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Where is Supercomputing?

(Pictures: Thomas Sterling, Caltech & NASA JPL, and Wu Feng, LANL)

We have spent decades focusing on performance, performance, performance (and price/performance).
Where is Supercomputing?
Top 500 Supercomputer List

- **Benchmark**
  - **LINPACK**: Solves a (random) dense system of linear equations in double-precision (64 bits) arithmetic.
    - Introduced by Prof. Jack Dongarra, U. Tennessee

- **Evaluation Metric**
  - Performance (i.e., Speed)
    - Floating-Operations Per Second (FLOPS)

- **Web Site**
  - [http://www.top500.org](http://www.top500.org)
  - Current #1: Japanese Earth Simulator @ 35.9 TFLOPS
Metrics for Evaluating Supercomputers (or HPC)

- **Performance (i.e., Speed)**
  - Metric: Floating-Operations Per Second (FLOPS)
  - Example: Japanese Earth Simulator, ASCI Thunder & Q.

- **Price/Performance → Cost Efficiency**
  - Metric: Acquisition Cost / FLOPS
  - Examples: LANL Space Simulator, VT System X cluster.
  (In general, Beowulf clusters.)

Performance & price/performance are important metrics, but ...
Where is Supercomputing? (Unfortunate) Assumptions

- Humans are infallible.
  - No mistakes made during integration, installation, configuration, maintenance, repair, or upgrade.

- Software will eventually be bug free.

- Hardware MTBF is already very large (~100 years between failures) and will continue to increase.

- Acquisition cost is what matters; maintenance costs are irrelevant.

- The above assumptions are even more problematic if one looks at current trends in supercomputing.

Adapted from David Patterson, UC-Berkeley
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Architectures / Systems
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Reliability & Availability of Leading-Edge Supercomputers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems</th>
<th>CPUs</th>
<th>Reliability &amp; Availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASCI Q</td>
<td>8,192</td>
<td>MTBI: 6.5 hrs. 114 unplanned outages/month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HW outage sources: storage, CPU, memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HW outage sources: storage, CPU, 3rd-party HW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NERSC Seaborg</td>
<td>6,656</td>
<td>MTBI: 14 days. MTTR: 3.3 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• SW is the main outage source.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability: 98.74%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC Lemieux</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>MTBI: 9.7 hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability: 98.33%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google</td>
<td>~15,000</td>
<td>20 reboots/day; 2-3% machines replaced/year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HW outage sources: storage, memory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Availability: ~100%.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MTBI: mean time between interrupts; MTBF: mean time between failures; MTTR: mean time to restore

Source: Daniel A. Reed, RENCI & UNC
Efficiency of Leading-Edge Supercomputers

- "Performance" and "Price/Performance" Metrics ...
  - Lower efficiency, reliability, and availability.
  - Higher operational costs, e.g., admin, maintenance, etc.

- Examples
  - Computational Efficiency
    - Relative to Peak: Actual Performance/Peak Performance
    - Relative to Space: Performance/Sq. Ft.
    - Relative to Power: Performance/Watt
  - Performance: 2000-fold increase (since the Cray C90).
    - Performance/Sq. Ft.: Only 65-fold increase.
    - Performance/Watt: Only 300-fold increase.
  - Massive construction and operational costs associated with powering and cooling.
Another Perspective:
“Commodity-Use Supercomputers”

- **Requirement:**Near-100% *availability* with *efficient* and *reliable* resource usage.
  - E-commerce, enterprise apps, online services, ISPs.

