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How do we recover after a Failure?

- Current FT approach → Coordinated PFS-based *Checkpointing*
  - On failure, stop application and *Restart*
  - Unfeasible at exascale!

- Online recovery can dramatically reduce failure overhead
- **Global recovery** involves all the cores in the recovery process
  - This can be done in a semi-transparent way, but...
  - **Scalability issues**!
- **Local recovery** can further benefit certain classes of applications
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**Goal:**

Study the feasibility of local recovery for stencil-based parallel applications
Target: Stencil-based Scientific Applications

- Application domain is partitioned using a block decomposition across processes.
- Typically, divided in iterations (timesteps), which include:
  - Computation to advance the local simulated data
  - Communication with immediate neighbors
- Example: PDEs using finite-difference methods
Local Recovery Technique

• How to recover?
  – replace failed processes
  – (recovered processes) rollback to the last checkpoint

• Distant parts of the domain continue the simulation

• Failure effect will slowly propagate through the machine
  – Only immediate neighbors will be immediately affected by that failure

• Perfect scalability
• Mask multiple failures
  – time to solution appear as if only a single failure occurred
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(a) No failures
(b) One failure
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(e) Seven failures

(f) Nine failures
Conclusion

• Local recovery is beneficial both for the application and the runtime

• Runtime
  – Scalable implementation of recovery constructs
  – No need to coordinate the whole domain in order to recovery

• Application
  – No Global Work Recomputation
  – Lower Energy Footprint
  – Failure Masking
    • it has been shown that failures don’t come alone, but they come in bursts

• We studied certain type of applications only
• How the conclusions apply to other types?
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