

WIR SCHAFFEN WISSEN - HEUTE FÜR
MORGEN



Mark Könnecke, Owen Arnold

Control Systems Survey for ESS

- European Spallation Source (ESS) being built in Lund, Sweden
- Switzerland contributes with money and work, In Kind
 - Survey of existing experiment control systems
- Aims
 - Choose an experiment control program (ECP) for ESS
 - Gather knowledge about control systems
- Participants in the survey:
 - EPICS (3,4), TANGO, GDA, Sardana, NOMAD, IROHA, NICOS-2, SECI, IBEX, SNS, pshell, NSLS-2(bluesky)

- A questionnaire was constructed covering an exhaustive list of aspects of control systems
- The questionnaires were filled in, discussed and validated with either the original authors of the software or experts in it
- The questionnaires can be obtained on request

- EPICS, TANGO discussed as a separate class
- Common Patterns
- What was learned?
- Details on selected systems
- The Selection of an ECP for ESS

- Distributed Hardware Abstraction Layer (DHAL)
 - Little servers implement hardware access and functionality
 - Multiple clients can access servers through a standard network protocol and standardized interfaces
- Large: collaborations, installations, many support tools
- No free lunch:
 - increase complexity
 - new sources of bugs
- BUT: Everyone is using one of them, Exceptions: (NOMAD, IROHA)
- MIA: Collect bits and pieces and present as an instrument to the user

- EPICS and TANGO are targeted towards accelerators
- Accelerators
 - **Very** static configurations
 - Trained operators
 - Standard operating procedures
- Instruments
 - Dynamic and changing configurations
 - Untrained users
 - Complex operations
- EPICS/TANGO work 90% for instruments too, the difficulties come in the last mile
- Example CSS or MEDM:
 - For accelerator displays: beautiful
 - For instruments: change code for every change at the instrument?

- EPICS 3
 - Best at home on register hardware (VME, ...)
 - Core developers greying
 - Not really good at transporting arrays
 - Steep learning curve: 18 months
- EPICS 4
 - Proper support for arrays and structures
 - MIA: device support
- TANGO: critical dependency: CORBA
 - More approachable: 3 days advertised
- Is there a market for a new system based on modern messaging concepts?

- Most systems have a notion of a device
 - Bunch of parameters (also an abstraction)
 - Often in hierarchical arrangements
 - Device classes:
 - Readable
 - Movable, Scannable,
 - Motors are treated special
 - Represent not only hardware but meta data etc. too

Device, Parameters: Why?

- There is a cost: Level of indirection
- Benefits:
 - Abstracts from hardware
 - Helps implement persistence
 - Helps implement change notifications
 - Helps implementing history
 - Caching
 - Fine grained access control
 - Simulation mode

Common Pattern: DataSet, DataSink

- DataSet
 - Collection of meta data and detector data for a measurement or scan point
- DataSink
 - takes a DataSet and does something with it
- Common somethings:
 - Data file writing
 - Live display
 - Online data reduction
 - Whatever you want to do with the data...

- Containers for devices and experiment routines
- Run experiment routines (scan etc)
 - against: Devices, backed by EPICS or TANGO
 - creating DataSets
 - forwarded to DataSink

Common Features

- Scanning
- Scripting and Batch Processing
- Various forms of waiting/running:
 - wait for something to finish
 - wait for a list of things to finish
 - start without waiting
- Access control, three levels:
 - RO
 - User
 - Specialist
- Data file writing (high entropy)
- Virtual or logical motors
- Managing configuration

- XML for configuration files
- Python for scripting and implementation
- Eclipse-RCP based UIs
- Client-Server architectures
 - Instrument server(s)
 - UI interacts with instrument server
- Linux as OS

- Command Line Interfaces
- Log viewers
- 1D or 2D online data displays with interaction
- Hierarchical parameter displays
- Device lists
- Dashboards
- NEW:
 - instrument schematics with possibility to drill down
 - 3D instrument views
- Clutter is a problem in all instrument UI's
 - Let us ask for visibility controls

- Direct bi-directional communication, command-response
 - write parameters
 - read parameters
- RPC-mechanisms, like CORBA are an extension of command-response
- Publish-subscribe

- Control systems are results of evolution
- Hardware standardization is a good thing
- Take care of data format and other standards right away
- Independent of the technical choice, having a uniform system is important
- Design for change
- Do not neglect the CLI
- Allow for easy modification of GUIs
- Avoid blame games
- Collaboration can have its downsides

- SECI:
 - LabView has all the features to write proper software
 - But makes it very easy to write bad software
 - ISIS had to reimplement 50% of all Labview drivers
- SNS
 - NI-Datasockets irregularly failing
 - Commodity PC were not so commodity after all: cards had to match PC
- Syntax addiction

- In Europe, when you do a TAS, you are supposed to implement MAD syntax
- NOMAD had to implement MAD syntax
- Nearly all newer synchrotron systems had to implement SPEC syntax
- ISIS had to try to be openGenie compatible
- ==> **Scientists are syntax addicted!!**



