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Context

• Most parallel programs are written using either:
  – Message passing with a SPMD model
    • Usually for scientific applications with C++/Fortran
    • Scales easily
  – Shared memory with threads in OpenMP, Threads+C/C++/F or Java
    • Usually for non-scientific applications
    • Easier to program, but less scalable performance
• Global Address Space (GAS) Languages take the best of both
  – global address space like threads (programmability)
  – SPMD parallelism like MPI (performance)
  – local/global distinction, i.e., layout matters (performance)
Partitioned Global Address Space Languages

• Explicitly-parallel programming model with SPMD parallelism
  – Fixed at program start-up, typically 1 thread per processor
• Global address space model of memory
  – Allows programmer to directly represent distributed data structures
• Address space is logically partitioned
  – Local vs. remote memory (two-level hierarchy)
• Programmer control over performance critical decisions
  – Data layout and communication
• Performance transparency and tunability are goals
  – Initial implementation can use fine-grained shared memory
• Multiple PGAS languages: UPC (C), CAF (Fortran), Titanium (Java)
Global Address Space Eases Programming

• The languages share the global address space abstraction
  – Shared memory is logically partitioned by processors
  – Remote memory may stay remote: no automatic caching implied
  – One-sided communication: reads/writes of shared variables
  – Both individual and bulk memory copies

• Languages differ on details
  – Some models have a separate private memory area
  – Distributed array generality and how they are constructed
State of PGAS Languages

• A successful language/library must run everywhere
• UPC
  – Commercial compilers available on Cray, SGI, HP machines
  – Open source compiler from LBNL/UCB (source-to-source)
  – Open source gcc-based compiler from Intrepid
• CAF
  – Commercial compiler available on Cray machines
  – Open source compiler available from Rice
• Titanium
  – Open source compiler from UCB runs on most machines
• Common tools
  – Open64 open source research compiler infrastructure
  – ARMCI, GASNet for distributed memory implementations
  – Pthreads, System V shared memory

Berkeley UPC: http://upc.lbl.gov
Titanium: http://titanium.cs.berkeley.edu
UPC Overview and Design

• Unified Parallel C (UPC) is:
  – An explicit parallel extension of ANSI C
  – A partitioned global address space language
  – Sometimes called a GAS language
• Similar to the C language philosophy
  – Programmers are clever and careful, and may need to get close to hardware
    • to get performance, but
    • can get in trouble
  – Concise and efficient syntax
• Common and familiar syntax and semantics for parallel C with simple extensions to ANSI C
• Based on ideas in Split-C, AC, and PCP
One-Sided vs. Two-Sided Messaging

- **Two-sided messaging**
  - Message does not contain information about final destination
  - Have to perform look up at the target or do a rendezvous
  - Point-to-point synchronization is implied with all transfers

- **One-sided messaging**
  - Message contains information about final destination
  - Decouple synchronization from data movement

- **What does the network hardware support?**
- **What about when we need point-to-point sync?**
  - Hold that thought…
GASNet Latency Performance

- GASNet implemented on top of Deep Computing Messaging Framework (DCMF)
  - Lower level than MPI
  - Provides Puts, Gets, AMSend, and Collectives
- Point-to-point ping-ack latency performance
  - N-byte transfer w/ 0 byte acknowledgement
    - GASNet takes advantage of DCMF remote completion notification
    - Minimum semantics needed to implement the UPC memory model
    - Almost a factor of two difference until 32 bytes
    - Indication of better semantic match to underlying communication system
GASNet Multilink Bandwidth

- Each node has six 850MB/s* bidirectional link
- Vary number of links from 1 to 6
- Initiate a series of nonblocking puts on the links (round-robin)
  - Communication/communication overlap
- Both MPI and GASNet asymptote to the same bandwidth
- GASNet outperforms MPI at midrange message sizes
  - Lower software overhead implies more efficient message injection
  - GASNet avoids rendezvous to leverage RDMA

* Kumar et. al showed the maximum achievable bandwidth for DCMF transfers is 748 MB/s per link so we use this as our peak bandwidth
See “The deep computing messaging framework: generalized scalable message passing on the blue gene/P supercomputer”, Kumar et al. ICS08
UPC (PGAS) Execution Model
UPC Execution Model

• A number of threads working independently in a SPMD fashion
  – Number of threads specified at compile-time or run-time; available as program variable `THREADS`
  – `MYTHREAD` specifies thread index (0..`THREADS-1`)
  – `upc_barrier` is a global synchronization: all wait
  – There is a form of parallel loop that we will see later

• There are two compilation modes
  – Static Threads mode:
    • `THREADS` is specified at compile time by the user
    • The program may use `THREADS` as a compile-time constant
  – Dynamic threads mode:
    • Compiled code may be run with varying numbers of threads
Hello World in UPC

• Any legal C program is also a legal UPC program
• If you compile and run it as UPC with P threads, it will run P copies of the program.
• Using this fact, plus the identifiers from the previous slides, we can parallel hello world:

```c
#include <upc.h> /* needed for UPC extensions */
#include <stdio.h>

main() {
    printf("Thread %d of %d: hello UPC world\n",
            MYTHREAD, THREARDS);
}
```
Example: Monte Carlo Pi Calculation

- Estimate Pi by throwing darts at a unit square
- Calculate percentage that fall in the unit circle
  - Area of square = $r^2 = 1$
  - Area of circle quadrant = $\frac{1}{4} \pi r^2 = \pi/4$
- Randomly throw darts at $x,y$ positions
- If $x^2 + y^2 < 1$, then point is inside circle
- Compute ratio:
  - $\frac{\# \text{ points inside}}{\# \text{ points total}}$
  - $\pi = 4\times\text{ratio}$
Pi in UPC

- Independent estimates of π:

```c
main(int argc, char **argv) {
    int i, hits, trials = 0;
    double pi;

    if (argc != 2) trials = 1000000;
    else trials = atoi(argv[1]);

    srand(MYTHREAD*17);

    for (i=0; i < trials; i++) hits += hit();
    pi = 4.0*hits/trials;
    printf("PI estimated to \%f.\n", pi);
}
```

Each thread gets its own copy of these variables
Each thread can use input arguments
Initialize random in math library
Each thread calls “hit” separately
Helper Code for Pi in UPC

• Required includes:
  
  ```
  #include <stdio.h>
  #include <math.h>
  #include <upc.h>
  ```

• Function to throw dart and calculate where it hits:

  ```
  int hit()
  {
    double x = ((double) rand()) / RAND_MAX;
    double y = ((double) rand()) / RAND_MAX;
    if ((x*x + y*y) <= 1.0) {
      return(1);
    } else {
      return(0);
    }
  }
  ```
Shared vs. Private Variables
Private vs. Shared Variables in UPC

- Normal C variables and objects are allocated in the private memory space for each thread.
- Shared variables are allocated only once, with thread 0
  
  ```
  shared int ours; // use sparingly: performance
  int mine;
  ```
- Shared variables may not have dynamic lifetime: may not occur in a function definition, except as static.

