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FEFLO

A converter was developed to automatically port the code FEFLO to GPUs. It is not the focus of this tutorial, but rather is used as an illustrative case study to highlight the main issues in porting large, legacy, Fortran codebases to GPUs.
FEFLO

A large-scale, actively developed and deployed, legacy, Fortran computational fluid dynamics code
FEFLO-GPU

Goals

- Full GPU performance
- Port ~1 million lines of code (~11,000 parallel loops)
- Continue development in Fortran using established coding practices.
- A single, unified codebase.
Porting Strategies

• Manual porting
  o Rewrite the code from scratch

• Automatic porting
  o Use a translator or compiler to largely automate the task.
Manual Porting

• Too much effort required.
  o 1 million lines / 11,000 parallel loops.
  o Intricate array bookkeeping
• Perpetual process
  o Fortran development will continue
• Error Prone.
• Separate codebases
• CUDA or OpenCL or CUDA Fortran or ?

Not Feasible
Automatic Porting

• Continued Fortran development.
• Single codebase.
• Reliable: No new bugs.
  • Either works perfectly,
  • Or fails catastrophically (easy to catch).
  • Actually, catches many old bugs.
• Supports CUDA.
  • Excellent option now: maturity, library support.
  • CUDA Fortran and OpenCL are partially supported.
  • Extensible to future platforms.
Using a Python script

• O(1000) line Python script based on FParser
  • Developed in a few months.
  • Generates an optimized, running code.
    • Does much more than translate loops in isolation.
  • Generates CUDA kernels from existing OpenMP and vector loops.
• Tracks array usage across the entire code.
  • By far the most difficult task.
• Many other tasks.

FParse:  [Peterson, 2009]
Performance

The performance issues of primary concern for GPUs are

- Achieving fine-grained parallelism.
- Avoiding CPU $\leftrightarrow$ GPU data transfer.
- Achieving coalesced memory access.
- Exploiting shared memory.
  - Not considered here.
Fine-Grained Parallelism

• CPUs achieve high performance by reducing memory latency: accessing memory in cache.
• GPUs achieve high performance by hiding memory latency: overlap memory access with computation

→ Need finer-grained parallelism to keep GPUs busy.
Fine-Grained Parallelism

- In the context of a CFD code, fine-grained parallelism corresponds to processing each cell, face, edge, or point in parallel.

⇒ If there are 1 million grid cells, then there should be 1 million threads running in parallel.

⇒ Domain decomposition is probably an insufficient level of parallelism.
Data Transfer

• CPUs and GPUs have separate memory spaces.
• Transfer between them is slow:
  • <10 GB/s
• Internal GPU bandwidth > 100 GB/s

→ Just porting “bottleneck subroutines” will often eliminate any potential performance gain.
→ All parallel loops should run on the GPU.
→ Transfer of large arrays, ideally, should be limited to startup and shutdown.
Coalescing

• Memory bandwidth is more often than not a bottleneck.
• Coalesced memory access is typically the determining factor in comparison to cache behavior.
• For many applications performance scales with the degree to which coalescing achieved.
• Technical specifications of coalescing requirements imply that arrays are transposed.

→ Transposing arrays is crucial to avoid needlessly incurring a substantial performance penalty.
Coalescing

• Given a Fortran array $x(2,n)$ the standard layout in memory is $x(1,1)$, $x(2,1)$, $x(1,2)$, $x(2,2)$, etc...
Coalescing

- The preferred layout for meeting GPU coalescing requirements is $x(1,1), x(1,2), \ldots, x(1,n), x(2,1), \ldots, x(2,n)$
Parallelization

• A CUDA kernel is generated for each OpenMP loop.
• OpenMP private items → Per-thread variables
• The array layout and indexes in kernel code are transposed.
• Reductions are performed after writing to a temporary buffer using Thrust

http://code.google.com/p/thrust [Hoberock, Bell, 2009]
Parallelization

!$omp parallel do private (ip,cmmat)
!cdir inner
!cdir concur

do 1600 ip=npami,npamx
cmmat=mmatm(ip)
delun(1,ip)=cmmat*delun(1,ip)
delun(2,ip)=cmmat*delun(2,ip)
delun(3,ip)=cmmat*delun(3,ip)
delun(4,ip)=cmmat*delun(4,ip)
delun(5,ip)=cmmat*delun(5,ip)
1600 continue

• This parallel loop, taken from FEFLO’s flux-corrected transport, compressible flow module, is straightforward, yet tedious to translate.

• It already exhibits fine-grained parallelism so a direct translation is sufficient.
Parallelization

• This CUDA kernel is a direct translation of the original OpenMP loop.
• The indexes are transposed to ensure coalescing.
• Array indexes are decremented by 1 to use 0-based indexing.
• The required per-thread variables \texttt{ip}, \texttt{cmmat} were detected from the OpenMP directive and locally declared.
• The required arrays \texttt{delun} and \texttt{mmatm} and parameters \texttt{npami} and \texttt{npamx} are automatically detected and passed in.
extern "C"
void locfct_loop2_(da_double2* delun, da_double1* mmatm,
                   int* npami, int* npamx)
{
    dim3 dimGrid=dim3(round_up((*npamx)-((*npami))+1),1,1);
    dim3 dimBlock=dim3(256,1,1);
    locfct_loop2<<<dimGrid,dimBlock>>>((delun->a,delun->shape[1],mmatm->a,*npami,*npamx);
}

call locfct_loop2(delun,mmatm,npami,npamx)

• This kernel wrapper function invokes the CUDA kernel.

