Developing NEPTUNE for U.S. Naval Weather Prediction

John Michalakes

University Corporation for Atmospheric Research/CPAESS Boulder, Colorado USA michalak@ucar.edu

Dr. Alex Reinecke

U.S. Naval Research Laboratory Marine Meteorology Division

18th ECMWF Workshop on HPC in Meteorology, 25 Sept. 2018

Acknowledgements

- NEPTUNE developers at NRL/MRY and NPS
 - James Doyle, Kevin Viner, Sasa Gabersek, Matus Martini, Dave Ryglicki, Dave Flagg, Sarah King, Sergey Frolov, and Francis Giraldo
- Martin Berzins, Mike Kirby, Ouermi Judicael, Brad Peterson: U. Utah
- Sameer Shende, Nick Chaimov: U. Oregon/Paratools
- Christian Trott: Sandia NL (Kokkos)
- Doug Doerfler: Lawrence Berkeley NL (Roofline)
- Vendors: Cavium, Intel, NEC, NVIDIA, Portland Group

NEPTUNE/NUMA

- Navy's Next Generation Prediction System
- Spectral element dynamics on a cubed sphere
 - Based on NUMA (Frank Giraldo, NPS)
 - Higher-order continuous Galerkin
 - Cubed sphere grid





NEPTUNE 72-h forecast (5 km resolution) of accumulated precipitation for Hurr. Sandy

- Computationally dense but highly scalable
 - Constant width-one halo communication
 - Good locality for next generation HPC

1**NEPTUNE: N**avy Environmental **P**rediction sys**T**em **U**tilizing the **N**UMA₂ cor**E** 2**NUMA: N**onhydrostatic **U**nified **M**odel of the **A**tmosphere (Giraldo et. al. 2013)



Example of Adaptive Grid tracking a severe event courtesy: Frank Giraldo, NPS

NEPTUNE/NUMA

- Navy's Next Generation Prediction System
 - Interoperable physics under NUOPC
 - Data assimilation development under JEDI framework
 - Coupling using ESMF framework

Basic Physics

Physics

- Conducting tests with real forecast data
- Designing, testing and optimizing for next-gen HPC **NEPTUNE Roadmap**



40

30

10

-10

-20

-30

_40

 One month of real-data forecasts initialized with GFS analysis fields

35-km horizontal grid spacing

FY24



Scale Aware

Performance and Portability requirements

- Performance has lagged badly: good scaling but poor node speed
 - Insufficient fine-grain (vector) utilization
 - Excessive data movement lowers C.I.
 - Low locality increases mem. latency
- **Portability** limited by parallel programming model (MPI/OpenMP/vector) and code structure
 - ☑ Intel Xeon (Broadwell, Skylake, Knights Landing)
 - ARM64 (Cavium ThunderX2)
 - MEC VE
 - GPU (Nvidia) (NPS has a NUMA port using OCCA[†])

• Solution likely to require major refactoring

- Minimize one-time and recurring costs
- Maximize performance benefit over time and range of architectures

Crucial: performance analysis and testing starting with kernels

[†]Abdi, D. S., Wilcox, L. C., Warburton, T. C., & Giraldo, F. X. (2017). A GPU-accelerated continuous and discontinuous Galerkin non-hydrostatic atmospheric model. *The International Journal of High Performance Computing Applications*, 1094342017694427.



NEPTUNE (blue) 6.6x slower than FV3 in NOAA benchmarks from 2015[‡]

[‡]https://www.weather.gov/media/sti/nggps/AVEC%20Level %201%20Benchmarking%20Report%2008%2020150602.pdf

Diffusion kernel: create_laplacian

Purpose: Damp energy that cascades to frequencies higher than model can resolve

- Local laplacian computed and applied on each 3D element in CGD layout
 - Computationally dense, element-local, thread safe
- Global solution computed on CGC layout using Direct Stiffness Summation (DSS) on points shared by neighboring elements
 - Copying from CGC to CGD to accumulate face values requires transposition and non-unit strides that trash data locality
 - Potential data races impede thread parallelism
- Hot spot routine in NEPTUNE
 - Original implementation only stored CGC layout and copied into and out of local CGC arrays for every subroutine in dycore
 - Initial optimization: Pick a layout and stick with it





Diffusion kernel: create_laplacian



What can we control? Data layout and loops

Memory Layout



element-**outer** arrays dimension(np,nv,ne)



element-inner arrays dimension(ne,np,nv)



do v ← 1,nv do p ← 1,np

do e \leftarrow 1,ne

do $e \leftarrow 1, ne$ do $v \leftarrow 1, nv$ do $p \leftarrow 1, np$

PX Optimization (element-outer)



element-**outer** arrays dimension(np,nv,ne)

- NEPTUNE Prototype
- Ported to
 - Xeon
 - ARM
 - NEC VE



do $e \leftarrow 1, ne$ do $v \leftarrow 1, nv$ do $p \leftarrow 1, np$

PX Optimization (element-outer)