![Diagram showing private and shared memory spaces for threads]
Pi in UPC: Shared Memory Style

- Parallel computing of pi, but with a bug

```c
shared int hits;

main(int argc, char **argv) {
    int i, my_trials = 0;
    int trials = atoi(argv[1]);
    my_trials = (trials + THREADS - 1)/THREADS;
    srand(MYTHREAD*17);
    for (i=0; i < my_trials; i++)
        hits += hit();
    upc_barrier;
    if (MYTHREAD == 0) {
        printf("PI estimated to %f.\n", 4.0*hits/
    trials);
    }
```
Shared Arrays Are Cyclic By Default

- Shared scalars always live in thread 0
- Shared arrays are spread over the threads
- Shared array elements are spread across the threads

```c
shared int x[THREADS]    /* 1 element per thread */
shared int y[3][THREADS] /* 3 elements per thread */
shared int z[3][3]       /* 2 or 3 elements per thread */
```

- In the pictures below, assume THREADS = 4
  - Red elts have affinity to thread 0

  ![Diagram showing the distribution of shared arrays]

  Think of linearized C array, then map in round-robin
  As a 2D array, y is logically blocked by columns
  z is not
Pi in UPC: Shared Array Version

• Alternative fix to the race condition
• Have each thread update a separate counter:
  – But do it in a shared array
  – Have one thread compute sum

```c
shared int all_hits [THREADS];
main(int argc, char **argv) {
...
for (i=0; i < my_trials; i++)
  all_hits[MYTHREAD] += hit();
upc_barrier;
if (MYTHREAD == 0) {
  for (i=0; i < THREADS; i++) hits += all_hits[i];
  printf("PI estimated to %f.", 4.0*hits/trials);
}
```
Recap: Private vs. Shared Variables in UPC

- We saw several kinds of variables in the pi example
  - Private scalars (my_hits)
  - Shared scalars (hits)
  - Shared arrays (all_hits)

![Diagram showing private and shared variables across threads]

Where:
\( n = \text{Threads} - 1 \)
UPC Global Synchronization

- UPC has two basic forms of barriers:
  - Barrier: block until all other threads arrive
    ```c
    upc_barrier
    ```
  - Split-phase barriers
    ```c
    upc_notify; // this thread is ready for barrier
do computation unrelated to barrier
    upc_wait; // wait for others to be ready
    ```
- Optional labels allow for debugging
  ```c
  #define MERGE_BARRIER 12
  if (MYTHREAD%2 == 0) {
    ...
    upc_barrier MERGE_BARRIER;
  } else {
    ...
    upc_barrier MERGE_BARRIER;
  }
  ```
Collectives

- UPC has support for many standard collectives (in latest language spec)
  - Data Movement: Broadcast, Scatter, Gather, Allgather, Exchange (i.e. Alltoall)
  - Computational: Reductions and Prefix Reductions
- Shared data semantics complicates when data is considered safe to read or modify
- Language lets user specify looser synchronization requirements (i.e. when is source data readable by the collective or modifiable)
  - Looser synchronization allows better implementation in runtime
  - Loose (NO): Data will not be touched within the current barrier phase
  - Medium (MY): Thread will not access remote data associated to collective without point-to-point synchronization or a barrier
  - Strict (All): Can access any and all data associated with a collective without synchronization (i.e. handled w/in the collective)
  - Defaults are to use “strict”
Pi in UPC: Data Parallel Style

• The previous version of Pi works, but is not scalable:
  – On a large # of threads, the locked region will be a bottleneck
• Use a reduction for better scalability

```cpp
#include <bupc_collectivev.h>

// shared int hits;
main(int argc, char **argv) {
  ...
  for (i=0; i < my_trials; i++)
    my_hits += hit();
  my_hits = bupc_allv_reduce(int, my_hits, 0, UPC_ADD);
  // upc_barrier;
  if (MYTHREAD == 0)
    printf("PI: %f", 4.0*my_hits/trials);
}
```

Berkeley collectives
no shared variables
barrier implied by collective
Work Distribution Using
upc_forall
Example: Vector Addition

- Questions about parallel vector additions:
  - How to layout data (here it is cyclic)
  - Which processor does what (here it is “owner computes”)

```c
/* vadd.c */
#include <upc_relaxed.h>
#define N 100*THREADS

shared int v1[N], v2[N], sum[N];
void main() {
    int i;
    for(i=0; i<N; i++)
        if (MYTHREAD == i%THREADS)
            sum[i]=v1[i]+v2[i];
}
```

- cyclic layout
- owner computes
Work Sharing with upc_forall()

• The idiom in the previous slide is very common
  – Loop over all; work on those owned by this proc

• UPC adds a special type of loop
  
  upc_forall(init; test; loop; affinity)
  
  statement;

• Programmer indicates the iterations are independent
  – Undefined if there are dependencies across threads

• Affinity expression indicates which iterations to run on each thread. It may have one of two types:
  – Integer: affinity%THREADS is MYTHREAD
  – Pointer: upc_threadof(affinity) is MYTHREAD

• Syntactic sugar for loop on previous slide
  – Some compilers may do better than this, e.g.,
    for(i=MYTHREAD; i<N; i+=THREADS)
  – Rather than having all threads iterate N times:
    for(i=0; i<N; i++) if (MYTHREAD == i%THREADS)
Vector Addition with upc_forall

• The vadd example can be rewritten as follows
  • Equivalent code could use \texttt{&sum[i]} for affinity
  • The code would be correct but slow if the affinity expression were \texttt{i+1} rather than \texttt{i}.

\begin{verbatim}
#define N 100*THREADS

    shared int v1[N], v2[N], sum[N];

    void main() {
        int i;
        upc_forall(i=0; i<N; i++; i)
            sum[i]=v1[i]+v2[i];
    }
\end{verbatim}

The cyclic data distribution may perform poorly on some machines
Distributed Arrays in UPC
Layouts in General

- All non-array objects have affinity with thread zero.
- Array layouts are controlled by layout specifiers:
  - Empty (cyclic layout)
  - [*] (blocked layout)
  - [0] or [] (indefinite layout, all on 1 thread)
  - [b] (fixed block size)
- The affinity of an array element is defined in terms of:
  - block size, a compile-time constant
  - and THREADS.
- Element $i$ has affinity with thread
  \[
  (i / \text{block size}) \mod \text{THREADS}
  \]
- In 2D and higher, linearize the elements as in a C representation, and then use above mapping.
More on Shared Arrays

