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ABSTRACT
The running times of many computational science applications are much longer than the mean-time-between-failures (MTBF) of current high-performance computing platforms. To run to completion, such applications must tolerate hardware failures.

Checkpoint-and-restart (CPR) is the most commonly used scheme for accomplishing this - the state of the computation is saved periodically on stable storage, and when a hardware failure is detected, the computation is restarted from the most recently saved state. Most automatic CPR schemes in the literature can be classified as system-level checkpointing schemes because they take core-dump style snapshots of the computational state when all the processes are blocked at global barriers in the program. Unfortunately, a system that implements this style of checkpointing is tied to a particular platform and cannot optimize the checkpointing process using application-specific knowledge.

We are exploring an alternative called automatic application-level checkpointing. In our approach, programs are transformed by a pre-processor so that they become self-checkpointing and self-restartable on any platform. In this paper, we evaluate a mechanism that utilizes application knowledge to minimize the amount of information saved in a checkpoint.

1. INTRODUCTION

The high-performance computing community has largely ignored the problem of implementing software systems that can tolerate hardware failures. This is because until recently, most parallel computing was done on relatively reliable big-iron machines whose mean-time-between-failures (MTBF) was much longer than the execution time of most programs. However, many programs are now designed to run for days or months on even the fastest computers, even as the growing size and complexity of parallel computers makes them more prone to hardware failure. Therefore it is becoming imperative for long-running scientific programs to tolerate hardware failures.

The standard technique for accomplishing this is checkpoint-and-restart (CPR for short)\(^1\). Most programmers implement CPR manually by (i) identifying points in the program where the amount of state that needs to be saved is small, (ii) determining what data must be saved at each such point, and (iii) inserting code to save that data on disk and restart the computation after failure. For example, in a protein-folding code using ab initio methods, programmers save the positions and velocities of the bases (and a few variables such as the time step number) at the end of each time step. In effect, the code becomes self-checkpointing and self-restarting, and it is as portable as the original application. Furthermore, if checkpoints are saved in a portable format, the application can be restarted on a platform different from the one on which the checkpoint was taken. To ensure a consistent view of global data structures, this approach of manual application-level checkpointing (ALC) [25] requires global barriers at the points where state is saved. Although barriers are present in parallel programs that are written in a bulk-synchronous manner [10], many other programs such as the HPL benchmark [17] and some of the NAS Parallel Benchmarks [15] do not have global barriers except in their initialization code.

A different approach to CPR, developed by the distributed systems community, is system-level checkpointing (SLC) [14] [7] [23] [18], in which all the bits of the computation are periodically saved on stable storage. For example, the Condor system [14], an industry standard cluster management software that provides checkpointing capabilities for sequential programs on a number of different platforms uses this technique for taking uniprocessor checkpoints. The amount of saved state can be reduced by using incremental state saving. For parallel programs, the problem of taking a system-level checkpoint reduces to the uniprocessor problem if there are global barriers where state can be saved and there are no messages in flight across these barriers. Without global synchronization, it is not obvious when the state of each process should be saved so as to obtain a global snapshot of the parallel computation. One possibility is to use coordination protocols such as the Chandy-Lamport [6] protocol.

The advantage of SLC is that unlike ALC, it requires no effort from the application programmer. A disadvantage of SLC is that it is very machine and OS-specific; for example, the Condor documentation states that “Linux is a difficult platform to support... The Condor team tries to provide support for various releases of the Red Hat distribution of Linux”.

\(^1\)Strictly speaking, CPR provides a solution only for fail-stop faults, a fault model in which failing processors just hang without doing harmful things allowed by more complex Byzantine fault models in which a processor can send erroneous messages or corrupt shared data [13].
[but] we do not provide any guarantees about this." [9]. Furthermore, by definition, system-level checkpoints cannot be restarted on a platform different from the one on which they were created. It is also usually the case that the sizes of system-level checkpoints are larger than those produced by manual application-level checkpointing.

In principle, one could get the best of both worlds with an automatic application-level checkpointing [2] [20] [24] [5] [21]. This requires a precompiler that can automatically transform a parallel program into one that can checkpoint its own state and restart itself from such a checkpoint. Compiler analysis is needed to identify that part of the state of the computation that needs to be saved, and code needs to be inserted to recompute the rest of the state of the computation from that saved state on recovery. To handle programs without global barriers, we need a protocol for coordinating checkpointing by different processes.

