

Exploring Fully Offloaded GPU Stream-Aware Message Passing

Naveen Namashivayam
naveen.ravi@hpe.com
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
USA

Krishna Kandalla
krishnachaitanya.kandalla@hpe.com
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
USA

James B White III
trey.white@hpe.com
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
USA

Larry Kaplan
larry.kaplan@hpe.com
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
USA

Mark Pagel
mark.pagel@hpe.com
Hewlett Packard Enterprise
USA

ABSTRACT

Modern heterogeneous supercomputing systems are comprised of CPUs, GPUs, and high-speed network interconnects. Communication libraries supporting efficient data transfers involving memory buffers from the GPU memory typically require the CPU to orchestrate the data transfer operations. A new offload-friendly communication strategy, *stream-triggered (ST) communication*, was explored to allow offloading the synchronization and data movement operations from the CPU to the GPU. A Message Passing Interface (MPI) one-sided active target synchronization based implementation was used as an exemplar to illustrate the proposed strategy. A latency-sensitive nearest-neighbor microbenchmark was used to explore the various performance aspects of the implementation. The offloaded implementation shows significant on-node performance advantages over standard MPI active RMA (36%) and point-to-point (61%) communication. The current multi-node improvement is less (23% faster than standard active RMA but 11% slower than point-to-point), but plans are in progress to pursue further improvements.

1 INTRODUCTION

To accommodate modern heterogeneous supercomputing systems comprised of CPUs and GPUs [16, 28, 36, 45], current-generation scientific applications and systems-software stacks use *GPU-aware* communication libraries [50]. GPU-aware libraries support performing inter-process communication operations involving GPU buffers without having to stage them through a CPU-attached memory. Remote direct memory access (RDMA) [43, 49] and vendor-specific peer-to-peer [38, 44] data transfer mechanisms are used to implement GPU-aware inter-node and intra-node data movement operations.

Even with GPU-awareness in the communication stack, CPU threads are still required to orchestrate data-moving communication and inter-process synchronization operations. Figure 1 demonstrates this issue using a typical GPU-aware parallel application based on the Message Passing Interface (MPI) [22] as an example for the inter-process communication.

An MPI process running on the CPU launches a device kernel (K1) and waits for its execution to complete. **a** It synchronizes with the local GPU to ensure completion of compute kernel (K1). Next, the CPU **b** launches and **c** waits for completion of the inter-process communication operation involving application GPU buffers previously updated by the kernel (K1). To reuse GPU buffers on subsequent compute kernel (K2), **d** K2 is launched only after the inter-process communication operations have completed.

This results in all communication and synchronization operations occurring at GPU kernel boundaries, and creates potentially expensive synchronization points that require the CPU to synchronize with the GPU and Network Interface Controller (NIC) devices.

A communication strategy called *stream-triggered (ST) communication* is explored in this work. Along with managing compute kernels defined by the application, the proposed ST solution allows the GPU to coordinate with the NIC to manage MPI communication operations. This design goal avoids using the CPU cycles to orchestrate and drive the MPI communication operations. This eliminates any potential synchronization points between an application process and its GPU device.

1.1 Contributions of This Work

The following are the major contributions of this work.

- (1) Propose a new communication strategy to fully offload the communication control paths from the CPU to the GPU;
- (2) Use an MPI one-sided active-target-synchronization [32] based solution to demonstrate the proposed strategy;
- (3) Implement the proposed strategy on a modern NIC, **HPE Slingshot NIC** [1, 7, 18], exploiting the supported *triggered operations* feature [13, 42];
- (4) Discuss various implementation design options to fully offload the communication control path to the GPU; and
- (5) Analyze the performance of the proposed ST strategy using a latency-sensitive microbenchmark kernel called *Faces*, inspired by the nearest-neighbor communication pattern from the CORAL-2 [3, 28] *Nekbone benchmark* [6].

2 PROPOSED COMMUNICATION SCHEME

Communication operations in GPU-aware applications are typically comprised of *data paths* and *control paths*. Data paths refer to those operations that involve moving data between the CPU-attached and the GPU-attached memory regions. These data movement operations can occur within the same compute node or between different compute nodes across a high-speed network. Control paths correspond to coordination operations that occur between (1) the application process running on the CPU, (2) application compute kernels running on the GPU, and (3) the network interface controller (NIC). The proposed ST strategy enables a GPU-aware application to offload the control paths to underlying implementation and hardware components.




Figure 1: Events on a typical GPU-aware application.

2.1 GPU Streams

A GPU stream [2] is a queue of device operations. GPU compute kernel concurrency is achieved by creating multiple concurrent streams. Operations issued on a stream typically run asynchronously with respect to the CPU and operations enqueued in other GPU streams. Operations in a given stream are guaranteed to be executed in FIFO order. In this work, the GPU component that provides these execution guarantees to schedule and control the execution of the enqueued operation is referred to as the *GPU Stream Execution Controller (GPU SEC)*. Depending on the GPU vendor, GPU SEC can be a software, hardware, or kernel component associated with the GPU.

2.2 Stream-Triggered Communication

A parallel application using the ST strategy continues to manage compute kernels on the GPU via existing mechanisms. In addition, the new strategy allows an application process running on the CPU to define a set of ST communication operations. These communication operations can be scheduled for execution at a later point in time. More importantly, in addition to offering a deferred execution model, ST enables the GPU to be closely involved in the control paths of the MPI communication operations.

Figure 2 illustrates a sequence of events involved in a parallel application using MPI-based ST inter-process communication and synchronization operations. An application process running on the CPU enqueues (a) GPU kernel K1 to the GPU stream, (b) triggered ST-based MPI operations to the NIC, (c) the corresponding trigger event to the GPU stream, and (d) GPU kernel K2 to the same stream. The CPU returns immediately after the operations are enqueued and is not blocked on the completion of the enqueued operations. It is the GPU SEC responsibility to (1) launch K1 and (2) wait for its completion. Once K1 completes, (3) GPU SEC triggers the execution of MPI operations and (4) waits for these operations to finish. Next, (5) the GPU SEC launches K2.

With the proposed solution, an application process running on the CPU enqueues operations to the NIC command queue and the GPU stream, but does not get directly involved in the control paths of MPI communication operations, subsequent kernel launch, and




Figure 2: Events on a GPU-aware application using ST.

tear-down operations. The CPU does not directly wait for MPI communication operations to complete. The GPU manages the control paths and eliminates potential synchronization points in the application.