- **Problems**
  - **Frequency of Service Outages**
    - 65% of IT managers report that their websites were unavailable to customers over a 6-month period.
  - **Cost of Service Outages**
    - NYC stockbroker: $6,500,000/hr
    - Ebay (22 hours): $225,000/hr
    - Amazon.com: $180,000/hr
  - **Social Effects:** negative press, loss of customers who “click over” to competitor (e.g., TeraGrid, Akamai/Google)

Source: David Patterson, UC-Berkeley
Another Perspective: “Commodity-Use Supercomputers”

- Pharmaceutical, financial, actuarial, retail, aerospace, automotive, science and engineering, data centers.
- Sampling of Consumer Requirements of HPC Systems
  - Myself, LANL (high-performance network simulations)
    Traditional cluster fails weekly, oftentimes more frequently.
  - Peter Bradley, Pratt & Whitney (CFD, composite modeling)
  - Eric Schmidt, Google (instantaneous search)
    ◆ Low power, NOT speed.
    ◆ DRAM density, NOT speed.
    ◆ Availability and reliability, NOT speed.
Where is Supercomputing?
(Pictures: Thomas Sterling, Caltech & NASA JPL and Wu Feng, LANL)

Efficiency, reliability, and availability will be the key issues of this decade.
Where is Supercomputing?  
Supercomputing in Our Lab

- Operating Environment
  - 85-90°F warehouse at 7,400 feet above sea level.
  - No air conditioning, no air filtration, no raised floor, and no humidifier/dehumidifier.

- Computing Requirement
  - Parallel computer to enable high-performance network research in simulation and implementation.

- Old Solution: Traditional Supercomputing Cluster
  - 100-processor cluster computer that failed weekly in the above operating environment.

- New Solution: Low-Power, Reliable Supercomputing Cluster
  - A 240-processor cluster in five square feet → Green Destiny

How did we come to the above solution?
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Goal

- Improve efficiency, reliability, and availability (ERA) in large-scale computing systems.
  - Sacrifice a little bit of raw performance.
  - Improve overall system throughput as the system will “always” be available, i.e., effectively no downtime, no HW failures, etc.
- Reduce the total cost of ownership (TCO). Another talk ...

Crude Analogy

- Formula One Race Car: Wins raw performance but reliability is so poor that it requires frequent maintenance. Throughput low.
- Honda S2000: Loses raw performance but high reliability results in high throughput (i.e., miles driven → answers/month).
How to Improve Efficiency, Reliability & Availability?

**Complementary Approaches**
- Via HW design & manufacturing (e.g., IBM Blue Gene)
- Via a software reliability layer that assumes underlying hardware unreliability *a la* the Internet (e.g., Google).
- Via systems design & integration (e.g., Green Destiny)

**Observation**
- High power density $\alpha$ high temperature $\alpha$ low reliability
- Arrhenius’ Equation*
  (circa 1890s in chemistry $\rightarrow$ circa 1980s in computer & defense industries)
  - As temperature increases by 10° C ...
    - The failure rate of a system doubles.
  - Twenty years of unpublished empirical data.

* The time to failure is a function of $e^{-E_a/kT}$ where $E_a$ = activation energy of the failure mechanism being accelerated, $k$ = Boltzmann’s constant, and $T$ = absolute temperature
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Moore's Law for Power

Chip Maximum Power in watts/cm²

Year

1985 1995 2001

1.5µ 1µ 0.7µ 0.5µ 0.35µ 0.25µ 0.18µ 0.13µ 0.1µ 0.07µ

- I386 - 1 watt
- I486 - 2 watts
- Pentium - 14 watts
- Pentium Pro - 30 watts
- Pentium II - 35 watts
- Pentium III - 35 watts
- Pentium 4 - 75 watts
- Itanium - 130 watts

- Not too long to reach Nuclear Reactor
- Surpassed Heating Plate

Source: Fred Pollack, Intel. New Microprocessor Challenges in the Coming Generations of CMOS Technologies, MICRO32 and Transmeta
Moore’s Law for Power

Can we build a low-power supercomputer that is efficient, reliable, and highly available but is still considered high performance?

Source: Fred Pollack, Intel. New Microprocessor Challenges in the Coming Generations of CMOS Technologies, MICRO32 and Transmeta
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Moore's Law for Power

Source: Fred Pollack, Intel. New Microprocessor Challenges in the Coming Generations of CMOS Technologies, MICRO32 and Transmeta
MetaBlade: The Origin of Green Destiny

- On a winding drive home through Los Alamos Canyon ... the need for reliable compute cycles.
  - Leverage RLX web-hosting servers with Transmeta CPUs.

