

The Energy Exascale Earth System Modeling Project: Goals for Meeting

David C. Bader
E3SM Lead Principal Investigator and Council Chair
March 19, 2019





"They" said it couldn't be done.. DOE said "Just Do It!!!!...







WE did it!!!!

The DOE E3SM coupled model version 1: Overview and evaluation at standard resolution

Jean-Christophe Golaz¹, Peter M. Caldwell¹, Luke P. Van Roekel², Mark R. Petersen², Qi Tang¹, Jonathan D. Wolfe², Guta Abeshu³, Valentine Anantharaj⁴, Xylar S. Asay-Davis², David C. Bader¹, Sterling A. Baldwin¹, Gautam Bisht⁵, Peter A. Bogenschutz¹, Marcia Branstetter⁴, Michael A. Brunke⁶, Steven R. Brus², Susannah M. Burrows⁷, Philip J. Cameron-Smith¹, Aaron S. Donahue¹, Michael Deakin^{8,9}, Richard C. Easter⁷, Katherine J. Evans⁴, Yan Feng¹⁰, Mark Flanner¹¹, James G. Foucar⁸, Jeremy G. Fyke^{2,12}, Brian M. Griffin¹³, Cécile Hannay¹⁴, Bryce E. Harrop⁷, Elizabeth C. Hunke², Robert L. Jacob¹⁰, Douglas W. Jacobsen², Nicole Jeffery², Philip W. Jones², Noel D. Keen⁵, Stephen A. Klein¹, Vincent E. Larson¹³, L. Ruby Leung⁷, Hong-Yi Li³, Wuvin Lin¹⁵, William H. Lipscomb¹⁴, Po-Lun Ma⁷, Salil Mahajan⁴, Mathew E. Maltrud², Azamat Mametjanov¹⁰, Julie L. McClean¹⁶, Renata B. McCoy¹, Richard B. Neale¹⁴, Stephen F. Price², Yun Qian⁷, Philip J. Rasch⁷, J. E. Jack Reeves Eyre⁶, William J. Riley⁵, Todd D. Ringler¹⁷, Andrew F. Roberts², Erika L. Roesler⁸, Andrew G. Salinger⁸, Zeshawn Shaheen¹, Xiaoying Shi⁴, Balwinder Singh⁷, Jinyun Tang⁵, Mark A. Taylor⁸, Peter E. Thornton⁴, Adrian K. Turner², Milena Veneziani², Hui Wan⁷, Hailong Wang⁷, Shanlin Wang², Dean N. Williams¹, Philip J. Wolfram², Patrick H. Worley¹⁸, Shaocheng Xie¹, Yang Yang⁷, Jin-Ho Yoon¹⁹, Mark D. Zelinka¹, Charles S. Zender²⁰, Xubin Zeng⁶, Chengzhu Zhang¹, Kai Zhang⁷, Yuying Zhang¹, Xue Zheng¹, Tian Zhou⁷, Oing Zhu⁵





A Quick Review





"A DOE Model for the DOE Mission on DOE Computers"

DOE Energy Questions

Exascale Computing



Earth System Modeling





Science and mission drives development and experimentation

- Resolution weather-scale to convective scaleatmosphere and eddy-resolving ocean for simulation of multi-scale phenomena
- Utilize next-generation disruptive computing to enable high-throughput, high resolution simulations
- Extensive use of ensembles to quantify and bound uncertainty for actionable predictions. Even small reductions in uncertainty are useful in risk analysis.
- Coordinated efforts to reduce biases and address mission questions





Overlapping Development Cycle

- Two time horizons
 - Near term v1 and v2 simulation campaigns and analysis
 - Intermediate term developments for v3 and v4 models that are tested and functioning in the coupled v3 system in 5 years (both scientific and computational)
- Changed (and changing) computing landscape
 - Summit hybrid CPU-GPU design; 100+ PFLOP machine
 - NERSC9 hybrid
 - Aurora ExaFLOP architecture just announced hybrid





Phase 2 project structure

- Core activities
 - Run more like a "traditional" modeling center
 - v1 simulation campaign
 - Finalize v2 development, testing and simulation campaign
 - Performance optimization on current machines (Jones)
 - 5 groups one for each science question, infrastructure (Jacob) and performance
- Next Generation Development for v3/v4 versions
 - Algorithms and Software
 - Cloud-Permitting Global Atmosphere
 - Atmospheric Physics
 - Land and Energy





Deliverables, Metrics and Roadmaps

- The project is evaluated
 - from delivering products
 - from documenting objective progress against metrics
- The plan to meet these objectives is in the roadmaps
- Reporting is everyone's responsibility





Goals for meeting

- Project team cohesion (with or without alcohol)
- Synchronization (reality) check on current status
- Revision of plans and road maps
 - Project-wide and groups/sub-projects
 - Gaps and needs
 - Reallocation of effort



