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THE EPIC COLLABORATION

We are a large collaboration for NP (160+ institutions)

49 groups indicate commitment to work on software for EIC, of which 22 also want to contribute to computing.

More commitments to software than any other topic!
LESSONS LEARNED FROM YEARS OF EIC SIMULATIONS

- We are not starting from scratch, we have years experience from the EIC Software Consortium, the EICUG SWG, and doing EIC simulations for the Yellow Report and the Detector Proposal.
- Both the ATHENA and ECCE proto-collaborations have successfully conducted detailed full detector simulations.
  - ATHENA successfully built and deployed a prototype modular software stack based on modern common NHEP packages (DD4hep, EDM4hep/PODIO, Gaudi).
  - ECCE leveraged familiar legacy NP software to ensure all milestones could be reached, with the intent to reevaluate the software stack going forward.
- The EICUG organized a series of “Lessons Learned” workshops to prepare the community to evolve from the proposal period towards software and computing for EIC itself.
SOFTWARE IS A COMMUNITY EFFORT
From “Lessons Learned” to software and computing at EPIC

The “Lessons Learned process effectively started the process of unifying the different software and computing efforts, laying the groundwork for the software and computer effort for the EPIC collaboration.
USER-CENTERED DESIGN
Ongoing effort by the EICUG SWG

▪ State of Software Survey (yearly): Collected information on software tools and practices during the Yellow Report and again after the Detector Proposals (think Software Census).

▪ Focus group discussions: (based on outcome from the Survey)
  ▪ Diverse groups: Students (2f, 2m), Junior Postdocs (2f, 3m), Senior Postdocs (2f, 3m), Professors (5m), Staff Scientists (2f, 3m), Industry (2f, 2m)
  ▪ Extremely valuable feedback
  ▪ Development of “User Archetypes”

User Archetypes: Input to software developers as to which users they are writing software for:

- Software is not my strong suit.
- Software as a necessary tool.
- Software as part of my research.
- Software is a social activity.
- Software emperors.
As part of the “Lessons Learned” process, the entire EIC community came together to create a community document to define our aspirations for software and computing for the EIC

Meant to form a sound foundation to design our software stack

This document was spread to the entire EIC community through several rounds of open suggestions and endorsement to ensure this is truly a community document

**Endorsed by a large group** representing the international EIC community.

100% of responses were positive!
EIC SOFTWARE: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Endorsers from the international community

Endorsers:

W. Armstrong (Argonne National Laboratory), M. Asai (Jefferson Lab), J. Bernauer (Stony Brook University), A. Bressan (University of Trieste and INFN), G. Bozzi (University of Cagliari and INFN Cagliari), W. Deconinck (University of Manitoba), M. Diefenthaler (Jefferson Lab), C. Dilks (Duke University), D. Elia (INFN Bari), P. Elmer (Princeton University), C. Fanelli (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), S. Fazio (University of Calabria and INFN Cosenza), O. Hen (Massachusetts Institute of Technology), D. Higinbotham (Jefferson Lab), T. Horn (Catholic University of America), J. Huang (Brookhaven National Laboratory), A. Jentsch (Brookhaven National Laboratory), S. Joosten (Argonne National Laboratory), K. Kauder (Brookhaven National Laboratory), D. Keller (University of Virginia), J. Lajoie (Iowa State University), E. Lancon (Brookhaven National Laboratory), J. Landgraf (Brookhaven National Laboratory), P. Laycock (Brookhaven National Laboratory), D. Lawrence (Jefferson Lab), W. Li (Stony Brook University), J. Osborn (Oak Ridge National Laboratory), B. Page (Brookhaven National Laboratory), M. Potekhin (Brookhaven National Laboratory), A. Puckett (University of Connecticut), J. Reinhold (Florida International University), J. Rittenhouse West (Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory), D. Romanov (Jefferson Lab), T. Sakaguchi (Brookhaven National Laboratory), B. Sawatzky (Jefferson Lab), A. Schmidt (George Washington University), R. Singh (Institute of Nuclear Physics Polish Academy of Sciences), P. Steinberg (Brookhaven National Laboratory), Z. Tu (Brookhaven National Laboratory), T. Wenaus (Brookhaven National Laboratory).
EIC SOFTWARE: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES
Guiding our design process

2 We will have an unprecedented compute-detector integration:
   • We will have a common software stack for online and offline software, including the processing of streamed data and its time-ordered structure.
   • We aim for autonomous alignment and calibration.
   • We aim for a rapid, near-real-time turnaround of the raw data to online and offline productions.