- Shared arrays are just data allocated on different processors
  - Can be cast into *any* block size
  - Casting just renumbers indices of shared array (data doesn’t move!)
  - Example with 4 threads
    - Allocate an array:
      ```
      shared int *A = upc_all_alloc(THREADS, sizeof(int)*4)
      ```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 |
|----|---|---|----|
| P1 | 1 | 5 | 9 | 13 |
| P2 | 2 | 6 | 10| 14 |
| P3 | 3 | 7 | 11| 15 |
UPC Matrix Vector Multiplication Code

• Matrix-vector multiplication with matrix stored by rows
• (Contrived example: problem size is square and multiple of thread count)

```c
#define N 1024
shared [N*N/THREADS] int A[N][N]; /*blocked row-wise*/
shared [N/THREADS] int b[N], c[N]; /*blocked row-wise*/

void main (void) {
    int i, j, l;
    upc_forall( i = 0 ; i < N ; i++ ; &A[i][0]) { 
        /*if I own row i of A*/
        c[i] = 0;
        for ( l= 0 ; l< THREADS ; l++)
            c[i] += a[i][l]*b[l];
        /*no communication since all data accessed is local*/
    }
}
```
UPC Matrix Multiplication Code

/* mat_mult_1.c */
#include <upc_relaxed.h>
#define N 1024
#define P 1024
#define M 1024

/* a and c are row-wise blocked shared matrices*/
shared [N*P/THREADS] int a[N][P];
shared [M*N/THREADS] int c[N][M];
shared [M/THREADS] int b[P][M]; /*column-wise blocking*/

void main (void) {
    int i, j, l; /* private variables*/

    upc_forall(i = 0 ; i<N ; i++; &c[i][0]) {
        for (j=0 ; j<M ; j++) {
            c[i][j] = 0;
            /*access remote data for matrix multiply*/
            for (l= 0 ; l<P ; l++) c[i][j] += a[i][l]*b[l][j];
        }
    }
}
Domain Decomposition for UPC

• Exploits locality in matrix multiplication

• A \((N \times P)\) is decomposed row-wise into blocks of size \((N \times P) / \text{THREADS}\) as shown below:

• \(B(P \times M)\) is decomposed column wise into \(M / \text{THREADS}\) blocks as shown below:

• Note: \(N\) and \(M\) are assumed to be multiples of \(\text{THREADS}\)
Points Queue to Shared vs. Arrays

• In the C tradition, array can be accessed through pointers
• Here is the vector addition example using pointers

```
#define N 100*THREADS
shared int v1[N], v2[N], sum[N]; /*cyclic layout*/
void main() {
    int i;
    shared int *p1, *p2;
    p1=v1; p2=v2;
    for (i=0; i<N; i++, p1++, p2++)
        if (i %THREADS == MYTHREAD)
            sum[i]= *p1 + *p2;
}
```
int *p1;  /* private pointer to local memory */
shared int *p2;  /* private pointer to shared space */
int *shared p3;  /* shared pointer to local memory */
shared int  *shared p4;  /* shared pointer to shared space */

Pointers to shared often require more storage and are more costly to dereference; they may refer to local or remote memory.
Common Uses for UPC Pointer Types

int *p1;
• These pointers are fast (just like C pointers)
• Use to access local data in part of code performing local work
• Often cast a pointer-to-shared to one of these to get faster access to shared data that is local

shared int *p2;
• Use to refer to remote data
• Larger and slower due to test-for-local + possible communication

int *shared p3;
• Not recommended

shared int *shared p4;
• Use to build shared linked structures, e.g., a linked list
Bulk Data Movement and Nonblocking Communication

• Using loops to perform bulk data movement could potentially be slow because of network traffic per element

• Language introduces variants of memcpy to address these issues
  • upc_memcpy (source and destination are in shared space)
  • upc_memput (source is in private / destination is in shared)
  • upc_memget (source is in shared / destination is in private)

• Berkeley UPC extensions provide nonblocking variants
  – Allows communication/computation or communication/communication overlap
  – Unlike MPI_Isend and MPI_Irecv, they are completely one sided and are a better semantic fit for Remote Direct Memory Access (RDMA)
  – Expected to be part of language standard soon
Berkeley UPC Extensions

• Nonblocking communication
  – Ability to have communication/computation or communication/communication overlap
  – Like MPI_Isend and Irecv, uses explicit handles that need to be synched.

• Semaphores and Point-to-Point synchronization
  – Many applications need point-to-point synchronization
  – Provide mechanisms to allow it in UPC without making it default
  – Interface provides a one-sided signaling put which notifies remote processor when data has arrived

• Value-based collectives
  – Simplify collective interface when you need collectives on scalar values

• Remote atomics
  – Perform atomic operations on 32 or 64 bit ints on shared heap
UPC Synchronization
Synchronization - Locks

• Locks in UPC are represented by an opaque type:
  
  \texttt{upc\_lock\_t}

• Locks must be allocated before use:

  \texttt{upc\_lock\_t *upc\_all\_lock\_alloc(\texttt{void})};
  
  allocates 1 lock, pointer to all threads

  \texttt{upc\_lock\_t *upc\_global\_lock\_alloc(\texttt{void})};
  
  allocates 1 lock, pointer to one thread

• To use a lock:

  \texttt{void upc\_lock(upc\_lock\_t *l)}
  
  \texttt{void upc\_unlock(upc\_lock\_t *l)}
  
  use at start and end of critical region

• Locks can be freed when not in use

  \texttt{void upc\_lock\_free(upc\_lock\_t *ptr);}
Pi in UPC: Shared Memory Style

- Parallel computing of pi, without the bug

```c
shared int hits;
main(int argc, char **argv) {
    int i, my_hits, my_trials = 0;
    upc_lock_t *hit_lock = upc_all_lock_alloc();
    int trials = atoi(argv[1]);
    my_trials = (trials + THREADS - 1)/THREADS;
    srand(MYTHREAD*17);
    for (i=0; i < my_trials; i++)
        my_hits += hit();
    upc_lock(hit_lock);
    hits += my_hits;
    upc_unlock(hit_lock);
    upc_barrier;
    if (MYTHREAD == 0)
        printf("PI: %f", 4.0*hits/trials);
}
```
Extensions and Tricks of the Trade
Pointer Directory

• Want each processor to dynamically allocate an array of \( k \) doubles of data on every processor that is remotely addressable.

