

Low-latency NuMI Trigger for the CHIPS-5 Neutrino Detector

Simeon Bash^a, John Cesar^a, Greg Deuerling^c, Thomas Dodwell^a, Stefano Germani^a, Petr Mánek^{a,b,*}, Evan Niner^c, Andrew Norman^c, Jennifer Thomas^a, Josh Tingey^a, Neil Wilcer^c

^a*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*

^b*Institute of Experimental and Applied Physics, Czech Technical University, Husova 240/5, Prague, 110 00, Czech Republic*

^c*Scientific Computing Division, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Illinois, United States*

Abstract

The CHIPS R&D project aims to develop affordable large-scale water Cherenkov neutrino detectors for underwater deployment. In 2019, a 5 kt prototype detector CHIPS-5 was deployed in northern Minnesota to potentially study neutrinos generated by the NuMI beam. This paper presents the dedicated low-latency triggering system for CHIPS-5 that delivers notifications of neutrino spills from the Fermilab accelerator complex to the detector with sub-nanosecond precision. Building on existing NOvA infrastructure, the time distribution system achieves this using only open-source software and conventional computing and network elements. In a time-of-flight study, the system reliably provided advance notifications 610 ± 330 ms prior to neutrino spills at 96% efficiency. This permits advanced analysis in real-time as well as hardware-assisted triggering that saves data bandwidth and reduces DAQ computing load outside time windows of interest.

Keywords: Water Cherenkov detectors, NuMI beam, Trigger, Time synchronisation, Software engineering

1. Introduction

The purpose of the CHIPS project is to develop affordable water Cherenkov neutrino detectors suitable for large-scale distributed deployments. Aiming to produce results of comparable quality to other current water Cherenkov experiments, CHIPS seeks to significantly reduce the cost per unit mass by utilising off-the-shelf components, readily available materials, and by designing modular parts that can be rapidly scaled and easily serviced. In 2019, CHIPS-5, the latest-generation CHIPS detector prototype, was deployed in northern Minnesota, USA. Comprising a 12 m tall cylindrical volume of 12.5 m radius (illustrated in Figure 1) the detector can provide up to 1924 m² available surface area, offering the first practical insights into construction, deployment and operation of CHIPS devices at such scale.

The site in northern Minnesota lies 7 mrad off the axis of the NuMI beam [1], a well-understood source of muon neutrinos that originates at Fermilab, Illinois. Under normal operation, NuMI delivers neutrinos in periodic spills separated by time intervals filled with cosmic background that would dominate the data stream if recorded without interruption. This motivates the introduction of the triggering system described here. Other detectors that have observed NuMI neutrinos such as MINOS [2] or NOvA [3] have applied the timing signals after the fact [4, 5], during the offline processing. Apart from using the accurate time-stamping capability developed for NOvA, the CHIPS-5 trigger uses only consumer electronics and conventional network elements that are affordable and widely available. Since triggering is performed in real-time, fractions of a second prior to neutrino arrival at the detector site, emphasis is put on the overall latency of the system.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Firstly, section 2.1 provides background on accelerator signals that are used as a basis for the trigger, and describes the facilities required for their decoding. Secondly, section 2.2 focuses on the timing distribution system that delivers notifications from the accelerator

*Corresponding author

Email address: petr.manek.19@ucl.ac.uk (Petr Mánek)




Figure 1: Artist's rendering of the CHIPS-5 detector.

complex over the baseline distance to the CHIPS-5 detector site. Thirdly, section 2.3 gives details on different triggering methods implemented on-site. Section 3 presents experimental measurements that demonstrate the viability of the new system and discusses the results.

2. Implementation

The trigger system described here is implemented as a chain with several stages that operate simultaneously together with the Data Acquisition (DAQ) at the detector site. They are described in order here.

2.1. Neutrino Spill Detection

NuMI neutrino spills can be detected by observing events of interest occurring in components of the accelerator. At Fermilab, these events are tracked by two precise timing systems:

1. The Beam-synchronous Clock System (BSYNC).
2. The Tevatron Clock (TCLK) [6].

During normal operation these clocks generate a stream of coded signals that describe various low-level hardware changes relevant for monitoring and steering the accelerator duty cycle (as illustrated in Figure 2). For the purposes of this work, these signals are assumed to occur periodically with constant and well-defined frequencies.

