# CUG2016

London, UK, May 8 - 12

# On Enhancing 3D-FFT Performance in VASP

Florian Wende

Martijn Marsman, Thomas Steinke



### Zuse Institute Berlin

# Outline

Many-core Optimizations in VASP

- From MPI to MPI + (OpenMP) Threading
- Multi-threaded FFT: MKL, FFTW (LibSci)
- 3D-FFT in VASP

How to improve FFT computation in VASP?

- FFTLIB: C++ template library to intercept FFTW calls
  - Plan Reuse
  - Composed FFT computation
  - ].
- Some performance numbers

2

### VASP – Vienna Ab-initio Simulation Package

- Electronic structure code
- MPI-only (latest official release)
- Implements DFT: many FFT computations

Optimization approach

- Introduce Threading
- Optimize code sections for SIMD (talk at CUG2015)
- Improve library integration/usage: FFT, BLAS/Scalapack, ...



4

Many-core processor = lots of (lightweigth) compute cores on a chip

- Intel Xeon Phi KNC/KNL: 60+ cores
- Highly parallel computation
- MPI-only will not work in the majority of cases

### MPI + (OpenMP) Threading

- KNL: 4, 8, 16 MPI ranks + lots of (OpenMP) threads
- User function part: code instrumentation via OpenMP compiler directives
- Library functions: multi-threaded context or call to multi-threaded library



Current state of VASP\* optimization

- MPI + OpenMP: almost fully adapted code base
- SIMD: OpenMP 4.x directives
- Multi-threaded FFT computation
  - □ 3D-FFT where possible: it is really fast!
  - □ "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization: composed 1D+1D+1D FFT



#### \*This VASP version is not yet officially available! Will be coming soon ③

6

### 3D-FFT in VASP

- FFTW library calls: Intel MKL can be used through its FFTW interface
- Calling scheme in VASP:

```
// create plan
p=fftw_plan_xxx(...)
```

// execute
fftw\_execute(p)

```
// destroy plan
fftw_destroy_plan(p)
```

This happens again and again

### 3D-FFT in VASP

 Program performance (PdO2: Paladiumdioxid on Paladium surface) 24 MPI ranks on 4 Cray XC-40 compute nodes (Haswell), T=1,4 threads per rank MKL 11.3.2, FFTW (from GitHub and Cray LibSci)

	Setup: PdO2						
	MKL 11.3.2		FFTW		FFTW (LibSci)		
	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	
Total	146.6s	78.0s	162.1s	122.5s	162.3s	121.9s	
3D-FFT + planner + execute	23.4s 1.0s 22.4s	10.7s 1.0s 9.7s	38.2s 10.0s 28.2s	43.3s 32.9s 10.4s	38.6s 9.8s 28.8s	41.9s 31.1s 10.8s	

8

### 3D-FFT in VASP

 Program performance (PdO2: Paladiumdioxid on Paladium surface) 24 MPI ranks on 4 Cray XC-40 compute nodes (Haswell), T=1,4 threads per rank MKL 11.3.2, FFTW (from GitHub and Cray LibSci)

	Setup: PdO2						
	MKL 11.3.2		FFTW		FFTW (LibSci)		
	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	
Total	146.6s	78.0s	162.1s	122.5s	162.3s	121.9s	
3D-FFT + planner + execute	23.4s 1.0s 22.4s	10.7s 1.0s 9.7s	38.2s 10.0s 28.2s	43.3 <sub>8</sub> 32.9s 10.4s	38.6s 9.8s 28.8s	41.9 <sub>8</sub> 31.1s 10.8s	

#### A lot of time is spent in the planner phase!

3D-FFT in VASP

 FFTW provides different planner schemes: ESTIMATE, MEASURE, ... ESTIMATE – cheap

MEASURE – expensive: kind of online-autotuning on different FFT algorithms



Number of Threads

9

### 3D-FFT in VASP

- FFTW provides different planner schemes: ESTIMATE, MEASURE, ... ESTIMATE – cheap
  - MEASURE expensive: kind of online-autotuning on different FFT algorithms



3D-FFT in VASP

 Costs for planning with MEASURE and using the FFTW Wisdom feature for faster plan creation



### 3D-FFT in VASP

 Costs for planning with MEASURE and with FFTW Wisdom feature for faster plan creation



3D-FFT in VASP

 Costs for planning with MEASURE and with FFTW Wisdom feature for faster plan creation Xeon Phi (KNC) Data

Planner Scheme: FFTW\_MEASURE + FFTW\_MEASURE



### 3D-FFT in VASP

 Costs for plan creation seems to become dominant with increasing number of threads to be used for the computation

Can we do better?

### Main issue when using FFTW: plan creation

- Recommendation on FFTW webpage: "reuse plans as long as possible"
- Plan caching mechanism in the application?
   No, create a library for that purpose!

