

Taking GPU Programming Models to Task for Performance Portability

Joshua H. Davis[†], Pranav Sivaraman[†], Joy Kitson[†], Konstantinos Parasyris*, Harshitha Menon*, Isaac Minn[†], Giorgis Georgakoudis*, Abhinav Bhatele[†]

[†]Department of Computer Science, University of Maryland

*Center for Applied Scientific Computing, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

Abstract—Ensuring high productivity in scientific software development necessitates developing and maintaining a single codebase that can run efficiently on a range of accelerator-based supercomputing platforms. While prior work has investigated the performance portability of a few selected proxy applications or programming models, this paper provides a comprehensive study of a range of proxy applications implemented in the major programming models suitable for GPU-based platforms. We present and analyze performance results across NVIDIA and AMD GPU hardware currently deployed in leadership-class computing facilities using a representative range of scientific codes and several programming models – CUDA, HIP, Kokkos, RAJA, OpenMP, OpenACC, and SYCL. Based on the specific characteristics of applications tested, we include recommendations to developers on how to choose the right programming model for their code. We find that Kokkos, RAJA, and SYCL in particular offer the most promise empirically as performance portable programming models. These results provide a comprehensive evaluation of the extent to which each programming model for heterogeneous systems provides true performance portability in real-world usage.

Index Terms—performance portability, heterogeneous systems, programming models

I. INTRODUCTION

Heterogeneous on-node architectures have become the dominant paradigm in high performance computing (HPC) platforms. Eight of the top ten systems in the November 2023 TOP500 list, and about 37% of all 500 systems on the list, employ co-processors or accelerators [1]. Further, there is substantial diversity of hardware vendors and specific architectures in use. The current top ten includes CPUs from AMD, Fujitsu, IBM, and Intel, as well as GPUs from AMD, NVIDIA, and Intel. A similarly diverse range of programming models have emerged, all aiming to allow scientific application developers to write their code once and run it on any system. Programming models such as OpenMP [2], RAJA [3], and Kokkos [4] act as *portability layers*, bridging the gap between the programmer’s high-level expression of an algorithm and the low-level implementation of that algorithm for correct execution on a given target architecture.

Using HPC machines efficiently for scientific applications demands more than just *functional* portability, which ensures correct execution on various platforms. *Performance* portability, a more desired property, refers to the capability of codes to achieve high performance across a range of target platforms.

Developers might address this by creating multiple specialized code versions of an application to optimize performance for each target system. However, this divergence in code creates a significant burden for maintenance and development. Thus, there is a strong need for programming models that enable single-source performance portability in scientific applications, with several of them having the potential to provide this capability. However, choosing a programming model for porting a CPU-only application to GPUs is a major commitment, requiring significant time for developer training and programming. If a programming model turns out to be ill-suited for an application, resulting in unacceptable performance, then that investment is wasted.

A deeper understanding of the performance portability implications of choosing a programming model, based on the application characteristics, would be of significant benefit to application developers. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of each programming model in enabling performance portability, as well as the accurate definition and measurement of performance portability itself, remain open questions. Although insights gained from developers’ experiences in comparing the performance portability enabled by various programming models in applications are valuable, we have observed that open-source applications or even proxy applications implemented in a majority of the available programming models are uncommon and difficult to find. Furthermore, a single smaller application or benchmark implemented in most programming models is unlikely to provide representative performance for the diverse and complex range of full applications typically run on these systems. Finally, conducting exhaustive combinatorial studies of programming model, compiler, system and application combinations is usually very time-consuming, as each programming model usually requires unique combinations of compilers flags and libraries for any given system.

In this paper, we address the developer’s dilemma of choosing a programming model by providing a comprehensive empirical study of programming models in terms of their ability to enable performance portability on GPU-based platforms. We use a variety of proxy applications implemented in the most popular programming models and test them across multiple leadership-class production supercomputers. By employing a selection of realistic codes implemented in multiple programming models, we make realistic and accurate comparisons of

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF PROGRAMMING MODELS USED IN THIS STUDY. VENDOR SUPPORT MAY BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN THE FUTURE.

Prog. Model	Year Introduced	Developing Org.	Category	GPU Vendors Supported
OpenMP	1997	OpenMP ARB	Directive-based	NVIDIA, AMD, Intel
OpenACC	2011	OpenACC Org.	Directive-based	NVIDIA, AMD
Kokkos	2017	Sandia Nat'l Lab	C++ abstraction lib.	NVIDIA, AMD, Intel
RAJA	2019	Livermore Nat'l Lab	C++ abstraction lib.	NVIDIA, AMD, Intel
SYCL	2014	Khronos Group	Language extension	NVIDIA, AMD, Intel
HIP	2016	AMD	Language extension	NVIDIA, AMD
CUDA	2007	NVIDIA	Language extension	NVIDIA

the performance portability of multiple programming models across different architectures for the same computational workload. We present a Spack-based environment and scripting system to significantly lower the barrier to entry in systematically building and running these applications in numerous programming models for new performance portability studies. Our analysis of the evaluation results includes specific insights into why certain programming models work exceptionally well or poorly for particular applications on different target systems. We conclude with a set of specific recommendations and guidelines for application developers to employ when looking to select the right programming model for their application. To our knowledge, this is the most comprehensive performance portability study to date, in terms of the breadth of programming models and applications studied, the level of detail in the analysis of results, and being the first to be conducted on large-scale production supercomputers.

To summarize, our contributions include the following:

- We evaluate the performance portability enabled by seven different popular programming models using a diverse set of proxy applications tested across state-of-the-art NVIDIA and AMD GPUs in production supercomputers. We provide several additional implementations of existing proxy applications in new programming models to ensure full coverage of programming models across applications.
- We describe a methodology employing Spack scripting and environment tools [5] to easily manage the process of building and running all thirty-five versions (five applications times seven programming models) across our four supercomputing platforms which each have unique software stacks. We provide this software to the community in order to substantially reduce the effort required to reproduce or extend our results.
- We compare the usefulness of the existing Φ performance portability metric to our own insights for representing the results of our study.
- We conduct a thorough analysis of the reasons for key outliers in the performance portability cases studied.
- We leverage the insights from our study to provide usable recommendations on selecting a programming model to application developers based on key characteristics of the applications studied.

II. BACKGROUND ON PORTABLE PROGRAMMING MODELS

In this section we provide relevant background information on the various programming models we evaluate. Table I displays key information about each programming model. HIP and CUDA act as our baselines in this study, as they are the native programming model for AMD and NVIDIA devices, respectively. Below, we describe the key characteristics of each category of programming model.

