

# Extending and Implementing the Self-adaptive Virtual Processor for Distributed Memory Architectures

Michiel W. van Tol  
University of Amsterdam  
Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
mwvantol@uva.nl

Juha Koivisto  
VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland  
Espoo, Finland  
Juha.Koivisto@vtt.fi

## Abstract

*Many-core architectures of the future are likely to have distributed memory organizations and need fine grained concurrency management to be used effectively. The Self-adaptive Virtual Processor (SVP) is an abstract concurrent programming model which can provide this, but the model and its current implementations assume a single address space shared memory. We investigate and extend SVP to handle distributed environments, and discuss a prototype SVP implementation which transparently supports execution on heterogeneous distributed memory clusters over TCP/IP connections, while retaining the original SVP programming model.*

## 1. Introduction

As processor architectures are moving into the many-core era, potentially scaling up to more than 1000s of cores on a chip [6, 1], it becomes infeasible to maintain a memory model which guarantees system-wide sequential consistency. Full cache-coherence will not scale for such architectures [25, 35] or will suffer from large latencies, so future many-core architectures are likely to have a more distributed and weakly consistent memory design. For example, these could be organized in a similar way as the experimental 48-core Intel SCC research chip [28], on which each processor can access both a private and shared memory, but no hardware cache coherence is provided. In order to exploit many-cores to their full potential, it is essential to be able to create parallelism at a fine granularity in order to expose the maximum amount of concurrency. We require a programming model to express this concurrency, but which can also handle such distributed memory organizations efficiently.

In this report, we apply and adapt the definition of

the Self-adaptive Virtual Processor (SVP) to distributed memory organizations, naming this extension DSVP<sup>1</sup>. SVP is an abstract concurrent programming and machine model [29], which evolved from the earlier work on the Microthread CMP architecture [7]. It can be used to express concurrency at many levels of granularity for multi- or manycore systems, and uses weakly consistent shared memory semantics. As SVP is a generic model to program parallel systems, this method can be applied to the whole spectrum of memory organizations; from cc-NUMA machines where you want to maintain locality, to non cache coherent shared memory machines such as the Intel SCC or other future many-core architectures, and even a cluster of nodes on a network, i.e. a heterogeneous distributed system. This is achieved by extending SVP implementations and the way they are programmed to support distributed memory spaces, and by translating SVP actions into messages in a distributed environment. Using this approach, we believe that we have made a step forward in efficiently targeting any architecture within the aforementioned spectrum.

In order to go into further details of this work, we will give a short introduction to the semantics and actions of the SVP model (Section 2), and we describe its current memory consistency model. We then define how we can apply SVP to a distributed environment, at which level of granularity we can identify and distribute software components, and how we identify their dependencies in order to communicate data between nodes in Section 3. We then discuss our research prototype that implements these techniques using messages over TCP/IP in Section 4, and show that this follows the original SVP memory consistency model. This implementation is then evaluated and discussed (Section 5), where we show that this approach integrates nicely with SVP

<sup>1</sup>We use the name DSVP throughout the report for matters specific to our extension, and SVP for anything that applies to both the original and extended model.

as SVP actions are handled transparently and uniformly between local and remote executions. This discussion is continued in Section 6 where we compare it with a broad spectrum of related approaches in distributed computing. We then conclude in Section 7.

## 2. The SVP Model

SVP is a generic concurrent programming and machine model [29], of which both coarse [41] and fine [30] grained implementations are available. The goal of SVP is to be able to express concurrency, without having to explicitly manage it. The  $\mu$ TC language [32], based on C99, has been defined to capture the semantics of SVP. This language is used to drive several SVP implementations, as it extends traditional C with syntax to express all SVP actions.

The SVP model defines a set of actions to express concurrency on groups (families) of indexed identical threads. Each thread can execute a *create* action to start a new concurrent child family of threads, and later on use the *sync* action to wait for its termination, implementing a fork-join style of parallelism. The *create* action has a set of parameters to control the number and sequence of created threads, as well as a reference to the thread function that the threads will execute. This thread function can have arguments, defined by SVP's communication channels explained later on.

As any thread can create a new family, the concurrency in a program can consist of many hierarchical levels, often referred to as the *concurrency tree* of a program. Besides these two basic constructs, there is the *kill* action to asynchronously terminate an execution.

**Resources** SVP code has no notion of what resources are, as it is resource and scheduling naive. However, the concept of *place* is provided as an abstract resource identifier. On a *create* action a *place* can be specified where the new family should be created, binding the execution onto a certain resource. What this *place* physically maps to, is left up to the SVP implementation; for example, on a many-core architecture like the Microgrid, it could be a group of processors. On other implementations it could, for example, be a reserved piece of FPGA fabric, an ASIC, or some time-sliced execution slot on a single- or multi- processor system. As long as the underlying implementation supports it, multiple *places* can be virtualized onto a single resource.

There is one important property that a *place* can have; it can be *exclusive*. This means that each *create* on such an *exclusive place* will be sequentialized. Only one family can be executing on such a place at a time, providing us with a mutual exclusion mechanism.

**Communication and Synchronization** Synchronized communication is provided through a set of channels, which run between threads in a family and their parent thread. There are two types of unidirectional write-once channels; *global* and *shared* of which multiple can be present. These channels have non-blocking writes and blocking reads. A *global* channel allows vertical communication in the concurrency tree from the parent thread to all threads in the family. A *shared* channel allows horizontal communication, as it daisy-chains through the sequence of threads in the family, connecting the parent to the first thread and the last thread back to the parent. These channels are defined as arguments of a thread function, similar to normal function arguments, and identify the data dependencies between the threads. Due to this restricted definition, and under restricted use of exclusive places, we can guarantee that the model is composable and free of communication deadlock [43]. Furthermore, this implies that every family of threads has a very well defined sequential schedule if concurrent execution is infeasible, as it is guaranteed that a family can run to completion when all of its threads are executed in sequence. This enables program transformations that sequentialize families into loops at the leaves of the concurrency tree, allowing us to adapt the granularity and amount of exposed concurrency in an SVP program for a specific platform.

