Monte Carlo neutron transport in the ECP *Coupled Monte Carlo Neutronics and Fluid Flow Simulation of Small Modular Reactor* (ExaSMR) project

Thomas M. Evans and Steven Hamilton, Oak Ridge National Laboratory

Geant4 R&D Task Force Meeting

April 14, 2020

ExaSMR: Modeling and Simulation of Small Modular Reactors

- Small modular nuclear reactors present significant simulation challenges
	- Small size invalidates existing low-order models
	- Natural circulation flow requires high-fidelity fluid flow simulation
- ExaSMR will couple most accurate available methods to perform "virtual experiment" simulations
	- Monte Carlo neutronics
	- Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) with turbulence models **models**

Fuel assembly mixing vane

Transport computational toolkit

- Exnihilo transport toolkit
	- C++(11/14)/Python/CUDA
	- ~280k lines executable
	- >600k lines including unit-test code
	- 60k lines Python
	- 15k lines in CUDA units (.cu)
- Shift Monte Carlo neutral particle transport
- Denovo deterministic solvers
- Hybrid fixed-source (CADIS/FW-CADIS)
- Multiple geometries
	- SCALE solid body general geometry (GG)
	- Reactor ToolKit (RTK)
	- MCNP
	- DagMC-CUBIT CAD
- Physics
	- Multigroup
	- Continuous-energy (CE) tabular
	- Temperature-dependent CE

High Flux Isotope Reactor **HFIR**

Model of JET facility

3

Physical Problem Characteristics

Clad (Zr) Gap (He)

 $r_f = 0.406$ cm $r_q = 0.414$ cm $r_c = 0.475$ cm

Pin pitch $= 1.26$ cm Assembly pitch $= 21.5$ cm Height = 227.56 cm Fuel $(UD₂)$

Problem Parameters

- Core Characteristics
	- Full core representative SMR model containing 37 assemblies with 17×17 pins per assembly and 264 fuels pins per assembly
	- -10^{10} particles per eigenvalue iteration
	- Pin-resolved reaction rate with 3 radial tally regions and 50 – 100 axial levels
	- O(150) nuclides and O(8) reactions per nuclide in each tally region
- Geometry Size
	- $N_{cells} = 1.9 \times 10^6 8.8 \times 10^6$
- Tally Sizes
	- $N_{t, cells} = 4.8 \times 10^5 5.9 \times 10^6$
	- $N_{t,bins} = 1.5 \times 10^9 1.8 \times 10^{10}$

Monte Carlo Neutron Transport Challenges

- MC neutronics is a stochastic method
	- Independent random walks are not readily amenable to SIMT algorithms – on-node concurrency
	- Sampling data is randomly accessed
	- Sampling data is characterized by detailed structure
	- Large variability in transport distributions both within and between particle histories

Developing GPU Continuous Energy Monte Carlo – Intra-Node

- Focus on high-level thread divergence
- Optimize for device **occupancy**
	- Separate geometry and physics kernels to increase occupancy
	- Boundary crossings (geometry)
	- Collision (physics)
- Smaller kernels help address variability in particle transport distributions
- Partition macro cross section calculations between fuel and non-fuel regions – separate kernels for each
- Use of hardware atomics for tallies and direct sort addressing
- Judicious use of *texture* memory
	- ldg on data interpolation bounds

Simple Event-Based Transport Algorithm

```
get vector of source particles
while any particles are alive do
  for each living particle do
    move particle
      dist-to-collision
      dist-to-boundary
      move-to-next
  end for
  for each living particle do
    process particle collision
  end for
  source particles
  sort/consolidate surviving particles
end while
```


Production continuous-energy Monte Carlo GPUs

- Petascale implementation did not use GPU hardware
- Enables three-dimensional, fully-depleted SMR core models simulated using continuous-energy physics and pin-resolved reaction rates with temperature-dependence
- A[lgorithmic improvements offer 1](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2019.01.012)0x speedup relative to initial implementation and nearly 60x per-node speedup over Titan

Increas

- Nearly perfect parallel scaling efficiency on ORNL's Summit supercomputer
- GPU algorithm executes more than 20x faster than CPU algorithm on Summit (per full node)
- Paper describes first production MC solver implementation on GPUs

Hamilton, S.P., Evans, T.M., 2019. Continuous-energy Monte Carlo neutron transport on GPUs in the Shift code. *Annals of Nuclear Energy* **128**, 236– 247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2019.01.012

Cross section calculations

• Computing transport cross sections requires contributions from various constituents

 $\Sigma(E) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} N_m \sigma_m(E)$

- Fuel compositions contain substantially more nuclides than non-fuel
- Partition mixtures into fuel and non-fuel
	- Evaluate cross sections in separate kernels to reduce divergence

GPU Device Occupancy

- Flattened algorithm allows small, focused kernels
	- Split geometry/physics components to reduce register usage
	- Smaller kernels = higher occupancy $-$ Smaller $\text{ker}\left(\mathbf{H} \right)$

Effect of varying occupancy

• Artificially limit occupancy by allocating shared memory

– *kernel*<<<grids, blocks, shared_mem>>>(…)

❊Only applied to "distance to collision kernel"

CPU v GPU performance

GPU performance increases have outpaced corresponding CPU improvements

Device saturation

Newest architectures remain unsaturated at 1M particles per GPU

Depleted SMR core

Inter-node Scaling

Domain decomposition fits cleanly in event algorithm

Investigating MPI-aware CUDA

- Communication device-to-device (bypass NIC)
- Does not currently give same performance as manually moving data
- Next-gen platforms will optimize device-to-device

On -the -Fly Doppler Broadening

- Cross section resonances significantly broaden due to thermal motion of nuclei
- The cross section (σ) at any energy (E) and temperature (T) can be expressed as a summation over contributions from poles (p_i) and corresponding residues (r_i) :

$$
\sigma(E,T) = \frac{1}{E} \sqrt{\frac{A\pi}{k_B T} \sum_j \Re \left[r_j W \left((\sqrt{E} - p_j) \sqrt{A/k_B T} \right) \right]}
$$

• A polynomial approximation can be used to reduce the number of $W(\cdot)$ evaluations

$$
\sigma(E,T) = \frac{1}{E} \sqrt{\frac{A\pi}{k_B T} \sum_j \Re \left[r_j W \left((\sqrt{E} - p_j) \sqrt{A/k_B T} \right) \right]} + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} a_{w,n} \mathfrak{D}_n
$$

GPU Performance

 $10⁷$

 10^6

 $10⁵$

 10^{\prime}

 $10³$

 10^2

 10^1

 10^{-2} 10^{-3}

 10^{-4} 10^{1}

Section (b)

Cross $10⁰$ 10^{-1}

- Performance testing with a quarter-core model of the awaited NuScale Small Modular Reactor (SMR)
- No significant sacrifice of accuracy compared to standard continuous energy (CE) data
- Each GPU thread does individual Fadeeva evaluations (no vectorization over nuclides)
- Factor of 2-3 performance penalty on both the CPU and GPU using Pole Method for Doppler Broadening

U-238 Total Cross Section, $T = 300$ K

 10^{2}

Energy (eV)

Relative Error, Shift, Pole Data

CE data

 $10¹$

 $10⁶$

 $10⁵$

 $10⁴$

10°
10⁻¹ deli
10⁻² del

 10^3

Questions?

Ø.

011001