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Hierarchical Coarray Fortran (HCAF)

• Motivation
  • Large parallel computers are deeply hierarchical
  • Applications must *exploit* this hierarchy, not ignore it

• HCAF goals
  • Explicit hierarchical locality in PGAS model
  • Dynamic task and data parallelism
  • Portable performance across machine topologies
  • In the spirit of Fortran
  • Extension of Rice CAF 2.0 with few incompatibilities

• Approach
  • Language exposes hierarchy, programmer exploits it
  • Exposed hierarchies automagically mapped to hardware

• Disclaimers
  • This work is preliminary
  • Still some pending design issues
  • No implementation yet
  • Irregular codes and heterogenous hardware are TBD

NERSC Edison
Cray XC30
8-level hierarchy

4 nodes x 2 sockets
1 socket = 12 cores
HCAF Goals

*Hierarchical locality, PGAS, and dynamic parallelism in the spirit of Fortran*

What do I mean by “spirit of Fortran”?

- Focus on dense array handling
- Emphasis on performance
- Strong type checking
- Aggressive static optimization
HCAF Design Principles

• Optimizable and manually controllable
  • Programmer makes high-level decisions, can intervene at low level if necessary
  • Compiler is responsible for most performance details

• Explicit hierarchical locality
  • Single hierarchy model for hardware, teams, coarrays, task/data parallelism
  • Hierarchy abstraction for locality-aware programming in a hardware-independent way

• Single programming model across all hierarchy levels (‘H-PGAS into the node’)
  • Teams & coarrays on sets of cores across or within nodes
  • Async, do-parallel, collectives on any team across or within nodes

• Mixed global-view & local-view programming
  • Hierarchical tiling supports both element-wise & tile-wise access (global and local view)
  • Relative locality redefines coarray local-vs-remote distinction to within-vs-outside current locale

• Strong typing and statically known locality
  • Type system captures hierarchical structure of teams and coarrays
  • Static correctness checking of hierarchy references (e.g. subscript rank)
  • Static locality-aware optimization
  • Dynamic hierarchy supported by runtime checking
Related Work

• **Hierarchically Tiled Arrays and HPF**
  - HTA's are *hierarchical*, but *dynamic tiling* ⇒ no static optimization
  - HPF has *static tiling info* ⇒ aggressive optimization, but *not hierarchical*
  - **HCAF**: hierarchical tiling with static info for locality optimization

• **Hierarchical Place Trees and Titanium Hierarchical Teams**
  - HPTs model locality only *intra-node* and are *global & fixed at startup*
  - Titanium teams are *programmable & modular*, but model only *inter-image* locality
  - **HCAF**: programmable, modular teams extending inter-node to intra-image

• **Topology Mapping**
  - Two approaches: *graph-based* (LibTopoMap) and *tree-based* (TreeMatch, Rubik)
  - TreeMatch maps *arbitrary-size* trees, but trees are *unordered*
  - Rubik uses *Cartesian topologies* but maps *same-size* trees
  - **HCAF**: maps arbitrary-size trees with Cartesian topologies

• **Dynamic Parallelism & Work Stealing** (X10, Habanero, HotSLAW et al)
  - *Locality-aware fork-join parallelism* + parallel loops based on fork-join
  - Sophisticated inter- and intra-node *hierarchical work stealing* algorithms
  - **HCAF**: same, but with more static info for locality optimization
Opportunity: Statically-known Hierarchical Tiling

[Our] current implementation as a library forces to use dynamic analysis techniques to determine the communication patterns required when data is to be shuffled among processors. A compiler could calculate statically those patterns when they are regular enough, and generate a code with less overhead.


(emphasis added)

Cross-component optimization is essential to attain reasonable performance. For languages like HPF, compilers synthesize message passing communication operations and manage local buffers. Interprocedural analysis can reduce the frequency and volume of communication significantly. In the HTA library, communication optimization is in the hands of the programmer. A possible concern is that the programmer may not use the library efficiently.