A. Directive-based models

Directive-based models provide compiler directives or “pragmas” to parallelize or offload code. They are typically standard specifications implemented by a compiler front-end and a runtime library to implement parallel or offloaded execution that abstracts the underlying hardware architecture. Directive-based models are usually less verbose and less intrusive, as users can often annotate existing code with minimal refactoring. This provides advantages for incremental development.

B. C++ abstraction libraries

C++ abstraction libraries are template-based C++ libraries that provide high-level functions and data types. Users write their code directly employing these data types and typically structure GPU code as lambdas to pass into library function calls. The library converts the user code to a device backend such as CUDA, HIP or OpenMP at compile-time or runtime. Note that Kokkos provides both memory and compute abstractions, while RAJA provides compute abstractions and users must employ the related Umpire or CHAI libraries to abstract memory management.

C. Language extensions

Language extension add features to the base language (C++, C, and/or Fortran) for programming heterogeneous systems. Some are open standards (SYCL, HIP), while CUDA is proprietary. The language extensions we consider are relatively more verbose than other programming model. Users call runtime functions to manage memory and write functions that they then invoke as kernels to offload execution. SYCL provides multiple methods of memory management, including “explicit USM” which allows for CUDA or HIP style runtime calls to move and allocate data, or the buffer/accessor API which is more implicit, allowing the compiler to schedule data movement.

III. RELATED WORK

There have been several studies on programming language extensions [2], [6], models [7], and libraries [3], [4] designed to assist developers in achieving performance portability. Additionally, several studies have been conducted to assess the portability of the developed frameworks. We categorize the related work on empirical performance portability studies into three groups: metric studies, application or programming model studies, and what we refer to as “broader” studies that are not scoped to a particular model or app. In this section, we provide an overview of the most recent work in each of these categories.

A. Studies of performance portability metrics

Pennycook et al. [8]–[12] proposed the metric \mathcal{P} for performance portability, where \mathcal{P} for an application is defined as the harmonic mean of the performance efficiencies across different platforms. An alternative metric proposed by Daniel et al. [13] accounts for problem size, and Marowka [14], [15] compares \mathcal{P} to $\overline{\mathcal{P}}$, a similar metric that uses the arithmetic mean instead of the harmonic mean.

B. Studies examining the portability of individual application categories or programming models

A number of studies compare performance portable programming models for either specific categories of application [16]–[24] or specific programming models [6], [25]–[28]. For instance, Dufek et al. [21] compare Kokkos and SYCL for the Milc-Dslash benchmark, while Rangel et al. [24] examine portability in CRK-HACC enabled by SYCL. For studies examining the performance portability achievable using a particular programming model, Brunst et al. [26] benchmarked the 2021 SPEChpc suite, which contains nine mini applications implemented in OpenMP and OpenACC, on Intel CPUs and NVIDIA and AMD GPUs. Kuncham et al. [27] evaluated the performance of SYCL in comparison to CUDA on the NVIDIA V100 using BabelStream, Mixbench, and Tiled Matrix-Multiplication.

While these studies provide useful information to developers working on similar applications or those interested in specific programming models, making more general statements about programming models themselves requires a more comprehensive evaluation of a diverse set of case studies.

C. Broader performance portability studies

Deakin et al. [29], [30] have presented performance portability studies of five programming models across a wide range of hardware architectures, using BabelStream, TeaLeaf, CloverLeaf, Neutral, and MiniFMM. More recent papers by Deakin et al. [31], [32] focus on more specific problems such as reductions and GPU to CPU portability. Lin et al. [33] have evaluated implementations of C++17 StdPar against five models on AMD devices. While these studies provide performance portability comparisons across platforms, applications, and models, they do not include RAJA and in some works omit

HIP. Furthermore, they do not provide analysis of the reasons for performance differences between programming models.

This category contains additional literature from other groups. Kwack et al. [34] evaluate portability development experiences for three full applications and three proxy applications across GPUs from multiple vendors. Harrell et al. [35] study performance portability alongside developer productivity. However, in these studies each application is only ported to a single portable programming model. This makes it difficult to draw conclusions about each programming model’s relative suitability to particular applications. Koskela et al. [36] provide six principles for reproducible portability benchmarking, along with a demonstration of these principles in a Spack+Reframe CI infrastructure for a study of BabelStream on some CPU architectures and an NVIDIA V100.

While there is an abundance of studies on the topic of performance portability, they suffer from several limitations. Some are limited to a single application or benchmark, making it difficult to do a cross-application comparison of programming models. Others are focused on a single programming model, making it challenging to draw comparisons between different programming models. Our work aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of performance portability across multiple applications and libraries, each implemented in several different programming models and executing on production supercomputers. Additionally, unlike prior work, we provide users with an understanding of how application characteristics related to performance portability in each model. Finally, prior work does not provide extensive description of the build and run infrastructure used to collect the results, leaving the task of consistently building the applications on a wide range of hardware platforms with complex library and compiler flag dependencies to the reader. Our study is the first to apply the principles of reproducible benchmarking [36] in a comprehensive study of performance-portable programming models.

IV. METHODOLOGY FOR EVALUATING PERFORMANCE PORTABILITY ON GPU PLATFORMS

In this section, we describe our methodology for conducting a comprehensive comparison of programming models that provide portability on GPU platforms. We illuminate our reasoning for the choices of programming models, proxy applications, hardware platforms, and metrics used.

A. Choice of programming models

Our goal in this work is to empirically compare the performance portability provided by popular programming models. In Section II, we described three categories of programming models with a few examples in each category. We started with a broad survey of proxy applications to identify which proxy applications have existing implementations (hereafter, “ports”) in different programming models. Armed with that knowledge and a goal to include some models from each category, we decided to focus on these programming models: CUDA, HIP, Kokkos, OpenACC, OpenMP, RAJA, and SYCL. These are

the models most commonly found in the proxy applications we surveyed.

B. Choice of proxy applications

From a survey of a range of sources, including the ECP Proxy Apps suite [41], the NERSC Proxy suite [42] and the Mantevo Applications Suite [43], we identify five proxy applications that represent the range of typical GPU scientific computing workloads. These five applications include a pure memory bandwidth benchmark as well as proxy applications. They range from highly compute-intensive (miniBUDE) to highly memory-intensive (BabelStream), and also include one representative from each of the three large proxy application suites we surveyed. These proxy applications include representations of hydrodynamics (CloverLeaf), molecular dynamics (miniBUDE), nuclear physics (XSBench), and particle physics (su3_bench) codes, and the structured grid (CloverLeaf and su3_bench), dense linear algebra (su3_bench), n-body (miniBUDE) and Monte Carlo (XSBench) computational methods.

