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Abstract

The vacuum control system for the Spallation Neutron Source (SNS) has been designed by a multi-laboratory collaboration. The system is comprised of over 550 vacuum instrumentation devices, and the successful operation of SNS is dependent upon its reliable operation under high-intensity beam operating conditions [1]. The first parts of this subsystem have been commissioned since it was last described in this series of conferences. To maintain the necessary high reliability, availability and flexibility of the vacuum system, both Programmable Logic Controllers (PLCs) and EPICS Input and Output Controllers (IOCs) are used for controlling and monitoring these devices. Experience in commissioning the SNS Front-End and DTL vacuum subsystems has shown that their performance is heavily impacted by the PLC and IOC software design. In this paper, we discuss the software design strategy as well as the lessons learned from our testing and commissioning experience.

Table 1: SNS Vacuum Level Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNS Subsystems</th>
<th>Vacuum Levels</th>
<th>Beam Energy</th>
<th>Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS/LEBT</td>
<td>1.0e-4 Torr</td>
<td>65 KeV</td>
<td>0.12 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFQ</td>
<td>1.0e-6 Torr</td>
<td>2.5 MeV</td>
<td>3.76 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEBT</td>
<td>5.0e-7 Torr</td>
<td>2.5 MeV</td>
<td>3.64 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTL</td>
<td>1.8e-7 Torr</td>
<td>86.8 MeV</td>
<td>36.57 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCL</td>
<td>1.4e-7 Torr</td>
<td>185.6 MeV</td>
<td>55.12 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL</td>
<td>1.0e-9 Torr</td>
<td>1 GeV</td>
<td>157.32 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEBT</td>
<td>5.0e-8 Torr</td>
<td>1 GeV</td>
<td>169.49 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring</td>
<td>1.0e-8 Torr</td>
<td>1 GeV</td>
<td>248.0 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTBT</td>
<td>1.0e-7 Torr</td>
<td>1 GeV</td>
<td>150.75 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARCHITECTURE

The system is architected with three layers of classic distributed real-time control system: Device Control Layer, equipped with Allen-Bradley ControlLogix programmable logic controllers (PLCs) to monitor gauge and pump set point outputs and control valves; Global Control Layer, equipped with an EPICS Input Output Controller (IOC) to overlook multiple subsystems; and Operator Interface Layer, equipped with LINUX boxed to provide machine operation interface (see Figure 1).

PLC – Device Layer Controller

Allen-Bradley ControlLogix PLCs [3] are used to monitor gauge and pump set point outputs and control valves. The SNS project has selected the ControlLogix PLC as the standard PLC. The principal function of the PLC is to provide the sector gate valves that sectionalize the vacuum systems. The valve control logic will be fail-safe. A sector valve will close in case of:

- Vacuum conditions deteriorating to a specified limit;
- Power loss;
- Pump fails

The vacuum PLC will also provide interlock outputs to SNS subsystems such as the RF system and Machine Protection Systems, and receive interlock inputs from subsystems such as water system and the target system.

All vacuum system interlocks use 24 Vdc control power and converted into 10mA to satisfy the MPS specification.
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The Input/Output Controller (IOC) is a VME controller or a Linux Soft IOC. The primary function of the IOC is to provide the supervisory controls among the vacuum subsystems and the interface to the other subsystems. It also acts as a gateway to OPI machines.

The interface between IOC and the PLCs is over Ethernet via EPICS Ether/IP driver [4].

To provide more detailed vacuum instrumentation controller information to operators, Hytec [5] VME 64x carrier and its serial 485 IP cards are used to link IOC to the gauge and ion pump controllers. Figure 2 shows a typical control hardware layout in DTL vacuum subsystem.

CONTROL SOFTWARE DESIGN

Up to now, we have successfully delivered beam to DTL warm LINAC. The first two parts of the machine include Front-End, designed by LBNL and DTL, designed by LANL. The two subsystems take two different software design approaches in terms of distribution of the functionality between PLC and IOC. The commissioning experience has shown that these two approaches have both advantages and disadvantages. The vacuum control subsystem design will be influenced based on the lessons learned from the commissioning of the early sections of the machine.

The Front-End Vacuum Control

The SNS Front-End consists of three subsystems: The Source/LEBT, RFQ and MEBT. The full system entails about 500 signals for valves, pumps and gauges. It uses one IOC and one PLC with Flex IO interface family. The IOC and PLC shares the responsibility of interlocks: the PLC performs through its ladder logic the basic validation of signals and the first level of interlocking. More complex interlocking is performed in the IOC, such as turning off pumps and closing valves depending on the status of nearby gauges or related devices and requiring valid status before energizing these devices. The IOC
logic also enforces the inter-system constraints on the isolation valves. Special over-rides are provided to permit device testing when appropriate. Figure 3 shows one P&ID EPICS OPI display in Front-End vacuum system.

**DTL Vacuum Control**

The SNS DTL consists of six tanks. There are 19 devices in each tank and about 95 for the whole DTL. One IOC and six PLCs are used. Each PLC controls the vacuum instrumentation devices for each tank: Turbo cart control, RF window control, Ion Pump control, RGA control, valve control and external interlocks. The IOC serves for supervisory controls among the tanks.

**Commissioning Experience**

Both SNS Front-End and DTL vacuum systems have the similar number of instrumentation devices. Both use PLC and IOC for controlling and monitoring the vacuum devices. They, however, use a different software design methods. Our commissioning experience shows that the two different software design strategies carry both advantages and disadvantages on system performance as listed in the following:

- Modularity of the software design will ease for trouble shooting and save programming time
- It is more flexible to implement interlocks in IOC than PLC
- But, implementing the basic fail-safe interlocks in PLC will permit IOC hot reboot
- Using Linux soft IOC may have better cost effective when PLC is used

**SUMMARY**

Our commissioning experience suggests us to be careful on the software design when using both PLC and IOC in a vacuum control system. To maximize both reliability and flexibility of the system performance, the function distribution between PLC and IOC has significant impact. Our lessons learned from our first part of machine commissioning will influence our system design for the other parts of the machine and future upgrading.

We have been successfully delivering our first beam in DTL tank in September this year. The commissioning continues and scheduled to have beam hit to target in 2006.
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