

# Simulation cost analysis of NEXTfoam BARAM on Rescale HPC Cloud

Bosung Lee, Ph.D. Director of Solutions Architect, Rescale (bosung@rescale.com)

### Contents

Introduction

Analysis model

**Simulation conditions** 

**Results** 

**Concluding remarks** 

# Introduction

- Backgrounds
  - Simulation cost (\$) = HPC hardware cost + simulation software license cost + simulation time
    - Limited simulation infrastructure (HW + SW) forces queuing the simulation
    - Simulation software license cost is more expensive than hardware cost
  - HPC Cloud & open-source software becomes the alternative for reducing the simulation cost
- Objectives
  - Simulation cost analysis using NEXTfoam BARAM, Ansys Fluent and Siemens StarCCM+
    - Simulation accuracy comparison using the <u>DrivAer full car model</u>
    - Cloud hardware cost on <u>Rescale HPC Cloud</u>
    - Simulation software license cost
    - Simulation time
  - Discuss about how to reduce the total cost of simulation

### **Rescale HPC cloud**

• Fully managed HPC Cloud platform with public cloud hardware and pre-installed simulation software



### **NEXTfoam BARAM on Rescale HPC cloud**

- GUI capable OpenFOAM®-based CFD solver released by NEXTfoam under the GNU GPL license
- GUI support using web-browser without installation on the local workstation / on-prem HPC









# **Analysis model**

- Fastback DrivAer Model
  - The new generic full car model for external flow to close the gap between the strongly simplified models and the highly complex production cars



- Simulation conditions
  - Fastback / smooth underbody / with mirror / rotating wheel / moving ground
  - Full 3D (not half) unsteady flow with  $k-\omega$  SST turbulence model
  - Free-stream velocity : 30 m/s
  - Compared with the experimental results

# **Domain dimensions and mesh generation**

- Base mesh was generated using BARAM-Snappy (BARAM version of SnappyHexMesh)
  - OpenFOAM base mesh was converted to Fluent mesh (.msh) using 'foamMeshToFluent'
  - Fluent mesh was imported to StarCCM+





## **Boundary conditions**

• Same boundary conditions are applied to BARAM / Fluent / StarCCM+



# **Simulation conditions**

#### • Simulation conditions

	Version	Solution scheme	Spatial Discretization	Relaxation Factors	Flow Time
BARAM	6.2	simpleNFoam Transient	Momentum : 2nd Turbulent : 1st	Pressure : 0.3 Momentum : 0.3 Turbulence : 0.7	t = 2.0 ∆t = 0.001 sub iter = 10
Fluent	2020R1	SIMPLE Unsteady	Momentum : 2nd Turbulent : 1st	Pressure : 0.3 Momentum : 0.3 Turbulence : 0.7	t = 2.0 ∆t = 0.001 sub iter = 10
StarCCM+	15.06.008 Double	Segregated Flow Implicit Unsteady	Momentum : 2nd Turbulent : 1st	Pressure : 0.3 Momentum : 0.3 Turbulence : 0.7	t = 2.0 ∆t = 0.001 sub iter = 10

#### • Hardware specifications

Rescale Coretype	Processor	#of Cores / node	Memory	Interconnect	Hourly price / node
Jasper	AMD EPYC 7742 (Rome) @ 2.4 Ghz	60	8 GB /core 488 GB / node	200 Gbps Infiniband	\$4.932

#### **Results**



StarCCM+ PoD license cost = \$32.5 / hour (estimated) Fluent required AEC = {20 + INT(5 x nCores<sup>0.57</sup>)}, Fluent AEC cost = \$1.4 / AEC (estimated)

# **Concluding remarks**

- NEXTfoam BARAM, Fluent and StarCCM+ show similar drag coefficients compared to experiments
- Elapsed time in NEXTfoam BARAM is slightly longer than Fluent and StarCCM+
  - Rescale cloud cost depends on the elapsed time
- Simulation license cost is very expensive than cloud hardware cost
  - StarCCM+ Power-session & Power-on-Demand license have no limit in the number of cores
  - Fluent AEC license cost requires the complex cost calculation depends on the problem
- Total simulation cost decreases as the number of cores increases
  - Reduced time using more number of cores can reduce the license cost
- Open source simulation software requires only hardware cost

#### NEXTfoam BARAM on Rescale HPC cloud shows the best price / performance

### Reference

[1] DrivAer Model: https://www.epc.ed.tum.de/en/aer/research-groups/automotive/drivaer/, 2021.11

[2] Drivaer validation case, Wolf Dynamics: http://www.wolfdynamics.com/validations/drivAer/tut\_drivaer.pdf, 2021.11

[3] R. Yazdani. Steady and Unsteady Numerical Analysis of the DrivAer Model. Chalmers University of Technology, Master Thesis, 2015

[4] Experimental Comparison of the Aerodynamic Behavior of Fastback and Notchback DrivAer Models. SAE 2014-01-0613.