CloverLeaf, miniBUDE, and XSBench were missing implementations in some programming models, and so we developed these implementations in order to obtain full coverage of the space of application and model combinations. Table II summarizes the key details of each proxy application and which programming model ports we created or modified in this study. Below, we briefly describe the five proxy applications that we use in this study:

BabelStream is a memory bandwidth benchmark with five kernels: `copy`, `add`, `mul`, `triad`, and `dot` [22]. The `dot` kernel includes a reduction operation, a challenging operation for some programming models [44].

CloverLeaf is a 2D structured compressible Euler equations solver, with 14 kernels [38]. The `pdv`, `calc_dt`, and `advection` kernels are typically the most intensive, and `calc_dt` contains a reduction.

miniBUDE is a proxy for the Bristol University Docking Engine (BUDE), a molecular dynamics simulation designed to simulate molecular docking for drug discovery [40]. miniBUDE computes the energy field for a single configuration of a protein repeatedly.

XSBench is a proxy for OpenMC [37]. XSBench runs the macroscopic cross-section lookup kernel, and we use the event-based transport method with the hash-based grid as it is preferred for GPUs. XSBench consists of one kernel that computes a large number of lookups.

su3_bench is a proxy application of the MILC Lattice Quantum Chromodynamics code [39]. It implements the SU(3) matrix-matrix multiply routine. `su3_bench` consists of one kernel.

C. Choice of hardware platforms

Evaluating performance portability requires selecting a range of hardware platforms with diverse hardware architec-

tures. An important goal of this study is to evaluate performance portability on production GPU-based supercomputers because eight out of the top ten systems in the Top500 list as of November 2023 use either NVIDIA or AMD GPUs [1]. We select four different supercomputers for our experiments: Summit and Frontier at ORNL, Perlmutter at NERSC, and Corona at LLNL (architectural details in Table III). These systems cover the majority of the GPU architectures in the top ten systems. Frontier and Summit are in the top ten, and Perlmutter is in the top fifteen. Additionally, we include Corona (AMD MI50) to provide additional context with older AMD hardware. We note that the Spack environment-based methodology we demonstrate means deploying our suite of portability tests on a new system requires little effort.

D. Measurement and evaluation strategy

In our experiments, we place great importance on ensuring the compilers, dependency versions, and flags are uniform. We accomplish this with Spack [5], a package manager that gives us fine control of dependency versions and the build process. For each system, we have a single Spack environment file which specifies the exact compiler, app, and library dependency versions along with any needed flags. As seen in Table II, we have created or updated Spack package files for each proxy app, and where applicable these updates will be provided to the community. We make use of a custom package, called “perf-port”, to manage offloading and optimization flags consistently across applications, models, compilers and systems. The Spack environments created for this project can be very easily adapted to any new system, allowing for simple reproduction of our experiments and significantly reducing the extremely time-consuming effort of building every combination of application and programming model. Additionally, we employ Spack Python to develop robust scripting tools for our experiments — we can create jobs with single command line executions leveraging Spack’s `spec` syntax to adjust which app, models, or compilers are used, and send profile data to a `csv` format that can be directly read by our plotting scripts. These scripts and environments will be published on GitHub to allow the community to make use of our portability study methodology. These infrastructural contributions will dramatically reduce the effort required to reproduce our results and create new studies of portable programming models.

In this study, we consider both the efficiency of the generated GPU kernel(s) and that of any data movement between host and device needed to run the application. As will be discussed in Sec. VII, the impact of data movement on overall execution time turns out to be minimal, so data movement time is not ultimately included in the results, but we detail here our method for determining this for completeness. We collect the time spent in data movement between host and device and in executing the kernels separately. To ensure we collect this data correctly for all application and programming model combinations, we reviewed the timer start and stop locations for all applications, changing them and adding new timers where necessary. For BabelStream specifically, we do

TABLE II

SUMMARY OF PROXY APPLICATIONS AND BENCHMARKS USED IN THIS STUDY AS WELL AS WHICH PROGRAMMING MODEL PORTS AND SPACK PACKAGES REQUIRED UPDATES OR CREATION BY THE AUTHORS. HERE, E = ALREADY EXISTS, M = MODIFIED BY US, C = CREATED BY US.

Application	Domain(s)	Method(s)	Bound	Publishing Org.	Suite	CUDA	HIP	Kokkos	RAJA	OpenMP	OpenACC	SYCL	Spack Pkgs
XSBench [37]	Nuclear physics	Monte Carlo	Memory	Argonne Nat'l Lab	ECP	E	E	C	C	E	C	M	M
BabelStream [22]	N/A	Bandwidth benchmark	Memory	Univ. of Bristol	N/A	E	E	E	M	E	E	E	M
CloverLeaf [38]	Hydrodynamics	Structured grid	Memory	Atomic Weapons Establishment	Mantevo	E	E	E	C	E	C	M	M
su3_bench [39]	Particle physics	Structured grid, dense lin. alg.	Memory	Lawrence Berkeley Nat'l Lab	NERSC	E	E	E	C	E	E	E	C
miniBUDE [40]	Molecular dynamics	N-body	Compute	Univ. of Bristol	N/A	E	E	E	M	E	E	M	C

TABLE III

ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS OF THE PLATFORMS USED IN THIS PAPER.

System	CPU Model	CPU Cores/node	CPU Memory (GB)	GPU Model	GPU Memory (GB)	Hosting Facility
Summit	IBM POWER9	44	512	NVIDIA V100	16	OLCF (Oak Ridge)
Perlmutter	AMD EPYC 7763	64	256	NVIDIA A100	40	NERSC (Berkeley Lab)
Corona	AMD Rome	48	256	AMD MI50	32	LC (Livermore)
Frontier	AMD Opt. 3rd Gen. EPYC	64	512	AMD MI250X	64	OLCF (Oak Ridge)

not modify the timers and do not consider the impact of data movement between host and device, since BabelStream is purely a benchmark of device memory bandwidth.

In order to more easily time data movement in the SYCL ports and make them more comparable to HIP/CUDA codes, we used SYCL “explicit unified shared memory (USM)”, which in the context of SYCL means manually invoking SYCL functions to allocate device memory rather than using SYCL buffers. Explicit USM SYCL versions did not exist for XSBench, CloverLeaf, or miniBUDE, so we created these. In the OpenMP and OpenACC ports, data movement was often annotated directly on the offloading directives, and so we separated the data movement to and from the device out of the offloaded loops using the appropriate standalone directives. The performance impact of these changes is minimal – about 1-3% difference in cases tested.

