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Pervasive Parallelism Lab

- **Goal: Parallel Programming environment for 2010**
  - Parallelism for the masses: make parallel programming accessible to the average programmer
  - Parallel algorithms, development environments, and runtime systems that scale to 1000s of hardware threads

- **PPL is a combination of**
  - Leading Stanford researchers in applications, languages, systems software and computer architecture
  - Leading companies in computer systems, software and applications
  - Compelling vision for creating and managing pervasive parallelism
End of Uniprocessor Performance


The free lunch is over!

Performance (vs. VAX-11/780)

- 25%/year
- 52%/year
- ??%/year


3X
The Era of Chip Multiprocessors

- ILP and deep pipelining have run out of steam:
  - ILP parallelism in applications has been mined out
  - The power and complexity of microarchitectures taxes our ability to cool and verify
  - Frequency scaling is now driven by technology
- Single-chip multiprocessors systems are here
  - In embedded, server, and even desktop systems
  - Cores are the new GHz
- Now need parallel applications to take full advantage of microprocessors!
  - Problem: need a new approach to HW and SW systems based on parallelism
  - Concurrency revolution
Predicting The End of Uniprocessor Performance

Performance (vs. VAX-11/780)

- Afara Websystems: 52%/year
- Hydra CMP Project: 25%/year
- Sun Niagara: ??%/year

Superior performance and performance/Watt using multiple simple cores
Sun Niagara 2 at a Glance

- 8 cores x 8 threads = 64 threads
- Dual single issue pipelines
- 1 FPU per core
- 4MB L2, 8-banks, 16-way S.A
- 4 x dual-channel FBDIMM ports (60+ GB/s)
- > 2x Niagara 1 throughput and throughput/watt
- 1.4 x Niagara 1 int
- > 10x Niagara 1 FP
- Available H2 2007
The Looming Crisis

• By 2010, software developers will face…

• CPU’s with:
  ♦ 20+ cores (e.g. Sun Niagara and Intel Manycore)
  ♦ 100+ hardware threads
  ♦ Heterogeneous cores and application specific accelerators
  ♦ Deep memory hierarchies
  ♦ >1 TFLOP of computing power

• GPU’s with general computing capabilities

• **Parallel programming gap**: Yawning divide between the capabilities of today’s programmers, programming languages, models, and tools and the challenges of future parallel architectures and applications
Components for Bridging the Parallel Programming Gap

**Education**
- New courses in parallel programming
- Move parallelism into mainstream CS curriculum

**Parallel Applications**
- Business, scientific, gaming, desktop, embedded
- Strong links to domain experts inside and outside of Stanford

**Programming Paradigms**
- High-level concurrency abstractions
- Domain specific languages

**Architecture**
- Hardware support for new paradigms
- Real system prototypes for complex application development
Demanding Applications

- Driving applications that leverage domain expertise at Stanford
- CS research groups & national centers for scientific computing
- New and emerging application areas (e.g. Neuroscience)
Shared Memory vs. Message Passing

- Lots of discussion in 90’s with MPPs
  - SM much easier programming model
  - Performance similar, but MP much better for some apps
  - MP hardware is simpler
- Message passing won
  - Most machines > 100 processors use message passing
  - MPI the defacto standard
- Programmer productivity suffers
  - It takes too long to do “computational science”
  - Architectural knowledge required to tune performance

Plot of top 500 supercomputer sites over a decade

- Single Instruction multiple data (SIMD)
- Cluster (network of workstations)
- Cluster (network of SMPs)
- Massively parallel processors (MPPs)
- Shared-memory multiprocessors (SMPs)
- Uniprocessors
High-Level Programming Paradigms

- Need new parallel programming paradigms
  - Raise level of abstraction
  - Domain specific programming languages
  - Declarative vs. imperative

- Map-Reduce
  - Data parallelism (data mining, machine learning)
  - CMPs or clusters

- SQL
  - Information data management

- Synchronous Data Flow
  - Streaming computation
  - Telecom, DSP and Networking

- Matlab
  - Matrix based computation
  - Scientific computing

- What have we missed?
Parallelism Under the Covers

• Streams
  ✷ Beyond message passing
  ✷ Explicitly managed data transfers
  ✷ Maximize use of memory and network bandwidth

• Transactions
  ✷ Beyond shared memory
  ✷ Eliminate locking problems and manual synchronization
  ✷ Structured parallel programming

• Other Paradigms
  ✷ Combining transactions and streams with mix of explicit and implicit data management
Streams

Alex Aiken, Bill Dally & Pat Hanrahan

• Goal
  - Efficient, portable, memory hierarchy aware, parallel, data-intensive programs
  - Required to achieve high performance with explicitly-managed deep memory hierarchies (e.g. clusters, IBM Cell)

• Approach: Sequoia programming
  - C++-based streaming language
  - Model parallel machines as trees of memories
  - Structure program as tree of self-contained computations called tasks
    - Data movement is explicit by parameter passing between tasks
    - Task hierarchies are machine independent
  - Map task hierarchies to memory hierarchies
    - Tasks are varied and parameterized to map efficiently to different levels of the memory hierarchy
Sequoia Matrix Multiplication

matmul:
1024x1024 matrix multiplication

matmul:
256x256 matrix mult

matmul:
256x256 matrix mult

matmul:
256x256 matrix mult

... 64 total subtasks ...

matmul:
32x32 matrix mult

matmul:
32x32 matrix mult

matmul:
32x32 matrix mult

... 512 total subtasks ...

