Steps in Creating a Parallel Program





(PCA Chapter 2.3)

More reading: PP Chapter 11.3 (Pages 352-364)

Solution of Linear System of Equation By Synchronous Iteration



Parallelization of An Example Program

Examine a simplified version of a piece of Ocean simulation

↓ • Iterative (Gauss-Seidel) linear equation solver Synchronous iteration

One 2D Grid, $n \ge n^2$ **points** (instead of 3D – n grids)

Illustrate parallel program in low-level parallel language:

- C-like pseudo-code with simple extensions for parallelism
- Expose basic communication and synchronization primitives that must be supported by parallel programming model.

Three parallel programming models targeted for orchestration:

- Data Parallel
 - Shared Address Space (SAS)
 - Message Passing



- Simplified version of solver in Ocean simulation 2D (one grid) not 3D
- Gauss-Seidel (near-neighbor) sweeps (iterations) to convergence:
- 1 Interior n-by-n points of (n+2)-by-(n+2) updated in each sweep (iteration) \mathbf{I}
- ² Updates done in-place in grid, and difference from previous value is computed
- <u>3</u> Accumulate partial differences into a global difference at the end of every sweep or iteration Iterate
- Check if error (global difference) has converged (to within a tolerance parameter)
 - If so, exit solver; if not, do another sweep (iteration)
 - Or iterate for a set maximum number of iterations.

Pseudocode, Sequential Equation Solver



Decomposition How?

•Simple way to <u>identify concurrency</u> is to look at loop iterations 1 **Dependency analysis**; if not enough concurrency is found, then look further into application -3

1 •Not much concurrency here at this level (all loops *sequential*)

²•Examine fundamental dependencies, ignoring loop structure



- Concurrency O(n) along anti-diagonals, serialization O(n) along diagonal
- Retain loop structure, use pt-to-pt synch; Problem: too many synch ops.
- or Restructure loops, use global synch; load imbalance and too much synch

i.e using barriers along diagonals

Decomposition: Exploit Application Knowledge



- Different ordering of updates: may converge quicker or slower
- <u>Red sweep</u> and <u>black sweep</u> are each <u>fully parallel</u>:
- Global synchronization between them (conservative but convenient)
- Ocean uses red-black; here we use <u>simpler</u>, asynchronous one to illustrate
 - <u>No red-black sweeps, simply ignore dependencies within a single sweep</u> / <u>(iteration) all points can be updated in parallel DOP = $n^2 = O(n^2)$ </u>

Iterations may converge slower than red-black ordering

– Sequential order same as original.

i.e. Max Software DOP = $n^2 = O(n^2)$



The "for_all" loop construct imply parallel loop computations



Data Parallel Solver







Notes on SAS Program

- <u>SPMD: not lockstep</u> (i.e. still MIMD not SIMD) or even
 necessarily same instructions.
 SPMD = Single Program Multiple Data
- <u>Row Assignment controlled by values of variables used as loop</u> <u>bounds and process ID (pid)</u> (i.e. mymin, mymax) Which n/p rows?
 - Unique pid (0, 1, 2, ... p-1) per process, used to control assignment of blocks of rows to processes.
- <u>Done condition (convergence test) evaluated redundantly by all</u>

processes

By checking if Global Difference = diff < Threshold

- Code that does the update identical to sequential program
- **But** Each process has private mydiff variable

Otherwise each process must enter the shared global difference critical section for each point, n^2/p times (n^2 times total) instead of just p times per iteration for all processes

• Most interesting special operations needed are for synchronization

Why?

- Accumulations of local differences (mydiff) into shared global difference (diff) have to be <u>mutually exclusive</u> Using LOCK () UNLOCK ()
- Why the need for all the barriers?



Need for Mutual Exclusion



• Need the sets of operations to be <u>atomic (mutually exclusive</u>) Fix ?

Mutual Exclusion Lock Enter Critical No order guarantee provided Section Exit Unlock

Provided by LOCK-UNLOCK around *critical section*

- Set of operations we want to execute atomically
- Implementation of LOCK/UNLOCK must guarantee mutual exclusion. However, no order guarantee

i.e one task/process or processor at a time in critical section

Can lead to significant <u>serialization</u> if contended (many tasks want to enter critical section at the same time)

- Especially costly since many accesses in critical section are non-local
- Main reason to use private mydiff for partial accumulation locally:
 - Reduce the number times needed to enter critical section by each process to update global difference:
 O(p) total number of accesses to critical section
 - Once per iteration vs. n^2/p times per process without mydiff

Or $O(n^2)$ total number of accesses to critical section by all processes i.e. Enter critical section once for each point update (Without private mydiff)

Global (or group) Event Synchronization

BARRIER(nprocs): wait here till nprocs processes get here

- Built using lower level primitives *i.e locks, semaphores*
- Global sum example: wait for all to accumulate before using sum
- Often used to separate phases of computation

Process P_1	Process P_2	Process P_nprocs			
set up eqn system	set up eqn system	set up eqn system Setup			
Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)			
solve eqn system	solve eqn system	solve eqn system Update Points			
Lock() Unlock ()	Lock() Unlock()	Lock() Unlock () Enter Critical Section			
Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)			
apply results	apply results	apply results Convergence Test			
Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)	Barrier (name, nprocs)			
• Conservative form of preserving dependencies, but easy to use					
Done by all					
Drocesses					

Most Critical Barrier?