**Memory Consistency** The model assumes a global, single address space, shared memory. However, this is seen as asynchronous and has a restricted consistency model. Therefore it is not suitable for synchronizations, and no explicit memory barriers or atomic operations are provided. The consistency model is described by the following three rules:

- Upon creation, a child family is guaranteed to see the same memory state as the parent thread saw at the point where it executed *create*.
- The parent thread is guaranteed to see the changes to memory by a child family only when *sync* on that family has completed.
- Subsequent families created on an *exclusive place* are guaranteed to see the changes to memory made earlier by other families on that place.

The memory consistency relationship between parent and child threads somewhat resembles the well-known *release consistency* model [19]. In that sense, the point of *create* resembles an *acquire*, and the point of *sync* resembles the *release*. We should note that the third rule

is a very important property as it can be used to implement communication between two arbitrary threads, but it can also be used to implement a service; state is resident at the *exclusive place* and instances of the functions implementing that service are created on the *place* by its clients. An example of such a service has been presented in [26] for the SVP based Microgrid architecture.

Data passed through the *global* or *shared* channels is always considered consistent. However, it is likely that in certain implementations the channels are limited to only scalar values, therefore a reference to a datastructure in memory would be passed instead of the structure itself. An implementation then has to guarantee that there is memory consistency for the referenced structure when it is read from the channel.

**Example** The basic concepts of SVP are illustrated in Figure 1 and Figure 2 using some example code that generates a Fibonacci sequence and stores it in an array. It must be noted that this example yields little exploitable concurrency, but is merely used as a simple illustration of the concepts.

```


1 thread fibonacci(shared int p1,
2   shared int p2, int* result)
3 {
4   index i;
5   result[i] = p1 + p2;
6   p2 = p1;
7   p1 = result[i];
8 }
9
10 main()
11 {
12   family fid;
13   place pid = PLACE_DEFAULT;
14   int result[N];
15   int a = result[1] = 1;
16   int b = result[0] = 0;
17
18   create(fid;pid;2;N;;)
19     fibonacci(a, b, result);
20   sync(fid);
21 }

```

**Figure 1. Fibonacci code example**

In Figure 1 we show the C-like  $\mu$ TC code that implements Fibonacci, with the iterations of the algorithm defined as a thread function in lines 1-8. The definition on lines 1 and 2 identifies the shared channels for the two dependencies in Fibonacci, as well as a global

that will pass the pointer for the result array. The shared channels are read implicitly on line 5, and written on lines 6 and 7. Line 10 to 21 show the main function of the program that will start the concurrent Fibonacci iterations. Line 12 defines a variable that can hold a family identifier which is set by the *create* on line 18. Line 13 defines a place identifier which is set to a default defined by the SVP implementation. Then the initial values for the algorithm are set in lines 15 and 16, and the spawn of concurrent iterations is done with the *create* statement in lines 18 and 19 creating a family of indexed threads from 2 to  $N$  on the place identified by pid. The two omitted parameters can be used to further control the creation and indexing of threads by step and block size. Information to identify the created family is stored in *fid*, and the *sync* statement on line 20 uses this to have the main thread wait until all threads in the Fibonacci family have terminated. On line 19, the variables *a* and *b* are used to initialize the shared channels for the fibonacci family, providing the values that the first thread will read, as well as the pointer to the array to store the results.



**Figure 2. Fibonacci time-concurrency diagram**

In Figure 2 the time-concurrency diagram is shown that corresponds with our example, which shows the interactions between threads.  $T_0$  is the main thread that executes the *create*, which then waits immediately using *sync* on the termination of the created family of threads. The fibonacci threads  $t_2, t_3, \dots, t_n$  are then started, and all but the first will immediately block and suspend on reading the shared channels. The first thread that received the shared values from the parent can execute,

and then passes on the values to the next thread. As Fibonacci requires the value of the  $n - 1$ th and the  $n - 2$ th iteration, the value from the shared channel  $p1$  is forwarded to  $p2$  in each thread. Only when its shares are written, a suspended thread will continue its execution again. When all threads have completed, the *sync* in the parent thread completes and it resumes its execution and can now safely use the results array. The writes to  $p1$  and  $p2$  by the last thread could be read by the parent again after the *sync*, but are not used in this example.

### 3. Distributed SVP

As we have claimed in the introduction, the work described here can be applied to a whole range of possible target architectures, we require a definition of what the *distributed environment* is that we want to apply SVP to, and how we represent this in the model. Then we will discuss how we identify the software components that we want to distribute, and how we identify which data to communicate.

**Distributed Environment in SVP** We define our distributed environment to consist of a set of processing resources which implement SVP, be it either in software or in hardware, and that are grouped into nodes of one or more of these resources. We define a node to have a single addressable, coherent, and optionally uniform, access to some memory. The nodes are interconnected by an infrastructure consisting of one or more, possibly heterogeneous, networks, on which each node can, directly or indirectly, send a message to any other node. A *place* is identified as a subset of one or more (or all) resources within a single node, which therefore inherits the properties that we have just described.

To give some more concrete examples; in a NUMA system which is not fully cache coherent, a node would be a group of processors that are in a single NUMA domain that is internally cache coherent. A *place* would then be one or more of these processors. In the case of a networked (e.g. Ethernet) cluster of multi-core machines, each machine would be a node and each core in a machine could be identified by its own *place*. However, if these multi-core machines would be cache coherent NUMA architectures themselves, one could optionally choose to subdivide these into separate nodes per NUMA domain to be able to express and exploit memory locality. As a final example, the Intel SCC [28] does not provide any cache coherence, so a node and a *place* would be only a single core on the chip.

