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Requirements

• Composibility
• Respect for locality
• Dealing with heterogeneity
• Dealing with the memory wall
• Dealing with dynamic resource variation
  – Machine running 2 parallel apps on 64 cores, needs to run a third one
  – Shrink and expand the sets of cores assigned to a job
• Dealing with Static resource variation: *Fwd Scaling*
  – I.e. Parallel App should run unchanged on the next generation manycore with twice as many cores
• Above all: Simplicity
Guidelines

• A guideline that appeals to me:
  – Bottom-up, application-driven development of abstractions

• Aim at a good division of labor between the programmer and System
  – Automate what the system can do well
  – Allow programmer to do what they can do best
Foundation: Adaptive Runtime System

For me, Based on Migratable Objects

**Programmer:** [Over] decomposition into virtual processors

**Runtime:** Assigns VPs to processors

Enables *adaptive runtime strategies*

**Implementations:** Charm++, AMPI

---

**Benefits**

- **Software engineering**
  - Num. of VPs to match application logic (not physical cores)
  - Separate VPs for different modules

- **Message driven execution**
  - Predictability :
  - Asynchronous reductions

- **Dynamic mapping**
  - Heterogeneity
    - Vacate, adjust to speed, share
  - Change set of processors used
  - Dynamic load balancing
What is the cost of Processor Virtualization?
“Overhead” of Virtualization

\[ T_1 = T(1 + \frac{v}{g}) \]
\[ T_p = \max(g, \frac{T_1}{P}) \]
\[ T_p = \max(g, \frac{v}{P}) \]

V: overhead per message
Tp: p processor completion time
G: grainsize (computation per message)

• Fragmentation cost?
  – Cache performance improves
  – Adaptive overlap improves
  – Difficult to see cost..

• Fixable Problems:
  – Memory overhead: (larger ghost areas)
  – Fine-grained messaging:

![Graph showing time per iteration against number of chunks per processor]
Modularity and Concurrent Composibility
Message Driven Execution

Virtualization leads to *Message Driven Execution*

> Which leads to Automatic Adaptive overlap of computation and communication
Adaptive overlap and modules

SPMD and Message-Driven Modules

NAMD: A Production MD program

**NAMD**
- Fully featured program
- NIH-funded development
- Installed at NSF centers
- Large published simulations
- *We were able to demonstrate the utility of adaptive overlap, and share the Gordon Bell award in 2002*

Collaboration with K. Schulten, R. Skeel, and coworkers
Integration

Electrostatics

PME/3DFFT
Modularization

• Logical Units decoupled from “Number of processors”
  – E.G. Oct tree nodes for particle data
  – No artificial restriction on the number of processors
    • Cube of power of 2

• Modularity:
  – Software engineering: cohesion and coupling
  – MPI’s “are on the same processor” is a bad coupling principle
  – Objects liberate you from that:
    • E.G. Solid and fluid modules in a rocket simulation
Rocket Simulation

• Large Collaboration headed Mike Heath
  – DOE supported ASCI center

• Challenge:
  – Multi-component code, with modules from independent researchers
  – MPI was common base

• AMPI: new wine in old bottle
  – Easier to convert
  – Can still run original codes on MPI, unchanged
Rocket Simulation Components in AMPI
AMPI and Roc* communications
Multicore Workshop IIT Kanpur
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Automatic Adaptive Runtime Optimizations
New Parallel Languages and Enhancements (MSA, Charisma, ..)

Applications Especially, dynamic, irregular and difficult to parallelize ones

Migratable Objects model

Resource Management On Computational Grids

Communication Support (SW/HW)
BigSim
OS support Memory Mgmt

How to build better parallel machines
Charm++/AMPI are mature systems

- Available on all parallel machines we know of
  - Clusters, Vendor supported: IBM, SGI, HP (Q), BlueGene/L, …

- Tools:
  - Performance analysis/visualization
  - Debuggers
  - Live visualization
  - Libraries and frameworks

- Used by many applications
  - 17,000+ installations
  - NAMD, Rocket simulation, Quantum Chemistry, Space-time meshes, animation graphics, Astronomy, ..

