



CSC

Elmer/Ice Updates: A high-resolution coupled permafrost model

Thomas Zwinger¹, Juha Hartikainen², Denis Cohen³, and Peter Råback¹

¹ CSC-IT Centre for Science, Espoo, Finland

- ² Tampere University of Technology, Tampere, Finland
- ³ New Mexico Tech, Socorro, NM, USA

CSC – Suomalainen tutkimuksen, koulutuksen, kulttuurin ja julkishallinnon ICTosaamiskeskus

Permafrost model



- Saturated porous medium that consists of skeleton of rock or soil, ice and groundwater of water and dissolved salts :
- 1. Heat transfer
- 2. Groundwater flow of saturated aquifer (Darcy)
- 3. Solute transport within groundwater
- 4. Deformation of bedrock (porosity)



Permafrost model





$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathrm{gw}}^{pp} \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_* \cdot \operatorname{grad} p \right) &+ \operatorname{div} \left(\varrho_{\mathrm{gw}} \boldsymbol{J}_{\mathrm{gw}}^{\mathrm{D}} \right) + C_{\mathrm{gw}}^{pT} \left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_* \cdot \operatorname{grad} T \right) + \\ &+ C_{\mathrm{gw}}^{py_{\mathrm{c}}} \left(\frac{\partial y_{\mathrm{c}}}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_* \cdot \operatorname{grad} y_{\mathrm{c}} \right) + \operatorname{div} \left[\eta \left(\varrho_{\mathrm{c}} - \varrho_{\mathrm{w}} \right) \boldsymbol{J}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{F}} \right] - C_{\mathrm{gw}}^{pI_{\mathrm{t}}} \left(\frac{\partial I_{\mathrm{1}}}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_* \cdot \operatorname{grad} I_{\mathrm{1}} \right) = S_{\mathrm{gw}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}} \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_{*} \cdot \operatorname{grad} \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}} \right) + \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}}{\chi} \varrho_{\mathrm{c}} \boldsymbol{J}_{\mathrm{gw}}^{\mathrm{D}} \right) + \operatorname{div} \left(\eta \varrho_{\mathrm{c}} \boldsymbol{J}_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathrm{F}} \right) + \\ &+ C_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}T} \left(\frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_{*} \cdot \operatorname{grad} T \right) + C_{\mathrm{c}}^{\mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{c}}p} \left(\frac{\partial p}{\partial t} + \boldsymbol{v}_{*} \cdot \operatorname{grad} p \right) = S_{\mathrm{c}} \end{aligned}$$

Permafrost Model

- Multiple bodies
- Different meshconcepts:
 - Ice-sheet: structured, layered mesh
 - Bedrock: unstructured, in places high-resolution mesh
 - Offset for displacement: Model for glacial isostatic adjustment (LLRA)





Ice-sheet advance











Elmer/Ice Updates: A versatile visco-elastic Earth deformation model

Thomas Zwinger¹, Juha Ruokolainen¹, Grace Nield^{2,3}, and Matt King³

¹ CSC-IT Centre for Science, Espoo, Finland, Europe
 ² Durham Univ., Durham, UK, (soon not) Europe
 ³ UTAS, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia

CSC – Suomalainen tutkimuksen, koulutuksen, kulttuurin ja julkishallinnon ICTosaamiskeskus

Maxwell rheology

- Standard FE linear elasticity: $\vec{\nabla} \cdot \overline{\vec{\tau}} = 0$,
- Elastic rheology: stress as a function of reversible deformation
- Visco-elastic: (partly non-reversible) deformation as a function of



By Pekaje at English Wikipedia - Transferred from en.wikipedia to Commons., Public Domain



Implementation into Elmer

- Introduction of visco-elastic stress (Wu 2004)
- $\partial_t \overline{\overline{\tau}} = \partial_t \overline{\overline{\tau}}^0 \frac{\mu}{\nu} (\overline{\overline{\tau}} \Pi \overline{\overline{I}}),$

$$\overline{\overline{\tau}}^0 = \lambda \theta \,\overline{\overline{I}} + 2\mu \overline{\overline{\varepsilon}},$$

- At the same time we introduce a pressure Π to enable incompressibility
- Additional term accounting for restoring force by specific weight gradient

$$\vec{\nabla} \cdot \overline{\overline{\tau}} - \rho_o g_o \vec{\nabla} w = 0,$$

