Generating OpenCL Kernels using Decompilation

Summary

- OpenCL is a framework for developing applications that execute across a range of device types (multicore x86, GPUs, FPGAs).
- It is gathering a lot of interest/momentum as a parallel programming platform.
- It uses a string representation for the kernels describing the OpenCL computations.
- This has a number of disadvantages, including difficulty of use and inefficiencies.
- An approach based on program decompilation might provide an alternative route to developing some kernels and does not suffer from these disadvantages.

OpenCL

- The Open Computing Language (OpenCL) is a framework for developing parallel applications that can be mapped to a range of target architectures.
- OpenCL includes a language (based on C99) for writing kernels (functions that execute on OpenCL devices), plus APIs that are used to define and then control the platforms.
- To allow kernels to be optimally compiled to the resources available at runtime they are represented as strings in the application.
- Has the added advantage that the host language, e.g. C++, does not need to know anything about the kernel language.
- An OpenCL device driver compiles these strings into platformspecific code at runtime. This distinguishes OpenCL from other more common approaches that strive for platform independence by using virtual machine code and just-in-time compilers.
- Here is an example kernel for vector addition:



Deficiencies

- Describing multiline string constants is tedious in many languages. Developers often write the kernels in separate files and then read the contents into strings at runtime.
- IDE support no longer available to us when developing kernels, including compile-time type-checking, syntax highlighting, and autocompletion.
- May decrease performance in some cases due to overheads.
- Not really platform-independent; even something simple like a parallel reduce may need to choose between different kernels depending on platform.

Parallel Patterns

- A lot of algorithms can be described by combining a set of common patterns, for example
 - Map
 - Reduce
 - Map-reduce
 - Adjacent difference
 - Scan (a.k.a. parallel prefix)
 - Searching
- We must parameterise each pattern with one or more user-defined functions.
- In OpenCL we must combine a string-based representation of the pattern with a string-based representation of the user function to produce the source for the kernel.
- For small problem sizes it may be faster to use a task-based native approach (less overheads).
- So we might need *two* versions of the user function, a native version and a "string" version; this is both tedious and error-prone.

Decompilation

- Given an executable, e.g. a .NET assembly, we can use the metadata, plus heuristics, to decompile selected methods back to a high-level abstract syntax tree (AST) representation.
- Not necessarily identical to the original, but semantically equivalent to it.



- Requires reflection/metadata, so not practical for C++.
- We can decompile the function arguments to our patterns to generate kernels and call them when appropriate.
- Use native version when required, e.g. data too small or functions too complex to convert to an OpenCL kernel.

Example

Func<float, float, float> f = // Some random function, e.g. (float a, float b) => (float)Math.Sqrt(Math.Abs(Math.Sin(a) + Math.Cos(b)));

// Use C# implementation with task-based parallelism if appropriate Map2(f, arrA, arrB, arrC); // Use either C# or OpenCL implementation based on heuristics etc.

Map2(f, arrA, arrB, arrC, context);

OpenCL context

We automatically generate the appropriate OpenCL kernel string if required, e.g.

ker	nel void K(
	global /* read_only */ float* a,
	global /* read_only */ float* b,
	global /* write_only */ float* c)
{	
	<pre>int index = get_global_id(0);</pre>
	<pre>c[index] = sqrt (fabs (sin (a [index]</pre>
}	

- We can use "lazy" operators to delay the computations until the result is required.
- Allows us to aggregate computations, e.g. map of a map of a ...
- Produces more compute-intensive OpenCL kernels.

Status

- Small prototype developed as proof of concept.
- Would need to develop a robust decompiler and translator to OpenCL kernels.
- For each pattern we would need to develop a family of efficient kernels to exploit each platform.
- Would require the development of heuristics, perhaps an autotuner, to choose when to use OpenCL, and when to use native code.
- Currently a "10% project".
- Could potentially be developed further if there was sufficient interest.



]) + cos (b [index]));