Additionally, for all applications we added a runtime option to specify a number of warmup iterations at the start of the simulation which are excluded from timing. XSBench originally ran only for only a single iteration, so we added a loop that repeatedly runs the kernel and a runtime option to specify the number of iterations, in order to reduce variability and ensure consistency across applications.

With the figure-of-merit chosen for each application, we can also derive additional higher-level metrics about performance portability for each combination of application and programming model. In this work, we use Φ **with application efficiency** proposed by Pennycook et al. [8]. Φ is defined, for some application a , problem p , set of hardware platforms H , and measure of application efficiency e , as:

$$\Phi(a, p, H) = \begin{cases} \frac{|H|}{\sum_{i \in H} \frac{1}{e_i(a, p)}} & \text{if } i \text{ is supported } \forall i \in H \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Intuitively, this is the harmonic mean of the application efficiencies of an application running a single problem across a set of hardware platforms. The application efficiency e_i of an application a solving problem p is the ratio $\frac{c}{b}$, where c is the performance of a solving p on the particular hardware i , and b the best observed performance across all variants of a solving p on i .

V. PORTING TO NEW PROGRAMMING MODELS

Most of the proxy applications we used provided a working implementation of most of the evaluated programming models. In these existing proxy versions we performed minor modifications to consistently align timing measurements across different programming models. RAJA versions did not exist for CloverLeaf, XSBench, su3_bench and the existing RAJA implementations of BabelStream and miniBUDE were using vendor specific memory allocation primitives, making them not portable across vendor architectures.

For all development of additional ports, we maintained similarity in the level of effort applied to creating the new ports, in order to avoid granting an unfair advantage to any particular model arising from excess optimization. Furthermore, we specifically did not tune any GPU kernel launch parameters for any port. For programming models that require the user to specify these values (CUDA, HIP, RAJA, SYCL), we used the default values provided by the respective proxy application

developers. For programming models that do not have this requirement and can select their own default parameter values (OpenMP, OpenACC, Kokkos), we allowed the model to do so. Our results reflect “out of the box” performance that a user would encounter with minimal porting effort.

In the following subsections, we discuss the porting experiences for each programming model we worked with. Table II summarizes the development efforts we undertook for this study. We plan to merge these contributions to their respective upstream repositories as soon as possible.

A. Porting to OpenACC

Since OpenMP ports already existed for XSBench and `su3_bench`, for example, the process of creating a similar OpenACC port was relatively easy, requiring just a direct one-to-one conversion of the relevant OpenMP pragma to OpenACC. For example, the OpenMP pragma `omp target teams distribute parallel for` becomes `acc parallel loop. map(to: ...)` and `from` become `copyin` and `out` clauses, respectively. This extremely rote method made our experience with porting from OpenMP to OpenACC very productive.

B. Porting to Kokkos

Porting the XSBench code to Kokkos required converting the existing `for` loop to be a lambda function passed into a `Kokkos::parallel_for` call. Kokkos, however, also required the user to convert the data structures used in Kokkos calls to `Kokkos::Views`. XSBench’s `SimulationData` struct contains several dynamic integer and double arrays which would need to be Views in order to work on the GPU. To avoid rewriting the data setup code, we set up the grid data as ordinary C++ dynamic arrays, and then converted the data to Views before copying them to the device and launching the kernel. Listing 1 provides an example. In summary, we construct an unmanaged View in the `HostSpace` called `u_concs` using the heap memory of the `SD.concs` array, construct a new View in the device space called `SD.d_concs`, and finally `deep_copy` the unmanaged host View to the new device View.

```

1 Kokkos::View<double*, Kokkos::LayoutLeft, Kokkos::
  HostSpace,
2   Kokkos::MemoryTraits<Kokkos::Unmanaged>>
  u_concs(SD.concs, SD.length_concs);
3 SD.d_concs = new Kokkos::View<double*>("d_concs", SD
  .length_concs);
4 Kokkos::deep_copy(*SD.d_concs, u_concs);

```

Listing 1. Example of converting a C++ dynamic array to a device View for incremental development

C. Porting to RAJA

In contrast to Kokkos, the RAJA portability ecosystem uses three independent libraries to provide portability. Briefly, the RAJA library provides C++ lambda-capturing to allow developers to express portable computations across architectures. The developer can either use a custom portable memory management library or use Umpire [45] which provide portable memory allocation primitives and memory pools. The

hierarchical structure of the RAJA ecosystem provides some advantages and disadvantages in comparison to Kokkos. The RAJA ecosystem provides greater capability for incremental porting of an existing codebase, avoiding more extensive refactoring. The developer can identify specific kernels, port them to RAJA, and use the rest of the code as-is. In a later step, the developers can replace the existing memory management with Umpire allocators to provide a portable memory allocation abstraction. In our case, this gradual modification has been useful for CloverLeaf and XSBench, which had more extensive existing code for managing and initializing data structures. In CloverLeaf specifically, we ported all device-kernels with RAJA primitives and modified the existing CloverLeaf copy abstractions to use Umpire API calls over vendor-specific calls.

Despite the advantages of the hierarchical design of the RAJA ecosystem, we observed several challenges related to the build system of the RAJA applications. Relying on multiple independent libraries increases the expertise required and frequency of errors in setting up build systems, a process that is already complicated for a single library containing device kernels. Package managers such as Spack [5] can remedy this for end users while developers can use *develop* environments (e.g. `spack dev-build CloverLeaf+raja -d ./`) – using Spack to manage dependencies for and build the CloverLeaf source code in the current directory. Nevertheless, this pushes the responsibility of correctly building and installing to the package maintainer.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section, we describe the setup for the experiments conducted in this work. We run all the applications on all four machines selected (listed in Table III).

Table IV provides details of the compilers and versions used with different programming models. We use GCC 12.2.0 as the host compiler where applicable on NVIDIA systems and ROCmCC 5.7.0 on AMD. We use CUDA version 12.2 on NVIDIA systems, and HIP 5.7.0 on AMD systems, as well as Kokkos version 4.2.00 and RAJA v2023.06.1. For several programming models there were several compiler options to choose from (OpenACC on NVIDIA systems, OpenMP, SYCL), so we tested all the available compilers¹ and choose for model and system combination the compiler with the best overall performance. In all applications except CloverLeaf the overall best-performing compiler was consistent per system. For CloverLeaf, AdaptiveCpp 23.10 was consistently superior, so we show AdaptiveCpp results for that application and DPC++ for all others. Note also that we were unable to build CloverLeaf with Clacc due to lack of support for the `host_data` clause, and hence we cannot run CloverLeaf on AMD systems with OpenACC.

