Some information from Nextef

For poster session in IWLC T. Higo

Conclusion

- Damped structure TD18 was tested
 - The BDR seems a little worse than T18.
 - Dark current was measured with beta from time to time. Beta X Es seems roughly speaking constant.
- Very long-term operations
 - BDR decreases but huge time is needed to reach 10⁻⁷. Can it be done gradually during operation?
 - Need to evaluate the phase shift for this and compare with that of TD18_#3 tested at SAC for much shorter period.
- Various findings and issues
 - Vacuum pressure gets worse at a few to 10MW level and it is reproducible.
 - Double pulse operation was tried. The BDR for each pulse, former and latter, seems the same.
 - SEM view was taken and we see gap at the highest magnetic field area. Flatness and bonding jigs may be the issue for improving diffusion bonding.

T18_Disk_#2 Undamped disk-based



Strategy

Disk-based CLIC electric design KEK mecha design +fab SLAC assembly Test at SLAC and KEK

TD18_Disk_#2 Damped disk-based





TD18: Characteristics in vacuum pressure increase at very low power level



Vacuum level was not so good, ~1x10^-6Pa at worst location.

Even after running at top power, the vacuum gets worse when it decreases power.

A few hour stop of RF pulses makes the vacuum level worse in the next startup process, during the recovery passing through the region.



TD18 Disk #2 pressure vs power

It is reproducible.

ă

Presented to IPAC10

Comparison of dark current

T18_Disk

TD18_Disk

TD18_Quad



The amount of the dark current tells the performance of the high gradient breakdown performance!?

TD18_#2: Evolution of dark current and its spectra





In T18_#2 at 108MV/m, energy peak at 7.5MeV and 3.5MeV, similar to TD18 shown here.

Dark current reduced by three order of magnitude. It followed roughly modified F-N formula. β reduced from 70 to 40. $\beta * E_s^{max} \sim 5 \sim 7 \text{ GV/m}$

101017 Breakdown rates in BDR vs Eacc selected points which were intentionally taken 10⁻³ \odot BDR vs Eacc at 252nsec at 1571-1726 various cutting views BDR vs Eace at 512nsec at 3300hr BDR (1/pulse/m) O1571 Eace²⁵ 10⁻⁴ 3364 Eacc²⁹ TD18 #2 All BDR data vs Eacc 325 1599 10^{-3} 10⁻⁵ BDR vs Eacc at 252nsee imes BDR vs Eacc at 412ns 1661 BDR vs Eace at 512nsee 726BDR (1/pulse/m) 1571 10⁻⁶ 10⁻⁴ 3364 ²⁷⁸⁵ 2035 80 85 95 100 90 105 Eacc 110 O 2116 Eacc (MV/m) 3195 3433 3250 0 double pulse O²²⁵⁵ 101017 10⁻⁵ 2176TD18 Disk #2 BDR vs Width 1929 1661 width 0 3485 O 2945 **10⁻⁴** 3106 2668 \bigcirc - BDR 100MV/m around 2800h Q726 BDR 90MV/m at 3364-3692hr 10⁻⁶ BDR double pulse at 90MV/m BDR (1/pulse/m) 80 85 90 95 100 105 110 width^{3.3} width⁵² Eacc (MV/m) Ø 10^{-5} Always changing in this stage of processing, only (? !) a few 10⁻⁶ 200 0 100 300 400 500 600 thousand hours since time=0. Width ns (set value)

Break down rate evolution in TD18_#2



In a short period

Decreasing in a logarithmic time scale BDR ~ t^-0.38



Need too much time to reach 10⁻⁷ level.

Cannot wait this long time. Need proper care in fabrication.

When in the pulse breakdown starts? 252 nsec run 512 nsec run

1000

1000



Little increase vs time! Different from the left figures. Need more statistics to judge.

400

fc-middle start[ns]

<Tr BD delay> histogram (ACC-BD)

600

600

800

800

1000

1000

400

Tr BD delay[ns]

shots

shots

٩f

ج ع

200

200

Time difference between Rs and Tr

Where in the structure the breakdown happens?



51+52 BD position

82 BD position





More to be confident.

Duble pulse operation

200ns + 210ns + 200ns







400

600

Time (ns)

800

1000



89[<23>20100929-015554]

Time (ns)

200ns + 50ns + 200ns

-500

-1000

200









BD timings



Need better bonding quality!?

Machining



Diffusion bonding at high temperature

Need good flatness for the surface to deform within a finite bonding time at high temperature. Brazing



Vacuum baking.

Only for surface change. No bonding quality change.





TD18_#3 After high gradient test SEM taken at CERN See a gap !?



TD18_#2_15b











Flatness of cells for TD18_#2

Even ~3 micron flatness was accepted as long as the opposite side was reversely deformed.

Judgment was done by estimating the residual flatness error to be less than 0.5 micron after sandwiching by flat plates.

Mostly potato chip type (right) but one or two cases the conical shape (left) was accepted.

2010/10/20