

## 15 Offline Computing

### 15.1 Introduction

This section describes the LZ offline computing systems, including offline software for the LZ experiment, the definition of the computing environment, the provision of hardware and manpower resources, and the eventual operation of the offline computing systems. The offline computing organization provides the software framework, computing infrastructure, data-management system, and analysis software as well as the hardware and networking required for offline processing and analysis of LZ data. The system will be designed to handle the data flow starting from the raw event data files (the so-called EVT files) on the SURF surface RAID array, all the way through to the data-analysis framework for physics analyses at collaborating institutions, as illustrated in Figure 15.1.1.




Figure 15.1.1. Schematic data-flow diagram for LZ.

### 15.2 Data Volume, Data Processing, and Data Centers

The LZ data will be stored, processed and distributed using two data centers, one in the United States and one in the UK. Both data centers will be capable of storing, processing, simulating and analyzing the LZ data in near real-time. The SURF surface staging computer ships the raw data files (EVT files) to the U.S. data center, which is expected to have sufficient CPU resources for initial processing. The National Energy Research Scientific Computing (NERSC) center at LBNL will contain the resources to act as the LZ U.S. data center. The run processing extracts the PMT charge and time information from the digitized signals, applies the calibrations, looks for S1 and S2 candidate events, performs the event reconstruction,

**Table 15.2.1. Daily (compressed) data rates in LZ based on scaled LUX data. The scaling factors are as follows: (a) PMT surface area ratio (2) times number of channels ratio — not including the low-gain channels (4); (b) number of channels ratio (8) times rate ratio (13); (c) liquid surface area ratio.**

Source	LUX (GB/d)	Scaling Factor	LZ (GB/d)	LZ Compressed (GB/d)
Single PE	44.00	8 <sup>(a)</sup>	352	117
S1	0.24	104 <sup>(b)</sup>	25	8
S2	76.34	104 <sup>(b)</sup>	7,939	2,646
Uncorrelated SE	20.00	9 <sup>(c)</sup>	180	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>140.58</b>		<b>8,496</b>	<b>2,831</b>

and produces the so-called reduced quantity (RQ) files. These files represent approximately 7% of the size of the original EVT files, based on the LUX experience. The RQ files will be accessible to all groups in the collaboration and represent the primary input for the physics analyses.

The EVT and the RQ files are also mirrored from the U.S. data center to the UK data center (located at Imperial College London) partly as a backup, and partly to share the load of file access/processing, giving better use of resources for all LZ collaborators. The EVT file transfer to the UK data center is done from the U.S. data center as opposed to directly from SURF in order to avoid eating into the bandwidth available to ship the data from the experiment. Subsequent reprocessing of the data (following new calibrations, reconstruction and identification algorithms, etc.) is expected to take place at one or both centers, with the newly generated RQ files copied to the other center and made available to the collaboration.

From the hardware point of view, the system must be able to deal with the LZ data volume in terms of storage capacity and processing. Based on the LUX experience and appropriate scaling for LZ (in terms of number of channels, single/dual gains, rates, etc.), the amount of WIMP search data generated in one year of LZ running is estimated to be 940 TB. Including calibration runs, the total amount of LZ data produced per year is expected to be 1.1-1.2 PB, depending on the amount and type of calibration data collected during yearly operation. This estimate assumes that about three hours of calibration data are collected each week.

The breakdown of the contributions for the different sources of light to the LUX data and their scaling to LZ is given in Table 15.2.1, which clearly shows that the data volume is dominated by the S2 signals. A similar estimate can be obtained by a simple scaling of the average LUX events recorded during krypton calibrations, as described in Chapter 11. These events, with a total energy deposition of 41.6 keV (from 32.2 keV and 9.4 keV conversion electrons), are 203 kB in size, and are dominated by the S2 signal. While these events generate more light than typical events in the WIMP search region, they do provide a useful measure for the data volume. Scaling by the LZ to LUX channel ratio, i.e., by a factor of 8, these events are expected to have 1.6 MB in LZ. With compression, which was shown in LUX to reduce the event size by a factor of 3, this yields 0.53 MB/event. Monte Carlo simulations show that the total background rate in LZ is about 40 Hz, which translates into 21 MB/s, or equivalently 1.83 TB/day. The difference between this rate and the 2.83 TB/day shown in Table 15.2.1 is due to higher-energy background events, some of which can have more than one scatter, i.e., more than one S2 signal. On the other hand, the background rate in the WIMP search region (below 30-50 keV) is expected to be about 0.4 Hz, which means that the total volume of the WIMP-search data can be reduced by optimizing the event selection.

