







• A regular sequential language with a parallelizing compiler: Attractive, but such compilers not easy.

- A language designed to support parallel programming: Perhaps the most expressive, but not all programmers are willing to learn new languages, and implementation from scratch not trivial.
- A regular sequential language plus calls to parallel library functions: Easier for programmers to learn, easier to implement.
- A regular sequential language with some added features: Also easier for programmer to learn, but implementation can be tough (consider making *any* addition to C++!).



threads (Pthreads), Win32 API, ...



- Start with understanding of problem to be solved / application.
- Decompose computation into "tasks" snippets of sequential code that you
  might be able to execute concurrently.
- Analyze tasks and data how do tasks depend on each other? what data do they access (local to task and shared)?

(Or start with decomposition of data and infer tasks from that.)

- Plan how to map tasks onto "units of execution" (threads/processes) and coordinate their execution. Also plan how to map these onto "processing elements".
- Translate this design into code.
- Our book organizes all of this into four "design spaces", corresponding to (we think) steps in program design/development.

Slide 5







Performance, Continued
Worst possible value would seem to be 1, right?
Can you think of circumstances in which you'd do worse? (Hint: What do you know so far about how the parts of the program running on different cores/processors/computers interact?)

Slide 10





# Amdahl's Law

Most "real programs" have some parts that have to be done sequentially.
 Gene Amdahl (principal architect of early IBM mainframe(s)) argued that this limits speedup — "Amdahl's Law":

If  $\gamma$  is the "serial fraction", speedup on P processors is (at best — this ignores overhead)

$$S(P) = \frac{1}{\gamma + \frac{1-\gamma}{P}}$$

and as P increase, this approaches  $\frac{1}{\gamma}$  — upper bound on speedup. (Details of math in chapter 2.)

Amdahl's Law, Continued
Example: 1/10 of program is not "parallelizable". Then best speedup is 10, i.e., wall-clock time decreases by a factor of 10.
Nothing to sneeze at, but clearly not very satisfactory if you need more

speedup and have lots of processors to use.

Slide 14



# OpenMP Early work on message-passing programming resulted in many competing programming environments — but eventually, MPI emerged as a standard. Similarly, initially many different programming environments for shared-memory programming, but OpenMP emerged as a standard. Slide 16 In both cases, idea was to come up with a single standard, then allow many implementations. For MPI, standard defines concepts and library. For OpenMP, standard defines concepts, library, and compiler directives. First release 1997 (for Fortran, followed in 1998 by version for C/C++). Production-quality commercial compilers appeared first. At one point, only no-cost compilers were "research software" or in work. Support then added to GNU compilers. ("And there was much rejoicing.")



## Simple Example / Compiling and Executing

- Look at simple program hello.c on sample programs page.
- Compile with compiler supporting OpenMP.
- Execute like regular program. Can set environment variable OMP\_NUM\_THREADS to specify number of threads. Default value seems to be one thread per processor.

Slide 18











