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Abstract

Model coupling is a well-known method employed to simulate complex multiphysics and multiscale phenomena. Approaches have concentrated on coupling parallel models involving static data distribution among processes without the consideration of top-level dynamic load balancing. Malleability, the ability to change during execution the number of processes in an application, allows applications to configure themselves to better utilize available system resources. To date, however, malleability has been applied primarily to monolithic applications. We have extended the Model Coupling Toolkit (MCT) to support processing element malleability for coupled models, resulting in the Malleable Model Coupling Toolkit (MMCT). MMCT consists of a load balance manager (LBM) implementing a practical dynamic load-balancing algorithm and a malleable model registry that allows management of dynamically evolving MPI communicators. MMCT requires only standard MPI-2, sockets, and MCT. We benchmark MMCT using a synthetic, simplified coupled model application similar to the Community Climate System Model. Preliminary performance data demonstrate the efficacy of the LBM and a low (≈ 3\%) monitoring overhead.
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1. Introduction

Current scientific challenges often involve complex systems spanning multiple disciplines (e.g., a climate system model) or spatiotemporal scales (e.g., nested-domain numerical weather prediction)—multiphysics and multiscale problems, respectively. A defining characteristic of these systems is the existence of data dependencies, or couplings, between their constituent subsystem models, or constituents. Thus, multiphysics and multiscale models are more generally called coupled models or coupled systems. Coupled models abound among grand challenge applications in computational science. Advancements in microprocessor technology and the advent of parallel computing have enabled coupled model development. The march toward exascale computing will make coupled models increasingly common and pose new challenges for model coupling software. A critical requirement for utilizing up to million-way parallelism will be the design and implementation of highly effective and efficient load balance mechanisms, including support for dynamic load balance both within and between constituents. An online automatic rebalancing scheme will be critical as multiphysics and multiscale models grow in complexity from relatively few to large numbers of constituents.

The challenge inherent in building coupled models is called the coupling problem [1]. Moreover, coupled systems frequently employ parallel computing, in particular distributed-memory parallelism using the Message Passing Interface (MPI) [2] standard, giving rise to the parallel coupling problem (PCP) [1]. Each constituent in a parallel coupled model resides on a set of processors—or processing elements (PEs)—called a PE cohort, or simply cohort. Parallel coupled models evolve their state by solving each constituent’s equations of evolution on its respective cohort, with data dependencies on other constituents satisfied at a minimum by parallel $M \times N$ data transfers [3], though other data transformation operations (e.g., intermesh interpolation) are likely required.
The main performance concern of scientists who use coupled models is *throughput*, which is the amount of simulation accomplished (in terms of the model’s timestep) divided by the wall clock time required to perform the simulation; for example, throughput in a coupled climate model is measured in model years per wall-clock day. Achieving high throughput requires not only that individual constituents scale well but also that the resources allocated to each constituent be harmonized to minimize lost cycles while constituents await data during the coupling process. A key challenge in building efficient parallel coupled models is the allocation of resources, specifically PEs, to constituents, and the reallocation of resources should runtime load characteristics change dramatically during a simulation. Load balance and resource allocation in parallel coupled models strongly affect model throughput. The present work’s focus is solely on this aspect of the PCP. Typically, parallel coupled models employ static load balance, with resource allocation to constituent subsystems determined offline through trial and error. Automatic dynamic load balance, both within and between constituents, is thus highly desirable. Load balance within a constituent is amenable to existing load-balancing approaches. Interconstituent load balance, however, requires further work, in particular the capability for a coupled model to resize constituents’ PE cohorts to better use system resources; we call this property *cohort malleability*, or simply *malleability* [4]. We define a parallel coupled model with malleable constituent cohorts to be a *malleable coupled model* (MCM).

Malleability imposes new requirements on coupled model infrastructure: (1) load monitoring; (2) evaluation of current load balance; (3) algorithms for computing more optimal resource distributions; (4) checkpointing or redistribution of constituents’ states; (5) reallocation of constituent PE pools; and (6) instantiation and initialization of constituents on the resized PE pools, including handshaking of interconstituent $M \times N$ communication schedules. One can also view these requirements as the sequence of operations performed by an MCM as it rebalances itself. Our primary focus is a generic, portable solution to requirements (1–3) and (5–6). We view checkpointing or redistribution as highly application-specific. A general mechanism for checkpointing parallel codes is a problem beyond the scope of our work.