Point-to-point (Ordering) Event SynchronizationSAS(Not Used or Needed Here)

One process notifies another of an event so it can proceed:

- Needed for task ordering according to data dependence between tasks
- Common example: producer-consumer (bounded buffer)
- Concurrent programming on uniprocessor: semaphores
- Shared address space parallel programs: semaphores, or use ordinary variables as **flags**



Message Passing Grid Solver

- Cannot declare A to be a shared array any more
 No shared address space
 Need to compose it logically from per-process private arrays
 Usually allocated in accordance with the assignment of work
 Process assigned a set of rows allocates them locally
 n/p rows in this case
 MyA
 Explicit transfers (communication) of entire border or "Ghost"rows between tasks is needed (as shown next slide)
- Structurally similar to SAS (e.g. SPMD), but orchestration is different
 - Data structures and data access/naming e.g Local arrays vs. shared array
- Explicit Communication

Implicit

– Synchronization **J** V

+

Message Passing Grid Solver



- Parallel Computation = $O(n^2/p)$
- Communication of rows = O(n)
- Communication of local DIFF = O(p)
- Computation = $O(n^2/p)$
- Communication = O(n + p)
- Communication-to-Computation Ratio = O($(n+p)/(n^2/p)$) = O($(np + p^2) / n^2$)

nprocs = **number** of **processes** = **number** of **processors** = **p**

Time per iteration: T = T(computation) + T(communication) $T = O(n^2/p + n + p)$



Notes on Message Passing Program

• Use of ghost rows. **Or border rows**

i.e Two-sided communication

• Receive does not transfer data, send does (sender-initiated)

- Unlike **SAS** which is usually <u>receiver-initiated</u> (load fetches data) i.e One-sided communication

- Communication done at beginning of iteration (exchange of ghost rows).
- Explicit communication in whole rows, not one element at a time (SAS)
- Core similar, but <u>indices/bounds</u> in <u>local space</u> rather than global space.
- Synchronization through sends and <u>blocking</u> receives (implicit)
 - Update of global difference and event synch for done condition
 - Could implement locks and barriers with messages
- Only one process (pid = 0) checks convergence (done condition).
- Can use REDUCE and BROADCAST library calls to simplify code:



- Affect event synch (mutual exclusion implied: only one process touches data)
- Affect ease of programming and performance

Synchronous messages provide built-in synch. through match

• Separate event synchronization needed with asynch. messages

With synchronous messages, our code is deadlocked. Fix?

Use asynchronous blocking sends/receives

Message-Passing Modes: Send and Receive Alternatives

Synchronous Message Passing: In MPI: MPI_Ssend() MPI_Srecv()

Process X executing a synchronous send to process Y has to wait until process Y has executed a synchronous receive from X.

Asynchronous Message Passing:

Blocking Send/Receive: In MPI: MPI_Send() MPI_Recv()

Most Common Type A blocking send is executed when a process reaches it without waiting for a corresponding receive. Returns when the message is sent. A blocking receive is executed when a process reaches it and only returns after the message has been received.

Non-Blocking Send/Receive:

In MPI: MPI_Isend() MPI_Irecv()

A non-blocking send is executed when reached by the process without waiting for a corresponding receive. A non-blocking receive is executed when a process reaches it without waiting for a corresponding send. <u>Both return immediately.</u>

Orchestration: Summary

Shared address space

- Shared and private data explicitly separate
- Communication implicit in access patterns
- No correctness need for data distribution
- Synchronization via atomic operations on shared data
- Synchronization <u>explicit</u> and <u>distinct</u> from <u>data communication</u>

Here Critical Section + Barriers

Message passing

- Data distribution among local address spaces needed myA's
- No explicit shared structures (implicit in communication patterns)
- Communication is explicit
- Synchronization *implicit in communication* (at least in synch. case)

– Mutual exclusion implied

No SAS

Correctness in Grid Solver Program

Decomposition and **Assignment** <u>similar</u> in SAS and message-passing <u>Orchestration is different:</u> i.e. n/p block of rows

• Data structures, data access/naming, communication, synchronization

AKA shared?		<u>SAS</u>	Msg-Passing
Explicit global data structure?		Yes	Νο
Assignment indept of data layout?		Yes	Νο
Communication		Implicit	Explicit Via
Synchronization	Lock/unlock Barriers	Explicit	Implicit Send/ Receive Pairs
Explicit replication of border rows?		Νο	Yes
i.e. ş	shost rows		Ghost Rows

Requirements for performance are another story ...