

A Rare Look at Real World Data Analysis of Supercomputer Faults –

DRAM, SRAM, and GPGPUs

Nathan DeBardeleben, Ph.D. (LANL)

**52nd HPC User Forum
Santa Fe, April 2014**

Many Collaborators

- HPC-5 (Sean Blanchard, Laura Monroe, Phil Romero, Craig Idler, Daryl Grunau, Cornell Wright, . . .)
- HPC-3 – lots of folks getting data for me (Kyle Lamb, Cory)
- Cray – data! Greg Hamilton
- AMD – Vilas Sridharan, Sudhanva Gurumurti
- Sandia – Jon Stearley
- UIUC – Rakesh Kumar, Xun Jian
- NVIDIA – Timothy Tsai
- . . . etc
- This is a team effort

Topics Covered

■ **Systems:**



- Cray systems:
 - Cielo (@LANL)
 - Jaguar (@ORNL)
 - Hopper (@NERSC)
- Moonlight GPGPU cluster (@LANL)

■ **Topics:**

- Corrected and uncorrected faults in DRAM and SRAM
- Altitude effects
- Positional effects (in a datacenter, separately we've looked at positional effects on a DRAM chip)
- GPGPU variability in memory bandwidth, performance, and reliability


Cielo Data – A More Detailed Analysis Than Others Do

- **Cielo affords us more data sources than are often available**
- **Furthermore, there is so *very little* published reports or available data in the public**
 - Our report is one of the largest ever done – 24billion DRAM hours
 - Our report demonstrated the problems others have done in their analysis (fault vs. error) and how wrong conclusions have been drawn (see: *DRAM Errors in the Wild* and then promptly forget what you read, please).
- **It's very easy to jump to wrong conclusions with the kind of data usually available**
- **Such as . . .**



▶ A correlation to physical location...

▶ ...is due to non-uniform distribution of vendor...




▶ ...and disappears when examined by vendor.

▶ DRAM reliability studies must account for DRAM vendor or risk inaccurate conclusions



Field Data – It Matters

- Not all vendors are created equal
- As much as a 4x difference in FIT rate depending on DRAM vendor used in Cielo nodes
- While B and C are about 50/50 vulnerable to permanent/transient, vendor is closer to 30/70 permanent/transient




Positional Effects

- Fault rates increase as you go vertically in a rack
- Shielding?
Temperature?
- We found a similar correlation in DRAM
- More studies are needed to explain why we see this



DDR Command and Address Parity – It's a Good Thing


- **Key feature of DDR3 (and on) is the ability to add parity-check logic to the command and address bus.**
- **Can have a significant positive impact on DDR memory reliability**
 - Not previously shown empirically
- **DDR3 sub-system on Cielo includes command and address parity checking.**
- **Rate of command/address parity errors was 75% that of the rate of uncorrected ECC errors.**
- **Increasing DDR memory channel speeds may cause an increase in signaling-related errors.**




SRAM Altitude Effects

- Higher altitude = increased fault rate due to increased cosmic ray-induced neutron strikes
- Whether this ultimately affects the application is correlated to the level of memory protection
- Cielo's AMD processors are *basically* the same as Jaguar's (@ORNL) AMD processors
- So what do we see in the data?

SRAM Altitude Effects – Field Data



L2




L3

SRAM Altitude Effects – Field Data

■ L2


- Cielo experiences 2.3x increase in SRAM transient fault rate relative to Jaguar in L2



L2

■ L3

- Cielo experiences 3.4x increase in SRAM transient fault rate relative to Jaguar in L3




L3

- **Average flux ratio between LANL and ORNL (without accounting for solar modulation) is 4.39.**
- **Cielo fault rate increase is less than predicted due to altitude alone.**
- **This likely means that there are additional sources of SRAM faults, such as alpha particles**
- **How does this compare with accelerated testing (beam testing)?**


SRAM Altitude Effects – Accelerated Testing

- Accelerated testing predicts a higher fault rate than seen in the field . . .
- . . . Except in the L3 tag array which was slightly higher in the field
- The per-bit fault rate seen in the field is expected to be somewhat lower than the rate seen in accelerated testing
 - Many reasons for this, essentially related to the applications run during beam testing != applications used in the field
- Conclusion is that the majority of SRAM faults in the field are caused by known high-energy particles



SRAM Uncorrected Errors – Field Data

- The majority of uncorrected errors in Cielo came from parity-protected structures
- **Even though these structures are *far* smaller than the ECC-protected structures**
- **Conclusion: The best way to reduce SRC uncorrected error rates simply is to extend single-bit correction (e.g. ECC) through additional structures in the processor.**
- Addressing multi-bit faults may be more challenging



Predictions for Exascale – DRAM and SRAM

- **We have several papers on this subject**
 - Analytical modeling
 - Monte Carlo simulations
- **All show an expected increase in SRAM and DRAM faults at larger scales (not surprising)**
- **Highly dependent upon theoretical exascale system's DRAM and SRAM configuration**
- **For the configurations we studied, we expect between 5x and 90x increase in uncorrected errors in these structures**
 - I realize this is a large variation
 - It is, again, because of the high dependency on memory configuration choices
- **Takeaway:**
 - Uncorrected error rates in the future are going to be higher
 - We need to pay attention to memory system design, they can have a huge impact!

