

Modeling Data Movement Performance on Heterogeneous Architectures

Amanda Bienz*, Luke N. Olson†, William D. Gropp† and Shelby Lockhart†

* *Department of Computer Science*

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, USA

bienz@unm.edu

† *Department of Computer Science*

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Champaign, USA

{lukeo,wgropp,sl2}@illinois.edu

Abstract—The cost of data movement on parallel systems varies greatly with machine architecture, job partition, and even nearby jobs. Performance models that accurately capture the cost of data movement provide a tool for analysis, allowing for communication bottlenecks to be pinpointed. Modern heterogeneous architectures yield increased variance in data movement as there are a number of viable paths for inter-GPU communication. In this paper, we present performance models for the various paths of inter-node communication on modern heterogeneous architectures. We model the performance of utilizing all available CPU cores as well as the benefit of copying data to the CPUs when sending many messages. Finally, we present optimizations for a variety of MPI collectives based on the performance expectations provided by these models.

Index Terms—performance modeling, GPU, data movement, CUDA-aware, GPUDirect, MPI, collectives

I. INTRODUCTION

Parallel architectures are continually advancing in compute power and energy efficiency, allowing for increasingly large high performance computing (HPC) applications. However, the performance of parallel applications often lags far behind the hardware capabilities. There is a large effort to improve the performance and scalability of parallel applications, from numerical algorithms to machine learning methods, on state-of-the-art architectures.

The parallel performance of applications varies greatly with machine architecture, job partition, and compiler. This performance variance is in large part due to data movement, from memory access to inter-process communication. The cost of data movement is often unpredictable, varying with memory layer and relative locations of sending and receiving processes. Moreover, data movement bottlenecks are amplified on heterogeneous architectures, with flop rates greatly increased on GPUs while having only limited performance with inter-GPU data movement. Furthermore, data movement variation is also magnified on heterogeneous architectures as the number of viable paths between two GPUs is increased.

Performance models, such as the max-rate model [1], can be used to analyze the cost of communication, allowing users to pinpoint application bottlenecks. Performance model measure-

ments, including message latency and per-byte transport rates, can be used to analyze all communication for a single compiler on one computer. Therefore, measurements at small scales can provide an accurate analysis of costs and bottlenecks at larger scales. In addition, these models can expose performance bugs in the application as well as in lower-level libraries, such as MPI and CUDA.

In this paper, we present performance models for data movement on both Summit [2] and Lassen [3]. We analyze the various paths of inter-GPU communication, and present a novel strategy for communicating large amounts of data between GPUs on different nodes. Finally, we apply the various inter-node data movement optimizations to the `MPI_Allreduce` collective, improving the performance of large reductions across 16 nodes by 4 – 6× on both Summit and Lassen.

The remainder of the paper is outlined as follows. Section II discusses background information, describing heterogeneous architectures and standard performance models. Section III profiles the various paths of inter-GPU data movement on Summit and presents performance modeling results for these various paths. Data movement optimizations that utilize all CPU processes per node are presented in Section IV while Section V analyzes the benefits of these optimizations when there are multiple messages sent from each GPU. Case studies for the `MPI_Alltoall`, `MPI_Alltoallv`, and `MPI_Allreduce` are presented in Section VI. Finally, Section VII presents concluding remarks and future directions.

II. BACKGROUND

While the postal model [4] accurately captures the cost of communicating a single message between two processes, the max-rate model [1] penalizes symmetric multiprocessing nodes with injection bandwidth limits.

MPI collectives are commonly modeled with measures for idle time, such as the LogP model [5], which accounts for latency bounds associated with asynchrony of processes. The LogGP model [6] improves over the logP models for large messages by adding a per-byte cost.

Locality can further improve models, distinguishing between on-socket, on-node but off-socket, and inter-node messages. Furthermore, models for irregular communication, which typically require processes to communicate many messages with non-neighboring processes, require additional parameters for accurately capturing queue search costs and estimating network contention penalties [7].