• We want the \( k \) bytes to be contiguous so that they can be cast into local pointers and passed into C-library functions without extra copies
  
  – If \( k \) is a compile constant: 
    
    \[
    \text{shared } [k] \text{ double } A[\text{THREADS}\ast k] \text{ else shared } [] \text{ double } **\text{my}\_\text{dir}; \]  
    
    /*local array of UPC pointers*/
    
    \[
    \text{shared double } *\text{global}\_\text{array}; \]  
    
    /*cyclic by default*/
    
    \[
    \text{my}\_\text{dir} = (\text{shared } [] \text{ double*})
    \]  
    
    \[
    \text{malloc(sizeof(shared[] double*)}\ast \text{THREADS})
    \]  
    
    \[
    \text{global}\_\text{array} = \text{upc\_all\_alloc(THREADS, } k);\]
    
    \[
    \text{for}(i=0; \text{i}<\text{THREADS}; \text{i}++) \{ /*cyclic dist. implies elem } i \text{ is on proc } i \text{ so cast gets all memory w/ affinity to that proc*/}
    \]  
    
    \[
    \text{my}\_\text{dir}[i] = (\text{shared } [] \text{ double*}) \&\text{global}\_\text{array}[i];\}
    \]

To access element \( i \) on proc \( p \) (\( i \) can range from 0 to \( k-1 \))

\[
\text{my}\_\text{dir}[p][i] \text{ or } *(\text{my}\_\text{dir}[p]+i)
\]
Point-to-Point Sync

• Many algorithms need point-to-point synchronization
  – Producer/consumer data dependencies (one-to-one, few-to-few)
    • Sweep3d, Jacobi, MG, CG, tree-based reductions, …
  – Ability to couple a data transfer with remote notification
  – Message passing provides this synchronization implicitly
    • recv operation only completes after send is posted
    • Pay costs for sync & ordered delivery whether you want it or not
  – For PGAS, really want something like a signaling store (Split-C)

• Current mechanisms available in UPC:
  – UPC Barriers - stop the world sync
  – UPC Locks - build a queue protected with critical sections
  – Strict variables - roll your own sync primitives

• Our Proposed Extension
  – Use semaphores in shared space at each threads and provide “signalling put”
  – User specifies remote semaphore to signal on a put
  – Point-to-point synchronization is provided only when needed
Point-to-Point Synchronization (cont):

- Simple extension to upc_memput interface
  
  ```c
  void bupc_memput_signal(shared void *dst, void *src, size_t nbytes,
                          bupc_sem_t *s, size_t n);
  ```

  - Two new args specify a semaphore to signal on arrival
  - Semaphore must have affinity to the target
  - Blocks for local completion only (doesn't stall for ack)
  - Enables implementation using a single network message
  - Also provide a non-blocking variant

- Target side calls wait on the same semaphore
  - When the semaphore gets tripped the data has arrived and the target can safely use the buffer
  - Interface: `bupc_sem_wait(bupc_sem_t *s)`

  ```c
  bupc_memput_signal(...,sem);  bupc_sem_wait(sem);
  /* overlap compute */         /* consume data */
  ```

**memput_signal:**
- latency ~0.5 round-trips
- allows overlap
- easy to use
Application Examples and Performance
Dense LU Factorization in UPC

• Direct methods have complicated dependencies
  • Especially with pivoting (unpredictable communication)
  • Especially for sparse matrices (dependence graph with holes)
• LU Factorization in UPC
  • Use overlap ideas and multithreading to mask latency
  • Multithreaded: UPC threads + user threads + threaded BLAS
    • Panel factorization: Including pivoting
    • Update to a block of U
    • Trailing submatrix updates
  • Written in a Data-centric way
    • Shared address space and one-sided communication allows remote enqueue of work w/o interrupting the remote processors
• Dense LU done: HPL-compliant
• Sparse version underway

• Ref: “Multi-Threading and One-Sided Communication in Parallel LU Factorization” by Parry Husbands and Kathy Yelick [SC’07]
UPC HPL Performance

• Comparison to ScaLAPACK on an Altix, a 2 x 4 process grid
  – ScaLAPACK (block size 64) 25.25 GFlop/s (tried several block sizes)
  – UPC LU (block size 256) - 33.60 GFlop/s, (block size 64) - 26.47 GFlop/s
• n = 32000 on a 4x4 process grid
  – ScaLAPACK - **43.34 GFlop/s** (block size = 64)
  – UPC - **70.26 Gflop/s** (block size = 200)

• MPI HPL numbers from HPCC database
• Large scaling:
  • 2.2 TFlops on 512p,
  • 4.4 TFlops on 1024p (Thunder)
Other Dense Linear Algebra Performance on BG/P

Parallel Matrix Multiplication (256 core BlueGene/P)

- PBLAS (MPI): 458 GFlops
- UPC hand-roll: 580 GFlops
- UPC collective: 625 GFlops

Parallel Cholesky Factorization (256 core BlueGene/P)

- ScaLapack (MPI): 202 GFLOPs
- UPC hand-roll: 212 GFLOPs
- UPC collective: 220 GFLOPs
Case Study: NAS FT Benchmark

- Perform a large 3D FFT
  - Molecular dynamics, CFD, image processing, signal processing, astrophysics, etc.
  - Representative of a class of communication intensive algorithms
    - Requires parallel many-to-many communication
    - Stresses communication subsystem
    - Limited by bandwidth (namely bisection bandwidth) of the network
- Building on our previous work, we perform a 2D partition of the domain
  - Requires two rounds of communication rather than one
  - Each processor communicates in two rounds with $O(\sqrt{T})$ threads in each
Strong Scaling

- Fix problem size at 2k x 1k x 1k and run in VN mode
  - Up to 4 racks of BG/P with 4 processes per node
- Analytic upper bound calculates megaflop rate based on time needed to transfer domain across the bisection
  - Kink at 2048 cores indicates where 3D Torus is completed
- MPI Packed Slabs scales better than MPI Slabs
  - Benefit of comm/comp. overlap outweighed by extra messages
- UPC (i.e. GASNet) Slabs consistently outperforms MPI
  - Lower software overhead enables better overlap
  - Outperforms Slabs by mean of 63% and Packed Slabs by mean of 37%
Weak Scaling

- Scale problem size with the number of cores
  - computation for FFT scales as $O(N \log N)$ so thus flops don’t scale linearly
- UPC Slabs scales better than strong scaling benchmark
  - Message size gets too small at high concurrency for strong scaling and becomes hard to utilize overlap
- MPI Packed Slabs outperforms MPI Slabs (most of the time)
  - Again indicates that overlapping communication/computation is not a fruitful optimization for MPI
- UPC achieves 1.93 Teraflops while best MPI achieves 1.37 Teraflops
  - 40% improvement in performance at 16k cores.
Latest FFT Performance on BG/P (strong scaling)
Latest FFT Performance on BG/P (weak scaling)

HPC Challenge Peak as of July 09 is ~4.5 TFlops on 128k Cores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Slabs</th>
<th>Slabs (Collective)</th>
<th>Packed Slabs (Collective)</th>
<th>MPI Packed Slabs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1024</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8192</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16384</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D*16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32768</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GFlops

