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Introduction
Rich space of techniques and issues
• Trade off and interact with one another
Issues can be addressed/helped by software or hardware
• Algorithmic or programming techniques
• Architectural techniques
Focus here on performance issues and software techniques
• Point out some architectural implications
• Architectural techniques covered in rest of class

Programming as Successive Refinement
Not all issues dealt with up front
Partitioning often independent of architecture, and done first
• View machine as a collection of communicating processors
  - balancing the workload
  - reducing the amount of inherent communication
  - reducing extra work
• Tug-o-war even among these three issues
Then interactions with architecture
• View machine as extended memory hierarchy
  - extra communication due to architectural interactions
  - cost of communication depends on how it is structured
• May inspire changes in partitioning
Discussion of issues is one at a time, but identifies tradeoffs
• Use examples, and measurements on SGI Origin2000

Outline
1. Partitioning for performance
2. Relationship of communication, data locality and architecture
3. Orchestration for performance
For each issue:
• Techniques to address it, and tradeoffs with previous issues
• Illustration using case studies
• Application to grid solver
• Some architectural implications
4. Components of execution time as seen by processor
• What workload looks like to architecture, and relate to software issues
Partitioning for Performance

1. Balancing the workload and reducing wait time at synch points
2. Reducing inherent communication
3. Reducing extra work

Even these algorithmic issues trade off:
- Minimize comm. => run on 1 processor => extreme load imbalance
- Maximize load balance => random assignment of tiny tasks => no control over communication
- Good partition may imply extra work to compute or manage it

Goal is to compromise
- Fortunately, often not difficult in practice

Load Balance and Synch Wait Time

Limit on speedup: \( \text{Speedup}_{\text{problem}}(p) \leq \frac{\text{Sequential Work}}{\text{Max Work on any Processor}} \)
- Work includes data access and other costs
- Not just equal work, but must be busy at same time

Four parts to load balance and reducing synch wait time:
1. Identify enough concurrency
2. Decide how to manage it
3. Determine the granularity at which to exploit it
4. Reduce serialization and cost of synchronization

Identifying Concurrency

Techniques seen for equation solver:
- Loop structure, fundamental dependences, new algorithms

Data Parallelism versus Function Parallelism

Often see orthogonal levels of parallelism; e.g. VLSI routing

Function parallelism:
- entire large tasks (procedures) that can be done in parallel
- on same or different data
- e.g. different independent grid computations in Ocean
- pipelining, as in video encoding/decoding, or polygon rendering
- degree usually modest and does not grow with input size
- difficult to load balance
- often used to reduce synch between data parallel phases

Most scalable programs data parallel (per this loose definition)
- function parallelism reduces synch between data parallel phases
Load Balance and Synch Wait Time

Limit on speedup: \[ \frac{\text{Speedup}_{\text{problem}(P)}}{\text{Max Work on any Processor}} \leq \frac{\text{Sequential Work}}{\text{Work includes data access and other costs}} \]
- Not just equal work, but must be busy at same time

Four parts to load balance and reducing synch wait time:
1. Identify enough concurrency
2. Decide how to manage it
3. Determine the granularity at which to exploit it
4. Reduce serialization and cost of synchronization

Deciding How to Manage Concurrency

Static versus Dynamic techniques

Static:
- Algorithmic assignment based on input; won’t change
- Low runtime overhead
- Computation must be predictable
- Preferable when applicable (except in multiprogrammed or heterogeneous environment)

Dynamic:
- Adapt at runtime to balance load
- Can increase communication and reduce locality
- Can increase task management overheads

Dynamic Assignment

Profile-based (semi-static):
- Profile work distribution at runtime, and repartition dynamically
- Applicable in many computations, e.g. Barnes-Hut, some graphics

Dynamic Tasking:
- Deal with unpredictability in program or environment (e.g. Raytrace)
  - computation, communication, and memory system interactions
  - multiprogramming and heterogeneity
  - used by runtime systems and OS too
- Pool of tasks; take and add tasks until done
- E.g. “self-scheduling” of loop iterations (shared loop counter)

Dynamic Tasking with Task Queues

Centralized versus distributed queues

Task stealing with distributed queues
- Can compromise comm and locality, and increase synchronization
- Whom to steal from, how many tasks to steal, ...
- Termination detection
- Maximum imbalance related to size of task

![Distributed task queues diagram]
Impact of Dynamic Assignment

On SGI Origin 2000 (cache-coherent shared memory):