We select input decks and command line inputs to each proxy application based on recommended representative settings from the respective application developers, choosing the

¹OpenMP: LLVM, GCC, ROCmCC, NVHPC, CCE, XL; OpenACC: Clacc, GCC, NVHPC; SYCL: DPC++, AdaptiveCpp

TABLE IV

COMPILERS AND VERSIONS USED FOR BUILDING DIFFERENT PROGRAMMING MODEL IMPLEMENTATIONS ON DIFFERENT PLATFORMS. NOTE WE USE ADAPTIVECPP 23.10 FOR SYCL CLOVERLEAF DUE TO IMPROVED PERFORMANCE.

Prog. Model	Summit	Perlmutter	Corona	Frontier
CUDA	GCC 12.2.0	GCC 12.2.0	N/A	N/A
HIP	N/A	N/A	ROCmCC 5.7.0	ROCmCC 5.7.0
Kokkos	GCC 12.2.0	GCC 12.2.0	ROCmCC 5.7.0	ROCmCC 5.7.0
RAJA	GCC 12.2.0	GCC 12.2.0	ROCmCC 5.7.0	ROCmCC 5.7.0
OpenMP	NVHPC 24.1	NVHPC 24.1	LLVM 17.0.6	LLVM 17.0.6
OpenACC	NVHPC 24.1	NVHPC 24.1	Clacc 2023-08-15	Clacc 2023-08-15
SYCL*	DPC++ 2024.01.20	DPC++ 2024.01.20	DPC++ 2024.01.20	DPC++ 2024.01.20

largest representative problem size available that would fit on all GPUs tested where applicable. We also select a number of iterations for each application that ensures about a minute of execution time to reduce variability. Section IV-D describes our modifications to the proxy applications to ensure consistent timings. We present the empirically determined command line arguments in Table V.

TABLE V
INPUT PARAMETERS TO THE PROXY APPLICATIONS.

Application	Input parameters
BabelStream	-n 1500 -w 150 -s $\$((1 << 29))$
CloverLeaf	--in clover_bm64_mid.in -w 52
su3_bench	-l 32 -i 100000 -w 10000
XSBench	-s large -m event -G hash -n 150 -w 15
miniBUDE	--deck bm2 -p 2 --wgsiz 128 -i 10 --warmups 1

Note that for all cases tested the time spent in data movement was negligible (less than 2%) compared to time spent in device kernels, so our results figures show **only** GPU kernel time. For all performance results presented we run the application three times and present the average result along with error bars representing min and max result. Variability is generally low; the largest range of times recorded as a percentage of mean for a case is 3.3%, and the mean is 0.1%. We report total runtime of BabelStream kernels rather than memory bandwidth in order ensure that “lower is better” across our results figures. The values collected can be converted to bandwidth (GB/s) by dividing the total data moved by the time.

VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We first present a roofline analysis of the native port implementations of each proxy application to understand their compute and memory behavior.

A. Roofline Analysis

Figure 1 plots the empirical roofline for the NVIDIA A100 GPU on Perlmutter along with the position of the most time-consuming kernel in the CUDA implementations of the five proxy applications in single and double precision where applicable. For BabelStream, this is the `dot` kernel; for CloverLeaf, this is the `PdV_kernel`; for miniBUDE, this is the `fasten_main` kernel. XSBench and su3_bench contain




Fig. 1. Roofline plot for the most time-consuming kernel in the CUDA versions of each application, run on Perlmutter (NVIDIA A100). Red points are single precision, and blue points are double precision.

a single kernel each. We can quickly observe that all kernels evaluated are memory-bound except for miniBUDE, which is highly compute-bound. BabelStream is overall the least operationally intense, which is expected given that it is a memory bandwidth benchmark. XSBench also falls relatively on the more memory-bound side, while CloverLeaf and su3_bench are much closer to the knee point. These kernels are relatively close to the roofline, suggesting these CUDA versions are relatively close to optimal for the algorithms they implement.

Next, we present performance results for XSBench, su3_bench, CloverLeaf, and the Dot kernel of BabelStream in Figures 2 thru 6. We omit the BabelStream Copy, Add, Triad and Mul kernels due to the high degree of consistency across models for those kernels. Each bar represents the average total **GPU kernel execution time** over three runs of the application, as described in Section IV. Note that while we do measure data movement time, we do not report it here in detail, as it is consistently negligible (<2%) compared to time spent in GPU kernels. The “Native Port” bar in each plot represents CUDA performance on Summit and Perlmutter (the NVIDIA systems) and HIP performance on Corona and Frontier (the AMD systems). We organize our initial insights into these results into five observations.




Fig. 2. Average GPU kernel execution time of the XSbench proxy application across all platforms and programming models. Lower is better.




Fig. 4. Average GPU kernel execution time of the CloverLeaf proxy application across all platforms and programming models. Lower is better.




Fig. 3. Average GPU kernel execution time of the su3_bench proxy application across all platforms and programming models. Lower is better.




Fig. 5. Average GPU kernel execution time of the BabelStream Dot kernel across all platforms and programming models. Lower is better.

B. Performance of native ports

Observation 1: On NVIDIA systems, CUDA often performs at or near the best observed performance.

CUDA is the best or within 3% of the best performing model in seven out of ten cases. The remaining three cases are the following: BabelStream Dot on Perlmutter, where CUDA is 4.2% slower than RAJA; XSbench on Summit, where CUDA is 5.4% slower than SYCL; and miniBUDE on Summit, where CUDA is 10.2% slower than SYCL. For all other applications, this is a useful validation of the maturity of the CUDA baseline for each application, and confirms our expectation that the low-level vendor model would be the most performant and portable across GPUs from the same vendor.

Observation 2: On AMD systems, HIP does not always guarantee the best performance.

For most cases on AMD systems, including CloverLeaf, su3_bench on Frontier, BabelStream Dot, and miniBUDE on Corona, AMD’s HIP programming model achieves the best performance, as expected. However in multiple instances HIP does not achieve the best performance, particularly for XSbench. Kokkos and SYCL outperform HIP on Corona and Frontier for XSbench, and OpenMP and OpenACC also outperform HIP on Frontier for XSbench. RAJA and SYCL also outperform HIP on Corona for su3_bench.

