CERN-ACC-2013-002

# **HiLumi LHC**

FP7 High Luminosity Large Hadron Collider Design Study

# **Milestone Report**

# **REQUIREMENTS FOR SEPARATION DIPOLES**

Todesco, Ezio (CERN) *et al*

30 November 2012



The HiLumi LHC Design Study is included in the High Luminosity LHC project and is partly funded by the European Commission within the Framework Programme 7 Capacities Specific Programme, Grant Agreement 284404.

This work is part of HiLumi LHC Work Package **3: Magnets for Insertion Regions**.

The electronic version of this HiLumi LHC Publication is available via the HiLumi LHC web site [<http://hilumilhc.web.cern.ch>](http://hilumilhc.web.cern.ch) or on the CERN Document Server at the following URL: [<http://cds.cern.ch/search?p=CERN-ACC-2013-002>](http://cds.cern.ch/search?p=CERN-ACC-2013-002)

 $-$  CERN-ACC-2013-002  $-$ 

**REQUIREMENTS FOR SEPARATION DIPOLES** *Date:* 30/11/2012

# Grant Agreement No: 284404 **HILUMI LHC**

### FP7 High Luminosity Large Hadron Collider Design Study

Seventh Framework Programme, Capacities Specific Programme, Research Infrastructures, Collaborative Project, Design Study

# **MILESTONE REPORT**

# **REQUIREMENTS FOR SEPARATION DIPOLES**

# **MILESTONE: MS34**



#### **Abstract:**

In this document we summarize the main requirements for the separation dipoles, and a baseline for the layout with possible options



Copyright notice:

Copyright © HiLumi LHC Consortium, 2012.

For more information on HiLumi LHC, its partners and contributors please see [www.cern.ch/HiLumiLHC](http://www.cern.ch/HiLumiLHC)

The HiLumi LHC Design Study is included in the High Luminosity LHC project and is partly funded by the European Commission within the Framework Programme 7 Capacities Specific Programme, Grant Agreement 284404. HiLumi LHC began in November 2011 and will run for 4 years.

The information herein only reflects the views of its authors and not those of the European Commission and no warranty expressed or implied is made with regard to such information or its use.

#### **Delivery Slip**





### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**





Executive summary

*In this report we give an overview of the requirements for the inner triplet quadrupoles stemming from beam dynamics and we compare with the present status of the development of Nb3Sn models built by LARP.*

# **1. INTRODUCTION**

The High Luminosity LHC (HL- LHC) design study has to produce a baseline for the layout of magnets in the Interaction Regions (IR). The new lattice has the main goal of having larger aperture inner triplet quadrupoles to allow squeezing the beam up to  $\sim$ 15 cm. The lattice also includes larger aperture separation dipoles, recombination dipoles, and two-in-one quadrupoles. The separation dipoles D1 will rely on Nb-Ti technology. The main challenges of this magnet are the large aperture, the high level of saturation, and the good field quality.

Here we give the main requirements for the separation dipoles, and a baseline for the layout with possible options.



# **2. SEPARATION DIPOLE REQUIREMENTS AND DESIGN TARGETS**

#### **2.1 PERFORMANCE**

In July 2012 the aperture of the triplet has been fixed to 150 mm diameter coil-to-coil [1], based on a first estimate of the shielding necessary to cope with radiation damage and heat loads, and on the beam dynamics requirements. The aperture of D1 has been required to be 10 mm larger than the triplet, i.e. 160 mm.

Integrated field is 40 T m, i.e. 50% more than present value of 26 T m, to reduce the space between D1 and D2, making room for crab cavities and reducing the number of parasitic encounters. This specification could be possibly lowered by 5-15% in 2013.

We specify a relatively large margin on the loadline of 30%. The following targets will be used to evaluate the dipole performance:

- First training to nominal gradient: less than four quenches.
- Training to ultimate gradient: less than ten additional quenches.
- Training after thermal cycle: nominal gradient reached with one quench or without quench.

These targets are based on the experience of the LHC magnet production.

#### **2.2 FIELD QUALITY**

- Reproducibility of the Transfer Function (TF): must be of the order of 1 unit or better along the whole operational range.
- Geometric multipoles: the target errors are given in Table 1.
	- o The random component is estimated on a tentative cross-section (see next section) with 40 µm standard deviation in the coil positioning for odd normal multipoles,  $40 \mu m$  for even skew multipoles,  $15 \mu m$  for odd skew multipoles, and 10 µm for odd skew multipoles. This ambitious target is based on the experience of the dipole productions of LHC, HERA, RHIC and Tevatron.
	- o The systematic component is optimized at high field. The saturation component in  $b_3$  is minimized by shaping the iron. The residual 0.9 units of saturation is compensated by -1.8 units of geometric.
- Persistent currents: the present estimate is  $-14$  units of *b<sub>3</sub>* and  $-1$  units of *b<sub>5</sub>*.







### **2.3 PROTECTION**

- Compensated voltage used for magnet protection (difference between two poles) should be stable within 100 mV during the ramp at nominal ramp rate.
- We set a target for the maximum hotspot temperature of 300 K.

### **2.4 RADIATION DAMAGE AND HEAT LOADS**

The current design targets for the triplet are a peak radiation dose of less than 40 MGy over the operational lifetime of HL-LHC (3000 fb<sup>-1</sup> integrated luminosity). This will be probably reviewed in 2013, and could be further lowered by optimization of the shielding and aperture. Heat loads are of the order of 10 W/m on the magnet and the same on the beam screen. The same values can be assumed for the separation dipole. A simulation of the actual layout will be available in 2013.

