# AMOS and UPC

Phil Merkey Michigan Tech

### Definition

A memory operation is atomic in case the only observable states for the memory are the state before the operation began or the state after the operation has completed.

It is as if it happens at the memory location.

#### Definition

- Link Load / Store Conditional
- Fetch\_and\_Add afadd(&p, v)

• return p, set p = p + v

- Compare and Swap acswap(&p, cmp, replace)
  - return p, if( cmp==p ) { p = replace }





load c, pointer to Q





#### UPC machines with AMOS

- Cray T3E: fetch\_and\_add(&p,v)
- Cray X1:
  - \_amo\_aadd(&p, v) //atomic add (long v)
  - \_amo\_afadd(&p,v) // fetch and add
  - \_amo\_aax(&p, A, X) // p=p&A^X
  - \_amo\_afax(&p,A,X)
  - \_amo\_acswap(&p, c, r) //compare and swap

#### UPC machines with AMOS

- MuPC:
  - \_upc\_faop(opcode, &p, v)
  - \_upc\_cas(&p, &c, &r)
  - \_upc\_dcas(&p, &c1, &r2, &c2, &r2)
  - \_upc\_maskswap(&p, v, mask)
  - \_upc\_ffaop(opcode, &p, v)

## Affinity and Blocking



shared [1] float x[MaxN];
shared [BLK] float y[MaxN];



```
Why not just use locks?
    old = amo cswap(\&A[k], C, R);
Is sort of equivalent to:
   _upc_lock( lockforA[k]);
      old = A[k];
      if(C==old)
           A[k] = R;
   upc unlock( lockforA[k]);
```

But there are issues.

#### Why not just use locks?

- Locks are ugly and not cool
- You need a lock for each element of A[]
  - Or a lock per thread if you can partition the writes by thread
  - Or some other way to hash into a table of locks

• There are issues with the memory model.

#### Memory Model

Every memory reference is either strict or relaxed.

- strict ~= sequential consistency "every thread sees this memory operation in program order wrt to other strict references"
- relaxed ~= weak consistency
   "just a C program within a thread"
- Important to implementors---legal issue
- Performance issues
- Interaction with I/O and Collectives and AMOs

#### Memory Models relaxed relaxed relaxed ••• relaxed ... ••• relaxed strict relaxed strict relaxed strict relaxed relaxed ... relaxed ... ... relaxed strict relaxed strict relaxed strict relaxed relaxed ... relaxed ... ... relaxed relaxed

```
Why not just use locks?
    old = amo cswap(\&A[k], C, R);
Is sort of equivalent to:
   strict null reference
   upc lock( lockforA[k]);
      old = A[k];
      if(C == old)
           A[k] = R;
   upc unlock( lockforA[k]);
   strict null reference
```

#### Relative Costs

#### No Head-to-Head Comparison is Meaningful

• T3E

- afadd == aadd
- upc\_lock is done with afadd
- a afadd about the same as an add

• X1

- amos don't vectorize
- aadd twice as fast as afadd
- don't know how upc\_lock works
- Beowulf (think simulator)
  - the current caching strategies are  $\perp$  amos

#### Relative Costs

Pick a modest number of threads 16-64 For array sizes from 1 to 1024 loop // baseline array[ random ]++

loop // a afaad(&array[ random ], 1)

// atomic

loop // locks upc\_lock( lockarray[ random ] ) array[random]++ upc\_unlock( lockarray[ random ] )

#### Relative Costs

buckets	updates	slow down
	raw +=1	w/ locks
1024	98%	3x
32	50%	5x
1	20%	20x
afadd is 2x over raw +=		

T3E:

X1:

buckets	updates	slow down
	raw +=1	w/locks
1024	98%	3x
32	50%	5x
1	20%	100×

amos don't vectorize, afadd is 2x over aadd

### PIC Code











As the particles move their affinity changes

#### Improving Affinity

n\_T = desired affinity of particle new position newindex[0:THREADS-1] = counter for each thread

for all my particles, P
n\_T = desired affinity of P
n\_idx[P] = amo\_afadd( &newindex[n\_T], 1 )
if out of bounds, work harder

for all my particles, P move P to new home





Each particle contributes (mass or charge) to the cell that contains it.

#### Interpolation

Fract(corner, particle) = the contribution to said corner

for each particle, P
 ffaop( Op, Grid[nw], Fract(nw, P) )
 ffaop( Op, Grid[ne], Fract(ne, P) )
 ffaop( Op, Grid[sw], Fract(sw, P) )
 ffaop( Op, Grid[se], Fract(se, P) )

barrier



### MuPC's atomic floating point fetch and add is the fastest on the planet.