3 We will leverage heterogeneous computing:
   • We will enable distributed workflows on the computing resources of the worldwide EIC community, leveraging not only HTC but also HPC systems.
   • EIC software should be able to run on as many systems as possible, while supporting specific system characteristics, e.g., accelerators such as GPUs, where beneficial.
   • We will have a modular software design with structures robust against changes in the computing environment so that changes in underlying code can be handled without an entire overhaul of the structure.

Provisions for streaming readout from the start

Software design should not limit what systems we can run on, including future HTC and HPC facilities

Our design should be resilient against changing requirements, which we can accomplish by building a toolkit of orthogonal components.
**EIC SOFTWARE: STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES**

Guiding our design process

4. We will aim for user-centered design:
   - We will enable scientists of all levels worldwide to actively participate in the science program of the EIC, keeping the barriers low for smaller teams.
   - EIC software will run on the systems used by the community, easily.
   - We aim for a modular development paradigm for algorithms and tools without the need for users to interface with the entire software environment.

5. Our data formats are open, simple and self-descriptive:
   - We will favor simple flat data structures and formats to encourage collaboration with computer, data, and other scientists outside of NP and HEP.
   - We aim for access to the EIC data to be simple and straightforward.

6. We will have reproducible software:
   - Data and analysis preservation will be an integral part of EIC software and the workflows of the community.
   - We aim for fully reproducible analyses that are based on reusable software and are amenable to adjustments and new interpretations.

Users should not need to know the entire toolchain to make meaningful contributions to a single component. Modularity helps here too.

We will make it easy for people to get started, and will avoid unnecessary requirements.

Simple, flat data structures will lower the bar for entry for new users, make it easier to accomplish data and analysis preservation, and facilitate multidisciplinary collaborations, e.g. with data scientists.

Data and analysis preservation is a hard problem, rarely effectively addressed. We will consider this from the start. This also includes reproducible software.
We will use existing community tools where possible and sustainable rather than reinventing the wheel. This allows us to focus less collaboration resources on framework tasks, and more on actual content (reconstruction, geometries, …)

We believe in an open source model, which has a track-record of success in particle physics. Additionally, open development will automatically help with career support of scientists that dedicate time on software.

We have deliverables for each of the CD milestones. We will ensure our new development goes hand-in-hand with continuous reliability to ensure the EIC detector and its science program are successful. Our modular approach will facilitate controlled and reproducible incrementalism.
STREAMING READOUT FOR THE EPIC

Designed from the ground up for streaming

- Integration of DAQ, analysis, and theory will optimize the physics reach for the EIC
- Aim for a research model with seamless processing from sensor through DAQ to analysis and theory.
- Need to consider this from the start to ensure we build the best detector that supports streaming readout and fast algorithms for alignment, calibration, and reconstruction in real time or near real time
- Streaming readout and AI work hand-in-hand to enable a rapid turnaround from data taking to physics analysis and publication
THE PATH TO A UNIFIED EPIC SOFTWARE STACK

Software for our future at the EIC

- The proposal period saw a fragmented approach including different major frameworks and many smaller standalone projects.
- We need to unify our efforts to make the EIC detector a success, starting today throughout all CD milestones and into operation.
- We strongly believe in the EIC Software Statement of Principles, an effort of the entire EIC community under the umbrella of the EICUG.
- We will embrace these practices today to avoid starting our journey to EIC with technical debt.
- We are writing software for the future, not the lowest common denominator of the past!
THE EPIC SOFTWARE AND COMPUTING TEAM(S)

