MPS/MU - NOTE/EP 68- 4 LH/ld - 2.4.1968.

MEASUREMENTS DURING THE M.D. - 22.3.1968

	Preliminary results on the measure	urements and calibrati	ions of		
moni	tors in the e4 beam are given below :				
Condi	ltions : Fast slow ejection 58 : 19.2 (Q 55 , 258 A . Sextupoles (+5, -15, +35, -45 Bumpcoils : 80 A Ejection efficiency : 50% Beam condition : as for week	GeV/c , 1.6 s, repet , -95) : 23.6 A s 11/12	ition		
<u>1.</u>	1. Calibration measurement (inside the ring) with foils exposed at position TV /				
	Transformer (Battisti)	1-26×1014			
	Monitor (TV 3)	32 202			
	Number of protons from $Na^{24}(\gamma)$	$1.11 \times 10^{14} \pm 2.4\%$			
	Monitor	293 mV/10 ¹¹ p			
2.	Calibration measurement with foils at position TV 4 and TV 8				
	Number of protons (transformer Battisti)	1.05×10 ¹⁴			
	Monitor (at TV3)	27 117	TV 3 :		
	Number of protons (from Na ²⁴ (γ) at TV 4)	$0.91 \times 10^{14} \pm 2.45\%$	298 mV/10 p		
	SEC	59 454	SEC-factor		
	Number of protons (from Na ²⁴ (γ) at TV 8)	0.88×10 ¹⁴ (± 2.62%)	1.5×10 ⁵ TV 8 :195mV/10 ¹¹ p		
	Monitor (at TV 8)	ر 17 154			
3.	Effect of preceeding monitors on the decrease of the singals				
	with monitor TV 2				
	Transformer (Battisti)	3.1 %			
	SEC	1.5 %			

<u>Remarks</u>: The ejection efficiency was about 50%. The relative stability of the efficiency during the time of measurement was better than 1%. This refers to the measurements with the transformer without monitor TV 2. Monitor TV 2

Monitor TV 8

2.1 %

obviously influences the beam and therefore the transformer reading (see above). The signal on the target k_8 drops by 30% introducing monitor TV 2, and the radiation level in the hall increases simultaneously (in an extreme case of the radiation monitor A5 by a factor 2 to 3).

The relative stability between transformer, SEC and monitor TV 8 was better than 1%.

4. Background during the time interval of 1 burst

TV 3	0.33
SEC	7.02
TV 8	3.01

With the ejection operating, but beam stopper closed, the background increases from 3 to 3.6 for monitor TV 8.

The calibration given in Table 2 are not corrected for the background.

- 5. The signal of the transformer and SEC as function of the intensity is shown in Fig. 1
- 6. Comparison between transformer and foilc

Taking the background of the transformer with 1.13×10^{10} /burst into account, the agreement between foils and transformer is better than 10% (the transformer indicates a flux 8 to 9% higher than the foils).

V. Agoritsas S. Battisti L. Henny L. Hoffmann H. Schönbacher Ch. Serre

Distribution :

E.i.C. M.D. File P. Lazeyras J.H.B. Madsen G.L. Munday Ch. Steinbach

MONITOR TV3/TV2	MONITOR TV3/TV8	REMAP KS
1.25	1.55	Monitor TV 2 and TV 3 in the beam
-	-	" TV 2 in the beam
-	1.60	" TV 3 in the beam
	MONITOR TV3/TV2 1.25 - -	MONITOR TV3/TV2 MONITOR TV3/TV8 1.25 1.55 - - - 1.60

TABLE 1 Ratio between the "charge-monitors"

TABLE 2

MONITOR	SIGNAL/ 10 ¹¹ p
TV 2	236 mV
TV 3	295 mV
TV 8	195 mV