3 TRIGGERED OPERATIONS BACKGROUND

This section describes the core components required in implementing GPU ST communications. Triggered operations [13, 15, 30, 42, 48] originally introduced in QsNet [41] and Portals [24] are currently supported in several modern network interconnects like **HPE Slingshot** [1, 7, 18]. This feature allows the application process from the software layer like MPI to enqueue NIC command descriptors ahead of time in the NIC command queue. Unlike regular NIC command descriptors, triggered operations offer deferred execution semantics, where the execution of these operations can be triggered at a later point in time. A modern HPC interconnect with support for triggered operations is used to implement and explore the proposed ST scheme. This hardware feature from the NIC is exposed to MPI through network middleware libraries like Libfabric [10, 26].

3.1 Trigger Events

This section describes the events required to trigger execution of an enqueued triggered operation from the GPU. The NIC command descriptor for the triggered operations takes three parameters [10] - *trigger counter*, *completion counter*, and *trigger threshold value*. Following are the options available to trigger the execution of an enqueued triggered operation.

- (1) Update the associated trigger counter to a previously defined threshold value; or
- (2) Associate a NIC counter with a Memory Mapped I/O (MMIO) register. When a *local store operation* is performed to this MMIO register, it increments the register value. When the value reaches a previously defined threshold, it triggers the execution of the enqueued operation.

For ST, a GPU triggers the execution of these NIC descriptors through the execution of a GPU kernel. The GPU kernel does not have access to the NIC HW counters; instead it performs a store to the MMIO register to trigger the execution of the enqueued operation. Figure 3 represents a sequence of events involved in offloading the trigger event to the GPU SEC, and the GPU SEC launching the GPU kernel to update the MMIO register associated with an enqueued triggered operation.




Figure 3: Trigger event interaction with GPU stream.

3.2 Completion Events

Completions of the executed triggered operations are identified by polling the associated completion counters from the NIC command descriptors. Section 3.1 describes using a lightweight MMIO register update to increment the trigger counter and execute the enqueued triggered operations from the GPU. There are no such options available for the GPU to directly poll for completions on the NIC counters. Instead, a triggered *chaining logic* is used to monitor completions.

In the chaining approach, an enqueued triggered operation used for payload data transfer is chained with an another triggered operation as a signaling update. The signaling triggered operations are triggered atomic increments updating a local GPU memory buffer. Chaining is performed by using the completion counter specified in the payload’s NIC command descriptor as a trigger counter for the signal’s NIC command descriptor. With this mapping, completion of a payload triggered operation will automatically trigger the execution of the signal. Figure 4 describes using an enqueued GPU kernel to wait for a signal increment update on a GPU buffer from executing a signal triggered operation chained with the payload triggered operation.

4 STREAM-TRIGGERED COMMUNICATION

This section introduces an MPI active-RMA-based solution to support ST with the following semantic goals.

4.0.1 Support for Automatic Progress. ST operations are enqueued by the CPU into the respective execution queues and return immediately. All enqueued operations are expected to guarantee automatic progress without blocking the CPU on the execution of the enqueued operations.




Figure 4: Completion event interaction with GPU stream.

4.0.2 Support for Non-blocking Communication. All ST operations support non-blocking semantics, but these semantics are different from traditional MPI non-blocking semantics. In the traditional non-blocking operation, return from the operation restricts any further updates to the memory buffers associated with the operation. Any updates to the associated buffers can result in undefined behavior. In ST, while the CPU is restricted from accessing the associated buffers, the GPU is free to make any updates until the execution of the trigger event by the GPU SEC.

4.0.3 Support for Aggregated Communication. Hardware resources used to offload ST operations (like the NIC counters) are limited. While different implementation design options are used to efficiently manage these resources, it is critical for the proposed solution to effectively support them. Aggregation allows multiple ST operations to be batched and use fewer resources for offloading communications.

The proposed MPI active-RMA-based solution provides support for all the above detailed expected semantics. Description of the proposal is provided below.

4.1 MPI RMA Overview

The MPI RMA communication model supports using (1) window creation for exposing remote accessible memory locations, (2) one-sided data movement operations, and (3) synchronization operations. Figure 5 represents the timeline of window creation, calls to RMA data movement, and synchronization operations.

- (1) Creation of *MPI_Win* establishes a memory window.
- (2) Synchronization is required to ensure memory consistency and coherence, as all RMA data movement operations offer non-blocking semantics.
- (3) RMA epochs are defined as the execution span within synchronization operations. The specific calls used for synchronization depend on whether the active or passive target synchronization model is being used. MPI RMA data movement operations are performed within an epoch.
- (4) Calls to *MPI_Put*, *MPI_Get*, and *MPI_Accumulate* RMA data movement operations must be contained within an epoch. Multiple data transfers can occur within the same epoch, amortizing the performance cost of synchronization operations.




Figure 5: Typical MPI window timeline.

4.2 MPI Active RMA Overview

In the active target synchronization paradigm, both the origin and target processes are actively involved in the synchronization operations. An RMA synchronization operation at the target process starts the *exposure epoch* that allows the origin processes to start accessing the memory window. A synchronization operation at the origin process starts the *access epoch* that allows it to issue data movement operations on the remotely accessible memory window.

Figure 6 demonstrates MPI active RMA by one origin and one target process using *MPI_Win_post*, *MPI_Win_start*, *MPI_Win_complete*, and *MPI_Win_wait* operations. Initially a remotely accessible memory window on all participating processes in the MPI communicator is created using *MPI_Win_create* operation. With the *MPI_Win* object created, Figure 6 represents the the exposure and access epochs, and the multiple one-sided data transfer operations performed within them.




Figure 6: MPI active RMA using post-wait-start-complete.

Availability of the exposure epoch on the target process, and the intent to close the access epoch on the origin process are performed by sending signals internally in the MPI runtime. *MPI_Win_post* generates signals on opening the exposure epoch, and the *MPI_Win_start* waits for these signals to arrive. Similarly, *MPI_Win_complete* initiates signals after completing all data transfer operations, and *MPI_Win_wait* waits for the arrival of all these completion signals.

