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Problem Definition

- CFD simulation of complex problems (moving and deforming multiple bodies) require overset meshes
- Overset Grid Assembly method required to identify point types (solver, receptor, hole)
- Many existing OGA codes: PEGASUS5, SUGGAR++/DiRTlib, CHIMPS, OVERFLOW with varying capabilities
- OGA method should be accurate, efficient and scalable, and fully automated.
- Two main challenges for partitioned unstructured meshes and unstructured dual-mesh systems
  - complex geometry of partition boundaries
  - **robustness problems** for the point-localization
  - Inherent load imbalance (large variation in the types of mesh-block overlap)
  - **poor efficiency and scalability**
Development history:
• Begin development in early 2008 as part of the HPC Institute for Advanced Rotorcraft Modeling and Simulation (HIARMS)
• First production version in Q4 2008
• Integral part of CREATE A/V Helios (rotary-wing tool) from 2009
• Integral part of CREATE A/V Kestrel (fixed-wing tool) from 2010

Capabilities:
• Based on implicit hole cutting
• Fully parallel and highly automated (no user input)
• Support for node-centered/cell-centered interpolation
• Support for adaptive Cartesian grids
• In production for last 5 years (1000+ different large scale simulations)
• Robust search algorithms
• Improved efficiency and scalability
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Three journal articles and 8 conference papers


This presentation is a synopsis of all of the above with focus on the last journal article.
Partition boundary problem

Unstructured Mesh-Block Partition

OGA core task = DONOR SEARCH: find cell(s) containing a point

Line-walk search algo:
Move from cell to cell along a line using cell connectivity

Complex geometry of partition boundary

Multiple exit/re-entry possible

Robustness issue
Load imbalance problem

HART-II unstructured mesh system:
1 fuselage, 4 blades, 260 mesh-blocks
Point Types Definition

Overlapping mesh system:

OGA procedure attempts to find donor cells for all mesh points (query points)

Donors are selected if they have better resolution capacity

Resolution capacity:
Heuristic parameter that quantifies solution quality
(Cell volume is used now for donor cells and averaged cell volume for grid nodes)
Point Types: hole points

Hole points:

Mesh points that are inside a solid wall
Point Types: receptor points

Receptor Points:
Mesh points that could find donor cells of better resolution capacity
flow solution will be interpolated to these points

Some points are mandatory receptors:
- Neighbors of hole points
- Neighbors of outer boundary
Point Types: Field Point

Field points:

Mesh points were flow variables are being solved

Point where resolution is best, and which is neither hole point nor mandatory receptor.

Automated procedure to identify point type

→ minimal mesh overlap
Staged execution

Automated off-body mesh

Off Near-body and
generated off-body grids
and (fringes and holes
after blanked out)
connectivity)
connectivity)
Overview of Presentation

1. Point Localization methods
   - EIM (Exact Inverse Maps): uses Cartesian auxiliary grids and inverse maps
     - ADT (Alternating Digital Tree): uses binary tree

2. Load re-balance Algorithm

3. Results
   - Timing and accuracy comparison between EIM and ADT (HART-II)
   - Scalability comparison with and without load re-balance (HART-II and WPS)
   - UH-60 forward flight CFD/CSD coupling
Overview of OGA method

**Hole profiling**
Create approximate representation of each solid body

**Query Point Identification**
For each mesh-block, list of points (from other MB) with potential overlap = QP

**Mesh-block profiling**
Pre-process mesh-block

**Donor search**
Identify donor cells for each QP

**Point type assignment**
Determine type of each query point (hole, receptor, of field point)

**Interpolation**
For receptor points, compute interpolation weights

**EIM:**
- Create Auxiliary grids and exact inverse maps
- Line-walk search algo, constrained to small volume.

**ADT:**
- Cells organized in binary tree
- Exhaustive search on reduced set of potential donor cells
Hole Profiling

Goal: Create approximate representation of each solid body using a Cartesian auxiliary grid to facilitate identification of hole points after donor search step:

Hole points are points in approximate hole representation AND with no donor from hole mesh

(true only if approximate hole representation is close enough to the actual body wall: does not include any face of the outer mesh boundary).

