Software Overview

HPS Collaboration Meeting JLab, October 26, 2015

NH University of New Hampshire

Maurik Holtrop

Status



Our software & software group are mostly working well.

- Mass production of reconstruction: Pass 3 done.
- DST updated, skims defined
- Advanced analysis started: see many later talks.
- Software bugs and questions reported on mailing list are usually resolved quickly.
- Only a few outstanding "critical" or "major" JIRA tasks.

Major Outstanding Tasks

- ECAL detector model that can be aligned properly
 - Multiple people working on this: Holly, Jeremy,...
- SVT Alignment & GBL
 - Several tasks related to this Pelle, Allessandra
- Vertexing in varying B-Field
 - See Norman's presentation
- Time stamps start time, event time
 - Issue around event time-stamp need to be revisited?
- Improve run database with DAQ info.
 - Should have better tracking of run info, start time etc. See Jeremy's talk.

Software presentations

Software presentations this meeting:

- Update on New Tracking Strategies
- Update on ECal code and Calibrations
- SVT Alignment
- Tracking and Vertexing in 3D B-Field
- Run DB, Data Catalog, Conditions
- Organizing DQM

- Omar Moreno
- Holly Szumila-Vance
- Alessandra Filipi/Pelle Hansson
- Norman Graf
- Jeremy McCormick
- Matt Graham

+ Lots of analysis talks.

Focus shifting to analysis!

Speed & Memory

Current code is slow: 8 Hz (0.1228 sec/event)

Speed currently this is not a problem.

but at 100 days of 25 kHz data, it will be.

(7.5M CPUhours = 312,500 CPU-days, about a year on a 1000 core farm.)

Memory hog?

- Unconstrained: I.6 GB active (6.7 GB virtual)
 - 800 MB is actual allocations, rest is Java?
 - Use depends on invocation and environment: Java obscures actual required amount of memory.
 - 26 threads

University of

- Actual Minimum (-Xmx256m): 400MB real (3GB virtual)
 - So "EvioToLcio" is mostly OK with the standard driver.



Profiling Code

Code profiling is a bit of an "art", results can be influenced by sampling methods used.

Output is a web-browsable file, showing where the most time is spend in the code (see https://confluence.slac.stanford.edu/display/hpsg/Code+Documentation)

Tree: Call Tree

calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 1,248,251.705 ms , **100.00 %** -- *org.lcsim.util.Driver.doProcess* calls: 0, local time:6.092 ms, total time: 822,772.673 ms, 65.90 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.TrackerReconDriver.process Calls: 0, local time:28.717 ms, total time: 288,693.455 ms, 23.10 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.RawTrackerHitFitterDriver.process calls: 0, local time: 13.053 ms , total time: 49,700.665 ms , 4.00 % -- org.hps.recon.ecal.EcalRawConverterDriver.process calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 30,794.082 ms , 2.50 % -- org.lcsim.util.loop.LCIODriver.process calls: 0, local time:47.428 ms , total time: 17,355.011 ms , 1.40 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.TrackDataDriver.process calls: 0, local time: 6.278 ms , total time: 12,775.682 ms , 1.00 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.gbl.HpsGblRefitter.process 🕨 🔟 👘 calls: 0, local time: 11.985 ms, total time: 9,850.229 ms, .80 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.DataTrackerHitDriver.process 🕨 🧰 i 🗉 calls: 0, local time: 11.529 ms , total time: 4,789.175 ms , .40 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.HelicalTrackHitDriver.process 🕨 🧰 i 🗉 calls: 0, local time: 22.818 ms , total time: 4,731.071 ms , .40 % -- org.hps.recon.particle.HpsReconParticleDriver.process ۰ 🔟 🕨 calls: 0, local time: 25.256 ms , total time: 4,284.412 ms , .30 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.gbl.GBLOutputDriver.process ۰ 🔟 calls: 0, local time: 18.095 ms , total time: 1,097.107 ms , .10 % -- org.hps.recon.ecal.cluster.ReconClusterDriver.process ۰ 🔟 calls: 0, local time: 74.776 ms , total time: 429.162 ms , .00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.digitization.sisim.config.RawTrackerHitSensorSetup.process ۰ 🔟 calls: 0, local time: 75.647 ms , total time: 344.651 ms , .00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.digitization.sisim.config.ReadoutCleanupDriver.process ا 💿 🕨 calls: 0, local time: .000 ms , total time: 307.923 ms , .00 % -- org.hps.recon.ecal.EcalRunningPedestalDriver.process ۰ 🔟 🕨 calls: 0, local time: 5.522 ms , total time: 215.162 ms , .00 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.MergeTrackCollections.process ۰ 🔟 🕨 calls: 0, local time: 53.366 ms , total time: 92.681 ms , .00 % -- org.hps.recon.ecal.cluster.CopyClusterCollectionDriver.process m calls: 0, local time: 18.564 ms , total time: 18.564 ms , .00 % -- java.lang.System.nanoTime