Improved architecture-aware performance models, such as the max-rate and node-aware models, have led to the development of methods for improving communication costs. For instance, the drastic performance differences between intra- and inter-node communication motivated node-aware communication optimizations on previous generation architectures [8]–[10].

Current large-scale supercomputers, such as Summit at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Sierra at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, are comprised of heterogeneous nodes, similar to Figure 1. Each node of Summit, for example,




Fig. 1. A schematic of a heterogeneous node.

contains 6 GPUs whereas each node on Sierra contains 4; both computers have 40 CPU cores per node. Furthermore, each node is comprised of two IBM Power9 processors with half of the GPUs directly connected to each. Finally, there are links directly connecting GPUs on the same Power9 processor as well as connecting each GPU to the Network Interface Card (NIC).

The heterogeneous architecture provides many different levels of data movement between GPUs. For instance, messages between two GPUs that are directly connected — e.g., GPU0 and GPU1 in Figure 1 — can pass messages directly. Furthermore, inter-node data can be copied directly to the NIC without being first copied to a CPU. Finally, any message can be communicated by first copying data to a CPU core.

CUDA-aware MPI allows data to be communicated between GPU memories with the MPI API. GPUDirect [11] allows for data to be communicated directly between GPUs without first copying to the CPU. Together, these optimizations provide in-

creased performance of inter-GPU data movement by avoiding unnecessary copies. Unified memory also affects data movement performance, allowing allocated memory to be accessed by both CPU and GPU cores. These various optimizations increase the variability of data movement performance on heterogeneous architectures.

MPI collective operations are one large source of inter-process communication. These operations have been optimized to minimize message counts for small messages, such as with Recursive-Doubling algorithms [12] and the Bruck algorithm [13]. Furthermore, collectives with large message sizes have been optimized to reduce the number of bytes transported between processes with algorithms such as the scatter-allgather and reduce-scatter [14], [15]. In recent years, collective algorithms have been optimized for symmetric multiprocessing (SMP) nodes by using a master process per node to avoid injection bandwidth limitations [16].

MPI implementations, such as the Spectrum MPI available on IBM Power9 systems, provide CUDA-aware MPI collectives that take advantage of GPUDirect. Related research has shown improvements to collectives on heterogeneous architectures. For example, performance of the MPI_Broadcast is improved by performing a hierarchical operation, using NVIDIA Collective Communications Library (NCCL) on-node and MPI for all inter-node communication [17]. In addition, the CUDA IPC can be utilized to reduce data on the GPU throughout intra-node MPI_Allreduce operations [18]. Furthermore, algorithms to optimize the performance of CUDA-aware collectives have been explored [19]. Finally, the performance of MPI collectives with managed memory has been explored [20].

Benchmarking and performance modeling are useful methods for pinpointing performance bottlenecks in methods and applications. A large variety of benchmarks are available to capture the performance of MPI applications. However, few capture inter-GPU data movement performance. Recently, a variety of benchmarks have been extended to capture the performance of heterogeneous architectures [21]–[23].

III. BENCHMARKING GPU TO GPU COMMUNICATION

Data movement bottlenecks reduce the performance and scalability of parallel applications. Heterogeneous architectures typically have data split across a large number of GPUs; consequently, rather than relying on inter-CPU communication, data must be communicated between GPUs. Communication bottlenecks can be determined by benchmarking and modeling the performance of inter-GPU communication. There are two main paths of inter-GPU communication on modern heterogeneous architectures:

- **CUDA-Aware GPUDirect Communication:** data is sent directly between the GPU and the NIC without being copied to the CPU, and
- **3-Step Communication:** data is first copied to the CPU, then communicated between two CPUs, and finally received data is copied to the destination GPU.

Throughout the remainder of this section, we will benchmark and model the performance of communicating a single message between two GPUs, through each viable path of communication using Spectrum MPI (the tests will be performed on Summit). The postal model [4] accurately captures the cost of communicating a single message between two processes and is formulated as

$$T = \alpha + \beta * s \quad (1)$$

where α is the message start-up cost, or latency, β is the per-byte transport cost, and s is the number of bytes to be communicated.

