COMMODORE benchmarks

Laurent Debreu, Nils Wedi, Sibylle Techene, Jaques Sainte-Marie, Julie Deshayes, Florian Lemarie, Sergei Danilov, Alistair Adcroft, Joseph Zhang ...



Test cases, COMMODORE group: main objectives

- 1. Test cases for a more systematic validation of new releases of state-of-the-art ocean models
- 2. Evaluation of innovative model developments on a well-established / documented suite of test cases
 - 1. Numerical methods
 - 2. Reduced precision computations
 - 3. HPC in general
- 3. One objective is also to open the door to a more interdisciplinary research (applied mathematicians, computer scientists, atmosphere/ocean feedback ...)



Atmosphere Experience

• The Dynamical Core Model Intercomparison Project (DCMIP-2016) and Summer School: Future-Generation Non-Hydrostatic Weather and Climate Models

 DCMIP-2012 and DCMIP-2016 have been endorsed by the WMO Working Group on Numerical Experimentation (WGNE).

DCMIP2016: a review of non-hydrostatic dynamical core design and intercomparison of participating models, (P Ullrich, C. Jablonowski et al, 2019; https://www.geosci-model-dev.net/10/4477/2017/)





NEMO performance tests



Scalability (left) and energy consumption (right) of several NEMO 3.6 model configurations, measured on beaufix2 Météo-France supercomputer, Intel Broadwell processors. BENCH and GYRE configurations (I) have 75 vertical levels, (ii) exclude realistic bathymetry (no effect on performance), sea-ice, bio-geo-chemistry and output but (iii) include TOP tracers, appropriate physics at each resolution and polar grid folding (BENCH only). Horizontal resolution varies from 1 degree (eORCA1) to 1 km (eORCAkm). Scalable NEMO eORCAkm performances are extrapolated from measurements of a simplified GYRE km scale configuration, assuming a perfect scalability until a 10 million MPI subdomain decomposition. Right figure compares the total production of one reactor of a power plant (FNPP) similar to Fessenheim, France and the energy consumption of a 1,000 year long simulation led with the four NEMO configurations (eORCAkm: projection) at maximum scalability, approximated as suggested in Balaji et al. 2017, assuming beaufix2 consumption E = 2.15e12 J/month and total capacity A = 5.2e7 CH/month

Other ocean models scalability

1/25 degree Global HYCOM Performance



Testing (reduced-precision) sensitivity of ocean models on pathological ocean modelling issues

- Behaviour at different time-scales
- Vertical mixing (more levels, change to isopycnal coordinates, more accurate advection)
- Barotropic mode (2D) coupling to the deep ocean (scalability bottleneck beyond ~6000 cores ?)
- Sea-ice model rheology
- Physics coupling and lateral ocean boundaries
- Complex ocean bathymetry interactions
- Coupling interface to the atmosphere and other ESM components (ABL, wave model)
 - E.g. mixing effects and wave excitation in the presence of (hurricane-like) atmospheric forcing

How to define a test case ?



- 1. Physical description of what we are looking at
- 2. A given set of equations

From Soufflet et al, 2016: 20 years average spectra at 10m depth for ROMS (plain line) and NEMO (dashed) at different resolutions

- 1. Several test cases should be able to run with simplified equations system
- 3. A configuration
- 4. A reference solution (analytical solution when available)
- 5. A set of diagnostics including sensitivity studies (Model resolution, viscosity ...)

Test cases

- Some difficulties
 - Model developers tends to tune their code according to a given test case
 - -> not representative of the general setup
 - Solution : the model parameters / choices should be detailed in the results
 - Representativeness of test cases for real simulations of ocean or coupled systems
- Different kind of test cases :
 - "Sanity" test cases
 - A suite of test cases to validate of model
 - Test cases that address a specific challenge:
 - Example : An idealized test case with a complex geometry

Considerations / Open questions

- Reference solutions:
 - Developments of analytic solutions for complex equations systems
 - Lab experiments
- Easy reduction of complexity for existing 3D ocean models
- Extending the test cases for the dynamical cores to
 - Physics-Dynamics coupling
 - Ocean-Atmosphere coupling
 - Tests that can be performed with both atmosphere and ocean dynamical cores
- In addition to idealized test cases, a small number of realistic configurations
 - COMMODORE encompasses a large variety of ocean models (global, regional, coastal)
 - Field based / observations constraint test cases



