSimTools** – R library for input generation and results analysis
- **slurm_sim_tools** – multiple convenience scripts

**Input generation**:
- Historic jobs (sacct output)
- Users and Accounts (sacctmgr output or sql dump)

**Results Analysis**:
- Job Execution Log

**Database**:
- MySQL

**Simulation Parameters**:
- Slurm Parameters
- Job Trace
- Users List
- Simulation Parameters

**Controller**:
- Slurm Controller Daemon
- Slurm Database Daemon

**Scripts**:
- run_sim.py - Python Convenience Start-up Script
Slurm Simulator: Implementation Details

- For better performance, the number of processes and threads was decreased.
- Communication with Slurmd was mimicked within Slurmctld.
- Slurmctld was serialized, functions are executed serially from the main simulation event loop.
- Slurm was compiled with optimization flags and assert functions off.
- Time is scaled within backfill schedule usually by a factor of 10 to reflect the difference in performance of real Slurm and Slurm simulator.
- At the end of the main simulator event loop, time is incremented by 1 second if no event happened during the loop.
- R-scripts are used to generate job trace files.
- R-scripts are used to analyze results.
Validating Simulator using Micro-Cluster, Small Model System

- Micro-Cluster is small model cluster created for Slurm simulator validation
- Reference data was obtained by running regular Slurm in front-end mode
- Micro-Cluster configuration was chosen to test constraints, GRes, cores and memory as consumable resources
- The workload consisted of 500 jobs and takes 12.9 hours to complete
- 5 users belonging to 2 accounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Type</th>
<th>Number of Nodes</th>
<th>Cores per Node</th>
<th>CPU Type</th>
<th>RAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CPU-N</td>
<td>48GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CPU-M</td>
<td>48GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Memory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CPU-G</td>
<td>512GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPU Compute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>CPU-G</td>
<td>48GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Micro-Cluster: Slurm Scheduling is not Unique

Job start time difference:

Between simulated and real Slurm runs

Between two real Slurm runs.

- Simulation has similar variability to real Slurm
Variability Origin

Job J has lower priority then Job K
Micro-Cluster: Comparison of Utilization and Job Priorities

Changing of Job Priority Factor over Time

- Resource utilization and job priority changes in simulation is similar to real Slurm
Micro-Cluster: Modifying fair-share priority factor weight

- Fair-share priority factor weight was increased by 20%
- User 1 should biggest decrease in wait time
- Real wait time are within the range of predicted values
Studying UB-HPC Cluster

### Node Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Type</th>
<th>Number of Nodes</th>
<th>Cores per Node</th>
<th>CPU Type</th>
<th>RAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Intel E5-2660</td>
<td>128GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Intel E5645</td>
<td>48GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intel L5630</td>
<td>24GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Intel L5520</td>
<td>24GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Memory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Intel E7-4830</td>
<td>256GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Memory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>AMD 6132HE</td>
<td>256GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Memory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Intel E7-4830</td>
<td>512GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPU Compute</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Intel X5650</td>
<td>48GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historic workload for 24 days was used (October 4, 2016 to October 28, 2016)
Studying UB-HPC Cluster: Simulation vs Historic Data

- Simulation was not having initial historic usage therefore initial fair-share priorities were incorrect.
Studying UB-HPC Cluster: Simulation vs Historic Data

- Missing the influence from excessive RPC calls, the performance hit from multiple threads started for jobs start-up and finalization
Reducing `bf_max_job_user`

- `{bf_max_job_user}` specifies maximal number of user’s jobs considered by backfill scheduler for scheduling
- `{bf_max_job_user}` was reduced from 20 to 10

- 0.1% (40 minutes or 0.1%) increase in time to complete the workload
- The mean wait time is 8 minutes longer and the standard deviation of the wait time differences is 3 hours.
- 25% decrease in the number of jobs considered for scheduling
- 30% decrease in backfill scheduler run time.
UB-HPC Cluster: Node sharing

- The exclusive mode takes 10.8 more days (45% more time) to complete the same workload.
- The average increase in waiting time is 5.1 days with a standard deviation of 6.6 days.
- The 45% increase in time to complete the same load can be translated into the need to have a 45% larger cluster to serve the same workload.

