

Introduction

Code_Saturne [1, 2] is an open-source multi-purpose CFD software developed by EDF-R&D (see Fig. 1 for its toolchain). It is currently being prepared for Exascale and with this objective tested on some of the largest existing high-end machines.



Figure 1: *Code_Saturne*'s toolchain

This works focuses on assessing Code_Saturne 4.2.0's performance on IBM Blue Gene/Qs (BGQs), namely Mira (Argonne) [3] and Juqueen (Jülich) [4], ranked #5 and #11 (November 2015's Top500 list).

Hardware - Settings

Mira and Juqueen are made of 1,024 node racks with 16 cores or 64 threads per node (16GiB RAM per node). Mira has got 48 racks and Juqueen 28.

Code_Saturne uses MPI/OpenMP for parallelism, and the Modified Compressed Sparse Row (MSR) algorithm is used here as a storage format.

Test Cases

The first test case consists of the flow in staggereddistributed tube bundles. The computational domain is made of 2 full tubes leading to an original 26 million cell (26M) hexa mesh. Mesh multiplication (MM) [5] is applied 4 times to this mesh to generate a 105 billion cell mesh (\mathbf{TB}_{105B}). The second test case deals with the 3-D flow in a lid-driven cubic cavity. The orginal mesh has got 13 million tetra cells and MM is applied 3 times to generate a 7 billion cell mesh (LDC_7B).

Code_Saturne's Extreme Scaling on IBM Blue Gene/Qs Charles Moulinec¹, Yvan Fournier², Ales Ronovsky³, Vendel Szeremi¹, Pascal Vezolle⁴, David R. Emerson¹ ¹SCD, STFC Daresbury Laboratory, Sci-Tech Daresbury, Keckwick Lane, Daresbury, Warrington, WA4 4AD, UK ²EDF R&D, 6 quai Watier, 78400 Chatou, FR ³Department of Applied Mathematics, VSB-Technical University of Ostrava, 708 00 Ostrava, CZ ⁴IBM France, 1 Rue de la Vieille Poste - 34006 Montpellier, FR

Partitioning - Halos

Partitioning is carried out by Space Filling Curve (Hilbert) and its performance is shown in Tab. 1. This stage requires using almost 1 GiB per MPI task and 16 ranks/node are used for all the simulations.

LDC_7B		TB_105B		
$\#$ nodes $\times \#$ ranks	Time	$\#$ nodes $\times \#$ ranks	Time	
$4,096 \times 16$	56 s	$32,768 \times 16$	112 s	
$8,192 \times 16$	57 s	$49,152 \times 16$	89 s	
$16,384 \times 16$	56 s	_	_	
$28,672 \times 16$	73 s	_	_	

 $(\mathbf{AMG} + \mathbf{CG})$. The first five time-steps are com-

The Navier-Stokes solver is segregated and the velocity-pressure coupling computed by a fractionalstep method. The 3 velocity components are coupled and solved using the Jacobi algorithm. The pressure is computed either using the Algebraic Multigrid (AMG) algorithm as a solver with a diagonal preconditioner $(\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{AMG})$ or as a preconditioner with the Conjugate Gradient algorithm as a solver puted for all the simulations.

Table 1: Time to perform each partition

Ghost cells are set to exchange information between neighboring subdomains (see timings in Tab. 2).

LDC_7B		TB_105B		
$\#$ nodes $\times \#$ ranks	Time	$\#$ nodes \times $\#$ ranks	Time	
$4,096 \times 16$	32 s	$32,768 \times 16$	112 s	
$8,192 \times 16$	40 s	$49,152 \times 16$	376 s	
$16,384 \times 16$	56 s	_	_	
$28,672 \times 16$	77 s	-	_	

Table 2: Time to create the halo cells

IOs

Both BGQs file systems are GPFS. Code_Saturne relies on MPI-IO for IOs, using a single 'shared file'. Table 3 (resp. 4) shows the time to write (resp. read) the mesh file on (resp. from) disk. For the **TB**_105B case, the file is **19 TiB** large.

TB_105B - 19	TiB
$\#$ nodes \times $\#$ ranks	Time
$16,384 \times 16$	$2,697 {\rm \ s}$
$32,768 \times 16$	2,536 s

Table 3: Time to write the mesh_output file on disk

LDC_7B - 620	GiB	TB_105B - 19	TiB
$\#$ nodes $\times \#$ ranks	Time	$\#$ nodes \times $\#$ ranks	Time
$4,096 \times 16$	46 s	$32,768 \times 16$	112 \$
$8,192 \times 16$	28 s	$49,152 \times 16$	262 \$
$16,384 \times 16$	32 s	_	_
$28,672 \times 16$	40 s	_	_

Tables 5 and 6 gather the CPU time per time-step as a function of the number of MPI tasks and threads for LDC_7B and TB_105B. All the tests show that using 4 threads per MPI tasks is faster than using 1 or 2 threads. Moreover, for a given number of threads per MPI task, a speed-up is observed in all the cases when the number of MPI tasks is increased. AMG + CG is always faster than D + AMG.

Table 4: Time to read the mesh_input file from disk

Solver

$LDC_7B - D + AMG$			
MPIs	1 thread	2 threads	4 threads
$4,096 \times 16$	394 s	$255 \mathrm{\ s}$	255 s
$8,192 \times 16$	251 s	173 s	148 s
$16,\!384 \times 16$	132 s	96 s	81 s
$28,\!672 \times 16$	82 s	62 s	56 s
$LDC_7B - AMG + CG$			
MPIs	1 thread	2 threads	4 threads
$4,096 \times 16$	363 s	231 s	191 s
$8,192 \times 16$	214 s	144 s	117 s
16.904×10^{-1}	111	76 с	63 s
$10,384 \times 10$	III S	105	
$10,384 \times 10$	III S	105	

Table 5: CPU time per time-step

$TB_{105B} - D + AMG$			
MPIs	1 thread	2 threads	4 threads
$32,768 \times 16$	236 s	185 s	117 s
$49,152 \times 16$	170 s	141 s	135 s
$TB_{105B} - AMG + CG$			
MPIs	1 thread	2 threads	4 threads
$32,768 \times 16$	133 s	112 s	108 s
$49,152 \times 16$	95 s	82 s	78 s

 Table 6:
 CPU time per time-step

This work assesses Code_Saturne 4.2.0's performance for 2 types of meshes (hexas only or tetras only), using MPI/OPenMP on two of the largest existing BGQs. Simulations were run up to **3,145,728 threads** on Mira and **1,835,008** threads on Juqueen, and reasonable scaling was observed for both, with a clear gain using 4 threads per MPI task instead of 1 or 2. The IO tests carried out using MPI-IO were conclusive, showing that reading the mesh_input file has the same cost as a few time-steps. Exascale performance will only be achieved by using accelerators. Several teams are exploring various options to optimise the code for Intel Xeon Phis and Nvidia GPUs.

This research used resources of the Argonne Leadership Computing Facility at Argonne National Laboratory (INCITE-PEAC), which is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-06CH11357. The authors would like to thank the Forschung Zentrum Jülich for performing their tests during the 2016 Extreme Scaling Workshop.

[1]	F
[2]	Υ.
[3]	htt
[4]	htt
[٢]	Λ







Final Remarks - Future Work

Acknowledgements

References

Archambeau et al. Int. J. on Fin. Vol. (2004). Fournier et al. Comp. & Fluids. (2011). tps://www.alcf.anl.gov tp://www.fz-juelich.de [5] A. Ronovsky et al. 3^{rd} PARENG. (2013).