It should be noted that within a single node, the classic definition of SVP works perfectly, and we only need to take into account interactions that are *remote*,

i.e. that are between nodes, in order to apply it to a distributed environment. All SVP actions can be trivially translated into messages that can be sent across a network, and the place concept is nicely suited to capture the necessary addressing information on which node this place is physically located. By using a place on a remote node, a create transparently turns from a local concurrency control into a concurrent remote procedure call. Threads in a family created this way can then again create more families there locally, or at some point decide to distribute their child families to other nodes again. However, the challenge lies in defining a way to handle a distributed memory organization instead of a loosely shared memory system. We need to define how, and at which level of granularity, we can identify parts of our program that we can distribute to other nodes.

**Software Components** Using the restrictions that SVP imposes, we can make some assumptions about the structure of SVP programs. Because a program is structured as a hierarchical tree of concurrency, most computation, and therefore data production and/or consumption, takes place at the more fine grained concurrency in the outer branches and leaf nodes in the tree. An application can be seen as a collection of software components at the outer branches, connected together with control code higher up the hierarchy. Due to the restrictions in communication and synchronization that SVP imposes, we can assume that these software components are relatively independent, and therefore are very suitable for distribution across different nodes.

Having this view in mind, and by taking the memory consistency model defined previously, we can make some further assumptions about the communication of data within an SVP program. As communication is restricted at the family level, where a thread can communicate data through the *shared* and *global* channels to a family it creates, we can make the following observation; The created threads will, disregarding global references, only access data that is either passed through these *shared* or *global* channels, or data in memory that is accessed through a reference that is passed this way. Newly generated data that needs to be communicated back to the parent, has to be passed back again through the *shared* channel. Therefore, the data dependencies of software components are identified by the *shared* and *global* channels to the top level family of such component. Threads accessing objects in memory through a global reference are the exception to this, but they have to be created on a specific exclusive place in order to guarantee consistency.

Our strategy for building DSVP programs is based

on the previous observations; we can identify software components at the level of a family and its children, that can be distributed to remote nodes with a *create* action using the corresponding *place*. This component can then internally create more threads locally on *places* on that node, or can decide at some point to create further sub components on other nodes. However, the whole component has a single interface at its top level family, and its dependencies are identified by the *shared* and *global* channels to that family.

**Distributed Memory** As distribution is only done at the level of families, we can use the information in the channels to the created family to determine which data needs to be transferred. At the point of *create*, we synchronize or copy all objects that the family receives references to, to the node it is created on. As all threads of the created family run on the same place and therefore within the same consistent memory, such replication is not required for internal communication of objects between sibling threads. When the family completes, at the point of *sync*, they are synchronized or copied back again, taking into account newly created references the family might send back through its *shared* channels. The second case where a family updates global state on an exclusive place is not an issue; as each family accessing this data is created on the same exclusive place, it shares the same consistent memory, and no data communication is required besides the earlier defined inputs and outputs.

This approach slightly restricts the original consistency model, as it delivers consistency only for the memory areas that the child family can effectively see. However, this approach is often too naive; for example, it does not keep track of how data is used. Depending on data being consumed or modified by the created family, we would like to avoid copying back unmodified data for efficiency, so an implementation has to detect or receive hints on which data has been modified. Furthermore, on more complex large objects, e.g. a database, do we suffice with a shallow copy or do we naively do an expensive deep copy of the object? And what about objects with a non-static size?

Some of these issues can be solved in a DSVP implementation or on top of that, by using the notion of *place* as we presented it for a distributed environment; instead of plain memory references, objects could be referenced by a combination of memory location and *place*, as a place also identifies a memory range attached to a specific node. This way, a shallow copy of complex objects is sufficient given that it internally uses this kind of *fat* references, so that other referred objects can be fetched from the appropriate *place* on demand.

We decided not to make this mechanism part of our model for flexibility. DSVP already provides the necessary constructs so that this can be done on top of any implementation. Another observation is that an implementation would benefit from having more fine grained control over the inputs and outputs of a family, which requires a programming language where we can either analyze or specify in detail which data goes in, and which data is generated or modified by a software component. In the next section we will discuss our prototype implementation which uses a C based language, in which this analysis is hard, and consequently we leave it to the programmer to explicitly specify this. After all, the designer of a component has the best knowledge of what its inputs and outputs are.

## 4. Prototype Implementation over TCP/IP

We have built a prototype implementation of DSVP using the mechanisms described in the previous section by extending the pthreads based implementation of SVP [41] with messages over TCP/IP to signal the SVP actions between nodes. It supports heterogeneous clusters of multi-core systems, connected with for example an Ethernet network, where each system is a single node. This implementation is driven by programs written in the C based  $\mu$ TC language [32], in which threads are declared in a similar manner to C functions. Additional keywords are used to distinguish the shared and global channels in the arguments, but the input and output data is not explicitly indicated. This gives us the same problem as when attempting to analyze C functions; pointer arguments may carry input data, output data, or both, and manipulation of file-scope or global variables (side effects) is not indicated at all. Yet, we must know exactly which data will need to be sent to the remote place and back. Therefore, we require that the programmer, or anything that generates  $\mu$ TC code, explicitly tells us what the complete set of input and output data is in a *data description function*. Besides being a requirement for our implementation, this also provides valuable documentation about the behaviour of a thread function.

