Integrate the latest version of new driver into ORCHIDEE trunk

Objective:

The new driver was initially developed by Jan in the branch Routing, and then included in ORCHIDEE by Josefine (and others ?). Since then, this code has been probably updated by Josefine (and others ?) in the trunk following the evolution of ORCHIDEE. This probably explains some differences between the trunk and the branch Routing. It is not yet very clear to me if some tests have been applied to the new driver in the trunk after all the updates.

In 2019-2020, more changes were applied to the new driver by Jan, realized in the branch Routing. These changes fixed some bugs in the previous version. Now we need integrate these new changes into the trunk.

What is done:

1) In order to understand the functionality of the new driver, I did simulation FG3nd by using the trunk (rev 6816), with the orchidee driver already integrated. This is carried out on the server of meso center.

The job script was created by using libIGCM. The forcing file is WFDEI. It can run without error message. However it seems quite slow (almost 1 day for 1-year simulation), and it uses large memory. For example the maximal virtual memory of 100 G is not enough, and 200G is OK. It seems that it might need 64 processors rather than 32.

I made some preliminary examination about possible reasons for the slowness. WFDEI forcing data has 0.5 degree resolution in space and 3 hour in time. By default, the variable slab_size_max is 80 in ORCHIDEE, which means reading/processing 10 days of data (that is 80*3/24). In order to test if the large value of slab_size_max is responsible for the slowness, I did a simple simulation by reducing slab_size_max from 80 to 20, and PeriodLength from 1Y to 1M (config.card). However, the simulation does not work when the max virtual memory is 100G or 150G…..

Just for checking, I made a test of FG1trans by using the same version of ORCHIDEE. It works well with default configuration (32 processus). It takes about 50 minutes to finish one year simulation on the meso center, which is reasonable. One reason is that the forcing file is 2 degree in this test. More test will be necessary by using the same configurations and the same input data as fg3nd experiment, except the drivers.

2) In order to integrate the latest version of new driver into the trunk, I downloaded the codes from the branch Routing. Then I compared the new driver between trunk (rev 6816) and the Routing. There are some important changes in orchideedriver.f90, forcing_tools.f90 for example. It is important to understand their differences. The detailed comparisons can be found in the appendix A.

3) I discussed with Jan about some of the differences.

Just for test, I modified the new driver in the trunk (rev 6816) according to this discussion. Then I compiled the ORCHIDEE and created a job by using libIGCM. The simulation FG3nd is running. But it is slow and takes large memory on meso center.

I also used CRUJRA 2 degree for a simple test, but there is an error due to the inconsistency between npland_loc and nbpoint_loc. We are examining this issue.

What to do:

1) to understand if the implementation of new driver is OK ?

How much time to be used if use the old driver and CRUJRA 0.5 degree ?

2) to compare the results from new and old driver, and to do some evaluation ?
Need make simulations with the same configuration by using old and new drivers
3) to include Tmin and Tmax into the processing ?

Appendix :

A: compare the new driver from trunk (6816) and branch Routing

forcing_tools.f90: some differences between routing and trunk.

1) use mask(1:slab_size) in the routing, instead of mask(:) in the trunk :
we accept that from the routing, suggested by Jan, in order to avoid a bug.

2) if forcing_tstep_ave >= one_day/4.0 in the routing (instead 3.0 in trunk):
we accept 3.0 from the trunk, suggested by Jan, in order that it works also for 6-hourly forcing data.

3) subroutine forcing_buildindex:
In the routing, there is a new condition if MAXVAL(var2d) > var_missing when dealing with the missing values in vard2D. This is included in my test within the trunk.

4) subroutine forcing_contfract2d: to be confirmed with Jan
In the routing, there is a new condition if MAXVAL(contfrac) >= contfrac_missing when counting the number of land points 'nbland'. This is accepted in my test.

5) subroutine forcing_zoomgrid: The computation of nbland_loc is slightly different. To be confirmed with Jan.

In the routing: nbland_loc = SUM(contfrac_loc)
in the trunk:

```
nbland_loc = 0
Do ik = 1, SIZE(contfrac_loc)
    IF (contfrac_loc(ik) > 0.0) THEN
        nbland_loc = nbland_loc  +1.0
    ENDIF
 ENDDO
```

In my test, I accept the lines from trunk temporarily.