(summarized)
Opportunity: Machine-independent Explicit Locality

- **Locale** denotes a relatively compact *subset of hardware*
- **Team** provides *abstraction of hardware subset* with desired topology
- **Coarray** *exposes data locality* for explicit management by application
- **Map** $M_1$ *distributes data* over application topology
- **Map** $M_2$ *embeds application topology* into physical topology
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Hierarchy: Basic Concepts

- **Hierarchy** here means *recursive partitioning*
  - ... of a finite set
  - Each set in the hierarchy has an associated partition into *subsets*
  - A hierarchy may be viewed as a *tree of sets* in two ways
    - Consider the hierarchy \{ \{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{4\}, \{5\} \}
    - \(T_1\) has nodes labeled with *included* sets
    - \(T_2\) has leaves labeled with *owned* sets;
      an interior node’s included set is the union of its children’s included sets
    - *We use \(T_1\) for natural global / local view*, but \(T_2\) describes hardware
  - HCAF uses hierarchies to represent *locality*
    - A subtree denotes a *neighborhood* of things *relatively close* together
    - A node’s children subdivide it into *smaller, closer* neighborhoods

- **Tiling** here means *rectangular partitioning*
  - ... of a rectangular \(n\)-dimensional grid into *tiles*, also rectangular
  - A tiling may be *nonaligned*, *aligned*, or *regular* [1]

- **Hierarchical tiling** means *recursive rectangular partitioning*
  - Each tile is partitioned into a set of *sub-tiles*
  - Can be viewed as a hierarchy or tree — with *rectangular structure*

---

Cartesian Resource Hierarchies

- The structure underlying locales, teams, and coarrays
- A **Cartesian resource hierarchy** is a tuple \((V, E, \{A_r\}, \mathcal{K})\) where
  - \((V, E, A)\) is a rooted attributed tree with \(A = \{A_r\} \cup \{\mathcal{K}\}\)
  - Each \(A_r\) is a resource attribute function of type \(R_r\)
  - \(\mathcal{K}\) is the topology function which assigns to each interior node \(n \in V\) with children \(C_n\) a Cartesian topology \(\mathcal{K}(n)\) for \(C_n\)
- A **resource attribute function of type \(R\)** is some \(f : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(R)\) where
  - \(R\) is a finite set of resource elements and \(\mathcal{P}(R)\) is the power set of \(R\)
  - \(\forall n \in V\) with children \(C_n : \{f(c) \mid c \in C_n\}\) is a partition of \(f(n)\)
  - \(\forall\) leaf \(n \in V : f(n)\) is a singleton
- A **Cartesian topology for \(V\)** is a function \(t : \mathcal{D}_k \rightarrow V\) where
  - \(t\) is one-to-one (need not be onto)
  - \(\mathcal{D}_k = \prod_i [L_i, U_i]\) is a \(k\)-dimensional Cartesian domain (ie with rank \(k\))
  - \(\{L_i\}\) and \(\{U_i\}\) are the lower and upper bounds of \(\mathcal{D}_k\)
  - The shape of the topology is \((U_1 - L_1, U_2 - L_2, \ldots U_k - L_k)\)
Characterization of Cartesian Hierarchies

- A **d-uniform** hierarchy is one where every leaf has depth $d$
- A **d-ranked** hierarchy is one where
  - Every leaf node has depth $\geq d$
  - $\forall d' < d \exists k_{d'}$ s.t. every node of depth $d'$ has a topology of rank $k_{d'}$
  - Then the **$d$-rank** of the hierarchy is $(k_0, k_2, \ldots, k_{d-1})$
- A **ranked** hierarchy is $d$-ranked and $d$-uniform for some $d$; then $(k_0, k_2, \ldots, k_{d-1})$ is its rank
- A **d-regular** hierarchy is one where
  - The hierarchy is $d$-ranked
  - $\forall d' < d \exists S_{d'}$ s.t. every node of depth $d'$ has a topology of shape $S_{d'}$
  - Then the **$d$-shape** of the hierarchy is $(S_0, S_2, \ldots, S_{d-1})$
- A **regular** hierarchy is $d$-regular and $d$-uniform for some $d$; then $(S_0, S_2, \ldots, S_{d-1})$ is its shape
- HCAF uses these properties for security and efficiency:
  - Locales and teams are ranked; coarrays are regular
  - **Types** of hierarchical objects have **$d$-rank type parameters** for type checking and optimization of subscripts and loops
Tiled Resource Hierarchies