**Data Description Functions** A data description function is a special function for each thread function which describes the inputs and outputs using special statements, allowing the corresponding thread function to be distributed to other nodes by our DSVP implementation. This function receives the same arguments as the thread function, and is called by the implementation at the creating and completing stage when the corresponding thread function is executed on a remote

```

1 DISTRIBUTABLE_THREAD(fibonacci)(int p1,
2                               int p2, int* result, int N)
3 {
4     INPUT(p1);
5     INPUT(p2);
6     for(int i = 2; i < N; i++)
7     {
8         OUTPUT(result[i]);
9     }
10 }

```

**Figure 3. Data description function for Fibonacci**

node. The data description function contains `INPUT(v)`, `OUTPUT(v)` and `INOUT(v)` statements, which trigger data transfers at the different stages. Data tagged with `INPUT` is copied to the remote node at the stage when the thread function is started by a *create*, and `OUTPUT` data is copied back to the creating node at the stage when the created family finishes and *sync* completes. `INOUT` is a shorthand notation for the combination of the previous two.

Within these data description functions, loops and conditional expressions can be used around the statements describing input and output. This provides the flexibility needed in order to express the dynamic nature of family input/output data, for example dynamically sized arrays or the traversal of more complex data structures. In Figure 3 on page 6 we show how we can make the Fibonacci example code shown earlier in Figure 1 on page 3 distributable by defining such a data description function. The startup values of the shared channels are only used as input to the Fibonacci function, and the array with the generated sequence is sent back as output. Please note that we needed to add the size parameter to the thread function to support a non-fixed size for the result array.

Using these data description functions we have a powerful way of expressing data dependencies and controlling which data goes into and comes out of a family of threads that is created on a remote node. Due to the restrictions on SVP programs, data only is communicated between two nodes at well known points, and no coherency protocols are required to keep data consistent. Because these data transfers are completely programmable in our prototype implementation, full control can be exercised over how data is distributed, for example for splitting up arrays or array subsets across multiple nodes.

**Types and Serialization** For each thread function that needs to be distributable, the arguments should consist of distributable data types, i.e. data types that the implementation knows how to serialize and represent on the network. Many standard C data-types are already provided as distributable, but more complex objects such as structs or structs linked with pointers must be defined using XDR [14], which allows a syntax similar to C. The XDR library provides us with (de)serialization, and guarantees data interoperability between different architectures so that we can support clusters of heterogeneous nodes. As long as a thread function is defined to be distributable, it can be created both remotely and locally. At run-time the implementation checks if a create is to a local or a remote place, and only on a remote create will the (de)serialization be performed; the function can still be created locally with a negligible effect on performance compared to the non-distributed implementation. In the distributed fibonacci example we’ve just shown, we could have defined the results array as a new distributable data type with a known fixed length, and then directly handle it with a single `OUTPUT()` statement without the loop. Alternatively, it could have been made dynamic by passing the length as an argument and then using this in the loop bounds.

**Message Implementation** We have implemented a simple socket protocol over TCP/IP to send events back and forth between nodes. The protocol consists of three messages only;

- **create** – is sent to the remote node and contains parameters for the family to be created as well as the encoded input data.
- **sync** (*family finished*) – is sent back from the remote node on completion, it includes return values and the encoded output data.
- **kill** – is sent to a remote node to interrupt the execution of a family, it contains information to identify this family.

As we can see from this enumeration, the nature of the messages is very simple, and induces minimal overhead. In general, the size of the encoded in- or output data will be the dominant factor of the message size. There is no message for the *break* action, as this it only applies to the family in which it is executed which will always be on the same place, and when recursing to child families it is the same as a recursing *kill*. Our current implementation does not contain any security, however this could be added easily by introducing ca-

pabilities [13] on every message and the use of *places*, as well as by using encryption with SSL sockets.

## 5. Evaluation and Discussion


**Latency Measurement** We have measured the overhead imposed by our distributed implementation, by measuring the latency over a paired *create* and *sync* action on an empty thread function that executes remotely. For comparison, we compare it with the latency of normal local creates of the same function, as well as remote creates to a second runtime instance running on the same machine over the internal loopback interface. These measurements give us insight in the startup cost for remote executions, and allows us to make decisions about the level of granularity at which it is still feasible to delegate to a different node when using this implementation. The results of these measurements are shown as a histogram in Figure 4 on page 8 representing the distribution of latency over 50000 connections. These experiments were all performed on Intel Dual-Core machines running Linux kernel 2.6, which were connected with a direct non-switched Gigabit Ethernet link. We see that creating a thread within another process on the same machine using the local loopback on average takes  $114\mu s$ , and through Gigabit Ethernet it takes  $345\mu s$  on average, but with  $236\mu s$  as a minimum. The  $50\mu s$  wide gaps between the peaks that are observed in the Ethernet transmission are probably caused by an optimization in the TCP/IP stack of the host systems that delays the delivery of ACK packets. Not surprisingly, the overhead for creating threads over the network is one order of magnitude slower than locally within the same runtime instance, which are on average created in around  $30\mu s$ . The difference between local create and local loopback, is that in that case the whole protocol and serialization over a local TCP/IP socket is performed, as well as the scheduling between two distinct processes.

**Reducing Overhead** In alternative implementations of the methods proposed in this report, there is potential to greatly reduce the overhead compared to our prototype implementation. For example, on a networked distributed system with relatively homogeneous nodes, i.e. with the same internal data representation (including endianness), time can be saved on (de)serialization and encoding. On future many-core architectures or NUMA systems, the communication between targets will likely use an efficient low overhead internal messaging implementation instead of TCP/IP, and the same argument against serialization holds. In fact, if we were to use such data description functions, they would probably

be used to synchronize the data between the local and remote node by software coherency or memory duplication. For the fully distributed heterogeneous platform it could perhaps be beneficial to investigate a protocol based on the much lighter UDP instead of the TCP/IP socket approach, as well as a run-time that supports a finer grain of threads than pthreads.