Berkeley UPC: http://upc.lbl.gov
Titanium: http://titanium.cs.berkeley.edu
Thanks!
Any Questions?
Titanium Overview
Titanium Overview and Design

• Based on Java, a cleaner C++
  – Classes, automatic memory management, etc.
  – Compiled to C and then machine code, no JVM
• Same parallelism model at UPC and CAF
  – SPMD parallelism
  – Dynamic Java threads are not supported
• Optimizing compiler
  – Analyzes global synchronization
  – Optimizes pointers, communication, memory
• Titanium is designed for
  – Structured grids
  – Locally-structured grids (AMR)
  – Particle/Mesh methods
SPMD Execution Model

• Titanium has the same execution model as UPC and CAF
• Basic Java programs may be run as Titanium programs, but all processors do all the work.
• E.g., parallel hello world

```java
class HelloWorld {
    public static void main (String [] argv) {
        System.out.println("Hello from proc "+ Ti.thisProc()+ " out of "+ Ti.numProcs());
    }
}
```

• Global synchronization done using Ti.barrier()
Barriers and Single

• To put a barrier (or equivalent) inside a method, you need to make the message “single” (aka “sglobal”).
  – A “single” method is one called by all procs
    
    ```java
    public single static void allStep(...) 
    ```
  – These single annotations on methods are optional, but useful in understanding compiler messages

• To put a barrier (or single method) inside a branch or loop, you need to use a “single” variable for branch

• A “single” variable has same value on all procs

  ```java
  int single timestep = 0; 
  ```

• Compiler proves that all processors call barriers together "Barrier Inference" [Gay & Aiken]
Titanium Arrays

- Titanium arrays are created and indexed using points:
  
  ```java
double [3d] gridA = new double[[-1:-1:-1]:[256:256:256]];
```

- `gridA` has a rectangular index set (called a RectDomain) of Points
  
  ```java
  Point<3> lb = [-1,-1,-1], ub = [256,256,256], randompoint = [6,7,42];
  RectDomain<3> allpoints = [lb:ub];
  double [3d] gridA = new double[allpoints];
  gridA[randompoint]= 3.1415;
```

- Unlike UPC all references are assumed global unless otherwise denoted by the user

- `foreach` loop iterator provides unordered iteration over a domain
  
  ```java
  foreach(p in gridA.domain()) {
  }
  ```
More about domains

• Titanium arrays have a rich set of operations

  translate restrict slice (n dim to n-1)

• None of these modify the original array, they just create another view of the data in that array

• You create arrays with a RectDomain and get it back later using A.domain() for array A
  • A Domain is a set of points in space
  • A RectDomain is a rectangular one

• Operations on Domains include +, -, * (union, different intersection)
Distributed Data Structures

• Building distributed arrays:

  Particle [1d] single [1d] allParticle =
  new Particle [0:Ti.numProcs-1][1d];
  Particle [1d] myParticle =
  new Particle [0:myParticleCount-1];
  allParticle.exchange(myParticle);

  All to all broadcast

• Now each processor has array of pointers, one to each processor’s chunk of particles
Domain Calculus and Array Copy

- Full power of Titanium arrays combined with PGAS model
- Titanium allows set operations on RectDomains:

```c
destarray.copy(sourcearray, domain/points (optional)); // copy all data where domains overlap
// update overlapping ghost cells of neighboring block
data[neighborPos].copy(myData.shrink(1));
```

- The copy is only done on intersection of source and dest array RectDomains
- Titanium also supports nonblocking array copy

Slide source: Datta et al. [LCPC ’06]
Performing a 3D FFT

• NX x NY x NZ elements spread across P processors
• Will Use 1-Dimensional Layout in Z dimension
  – Each processor gets NZ / P “planes” of NX x NY elements per plane

Example: P = 4

[Diagram showing 3D partition with NX, NY, and NZ dimensions, and how they are partitioned across P processors]
**Performance Summary**

- Best MPI/UPC implementation leverage aggressive communication/computation overlap
  - pencils is finer-grained overlap than slabs
- UPC achieves better performance because one-sided semantics (i.e. decoupling synth and data movement) are a better match to the network hardware
- Ref: “Optimizing Bandwidth Limited Problems Using One-Sided Communication and Overlap” C. Bell, D. Bonacha, R. Nishtala, and K. Yelick [IPDPS ’06]
3D-FFT Algorithm

- Perform a 3D FFT (as part of NAS FT) across a large rectangular prism
  - Perform an FFT in each of the 3 Dimensions
  - Need to Team-Exchange for other 2/3 dimensions for a 2-D processor layout
  - Performance limited by bisection bandwidth of the network

- Algorithm:
  - Perform FFT across the rows
  - Do an exchange within each plane
  - Perform FFT across the columns
  - Do an exchange across planes
  - Perform FFT across the last dimension

Each processor owns a row of 4 squares
(16 processors in example)
Adaptive Mesh Refinement in Titanium

C++/Fortran/MPI AMR
• Chombo package from LBNL
• Bulk-synchronous comm:
  – Pack boundary data between procs
  – All optimizations done by programmer

Titanium AMR
• Entirely in Titanium
• Finer-grained communication
  – No explicit pack/unpack code
  – Automated in runtime system
• General approach
  – Language allow programmer optimizations
  – Compiler/runtime does some automatically

Work by Tong Wen and Philip Colella; Communication optimizations joint with Jimmy Su
Titanium AMR Performance

• Performance is comparable with much less programming work
• Compiler/runtime perform some tedious (SMP-aware) optimizations
Lots of Other Features

- Immutable classes
  - Want to pass C-like structures by value (i.e. Complex numbers or coordinates)
  - Values can’t be modified outside of data structures.
- Cross Language Calls
  - Allows users to call serial libraries written in C
  - Call serial libraries with C interfaces (i.e. BLAS, FFTW, OSKI, etc)
- Region-based Memory Management
  - Preserves safety – cannot deallocate live data
    - (True in principle, although runtime is missing some checking required by language in practice)
  - Garbage collection is the default (on most platforms)
  - Higher performance is possible using region-based explicit memory management
  - Takes advantage of memory management phases
- And a whole lot more…
UPC Continued
Backup Slides
Blocked Layouts in UPC

• The cyclic layout is typically stored in one of two ways
  • Distributed memory: each processor has a chunk of memory
    • Thread 0 would have: 0,THREADS, THREADS*2,… in a chunk
  • Shared memory machine: each thread has a logical chunk
    • Shared memory would have: 0,1,2,…THREADS,THREADS+1,…
  • What performance problem is there with the latter?
  • What is this code was instead doing nearest neighbor averaging?
• Vector addition example can be rewritten as follows

```
#define N 100*THREADS
shared [*] int v1[N], v2[N], sum[N];

void main() {
    int i;
    upc_forall(i=0; i<N; i++; &sum[i])
        sum[i]=v1[i]+v2[i];
}
```
UPC Collectives in General