Malleable iterative parallel applications have been investigated and shown to be beneficial. The ReSHAPE [5] framework adopts malleability for efficient job scheduling by resizing the processor allocation of malleable applications based on the utilization of distributed resources. Maghraoui et al. [6, 7] introduced malleable iterative MPI applications that can change their process configuration dynamically by working with the PCM/IOS runtime environment. PCM/IOS provides mechanisms for reconfiguration, most notably a profiling module that monitors the status of applications to guide and inform resource reallocation. SRS [8] also provides methods to allow a parallel application to reconfigure itself through its stop and restart processes. These approaches, however, are not immediately applicable to malleable model coupling because they are targeted to monolithic parallel applications, as opposed to frameworks/toolkits for model coupling. Ko et al. [9] describe a coupled multiphysics simulation that can optimize the allocation of constituents on the given set of PEs. The load-balancing algorithm described in [9] is acceptable only for a coupled model consisting of two constituents. Moreover, each model communicates by exchanging files, an approach that is less general than MPI or socket-based communication. The CSCAPES project [10] has investigated load balancing and allocation issues but primarily has used a priori knowledge about the application and has examined mainly load balance within a constituent. As coupled models become increasingly complex, mechanisms that gather online performance information and utilize it to perform interconstituent dynamic load balance become increasingly attractive.

To address these issues, we extended the Model Coupling Toolkit (MCT) [11, 12] to enable it to support malleable MPI communicators and a malleable MPICOMM_World, thus supporting MCMs. MCT is generic MPI-based coupling middleware that is widely used by the climate, weather, and ocean modeling communities. We enhanced MCT by adding load-monitoring and optimization schemes, a central load balance manager, and a mechanism for resizing constituents’ cohorts. The resulting system—*malleable MCT* (MMCT)—extends MCT’s programming model to allow construction of parallel coupled models whose constituent PE cohort configuration is automatically reconfigurable at runtime using decisions made by its load balance manager. We then investigated various dynamic load-balancing techniques to show the feasibility of the approach and the effectiveness of the modifications to MCT. We devised general optimization and expansion algorithms loosely based on the gradient descent method [13]. The optimization and expansion algorithms are used to optimize the configuration for $N$ constituents and to allocate more available resources on a homogeneous cluster to improve utilization of distributed resources and coupled model throughput.

We briefly discuss MCT, describe our load-balancing mechanism, and give an overview of MMCT in Sections 2, 3, and 4, respectively. In Section 5 we describe a testbed coupled climate model simulator that employs MMCT to implement malleable model coupling, and we present preliminary performance results. We conclude with a discussion of the implications of our results and an outline of future work necessary to deploy MMCT in production.

2. Model Coupling Toolkit

MCT is open-source software [14] that provides an API consisting of datatypes and functions supporting the description of constituents and their input/output data, parallel data transfer and redistribution, and commonly encountered
data transformation operations. Supported data transformation operations include conservative intergrid interpolation implemented as a parallel linear transformation, time integration (averaging) of flux (state) variables, and merging of outputs from multiple constituents for input to another constituent. Collectively, MCT’s API is widely applicable to data coupling between legacy MPI-based parallel models. MCT implements a peer communication approach: couplings are viewed as large-scale $M \times N$ messaging between models, extended by other data transformation operations. A complete discussion of MCT’s design philosophy and object model is given in [11]. A detailed description of MCT’s parallel data transfer and regidding facilities is given in [12]. MCT has been used in numerous applications, most notably as coupling middleware for versions 3 and 4 of the Community Climate System Model (CCSM) [15, 16], used by an international community to study climate change, climate variability, climate sensitivity, and paleoclimates.

Below we describe aspects of MCT pertinent to its extension to support malleability. The MCT programming model is largely unchanged by the implementation of cohort malleability, and modifications of an existing parallel coupled model to make it an MCM should be straightforward.

The MCTWorld class is a lightweight constituent registry, encapsulating the number of constituents in the coupled model, the allocation of processors to constituents, and their individual communicators. MCT was developed by using the MPI-1 standard’s [2] communicator creation and manipulation scheme. The MCTWorld class encapsulates a global communicator that is typically a copy of MPI_COMM_WORLD. The singleton MCTWorld can be created by using either a single master call by the root PE on the global communicator or a distributed call by each PE on each constituent’s cohort, with individual constituent communicators previously created by application of a communicator splitting mechanism such as MPI_COMM_SPLIT() to the global communicator. MCT stores the communicator ID and list of member MPI processes for each cohort in the MCTWorld. MCT builds communications schedulers for $M \times N$ transfers through process ID lookup using the MCTWorld registry. This is conceptually attractive because it allows constituents to exchange domain decomposition descriptions defined using local process IDs on their respective communicators, with the MCTWorld the interlocutor to create interconstituent communications schedules. In the current, publicly released version of MCT, the MCTWorld class is considered a singleton, instantiated in the global variable ThisMCTWorld, and static over the life of an application at runtime.