Example: approximate representation of aircraft hole:

Cartesian auxiliary grid (AG):
- Bounding box of aircraft
- Equal size cells (sub-blocks)

Sub-blocks with potential wall face overlap

Advantage of Cartesian AG:
- Compact representation
- Very efficient identification of containing sub-block
Hole Profiling: step 1

Find bounding box of wall faces (gather info from all processors)

Partitioned mesh

Local wall bounding boxes

Outer boundary

Hole Bounding Box
Create auxiliary grid, refine until no hole sub-block contains any outer face.
Perform flood-fill to identify all hole sub-blocks

Hole (inner) sub-blocks

Outer layer of sub-blocks tagged as OUT (seeds of flood-fill algorithm)

Query point in hole SB AND no donor in hole mesh → HOLE POINT

Query point in hole SB, but donor cell exists in hole mesh → Not a Hole Point
Query Point Identification

For each mesh-block, find query points: points in region of potential overlap (for which donor cells need to be searched) → important to minimize number of QP

Use a combination of:
- oriented bounding box (OBB) overlap check and
- Cartesian auxiliary grids superimposed on each Mesh-block (non-empty sub-blocks tagged)

to obtain set of query points as small as possible
Query Point Identification

Only cells overlapping Query Points need to be pre-processed in next step (Mesh-Block profiling):

Oriented Bounding Box of Mesh-Block: OBB 1

Oriented Bounding Box of query points: OBB 2

Mesh-block cells overlapping OBB 2

OBB = outer bounds of Auxiliary Grid
Mesh-Block Profiling (EIM)

Create Cartesian Auxiliary Grid around cells and identify, for each sub-block, at least a cell point:
- cell centers whenever possible
- any cell point otherwise

This point will serve as the starting point of the line search during donor search

Exact Inverse Map:
only sub-blocks with no overlap with mesh-block cells do not store any point.

Another map is also created to store, for each sub-block, all boundary faces contained (based on BB overlap)

Sub-block size determines efficiency of algorithm.
From empirical order analysis, near-optimal rule is:

$$ N_{SB} = 0.1 N_p^{0.4} N_c^{0.6} $$
Donor Search (EIM)

Problem: identify containing mesh-block cell for each Query Point

Line-walk search algorithm:
Form a line from starting point to query point (inside known cell), walk from cell to cell along that line until line does not intersect any cell face (donor found) or a boundary face is crossed (QP possibly out, but must check for re-entry)

Cell centers in sub-block of QP
No cell centers in sub-block of QP

Both start point and query point are in a single sub-block of the AG
→ Entire line-search constrained to sub-block: easier to check for re-entry
Donor Search (EIM)

If the search-line crosses a boundary face, check other boundary faces in the sub-block for possible re-entry:
New intersection closest to QP: face normal points in same or different direction as search vector?

- Same $\rightarrow$ no donor exists
- Different $\rightarrow$ a donor cell exists, search can resume from this cell.

Robustness issues:
- Tolerance for determining face crossing
- Interpolation weight check
- Moving search-line if too close to vertex/edge /face
Point Type Assignment

1. IDENTIFY HOLE POINTS

2. IDENTIFY FIELD/RECEPTOR POINTS

3. RESOLVE POINT TYPE CONFLICTS

- Field Point
- Receptor Point
- Mandatory Receptor Point

Donor cells should not have any node of “Receptor Point” type
Interpolation

Receptor points: interpolation weights computed using Newton-Raphson procedure.

Supported cell types:

- tetrahedron
- pyramid
- prism
- hexahedron
Load imbalance problem

HART-II unstructured mesh system:
1 fuselage, 4 blades, 260 mesh-blocks
Load imbalance problem

Task Duration (s)

Processor ID (256 procs)

Partition 94 (bottleneck)

Blade mesh-blocks

Sectional view
Load Re-balance Algorithm

Simple load re-balancing:

✓ Load per processor estimated: total OGA time
target load = load average

✓ Most loaded processor donates to least loaded processor,
until all are within 20% of target load

✓ Load assumed prop. to number of QP: if P1 needs to transfer
x% of its load, it transfers x% of its Query Points.
Load Re-balance Algorithm

✅ QP to transfer are chosen by dividing overloaded mesh-block in the longest direction and using a Cartesian auxiliary grid to efficiently identify the required number of QP

✅ Along with QP, overlapping cells information is also transferred. Currently, ADT method is used to perform load rebalance (less data required)
Adaptive Load Re-balance

- After initial load re-balance, load distribution still inadequate:
  - Duration of new communication tasks not accounted for
  - Assumption of load prop to nQP inaccurate

- Adaptive load re-balance: use current load measurements to correct previous load transfer matrices

