Incomplete Models for Parallel Programming

Aaron Becker, Pritish Jetley, Phil Miller 7th Charm Workshop, 2009



One Model to Rule Them All?

- multicore
- cluster
- GPU
- Cell
- many core
- irregular communication

- deadlock and race condition avoidance
- memory consistency
- transparent performance model
- critical path detection
- simple semantics

- Sometimes you don't need full generality
- Complete freedom implies the freedom to create all possible incorrect programs

Downside

some things will not be expressible

Upside

some things will not be expressible

Upside

better safety guarantees easier to get high performance possibility for greater expressiveness

Common Infrastructure



Composition



Charj

- Glue language for incomplete models
- Has model knowledge which C++ compiler lacks
- Facilitates clean interaction between different models

Multiphase Shared Arrays

Discipline

- Phase defines allowed access
- Had phase before X10 existed
- Access modes for consistency seen in early Charm, Munin DSM

Modes

- Read-only: duh
- Write-once: each element may be written by one object/thread
- Accumulate: apply an associative, commutative operation (element-wise reduction)
- Owner-computes: some routine on local data

Benefit

- Adaptive fetching and caching
- No race conditions

Usage Flow

- Create
 - Dimension
 - Type
 - Shape
 - (Data Distribution)

Usage Flow

- Create
- Distribute
 - Send handle to all interested objects
- Sync to initialization mode
 - Parallel I/O with coordinates: Write-once
 - Generated based on coordinates: Owner-computes
 - Summed from other data: Accumulate
- Initialize

Usage Flow

- Create
- Distribute
- Sync to initialization mode
- Initialize
- Sync; Use; Sync; Use

Open questions

- How much can the compiler enforce?
- How to match distribution to application?
- What other modes make sense?

Charisma

Static Dataflow

- Objects communicate with fixed sets of neighbors
- Produce and consume parameters
- Defines a powerful paradigm on which several classes of applications can be based
 - Structured meshes
 - Unstructured meshes
 - Molecular dynamics

Stencil computation



Produce own boundaries



Produce own boundaries



foreach x,y in workers
 (LB[x,y],RB[x,y],
 TB[x,y],BB[x,y])
 <- workers[x,y].prod() [
end-foreach</pre>

Consume neighbors' boundaries



Consume neighbors' boundaries



foreach x,y in workers
 (+err)
 <- workers[x,y].cons(
 LB[x+1,y],
 RB[x-1,y],
 TB[x,y-1],
 BB[x,y+1]) []
end-foreach</pre>

• Point-to-point

```
(param[i]) ← obj[i].prod() 
...
obj[i].cons(param[i-1])
```

Reduction

```
foreach x,y in cells
  (+err) ← cells[x,y].compute();
end-foreach
...
main.reportError(err);
```

Multicast

```
foreach x in A
  (points[x]) ← A[x].prod();
end-foreach
foreach x,y in B
  B[x,y].cons(points[x]);
end-foreach
```

Scatter

```
foreach x in A
  (points[x,*]) ← A[x].prod();
end-foreach
foreach x,y in B
  B[x,y].cons(points[x,y]);
end-foreach
```

Gather

```
foreach x,y in A
  (points[x,y]) ← A[x,y].prod();
end-foreach
foreach x in B
  B[x].cons(points[x,*]);
end-foreach
```

Future directions

- Bags of neighbors
 - Affine expressions can do only so much
 - -e.g. unstructured meshes
- Topology mapping
 - Place communicating objects together
- Streaming extensions

Future directions

- Incremental gather
 - The Agarwal et al. algorithm for matrix multiplication:

end-foreach

-mult can be performed in a piecemeal fashion; more overlap of comp/comm.