Modern heterogeneous architectures support CUDA-aware MPI and GPUDirect, allowing inter-node data to be transported directly to the NIC without first being copied to the CPU. This path of data movement can be measured and modeled with simple postal models corresponding to CUDA-aware communication. There are measurements for α and β corresponding to each message sending strategy: short, in which messages fit in the envelope and are communicated directly; eager, which assumes sufficient buffer space and communicates immediately; and finally rendezvous, which waits for the receiving process to allocate required buffer space before sending data.

Figure 2 displays the cost of transporting data between a set of GPUs, avoiding copies to CPUs when possible. The communication costs are split into on-socket, for which the GPUs are directly connected via a link, on-node, for which the GPUs are connected to the same node but do not contain a direct link, and network messages that are transported directly to the NIC before being communicated across the interconnect. The parameters associated with the postal models for inter-GPU communication are displayed in Table I.




Fig. 2. The cost of communicating data directly between two GPUs of Summit with GPUDirect. The communication costs are separated into on-socket, for which two GPUs are connected directly by a link, on-node communication, which must be transferred across sockets, and communication that must be injected into the network.

A 3-step communication strategy requires copying all data from a GPU to a corresponding CPU, communicating between

	on-socket	on-node	off-node
α	1.68e-05	1.80e-05	4.96e-06
β	1.86e-11	2.09e-11	1.69e-10

TABLE I
MEASURED PARAMETERS FOR CUDA-AWARE INTER-GPU COMMUNICATION ON SUMMIT, UTILIZING GPUDIRECT WHEN POSSIBLE.

MPI processes, and finally copying data to the destination GPU. This requires profiling both the cost of copying data between CPUs and GPUs as well as the cost of inter-CPU communication. Figure 3 displays the costs of performing `cudaMemcpyAsync` between a GPU and CPU, both for transferring from the host to the device as well as from the device to the host. The cost of both on- and off-socket data transfers are presented, with on-socket data transfers copying between a CPU and GPU that are directly connected, while off-socket data transfers require traversing non-uniform memory access (NUMA) regions. Furthermore, the method `cudaMemcpyAsync` is used as it allows programs to overlap the various streams. Table II displays the postal model




Fig. 3. The cost of transporting data with `cudaMemcpyAsync` between a GPU and CPU. The solid lines display timings for `cudaMemcpyHostToDevice` while the dotted lines show the costs of `cudaMemcpyDeviceToHost`. On-socket measurements time data transports when the GPU and CPU are directly connected, while on-node copies must traverse NUMA regions.

		HostToDevice	DeviceToHost
on socket	α	1.09e-05	1.09e-05
	β	2.38e-11	2.36e-11
off socket	α	1.26e-05	1.25e-05
	β	2.71e-11	2.72e-11

TABLE II
MEASURED PARAMETERS FOR `CUDA-MEMCPYASYNC` ON SUMMIT.

parameters for each `cudaMemcpyAsync`.

The measured costs of inter-CPU MPI communication is presented in Figure 4. The corresponding postal model measurements are presented in Table III.




Fig. 4. The measured times required to communicate a single message of various sizes between CPUs, split into on-socket, on-node but off-socket, and off-node communication.

		short	eager	rendevous
on socket	α	3.51e-07	4.73e-07	2.46e-06
	β	2.62e-10	6.95e-11	3.31e-11
on node	α	9.08e-07	1.17e-06	5.81e-06
	β	1.46e-09	2.16e-10	1.46e-10
off node	α	1.38e-06	1.85e-06	6.56e-06
	β	3.82e-10	3.93e-10	8.51e-11

TABLE III

MEASURED PARAMETERS FOR INTER-CPU POSTAL MODEL ON SUMMIT.

The model parameters presented in Tables I, II, and III can be used to analyze the cost of the various paths of inter-node data movement. Figure 5 displays the modeled costs of communicating inter-node messages of various sizes between two GPUs through either GPUDirect communication or 3-step communication that requires first copying data to the CPUs. These models indicate that when sending a single message between a set of GPUs, GPUDirect is more efficient for all modeled sizes. The difference is most drastic for small messages due to the large latency associated with the `cudaMemcpyAsync` operations.