**Reference Transparency** Many Distributed Shared Memory (DSM) implementations strive to have a form of reference transparency where a reference to an object can be accessed on any node. Usually this is done by using a shared address space, and optionally using some special *fat* references which also encapsulate which node is the data's home location. As we have argued earlier, such *fat* references can be built on top of DSVP as a combination between a *place* and a normal reference, and nothing prohibits a DSVP implementation from using a distributed shared address space between nodes. However, with the prototype implementation that we have described here, and using the restricted consistency model of SVP, we achieve a similar programming model in a heterogeneous environment. Also the implementation can support a dynamic number of nodes, as the interaction between nodes is only limited to the points where concurrency is created and synchronized. This is not easy to achieve in a system that attempts to maintain a single global address space.

**Mapping and Resource Management** Even though some notions of resources and their organization are visible through the concept of *places*, the extension of the SVP model presented here is still resource agnostic. Using our prototype, we can specify other nodes by hand so that they appear as *places* to the user program and can remotely execute functions. We have also implemented a resource management system based on the SEP protocol [31] which can do this dynamically. The details of that implementation are beyond the scope of this report, but it supports the dynamic aggregation of resources into a single DSVP system where nodes can join and leave the network at run time, offering a set of software components as services. A program can acquire a *place* on another node and then *create* there one of the software components that the node offers. As SVP only provides *place* as a hook to identify resources that a computation is bound to, and does not perform any mapping itself, an SEP like service that acts as a *place-server* handing out *places* could also take into account mapping and placing software components efficiently.



**Figure 4. Response time of TCP/IP implementation**

**Fault Tolerance** Distributed systems have the disadvantage that communication is not always reliable. The communication link, or perhaps even the whole node might be unreliable or completely down. Besides distributed systems, the many-core architectures of the future are not an exception to these kinds of problems; with 1000s of cores on a chip it is unavoidable that there will be faulty cores or interconnects present. Therefore, it is essential that software on such platforms is fault tolerant [45, 1].

In our implementation, we can use retries up to a certain level to hide some of the communication problems, unless a target is not responding within a reasonable amount of time. When waiting and retrying are not enough, we want to inform the application, which then may give up and display an error message, or could try to adapt itself to the new situation. If the application is looking for generic resources to execute a certain software component, it could try to get resources to execute it on another target instead of the failed one. In terms of SVP, this means sending a *kill* to the old family that is not responding, and creating a new family on a new place. As the input and output data of a software component are defined, it can easily be restarted on another

target using the same input data again. Software components that do maintain state at a place are typically services, which are required to be implemented redundantly in such a system using replication.

When the implementation cannot create a component on the desired target or gets notified that the target failed, it will have the corresponding *sync* return an indication that the family did not complete and the state of the output data is undefined. Similarly, if the component fails to complete within an application-defined time, it can be killed by a watchdog process, which is then reflected in the *sync* return value. In both cases, a new place should be selected, and the component is (re)started there. This kind of flexibility in a system can be very useful, not only to recover from communication errors but also to adapt to, for example, dynamically changing load or availability of resources.

## 6. Related and Future Work

Over the years, many ways of programming distributed environments have been developed. There are distributed shared memory (DSM) implementations,



which for example use implicit or explicit sharing of objects [34, 10, 40, 38], regions [27, 33, 2, 15], or an entire address space [37]. The other end of the spectrum has been dominated by explicit message passing techniques [16, 17], and in between we have remote calls (possibly to remote objects) [3, 42, 23, 46, 36, 39], which can also be based on web service interfaces [9]. We will now discuss some of these approaches in more detail, and compare them with DSVP.

Ivy [37] was one of the first DSM systems that attempted to act as a transparent single address space shared memory system by sharing memory on the page level and using handlers on page miss to transfer data. However, this did not turn out to work efficiently enough, false sharing being one of the issues, and many later DSM implementations are based on explicitly acquiring, reading or modifying and releasing state. CRL [33] for example uses a region based approach where special global pointers are used to map and unmap shared regions of arbitrary size to code running on a node. After a region is mapped, the code can enter either a reading or writing section, where writing sections guarantee exclusive access. Munin [10] also uses the acquire/release principle, but allows the consistency protocol, which is based on release consistency [19], to be configured for individual objects; i.e. invalidate or update copies on write, enabling replication and fixed home locations. Cid [38] also implements acquire/release with single writer multiple readers, but also exposes the location of objects with the ability to start a computation on an object on the node where it is located, providing the flexibility of moving either the computation or the data.

In Orca [40] the acquire/release happens transparently on shared objects that get replicated. The objects are not globally visible but are passed by reference between (concurrent) invocation of functions, limiting their visibility to a relatively local scope similar as in DSVP. However, when multiple functions operate on the same object it is kept coherent by updating or invalidating copies on write. Emerald [34] provided similar mechanisms, however it did not support replication and therefore did not have to deal with coherency.

CICO [27] is a cooperative model in which memory regions in a shared address space can be checked out, in and prefetched, which provides a hinting mechanism for a hardware based coherency implementation, similarlar to how we see that the data description function annotations could be used on a NUMA style system. This restricted way in which we move data in and out of created families, has some similarities and provides the same advantage as the DAG-consistency [4] provided in Cilk [5]; in both there are well defined

points when data needs to be communicated, as there is no strict coherency which requires propagation of updates as soon as data is modified. Another approach that matches our work even more closely is CellSc [2] which uses compiler pragmas to annotate functions with their input and output signature to efficiently write programs for the distributed memory in the Cell [24] architecture. Sequoia [15] is a programming model in which a (distributed) system is viewed as a hierarchy of memories, and, similar to SVP, programs in Sequoia can be automatically adopted to the granularity of the target system. Sequoia uses call-by-value-result semantics, where for each function argument is specified if it describes an input, output or both. GMAC [18] is an implementation of an asynchronous distributed shared memory which attempts to unify the programmability of CPU and GPU memories. The Batch-update mode of GMAC matches closely with our approach to consistency, however it also supports more elaborate coherency protocols where the GPU can receive updated data from the CPU asynchronously.

