

#### Efficient Parallelization Strategy of STREAM for Three-dimensional Whole-core Neutron Transport Calculation

Sooyoung Choi and Deokjung Lee<sup>\*</sup>

Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology (UNIST)



Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology Address 50 UNIST-gil, Ulju-gun, Ulsan, 44919, Korea Tel. +82 52 217 0114 Web. www.unist.ac.kr Computational Reactor physics & Experiment lab Tel. +82 52 217 2940 Web, reactorcore.unist.ac.kr

- I. Introduction
- **II. Methodology**
- **III. Numerical results**
- **IV. Conclusions & Future work**



### Introduction

#### Neutron Transport Analysis Code STREAM

- Features and methodologies
  - 2D & 3D transport calculations
  - Hybrid MPI/OPENMP parallelization
  - Resonance self-shielding using PSM
  - Depletion calculation
  - On-the-fly energy release model
  - Sub-channel T/H feedback
  - Automatic thermal expansion
  - Few-group constant generation
  - CBC search, Equilibrium-Xe feedback
  - 6 symmetric modeling options
  - Source term calculation

#### Applications

- PWR fuel pin / assembly / whole core analyses
- STREAM/RAST-K 2-step procedure
- UO<sub>2</sub>, gadolinia, MOX and R-BA fuel analyses
- Spent fuel analysis



- 2D/3D Method in STREAM
  - Method of Characteristics (MOC) + discontinuous Galerkin (DG) method
  - Flux & source approximations
    - Combination of radial and axial components

$$\hat{\Phi}^{g}_{i,j,k}(s,z) \approx \sum_{n} \psi^{g}_{i,j,k,n}(s) b_{n}(z) \qquad \phi^{g}_{m} \approx \sum_{n} \phi^{g}_{m,n} b_{n}(z) \qquad \hat{Q}^{g}_{i,j,m} \approx \sum_{n} Q^{g}_{i,j,m,n} b_{n}(z)$$

- Linear polynomial function for axial flux representation
- 3D transport equation with approximated variables

$$\Omega \cdot \nabla \hat{\Phi}_{i,j,k}^g(s,z) + \Sigma_{tr,m}^g \hat{\Phi}_{i,j,k}^g(s,z) = \hat{Q}_{i,j,m}^g$$

- By using orthogonal properties and integrating over discretized axial domain,

$$\cos \overline{\theta}_{j} \frac{d\psi_{i,j,k,n}^{g}(s)}{ds} + \widetilde{\Sigma}_{tr,m,n}^{g} \psi_{i,j,k,n}^{g}(s) = S_{i,j,m,n}^{g}$$

$$\widetilde{\Sigma}_{tr,m,1}^{g} = \Sigma_{tr,m}^{g} + \frac{2\sin \overline{\theta}_{j}}{\Delta z} \begin{cases} S_{i,j,m,1}^{g} = Q_{i,j,m,1}^{g} + \frac{2\sin \overline{\theta}_{j}}{\Delta z} \hat{\Phi}_{i,j,m}^{g,\mp} \\ S_{i,j,m,2}^{g} = \Sigma_{tr,m}^{g} \end{cases}$$

> where

#### D/3D Method in STREAM

- Pros
  - **1. Similar formula as a conventional 2D MOC**  $\cos \overline{\theta}_j \frac{d\psi_{i,j,k,n}^g(s)}{ds} + \tilde{\Sigma}_{tr,m,n}^g \psi_{i,j,k,n}^g(s) = S_{i,j,m,n}^g$ 
    - > Easy to implement 3D solver
  - 2. Implicit evaluation of second order flux
    - > Reduced # of operations
    - $\,\,$  > PROTEUS-MOC solves  $1^{st}$  and  $2^{nd}$  order fluxes by using matrix form
  - 3. Stable convergence behavior
    - > 2D/1D method has stability issue for problems with large axial leakage
  - 4. Angle dependent axial source
    - > Detailed representation of axial neutron streaming
- Cons
  - 1. Much expensive compared to 2D/1D method
    - > Difficult to use sub-plane method
    - > Need to implement higher order basis function (future work)
  - 2. Limited to extruded geometry modeling