The SURF staging computer will have a disk capacity of 192 TB, enough storage for slightly more than two months of LZ running in WIMP-search mode (at 2.8 TB/day), similar to its underground counterpart. The capacity of the staging arrays was based on the assumption that any network problems between SURF underground and the surface, or the surface to the outside, would take at most several weeks to be fully resolved. The remaining storage capacity can be used to store additional calibration data.

The anticipated data rates imply that the network must be able to sustain a transfer rate of about 0.07 GB/s (which is actually a factor of 2 higher than the nominal rate as a safety margin). Such rates do not represent a particular challenge for the existing networks between SURF and NERSC/LBNL or LBNL and Imperial College.

From the current LUX experience, we expect that processing one LZ event should take no more than six seconds on one core (using a conservative estimate based on an Intel Xeon ES-2670 at 2.6 GHz and 4 GB of RAM per core). Therefore, assuming a data-collection rate of 40 Hz, LZ needs 240 cores to keep up with the incoming data stream. For reprocessing, as software/calibrations are refined, a larger number of cores will be needed to keep the processing time within reasonable limits (e.g., a factor of 10 more CPU cores allows reprocessing of a year's data in approximately one month).

### 15.2.1 The U.S. Data Center

The U.S. data center will be located at NERSC/LBNL. Currently NERSC has four main systems: the Parallel Distributed Systems Facility (PDSF) provides approximately 2,600 cores running Scientific Linux and is the default system for high-energy and nuclear physics projects. The Carver system provides an additional 10,000 cores, while the two CRAY systems, Edison and Hopper, provide 134,000 and 153,000 cores, respectively. All systems can access the Global Parallel File System (GPFS) with a current capacity of about 7.5 PB, which is coupled to the High Performance Storage System (HPSS) with a 240 PB tape robot archive. The LZ resources will be incorporated within the PDSF cluster.

Our planning assumes modest needs for data storage and processing power for simulations, as described in Section 15.4, a rapid growth in preparation for commissioning and first operation, and then a steady growth of resources during LZ operations. The planned evolution of data storage and processing power at the U.S. data center is given in Table 15.2.1.1.

The amounts of raw and calibration data per year are assumed to be 940 TB and 270 TB, as described in the text, while the Monte Carlo data are ramped up to the maximum estimated capacity over the Project period. The processed data are assumed to be 50% of the Monte Carlo simulations and 10% of the data (assuming a slightly higher percentage of 10% in the size of the RQ-files compared to the 7% in LUX). The user data are assumed to be 50% of the Monte Carlo simulations in the years prior to experimental data, and 5% of the total data once LZ is running. The total disk space allocated includes a 20% safety margin with respect to the total amount of calculated data.

The CPU power is slowly ramped up to reach the maximum of 300 cores needed by the simulations one year before LZ operations, after which the yearly CPU capacity is such that it allows continued Monte Carlo production in parallel with real-time data processing, as well as full data reprocessing in a reasonable time.