IV. UTILIZING MANY CPU PROCESSES

Modern heterogeneous nodes are comprised of multiple GPUs and also contain many CPU cores. The max-rate model

$$T = \alpha + \frac{\text{ppn} \cdot s}{\max R_N, R_p \cdot \text{ppn}} \beta * s \quad (2)$$

captures the cost of communication when multiple processes are active per node. In this model, ppn is equal to the number of communicating processes per node, R_p is the inter-process data transport rate, and R_N is the rate at which data can be injected into the network. If $R_p \cdot \text{ppn}$ is less than R_N , this model reduces to the postal model from Equation 1. Table IV displays the injection bandwidth rate for both inter-CPU and inter-GPU communication.

Figure 6 displays the measured cost of communicating various amounts of data between two nodes, splitting the




Fig. 5. The modeled cost of inter-GPU communication for various message sizes. Both viable paths of data movement are modeled, indicating that GPUDirect communication outperforms the 3-step copy to CPU method when communicating a single message between GPUs.

R_N	
inter-CPU	3.0e-11
inter-GPU	5.1e-11

TABLE IV

MEASURED PARAMETERS FOR INJECTION BANDWIDTH LIMITS

data across a portion of the available 40 processes per node. Even with injection bandwidth limits, it is most efficient to have all processes active in inter-node communication, with data evenly split across them. Therefore, the three-step inter-GPU communication can be further optimized by utilizing all available CPUs rather than copying data to a single CPU.




Fig. 6. The cost of communicating various numbers of bytes between two nodes, splitting the data evenly across PPN CPU processes.

There are multiple methods for distributing data across all CPU cores per node. Data can be copied to a single CPU core with `cudaMemcpyAsync`, and then communicated to the

other processes through intra-node MPI communication. Alternatively, CUDA Multi-Process Service (MPS) allows multiple processes to overlap `memcpy` operations. Furthermore, an allocated region of device memory can be shared among multiple MPI processes. Therefore, multiple CPU processes can each `memcpy` a portion of the data from the GPU, enabling the data to be evenly distributed across all processes without extra MPI intra-node communication. Figure 7 displays the modeled




Fig. 7. The modeled cost of communicating data between two GPUs through three different methods: communicating directly between GPUs and the NIC with GPUDirect, copying to a single CPU with the 3-step method, and copying to all available CPUs per process, evenly distributing the data across all available CPU cores. **Note: the latter model does not include the extra time associated with distributing data across the CPUs**

cost of the various paths of inter-node communication between two GPUs, including distributing data across all available processes with and extra intra-node message as well as using duplicate device pointers to pull data directly to the processes. While distributing the data across all processes improves the performance of the three-step communication, there is still little benefit over CUDA-aware MPI with GPUDirect when communicating a single message.

V. OPTIMIZING MULTIPLE MESSAGES

In practice, applications often require multiple messages to be sent from and received by each GPU. The cost of communicating multiple messages can be modeled with the max-rate model used for each message such as

$$T = \alpha \cdot n + \frac{ppn \cdot s}{\max R_N, R_p \cdot ppn} \beta * s \quad (3)$$

where n is the number of messages communicated from any process. As the latency term α is correlated with the number of messages, larger message counts greatly reduce the performance of GPUDirect communication, which has significantly higher latency than inter-CPU communication.

The additional cost associated with sending multiple messages between CPUs and GPUs is displayed in Figures 8 and 9, respectively. Sending a constant amount of data but splitting the data across a number of different messages shows

a significant slowdown associated with additional inter-GPU messages. For instance, splitting data across 5 inter-CPU messages results in a 2x slowdown compared to a 4x slowdown associated with splitting across 5 inter-GPU messages.




Fig. 8. Slowdown that occurs when splitting bytes across different numbers of messages during inter-CPU communication.




Fig. 9. Slowdown that occurs when splitting bytes across different numbers of messages during inter-GPU communication.