Diagram:

\[
\begin{align*}
&P_i \quad \text{Transfers} \quad \text{Load to} \quad P_j \\
&P_i, \text{Previously donor} \quad &\quad P_j, \text{Previously receptor}
\end{align*}
\]
After initial load re-balance, load distribution still inadequate:
• Duration of new communication and partitioning tasks not accounted
• Assumption of load prop to nQP inaccurate

Adaptive load re-balance: use current load measurements to correct previous load transfer matrices, include cost of new operations
Adaptive Load Re-balance

✓ After initial load re-balance, load distribution still inadequate:
  • Duration of new communication tasks not accounted for
  • Assumption of load prop to nQP inaccurate

✓ Adaptive load re-balance: use current load measurements to correct previous load transfer matrices

\[ P_i \xrightarrow{\text{Transfers}} P_j \]

Previously donor \hspace{2cm} Previously donor
Adaptive Load Re-balance

✓ After initial load re-balance, load distribution still inadequate:
  • Duration of new communication tasks not accounted for
  • Assumption of load prop to nQP inaccurate

✓ Adaptive load re-balance: use current load measurements to correct previous load transfer matrices
HART-II case

256 processors
1 fuselage, 4 blades
7 million nodes
Detail of Blade/Fuselage overlap
HART-II case: OGA results

Before:

Same point types identified for ADT and EIM methods

After:

Mesh with best resolution selected automatically → minimal overlap
Timing comparison EIM / ADT

- EIM
  - Task Duration (s)
  - Processor ID
  - 7% 1.3 sec.
  - 93% 16.3 sec.
  - Interp
  - Comm
  - SRCH
  - MBP
  - HP

- ADT
  - Task Duration (s)
  - Processor ID
  - 14% 2.6 sec.
  - 86% 16.3 sec.
  - OGA
  - OBS
Load re-balance Results

![Graphs showing load re-balance results for iterations 1, 2, and 3. The graphs display task duration against processor ID for each iteration. The bar chart on the right shows total time for each iteration, with 1 iteration at 2.1 seconds, 2 iterations at 0.7 seconds, and 3 iterations at 0.5 seconds.]

- **Iteration 1**: Graph showing task duration against processor ID for the first iteration.
- **Iteration 2**: Graph showing task duration against processor ID for the second iteration.
- **Iteration 3**: Graph showing task duration against processor ID for the third iteration.

**Legend**:
- **compute load re-balance**: Pink line
- **update donor cells**: Black line
- **donor search (rcvd data)**: Cyan line
- **find data to transfer**: Yellow line
- **donor search**: Red line
- **mesh-block profiling**: Blue line

**Bar Chart**:
- Total time (s)
  - Iteration 1: 2.1 seconds
  - Iteration 2: 0.7 seconds
  - Iteration 3: 0.5 seconds
WPS case:

3 unstructured meshes
(1 wing, 2 stores)

15 million cells
Detail of pylon/store overlap
Scalability Results: WPS

- Left graph: Total time (s) vs. Number of processors
  - Blue line: Before load re-balance
  - Red line: After load re-balance

- Right graph: Speed-up vs. Number of processors
  - Blue line: Before load re-balance
  - Red line: After load re-balance
Scaling to large number of cores

HART-II with 80 million nodes and ~ 320 million cells

At 8192 cores overset grid assembly takes more time than solver time (136%) without load-balancing. With load-balancing this overhead is reduced to a manageable (20%).

However, OGA is still not linearly scalable
UH-60A CFD/CSD coupling

256 core simulation

Overcast Grid Assembly time (seconds)

Time Steps
Predicted Aerodynamic loading

Overset grid assembly time reduced by an order of magnitude with the same end result in prediction.

Increased throughput
Conclusions and Outlook

• Exact Inverse Map method to perform OGA on partitioned unstructured meshes in parallel:
  • method uses Cartesian auxiliary grids to build exact inverse maps to speed up donor search (line-walk search)
  • Method shown to be robust and accurate by comparing with ADT method, while at the same time more efficient than ADT (x 2 for HART-II case)
• Designed an adaptive load re-balance algorithm to tackle the large load imbalance:
  • improved efficiency (total time reduced by 76% for HART-II) and scalability (speed-up increased from 117 to 213 using 256 processor for the WPS case)
  • Showed improvement in execution time on up to 8192 cores
Future Work and Acknowledgements

• Explore further improvements in efficiency:
  
  ✓ Extend load re-balance algorithm for improving scalability further

• High-order and conservative overset grid assembly in parallel
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