A Lightweight OpenMP Runtime

-- OpenMP for Exascale Architectures --
Goals

- **Thread-rich computing environments are becoming more prevalent**
  - more computing power, more threads
  - less memory relative to compute

- **There is parallelism, it comes in many forms**
  - hybrid MPI - OpenMP parallelism
  - mixed mode OpenMP / Pthread parallelism
  - nested OpenMP parallelism

- **Have to exploit parallelism efficiently**
  - providing ease of use for casual programmers
  - providing full control for power programmers
  - providing timing feedback
Objectives Of Lightweight-OpenMP Runtime

- **Handle more threads**
  - lower OpenMP overheads
    - lower scalar overheads (Amdal’s law)
    - better scaling of overheads (more threads)
  - develop new algorithms inside research runtime

- **Handle nested parallelism: more control with thread affinity**
  - more user input on how to map computation to threads
    - currently: no affinity support provided by user
  - proposed a new thread-affinity to OpenMP standard committee
  - contributed reference implementation in research runtime

- **Todo: Provide timing feedback**
  - user want to know where is the time spent
  - feedback at little overheads
Part 1: Handle more threads

- Impact of overheads
- Approach for near constant-time parallel-region creation
- Results on BGQ
Impact of Overhead in Prevalent Threading Model

Programming Model

- **MPI**
  - distributed process across/within nodes
  - explicit user-managed communication

- **Coarse-grain Parallel (OpenMP/Auto)**
  - shared memory within nodes/cores
  - for outer parallel-loops

- **Fine-grain Parallel (OpenMP/Auto)**
  - shared memory within cores/nodes
  - for inner parallel-loops
Basic OpenMP Operation: Parallel Region

Beginning of parallel region
• recruits threads
• initializes participating threads

End of parallel region
• barrier & cleanup

sequential work
master thread
worker threads

parallel work

sequential work
**Source of Overheads, Due to OpenMP Standard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Time line</th>
<th>Data used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>sequential work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. find 3 avail threads</td>
<td></td>
<td>avail:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. assign thread IDs</td>
<td></td>
<td>tid:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. assign work</td>
<td></td>
<td>work:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. signal ready</td>
<td></td>
<td>state:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. init. thread state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>parallel work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. cleanup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sequential work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

beginning region

end region

- sequential overheads
- parallel overheads
- useful work
Optimized OpenMP Runtime Design

Systematic re-design to lower overheads

- **Eliminate sequential overhead**
  - reuse previous thread allocations
  - in practice, near 100% hit

- **Extremely compact state**
  - minimize initialization/cleanup

- **Use hardware support**
  - atomic instructions (atomic increment / xor)
Optimization Guiding Principles

- **Cache configurations to eliminate computation & communication**
  - reuse as much as possible when nothing has changed

- **Minimum locking**
  - one lock for protecting thread allocation data structure
  - locked only on thread recruiting / freeing
  - rest use atomic operations

- **Use global state sparingly**
  - work descriptor is only used for parallel region
  - most other OpenMP constructs use no work descriptors

- **Allocate state statically, initialize mostly statically**
  - barriers use counters initialized when initializing OpenMP
  - some local state is only initialized on first use
Example: Caching Worker Configurations

- **When freeing workers**
  - leave workers in reserved state (A: end t8)

- **When recruiting workers**
  - avoid stealing workers that were reserved by others (B: start t0)
  - aim at reusing workers that were previously reserved by this master (C: start t4)
OpenMP Micro-Benchmark (EPCC) Results

- Contributions of individual optimizations

![Diagram showing contributions of individual optimizations]

- Bar graph showing overheads in ns for different thread counts (4, 16, 64) with various optimizations.

- X-axis: Threads (4, 16, 64)
- Y-axis: Overheads in ns

- Graph colors represent different optimizations:
  - Original
  - + Thread Allocation Caching
  - + Work Description Caching
  - + Bitvector Go-Ahead Signaling
  - + New Interface
Overhead Scaling for Parallel Region (ECPP)

- Nearly constant overhead over wide range of thread counts

LOMP is an experimental runtime that implements a subset of all OpenMP functionality. Performance will be impacted until full functionality is provided.
Observations

- Creating a parallel region with 4 to 64 threads
  - overhead are now reduced to below 2K cycles
  - preliminary numbers, will change as we support full OpenMP

- While we have reduced overheads by 4x – 10x
  - remaining overheads are due to the OpenMP standard
  - others are due to necessary locks / barriers / msyncs
  - compiler optimization can further reduce overheads in some cases

- Barriers becoming the dominant factor at higher thread counts
Part 2: Efficient Nested Parallelism

- **Examples of requests that are not currently possible**
  - get threads on separate cores to get more L1 cache
  - get threads collocated on same core to maximize cache reuse

- **Current runtimes have a fixed policy**
  - runtime tries to even out load balance across the machine
  - this works well for single level of parallelism,
  - not as well for nested parallelism

- **Want to allow users to specify where to get threads**
  - broad policies that cover most cases

- **Want to allow users to specify where threads are allowed to migrate**
  - for load balancing purpose
OpenMP Affinity Proposal

