Library Oriented Approaches for Parallel Loop Constructs

Outline

- Parallelism Intro
 - Loops and Blocks
 - The Challenge of Loop Reduction
- Paraffin
 - Design
 - Capabilities
 - Examples
- Syntax Helpers?
 - Goal: Integrate with libraries
 - What can be done?

Where Ada stands to shine

- Ada's focus on correctness
- Static checking
 - Let compiler find problems when possible
 - Catch bugs earlier in development.
- Parallel Programming is difficult to get right.
 - Let Ada compiler help programmer out as much as possible.
- . Ideally Ada would prevent data races
 - Other languages let programmers shoot themselves in the foot more readily.

Parallelism Constructs

- Basically two constructs needed
 - Parallel Blocks
 - Forking two or more actions in parallel.
 - Parallel Loops
 - . Simple Iteration loops
 - Reduction loops
 - Container Iteration

Parallel Blocks

• When Two or more lengthy actions can execute at the same time.

Paint_Sistine_Chapel; -- 1502 - 1512 Paint_Mona_Lisa; -- 1503 - 1506

- Doesn't work so well with just one worker
 - But with two or more workers, works great!
- Same goes for;

Build_Rome; -- Took longer than a day

- A classic Divide and Conquer problem

Parallel Blocks Works well with Recursion

- Leonardo Bonacci (c. 1170 c. 1250)
 - Known also as Leonardo of Pisa
 - You might know him by his other name;
 - . Leonardo Fibonacci
 - popularized the Hindu—Arabic numeral system
 - -Wrote Liber Abaci in 1202
 - A historic book on Arithmetic
 - Among many other things, introduced the Fibonacci sequence

Recursive Parallel Fibonacci

 $Fn = Fn-1 + Fn-2 \{0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, 89, ...\}$

- function Fibonacci (N : Natural) return
 Natural is
 begin
 - if N < 2 then
 return N;
 end if;</pre>

Opportunity for Divide & Conquer



return Fibonacci (N - 2) +
 Fibonacci (N - 1);
end Fibonacci;

Rework for Parallelism

```
function Fibonacci (N : Natural) return Natural
is
   Left, Right : Natural;
begin
   if N < 2 then
      return N;
                              Calculation of Left
   end if;
                              & Right
                              occur in parallel
   parallel
      Left := Fibonacci (N - 2);
   and
      Right := Fibonacci (N - 1);
   end parallel; Synchronization occurs
                               here
   return Left + Right;
```

end Fibonacci;

Parallel Loops

Go back to the Beginning

Same action occurring multiple times

Italian Music Term: Da Capo (D.C.)



Biggest challenge for parallelism syntax

- Loop Reductions (by far)
 - Combining parallel results into a single overall result
 Global result,

Sum := 0;

for I in 1 .. N loop

Sum := Sum + I;

end loop;

Need to be able to run this loop in parallel, But how?

races

need to avoid data

Benefits of Syntax

- Can be tailored to "suit" a particular problem
 - Has to "fit" in the language, however
- Compiler can have more intimate knowledge
 - eg. Detect data races
- . Can be easier to read and write
- Examples of syntactic solution
 - OpenMP (C, C++, FORTRAN)
 - Cilk (C, C++)

Other side of Syntax

- Adds complexity to language definition
- More work for compiler writers
- Danger of unseen problems, or regrets
 - Once something is in Standard, there for good
- Might think of better idea down the road
 - As new hardware and computing platforms arise



- All roads might lead to Rome...
 - but some get us there faster. (Parallelism goal)

Other extreme – Library Approach

- Libraries can be written today using existing syntax (Examples C#, Java)
- Generally easier to implement a library than syntax
- No additional complexity for language definition
- Syntax tends to be generalized
- Libraries can more easily adapt to specific needs
 - Controls, Parameters, Variants, etc