![Graph showing speedup vs. number of processors for different configurations](image)

Load Balance and Synch Wait Time

Limit on speedup: \( \text{Speedup}_{\text{problem}}(p) \leq \frac{\text{Sequential Work}}{\text{Max Work on any Processor}} \)

- Work includes data access and other costs
- Not just equal work, but must be busy at same time

Four parts to load balance and reducing synch wait time:
1. Identify enough concurrency
2. Decide how to manage it
3. Determine the granularity at which to exploit it
4. Reduce serialization and cost of synchronization

Determining Task Granularity

Task granularity: amount of work associated with a task

General rule:
- Coarse-grained \( \Rightarrow \) often less load balance
- Fine-grained \( \Rightarrow \) more overhead; often more communication & contention

Communication & contention actually affected by assignment, not size
- Overhead by size itself too, particularly with task queues

Load Balance and Synch Wait Time

Limit on speedup: \( \text{Speedup}_{\text{problem}}(p) \leq \frac{\text{Sequential Work}}{\text{Max Work on any Processor}} \)

- Work includes data access and other costs
- Not just equal work, but must be busy at same time

Four parts to load balance and reducing synch wait time:
1. Identify enough concurrency
2. Decide how to manage it
3. Determine the granularity at which to exploit it
4. Reduce serialization and cost of synchronization
Reducing Serialization

Careful about assignment and orchestration (including scheduling)

Event synchronization
- Reduce use of conservative synchronization
  - e.g. point-to-point instead of barriers, or granularity of pt-to-pt
- But fine-grained sync more difficult to program, more sync ops.

Mutual exclusion
- Separate locks for separate data
  - e.g. locking records in a database: lock per process, record, or field
  - lock per task in task queue, not per queue
  - finer grain => less contention/serialization, more space, less reuse
- Smaller, less frequent critical sections
  - don’t do reading/testing in critical section, only modification
  - e.g. searching for task to dequeue in task queue, building tree
- Stagger critical sections in time

Partitioning for Performance

1. Balancing the workload and reducing wait time at sync points
2. Reducing inherent communication
3. Reducing extra work

Domain Decomposition

Works well for scientific, engineering, graphics, … applications

Exploits local-biased nature of physical problems
- Information requirements often short-range
- Or long-range but fall off with distance

Simple example: nearest-neighbor grid computation

Perimeter to Area comm-to-comp ratio (area to volume in 3D)
- Depends on $n,p$: decreases with $n$, increases with $p$

Domain Decomposition (Continued)

Best domain decomposition depends on information requirements

Nearest neighbor example: block versus strip decomposition

Comm to comp: $\frac{4s^2}{n}$ for block, $\frac{2sp}{n}$ for strip

- Retain block from here on

Application dependent: strip may be better in other cases
- E.g. particle flow in tunnel
Finding a Domain Decomposition

**Static, by inspection**
- Must be predictable: grid example above, and Ocean

**Static, but not by inspection**
- Input-dependent, require analyzing input structure
- E.g. sparse matrix computations, data mining

**Semi-static (periodic repartitioning)**
- Characteristics change but slowly: e.g. Barnes-Hut

**Static or semi-static, with dynamic task stealing**
- Initial decomposition, but highly unpredictable: e.g. ray tracing

Partitioning for Performance

1. Balancing the workload and reducing wait time at synch points
2. Reducing inherent communication
3. Reducing extra work

Reducing Extra Work

**Common sources of extra work:**
- Computing a good partition
  - e.g. partitioning in Barnes-Hut or sparse matrix
- Using redundant computation to avoid communication
- Task, data and process management overhead
  - applications, languages, runtime systems, OS
- Imposing structure on communication
  - coalescing messages, allowing effective naming

**Architectural Implications:**
- Reduce need by making communication and orchestration efficient

\[
\text{Speedup} \leq \frac{\text{Sequential Work}}{\text{Max} (\text{Work} + \text{Synch Wait Time} + \text{Comm Cost} + \text{Extra Work})}
\]

Outline

1. Partitioning for performance
2. Relationship of communication, data locality and architecture
3. Orchestration for performance
4. Components of execution time as seen by processor
Limitations of Algorithm Analysis

Inherent communication in parallel algorithm is not all
- artificial communication caused by program implementation and architectural interactions can even dominate
- thus, amount of communication not dealt with adequately
Cost of communication determined not only by amount
- also how communication is structured
- and cost of communication in system
Both architecture-dependent, and addressed in orchestration step
To understand techniques, first look at system interactions

What is a Multiprocessor?

