

Results on Neutrinoless Double Beta Decay from GERDA Phase I

Manfred Lindner

(on behalf of the GERDA collaboration)




Outline

- **Introduction**
- **Experimental requirements**
- **GERDA design and construction**
- **Phase I run parameters**
- **Backgrounds**
- **Pulse shape discrimination**
- **Results**
- **Conclusions & Implications**


Double Beta Decay Processes

Standard Model:



→ 2 electrons + 2 neutrinos

Majorana ν -masses or other $\Delta L=2$ physics: → 2 electrons




Majorana
neutrino masses
↔ Dirac?

SM + Higgs triplet

SUSY

important connections to LHC and LFV ...
sub eV Majorana mass ↔ TeV scale physics

Double Beta Decay & Mass Parabolas




Double beta decay: $2n \rightarrow 2p + X$; $Q_x = -2$; energy $Q_{\beta\beta}$ goes \simeq into X if $m_X \ll \text{GeV}$

Standard Model: 2 weak decays $X=2e^- + 2\nu_e \rightarrow 2\nu$ beta decay


Beyond the SM: $X=2e^- \rightarrow 0\nu$ (neutrino less) beta decay

Options: a) Majorana neutrino masses *OR* b) other $\Delta L=2$ operators

Double Beta Decay Kinematics




$2\nu\beta\beta$ decay seen for diff. isotopes (Kirtsen,...)
 $T^{1/2} = O(10^{18}-10^{21} \text{ years}) \rightarrow \text{up to } 10^{11} \otimes T_{\text{Universe}}$




$T^{1/2} > O(10^{24}y)$

- $2\nu\beta\beta \rightarrow$ improvement
- search for $0\nu\beta\beta$ signal at $Q_{\beta\beta} = 2039 \text{ MeV}$
- ...backgrounds!



Experimental Challenges



- extremely rare process
→ low statistics = few counts/bin
- known (unknown?) nuclear lines
- tail of $2\nu\beta\beta$ signal
- backgrounds
- signal at known $Q_{\beta\beta}$ -value ?

To best extract a $0\nu\beta\beta$ signal at $Q_{\beta\beta}$ and to avoid any misinterpretations:

- low background index (BI)
→ careful material selection, screening, shielding, PSD (pulse shape disc.), ...
- best possible energy resolution
→ Germanium: source = detector (diode) → few keV resolution
- if there is a signal
→ different nuclei to exclude unknown nuclear physics

Sensitivity & Background (for a Majorana Mass)

$$(T_{1/2}^{0\nu})^{-1} = G_{0\nu}(Q_{\beta\beta}, Z) |M_{0\nu}|^2 m_{\beta\beta}^2$$

$$m_{\beta\beta} = \left| \sum_i U_{ei}^2 m_i \right|$$

Without background:

$$N = \log 2 \cdot \frac{N_A}{W} \cdot \varepsilon \cdot \frac{M \cdot t}{T_{1/2}^{0\nu}}$$

N_A = Avogadro's number

W = atomic weight of isotope

ε = signal detection efficiency

M = isotope mass

t = data taking time




$$m_{\beta\beta} = K_1 \sqrt{\frac{N}{\varepsilon M t}}$$

With background:


$$N' = N + N_{\text{background}}$$

$$m_{\beta\beta} = K_2 \sqrt{1/\varepsilon} \left(\frac{c \Delta E}{M t} \right)^{1/4}$$

c = cts/keV kg yr ; ΔE = ROI




Which $0\nu\beta\beta$ Isotope?



- mass \leftrightarrow isotopic abundance / enrichment \leftrightarrow cost, feasibility
- cleanliness (radiopurity) of $0\nu\beta\beta$ source and instrumentation
- high $Q_{\beta\beta}$ \leftrightarrow less nuclear backgrounds
- good energy resolution
- uncertainties in nuclear matrix elements (later...)
- ... **\rightarrow Germanium is a very good choice**

The GERDA Collaboration

<http://www.mpi-hd.mpg.de/gerda/>




MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT
FÜR KERNPHYSIK
HEIDELBERG

