





Interoperability and automation in searches for Hard X-ray counterparts of multi-messenger transients with INTEGRAL

Volodymyr SAVCHENKO

SCIOPS 2019 ESAC



INTEGRAL hard X-ray and soft gamma-ray observatory

2002 - **, operations currently approved until December 2022

2.7 days orbit with **85% useful observing time** above radiation belts

Only very small fraction of sky occulted by Earth

Especially suited for serendipitous observations

2

Old Spacecraft => "New" Ground Segment





Old on-board CPU

No on-board trigger

No memory

Limited capacity to resist problematic commanding



Ground segment receives **all data** and can command the spacecraft with only **0.5s** light travel time

Extensible on the ground, though automated commanding from GC is limited



3 - 8000 keV pointing field of view (from 3x3deg at 3-30 keV to 30x30deg > 25 keV) sub-arcmin imaging, good spectral resolution



unique 100 keV - 10 MeV, both FoV and all-sky

3 - 8000 keV pointing field of view (from 3x3deg at 3-30 keV to 30x30deg > 25 keV) sub-arcmin imaging, good spectral resolution



unique 100 keV - 10 MeV, both FoV and all-sky

3 - 8000 keV pointing field of view (from 3x3deg at 3-30 keV to 30x30deg > 25 keV) sub-arcmin imaging, good spectral resolution



unique 100 keV - 10 MeV, both FoV and all-sky

GW 170817: to best advise the follow up



Fermi + INTEGRAL Triangulation unique multi-mission approach



LIGO and Fermi trigger at T₀+14s (GCN Notice/VOEvent)

Final Fermi location at T0+44m

INTEGRAL data was analysed at $\rm T_0+1h,$ and produced a GCN Circular

Triangulation (IPN: INTEGRAL + Fermi) was computed at T_0 +6h

Learned further needs:

- latency to access INTEGRAL data was not optimal (fixed)
- Fermi/GBM could make faster reliable localizations (**fixed**)
- Multi-instrument INTEGRAL analysis (IBIS, SPI, etc) requires combination of specialist expertise (**partially addressed**) intra-mission interoperability
- Combing multi-mission expertise, e.g. for triangulation, is even harder (very partially addressed) intra-mission interoperability

Building automation which expresses researcher capacity in reusable code costs effort.

Sharing effort requires communication languages, standards

Building automation which expresses researcher capacity in reusable code costs effort.

Sharing effort requires communication languages, **standards**

Standards for messages, facts, exist, allow to exchange data

- **Structured (well-defined but diverse)**: GCN/Notices, VOEvent, Kafka (e.g. ANTARES/ZTF/LSST), TNS
- Free-text (poorly defined standards): GCN/Circulars, ATels, arXiv, zenodo

Building automation which expresses researcher capacity in reusable code costs effort.

Sharing effort requires communication languages, standards

Standards for messages, facts, exist:

- **Structured (well-defined but diverse)**: GCN/Notices, VOEvent, Kafka (e.g. ANTARES/ZTF/LSST), TNS
- **Free-text (poorly defined standards)**: GCN/Circulars, ATels, arXiv, zenodo

But not for **transformations of methods (workflows) scientific** data analysis and modelling

Building automation which expresses researcher capacity in reusable code costs effort.

Sharing effort requires communication languages, **standards**

Standards for messages, facts, exist:

- **Structured (well-defined but diverse)**: GCN/Notices, VOEvent, Kafka (e.g. ANTARES/ZTF/LSST), TNS
- Free-text (poorly defined standards): GCN/Circulars, ATels, arXiv, zenodo

But not for **transformations of methods (workflows) scientific** data analysis and modelling

Example:

- 1. INTEGRAL, Fermi data is distributed in FITS tables and IPN SSV, Fermi data is in FITS images and tables
- 2. Input trigger is in VOEvent, healpix
- 3. Likely targets in TAP
- 4. Planning information in REST
- 5. Methods to converge the formats, perform the analysis, and format the output: not very findable, accessible, and described

Building automation which expresses researcher capacity in reusable code costs effort.

Sharing effort requires communication languages, **standards**

Standards for messages, facts, exist:

- **Structured (well-defined but diverse)**: GCN/Notices, VOEvent, Kafka (e.g. ANTARES/ZTF/LSST), TNS
- Free-text (poorly defined standards): GCN/Circulars, ATels, arXiv, zenodo

But not for **transformations of methods (workflows) scientific** data analysis and modelling

Especially needed when software is contributed, exchanged, integrated, automatically used

But what kind of standard? Imposing? Very general?

Example:

- 1. INTEGRAL, Fermi data is distributed in FITS tables and IPN SSV, Fermi data is in FITS images and tables
- 2. Input trigger is in VOEvent, healpix
- 3. Likely targets in TAP
- 4. Planning information in REST
- 5. Methods to converge the formats, perform the analysis, and format the output: not very findable, accessible, and described

The **workflow standard** can be build from **existing standards for data** (e.g. <u>http://www.ivoa.net/rdf/</u>), **independently of origin, to set:**

- Input, output data types/standards
- Execution rules
- Content keywords (e.g. statistical methods, binning, etc)



The **workflow standard** can be build from **existing standards for data** (e.g. <u>http://www.ivoa.net/rdf/</u>), **independently of origin, to set:**