Test case	H Y C M	M A R S	N E M O	R O M S	R S D M S	Pycomodo tool : Python graphs of the test case results			
Instable jet	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	dinate of vortex		
Baroclinic vortex	✓	✓	✓	~	✓	✓			
Lock exchange	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	√	$-500 \begin{bmatrix} y \\ -500 \\ 0 \\ 20 \\ 40 \\ 60 \\ 80 \\ 100 \\ Time [days] \end{bmatrix}$ Density cut — HYCOM (Δx =500 m)		
Passive lenses of tracer	-	~					Ξ_{-10}		
Internal wave	✓			✓			-15 Z22 21		
Thacker	✓	✓	-	✓		✓	0 20 40 60 80 100 120		
Upwelling	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	Normalized density distribution HYCOM (Δx=500 m)		
Interaction current- topography			√		√				
Traj. bt vortex									
Jet – mixing layer		~	~				Density anomaly [$kg \cdot m^{-3}$]		

Lab experiment

Using experimental data allows to compare code outputs to a reference given a metric.

- Convergence study
- Numerical comparison
- Sensitivity studies (schemes, resolution viscosity)
- Parameterization tests e.g. TKE



Literature shows various Lock Exchange experiments, we used Adduce Sciortino and Proietti (2012) results.

The figure taken from Adduce & al. paper shows a longitudinal section of the Lock Exchange lab experiment #9 ($\Delta \rho$ = 90 kg/m3) white lines are numerical models.

Lab experiment - Lock Exchange

Navier-Stokes 2D hydrostatic equations with variable density and both incompressible and Boussinesq assumptions. $\Delta x : 0.01 \text{ m}, \Delta z : 0.015 \text{ m}, \text{ viscosity} : 10^{-4} \text{ m}^{2}/\text{s}$



Analytical solution

There are various configurations likely to be implemented in an global circulation model (hydrostatic or Boussinesq hypothesis for example).

Using analytical solutions for studying global circulation models offers

- a solid understanding in the numerical methods involved,
- a rigorous testing tool of the model ingredients,

Sibylle Techene $\delta X / \delta t + \delta F(X) / \delta x = S(X)$ $X_{i,n+1} = X_{i,n} - \Delta t / \Delta x (F_{i+1/2} - F_{i-1/2}) + \Delta t S(X_{i,n})$

- convergence study from discrete to continuous system
- consistency ensure to solve the proper equations
- order and stability shows the numerical scheme actual performance

Sibylle Techene

Analytical solution Example

Flat bottom emptying box solutions for Navier-Stokes free surface non hydrostatic equations.



For some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $t_1 \in \mathbb{R}^*_+$, $\phi_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]/\{\pi\}$ let us consider the functions h, u, v, w, p, ϕ defined for $t \ge t_0$ by

$$\begin{split} h(t, x, y) &= \alpha f(t), \\ u(t, x, y, z) &= f(t) \left(x \cos(\theta) + y \sin(\theta) \right), \\ v(t, x, y, z) &= f(t) \tan\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \left(x \cos(\theta) + y \sin(\theta) \right), \\ w(t, x, y, z) &= f(t) \left(z_b - z \right), \\ p(t, x, y, z) &= p^{a,0}(t) + g(h - (z - z_b)) + \left(h^2 - (z - z_b)^2 \right) f(t)^2, \\ \phi(t, x, y, z) &= \frac{\phi_0}{L} (x \cos(\theta) + y \sin(\theta)) \frac{z - z_b}{h_0}, \end{split}$$

where $f(t) = 1/(t-t_0+t_1)$ and with a flat bottom $z_b(x, y) = z_{b,0} = cst$, $h_0 = h(t_0, x, y) = \alpha/t_1$ and $p^{a,0}(t)$ a given function.