To receive and decode BSYNC and TCLK signals in real-time, CHIPS relies on existing infrastructure developed by NOvA; in particular, its proprietary Timing Distribution System (TDS) [5]. The TDS timestamps accelerator signals with high-precision Coordinated Universal Time (UTC) provided by a commercial GPS satellite receiver, and transmits them through a hierarchy of Timing Distribution Units (TDUs, shown in Figure 3) that permit system-wide synchronisation to within 7.8 ns across all elements. CHIPS utilised a prototype TDU supplied by NOvA, which was customised for the purposes of this work. Specifically, its on-board PowerPC 8347 computer was reprogrammed to only receive adjustable subset of accelerator signals, convert them from NOvA time specification to International Atomic Time (TAI) and relay them to subsequent stages of the trigger. To allow remote-controlled operation, an independent watchdog system was installed that generates telemetry for CHIPS-5 detector operators, and can reset the TDU upon request.

Following analysis of the accelerator hardware, two signals were selected for consideration with respect to triggering: (1) TCLK \$A5, which marks the reset of the accelerator prior to the start of a new spill cycle, and (2) BSYNC MIB\$74, which is generated when neutrinos exit the accelerator complex. These candidates were selected according to the following criteria:

1. The selected signal must be reliably generated for all neutrino spills, and not be present otherwise.
2. The time elapsed between the selected signal and the neutrino spill must have minimal jitter.




Figure 2: Operation of selected parts of the accelerator duty cycle relevant to the NuMI beam plotted as a function of time. Different series illustrate the current delivered to control magnets of various components (not to scale). Accelerator signals are labeled in bold magenta (e.g. AE, 2A). [7]




Figure 3: NOvA Timing Distribution Unit (TDU). [5]




Figure 4: Schematic of the spill signal delivery system. Fermilab accelerator signals are decoded by a NOvA TDU, which forwards them through the “chipsdaq” relay computer to CHIPS detector site.

3. The time elapsed between the selected signal and the neutrino spill must be sufficiently large, so as to allow CHIPS DAQ infrastructure to prepare for the arrival of neutrinos.

2.2. Timing Distribution System

Once the TDU detects a selected accelerator signal, low-latency notifications are transmitted across the baseline of 707 km to the CHIPS-5 site. This is facilitated by the next stage of the trigger, the CHIPS Timing Distribution System (TDS). Unlike its NOvA counterpart, the CHIPS TDS does not rely on any proprietary components or dedicated network lines. Instead, the system is implemented using conventional computers and widely available network elements, which allow a multitude of relay nodes to communicate using direct socket connections. Sparse spill notifications are multiplexed and transmitted redundantly through these nodes and over the Internet until they reach the CHIPS-5 site, where they are finally processed by the DAQ software that performs sequencing and deduplication.

The CHIPS TDS must overcome the large physical distance between sites as well as a variety of location-specific network obstacles while maintaining relatively short delivery times. To this end, parts of the system were optimised. The relay node topology installed at Fermilab implements an elaborate tunnelling scheme (illustrated in Figure 4) to safely and efficiently traverse the perimeter firewall. At the CHIPS-5 detector site, a reverse Secure Shell (SSH) proxy tunnel was initiated that permits the DAQ system to expose a direct socket interface reachable from the relay nodes at the Fermilab site. The TDS has been shown to achieve end-to-end latency on the order of 10 ms.

2.3. On-site Trigger

After spill notifications are delivered to the CHIPS-5 site in Minnesota, they are processed by the last stage of the trigger system which is responsible for integrating spill information with DAQ software in order to promptly apply trigger logic. Since this task is closely coupled with the detector equipment, in addition to trigger integration this section also provides background on the relevant CHIPS-5 DAQ components.

During runs, the detector relies on Plane Optical Modules (POMs) to measure Cherenkov light within the detector volume using photomultiplier tubes (PMTs). POMs digitise analog PMT signals as discrete hits and timestamp them with nanosecond-precise TAI that is synchronised to a local GPS receiver using a hierarchy of White Rabbit devices [8]. Once timestamped, hits are streamed to a data processing facility via a 10 Gbit Ethernet link. Depending on the POM hardware in use, the presented trigger integrates with this process in two modes:



Figure 5: Real-time dashboard that was developed to display information about the state of the Fermilab accelerator to CHIPS DAQ operators. Visualisation is performed by the Kibana front-end.