3. Load-Balancing Algorithm

We first define terms for timestepping and resource allocation in coupled models. The time evolution of a coupled model occurs as each constituent solves its respective equations of evolution on its domain, utilizing (supplying) coupling input (output) from (to) other constituents. The provision (uptake) of coupling data occurs during coupling events [1]. The timing of coupling events may not be known in advance, but rather as a consequence of runtime behavior. Or, the coupling events may be known a priori—scheduled coupling [1]. For some scheduled coupling situations, the full schedule of interconstituent coupling time intervals may be mutually commensurate, resulting in a coupling cycle [1]. The ratio of timescales corresponding to the constituent’s timestep versus the interval between coupling events can be used to define the tightness of the couplings [1]. For example, in the standard configuration of CCSM, the constituents are the atmosphere, ocean, sea-ice, and land models and an additional entity called the coupler; all data traffic between the constituents in CCSM is directed via the coupler. In a standard configuration of CCSM, the model timesteps are $\{\Delta t_{atm}, \Delta t_{ocean}, \Delta t_{ice}, \Delta t_{land}, \Delta t_{cpl}\} = \{20, 20, 60, 60, 60\}$ minutes. CCSM’s couplings are scheduled, with the interval between the atmosphere, land, and sea-ice models’ interactions with the coupler occurring hourly, while the ocean communicates with the coupler once per model-day; thus CCSM has a repeating coupling cycle $\Delta T$ equal to one model-day. Note that the atmosphere, land, and sea-ice models are more tightly coupled to the system than is the ocean model.

PE cohorts in coupled models can be defined in a wide variety of configurations, or process compositions [1]. The two most basic are sequential and parallel compositions [17]. A sequential composition allocates all constituents to the same PE cohort, with the coupled system running as an event loop executing each constituent in turn. A parallel composition allocates each constituent its own PE cohort, and these cohorts are disjoint.

Consider a coupled model with $N$ constituents. In the load balance analysis that follows, we assume that each constituent has its own constant timestep $\Delta t_i, i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$; coupling events fall into a coupling cycle $\Delta T \geq \Delta t_i t^c_i t^c_i$; and the constituents are configured in a parallel composition. These assumptions, though highly restrictive, are present in a wide variety of coupled climate, weather, and ocean applications.

Our load-balancing schemes analyze constituent profiling data gathered over a load-sampling interval (LSI); in the analyses presented here, the LSI corresponds to the coupling cycle time $\Delta T$. The global iteration time $\tau_G$ is the wall clock time required by the coupled model to evolve its state over a period $\Delta T$. The constituent iteration time $\tau_i$ is the wall clock time required for the constituent to evolve its state over the period $\Delta T$; this time is decomposed as $\tau_i = \tau_i^{comp} + \tau_i^{coup}$, the sum of the constituent computation and constituent coupling times, respectively. In other words, $\tau_i^{comp}$ and $\tau_i^{coup}$ are the wall clock times during which the constituent computes its internal state (including comcomitant communications within
its cohort) and awaits (supplies) data from (to) other constituents, respectively. Our objective is to formulate analyses of \( \{ r_1, \ldots, r_N \} \) that guide constituent cohort reallocation to decrease \( \tau_G \).

We assume that \( r_1 \) for a constituent follows a simple curve with respect to the number of PEs \( N_i \) allocated to it. Initially, the curve slopes downward, indicating that the performance increases. At some point, we assume performance saturates, and the curve starts to slope upward, indicating that communication and other overheads are starting to dominate \( r_1 \). The iteration time of the complete coupled application, \( \tau_G \), is a complex function of its PE allocation to its constituents. If the models are fully concurrent and never wait on each other except at the end of an iteration, the \( \tau_G \) will be the same as that of the slowest constituent (i.e., the one with the maximum value of \( r_1 \)). In more realistic cases, however, the situation is more complex.