- It is C++, with message (event) driven execution
  - So, a familiar model for desktop programmers
The enabling CS technology of parallel objects and intelligent Runtime systems has led to several collaborative applications in CSE.
CSE to ManyCore

• The Charm++ model has succeeded in CSE/HPC
  Because:
  – Resource management, …

• In spite of:
  – Based on C++, not Fortran, message-driven model,..

• But is an even better fit for desktop programmers
  – C++, event driven execution
  – Predictability of data/code accesses

15% of cycles at NCSA, 20% at PSC, were used on Charm++ apps, in a one year period
Why is it suitable for Multi-cores

• Objects connote and promote locality
• Message-driven execution
  – A strong principle of prediction for data and code use
  – Much stronger than Principle of locality
    • Can use to scale memory wall:
    • Prefetching of needed data:
      – into scratch pad memories, for example
Why Charm++ & Cell?

• **Data Encapsulation / Locality**
  – Each message associated with…
    • Code : Entry Method
    • Data : Message & Chare Data
  – Entry methods tend to access data local to chare and message

• **Virtualization (many chares per processor)**
  – Provides opportunity to overlap SPE computation with DMA transactions
  – Helps ensure there is always useful work to do

• **Message Queue Peek-Ahead / Predictability**
  – Peek-ahead in message queue to determine future work
  – Fetch code and data before execution of entry method
System View on Cell

Work by David Kunzman (with Gengbin Zheng, Eric Bohm, )
Charm++ on Cell Roadmap

Phase 1
Charm++ Runtime System on PPE (trivial)

Development of Offload API
Creation of the Offload API to allow arbitrary “chunks” of code to execute on the SPEs (i.e. allow Charm++ Runtime System to “offload” entry methods to SPEs)

Phase 2
Allow Charm++ applications (with modification) to take advantage of SPEs on multiple Cell chips. (e.g. 2D Jacobi program written in Charm++ has already been run across the 4 chips we have access to: 4 PPEs + 32 SPEs).

Projections
Collection of performance data which can be visualized using Projections.

Phase 3
Modification of Charm++ tools (charmxi and/or charmc) so little to no code modification to the original Charm++ application is needed to allow it to run on Cell.
So, I expect Charm++ to be a strong contender for manycore models

BUT:
What about the quest for Simplicity?

Charm++ is powerful, but not much simpler than, say, MPI
How to Get to Simple Parallel Programming Models?

- Parallel Programming is much too complex
  - In part because of resource management issues:
    - Handled by Adaptive Runtime Systems
  - In a larger part, because of unintended non-determinacy
    - Race conditions

- Clearly, we need *simple* models
  - But what are willing to give up? (No free lunch)
  - Give up “Completeness”!?!?
  - May be one can design a language that is simple to use, but not expressive enough to capture all needs
Simplicity?

• A collection of “incomplete” languages, backed by a (few) complete ones, will do the trick
  – As long as they are interoperable

• Where does simplicity come from?
  – Outlaw non-determinacy!
  – Deterministic, Simple, parallel programming models
    • With Marc Snir, Vikram Adve, ..
  – Are there examples of such paradigms?
    • Multiphase shared Arrays : [LCPC ‘04]
    • Charisma++ : [LCR ’04]
Shared memory or not

• Smart people on both sides:
  – Thesis, antithesis

• Clearly, needs a “synthesis”

• “Shared memory is easy to program” has
  – Only a grain of truth
  – But there exists that grain of truth

• We as a community, need to have this debate
  – Put some armor on, drink friendship potion, but debate the issue threadbare..
  – What do we mean by SAS model and what we like and dislike about it
Multiphase Shared Arrays

- **Observations:**
  - General shared address space abstraction is complex
  - Certain special cases are simple, and cover most uses

- Each array is in one mode at a time
  - But its mode may change from phase to phase

- **Modes**
  - Write-once
  - Read-only
  - Accumulate
  - Owner-computes

- All workers **sync**, at end of each phase
MSA:

- **In the simple model:**
  - A program consists of
    - A collection of Charm threads, and
    - Multiple collections of data-arrays
      - Partitioned into pages (user-specified)
  - Execution begins in a “main”
    - Then all threads are fired in parallel
- **More complex model**
  - Multiple collections of threads
  - ...
for timestep = 0 to Tmax {
    // Phase I : Force Computation: for a section of the interaction matrix
    for i = i_start to i_end
        for j = j_start to j_end
            if (nbrlist[i][j]) {  // nbrlist enters ReadOnly mode
                force = calculateForce(coords[i], atominfo[i], coords[j], atominfo[j]);
                forces[i] += force;  // Accumulate mode
                forces[j] += -force;
            }
    nbrlist.sync(); forces.sync(); coords.sync(); atominfo.sync();

    for k = myAtomsBegin to myAtomsEnd  // Phase II : Integration
        coords[k] = integrate(atominfo[k], forces[k]);  // WriteOnly mode
    coords.sync(); atominfo.sync(); forces.sync();

    if (timestep %8 == 0) {  // Phase III: update neighbor list every 8 steps
        for i = i_start to i_end
            for j = j_start to j_end
                nbrList[i][j] = distance(coords[i],coords[j]) < CUTOFF;
        nbrList.sync(); coords.sync();
    }
}
Extensions

• Need check for each access: is the page here?
  – Pre-fetching, and known-local accesses

• A Twist on ACCUMULATE
  – Each array element can be a set
  – Set Union operation is a valid accumulate operation.
  – Example:
    • Appending a list of \((x,y)\) points
MSA: Graph Partition

// Phase I: EtoN: RO, NtoE: Accumulate
for i = 1 to EtoN.length()
    for j = 1 to EtoN[i].length() {
        n = EtoN[i][j];
        NtoE[n] += i; // Accumulate
    }
EtoN.sync(); NtoE.sync();

// Phase II: NtoE: RO, EtoE: Accumulate
for j = my section of j
    // foreach pair e1, e2 elementof NtoE[j]
    for i1 = 1 to NtoE[j].length()
        for i2 = i1 + 1 to NtoE[j].length() {
            e1 = NtoE[j][i1];
            e2 = NtoE[j][i2];
            EtoE[e1] += e2; // Accumulate
            EtoE[e2] += e1;
        }
EtoN.sync(); NtoE.sync();
Charisma: Motivation

- Rocket simulation example under traditional MPI vs. Charm++/AMPI framework

- Benefit: load balance, communication optimizations, modularity
- Problem: flow of control buried in asynchronous method invocations
Motivation: Car-Parrinello Ab Initio Molecular Dynamics (CPMD)
Charisma++ example (Simple)

Jacobi 1D
begin
forall i in J
  <lb[i], rb[i]> := J[i].init();
end-forall
while (e > threshold)
  forall i in J
    <+e, lb[i], rb[i]> := J[i].compute(rb[i-1], lb[i+1]);
  end-forall
end-while
end
Mol. Dynamics with Spatial Decomposition

```plaintext

foreach i,j,k in cells
    <atoms[i,j,k]> := cells[i,j,k].produceAtoms();
end-foreach

for iter := 0 to MAX_ITER
    foreach i1,j1,k1,i2,j2,k2 in cellpairs
        <+forces[i1,j1,k1]> :=
            cellpairs[i1,j1,k1,i2,j2,k2].computeCoulombForces(
                atoms[i1,j1,k1], atoms[i2,j2,k2]);
    end-foreach

    foreach ... for bonded forces.. Uses atoms and add to forces

    foreach i,j,k in cells
        <atoms[i,j,k]> := cells[i,j,k].integrate(forces[i,j,k]);
    end-foreach
end-for
```
A set of “incomplete” but elegant/simple languages, backed by a low-level complete one.
Let's play together

• Multiple programming models need to be investigated
  – “Survival of the fittest” doesn’t lead to a single species, it leads to an eco-system.

• Different ones may be good for different algorithms/domains/…

• Allow them to interoperate in a multi-paradigm environment
Summary

• It is necessary to raise the level of abstraction
  – Foundation: adaptive runtime system, based on migratable objects
    • Automate resource management
    • Composibility
    • Interoperability
  – Design new Models that avoid data races, and promote locality
  – Incorporate good aspects of shared memory model

More info on my group’s work:
http://charm.cs.uiuc.edu