Observations – example Alamo floats dropped in before Tropical Cyclone (TC) Florence K. Mogensen



Observations – example Alamo floats dropped in before TC Florence 9 km atmosphere

K. Mogensen



Cooling not strong enough: too weak winds or errors in the ocean model?



florian.lemarie@inria.fr Univ. Grenoble Alpes, Inria, CNRS, Grenoble INP, LJK, 38000 Grenoble, France

Challenges and prospects for dynamical cores of oceanic models across all scales

Florian Lemarié¹, Hans Burchard, Knut Klingbeil, and Laurent Debreu

A. Adcroft (Princeton, USA), A. Androsov (AWI, Ger.), H. Arango (Rutgers, USA), E. Audusse (LAGA, Fr.), S. Bachman (NCAR, USA), M. Bell (MetOffice, UK), R. Benshila (LEGOS, Fr.), M. Bentsen (Uni, Nor.), J. Berntsen (Bergen, Nor.), E. Blayo (UGA, Fr.), J.-M. Campin (MIT, USA), J. Chanut (Mercator, Fr.), E. Chassignet (COAPS, USA), S. Danilov (AWI, Ger.), C. Eldred (Inria, Fr.), D. Engwirda (Columbia, USA), M. Iskandarani (FSU, USA), T. Kärnä (FMI, Fin.), N. Kevlahan (McMaster, Can.), P. Korn (MPI, Ger.), D. Le Roux (ICJ, Fr.), M. Losch (AWI, Ger.), G. Madec (LOCEAN, Fr.), G. Marques (NCAR, USA), P. Marsaleix (LA, Fr.), M. Petersen (LANL, USA), J. Sainte-Marie (Inria, Fr.), A. Shao (UVIC, Can.), P. Wolfram (LANL, USA), J. Zhang (VIMS, USA)

IRST COMMODORE WORKSHOP: COMMUNITY FOR THE NUMERICAL MODELING OF THE GLOBAL. REGIONAL. AND COASTAL OCEAN

WHAT: A total of 47 participants from 9 countries representing 15 different oceanic numerical models met to review our current understanding of future challenges in the design of oceanic dynamical cores WHEN: 17-19 September 2018 WHERE: Paris, France

1 - Major differences compared to atmospheric modeling

	Atmosphere	Ocean
Horizontal velocities U	10 m s^{-1}	0.1 m s^{-1}
Sound speed cs	$\sim 340 \; \mathrm{m \; s^{-1}}$	$\sim 1500 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$
External gravity waves co	$\sim 300 \ {\rm m \ s^{-1}}$	$\sim 100 \text{ m s}^{-1}$
Internal gravity waves c1	$\sim 100 \ {\rm m \ s^{-1}}$	$\sim 1 \mathrm{~m~s^{-1}}$
First deformation radius	O(100 km)	O(10 km)

- Density variations are guite small compared to the mean density → Boussinesg approximation is valid (i.e. no acoustic modes)
- Validity of hydrostatic balance ($\delta^2 Fr^2 \ll 1$) : in the ocean the hydrostatic balance is violated approximately for L < 1 km and weak stratification

 \rightarrow Oceanic non-hydrostatic models are at an early development stage

- Stiffness $(c_0 \gg c_1)$: fast modes are meteorologically important (i.e. accuracy matters) and propagate horizontally
- → Split-explicit treatment of 2D barotropic mode + consistency enforcement between barotropic and baroclinic modes
- Away from boundary layers, tracers are stirred and mixed preferentially along isopycnal surfaces : $\kappa_{dia} \approx 10^{-5} \,\mathrm{m^2 \, s^{-1}}$ (e.g. Ledwell et al., 1993); $\kappa_{iso} \approx 10^3 \,\mathrm{m^2 \, s^{-1}}$ (for $L_x \approx 100 \,\mathrm{km}$) -> Strong constraint on the choice of vert. coord. & tracer advection/remapping schemes
- Complex geometry (but no "Pole problem") \rightarrow Computational domain is bounded with irregular boundaries

Vacuum states (wetting and drying)

depth-independent barotropic mode

approximation)

 \rightarrow Volume-conserving treatment of dry states and non-negativity of water heights

2 - Overview of equations and associated modeling assumptions

Geometric assumptions: Baroclinic (internal) mode spherical geoid, traditional shallow-fluid A completer • fixed bathymetry ($-H(x,y) \le z \le \eta(x,y,t)$) Boussinesa • Barotropic (external) mode ($\overline{\mathbf{u}} = \int_{u}^{\eta} \mathbf{u}_{h} \, dz$) • *in-situ* density $\rho \rightarrow \rho_0$ except when $\partial_t \eta = -\boldsymbol{\nabla}_h \cdot (D \overline{\mathbf{u}}) - (E - P)$ associated with the gravitational term $\partial_t (D\overline{\mathbf{u}}) = -Df\mathbf{k} \times \overline{\mathbf{u}} - gD\nabla_h \eta + D\mathcal{F}_{3D \to 2D}$ Hydrostatic $\mathcal{F}_{3D \rightarrow 2D}$: baroclinic-to-barotropic forcing term Thermodynamically consistent description of kept frozen seawater via a Gibbs function (TEOS10) • Potential temperature θ is replaced by the conservative temperature $\Theta = h_0/c_n^0$. Mode splitting: fast surface gravity waves are integrated separately (under a