- Received the “bare” hardware components.
- Two man-hours later ...
  - Completed construction of a 24-CPU RLX System 324 (dubbed MetaBlade) and installation of system software.
- One man-hour later ...
  - Successfully executing a 10-million N-body simulation of a galaxy formation

SC 2001: The First Bladed Beowulf

MetaBlade: 24 ServerBlade 633s

MetaBlade2: 24 ServerBlade 800s
(On-loan from RLX for SC 2001)

MetaBlade Node
- 633-MHz Transmeta TM5600
- 512-KB cache, 256-MB RAM
- 100-MHz front-side bus
- 3 x 100-Mb/s Ethernet

MetaBlade2 Node
- 800-MHz Transmeta TM5800
- 512-KB cache, 384-MB RAM
  (128-MB on-board DDR + 256-MB SDR DIMM)
- 133-MHz front-side bus
- 3 x 100-Mb/s Ethernet

Performance of an N-body Simulation of Galaxy Formation
- MetaBlade: 2.1 Gflops; MetaBlade2: 3.3 Gflops

No failures in its lifetime despite no cooling facilities.
Scaling MetaBlade...

- Interest in MetaBlade and MetaBlade2?
  - Continual crowds over the three days of SC 2001.

- Inspiration
  - Build a full 42U rack of MetaBlade clusters.
    - Scale up performance/space to 3500 Mflop/sq. ft.
  - Problem: In 2001, performance per node on MetaBlade was *three* times worse than the fastest processor at the time (i.e., 2.0-GHz Intel P4).
  - Can we improve performance while maintaining low power? Yes via Transmeta’s code-morphing software, which is part of the Transmeta CPU.
    - What is code-morphing software?
Transmeta TM5600 CPU: VLIW + CMS

- **VLIW Engine**
  - Up to four-way issue
    - In-order execution only.
  - Two integer units
  - Floating-point unit
  - Memory unit
  - Branch unit

- **VLIW Transistor Count ("Anti-Moore's Law")**
  - $\frac{1}{4}$ of Intel PIII $\rightarrow$ $\sim 7x$ less power consumption
  - Less power $\rightarrow$ lower "on-die" temp. $\rightarrow$ better reliability & availability
Transmeta TM5x00 CMS

- **Code-Morphing Software (CMS)**
  - Provides compatibility by dynamically “morphing” x86 instructions into simple VLIW instructions.
  - Learns and improves with time, i.e., iterative execution.

- **High-Performance Code-Morphing Software (HP-CMS)**
  - **Results (circa 2001)**
    - Optimized to improve floating-pt. performance by 50%.
    - 1-GHz Transmeta performs as well as a 1.2-GHz PIII-M.
  - **How?**
### Transmeta TM5x00 Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>MEM</th>
<th>2xALU</th>
<th>2xALU</th>
<th>FPU</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>SSE</th>
<th>Br</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intel P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmeta TM5x00</td>
<td>MEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2xALU</td>
<td></td>
<td>FPU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Br</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Previous-generation Transmeta TM5800 + HP-CMS**
  - Performs better than an Intel PIII over iterative scientific codes on a clock-for-clock-cycle basis.
  - Performs only *twice* as slow as the fastest CPU (at the time) rather than three times as slow.

- **Efficeon**, the current-generation CPU from Transmeta, rectifies the above mismatch in functional units.
Low-Power Network Switches

- **WWP LE-410**: 16 ports of Gigabit Ethernet
- **WWP LE-210**: 24 ports of Fast Ethernet via RJ-21s
- *(Avg.)* Power Dissipation / Port: A few watts.
A 240-Node Beowulf in Five Square Feet

Each Node
- 667-MHz Transmeta TM5600 CPU w/ Linux 2.4.x
  - Upgraded to 1-GHz Transmeta TM5800 CPUs
- 640-MB RAM, 20-GB hard disk, 100-Mb/s Ethernet (up to 3 interfaces)

Total
- 160 Gflops peak (240 Gflops with upgrade)
- 150 GB of RAM (expandable to 276 GB)
- 4.8 TB of storage (expandable to 38.4 TB)
- Power Consumption: Only 3.2 kW.