In our definition of DSVP we unify the use of distributed memory and dynamic concurrency management. Unifying the creation of local and remote concurrency was investigated widely in the 90s, but was considered a bad idea back then [44]. This makes sense as a remote execution on a cluster takes many orders of magnitude more latency, and partial failure exposes different failure patterns. However, we are on the brink of the many-core era and things have changed. With many cores on one chip, starting an execution from one core on another will be orders of magnitude faster than on a cluster. And with thousands of cores on a chip, fault tolerance needs to be supported to cater for failing cores and communication links [1, 45]. Checking for failure on any concurrent invocation would still be expensive, but can be done at the software component level as discussed earlier. R-OSGi [39] is a system that takes this into account, it distributes transparently at the software module level, and does not introduce any new failure patterns. Similarly to our prototype implementation, it does not impose any role assignments i.e. whether a node acts as a client or server; the relation between modules is symmetric. Chapel [11] is a new programming language aimed to bridge the gap between parallel and sequential programming. Similarly to DSVP, it hierarchically expresses both task and data level concurrency, which transparently can be executed locally or remotely in parallel, or sequential, but it does not deal with partial failure. X10 [12] is similar in that respect and is developed with the same goal as Chapel. It bears more similarities to SVP with its *futures* and *final* variables which resemble our shared and global channels. It

also uses places to express locations that have sequential consistency, which provides a handle for expressing locality. Cid [38] has this feature as well in a way, as the home node of a piece of data can be extracted. This can then be used with its *fork if remote* construct, executing sequentially if the referenced object is local, or otherwise remotely in parallel.

Other approaches such as Active Messages [42], CORBA [23], Legion [36], RPC [3], Java RMI [46] and SOAP [9] but also message passing approaches such as MPI-2 [17] and PVM [16] are based on coarse grained parallelism where finer grained parallelism must be expressed in something else; for example in a separate threading implementation. MPI-2 and PVM support the dynamic creation of tasks, but again, only at task level parallelism. Most of these approaches support partial failure, but at the cost of not making remote communication transparent. None of them provide a distributed memory abstraction, though CORBA, Java RMI and Legion do this in a way by accessing remote objects. A lookup service is provided to locate these objects, which can be added to DSVP by an SEP [31] implementation.

Many of the discussed approaches rely on new languages or language features, while others will work as pure library implementations. DSVP does not exclude either of the two approaches; the prototype implementation uses a C based language as input, but this is translated to pure C++ with library calls [41] behind the scenes. Of course, the argument for a language approach would be to be more friendly or efficient for the programmer, but in our current toolchains SVP is seen as an intermediate low level representation. There are already tools to compile from SAC [21, 20], a high level array programming language, and an SVP based runtime for S-Net [22, 8], a coordination language for streaming networks, has been developed. As future work, we see that these tools can solve the problem of efficiently describing the data dependencies as required for DSVP. These are well known in the higher level representations of SAC and S-Net, and could be automatically generated when compiling down to DSVP.

More future work lies in applying DSVP to emerging many-core architectures, either in hardware or low-level software. We are currently working on an implementation on the Intel SCC [28], an experimental 48-core processor created by Intel as a 'concept vehicle' platform for many-core software research. This platform's NUMA style memory organization and lack of cache coherence fit well with the distributed style of memory for which DSVP was developed. We hope to exploit the efficient on chip network for communication and delegation, as well as its ability to change the memory mapping of each core.

## 7. Conclusion

In this report we have discussed how we can apply the SVP model of concurrency to platforms with distributed memory organizations, which is important in order to support decentralized memory organizations in future many-core architectures. We came to the conclusion that as long as we can identify software components and their data dependencies in SVP programs, we can trivially distribute them across multiple distributed memory domains. This approach fits the original memory consistency model of SVP and still exposes the same restricted-consistency shared memory behavior.

We have discussed our prototype software implementation that we used to explore this domain. It can run SVP applications on TCP/IP networks of heterogeneous nodes, and uses data description functions to capture the dynamic nature of input and output data. We identified the minimal latencies imposed by this implementation to give an indication at which level of granularity it can be used efficiently. However, the main contribution are the techniques explored here that can be used as a basis for more fine grained SVP implementations, applied to future or current many-core architectures with distributed or non cache-coherent memory. As such architectures and also distributed systems can suffer from partial failure, we have shown how the combination of the accurate description of input and output data and restricted points of communication in SVP can aid in the recovery of failure at the software component level.

## 8. Acknowledgments

The work presented in this report was based on work undertaken in the ÆTHER project, which was an IST-FET project funded by the European Community under the FP6 ACA program.

## References

- [1] M. Azimi, N. Cherukuri, D. N. Jayasimha, A. Kumar, P. Kundu, S. Park, I. Schoinas, and A. S. Vaidya. Integration Challenges and Tradeoffs for Tera-scale Architectures. *Intel Technology Journal*, 11(3):173–184, 2007.
- [2] P. Bellens, J. M. Perez, R. M. Badia, and J. Labarta. Cellss: a programming model for the cell be architecture. In *SC '06: Proceedings of the 2006 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, page 86, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM.
- [3] A. D. Birrell and B. J. Nelson. Implementing remote procedure calls. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 2:39–59, February 1984.

