

# Report on field quality in the main LHC dipoles July-August 2006

E. Todesco, AT-MAS-MA

This report gives data relative to field quality measured in collared coils and cold masses during the period July 1 – August 31 2006, warm-to-cold correlations, comparison to beam dynamics targets, and status of the holding points. Updated graphs can be found in the field quality observatory <http://lhc-div-mms.web.cern.ch/lhc-div-mms/MMSPAGES/MA/Obs.html>.

EDMS n. *772228*

## The dashboard

- Available measurements:
  - 1214 collared coils and 1187 cold masses at room temperature,
  - 192 equivalent dipoles at 1.9 K<sup>1</sup>.
- In these two months we had:
  - 31 new collared coils (10 from Firm1, 21 from Firm2) measured at room temperature,
  - 3 dipoles measured at 1.9 K<sup>1</sup>.

## What's new (not much)

- **Production rate** dropped at 15.5 collared coils per month. The rate is 1.1 and 2.4 collared coils per week in Firm1, Firm2, respectively.
- **34 collared coils** have to be manufactured, 8 from Firm1 and 26 from Firm2, to complete the 1248 dipoles.

---

<sup>1</sup> These numbers refers to measurements of either magnets or single apertures available in AT-MTM Oracle database at the time of distribution of the report.

# CONTENTS

PART I: MEASURED MAGNETS AND ASSEMBLY DATA.....	pg. 3
PART II: MEASUREMENTS VERSUS BEAM DYNAMICS TARGETS.....	pg. 4
2.1 Summary of systematics components.....	pg. 4
2.2 Summary of random components.....	pg. 5
PART III: TRENDS IN FIELD QUALITY.....	pg. 6
3.1 Trends in bending strength.....	pg. 6
3.2 Trends in normal odd multipoles.....	pg. 9
3.3 Trends in normal even multipoles.....	pg. 11
3.4 Trends in skew multipoles.....	pg. 14
3.5 Trends in systematic differences between Firms.....	pg. 15
3.6 Trends in correlations to measurements at 1.9 K.....	pg. 16
PART IV: QUALITY CONTROL.....	pg. 18
4.1 Holding point results.....	pg. 18
4.2 Coil waviness.....	pg. 19

## The format of the report

We remind the reader the most important features of the report.

- The first section deals with the number of measured magnets in the last two months and the assembly data (cross-section type and shim size).
- In the second section we have the summary of the measured field quality of all collared coils versus beam dynamics targets. This gives a quick overview of the best guess for the status of field quality versus beam dynamics.
- The third section is devoted to trends in field quality.
  - The trend plots show multipole moving averages for each manufacturer versus the magnet progressive number<sup>2</sup>. Each marker is the average of 5 measurements:
    - the collared coil characterized by the progressive number in the horizontal axis
    - the two collared coils previously produced by the same Firm
    - the two collared coils produced afterwards by the same Firm
  - We always give plots for the collared coil measurements, except the case of bending strength where also cold mass measurements are adding important information. When comparing these cold masses to collared coils, one has to take into account that usually the last 60 collared coils have not yet become cold masses, and therefore a different pattern has to be expected in the end of the plot (see Figs. 9-10, and 11-12).
  - We give the reduction to nominal shims only for b3. Shims are nominal since September 2004, except a few cases.
  - Correlations are not presented in the standard plot 'warm-vs-cold', but rather as a trend plot of the offset between warm and cold vs the magnet progressive number. In this way we can visualize trends in correlations and the type of sampling that is being carried out at 1.9 K.
  - All plots give integral values (i.e. including contribution of coil heads).
- The final section is devoted to field quality used to detect a faulty assembly procedure.

---

<sup>2</sup> We recall the definition of magnet progressive number, used as abscissa axis in most of our trend plots: it is a number running from 1 to 1232 which is associated to each magnet, according to the date of the first magnetic measurement at room temperature.

## PART I: MEASURED MAGNETS AND ASSEMBLY DATA

- 31 new collared coils have been measured (collared coils 1184<sup>th</sup> to 1214<sup>th</sup>).




Fig. 1: Number of magnets measured at CERN at 1.9 K and at the manufacturers at room temperature at different stages of assembly procedure.

- Cross-section: collared coils have X-section 3.
- Shims are nominal in all Firms (see Fig. 2).




Fig. 2: Thickness of the polar shims used in the collared coils.

## PART II: MEASUREMENTS VERSUS BEAM DYNAMICS TARGETS

### 2.1 Summary of systematic components

- Best estimates of skew and even normal systematic components are given in Fig. 3. All the multipoles are within specifications. Details on trends are given in Part III.




Fig. 3: Best estimate for systematic skew multipoles and even normal multipoles (markers) versus beam dynamics limits (solid red line).