1. *Software data selection* – a procedure that performs continuous acquisition but later excludes data taken outside of specified time windows.
2. *Hardware triggering* – a procedure that leaves POMs primed in insensitive standby mode, occasionally instructing them at short notice to become sensitive in order to measure within specified time windows.

While the former approach requires no hardware upgrades, and is therefore readily compatible with all POMs, the latter approach uses the MicroDAQ subsystem [9] on-board the latest-generation POMs. Hardware triggering with MicroDAQs is desirable since it saves data bandwidth and reduces DAQ system load, which would otherwise be required to identify and discard out-of-window hits. In both cases, DAQ software needs to be supplied with a series of triggered time windows in real-time. Depending on run type, these windows are calculated to either include or exclude the estimated time at which the neutrino beam passes through the detector. In parallel, trigger information is fed to on-site monitoring systems that inform detector operators (as illustrated in Figure 5).

3. Benchmark

To demonstrate the viability of the presented trigger system, this section evaluates its capability to reliably deliver notifications to the CHIPS-5 detector ahead of the neutrino spills. In this context, it is assumed that each notification and its corresponding spill undergoes the following sequence of events:

1. The trigger signal is detected at the accelerator and a notification is dispatched.
2. A neutrino spill exits the accelerator complex.
3. The notification is read at the detector site.
4. The neutrino spill arrives at the detector.

For convenience, times elapsed between these events are denoted t_{xy} , where x and y refer to event numbers 1-4. It is desirable to show that the time elapsed between the arrival of notifications and their corresponding neutrino spills, later labeled as time budget t_{34} , is as large as possible, and not smaller than




Figure 6: Events of interest used in the analysis of a single spill, plotted in the order of time (not to scale). Ongoing processes are indicated using thick colored arrows, whereas time intervals t_{xy} are labeled using thin arrows in the bottom. The time budget t_{34} is indicated in red.




Figure 7: Time between subsequent emissions of the \$74 signal aggregated in a histogram over the period of roughly 52 hours of NuMI beam operation.

200 ms, which is the estimated minimum time required by DAQ systems to schedule a sensitive time window in hardware triggering mode. To this end, three key properties are investigated:

1. The time difference t_{12} and jitter σ_{12} between trigger signal and neutrino spill at the accelerator site.
2. The notification latency t_{13} of the CHIPS TDS.
3. The time t_{14} between the trigger signal and the arrival of neutrinos at the CHIPS-5 site.

These values were chosen to allow the budget t_{34} to be expressed as $t_{14} - t_{13}$, where t_{14} is substituted for $t_{12} + t_{24}$ (this is also shown in Figure 6). While t_{12}, t_{13} are measured experimentally, the neutrino time of flight t_{24} is calculated analytically.

Before proceeding to evaluation, it is first necessary to verify the instrumentation used for this analysis; specifically, the customised NOvA TDU (introduced in section 2.1). This is achieved by measuring the period of the BSYNC MIB\$74 signal, and comparing it to the expected value¹ of 1.333s. Aggregating roughly 128,000 real signals observed over a 3-day run during NuMI operation in late 2019 (shown in Figure 7), the period was experimentally determined to be $1.333\text{s} \pm 317.7\text{ }\mu\text{s}$. This agreement was found to be acceptable for the purposes of this study.

While \$74 would represent an ideal choice for a trigger signal since it marks the precise time of neutrino exit from the accelerator complex, it is considered unsuitable because it is emitted late in the duty cycle, and cannot be delivered to the detector with a sufficient time budget. For this reason, the rest of the analysis assumes the trigger signal (event 1) to be TCLK \$A5, which appears earlier. In addition, \$74 is understood

¹Even though the observed period is known to vary in discrete increments depending on the programmed accelerator cycle, the given value can be expected to be dominant.




Figure 8: Time t_{12} between emission of an \$A5 signal and subsequent \$74 signal aggregated in a histogram over the period of roughly 52 hours of NuMI beam operation.




Figure 9: Histogram of the budget t_{34} remaining to schedule time window in CHIPS DAQ. Negative values do not allow triggering since neutrinos arrive at the detector prior to notification.

to be the point of departure for the neutrino time-of-flight calculation (event 2). With this interpretation established, we may now proceed to estimate the three key properties of interest introduced at the beginning.