• The UPC collectives interface is available from:
  – [http://www.gwu.edu/~upc/documentation.html](http://www.gwu.edu/~upc/documentation.html)

• It contains typical functions:
  – Data movement: broadcast, scatter, gather, …
  – Computational: reduce, prefix, …

• Interface has synchronization modes:
  – Avoid over-synchronizing (barrier before/after is simplest semantics, but may be unnecessary)
  – Data being collected may be read/written by any thread simultaneously
2D Array Layouts in UPC

• Array a1 has a row layout and array a2 has a block row layout.

```c
shared [m] int a1 [n][m];
shared [k*m] int a2 [n][m];
```

• If \((k + m) \mod \text{THREADS} = 0\) them a3 has a row layout

```c
shared int a3 [n][m+k];
```

• To get more general HPF and ScaLAPACK style 2D blocked layouts, one needs to add dimensions.

• Assume \(r*c = \text{THREADS}\);

```c
shared [b1][b2] int a5 [m][n][r][c][b1][b2];
```

• or equivalently

```c
shared [b1*b2] int a5 [m][n][r][c][b1][b2];
```
Notes on the Matrix Multiplication Example

• The UPC code for the matrix multiplication is almost the same size as the sequential code
• Shared variable declarations include the keyword shared
• Making a private copy of matrix B in each thread might result in better performance since many remote memory operations can be avoided
• Can be done with the help of upc_memget
### UPC Pointers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where does the pointer point?</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>Shared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>PP (p1)</td>
<td>PS (p3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>SP (p2)</td>
<td>SS (p4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where does the pointer reside?

- `int *p1;` /* private pointer to local memory */
- `shared int *p2;` /* private pointer to shared space */
- `int *shared p3;` /* shared pointer to local memory */
- `shared int *shared p4;` /* shared pointer to shared space */

Shared to private is not recommended.
(FT) IPDPS '06 Talk
Optimizing Bandwidth Limited Problems Using One-Sided Communication and Overlap

Christian Bell\textsuperscript{1,2}, Dan Bonachea\textsuperscript{1}, Rajesh Nishtala\textsuperscript{1}, and Katherine Yelick\textsuperscript{1,2}
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Conventional Wisdom

• Send few, large messages
  – Allows the network to deliver the most effective bandwidth

• Isolate computation and communication phases
  – Uses bulk-synchronous programming
  – Allows for packing to maximize message size

• Message passing is preferred paradigm for clusters

• Global Address Space (GAS) Languages are primarily useful for latency sensitive applications

• GAS Languages mainly help productivity
  – However, not well known for their performance advantages
Our Contributions

• Increasingly, cost of HPC machines is in the network

• One-sided communication model is a better match to modern networks
  – GAS Languages simplify programming for this model

• How to use these communication advantages
  – Case study with NAS Fourier Transform (FT)
  – Algorithms designed to relieve communication bottlenecks
    • Overlap communication \textit{and} computation
    • Send messages early and often to maximize overlap
UPC Programming Model

- **Global address space:** any thread/process may directly read/write data allocated by another
- **Partitioned:** data is designated as local (near) or global (possibly far); programmer controls layout

![Diagram of UPC programming model]

- **3 of the current languages:** UPC, CAF, and Titanium
  - Emphasis in this talk on UPC (based on C)
  - However programming paradigms presented in this work are not limited to UPC
Advantages of GAS Languages

• Productivity
  – GAS supports construction of complex shared data structures
  – High level constructs simplify parallel programming
  – Related work has already focused on these advantages

• Performance (the main focus of this talk)
  – GAS Languages can be faster than two-sided MPI
  – One-sided communication paradigm for GAS languages more natural fit to modern cluster networks
  – Enables novel algorithms to leverage the power of these networks
  – GASNet, the communication system in the Berkeley UPC Project, is designed to take advantage of this communication paradigm
One-Sided vs Two-Sided

- A one-sided put/get can be entirely handled by network interface with RDMA support
  - CPU can dedicate more time to computation rather than handling communication

- A two-sided message can employ RDMA for only part of the communication
  - Each message requires the target to provide the destination address
  - Offloaded to network interface in networks like Quadrics

- RDMA makes it apparent that MPI has added costs associated with ordering to make it usable as a end-user programming model
Latency Advantages

• Comparison:
  – One-sided:
    • Initiator can always transmit remote address
    • Close semantic match to high bandwidth, zero-copy RDMA
  – Two-sided:
    • Receiver must provide destination address

• Latency measurement correlates to software overhead
  – Much of the small-message latency is due to time spent in software/firmware processing

One-sided implementation consistently outperforms 2-sided counterpart
Bandwidth Advantages

- One-sided semantics better match to RDMA supported networks
  - Relaxing point-to-point ordering constraint can allow for higher performance on some networks
  - GASNet saturates to hardware peak at lower message sizes
  - Synchronization decoupled from data transfer
- MPI semantics designed for end user
  - Comparison against good MPI implementation
  - Semantic requirements hinder MPI performance
  - Synchronization and data transferred coupled together in message passing

Over a factor of 2 improvement for 1kB messages
Bandwidth Advantages (cont)

- GASNet and MPI saturate to roughly the same bandwidth for “large” messages.
- GASNet consistently outperforms MPI for “mid-range” message sizes.
A Case Study: NAS FT

• How to use the potential that the microbenchmarks reveal?

• Perform a large 3 dimensional Fourier Transform
  – Used in many areas of computational sciences
    • Molecular dynamics, computational fluid dynamics, image processing, signal processing, nanoscience, astrophysics, etc.

• Representative of a class of communication intensive algorithms
  – Sorting algorithms rely on a similar intensive communication pattern
  – Requires every processor to communicate with every other processor
  – Limited by bandwidth
Performing a 3D FFT (part 2)

- Perform an FFT in all three dimensions
- With 1D layout, 2 out of the 3 dimensions are local while the last Z dimension is distributed

Step 1: FFTs on the columns (all elements local)
Step 2: FFTs on the rows (all elements local)
Step 3: FFTs in the Z-dimension (requires communication)
Performing the 3D FFT (part 3)

• Can perform Steps 1 and 2 since all the data is available without communication
• Perform a Global Transpose of the cube
  – Allows step 3 to continue
The Transpose

- Each processor has to scatter input domain to other processors
  - Every processor divides its portion of the domain into P pieces
  - Send each of the P pieces to a different processor

- Three different ways to break it up the messages
  1. Packed Slabs (i.e. single packed “Alltoall” in MPI parlance)
  2. Slabs
  3. Pencils