### **2.5 MECHANICAL STRUCTURE**

We aim at having less than 150 MPa during assembly cool-down and powering to avoid damage to insulation.



# **3. DESIGN OPTIONS FOR THE SEPARATION DIPOLE**

## **3.1 A POSSIBLE BASELINE**

We chose a one-layer coil with the 15 mm width cable used in the LHC main dipole, inner layer (see Fig. 1). With this cable one obtains

- 5.44 T operational field;
- 7.35 m magnetic length;
- 13.9 kA operational current;
- 1495 A/mm<sup>2</sup> current density in the non-Cu (see Fig. 2);
- 600 m long cable for manufacturing one pole.
- 48 mT fringe field just outside the cryostat.

The unit length is longer than the LHC dipole inner cable unit length (480 m) therefore new cables should be made, with new strand ordered with the specifications of LHC main dipole inner layer. This could take up to two years, but the short model could be already manufactured with existing lengths. The alternative is to have a splice between the first and the second block. Cable dimensions are already well known and therefore engineering design could start without additional delays.



*Fig. 1 Cross section of the magnet (left) and of the coil (right)*

Pro:

- Cable is well known, both in terms of width and windability. Reduced time for development of engineering design.
- Operational current within the limits of KEK test station (15 kA), possible to reach 90% short sample.
- Quench protection could be viable without heaters.

Cons:

- New order of strand and cabling to get the required length for manufacturing the series magnets or internal splice;
- Not fitting the length of the vertical test station.





*Fig. 2 Non-Cu critical current density (triangular markers), loadline for the peak field in the coil (solid line) and operational point (round marker).* 

## **3.2 FIRST VARIANT: OUTER LAYER DIPOLE CABLE**

If we choose the outer layer of the LHC dipole the field is reduced by 5% (5.23 T), length is increased of the same percentage (7.65 m).

- 5.23 T operational field  $(-5\%)$ ;
- 7.65 m magnetic length  $(+5\%, +30 \text{ cm})$ ;
- 11.0 kA operational current;
- 1710 A/mm<sup>2</sup> current density in the non-Cu;
- 750 m long cable for manufacturing one pole.
- 40 mT fringe field just outside the cryostat.

Pro:

- Cable is ready and well known, both in terms of width and windability;
- Unit lengths are available;
- Current within the limits of test station (15 kA), possible to reach 100% short sample.

Cons:

- Not fitting the length of the vertical test station with present requirements;
- Heaters needed for quench protection

#### **3.3 SECOND VARIANT: 20 MM WIDTH CABLE**

If we choose to increase the cable width to 20 mm, the field is increased by 5% (5.90 T), length is reduced of the same percentage (6.78 m).

- 5.90 T operational field  $(+10\%)$ ;
- 6.78 m magnetic length (-8%, -50 cm);
- 15.8 kA operational current;
- 1290 A/mm<sup>2</sup> current density in the non-Cu;
- 554 m long cable for manufacturing one pole.
- 80 mT fringe field just outside the cryostat.



Pro:

Lower loadline, lower current density.

Neutral

• Not fitting the length of the vertical test station with present requirements, but just at the limit.

Cons:

- Cable to develop, delays in engineering design;
- Current above the limits of test station  $(15 kA)$ ;
- Larger fringe field.

#### **3.4 RADIATION DAMAGE**

The weakest component of the magnet is the insulation of the coils. An assessment of the radiation damage level should be given, and an estimate of the expected dose will be provided through FLUKA simulations in 2013.

#### **3.5 MECHANICAL DESIGN**

All options have stress lower than 150 MPa in assembly, cool down, and powering. The favorite structure is an option where collars are spacers and stress is given by the yoke, as in MQXA. This has the advantage of reducing the collar thickness, giving more space for iron and reducing the fringe field. An alternative option would be the self-standing collars as in MQXB and MQXC.

# **4. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PLANS**

The magnet is built with a large margin. The critical aspects are field quality and fringe field. The optimization of engineering constraints as test station length, cable and strand availability, magnet weight, margin and protection will allow to choose between the different options in a few months. An essential ingredient is the heat load and the radiation dose, which need a full model rom the IP to D1, including the corrector package.



# **5. REFERENCES**

[1] E. Todesco, et al., (2013) Design studies of Nb3Sn quadrupole magnet for the high luminosity LHC. Submitted to: IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. *ASC Conference proceeding*, 2012 Portland.

[2] G. L. Sabbi, et al., (2013) Nb3Sn IR quadrupoles for HL-LHC. Submitted to: IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. *ASC Conference proceeding*, 2012 Portland.

[3] X. Wang, private communication.

[4] H. Bajas, et al., (2013) Test results of the LARP HQ01e Nb3Sn quadrupole at 1.9 K. Submitted to: IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. *ASC Conference proceeding*, 2012 Portland.

[5] A. Ghosh, et al. (2013) A review of conductor performance for the LARP. Submitted to: IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. *ASC Conference proceeding*, 2012 Portland.

[6] L. Oberli, et al.,(2013) Development of the Nb3SN rutherford cable for the EuCARD high field dipole magnet Fresca2. Submitted to: IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond. *ASC Conference proceeding*, 2012 Portland.



# **ANNEX: GLOSSARY**