Reliability & Availability
- No unscheduled failures in 24 months.
Experimental Results
Gravitational Microkernel Benchmark (circa June 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Math sqrt</th>
<th>Karp sqrt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500-MHz Intel PIII</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>137.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>533-MHz Compaq Alpha EV56</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>178.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633-MHz Transmeta TM5600</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>144.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800-MHz Transmeta TM5800</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>296.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375-MHz IBM Power3</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>379.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200-MHz AMD Athlon MP</td>
<td>350.7</td>
<td>452.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Units are in Mflops.

Source: Michael S. Warren, Theoretical Astrophysics Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory.
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## Treecode Benchmark within n-Body Galaxy Formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>CPUs</th>
<th>Gflops</th>
<th>Mflops/CPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>ASCI QB</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>775.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Space Simulator</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>623.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>NERSC</td>
<td>IBM SP-3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>57.70</td>
<td>225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>SGI O2K</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>205.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Green Destiny</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>183.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>SC’01</td>
<td>MetaBlade2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Avalon</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>16.16</td>
<td>126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Loki</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>SC ’96</td>
<td>Loki+Hyglac</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sandia</td>
<td>ASCI Red</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>464.90</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>JPL</td>
<td>Cray T3D</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michael S. Warren, Theoretical Astrophysics Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory.
### Treecode Benchmark within n-Body Galaxy Formation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>CPUs</th>
<th>Gflops</th>
<th>Mflops/CPU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>ASCI QB</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>775.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Space Simulator</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>179.7</td>
<td>623.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>NERSC</td>
<td>IBM SP-3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>57.70</td>
<td>225.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>SGI O2K</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>205.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Green Destiny</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38.90</td>
<td>183.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>SC'01</td>
<td>MetaBlade-2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>138.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>LANL</td>
<td>Loki+Hyglac</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>126.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Sandia</td>
<td>ASCI Red</td>
<td>8800</td>
<td>464.90</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>JPL</td>
<td>Cray T3D</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Michael S. Warren, Theoretical Astrophysics Group at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Upgraded “Green Destiny” (Dec. 2002)

58 Gflops → 274 Mflops/CPU
Experimental Results

(relative to efficiency, reliability, availability)
Performance Metrics for …

- **Efficiency, Reliability, and Availability (ERA)**
  - Total Cost of Ownership. Another talk ...
  - Computational Efficiency
    - Relative to Space: Performance/Sq. Ft.
    - Relative to Power: Performance/Watt.
  - Reliability
    - MTBF: Mean Time Between Failures.
  - Availability
    - Percentage of time that resources are available for HPC.

- Continue to use *n-body galaxy formation* application as benchmark.
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Parallel Computing Platforms
("Apples-to-Oranges" Comparison)

- **Avalon (1996)**
  - 140-CPU *Traditional Beowulf Cluster*

- **ASCI Red (1996)**
  - 9632-CPU *MPP*

- **ASCI White (2000)**
  - 512-Node (8192-CPU) *Cluster of SMPs*

- **Green Destiny (2002)**
  - 240-CPU *Bladed Beowulf Cluster*
## Parallel Computing Platforms
### Running the N-body Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Avalon Beowulf</th>
<th>ASCI Red</th>
<th>ASCI White</th>
<th>Green Destiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (Gflops)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ft²)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>9920</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (kW)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM (GB)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk (TB)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM density (MB/ft²)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk density (GB/ft²)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Space (Mflops/ft²)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Power (Mflops/watt)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Los Alamos National Laboratory
## Parallel Computing Platforms Running the N-body Code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Machine</th>
<th>Avalon Beowulf</th>
<th>ASCI Red</th>
<th>ASCI White</th>
<th>Green Destiny</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (Gflops)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ft²)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>9920</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (kW)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM (GB)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk (TB)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM density (MB/ft²)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk density (GB/ft²)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Space (Mflops/ft²)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Power (Mflops/watt)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>Avalon Beowulf</td>
<td>ASCI Red</td>
<td>ASCI White</td>
<td>Green Destiny+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance (Gflops)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ft²)</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>9920</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (kW)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM (GB)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk (TB)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRAM density (MB/ft²)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disk density (GB/ft²)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>800.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Space (Mflops/ft²)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>9667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Power (Mflops/watt)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine</td>
<td>Green Destiny+</td>
<td>Earth Simulator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINPACK Performance (Gflops)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>35,860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (ft²)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17,222 * 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power (kW)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost efficiency ($/Mflop)</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Space (Mflops/ft²)</td>
<td>16,833</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf/Power (Mflops/watt)</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer: This is not a fair comparison. Why?
(1) Price and the use of area and power do not scale linearly.
(2) Goals of the two machines are different.
Efficiency, Reliability, and Availability for ...