**Table 15.2.1.1. Planned storage (in TB) and processing power by U.S. fiscal year at the U.S. data center.**

<b>FY</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>
<b>Raw data (TB)</b>	-	-	-	-	470	1410	2350	3290	4230	5170
<b>Calibration data</b>	-	-	-	-	135	405	675	945	1215	1485
<b>Simulation data</b>	10	40	60	80	200	200	200	200	200	200
<b>Processed data</b>	5	20	30	40	161	282	403	524	645	766
<b>User data</b>	5	20	30	40	48	115	181	248	314	381
<b>Total data</b>	20	80	120	160	1014	2412	3809	5207	6604	8002
<b>Disk space</b>	24	96	144	192	1217	2894	4571	6248	7925	9602
<b>CPU cores</b>	75	150	150	300	300	2700	5100	7500	9900	12300

We note that the LUX experiment currently sends data from SURF to the primary data mirror at Brown University with an average throughput of 100 MB/s. The primary mirror syncs the data to disk storage at the NERSC center. At NERSC, the LUX data are saved to the RAID 6 disk on the PDSF cluster, and the data are subsequently archived to tape using the HPSS system. Although the U.S. data center will be located at NERSC, other U.S. computing resources are likely to be available to the collaboration. We will utilize resources available to the collaboration in the most effective approach.

### 15.2.2 The UK Data Center

The UK data center will be implemented within the GridPP infrastructure at Imperial College. The UK data center will provide redundancy and parallel capacity for carrying out the first level, near real-time processing of all LZ raw data (when needed), and carrying out reprocessing of the entire data set on timescales of several weeks. Furthermore, the UK data center will contribute to systematic Monte Carlo simulation studies, as well as generating Monte Carlo production runs. In terms of LZ specific software and data, it will be an exact mirror of the U.S. data center and use the same analysis framework, and access the same central database and software repository.

The UK data center at the Imperial College will benefit from a range of local expertise within the HEP group including both technical computing infrastructure and scientific data-processing heritage specific to the LZ requirements. The Imperial College HEP group is a Tier-2 GridPP node and provides the London Group lead and the overall Technical Director for UK GridPP. Local GridPP computing infrastructure includes ~4,000 cores ( $\equiv$ 38,890 HEP SPEC), 3.0 PB storage, a 40 Gbit/s network connection (into Janet), and within UK GridPP as a whole there are ~30,000 cores. Within the HEP group are 5 FTE of IT personnel (two SysAdmin, two GridPP, and one other experiment support). Hardware purchased as part of an LZ contribution to the GridPP will be installed into the GridPP and maintained by the local IT personnel and LZ will become an approved project for its entire duration, having both general and dedicated access to GridPP resources. At times of full reprocessing, GridPP will make available on demand at least 1,000 dedicated cores to ensure a several-week turnaround on the full LZ data set. In terms of processing expertise, the HEP group has many people experienced with both CMS and LHCb software coding as well as the lead for the GANGA software used to initiate processing tasks within the GridPP environment. In addition, the Imperial LZ team members who have provided data-center tasks for a number of international projects including ROSAT, ELAIS, ZEPLIN III, and LUX. Working closely with the Imperial College team will be the University of Sheffield and Edinburgh teams, which also bring GridPP expertise and extensive prior experience in direct dark-matter search projects, including LUX and ZEPLIN.

The hardware requirements defined as a contribution to GridPP are 1 PB of storage and 800 processor cores. The hardware will be purchased in two stages, both to defray final costs and to ensure the most up-to-date hardware for the GridPP. At the time of end-use by LZ, GridPP will provide sufficient resources from its available pool and this will be guaranteed for the duration of the LZ Experiment at no further cost to the project. The currently envisioned milestones for the hardware are:


- Early hardware purchase (0.05 PB + 100 cores) by August 2015
- Late hardware purchase (0.95 PB + 700 cores) by April 2017

The early purchase provides sufficient resources to support data-center development and simulation activities at that stage, with the late purchase providing full resources in time to support the experiment commissioning phase.