We assume that two types of allocation situations may occur. The first is where the current PE allocation across constituents is performing poorly and needs to be rebalanced. We consider this an optimization phase. The other is where a new PE is to be donated to the application’s global PE pool, and thus a recipient constituent needs to be chosen. We call this an expansion phase. The two phases may be interleaved, of course. Contraction, or rescinding a PE from the global pool, would also be a useful operation but is not considered in this paper; it will be examined in future work.

**Optimization.** The algorithm for optimization is described in Figure 1. We assume that each pair of constituents, a donor and a recipient, represents a direction for possible reallocation (i.e., taking a PE away from the donor and giving it to the recipient). The algorithm reallocates in a direction as long as performance is improved. The directions that are tried are selected by the algorithms SEL1 and SEL2 given in Figure 3 and 2, respectively. When it is detected that a direction works, the opposite direction is marked false, to indicate that it should not be considered. Once a direction fails to improve performance, the last reallocation is undone. The algorithm tries all possible directions for reallocation at least once.
The performance of a constituent may be subject to factors other than the number of processors, such as OS jitter, communication bottlenecks caused by other jobs, or computational changes in any particular iteration. We detect such an anomaly by using both $\tau_i$ and the sum $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_i^{comp}$. If a reallocation direction reduces one of these quantities but not the other, we consider this an ambiguous situation and continue to reallocate in this direction until we can unambiguously determine that this direction negatively affects performance.

To choose the donor and recipient constituents, we tried two different algorithms. The SEL1 algorithm uses only a constituent’s computation time $\tau_i^{comp}$ to make its decisions. The SEL2 algorithm uses a constituent’s $\tau_i^{comp}$ and the ratio $\delta \tau_i^{comp} = \tau_i^{comp} / N$. We call the term $\delta \tau_i^{comp}$ the derivative, which is under the assumption of perfect intraconstituent load balance, a finite-difference approximation of $d\tau^{comp} / dN$; the uncertainty in the derivative $\delta \tau_i^{comp}$ is proportional to the imbalance within the $i$th constituent. For both SEL1 and SEL2, the guiding heuristic is that we should try to speed the slowest constituent (i.e., the one with the greatest $\tau_i^{comp}$).

SEL1 proceeds by iterating through the constituents in increasing order of their $\tau_i^{comp}$, choosing each in turn as a candidate donor. For each candidate donor, the slowest constituent is chosen as a recipient. This pair is used as a candidate direction, and the first viable direction is used. If no viable directions can be found, we assume that the slowest constituent has reached the point of negative returns. SEL1 then tries to donate from the slower constituents. Details are given in Figure 3.

We noted that SEL1 did not always work well, as discussed in Section 5. To address this issue, we modified the algorithm to also consider the derivative. SEL2 proceeds by iterating through the constituents in increasing order of their derivative $\delta \tau_i^{comp}$, choosing each in turn as a candidate donor. For each candidate donor, the slowest constituent (one with the greatest $\tau_i^{comp}$) is chosen as a recipient. This pair is used as a candidate direction, and the first viable direction is used. If no viable directions can be found this way, we assume that the slowest constituent has reached the point of negative returns. We then try to donate from the slower constituents instead. Details are given in Figure 2.

Expansion. The expansion algorithm uses the same algorithm as the optimization algorithm except that no donor constituent is chosen. Instead, the processor is a free processor obtained externally. The recipient can be chosen by two means. The first is based on $\tau_i^{comp}$, the second is based on $\delta \tau_i^{comp}$.

4. Malleable MCT

We extended MCT for use in developing MCMs by adding a communicator management system that employs dynamic process management, a global constituent load diagnosis and balance calculation system that employs the algo-
rithms described in Section 3, and a central load balance manager that coordinates constituent cohort reapportionment. The current implementation of MMCT is a research prototype but is fully capable of supporting malleable parallel composition of models such as the testbed application described and evaluated in Section 5. Two new modules were added to MCT to implement these features. EMCTWorld implements dynamic process management to enable constituent cohort malleability. EMCT_LB implements interconstituent dynamic load balancing. The current MCT programming model is unchanged aside from these additions; in fact, legacy MCT applications can use the nonmalleability features in MMCT without modification. No modifications to the MCTWorld source code were required. For reference, we provide a skeleton Fortran code (Figure 4) to illustrate the usage of MMCT’s methods in an MMCT-based MCM.