A collection of communicating processors
- View taken so far
- Goals: balance load, reduce inherent communication and extra work
A multi-cache, multi-memory system
- Role of these components essential regardless of programming model
- Programming model and comm. abstraction affect specific performance tradeoffs
Most of remaining performance issues focus on second aspect

Memory-Oriented View

Multiprocessor as Extended Memory Hierarchy
- as seen by a given processor
Levels in extended hierarchy:
- Registers, caches, local memory, remote memory (topology)
- Glued together by communication architecture
- Levels communicate at a certain granularity of data transfer
Need to exploit spatial and temporal locality in hierarchy
- Otherwise extra communication may also be caused
- Especially important since communication is expensive

Artifactual Comm. in Extended Hierarchy

Accesses not satisfied in local portion cause communication
- Inherent communication, implicit or explicit, causes transfers
  - determined by program
- Artificial communication
  - determined by program implementation and arch. interactions
  - poor allocation of data across distributed memories
  - unnecessary data in a transfer
  - unnecessary transfers due to system granularities
  - redundant communication of data
  - finite replication capacity (in cache or main memory)
- Inherent communication assumes unlimited capacity, small transfers, perfect knowledge of what is needed.
- More on artifactual later; first consider replication-induced further
Communication and Replication

Comm. due to finite capacity is most fundamental artifact
• Like cache size and miss rate or memory traffic in uniprocessors
• Extended memory hierarchy view useful for this relationship
View as three level hierarchy for simplicity
• Local cache, local memory, remote memory (ignore network topology)
Classify "misses" in "cache" at any level as for uniprocessors
  • compulsory or cold misses (no size effect)
  • capacity misses (yes)
  • conflict or collision misses (yes)
  • communication or coherence misses (no)
  • Each may be helped/hurt by large transfer granularity (spatial locality)

Working Set Perspective

• At a given level of the hierarchy (to the next further one)
  • Hierarchy of working sets
    • At first level cache (fully assoc, one-word block), inherent to algorithm
      • working set curve for program
    • Traffic from any type of miss can be local or non-local (communication)

Outline

1. Partitioning for performance
2. Relationship of communication, data locality and architecture
3. Orchestration for performance
4. Components of execution time as seen by processor

Reducing Artifactual Communication

Message passing model
  • Communication and replication are both explicit
  • Even artifactual communication is in explicit messages
Shared address space model
  • More interesting from an architectural perspective
  • Occurs transparently due to interactions of program and system
    • sizes and granularities in extended memory hierarchy
Use shared address space to illustrate issues
Exploiting Temporal Locality

- Structure algorithm so working sets map well to hierarchy
  - Often techniques to reduce inherent communication do well here
  - Schedule tasks for data reuse once assigned
- Multiple data structures in same phase
  - E.g., database records: local versus remote
- Solver example: blocking
  - More useful when $O(n^{k+1})$ computation on $O(n^k)$ data
  - Many linear algebra computations (factorization, matrix multiply)

Exploiting Spatial Locality

Besides capacity, granularities are important:
- Granularity of allocation
- Granularity of communication or data transfer
- Granularity of coherence

Major spatial-related causes of artifactual communication:
- Conflict misses
- Data distribution/layout (allocation granularity)
- Fragmentation (communication granularity)
- False sharing of data (coherence granularity)

All depend on how spatial access patterns interact with data structures
- Fix problems by modifying data structures, or layout/alignment

Examine later in context of architectures
- One simple example here: data distribution in SAS solver

Spatial Locality Example

- Repeated sweeps over 2-d grid, each time adding 1 to elements
- Natural 2-d versus higher-dimensional array representation

Tradeoffs with Inherent Communication

Partitioning grid solver: blocks versus rows
- Blocks still have a spatial locality problem on remote data
- Rows can perform better despite worse inherent c-to-c ratio

Result depends on $n$ and $p$
**Example Performance Impact**

Performance measured on an SGI Origin2000

![Graph showing performance impact](image)

**Structuring Communication**

Given amount of communication, goal is to reduce cost

Cost of communication as seen by process:

\[C = f \cdot \left( a + l + \frac{n_c}{m} + t_c - \text{overlap} \right)\]

- \(f\) = frequency of messages
- \(a\) = overhead per message (at both ends)
- \(l\) = network delay per message
- \(n_c\) = total data sent
- \(m\) = number of messages
- \(B\) = bandwidth along path (determined by network, NI, assist)
- \(t_c\) = cost induced by contention per message
- \(\text{overlap}\) = amount of latency hidden by overlap with comp. or comm.