The time t_{12} is measured by examining subsequent occurrences of \$A5 and \$74 (as shown in Figure 8). Processing the same data that was previously used for instrument verification, t_{12} was found to be 1.437 s with jitter $\sigma_{12} = 3.48 \mu\text{s}$. In order to measure t_{13} , the CHIPS TDS was modified to assign two additional timestamps to each spill notification, one at the time of its transmission, and another at the time of its consumption by DAQ. The value of t_{13} is obtained as the difference between these timestamps. Finally, t_{24} is analytically given by d/c , where $d = 707 \text{ km}$ is the baseline length and c is the speed of light.

Combining all components together, the time budget $t_{34} = t_{14} - t_{13}$ may now be evaluated. As mentioned earlier, the time t_{14} is substituted for $t_{12} + t_{24}$. To obtain a conservative lower bound on t_{14} , the measured jitter σ_{12} is subtracted from t_{12} , yielding the following result:

$$t_{14} = t_{12} + t_{24} \quad (1)$$

$$\geq t_{12} - \sigma_{12} + t_{24} \quad (2)$$

$$\approx 1.437 \text{ s} - 3.48 \mu\text{s} + 2.5 \text{ ms} = 1.4395 \text{ s}. \quad (3)$$

With this value, the time budget t_{34} experimentally evaluates as $610.2 \pm 330.1 \text{ ms}$ (plotted in Figure 9). Out of roughly 160,000 observed signals, approximately 3.69 % had negative time budget, meaning that in such cases notifications were delivered to the detector only *after* it had already encountered NuMI neutrinos. The remaining 96.3 % notifications preceded their corresponding neutrino spills. Furthermore, t_{34} as well as $t_{34} - \sigma_{34}$ exceed the required 200 ms threshold imposed by DAQ hardware, meaning that more than 83.9 % of all notifications will be viable.

4. Conclusion

A new triggering system was developed that allows delivery of nanosecond-precise accelerator signals from Fermilab site to the CHIPS-5 detector 707 km away. Aside from existing NOvA infrastructure, the presented system relies only on open-source software, conventional computing and network infrastructure to provide a resilient low-latency trigger.

In a benchmark, the system delivered over 96 % notifications ahead of their corresponding neutrino spills, and more than 83 % notifications with a sufficient time budget required for hardware-assisted triggering. This permits the latest-generation CHIPS POMs to save data bandwidth and reduce DAQ computing load outside of triggered time windows.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Fermilab; the Leverhulme Trust Research Project Grant; U.S. Department of Energy; and the European Research Council funding for the CHROMIUM project. Fermilab is operated by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the U.S. DOE.

References

- [1] P. Adamson, et al., The NuMI neutrino beam, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 806 (2016) 279–306. doi:10.1016/j.nima.2015.08.063.
- [2] D. Michael, The MINOS experiment, *Nuclear Physics B-Proceedings Supplements* 118 (2003) 189–196.
- [3] D. Ayres, N. Collaboration, et al., NOvA proposal to build a 30 kiloton off-axis detector to study neutrino oscillations in the Fermilab NuMI beamline, arXiv preprint hep-ex/0503053 (2005).
- [4] S. Romisch, S. R. Jefferts, V. Zhang, T. E. Parker, N. Ashby, P. Adamson, G. Barr, A. Habig, J. Meier, C. James, et al., Synchronization between remote sites for the MINOS experiment, in: *Proceedings of the 44th Annual Precise Time and Time Interval Systems and Applications Meeting*, 2012, pp. 99–118.
- [5] A. Norman, R. Kwarcianny, G. Deuerling, N. Wilcer, The NOvA timing system: A system for synchronizing a long baseline neutrino experiment, in: *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, Vol. 396, IOP Publishing, 2012, p. 012034.
- [6] D. G. Beechy, R. J. Ducar, Time and data distribution systems at the Fermilab accelerator, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research Section A: Accelerators, Spectrometers, Detectors and Associated Equipment* 247 (1) (1986) 231–238.
- [7] P. Adamson, Private communication (2019).
- [8] J. Serrano, M. Lipinski, T. Wlostowski, E. Gousiou, E. van der Bij, M. Cattin, G. Daniluk, The White Rabbit project (2013).
- [9] T. Huber, J. Kelley, S. Kunwar, D. Tosi, I.-G. Collaboration, et al., The IceTop scintillator upgrade, in: *35th International Cosmic Ray Conference*, Vol. 301, SISSA Medialab, 2018, p. 401.