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Why HPC \( \Rightarrow \) Time to Solution

- Why is this important?
  - More Science Can Get Done
  - More Breakthroughs
  - More Publications
  - More Realistic Models
  - More Understanding
  - End Member Simulations
  - Time Sensitive Decisions
GEOPHYSICAL IMAGING

• Seismic
  – 3D Reverse Time Migration
    • Large Scale Computations: 1,000s Cores, Weeks of Processing
  – 3D Elastic and Acoustic Full Waveform Inversion
    • Iterative reverse time migration
    • Promises Much Greater Image Fidelity
    • Formidable Numerical Issues – Local Minima, Very Good Starting Models Required
    • Frontier Research Area
    • Enormous Computation: 10,000’s Cores, Months of Processing

• Electromagnetic (CSEM & MT)
  – 3D Full Waveform Inversion
    • Provides information on non-seismic attributes
    • Complements seismic imaging – through lower resolution
    • Constrained by seismic imaging
    • Computational demands also big: 1,000s to 10,000s cores

• Joint Seismic-Electromagnetic Imaging
  – The Holy Grail?
    • Frontier Research Area
    • Grand Challenge Problem
Wave Equations for Geophysical Simulation and Imaging

Acoustic Waves

Time Domain

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{v^2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2} - \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) \right] p(x, y, z, t) = s(t).
\]

Frequency Domain

\[
\left[ \frac{\omega^2}{v^2} - \left( \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} \right) \right] p(x, y, z, \omega) = s(\omega).
\]

Electromagnetic Waves

\[
\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{E}_s + i \omega \mu \sigma \mathbf{E}_s = \mathbf{S}.
\]

Discretization Methods: Finite Differences, Finite Elements
Elastic Wave Field Simulation

First-order system for velocity–stress components

Laplace-Fourier Domain

\[ s \rho v_x = \text{div}\left(\frac{\tau_x}{\rho}\right) + f_x, \quad \tau_x = (\tau_{xx}, \tau_{xy}, \tau_{xz}); \]
\[ s \rho v_y = \text{div}\left(\frac{\tau_y}{\rho}\right) + f_y, \quad \tau_y = (\tau_{xy}, \tau_{yy}, \tau_{yz}); \]
\[ s \rho v_z = \text{div}\left(\frac{\tau_z}{\rho}\right) + f_z, \quad \tau_z = (\tau_{xz}, \tau_{yz}, \tau_{zz}); \]
\[ s \tau_{xy} = \mu \left( \partial_y v_x + \partial_x v_y \right); \]
\[ s \tau_{xz} = \mu \left( \partial_z v_x + \partial_x v_z \right); \]
\[ s \tau_{yz} = \mu \left( \partial_z v_y + \partial_y v_z \right); \]
\[ s \tau_{xx} = \lambda \text{div}\left(\nu\right) + 2\mu \partial_x v_x; \]
\[ s \tau_{yy} = \lambda \text{div}\left(\nu\right) + 2\mu \partial_y v_y; \]
\[ s \tau_{zz} = \lambda \text{div}\left(\nu\right) + 2\mu \partial_z v_z. \]

\[ \mathbf{M} = \begin{pmatrix} M_{xx} & M_{xy} & M_{xz} \\ M_{yx} & M_{yy} & M_{yz} \\ M_{zx} & M_{zy} & M_{zz} \end{pmatrix} \]

Forces \( f_{x,y,z} \) are defined via \( \nabla \cdot \mathbf{M} \)

Moment-Tensor components (R. Graves 1996)
LARGE-SCALE MODELING & IMAGING CONSIDERATIONS

• Require Large-Scale Complex Modeling and Imaging Solutions
  – 10’s of million’s field unknowns (fwd problem; Maxwell’s & Poisson’s, acoustic and elastic field wave equations)
    • Solved with finite difference approximations & iterative Krylov solvers
  – Imaging grids 400 nodes on a side
    • Exploit gradient optimization & implicit Gauss-Newton schemes, adjoint state methods

• Parallel Implementation
  – Domain Decomposition Techniques, MPI Interconnect fabric
  – Two levels of parallelization
    • Model Space (simulation and inversion mesh)
    • Data Space (each transmitter/frequency - receiver set fwd calculation independent)
    • Installed & tested on multiple distributed computing systems; 10 – 30,000 Processors

• Above procedure satisfactory except for very largest problems
  – To treat such problems requires a higher level of efficiency

• Optimal Grids
  – Separate inversion grid from the simulation/modeling grid
  – Effect: A huge increase in computational efficiency ~ can be orders of magnitude
HPC MODELING & INVERSE MODELING

• FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS
  – Sometimes Smaller Model Parameterizations Encountered
    • Induction logging, but still 1000’s of fwd solves needed for imaging
    • Stochastic imaging

• Parallel Implementation Considerations
  – Will the application scale with processors employed => 10’s to 10,000’s ?
    • Reduction in time to solution
    • Efficient exploitation of resources
    • Shows capability to attack large scale problems that cannot be solved otherwise
Solver Selection

