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Future Computing Challenges

Processor Scaling Trends

- **Moore's Law**
- **original Gaudi design**
- **realism**
- **long term solution:**
  - Invest in multi-threading

CPU Core and Hardware Thread Count

- **CPUs are getting wider**
- **memory prices have plateaued**

Historical Memory Prices

- **ATLAS reconstruction uses** upwards of 3 GB of memory, more with high luminosity runs
- **Cost to equip all grid compute nodes with full memory requirements is more than US$ 6 Million**
- **Increasing adoption of many-core systems**, *e.g.* Cori, Aurora

**Long Term Solution:**
Invest in multi-threading
## Migration of ATLAS Software to AthenaMT

| Date     | Framework                                                                 | Algorithms                                                                                     |
|----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2015     | Event Store access via Data Handles; Event View design completed; Updated Configuration design; Re-integration of Hive features into Gaudi trunk | Few Algorithms as concurrent prototypes, concentrate on high inherent parallelism; general clean-up of code |
| 2016 Q2  | Event Views implemented; IO Layer redesigned; Core Gaudi service migration starts | Wider set, prototype CPU expensive Algs with internal parallelism                              |
| 2016 Q4  | Parallel Algorithm support; Detector/Condition Store re-implementation; Schedulable Incidents; Main Athena development branch moved to Gaudi trunk | First trigger chains running with Event Views; limited reconstruction                           |
| 2017     | All Athena and Gaudi Services made thread safe; Support for re-entrant Algorithms | Serious migration with select groups; Core of useful Algorithms to allow for framework optimization |
| 2018     | Framework optimization, and tuning for different hardware                 | Bulk of Algorithm migration                                                                     |
| 2019     |                                                                           | Integration and Readiness for Run 3                                                             |

- Aggressive schedule
  - many migrations steps are not parallelizable
- On track for most milestones
  - but not all!

- Will focus on what we've accomplished in 2016
Enabling Concurrency for Core Services

- Majority of hard work in migrating ATLAS code to AthenaMT is in making shared Services thread safe or able to handle multiple concurrent events.

- Some Services can be made concurrent / thread safe with simple mutexes or thread safe data structures

- Some need more modifications to handle state information of multiple concurrent events
  - **MagFieldSvc**: carry event specific cache along with each request
  - **THistSvc**: users can choose whether to share or clone histograms
    - thread safe access to shared histograms via smart locking handles

- Some need complete redesign
  - Conditions / **IOVSvc** (Intervals of Validity) / **GeoModelSvc** (Detector Alignment)
  - **IncidentSvc**
Concurrent Processing of Asynchronous Data

► **Conditions**
  - *eg* high voltages, calibrations, *etc*

► **Detector Geometry and Alignments**
  - *eg* position changes

► **Requirement**: Minimize changes to client code
  - there's lots and lots of it!
  - avoid forcing Users to implement fully thread-safe code by handling most thread-safety issues at the framework / Services level (without compromising concurrency)

► **Requirement**: All access to Event data is *via* smart **DataHandles**, which also declare data dependency relationship to the framework
  - we can use this by implementing **ConditionHandles**
    - do all the heavy lifting inside the Handle
Serial Processing with Conditions

- All framework elements process data from the same Interval Of Validity

- Algorithms are blind to the IOV, and retrieve data from the ConditionStore

- At the start of every Event, IOVSvc checks IOVs, and triggers any necessary updates
  - handled by the Callback Functions
  - Callback Functions are shared instances

- Only one copy of any Conditions object is maintained in the Store
Concurrent Processing with Conditions

**ISSUES**

- The current callback functions are **NOT** thread-safe
- Even if they were made thread-safe, could **NOT** run with multiple concurrent Events from different IOVs due to the single ConditionStore
- IOV infrastructure needs to be **significantly** modified for MT
Concurrent: Single Multi-Cache Condition Store

- One ConditionStore, shared by all Events.
- no wasted memory
- no duplicate calls
- Store elements are **ConditionContainers**, with one entry per IOV

- Data access via **ConditionHandles** that point to appropriate entry
- Callback Functions become **Algorithms**, scheduled by framework
Geometry Alignments in AthenaMT

- Detector Element position cached in **Full Physical Volume**
  - built from a **Physical Volume** description, a **Transform**, and a time dependent **Alignable Transform** that reads a **Delta** from a database