Figure 1 is an overview of our approach. The C³ (Cornell Checkpoint [pre] Compiler) [3] [4] [5] [21] reads almost unmodified C, C/MPIf and C/OpenMP source files and instruments them to perform application-level state-saving; the only additional requirement for programmers is that they must insert a `pragma potential_checkpoint` at locations in the application where checkpoints might be taken. At runtime, when the application reaches such a location, a checkpoint will be taken if a runtime condition (such as the expiration of a timer) has been satisfied. The output of this precompiler is compiled with the native compiler on the hardware platform, and linked with a library that constitutes a co-ordination layer for implementing the necessary coordination. This layer sits between the application and the MPI or OpenMP library, and intercepts all calls from the instrumented application program to MPI or OpenMP.

This design permits us to implement the coordination protocol without modifying the underlying MPI or OpenMP library. This promotes modularity and eliminates the need for access to communication library code, which is proprietary on some systems. Furthermore, instrumented programs are self-checkpointing and self-restarting on any platform. The entire runtime system is written in C and uses only a very small set of system calls. Therefore, the C³ system is easily ported among different architectures and operating systems; currently, it has been tested on x86 and PPC Linux, Sparc Solaris, x86 Win32, and Alpha Tru64, as well as MPI and OpenMP implementations from multiple vendors. This facile portability is in contrast to a typical system-level CFR system, which needs to deal with the specifics of machine architectures, operating systems, and compilers.

In this paper, we evaluate a API that utilizes application knowledge to minimize the amount of information saved in a checkpoint. We expect that a compiler analysis [12] [1] [19] can be used to automate the usage of this API, enabling ALC approaches to offer performance superior to that of SLC systems.

2. CHECKPOINTING OVERHEADS

When evaluating the performance of an automated ALC technique, it is important to examine whether the transformations performed by the ALC compiler noticeably affect the running time of the application. This overhead may come from the new code that is inserted and/or the negative effect that the transformations may have on the native compiler’s ability to optimize the application. In order to evaluate this we ran several benchmarks in multiple configurations:

- Original Application
- Original Application using SLC, no checkpoints taken
- Original Application transformed via C³, no checkpoints taken.

We ran experiments comparing C³ with Condor. This comparison was performed using art, equake, mcf and cpr from the SPEC [22] suite of benchmarks and mg from the NAS OpenMP³ C suite [16] on a P4 Linux machine with a networked disk. The comparison is shown in Figure 2.

From these numbers we can see two things. First, Condor has minimal overhead when no checkpoints are being taken. This is hardly surprising since during checkpoint-free execution it needs to do little more than load up some checkpointing library code and provide hooks into the application that can be used during checkpointing. The more interesting result is the very low overhead resulting from C³’s code transformations (in order, it was approximately 0%, 1.5%, 0%, 2.5%, 1.5%).

Having established that C³’s transformations introduce minimal overhead, we need to examine the cost of taking checkpoints using C³ vs using SLC solutions. Figure 3 shows the running time of applications that take 5 checkpoints using Condor vs their running time when they take 5 checkpoints using C³. For the purposes of making this a fair comparison, we have written a library that limits Condor to taking checkpoints at the same potential checkpoint locations used by C³.

Once again we see little difference between C³ and Condor. Both take approximately the same amount of time to take the same number of checkpoints, meaning that the overhead of using C³ or Condor in a real application would be the same for any given checkpointing frequency. Though Condor and C³ have the same performance, a quick look at Figure 3 shows that for low enough checkpointing frequencies and large enough application state sizes both systems

---

3 For these experiments, we ran this code sequentially.
may have high overheads. As such, it is important to develop techniques to minimize the overheads of checkpointing.

There are two orthogonal strategies for reducing the time that an application spends checkpointing: reduce the frequency at which checkpointing occurs, or reduce the amount of state that is saved at each checkpoint. Since checkpointing frequency is typically determined by environmental factors such as the MTBF of the system, for our work we assume that the checkpoint frequency is immutable and therefore focus on reducing checkpoint size. Figure 4 shows the sizes of checkpoints recorded by Condor and $C^3$. Two things become apparent:

- Condor and $C^3$ save approximately the same amount of state on all the benchmarks
- The amount of time each application spends in checkpointing is correlated with the sizes of the checkpoints

The latter point is not surprising since checkpoints are written to a network disk, which is a relatively slow resource. As such, minimizing the amount of state saved appears to be a promising way to reducing the overhead of checkpointing.

