### The TDAQ System of the MEG Experiment

- The MEG experiment
- requirements for the TDAQ from physics
  - DAQ choice
  - requirements for the trigger
- An FPGA based trigger
  - algorithm implementation
- TDAQ efficiency considerations



#### PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT



Luca Galli, PSI e INFN Pisa



### Very few words about the MEG experiment





- "Tiny" collaboration
- Search  $\mu$ ->e $\gamma$  with 5x10^(-13) sensitivity on the process @Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen Switzerland
  - prohibited in SM -> new physics?/! (SUSY?)
- positive μ-beam stopped in a thin target (3x10<sup>7</sup> μ/sec)
  - positron detector
    - non-uniform magnetic field COBRA to bend positrons
    - · tracking with drift chamber modules
    - timing with plastic scintillator slabs read by PMTs (Timing Counter)
  - photon detector
    - Liquid Xenon calorimeter read with PMTs

NFN

# Requirements to the TDAQ



- A precision experiment demands for:
  - statistics -> high beam intensity (and associated raw event rate and detector occupancy)
    - electronics to resolve any possible pile-up in detectors
      - use of waveform digitisers, no TDC and QDC
  - resolution -> background suppression
    - development of detector with unprecedented resolutions at signal energy (52.8 MeV)
      - high precision electronics for charge and time measurements
  - stability -> systematics under control
    - the detector stability measured with a redundant set of calibration methods (evolving year by year)
      - trigger system flexible to cope with any experimental requests

### FE readout choice: the DRS chip

- The Domino Ring Sampler
  - waveform digitiser developed at Paul Scherrer Institut
  - capacitor array to store the charge from detector signals, each capacitor is a "bin" in our waveform
    - read out with external ADC
  - sampling speed tuneable from 800 MSPS to 5 GSPS
  - memory depth = 1024 bins (from 12.8 µs to 200 ns)
    - time resolution demands for sampling speed greater that 1.5 GSPS - 600 ns memory depth
      - requirement on trigger latency!







# The DRS system

- DRS chips in VME boards
  - 32 channel per board
- 5 crates
  - <= 20 boards per crate
    - 640 channels per crate
- Boards read-out with 2eVME protocol
  - 80 MB/s transfer speed



### L. Galli, PSI & INFN Pisa 6

#### Budapest, 01-02-2014

#### Trigger technology choice PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT

- The trigger will be a separate system
  - dedicated splitter system to drive signal to both DRS and trigger
- Latency requirements
  - DRS with 1.6 GSPS
    - memory depth of about 600ns
  - ~50 ns are required before the pulse in DRS waveforms for offline processing
  - ~50 ns is a conservative estimate for the trigger signal distribution from the trigger to the DAQ
  - the decision must be taken as fast as 500 ns after the event occurrence
    - at trigger level only fast detectors are used: LXe calorimeter and Timing Counter (plastic scintillator detector)
- Flexibility requirements
  - the system have to cope with any possible experimental needs
    - ...and there are really a lot of!
- FPGA based trigger
  - Xilinx Virtex-II pro FPGA (bought in 2004)
    - algorithm execution frequency to be 100 MHz
  - VME boards
    - the trigger data stored in the data stream for online algorithm calibration and monitoring
  - Multi layer system
    - · transmission with LVDS serialiser-deserialiser, 4.8Gbit/s per connection







- receiving detector data
  equipped with FADC 100MHz, 10 bit
   Interpret data
   Interpret data</l
  - Type2 board

Three layers system

6U VME board

Type1 board

- data processing
- the master issues the trigger signal



### Generation Overview of the trigger system

7

### Some pictures... trigger boards

Type1



Type2





### Type1 6U crate

### Type2 9U crate





### Data read-out system



Budapest, 01-02-2014

PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT

PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT

# Event building



- The raw data are scattered over several VME crate
  - each crate is read-out after any trigger by dedicated CPU that create a fragment
  - all the fragments sent to the main CPU
    - what happens if at a certain point a fragment is loss??
      - · fragment belonging different events are mixed
      - data useless!!



- The solution is the trigger bus: from the trigger to the DAQ crates
  - event number + event code (trigger type)
  - connected via the VME transition cards

Some consideration about DAQ efficiency

- DAQ efficiency is defined as
  - DAQLiveTime x TriggerEfficiency
- This quantity has to be as large as possible in any TDAQ system



- Compromise...
  - milestones! let's start from dead time...



### Read-out dead time

INFN

- As a first attempt we used a single buffer read-out
  - the system is in dead time during the read-out of a crate through VME
  - the dead time is dictated by the heaviest crate

 $t_d = \frac{40}{\# \text{ mezzanines/crate}} \times \begin{pmatrix} 0.125 \text{ ms} \\ \# \text{ DMA setup time} \end{pmatrix} \times \frac{40960 \text{ B}/83000 \text{ MB/ms}}{\# \text{ data transfer time}} = 24.7 \text{ ms}$ 

 the associated DAQ live time is given by the probability to have 0 event during the read-out (trigger rate = 7 Hz, Poissonian event distribution)

 $LT = \exp(-R_{trg} \cdot t_d) \simeq 84\%$ 

- Requirement for the trigger rate
  - which trigger algorithms can we use?
  - what about the rejection power?