- Define the concept of an OpenMP Place
  - a set of one or more logical processors on which OpenMP-threads execute
  - OpenMP-threads may migrate within one place

- Let the user specify its own set of places
  - by default, the system defines its own list of places
  - in MPI hybrid mode, the “mpi-run” script would defines the set of places

- Let the user specify how to recruit threads for OpenMP parallel
  - MASTER: put threads in same place as master
  - CLOSE: put threads close to master
    - reduce false sharing, distribute among places
  - SPREAD: spread threads across the machine
    - reduce overheads of threads sharing the same core
    - optimize memory bandwidth by exploiting cores/sockets
How to use Place Lists

- Consider a system with 2 chips, 4 cores, and 8 hardware-threads

  - One place per hardware-thread
    - OMP_PLACES=hwthread
    - OMP_PLACES=(0),(1),(2),…(15)

  - One place per core, including both hardware-threads
    - OMP_PLACES=core
    - OMP_PLACES=(0,1),(2,3),(4,5)…(14,15)

  - One place per chip, excluding first hardware-thread
    - OMP_PLACES=(1,2,…,7),(9,10,11,..15)
CLOSE Policy

Compact selects OpenMP threads in the same place as the master
– consider the next place(s) when master place is full

- Example with OMP_PLACES=hwthread

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chip 0</th>
<th>chip 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>core 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>t4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>t6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>t8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>t10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t5</td>
<td>t11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>core 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t6</td>
<td>t12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t7</td>
<td>t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

- close 2*
  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chip 0</th>
<th>chip 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>t8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>t10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>t12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t5</td>
<td>t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t6</td>
<td>t14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t7</td>
<td>t15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  ```

- close 4
  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chip 0</th>
<th>chip 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>t8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>t10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>t12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t5</td>
<td>t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t6</td>
<td>t14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t7</td>
<td>t15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  ```

- close 4
  ```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chip 0</th>
<th>chip 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>t8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t2</td>
<td>t10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t3</td>
<td>t11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t4</td>
<td>t12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t5</td>
<td>t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t6</td>
<td>t14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t7</td>
<td>t15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  ```

* technically “omp parallel num_threads(2) affinity(close)”

© 2011 IBM Corporation
**SPREAD Policy**

- Spread OpenMP threads as evenly as possible among places

- Example with OMP_PLACES=hwthread

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chip 0</th>
<th>Chip 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core 0</td>
<td>Core 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t0</td>
<td>t2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t1</td>
<td>t3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- spread 2*:
  - Chip 0:
    - Core 0: t0, t1
    - Core 1: t2, t3
    - Core 2: t4, t5
    - Core 3: t6, t7
  - Chip 1:
    - Core 4: t8, t9
    - Core 5: t10, t11
    - Core 6: t12, t13
    - Core 7: t14, t15

- spread 4:
  - Chip 0:
    - Core 0: t0, t1
    - Core 1: t2, t3
    - Core 2: t4, t5
    - Core 3: t6, t7
  - Chip 1:
    - Core 4: t8, t9
    - Core 5: t10, t11
    - Core 6: t12, t13
    - Core 7: t14, t15

- spread 8:
  - Chip 0:
    - Core 0: t0, t1
    - Core 1: t2, t3
    - Core 2: t4, t5
    - Core 3: t6, t7
  - Chip 1:
    - Core 4: t8, t9
    - Core 5: t10, t11
    - Core 6: t12, t13
    - Core 7: t14, t15

* technically “omp parallel num_threads(2) affinity(spread)”

- master
- worker
Spread Policy Partition the Machine

- **Spread also implicitly partition the machine**
  - so that nested parallel-regions get threads only from its subset of the machine

- **Example: spread with nested, compact, parallel-regions**

![Diagram showing spread policy partitioning](image)
Observations

- **Give the user more fine-grain control**
  - which hardware thread / core / chip to use
  - which thread to select for a given parallel region
    - e.g. spread vs. compact
  - where threads are allowed to migrate (within a place)

- **Ongoing work**
  - implemented in our research OpenMP runtime
  - currently under review with the OpenMP Standard Language Committee
Part 3: Providing Timing Info

- **Possible approaches**
  - callbacks
  - statistical sampling (requires interrupt support)
  - embedded timing (using low overhead hardware timers)

- **Experimented with second approach**
  - approximate overheads: 100 cycles per OpenMP constructs
  - (for ref: 64-thread barrier 800-1000 cycles, parallel region 1800-2000 cycles)

- **Questions:**
  - what is needed by users
  - what is needed by tool developers
  - what can info can be provided cheaply
Timing Info: Cost Evaluation

- **Timing is relatively cheap on POWER**
  - get a local timer (register move)
  - save difference of 2 timer values (one store)

- **Saving a current state (idle-barrier/idle-lock)**
  - one store per transition

- **Callbacks**
  - load value of “enabled/disabled”, one branch
  - BUT having a call has performance impact on optimized runtime
    - in optimized runtime, everything is inlined (except call outlined functions)
    - calls force caller-saved register back into memory (potentially 10+ load/store)
    - have seen overhead in 100+ cycles just for one additional function call
  - cheaper if are located just before/after outlined function calls