- This is not standard in commercial FE packages, hence needs to be "cheated" around by putting jump-conditions on interlayer boundaries (Wrinkler foundations)
- In Elmer we can include this, which introduces the right boundary condition naturally over



GIA benchmark model



1.000++00

Layer	Layer top	Layer base	Thickness	Viscosity	Density	Young's	Poisson's	Gravitational
	(radius, km)	(radius, km)	(km)			Modulus	Ratio	Acceleration
Lithosphere	6371	6336	35	1x10^44	3196	1.8148E+11	0.4	9.7852
Lithosphere	6336	6301	35	1x10^44	3196	1.8148E+11	0.4	9.7852
Lithosphere	6301	6251	50	1x10^44	3196	1.8148E+11	0.4	9.7852
Upper Mantle	6251	6201	50	1x10^18	3439	2.1901E+11	0.4	9.8367
Upper Mantle	6201	6141	60	1x10^18	3439	2.1901E+11	0.4	9.8367
Upper Mantle	6141	5971	170	1x10^18	3420	2 10015 11	0.4	0 8367
Upper Mantle	5971	5835	136	1x10^18	38			<mark>349</mark>
Upper Mantle	5835	5701	134	1x10^18	38			<mark>349</mark>
Lower Mantle	5701	5450	251	1x10^22	4			799
Lower Mantle	5450	4770	680	1x10^22	4			799
Lower Mantle	4770	4340	430	1x10^22	50			L08
Lower Mantle	4340	3910	430	1x10^22	50			L08
Lower Mantle	3910	3480	430	1x10^22	50			108

GIA benchmark model

- Total width 4000km (2000km each side of the ice load centre)
- Depth surface to core (6371 – 3480km)
- Load:
 - Disc radius: 50km (dia 100km)
 - \circ Disc thickness: 100m
 - Ice density: 917 kg/m3
 - Loading 100 years, unloading 100 years



Vertical displacement ABAQUS - Elmer multilayer model

time [years]

CSC

Benchmark run: 100 km- diameter











Elmer/Ice Updates: A (even faster) scaling Stokes ice-flow solver

Elmer team + Intel (Intel Parallel Computing Center = IPCC) At UTAS: Chen Zhao for several MIPS

CSC – Suomalainen tutkimuksen, koulutuksen, kulttuurin ja julkishallinnon ICTosaamiskeskus

- New computer architectures use SIMD (=vector) units to do fast computations
- If you (on an Intel chip) don't utilize this, you a priori loose ³/₄ of your performance
- FEM: assembly = creating the matrix

solution = solving it

- Until recently, assembly procedures in Elmer did not utilize SIMD
- New Stokes solver does!
- It also recently go the block-preconditioner functionality to increase solution efficiency



By Vadikus - Own work, CC BY-SA 4.0, https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=3 9715273



```
lncompressibleNSVec.F90 - emacs
                                     0
               dBasisdxVec(1:ngp,1:ntot,i), dBasisdxVec(1:ngp,1:ntot,j), weight c, stif
ford(1:ntot,1:ntot,i,j))
П
         END DO
       END DO
     END IF
     IF (GradPVersion) THEN
       ! b(u,q) = (u, grad q) part
         DO i = 1, dim
         CALL LinearForms UdotV(ngp, ntot, elemdim, &
             BasisVec, dbasisdxvec(:,:,i), detJVec, stifford(:,:,i,dofs))
         StiffOrd(:,:,dofs,i) = transpose(stifford(:,:,i,dofs))
       END DO
     ELSE
       DO i = 1, dim
          CALL LinearForms UdotV(ngp, ntot, elemdim, &
             dBasisdxVec(:, :, i), BasisVec, -detJVec, StiffOrd(:,:,i,dofs))
         StiffOrd(:,:,dofs,i) = transpose(stifford(:,:,i,dofs))
       END DO
     END IF
     ! Masses (use symmetry)
     ! Compute bilinear form G=G+(alpha u, u) = u .dot. (grad u)
     IF ( .NOT. StokesFlow ) THEN
       CALL LinearForms UdotU(ngp, ntot, elemdim, BasisVec, DetJVec, VelocityMass, rhov ≥
Sec)
       ! Scatter to the usual local mass matrix
       DO i = 1, dim
         mass(i::dofs, i::dofs) = mass(i::dofs, i::dofs) + VelocityMass(1:ntot, 1:ntot)
       END DO
       !CALL LinearForms_UdotU(ngp, ntot, elemdim, BasisVec, DetJVec, PressureMass, -ka
sppavec)
       !mass(dofs::dofs, dofs::dofs) = mass(dofs::dofs, dofs::dofs) + PressureMass(1:nt)
sot,1:ntot)
U:--- IncompressibleNSVec.F90
                                  28% L370 Git-devel (F90 AC Abbrev)
```



