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What is OpenMP?

```
#pragma omp parallel for
for(int i=0; i<N; ++i) {
    do_something(i);
}
```
History of OpenMP

- In spring, 7 vendors and the DOE agree on the spelling of parallel loops and form the OpenMP ARB. By October, version 1.0 of the OpenMP specification for Fortran is released.

- 1.0
  - First hybrid applications with MPI and OpenMP appear.

- 1.1
  - Minor modifications.

- 2.0
  - Unified Fortran and C/C++: Bigger than both individual specifications combined.

- 2.5
  - The merge of Fortran and C/C++ specifications begins.

- 3.0
  - Incorporates task parallelism. The OpenMP memory model is defined and codified.

- 3.1
  - Support minimal reductions in C/C++.

- 4.0
  - Supports offloading execution to accelerator and coprocessor devices, SIMD parallelism, and more. Expands OpenMP beyond traditional boundaries.

- 4.5
  - OpenMP supports loop, task, and functionality, and adds support for OpenMP and standard functions.

- 5.0
  - OpenMP supports loop and task features, and adds support for OpenMP and standard functions.

Timeline:
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- 1999
- 2000
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- 2002
- 2003
- 2004
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- 2006
- 2007
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- 2012
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- 2014
- 2015
- 2016
- 2017
- 2018
Why expand OpenMP target support now?

- We need heterogeneous computing
  - Better energy efficiency
  - More performance without increasing clock speed

- C/C++ abstractions (CUDA, Kokkos or RAJA) aren’t enough
  - Even the C++ abstractions have to run atop something!
  - Not all codes are written in C++, some are even written in F******!

- New mainstream system architectures require it!
Sierra: The next LLNL Capability System
The Sierra system features a GPU-accelerated architecture.

**Compute Node**
- 2 IBM POWER9 CPUs
- 4 NVIDIA Volta GPUs
- NVMe-compatible PCIe 1.6 TB SSD
- 256 GiB DDR4
- 16 GiB Globally addressable HBM2 associated with each GPU
  - Coherent Shared Memory

**IBM POWER9**
- Gen2 NVLink

**NVIDIA Volta**
- 7 TFlop/s
- HBM2
- Gen2 NVLink

**Mellanox Interconnect**
- Single Plane EDR InfiniBand
- 2 to 1 Tapered Fat Tree

**Compute Rack**
- Standard 19"
- Warm water cooling

**Compute System**
- 4320 nodes
- 1.29 PB Memory
- 125 PFLOPS
- ~12 MW

**Spectrum Scale File System**
- 154 PB usable storage
- 1.54 TB/s R/W bandwidth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sierra</th>
<th>uSierra</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nodes</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWER9 processors per node</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GV100 (Volta) GPUs per node</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node Peak (TFLOP/s)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Peak (PFLOP/s)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Node Memory (GiB)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Memory (PiB)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interconnect</td>
<td>2x IB EDR</td>
<td>2x IB EDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Node Aggregate b/w (GB/s)</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compute racks</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network and Infrastructure racks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Racks</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total racks</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak Power (MW)</td>
<td>~12</td>
<td>~1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many Updates to Accelerator Support in OpenMP 4.5

- Unstructured data mapping
- Asynchronous execution
- Scalar variables are firstprivate by default
- Improvements for C/C++ array sections
- Device runtime routines: allocation, copy, etc.
- Clauses to support device pointers
- Ability to map structure elements
- New combined constructs
- New way to map global variables (link)

Tons of non-accelerator updates for tasking, SIMD and even performance of classic worksharing
Gaps in OpenMP 4.5

• Base language support is out of date
  • C99
  • C++03
  • Fortran 03

• Mapping complex data structures is painful
  • No direct support for unified memory devices
  • No mechanism for deep copying in mappings

• Overlapping data transfers with computation is complex and error prone

• Etc.
Base Language Support in OpenMP 5.0

- C99 -> C11
  - _Atomic still in discussion

- C++03 -> C++17 (yes, 11, 14 and 17 all at once)
  - C++ threads still in discussion
  - Explicit support for mapping lambdas (sanely)
  - Improved support for device code
    - Classes with virtual methods can be mapped (may even be callable)

- Fortran 2008? (in the works, maybe)
Complex Data in OpenMP 5.0: Unified Memory and Deep Copy, Why Both?

1. Mapping provides more information to both the compiler and the runtime
2. Not all hardware has unified memory
3. Not all unified memory is the same
   1. Can all memory be accessed with the same performance from everywhere?
   2. Do atomics work across the full system?
   3. Are flushes required for coherence? How expensive are they?
Specifying unified memory in OpenMP

- OpenMP does not require unified memory
  - Or even a unified address space
- This is not going to change
How do you make non-portable features portable?