XSbench is a performance test case used in the development of LLVM OpenMP offloading, which Clacc also uses for OpenACC on Frontier, explaining why both directive-based models perform so well with XSbench. However, given that RAJA and Kokkos are C++ abstractions over HIP code, it is surprising that they can outperform HIP. We note that HIP XSbench performance on Frontier is only slightly better than HIP XSbench on Corona, suggesting that the XSbench HIP implementation is not a fully optimized and mature baseline.

The XSbench developers directly state that they used the Hipify tool to create the XSbench HIP port, and in comparing the HIP and CUDA versions it is clear that they are identical aside from simple substitution of CUDA syntax for HIP syntax. It is possible that writing HIP kernels by translating existing CUDA kernels without additional modification or optimization does not guarantee optimal performance on AMD hardware. Portable programming models are able to achieve superior performance in some cases with a similar level of effort.

C. Portability of C++ abstraction libraries

Observation 3: Kokkos and RAJA can be competitive with CUDA and HIP, on many system and application pairs.

Kokkos and RAJA compare favorably with CUDA and HIP on NVIDIA and AMD systems, with one of the two ports




Fig. 6. Average GPU kernel execution time of the miniBUDE proxy application across all platforms and programming models. Lower is better.

either nearing or exceeding the native port’s performance on every combination of system and app, besides those involving CloverLeaf. For these applications, RAJA is competitive with CUDA on NVIDIA systems, except for XSBench on Summit and su3_bench on both systems. RAJA generally outperforms Kokkos on these systems as well, with the exception of XSBench and su3_bench. On AMD systems, the results are also application-dependent, with RAJA besting Kokkos on CloverLeaf, the two ports being roughly equal on miniBUDE, and Kokkos out-performing RAJA on BabelStream Dot, XSBench and su3_bench. RAJA particularly struggles on BabelStream Dot on both AMD systems, running significantly slower than HIP. Conversely, Kokkos exceeds the performance of HIP on XSBench on both Corona and Frontier. On the other hand, both RAJA and Kokkos lag behind the native port of CloverLeaf — Kokkos to an especially large degree — on all studied systems.

With these very mixed results it is hard to pick a clear portability winner between Kokkos and RAJA, but we can observe that RAJA tends to perform more competitively for NVIDIA systems, and Kokkos tends to have an advantage on AMD systems. RAJA’s difficulty with BabelStream Dot suggests reduction performance remains a challenge for RAJA on AMD systems. Meanwhile, Kokkos’s lack of performance in CloverLeaf and BabelStream dot suggests poor reduction performance on both NVIDIA and AMD platforms. The main cause of Kokkos performance issues with CloverLeaf is slowdown in `calc_dt_kernel`, which performs a minimum reduction.

D. Portability of directive-based models

Observation 4: *OpenMP is often much slower than other implementations, and OpenACC somewhat less so.*

OpenMP performance across systems and cases is often slower than the native baseline. In only one case, XSBench on Frontier, does OpenMP achieve better performance than the baseline. OpenMP is able to achieve parity with the native baseline for XSBench generally, for su3_bench on Perlmutter, for CloverLeaf on NVIDIA systems, and for BabelStream Dot on Summit. In other words, in the majority of cases tested




Fig. 7. Φ of GPU kernel performance for each programming model and application combination. Applications are shown in ascending order of arithmetic intensity. Note for OpenACC we are unable to compile CloverLeaf on AMD systems.

OpenMP does not achieve similar performance to the native baseline.

OpenACC generally achieves more consistent performance with the baseline. It never achieves better performance than the baseline, but only has substantially worse performance in one case on NVIDIA systems — su3_bench on Perlmutter. OpenACC is consistently slightly worse than OpenMP, wherever it falls, on AMD systems, likely because it is employing the same LLVM offloading runtime through the Clacc compiler that OpenMP is using. According to Clacc developers, this is due to suboptimal translation of OpenACC to OpenMP within Clacc which will be fixed in a future release.

E. Portability of SYCL

Observation 5: *SYCL performance is very often competitive with native ports.*

We observe that in many cases, SYCL performs as well or better than native programming models (CUDA and HIP). As a lower-level language extension, like CUDA or HIP, this is not necessarily surprising. In some cases, SYCL is able to improve on CUDA or HIP performance: miniBUDE on all systems, su3_bench on Corona, and XSBench on all systems but Perlmutter. Even where SYCL is more than 3% slower than a native port, it is never the worst-performing port except in XSBench on Perlmutter, where it is only 5.3% slower. SYCL is the second-best performer in CloverLeaf on AMD systems, XSBench on Corona, and su3_bench on Perlmutter. From this, we can suggest that SYCL may be more suited to relatively compute-bound applications, like miniBUDE and to a lesser extent su3_bench and XSBench, particularly on AMD systems.

F. Performance portability metric

Figure 7 lists the \mathcal{P} metric for each programming model and proxy application combination. The “Native Port” column is provided for context, and simply indicates what the metric would report if a team decided to maintain both a HIP and CUDA version of the application. Note that because we were unable to run OpenACC on AMD systems with CloverLeaf, that cell is zero per the official formulation of the metric. For the subset of platforms (Summit and Perlmutter) we were able to run OpenACC on, the value is 0.98. According to \mathcal{P} , we observe a strong preference for SYCL, Kokkos, and RAJA as performance portable programming models. Kokkos’s difficulties with CloverLeaf appear to be an outlier, as it outperforms RAJA on all other applications except miniBUDE, where it is only slightly behind. Between Kokkos and SYCL, SYCL scores higher more often, and encounters much less difficulty with CloverLeaf.

Overall, the \mathcal{P} results mostly conform with our earlier observations from the raw data. However, they more strongly favor SYCL than we observed. Inevitably, summarizing the performance results with one number for each application and programming model obscures some details, particularly exceptional cases where a model that usually does poorly is able to win out. The reverse, in which a model that usually does well does poorly, can also be obscured, but is less likely to be so obscured, due to \mathcal{P} ’s bias towards low outliers arising from the behavior of the harmonic mean.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Scientific software developers must have the ability to focus their efforts on a single codebase in order to achieve optimal productivity — maintaining a specialized version for each hardware type and vendor is impractical. In this paper, we empirically evaluated and directly compared six portable GPU programming models for how well they enable performance portability across the fastest supercomputers in the world using existing proxy application codes that represent real science workloads. We found, most notably, that the SYCL, RAJA and Kokkos show significant promise in their ability to enable performance portability, and are even able to outperform native ports that are written with a similar level of effort in some cases. These results should act as an encouragement for application developers to consider porting their codes to SYCL, RAJA, or Kokkos. We also intend for our study’s Spack-based methodology to substantially lower the barrier to entry for similar portable programming model comparison experiments in the future — we invested significant effort in ensuring each proxy application’s programming model ports could be easily built and run on additional systems, and are sharing the product of these efforts with the community.