- **Green Destiny**
  - **Computational Efficiency**
    - Relative to Space: Performance/Sq. Ft.
      *Up to 60x better.*
    - Relative to Power: Performance/Watt
      *Up to 20x better.*
  - **Reliability**
    - MTBF: Mean Time Between Failures
      *"Infinite"*
  - **Availability**
    - Percentage of time that resources are available for HPC.
      *Nearly 100%.*
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- **LINPACK Performance**
  - 16.97 Gflops

- **Footprint**
  - 3 sq. ft.
  - 1 cu. ft.

- **Power Consumption**
  - < 150 watts at load

- **How does this compare with a traditional desktop?**

**ORION DT-12 DESKTOP CLUSTER WORKSTATION**

Imagine a 36 Gflop cluster on your desk!

- **12 Nodes** in a single computer
- **36 Gflops** peak processing power

- **24 GBytes** memory capacity
- **1 TByte** internal storage

**DESIGNED FOR THE INDIVIDUAL**
The Orion DT-12 cluster workstation is a fully integrated, completely self-contained, personal workstation based on the best of today's cluster technologies. Designed to be an affordable individual resource it is capable of 36 Gflops peak performance (18 GFlops sustained) with models starting at under $10k.

The Orion DT-12 cluster workstation provides supercomputer performance for the engineering, scientific, financial and creative professionals who need to solve computationally complex problems without waiting in the queue of the back-room cluster.

**FASTER SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT**
The Orion DT-12 cluster workstation is the perfect platform for developers writing (and deploying) cluster software packages. It comes with cluster software development tools pre-installed, including libraries and a parallel compiler that allows you to spread one multiple file compile to all the nodes in the system. Also included is a suite of system monitoring and management software.

**NO ASSEMBLY REQUIRED**
Orion workstations are designed from the ground up as a single computer. The entire system boots with the press of a button and has the ergonomic and ease of use of a personal computer. The modular design allows for flexible configurations and scalability by stacking up to 4 systems as one 48 node cluster.

**PRESEVE SOFTWARE INVESTMENTS**
Orion workstations are built around industry standards for clustering: x86 processors, Ethernet, the Linux operating system and standard parallel programming libraries, including MPI, PVM and SGE. Existing Linux cluster applications run without modification.

**PERFORMANCE AND FEATURES**
The Orion DT-12 is a cluster of 12 x86-compatible nodes linked by a switched Gigabit Ethernet fabric. The cluster operates as a single computer with a single on-off switch and a single system image rapid boot sequence, which allows the entire system to boot in less than 90 seconds.

The Orion DT-12 cluster workstation is highly efficient, consuming a maximum of 220 Watts of power under peak load—about the same as an average desktop PC. It operates quietly, plugs into a standard 110V 15A wall socket and fits unobtrusively on a desk or lab bench.
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ORION DS-96 DESKSIDE CLUSTER WORKSTATION

Imagine a 300 Gflop cluster... under your desk.

96 Nodes in a single computer
300 Gflops peak processing power
192 GBytes memory capacity
9.6 TBytes internal storage

INCREASE YOUR PRODUCTIVITY
The Orion DS-96 cluster workstation is the highest performance general-purpose computing platform that can be plugged into a standard wall outlet and operated in an office or laboratory environment.