- A **tiled resource hierarchy** is a tuple \((V, E, \mathcal{K}, \{A_t\}, \mathcal{T})\) where
  - \((V, E, \mathcal{K}, \{A_t\})\) is a Cartesian resource hierarchy
  - \(A_t \in \{A_r\}\) is the *tiled resource* of type \(R_t\)
  - \(\mathcal{T}\) is the *tiling function*, a resource attribute assigning to each node \(n \in V\) a Cartesian topology \(\mathcal{T}(n)\) for \(A_t(n)\) which satisfies certain conditions
  - \(R_t\) is the set of *tiled elements*, \(A_t(n) \subset R_t\) is the *tile* at \(n\), and \(\mathcal{T}(n)\) is the *element topology* at \(n\)
  - \(\mathcal{T}(n)\) specifies an index tuple for each tile element of \(n\)'s tile
  - \(\mathcal{T}\) must satisfy *tiling conditions* at every \(n \in V\) with children \(C_n\):
    - \(\{\mathcal{T}(c) \mid c \in C_n\}\) is a partition of \(\mathcal{T}(n)\), viewing the functions as sets of pairs
    - The tile at \(n\) has rank \(k\) and bounds \([L_i]\) and \([U_i]\) of \(D_k\), where \(\mathcal{T}(n) : D_k \to V\)
    - Thus a given tile element has the same *indices at every level of tiling*;
      HCAF uses this convention for subscripting teams and coarrays
  - *Rank* and *shape* are defined for both *elements* and *tiles* at a node:
    - We use *rank*, *shape*, and *size* for the *element-wise* topology at a node
    - We use *corank*, *coshape*, and *cosize* for the *tile-wise* topology at a node
Hierarchy Maps

- A **hierarchy map** $M$ from $G$ to $H$ is a tuple $(G, H, m)$ where
  - $m : V_G \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V_H)$ is descendant-preserving, i.e.
    if $p, q \in V_G$ and $p$ is a descendant of $q$, then
    $\forall r \in m(p) \exists s \in m(q)$ such that $r$ is a descendant of $s$
  - This preserves our notion of locality (relative closeness)
  - Cartesian topologies are not preserved, but should be “respected”
- Hierarchy maps adapt an application’s **virtual hierarchies** to fit the current job’s **hardware hierarchy**
  - A **hierarchical team** is mapped to a set of processors
    (with corresponding hierarchical structure)
  - A **hierarchical coarray** is mapped to a set of memories
    (with corresponding hierarchical structure)
  - Hierarchy map **composition** provides modularity:
    e.g. if $H$ is the hardware and $G$ is a team passed to a library,
    the library realizes its preferred team structure $G_2$
    by composing a new map with $G$’s existing map:
    $G_2 \rightarrow G \rightarrow H$
- **Goodness of maps** and finding good ones are TBD
  - But there are many relevant papers & working systems
Hierarchy Map Examples

coarse to fine

shallow to deep

low to high rank

fine to coarse

depth to shallow

high to low rank
**Goodness of Hierarchy Maps**

Better: \( m(b) \) and \( m(c) \) in nearby locale \( r \)

Worse: \( m(b) \) and \( m(c) \) in distant locale \( q \)
Goodness of Hierarchy Maps
(hierarchical team → hardware)

Better: \( m(b) \) and \( m(c) \) in nearby locale \( r \)
\[ \Rightarrow b \leftrightarrow c \text{ communicate via memory access} \]

