Gaudi and the FCC Software

Benedikt Hegner

Gaudi Developers Meeting 11.7.2015

- Provide robust software to allow physics studies for CDR in 2018
- Support all FCC-ee, -eh, and -hh communities at the same time

 Requires flexibility for Geometry and Simulation
- Start pragmatically
- As studies progress move to more sophisticated solutions
 - Allow components to be replaced later on
- FCC software effort relies on effort of other people
 - There is a give and take
 - Aim for, but don't blindly force, synergy with other communities

$A \rightarrow \tau \tau \rightarrow two \tau jets + X, 60 fb^{-1}$

- Adapt existing solutions from LHC
 - Gaudi as underlying framework
 - ROOT for I/O
 - Geant4 for simulation
 - C++ and Python for user analysis
- Adapt software developments from ILC/CLIC
 - DD4Hep for detector description
- Invest in better fast vs. full sim integration
 - Geant4 fastsim, Atlfast (ATLAS)
- Invest in proper data model
 - The LHC experiments' ones are over-engineered
 - The ILC/CLIC implementation (LCIO) isn't state of the art

 $I, A \rightarrow \forall \tau \rightarrow t wo \tau jets + X, 60 fb^{-1}$

- Backward compatibility obviously a non-issue for us
 - We'd like clean interfaces w/o historical remnants
- We should drop
 - Historical duplications of services
 - Patterns invalidated by multithreading (e.g. various categories of tools)
 - Configuration options/syntax not matching GaudiHive (sequence unrolling is a hack!)
- We should update to more modern C++
 - Namespaces, more STL, smart pointers, ...
- We could take advantage of the [[deprecated]] attribute at many places and introduce a new deprecation warning for Components
- We understand that adiabatic changes are easier for running experiments...
 - ... but we should make sure that we do not spoil the migration end-point by doing this

"The Gaudi project is a open project for providing the necessary interfaces and services for building HEP experiment frameworks in the domain of event data processing applications.The Gaudi framework is experiment independent." - Gaudi website

• The most important question to us is - what is the aim of the Gaudi project?

H,A 4 77 4 two ; jets + X, 60 16

- currently it is for building an **experiment framework**
- That is not enough for FCC!
- In our vision there should be the **building blocks for an entire HEP application** (turn-key system), including
 - Generation, Simulation, Detector Description
 - Interfaces to common physics libraries (e.g.fastjet)
 - Basic data models to communicate between components
- The development will happen in any case, but where should the code go?
 - Extending Gaudi or creating a new project?

 $H, A \rightarrow \tau \tau \rightarrow two \tau jets + X, 60 fb^{T}$

- Following the GaudiHive approach through the entire code base...
 ... and making all services thread-safe
- What's our vision concerning platforms, heterogeneity and multi-process communication?

Organizing the Development

- How do we tackle backwards compatibility vs. making rapid progress?
 - Two main branches legacy-branch and future-branch
 - More work for experiments
 - One main development branch
 - Slows down deprecation progress
- The internal repository organization doesn't follow an easy-to-understand structure
 - should dare moving things around
- Merging of feature pull requests by four-eyes/two collaborations principle
 - reducing the risk of writing too experiment specific code
- Major designs are decided upon in this very meeting (in particular all interface classes)
 - No new feature without JIRA ticket
- Time for a new design document as HSF technical note?

$I, A \rightarrow \tau \tau \rightarrow two \tau jets + X, 60 fb^{1}$

- We are willing to contribute with
 - fractions of my time
 - fraction of a senior fellow and a doctoral student (from end of 2015)

Our contribution

- Contributions to the very core of Gaudi
 - Multi-thread compatible services and tools
- Contributions w/ an extended feature set
 - Pick-and-choose of existing code or adding our own for a turn-key system
- Library services for the future branch
 - We need to do that anyhow for FCC
- We will not contribute to the legacy branch
 - we are not users of it and cannot judge the impact of changes