4.3 Motivation for Active RMA Usage

Multiple API options were considered for introducing GPU stream-awareness in MPI. Apart from providing support for the expected

semantics from Sections 4.0.1- 4.0.3, MPI active RMA operations support the following semantics that motivates using the active RMA communication model for introducing GPU Stream-awareness.

RMA data movement operations in general *do not* use message matching [14, 20, 21, 25, 31, 46, 47] semantics for message ordering as supported by traditional MPI point-to-point (P2P) communication operations. This is critical for offloading the intra-node ST operations into the GPU kernel. Implementing message matching semantics for intra-node operations requires using a progress thread to emulate the required deferred execution ST semantics. Using an RMA based communication model eliminates this implementation difficulty.

While both active and passive RMA models support the necessary semantics, the ease of application conversion using the existing MPI P2P communication is another major reason for active RMA selection. Figure 7 shows the similarities in the semantics for MPI active RMA with the traditional MPI P2P operations. As shown in Figure 7, most MPI P2P operations have an equivalent matching operation in active RMA. With many GPU aware applications using MPI P2P operations, providing support for GPU stream-awareness through MPI active RMA allows the application programmers to port to the new proposed APIs.




Figure 7: Comparing MPI P2P and MPI active RMA.

4.4 GPU Stream-Triggered Active RMA

GPU stream-awareness in active RMA is proposed by introducing new MPI operations. Summary of the new proposed operations is provided below.

- (1) *MPIX_Win_post_stream*, *MPIX_Win_complete_stream*, and *MPIX_Win_wait_stream* take a GPU stream argument as input and replace existing *MPI_Win_post*, *MPI_Win_complete*, and *MPI_Win_wait* active RMA operations.
- (2) Proposed GPU stream aware operations are used to enqueue (a) the signals internally used by the runtime to create and manage the epochs, and (b) the data transfer operations into the GPU and NIC execution queue. An application process returns immediately after enqueueing operations.
- (3) Proposed operations allow offloading both signals and data transfers from the application host process to the GPU. These operations are non-blocking with respect to the application host process.

Along with managing compute kernels defined by the application, the proposed ST scheme enables the GPU to coordinate with the NIC in managing the control paths of MPI operations.

4.5 Stream-Triggered Active RMA Usage Model

Figure 8 represents the sequence of operations supported by the ST active RMA. From the application process perspective, all synchronization (post-start-complete-wait) and data transfer operations are non-blocking.

- (1) *MPIX_Win_post_stream* enqueues signals and returns immediately. Once returned from the operation, the application process is free to execute other operations. All enqueued signals are executed in-order by the GPU stream.
- (2) *MPIX_MODE_STREAM* is a new RMA execution mode introduced as part of the proposed change. Using this mode with *MPI_Win_start* notifies the MPI runtime that subsequent data movement operations executed, like the *MPI_Put* as shown in Figure 8, at the origin process are GPU stream-aware. These data movement operations are just enqueued and not executed immediately by the host process.
- (3) *MPIX_Win_complete_stream* enqueues both trigger events and completion signals for previously enqueued payload data transfer operations.
- (4) *MPIX_Win_wait_stream* enqueues GPU wait kernels. The GPU wait kernels poll for the completion signal updates from the origin process. The host process enqueues the GPU wait kernels and returns immediately.




Figure 8: MPI ST active RMA usage model.

Overall from the application host process perspective, the proposed ST active RMA solution enqueues signals and data transfer events to the GPU and the NIC execution stream, and returns immediately. And the control path of the operations is offloaded into the GPU. This property satisfies the major design goal for minimizing the need for the CPU cycles to drive the control paths of the MPI communication operations.

4.6 Stream-Triggered Active RMA Example

Figure 9 provides a simple example to describe the functionality of the proposed ST active RMA operations and compares them to regular active RMA operations. In this example, the window and

group creation operations are not shown. Instead, only the core communication and synchronization operations are discussed.

Every process in the example acts both as an origin and as a target. Each process writes into the remote accessible target memory location on its left and right ranks, and expects updates from its left and right ranks. As shown in Figure 9a, each process opens its exposure epoch using *MPI_Win_post*. This is followed by a kernel launch of *increment* to update the memory location that the process is preparing to transfer to its left and right neighbors. Before using the *src* buffer for any further RMA operation (like *MPI_Put*) by opening an access epoch using *MPI_Win_start*, the application process is required to synchronize with the GPU stream to guarantee the availability of the *src* buffer. *hipStreamSynchronize* is used for synchronization and has non-negligible performance cost.

MPI_Win_complete ensures the completion of all posted RMA operations in the access epoch. *MPI_Win_wait* is used to wait for the closure signal from the access epoch to close its exposure epoch. With the exposure epoch closed, all received data from its left and right neighbors are accessed using *compare* kernels.

The example in Figure 9a shows multiple iterations. A call to synchronize with the GPU stream using *hipStreamSynchronize* is required to ensure the completion of all operations before proceeding to the next iteration. Synchronizing the application process with the GPU kernel has non-negligible performance costs. Two synchronization calls are required:

- (1) To validate the availability of the *src* buffers updated by the *increment* GPU kernel for data transfer operations in the access epoch, and
- (2) To validate the completion of the verification GPU kernel *compare* and reuse the received buffer for next iteration.

Figure 9b shows the ST variant of the example shown in Figure 9a. Since calls to *MPIX_Win_post_stream*, *MPIX_Win_complete_stream*, and *MPIX_Win_wait_stream* are non-blocking with respect to the application process, all operations are enqueued to the required execution queues, and the application host process returns without being blocked on the completion of execution of the enqueued operations. Implicit in-order execution guarantees by the GPU stream allows enqueueing multiple iterations of the operations without synchronizing the application process with the GPU stream. Usage of a single *hipStreamSynchronize* call at the end of all the iterations is shown in Figure 9b.

The example shown in Figure 9b shows the application process fully offloading the MPI control path to the GPU. Enqueueing multiple iterations of operations into the GPU and synchronizing with the GPU stream at the end of all iterations shows the offloading semantics of the ST active RMA.

5 ST ACTIVE RMA IMPLEMENTATION

This section provides the ST implementation details.