Between RAJA and Kokkos, we can conclude that Kokkos tends to achieve greater performance on AMD systems, and RAJA on NVIDIA. SYCL, on the other hand, often won more consistently for codes containing reductions and more compute-bound codes. While OpenMP and OpenACC provide an easier porting experience, they were in several cases unable

to provide the same level of performance portability as other models. OpenMP does achieve the best performance across platforms for XSBench, while struggling with reductions, particularly on AMD GPUs. OpenACC provides relatively strong portability for reduction-based codes and compute-bound codes on NVIDIA GPUs, as well as where it is able to take advantage the LLVM offloading backend’s strong performance on AMD systems via the Clacc compiler.

For compiler and programming model developers, we highlight several important insights from our experiences.

- The of process successfully building all of these applications across systems was not trivial, especially for RAJA, a multi-library portability suite. The Spack-based methodology we describe and will offer to the community seeks to address this difficulty.
- We found that AMD profiling tools on Frontier are somewhat far from being as mature and usable as those available on the NVIDIA systems, which limited our ability to dive deeply into AMD results. We also note that NVIDIA profiling tools demonstrate more limited capability to analyze OpenMP and SYCL codes, and often crash during execution of those codes on Perlmutter.
- Reduction operations continued to be a major bottleneck for RAJA and particularly for Kokkos and OpenMP, as observed in other studies.
- Time spent in data movement, while possibly relevant in other applications, tends to be largely negligible in comparison to time spent in kernels.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 2047120, and the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program under Grant No. DGE 2236417. This work was performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract DE-AC52-07NA27344 (LLNL-CONF-855581).

This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. DOE under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725. This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center (NERSC), a U.S. DOE Office of Science User Facility located at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231 using NERSC award DDR-ERCAP0025593.

REFERENCES

- [1] TOP500.org, “November 2023 top500,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.top500.org/lists/top500/2023/06/>
- [2] “OpenMP Application Program Interface. Version 4.0. July 2013,” 2013.
- [3] R. D. Hornung and J. A. Keasler, “The RAJA Portability Layer: Overview and Status,” Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Tech. Rep. LLNL-TR-661403, Sep. 2014.