Selection of Ideas Implemented

- GDA: baton system for controlling access
- NOMAD: Block programming for batch file generation
- PSHELL: git for managing configuration files and scripts, a git commit per script run
- NSLS-2
 - Use of functional programming constructs in bluesky
 - Data handling
 - The Flyer abstraction
 - More details: Maksim Raitkin's presentation

Choosing an ECP for ESS

- The accelerator people had already settled for EPICS; we had to follow
- C-Python was to be the preferred scripting language, because of numpy and better package support.
 - This deselected all the Java based systems having jython as scripting language
- This left four candidates: NICOS, Sardana, NSLS-2, IBEX

Decision Matrix

Criterion		IBEX			NICOS			Bluesky			Sardana		
	Weight	Answer	Points	Weighted	Answer	Points	Weighted	Answer	Points	Weighted	Answer	Points	Weighted
Does support for EPICS devices	2	yes	1	2	not fully yes	0.5	1	yes	1	2	partly	0.5	1
Uses Python - Mantid integration	1	scripting test	0.5	0.5	yes	python	1	python	1	1	python	1	1
Uses Qt - Mantid integration	0.8	no	0	0	no	0	0	no	0	0	no	0	0
Uses scientific plotting lib	1	not really	0	0	matplotlib	1	1	matplotlib	1	1	matplotlib	1	1
Easy to configure GUI / creating multiple experiment views	0.8	yes	1	0.8	partial	0.5	0.4	no	0	0	taurus	1	0.8
Easy to create a Synoptic view Support for "instrument configuration"	0.5	yes	1	0.5	partial	0.2	0.1	no	0	0	no	0	0
Already used at other sources (prior to adoption)	2	no	0	0	no	0	0	no	0	0	yes	1	2
Size of development community / current development work	2	ISIS only	0	0	FRM2 only	0	0	NSLS-2	0	0	many	1	2
Learning time as developer	0.8	steep	0.5	0.4	moderate	0.5	0.4	moderate	0.5	0.4	some	1	0.8
Sum over dependencies * number of active authors over last 6 months	2	new	1	2	moderate	0.5	1	new	1	2	CORBA	0	0
Project is NOT vulnerable to forked dependencies	2	old CSS	0.5	1	no	1	2	no	1	2	no	1	2
Uses technologies or knowledge already available at DMSC	2	yes	1	2	yes	1	2	yes	1	2	half/corba	0.5	1
Integration / synergy with other ESS ICS technologies/products/services	0.5	yes	1	0.5	not fully	0.5	0.25	yes	1	0.5	no	0	0
Multi platform client	2	yes	1	2	some hassle	0.5	1	no	0	0	some hassle	0.5	1
Mainly runs on Linux	1	no	0.5	0.5	yes	1	1	yes	1	1	yes	1	1
Security / authentication / authorisation model	1	no	0	0	yes	1	1	no	0	0	yes	1	1
Support for scanning CLI. Scan everything against everything.	2	in deve	0	0	yes	1	2	yes	1	2	yes	1	2
Web Interface	1	dashboard	0.2	0.2	mini	0.2	0.2	no	0	0	no	0	0
Programmatic Interface	2	at EPICSS	0.5	1	pythonic	1	2	for data	0.5	1	tango	1	2
Dry Run Mode	1	genie python	0.5	0.5	built in	1		no	0	0	no	0	0
Provides a Logging service	1	MySQL	1	1	yes	1	1	python log	1	1	yes	1	1
Provides Error handling	1	distributed	0.3	0.3	yes	1	1	yes	1	1	yes	1	1
Ease of Integration with data streaming project	1	with difficulty	0.3	0.3	add device	1	1	add device	1	1	new dev type	0.5	0.5
Quick fixes in production by team	1	partly	0.5	0.5	yes	1	1	yes	1	1	more difficult	0.5	0.5
Codacy project grade. For points A = 1, F = 0	2									0			
Total	33.4		12.3	16		15.4	20.35		15	18.9		15.5	21.6

- Candidates are close together
- IBEX: lowest score, no central instrument server
- NSLS-2: no server functionality
- Sardana: critical dependency CORBA
- The winner is: **NICOS**

- There are patterns:
 - Use of a DHAL
 - Experiment routines act upon devices creating datasets being forwarded to DataSinks
- On comparison, successful systems are very close together in features and capabilities

Selection Criteria

- EPICS Support
- Support for non EPICS devices
- # community provided drivers
- Driver development time
- Ease of GUI configuration
- Support for synoptic view
- Support for "instrument configurations"
- GUI technology "looks nice", or is easy to make so
- Already used at other neutron sources / shared user base
- Size of development community / current development work / opportunities for collaboration
- Learning time
- Integration with Streaming

- Community size
- Use at other n-facilities
- Dependencies/Longevity
- Use of technology already available at ESS
- Multi platform client
- Security model
- Scan support
- Scripting support
- Remote WWW-interface
- Simulation support
- Logging/Error reporting integration
- Ease of analysis -DAQ integration