- Not functional with concurrent events that have different Deltas and associated caches
Geometry Alignments in AthenaMT

- Encapsulate alignment deltas and cached positions in AlignmentObjects that reside in the ConditionStore
  - accessed via ConditionHandles
  - updated on demand via a scheduled GeoAlginAlg
- Clients of DetectorElements are completely unaware of migration
IncidentSvc in AthenaMT

- **IncidentSvc**: manages asynchronous callbacks for clients using an Observer pattern

- **Study**: design is far more flexible than actual usage
  - mostly fired **outside** of the Algorithm processing loop

- **Solution**: **limit scope**: Incidents can be re-classified as discrete state changes
  - Incidents become **schedulable**, managed by framework
  - Incident handlers / observers become discrete Algorithms, that interact with EventContext aware Services
For performance reasons, the High Level Trigger operates on geometrical Regions of Interest (ROI)

Since all Algorithms access Event data via smart DataHandles, they can be run unmodified in a ROI simply by having the framework modify the DataHandle itself.

Implemented an EventView class that can be used interchangeably with the whole event store. Each View is populated with data corresponding to a single ROI:

- Each EventView has the same interface as the whole event store.
- Contain Data Objects that describe the corresponding ROI.
- Allow for potential alternative use-cases.

see presentation by Ben Wynne on Tuesday at 2PM for further details.
Re-Entrant Algorithms

- Cloning of Algorithms in GaudiHive allows us to avoid most thread safety issues
  - clones can run concurrently with different Event Contexts without interference
  - have to avoid "thread hostile" behaviour
    - global statics
    - back channel communications
  - some Algorithms can't be cloned – scheduling bottleneck

- Downside of many clones is increased memory use
  - can limit number of clones, at the expense of limiting possible concurrency

- Added support for re-entrant Algorithms
  - only one instance
  - can be executed simultaneously in multiple threads in different Events
  - **MUST** be thread safe
    - enforced with new base class and `Algorithm::execute_r() const` signature
  - envision limited usage for special purpose tasks, written by experts
**Summary**

► ATLAS has begun the migration of core framework elements that require the most significant design changes beyond mere thread safety
  • sometimes by completely re-evaluating functionality and limiting design to actual use cases

► We have made design choices that minimized alterations to client code
  • leverage existing features of framework, eg DataHandles and the Scheduler

► Changes to Algorithmic client code that use these elements are also underway
  • relatively straight forward recipe for the most part (but a lot of grunt work)

► Anticipate on-schedule finalization of design, and implementation of essential core Services by end of 2016, with full support of MT concurrency by end of 2017
  • we already have production level Atlas G4 simulation running in MT on KNL.
    see Steve Farrell's talk Thursday, track 2, 2PM

► Broad migration of Algorithm code to use these features will begin in 2017
Extras
AthenaMT / Gaudi Hive

- **AthenaMT**: based on Gaudi Hive: multi-threaded, concurrent **extension** to Gaudi

- **Data Flow driven**
  - Algorithms declare their data dependencies
  - Scheduler automatically executes Algorithms as data becomes available.
    - optimal traversal of graph possible if avg. Algorithm runtimes known

- **Multi-threaded**
  - Algorithms process events in their own thread, from a shared Thread Pool.

- **Pipelining**: multiple algorithms and events can be executed concurrently
  - some Algorithms are long, and produce data that many others need (eg track fitting). instead of waiting for it to finish, and idling processor, start a new event.

- **Algorithm Cloning**
  - multiple instances of the same Algorithm may exist, and be executed concurrently, each with different Event Context.
    - legacy: one instance, non-concurrent
    - cloneable: one or more instances, in its own thread
    - re-entrant: once instance, executed concurrently by multiple threads

- **Thread Safety**
  - Only shared Services and re-entrant Algorithms need to be thread safe
  - Algorithms must avoid thread-hostile behaviour
    - global statics, etc
Concurrent: Scheduling Barrier

Scheduler can only **concurrently** process events which have all Conditions in the same IOV.

NO changes required in User code and minimal changes in IOV code.

one ConditionStore shared by all Events
Scheduler can only **concurrently** process events which have all Conditions in the **same** IOV.

**ISSUES**

- loss of Concurrency when Scheduler is drained at a barrier
  - barrier is at intersection of all IOVs
  - significant impact on Event throughput if IOVs change often

- Events must be processed in order, or reshuffled by the Scheduler to avoid bouncing back and forth