EPIC CompSW
Software and Computing
Conveners

- Andrea Bressan
  INFN
  andrea.bressan@ts.infn.it

- Cristiano Fanelli
  William & Mary
  cfanelli@wm.edu

- Sylvester Joosten
  ANL
  sjoosten@anl.gov

- Markus Diefenthaler
  JLab
  mdiefenthaler@jlab.org

EPIC SimQA
Simulation, Production, and Quality Assurance Conveners

- Wouter Deconinck
  U. Manitoba
  wouter.deconinck@umanitoba.ca

- Wenliang (Bill) Li
  Stony Brook
  wenliang.li@stonybrook.edu

+  

- Joe Osborn
  BNL
  josborn1@bnl.gov

- Zhoudunming (Kong) Tu
  BNL
  zhoudunming@bnl.gov
1. Assessment on the software solutions (pro & con list) together with the SimQA and DAQ working groups, guided by the EIC Software Statement of Principles.

2. Propose conclusion and recommendation to collaboration management and Project by the Summer EICUG meeting.


4. Once decision is made, all new development should go in the official framework.

5. Full transition to the official software by October 2023.

6. “Next Steps” process starting in December 2022
TRAVELING THE CRITICAL PATH

Our decision-making process

1. Publicize schedule of topics with dates of discussion and decision
2. Assign chair for each topic. Chair will be POC for the topic. Responsibilities are:
   a. Organize discussion session agenda
   b. Publish draft list of requirements for the software being discussed at least 1 week in advance.
   c. Form list with at least one choice for the software to adopt to address the topic
   d. Collect suggestions for modifications to the requirements list and/or the software choices list
   e. Lead discussion on topic, starting with requirements list and the list of options
3. Presentations may be made regarding a specific decision topic, but should be communicated to discussion lead in advance for purposes of scheduling.
4. Use guiding principles from the EIC Software Statement of Principles
5. Discussion is required for all topics (formal presentations only as necessary).

6. Based on the meeting, the joint CompSW and SimQA WG conveners will propose a single option, which will be open for comments and endorsement for one week.
WHERE WE ARE NOW
From the critical path to the “Next Steps” process

### “Next Steps” Process
1. Reconstruction: next steps
2. Data and Analysis Preservation
3. Documentation
4. Testing and CI Workflows
5. Conditions and Calibrations
6. Software licensing
7. …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussion topic(s)</th>
<th>Decision topic(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transition Period</td>
<td>Present procedure, Decide on list and order of decision topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Code Repository</td>
<td>Repository: - Location (GitHub, GitLab+Host) - Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion Schedule</td>
<td>Schedule: - Decide most critical decisions to make before July 27th EICUG meeting - Schedule of topic discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>Geometry: - Package (e.g. D04HEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Data Model</td>
<td>Data format: - Generated events - Simulated data - Processed data (e.g. ROOT w/ specific tree format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Data Model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Reconstruction Framework</td>
<td>Reconstruction Framework - Package</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reconstruction Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GEOMETRY DESCRIPTION AND DETECTOR INTERFACE

We picked **DD4hep** as tool to describe the detector geometry and to provide the detector interface for the reconstruction algorithms.

The entire EPIC geometry (two competing versions to compare technologies) implemented in DD4hep.

https://github.com/eic/epic
We will leverage the existing projects **podio** and **EDM4hep** to provide a standardized flat data model, accessible to researchers with modern AI/ML tools, on a variety of hardware and software systems.

For those aspects that are not in EDM4hep due to scope considerations, we will extend the data model with our own data definitions (**EDM4eic**). We have experience with this from the proposal stage.

The standard data model for EIC will allow modularity and experimentation with new methodologies for data analysis.