• Specify what they provide when they are present
• Give the user a way to assert that they are required
• Give implementers a way to react to that assertion
# One solution: Requirement declarations

```
#pragma omp requires [extension clauses…]
```

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension name</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unified_address</td>
<td>Guarantee that device pointers are unique across all devices, is_device_ptr is not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unified_shared_memory</td>
<td>Host pointers are valid device pointers and considered present by all implicit maps, implies unified_address, memory is synchronized at target task sync</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OpenMP unified memory example

```c
int * arr = new int[50];
#pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for for (int i=0; i<50; ++i){
    arr[i] = i;
}
```
OpenMP unified memory example

```c
int * arr = new int[50];
#pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
for (int i=0; i<50; ++i)
    arr[i] = i;
```
OpenMP unified memory example

```c
#pragma omp requires unified_shared_memory
int * arr = new int[50];
#pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
for (int i=0; i<50; ++i){
    arr[i] = i;
}
```
OpenMP unified memory example

```c
#pragma omp requires unified_shared_memory
int * arr = new int[50];
#pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
for (int i=0; i<50; ++i){
    arr[i] = i;
}
```
Deep copy today

• It is possible to use deep copy in OpenMP today

• Manual deep copy works by pointer attachment
typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

myvec_t v = init_myvec();
#pragma omp target map(v, v.data[:v.len])
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}
typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;
myvec_t v = init_myvec();
#pragma omp target map(v, v.data[:v.len])
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}
typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

myvec_t v = init_myvec();
#pragma omp target map(v, v.data[:v.len])
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}
What’s the downside?

typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

size_t num = 50;
myvec_t *v = alloc_array_of_myvec(num);
#pragma omp target map(v[50], ??????)
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}

Now we need a loop, more breaking up the code!
The future of deep copy: User-defined mappers

```c
#pragma omp declare mapper(<type> <var>)
    [name(<name>)]
    [use_by_default]
    [map(<list-items>…)]
```

- Allow users to define mappers in terms of normal map clauses
- Offer extension mechanisms to pack or unpack data that can’t be bitwise copied, or expressed as flat maps
typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;
#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v)
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])
size_t num = 50;
myvec_t *v = alloc_array_of_myvec(num);
#pragma omp target map(v[:50])
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}
typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v)\  
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])

size_t num = 50;
myvec_t *v = alloc_array_of_myvec(num);

#pragma omp target map(v[:50])
{
    do_something_with_v(&v);
}

No loop required, no extra code at usage, just map
Composition of mappers

typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;
#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v) 
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])

typedef struct mypoints {
    struct myvec * x;
    struct myvec scratch;
    double useless_data[500000];
} mypoints_t;
#pragma omp declare mapper(mypoints_t p) 
    use_by_default 
    map(/* self only partially mapped, useless_data can be ignored */
        p.x, p.x[1]) /* map and attach x */ 
    map(alloc:p.scratch) /* never update scratch, including its internal maps */

mypoints_t p = new_mypoints_t();
#pragma omp target
{
    do_something_with_p(&v);
}
Composition of mappers

typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;
#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v) \
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])

typedef struct mypoints {
    struct myvec *x;
    struct myvec scratch;
    double useless_data[500000];
} mypoints_t;
#pragma omp declare mapper(mypoints_t p) \
    use_by_default \
    map(/* self only partially mapped, useless_data can be ignored */\n        p.x, p.x[:1]) /* map and attach x */ \
    map(alloc:p.scratch) /* never update scratch, including its internal maps */

mypoints_t p = new_mypoints_t();
#pragma omp target
{
    do_something_with_p(&v);
}

Pick and choose what to map
Composition of mappers

typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v)
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])

typedef struct mypoints {
    struct myvec *x;
    struct myvec scratch;
    double useless_data[500000];
} mypoints_t;

#pragma omp declare mapper(mypoints_t p)
    use_by_default
    map(/* self only partially mapped, useless_data can be ignored */
        p.x, p.x[1]) /* map and attach x */
    map(alloc:p.scratch) /* never update scratch, including its internal maps */

mypoints_t p = new_mypoints_t();
#pragma omp target
{   do_something_with_p(&v);
}

Pick and choose what to map

Re-use the myvec_t mapper
Composition of mappers

typedef struct myvec {
    size_t len;
    double *data;
} myvec_t;

#pragma omp declare mapper(myvec_t v)
    use_by_default map(v, v.data[:v.len])

typedef struct mypoints {
    struct myvec *x;
    struct myvec scratch;
    double useless_data[500000];
} mypoints_t;

#pragma omp declare mapper(mypoints_t p) \
    use_by_default \
    map(/* self only partially mapped, useless_data can be ignored */\n        p.x, p.x[1]) /* map and attach x */ \
    map(alloc:p.scratch) /* never update scratch, including its internal maps */

mypoints_t p = new_mypoints_t();
#pragma omp target
{
    do_something_with_p(&v);
}

Re-use the myvec_t mapper

Pick and choose what to map

No explicit map required!
Defining mappers from explicit serialization and deserialization (OpenMP 5.1+)

