Two Topics: IO & Control Replication

CS315B

Lecture 10

Prof. Aiken CS 315B Lecture 10

1

I/O in Parallel Programming

- I/O tends to be an afterthought in parallel programming systems
- Many papers ignore I/O time in reported results!
- But in real life, I/O time is ... time

Regent I/O

- The situation is better with Regent
- Already have the notion
 - There are distinct collections of data
 - regions
 - That can be in different places, have different layouts, etc.
 - And the details are kept abstract
 - Programmer doesn't need to know how data is accessed

Regent I/O Outline

- Interpret files as regions
 - Integrate I/O into the programming model
- Why?
 - Want to overlap I/O with computation
 - Need to define consistency semantics
- Bottom line
 - I/O is (almost) like any other data movement

- Attach external resource to a region
 - Normal files, formatted files (HDF5), ...



- Semantics
 - Invalidate existing physical instance of *lr*
 - Maps *Ir* to a new physical instance that represents external data (no external I/O)



- Semantics
 - Invalidate existing physical instance of *lr*
 - Maps *Ir* to a new physical instance that represents external data (no external I/O)



Digression: Task Coherence

Privileges

- Reads
- Reads/Writes
- Reduces (with operator)

Coherence

- Exclusive
- Atomic
- Simultaneous
- Relaxed
- Coherence declarations are wrt *sibling* tasks

- Attached region accessed using *simultaneous coherence*
 - Different tasks access the region simultaneously
 - Requires that all tasks must use the *only valid* physical instance
- Copy restriction
 - Simultaneous coherence implies tasks cannot create local copies
 - May result in inefficient memory accesses

Acquire/Release

- For regions with simultaneous coherence
- Acquire removes the copy restriction
 - Can create copies in any memory
 - Up to application to know this is OK!
- Release restores the copy restriction
 - Invalidates all existing local copies
 - Flushes dirty data back to the file

Acquire/Release Example



Opaque Data Sources

- Can also attach to sources that are other programs
 - E.g., read/write in-memory data structures from another process
- Done through a serialization/deserialization interface
 - Attach specifies the ser/des routines

S3D I/O Example

- A production combustion simulation
- Checkpoint after fixed # of time steps



I/O Summary

- Definitely a useful feature!
- And less mature than other features
 - But simple cases will work fine
- Let us know if you need/want to use I/O

Implicit Parallel Programming Template

How Do We Scale This Program?

- Make more Parts
- Make each subregion R smaller

Amdahl Strikes Back

- Recall Amdahl's law
 - Parallel speedup is limited by the sequential portion left un-parallelized
 - There is some sequential overhead to launching tasks on a single processor
- If we double the # of subregions
 - Each subregion is ½ the size, so <= ½ of the work
 - Launch overhead doubles
 - Useful compute/overhead ratio decreases by >= 4X

Picture







task T(){ while (...) do for R in Parts do task1(R) end for R in Parts do task2(R) end end

ł













What Does That Mean?

- Can scale this program to 8 or 16 nodes
 - Should be more, but...
- We want to run on 100's or 1,000's of nodes

SPMD Programming Revisited

- Recall that SPMD programs
 - Launch 1 task per processor at program start-up
 - These tasks run for the duration of the program
 - Tasks explicitly communicate to exchange data
- Notice
 - SPMD programs launch the minimum # of tasks to keep the machine busy
 - These tasks run for the maximum amount of time
 - Best possible launch overhead/work ratio!

How Do We Scale This Program?

while (...) do for R in Parts do task1(R) end for R in Parts do task2(R) end end

must_epoch
for i = 1,num_tasks do
 task(part[i],phaseb[i])
end

where

tasks know which other tasks they have to communicate with

The Price

- SPMD programs minimize distributed overheads related to control
- The price is explicit parallel programming
 - Tasks must communicate with each other while they execute
 - Introduces synchronization, message passing ...

Implicit Parallelism

Traditional auto-parallelization [Irigoin 91; Blume 95; Hall 96; ...]

```
for step = 0, nsteps:
for i, j in grid:
out[i,j] = F(in[i,j], in[i+1, j], ...)
```



...

- Requires static analysis of individual memory accesses
- Limited applicability

Inspector/executor method [Crowley 89; Ravishankar 12; ...]

```
for step = 0, nsteps:
  for c in mesh:
    out[c] = G(in[c],in[neighbor[c]])
```



- Requires dynamic analysis of individual memory accesses
- Expensive runtime analysis

...

Task-Based Implicit Parallelism

```
task tF(out, in):
  for i, j in out:
    out[i,j] = F(in[i,j], in[i+1, j], ...)
```

```
for step = 0, nsteps:
for sg in grid:
tF(out[sg], in[sg])
```

...

```
task tG(out, in):
  for c in out:
    out[c] = G(in[c], in[neighbor[c]])
```

```
for step = 0, nsteps:
    for sm in mesh:
        tG(out[sm], in[sm])
```

...





- User specifies coarse-grain tasks (and data)
 - Analysis performed at level of tasks (instead of iterations)
- Dynamic analysis is better-but still expensive

Task Execution (Not Replicated)

- Sequential execution: tasks form a stream in program order
- System discovers parallelism by analyzing dependencies
- Dataflow is scheduled and copies are inserted as needed



Technique to generate scalable SPMD code from implicitly parallel (task-based) programs

Asymptotic reduction in steady state analysis
 O(1) instead of O(N) in number of nodes

Task Execution (Replicated)





- Regent can do this for you!
- __demand(__replicable)
- Takes a program in implicit parallel style, converts it to SPMD style
- Restrictions
 - Each "rank" must execute the same sequence of Legion API calls
 - i.e., the control code is replicated in each rank

- We recommend using control replication for your project
 - Write in implicit style
- Should scale to 256-512 nodes
 - At least