2-way communication with Key4hep

---

**edm4eic::TrackerHit:**

Description: "Tracker hit (reconstructed from Raw)"

Author: "W. Armstrong, S. Joosten"

**Members:**

- `uint64_t callID` // The detector specific (geometrical) call id.
- `edm4eic::Vector3f position` // Hit (call) position and time [mm, ns]
- `edm4eic::CovDiagSF positionError` // Covariance Matrix
- `float time` // Hit time
- `float timeError` // Error on the time
- `float edep` // Energy deposit in this hit [GeV]
- `float edepError` // Error on the energy deposit [GeV]
We selected **JANA2 as the reconstruction framework** based on a carefully formed set of requirements reviewed by the EIC software community.

Development of the JANA2-based EICrecon software (a first fully functional prototype) has been used successfully for the latest productions.

Leverage ACTS for tracking.

Exploring next steps including the use of generic framework-independent algorithms to enable algorithm-sharing.

https://github.com/eic/algorithms (prototype)
THOUGHTS ON COMMUNITY SOFTWARE

We are using many HEP community packages:

- DD4hep
- ACTS
- PODIO/EDM4hep
- ...

Using generic packages has been highly successful so far (quick development turnaround, good 2-way engagement with developers).

Common hurdles we encounter w.r.t. differing assumptions between EIC and typical HEP experiments (asymmetric tracker, beam with crossing angle, …)
The software infrastructure will use a **hybrid solution** that combines the benefits of public and accessible **code repositories on GitHub** with powerful and scalable backends with **self-hosted GitLab servers for continuous integration**.

Implementation of integration of GitHub continuous integration with self-hosted GitLab servers seems to be working well.

Still exploring alternatives to minimize the maintenance burden.
Leveraging AI and ML from the start

- The recently formed EPIC collaboration is quite active in AI/ML, and as a matter of fact EPIC can be one of the first experiments to be designed with the support of AI
  - The number of AI/ML activities is anticipated to grow in the next few months
- Lots of work has been recently done to determine the SW stack for the collaboration (DD4Hep, data model, JANA2), a fundamental step towards the CD2/3a.
- From an AI/ML perspective, several of these features seem forward-looking and allow for AI/ML applications and utilization of heterogeneous resources.
- Large-scale AI/ML applications entails specific infrastructure needs that require additional discussion
  - ML lifecycle, distributed training, etc
- The EIC community is engaged in AI/ML activities, and the AI4EIC WG is a good forum to address these important aspects. More info on meetings and workshop in [https://eic.ai/events](https://eic.ai/events)
"[A]spects to consider beyond a choice of software [...] include policy decisions that will require endorsement from the collaboration as a whole and resources to back them up. A task force assigned to this purpose was called for in the discussion. [...] The task force will be organized by two interim co-leads until the official formation of a collaboration."
Following the software decision schedule, the distributed workflow management system discussion to be held in forthcoming weeks. Technical solutions deployed by both proto-collaborations in proposal stage are not adequate long term. EIC S&C community has engaged with development teams of available technologies, e.g. DIRAC and PanDA.
WHAT ABOUT A SECOND DETECTOR?
Software for all EIC experiments - and beyond

Nothing about the modular software toolkit design is unique to Detector 1
We explicitly expect the toolkit to be used as a starting point for the Detector 2 software toolkit
Many design decisions were taken to explicitly allow collaboration and even algorithm sharing with other NP and HEP experiments
The EPIC software stack could be used for future NP experiments, e.g. SoLID at Jefferson Lab (a fixed-target experiment!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Modification for detector 2?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>New configuration, can reuse many detector components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data model</td>
<td>Identical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td>Can reuse/add to algorithms, only need different configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code repository and CI</td>
<td>Same resources could be used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and preservation</td>
<td>Same strategy can apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI and ML</td>
<td>Same strategy can apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bottom line: Detector 2 can hit the ground running!
SUMMARY

Journey to a unified EPIC Software Stack built on the shoulders of the proto-collaborations
All major components in place
Good alignment with the Key4hep project
“Next Steps” process to tackle topics important to get right early in the process
Need to balance new development with imminent deliverables.