PRESERVE SOFTWARE INVESTMENTS
Orion workstations are built around industry standards for clustering: x86 processors, the Linux operating system and standard parallel programming libraries, including MPI, PVM and SGE. Your existing Linux cluster software applications can run without modification.

NO ASSEMBLY REQUIRED
Orion workstations are designed from the ground up as a single computer. The entire system boots with the push of a button and has the ergonomics and ease of use of a personal computer. Modular, solid state design allows for flexible configurations and scalability.

PERFORMANCE AND FEATURES
The Orion DS-96 cluster workstation is a fully integrated, completely self-contained personal workstation based on the best of today's cluster technologies and commodity components. Designed to be an individual's or departmental resource, it is capable of 300 Gflops peak performance (150 Gflops sustained). The DS-96 is also highly efficient, consuming a maximum of 1500 Watts of power under peak load. It operates quietly, plugs into a standard 110V 15A wall socket, and fits unobtrusively beneath a desk or lab bench.

The DS-96 is a cluster of 96 x86-compatible nodes linked by an integrated Ggabit Ethernet fabric. The cluster operates as a single computer, with a single on-off switch, and a single-system-image rapid boot sequence which allows the entire system to boot in less than 2 minutes. The DS-96 comes with standard Linux and drivers pre-installed, including an optimized MPI message-passing library. Also included is a suite of cluster software development tools, system monitoring and system management software.
Software-Based Evolution of **GD**: Dynamic Voltage Scaling (DVS)

- **DVS Mechanism**
  - Trades CPU performance for power reduction by allowing the CPU supply voltage and/or frequency to be adjusted at run-time.

- **Why is DVS important?**
  - Recall: Moore’s Law for Power.
  - CPU power consumption is directly proportional to the square of the supply voltage and to frequency.

- **DVS Algorithm**
  - Determines when to adjust the current frequency-voltage setting and what the new frequency-voltage setting should be.
Key Observation
- The execution time of many programs are insensitive to the CPU speed change. e.g., NAS IS benchmark.

Motivation for Real-Time Constraint-Based DVS

![Graph showing the relationship between CPU speed and execution time.](http://www.lanl.gov/radiant)

Performance degraded by 4%
Clock speed slowed down by 50%
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Key Idea

- Applying DVS to these programs will result in significant power and energy savings at a minimal performance impact.
Problem Formulation for Real-Time Constraint-Based DVS

- **Key Challenge**
  - Find a performance-constrained, energy-optimal DVS schedule on a realistic processor in real time.

- **Previous Related Work**
  - Targeted at Embedded Systems ...
  - \( P \propto V^2f \)
    1. \( P \propto f^3 \) [assumes \( V \propto f \)]
    2. Discretize \( V \). Use continuous mapping function, e.g., \( f = g(V) \), to get discrete \( f \), e.g., 512 MHz, 894 MHz. Solve as ILP (offline) problem.
    3. Discretize \( V \) and \( f \), e.g., AMD frequency-voltage table.

- **Simulation vs. Real Implementation**
  - Problem with Simulation: Simplified Power Model
    - Does not account for leakage power.
    - Assumes zero-time switching overhead between \( (f, V) \) settings.
    - Assumes zero-time to construct a DVS schedule.
    - Does not assume realistic CPU support.
Solve the following constraint-based problem:

\[ E = \min \{ \sum_i r_i \cdot E_i : \sum_i r_i \cdot T_i \leq d, \sum_i r_i = 1, r_i \geq 0 \} \]
If the execution-time vs. energy curve is convex, then the energy-optimal DVS schedule can be constructed in constant time.