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

**do** Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations **do** Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source do Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source do Azimuthal angles **do** Parallel rays do Segments **do** Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end do end do end do end do Check convergence end do

! MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition
! MPI communication with adjacent assemblies

! Upward ( $\theta_p = 0 \sim \pi/2$ ) / Downward ( $\theta_p = -\pi/2 \sim 0$ )

! Surface sources from adjacent plane or boundary
! OPENMP parallelization
! Parallel MOC rays in an assembly
! Sequential segments in a MOC ray

! Forward/backward sweeping is omitted

! Surface source for adjacent plane ! Scalar flux of current plane

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

do Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations **- do** Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source **do** Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source do Azimuthal angles do Parallel rays do Segments do Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end dô end do end do end do Check convergence end do

! MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition

- Domain decomposition to reduce a huge amount of memory required in whole core simulation
- CMFD can eliminate slower convergence behavior arising from discontinuous ray tracking
- Plane-wise decomposition requires a lot of memory for STREAM 3D method
   Forward backward sweeping is on method
- ! Surface source for adjacent plane ! Scalar flux of current plane

#### Estimation of memory requirement for whole core simulation

Plane decomposition

•	Assem	bly (	decom	position
---	-------	-------	-------	----------

Category	Values		Category	Values
# of 2D FSRs/assembly	10,000	#	of boundary points/assembly	1,000
# of assemblies	300		# of axial planes	200
# of energy groups	72		# of energy groups	72
# of azimuthal angles	48		# of azimuthal angles	48
# of polar angles	6		# of polar angles	6
Real type (byte)	4		Real type (byte)	4
Memory / domain (GB)	249		Memory / domain (GB)	17
# of axial planes	200		# of assemblies	300
Total memory (GB)	49,766		Total memory (GB)	4,977

> Assuming 0.05 cm MOC ray spacing / ~20 cm assembly pitch / 2 cm plane height

- Plane-wise domain decomposition requires a lot of memory to link surfaces
  - > Angle dependent angular sources for each flat source region need to be stored

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

do Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations **- do** Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source **do** Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source **do** Azimuthal angles do Parallel rays do Segments **do** Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end do end do end do end do Check convergence end do

MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition MPI communication with adjacent assemblies
Upward (θ<sub>p</sub> = 0~π/2) / Downward (θ<sub>p</sub>= -π/2~0)
Surface sources from adjacent plane or boundary OPENMP parallelization
Each MPI process calls OPENMP threads
OPENMP threads distribute work with shared memory allocated for each MPI process
No need to synchronize angular flux

! Surface source for adjacent plane ! Scalar flux of current plane

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

**do** Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations **- do** Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source **do** Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source **do** Azimuthal angles **do** Parallel rays do Segments **do** Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do -end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end do end do end do end do Check convergence end do

MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition
MPI communication with adjacent assemblies
Upward (θ<sub>p</sub> = 0~π/2) / Downward (θ<sub>p</sub>= -π/2~0)
Surface sources from adjacent plane or boundary
OPENMP parallelization
Parallel MOC rays in an assembly
Loop for parallel ray is also one of possible choices to use OPENMP

! Forward/backward sweeping is omitted

! Surface source for adjacent plane ! Scalar flux of current plane

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

do Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations - do Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source **do** Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source **do** Azimuthal angles **do** Parallel rays **rdo** Segments **do** Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end do end do end do end do Check convergence end do

! MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition
! MPI communication with adjacent assemblies

! Upward ( $\theta_p = 0 \sim \pi/2$ ) / Downward ( $\theta_p = -\pi/2 \sim 0$ )

- Length of MOC ray segment projected on the *x*-*y* plane is the same for energy groups and polar angles
- No need to access track length data repeatedly
- Possible to reduce the number of calculations
- Possible to maximize cache usage

