

## RQX simulations using STEAM Event in RQX.R1 on 3 June 2018 →Update #3 (Last?)

E. Ravaioli (TE-MPE) on behalf of the STEAM team Thanks to D. Nisbet (TE-EPC), L. Bortot, Z. Charifoulline, Björn Lindström, M. Prioli, S. Rowan, R. Schmidt, A. Verweij, D. Wollmann (TE-MPE)

14 September 2018





- Event description: <a href="https://issues.cern.ch/browse/TEMPECOMS-685">https://issues.cern.ch/browse/TEMPECOMS-685</a>
- Arjan's LMC presentation of 2018/6/20: <u>https://indico.cern.ch/event/738302/</u>
- Emmanuele's and Björn's MPP presentations 2018/9/14: <u>https://indico.cern.ch/event/752454/</u>
- Thanks to D. Nisbed (TE-EPC) for the useful summary!



Thanks to B. Lindström

in [mT]	From BPM	From ΔI	
B1, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	+0.7	+0.233	
B1, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	
B2, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	<0.1	-0.197	
B2, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	

 ΔB<sub>x</sub>~0.7 mT dipole field acting on B1 deduced from
measured Y offset of ~250 μm at BPMS.2R1.B1 (0.2 μrad),
corresponding to ~180 μm at
the center of MQXA.1R1 (Q1)





- 1. Inter-Filament Coupling Currents (IFCC) [already presented on 2018/08/31]
- 2. Inter-Strand Coupling Currents (ISCC)
- 3. Current Redistribution in the Cable (CRC)

## Inter-Filament Coupling Currents (IFCC)





in [mT]	From BPM	From ∆I	IFCC	ISCC	CRC	All
B1, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	+0.7	+0.233	+0.014			
B1, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.002			
B2, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	<0.1	-0.197	+0.022			
B2, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.003			

## Inter-Strand Coupling Currents (ISCC)





in [mT]	From BPM	From ∆I	IFCC	ISCC	CRC	All
B1, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	+0.7	+0.233	+0.014	-0.026		
B1, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.002	+0.000		
B2, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	<0.1	-0.197	+0.022	+0.048		
B2, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.003	+0.000		

## Current Redistribution in the Cable (CRC)





in [mT]	From BPM	From ∆I	IFCC	ISCC	CRC	All
B1, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	+0.7	+0.233	+0.014	-0.026	+0 / +0.967	
B1, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.002	+0.000	+0.000	
B2, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	<0.1	-0.197	+0.022	+0.048	+0 / +0.636	
B2, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.003	+0.000	+0.000	

![](_page_7_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_2.jpeg)

in [mT]	From BPM	From ∆I	IFCC	ISCC	CRC	All
B1, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	+0.7	+0.233	+0.014	-0.026	+0 / +0.967	+0.221 / +1.188
B1, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.002	+0.000	+0.000	+0.002
B2, ΔB <sub>x</sub>	<0.1	-0.197	+0.022	+0.048	+0 / +0.636	-0.127 / +0.509
B2, ΔB <sub>γ</sub>	<0.1	+0.000	+0.003	+0.000	+0.000	+0.003

![](_page_7_Figure_4.jpeg)

- The real cable redistribution currents are between two extreme cases
  - Infinite contact resistance between strands: Effect is zero
  - Zero contact resistance between strands: Effect is maximum (full redistribution)
- Dipole kicks deduced from the BPM reading lie in the range that can be explained by CRC
- The simulation includes many unknowns, including the number of quenched turns, the initial length of the quenched region, the normal-zone propagation velocity, the turn-toturn quench propagation time, and the conductor properties, ...

![](_page_8_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_2.jpeg)

- 1. Magnet current was discharged very quickly
- $\rightarrow$  Simulations reproduce power supply voltages/currents before the power abort
- $\rightarrow$  Simulations confirm that current in Q1 equals measured RQX+RTQX1 currents
- $\rightarrow$  In order to match the fast current discharge, very high normal zone propagation velocity is assumed (Hot-spot starts in eight turns, 20 cm, 50 m/s NZPV, 1 ms turn-to-turn propagation)
- 2. Quench detection system was not triggered until 20 ms after beam dump
- $\rightarrow$  Hypothesis: Quench propagating very quickly AND symmetrically
- $\rightarrow$  Bath temperature at the moment of the event was >2.15 K
- 3. <u>B1 and B2 change their positions more/less quickly than expected, respectively</u>

→ Analysis includes three transitory effects in the superconductor: inter-filament coupling currents, inter-strand coupling currents, current redistribution in the cables. They all affect the magnetic field in the bore.