Worse: \( m(b) \) and \( m(c) \) in distant locale \( q \)
\[ \Rightarrow b \leftrightarrow c \text{ communicate via messaging} \]
Goodness of Hierarchy Maps

Best mapping between a given pair of hierarchies may not be great
- How serious this is depends on the situation
- E.g. the map above may be fine if all target locales are shared-memory

For best results: choose a source hierarchy that maps well to target

HCAF’s answer for this is tiling patterns

Bad: \( m(b), m(c), \) and \( m(d) \) in distant locale \( q \)
…and can’t do better!
Tiling Patterns

• A **tiling pattern** is a pair \( P = (R, M) \) where
  - \( R = (k_0, k_2, \ldots, k_{d-1}) \) is a d-rank
  - \( M \) is a possibly infinite set of tiled resource hierarchies with d-rank \( R \), comprising all the matches of \( P \)

• A **matching function** is some \( \text{Match} : (P, \mathcal{D}_k, H_T) \mapsto (H_O, m) \) where
  - \( P = ( (k_0, k_2, \ldots, k_{d-1}), M ) \) is the **tiling pattern to be matched**
  - \( \mathcal{D}_k \) is the **input domain**, a Cartesian domain with rank \( k = k_0 \)
  - \( H_T \) is the **target hierarchy**, a tiled resource hierarchy that the match result should conform to
  - \( H_O \in M \) is the **output hierarchy**, a tiled resource hierarchy satisfying:
    - \( H_R \in M \), i.e. the output hierarchy matches the pattern \( P \)
    - \( \text{Domain}(\mathcal{T}(r)) = \mathcal{D}_k \), where \( r \) is the root of \( H_O \); i.e. the top level tile of \( H_O \) is the input domain, i.e. the input domain is tiled by \( P \) to give the output hierarchy
  - \( m \) is the **output hierarchy map** from \( H_R \) to \( H_T \); i.e. a view of the output hierarchy as an abstraction of the target

• Of course we prefer that \( m \) be a **good** hierarchy map
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Locales: Hierarchical Machine Topology

- **Locales** are units of computer hardware locality
  - Nested regions of a parallel computer containing computing resources which are relatively close in terms of communication cost
  - E.g. cores, dies, sockets, nodes, boards, chassis, cabinets, ...
- A locale is a Cartesian resource hierarchy \((V, E, A, \mathcal{K})\) where
  - \(V\) is the set of regions and \(E\) is the containment relation among them
  - \(A = \{\text{Procs}, \text{Mems}, \text{Comm}\}\) describes each locale's computing elements
  - \(\text{Procs} : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(P)\) is the processor resource function
    - \(P\) is the set of processors (hardware threads)
    - \(\text{Procs}(e) = \{p_1, p_2, \ldots\}\) is the set of processors contained in locale \(e\)
  - \(\text{Mems} : V \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(M)\) is the memory resource function
    - \(M\) is the set of memories (RAMs or caches)
    - \(\text{Mems}(e) = \{m_1, m_2, \ldots\}\) is the set of memories contained in locale \(e\)
  - \(\text{Comm} : V \rightarrow \{\text{distributed, shared}\}\) is the communication attribute function
    - \text{distributed} and \text{shared} denote respectively communication via message passing and memory reference
    - \(\text{Comm}(e)\) is the worst-case communication kind among elements of \(e\)
    - Require that no shared locale has a distributed sub-locale
Example Locale: 2 Hopper 24-core Nodes

- 2 Magny-Cours cpus / node
- 2 6-core dies / socket
- 2 memory paths / die
- 4 HyperTransport3 links / die

nested locales

sockets

nodes

dies

cores

RAM

L3 cache

M M

P

M M

L1 & L2 caches

shared 8 Gb/s

distributed 6 Gb/s

shared 19 Gb/s

shared 42 Gb/s
Locales and Hierarchical PGAS

locales = hierarchically partitioned address spaces
smaller locale = closer elements = cheaper communication