- Best estimates for systematic odd normal multipoles are shown in Fig. 4. In the left part, raw data are plotted. This gives the actual situation for global values relative to all manufactured collared coils:  $b_3$  is within target, giving 2.6 units at high field.  $b_5$  is larger than the upper target of 0.07 units, corresponding to 1.16 units at injection, and  $b_7$  is 0.28 units larger than target, corresponding at 0.34 units at injection.
- In the right part of Fig. 4, data are separated according to the three cross-sections (34 collared coils have cross-section 1, 147 have cross-section 2, 1032 have cross-section 3, plus one hybrid 1-2). With cross-section 3,  $b_3$  in the collared coil is 0.80 units below the upper limit, and also  $b_5$  is within targets, just below the upper limit. Finally,  $b_7$  in the collared coil is 0.29 units larger than the limits.




Fig. 4: Best estimate for systematic odd normal multipoles (markers) versus beam dynamics limits (solid red line). Raw data (left) and data separated according to different cross-sections (right).

## 2.2 Summary of random components

- We first evaluate the standard deviation of the bending strength and multipoles for each Firm and for magnets with cross-section 3 (1001 collared coils, see Fig. 5). The standard deviation of multipoles in collared coil is divided by 1.18 (i.e. the increase of the main field due to the iron yoke) and summed in quadrature to the spread of warm-cold correlations in order to give the best estimate of the random at 1.9 K. All values are well within targets, with the exception of the main field in the straight part B; please note that the relevant constraint for beam dynamics is only on the bending strength BdL, which is within targets.




Fig. 5: Expected random component at 1.9 K (cross-section 3 only) compared to targets for random at 1.9 K.

We then evaluate the expected random component at 1.9 K in each sector. Also in this case, we take the spread in the collared coil, rescale it by 1.18, and sum in quadrature to the spread of the warm-cold correlations.

In Fig. 6 the expected random components for each sector are compared to targets. All expected values are within or close to targets, with the exception of the spread of b3 in sector 7-8 (this is due to the mix of different cross-sections). For sectors 1-2 to 6-7, which are made of magnets belonging to the mature phase of production, the spread is within targets. The only exception is b5, which is not considered as critical. The impact of the recent trends in b3 is visible in Sectors 1-2 and 3-4, where its spread is at the target value.




Fig. 6: Expected random component at 1.9 K (markers) compared to targets (solid line), separated according to the provisional allocation to 6 sectors.

## PART III: TRENDS IN FIELD QUALITY

### 3.1 Trends in bending strength

#### 3.1.1 Trends in magnetic length

- Magnetic length of the collared coils is extremely stable in all Firms since magnet progressive number 100 (see Fig. 7). Magnetic length in Firm1 is 5 units higher than in Firm2 and Firm3.




Fig. 7: Magnetic length of the measured collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).

- Magnetic length of **cold masses** is also extremely stable in all Firms since magnet progressive number 100 (see Fig. 8). When iron laminations are added, magnetic length in Firm3 is getting smaller than in Firm1 and 2. The net result is that there are around 10 units of difference between Firm1 and Firm3, with Firm2 in between.




Fig. 8: Magnetic length of the measured **cold masses**, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).

### 3.1.2 Trends in transfer function

- Transfer function in collared coils 1184<sup>th</sup> to 1214<sup>th</sup> has an upward trend in both Firms.




Fig. 9: Transfer function of the measured collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).

- **Cold mass** data confirm the collared coil ones.




Fig. 10: Transfer function of the measured **cold masses**, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).

### 3.1.3 Trends in integrated transfer function

- The integrated transfer function has an upward trend in the recent production (see Fig. 11).




Fig. 11: Integrated transfer function of the measured collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).

- **Cold mass** data confirm the collared coil ones.




Fig. 12: Integrated transfer function of the measured **cold masses**, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm).



### 3.2 Trends in odd normal multipoles

- The situation is stable: at the end of the production, we have a difference in normal sextupole of about 3 units (two to three times the standard deviation per Firm) between Firm1 and Firm2.




Fig. 13: Integral  $b_3$  in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 14: Integral  $b_3$  in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles. Data normalised to nominal shims<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> This plot is very similar to the plot of Fig. 13 since shims are nominal for most of the production.

- Normal decapole b5 is stable in both Firms.




Fig. 15: Integral b5 in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

- Normal 14<sup>th</sup> pole b7 is stable in both Firms.




Fig. 16: Integral b7 in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

### 3.3 Trends in even normal multipoles

For each multipole being subject to beam dynamics specifications, we present two separated plots for the systematic per aperture, plus a plot of the systematic per beam, i.e. the average of both apertures (that cancel each other due to the two-in-one symmetry).

#### 3.3.1 Trends in normal quadrupole

- All measured values are within targets (see Figs. 17-19).




Fig. 17: Integral b2 in the collared coils (aperture 1), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 18: Integral b2 in the collared coils (aperture 2), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 19: Integral b2 in the collared coils (average of both apertures), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

### 3.3.2 Trends in normal octupole

- All measured values are within targets (see Figs. 20-22).