GPGPU Field Study


The Moonlight GPGPU Cluster

- Deployed in 2011
- As high as 74 on top500 (not a large machine)
- 308 nodes
- Dual socket
- 8-core Intel Sandy Bridge
- 32GB memory / node
- PCIe-3
- **Two NVIDIA Tesla M2090 GPGPUs per node (Fermi generation)**
 - No large-scale Kepler deployment available at LANL at this time
- **Compute cores: 4,928 CPUs + 315,392 GPGPUs**

Overview of the Moonlight Saga

- An early foray into GPGPU computing at LANL
- A story of memory bandwidth problems, GPU performance variability, and correctness issues
- And also a story of an evolving software and driver stack, problems encountered and problems fixed
- The point is – the data I will show you were the problem data that lead to fixes
- Most importantly, the data shown here were acquired over 1.5 years and involved many CUDA driver upgrades
- At the end, we'll get to the question about whether things are better in the Kepler generation of cards


GPGPU Memory Bandwidth Woes



- **GPU to CPU transfer rate, not always consistent**
These bandwidth problems went away with driver upgrade


Moonlight HPL CPU Performance

- CPU performance is “normal”
- This is what we expect



Moonlight HPL CPU/GPU Performance

- Performance is good . . .
 - But irregular
- Recall our tightly coupled numerical simulations run at the speed of the slowest component




Matrix Multiplication Test Code

- Is this problem unique to HPL?
- Perhaps, we built a simple matrix multiplication GPU code to explore that question


ML M2090 Performance

- Performance is variable on this test application as well
- Seem to be “bands” of performance
- GPU zero (red) is clearly under performing



ML M2090 Performance


- Adding an alpha blur shows us that there are clear modes of performance
- GPU zero (red) is clearly under performing
- Why?



M2090 Performance Throttling?


- **Something is causing the M2090s on this machine to throttle**
- **Sadly, the API calls to find out what is causing it don't appear until the Kepler generation**

conlightM2090: Varying Performance States Between GPUs on the Same Node



Unique to This One Machine?


- **M2050s tested by Argonne National Laboratory (Franck Cappello, Leonardo Bautista Gomez) on a Virginia Tech GPU cluster**



Unique to This One Machine?

- **M2090 small testbed at LANL also shows this performance variability**

JaddyM2090: Varying Performance States Between GPUs on the Same Node




Moonlight Bit Errors

- **1.32 double bit errors / day reported in the logs**
- **~10,000x higher double bit error rate than LANL's Cielo supercomputer (DRAM only) when scaled to memory size**
 - Cielo is DDR3 with single chipkill correct, double chipkill detect
 - Moonlight is GDDR5 with SECDED
- **Inconsistent error logging**
 - This is a very long story, I will be happy to explain this offline to folks if they are interested
 - In short, we see every permutation of logs in the counters of the cards and the syslog leaving us with little confidence in either of them


Do Things Get Better in Kepler Generation?

- Performance variation on our two (2) K20s at LANL are extremely regular!
- Look at that massive performance improvement too!



Do Things Get Better in Kepler Generation?

- Argonne colleagues confirm similar results on a K20 system in Europe
- Performance variability seems very much improved in Kepler generation



GPGPU Takeaway

- The cards have evolved a lot since deployed
- Sadly, our scientists were asked to evaluate the cards as deployed, not as they are now
- Upgrading drivers and studying systems is *extremely* challenging on a production HPC system
- Vendors need to be *extremely* cautious of shipping hardware that is not “ready for prime time” in the community they are deploying it

Conclusions

- **It is not often one gets to see field studies in HPC**
- **We have shown the value of:**
 - Collaborating with vendors to interpret the data (vendor “special sauce”)
 - Analyzing reliability based on vendor choice
 - Studying positional effects of faults in a data center
- **SRAM would benefit from more advanced ECC**
- **SRAM field data lines up relatively well with accelerated testing**
- **DDR3 address and command parity check is useful**
- **Some of the smallest SRAM structures are the most problematic on Cielo due to the low error protection provided in them**
- **With quality ECC, altitude effects are largely mitigated**
- **GPGPUs are an evolving story**

What Kind of ECC Is There? What Do We Use?

■ TERMS:

- Correct – found an error, fixed it, reports it to the system, the correct data is returned to you (small performance impact).
- Detect – found an error, you can't have the correct data – we don't know what it is, today usually this crashes the system, next gen systems this will likely just kill the associated application
- Silent Data Corruption (SDC) – we don't know these rates, highly application dependent, requires an application that can self-check

■ Takeaway:

- Some of these events are benign
- Some of these events cause your applications to crash (or the node, or middleware)
- Some of these events can cause SDC
- ALL of these events are based on memory access patterns, usage

What Kind of ECC Is There? What Do We Use?

■ TERMS:

- Correct – found an error, fixed it, reports it to the system, the correct data is returned to you (small performance impact).
- Detect – found an error, you can't have the correct data – we don't know what it is, today usually this crashes the system, next gen systems this will likely just kill the associated application
- Silent Data Corruption (SDC) – we don't know these rates, highly application dependent, requires an application that can self-check

■ Parity – can tell if 1 bit changes, cannot correct

■ SECCDED (Single Error Correct, Double Error Detect)

■ DECCDED (Double Error Correct, Triple Error Detect)

■ Chipkill:

- Single-chipkill detect (“x4”)
- Single-chipkill correct, double-chipkill detect (“x8”)
- Double chip sparing
- Double-chipkill correct

Cielo SRAM,
Varies by Structure

Cielo DRAM Sometimes

Cielo DRAM Usually