### Considerations about trigger algorithms

- Goal: DAQ rate of about 7 Hz
- Detector to be used:
  - LXe calorimeter (photon energy, time and direction)
  - Timing Counter (positron time and hit position)
- Synchronous processing with FPGA
  - algorithms to use 1 CLK cycle per operation (if possible)
    - · registers, adders, subtracters, comparators for simple operations
    - Look Up Tables for more complex operations, for example multiplications
- Final choice
  - photon energy discrimination
  - photon-positron timing
  - photon-positron space correlation
- The discrimination on photon energy plays the lead role
  - take care of online energy reconstruction



This choice is driven by physics and your detector!



#### L. Galli, PSI & INFN Pisa



- Synchronous sum of the LXe signals
  - the peak of the obtained waveform is the online energy estimate



- the baseline value may differ from channel to channel (remember QDC in lab4)
  - refer the waveform to a common value before the sum stage
- channel calibration with Look Up Table
  - for example in case of PhotoMulTipliers gain and Quantum Efficiency calibration

Fee Implementation of online pedestal subtraction



NFN



## Effect of calibration!

- By applying a refined calibration reconstruction improves!
  - better reconstruction -> higher threshold with same efficiency on signal -> lower trigger rate -> higher DAQ Live Time
    - improvement of the DAQ efficiency



• It is important to get the best from the system with the available techniques!

#### PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT Run configuration and monitoring

- The trigger system provides the DAQ with 32 different selection algorithms
  - the trigger type are order with a priority
  - pre-scaling factors
    - · programmable fraction of minimum bias selection in the data stream
      - trigger efficiency studies
      - detector calibration and monitoring
      - physics analysis, normalisation evaluation
- This flexibility is crucial to take under control the detector
  - the run configuration is store in a database
    - · access to the shift crew
    - few default run configuration available
    - is it written together for data to be used in analysis
- GUI to check data quality online
  - events "photographs"
    - · not so precise, sensitive to major problems
- Automatic analysis right after the acquisition to check further the data quality
  - histograms for detector debugging
    - · dead channels, electronic noise...



DAQ efficiency: measurement and optimisation

INFN

- First run in 2008: DAQ efficiency = 55%
  - "preliminary" trigger system configuration
    - first version of online reconstruction algorithm
    - · calibration not optimised yet
- The DAQ (trigger) efficiency measured at the end of data taking
  - the selection has to be trained with data
  - the higher Live Time is NOT the experimental working point
    - but the Live Time is measured online...
- How to find the best working point?
  - trigger "simulation" with real data
    - modify selection and predict the trigger rate and efficiency with no algorithm improvement
  - improve the selection algorithms
    - for example improve calibrations!
- By algorithm refinement we reached 75% DAQ efficiency



### Is it possible to improve further?

- Many possibilities
  - reduce dead time read out
    - zero-suppression of FPGA to neglect the read-out of "empty" channels
      - this is dangerous with an homogeneous calorimeter...
    - Use 2eVME D64 read-out (160 MB/s instead of 80 MB/s)
      - you have to foreseen it at design phase... :(
        - unfortunately you usually miss something in your original design
  - refined selection algorithms
    - current latency of the order of 500 ns, DRS running at 1.6GSPS
      - a more complex algorithm would lead to a larger latency... :(
  - *Multiple-buffer read-out!* 
    - data stored in circular memories on VME boards
      - during a buffer read-out the next buffer is filled (if free...)
      - busy released immediately!
        - this can be implanted in FPGA in any time... if you have enough resources!











### Busy handling



- Read-out when one of the buffer busy is 1
- The system is busy when all the 3 buffers are full



## And DAQ Live Time?

- The system is busy when all the 3 buffers are filled during while you are reading
  - the read out time is unchanged
    - ~25ms
  - the LiveTime fraction can be evaluated

$$LT = e^{-R_{trg} \cdot t_d} \cdot \left[1 + R_{trg} \cdot t_d + (R_{trg} \cdot t_d)^2/2!\right]$$

- it is close to 99% even with a trigger rate close to 14 Hz
  - there is room to relax the trigger condition and improve also the trigger efficiency!



PAUL SCHERRER INSTITUT

NFN



# Conclusions



- A TDAQ system to be designed on top of an experiment
  - the experimental needs drive the choice of the technology
- Even when the technology is decided a lot of compromise, in this case
  - Waveform digitiser with lat least 1.6 GSPS sampling speed
    - background rejection requires the best timing possible
    - trigger latency to be least than 500 ns
  - trigger based FPGA
    - system flexibility, for example detector calibration
      - calibration procedures may changes during the run... and you do want to be the reason why a new calibration procedure will not be used ;)
- Once your TDAQ is built you have to get the best performance
  - use all the accessible handles
    - this is just an example but can help