Fig. 20: Integral b4 in the collared coils (aperture 1), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 21: Integral  $b_4$  in the collared coils (aperture 2), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 22: Integral  $b_4$  in the collared coils (average of the apertures), separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

### 3.4 Trends in skew multipoles

- Systematic skew quadrupole and octupole  $a_2$  and  $a_3$  are within targets (see Fig. 23-24), and the production of these two months is stable.




Fig. 23: Integral  $a_2$  in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.




Fig. 24: Integral  $a_3$  in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

- Average skew octupole  $a_4$  is within the tight beam dynamics targets in both Firms.
- The strong systematic component (around 0.5 units in average) in Firm2, observed between magnet progressive number 100 and 600, has disappeared.




Fig. 25: Integral  $a_4$  in the collared coils, separated per Firm (each dot is the average of 5 consecutive magnets of the same Firm), and beam dynamics targets for the systematic (red lines) based on correlations with 183 cryodipoles.

### 3.5 Trends in systematic differences between Firms

The more relevant signature of Firms is in  $b_7$  and  $a_3$ .

- Normal 14<sup>th</sup> pole:  $b_7$  at Firm2 is 0.5 units lower than Firm3 and Firm1 (see Fig. 16). This difference is three times the natural sigma within the same manufacturer measured in cross-section 3. Firm2 is within targets, whereas both Firm1 and Firm3 are outside.
- Skew sextupole  $a_3$ : Firm3 has a systematic  $a_3$  of 0.5 units, against  $-0.5$  units in Firm1-2 (see Fig. 24). This difference is three times the natural sigma within the same manufacturer. All Firms are within targets.

We observe some systematic difference between Firms (from one to two times the natural sigma within the same manufacturer) in the following cases:

- Normal decapole  $b_5$ : Firm1 has a systematic  $b_5$  of 1 unit larger than Firm2-3. This difference is two times the natural sigma within the same manufacturer (see Fig. 15). Firm2-3 are within targets, whereas Firm1 is outside.
- Skew octupole  $a_4$ : Firm2 has a systematic  $a_4$  of 0.3 units, against  $-0.09$  and  $0.01$  units in Firm3 and Firm1, respectively (see Fig. 25). This difference is equal to the natural sigma within the same manufacturer. Firm1 and Firm3 are within targets, whereas Firm2 is outside.

Systematic differences between Firms are small or negligible in  $a_2$ ,  $b_2$ ,  $b_3$  and  $b_4$ . Recent data show a  $b_3$  difference of about 3 units between Firm1 and Firm2.

### 3.6 Trends in correlations to measurements at 1.9 K

We give plots of the offsets between the values measured at injection field (or high field) at 1.9 K, without beam screen, and the cold mass measured at room temperature. The offsets are given versus the magnet progressive number. This gives a hint on the sampling rate of the production that is being carried out with the measurement at 1.9 K. The last magnet measured at 1.9 K is collared coil 1151<sup>st</sup>, thus implying a delay of 63 collared coils with respect to the last manufactured collared coil (i.e. the 1214<sup>th</sup>), corresponding to four months of production at present rates.

- Trend plots for the offsets relative to the integrated transfer function are given in Figs. 26 and 27, at injection and at high field, respectively. In both cases no trends are visible after collared coil 100<sup>th</sup>.




Fig. 26: Difference for the integrated transfer function between measured values at 1.9 K, injection field, and **cold mass at r.t.** along the magnet production.




Fig. 27: Difference for the integrated transfer function between measured values at 1.9 K, high field, and **cold mass at r.t.** along the magnet production.



- We present data relative to b3-injection and b3-high field in Figs. 28 and 29. Please note the enlarged scale with respect to b3 plots in Figs. 13 and 14. Offsets are stable, and are within a range of  $\pm 0.7$  units at injection, and  $\pm 0.5$  units at high field.




Fig. 28: Difference for the b3 between measured values at 1.9 K, injection field, and **cold mass at r.t.**, along the magnet production.




Fig. 29: Difference for the b3 between measured values at 1.9 K, high field, and **cold mass at r.t.**, along the magnet production.

- Trends for the b5 and b7 offsets between injection and cold mass are given in Fig. 30 and 31. The situation is stable in both cases.




Fig. 30: Difference for the b5 between measured values at 1.9 K, injection field, and **cold mass at r.t.**, along the magnet production.




Fig. 31: Difference for the b7 between measured values at 1.9 K, injection field, and **cold mass at r.t.**, along the magnet production.

## PART IV: QUALITY CONTROL

### 4.1 Holding point results

No anomalies have been detected.

### 4.2 Estimated coil waviness

- Coil waviness estimated from the variation of the multipoles along the axis is in general below 30 microns. The recent part of the production is very stable, showing values of waviness below 25 microns.




Fig. 33: Estimated coil waviness in the straight part of the measured collared coils (black dots: aperture 1, blue dots: aperture 2).

## Acknowledgements

We wish to thank all colleagues involved in the measurements at room temperature and at 1.9 K, and the Firm personnel involved in magnetic measurements. We acknowledge P. Hagen, and C. Vollinger for data validation and analysis. We finally acknowledge the project engineers and MTM-AS for discussions and support in the analysis.