

Follow-up Discussion of AI Computing Network Requirements

Jesus Escudero-Sahuquillo (UCLM)

Jose Duato (RSAC)




Who am I?

- **Associate Professor** at UCLM, Spain
- **Research and development in interconnection networks for 18 years** at different institutions: UCLM (Spain), Oracle (Norway), and UPV (Spain):
 - Solutions intended for specific network technologies (InfiniBand, Omni-path, BXI, Datacenter networks, etc.), while others could be quickly adopted.
 - Main R&D lines: congestion control, QoS, routing, and network topologies.
- Participated in **previous IEEE 802.1Q, NENDICA, and IETF** meetings (2018 and 2019) to support the Qcz amendment on CI, the congestion management applied to Lossless Ethernet:
 - <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2018/cz-escuderosahuquillo-CIAnalysis-response-0518-v01.pdf>
 - <https://www.ieee802.org/1/files/public/docs2018/cz-escudero-sahuquillo-ci-internetworking-0718-v1.pdf>
 - <https://datatracker.ietf.org/meeting/105/materials/slides-105-hotrfc-7-strategies-to-drastically-improve-congestion-control-in-high-performance-data-centers-next-steps-for-rdma-00>
 - <https://mentor.ieee.org/802.1/dcn/19/1-19-0020-00-ICne-presentation-on-congestion-management-for-ethernet-based-lossless-datacenter-networks.pdf>

Motivation

- Review the **major challenges** for the AI Datacenter network
- Discuss the **proposed solutions** and technologies to overcome the described challenges
- Analyze the **standardization opportunities** of the proposed solutions

COVER FEATURE TECHNOLOGY PREDICTIONS



Torsten Hoefler, ETH Zurich
Ariel Hendel, Scala Computing
Duncan Roweth, Hewlett Packard Enterprise

We discuss the differences and commonalities between network technologies used in supercomputers and data centers and outline a path to convergence at multiple layers. We predict that emerging smart networking solutions will accelerate that convergence.

“intelligent, high-performance data center networks enabling both HPC and mega data center workloads will be adopted in the industry soon”

T. Hoefler et al. 2022



Expected Demand

- The last decade has witnessed a very rapid expansion of many DNN-based AI solutions
- Regardless of where they are deployed, cloud datacenters are massively used for AI training
- The release of ChatGPT in Nov 2022 has garnered unprecedented attention, and triggered the recent boom of large language models (LLMs).

Model	Falcon_40B	GPT3_175B	GPT4_1.8T
Token Number	1 T	300 B	13 T
Training Time	2 months	34 days	100 days


- Huge datacenters are exclusively devoted to AI training and inference, and more are planned
- Expected size is on the order of 200K+ servers

DNN-based AI Training




Parallelism in AI Training


- Data parallelism
 - Massive parallelism: Batches are independent from each other
- Pipeline parallelism
 - Implemented when model does not fit into CPU/GPU memory
 - It is indeed two pipelines in opposite direction, where each pair of stages (one from each pipeline) need to share memory
 - Implemented with a multicore CPU/GPU with half the cores devoted to each of the pipelines
- Tensor parallelism
 - Samples processed in batches (matrix-matrix instead of matrix-vector)
 - Tensor parallelism is critical to maximize data reuse, increasing performance and energy efficiency
 - Benefits of tensor parallelism are maximized through scale-up technologies
- Expert parallelism
 - Multiple experts are used to expand AI model parameters. Normally only one of a few of them will be running.




DP illustration in NN



PP illustration in NN





TP illustration in NN



EP illustration in NN


Collective Communication in AI Training

- Collective communication is defined as communication that involves a group of processors. It used to be in MPI, including one to many, many to one or many to many communications.
- Modern distributed AI training relies on parallelism, that requires collective communication to achieve high performance.
- AllReduce and AlltoAll are typical collective communication operations in AI training.



Viable implementations - Topology and Collective Communication Optimizations

- A ring can be simply embedded into a switch
 - Multi-port NICs or multiple NICs per server may be needed to achieve the required bandwidth
 - Attaching servers to the same switch also helps reducing latency (assuming that the required number of servers does not exceed the number of ports)
- The reduce phase of AllReduce can be implemented in software (possibly, with support in the NIC) in log time with a fat tree
 - Recursive reduce. A tree is required for each reduction, but many reductions occur in parallel
 - The communication is faster if different servers collect the results for different reductions



- The broadcast phase of AllReduce requires a topology with full bisection bandwidth (fat tree)

Network requirements for AI datacenters

Let's consider a realistic scenario:

- The datacenter may not be exclusively devoted to AI training → several applications can be mixed with very different communication requirements.
- Task-to-server allocation and collective communication may not be fully optimized.
- Most importantly, for 200K+ servers, components will frequently fail

Network requirements for AI datacenters

What happens in this scenario?