It is in this aspect that ALC and SLC significantly differ. SLC solutions know nothing about the applications they checkpoint. As such, they must save all of the address space that may be in use by the application. However, an automated ALC solution like $C^3$ works with the application's
source code and can perform analysis to determine whether it can safely omit certain portions of application state from the checkpoint, without compromising recovery. Therefore, this type of analysis appears to be a promising way to minimize the overheads of checkpointing.

3. OPTIMIZING CHECKPOINT SIZE

In this section, we describe a mechanism and API for reducing the amount of state that an application needs to save at each checkpoint, and show how manually inserting calls to this API affects the checkpoint sizes and runtimes of our benchmark codes. It is our belief that these API calls could be inserted correctly and beneficially by a compiler.

3.1 A Logical Partitioning of Objects

The C3 implementation has a portable implementation of a memory allocator that is used by codes that were transformed by the C3 system. Our replacement allocator ensures that after restart dynamically allocated objects get “rebuilt” at the same address they had before the checkpoint was taken.

Given that we needed to construct a memory allocator from scratch, we designed our allocator to support features that would be beneficial for use in a checkpointing system. One such feature is support for logically partitioning dynamically allocated objects into subheaps.

The C3 memory allocator is normally invoked via a call to \texttt{C3\_malloc()}, which takes the same parameters as a call to the C library’s \texttt{malloc()} function (C3 also provides versions of \texttt{malloc()} and \texttt{ realloc()}).

As an alternative, the C3 memory allocator may also be invoked via a call to \texttt{C3\_subheap\_malloc()}, which takes an additional parameter \texttt{S} that specifies in the subheap this object should be placed in. The number of different subheaps is finite, and fixed at compile time. Calls to the normal \texttt{C3\_malloc()} function place the created objects in subheap 0.

Allocating objects to different subheaps represents a logical partitioning of an application’s dynamic structures. Such partitioning is entirely safe, as it does not affect correctness. In fact, the partitioning is invisible to the application. Partitioning may affect performance, however, as subheaping enforces some constraints on an object’s placement. Discussion on this is beyond the scope of this article. Others have studied the effect of dynamic object placement on performance [8] [11].

3.2 Specifying Subheap Checkpointing Behavior

The C3 API for specifying how the checkpoint mechanism should treat all the objects belonging to a specific subheap at checkpoint time is the following:

- \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Always()} specifies that at all future checkpoints taken, the system is to save the contents of subheap \texttt{s}.
- \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Never()} specifies that at all future checkpoints taken, the system is not to save the contents of subheap \texttt{s}.
- \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Next()} specifies that at the next checkpoint taken, the system is to save the contents of subheap \texttt{s}, but at future checkpoints after that, it only needs to save a reference to the most recently saved version of \texttt{s}.

Calls to \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Never()} are used by the application to inform the checkpointing mechanism that, after this point, all objects of subheap \texttt{s} are never to be used (read-from, written-to, or \texttt{free()-ed}) again. Therefore, they don’t need to be saved to the checkpoint. After this call, future \texttt{malloc()}s of an object to subheap \texttt{s} will succeed, but those objects will be neither saved nor restored.

Calls to \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Next()} are used by the application to notify the checkpointing mechanism that after this point all objects of subheap \texttt{s} are never to be written-to again (including being \texttt{free()-ed}). Therefore, the mechanism only needs to save this subheap at the next checkpoint that is taken, \texttt{Cn}. At any future checkpoint, \texttt{Cn+i}, instead of saving the objects of subheap \texttt{s}, the mechanism will only save a reference to the version of \texttt{s} that was saved at \texttt{Cn}. If the application restarts at \texttt{Cn+i}, the objects of \texttt{s} will be restored as they were when saved at \texttt{Cn}. After this call, and after the next checkpoint is taken, future \texttt{malloc()}s of an object to subheap \texttt{s} will succeed, but those objects will be neither saved nor restored.

Calls to \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Always()} specify that the checkpoint mechanism should resume saving \texttt{s} at every future checkpoint.

Notice that although assigning objects to subheaps always preserves program correctness, improper use of this API could result in incorrect program behavior, so the insertion of these calls must be done carefully.