- Any processor can access any address space
- Speed of access is modeled by the smallest enclosing locale of a processor and the other processor or memory it accesses
- Equivalently, by the lowest common ancestor node in the corresponding Cartesian resource hierarchy
Locales and Hierarchical PGAS

finest partition of address space =
innermost locale =
one die ⇒
shared-memory comm at 42 Gb/s
Locales and Hierarchical PGAS

mid-level partition of address space = mid-level locale = one node ⇒ shared-memory comm at 8 Gb/s
Locales and Hierarchical PGAS

coldest partition of address space = top-level locale = two nodes
⇒ distributed-memory comm at 6 Gb/s
Teams: Hierarchical Processor Groups

- **Teams** are groups of hardware processors (cores)
  - Nested sets of processors which are *relatively close* in communication cost
  - Teams *specify* sets of processors and *inherit* sets of memories
  - Teams serve as *abstract locales* to isolate application from hardware details
- A team is a Cartesian resource hierarchy $T = (V, E, A, \mathcal{K})$ where
  - $V$ is the set of subteams and $E$ is the containment relation among them
  - $A = \{\text{Procs, Mems, Comm}\}$ just as for locales
- A team has a hierarchy map $m : V_T \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V_H)$ where
  - $H$ is the hardware locale (root)
  - $m(r)$ is typically a *sub-locale* of the hardware locale, where $r$ the root of $T$; it denotes the *machine subset implementing* $T$
  - $\text{Procs}(r)$ is the team’s set of processors, possibly a subset of $\text{Procs}(m(r))$
  - $m$ describes how the team’s processors are distributed on the machine
- Consider a team as a *hierarchy of processors*, with its memories just inherited from its associated locale:
  - Require $\forall t \in V : \text{Mems}(t) = \text{Mems}(m(t))$
  - These are the memories close to the team’s processors
- A team is mapped to hardware by the map $m$
Teams: Locality-aware Parallelism

- Teams are resources for parallel execution
  - Not a set of images or threads, but a set of processors (w/ nearby memories)
  - Basic unit of parallelism: spawn task on team (controls execution locality at arbitrary grain)
  - Team's processors cooperate to execute in parallel all tasks spawned on it
  - Team's memories hold tasks' stack frames & heap-allocated objects (by default)
- Uniform model for all concurrency in HCAF
  - Task parallelism: like async/finish X10, Habanero, Chapel, CAF 2.0
  - Loop parallelism: iterations are spawned on current team like X10 ateach
  - Data parallelism: array intrinsics implemented as parallel loops
  - Both intra-node and inter-node spawning are supported
- Hierarchical work-stealing scheduler per team
  - Similar to place schedulers in Habanero’s Hierarchical Place Trees
  - Both distributed-memory and shared-memory work stealing are supported
  - Problem: lexical closures — Habanero/Chapel style {in, out, inout} specifiers?
- Implementation
  - Berkeley HotSLAW; Quintin & Wagner; Olivier & Prins; Saraswat, Paudel et al; etc
Coarrays: Hierarchical Data Objects

• **Coarrays** are tiled groups of storage locations (elements)
  • Nested tiles of elements which are *relatively close* in communication cost
  • Coarrays *specify* sets of elements and *inherit* processors and memories
  • Coarrays are *allocated on teams* and their tiles are placed in teams’ memories

• A coarray is a tiled resource hierarchy $C = (V, E, K, A, T)$ where
  • $V$ is the set of sub-tiles and $E$ is the containment relation among them
  • $A = \{\text{Elems, Procs, Mems, Comm}\}$ where $\text{Elems} \mapsto$ storage locations in each tile
  • $\text{Elems}(r)$ is the coarray’s top level (global-view) tile and $T(r)$ is the tile’s shape

• A coarray has a hierarchy map $m : V_C \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(V_T)$ where
  • $T$ is the team on which $C$ is allocated
  • $m(r)$ is typically the root of the team, where $r$ is the root of $C$
  • $m$ describes how the coarray’s tiles are distributed on the team