5.1 Inter-node Communication

Inter-node ST active RMA uses the NIC-based triggered operations for implementing the required deferred execution semantics. Triggered operations and associated trigger and completion events were discussed in Section 3.1.

```

for (n = 0 -> niter) {
    MPI_Win_post(group, 0, win);

    increment<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, src);
    hipStreamSynchronize(stream);
    MPI_Win_start(group, 0, win);
    MPI_Put(src, ...left_rank, ..., win);
    MPI_Put(src, ...right_rank, ..., win);
    MPI_Win_complete(win);

    MPI_Win_wait(win);
    compare<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, from_left_rank);
    compare<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, from_right_rank);
    hipStreamSynchronize(stream);
}

```

(a) Baseline MPI program with active RMA communication.

```

for (n = 0 -> niter) {
    MPIX_Win_post_stream(group, 0, win);

    increment<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, src);
    MPI_Win_start(group, 0, win);
    MPI_Put(src, ...left_rank, ..., win);
    MPI_Put(src, ...right_rank, ..., win);
    MPIX_Win_complete_stream(win);

    MPIX_Win_wait_stream(win);
    compare<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, from_left_rank);
    compare<<<nb,nt,0,stream>>>(n, from_right_rank);
    hipStreamSynchronize(stream);
}

```

(b) MPI program with GPU ST active RMA communication.

Figure 9: Compare ST and baseline MPI programs.

5.1.1 **Triggered Operations Usage from Origin Process.** Figure 10 represents the triggered operations usage from the origin process perspective.

- (1) When `MPI_Win_start` is used with `MPIX_MODE_STREAM`, the MPI runtime updates the internal metadata for the MPI window used in the operation to be GPU stream aware. This update gets released only by closing the access epoch using `MPIX_Win_complete_stream`.
- (2) In the example shown in Figure 10, within the access epoch there are three inter-node data transfers using `MPI_Put`. Separate triggered operation descriptors are enqueued per `MPI_Put` to the NIC command queue. The application process returns immediately after the enqueue operations. All the enqueued triggered operations within an access epoch use the same threshold value, same triggering, and same completion counter.
- (3) `MPIX_Win_complete_stream` handles opening the access epoch on the GPU execution stream, enqueues a trigger event for all the previously enqueued triggered data transfers, and signals the target process on the completion of the access epoch.

- Initially a GPU kernel is enqueued into the GPU execution stream and the CPU returns immediately. The GPU kernel polls for the signal update from the target process on the availability of the exposure epoch. All further operations on the GPU stream are blocked, and the only option to successfully exit the kernel execution is the arrival of the signaling updates from the target process.
- A GPU kernel to update the NIC memory mapped I/O register associated with the triggering counter used in all the previously enqueued triggered operations is enqueued.
- New triggered operations are enqueued into the NIC command queue as completion signals to all target processes in the window. The completion counter used in all the previously enqueued triggered operations is now used as a trigger counter for all the signaling triggered operations.




Figure 10: Triggered operations usage from origin process.

5.1.2 **Triggered Operations Usage from Target Process.** Figure 11 represents the triggered operations usage from the target process perspective.

- (1) When the application process calls `MPIX_Win_post_stream` to initiate the start of the exposure epoch, signals are sent to all origin processes in the window. Signals enqueued are triggered inter-node Put operations. Corresponding trigger events used to trigger the enqueued signals are also immediately enqueued into the GPU SEC execution queue.
- (2) The `MPIX_Win_wait_stream` operation enqueues a GPU kernel in the GPU SEC execution queue to wait on the arrival of the completion signals from the origin process. Wait operations are GPU kernels polling on the memory locations expecting a signal update.

Overall, the triggered operations used on both the origin and the target process are stateless. Triggered operations usage shows the option to fully offload the control path of the MPI RMA operations into the GPU. The application process is free to return from all the operations after enqueueing the required triggered operations, and the trigger and wait GPU kernels. As described in Section 2.1, in-order execution of all enqueued operations in the GPU stream is guaranteed by GPU SEC.




Figure 11: Triggered operations usage from target process.

5.2 Triggered Operations Throttling

As described in Section 5.1, all inter-node ST operations are fully offloaded as NIC triggered operations. But NIC triggered operation resources are limited. It is not possible to indefinitely enqueue triggered operations into the NIC. The CPU will eventually be blocked and needs to synchronize with the NIC to recapture the triggered operation resources for re-use. This section describes the different throttling algorithms designed to manage the resources.

5.2.1 Application-Level Throttling. Application-level throttling introduces synchronization points in the application to avoid over-subscription. This is similar to the standard active RMA model without GPU stream-awareness. The application process is synchronized with the GPU stream (using operations like *hipStreamSynchronize*) for every few iterations and waits for all the previous iterations to complete before proceeding further.

Functionally this scheme moves the throttling requirement from the MPI runtime to the application programmer. Though implementable, the practical usability of this approach is limited. It is hard for applications to determine either the synchronization points or the number of triggered operations internally generated by the ST MPI runtime per iteration. The limitations of this approach motivate the need for other throttling algorithms, and this approach is mostly used to introduce the need for throttling in the MPI ST runtime.

5.2.2 Static Throttling. Static throttling converts the sync point described in the application-level throttling into weak sync points within the ST MPI implementation. Instead of using heavy options like *hipStreamSynchronize*, in this scheme the ST implementation uses the CPU to poll for completion of all previously posted triggered operations and determine the availability of triggered operation resources before attempting to enqueue any new operations.

The core semantic of this scheme is to wait for completions of all previously posted operations before enqueueing any new operations. This completion counter evaluation is performed on an epoch basis, instead of every triggered operation. An epoch may consist of multiple triggered operations.

5.2.3 Adaptive Throttling. Adaptive throttling is an incremental update from the static throttling. Similar to the static throttling, this scheme is implemented in the ST implementation and not in the application directly. The main difference is that in adaptive throttling, instead of waiting for the completions of all previously posted operations, triggered resources are recaptured and immediately used as soon as the previous operations are completed. As the name suggests, the adaptive throttling algorithm adapts to the

available number of triggered resources in the NIC and recaptures them for reuse as soon as they are available for ST active RMA usage.

5.3 Intra-node Communication

This section briefly describes the intra-node ST implementation. Three different types of GPU kernels are used to implement the intra-node sequence of events required to implement ST active RMA:

- (1) GPU kernels performing signal updates,
- (2) GPU kernels performing payload data transfers, and
- (3) GPU kernels performing wait operations on the incoming signals.