EMCTWorld represents a profound change in how MCT’s constituent registry is initialized and functions. In MCT, constituents’ individual communicators are created by splitting the global communicator. This top-down approach, however, is not appropriate for MCMS because any initial PE that belongs to MPI_COMM_WORLD cannot be removed at runtime; hence MCTWorld is considered a singleton class in MCT. In MMCT we employed a bottom-up approach that leverages MPI2’s [2] dynamic process management facility to create and manipulate communicators. MPI-2 allows one to spawns new PEs that can be merged into the global communicator. In MMCT the global communicator is constructed by combining constituents’ communicators via invocations of MPI_Comm_Connect() and MPI_Comm_Accept(). These operations reside in the EMCTWorld_init() method. Under MMCT, an MCM with N constituents is initialized with a global communicator containing N PEs, one per constituent; these PEs are each constituent’s ‘head nodes’ and are the only PEs guaranteed to remain with the constituent throughout the full run of the MCM. PEs are added incrementally to each constituent’s communicator to establish the initial configuration of (P1, ..., PN) PE’s. EMCTWorld_init() also registers the constituents’ and global communicators in the MCTWorld module, allowing the rest of MCT to function as is.

The LoadBalance module encapsulates system constituent load information and implements the initialization, load assessment and rebalancing, and PE reallocation mechanisms. EMCT_LB_init() initializes the LoadBalance module by referring to communicators registered in the MCTWorld object. EMCT_LB_profile() is the constituent load balance analysis system and is called periodically in the global time integration loop of an MCM. This function is typically invoked at the beginning of the time loop of the malleable constituent to measure the constituent’s computation and coupling times, τcomp and τcomp (e.g., execution times for routines such as MCT_Send(), MCT_Recv(), and MCT_Wait()), respectively. This function also serves as a synchronization point in the MCM, which is vital to ensuring constituent cohort reallocation proceeds correctly. EMCT_LB_resizeset() performs constituent cohort resizing. Each constituent PE cohort undergoes one of three actions—expand, shrink, or preserve—that result in respective increased, decreased, or unchanged size.

Each PE in an MMCT-based system has a status that evolves as the system runs. Five possible status values exist—BEGIN, SHRINK, EXPAND, PRESERVE, and RUN. The process status can be queried at any time by calling the MMCT function Get_emctstatus(). BEGIN indicates the malleable coupled model is to be initialized. SHRINK, EXPAND, and PRESERVE indicate constituent cohort reallocation must occur, with appropriate action required to resize allocated memory for data and/or data redistribution. RUN indicates no cohort reapportionment is necessary; that is, the system is in between load diagnosis or rebalancing events. Note that when the PE status is not RUN, constituents will likely require re-handshaking of interconstituent parallel data transfer communication schedules.

The centralized load balance manager (LBM) runs on a physical processor distinct from the MPI global communicator. It communicates with constituents’ head nodes using out-of-band, socket-based communications; thus the communications burden on the LBM scales as the number of an MCM’s constituents rather than the total number of MPI PEs, lowering the likelihood the LBM will be a bottleneck. Socket-based communications were chosen to separate concerns between the LBM and issues of the MPI-based malleable simulation environment, such as communicator management.

The LBM is initialized with the machine information of the cluster on which the MCM will run and sends a list of machines and/or free PEs to the MCM’s constituents’ head nodes. The LBM receives profiling data reports from each constituent’s head node; these reports are generated by constituents’ calls to EMCT_LB_profile(). The LBM analyzes constituents’ profiling data using one of its load balance algorithms, computing a refined resource allocation for the MCM. The LBM sends reconfiguration decisions to each constituent’s head node, with orders on whether the constituent must SHRINK, EXPAND, or PRESERVE its cohort; for SHRINK or EXPAND decisions, a list of machines/PEs to be respectively eliminated or added to the cohort is included.

The runtime architecture for a simple MMCT-based MCM is depicted in Figure 6. Constituents’ argument lists must be extended to include the following arguments: NPEi, the initial number of PEs assigned to the ith constituent; LBM_HOST, the hostname of machine where LBM will run; and LBM_PORT, the port number constituents’ head nodes will use to communicate with the LBM. The MCM application is invoked by first initiating execution of the LBM, followed by execution of the MPI-based coupled model using mpiexec:

```
mpiexec -np 1 ./constituent1 $NPE1 $LBM_HOST $LBM_PORT : ...
```
Runtime overhead for the LBM was measured as part of the testbed experiments described in Section 5. The LBM, out-of-band LBM/MCM, communications, constituent profiling, and optimization algorithms occupied approximately 3% of the total wall-clock runtime—well below the performance gains realized by enabling interconstituent dynamic load balance. This initial result augurs well for MMCT’s viability in implementing model coupling malleability.