TECHNISCHE
UNIVERSITÄT
DRESDEN

JOINT INSTITUTE
FOR NUCLEAR RESEARCH



INR
Moscow



ITEP
Moscow



Kurchatov
Institute

JAGIELLONIAN
UNIVERSITY
IN KRAKOW

TUM

Technische Universität München

EBERHARD KARLS
UNIVERSITÄT
TÜBINGEN



Universität
Zürich

INFN
Istituto Nazionale
di Fisica Nucleare
SEZIONE DI MILANO

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik
(Werner-Heisenberg-Institut)

INFN
Istituto Nazionale
di Fisica Nucleare
SEZIONE DI MILANO BICOCCA

INFN
Istituto Nazionale
di Fisica Nucleare
Sezione di Padova

INFN
Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso




M. Lindner




CERN, Oct. 1, 2013

9

The GERDA Detector (original idea by G. Heusser, MPIK)



GERDA Location: LNGS Hall A





MPIK Material γ -Screening Facilities

- Different screening stations @MPIK underground lab (1mBq/kg)

- 4 GEMPIs @LNGS (10 μ Bq/kg)

- New: GIOVE @MPIK (50 μ Bq/kg)

→ extensive task for GERDA and other experiments (XENON, ...)



MPIK Rn Screening Facilities

Gas counting systems

@ LNGS and @ MPIK

^{222}Rn emanation technique:

- sensitivity = few atoms/probe
- large samples \leftrightarrow absolute sens.

- non-trivial; not commonly available; routine @MPIK


- established numbers:

Nylon (Borexino) $< 1\mu\text{Bq}/\text{m}^2$

Copper (Gerda): $2\mu\text{Bq}/\text{m}^2$

Stainless steel (Borexino): $5\mu\text{Bq}/\text{m}^2$

Titanium (preliminary): $(100 \pm 30) \mu\text{Bq}/\text{m}^2$




Detector Construction

- **2004: Letter of Intent**
- **R&D:** material selection and screening, tests of bare diodes in LAr
- **2008-2010: construction at LNGS (Gran Sasso, Italy)**
 - infrastructure & cryostat
 - water tank & muon veto
 - clean room, lock 6 clean benches
- **2010-2011: commissioning**
- **Nov. 2011: start of phase I data taking**





HP Germanium Detectors




Wanted:


- energy resolution
↔ Ge diode
- fast det. response
↔ small capacity
- pulse shape discr.
↔ shape
- very high radiopurity
↔ crystals
↔ "naked"



GERDA Detector Types




- 1) re-processed HdM, IGEX and GTF detectors
p-type semi-coaxial
- 2) new p-type BEGe (Broad Energy Ge) detectors
 - n⁺ conductive Li layer, separated by a groove from the boron implanted p⁺ contact
 - operated as "diode"
 - SSE/MSE (single/multi site event) discrimination




← coaxial

BEGe ↓



BEGe Detector production




3) Crystal pulling at Oak Ridge (USA)

4) Detector production at Olen (Be)



2) Reduction and zone refinement at Goettingen (Germany)

1) Isotope enrichment at ECP, Svetlana (Ru)



To minimize activation by cosmic ray:

- Transportation by truck or ship in shielded containers
- deep underground storage



← accumulated activity and its decay

GERDA Phase I Detectors

Since Nov. 2011:

6 enriched (86% of ^{76}Ge)

ANG2, ANG3, ANG4, ANG5, RG1, RG2

→ 14.63 kg

1 natural (7,83% of ^{76}Ge)

GTF112

→ 2.96 kg


Since July 2012:

4 BEGe (87% of ^{76}Ge)

GD32B-GD32D, GD35B

→ 3.00 kg


In addition: 2 coaxial and 1 BEGe
unused due to high leakage currents



Detector Parameter Details


detector	enrichment factor	mass [g]	active mass [g]	active mass fraction	d_{dl} mm
enriched coaxial detectors					
ANG 1 †)	0.859(29)	958	795(50)	0.830(52)	1.8(5)
ANG 2	0.866(25)	2833	2468(145)	0.871(51)	2.3(7)
ANG 3	0.883(26)	2391	2070(136)	0.866(57)	1.9(7)
ANG 4	0.863(13)	2372	2136(135)	0.901(57)	1.4(7)
ANG 5	0.856(13)	2746	2281(132)	0.831(48)	2.6(6)
RG 1	0.855(15)	2110	1908(125)	0.904(59)	1.5(7)
RG 2	0.855(15)	2166	1800(115)	0.831(53)	2.3(7)
RG 3 †)	0.855(15)	2087	1868(113)	0.895(54)	1.4(7)
enriched BEGe detectors					
GD32B	0.877(13)	717	638(19)	0.890(27)	1.0(2)
GD32C	0.877(13)	743	677(22)	0.911(30)	0.8(3)
GD32D	0.877(13)	723	667(19)	0.923(26)	0.7(2)
GD35B	0.877(13)	812	742(24)	0.914(29)	0.8(3)
GD35C †)	0.877(13)	635	575(20)	0.906(32)	0.8(3)
natural coaxial detectors					
GTF 32 †)	0.078(1)	2321	2251(116)	0.97(5)	0.4(8)
GTF 45 †)	0.078(1)	2312			
GTF 112	0.078(1)	2965			

Data Taking



Stable data taking during most of the time (556 d, duty cycle 88%)
→ 20 kg*y in April 2013 → **final exposure 21.6 kg * yr**

The Blinding Procedure



After Jan. 2012:
blinding of $Q_{\beta\beta} \pm 20 \text{ keV}$
↔ avoid biases

Data processing details fixed before unblinding

- quality cuts
- puls shape discrimination parameters
- analysis method → three data sets

golden = 17.9 kg*yr

silver = 1.3 kg*yr

BEGe = 2.4 kg*yr

**unblinding
In June 2013**

Backgrounds


The outer dead layer of the detectors is not active

Background sources:



- α decays on the p^+ surface
- β decay of ^{42}K on the surface or close to the detector from ^{42}Ar (10x more than expected)
- β decay of ^{60}Co inside detectors
- γ from ^{208}Tl , ^{214}Bi and from various set-up components

Generic phase I background reduction

- use cleanest possible material
- cut detector coincidences
- prevent ^{42}K ions from drifting to detectors using minishrouds



Detector Performance





Energy resolution:

coaxial at $Q_{\beta\beta}$: (4.8 ± 0.2) keV
BEGe (3.2 ± 0.2) keV


at 2614.5 keV $(4.2 - 5.8)$ keV
 $(2.6 - 4.0)$ keV

- stable energy resolution
- no energy drift between consecutive calibrations ($<0.05\%$)
- leakage currents stable (except RG2)

Good Energy Resolution and Gain Stability




FWHM of long term data at ^{42}K 1525 keV γ -peak



FWHM (resolution) of $0\nu\beta\beta$ data at $Q_{\beta\beta}$

detector	FWHM [keV]	detector	FWHM [keV]
<i>SUM-coax</i>		<i>SUM-bege</i>	
ANG 2	5.8 (3)	GD32B	2.6 (1)
ANG 3	4.5 (1)	GD32C	2.6 (1)
ANG 4	4.9 (3)	GD32D	3.7 (5)
ANG 5	4.2 (1)	GD35B	4.0 (1)
RG 1	4.5 (3)		
RG 2	4.9 (3)		
mean coax	4.8 (2)	mean BEGe	3.2 (2)

The Background Spectrum



green = blinded

$2\nu\beta\beta$ result
arXiv:1212.3210
J.Phys.G: Nucl. Part.
Phys. 40(2013) 035110


$$T_{1/2}^{2\nu} = (1.84^{+0.14}_{-0.08}) 10^{21} \text{ yr}$$

backgrd. paper
arXiv:1306.5084
to appear in EPJ C


The Background Model

Background decomposition with all simulated components; fit window 570-7500 keV

Minimum model: minimum set of background components




Larger energy range...




→ fits data very well

→ background is FLAT in ROI

For BEGEs...