The three different GPU kernels used are accessing MPI RMA window memory exposed by other MPI ranks using GPU IPC-based [44] transfers. The GPU signaling kernels perform a simple store operation onto the signal buffers on the other MPI ranks' part of the MPI window. Payload transfers perform memory copy operations on the target process memory, which is part of a separate process address space, using IPC communications. The wait kernels are polling on a local memory location expecting signal updates from all ranks.

In brief, the sequence of events for intra-node operations is similar to the inter-node logic described in Section 5.1.1 and Section 5.1.2. The major difference is that all triggered operations from the inter-node design are replaced with the above described GPU kernels, and the kernels are enqueued into the GPU execution stream. All triggered operations for signaling and payload transfers from the inter-node design are replaced with GPU kernels performing signal updates and payload memory copy operations using GPU IPC communication.

Similar to the inter-node design, intra-node ST transfers are also fully offloaded into the GPU, and the implementation is stateless. This intra-node implementation is feasible, as the MPI RMA semantics do not require any message matching [37] based ordering semantics.

5.4 Merged GPU Kernels

If the MPI group used in the synchronization operations consists of multiple MPI ranks, signals must be generated for all the participating processes. Launching a GPU kernel per signaling operation is expensive. As all the GPU kernels are generated either from the operation *MPIX_Win_complete_stream* or *MPIX_Win_post_stream*, it is possible for the MPI runtime to aggregate the launch of all operations as a single merged kernel updating multiple different locations. Similar to using a merged signaling kernel, it is possible to independently merge the wait and memory copy kernels used for intra-node ST operations. Optimized implementations of the above described merged kernels are designed specifically for the ST implementation, and the performance benefits of these kernels are evaluated in Section 6.6.

6 PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

In this section, the Faces microbenchmark is used to evaluate the performance of the prototype ST MPI communication operations.

6.1 Test System

All tests were performed on a system based on a node architecture consisting of AMD CPUs and GPUs. Each node offers a single AMD Milan CPU socket, four MI200 GPU modules, and four HPE Slingshot NICs [1, 7, 18]. Each GPU module consists of two GPU devices (GCDs). Each NIC is attached to a single MI200 module via PCIe Gen4. The MI200 modules are interconnected with 1x or 2x high speed xGMI3 links. A prototype implementation of ST active RMA was used for all experiments, along with ROCm [8], and Libfabric [26] for the GPU and NIC interface.

6.2 Test Case Overview

The Faces microbenchmark is inspired by the nearest-neighbor communication pattern from the CORAL-2 [3] Nekbone [6] benchmark. Faces represents a common communication pattern from multiple user applications. Faces communicates with at most 26 neighbors and transfers the faces, edges, and corners of spectral elements on the surface of the local block. Weak scaling Faces has three nested loops that performs the following: (1) **outer loop** allocates MPI windows, runs loops, and deallocates windows, (2) **middle loop** initializes the values of the spectral elements and runs the inner loop; and (3) **inner loop** runs the communication steps and accumulates the wall-clock runtime. Three different versions of the Faces benchmark are used for this analysis:

- Traditional P2P Faces using MPI P2P communication;
- Active RMA Faces using standard active RMA;
- And, ST Active RMA Faces using the proposed ST features from this work.

6.3 Overall Faces Performance

Results of the single and multi-node runs using the active RMA and ST active RMA variants of the Faces benchmark are reported in Figure 12. The multi-node test uses 64 application processes (or MPI ranks) distributed across eight nodes, with eight ranks per node. On each node, a one-to-one mapping between MPI ranks and GCDs is enforced.

On average the ST active RMA version of the Faces microbenchmark shows **23% better performance** than the active RMA version of the Faces microbenchmark. Figure 12 shows the execution time involved in running the Faces benchmark. The ST active RMA implementation in this test makes use of the optimized merged GPU kernels and optimized adaptive throttling algorithm to fully offload the communication control path into the GPU for all inter-node and intra-node communication operations. This performance improvement validates the expected performance improvements involved with the original design goal in minimizing the need for the application process running on the CPU to drive the control paths of MPI communication operations.

6.4 Impact of Intra-node Operations

Results of Faces using the active RMA and ST active RMA variants within a single node are reported in Figure 12. The reported single-node test uses 8 MPI ranks within a single node. Performance of ST active RMA shows **36% improvement** over the active RMA variant. The ST active RMA implementation in this test makes use of the optimized merged GPU kernels discussed in Section 5.4. No

throttling algorithm is involved, as all communication operations are within a single node. This performance improvement validates the expected performance improvements involved in fully offloading the intra-node communication operations from the application process running on the CPU to the GPU.




Figure 12: Faces multiple and single-node performance analysis.

6.5 Impact of Throttling Triggered Operations

Section 5.2 describes the different algorithms used to effectively manage the triggered operation communication resources. Figure 13 shows the impact of using different throttling algorithms. In brief, for an 8-node test with 8 MPI processes per node (64 processes total), ST active RMA using adaptive throttling shows the best performance improvement over other throttling options. Using adaptive throttling shows 23% improvement over the active RMA version without GPU stream awareness. While the performance difference between using adaptive and static throttling is not huge, there is a 10% improvement in using adaptive throttling. Adaptive throttling shows 21% improvement over application-level throttling.




Figure 13: Impact of different throttling algorithms.

6.6 Impact of Merged GPU Kernels

The ST active RMA implementation used for reporting the performance in Figure 12 employs merged GPU kernels, as discussed in Section 5.4. This section describes the impact of using merged GPU kernels in the implementation. 8 nodes with 8 MPI processes per node, and 1 node with 8 MPI processes per node are both used for this analysis.

Using independent GPU kernels introduces expensive launch and cleanup cost. Using merged GPU kernels minimizes the number of launched GPU kernels and with that the performance cost of the ST active RMA operations. Performance results from Figure 14 show the need for using merged GPU kernels in the ST implementation. Using merged kernel shows around 90% and 2X improvement over launching independent kernels across multiple nodes and within a single node, respectively.




Figure 14: Impact of using merged GPU kernels.

6.7 Impact of Overlapping Compute Kernels

Faces can test the overlap of MPI communication with independent local computation, in the form of a separate compute kernel launched on an independent GPU stream. This section details the impact of adding a compute kernel in the Faces microbenchmark. A configuration with 8 nodes and 8 MPI processes per node is used for this test. From Figure 15, the ST active RMA implemen-




Figure 15: Impact on using overlapping compute kernels.

tation with an overlapping compute kernel shows at most only a 3% performance improvement over the active RMA variant of the benchmark without GPU stream awareness. With changing the version of the ROCm library used, the performance is hit by 8%. This is significantly different from the performance behavior with just the communication operations as discussed in Section 6.3.