## 15.3 Software Packages

Among the most important infrastructure offline software packages are the database (DB) and the analysis framework (AF). Figure 15.3.1 shows a schematic flow diagram for the DB. All processes associated with direct control/access to the experiment, i.e., run control (such as run number, time, run configuration,

trigger, etc.), slow controls (such as temperature, pressure, HV, etc.), data monitoring, and electronic logs write their data to a secondary DB, located at the experiment (SURF underground). This allows continued data-taking, independent of the connection to the outside world. The secondary DB is mirrored by a tertiary DB, located on the surface at SURF, which in turn is synchronized with the primary DB, located and maintained at the University of Alabama or at the U.S. data center. The data sent from the secondary to the tertiary and subsequently to the primary DB



**Figure 15.3.1. Flow diagram for the LZ database system.**

are propagated in near-real time, with latencies of no more than 5-10 minutes. In addition to the information from the underground (secondary) DB, the primary DB records the data-quality information, calibration constants, and run-processing status. Read access from the primary DB is needed for data-quality analysis, calibration, run processing, and ultimately data analysis. The LZ DB will be based on one of the open-source database-management systems — MySQL or PostgreSQL. Although only the latter supports the implementation of bi-temporal data, simpler solutions can be developed to achieve the same functionality.

All three DB computers will have identical backup computers ready to take their places should a failure occur. The primary DB itself is backed up by a separate computer, which also ensures the backup of all other offline software components.

The analysis framework will allow users to put together modular code for data analysis to automatically take care of the basic data handling (I/O, event/run selection, etc.). A dedicated task force evaluated various options. In terms of existing frameworks, two ROOT-based frameworks were considered: *Gaudi* (developed at CERN and used by ATLAS, LHCb, MINERvA, Daya Bay, etc.) and *art* (developed at Fermilab and used by MicroBooNE, NOvA, LBNE, DarkSide-50, etc.). In parallel, we evaluated the possibility of evolving the framework developed for LUX, which is based on Python scripts and a MySQL database, and supports modules written in Python, C++/ROOT or MATLAB. For completeness, developing a new framework from scratch was considered as another alternative. However, given the amount of effort this would require (of the order of at least several FTE-years based on estimates from other experiments such as CMS, Double Chooz, MiniBooNE, T2K, etc.), it is an unlikely option. Selection of *Gaudi* as the analysis framework was made in February 2015.

Wherever possible, we anticipate that existing code from the successful LUX and ZEPLIN experiments will be adapted and optimized for LZ, as is, for instance, the case with LUXSim with a geometry option for LZ. In the long run, the LZ simulation is expected to become a stand-alone package, which will be integrated into the data centers frameworks for general LZ community use. The LZ processing and analysis codes will be written to be as portable as possible to ensure straightforward running on both Linux and OSX platforms for those groups who wish to do analysis in-house in addition to (or instead of) running codes on the data centers.

All LZ software (including both online and offline code) will be centrally maintained through a software repository based on *git*, which will include tagged release versions and nightly builds, as well as a suite of

well-defined standard performance and integrity tests. A test system based on *gitlab* is currently being evaluated at the University of Alabama.

Cybersecurity risks posed to the offline computing systems relate to the experiment's data and information systems. Much of the LZ computing and data will be housed at major computing facilities in the United States (NERSC/LBNL) and UK (Imperial College), which have excellent cybersecurity experience and records. Specific risks posed to the LZ project relate to data transfer (in terms of data loss or corruption during transfer) and malicious code insertion. File checksums will mitigate the danger of loss or corruption of data during transfer, while copies at both the U.S. and UK data centers provide added redundancy. Malicious code insertion can be mitigated by monitoring each commit to the code repository by the offline group, requiring username/password authentication unique to each contributor to the code repository, eliminating the malicious code from the code repository, and reverting to the previous release.

## 15.4 Simulations

Detailed, accurate simulations of the LZ detector response and backgrounds are necessary, both at the detector design phase and during data analysis. Current LZ simulations use the existing LUXSim software package [1], originally developed for the LUX experiment. This software provides object-oriented coding capability specifically tuned for noble liquid detectors, working on top of the GEANT4 engine. All LZ simulations are expected to be integrated into the broader LZ analysis framework and, as such, this will naturally support ROOT format output at least at the photon level.