- Portion in parentheses is cost of a message (as seen by processor)
- That portion, ignoring overlap, is latency of a message
- Goal: reduce terms in latency and increase overlap

**Reducing Overhead**

Can reduce \# of messages \(m\) or overhead per message \(a\)

- \(a\) is usually determined by hardware or system software
  - Program should try to reduce \(m\) by coalescing messages
  - More control when communication is explicit

Coalescing data into larger messages:

- Easy for regular, coarse-grained communication
- Can be difficult for irregular, naturally fine-grained communication
  - may require changes to algorithm and extra work
    » coalescing data and determining what and to whom to send
  - will discuss more in implications for programming models later

**Reducing Network Delay**

Network delay component = \(f \cdot h \cdot t_h\)

- \(h\) = number of hops traversed in network
- \(t_h\) = link-switch latency per hop

Reducing \(f\): communicate less, or make messages larger

Reducing \(h\):

- Map communication patterns to network topology
  - e.g. nearest-neighbor on mesh and ring; all-to-all
- How important is this?
  - used to be major focus of parallel algorithms
  - depends on no. of processors, how \(t_h\) compares with other components
  - less important on modern machines
    » overheads, processor count, multiprogramming
Reducing Contention

All resources have nonzero occupancy
- Memory, communication controller, network link, etc.
- Can only handle so many transactions per unit time

Effects of contention:
- Increased end-to-end cost for messages
- Reduced available bandwidth for individual messages
- Causes imbalances across processors

Particularly insidious performance problem
- Easy to ignore when programming
- Slow down messages that don’t even need that resource
  - by causing other dependent resources to also congest
- Effect can be devastating: Don’t flood a resource!

Types of Contention

Network contention and end-point contention (hot-spots)

Location and Module Hot-spots

Location: e.g. accumulating into global variable, barrier
- solution: tree-structured communication

Module: all-to-all personalized comm. in matrix transpose
- solution: stagger access by different processors to same node temporally

Overlapping Communication

Cannot afford to stall for high latencies
- even on uniprocessors!

Overlap with computation or communication to hide latency
Requires extra concurrency (slackness), higher bandwidth

Techniques:
- Prefetching
- Block data transfer
- Proceeding past communication
- Multithreading

Summary of Tradeoffs

Different goals often have conflicting demands

- Load Balance
  - fine-grain tasks
  - random or dynamic assignment
- Communication
  - usually coarse grain tasks
  - decompose to obtain locality: not random/dynamic
- Extra Work
  - coarse grain tasks
  - simple assignment
- Communication Cost:
  - big transfers: amortize overhead and latency
  - small transfers: reduce contention
Outline

1. Partitioning for performance
2. Relationship of communication, data locality and architecture
3. Orchestration for performance
4. Components of execution time as seen by processor
   - What workload looks like to architecture
   - Relate to software issues

Processor-Centric Perspective

Relationship between Perspectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallelization step(s)</th>
<th>Performance issue</th>
<th>Processor time component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decomposition/assignment/orchestration</td>
<td>Load imbalance and synchronization</td>
<td>Synch wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decomposition/assignment</td>
<td>Extra work</td>
<td>Busy-overhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decomposition/assignment</td>
<td>Inherent communication volume</td>
<td>Data-remote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>Artifactual communication</td>
<td>Data-local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration/mapping</td>
<td>Communication structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

\[
\text{Speedup}_{\text{proc}}(p) = \frac{\text{Busy}(1) + \text{Data}(1)}{\text{Busy}_{\text{user}}(p) + \text{Data}_{\text{local}}(p) + \text{Synch}(p) + \text{Data}_{\text{remote}}(p) + \text{Busy}_{\text{overhead}}(p)}
\]

- Goal is to reduce denominator components
- Both programmer and system have role to play
- Architecture cannot do much about load imbalance or too much communication
- But it can:
  - reduce incentive for creating ill-behaved programs (efficient naming, communication and synchronization)
  - reduce artifactual communication
  - provide efficient naming for flexible assignment
  - allow effective overlapping of communication