

Applications of electroforming to accelerator components

Lucia Lain Amador (CERN)

Sergio Calatroni, Paolo Chiggiato, Leonel M. A. Ferreira, Guillaume Rosaz, Mauro Taborelli

This R&D project is supported by KT funding

Outline

1. Electroforming process and copper properties

 Development of thin-walled copper electroformed vacuum chambers for undulators

 Electrodeposition of copper applied to the manufacture of seamless SRF cavities

Electroforming process



Process: copper electroforming around a sacrificial aluminium mandrel which is pre-coated with a copper thin film.



Cu coating by plannar magnetron sputtering

3 µm Cu

Electroforming process

Two copper sulphate-sulphuric acid baths

Bath without additives



Pulse plating





DC plating



- Electrodeposition of Cu, 2 A/dm²
 96 hours, 1.5 mm electroformed layer
- Aluminium removal dissolution

UTS/ Young modulus



- DC electroforming stronger than copper OFE cold-worked
- PC electroforming similar to copper OFE annealed

Ultimate tensile strength (UTS)

DC	PP	
352 ± 41 MPa	174 ± 6 MPa	

E modulus – impact excitation

DC	PP	
124 ± 15 GPa	131± 15 GPa	

Microstructure and EBSD



• EBSD shows no preferential grain orientation.

Thermal conductivity

- Samples measured after deposition
- Pulse plated sample conductivity 5 times larger than OFE spec.



- After 2h at 400°C
- Triplicated conductivity for DC plated after thermal treatment

 Pulse plated layer is very pure (less than 2 ppm of Oxygen measured by IGA) in comparison with OFE copper (5 ppm) and DC plated copper (6.2 ppm)

Standard mandrel machining

 $(R_2 \cap 40 \text{ µm})$

Roughness of internal layer



Diamond mandrel machining

 $(Ra 0.002 \mu m)$

	(Rd 0.40 µm)			(Ru 0.002 µm)	
Ra (µm)	DC plated	Pulse Plated	DC plated	Pulse Plated	
Cu	0.39	0.65	0.023	0.028	
	6.0 mm	6.0 UM 4.00 - 3.00 - 2.00 - 1.00 1.00 2.00 3.00	6.0 mm	4.00 4.00 - 3.00 - 2.00 - 1.00 - 0.00 1.00 2.00 3.00 3.00	

Cu layer reproduces mandrel topography

More suited for



2. Development of thin-walled copper electroformed vacuum chambers for undulators

Electroformed undulator vacuum chamber (SwissFEL)



Electroformed undulator vacuum chamber (SwissFEL)

Chamber manufacturing process by conventional methods

- 1. Extruded Cu tube of 200 µm wall thickness
- 2. Welding of the copper tube to the stainless steel flanges

Stiffener can not be welded! (penetrated groove will damage the smooth inner surface)

3. Stiffener is glued

Poor mechanical performance Glue cannot be heated up at high temperature Unknown glue behaviour under radiation

Can the thin-walled chamber be produced by electroforming?







Starting point: 400 mm long chamber

Goal: 2 m length

Preparation of AI mandrel

Cu coating (3 microm)



Cu coating process is performed by planar magnetron sputtering.

- Kr sputtering gas 1x10⁻³ mbar
- 2 coating steps with rotation of the mandrel (350W average)

Preparation of the flanges

Modified DN16 flanges



Cu plating is not adherent on SS. We need a Ni flash plated layer

Ni and Cu plating on stainless steel





First plating: 200 μm thickness on the tube



Direct Plating



Cathode (reduction): $Cu^{2+} + 2e^{-} \rightarrow Cu$

Anode (oxidation): $Cu \rightarrow Cu^{2+} + 2^{e-}$

Acidic copper sulphate with brigthener bath

6 hours at 2.4 A/dm²

Second plating: Addition of the stiffener



Mandrel etching: Aluminium dissolution NaOH 5M



Mask-tube-stiffener

24 hours at 1.6 A/dm 2

Main challenges



The stiffener-tube junction has to be mechanically strong.

Tensile tests of the junction





Tensile specimens

- No standard specimens
- No values of strain but values of stress





Metallographic cuts

- Microstructure observation
- Junction properties

Tensile tests of the junction

Prototype 1- Starting point (10 hours)



Connection of 2 x 90 µm





- Samples broke on the junction
- For a 34 cm stiffener, this translates on a max. load of 8000N.



Tensile tests of the junction



Connection of 2 x 612 µm





Samples broke on the tube

Always for a thickness greater than 200µm (tube wall).

• Triplicated max. load: 24000N.



Strong connection

Main challenges



The stiffener-tube junction has to be mechanically strong.



The inner surface must guarantee a roughness of less than 0.3 μm over the length of the tube.

