

Integrating AA software in COBRA

SC2, April 2004

Vincenzo Innocente

CERN/EP



CMS & Pool

❖ CMS has established a fruitful collaboration with the Pool team since the very beginning of the project

- ❑ Direct participation to the project itself: **2.6 FTE**
- ❑ Efficient communication
 - Savannah Portal
 - Direct mail (and phone) exchange among developers
 - In person meetings when required
- ❑ Continuous and prompt feedback
 - CMS typically feedbacks on any new pre-release in few hours
 - POOL responds to bug reports in 24/48 hours
 - Only few bugs took more than a week to be fixed in a new pre-release



Few old milestones

- ❖ **Dec 2002: dictionary built for typical CMS data classes parsing original header file with gcc-xml**
 - ❑ dictionary moved to SEAL, no further direct involvement of CMS
- ❖ **March 2003: first tests of FileCatalog**
 - ❑ Feedback on performances, API and command-line tools
- ❖ **April 2003: POOL_0_5_0 released**
 - ❑ First version able to support realistic use-cases
- ❖ **May 2003: first full scale integration completed**
 - ❑ 99% of persistent classes in lcg-dict
 - ❑ Missing features identified
 - All about items already supported by “Vanilla” Root
- ❖ **14 June 2003: POOL_1_1_0-theta released**
 - ❑ satisfied most of the cms requirements
 - ❑ Start of full-scale realistic tests



Use of Pool in CMS: Current Status

❖ COBRA 7.7.x OSCAR 3.0.y ORCA 8.0.w

- ❑ Based on POOL 1.6.z
- ❑ First public release on September 20 2003 (based on POOL 1.3)
- ❑ In use in production

❖ Usable for production, deployed to physicists

- ❑ 2 Million events produced with OSCAR (G4 simulation) in a week-end
- ❑ 10 Million events reconstructed in DC04 with no crash
- ❑ [SW tutorials](#) each Friday based on ORCA 7.5 since October 2003

❖ Essentially same functionality as Objectivity-based code but

- ❑ No concurrent update of databases
 - No direct connection to central database while running
- ❑ Remote access limited to RFIO or dCache
- ❑ No Schema evolution

❖ Many bugs, missing-features, performance problems solved since first deployment

- ❑ Always a very effective collaboration between CMS POOL ROOT and SEAL
- ❑ Never more than a week to solve a problem



What CMS use of POOL?

All objects (event and metadata) are stores as root keyed-objects (no root-tree)

Only object navigation is used, no other access mechanisms

❖ File Catalog

- ❑ Full interface
- ❑ XML implementation in Physics Applications
- ❑ MySQL & RLS under test for production use cases

❖ Ref

- ❑ Full interface

❖ Session

- ❑ Only Transaction Management

❖ Few other classes and methods

- ❑ Mainly workaround to bug/missing-features
- ❑ In test programs



CMS persistency paraphernalia

- ❖ Thread-safe proxy-wrappers to pool-interfaces
- ❖ Scoped (exception-safe) nested-transaction
- ❖ Context/Thread-specific Data Services
- ❖ Creation and management of DataBases and Containers
 - Including catalog, PFN, LFN and metadata
- ❖ Object (RefBase) -based placement hint
- ❖ Generic “named” navigation
 - Mono and bi-directional map<string,Ref>
- ❖ Specialized (base) classes
 - Smart-Proxies
 - Collections
 - ...



Integration with LCG-2

- ❖ **CMS was very pleased to discover how the File Catalog interfaces (API, command-line and python) responded to all requirements related to the use of COBRA in the grid environment**
 - ❑ Unfortunately we discovered also that this was not the case for the EDG side
- ❖ **All functionalities seem to be there and working**
 - ❑ Catalog management
 - ❑ Query using all sort of attributes
 - ❑ Publishing fragments in and out a Master catalog
 - ❑ Possibility of use multiple catalogs (new in POOL 1.6)
 - ❑ Replica registration and discovery
 - ❑ Possibility to implement custom backend to “bestPFN”
- ❖ **Performance**
 - ❑ Resonable for XML and SQL implementation
 - ❑ VERY poor for the RLS implementation
- ❖ **All these features have been tested on LCG-2**
 - ❑ In particular at CERN and INFN



Few Comments on SEAL

CMS contributed with 1 FTE to port Iguana-classlib to SEAL-Foundation

❖ **SEAL looks more and more like a collection of quite heterogeneous and independent products**

- ❑ SPI distribution hides well the complexity of the project
- ❑ More difficult for individuals willing to test or integrate a single component
- ❑ The dependency from Root and CLHEP makes integration difficult