![Graph showing utilization over time with two lines representing exclusive and shared modes.](image-url)
Studying Stampede 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Node Type</th>
<th>Number of Nodes</th>
<th>Cores per Node</th>
<th>CPU Type</th>
<th>RAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intel Knights Landing</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Intel Xeon Phi 7250</td>
<td>96GB+16GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel Xeon Skylake-X</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Intel Xeon Platinum 8160</td>
<td>192GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Node Sharing on Skylake-X Nodes
  - Sharing by Sockets or by Cores
- Separate Controller For KNL and Skylake-X Nodes

- 12 weeks workload was generated from stampede 1 historic workload (2015-05-16 to 2015-08-08)
- Number of jobs was scaled proportional to node count
- Sub-node jobs was calculated using CPU utilization
## Stampede 2. Node Sharing and Separate Slurm Controllers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Node Sharing on SKX Nodes</th>
<th>Wait Hours, Mean</th>
<th>Wait Hours, Mean Weighted by Node Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs on SKX Nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>no sharing</td>
<td><strong>10.9 ( 0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.0 ( 0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by sockets</td>
<td>8.2 (-25%)</td>
<td>15.5 (-9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by cores</td>
<td>8.2 (-24%)</td>
<td>15.5 (-9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>no sharing</td>
<td><strong>7.1 (-35%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>15.0 (-12%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by sockets</td>
<td>5.3 (-51%)</td>
<td>13.8 (-19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by cores</td>
<td><strong>5.5 (-49%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.9 (-18%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs on KNL Nodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>no sharing</td>
<td><strong>8.6 ( 0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.2 ( 0%)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by sockets</td>
<td>7.2 (-16%)</td>
<td>9.2 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sharing by cores</td>
<td>7.3 (-15%)</td>
<td>9.1 (-1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate</td>
<td>no sharing</td>
<td><strong>8.2 (-4%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4 ( 2%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Node sharing and separate controllers cut waiting times nearly in half
The simulator speed heavily depends on the cluster size, workload and Slurm configuration.
How to Get Simulator

Various utilities and documentation are available at
https://github.com/nsimakov/slurm_sim_tools

Slurm Simulator code:
https://github.com/nsimakov/slurm_simulator
Conclusions

• A new Slurm simulator was developed capable of simulation of a mid-sized cluster with a simulation speed of multiple days per hour

• Its validity was established by comparison with actual Slurm runs which showed a good match with similar mean values for job start times with a slightly larger standard deviation

• Simulator can be used to study a number of Slurm parameters that effect system utilization and throughput such as fair share policy, maximum number of user jobs considered for backfill, and node sharing policy

• As expected fair share policy alters job priorities and start times but in a non-trivial fashion

• Decreasing the maximal number of user’s job considered by the backfill scheduler from 20 to 10 was found to have a minimal effect on average scheduling and decrease the backfill scheduler run time by 30%

• The simulation study of node sharing on our cluster showed a 45% increase in the time needed to complete the workload in exclusive mode compared to shared mode.

• For a large system (>6000 nodes) comprised of two distinct sub-clusters, two separate Slurm controllers and adding node sharing can cut waiting times nearly in half.
Acknowledgments

- **XDMoD Developers Team**
  - **UB**: Tom Furlani, Matt Jones, Steve Gallo, Bob DeLeon, Martins Innus, Jeff Palmer, Ben Plessenger, Ryan Rathsam, Nikolay Simakov, Jeanette Sperhac, Joe White, Tom Yearke, Rudra Chakraborty, Cynthia Cornelius, Abani Patra
  - **Indiana**: Gregor von Laszewski, Fugang Wang
  - **University of Texas**: Jim Browne
  - **TACC**: Bill Barth, Todd Evans, Weijia Xu
  - **NCAR**: Shiquan Su

- **Funding**:
  - National Science Foundation under awards OCI 1025159, 1203560, ACI 1445806.
Questions?

• Visit our Booth at:
  • University at Buffalo/Center for Computational Research, booth 1867

• Visit XDMoD Birds-of-a-Feather (BOF) session:
  • Tracking and Analyzing Job-level Activity Using Open XDMoD, XALT and OGRT
  • Tuesday, November 14th, 5:15pm - 7pm
  • Room: 205-207

Various utilities and documentation are available at https://github.com/nsimakov/slurm_sim_tools

Slurm Simulator code:
https://github.com/nsimakov/slurm_simulator