• A call to this wrapper function replaces the original parallel loop in the Fortran code.

• delun and mmatm are now GPU arrays and array shape and offset information is tracked using a simple C-struct/Fortran-derived type.
Parallelization

• The previous example already exhibited fine-grained parallelism and was directly converted.
• Some loops in FEFLO are parallelized with OpenMP but only in a coarse-grained way

→ Requires restructuring the loops, manually or automatically, to expose fine-grained parallelism.
Parallelization

- Due to FEFLO’s uniform coding conventions, automatic restructuring was possible in a large percentage of cases, requiring an additional ~200 lines of FEFLO-specific conversion code.
- This typically involved parallelizing inner loop(s), indicated by:
  - Not containing any sub-loops.
  - Vectorization directives.
  - Certain loop variable names
- It is conceivable a similar approach could be applied to other codes.
Tracking Arrays

- Uses a transposed GPU layout for coalescing requirements
- Determines memory space placement (GPU or CPU).
- Enforces consistent placement to avoid expensive data transfer.
- Handles memory transfer when explicitly requested.
- Handles different sub-array semantics depending on the context.
- Placement of arrays in constant memory.
- And more...
Array Placement

• CPUs and GPUs have separate memory spaces, memory transfer is slow and avoided.

Criterion: An array used in a single parallel loop is designated as a GPU array throughout the entire code.

→ The converter strictly enforces this and reports any inconsistent usage as errors.
Array Transfer

- Some CPU ↔ GPU transfer is necessary:
- Serial Code
  - Certain portions of the code (e.g., mesh generation) are intentionally left as serial, CPU code, and not converted.
  - Also needed for incremental GPU porting.
  - Calls made to these subroutines are automatically wrapped with data transfer and transposition calls.
- Input/Output
- Results of reduction loops
- When explicitly requested via custom directives.
Sub-arrays

• In Fortran, a particular memory layout is relied upon when passing an array to another subroutine expecting a sub-array or an array with a different shape

Dilemma: *Is a logically offset, non-contiguous sub-array intended OR is a contiguous sub-array intended?*

→ Due to the transposed, coalesced GPU array layout, the two cases are *NOT* always equivalent and can lead to subtle bugs if the wrong approach is taken.
Sub-arrays

• All of these issues are handled automatically by the converter.
  • Each case must be distinguished based on FEFLO-specific conventions.
  • Pointer arithmetic corresponding to multi-dimensional offsets performed.
  • Array dimensions and offsets are tracked.
  • Various conversion-time and run-time checks are performed.

• Relies upon FEFLO-specific conventions.
  → This issue would seem to hinder the efforts of a fully general Fortran GPU compiler from using a coalesced memory layout while simultaneously avoiding injecting unnecessary transposition or transfer calls.

→ A complicated but essential requirement for achieving full GPU performance.
Multiple Output Targets

- Completely rewriting FEFLO the next time a new architecture comes out is not a good option.
- OpenCL is not a completely satisfactory solution to this issue.
  → Portable code, not necessarily portable performance.
- The converter has varying degrees of support for outputting to:
  - CUDA
  - PGI CUDA Fortran
  - OpenCL
- Targets can be added very rapidly.
MPI Integration

- CUDA = Fine-grained parallelism
  - Granularity of individual mesh points, edges, elements, etc.
- MPI = Coarse-grained parallelism
  - Decomposes meshes into sub-domains based on partitioning.

→ Complementary forms of parallelism.

→ Use existing MPI code to achieve multi-GPU parallelization.

  • The MPI wrapper subroutines are not processed by the converter, and the converter automatically places appropriate data transfer calls.
Manual Effort Required

• Exposing fine-grained parallelism sufficient for running on GPUs.
• Ensuring consistent array placement
  • Any errors regarding inconsistencies in array usage reported by the converter must be resolved.
• Removing assumptions regarding memory layout
  • Certain sub-array tricks must be prohibited or only interpreted based on conventions being followed.
Performance Hit?

- The converter allows for overriding a few difficult subroutines (usually using Thrust) using custom implementations.
- Otherwise, automatically porting the code in this case produced the same code that would have resulted from a manual translation, without the bugs.
  → There is no performance hit using an automatic conversion in the case of FEFLO.
Limitations

• Requires code to already express fine-grained parallelism.
  • Conversion of arbitrary, serial Fortran code is not attempted.
• Requires code to primarily use data on the GPU or CPU, not both.
• Shared memory management code is not generated.
  • Not relevant to FEFLO, but important for other codes.
• Only the subset of Fortran needed by FEFLO supported.
  • Support could be broadened as needed.
• C/C++ not supported
FEFLO: Blast in a Room

- Compressible Euler
- Ideal Gas Equation of State
- Flux-Corrected Transport
- 1 million elements
- 60 Time Steps
- Double Precision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU/GPU</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (1)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (2)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (4)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (8)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTX 285</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FEFLO: NACA 0012 Air Foil

- Steady State Compressible Euler
- Ideal Gas Equation of State
- HLLC Riemann Solver
- 1 million elements
- 100 Time Steps
- Double Precision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPU/GPU</th>
<th>Time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (1)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (2)</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (4)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core i7 940 (8)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTX 285</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

• It is possible to automatically generate running GPU code from a large-scale legacy Fortran code, which allows for continued development in single codebase.

• Sufficient fine-grained parallelism must be expressed in the original Fortran code.

• Coding conventions should be employed consistently to ease any necessary custom restructuring of the code, or to allow for assumptions to be made when tracking arrays across subroutine calls.