IBM CELL processor

Main memory
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ALUs
ALUs
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cluster

single node
Transactional Memory

• Programmer specifies large, atomic tasks
  - atomic { some_work; }
  - Multiple objects, unstructured control-flow, …
  - Declarative: user simply specifies, system implements details

• Transactional memory provides
  - Atomicity: all or nothing
  - Isolation: writes not visible until transaction commits
  - Consistency: serializable transaction commit order

• Performance through optimistic concurrency
  - Execute in parallel assuming independent transactions
  - If conflicts are detected, abort & re-execute one transaction
    - Conflict = one transaction reads and another writes same data
Why Transactional Memory?

• Locks are broken
  ♦ Performance – correctness tradeoff
    ▪ Coarse-grain locks: serialization
    ▪ Fine-grain locks: deadlocks, livelocks, races, …
  ♦ Cannot easily compose lock-based code

• TM simplifies parallel programming
  ♦ Parallel algorithms: non-blocking sync with coarse-grain code
  ♦ Sequential algorithms: speculative parallelization

• TM improves scalability and performance debugging
  ♦ Facilitates monitoring & dynamic tuning for parallelism & locality

• TM enhances reliability
  ♦ Atomic recovery from faults and bugs at the micro level
  ♦ Clear boundaries for checkpoint schemes at the macro level
The Stanford Transactional Coherence and Consistency (TCC) Project

• A hardware-assisted TM implementation
  ✷ Avoids ≥2x overhead of software-only implementation
  ✷ Does not require recompilation of base libraries

• A system that uses TM for coherence & consistency
  ✷ All transactions, all the time
  ✷ Use TM to replace MESI coherence
    ▪ Other proposals build TM on top of MESI
  ✷ Sequential consistency at the transaction level
    ▪ Address the memory model challenge as well

• Research on applications, TM languages, TM system issues, TM implementations, TM prototypes,…
  ✷ See posters
Java HashMap performance

Transactions scale as well as fine-grained locks
TCC Performance On SPEC JBB

- Simulated 8-way CMP with TCC support
- Speedup over sequential
  - Flat transactions: 1.9x
    - Code similar to coarse-grain locks
    - Frequent aborted transactions due to dependencies
  - Nested transactions: 3.9x to 4.2x
    - Reduced abort cost OR
    - Reduced abort frequency
- See paper in [WTW'06] for details
  - [http://tcc.stanford.edu](http://tcc.stanford.edu)
Scalable TCC Performance

64 proc DSM

- Improve commit
  - 2-phase commit
  - parallel commit
- Excellent scalability
  - Commit is not a bottleneck

![Graph showing normalized execution time for various benchmarks with bar colors indicating Useful, Cache Miss, Idle, Commit, and Violations.]
PPL: A Real Systems Approach

- Experiment with full-system prototypes
  - Research at full scale
  - Involves research in HW, system SW, and PL
  - Gets students excited
  - Forces the development of robust technology
  - Shows industry the way to commercialization
  - Many examples at Stanford: SUN, MIPS, DASH, Imagine, Hydra

- Flexible Architecture Research Machine (FARM)
  - High-performance cluster technology augmented with FPGAs in the memory system
  - Platform enables significant parallel software and hardware co-development
Stanford FARM in a Nutshell

• An industrial-strength scalable machine
  - 0.1-0.25 TFLOPS per node
  - Infiniband interconnect
  - Can scale to 10s or 100s nodes
  - Run real software

• A research machine
  - Can personalize computing
    - Threads, vectors, data-flow, reconfigurable
  - Can personalize memory system
    - Shared-memory, messages, transactions, streams
  - Can personalize IO and system support
    - Off-load engines, reliability support, …
  - Using FPGA technology
FARM Organization

- Industrial strength parallel system
  - High-end commodity CPU (AMD, Intel, Sun) and GPU
  - Infiniband interconnect
- Flexible protocol in FPGA
  - Connect to CPU through coherent link
Example Uses of FARM

- **Transaction-based Shared-memory architecture**
  - Implement TM hardware in FPGA
    - Directory, RAC, proactive research engine
  - Research
    - Explore scalability limits of transactions
    - Explore locality optimization potential of transactions

- **Streaming architectures**
  - Extended, chip-to-chip streaming engine in the FPGA

- **Other**
  - New hybrid architecture models
  - Accelerate networking tasks
  - Provide new functionality for reliability, debugging, and profiling
Summary

• Harnessing high degrees of thread-level parallelism is the next big challenge in computer systems

• “parallelism is the biggest challenge since high-level programming languages. It’s the biggest thing in 50 years because industry is betting its future that parallel programming will be useful.” David Patterson

• Pervasive Parallelism Lab
  ♦ Figure out how to build/program/manage large scale parallel systems (1000s–10,000s of CPUs) for average programmers
  ♦ Opportunity to collaborate on hardware and software research
    ▪ Languages, programming models, operating systems, applications and architecture

• Kunle@stanford.edu