 $\rightarrow$  Field induced by cable current redistribution is one order of magnitude higher than other contributions. It is high enough to explain the observed beam position changes.

 $\rightarrow$  **<u>Report on the event is ready</u>**: B. Lindström and E. Ravaioli, "Analysis of the sequence of events in the RQX.R1 circuit on 3 June 2018", EDMS 2025613, 2018.

![](_page_9_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Event description: <a href="https://issues.cern.ch/browse/TEMPECOMS-685">https://issues.cern.ch/browse/TEMPECOMS-685</a>
- Arjan's LMC presentation of 2018/6/20: <a href="https://indico.cern.ch/event/738302/">https://indico.cern.ch/event/738302/</a>
- Emmanuele's and Björn's MPP presentations 2018/9/14: https://indico.cern.ch/event/752454/
- Thanks to D. Nisbed (TE-EPC) for the useful summary!

	BEAM POSITION CHANGES	RTQX1 CURRENT CHANGES	BEAM DUMP	FAST ABORT	QUENCH DETECTION
Absolute time [s]	19:28:13.81648	19:28:13.818	19:28:13.838	19:28:13.8562	19:28:13.857
Relative time [s]	-0.04052	-0.039	-0.019	-0.0008	0
Δ Beam position	starts changing (242*88.924µs before beam dump)	$\rightarrow$	Max Δ= ~-0.25 mm @BPM (~-0.7 mT kick)		
ΔI_PC_RTQX1	~0	starts changing	Δ= -1.7 A	$\rightarrow$	Max Δ= -6.8 A
ΔI_PC_RTQX2	~0	~0	~0	~0	
ΔI_PC_RQX	~0	~0	~0	~0	
ΔU_PC_RTQX1	~0	~0	~0	~0	
$\Delta U_{PC}RTQX2$	~0	~0	~0	~0	
ΔU_PC_RQX	~0	~0	~0	~0	
ΔU_RES_Q1	~0	~0	Spike?	pos/neg swing	Trigger after 2nd point below -100 mV
ΔU_RES_Q2	~0	~0	~0	~0	
ΔU_RES_Q3	~0	~0	~0	~0	

![](_page_11_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

# Event in RQX.R1 on June 3 2018

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

STEAM

![](_page_13_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

A symmetric quench would not trigger the magnet quench detection based on voltage monitoring. Very fast propagating AND symmetric quench seem rather improbable events, especially occurring simultaneously. However, the measured bath temperature at the moment of the event was >2.15 K, which makes the event less unlikely.

![](_page_14_Figure_4.jpeg)

From Arjan's LMC presentation of 20 June: <u>https://indico.cern.ch/event/738302/</u>

## Effect of coupling currents during transients

![](_page_15_Picture_1.jpeg)

→ How significant is the influence of coupling currents on the magnetic field in the bore? Equivalent model developed to investigate this phenomenon (with LEDET and a Matlab script)

![](_page_15_Figure_3.jpeg)

# Inter-filament coupling currents (IFCC)

![](_page_16_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Model description

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Starting point: STEAM model presented on 13 June 2018
  - Electrical circuit validated
  - Electro-thermal magnet models partially validated
- In the electrical circuit, ideal current sources are now replaced by constant voltage sources (since in reality the power supplies don not correct their voltage during the relatively short transient)
- Investigate the effect of a quench in different points of the magnet, and/or starting in more than one turn at the same time

![](_page_17_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

Next slides present the results of the simulation with quench developing as follows

- Starts in 2 turns (from 0 quenched length)
- Quench propagation velocity = 150 m/s
- Turn-to-turn propagation: 5 ms
- RRR=193-226
- Magneto-resistivity included
- NIST properties
- No temperature increase in the hot-spot in the first 40 ms

![](_page_19_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Simulation of the event

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Simulated magnet currents

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_0.jpeg)

The **interaction** between the superconducting magnet and the local coupling currents is modeled with an array of **RL dissipative loops mutually coupled** with the magnet self-inductance

![](_page_25_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_6.jpeg)

STEAM

Example: HL-LHC 12 T Nb<sub>3</sub>Sn quadrupole magnet (MQXF)

- 2x 16000 IFCL loops
- 400 ISCL loops

[1] E. Ravaioli, "CLIQ", PhD thesis, 2015 [2] E. Ravaioli et al., Cryogenics 2016

#### LEDET (Lumped-Element Dynamic Electro-Thermal)

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)