This significant change in performance and the variations of the performance behavior with changing the ROCm library version is not fully studied.

6.8 Relative Comparison with Traditional P2P

In this section, performance data from the traditional P2P variant of the Faces microbenchmark is compared against the active RMA and ST variants. Figure 16 shows performance results for runs within a single node with 8 MPI ranks per node. Performance of active RMA is 19% better than the traditional P2P implementation. On top of the performance improvement in using the active RMA, introducing GPU stream-awareness using the ST active RMA operations improves the performance by 36%. ST thus shows 61% improvement over the traditional P2P variant of the Faces benchmark.

On the multi-node distribution, this test uses 64 MPI ranks distributed across 8 nodes, with 8 ranks per node. On each node, a one-to-one mapping between MPI ranks and GCDs is enforced. Figure 17 shows the results of the analysis. In brief, the traditional P2P variant of the benchmark performs 27% and 11% better than the active RMA and ST active RMA variants of the benchmark, respectively. This performance behavior is significantly different from the comparisons shown in Figure 16 within a single node.




Figure 16: Intra-node comparison with traditional P2P.

The performance behavior shown in Figure 17 is not fully understood, and analysis is in progress. Our initial assumption points to the inherent performance characteristics of the triggered communication operations and the usage of triggered put operations for inter-node signaling. Detailed understanding on the performance characteristics of the triggered operations is in progress, and usage of other forms of signaling is being considered.




Figure 17: Multi-node comparison with traditional P2P.

6.9 Overall Performance Inference

Performance analysis from Section 6.3 shows the potential benefit of fully offloading the MPI control path into the GPU from the application host process. Both multi-node (23% improvement) and single-node (36% improvement) performance of ST active RMA is significantly better than the active RMA version of the benchmark without GPU stream awareness. Section 6.5 and Section 6.6 show the need for using an effective throttling algorithm as well as merged GPU kernels in the ST active RMA implementation.

While the relative comparison of the active RMA variant of the benchmark with and without GPU stream awareness is used in most of the section, it is established through Section 6.8 that the ST RMA implementation of the Faces benchmark shows either a significant improvement (single node) or an 11% performance hit (multiple nodes) versus the traditional P2P communication model. Options for improving the multi-node performance of the ST active RMA variant against the traditional P2P variant of the benchmark are being analyzed.

Overall, the major design goal of fully offloading the MPI control path into the GPU is realized using the proposed ST active RMA communication scheme. The performance results from analyzing the Faces microbenchmark show both the benefits as well as the issues with the current implementation.

The Comb [37] communication microbenchmark was also ported to standard MPI active RMA and ST active RMA, and the performance results were similar. For brevity those results are not included.

7 OTHER PROPOSAL CONSIDERATIONS

While the proposed ST solution uses MPI active RMA, multiple other alternatives were considered.

(1) Traditional P2P communication

- As described by Namashivayam et al. [39], implementing MPI message matching semantics [14, 20, 21, 25, 31, 46, 47] for intra-node communication operations is not as simple as the design from Section 5.3. A progress thread is required to emulate the deferred execution semantics for intra-node operations.
- Traditional P2P semantics do not enable aggregation, while aggregation is straightforward during RMA operation (*MPIX_Win_complete_stream*). API changes are required to support aggregation for P2P.
- As an initial design, a P2P-based ST solution was evaluated [39]. For brevity, results of this effort are not included as part of this work. In brief, the ST with P2P solution showed limited performance improvements on use cases where only inter-node data transfers were involved, and only by using ST for just the send side. Using a progress thread to emulate the deferred execution semantics for use cases with intra-node transfers negated any potential performance benefits.

(2) Persistent P2P communication [29, 35] allows aggregation, but it has similar implementation limitations for intra-node transfers as the traditional P2P interfaces.

(3) Partitioned communication [19, 23] may have promise for pipelining communication to individual targets through

triggering the operations from within a GPU kernel, but it provides no advantage for aggregating multiple messages to different neighbors.

- (4) **One-sided Passive RMA communication** [33] avoids tag matching and has potential benefits similar to the proposed solution. But the passive semantics make aggregation difficult, and the global fences make efficient synchronization difficult for nearest-neighbor communication use cases as discussed in Section 6.2.

8 RELATED WORK

There is limited research performed on exploring options for introducing GPU stream-awareness into message-passing programming models with deferred execution semantics [13]. Most known works involve using a progress thread for implementation [51]. To the authors' knowledge, this work describes the first GPU-aware MPI implementation to offload all control and data operations for both intra-node and inter-node communication from the CPU to the GPU and NIC, allowing the CPU to proceed asynchronously without any progress threads.

Agostini et al. [12] explores the basic building blocks required for offloading communication control logic in GPU accelerated applications into the GPU device. [12] explores hardware offload capabilities using NVIDIA GPUDirect Async [5, 11] and InfiniBand Connect-IB network adapters [9].

Oden et al. [40] and Daoud et al. [17] explore the possibilities of GPUs handling the communication and control paths by hosting the Verbs layer [9] in the GPU. Similarly, Hsu et al. [34] and Hamidouche and LeBeane [27] explore the options to host communication on the GPU using the OpenSHMEM programming model [4]. This research [17, 27, 34, 40] is mostly done using the NVIDIA Infiniband Host Channel Adapter.

9 CONCLUSION

In this work, a new strategy uses *stream-triggered communication* to introduce GPU stream-awareness in MPI without the need for CPU progress threads. The proposed strategy extends MPI active target synchronization to allow an application to offload both the *control* and *data* paths to the underlying implementation and hardware components, and it avoids CPU-GPU synchronization at the GPU compute kernel boundaries.

Description of the proposed implementation shows the ability to fully offload the communication control path from the CPU to GPU. Performance analysis using the Faces microbenchmark kernel shows 23-36% improvement in performance over the MPI active RMA communication model without GPU stream awareness. Benefits in selecting an optimized throttling algorithm to manage triggered operation resources and using merged GPU kernel strategies are also discussed. Overall the performance results reflect the performance improvements on applications with near-neighbor communication models like Faces for the latency-bound regime of small messages.

