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



Reproduced with permission





FLOW MIXING NOZZLE

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



Physical Problem Characteristics



Clad (Zr)



 $r_{f} = 0.406 \text{ cm}$ $r_{g} = 0.414 \text{ cm}$ $r_{c} = 0.475 \text{ cm}$

Gap (He)

Pin pitch = 1.26 cmAssembly pitch = 21.5 cmHeight = 227.56 cmFuel (UO₂)

Problem Parameters

- Core Characteristics
 - Full core representative SMR model containing 37 assemblies with 17×17 pins per assembly and 264 fuels pins per assembly
 - 10¹⁰ 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 transport solver on 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
- Algorithmic improvements offer 10x speedup relative to initial implementation and nearly 60x per-node speedup over Titan
- 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. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anucene.2019.01.012</u>



Increase in particle tracking rate across GPU computing architectures



Total reaction rate in SMR core



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



MC type	Algorithm	Registers	Occupancy
Multigroup	History-based Event-based	85 83	25% 25%
Continuous-Energy	is-Energy History-based Event-based		12.5% 50%





Effect of varying occupancy

• Artificially limit occupancy by allocating shared memory

- kernel<<<grids, blocks, shared_mem>>>(...)

	Algorithm		
Occupancy (%)	History-based	Event-based	Flattened event-based
12.5	3.7	3.4	8.2
25.0	-	5.8	13.3
37.5	-	-	14.5
50.0	-	-	16.9
62.5*	-	-	18.0
62.5*	-		18.0

*Only applied to "distance to collision kernel"



CPU v GPU performance

CPU tracking rate per core

160 160 Tracking rate per core (neutrons/s) 140 CPU core equivalent per GPU 120 100 80 60 40 20 20 0 0 Titan SummitDev Summit SummitDev Emmet Titan Emmet Summit Computing system Computing system

GPU core equivalent

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):

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

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

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



GPU Performance

 10^{7}

10⁶

 10^{5}

10'

 10^{3}

 10^{2}

10

 10^{-2}

10⁻³

10⁻⁴∟ 10¹

Section (b)

Cross 10 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



Questions?