- [4] R. D. Blumofe, M. Frigo, C. F. Joerg, C. E. Leiserson, and K. H. Randall. Dag-consistent distributed shared memory. *Parallel Processing Symposium, International*, 0:132, 1996.
- [5] R. D. Blumofe, C. F. Joerg, B. C. Kuszmaul, C. E. Leiserson, K. H. Randall, and Y. Zhou. Cilk: an efficient multithreaded runtime system. *SIGPLAN Not.*, 30(8):207–216, 1995.
- [6] S. Borkar. Thousand core chips: a technology perspective. In *DAC '07: Proceedings of the 44th annual Design Automation Conference*, pages 746–749, New York, NY, USA, 2007. ACM.
- [7] K. Bousias, N. Hasasneh, and C. Jesshope. Instruction level parallelism through microthreading—a scalable approach to chip multiprocessors. *Comput. J.*, 49:211–233, March 2006.
- [8] K. Bousias, C. Jesshope, J. Thiyagalingam, S.-B. Scholz, and A. Shafarenko. Graph Walker: Implementing S-Net on the Self-adaptive Virtual Processor. In *Proceedings of the Æther-Morpheus Workshop From Reconfigurable to Self-Adaptive Computing (AMWAS'08)*, 2008.
- [9] D. Box, D. Ehnebuske, G. Kakivaya, A. Layman, N. Mendelsohn, H. Frystyk Nielsen, S. Thatte, and D. Winer. Simple object access protocol (soap) 1.1. World Wide Web Consortium, Note NOTE-SOAP-20000508, May 2000.
- [10] J. B. Carter, J. K. Bennett, and W. Zwaenepoel. Implementation and performance of munin. In *SOSP '91: Proceedings of the thirteenth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles*, pages 152–164, New York, NY, USA, 1991. ACM.
- [11] B. Chamberlain, D. Callahan, and H. Zima. Parallel programmability and the chapel language. *Int. J. High Perform. Comput. Appl.*, 21(3):291–312, 2007.
- [12] P. Charles, C. Grothoff, V. Saraswat, C. Donawa, A. Kielstra, K. Ebcioglu, C. von Praun, and V. Sarkar. X10: an object-oriented approach to non-uniform cluster computing. In *OOPSLA '05: Proceedings of the 20th annual ACM SIGPLAN conference on Object-oriented programming, systems, languages, and applications*, pages 519–538, New York, NY, USA, 2005. ACM.
- [13] J. B. Dennis and E. C. Van Horn. Programming semantics for multiprogrammed computations. *Commun. ACM*, 9(3):143–155, 1966.
- [14] M. Eisler. XDR: External Data Representation Standard. RFC 4506 (Standard), May 2006.
- [15] K. Fatahalian, D. R. Horn, T. J. Knight, L. Leem, M. Houston, J. Y. Park, M. Erez, M. Ren, A. Aiken, W. J. Dally, and P. Hanrahan. Sequoia: programming the memory hierarchy. In *SC '06: Proceedings of the 2006 ACM/IEEE conference on Supercomputing*, page 83, New York, NY, USA, 2006. ACM.
- [16] A. Geist, A. Beguelin, J. Dongarra, W. Jiang, R. Manchek, and V. Sunderam. *PVM: Parallel virtual machine: a users' guide and tutorial for networked parallel computing*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1994.
- [17] A. Geist, W. Gropp, S. Huss-Lederman, A. Lumsdaine, E. Lusk, W. Saphir, T. Skjellum, and M. Snir. Mpi-2: Extending the message-passing interface. In L. Bougé, P. Fraigniaud, A. Mignotte, and Y. Robert, editors, *Euro-Par'96 Parallel Processing*, volume 1123 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 128–135. Springer Berlin / Heidelberg, 1996.
- [18] I. Gelado, J. E. Stone, J. Cabezas, S. Patel, N. Navarro, and W.-m. W. Hwu. An asymmetric distributed shared memory model for heterogeneous parallel systems. In *ASPLOS '10: Proceedings of the fifteenth edition of ASPLOS on Architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, pages 347–358, New York, NY, USA, 2010. ACM.
- [19] K. Gharachorloo, D. Lenoski, J. Laudon, P. Gibbons, A. Gupta, and J. Hennessy. Memory consistency and event ordering in scalable shared-memory multiprocessors. In *ISCA '90: Proceedings of the 17th annual international symposium on Computer Architecture*, pages 15–26, New York, NY, USA, 1990. ACM.
- [20] C. Grelck, S. Herhut, C. Jesshope, C. Joslin, M. Lankamp, S.-B. Scholz, and A. Shafarenko. Compiling the Functional Data-Parallel Language SAC for Microgrids of Self-Adaptive Virtual Processors. In *14th Workshop on Compilers for Parallel Computing (CPC'09)*, IBM Research Center, Zürich, Switzerland, 2009.
- [21] C. Grelck and S.-B. Scholz. SAC: A functional array language for efficient multithreaded execution. *International Journal of Parallel Programming*, 34(4):383–427, 2006.
- [22] C. Grelck, Shafarenko, A. (eds)., F. Penczek, C. Grelck, H. Cai, J. Julku, P. Hölzenspies, Scholz, S.B., and A. Shafarenko. S-Net Language Report 2.0. Technical Report 499, University of Hertfordshire, School of Computer Science, Hatfield, England, United Kingdom, 2010.
- [23] O. M. Group. Corba component model 4.0 specification. Specification Version 4.0, Object Management Group, April 2006.
- [24] M. Gschwind, H. Hofstee, B. Flachs, M. Hopkin, Y. Watanabe, and T. Yamazaki. Synergistic processing in cell's multicore architecture. *Micro, IEEE*, 26(2):10–24, march-april 2006.
- [25] G. Heiser. Many-core chips – a case for virtual shared memory. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Workshop on Managed Many-Core Systems*, Washington, DC, USA, March 2009. ACM.
- [26] M. A. Hicks, M. W. van Tol, and C. R. Jesshope. Towards scalable i/o on a many-core architecture. In *Embedded Computer Systems (SAMOS), 2010 International Conference on*, pages 341–348, 2010.
- [27] M. D. Hill, J. R. Larus, S. K. Reinhardt, and D. A. Wood. Cooperative shared memory: software and hardware for scalable multiprocessor. In *ASPLOS-V: Proceedings of the fifth international conference on Architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, pages 262–273, New York, NY, USA, 1992. ACM.