While ST active RMA shows the expected performance improvements for intra-node communication, inter-node performance does

not show the expected advantages over standard MPI P2P communication. Future work will investigate this performance shortfall and endeavor to improve it.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n. d.]. HPE Slingshot Interconnect. <https://www.hpe.com/in/en/compute/hpe/slingshot-interconnect.html>.
- [2] 2013. NVIDIA CUDA C/C++ Streams and Concurrency. <http://on-demand.gputechconf.com/gtc-express/2011/presentations/StreamsAndConcurrencyWebinar.pdf>.
- [3] 2017. CORAL-2 Benchmarks Summary. <https://asc.llnl.gov/coral-2-benchmarks>.
- [4] 2017. OpenSHMEM standard version-1.4. http://openshmem.org/site/sites/default/site_files/OpenSHMEM-1.4.pdf.
- [5] 2020. NVIDIA GPUDirect libgdsync. <https://github.com/gpudirect/libgdsync>.
- [6] 2022. CORAL-2 Benchmarks Summary - Nekbone. https://asc.llnl.gov/sites/asc/files/2020-06/Nekbone_Summary_v2.3.4.1.pdf.
- [7] 2022. Cray's Slingshot Interconnect is at the Heart of HPE's HPC and AI Ambitions. <https://tinyurl.com/22rt7utz>.
- [8] 2023. AMD ROCr-RunTime Manpage and Guide. https://rocmdocs.amd.com/en/latest/Installation_Guide/ROCr-RunTime.html.
- [9] 2023. IB Verbs RDMA programming guide. <https://docs.nvidia.com/networking/display/RDMAAwareProgrammingv17/RDMA+Aware+Networks+Programming+User+Manual+v1.7>.
- [10] 2023. Libfabric Deferred Work Queue. https://ofiwg.github.io/libfabric/v1.9.1/man/ft_trigger.3.html.
- [11] 2023. NVIDIA GPUDirect family. <https://developer.nvidia.com/gpudirect>.
- [12] Elena Agostini, Davide Rossetti, and Sreeram Potluri. 2017. Offloading Communication Control Logic in GPU Accelerated Applications. In *2017 17th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGRID)*. 248–257. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CCGRID.2017.29>
- [13] Brian W. Barrett, Ron Brightwell, K. Scott Hemmert, Kyle B. Wheeler, and Keith D. Underwood. 2011. Using Triggered Operations to Offload Rendezvous Messages. In *Proceedings of the 18th European MPI Users' Group Conference on Recent Advances in the Message Passing Interface (EuroMPI'11)*.
- [14] Mohammadreza Bayatpour, Hari Subramoni, Sourav Chakraborty, and Dhaleswar Kumar Panda. 2016. Adaptive and Dynamic Design for MPI Tag Matching. *2016 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing (CLUSTER)* (2016), 1–10.
- [15] Jon Beecroft, David Addison, Fabrizio Petrini, and Moray McLaren. 2004. QsNet II : An Interconnect for Supercomputing Applications *.
- [16] J. P. Dahm, D. F. Richards, A. Black, A. D. Bertsch, L. Grinberg, I. Karlin, S. Kokkila-Schumacher, E. A. León, J. R. Neely, R. Pankajakshan, and O. Pearce. 2020. Sierra Center of Excellence: Lessons learned. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* (2020).
- [17] Feras Daoud, Amir Watad, and Mark Silberstein. 2016. GPUrdma: GPU-Side Library for High Performance Networking from GPU Kernels. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Workshop on Runtime and Operating Systems for Supercomputers* (Kyoto, Japan) (ROSS '16). Association for Computing Machinery, Article 6, 8 pages.
- [18] Daniele De Sensi, Salvatore Di Girolamo, Kim H. McMahon, Duncan Roweth, and Torsten Hoefer. 2020. An In-Depth Analysis of the Slingshot Interconnect. In *SC20: International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*.
- [19] Matthew G.F. Dosanjh, Andrew Worley, Derek Schafer, Prema Soundararajan, Sheikh Ghaffor, Anthony Skjellum, Purushotham V. Bangalore, and Ryan E. Grant. 2021. Implementation and evaluation of MPI 4.0 partitioned communication libraries. *Parallel Comput.* (2021).
- [20] Kurt Ferreira, Ryan E. Grant, Michael J. Levenhagen, Scott Levy, and Taylor Groves. 2019. Hardware MPI message matching: Insights into MPI matching behavior to inform design: Hardware MPI message matching. *Concurrency and Computation. Practice and Experience* 32 (2019).
- [21] Mario Flajslik, James Dinan, and Keith D. Underwood. 2016. Mitigating MPI Message Matching Misery. In *Information Security Conference*.
- [22] Message Passing Forum. 1994. *MPI: A Message-Passing Interface Standard*. Technical Report.
- [23] Ryan E Grant, Matthew GF Dosanjh, Michael J Levenhagen, Ron Brightwell, and Anthony Skjellum. 2019. Finepoints: Partitioned multithreaded MPI communication. In *High Performance Computing: 34th International Conference, ISC High Performance 2019*.
- [24] David S. Greenberg, Ron Brightwell, Lee Ann Fisk, Arthur Maccabe, and Rolf Riesen. [n. d.]. A System Software Architecture for High-End Computing. In *Proceedings of the 1997 ACM/IEEE Conference on Supercomputing* (San Jose, CA) (SC '97). 1–15.
- [25] Taylor Groves, Naveen Ravichandrasekaran, Brandon Cook, Noel Keen, David Trebotich, Nicholas J. Wright, Bob Alverson, Duncan Roweth, and Keith Underwood. 2021. Not all applications have boring communication patterns: Profiling message matching with BMM. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* (jun 2021). <https://doi.org/10.1002%2Fcpce.6380>
- [26] P. Grun, S. Hefty, S. Sur, D. Goodell, R. D. Russell, H. Pritchard, and J. M. Squyres. 2015. A Brief Introduction to the OpenFabrics Interfaces - A New Network API for Maximizing High Performance Application Efficiency.
- [27] Khaled Hamidouche and Michael LeBeane. 2020. *GPU INitiated OPenSHMEM: Correct and Efficient Intra-Kernel Networking for DGPUs*. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [28] William Hanson. 2019. The CORAL supercomputer systems. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* (2019).