While the latency of inter-CPU communication is much smaller than that between GPUs, there is a significant latency associated with `cudaMemcpyAsync`. However, this operation can be performed one time regardless of the number of messages to be communicated. Furthermore, there is additional benefit associated with copying to the CPUs when sending many messages as all data can be copied via a single `cudaMemcpyAsync` before communicating a portion of the messages from each MPI process. As the same data is often communicated in multiple messages, there is also the potential for the `cudaMemcpyAsync` to be significantly smaller than

the inter-CPU communication as each data value only needs to be copied to the CPU once.

Figure 10 shows the modeled speedup associated with copying to the CPU over CUDA-aware MPI when sending various numbers of messages. Two cases are presented: (1) assuming no duplicate data between messages, such that the `cudaMemcpyAsync` is as large as the sum of all inter-CPU communications, and (2) assuming all data is sent in every message, so that the `cudaMemcpyAsync` is the same size as any one message. In practice, data duplication often falls in between these two cases, with a portion of data communicated in multiple messages. Assuming no data is duplicated, the models indicate that copying to the CPU is faster than CUDA-aware MPI for nearly all sizes when sending at least 10 messages. This speedup can be further amplified through node-aware communication techniques, splitting the messages across the MPI processes.




Fig. 10. The modeled cost of GPUDirect (solid) and 3-Step copy to CPU (dotted) approaches when communicating 1, 5, 10, or 50 messages of various sizes. When sending 10 or more messages, it is optimal to copy to the CPU for nearly all message sizes.

VI. CASE STUDIES: MPI COLLECTIVES

MPI collective operations require communication of data among all processes in an MPI communicator. On heterogeneous architectures, the data is typically communicated between all GPUs. Therefore, the number of messages is proportional to the active number of GPUs.

CUDA-aware versions of the MPI collectives are implemented in Spectrum MPI to utilize GPUDirect. However, the performance models in Section V show that when communicating more than 10 messages, the three-step copy to CPU approach should outperform the CUDA-aware algorithm. Furthermore, the models show speedup for large message sizes when data is distributed across all CPU processes.

All CPU processes are utilized during the MPI collectives by distributing data across all available cores so that each core holds a portion of the data to be sent to each GPU. For example, Summit has 6 GPUs and 40 CPU cores per node,

so we use 6 CPU cores per GPU. We then assign a GPU rank to each CPU core between 0 and 5 and create an MPI communicator for each GPU rank. We have each of the CPU cores hold $\frac{1}{6}$ of the data and perform the collective on this smaller data size among all processes with the same GPU rank. This uses the results from Figure 6, which indicate that inter-node MPI communication is optimized by having each available CPU process communicate an equal portion of data.

Four different options are tested for `MPI_Alltoall`, `MPI_Alltoallv`, and `MPI_Allreduce`:

- **CUDA-Aware:** the Spectrum MPI implementation data allocated in GPU memory is passed to the collective operation, utilizing GPUDirect to avoid copying data to the CPUs.
- **3-Step:** all data is copied to a single GPU with `cudaMemcpyAsync`, the Spectrum MPI standard inter-CPU collective is then performed, and finally all received data is copied from the receiving CPU to the destination GPU with `cudaMemcpyAsync`.
- **Extra Msg:** add data is initially copied to a single GPU with `cudaMemcpyAsync`. The data is then redistributed across all available CPU processes per GPU with MPI intra-node communication so that each process holds a portion of the values to be sent to each GPU. Each process then calls the collective operation on this smaller portion of data. Received data is then sent back to a single CPU core per GPU. Finally, a single CPU transfers all received data to the destination GPU with `cudaMemcpyAsync`.
- **Dup Devptr:** each CPU core per GPU transfers a portion of the data from the GPU before calling the collective on this portion of data. Each process then transfers the portion of received data back to the GPU.

Each test is performed four times, and the minimum of all timings is presented. The methods are tested both on Summit and Lassen (a supercomputer at Lawrence Livermore that is similar to Sierra).

A. Case Study: `MPI_Alltoall`

The `MPI_Alltoall` operation consists of sending data to every other process, yielding a large number of messages. Therefore, the CUDA-aware `MPI_Alltoall` requires many messages to be communicated between GPUs.