Acronym	website	Primary target application	horiz. grid	NH option
Croco	https://www.croco-ocean.org/	coastal	structured	Yes
FESOM	https://fesom.de/	global	unstructured	
GETM	https://getm.eu/	coastal	structured	Yes
Hycom	https://hycom.org/	global	structured	
ICON-0	https://www.mpimet.mpg.de/en/ science/models/icon-esm/icon-o/	global	unstructured	
MITgcm	http://mitgcm.org/	global	structured	Yes
MOM6	https://github.com/NOAA-GFDL/ MOM6-examples/wiki	global	structured	
MPAS-O	https://mpas-dev.github.io/	global	unstructured	
NEMO	https://www.nemo-ocean.eu/	global	structured	
Roms-Rutgers	https://www.myroms.org/	coastal	structured	
SCHISM	http://ccrm.vims.edu/schismweb/	coastal	unstructured	
Suntans		coastal	unstructured	Yes
Symphonie	http://sirocco.obs-mip.fr/ ocean-models/s-model/	coastal	structured	Yes
Thetis	http://thetisproject.org/	coastal	unstructured	

3 - Brief overview of some existing dynamical core

Model	Variables arrangement	Discretization technique	FE pair	Stabilization	Mesh	Mode splitting
FESOM	triangular B-grid	FV			Arbitrary	SPI
ICON-O	triangular C-grid	FE	modified $RT_0 - P_0$	No	Orthogonal	SPI
MPAS-O	hexagonal C-grid	FV			Orthogonal	SPE
SCHISM	triangles or quads	FE	$P_{1} - P_{1}^{NC}$	No	Arbitrary	No
Thetis	triangles or quads	FE	$P_1^{\rm DG} - P_1^{\rm DG}$	Roe	Orthogonal	SPI

4 - Some prospects for oceanic dynamical cores



Table





Inclusion of NH effects

1. Pseudo-compressible approach (Auclair et al., 2018) [Croco, SNH] 2. Incompressible pressure projection/correction approach {MITGcM, Suntans 3. Artificial compressibility method (ACM) (Lee et al., 2006) (Symphonie) 4. Diagnostic approach for NH pressure (Klingheil and Burchard, 2013) (GETM)





Variable resolution unstructured meshes (Courtesy of D. Engwirda)



A.L.E. vertical coordinates





5 - Challenges

- Challenges for unstructured meshes: High-order methods and Local time-stepping Energy consistency and resolved/unresolved scales coupling Discrete closing of the energy budget Design of energy-conserving space and time discretizations
- Control of energy, non-negativity and dry states for nonlinear scalar conservation laws
- Stable and consistent coupling with other Earth-system compartments

 Multi-resolution strategies with local adaptation of model equations



6 - Toward a "DCMIP-like" test-case suite



References

B Griffies, S., Adcroft, A., 2008, Formulating the Equations of ocean models, in: Hecht, M., Hasumi, H. (Eds.), Ocean Modeling in an Eddying Regime. AGU, USA. volume 177 of Geophysical Monograph Series, p. 350.

B IOC, SCOR and IAPSO, 2010. The international thermodynamic equation of seawater - 2010: Calculation and use of thermodynamic properties. Technical Report, Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, UNESCO.

B Klingbeil, K., Lemarié, F., Debreu, L., Burchard, H., 2018. The numerics of hydrostatic structured-grid coastal ocean models: State of the art and future perspectives. Ocean Modell. 125, 80 - 10

a Lemarié, F., Burchard, H., Debreu, L., Klingbeil, K., Sainte-Marie, J., 2019. Advancing dynamical cores of oceanic models across all scales, Bull, Amer, Meteorol, Soc. 100(3), ES109-ES115

COMMODORE

- Partners ?
 - INRIA
 - IPSL
 - UKMO
 - GFDL
 - AWE
 - MPI
 - ECMWF
 - ...
- Endorsed by WGNE ?
- Fast-track initiative ?
- Financial support for networking ?
- Summer school / Hackathon involving students ?



Hamburg: 28th-31st January 2020

Additional slides