The prototype MMCT provides a scientist-friendly programming model for implementing constituent cohort malleability in MCMs. Creating a fully functional MCM still requires the model developers to change the number of PEs in the middle of a run, with accompanying reinstatement and reinitialization of constituents and re-handshaking of interconstituent $M \times N$ connections. These tasks can be handled by explicitly coding the necessary state checkpointing and data redistribution mechanisms (which is what we did for our testbed application in Section 5); leveraging any system-level checkpoint/restart functionality that may already be present to provide fault tolerance; or, if the application supports it, using its own restart file mechanisms. For CCSM, we expect the easiest, most portable checkpointing strategy may be to leverage its restart file mechanism (for a description and example, consult Chapter 5 of [18]).

5. Results

To validate our algorithms and evaluate the performance of MMCT, we have built a malleable coupled model testbed application that mimics a coupled climate model running in parallel composition. The testbed consists of three constituents: atmosphere (atm), ocean (ocn), and coupler (cpl) that computes interfacial fluxes exchanged between atm and ocn. The atm grid is identical to that of CCSM’s atmosphere’s T42 spectral solver, with 64 latitudes and 128 longitudes. The ocn grid corresponds to CCSM’s ocean grid, with 384 latitudes and 320 longitudes. The domain decompositions of these two-dimensional grids are described by using MCT GlobalSegMaps. Parallel data transfer schedules are stored in MCT Routers. The domain decompositions for this test case are purely one-dimensional by latitude. The cpl uses both atmosphere and ocean grids and performs intergrid interpolation of field and flux data. The amount of data is not large, but our goal in this work was to focus on the feasibility of the implementing a malleable MCT and using it with a variety of possible load balancing algorithms. Larger data sets would result in greater data redistribution costs, which would affect the scheduling and trade-offs of reallocation decisions, but not our primary contributions.

Figure 5 shows the simplified structure of the climate testbed and the communication pattern between atmosphere model, ocean model, and coupler. Each model invokes four routines denoted as sload(), mctload(), send(), and recv() inside the time evolution loop. The sload() functions in atm, cpl, and ocn use the sleep() function to simulate the amount of time taken by each model to integrate its equations of evolution during intervals between coupling events. The amount of sleep time is determined from previously measured CCSM performance data [19] on a number of PE cohort sizes. The function mctload() performs several MCT data transformation operations, including intergrid interpolation, implemented as sparse matrix-vector multiplication, and time averaging/accumulation of state/flux data. Taken together, these loads provide a plausible picture of constituent load balance in a coupled climate model. Interconstituent communications occur between atm and cpl and between ocn and cpl. These parallel data transfers are implemented by using MCT, encapsulated in interconstituent communication via send() and receive(). These $M \times N$ transfers comprise numerous point-to-point nonblocking MPI messages, but the overall transfers employ MPI_Waitall(); this means the overall parallel data transfer constitutes blocking communication. The intercommunication pattern (arrows in Figure 5) allows all models to run concurrently since the ocean model can perform its own work while the atmosphere model is doing computation and communication with the coupler in a nested time loop representing 24 hours.

We benchmarked the optimization and expansion algorithms and the performance of MMCT LBM on Argonne National Laboratory’s Fusion cluster. Fusion contains 320 compute nodes, each with dual 2.53 GHz Xeon quad core processors and 36 GB or 96 GB memory. The nodes are connected by InfiniBand QDR.
The optimization algorithm was tested by running the climate model simulator benchmark with three initial PE allocations. For all these allocations the initial global processor pool has 160 PEs, a number drawn from previous benchmarking data [19]. Through trial and error, CCSM developers had discovered that a PE configuration \((N_{cpl}, N_{atm}, N_{ocn}) = (16, 64, 80)\) worked well for the model for its standard resolution and configuration; in the discussion that follows, we refer to this as the “ideal” configuration.

For reference purposes, we ran the benchmark with the ideal constituent PE cohort configuration, with the LBM active but no PE redistribution performed. This setup allowed us to measure for our simulator the “ideal” value of \(\tau_G = 19.5s\), analogous to that found by hand tuning CCSM. We will use this ideal value to estimate PE cohort reallocation overhead.