6) subroutine forcing_givegrid: to be discussed with Jan
In the trunk, there is a few new lines to compare nbpoint_loc and nbland_loc. If they are not equal, then an error will be raised up and the computation will be stopped. This condition is not included in the routing.
I keep this condition in my test. But this is a point to be examined.

forcingdaily_tools.f90: identical

globgrd.f90: slight difference.
There is a new line CALL getin('WRF_CALENDAR', calendar) in the routing. This defines the calendar used by the WRF simulation.

If we do not do the WRF simulation, I guess that we do not need this line ? In my current test, it is not yet included.

orchidee_drive.f90: important changes between trunk and routing.

Trunk:

1) use time module (which is not used in routing)

2) use xios_orchidee, constants, constants_soil (which seem to have been reorganized differently from the routing)

3) new parameters (co2 and vege related) added in the trunk compared to the routing

4) call grid_init : minor change.

CALL grid_init (nbp_loc, nbseg, "RegLonLat", "ForcingGrid") in the routing

CALL grid_init (nbp_loc, nbseg, regular_lonlat, "ForcingGrid") in the trunk

5) when transferring global grid variables to the orchidee version of the root proc:

A condition 'is_root_proc' is applied in the routing, but not in the trunk. This condition is not applied in my current test (also agreed to Jan).

6) call time_initialise in order to set the starting date in IOISPL and initialize the calendar (realized differently in the routing, see below)

7) before going into the time loop for itau = 1, nbdt:

a) calling xios_orchidee_init:

this subroutine need an input variable julian_diff, which is now a global variable in the src_global/time.f90 in the trunk. (it is only a local variable in the routing).

b) Then calling sechiba_xios_initialize (which is not used in the routing)

c) Then calling xios_orchidee_close_definition (not used in the routing)

8) within the time loop:

a) call time_nextstep in order to update the time

b) Julian = data0+itau *(dt/one_day), which is switched by 0.5 from routing.

I modified to julian = (julian_start + julian_end) /2.0 in the trunk to be consistent with the routing.

c) after getting forcing data, call xios_orchidee_update_calendar without any condition, (while a condition of ok_calendar is applied in the routing)

d) if itau == 1:

call sechiba_initialize to set up orchidee before doing an call for getting actual fluxes.

Else:

call sechiba_main

There is no update of calendar in these steps in the trunk, while there are several calls of xios_orchidee_update_calendar in the routing with some condition applied. These updates of calendar are not necessary in the trunk.

Routing:

1) Use tool_para module (not used in trunk) : this difference seems not important

2) use xios (not xios_orchidee as the trunk): the subroutine xios_orchidee_init from xios has less input arguments.

3) use thermosoilc (soilth_lev) : not necessary for the version in the trunk

4) define a variable julian0 in the routing, but the same variable is now defined in

src_global/solar.f90 in trunk

5) get the vertical soil levels soilth_lev for the thermo scheme, which is to be used in xios_orchidee_init:

This is not necessary in the trunk, because it is already included in xios_orchidee_init.

6) initialize the calendar:

The routing initialize julian = date0 + 0.5*dt/one_day, this line is not used in the trunk. This seems not necessary to be taken into account (according to Jan).

Then call xios_orchidee_init with a condition of NOT ok_calendar, which is not included in the trunk. This call is not necessary for trunk.

7**)** Within the time loop:

a) the definition of variable 'julian' is different from that in the trunk.

julian = date0 + (itau-0.5)*(dt/one_day), while in trunk julian=data0+itau *(dt/one_day).

The one from the routing is accepted.

b) xios_orchidee_update_calendar is called in the routing for several times with the conditions of ok_calendar, not ok_largest, not ok_grdc etc.

This is not necessary in the trunk according to Jan.

8) when close everything: call xios_orchidee_context_finalize. This line is not used in the trunk.

B: Rev 6816 .vs. the current version of trunk

The reason to use the revision 6816, instead of the latest version of trunk, is explained below. I made a test of FG1trans with the latest version of trunk. The compilation is OK. But when running a simulation, I found an error message: MPI_ABORT was invoked on rank 0 in communicator MPI_COMM_WORLD with errorcode 1. Looking at this with Fabienne, it is related to an issue of mass balance, that is., the mass balance is not closed in stomate_lpj for carbon.