- [4] C. R. Trott, D. Lebrun-Grandié, D. Arndt, J. Ciesko, V. Dang, N. Ellingwood, R. Gayatri, E. Harvey, D. S. Hollman, D. Ibanez, N. Liber, J. Madsen, J. Miles, D. Poliakoff, A. Powell, S. Rajamanickam, M. Simberg, D. Sunderland, B. Turckin, and J. Wilke, "Kokkos 3: Programming model extensions for the exascale era," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 805–817, 2022.
- [5] T. Gambelin, M. LeGendre, M. R. Collette, G. L. Lee, A. Moody, B. R. de Supinski, and S. Futral, "The spack package manager: bringing order to hpc software chaos," in *SC15: International Conference for High-Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*. Los Alamitos, CA, USA: IEEE Computer Society, nov 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1145/2807591.2807623>
- [6] A. Sabne, P. Sakdhnagool, S. Lee, and J. S. Vetter, "Evaluating performance portability of openacc," in *Languages and Compilers for Parallel Computing: 27th International Workshop, LCPC 2014, Hillsboro, OR, USA, September 15-17, 2014, Revised Selected Papers 27*. Springer, 2015, pp. 51–66.
- [7] T. Ben-Nun, J. de Fine Licht, A. N. Ziogas, T. Schneider, and T. Hoefler, "Stateful dataflow multigraphs: A data-centric model for performance portability on heterogeneous architectures," in *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, 2019, pp. 1–14.
- [8] S. J. Pennycook, J. D. Sewall, and V. W. Lee, "A metric for performance portability," in *Proceedings of the 7th International Workshop in Performance Modeling, Benchmarking and Simulation of High Performance Computer Systems*, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1611.07409>
- [9] —, "Implications of a metric for performance portability," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 92, pp. 947–958, 2019.
- [10] J. Sewall, S. J. Pennycook, D. Jacobsen, T. Deakin, and S. McIntosh-Smith, "Interpreting and visualizing performance portability metrics," in *2020 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2020, pp. 14–24.
- [11] S. J. Pennycook, J. D. Sewall, D. W. Jacobsen, T. Deakin, and S. McIntosh-Smith, "Navigating performance, portability, and productivity," *Computing in Science & Engineering*, vol. 23, no. 5, pp. 28–38, 2021.
- [12] S. J. Pennycook and J. D. Sewall, "Revisiting a metric for performance portability," in *2021 International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2021, pp. 1–9.
- [13] D. F. Daniel and J. Panetta, "On applying performance portability metrics," in *2019 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2019, pp. 50–59.
- [14] A. Marowka, "A comparison of two performance portability metrics," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, p. e7868, 2023.
- [15] —, "Toward a better performance portability metric," in *2021 29th Euro-micro International Conference on Parallel, Distributed and Network-Based Processing (PDP)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 181–184.
- [16] M. Martineau, S. McIntosh-Smith, and W. Gaudin, "Assessing the performance portability of modern parallel programming models using tealeaf," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 29, no. 15, p. e4117, 2017.
- [17] I. Z. Reguly and G. R. Mudalige, "Productivity, performance, and portability for computational fluid dynamics applications," *Computers & Fluids*, vol. 199, p. 104425, 2020.
- [18] I. Z. Reguly, "Performance portability of multi-material kernels," in *2019 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 26–35.
- [19] A. Sedova, J. D. Eblen, R. Budiardja, A. Tharrington, and J. C. Smith, "High-performance molecular dynamics simulation for biological and materials sciences: Challenges of performance portability," in *2018 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 1–13.
- [20] S. Boehm, S. Pophale, V. G. Vergara Larrea, and O. Hernandez, "Evaluating performance portability of accelerator programming models using spec accel 1.2 benchmarks," in *High Performance Computing: ISC High Performance 2018 International Workshops, Frankfurt/Main, Germany, June 28, 2018, Revised Selected Papers 33*. Springer, 2018, pp. 711–723.
- [21] A. S. Dufek, R. Gayatri, N. Mehta, D. Doerfler, B. Cook, Y. Ghadar, and C. DeTar, "Case study of using kokkos and sycl as performance-portable frameworks for milc-dslash benchmark on nvidia, amd and intel gpus," in *2021 International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 57–67.
- [22] T. Deakin, J. Price, M. Martineau, and S. McIntosh-Smith, "Evaluating attainable memory bandwidth of parallel programming models via babelstream," *Int. J. Comput. Sci. Eng.*, vol. 17, no. 3, p. 247–262, jan 2018.
- [23] V. Artigues, K. Kormann, M. Rampp, and K. Reuter, "Evaluation of performance portability frameworks for the implementation of a particle-in-cell code," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 32, no. 11, p. e5640, 2020.
- [24] E. M. Rangel, S. J. Pennycook, A. Pope, N. Frontiere, Z. Ma, and V. Madananth, "A performance-portable sycl implementation of crk-hacc for exascale," in *Proceedings of the SC'23 Workshops of The International Conference on High Performance Computing, Network, Storage, and Analysis*, 2023, pp. 1114–1125.
- [25] R. Gayatri, C. Yang, T. Kurth, and J. Deslippe, "A case study for performance portability using openmp 4.5," in *Accelerator Programming Using Directives: 5th International Workshop, WACCPD 2018, Dallas, TX, USA, November 11-17, 2018, Proceedings 5*. Springer, 2019, pp. 75–95.
- [26] H. Brunst, S. Chandrasekaran, F. M. Ciorba, N. Hagerty, R. Henschel, G. Juckeland, J. Li, V. G. M. Vergara, S. Wienke, and M. Zavala, "First experiences in performance benchmarking with the new spehpc 2021 suites," in *2022 22nd IEEE International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Internet Computing (CCGrid)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 675–684.
- [27] G. K. Reddy Kuncham, R. Vaidya, and M. Barve, "Performance study of gpu applications using sycl and cuda on tesla v100 gpu," in *2021 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC)*, 2021, pp. 1–7.
- [28] I. Karlin, A. Bhatele, J. Keasler, B. L. Chamberlain, J. Cohen, Z. DeVito, R. Haque, D. Laney, E. Luke, F. Wang, D. Richards, M. Schulz, and C. H. Still, "Exploring traditional and emerging parallel programming models using a proxy application," in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium*, ser. IPDPS '13. IEEE Computer Society, May 2013.
- [29] T. Deakin, S. McIntosh-Smith, J. Price, A. Poenaru, P. Atkinson, C. Popa, and J. Salmon, "Performance portability across diverse computer architectures," in *2019 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2019, pp. 1–13.
- [30] T. Deakin, A. Poenaru, T. Lin, and S. McIntosh-Smith, "Tracking performance portability on the yellow brick road to exascale," in *2020 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2020, pp. 1–13.
- [31] T. Deakin, S. McIntosh-Smith, S. J. Pennycook, and J. Sewall, "Analyzing reduction abstraction capabilities," in *2021 International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 33–44.
- [32] T. Deakin, J. Cownie, W.-C. Lin, and S. McIntosh-Smith, "Heterogeneous programming for the homogeneous majority," in *2022 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2022, pp. 1–13.
- [33] W.-C. Lin, S. McIntosh-Smith, and T. Deakin, "Preliminary report: Initial evaluation of stdpar implementations on amd gpus for hpc," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02680*, 2024.
- [34] J. Kwack, J. Tramm, C. Bertoni, Y. Ghadar, B. Homerding, E. Rangel, C. Knight, and S. Parker, "Evaluation of performance portability of applications and mini-apps across amd, intel and nvidia gpus," in *2021 International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*, 2021, pp. 45–56.
- [35] S. L. Harrell, J. Kitson, R. Bird, S. J. Pennycook, J. Sewall, D. Jacobsen, D. N. Asanza, A. Hsu, H. C. Carrillo, H. Kim *et al.*, "Effective performance portability," in *2018 IEEE/ACM International Workshop on Performance, Portability and Productivity in HPC (P3HPC)*. IEEE, 2018, pp. 24–36.
- [36] T. Koskela, I. Christidi, M. Giordano, E. Dubrovskaya, J. Quinn, C. Maynard, D. Case, K. Olgu, and T. Deakin, "Principles for automated and reproducible benchmarking," in *Proceedings of the SC'23 Workshops of The International Conference on High Performance Computing, Network, Storage, and Analysis*, 2023, pp. 609–618.
- [37] J. R. Tramm, A. R. Siegel, T. Islam, and M. Schulz, "Xsbench—the development and verification of a performance abstraction for monte carlo reactor analysis," *The Role of Reactor Physics toward a Sustainable Future (PHYSOR)*, 2014.

- [38] J. Herdman, W. Gaudin, S. McIntosh-Smith, M. Boulton, D. A. Beckingsale, A. C. Mallinson, and S. A. Jarvis, "Accelerating hydrocodes with openacc, opencl and cuda," in *2012 SC Companion: High Performance Computing, Networking Storage and Analysis*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 465–471.
- [39] D. Doerfler and C. Daley, "su3_bench: Lattice qcd su (3) matrix-matrix multiply microbenchmark (su3_bench) v1. 0," Lawrence Berkeley National Lab.(LBNL), Berkeley, CA (United States), Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [40] S. McIntosh-Smith, J. Price, R. B. Sessions, and A. A. Ibarra, "High performance in silico virtual drug screening on many-core processors," *The international journal of high performance computing applications*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 119–134, 2015.
- [41] "Ecp proxy applications," <https://proxyapps.exascaleproject.org/>, accessed: 2023-09-30.
- [42] "Nersc proxy suite," <https://www.nersc.gov/research-and-development/nersc-proxy-suite/>.
- [43] M. A. Heroux, R. F. Barrett, J. M. Willenbring, S. D. Hammond, D. Richards, J. Mohd-Yusof, and A. Herdman, "Mantevo suite 1.0." Sandia National Lab.(SNL-NM), Albuquerque, NM (United States), Tech. Rep., 2013.
- [44] J. H. Davis, C. Daley, S. Pophale, T. Huber, S. Chandrasekaran, and N. J. Wright, "Performance assessment of openmp compilers targeting nvidia v100 gpus," in *Accelerator Programming Using Directives*, S. Bhalachandra, S. Wienke, S. Chandrasekaran, and G. Juckeland, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2021, pp. 25–44.
- [45] D. A. Beckingsale, M. J. McFadden, J. P. S. Dahm, R. Pankajakshan, and R. D. Hornung, "Umpire: Application-focused management and coordination of complex hierarchical memory," *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, vol. 64, no. 3/4, pp. 00:1–00:10, 2020.