- Choice depends on problem:
  - Direct Solvers
    - Multiple Right Hand Side Solutions
    - Robust with Respect to Mesh Design
    - Requires Matrix Factorization – expensive and time consuming for large meshes
    - Parts of the solver solution inherently non-parallel (triangular forward and back solves)
    - Parallel Solvers: MUMPS, SUPER LU, PARDISO
  - Iterative Solvers
    - Single Right Hand Side Solution
    - Sensitive to Mesh Design – Preconditioning Required
    - Highly Efficient Solution Process for Large Meshes
    - Parallel Krylov Solvers: Your Own, PETSE and TRILINOS Libraries
    - Algebraic Muligrid and Preconditions
Some HPC Applications

• Resistivity Mapping of Hydrocarbons
• End Member Solutions (SEAMS Resistivity Model)
• Geothermal Resource Evaluation
• Joint EM & Seismic Imaging
• 3D Elastic Wave-Field Simulation & Imaging
Marine CSEM & MT Surveying

CSEM
- Deep-towed Electric Dipole transmitter
  - ~ 100 Amps
  - Water Depth 1 to 7 km
  - Alternating current 0.01 to 3 Hz
  - ‘Flies’ 50 m above the sea floor
  - Profiles 10’s of km in length
  - Excites vertical & horizontal currents
  - Depth of interrogation ~ 3 to 4 km
  - Sensitive to thin resistive beds

MT
- Natural Source Fields
  - Less than 0.1 Hz
  - Measured with CSEM detectors
  - Sensitive to horizontal currents
  - Depth of interrogation 10’s km
  - Resolution is frequency dependent
  - Sensitive to larger scale geology
Campos Basin CSEM Survey
Offshore Brazil

- Study: CSEM Imaging in the presence of electrical anisotropy
- Field Data: 23 detectors, 10 sail lines, 3 frequencies @ 1.25, 0.75, 1.25 Hz
- Image Processing: ~ 1 million data points, 27 million image cells
- Processing Times: 24 hours, 32,768 tasks, IBM Blue Gene (BG/L)
- Conclusions: data cannot be fit using isotropic model, anisotropic model required

Survey layout
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Isotropic model

Anisotropic model
3D CSEM Resistivity Imaging

Offshore Brazil

Integrated vertical resistivity map
500 to 2500 m below seafloor

Vertical resistivity cross section
A is known oil field, B ?, C is brine
The Marmousi Model

Imaging results for shear velocity

• Exact model

• Inverted model (3,5,6 Hz)
Measuring HPC Performance
Parallel scaling of the Elastic simulator

\[ S = \frac{T_1(n)}{T_p(n)} \leq p, \]

where \( p \) = “ideal speedup”,

\( T_1(n), T_p(n) \)

are the times for running a problem of size \( n \) on 1 and \( p \) processors.

Scaling curves for a fixed-size (588x588x261) problem run on Cray XT4 – NERSC Franklin System
Geophysical Simulations on GPUs

Main challenge:
Manage memory access in most efficient way
Iterative Krylov Solver Performance Tests

Typically used for EM problems:

CG, BiCG, QMR
Computing times for 1000 Krylov solver iterations

- **a) CG, real double precision**
- **b) CG, memory bandwidth**
- **c) BiCG, complex double precision**
- **d) BiCG, memory bandwidth**
- **e) QMR, complex double precision**
- **f) QMR, memory bandwidth**
GPU/CPU-MPI Comparisons

• For Largest Problems Tested:
  – 1 GPU (448 processor cores)
    • Equivalent to 23 CPU’s for CG iteration (DC & IP Problems)
    • Equivalent to 19 QMR and BiCG iterations (EM and MT)

• GPU’s Impressive, but not good enough for now.
  – Marine CSEM and MT Imaging (Production)
    • Use routinely 64 to 512 CPU cores per fwd solve
    • What about multiple GPU’s with MPI (too slow for now)
  – Elastic Wave field modeling and Imaging
    • Similar performance comparisons are expected
Current HPC Usage

• Machines currently using Hopper and Edison at NERSC

• Hours used in 2012-2013 is now approaching 16M

• Biggest Jobs > 5000 to 20,000 compute cores

• Run times per job 24 to 36 hours

• Data read/written per run: approximately 16 to 160 Gigabytes of data written to scratch mostly for check pointing.

• Maximum Memory used per (node 16 Gbytes | core 0.5 Gbytes | globally 2.5 to 5 Terrabytes)

• Necessary software, services or infrastructure: Fortan 90, 95, C, C++, MPI, Cuda
HPC Requirements for 2017

- Science goals: solve problems approaching $10^9$ grid nodes; elastic wave field simulation and imaging, joint imaging experiments, treat larger data volumes

- Compute hours needed (in units of Hopper hours) > 30M

- Faster Solvers: massively parallel algebraic Multigrid, designed specifically from complex and complex-symmetric linear Systems.

- Changes to memory needed per (2-4x core | 2-4x node | 2-4x globally)

- Changes to necessary software, services or infrastructure: hybrid computing systems are coming (multi-core GPU-CPU-MPI interconnects)

- Legacy Software: porting to such hybrid machines will be an issue