

ASCR Programming Challenges Workshop

William Harrod Sonia R. Sachs July 27-29, 2011



Welcome and Goals

Office of Science

- Welcome
- Workshop Goals:
 - Define objective criteria for assessing programming models and language features that enable effective use of diverse Exascale architectures for important science applications.
 - Prioritize challenges for programming models, languages, compilers and runtime systems for Exascale
 - Prioritize options for
 - evolutionary path,
 - revolutionary path and
 - bridging the gap between evolutionary and revolutionary paths
 - Create a roadmap, with options, timeline, and rough cost estimates for programming Exascale systems that are responsive to the needs of applications and to future architectural constraints



State-of-the-art Session I

Office of Science

 Presentations on advanced programming models and languages, describing and comparing capabilities and advantages and disadvantages of approaches. 20 minutes + 5 minutes for questions.

• Focused Parallel Panel discussions

- Develop objective criteria to assess programming models considering various models of computation primitives:
 - Communication and Synchronization Primitives Panel
 - Scheduling Primitives Panel
 - Partitioning and Placement Primitives Panel
- Session I General Panel



Explaining Focused Panels for Session I

- These primitives apply at all levels of abstraction:
 - →algorithm → execution model → programming model → language → machine model
- We are focusing today on programming models
- We are here to explore how these primitives are defined in Exascale environments



Explaining Focused Panels for Session I

Office of Science

• Communication:

 describes how work and data are passed from one parallel task to another (broadcast, multicast, point-to-point, near neighbor, tree, etc.)

• Synchronization:

describes the control and data mechanisms for coordinating parallel operations (producer-consumer, barrier, locks)

• Partitioning:

 describes how work and data are split between different physical resources (what to run as threads, what is the grain size, division of work...)

• Placement:

 describes the location of first class objects throughout the system (where to run, where to place the data...)

• Scheduling:

 describes the ordering of work (when to run, static or dynamic, user-level or system-level...)



A Few Words about Exascale Challenges

Office of Science

- **Asynchrony** will be needed at all levels in Exascale computing:
 - → Algorithms → execution models → programming models
 → languages → machine models.
- The **paradigm shift** from bulk-synchronous computing to asynchronous computing appears unsettling and chaotic to many.
 - Not to worry:
 - From a theoretical, formal methods view point, we have shown¹ that one can model asynchrony with a synchronous model.
- On the other hand, this may only apply if the abstractions that we use in the new asynchronous, massively parallel environment are good enough so that the theory applies...

1. R.P.Kurshan, M. Merritt, A. Orda, and S.R.Sachs, "Modelling Asynchrony with a Synchronous Model, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 1995, Volume 939/1995, 339-352.



A Few Words about Exascale Challenges

- Concurrent programming is difficult¹
- **Our physical world is highly concurrent**, so why is concurrent programming difficult?
 - Have we chosen incorrect programming abstractions?
 - Are threads an example of such incorrect abstractions?
 - "achieving reliability and predictability using threads is essentially impossible for many applications.²"
 - Is message passing another example of incorrect abstraction?
 - "Message passing can be made as non-deterministic and difficult to understand as threads^{.2"}

 H. Sutter and J. Larus, "Software and the Concurrency Revolution," ACM Queue, vol. 3, no. 7, 2005, pp. 54-62.
 E. Lee, "The Problem with Threads," Computer, pp. 33-42, May 2006.



A Few Words about Exascale Challenges

- Do we have examples of good abstractions?
 - In embedded systems, actor-oriented
 programming¹ used in the context of several
 models of computation (Kahn Process Networks,
 Synchronous/Reactive, and Discrete Events) very
 naturally expresses concurrency.
 - We hope that at this workshop we will explore many abstractions to deal with asynchrony.

1. E.A. Lee and S. Neuendorffer, "Clases and Subclasses in Actor-Oriented Design," *Proc. ACM/IEEE Conf. Formal Methods and Models for Codesign (MEMOCODE), 2004;* http://ptolemy.eecs.berkeley.edu/publications/papers/04/ Classes/



Workshop Organization

Office of Science

- Our Special Thanks to Bob Lucas for hosting this workshop
- Our Thanks to:
 - The Workshop Committee
 - Saman Amarasinghe (MIT),
 - Mary Hall (U. Utah),
 - Pat McCormick (LANL),
 - Richard Murphy (Sandia),
 - Keshav Pingali (U. Texas-Austin),
 - Dan Quinlan (LLNL),
 - Vivek Sarkar (Rice),
 - John Shalf(LBNL).
 - The Advisory Committee:
 - Bob Lucas (USC/ISI)
 - Kathy Yelick (LBNL/UCB)
 - Participants who contributed panel questions
 - ASCR Website team: Tom Monahan and Ginger Kirkendall
 - Support from Sandia, ISI, and ORISE (Larry Godinez, Dolores Cadena, Jeannie Robinson, and Deneise Terry)