Roughness of inner copper tube surface



It replicates the roughness of the aluminium



Successful prototypes

Reproducibility

Several prototypes meet the specifications



Strong connection



Wall thickness tube 200 μm



Smooth inner surface



Towards meter-length chamber

٠





Improved alignement stiffener-tube





Towards meter-length chamber





Procurement tubes and stiffeners



Prototyping campaign (March-July 2021)

Design





Thin-walled meter-length chamber







Cu PVD



Assembly



- First 1m prototype ongoing •
- **Measurements** •
 - Straigthness •
 - Pump down •
 - Bake-out •

200 µm plated tube

Towards adding the stiffener

Conclusions

- The feasibility of producing the thin-wall chambers, up to half a meter, was demonstrated.
- The strength of the junction to the stiffener is large enough to hold and handle the chamber.
- The specified wall thickness of 200 µm is achieved.
- The roughness of the inner surface is within specifications.

Perspectives

- Production of 1 meter length chambers.
- Extend to 2 m length.
- Inverse NEG scheme could be used for the future upgrade.

Inverse NEG coating

Future upgrades will require of NEG coated vacuum chambers for the undulators

NEG thin film coating, is usually performed by DC magnetron sputtering from a TiZrV wire cathode that is positioned in the vacuum chamber centre.

Problem: Physical vapor deposition techniques are difficult to apply to few-mm diameter pipes that are several meter long.

Solution: Integrate the NEG coating on the production step

Inverted NEG process

Next talk by Mauro Taborelli





3. Electrodeposition of copper applied to the manufacture of seamless SRF cavities

In the framework of Superconducting radio frequency niobium coated cavities

Production of copper SRF substrates

STANDARD METHOD - Half cell spinning and welding



Half cell spinning

Welding

Cut-off Cut-off Cell

Possible defects





Weld porosities

- Presence of porosities along the junction caused by the ٠ welding process
- Welding grooves are localized in critical regions which are very important for RF performance.
- Copper sheets can contain defects.

welds

Cu electroforming - approach

The cavity is produced by copper electroforming around a sacrificial aluminium mandrel which is precoated with a copper thin film.



- Seamless cavities (No EB welding)
- Stainless steel flanges assembled during electroforming

1.3 GHz Mandrel production

How to produce such an aluminium mandrel?

Machined from bulk aluminium



Mandrel cell turning



Mechanical finishing



Tubes welding/machining





Final Mandrel

For the moment: Standard machining finishing

1.3 GHz cavity production





336 hours of plating(192 h pulse plating,144 h DC plating)

1.3 GHz cavity production



Aluminum dissolution NaOH 5M

Surface preparation: SUBU



First 1.3 GHz cavity



First 1.3 GHz cavity



- 2 mm plating at the iris
- 6.4 mm plating at the equator



• Simulation can be used for optimization of anodes and mask.

Design of secondary anodes and masking

• Solution for uniformity: Secondary anodes positioned at the iris to promote plating, mask at the equator to reduce the deposition.



Design of secondary anodes and masking

Thickness profile simulated with COMSOL



Summary



• Cavity lifecycle (production-coating-rinsing-testing-stripping) feasibility has been demonstrated with the electroformed 1.3 GHz cavity.



- The main drawback of the electroforming approach is the non-uniform thickness distribution along the cavity.
 - Solution: secondary anodes and masking to the cavity. The plating time will be reduced by half.

Future steps

- 1.3 GHz cavity production and validation of the secondary anodes support.
- Nb thin film coating using best recipe and RF testing.
- Different mandrels surface state: electroforming on polished mandrels.

Publications

- L. Lain Amador, P. Chiggiato, L. M.A Ferreira, V. Nistor, A. T. Perez Fontenla, M. Taborelli, W. Vollenberg, M-L Doche, J-Y Hihn, J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A, 36, 021601 (2018).
- L. Lain Amador, J Rolet, M-L Doche, P. Massuti-Ballester, M-P Gigandet, V. Moutarlier, M. Taborelli, L. M. A. Ferreira, P. Chiggiato, J-Y Hihn, ECS Transactions 85(13): 815-822 (2018).
- L. Lain Amador, J. Rolet, M-L Doche, P. Massuti-Ballester, M-P Gigandet, V. Moutarlier, M. Taborelli, L. M. A. Ferreira, P. Chiggiato, J-Y Hihn. Journal of The Electrochemical Society 166:10, D366-D373 (2019).
- L. Lain Amador, CERN-THESIS-2019-160, (2019) "https://cds.cern.ch/record/2693564"
- L. Lain Amador, L. M.A Ferreira, M. Taborelli, Proceedings of European COMSOL conference (2020). https://www.comsol.ch/paper/download/855161/Lucia_Lain_COMSOL_Europe.pdf
- L. Lain Amador, P. Chiggiato, L. M.A Ferreira, E. Garcia-Tabares, T. Koettig, M.S. Meyer, A. T. Perez Fontenla, K. Puthran, G. Rosaz and M. Taborelli, J. of Materials Processing Technology (submission process)

Thank you for your attention!