We performed three experiments with \(\text{try count limit} = 2\), shown in Figure 1, and differing initial allocations. In the discussion that follows we describe model configurations as the triple \((N_{cpl}, N_{atm}, N_{ocn})\). The first initial allocation, INIT1 = (54, 53, 53), was as uniform an apportionment of PEs between constituents as possible; this allocation overprovisions \(cpl\) with PEs. The second initial allocation, INIT2 = (10, 110, 40) overprovisions the \(atm\) constituent. The third initial allocation, INIT3 = (10, 40, 110), overprovisions the slowest constituent (\(ocn\)).

Table 1 summarizes throughput improvements realized by performing cohort reallocation employing the SEL1 and SEL2 criteria. For the INIT1 case, values of \(\tau_G\) obtained by the SEL1 and SEL2 algorithms were almost the same as the ideal \(\tau_G\). Both SEL1 and SEL2 improved the throughput by 22% from the initial allocation. Moreover, the final allocations obtained by SEL1 and SEL2 were similar to the ideal allocation; the reason is that all constituents had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alg., Init. alloc.</th>
<th>Initial (\tau_G)</th>
<th>SEL1 (\tau_G)</th>
<th>SEL2 (\tau_G)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opt., INIT1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt., INIT2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt., INIT3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Reconfiguration and \(M \times N\) Re-handshaking timings (sec).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>Remove PE</th>
<th>Create PE (intra-cohort)</th>
<th>Create PE (extra-cohort)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reconfig</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reroute</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sufficient PEs so that reconfiguration for any donor/recipient pair resulted in smooth changes to $\tau_G$, allowing both SEL1 and SEL2 to find near-ideal allocations. For the INIT2 and INIT3 cases, both SEL1 and SEL2 found good cohort PE allocations but were not always able to match the ideal value of $\tau_G$. Instabilities in our benchmark’s global iteration time is the likely cause. For example, underprovisioning $cpl$ often makes the $\tau_G$ noisy because it adversely impacts interconstituent communications times, notably the hourly interactions with $atm$.

For the INIT2 case, SEL2 performed superior load balancing to SEL1 because SEL2 can avoid choosing constituents with a large derivatives as either donor or recipient. Moreover, the fluctuation caused by a constituent that is allocated too few processors can be reduced as its PE cohort size is increased. Additionally, SEL2 always tries to reallocate PEs in a way that reduces noise. For the INIT2 case, in 83% of the runs (5 times out of 6) SEL2 found an allocation that resulted in a $\tau_G < 20$ s. The other run was very close, with $\tau_G = 20.6$ s. By contrast, SEL1 found a near-ideal configuration in only 33% (2 times out of 6) of the runs. As a result, SEL2 reduced $\tau_G$ by 38.4% on average for this case. For the INIT3 case, both SEL1 and SEL2 found a near-ideal allocation ($\tau_G < 20s$) 83% of the time (5 times out of 6), with the remaining trials for SEL1 and SEL2 producing values of $\tau_G$ of 22.25 s and 21.75 s, respectively. On average, SEL1 and SEL2 reduced $\tau_G$ by about 23% from its initial value.

Figures 7, 8, and 9 display the time evolution of constituent PE cohort configurations determined by the SEL1 and SEL2 algorithms for the INIT1, INIT2, and INIT3 cases, respectively. Superimposed on these plots are curves for the time evolution of $\tau_G$ (the scale for $\tau_G$ is on right vertical axis in each plot). The time unit for all of these plots is the LBI, which corresponds to the coupling cycle (one model-day). SEL2 reduced $\tau_G$ smoothly. In Figure 7, SEL2 found an optimal allocation of (20, 55, 85) with $\tau_G = 19.3$ s, slightly better than the ideal value. This implies the allocation for constituents could differ from their ideal allocations depending on the degree of concurrency of the coupled model. Figure 8 shows the time evolution of SEL1 and SEL2 for the INIT2 case. Here, SEL1 chose $cpl$ as the donor, handing over PEs to $ocn$ at the fourth coupling cycle even though $cpl$ was starved for resources; $cpl$ ceased donating PEs to $ocn$ at the 35th iteration and took back two PEs from $ocn$ to undo previous reconfiguration, an action caused by large increments in $\tau_G$. By this point, however, $cpl$ had already lost 6 of its initially allocated 10 PEs, making it so badly underallocated that it made $\tau_G$ unstable, disrupting the optimization process. By contrast, SEL2 chose $atm$ as the donor because it realized that $atm$ had sufficient processors and its iteration time would not be greatly changed even if it lost a processor; this decision stabilized $\tau_G$ until optimization was completed.