FFTLIB (will be hosted as open source library soon)

- C++ template library encapsulation FFTW and DFTI specifics
- Plan reuse: hash-map + cache
- Composed FFT
  - $\square$  "Ball  $\leftrightarrow$  Cube" FFT optimization
  - Skip transpose operation(s)
  - High Bandwidth Memory (preparation for Intel's Xeon Phi KNL)

### FFTLIB – Approach

Intercept FFTW calls + additional features



### FFTLIB – Approach

Intercept FFTW calls + additional features



#### FFTLIB – Plan Reuse

- Plans are stored permanently in a hash-map + cache
  - First planner call goes to FFTW / MKL for each geometry
  - Successive planner calls are served by FFTLIB

Planner Scheme: FFTW\_MEASURE (+ FFTLIB)



### FFTLIB – Plan Reuse

- Plans are stored permanently in a hash-map + cache
  - First planner call goes to FFTW / MKL for each geomet
  - Successive planner calls are served by FFTLIB



Xeon Phi

(KNC) Data

### 3D-FFT in VASP <u>with FFTLIB</u>

 Program performance (PdO2: Paladiumdioxid on Paladium surface) 24 MPI ranks on 4 Cray XC-40 compute nodes (Haswell), T=1,4 threads per rank MKL 11.3.2, FFTW (from GitHub and Cray LibSci)

	Setup: PdO2							
	MKL 11.3.2		FFTW		FFTW (LibSci)		Without FFTLIB:	
	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	Approx. 32	
Total	145.5s	84.8s	152.6s	86.5s	153.3s	90.0s	just for plan	
3D-FFT + planner	23.4s 0.3s	10.0s 0.3s	29.0s 0.8s	11.3s 0.9s	29.6s 0.8s	11.7s 0.9s	creation with FFTW	
+ execute	22.4s	9.7s	28.2s	10.4s	28.8s	10.8s		

#### Only the initial planner costs contribute

### 3D-FFT in VASP with FFTLIB

 Program performance (PdO2: Paladiumdioxid on Paladium surface) 24 MPI ranks on 4 Cray XC-40 compute nodes (Haswell), T=1,4 threads per rank MKL 11.3.2, FFTW (from GitHub and Cray LibSci)

	Setup: PdO2						
	MKL 11.3.2		FFTW		FFTW (LibSci)		
	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	T=1	T=4	
Total	1 1.01x	8 0.92x	1500 1.06x	8 1.42x	1 1.06x	1.35x	
3D-FFT	23.4s	10.0s	29.0s	11.3s	29.6s	11.7s	
+ planner + execute	0.3s 22.4s	0.3s 9.7s	0.8s 28.2s	0.9s 10.4s	0.8s 28.8s	0.9s 10.8s	

### **3D-FFT with FFTLIB**

- Composed FFT: "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization (optional)
  - Reciprocal space vector G below a certain cutoff



This is what VASP is doing right now

### 3D-FFT with FFTLIB

- Composed FFT: "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization (optional)
  - Reciprocal space vector <u>G below a certain cutoff</u>



### **3D-FFT with FFTLIB**

- Composed FFT: "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization (optional)
  - Reciprocal space vector *G* below a certain cutoff



### 3D-FFT with FFTLIB

Composed FFT: "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization + skip last transpose
 Synthetic benchmark kernel: here for FFTW, but similar for MKL

Not yet integrated into VASP



Ball↔Cube FFT vs. 3D-FFT (FFTW3)

### 3D-FFT with FFTLIB

Composed FFT: "Ball ↔ Cube" FFT optimization + skip last transpose
 Synthetic benchmark kernel: here for FFTW, but similar for MKL

Not yet integrated into VASP



Ball↔Cube FFT vs. 3D-FFT (FFTW3)

# Summary

# Summary

### Many-core optimization in VASP

- MPI + OpenMP, SIMD
- Multi-threaded library calls: 3D-FFT in this talk
  - Scaling quite acceptable
  - □ Issue with plan creation when using FFTW: consumes a lot of time

### FFTLIB: C++ template library intercepting FFTW calls

- Plan reuse via hash-map + cache: up to 1.4x for VASP application with FFTW
- Composed 3D-FFT: 1.4x with FFTW when skipping last transpose

### Not shown here (but in the paper)

- High bandwidth memory usage (memkind): 10% gain for transpose
- Autotuning within FFTLIB: just an outlook

# Acknowledgement

Jeongnim Kim (Intel, US)

Funding:

Research Center for Many-core HPC (IPCC@ZIB)

Partners:

ZIB + VASP developer team (Georg Kresse, Martijn Marsman) Joint research project ZIB + Cray