Larger energy range for BEGE's



Derived Background Composition

source	location	units	<i>GOLD-coax</i>		<i>GOLD-nat</i>
			minimum	maximum	minimum
^{40}K ^{c)}	det. assembly	$\mu\text{Bq/det.}$	152[136,174]	151[136,174]	218[188,259]
^{42}K ^{c)}	LAr	$\mu\text{Bq/kg}$	106[103,111]	91[72,99]	98.3[92,108]
^{42}K ^{c)}	p^+ surface	μBq		11.6[3.1,18,3]	
^{42}K ^{c)}	n^+ surface	μBq		4.1[1,2,8.5]	
^{60}Co ^{c)}	det. assembly	$\mu\text{Bq/det.}$	4.9[3.1,7.3]	3.2[1.6,5.6]	2.6[0,6.0]
^{60}Co ^{c)}	germanium	μBq	>0.4 †)	>0.2 †)	6[3.0,8.4]
^{214}Bi ^{c)}	det. assembly	$\mu\text{Bq/det.}$	35[31,39]	15[3.7,21.1]	34.1[27.3,42.1]
^{214}Bi ^{c)}	LAr close to p^+	$\mu\text{Bq/kg}$		<299.5	
^{214}Bi ^{m)}	radon shroud	mBq		<49.9	
^{214}Bi ^{c)}	p^+ surface	μBq	2.9[2.3,3.9] †)	3.0[2.1,4.0] †)	1.6[1.2,2.1] †)
^{228}Th ^{c)}	det. assembly	$\mu\text{Bq/det.}$	15.1[12.7,18.3]	5.5[1.8,8.8]	15.7[10.0,25.0]
^{228}Ac ^{c)}	det. assembly	$\mu\text{Bq/det.}$	17.8[10.0,26.8]	<15.7	25.9[16.7,36.7]
^{228}Th ^{m)}	radon shroud	mBq		<10.1	
^{228}Ac ^{m)}	radon shroud	mBq		91.5[27,97]	
^{228}Th ^{f)}	heat exchanger	Bq		<4.1	

good agreement between model and activities of ^{40}K , ^{42}K , ^{60}Co

the position of some components can not be resolved (^{214}Bi , ^{228}Th , ...)

More on Backgrounds...

Intensity of gamma peak outside background analysis energy window

Gold Coax:

Min model 294 ± 27


Max model 258 ± 27

Data 262 ± 48

GTF112:

Min model 70 ± 11


Data 77 ± 19



- Very good agreement between peak intensities vs. background model
- further cross checks... (BiPo coincidences, PSA)


Background Composition: Minimum Model

minimum set of background components →



Background Composition: Maximum Model




total set of known background components leading to distinguishable spectra →



Pulse Shape Discrimination

- **Single Site Events (SSE)**
- **Multi Site Events (MSE)**

- $0\nu\beta\beta$ -decays \rightarrow localized energy deposition \rightarrow SSE
- Compton scattering evt. \rightarrow background like MSE
- surface events \rightarrow SSE @ surface
- SSE by γ 's look like events (cannot be rejected)
- β particles enter via n^+ surface \rightarrow slow pulses
- α 's @ p^+ contact \rightarrow comparatively high signal





Pulse Shape Discrimination: Coaxial

3 independent PSD methods:

- likelihood classification
- PSD selection based on pulse asymmetry
- **neural network analysis (ANN)**
→ training with calibration data



SSE library: DEP peak of ^{208}Tl → gamma at 1592 ± 1 keV

MSE library: FAP (Full Absorption Peak) of ^{212}Bi at 1620 keV




Neural Network Training with Calibration Data

- DEP events in the interval $1592 \text{ keV} \pm 1FWHM$ serve as proxy for SSE
- Full energy line of ^{212}Bi in the equivalent interval around 1620 keV are dominantly MSE, taken as background events




Pulse Shape Discrimination: BEGe A/E Cuts



→ Cutting in A/E → rejects background like MSEs

→ $\epsilon_{\text{PSD}} = 0.92 \pm 0.02$ → ca. 85% of background events at $Q_{\beta\beta}$ rejected

Application of PSD to Phase I Data




- all events removed by ANN are removed by at least one other method
- events discarded by ANN are in 90% of the cases discarded by all 3 methods
- in a larger energy window about 3% are only rejected by ANN

⇒ About 45% of events are rejected

Efficiency: $\epsilon_{0\nu\beta\beta} = 0.90^{+0.05}_{-0.09}$


The Region of Interest



expected bg from
interpolation:

5.1 events w/o PSD
2.5 events with PSD

The Region of Interest




expected bg from
interpolation:

5.1 events w/o PSD
2.5 events with PSD

observed

→ 7 events w/o PSD
→ 3 events with PSD

Details of the unblinded Spectrum




7 events in $Q_{\beta\beta} \pm 5$ keV
4 events rejected by PSD
→ 3 events in $Q_{\beta\beta} \pm 5$ keV after PSD
→ 0 events in $Q_{\beta\beta} \pm 1 \sigma$

data set	detector	energy [keV]	date	PSD passed
<i>golden</i>	ANG 5	2041.8	18-Nov-2011 22:52	no
<i>silver</i>	ANG 5	2036.9	23-Jun-2012 23:02	yes
<i>golden</i>	RG 2	2041.3	16-Dec-2012 00:09	yes
<i>BEGe</i>	GD32B	2036.6	28-Dec-2012 09:50	no
<i>golden</i>	RG 1	2035.5	29-Jan-2013 03:35	yes
<i>golden</i>	ANG 3	2037.4	02-Mar-2013 08:08	no
<i>golden</i>	RG 1	2041.7	27-Apr-2013 22:21	no

data set	\mathcal{E} [kg-yr]	$\langle \epsilon \rangle$	bkg	BI [†]	cts
without PSD					
<i>golden</i>	17.9	0.688 ± 0.031	76	$18.4^{+2.2}_{-2.1}$	5
<i>silver</i>	1.3	0.688 ± 0.031	19	63^{+16}_{-14}	1
<i>BEGe</i>	2.4	0.720 ± 0.018	23	42^{+10}_{-8}	1
with PSD					
<i>golden</i>	17.9	$0.619^{+0.044}_{-0.070}$	45	$10.9^{+1.7}_{-1.6}$	2
<i>silver</i>	1.3	$0.619^{+0.044}_{-0.070}$	9	30^{+11}_{-9}	1
<i>BEGe</i>	2.4	0.663 ± 0.022	3	$0.5^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$	0

[†]) in units of 10^{-3} cts/(keV·kg·yr).

Profile Likelihood Fit to PSD Spectrum




profile likelihood (PL) fit:

signal = a*flat background + b*line

→ best fit: $N^{0\nu} = 0$; upper limit: $N^{0\nu} < 3.5$ (90%CL)

→ half life limit $T_{1/2}(0\nu\beta\beta) > 2.1 * 10^{25}$ yr (90% C.L.)

Comparison with the KK Claim (2004)



claim:


$$T_{1/2}(0\nu\beta\beta) = 1.19 * 10^{25} \text{ yr}$$

Phys. Lett. B 586 (2004) 198

Stronger 2006 claim: 100% PSD efficiency assumed
 → incorrect → realistic efficiency = no improvement

GERDA:

- much lower BI
- no unknown nuclear lines
- remaining flat background in ROI



GERDA upper limit from PL fit:

< 3.5 events (90%CL)


for the KK claim GERDA is expected to see (2σ):

5.9 ± 1.4 signal counts

2.0 ± 0.3 background counts

→ probability for a fluctuation 1%

Combination of Ge Results




Combination of
 - GERDA phase I
 - HdM
 - IGEX

→ PL fit to combined data
 → backgrounds = free parameters
 → Best fit for $N^{0\nu} = 0$

→ Limit:
 $T_{1/2}(0\nu\beta\beta) > 3.0 \times 10^{25} \text{ yr (90\% CL)}$

→ claim strongly disfavoured
 Bayes factor 2×10^{-4}

Comparison with Xenon Results



Assumptions:

- exchange of Majorana neutrinos
- NME ratios better known

- NME ratio has spread !
- at best one is right
- model dependence

Bayes factors:

EXO: 0.23

KamLAND-Zen: 0.40

All with GERDA: 0.0022

→ claim even more disfavoured



NME's: Relating Lifetimes & Neutrino Masses

phase space nuclear matrix elements effective Majorana neutrino mass

rate of $0\nu\beta\beta$ $1/\tau = G(Q,Z) |M_{\text{nucl}}|^2 \langle m_{ee} \rangle^2$

nuclear matrix elements:

→ virtual excitations of intermediate states



in recent years:


good progress in TH errors

- reduced uncertainties
- which NME is correct?
- what is a 1σ theory error?

The $0\nu\beta\beta$ -decay NMEs (Status:2013)

Nobody is perfect:

Simkovic
Erice 2013



$g_A=1.25(7)$, CCm or UCOM s.r.c., $r_0=1.20$ fm

Differences:

- i) mean field;
- ii) residual int.;
- iii) size of the m.s.
- iv) many-body appr.