- [29] Masayuki Hatanaka, Atsushi Hori, and Yutaka Ishikawa. 2013. Optimization of MPI Persistent Communication. In *Proceedings of the 20th European MPI Users' Group Meeting (EuroMPI '13)*.
- [30] K. Scott Hemmert, Brian Barrett, and Keith D. Underwood. 2010. Using Triggered Operations to Offload Collective Communication Operations. In *Proceedings of the 17th European MPI Users' Group Meeting Conference on Recent Advances in the Message Passing Interface* (Stuttgart, Germany) (EuroMPI'10). 249–256.
- [31] K. Scott Hemmert, Keith D. Underwood, and Arun Rodrigues. 2007. An architecture to perform NIC based MPI matching. In *2007 IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CLUSTER.2007.4629234>
- [32] Torsten Hoefer, James Dinan, Rajeev Thakur, Brian Barrett, Pavan Balaji, William Gropp, and Keith Underwood. 2015. Remote Memory Access Programming in MPI-3. *ACM Trans. Parallel Comput.* 2, 2 (June 2015), 9:1–9:26. <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2780584>
- [33] Torsten Hoefer, James Dinan, Rajeev Thakur, Brian Barrett, Pavan Balaji, William Gropp, and Keith Underwood. 2015. Remote Memory Access Programming in MPI-3. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing* (2015).
- [34] Chung-Hsing Hsu, Neena Imam, Akhil Langer, Sreeram Potluri, and Chris J. Newburn. 2020. An Initial Assessment of NVSHMEM for High Performance Computing. In *2020 IEEE International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops (IPDPSW)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPSW50202.2020.00104>
- [35] Yutaka Ishikawa, Kengo Nakajima, and Atsushi Hori. 2012. Revisiting Persistent Communication in MPI. In *Proceedings of the 19th European Conference on Recent Advances in the Message Passing Interface (EuroMPI'12)*.
- [36] Verónica G. Vergara Larrea, Wayne Joubert, Michael J. Brim, Reuben D. Budiardja, Don E. Maxwell, Matthew A. Ezell, Christopher Zimmer, Swen Boehm, Wael R. Elwasif, Sarp H. Oral, Christopher Fuson, Daniel Pelfrey, Oscar R. Hernandez, Dustin Leverman, Jesse Hanley, Mark A. Berrill, and Arnold N. Tharrington. 2019. Scaling the Summit: Deploying the World's Fastest Supercomputer. In *ISC Workshops*.
- [37] W. Lawry, C. Wilson, A.B. Maccabe, and R. Brightwell. 2002. COMB: a portable benchmark suite for assessing MPI overlap. In *Proceedings. IEEE International Conference on Cluster Computing*.
- [38] K. V. Manian, A. A. Ammar, A. Ruhela, C.-H. Chu, H. Subramoni, and D. K. Panda. 2019. Characterizing CUDA Unified Memory (UM)-Aware MPI Designs on Modern GPU Architectures. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on General Purpose Processing Using GPUs (GPGPU '19)*.
- [39] Naveen Namashivayam, Krishna Kandalla, Trey White, Nick Radcliffe, Larry Kaplan, and Mark Pagel. 2022. Exploring GPU Stream-Aware Message Passing using Triggered Operations. [arXiv:2208.04817](https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.04817)
- [40] Lena Oden, Holger Fröning, and Franz-Joseph Pfreundt. 2014. Infiniband-Verbs on GPU: A Case Study of Controlling an Infiniband Network Device from the GPU. In *2014 IEEE International Parallel Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IPDPSW.2014.111>
- [41] Fabrizio Petrini, Wu chun Feng, Adolfo Hoisie, Salvador Coll, and E. Frachtenberg. 2002. The Quadrics Network: High-Performance Clustering Technology. *IEEE Micro* (2002).
- [42] F. Petrini, S. Coll, E. Frachtenberg, and A. Hoisie. 2001. Hardware- and software-based collective communication on the Quadrics network. In *Proceedings IEEE International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications. NCA 2001*.
- [43] Sreeram Potluri, Khaled Hamidouche, Akshay Venkatesh, Devendar Bureddy, and Dhaleswar K. Panda. 2013. Efficient Inter-node MPI Communication Using GPUDirect RDMA for InfiniBand Clusters with NVIDIA GPUs. In *2013 42nd International Conference on Parallel Processing*.
- [44] S. Potluri, H. Wang, D. Bureddy, A.K. Singh, C. Rosales, and Dhaleswar K. Panda. 2012. Optimizing MPI Communication on Multi-GPU Systems Using CUDA Inter-Process Communication. In *2012 IEEE 26th International Parallel and Distributed Processing Symposium*.
- [45] David Schneider. 2022. The Exascale Era is Upon Us: The Frontier supercomputer may be the first to reach 1,000,000,000,000,000 operations per second. *IEEE Spectrum* (2022).
- [46] Whit Schonbein, Matthew G. F. Dosanjh, Ryan E. Grant, and Patrick G. Bridges. 2018. Measuring Multithreaded Message Matching Misery. In *European Conference on Parallel Processing*.
- [47] K.D. Underwood and R. Brightwell. 2004. The impact of MPI queue usage on message latency. In *International Conference on Parallel Processing, 2004. ICPP 2004*.

- [48] Keith D. Underwood, Jerrie Coffman, Roy Larsen, K. Scott Hemmert, Brian W. Barrett, Ron Brightwell, and Michael Levenhagen. 2011. Enabling Flexible Collective Communication Offload with Triggered Operations. In *2011 IEEE 19th Annual Symposium on High Performance Interconnects*.
- [49] Hao Wang, Sreeram Potluri, Devendar Bureddy, Carlos Rosales, and Dhabaleswar K. Panda. 2014. GPU-Aware MPI on RDMA-Enabled Clusters: Design, Implementation and Evaluation. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems* 25 (2014).
- [50] Hao Wang, Sreeram Potluri, Miao Luo, Ashish Kumar Singh, Sayantan Sur, and Dhabaleswar K. Panda. 2011. MVAPICH2-GPU: optimized GPU to GPU communication for InfiniBand clusters. *Computer Science - Research and Development* 26 (2011).
- [51] Hui Zhou, Ken Raffanetti, Yanfei Guo, and Rajeev Thakur. 2022. MPIX Stream: An Explicit Solution to Hybrid MPI+ X Programming. In *Proceedings of the 29th European MPI Users' Group Meeting*.