The current simulations group is organized into several distinct areas of technical expertise, a structure reflected in the organization of this task:

- (a) Definition, maintenance, and implementation of an accurate detector geometry;
- (b) Generators for relevant event sources in LZ for both backgrounds and signal;
- (c) Maintenance and continued improvement of the micro-physics model of particle interactions in liquid xenon, as captured in the NEST package [2];
- (d) Detector response implementation — which transforms the ensemble of individual GEANT4 photon hits at the PMTs to produce an event file of the same format and structure as in the data.

A survey of existing resources within the LZ collaboration shows sufficient CPU power and storage capacity to cover the immediate LZ simulation needs. However, during the LZ project and operation period, the simulations will require an estimated average of  $3\text{--}5 \times 10^4$  CPU hours per week (or equivalently 200-300 cores) and a total of 100-200 TB of disk space (as extrapolated from the current LUX simulation data sets and proper scaling to LZ). These estimates have been fully incorporated in the U.S. and UK data center allocations, both in terms of storage and processing power.

## 15.5 Schedule and Organization

Offline software by its nature is heavily front-loaded in the schedule. To enable the scientists to commission the LZ detector, the software for reading, assembling, transferring, and processing the data must be in place before detector installation. This implies, in particular, that the data transfer, offline framework, and analysis tools themselves will have been developed, tested, debugged, and deployed to the collaboration. We rely on the collaboration's existing experience with the LUX experiment and others (Daya Bay, Double Chooz, Fermi-LAT, DarkSide-50 etc.), which routinely handled similar challenges.

Key offline computing milestones are summarized in Table 15.5.1. After the decision on the choice of the analysis framework for LZ (February 2015), the first framework is expected to be released one year later (February 2016), followed by the first physics integration release another six months later (August 2016). This version includes all necessary modules for real-time processing (i.e., hit-finding algorithms, calibration constants modules, S1/S2 identification, event reconstruction), as well as a fully integrated

**Table 15.5.1 Key offline computing milestones.**

<b>Feb. 2015</b>	Analysis Framework decision
<b>Feb. 2016</b>	First Analysis Framework release
<b>Aug. 2016</b>	First physics integration release
<b>Feb. 2017</b>	First mock data challenge
<b>Dec. 2017</b>	Second mock data challenge
<b>June 2018</b>	Third mock data challenge

simulations package (i.e., from event generation through photon hits, digitization, trigger, and data-format output). The first mock data challenge (February 2017) will test both the data flow (transfers, processing, distribution, and logging), as well as the full physics analysis functionality of the framework, separately, while the second data challenge (December 2017) will be dedicated to testing the entire data chain. The third data challenge (June 2018) will also test the entire data chain and is expected to validate the readiness of the offline system just before the LZ cool-down phase.

Offline computing will be co-led by a physicist experienced in software development and use and a computing professional from LBNL. The software professional will also liaise with NERSC for collaboration on providing LZ compute resources — in particular, provisioning and/or allocating of network, CPU, disk, and tape resources sufficient for LZ collaborators to transfer, manage, archive, and analyze all data for the experiment.

The infrastructure software effort will also involve professional software engineering from LBNL. This person will provide technical leadership, oversight, and coordination of LZ collaboration efforts on infrastructure software as well as the design, implementation, testing, and deployment of critical LZ infrastructure components. LZ infrastructure software includes data management and processing, offline systems and monitoring, offline interfaces to LZ databases, and the analysis framework. The remainder, and bulk, of the software is a collaboration responsibility. Software for simulation, analysis, monitoring, and other tasks will be written and maintained by collaboration scientists.

## Chapter 15 References

- [1] D. S. Akerib *et al.* (LUX), [Nucl. Instrum. Meth. \*\*A675\*\*, 63 \(2012\)](#), [arXiv:1111.2074 \[physics.data-an\]](#).
- [2] M. Szydagis, A. Fyhrie, D. Thorngren, and M. Tripathi ([NEST](#)), *Proceedings, Light Detection In Noble Elements (LIDINE2013)*, [J. Instrum. \*\*8\*\*, C10003 \(2013\)](#), [arXiv:1307.6601 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).