Figure 11 shows the speedup of performing the various methods of `MPI_Alltoall` over the CUDA-aware approach on 32 nodes of Summit. The extra message approach outperforms the other methods for very small messages, and using a duplicate device pointer to spread the data across the available processes performs best for very large messages. However, CUDA-aware MPI with GPUDirect and copying to a single CPU both perform equally well for message sizes near the middle of all sizes tested.

The various methods of `MPI_Alltoall` perform similarly on Lassen, as displayed in Figure 12. However, for small messages on Lassen, there is a significant overhead associated with multiple processes copying data from a single GPU at one




Fig. 11. The performance of `MPI_Alltoall` on 32 nodes of **Summit** with the various methods of communication.

time. Therefore, there is tangible slowdown with the duplicate device pointer approach for smaller messages on Lassen.




Fig. 12. The performance of `MPI_Alltoall` on 32 nodes of **Lassen** with the various methods of communication.

B. Case Study: `MPI_Alltoallv`

The `MPI_Alltoallv` consists of sending messages of any size to each of the other processes, allowing for communication among only a subset of the processes. The Spectrum MPI implementation of the `MPI_Alltoallv` is outperformed in many cases by using `MPI_Isend` and `MPI_Irecv` for each message, and waiting for all messages to complete. Therefore, this study tests both the `MPI_Alltoallv` in Spectrum MPI as well as performing all communication with `MPI_Isend` and `MPI_Irecv`, and all results use the least costly of these two strategies.

The `MPI_Alltoallv` is tested with a constant size communicated to all processes. As `MPI_Isend` and `MPI_Irecv`

are used to communicate this data, the CPU processes can be utilized to not only split data across CPU cores, but also to reduce the number of messages communicated with each process. For example, each of the 6 CPU cores per GPU on Summit holds all of the data to be sent to $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the GPUs, resulting in each CPU core not only communicating $\frac{1}{6}$ th of the bytes but also yielding an equivalent reduction in message count.

Figure 13 presents the speedup over CUDA-aware MPI associated with each of the various methods of communication. Copying to a single CPU core before redistributing data with intra-node MPI communication outperforms all other methods for small message sizes, improving over CUDA-aware MPI by up to 5x. Alternatively, for mid-sized and larger messages, using a duplicate device pointer to avoid additional MPI communication performs best, with speedups of 3–5× over CUDA-aware MPI. For all tested sizes, copying to a single CPU performs similarly to the GPUDirect implementation.




Fig. 13. The performance of `MPI_Alltoallv` on 32 nodes of **Summit** with the various methods of communication.

The speedups associated with these methods on Lassen are presented in Figure 14. While significant speedups are seen when redistributing data on-node with MPI for small messages, all speedups for larger messages are less significant. However, using duplicate device pointers remains the optimal strategy for large message sizes. As seen with the `MPI_Alltoall`, the large overhead on Lassen associated with copying small amounts of data from multiple messages results in a significant slowdown when using duplicate device pointers for small message sizes.

C. Case Study: `MPI_Allreduce`

The `MPI_Allreduce` performs a reduction over a set of values on every process. For small message sizes, this method only requires $\log_2(p)$ messages, where p is the number of processes calling a reduction. Therefore, speedup over CUDA-aware MPI is unlikely for small reductions over




Fig. 14. The performance of `MPI_Alltoallv` on 32 nodes of **Lassen** with the various methods of communication.

few processes. Furthermore, unlike the `MPI_Alltoall` and `MPI_Alltoallv`, this collective consists of both communication and local computation at each step, providing additional benefit to the GPUDirect method, which can utilize the significant floprates available on GPUs. However, the Spectrum MPI implementation of `MPI_Allreduce` does not efficiently reduce values on the GPUs, allowing for significant improvements over the CUDA-aware approach for large messages.

Distributing data across all available CPU cores not only optimizes inter-node communication, but also provides a larger number of processes to perform the local reductions at each step.