- Input, output data types/standards
- Execution rules
- Content keywords (e.g. statistical methods, binning, etc)
 - Notebook or library in a **GitLab/GitHub repository**
 - Package in a **traditional repository** (e.g. pypi/pip)
 - Container on dockerhub
 - Live, (OpenAPI) remote service (private workflows):
 view, close-the-data analysis

https://w3id	Stotus of Contraction/spec	Subclass of Subclass of Decession Accelerations
FnHub Simple Search Advanced S	Search Add a function/implementation	FnC
Advanced S	earch	
Keywords:		
Keywords for name and description	on	
Expected parameters		
Parameter keywords	Select a type	÷ 💼
	⊕ Add parameter	
Expected return value	⊕ Add parameter	

The **workflow standard** can be build from **existing standards for data** (e.g. <u>http://www.ivoa.net/rdf/</u>), **independently of origin, to set:**

- Input, output data types/standards
- Execution rules
- Content keywords (e.g. statistical methods, binning, etc)
 - Notebook or library in a **GitLab/GitHub repository**
 - Package in a traditional repository (e.g. pypi/pip)
 - Container on dockerhub
 - Live, (OpenAPI) remote service (private workflows):
 view, close-the-data analysis



FTP links to Data files => TAP

libraries, codes => workflows

The **workflow standard** can be build from **existing standards for data** (e.g. <u>http://www.ivoa.net/rdf/</u>), **independently of origin, to set:**

- Input, output data types/standards
- Execution rules
- Content keywords (e.g. statistical methods, binning, etc)
 - Notebook or library in a **GitLab/GitHub repository**
 - Package in a **traditional repository** (e.g. pypi/pip)
 - Container on dockerhub
 - Live, (OpenAPI) remote service (private workflows):
 view, close-the-data analysis



FTP links to Data files => TAP

libraries, codes => workflows

This description allows to **associate workflows to data and scientific context and execute them,** a variant of a "live" distributed appstore

- data reduction (close to data)
- GRB spectral models (linked to literature)
- statistical methods (as portable as possible)
- visibility planning tools (remote ESAC service)



- data reduction (close to data)
- GRB spectral models (linked to literature)
- statistical methods (as portable as possible)
- visibility planning tools (remote ESAC service)



- data reduction (close to data)
- GRB spectral models (linked to literature)
- statistical methods (as portable as possible)
- visibility planning tools (remote ESAC service)



- data reduction (close to data)
- GRB spectral models (linked to literature)
- statistical methods (as portable as possible)
- visibility planning tools (remote ESAC service)

- **Find combinations** of data, adapters, statistical methods, publishers, planners
- suggest follow-up
- **distribute** standard results with public data, uploads to zenodo sandbox.



- data reduction (close to data)
- GRB spectral models (linked to literature)
- statistical methods (as portable as possible)
- visibility planning tools (remote ESAC service)

- **Find combinations** of data, adapters, statistical methods, publishers, planners
- suggest follow-up
- **distribute** standard results with public data, uploads to zenodo sandbox.



Workflow standards let researchers build the system



- Workflow standards foster understandable, usable publishing of Findable Accessible Interoperable Reusable methods
- Workflows can offert **adapters for data formats**
- Deriving **data**, **result provenance**
 - explain data
 - trace history
 - credit and blame creators



Ongoing

How to expand:

- Standard (e.g. https://w3id.org/function/spec/)
- Tools to implement standards (workflows that act on workflow standards)
- An exchange hub (e.g. public SPARQL endpoint)

Intercalibration test kit: instrument support in ops

Ongoing development (aligned with **IACHEC and DataLabs**) is a **intercalibration "test kit"** platform allowing to build workflows for **verifying expectations** for instruments, **linking**:

- Data reduction of different missions
- Astrophysical Source models
- Statistical methods

To ensure consensus on source and "standard candle" properties

Provide a reference, living report, reference for instrument status







- INTEGRAL has unique capabilities for multi-messenger prompt observations at least for O3 and O4, but fases Unique challenges of inter-instrument interoperability, and the best results (triangulations) can be derived in interoperability with other projects: LIGO/Virgo, Fermi, Konus-Wind, etc
- Need to adopt expert contributions in consistent rapid reaction system require standards for scientific data analysis workflows, and an environment reducing the development efforts
- Workflow standards allow to build a distributed smart "live" semantic software and service discovery hub, with many ways of contributing, many ways to access.
- Libraries/codes to workflows could be similar to transition from various HTML/CSV/FITS tables to TAP
- ESA's DataLabs, could be a perfect basis, assuming suitable metadata for workflows
- Workflows allow to **create adapters between data formats** and interfaces and naturally create data **provenance**, **tracking data rights and credits** for data and calibrations, ensuring **reproducibility**
- The approach has been fully implemented in a prototype **INTEGRAL "standard" transient analysis**
- Growing development is an inter-calibration platform allowing to build "test kit" for verifying expectations for instrument (and sky)
- Path to living publications: define paper as a workflow, publish, compile paper from data!

EXTRA SLIDES

What is the ODA research and dev environment

- Packages: nb2w, ... oda client
- frontends
- Validate explore methods locally
- Gitlab (to store code)
- Containers to keep software portable
- CWL to define execution, input injection
- REANA runner
- Kubernetes
- slurm



GRBs in the IBIS field of view

about 6 times per year, we detect a GRB in the Imager field of view and we can provide immediate localisation at 3 arcmin plus spectra



GW 190425z: a BNS merger 150 Mpc



Martin-Carillo et al 2019, Savchenko et al 2019, Minaev et al 2019: discussed a weak, poorly associated possible counterpart in SPI-ACS



Fermi GBM-190816: subthreshold GRB-GW candidate