Figure 9 demonstrates that both SEL1 and SEL2 determined good, though slightly different allocations for the INIT3 case. SEL1 encounters a similar problem here as with INIT2, but less dramatic. SEL1 chose $cpl$ as the donor for $atm$ early in the run. But, $cpl$ did not lose as many processors as in the INIT2 case because the benefit generated by adding processors to $atm$ was often less pronounced than the disadvantage resulting from removing PEs from $cpl$. Moreover, $cpl$ did not donate any PEs to $ocn$ because $ocn$ was initially overallocated. Hence, $cpl$ maintained 8 PEs, which is enough to reduce—though not eliminate—the fluctuations in $\tau_G$ caused by underprovisioning $cpl$.

To evaluate the expansion algorithm, we ran the climate benchmark on an initial configuration of (10,40,50) PEs with $try\_count\_limit = 2$. We chose this initial allocation as it represents a 38% across-the-board cut in constituents’ resource allocations in the ideal configuration of (16,64,80). Table 1 shows $\tau_G$ when run with the expansion algorithm using the SEL1 and SEL2 criteria. Both variations reduce $\tau_G$, but the performance was worse than we expected. Figure 10 shows the time evolution of the PE cohorts for the expansion algorithm with SEL1 and SEL2; time evolution curves for corresponding $\tau_G$ values are also included (refer to right vertical axis for scale). The expansion algorithm with SEL1 found the ideal allocation for one of the six trials because it just kept adding processors to $ocn$, which was the slowest model. This caused the communication overhead imposed on other constituents to be large and unstable, since the other constituents maintained their PE cohort sizes as the $ocn$ cohort was expanded. Eventually, $ocn$ could not be a recipient once the communication or noise was larger than the decreased time by adding a processor to $ocn$. At the 51st coupling cycle, $\tau_G$ increased while $ocn$ gained processors, meaning that $ocn$ could not be a recipient during the rest of the expansion process. When recipients were selected with SEL2, the algorithm determined good allocations 50% of the time (3 times out of 6) and on average improved $\tau_G$ by 13%. For the three trials where this approach failed, we found that after adding processors to $atm$, whose derivative was biggest at the beginning of iteration, $\tau_G$ slightly increased (by less than 0.05 s). We believe this noise in $\tau_G$ originates in unstable communication costs and overhead; future work will seek to address these fluctuations by appropriate filtering or weighting.

Our performance results demonstrate MMCT can support coupling malleability and achieve faster runtimes. An important question is: At what cost? That is, what is the overhead associated with redistributing a constituent’s state data from the old cohort to the new one? Table 2 summarizes wall clock time measured from $ocn$ with under the expansion algorithm, including reconfiguration (the cost of adding or removing a PE) and rerouting (re-handshaking the $M \times N$ communications schedules). In our test case, the model grids are still rather coarse, and data redistribution costs were low compared to $\tau_G$. The overhead for rerouting is nearly equal to that of adding or removing a PE if the operation is performed on a machine where the current cohort resides. The wall clock time to create a processor on an extra-
6. Conclusion and Future Work

Coupled systems are an important feature on the scientific computing landscape. Achieving the scalability required for these systems to use exascale platforms will prove a tremendous challenge. We have identified top-level load balance to be a crucial problem. We have shown the feasibility of malleable coupling by developing a simple yet effective research prototype that is an extension of the widely used Model Coupling Toolkit. This coupling malleability mechanism, MMCT, extends the MCT API to runtime reallocation of PE resources in a wide class of parallel coupled models. Benchmark results for the simple load-balancing strategies currently included in MMCT demonstrate their effectiveness; the schemes reported here provide significant improvements in model throughput with acceptably low overhead. Both of these performance characteristics will be studied further, with an eye to their optimization.

Future research and development will focus on creating a production environment. Further investigation of the current load balance schemes in our LBM is warranted, along with investigations into a wider variety of load-balancing strategies. Such research will become critical once we move beyond the current assumption of a purely parallel composition to nested compositions such as those used in CCSM4. MMCT’s LBM requires further design to make it open to inclusion of third-party load diagnosis and management software. Additionally, MMCT’s architecture must be expanded to offer interoperability with current and emerging parallel application checkpointing mechanisms.
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