Algorithm Transport sweep for STREAM3D

**do** Outer iterations CMFD acceleration Update fission source **do** Inner iterations - do Assemblies Collect boundary angular flux Update scattering source **do** Upward/downward sweepings **do** Planes Get surface source **do** Azimuthal angles **do** Parallel rays **rdo** Segments **do** Energy groups **do** Polar angles Compute and collect angular flux change Update segment outgoing flux end do end do end do end do end do Update axial surface sources Compute scalar fluxes end do end do end do end do Check convergence end do

! MPI parallelization & Domain decomposition
! MPI communication with adjacent assemblies

! Upward ( $\theta_p = 0 \sim \pi/2$ ) / Downward ( $\theta_p = -\pi/2 \sim 0$ )

! Surface sources from adjacent plane or boundary
! OPENMP parallelization
! Parallel MOC rays in an assembly
! Sequential segments in a MOC ray

! Forward/backward sweeping is omitted

! Surface source for adjacent plane ! Scalar flux of current plane

- C5G7 benchmark
  - OECD/NEA C5G7 benchmark
  - 7-group cross-sections





Pin power distribution (C5G7 benchmark + void case)



- C5G7 benchmark results
  - k-eff & pint power distribution

	k-eff			Pin power distribution			
				RMS.		Max.	
	MCS	STREAM Difference (pcm)		Difference (%)	STD (%)	Difference (%)	STD (%)
Unrodded	1.14302 ±0.00001	1.14279	-23	0.33	±0.02	1.13	±0.03
Rodded A	1.12809 ±0.00001	1.12786	-23	0.32	±0.02	1.09	±0.03
Rodded B	$1.07772 \pm 0.00001$	1.07744	-28	0.32	±0.02	1.10	±0.03
Void	0.40274 ±0.00001	0.40274	-1	0.10	$\pm 0.01$	0.47	±0.02

- Parallel performance
  - 41,616 flat source regions in 2D plane
  - 21 planes with 3.06 cm height
  - 0.05 cm ray spacing/48 azimuthal angles/10 polar angles



43

CUSMR Design

#### Configuration of assembly

FA01	WABA01	FA01	WABA03	REF	en e
WABA01	FA01	WABA02	FA02	REF	
FA01	WABA02	FA03	REF	REF	
WABA03	FA02	REF	REF		
REF	REF	REF		-	Stainless steel reflector

#### Design Parameters

Parameter	Value	
Thermal Power	180 MWth	
Target cycle length	1,500 days	
Fuel lattice	17x17	
# of fuel assemblies	37	
Active length	200 cm	
Inlet Temperature	558.15 K	
Assembly Pitch	21.504 cm	
Pin pitch	1.260 cm	



- STREAM3D CUSMR analysis results at BOC
  - Calculation options: T-H feedback/Eq-Xe feedback/CBC search

1046.

- 761.0

662.9

602.1

558.0

Pin power distribution

Fuel temperature (K)





- STREAM3D CUSMR analysis results at BOC
  - Calculation options: T-H feedback/Eq-Xe feedback/CBC search

**Moderator temperature (K)** 



#### UNIST CORE

Moderator density (g/cc)

#### STREAM3D CUSMR analysis

- Calculation options: T-H feedback/Eq-Xe feedback/CBC search
- 0.1 cm ray spacing/24 azimuthal angles/6 polar angles
- 155 planes with less than 2 cm axial height
- 28 burnup steps
- 1.5 days spent with 84 computing cores / ~200 GB memory in total



### **Conclusions & Future work**

- Conclusions
  - STREAM has been parallelized to solve a large size 3D problem
  - Algorithm for 2D/3D method has been developed
  - Hybrid MPI/OPENMP parallel algorithm has been developed
  - STREAM adopts assembly-wise domain decomposition to store required memory in distributed storage
  - Accuracy and performance have been examined

#### Future work

- Parallel algorithm of whole subroutines/functions will be implemented and improved
- Application to 3D whole core problem

# 

### Linear Approximation in Axial Flux Distribution

- Extremely severe case in term of axial neutron leakage
  - 5 cm height square cell with void boundary condition in top/bottom



- Linear approximation gives much better accuracy
- In general case, 2 ~ 3 cm height axial mesh gives reasonable solution