Overall impact of first optimization pass



EPX (element-inner) Optimization



EPX (element-inner) Optimization – CPU



EPX (element-inner) Optimization – GPU



EPX (element-inner) Optimization



Kokkos Implementation



element-**outer** arrays dimension(np,nv,ne)



element-inner arrays dimension(ne,np,nv)

- Template-meta programming lib.
- Single source (C++)
 - Xeon, ARM & NEC VE
 - Nvidia V100
- https://github.com/kokkos

(Thanks: C. Trott, Sandia NL)



Kokkos Implementation

// Define Functor Class and Operators typedef Kokkos::View<double [nelem][nvar][npts]> ViewNvarType ; class CreateLaplacianFunctor { ViewNvarType q, rhs ; KOKKOS INLINE FUNCTION CreateLaplacianFunctor(const ViewNvarType q , const ViewNvarType rhs) : q(q) , $rhs(rhs) \{\}$; KOKKOS INLINE FUNCTION void operator()(CreateLaplacianTag, const size t ie) const{ // compute laplacian . . . KOKKOS INLINE FUNCTION void operator()(CreateGlobalTag, const size t ie) const{ // DSS . . . } } ; int main (int argc, char *argv[]) { ViewNvarType rhs("rhs"), q("q") ; // construct views // Executable Kokkos::initialize(argc, argv) ; Kokkos::parallel for(Kokkos::RangePolicy<CreateLaplacianTag>(0,nelem),CreateLaplacian) ; Kokkos::parallel for(Kokkos::RangePolicy<CreateGlobalTag>(0,nelem),CreateLaplacian) ;

https://gitnub.com/kokkos

(Thanks: C. Trott, Sandia NL)

OpenMP threads option to vectorized inner loop using hierarchical parallelism



Performance results



Performance results



Performance results

						Orig	PX	EPX	KOKKOS
	0.4	0			Scalar (M)	153	383	6	480
		().364		128 (2 word) vector (M)	0	0	0	0
	0.3	5 —		Ints	256 (4 word) vector (M)	15	39	0	15
				con	512 (8 word) vector (M)	112	0	70	0
	0.30	0 —		do	Total instructions (M)	279	422	76	495
	er)				DP ops (M)	1,104	539	564	539
	ti 0.2!	5 —			% v ec	0.75	0.22	0.87	0.08
	(er is			'S.	L1 misses (M)	9.5	na	19.3	10.1
		0		ı. sy	L2 misses (M)	7.3	na	3.9	6.8
	onds	_		em	L3 misses (M)	5.8	na	3.7	5.1
	0.1 S	5		5	r/w MB	414	na	294	399
	e u u u	0			Comp. Intens.	2.66	na	1.91	1.35
	F 0.10				20 steps sec 1 thread	3.876	2.378	2.252	1.923
SP over DP (Full Node)				1	GFLOPs	14.2	11.3	12.5	14.0
Orig	PX E	EPX	Kokkos		% peak	0.19	0.15	0.17	0.19
1.11	1.10 2	2.09	1.12		speedup rel orig	1.0	1.6	1.7	2.0
Effect of Floating Point Precision Skylake TAU/PAPI Performance Metrics									trics
	_		JUC/ / ZL		(Double Prec., Single Core)				

Diffusion Kernel Performance Summary

Competitive Performance over Programming Models and Devices

- ✓ Kokkos
 - GPU: Excellent fine-grained utilization on GPU
 - Good occupancy; 25% to 100%; moderate register pressure
 - CPU: Nearly identical performance to GPU
 - Kokkos fails to exploit vectorization on CPU (8%) because of strictly element-outer loops that only benefit OpenMP threading.
 - Kokkos has mechanism for vectorizing explicitly (not arch. agnostic but fix coming)
 - Good environment, user support: https://github.com/kokkos/kokkos/issues
- ✓ Element-inner (EPX) Fortran
 - GPU: Best V100 performance with OpenACC
 - Lower occupancy: 18.8% to 31% occupancy; high register pressure
 - CPU: Skylake 20 percent slower than GPU
 - + Excellent 85% vector utilization on CPU (both AVX512 and ARM)
 - Large working set and L1 pressure and AVX-512 clock penalty
 - + Dramatic 2x benefit from single-precision
- Element-outer (PX, the current whole-code optimized prototype)
 - CPU-only, close to Kokkos CPU performance if vectorization disabled to avoid compiler-generated scatter gathers around non unit-stride loops

Next steps

- Additional kernels covering NEPTUNE dynamics
- Effects of varying workloads, numerical order
- Evaluate other DSL approaches: GridTools, PSyKAI
- Whole code prototypes and testing
- Recommendation on refactoring with costs, benefits and timelines for different options



Performa

Orig

1.11