- [28] J. Howard, S. Dighe, Y. Hoskote, S. Vangal, D. Finan, G. Ruhl, D. Jenkins, H. Wilson, N. Borkar, G. Schrom, F. Paillet, S. Jain, T. Jacob, S. Yada, S. Marella, P. Salihundam, V. Erraguntla, M. Konow, M. Riepen, G. Droege, J. Lindemann, M. Gries, T. Apel, K. Henriss, T. Lund-Larsen, S. Steibl, S. Borkar, V. De, R. van der Wijngaart, and T. Mattson. A 48-core ia-32 message-passing processor with dvfs in 45nm cmos. In *Solid-State Circuits Conference - Digest of Technical Papers, 2010. ISSCC 2010. IEEE International*, pages 19–21, February 2010.
- [29] C. Jesshope. A model for the design and programming of multi-cores. *Advances in Parallel Computing, High Performance Computing and Grids in Action*(16):37–55, 2008.
- [30] C. Jesshope, M. Lankamp, and L. Zhang. Evaluating CMPs and their memory architecture. In M. Berekovic, C. Muller-Schoer, C. Hochberger, and S. Wong, editors, *Proc. Architecture of Computing Systems*, pages 246–257, 2009.
- [31] C. Jesshope, J.-M. Philippe, and M. van Tol. An architecture and protocol for the management of resources in ubiquitous and heterogeneous systems based on the svp model of concurrency. In *SAMOS '08: Proceedings of the 8th international workshop on Embedded Computer Systems*, pages 218–228, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2008. Springer-Verlag.
- [32] C. R. Jesshope.  $\mu$ tc - an intermediate language for programming chip multiprocessors. In C. R. Jesshope and C. Egan, editors, *Asia-Pacific Computer Systems Architecture Conference*, volume 4186 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 147–160. Springer, 2006.
- [33] K. L. Johnson, M. F. Kaashoek, and D. A. Wallach. Crl: high-performance all-software distributed shared memory. In *SOSP '95: Proceedings of the fifteenth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles*, pages 213–226, New York, NY, USA, 1995. ACM.
- [34] E. Jul, H. Levy, N. Hutchinson, and A. Black. Fine-grained mobility in the emerald system. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 6:109–133, February 1988.
- [35] G. Kurian, N. Beckmann, J. Miller, J. Psota, and A. Agarwal. Efficient cache coherence on manycore optical networks. Technical Report MIT-CSAIL-TR-2010-009, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab, MIT, February 2010.
- [36] M. Lewis and A. Grimshaw. The core legion object model. In *HPDC '96: Proceedings of the 5th IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Distributed Computing*, page 551, Washington, DC, USA, 1996. IEEE Computer Society.
- [37] K. Li and P. Hudak. Memory coherence in shared virtual memory systems. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.*, 7:321–359, November 1989.
- [38] R. Nikhil. *Parallel symbolic computing in Cid*, volume 1068 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 215–242. Springer-Verlag Berlin / Heidelberg, 1996.
- [39] J. S. Rellermeier, G. Alonso, and T. Roscoe. R-osgi: distributed applications through software modularization. In *Middleware '07: Proceedings of the ACM/FIP/USENIX 2007 International Conference on Middleware*, pages 1–20, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc.
- [40] A. Tanenbaum, H. Bal, and M. Kaashoek. Programming a distributed system using shared objects. In *High Performance Distributed Computing, 1993., Proceedings the 2nd International Symposium on*, pages 5–12, 20–23 1993.
- [41] M. van Tol, C. Jesshope, M. Lankamp, and S. Polstra. An implementation of the sane virtual processor using posix threads. *Journal of Systems Architecture*, 55(3):162–169, 2009. Challenges in self-adaptive computing (Selected papers from the Aether-Morpheus 2007 workshop).
- [42] T. von Eicken, D. E. Culler, S. C. Goldstein, and K. E. Schauser. Active messages: a mechanism for integrated communication and computation. In *ISCA '92: Proceedings of the 19th annual international symposium on Computer architecture*, pages 256–266, New York, NY, USA, 1992. ACM.
- [43] T. D. Vu and C. R. Jesshope. Formalizing sane virtual processor in thread algebra. In M. Butler, M. G. Hinchey, and M. M. Larrondo-Petrie, editors, *ICFEM*, volume 4789 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 345–365. Springer, 2007.
- [44] J. Waldo, G. Wyant, A. Wollrath, and S. C. Kendall. A note on distributed computing. Technical Report TR-94-29, Sun Microsystems Research, November 1994.
- [45] D. Wentzlaff, C. Gruenwald, N. Beckmann, K. Modzelewski, A. Belay, L. Youseff, J. Miller, and A. Agarwal. A unified operating system for clouds and manycore: fos. Technical Report MIT-CSAIL-TR-2009-059, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Lab, MIT, November 2009.
- [46] A. Wollrath, R. Riggs, and J. Waldo. A distributed object model for the java system. In *COOTS. USENIX*, 1996.