- An order of magnitude increase in the number of messages
- An order of magnitude decrease in the size of each message
- “Slabs” and “Pencils” allow overlapping communication and computation and leverage RDMA support in modern networks
Algorithm 1: Packed Slabs

Example with P=4, NX=NY=NZ=16

1. Perform all row and column FFTs
2. Perform local transpose
   - data destined to a remote processor are grouped together
3. Perform P puts of the data

- For $512^3$ grid across 64 processors
  - Send 64 messages of 512kB each
Bandwidth Utilization

• NAS FT (Class D) with 256 processors on Opteron/InfiniBand
  – Each processor sends 256 messages of 512kBytes
  – Global Transpose (i.e. all to all exchange) only achieves 67% of peak point-to-point bidirectional bandwidth
  – Many factors could cause this slowdown
    • Network contention
    • Number of processors that each processor communicates with

• Can we do better?
Algorithm 2: Slabs

- Waiting to send all data in one phase bunches up communication events

- Algorithm Sketch
  - for each of the NZ/P planes
    - Perform all column FFTs
    - for each of the P “slabs”
      (a slab is NX/P rows)
      - Perform FFTs on the rows in the slab
      - Initiate 1-sided put of the slab
  - Wait for all puts to finish
  - Barrier

- Non-blocking RDMA puts allow data movement to be overlapped with computation.

- Puts are spaced apart by the amount of time to perform FFTs on NX/P rows

- For $512^3$ grid across 64 processors
  - Send 512 messages of 64kB each
Algorithm 3: Pencils

- Further reduce the granularity of communication
  - Send a row (*pencil*) as soon as it is ready

- Algorithm Sketch
  - For each of the NZ/P planes
    - Perform all 16 column FFTs
    - For r=0; r<NX/P; r++
      - For each slab s in the plane
        - Perform FFT on row r of slab s
        - Initiate 1-sided put of row r

  - Wait for all puts to finish
  - Barrier

- Large increase in message count
- Communication events finely diffused through computation
  - Maximum amount of overlap
  - Communication starts early

- For 512^3 grid across 64 processors
  - Send 4096 messages of 8kB each
Communication Requirements

- $512^3$ across 64 processors
  - Alg 1: Packed Slabs
    - Send 64 messages of 512kB
  - Alg 2: Slabs
    - Send 512 messages of 64kB
  - Alg 3: Pencils
    - Send 4096 messages of 8kB

With Slabs GASNet is slightly faster than MPI.

GASNet achieves close to peak bandwidth with Pencils but MPI is about 50% less efficient at 8k.

With the message sizes in Packed Slabs both comm systems reach the same peak bandwidth.
## Platforms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Processor</th>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Software</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opteron/Infiniband “Jacquard” @ NERSC</td>
<td>Dual 2.2 GHz Opteron (320 nodes @ 4GB/node)</td>
<td>Mellanox Cougar InfiniBand 4x HCA</td>
<td>Linux 2.6.5, Mellanox VAPI, MVAPICH 0.9.5, Pathscale CC/F77 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha/Elan3 “Lemieux” @ PSC</td>
<td>Quad 1 GHz Alpha 21264 (750 nodes @ 4GB/node)</td>
<td>Quadrics QsNet1 Elan3 /w dual rail (one rail used)</td>
<td>Tru64 v5.1, Elan3 libelan 1.4.20, Compaq C V6.5-303, HP Fortra Compiler X5.5A-4085-48E1K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itanium2/Elan4 “Thunder” @ LLNL</td>
<td>Quad 1.4 Ghz Itanium2 (1024 nodes @ 8GB/node)</td>
<td>Quadrics QsNet2 Elan4</td>
<td>Linux 2.4.21-chaos, Elan4 libelan 1.8.14, Intel ifort 8.1.025, icc 8.1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4/Myrinet “FSN” @ UC Berkeley Millennium Cluster</td>
<td>Dual 3.0 Ghz Pentium 4 Xeon (64 nodes @ 3GB/node)</td>
<td>Myricom Myrinet 2000 M3S-PCI64B</td>
<td>Linux 2.6.13, GM 2.0.19, Intel ifort 8.1-20050207Z, icc 8.1-20050207Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Algorithms

• Compare 3 algorithms against original NAS FT
  – All versions including Fortran use FFTW for local 1D FFTs
  – Largest class that fit in the memory (usually class D)

• All UPC flavors outperform original Fortran/MPI implementation by at least 20%
  – One-sided semantics allow even exchange based implementations to improve over MPI implementations
  – Overlap algorithms spread the messages out, easing the bottlenecks
  – ~1.9x speedup in the best case
• Implemented the 3 algorithms in MPI using Irecvs and Isends

• Compare time spent initiating or waiting for communication to finish
  – UPC consistently spends less time in communication than its MPI counterpart
  – MPI unable to handle pencils algorithm in some cases
Conclusions

• One-sided semantics used in GAS languages, such as UPC, provide a more natural fit to modern networks
  – Benchmarks demonstrate these advantages

• Use these advantages to alleviate communication bottlenecks in bandwidth limited applications
  – Paradoxically it helps to send more, smaller messages

• Both two-sided and one-sided implementations can see advantages of overlap
  – One-sided implementations consistently outperform two-sided counterparts because comm model more natural fit

• *Send early and often* to avoid communication bottlenecks
Try It!

- Berkeley UPC is open source
  - Download it from [http://upc.lbl.gov](http://upc.lbl.gov)
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Outline

• Motivation for point-to-point sync operations
• Review existing mechanisms in UPC
• Overview of proposed extension
• Microbenchmark performance
• App kernel performance
Point-to-Point Sync: Motivation

• Many algorithms need point-to-point synchronization
  – Producer/consumer data dependencies (one-to-one, few-to-few)
    • Sweep3d, Jacobi, MG, CG, tree-based reductions, …
  – Ability to couple a data transfer with remote notification
  – Message passing provides this synchronization implicitly
    • recv operation only completes after send is posted
    • Pay costs for sync & ordered delivery whether you want it or not
  – For PGAS, really want something like a signaling store (Split-C)

• Current mechanisms available in UPC:
  – UPC Barriers - stop the world sync
  – UPC Locks - build a queue protected with critical sections
  – Strict variables - roll your own sync primitives

• We feel these current mechanisms are insufficient
  – None directly express the semantic of a synchronizing data transfer
    • hurts productivity
    • Inhibits high-performance implementations, esp on clusters
  – This talk will focus on impact for cluster-based UPC implementations
Point-to-Point Sync Data Xfer in UPC

- Works well for apps that are naturally bulk-synchronous
  - all threads produce data, then all threads consume data
  - not so good if your algorithm doesn't naturally fit that model

```c
shared [] int data[...];

upc_memput(&data,...);

upc_barrier;                 upc_barrier;
/* consume data */
```

