



WG3

Cryo-module design & integration

V.Parma, P.Duthil
for the Working Group



GOALS and RESULTS:

- Understand limits of scope of CEA and CNRS contributions

Result:

- CNRS: H/W contribution clear;
- CEA: not treated (busy in other WG). Limits of scope of CEA assembly tools to be appreciated later

- Identification of integration needs: components type, interfaces, functional needs (ex. cooling of HOM)

Result:

- Most components identified, but interface/functional needs need further iteration and work.

- Identify non covered items and possible distribution to institutes interested

Result:

Still unclear choice for some components and no commitment yet from institutes:

- ex. Coupler: CEA's solution; tuner (CEA?, BNL?) HOM type? (who supplies it?); magnetic shield?

- Define list of topics towards a functional specification: alignment requirements, thermal budgets (static+dynamic), mechanical requirements

Result:

Most of them addressed, but functionalities/specifications need iteration/definition (ex. T of heat intercepts).



WG3 (cont.d)



- Define input for mechanical layouts (longitudinal and x-sectional),

Result:

New issues:

- Continuous SPL cryostat? Need for warm regions (diagnostics that cannot be cold)? Important cryomodule design consequences (cold to warm transitions).
- Vacuum valves:
- Cold/manual valves for cryomodule maintenance (remove at shut-downs)?
- Cold/fast valves for safety (vacuum break/leaks)?
- Input from SPL beam physics and learn from XFEL or others

- Cryogenics specs (pressures & temperatures):

Result:

Temperature: ~2K is the baseline (but with provision for operation at 4.5K):

- 1.7% tunnel slope. No show stopper identified (control/instrumentation issues need to be addressed)
- HeGRP (large gas return pipe) needs to be designed specifically for HPSPL (large vapor mass flow)

Pressure: design pressure and operating stability (impact on cavity design/operation) was not addressed.



WG3 (cont.d)



- Define the key ingredients for defining a layout for tunnel interfaces: longitudinal layout, interconnect space, coupler layout (vertical, lateral?)

Result:

Many ingredients identified:

- Supporting/hanging system: LHC system proposed but needs thorough tunnel integration study
 - Couplers: vertical seems better but...difficult integration?
 - What about connection to wave guides? (Not addressed in this WG)
- Needs an urgent study with tunnel integration/civil engineering people

- Elaborate a work organization structure (for cryo-module prototype design/manufacture)

Result

- Proposal: Dedicated cryo-module Working Group steered by CERN, with regular (monthly?) meetings with CEA/CNRS (and other labs if any)



Other Issues



- **Quadrupole magnets.**
 - Powering schemes (individual? in series? clustered?) and gradient along linac?
Fringe fields acceptance on cavities?
 - Trimming needs? Permanent magnets could be also used but may need trim coils.
→ Needs will be addressed in SPL beam dynamics.
- **Type of piezo tuner?** CEA type could be used but also BNL (cold motor and piezo). Pending decision.
 - Inner cold motor? Yes,
 - Needs maintenance ? In principle no, but...
- **Magnetic shielding** design & integration (internal? external?) <10 milligauss
Fringe field acceptance from adjacent quad magnets?
- **Helium vessel:** material? Interface to piping? if Ti needs transition or Ti piping.
- **Alignment requirements?**
 - Cavity alignment today as tight as quad? Can be relaxed? → Q. to WG4. Will be addressed.



Thanks to all for the collaboration work!