• Consider a coarray as a **hierarchy of elements**, with its processors and memories just inherited from its associated team:
  • Require $\forall c \in V_C : \text{Procs}(c) = \text{Procs}(m(c))$ and $\text{Mems}(c) = \text{Mems}(m(c))$
  • These are the processors owning and memories storing the coarray

• A coarray is mapped to hardware by the composition $C \rightarrow T \rightarrow H$
Example: Coarray on Team on 2 Hopper Nodes

- Team and coarray hierarchies have same shape here, but this is not required.
- Each leaf coarray tile is allocated in one die’s memories and has 3 cores of the die assigned to it.
- Each 3-core leaf subteam is mapped to a die’s locale, which is the smallest locale enclosing its cores.
- The team is a 3-level 16-leaf *abstraction* of the 5-level 48-leaf hardware hierarchy.
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Tiling Patterns

• Problem:
  • Locality-aware applications and optimizers *statically depend on hierarchy shape*
  • Hardware hierarchy is *known only at runtime* (cf. machine type & job scheduler)
  • Need *abstraction* to decouple application’s *virtual hierarchies* from machine’s *real hierarchy*
  • But manually mapping virtual to real is difficult

• Solution:
  • *Tiling pattern* describes a *set of desirable hierarchies*
  • Compiler *statically optimizes* using properties common to all set members
  • Runtime *dynamically chooses* desirable hierarchy with a *good mapping* to hardware

• Tiling pattern specifies:
  • *Hierarchy rank* (first \( d \) levels) and set of *hierarchy coshapes*
  • Required *communication kind* at each level (distributed vs shared memory)
  • Tile *distributions* and Rubik-style *tilts/shifts/etc*

• Example tiling pattern 'P' with hierarchy rank (2,1):

\[
\text{tiling :: P(N)} \\
\text{[ N block, N cyclic(100) ]} \\
\text{[ 2..32 ] shared} \\
\text{end tiling}
\]
Tiling Patterns: Level & Dimension Specs

Level spec: $[2, \ast]$  

Dimension specs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tile rank</th>
<th>shape</th>
<th>corank</th>
<th>coshape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2, 2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2, 4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4, 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4, 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n$ divides into $n$ tiles  

$\#n$ divides into tiles of size $n$  

$\ast$ leaves dimension undivided  

$-$ “tiles out” dimension

Tile rank = 2  
Tile shape = (4, 4)  
Corank = 0
Tiling Patterns: Level & Dimension Specs

level spec: $[2, *, 2]$  
dimension specs

$$\text{tile rank} = 2$$  
$$\text{tile shape} = (4, 4)$$  
$$\text{corank} = 0$$  

$n$ divides into $n$ tiles  
$\#n$ divides into tiles of size $n$  
$*$ leaves dimension undivided  
$-$ “tiles out” dimension
**Tiling Patterns: Parameters & Constraints**

- **Parametrized** pattern specifies a *set of hierarchies*
  - *Parameters* are positive integer variables local to pattern
  - *Constraints* are arithmetic predicates over parameters
  - An *instantiation* is an assignment of values to parameters s.t. all constraints are satisfied

- **Pattern matching:**
  - Given hierarchy \( H \), pattern \( P \), and input tile \( T \), find instantiation \( P' \) of \( P \) and \( H' = tiling(T, P') \) s.t. \( \exists \) “good” mapping \( M : H' \rightarrow H \)
  - Result is \( (H', M) \)

- **Implicit parameter** = unnamed param + constraint
  - Range: \( expr .. expr \)

- **Extents** in dimension-specs are Fortran exprs
  - Treated like array bound expressions

- Dimension-specs have *lower* and *upper bounds*
  - Like array bounds: \( extent : extent \)
  - Empty lower bound \( \equiv 1 \), empty upper bound \( \equiv \text{any} \)
    - \( 0 : 7..15 \) \( \Rightarrow \) \( 8 \leq n \leq 16 \) elements indexed from 0
    - \( : \) \( \Rightarrow n > 0 \) elements indexed from 1

```
tiling :: P( N )
[ 1..4 ]
[ N, N ]
where
N <= 3
end tiling
```
Tiling Patterns: Distribution & Comm Specs