Profiling Code

Tree: Call Tree

University of

INH

calls: 0, local time: .000 ms , total time: 1,248,251.705 ms , 100.00 % -- org.lcsim.util.Driver.doProcess calls: 0, local time: 6.092 ms, total time: 822,772.673 ms, 65.90 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.TrackerReconDriver.process calls: 0, local time:.000 ms, total time: 822,761.330 ms, 65.90 % -- org.lcsim.util.Driver.process calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 822,761.330 ms , 65.90 % -- org.lcsim.util.Driver.processChildren calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 822,761.330 ms , 65.90 % -- org.lcsim.util.Driver.doProcess calls: 0, local time: 36.326 ms , total time: 822,761.330 ms , 65.90 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.SeedTracker.process calls: 0, local time: 51.774 ms , total time: 798,430.923 ms , 64.00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.SeedTrackFinder.FindTracks calls: 0, local time:10.821 ms , total time: 597,882.168 ms , 47.90 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.ConfirmerExtender.Extend calls: 0, local time:93.067 ms , total time: 597,799.347 ms , 47.90 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.ConfirmerExtender.doTask calls: 0, local time: 25.443 ms , total time: 385,338.618 ms , 30.90 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.HelixFitter.FitCandidate calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 363,597.020 ms , 29.10 % -- org.hps.recon.tracking.MultipleScattering.FindScatters calls: 0, local time:69.280 ms , total time: 18,803.096 ms , 1.50 % -- org.lcsim.fit.helicaltrack.HelicalTrackFitter.fit calls: 0, local time: 5.710 ms , total time: 2,894.336 ms , .20 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.SeedCandidate.setScatterAngles calls: 0, local time: 12.288 ms , total time: 12.288 ms , .00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.HelixFitter.CorrectStereoHits calls: 0, local time:6.435 ms , total time: 6.435 ms , .00 % -- org.lcsim.fit.helicaltrack.HelicalTrackFitter.getFit calls: 0, local time: 11.878 ms , total time: 150,255.819 ms , 12.00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.FastCheck.CheckHitSeed calls: 0, local time: 33.355 ms , total time: 29,222.273 ms , 2.30 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.FastCheck.CheckSector calls: 0, local time:.000 ms , total time: 29,212.201 ms , 2.30 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.SeedCandidate.addHit calls: 0, local time: 256.860 ms , total time: 2,223.570 ms , .20 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.SeedCandidate.<init> ا ش calls: 0, local time: 80.211 ms , total time: 486.845 ms , .00 % -- org.lcsim.recon.tracking.seedtracker.MergeSeedLists.Merge calls: 0, local time: 238.153 ms , total time: 244.001 ms , .00 % -- java.util.Collections.sort caller 0, local timer 228,038 ms, total timer 228,038 ms, 00,06 -- java util Linkodlist addEirst

Code speedup possible:

- Raw data fitters are slow, using Minuit
- FindScatters Matt already looked at improving this, but not in trunk.
- Optimize tracking strategies
- ... many of the speed optimizations will be hard ...



Continuity

- Many of our previous crew of developers (i.e. the students) are now moving on.
- We need to start identifying who will take over specific areas of responsibility.
 - ECAL codes (readout, analysis, calibration, ...)
 - SVT/tracking code (readout, tracker, GBL, analysis, calibration, ...)
 - DST
- We need to make sure sufficient documentation is in place!

Next Run Preparations.

- There have been no new feature requests for online software (?)
- We need to do a "shake down" of all online codes to make sure everything still works. (not guaranteed with all the changes)
 - Test all modes of monitor app, test with latest DAQ setup.
 - Test all calibrations codes.
 - Make sure of smooth operations when run starts.
- Organize offline data processing and Data Quality Monitoring (DQM) See Matt's talk.



University of

Analysis Codes

- We now have many different people making their own analysis codes.
 - Different approaches: Java, C++/LCIO, C++/Root.
 - Different event selection cuts.
 - Different histograms used for comparisons.
- We have a confusing number of different track collections, particle collections...
- At some point, we will need some standardization of event selection etc. This started with skims.
- Make sure your analysis code is well documented!
- Make sure your analysis code is in SVN or GitHub.

Conclusions

- HPS Software is in fairly good shape.
 - All main components are in place
 - Need an online shake-down before the next run.
- Emphasis now shifts to analysis code.
- We need to document what our code does, on confluence and in the code itself.
- Online code shake-down.