Figure 15 shows the speedups over CUDA-aware MPI associated with the various methods. As expected, there are minimal performance improvements over the GPUDirect approach for small message sizes. However, when reducing over a large number of bytes, we see up to a $5\times$ improvement when using duplicate device pointers to distribute this data across all processes.

We see similar results on Lassen, as displayed in Figure 16. The larger overhead associated with duplicate device pointers for small messages results in significant slowdowns until the message size is large. However, this strategy greatly outperforms the other methods for larger reductions.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

Accurate performance models are a useful tool that guide the development of performant parallel applications. Performance models for the various paths of inter-GPU communication show that, while GPUDirect communication is optimal when sending a single small message between GPUs, programs that send a number of messages perform optimally by copying the data to the CPU. Furthermore, the performance can be further improved by evenly distributing the data across all available CPU cores so that each process communicates a




Fig. 15. The performance of `MPI_Allreduce` on 32 nodes of **Summit** with the various methods of communication.




Fig. 16. The performance of `MPI_Allreduce` on 32 nodes of **Lassen** with the various methods of communication.

smaller amount of data, and in some cases fewer messages, through the network.

This work can be extended to other heterogeneous architectures and alternative MPI implementations. Furthermore, while this paper focuses on inter-node communication, performance models for intra-node communication can also be analyzed to improve application bottlenecks. Finally, optimizations from this paper can be applied to HPC applications, as a large number of inter-GPU messages are required for many applications from stencil codes to sparse matrix operations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This material is based in part upon work supported by the Department of Energy, National Nuclear Security Administration, under Award Number DE-NA0002374.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. Gropp, L. N. Olson, and P. Samfass, "Modeling MPI communication performance on SMP nodes: Is it time to retire the ping pong test," in *Proceedings of the 23rd European MPI Users' Group Meeting*, ser. EuroMPI 2016. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2016, pp. 41–50. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2966884.2966919>
- [2] S. S. Vazhkudai, B. R. de Supinski, A. S. Bland, A. Geist, J. Sexton, J. Kahle, C. J. Zimmer, S. Atchley, S. Oral, D. E. Maxwell, V. G. V. Larrea, A. Bertsch, R. Goldstone, W. Joubert, C. Chambreau, D. Appelhans, R. Blackmore, B. Casses, G. Chochia, G. Davison, M. A. Ezell, T. Gooding, E. Gonsiorowski, L. Grinberg, B. Hanson, B. Hartner, I. Karlin, M. L. Leininger, D. Leverman, C. Marroquin, A. Moody, M. Ohmacht, R. Pankajakshan, F. Pizzano, J. H. Rogers, B. Rosenburg, D. Schmidt, M. Shankar, F. Wang, P. Watson, B. Walkup, L. D. Weems, and J. Yin, "The design, deployment, and evaluation of the coral pre-exascale systems," in *SC18: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2018, pp. 661–672.
- [3] W. A. Hanson, "The coral supercomputer systems," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 64, no. 3/4, pp. 1:1–1:10, 2020.
- [4] A. Bar-Noy and S. Kipnis, "Designing broadcasting algorithms in the postal model for message-passing systems," in *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures*, ser. SPAA '92. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 1992, p. 13–22. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/140901.140903>
- [5] D. Culler, R. Karp, D. Patterson, A. Sahay, K. E. Schauer, E. Santos, R. Subramonian, and T. von Eicken, "Logp: Towards a realistic model of parallel computation," *SIGPLAN Not.*, vol. 28, no. 7, p. 1–12, Jul. 1993. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/173284.155333>
- [6] A. Alexandrov, M. F. Ionescu, K. E. Schauer, and C. Scheiman, "Loggp: Incorporating long messages into the logp model for parallel computation," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 71 – 79, 1997. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743731597913460>
- [7] A. Bienz, W. D. Gropp, and L. N. Olson, "Improving performance models for irregular point-to-point communication," in *Proceedings of the 25th European MPI Users' Group Meeting, Barcelona, Spain, September 23-26, 2018*, 2018, pp. 7:1–7:8. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3236367.3236368>