3.3 Experimental Results

To evaluate the effectiveness of utilizing this API, we manually instrumented the five benchmark codes described in the previous section. For each call to \texttt{malloc()}, we specified the subheap in which all the objects built by that statement should be placed. (This is done via an insertion of a \texttt{#pragma} in the original source – the C3 pre-compiler automatically replaces calls to \texttt{malloc()} with calls to the C3 version of the function.) For \texttt{vpr}, we needed to identify that certain methods are object factories (i.e., a method that returns the result of calling \texttt{malloc()}, and is called by the application instead of directly calling \texttt{malloc()}) so that the pre-compiler could transform them to accept an extra parameter to be passed to \texttt{C3\_subheap\_malloc()}.

We also inserted calls to \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Next()} at appropriate locations in the code where they would be correct and would be beneficial for reducing checkpoint size. We then ran the codes, observing how the checkpoint size was reduced (Fig. 5), and how this affected the runtime of the application (Fig. 6) compared to the Condor and original C3 versions of the application. We did not attempt to insert calls to \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Never()} for these codes. On those charts, the version of the application using C3 combined with this API is referred to as \texttt{C3memex}.

For most codes, using the subheap API reduces the amount of data that needs to be saved. For \texttt{equake}, the total amount saved is reduced by 73%; for \texttt{art}, 60% for \texttt{vpr}, 50%; and for \texttt{mg}, 25%. For \texttt{mcf} there was no safe, no trivial, place to insert \texttt{Subheap\_Save\_Next()}, so the size of the checkpoint was not reduced.

In Fig. 6 we can see the effect that reducing the checkpoint size has on the application runtime.
For mcf, where there was no reduction in checkpoint size, clearly, there was no performance benefit.

For art, where the checkpoints were very small and very little time was spent checkpointing, reducing the checkpoint size by 60% reduced the checkpointing overhead by 66% but had no noticeable effect on overall runtime.

For quake, reducing the checkpoint size by 73% reduced the checkpointing overhead by 71%, reducing the overall execution time by 22%.

For vpr, reducing the checkpoint size by 50% reduced the checkpointing overhead by 50% and the runtime by 14%.

For mg, where the checkpoint size was shrunk by 25%, the overhead went down by 27% and the runtime by 20%.

These results show that the overhead of checkpointing is directly proportional to the size of the checkpoint. However, the benefit of state reduction on runtime depends on the details of the application.
4. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We believe that these results imply that the $C^3$ subheap API presented is useful for reducing the overhead added by checkpointing, but that other techniques should be developed to supplement it.

We believe that the insertion of these API calls can and should be done by a compiler, because bad placement of these calls can lead to unexpected and incorrect program behavior. We are currently developing an analysis to determine the safe and beneficial spots to place such calls, and to determine a good assignment of objects to subheaps.

We envision that the $C^3$ system will have multiple automated mechanisms for reducing checkpoint size, and that for each application, depending on its data use patterns, a different set of these mechanisms will be applied to reduce the overhead that checkpointing adds to an application.

5. REFERENCES


[16] NPB OMP webpage.
http://phase.hpcc.jp/Omini/benchmarks/NPB/.

HPL - a portable implementation of the
high-performance linpack benchmark for
distributed-memory computers. Available at
http://www.netlib.org/benchmark/hpl/.

[18] James S. Plank, Micah Beck, Gerry Kingsley, and Kai
Li. Libckpt: Transparent checkpointing under UNIX.
Technical Report UT-CS-94-242, Dept. of Computer
Science, University of Tennessee, 1994.

[19] James S. Plank, Yuqun Chen, Kai Li, Micah Beck,
and Gerry Kingsley. Memory exclusion: optimizing
the performance of checkpointing systems. Software

[20] Balkrishna Ramkumar and Volker Strumpen. Portable
checkpointing for heterogenous architectures. In
Symposium on Fault-Tolerant Computing, pages

[21] Martin Schulz, Greg Bronievitsky, Rohit Fernandes,
Daniel Marques, Keshav Pingali, and Paul Stodghill.
Implementation and evaluation of a scalable
application-level checkpoint-recovery scheme for mpi
programs. In Supercomputing 2004, Pittsburgh, PA,


Migration for MPI. In Proceedings of the 10th
International Parallel Processing Symposium (IPPS
96), Honolulu, Hawaii, 1996.

[24] Nathan Stone, John Kochmar, Raghu Raman Reddy,
J. Ray Scott, Jason Sommerfield, and Chad Vizino. A
checkpoint and recovery system for the Pittsburgh
Supercomputing Center Terascale Computing System.
In Supercomputing, 2001. Available at
http://www.psc.edu/publications/tech\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un\protect\un

developing malleable and migratable parallel software.