- Solver works basically like legacy solver, except for the assembly being SIMD parallel
- Switch off Div-curl discretization (else we have wrogn natural BC's)
- You can (don't have to) use the library version of the blockpreconditioner
- Else, just use the iteration method of your choice
- ISMIP-HOM-C (solved with cPardiso in both cases) was about 1/3rd the solution time of a comparable legacy solver run





```
ISMIP-HOM-C_vec_BPC.sif - emacs
📄 🗁 🚍 🗙 🔚 🥱 🐰 🖬 🛗 🗬
  Outer: Linear System Convergence Tolerance = 1e-5
  $blocktol = 0.0001
  block 11: Linear System Convergence Tolerance = $blocktol
 block 11: Linear System Solver = "iterative"
  block 11: Linear System Preconditioning = ilu
  block 11: Linear System Residual Output = 500
  block 11: Linear System Max Iterations = 500
  block 11: Linear System Iterative Method = idrs
  block 22: Linear System Convergence Tolerance = $blocktol
  block 22: Linear System Solver = "iterative"
  block 22: Linear System Preconditioning = ilu
  block 22: Linear System Residual Output = 500
  block 22: Linear System Max Iterations = 500
  block 22: Linear System Iterative Method = idrs
block 33: Linear System Convergence Tolerance = $blocktol
 block 33: Linear System Solver = "iterative"
  block 33: Linear System Preconditioning = ilu
  block 33: Linear System Residual Output = 500
  block 33: Linear System Max Iterations = 500
  block 33: Linear System Iterative Method = idrs
  block 44: Linear System Convergence Tolerance = $blocktol
  block 44: Linear System Solver = "iterative"
  block 44: Linear System Preconditioning = ilu
  block 44: Linear System Residual Output = 500
 block 44: Linear System Max Iterations = 500
  block 44: Linear System Iterative Method = idrs
  Nonlinear System Convergence Tolerance = 1.0e-4
  Nonlinear System Newton After Iterations = 100
-:--- ISMIP-HOM-C vec BPC.sif 61% L186
                                           (Sif)
```

CSC

CSC

Comparison vectorised/legacy Solver using Intel VTune

HPC Performance Characterization HPC Performance Char 🗓 Summary 🛛 😪 Bottom-up Elapsed Time ⁽²⁾: 61.683s - 182.068s = -120.385s SP GFLOPS ⁽²⁾: 8.262 - 2.377 = 5.885 ○ CPU Utilization ²: 12.3% | 12.1% Average CPU Usage ⁽²⁾: 0.982 Out of 8 logical CPUs | 0.971 Out of 8 logical CPUs OPU Usage Histogram Memory Bound ⁽²⁾: 8.7% - 4.3% = 4.4% Cache Bound ⁽²⁾: 10.1% - 7.1% = 2.9% of Clockticks DRAM Bound⁽²⁾: 5.7% - 1.9% = 3.8% of Clockticks Bandwidth Utilization FPU Utilization ⁽²⁾: 7.4% - 2.0% = 5.3% SP FLOPs per Cycle 2: 2.360 Out of 32 | 0.654 Out of 32 Vector Capacity Usage ⁽²⁾: 73.0% - 35.7% = 37.3% FP Instruction Mix:
 % of 128-bit⁽²⁾: 0.2% - 19.4% = -19.2% % of 256-bit [®]: 63.9% - 7.7% = 56.2% % of Scalar FP Instr. (2): 35.9% - 72.8% = -37.0% FP Arith/Mem Rd Instr. Ratio 2: 0.496 - 0.290 = 0.207 FP Arith/Mem Wr Instr. Ratio 2: 2.404 - 0.959 = 1.445



Comparison vectorised/legacy Solver using Intel VTune