The syntax spectrum

- . No need to stick with one extreme or the other
- Might be a middle ground that combines more general syntax with a library approach...
 - The more places new syntax can be used...
 - . Generally means more useful
- Other possibility is to provide both
 - Libraries for those who want less "magic"
 - Syntax for those that want ease of expression

Library approach

- . How far can we go?
 - To make libraries easy to use
 - . Specifically parallelism libraries
 - Maybe sprinkle on some syntactic sugar?
 - Eg. Ada Containers + Ada 2012 Iterator Syntax

for Element of Container loop
 Element := Element + 1;
end loop;

Paraffin – A study in parallelism libraries

- . Features
 - Written in Ada
 - Parallel Loops
 - Parallel Blocks
 - Parallel subprograms
 - Task Pools (optional)
 - Ravenscar (optional)
 - Non-commutative reduction (optional)

Paraffin – Features (Cont)

- . Support for multilangage use
 - C, C++, C#, Java, FORTRAN, Python, Rust
- Bindings to OpenMP and Cilk
- Native Paraffin implementations as well
- Stack safe parallel recursion
- 3 native load balancing strategies
 - Work Sharing, Work Seeking, Work Stealing
- Supports for Ada 95, Ada 2005, and Ada 2012
- . At least two different compiler vendors
 - Adacore + ICC Irvine Compiler

C# Interfacing to Paraffin

class test paraffin lib

```
[ThreadStatic]
```

{

```
private static int partial sum;
```

```
static void Main(string[] args)
{
  int sum = 0;
```

Paraffin Library API

```
generic
  type Loop_Index is range <>;
  type Result_Type is private;
  with function Reducer
      (Left, Right : Result_Type)
          return Result_Type;
  Identity_Value : Result_Type;
package Parallel.Generic_Reducing_Loops is
```

```
function Parallel_Loop
  (From, To : Loop_Index;
   Loop_Body : not null access
      procedure (From, To : Loop_Index;
            Result : in out Result_Type))
return Result_Type;
```

end Parallel.Generic_Reducing_Loops;

Calling Paraffin From Ada Today

```
package Loops is new
   Parallel.Generic Reducing Loops
             (Loop Index => Integer,
              Result Type => Integer,
              Identity => 0,
              Reducer => "'+"); use Loops;
procedure Loop Body
   (Start, Finish : Integer;
    Partial Result : in out Integer) is
begin
  for I in Start .. Finish loop
     Partial Result := Partial Result + I;
  end loop;
end Loop Body;
Sum := Parallel Loop (From => 1, To => N,
                      Loop Body => Loop Body 'Access);
```

Idea #1 Lambda Procedures

```
Sum := Parallel_Loop
 (From => 1,
  To => N,
  Loop_Body => (Start, Finish, Result)
   (for I in Start .. Finish loop
        Result := Result + I;
   end loop));
```

Idea #2 Loop Body Procedures

Idea #3 Stream Function Loops

- Java takes a unique approach with Java Streams
- Functions are pipelined together
 - A library approach
- int sum = IntStream.range(1,N).parallel().sum();

Delete "Parallel" to get Sequential loop

Collector function terminates Stream

Idea #3 Stream Function Loops

Sum := 0;

for I of Iter(1,N).Parallel.Add(Sum) loop
 Sum := Sum + I;
end loop;

Idea #3 Stream Function Loops Container Iteration example

-- Iterating through a map containers keys.
for Pair of Container.Keys loop
 Put_Line(Key_Type'Image(Pair.Key) &
 " => " &
 Elem_Type'Image(Pair.Elem));
end loop;

Total : Integer := 0;

for V of Container.Elements.Sum(Total) loop
 Total := Total + V;
end loop;

Summary

- A blend of libraries + general loop syntax can express a parallel loop quite nicely
- Desire to represent parallel loops as loops
- Desire to represent functions as functions
- Which one wins? Maybe we need both?
- Combining Java Stream idea with idea for loop procedure bodies seems like a good way to express parallelism with minimal syntax.

Questions? Comments?

• Thank you!