LSSM (small m.s., negative parity states)

PHFB (GT force neglected)

IBM (Hamiltonian truncated)

(R)QRPA (g.s. correlations not accurate enough)

m_{ee} : The Effective Neutrino Mass



Beta particle (electron) \times \propto $\propto |\langle m_{ee} \rangle| = |\sum m_i U_{ei}^2| \leq 0.35 \text{ eV ?}$

Majorana $\nu \rightarrow 0\nu 2\beta$ decay

Heidelberg-Moscow experiment

$$m_{ee} = |m_{ee}^{(1)}| + |m_{ee}^{(2)}| \cdot e^{i\Phi_2} + |m_{ee}^{(3)}| \cdot e^{i\Phi_3}$$


$$|m_{ee}^{(1)}| = |U_{e1}|^2 m_1$$


$$|m_{ee}^{(2)}| = |U_{e2}|^2 \sqrt{m_1^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2}$$

$$|m_{ee}^{(3)}| = |U_{e3}|^2 \sqrt{m_1^2 + \Delta m_{31}^2}$$

solar $\Rightarrow |U_{e1}|^2, |U_{e2}|^2, \Delta m_{21}^2$
 atmosph. $\Rightarrow |\Delta m_{31}^2|$
 CHOOZ $\Rightarrow |U_{e3}|^2 < 0.05$

\rightarrow free parameters: $m_1, \text{sign}(\Delta m_{31}^2), \text{CP-phases } \Phi_2, \Phi_3$





Comments:


- cosmology: further improvements \leftrightarrow systematical errors
- NMEs \rightarrow unavoidable **theory** error in m_{ee}
- assumptions: no *other* $\Delta L=2$ physics, no sterile neutrinos, ...

Interferences in $0\nu\beta\beta$ Decays

Usually

$$\left(T_{1/2}^{0\nu}\right)^{-1} = \left(\frac{|m_{0\nu\beta\beta}|}{m_e}\right)^2 |\mathcal{M}^{0\nu}|^2 G^{0\nu}.$$

with interferences



$$\begin{aligned} \left(T_{1/2}^{0\nu}\right)^{-1} &= |m_{0\nu\beta\beta}\mathcal{M}^{0\nu} + \epsilon m_e \mathcal{M}^\epsilon|^2 \frac{G^{\text{int}}}{m_e^2} \\ &= |(m_{0\nu\beta\beta} + \epsilon m_e \mathcal{M}^\epsilon (\mathcal{M}^{0\nu})^{-1}) \mathcal{M}^{0\nu}|^2 \frac{G^{\text{int}}}{m_e^2} \\ &= |m_{0\nu\beta\beta}^{\text{int}}|^2 |\mathcal{M}^{0\nu}|^2 \frac{G^{\text{int}}}{m_e^2}, \end{aligned}$$

G^{int}



= overall phase space factor

$\epsilon m_e \mathcal{M}^\epsilon$

\leftrightarrow determined by parameters of new physics

$$m_{0\nu\beta\beta}^{\text{int}} \equiv m_{0\nu\beta\beta} + \epsilon m_e \mathcal{M}^\epsilon (\mathcal{M}^{0\nu})^{-1} \equiv m_{0\nu\beta\beta} + m_\epsilon.$$

Dürr, ML, Neuenfeld




- growing m_ϵ**
fixed $0\nu\beta\beta \rightarrow$ shifts
- masses
 - mixings
 - CP phases
 - interferences


GERDA Outlook

Transition to phase II:

- ✓ drainage, inspection & refilling of WT
- Installation of more new BEGe detectors
 - ~factor 2 in ^{76}Ge mass
- Installation of light instrumentation
 - fibers and PMTs = anti-Compton veto
 - further reduction of background index
- **Continue data taking with more mass, less BI, longer time, ...**



→ ?



Summary



- GERDA has finished phase I data taking with unprecedented BI in ROI
- The background in the GERDA experiment can be explained well & and is flat around ROI!
- 3 independent pulse shape discrimination techniques efficiently reduces background
- Half life limit for $0\nu\beta\beta$ -decay of ^{76}Ge :
 $2.1 \cdot 10^{25}$ yr (90% C.L.)
- Combined with HdM and IGEX:
 $3.0 \cdot 10^{25}$ yr (90% C.L.)
→ HdM claim strongly disfavored!
- Transition to phase II is on-going