- **Distribution specifier** modifies dimension-spec
  - Specifies a dimension’s assignment of elements to tiles
    i.e. partially specifies $T(c)$ at each child $c$ of tiled node
  - Classic distribution specs like HPF:
    - *block* contiguous w/ extent $n$ or $#n$
    - *cyclic*(k) cyclic over $n$ w/ extent $k$
  - Additional distribution specs like Rubik
    - *tilt* tile boundary tilted
    - *zigzag* tile boundary zig-zagged
    - *zorder* space filling curve
  - Default distribution is *block*, yields conventional tiling

- **Communication specifier** modifies level-spec
  - Specifies worst-case communication type at level
    $\Rightarrow$ acts as a constraint in pattern matching
  - Types of communication:
    - *distributed* message passing
    - *shared* memory access
    - *image* SPMD program instance (shared)
    - *any* unspecified (the default)
Generic Hierarchy Operations

- $H$ may be a locale, a team, or a coarray (some operations require hierarchy be regular)

  - **Shape and size**
    - `codepth(H)` number of tiling levels ($0 \Rightarrow$ leaf)
    - `corank(H), corank(H,k)` number of tile dimensions at top or specified tiling level
    - `coshape(H), coshape(H,k)` tuple of tile extents at top or specified tiling level
    - `cosize(H), cosize(H,k)` total number of tiles at top or specified tiling level
    - `rank(H), rank(H,k)` number of element dimensions at top or specified tiling level
    - `shape(H), shape(H,k)` tuple of element extents at top or specified tiling level
    - `size(H), size(H,k)` total number of elements at top or specified tiling level

  - **Access**
    - $H[i,j,...]$ tile access
    - $H[l:u:s,...]$ tile section access
    - $H(i,j,...)$ element access
    - $H(l:u:s,...)$ element section access

  - **Locality**
    - `locale(H)` opaque id of hardware locale to which $H$ maps
    - `locale_info(id)` description of hardware locale identified by $id$

  - **Mapping**
    - `map_hierarchy(H,T)` new hierarchy by tiling $H$ with tiling pattern $T$
    - `map_hierarchy(H,H2)` new hierarchy by tiling $H$ with tiling pattern of $H2`
Constructs: Hierarchical Teams

- A **team** is a cartesian hierarchy of **processors** (not SPMD instances)
  - Team’s processors cooperate to execute tasks spawned dynamically on the team
  - Team’s processors communicate and synchronize via *collectives* as in CAF 2.0
  - Teams are characterized by the *(worst case)* kind of communication available between processors
    - *Distributed-memory team*: communication by message passing
    - *Shared-memory team*: communication by memory access
    - *Image team*: communication by global variables
      — a shared-memory team within an execution of the SPMD program
  - Team characterization is determined by locale to which it is mapped

- **Team variable declarations**
  - Recall that HCAF hierarchy types include a partial characterization of the hierarchy (i.e. of top *d* levels)
  - So HCAF’s type `team` is parametrized by a tiling rank:
    ```
    team, tiling[:,::] :: t1        tiling rank is (2)
    team, tiling[:,::][:] :: t2    tiling rank is (2,1)
    team, tiling(T) :: t3          tiling rank is T’s rank
    ```
  - Default tiling rank is “any”:
    ```
    team :: t                          rank is ( )
    ```
  - Team sub-typing by tiling rank subsumption:
    ```
    t = t1                             ✔ since ( ) is a prefix of (2)
    t1 = t2                            ✔ since (2) is a prefix of (2,1)
    t2 = t1                            ✗ since (2,1) is not a prefix of (2)
    ```
  - Allows static type checking of team variable uses
Constructs: Hierarchical Teams (2)

