Comparision of Benchmarks Across CIRC Supercomputing Architectures

Abstract

The Center for Integrated Research Computing provides technology and support for researchers at the University in all disciplines, using high-performance computing systems Bluehive and Blue Gene. Here we present the benchmark testing results done on these systems to demonstrate the performance of CIRC supercomputing resources. The software we used include a molecular dynamics software package called Amber, and a standard supercomputing linear algebra benchmark to , Linpack. The results include the performance of both packages on different numbers of cores and the performance of Amber on GPUs.



- 1024 nodes
- 4096 CPU cores
- 2 TB ram

- 152 nodes(Ten of which are equipped with 20 GPU cards)
- 1496 CPU cores
- 3.3 TB ram

High Performance Computing

Modern supercomputers gain their computational power and speed from parallel processing. High performance computing (HPC) is the use of parallel processing for speeding up advanced application programs running. Typical parallel programming tools include MPI, openMP for multicore CPUs and CUDA/OpenCL for GPUs.

Systems

Blue Hive

Peter Fogg, Baowei Liu Center for Integrated Research Computing

Amber Scaling Tests

AMBER is an software package that simulates a Linpack is a software library for performing numerfamily of force fields for molecular dynamics of ical linear algebra on computers. Linpack benchbiomolecules. Figures 1 and 2 show the scaling test marks measure a computer system's floating comresults of one typical Amber benchmark Cellulose puting power by checking how fast the computer solves a dense n by n system of linear equations run with over 400,000 atoms on BlueHive. As more Ax = b, which is a common task in egnineering. The cores are added, the running time decreases. Above eight cores, though, the simulation slows. This is computing performance is given in FLOPS, floatingdue to the fact that one node contains eight cores, point operations per second. One GFLOPS is equal and above that number, multiple nodes must comto 1 billion FLOPS. ON BlueHive, we see the rise in speed slowing down due to internode communimunicate across Ethernet. This is a relatively slow process, and the running time increases accordingly. cation, similar to the Amber benchmarks (Figure 5). On Blue Gene, however, Linpack scales much Blue Gene contains a high-speed optical network for communication, and a library which allows many better, without any significant slowdown as more processors are added (Figure 6). Again, this is due processors to communicate and share data so the same benchmark scales much better (Figures 3 and to Blue Gene's high-speed communications between nodes.



Figure 1: Cellulose on BlueHive



Figure 2: Cellulose speedup on BlueHive



Figure 3: Cellulose on Blue Gene

Results

Linpack Benchmarks

Cellulose Speedup on Blue Gene





Figure 5: Linpack on BlueHive



Figure 6: Linpack on Blue Gene

Modern GPUs (Graphics Processing Unit), which are initially used for very compute-intensive graphics tasks like decoding real-time high-resolution video, have evolved into highly parallel multi-core systems and can be used to do high performance general purpose computations. Nvidia's CUDA platform was the earliest widely adopted programming model for GPU computing. Amber benchmarks can be run on a Nvidia GPU with CUDA. Figure 7 compares the fastest running times of Amber simulations using CPUs(8 or 16 processors per run) and the running time on a single GPU on BlueHive. The GPUs complete the benchmarks much faster than CPUs, due to their highly parallel architecture.

We run Amber and Linpack benchmarks on the CIRC supercomputing resources. Both the Amber and the Linpack scaling tests show that Blue Gene has a better scaling performance due to its highspeed optical network for communication. Tests on BlueHive GPU nodes also show that Amber Benchmarks run faster on GPUs than on CPUs.

Amber Benchmarks on GPU



Figure 7: Amber Benchmarks on GPU and CPUs of BlueHive





Conclusion