- Application mix:
 - Not all traffic is based on collective communications
 - Network congestion and Head-of-line (HoL) blocking will occur
- Allocation and communication may not be optimized:
 - Unbalanced resource utilization
 - Likely, network congestion and HoL blocking
- Components will frequently fail:
 - Solutions are required: combination of hot swap, automatic path migration (APM), and checkpointing
 - Those solutions (especially APM) will unbalance traffic

Viable implementations to meet AI training

- Load balancing:
 - Load-aware packet-level load balancing mechanisms will significantly help to eliminate bottlenecks and fully utilize existing bandwidth
 - It is mandatory when implementing APM to balance traffic among the remaining healthy paths
- Adaptive routing with congestion control:
 - Adaptive routing may be used together with load balancing to alleviate in-network congestion further, especially when produced by faulty components
 - Adaptive routing should only be used for in-network congestion, but never for incast congestion
 - Thus, incast congestion still requires congestion control
 - Incast congestion will likely occur during AllReduce

Viable implementations to meet AI training


Limitations of load balancing:

- Technique to **avoid in-network congestion**.
- Ineffective approaches can do the opposite.
- Load balancing **selects a path by hashing the flow identity fields** in the routed packet such that all packets from a particular flow traverse the same route.
- Equal Cost Multi-Path (ECMP) routing: **Flow granularity is a problem** that may cause elephant flows to traverse and occupy a route in the network for a longer time.
- Solution: Load-aware packet-level load balancing

Viable implementations to meet AI training

- Reducing the granularity from flows to packets to make better load-balancing decisions.
 - Solution: Load-aware packet-level balancing
- Issues with the uniformity of traffic flow distribution and in-order delivery
 - Solution: Intelligent packet reordering and selective retransmissions
- Balancing congested packets through alternative routes may end up moving congestion roots near end nodes, transforming in-network congestion into incast congestion → **The congestion spreading problem**

Viable implementations to meet AI training



In-network congestion in a 3-tier CLOS evolves to incast due to multi-path routing

LB/AR/CC cooperation

- To deal with the **congestion-spreading problem**, we proposed to avoid routing congesting flows through alternative routes
 - Single-path (deterministic) routing is used for congesting flows
 - Multi-path (LB or AR) routing is used for non-congesting flows
- The **evolution of congestion trees** depends on the traffic patterns, network topology, and routing and needs to be thoroughly analyzed [[Garcia19Nendica](#)]:
 - It is the basis for efficient HoL-blocking elimination.
- Solution: Multi-path routing combined with CC that distinguishes between in-network and incast congestion



J. Rocher, J. Escudero Sahuquillo, P.J. Garcia, F.J. Quiles and J. Duato: *A Smart and Novel Approach for Managing Incast and In-Network Congestion Through Adaptive Routing* (May 10, 2023). Pre-print available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4660017>

LB/AR/CC cooperation

- Congestion is detected at switches based on queuing occupancy, which triggers adaptive routing.
- Notifications must be sent between switches (as InfiniBand does with ARNs and CI with CNPs).
- Based on notifications, switches use adaptive routing to alleviate in-network congestion or deterministic routing when an incast is notified.
- HoL blocking can be avoided using CI.
- Challenge: AR+CC cooperation with intelligent LB

J. Rocher, J. Escudero Sahuquillo, P.J. Garcia, F.J. Quiles and J. Duato: *A Smart and Novel Approach for Managing Incast and In-Network Congestion Through Adaptive Routing* (May 10, 2023). Pre-print available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4660017>

LB/AR/CC cooperation






LB/AR/CC cooperation

- Congestion Isolation (CI) deals with congesting flows and marks packets so they cannot be routed using adaptive routing
 - It also entirely avoids HoL blocking.
- Non-congesting packets are routed using either LB or AR.
 - Intelligent LB can be used if APM reacts to network failures.
 - Analyze congestion trees' evolution and traffic patterns on the fly to select between LB and AR:
 - LB is better suited for regular, massive traffic.
 - AR is best suited for very random or time-varying traffic.
 - Network load may vary so fast that load-aware LB may need to adapt faster. In that case, AR achieves a very fast local response and quickly avoids rapidly arising congestion scenario.




Other examples of cooperation

- 3SC: Combination of SFC, CI, and DCQCN



(a) msg_size < 10KB

(b) 10KB < msg_size < 100KB



Potential standardization opportunities

- Cooperation between protocols, if done correctly, benefits network performance.
- SFC, LB, AR, CC, and CI techniques are in the standard, and no significant modifications are required.
 - Event LB with intelligent reordering and selective retransmissions can be used to cooperate
- CC/AR coordination is possible using fast status feedback of link/port/queue.