Theorem for Real-Time Constraint-Based DVS Performance constraint

Energy-optimal DVS schedule

0.8 GHz

2 GHz
Emulating Frequencies for an Energy-Optimal DVS Schedule

\[ E = \gamma \cdot E_j + (1 - \gamma) \cdot E_{j+1} \text{ where} \]

\[ \gamma = \frac{d - T_{j+1}}{T_j - T_{j+1}} \text{ and } T_{j+1} < d \leq T_j \]
DVS Scheduling Algorithm

**Input:** deadline $d$ and performance model $T(f)$

**Output:** deadline-constrained energy-optimal DVS schedule

**Algorithm:**

1. Figure out $f_j$ and $f_{j+1}$.
   \[ T(f_{j+1}) < d \leq T(f_j) \]

2. Compute the ratio $\gamma$.
   \[ \gamma = \frac{d - T_{j+1}}{T_j - T_{j+1}} \]

3. Execute for $\gamma$ percent of time at $f_j$

4. Execute for $1 - \gamma$ percent of time at $f_{j+1}$.
Many programs can be modeled as follows:

\[
\frac{T(f)}{T(f_{max})} = \beta \cdot \frac{f_{max}}{f} + (1 - \beta)
\]

To guarantee the execution-time vs. energy curve is convex, the following theorem is useful:

**Theorem.** If the above performance model holds and

\[
\frac{P_1 - 0}{f_1 - 0} \leq \frac{P_2 - P_1}{f_2 - f_1} \leq \frac{P_3 - P_2}{f_3 - f_2} \leq \cdots \leq \frac{P_n - P_{n-1}}{f_n - f_{n-1}}
\]

then

\[
0 \geq \frac{E_2 - E_1}{T_2 - T_1} \geq \frac{E_3 - E_2}{T_3 - T_2} \geq \cdots \geq \frac{E_n - E_{n-1}}{T_n - T_{n-1}}
\]
Initial Experimental Results

- Tested on a mobile AMD Athlon XP system with 5 settings
- Measured through Yokogawa WT210 digital power meter
- $\beta \in [0, 1]$ indicates performance sensitivity to changes in CPU speed, with 1 being most sensitive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>program</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>$T_{rel}/E_{rel}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swim</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.02/0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomcatv</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.01/0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>su2cor</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.02/0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compress</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.05/0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgrid</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.04/0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vortex</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.06/0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turb3d</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.04/0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05/0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAFfeine Supercomputer

- To debut by the end of the calendar year ...  
  - Imagine the results on the previous slide applied to a high-end compute node.
- Stay tuned ...
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mpiBLAST (http://mpiblast.lanl.gov)
Performance on Green Destiny

BLAST Run Time for 300-kB Query against nt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nodes</th>
<th>Runtime (s)</th>
<th>Speedup over 1 node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>80774.93</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8751.97</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4547.83</td>
<td>17.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2436.60</td>
<td>33.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1349.92</td>
<td>59.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>850.75</td>
<td>94.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>473.79</td>
<td>170.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bottom Line
mpiBLAST reduces search time from 1346 minutes (or 22.4 hours) to under 8 minutes.
Past, Present, and Future for **Green Destiny**

- **Application Codes**
  - Astrophysics: Galaxy formation and 3-D supernova simulations
  - Large-scale molecular dynamics
  - mpiBLAST: Parallel genetic search tool
  - LINPACK: A collection of subroutines that analyze and solve linear equations and linear least-squares problems

- **System Reliability**
  - No unscheduled failures in 24 months despite the absence of special infrastructure such as cooling.

- **Green Destiny R.I.P. and Re-Birth**
  - Dismantled, re-configured, and expanded to 360 nodes in ten square feet. April 2004 - present.
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Awards

- Green Destiny
  - ... and Its Evolving Parts
    - Innovative Supercomputer Architecture Award at the 2004 International Supercomputer Conference, where the Top 500 Supercomputer List is announced every June.
Sampling of Media Overexposure

Conclusion

- Efficiency, reliability, and availability will be the key issues of this decade.

- Performance Metrics for Green Destiny (circa 2002)
  - Performance: 2x to 2.5x worse than fastest AMD/Intel.
  - Price/Performance: 2x to 2.5x worse.
  - Overall Efficiency (Total Price-Performance Ratio)
    - 1.5x to 2.0x better. See ACM Queue, Oct. 2003.
  - Power Efficiency (Perf/Power): 10x to 20x better.
  - Space Efficiency (Perf/Space): 20x to 60x better.
  - Reliability: “Infinite”
  - Availability: Nearly 100%.
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