- **Team construction**
  - Predefined team values:
    - \texttt{TEAM\_HARDWARE} precisely describes hierarchy of current job’s machine partition
    - \texttt{TEAM\_WORLD} as in CAF 2.0 (all processors, partitioned into image teams)
    - \texttt{TEAM\_DEFAULT} as in CAF 2.0
  - By splitting with a tiling pattern:
    - \texttt{t3 = tile\_map(TEAM\_HARDWARE, T)}
  - By CAF 2.0’s notion of team splitting?
    - \texttt{Don’t know how to make this work hierarchically}

- **Team usage**
  - Allocate a coarray on a team
  - Perform collectives on a team
  - Team-oriented control structures:
    - \texttt{with team t} as in CAF 2.0
    - \texttt{with subteam t} our version of Titanium \texttt{team\_split} statement
    - \texttt{select subteam t} our version of Titanium \texttt{partition} statement
      - \texttt{case <stmt> ...}
      - \texttt{end select}
Data Parallelism: Parallel Loops

- Explicit data parallelism via *loops*
  - Iterating over *element* indices of a coarray:
    ```
    do parallel( i, j in A )
    <statement list>
    end
    ```
  - Iterating over *tile* indices of a coarray:
    ```
    do parallel( tile i, j in A )
    <statement list>
    end
    ```
  - Iterating over part of a coarray:
    ```
    do parallel( tile j in A[k,:] )
    <statement list>
    end
    ```
  - Loop indices can be omitted ⇒ rank-independent data parallelism
    ```
    do parallel( tile in A )
    <statement list>
    end
    ```

- Locality via hierarchy mapping:
  - Iterations of body are all spawned at once into implicit `finish`
  - Each iteration is spawned on the subteam owning the indexed element or tile
Task Parallelism: Async & Finish

• Two forms of `async`, analogous to Fortran’s two forms of `if`
  • `async(t) <statement>`
  • `async(t) <statement-list> end async`
  • Can supply data reference instead of team ⇒ spawns on team owning the data

• Two forms of `finish`
  • `finish <statement>`
  • `finish <statement-list> end finish`

• Additional `event` argument signals completion
  • `async(team = t, event = e) <statement>`
  • `async(team = t, event = e) <statement list> end async`
What about SPMD Parallelism?

- What are the essential differences between task and SPMD parallelism?
  - **Number of “program images”**
    - Number of instantiations of libraries, number of copies of global variables
    - This matters because *program scope* is special!
  - **Degree of parallelism present at startup**
    - Task parallel $\Rightarrow$ 1 control thread; SMPD parallel $\Rightarrow$ P control threads
    - This matters because of data parallel loops:
      - are they *fork/joins*?
      - or are they *collectives*?

- Can SPMD be modeled as implicit an *initial fork* and a *final join*?

- Can a data-parallel loop on a *distributed-memory* team have the same semantics as a data-parallel loop on a *shared-memory* team?
  - if not, how can we have one programming model with uniform semantics throughout the machine hierarchy?

- See following example for more insight
Example: Naive Matrix Multiply

program main

  tiling :: T(m1, m2)
    [m1, m1]
    [m2, m2] shared
  end

  real, dimension(:,:), tiling(T) :: A, B, C
  integer, parameter :: n = 1000

  allocate( A(n,n), B(n,n), C(n,n) ) on(TEAM_HARDWARE)
  ! initialize A and B somehow ...
  C = 0

  call matmul(A, B, C)

end program
Example: Naive Matrix Multiply cont’d

```fortran
subroutine matmul(A, B, C)
  real :: A(:,,:), B(:,,:), C(:,,:)
  integer :: n

  select tiling( A )
    case [:,:]
      n = cosize(A, 1)
      do parallel( tile i, j in C )
        do k = 1, n
          call matmul(A[i,k], B[k,j], C)
        end do
      end do
    case [:]
      n = size(A, 1)
      do parallel( i, j in C )
        do k = 1, n
          C(i,j) = C(i,j) + A(i,k) * B(k,j)
        end do
      end do
  end select

end subroutine
```