**barrier:**
over-synchronizes threads
high-latency due to barrier
no overlap on producer
Point-to-Point Sync Data Xfer in UPC

Thread 1

```c
shared [] int data[…];
int f = 0;
upc_lock_t *L = …;

upc_lock(&L);

upc_memput(&data,…);

f = 1;

upc_unlock(&L);
```

Thread 0

```c
while (1) {
    upc_lock(&L);
    if (f) break;
    upc_unlock(&L);
}

/* consume data */
```

- This one performs so poorly on clusters that we won't consider it further…

upc_locks:
latency 2.5+ round-trips
limited overlap on producer
Thread 1

strict int f = 0;

upc_memput(&data,…);

f = 1;

while (!f) bupc_poll();

/* consume data */

Thread 0

strict int f = 0;

h = bupc_memput_async(&data,…);

/* overlapped work… */

bupc_waitsync(h);

upc_fence;

h2 = bupc_memput_async(&f,…);

/* overlapped work… */

bupc_waitsync(h2);

while (!f) bupc_poll();

/* consume data */

- There are several subtle ways to get this wrong
  - not suitable for novice UPC programmers
Signaling Put Overview

• Friendly, high-performance interface for a synchronizing, one-sided data transfer
  – Want an easy-to-use and obvious interface

• Provide coupled data transfer & synchronization
  – Get overlap capability and low-latency end-to-end
  – Simplify optimal implementations by expressing the right semantics
  – Without the downfalls of full-blown message passing
    • still one-sided in flavor, no unexpected messages, no msg ordering costs
  – Similar to signaling store operator (\textasciitilde) in Split-C, with improvements

\textbf{Thread 1} \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Thread 0}

\begin{verbatim}
bupc_sem_t *sem = ...; bupc_memput_signal(...,sem);
/* overlap compute */ bupc_sem_wait(sem);
/* consume data */
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{memput\_signal}: latency \textasciitilde 0.5 round-trips
allows overlap
easy to use
Point-to-Point Synchronization: Signaling Put Interface

- Simple extension to upc_memput interface
  ```c
  void bupc_memput_signal(shared void *dst, void *src, size_t nbytes,
                           bupc_sem_t *s, size_t n);
  ```
  - Two new args specify a semaphore to signal on arrival
  - Semaphore must have affinity to the target
  - Blocks for local completion only (doesn't stall for ack)
  - Enables implementation using a single network message

- Async variant
  ```c
  void bupc_memput_signal_async(shared void *dst, void *src, size_t nbytes,
                                 bupc_sem_t *s, size_t n);
  ```
  - Same except doesn't block for local completion
  - Analogous to MPI_ISend
  - More overlap potential, higher throughput for large payloads
Point-to-Point Synchronization: Semaphore Interface

- **Consumer-side sync ops** - akin to POSIX semaphores
  - `void bupc_sem_wait(bupc_sem_t *s);` block for signal "atomic down"
  - `int bupc_sem_try(bupc_sem_t *s);` test for signal "test-and-down"
  - Also variants to wait/try multiple signals at once "down N"
  - All of these imply a upc_fence

- **Opaque sem_t objects**
  - Encapsulation in opaque type provides implementation freedom
  - `bupc_sem_t *bupc_sem_alloc(int flags);` non-collectively creates a sem_t
  - `void bupc_sem_free(bupc_sem_t *s);`
  - `flags` specify a few different usage flavors
    - eg one or many producer/consumer threads, integral or boolean signaling

- **Bare signal operation with no coupled data transfer:**
  - `void bupc_sem_post(bupc_sem_t *s);` signal sem "atomic up (N)"
  - post/wait sync that might not exactly fit the model of signaling put
Microbenchmark Performance of Signaling Put
Signaling Put: Microbenchmarks

- memput (roundtrip) + strict put: Latency is ~ 1½ RDMA put roundtrips
- bupc_sem_t: Latency is ~ ½ message send roundtrip
  - same mechanism used by eager MPI_Send - so performance closely matches

RDMA put or message send latency:
~13 us round-trip

CITRIS @ UC Berkeley
1.3 GHz Itanium-2
Myrinet PCI-XD
MPICH-GM 1.2.6..14a
Linux 2.4.20
Signaling Put: Microbenchmarks

- memput (roundtrip) + strict put: Latency is $\sim1\frac{1}{2}$ RDMA put roundtrips
- bupc_sem_t: Latency is $\sim\frac{1}{2}$ RDMA put roundtrip
  - sem_t and MPI both using a single RDMA put, at least up to 1KB
Using Signaling Put to Implement Tree-based Collective Communication
Performance Comparison: UPC Broadcast

8-byte Broadcast Performance

- mpi
- best memput + strict flag
- best memput_signal

Broadcast Latency (us)

Processor/Network/Thread Count

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processor/Network/Thread Count</th>
<th>Power5 Federation 16</th>
<th>Itanium2 Myrinet 16</th>
<th>Opteron InfiniBand 64</th>
<th>G5 InfiniBand 16</th>
<th>Itanium2 QSNet2 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(down is good)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UPC-level implementation of collectives

Tree-based broadcast - show best performance across tree geom.

memput_signal competitive with MPI broadcast (shown for comparison)
Performance Comparison: All-Reduce-All

Dissemination-based implementations of all-reduce-all collective

memput_signal consistently outperforms memput+strict flag, competitive w/ MPI

Over a 65% improvement in latency at small sizes
Using Signaling Put in Application Kernels
Performance Comparison: SPMV

SPMV: 9pt 2D-stencil on 1024x1024 grid (Opteron/Infiniband, 64 Nodes)

- Global Barrier
- Comm Barrier
- Comm Recv
- Comm Send
- Computation

Time (ms)

Barrier
Memput + Strict flag
Nonblocking Memput + Strict flag
Memput_signal

75% improvement in synchronous communication time
28% improvement in total runtime (relative to barrier)
Incorporates both SPMV and All Reduce into an app kernel

memput_signal speeds up both SPMV and All Reduce portions of the application

Leads to an 15% improvement in overall running time
Conclusions

• Proposed a signaling put extension to UPC
  • Friendly interface for synchronizing, one-sided data transfers
    • Allows coupling data transfer & synchronization when needed
    • Concise and expressive
  • Enable high-perf. implementation by encapsulating the right semantics
    • Allows overlap and low-latency, single message on the wire
  • Provides the strengths of message-passing in a UPC library
    • Remains true to the one-sided nature of UPC communication
    • Avoids the downfalls of full-blown message passing

• Implementation status
  • Functional version available in Berkeley UPC 2.2.2
  • More tuned version available in 2.3.16 and upcoming 2.4 release

• Future work
  • Need more application experience
  • Incorporate extension in future revision of UPC standard library