• Declare mappers by stages, all are replaceable
  • alloc
  • pack_to
  • unpack_to
  • pack_from
  • unpack_from
  • release

• Any arbitrary data can be mapped, transformed, or munged how you like!
Dealing with overlapping complexity (OpenMP 5.1+): Automating pipelined data transfers

- Pipelining normally requires users to:
  - Split their work into multiple chunks
  - Add another loop nesting level over the chunks
  - Explicitly copy a subset of their data
  - Transform accesses to reference that subset
  - Ensure all chunks are synchronized

- Doing this as an extension to OpenMP requires:
  - A data motion direction
  - The portion of data accessed by each iteration
  - Which dimension is being looped over

- Optionally we can do more with:
  - Number of concurrent transfers
  - Memory limits
  - Schedulers
  - Etc.
Pipelining for OpenMP: Why pipelining?

- Default synchronous data motion

- Pipelined data motion
Pipelining in OpenMP: non-pipelined stencil

```c
#pragma omp target data \
  map(to:A0[0:nz-1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1]) \n  map(from:Anext[0:nz-1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])
for(k=1;k<nz-1;k++) {
  #pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
  for(i=1;i<nx-1;i++) {
    for(j=1;j<ny-1;j++) {
      Anext[Index3D (i, j, k)] =
      (A0[Index3D (i, j, k + 1)] +
       A0[Index3D (i, j, k - 1)] +
       A0[Index3D (i, j + 1, k)] +
       A0[Index3D (i, j - 1, k)] +
       A0[Index3D (i + 1, j, k)] +
       A0[Index3D (i - 1, j, k)])*c1
      - A0[Index3D (i, j, k)]*c0;
    }
  }
}
```
Pipelining in OpenMP: non-pipelined stencil

```c
#pragma omp target data \
  map(to:A0[0:nz-1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1]) \
  map(from:Anext[0:nz-1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])
for(k=1;k<nz-1;k++) {
  #pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for 
  for(i=1;i<nx-1;i++) {
    for(j=1;j<ny-1;j++) {
      Anext[Index3D (i, j, k)] =
        (A0[Index3D (i, j, k + 1)] +
         A0[Index3D (i, j, k - 1)] +
         A0[Index3D (i, j + 1, k)] +
         A0[Index3D (i, j - 1, k)] +
         A0[Index3D (i + 1, j, k)] +
         A0[Index3D (i - 1, j, k)])*c1
        - A0[Index3D (i, j, k)]*c0;
    }
  }
}
```
Pipelining in OpenMP: pipelined stencil

#pragma omp target
pipeline(static[1,3])\
pipeline_map(to:A0[k-1:3][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])\
pipeline_map(from:Anext[k:1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])\
for(k=1;k<nz-1;k++) {
    #pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
    for(i=1;i<nx-1;i++) {
        for(j=1;j<ny-1;j++) {
            Anext[Index3D (i, j, k)] =
            (A0[Index3D (i, j, k + 1)] +
             A0[Index3D (i, j, k - 1)] +
             A0[Index3D (i, j + 1, k)] +
             A0[Index3D (i, j - 1, k)] +
             A0[Index3D (i + 1, j, k)] +
             A0[Index3D (i - 1, j, k)])*c1
             - A0[Index3D (i, j, k)]*c0;
        }
    }
}
Pipelining in OpenMP: pipelined and buffered with our proposed extension

```c
#pragma omp target
pipeline(static[1,3])
pipeline_map(to:A0[k-1:3][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])
pipeline_map(from:Anext[k:1][0:ny-1][0:nx-1])
pipeline_mem_limit(MB 256)
for(k=1;k<nz-1;k++) {
#pragma omp target teams distribute parallel for
for(i=1;i<nx-1;i++) {
    for(j=1;j<ny-1;j++) {
        Anext[Index3D (i, j, k)] = (A0[Index3D (i, j, k + 1)] + A0[Index3D (i, j, k - 1)] + A0[Index3D (i, j + 1, k)] + A0[Index3D (i, j - 1, k)] + A0[Index3D (i + 1, j, k)] + A0[Index3D (i - 1, j, k)])*c1 - A0[Index3D (i, j, k)]*c0;
    }
}
}
```

Replicating this manually requires ~20 more lines of error-prone boilerplate per loop!
Pipelining in OpenMP: Kernel and benchmark performance (Sierra EA, P100)

All results with PGI OpenACC on k40 GPUs, LLNL surface cluster
Pipelining in OpenMP: Lattice QCD benchmark memory usage

Buffering reduces memory by 80%

Lower is better
OpenMP into the Future: What’s next?

- Descriptive loop constructs
- Automated pipelining
- Arbitrarily complex data transformation and deep copy
- Memory affinity
- Multi-target worksharing
- Support for complex hierarchical memories
- Better task dependencies and taskloop support
- Free-agent threads, possibly even detachable teams
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