❖ **No plan for big-bang migration to SEAL at the moment**

- ❑ Slow replacement of foundation classes
- ❑ dictionary used for POOL, possibly as bridge to python
- ❑ No plan to use high level framework infrastructure (whiteboard for instance)
- ❑ Experimenting with new Minuit: used already in physics code
- ❑ Plugin-manager used in new packages
 - to load algorithmic geometry-builders in CMS-DDD (XML)
 - to load SEAL Storage Manager as generic root I/O plugin



Few Comments on Simulation

❖ CMS is in production using Geant4

- ❑ Physics processes have been validated
- ❑ Current framework and interface to G4 considered sufficient
- ❑ Geometry translated from Geant3

❖ Geant4

- ❑ Relationship with G4 team improved dramatically over last year
 - Excellent communication and two-way feed-back
 - Needs for an “insulation layer” almost disappeared

❖ Geometry

- ❑ CMS is in the process of reviewing its simulation geometry description
 - Target: ready end of 2004
 - Tools are essentially in place

❖ Fluka

- ❑ Low priority activity: use of common geometry with G4 is a must
 - Port a test-beam setup first

❖ Generator

- ❑ CMS considers the current LCG/AA effort satisfactory
- ❑ Concerns for non converging toward a common “Event” structure (in memory and persistent)



SPI Services

- ❖ **CMS has been between the first to uptake Savannah**
 - We are satisfied of the service and its development
- ❖ **SPI had taken up two CMS products: Oval and SCRAM**
 - It was expected a major development of SCRAM under SPI
 - This has not happened, LGC/AA decided to drop SCRAM and develop a new tool
 - CMS has been forced to invest his own person-power to complete the development of SCRAM according to the original plan
- ❖ **CMS supports the strengthen of the role of a central librarian in SPI**
 - Should help in guarantee the coherence and quality of software releases
- ❖ **CMS would like SPI to support more directly experiments providing tools and service in the area of the software development process**



Scripting and interactive environment

- ❖ **COBRA provides a scripting and interactive environment in python (using boost)**
 - ❑ Seamless integration with SEAL, POOL and PI components exported to python (as for many other external software such as HippoDraw, KDE etc)
 - ❑ Plan to test python binding using LCG-Dict
- ❖ **No experience in exporting CMS software to Root/CINT**
 - ❑ No LCG/AA software exported to root/cint yet



Future

- ❖ **Freeze “schema” now for next 18 months (now only 12 left)**
 - SEAL/POOL will not support schema evolution in near future
- ❖ **Follow a minimalist approach to avoid further confrontations with bugs, missing features, performance problems**
 - Use only what is really needed and produces major benefits to CMS use-cases
 - Avoid early migration to LCG/AA software in areas where CMS has already deployed solutions
- ❖ **Focus on CMS near-term use-cases**
 - Develop/integrate only components with a wide use potential
 - Do not get involved in projects of unclear benefit to CMS
 - Involve more deeply in areas critical to CMS



Examples of “near-term use-cases”

❖ Mathlib

- ❑ Collaboration with SEAL

❖ Condition DB

- ❑ Collaboration with POOL to develop a RDBMS-backend

❖ Scripting environment

- ❑ We will evaluate PyLCGDict

❖ Grid Replica Location

- ❑ Will use Pool FileCatalog as front-end

❖ User Level Event Collections

- ❑ Will use Pool Root-Collections (possibly enhanced by an AIDA interface)



Priorities for 2004

❖ Optimization of the POOL streaming layer

- ❑ Single LCG-ROOT dictionary
- ❑ Improvement of performances

❖ Development of a POOL RDBMS back-end

- ❑ Main client is Condition DB
- ❑ ARDA Metadata layer will also profit

❖ Deployment of a MathLib for LHC experiment

❖ Complete AIDA implementation in terms of LCG/AA software

❖ GEANT4

- ❑ Complete integration between Geant4 and experiment framework
- ❑ Further improve performance and reliability
- ❑ Fully validate physics for LHC use cases
- ❑ GEANE replacement



Concluding Remarks

CMS has ported to AA all applications that were previously based on Geant3, Objectivity, LHC++ for all previously supported use cases.

Still a long way ahead of us

- ❑ Some critical use cases not yet supported
- ❑ LAN and WAN data access/replication still very unsatisfactory
- ❑ Tuning of performances will require more work
- ❑ Integration with LCG-2 (and Grid services in general) is still problematic

Pool (and application software in general) has never been a show-stopper for CMS Data Challenge in 2004