- [8] A. Bienz, L. Olson, and W. Gropp, "Node aware sparse matrix-vector multiplication," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 130, pp. 166 – 178, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0743731519302321>
- [9] A. Bienz, W. D. Gropp, and L. N. Olson, "Reducing communication in algebraic multigrid with multi-step node aware communication," *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 547–561, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094342020925535>
- [10] A. Bienz, L. Olson, and W. Gropp, "Node-aware improvements to allreduce," in *Proceedings of ExaMPI 2019*, ser. Proceedings of ExaMPI 2019: Workshop on Exascale MPI - Held in conjunction with SC 2019: The International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis. United States: Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc., Nov. 2019, pp. 19–28, 2019 IEEE/ACM Workshop on Exascale MPI, ExaMPI 2019 ; Conference date: 17-11-2019.
- [11] 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, pp. 80–89.
- [12] O. Arap, M. Swamy, G. Brown, and B. Himebaugh, "Adaptive recursive doubling algorithm for collective communication," in *2015 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshop*, 2015, pp. 121–128.
- [13] J. Bruck, Ching-Tien Ho, S. Kipnis, E. Upfal, and D. Weathersby, "Efficient algorithms for all-to-all communications in multiport message-passing systems," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 8, no. 11, pp. 1143–1156, 1997.
- [14] R. Thakur, R. Rabenseifner, and W. Gropp, "Optimization of collective communication operations in mpich," *Int. J. High Perform. Comput. Appl.*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 49–66, Feb. 2005. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094342005051521>
- [15] R. Thakur and W. D. Gropp, "Improving the performance of collective operations in mpich," in *Recent Advances in Parallel Virtual Machine and Message Passing Interface*, J. Dongarra, D. Laforenza, and S. Orlando, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2003, pp. 257–267.
- [16] H. Zhu, D. Goodell, W. Gropp, and R. Thakur, "Hierarchical collectives in mpich2," in *Recent Advances in Parallel Virtual Machine and Message Passing Interface*, M. Ropo, J. Westerholm, and J. Dongarra, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009, pp. 325–326.
- [17] A. A. Awan, K. Hamidouche, A. Venkatesh, and D. K. Panda, "Efficient large message broadcast using nccl and cuda-aware mpi for deep learning," in *Proceedings of the 23rd European MPI Users' Group Meeting*, ser. EuroMPI 2016. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, p. 15–22. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2966884.2966912>
- [18] I. Faraji and A. Afsahi, "Gpu-aware intranode mpi_allreduce," in *Proceedings of the 21st European MPI Users' Group Meeting*, ser. EuroMPI/ASIA '14. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2014, p. 45–50. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2642769.2642773>
- [19] C. Chu, K. Hamidouche, A. Venkatesh, A. A. Awan, and D. K. Panda, "Cuda kernel based collective reduction operations on large-scale gpu clusters," in *2016 16th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGrid)*, 2016, pp. 726–735.
- [20] D. S. Banerjee, K. Hamidouche, and D. K. Panda, "Designing high performance communication runtime for gpu managed memory: Early experiences," in *Proceedings of the 9th Annual Workshop on General Purpose Processing Using Graphics Processing Unit*, ser. GPGPU '16. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2016, p. 82–91. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/2884045.2884050>
- [21] A. Lastovetsky, V. Rychkov, and M. O'Flynn, "Mpiplib: Benchmarking mpi communications for parallel computing on homogeneous and heterogeneous clusters," in *Recent Advances in Parallel Virtual Machine and Message Passing Interface*, A. Lastovetsky, T. Kechadi, and J. Dongarra, Eds. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008, pp. 227–238.
- [22] T. Agarwal and M. Becchi, "Design of a hybrid mpi-cuda benchmark suite for cpu-gpu clusters," in *2014 23rd International Conference on Parallel Architecture and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, 2014, pp. 505–506.
- [23] J. Kraus, M. Pivanti, S. F. Schifano, R. Tripiccione, and M. Zanella, "Benchmarking gpus with a parallel lattice-boltzmann code," in *2013 25th International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing*, 2013, pp. 160–167.